**Management Group Planning Meeting: Q2 2015 (21-22 April)**

Management Group: Maria, Tim, Tim, Mario and Thais

Secretariat: Mike, Mirey and Reem

Summary of decisions/actions:

**ToC session decisions/actions:**

1. Agree to re-design the ToC and develop revised versions of the diagram as presented (2 options above + original) and decide which is the best illustration in consultation with donors and stakeholders before including in the final document
2. Agree that KM is not an outcome and thus will be covered in the narrative where all ideas already expressed in the document will not be lost but rather reinforced in the narrative, and at a later stage it will be possible to drive KM and allocate resources in the results framework and will be captured as part of a “means of achievement” category in the illustration of the ToC
3. The narrative will include a full explanation of the cause/effect relationship and sequencing of the ToC
4. Will provide first cut comments tonight on the narrative with further comments by Thursday 23 April mid-day CET
5. The revised version of the strategy will be completed by next week, with revisions to sections needing to be revised and cosmetic changes otherwise
6. Feedback on lessons learned, comparative advantage, preliminary result framework and Programme principles are due by Monday 27 April at 9am CET
7. Secretariat, KM, global support, inter-agency support teams are part of the “means of achievement”

**Delivery session decisions/actions:**

1. Agree to keep the idea of lead agency as lead facilitator (as defined in Viet Nam ) and should be based on who has the best relationship in a given context
2. Agree that all three agencies should be involved in the scoping mission as full members of the scoping team for all to have a good understanding of the country context and mission irrespective of role/budgetary responsibility in the final project plan
3. Agree that UNEP has a more technical resource role than an implementing role to play and will be involved in the implementation phase with the exception of: cash transfer, procurement, HR management and recruitment, and auditing
4. Agree that the lead expert can be from an agency other than that of the lead and who may sit in the country office and who has the best relationship/ or understanding of the context
5. Review the table on page 44 of draft strategic framework re comparative advantage of agencies and provide inputs to try and better articulate these advantages in the context of country level engagement/implementation by Thursday 23 April mid-day CET
6. Based on discussion Mirey to revise text on lead agency, expert and country support team
7. Feedback on the operations manual to be sent by Thursday 23 April
8. Mirey to provide guidance on next steps beyond this
9. Agree that through the process of identifying, designing and implementing a programme, there will be space for all agencies
10. Agree to start this week in parallel to finalizing the strategy an internal discussion in each agency on how each can contribute to each aspect of the model to ensure it is robust (learning from our past experiences)
11. Agree to explore what staff contingent will be required to deliver the Programme and start that conversation (ideas, staff required and figures)
12. Agree that our primary entry points for implementation will be FAO/UNDP, and the Secretariat will develop an internal agreement that spells out roles/responsibilities across the entire project cycle but the level of detail will be in line with what has been determined for those issues already covered in the Viet Nam experience
13. The internal agreement will be the second layer of the operational manual and will be based on the section of the ops manual that outlines steps on cash transfer, etc. as discussed and agreed in the Viet Nam experience (where the dual-HACT agreement is the minimum basis for example)
14. Agree that these changes are linked closely with lessons learned, Mike to build on the lessons learned imbedded in the ops manual and ensure coherence with those mentioned at the start of the doc
15. Recognize that UNDP has a comparative advantage with in country presence and country context, leading the dialogue with countries and in turn can leverage this during the implementation of projects, plugging in to these systems UN-REDD technical expertise in the most effective and transparent way
16. UNDP and UNEP agree to develop an internal agreement that satisfies any concerns with the shared work under O1 & O3

**Partnerships session decisions/actions:**

1. Agree to make text more explicit about the GCF alignment and connection to payments
2. Agree to explore and consolidate contacts with the GCF secretariat as soon as possible
3. Agree that the comments received from World Bank on the current draft of the strategy should be included in the overall strategy document (UNDP – harmonizing will need to come from UN-REDD side, as the FCPF scope is not focusing on harmonization of work)
4. There is a need to clearly define a certain threshold/filters for UN-REDD and what those requirements/criteria are for collaboration with the CF
5. The Programme will support countries in meeting the Carbon Fund requirements where the results will be recognized under the UNFCCC (as placeholder)
6. Follow-up discussion with Norway needed on how the Programme responded to the comments provided, was that what they envisaged? (should be done with Andreas)

