

## Minutes from meeting in the Council for Development Policy 26 September 2017

### Present:

- Members: Vice Secretary-General Tania Dethlefsen, The Danish Family Planning Association (vice chair)  
Director Jan Laustsen, The Danish Agriculture & Food Council  
Head of Projects Tine Bork, The Danish Federation of Small and Medium-sized Enterprises  
Partner Marina Buch Kristensen, Nordic Consulting Group  
Associate Professor Michael W. Hansen, Copenhagen Business School  
Senior Researcher Lars Engberg-Pedersen, Danish Institute for International Studies  
General Secretary Birgitte Qvist-Sørensen, DanChurchAid  
Director Mads Bugge Madsen, The LO/FTF Council
- MFA: Morten Jespersen, Under-Secretary for Global Development and Cooperation  
Nicolaj A. Hejberg Petersen, Head of Department for Technical Quality Support  
Signe Skovbakke Winding Albjerg, Deputy Head of Department for Development policy and Finance  
Mette Brink Madsen, Administrative Officer, Department for Technical Quality Support
- Agenda item 2: Ambassador Jakob Brix Tange, Deputy Head of Mission Anders Bitsch Karlsen, Special Adviser Flemming Poul Winther Olsen and Financial Officer Jan Hindhede Justsen, Danish Embassy Kabul
- Agenda item 3: Ambassador Carsten Staur, Special Adviser Gitte Hundahl and Intern Mie Dall Azan, Danish UN Mission Geneva
- Agenda item 4: Ambassador Carsten Staur, Special Adviser Monica Eimert and Intern Sofie Louise Friis-Bach, Danish UN Mission Geneva
- Agenda item 5: Deputy Head of Department Louise Auken Wagner, Chief Adviser Catherine Jane Lorenzen Franklin and Bachelor Victor Boysen, Department for Stabilisation and Security Policy, SSP
- Agenda item 6: Head of Department Ole Thonke, Special Adviser Lars Friis Jensen and Head of Section Lone Bøge Jensen, Department for Growth and Employment, VBE

## **Agenda item no. 1: Announcements**

The Under-Secretary for Global Development and Cooperation briefly gave a status on the planning and considerations regarding the Councils visit to Bangladesh and Myanmar in November. Ministry would monitor the situation closely, and if it was deemed necessary to change the plans, the Council members would of course be informed as soon as possible.

## **Agenda item no. 2: Follow-up after mid-term review: Afghanistan Country Programme**

*For discussion*

(Embassy Kabul)

*Summary:*

*The focus for engagement during the current Country Programme period (2014-2018) is on good governance, education and growth and employment. The ongoing formulation of a new Country Policy Paper and a new Country Programme is set to broadly maintain the current focus. The overall expected outcomes are advancements in primary education, on anti-corruption, human rights and economic development – advancements to be achieved in very challenging security situations and through very fragile state and political structures in close collaboration with international partners. The Country Programme was originally formulated for the period late 2014 to 2017 with a total funding of DKK 1,085 million. The programme was extended in 2016 to encompass 2018 with no additional allocation of funds. Priorities for the Danish development assistance to Afghanistan remained broadly aligned with national development strategies. A mid-term review (MTR) had been carried out in May 2017 and it was against this background that the Council received a status on the Country Programme.*

The Council for Development Policy took note of the status after the MTR and acknowledged the relevance of the programme and the results achieved so far.

The Council noted that Denmark was using considerable funds in Afghanistan. The aim of strengthening state institutions in the fight against corruption was noted. With a considerable part of the funds being channelled through multilateral trust funds the Council questioned if Denmark and other like-minded donors were doing enough to influence the multilateral partners to take sufficient measures to prevent corruption. A reference was made to a study commissioned by the Embassy to look into vulnerabilities to corruption in the different aid modalities used in Afghanistan. In this regard, reference was also made to SIGAR (Special Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction), which in some reports had indicated that donors take unnecessary risks. Regarding the multilateral cooperation the Council also inquired about how the Embassy was promoting Danish positions, including for example in relation to support within the education sector.

A general question about the value of the development interventions was raised including if there had been cases of setbacks in the general development of the country. At the same time, the Council was impressed with the overall achievement as presented in the MTR, also with regard to the efforts related to anti-corruption. Corruption was a huge challenge, be it the small-scale corruption or the big, high-profiled cases. In this regard, it was questioned how local authorities were drawn into the fight against corruption.

The Council also raised questions about the availability of data and statistics in a country like Afghanistan in order to measure progress. The Council also inquired about the nature of support to economic growth. Finally, the Council wanted to know how the Embassy would respond to the critical question in the MTR on resources available vis-à-vis the desire to continue with a few limited bilateral engagements.

The Embassy explained that it had stepped up its engagement with particularly the World Bank by establishing a position with the primary purpose of liaising with the World Bank. The adviser holding the position had just visited the WB headquarters and had had constructive consultations with the Bank, including on increased transparency. The Embassy had indeed commissioned a study with the purpose of getting a better understanding of the vulnerabilities in the different aid modalities and had been satisfied that the overall conclusion was that Denmark had a robust set of measures in place to prevent corruption.

The Embassy found it had reached a good balance in its programme of support to institutions such as the Anti-Corruption Justice Centre that focused on the big, systemic corruption, not least in the security sector, and smaller interventions that focused more on advocacy and the need to change the “culture of corruption”. Another example of a small intervention with a good impact was the support the Danner Foundation in their work with establishing shelters for women exposed to violence, which remained a big problem in Afghanistan.

The Embassy highlighted the Government Programme named Citizens Charter and its local Community Development Councils as a way to improve service delivery and combat corruption at the local level. With regard to education there had clearly been a positive development, however, it remained a challenge to retain especially girls in schools when they reached puberty.

In terms of backlashes, there had been a negative development in the security situation since 2014, exemplified by the number of districts not controlled by the government. At the same time, recent information suggested an improvement following the announcement by the US of its new strategy to remain engaged indefinitely. Getting reliable data in Afghanistan was a big challenge but some information was made available by for example the UN system that had a presence countrywide.

Regarding economic growth, the Embassy focused on agriculture and the development of better value chains in specific areas. Given the demographics of Afghanistan with a very young population and the many returnees from particularly Pakistan and Iran it was crucial to create growth and thereby employment. On the question about resources to manage its portfolio the Embassy would make this subject to careful consideration in the formulation and appraisal stages of the next phase of the Country Programme in order to secure a match between ambitions and manpower. It would also look into the possibilities to strengthen technical assistance to implement the programme.

Summing up, the Vice Chair expressed appreciation for the constructive and honest dialogue and concluded that the Council was supportive of the general direction and priorities of the programme, also when looking ahead to the next phase. Furthermore, the Council understood the desire to include a few bilateral interventions and was particularly supportive of the strong focus on anti-corruption.

**Agenda item no. 3: Danish Organisation Strategy for The Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria, GFATM**

*For discussion and recommendation to the Minister*  
(Geneva UN Mission)

*Summary:*

*The organisation strategy for cooperation between Denmark and the Global Fund forms the basis for Denmark's dialogue and partnership with the organisation. It will build on and strengthen the strategic direction from the first strategy (2014-2016), focussing on human rights, strengthening health systems, and institutional reform and risk management. It determines Denmark's priorities within the Fund's own strategy 2017-2022 ("Investing to End Epidemics") and is aligned with its timeline. In addition, it outlines specific results, which Denmark will pursue in the cooperation. Denmark will work closely with like-minded countries, especially its Board constituency, Point Seven (P7) towards achieving results. The Global Fund was established in 2001 to increase international efforts in the fight against AIDS, tuberculosis and malaria, and to work with partners in support of the most effective prevention and treatment. The Fund is the largest global public-private partnership dedicated to attracting and disbursing resources against the three diseases.*

The Council for Development Policy recommended the strategy for approval by the Minister for Development Cooperation.
---

The Council found the strategy consolidated, focused and well integrated in the organisation's own strategy supporting an important purpose. The Council supported the proposed Danish priorities focusing on human rights, including equity and gender, strengthening health systems and good governance, as well as a continued focus on the poorest countries with the highest disease burden, mostly low-income countries in Africa. The Council underlined the importance of maintaining focus on the three diseases while building sustainable health systems.

The Council encouraged openness regarding the consequences of the dilemma between the aim of ensuring investment in "most effective interventions" and the high focus on low-income countries. The Council noted a reference to the relevance of SDG-10 (reducing inequality) and found that a broader focus than equal access to health was essential.

The Council underlined the importance of participation of those directly affected by the diseases, including marginalised groups and the most vulnerable, people living with the diseases, sex workers, men having sex with men, and employees at higher risk (i.e. transport sector). It was recommended engaging social partners and civil society in advocacy and including them in the strategic considerations. The Council underlined the importance of anti-discriminations efforts, including sexual and reproductive health and rights. The Council noted that Denmark would actively follow the Fund's efforts to reach the objective 3 on reducing human rights barriers to services. In this

regard, the Council raised questions related to how Denmark plans to ensure that the human rights based approach of the Fund will be implemented in practice, for example in Uganda where men having sex with men are excluded by the Government from HIV/AIDS programmes.

The Council discussed the Global Fund as a possible model for other international cooperation outside the traditional multilateral system with its special innovative financial mechanism, private-public partnership, absence of field office, and governance structure balancing donors, recipient countries, affected populations and civil society.

The Council noted the poor success in balancing private and public financial support with a very low percentage of private funding and a high dependency on a few donor countries. The Council discussed the role of the US as the original initiator of the Global Fund and present provider of one third of donor support and noted continued US support, so far not affected by the GAG-rule decision. The Council discussed the upcoming election of a new executive director and underlined the importance hereof in maintaining broad support, including from the US.

The Council commended the active Danish role in governance as a member of the Executive Board in 2016-2017 and the strong and effective cooperation and agreement among the group of six countries sharing a board seat (P7). The Council underlined the importance of good governance and risk management and commended the organisation for its improvements over recent years.