**Governance session decisions/actions:**

1. Agreed on the draft agenda revisions and Thais to share post meeting
2. MG to identify additional (NEW) functions of the PB that are currently missing
3. Agree that there will be a PB, EB and CB with the EB and CB leading to a NSC, with the EB and CB reporting annually to the PB
4. EB will be responsible for funding allocations on non-earmarked funds based on eligibility of criteria, and providing updates to PB, composed
5. CB will be responsible for funding allocations on earmarked funds, has a quality assurance role, composed of donor, country and UNREDD
6. NSC will deal with non-cost extension, evaluation, annual reports
7. PB provides strategic guidance and overall oversight for results with the EB and CB allocating funds and through the EB the NSC determines work-plans, with the EB and CB reporting back to the PB
8. The PB will approve the result-based monitoring framework, annual consolidated report of the EB and CB prepared by the MPTF-O, composed of countries, UN, IP/CSOs
9. Sec responsible for providing data for the result framework, to provide the consolidated annual report, provide platforms for KM exchanges or connect to other initiatives, logistics to run PB and CB meetings
10. Agree that for now the role of the secretariat is to create the architecture for KM, facilitates inter-agency communication, prepares reports and compiles information to support implementation, support preparation of governance meetings, lead on result-based reporting
11. The secretariat to draft a TOR for the secretariat accompanied by staffing profiles and budget; clarifying communication and KM role in particular, is based on the needs of the new strategy as well as the lessons learned from past experience
12. Evaluate the role and responsibility of the secretariat vis-à-vis similar programmes and how they operate

*Items listed below as per the circulated agenda, including a synthesis of the main discussion points where there was either convergence or disagreement, followed by any decision/or action to be taken:*

**2a) ToC**

The session was aimed at finalizing the ToC and results framework, primarily to address feedback arising from the consultations, as well as improving description of outcome 3 (PAMs/implementation)

Expected MG decision/actions:

1. Approval of revised ToC section, as required
2. Any guidance/feedback on emerging RBM framework

Synthesis of main discussion points:

* Overall all the elements are there but they don’t translate into an impactful vision. The ToC must tell a convincing story of how the objective for change will be made. The ToC tells the story of change, the narrative explains the links and the result framework illustrates how results will be captured and measured against the ToC. The narrative needs to be refined by moving away from our labels and adapted to reality of what and how, despite that there is convergence between the current narrative and the ToC they just need to be fine-tuned. In terms of the comparative advantage issue, it was clear that this related to the Programme vis-à-vis the FCPF specifically and as such the narrative should stress this.
* Based on comments received on the draft strategic framework, the ToC did not resonate with some external and internal audiences, in particular taking into consideration the diverging views of Spain (create the enabling environment) and Norway (investments on how the policies and measures will be implemented) it is challenging to strike a balance through the ToC, which at this stage cannot be fundamentally changed as the logical model from which the strategy is built on.
* In terms of the ensuing discussion concerns were raised about: the outcomes being too contrived and as such did not resonate well with countries, in large part because the design was one that fit the Programme needs rather than taking a country perspective approach, and in particular with respect to KM where when reading this from the countries perspective the logic is not clear on how KM as an outcome is an essential component to reach the change proposed; that KM is not an outcome but rather a cross-cutting theme, and what KM represented needed to be determined further as some believe it refers to technical work (what you want to produce and define the means to achieving that), or to ensure institutional memory, etc. It was clear that KM now represented something even more critical for the Programme now than in the past, given the large volume of knowledge and growing body of work being developed within and without the Programme
* In addition other concerns were raised on the overlaps in the ToC and how it does not necessarily reflect the progression/sequencing of steps in a clear way, and there is a need to reflect more on what the readiness outcomes entail and what comes after that; the outcomes needing to be refined to ensure that they connect logically to the impacts; difficulty in assigning budget lines to areas of work that are not outcomes per se; that for some countries the elements are starting to emerge for the creation of the enabling environment, and the main area of support needed is to help catalyze domestic investment and this is the new departure for future Programme support.
* Approaches to dealing with some of these issues among others centered around the narrative of the ToC and how some aspects could be further flushed out there rather than in the simplified illustration of the ToC; and that creating the links in the narrative is critical to respond adequately to comments received (i.e. for the multiple benefits work area, the idea that there are social and environmental benefits beyond that of carbon speaks to policy makers who are compelled when seeing the linkages clearly detailed). The narrative needs to be refined by moving away from our labels and adapt it to the reality of what and how needs to be explained. In addition, in terms of length it was suggested that the text could be reduced by dropping the indicative activities, as long as there was enough clarity in each of the outputs and outcomes.
* Regarding the impacts, it was noted that the mention of the UNFCCC was merely to ensure that we intend to support mitigation actions taken by countries that are recognized by the Convention as opposed to other mechanisms, however, this was seen to be limiting for countries as their efforts go beyond the requirement of the Convention. The following was suggested as text for this impact: “contributions to mitigation will be visible and measurable.” Further, as the commitment of countries to report to the convention goes beyond REDD+ and represents a mindset change which is not clear from the current impact statement. It was suggested that one way to deal with this issue would be to include it in the principles section and take it out of the ToC.
* In terms of the concerns about the understanding of the simplified ToC illustration, some believed that it had to do with how the visual is laid out, in particular because there are overlaps in the outcomes where for instance design is dynamic and continues to be refined, there will also always be overlaps because the process is dynamic for countries and maybe the illustration needs to address that. As such it was suggest that there could be a split between the “enabling environments” – readiness and “beyond”— implementation. The following was proposed for further consideration:

Enabling environment/readiness Beyond readiness/implementation

RBPs

Outcome 1

Outcome 3

SIS & MRV

SIS

Outcome 2

Cross-cutting themes: KM, governance, gender equality, tenure…

NS/APs and respect safeguards

Respect safeguards

Implement initial PAMs

SIS

Respect safeguards

SIS

Respect safeguards

First step FREL/FRL

Respect safeguards

Designed NFMS

Respect safeguards

“Readiness”

Monitoring & reporting

Respect safeguards

“Beyond

Readiness”

* The role of the secretariat and HR were highlighted as omissions and there is a need to be more explicit given their absence has raised suspicions, which had been raised by Spain and others.

**2b) Programme delivery**

The objective here is to iron out and approve any remaining issues related to the inter-agency arrangements - section 5.2 of the final draft. This is key to Norway and also related to the draft annotated operations note currently being prepared with interagency inputs. MG discussion is anticipated to include:

1. Country lead advisors:
2. Thematic anchors
3. MG/SG
4. Operations note
5. Any other change details (for communication to Norway)?

Expected MG decision/actions:

1. Approval of revised section 5.2
2. Feedback on draft operations note

Synthesis of main discussion points:

* Supported by a concept note: “UN-REDD operations manual…, “ the discussion centered on several key questions of which explored the options for improving delivery for this type of Programme, and what are the roles, authority and accountability for the various bodies/functions (lead expert, lead agency, country support teams, UNRC, SG, MG, NSC and Secretariat). Answering these questions helps countries work out how they will deal with key decisions they will need to take on: assessment and determination of implementation, adaptive management, auditing, procurement, HR management and recruitment, cash transfer, inception phase, annual work-planning and budgeting, and coordination and policy dialogue.
* Comments were made about several key issues faced in the past, for example with fragmentation in the implementation of NPs, issues relating to procurement, recruitment, oversight, inception phases and the need for different elements of the NPs to be anchored in different units across the Programme.
* From the outset it was noted that this topic should be approached with caution not to narrowly define how we operate in countries, because each is different this will require flexibility, and though there are challenges, it may not be due to the structure but that we may not have necessarily implemented things well, and as such the issues with implementation are not necessarily as a result of the nature of the arrangements. Concern was also raised about the framing of the concept note and that we should be aware of any issues that may come up vis-vis the legal departments of each agency; and the need to address the process that has already been established with the EOIs and the need to manage those going forward. Lastly, the promise made at PB13 to have one interface between us and the countries needs to be kept in mind.
* The document will need to map out the steps required in the full programme cycle. Suggested as a starting point for better coordination was the co-planning of a joint scoping mission to each country to better understand where they are in their process, their requests, etc. (looking at quick data, vision, pathway, etc.) and that from this common starting point a plan can be devised to support countries based on the needs identified. This also relates to the question on scope of NPs and the need to be proactive in tailoring these programmes (as there is no one size fits all) to avoid past lessons learned where the scale and scope did not match that of what a country was capable of doing or their willingness to do. These points also need to be considered when planning future targeted support.
* In terms of the roles and responsibilities, through the experience in Viet Nam it had become clearer that the role of the lead advisor was redundant if there is one lead agency, and what are the new changes being proposed given there was already a lead agency identified in country. The past trust issues, overall picture was not clear/transparent to all, cumbersome paper work, ad hoc engagements, etc., contributed to the lack of coherence and coordination and blurred the agreement to have one lead agency in the first place. A proposal was made to identify the areas of work that are doable for each agency and then agree on who does what in the programme cycle [i.e. scoping/screening/identification, selection of countries, coordination, policy dialogue, inception phase, cash transfer, procurement, HR management and recruitment, adaptive management, assessment and determination of implementation arrangements, annual work-planning and budgeting, quality assurance and technical advice (QATS)]
* Regarding the involvement and presence of all three agencies at the country level, it was determined that this arrangement was not feasible if there was to a real “revolution” and response to concerns raised by countries, and there is a need to further explore the comparative advantage of each agency overall as well as on a case-by-case basis, as the way we are working is not having the desired impact and we need to change that. There was a long discussion about what is UNEP’s role in the partnership at the country level and whether or not this role may be better suited as a per UNEP’s mandate. There was some concern about being left out of the process if there was no country level presence per se, however the agencies reassured that despite this, UNEP does have a valued role to play and that the work would be development and followed through jointly right from the start, and that what was critical was that the Programme deliver on the so-called “revolution” and try to be address issues of inefficiency, redundancy, overlap, etc., by honing in on the comparative advantages that each brings to this partnership. More reassurances were needed, and as such suggestions were made to come up with internal mechanisms/or agreements that mutually supports the partnership and reinforces each other.
* In terms of on the ground implementation UNDP delivers outcome 1 & 3 and FAO outcome 2, with technical agreements with UNEP under outcome 1 and 3, with links between 1& 3 and 2 to ensure consistencies are in place. However, it will be within the mandate of the agencies leading the work area to coordinate inputs and participation of others as needed and to lead the dialogue with governments on behalf of others which also depends on who has the best relationship. Further, it’s also about what are the appropriate channels of communication/protocol and not just about coordination.
* Regarding the role of the lead advisor, this person could be from a different agency than that of the lead agency.
* Concerns were raised about and the need to address: the willingness of the country offices to cooperate with the Programme; ensuring that the technical quality of work is not compromised and capacity is harnessed and remains to be relevant for each agency; what is each agency willing to do to reach the level of ambition they set out for the Programme; clear that the typology of each agency staff member is unique and avoid trying to mirror them from agency to agency; UNEP remaining part of the leadership in technical work; linking changes proposed with lessons learned; and the explicit mention of the lead agencies as UNDP and FAO for readiness and implementation in the ToC as no mention of UNEP may be misperceived to the team that UNEP does not have an important role to play in these activities.
* A suggestion was made to bring together the teams and ask them to identify how the pieces best fit together.
* The country support team is responsible for the technical leadership and will be determined by how this team is put together.
* The country office has a better understanding of the country context and as such should inform how we approach a given programme.

**2c) Partnerships**

This is the second key issue for Norway, and given the lack of inputs to date, the objective will be to resolve a number of key issues concerning the scope and level of ambition envisaged in future collaboration between the UNRP and other initiatives:

Expected MG decision/actions:

1. Agreed approach to be incorporated into revised section 5.3

Synthesis of main discussion points:

* The discussion as per the other agenda items centered on some key questions of which explored how countries can use all the mechanisms available in a useful way and how do we ensure positive coordination at the country level that is constructive, efficient and effective, specifically with respect to the FCPF and GCF for the time being. That being said, experience has shown that clearly defined boundaries and criteria for engagement are critical.
* The Programme has an opportunity to play a coordination role and needs partnerships to do this. Aligning well with our strategic approach, would be to build on our partnership with the FCPF and establish one with the GCF being explicit about our understanding of the large role the GCF will play in REDD+ and how we will bring our comparative advantage to the Fund. That comparative advantage relates to the vast forestry expertise and that we can get countries ready to eventually receive directly RBPs challenged through the GCF and go a step further to say that we can provide technical advice/support to the GCF in conceptualizing how we operate the pipeline of countries to RBPs. However, at the same time despite the “Performance measurement framework for REDD+ based payments” having been developed which specifies that payments will be made for RBAs recognized under the Convention, we need to take into consideration the timeline and that experience with funds under the Convention is quite a cumbersome process. Therefore, it may not be that simple especially given that the Parties that sit on the board of the Fund may not be so open to receiving support from one entity. As such there are some important steps that need to be taken in aligning the specificities of REDD+ to the fund (linking results to payments), opening a dialogue with the GCF secretariat, and how will markets will play a role under the Convention is a key question to be explored given that the Convention makes mention that “extra provisions may be needed.”
* UNDP will not proceed with REDD+ projects without clearance from TC1 under the GCF. However, the willingness of the GCF secretariat to fund implementation projects (PAMs) is not yet clear. Further, the GCF secretariat is still uncertain about its authority to approve funding requests, however there is no official indication of the amount of funds under their prevue, but estimates are around 25-50million.
* However, we are not in a position to engage as the Programme and must go through (if at all possible) the strict engagement protocols of the UNDP who has been accredited (UNEP and FAO are in the accreditation pipeline) to the GCF. UNDP has concerns regarding accountability and the risks associated with the Programme entering through them (need to define what that means in terms of accountability as well as dealing with the internal UN-REDD issue where the three agencies have different levels of accountability).
* For the World Bank, we need to be clear on when demands for collaboration are compatible and when they are not (Norway can’t expect to request that we show our niche, then expect us to resolve fund issues they have in the FCPF that are not being used). There is also an internal issue with the CF over ownership of emission reductions and countries have to make an explicit request to the trustee to have ownership over the emission reductions which at a later stage could help but is yet to be clarified and determined. In terms of comparative advantage, the Programme brings in the national scope and alignment with the UNFCCC to this work, compared with that of the FCPF. We coordinate the understanding that this work is being put in the broader context (i.e. taking the CF projects into the national and UNFCCC context). However, there are some challenges to collaboration with the CF where countries are being advised to disregard all the steps the Programme has devised (i.e. NS/APs, etc.) and how do we deal with that. At the same time, we need to keep in mind that countries may lose interest in REDD+ if we disregard the jurisdictional projects that may show the possibility of progress and potential success of REDD+ on a larger scale. Overall, we should collaborate and work where the results will be recognized under the Convention or in places where countries have decided to use different reference levels of those used under the CF.
* The strategy should be formulated in a way that enables the Programme to refuse requests from countries that are asking for support that is not in consistency with the Warsaw Framework and the overall framework of UNFCCCC
* Examples might be needed to underline of how UN-REDD is successfully working with the Carbon Fund (i.e., Cote d’Ivoire, Uganda); difference of UN-REDD and the use of the carbon fund needs to be made clear

**3) Governance**

The objective of this session will be to consider and address any issues raised in the initial governance consultations (15 March- 15 April) in order to prepare for the expert meeting on 24 April, to agree the approach to handling at PB14, and to agree on the process to prepare the new MoU.

Expected MG decision/actions:

1. Preparation for Governance expert meeting and handling at PB14
2. Agreement of roadmap for MoU

Synthesis of main discussion points:

* The discussion was grounded in the proposed roadmap and matrix of comments received on the governance arrangements and roadmap. With these in mind, it was determined that a collective vision would be presented to the participants of the expert workshop on governance on 24 April, with the circulation of the final draft of the agenda (key questions to resolve will be discussed in break-out groups), a presentation by Mario on the role of the secretariat in the future, including a presentation on the Programme response to the evaluation, focusing on what has already been/is currently addressed, what is not yet resolved, key questions, difference between readiness and implementation (which will also directly play into the discussion whether there is a need for one or two EBs in the future), proposed structure of PB/EB/etc. and their governance functions (MG to identify additional (NEW) functions of the PB that are currently missing); potential role of the independent advisory group (or alternatives).
* To identify the instruments required, we need to ask what are the decision making needs for readiness and implementation?
* Concerns were raised around comments received from Norway and their desire to want to earmark funds only, as this would not be well received by other donors, PB members, and IPs/CSOs, and should be discussed between donors; the desire to have meetings in country—the distinction between EB and PB was precisely aimed at allowing space for UN-REDD have a channel for dialogue with government and should avoid having these meetings take place in country where there is a protocol issue having the UNRC as an observer in these meetings and which is to be avoided after Viet Nam and that despite Norway wanted to pursue this option they may not be aware that the level of engagement is not at the level of EG meetings but at country office. Further, the Country Director represents the UN at the country level and with the set-up of country boards this will mean that the UN-REDD team would be excluded. One way to address this issue is to come up with what the experience in Viet Nam was what worked and what didn’t. There are limitations within the UN that Norway may not have a good understanding of given their request to have country boards set-up in each country for earmarked funds. There is an issue with the proposal Norway has made, because it mixes up the funds, technical, implementation and country-driven roles. Furthermore, this proposal conflicts with country-driven principles and the sovereignty of countries. The other issue is that there is not one singular perspective on what Norway wants. Norway is politically naïve here and we should be wary of taking on their requests without careful consideration of all angles. Norway wants us a technical arm, but don’t see the value of this Programme at the level of governance; seeing us as implementers only. As such we need to demonstrate the value we add in the governance of the Programme.
* Concerns were also raised about building in a level of complexity with the addition of the country board alongside the executive board, and sought to clarify this from Norway. Concern was also raised over having an EB that does not take decisions on funds, but has a role to approve reports, etc. In addition, the issue of country selection and earmarked funds being determined outside the governance structure raises an issue of transparency, which happens all the time anyway, but it’s up to the donor to make the announcement of earmarking funds and is not up to the Programme to do this. Concerns were further raised about the perception other countries may have if we are earmarking funds and we need to consider how we manage these relationships moving forward.
* Given the concerns raised over optics of the PAMs projects, there will in turn be pressure on the Programme to mobilize funds for the other countries’ expectations, and will need to further discuss and negotiate with Norway about the risk of accepting earmarked funds and developing a structure to deploy these funds, where we are also left with 60 some odd countries that we need to engage with in a meaningful way. Therefore, the strategy should be explicit about it and how we plan to deal with this and dealt with in a negotiated agreement between donor, country and UN-REDD.
* There was a suggestion to merge readiness and implementation for non-ear marked funds.
* The table below is aimed at identifying the differences and complementarity of each, while also ensuring that countries are in the driving seat

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **National Steering Committees** | **Executive Board** |
| National representation | High-level representation (i.e. Ministerial level) |
| UN country office representation | UN-REDD representation |
| Meets frequently | Meets bi-annually or annually |
| Representation is decided at the national level | Meets at a global venue |
| Provide recommendations to EB | Donor representation |
|  | Setting min. requirements for scoping of individual NPs |
|  | Approve budgets and annual work plans |

* To ensure the UN-REDD standards are applied in the case of ear-marked funds, we need to identify and apply some criteria based on experience that needs to be taken into consideration despite representation in the country boards (i.e. safeguards, consultation with IP/CSOs, etc.)
* If we are ready to take on accountability, we need to be involved to ensure that standards are met
* There is a need to explain clearly to Norway that if the liability is with UNREDD than they need to be prepared for UNREDD to be part of the accountability structures to manage the risk, and in turn UNREDD needs to manage that when EB meetings take place outside the country that UN counterparts in the country who will participate in the NSC meetings are all briefed and all UN staff are on the same page otherwise we run the risk of entering into the same situation we are in today

Policy Board

* Composition: countries, donors, IP/CSO, UN
* Function: Policy Board provides strategic guidance and overall oversight for results with the EB and CB allocating funds and through the EB the NSC determines work-plans, with the EB and CB reporting back to the PB

Executive Board

* Composition: One donor rep, one UN rep, country (1 or 3?), IP/CSO (1 or 3?)
* Function: approval of NP doc and the annual work plan and budget
* Funds would be released in installments based on progress

Country Boards

* Composition: donor, country, UN
* Function: release of funds in tranches with a quality assurance role.
* The country board is meant to replace Tier 2 under one SSA and the narrative could be that we are bringing it in under the chapeau of the Programme more officially; the story line built around these funds is that: a) brings the Tier 2 in b) those that are accepted are accepted as they contribute to the ToC.

National Steering Committees

* Composition: see table above
* Function: see table above

IP/CSO

* In terms of the role of IP/CSO groups the best outcome they could be represented on the EB and NSC, but observers on the CB
* A proposal was made that IP/CSOs use the 10,000 in funds allocated to each of them to follow the process at the national level and present a report on this to the CBs
* IP/CSO play a role at the global or local level and are best suited to play a role in the PB as they do to oversee the overall normative work and guidelines, tools being developed and guiding the work of the Programme
* Regarding the role of the Secretariat, given that everything it does needs to be cleared by the agencies means that it does not really have a functional role and the work is essentially delivered by the agencies. There is no systemic issue to be resolved, but we need to think about the technical role, coordination, facilitation, monitoring role and what it really means. The secretariat is an expensive operation and we need to be accountable for this and understand better how the professionals in the secretariat can function and whether or not they are being used to best of their abilities. The secretariat has been filling gaps and has been trying to keep the programme together, but we are now moving into a new phase which has new demands. There is a need for the secretariat to archive information, follow-up on the consolidation of reports and coordinate meetings. Secretariat role could be more focused on playing a representational role rather than technical, the reporting role needs more discussion, and also support to whatever governance structure is decided. The secretariat should be given the responsibility to do result-based reporting.
* The secretariat is setting up the infrastructure needed to oversee country level support without the need for a NPs department in the secretariat this coupled with the new structures being proposed (i.e. lead advisor, country support teams, etc.) there is less of a need to have a dedicated unit in the secretariat to deliver this work. Despite this, the role of the NP officers is integral and should not be omitted despite the tools and structures in place.
* The secretariat playing a strategic leadership is intended but may have gotten lost in the micromanaging the day-to-day work, but was intended to be played by the head of the secretariat.
* Once the systems are place for KM the work should be fully assigned to one agency
* The secretariat should play the role of galvanizing the partnership to get those that are not rising to the occasion to do so and should feel that they can hold the others accountable. The agencies cannot be the ones to decide on what they can or cannot report on.
* Concerns were raised about the micro-management of the secretariat and the challenges faced in trying to deliver in light of this. The group stressed that innovations need to be developed in how best to approach this and how it can be better managed.

**NB:** Given the time taken to cover the above items the remaining items to be addressed at a later stage included: Transition from 2015-2016, approach and outreach for PB14, strategic staffing, costs, audit and recapping of decisions/actions and any items for elevation to SG call.