The Mission in Geneva noted that the Global Fund was a strong organisation, building on a new innovative model delivering important results. The Mission underlined that continued financial support was critical to sustaining previous investments, particularly on HIV/AIDS to prevent a deterioration of the situation in the future. The Mission underlined the importance of strong cooperation among the global health actors, with WHO as the normative body, the UNAIDS strong on data and advocacy and the Global fund on fund raising, including at country level, and noted that such would also contribute to ensuring SDG-10 on reducing inequality. The Mission underlined the importance of maintaining US' support and of local domestic financing by affected countries, which amounts to more than 50% today. The Mission noted the strong agreement on priorities among P7 members on thematic and geographical focus, and mentioned that such priorities were being challenged by some, including Eastern European countries, advocating increased focus on middle-income countries. The Mission noted the organisation's high focus on risk-management and a very active inspector general and clear policy on return of funds lost.

In conclusion, the Vice Chair underlined that the Council supported the strategy as well as the active Danish participation in the governance of the Fund. The discussion concentrated on whether to focus on diseases or on broader health issues, resources and the financial situation of the organisation, including other donors, Denmark's role in the P7, the role of the US, including in relation to the GAG-rule, focus on risk management and anti-corruption, the Global Fund as a possible model for cooperation elsewhere, and the importance of anti-discrimination.

## **Agenda item no. 4: Strategy for Denmark's Co-operation with United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, UNHCR**

*For discussion and recommendation to the Minister*  
(Geneva UN Mission)

### *Summary:*

*The organisation strategy for the cooperation between Denmark and UNHCR defines Danish priorities regarding UNHCR's work and outlines the basis for the Danish cooperation with and financial support to UNHCR. It builds on the new "Humanitarian Partnership Framework Agreement 2017-2021" between Denmark and UNHCR signed in March 2017. For many years, UNHCR has been a key partner in Danish humanitarian assistance. The organisation contributes directly to the implementation of the priorities of Danish humanitarian and development cooperation by protecting conflict affected populations and help addressing complex challenges related to displacement and forced migration as well as to finding durable solutions for refugees and IDP's. Denmark's relations with UNHCR are guided by the Sustainable Development Goals and the overall priorities of the new strategy for Denmark's development cooperation and humanitarian assistance that was adopted in January 2017, "The World 2030", in particular those parts related to the response to conflict and fragility, including the protection of conflict-affected populations with a focus on vulnerable people and groups.*

The Council for Development Policy recommended the strategy for approval by the Minister for Development Cooperation.

The Council found the organisation strategy relevant and important, and took note of the record number of persons displaced due to conflict and instability in a number of countries. At the same time, the Council highlighted some key observation points regarding the future cooperation.

The Council noted that in view of the protection mandate and humanitarian nature of UNHCR it was important to underline the key Danish priorities, which aligned with the organisation's Global Strategic Priorities. The Council acknowledged that the Strategy's reference to age- and gender specific issues and particularly to SRSR was in line with Danish strategic priorities for development and humanitarian aid, but also suggested that this issue be kept high on the agenda *inter alia* in the bilateral dialogue with the organisation. The Council also acknowledged the organisation's role in finding global solutions to global problems, while noting the reference in the strategy to softly earmarked funding for protracted situations *inter alia* in Afghanistan aligning with Danish priorities.

The Council noted the strategy's reference to the risk concerning the global protection environment and inquired whether a diplomatic approach was also part of the organisation's toolbox. The Council considered the issue of the organisation's budget model, which was needs, based and thus brought attention to the very large budget deficit.

The Council highlighted the need for a more efficient and agile UNHCR. In this regard, the Council highlighted the issue of the organisation's cooperation with civil society organisations in general and implementing partners in particular, including whether it would be possible set clear implementation goals also for UNHCR's implementing partners and set more specific demands for the organisation's involvement of local/implementing partners. In this regard, the Council

also brought attention to the issue of local businesses and vocational training in connection with large-scale refugee response and protracted crisis.

The Council inquired whether the fact that the organisation needs to cooperate with the authorities of the countries in question in order to be able to fulfil its mandate of protecting refugees and seeking durable solutions to protracted crisis could lead to not advocating strongly enough for the rights of refugees. In this regard, the Council inquired whether it would be possible to strengthen the role of UNHCR's local/field offices. Finally, the Council asked questions regarding the process towards the Global Compact on Refugees and possible outcomes.

The Geneva UN Mission informed that the 5-year Strategy aligns with Denmark's partnership agreement with the organisation which covers the same term as the Organisation Strategy and that the agreement and the strategy are parallel processes. The strategy should be read in light of the ever-growing needs and the unprecedented number of persons displaced. At the same time, resettlement possibilities were getting more limited. The Mission informed that the protection mandate of the organisation was linked to the 1951 Refugee Convention and the 1961 Convention on the Reduction of Statelessness. The organisation also serves internally displaced persons and acts as cluster lead in displacement situations. The organisation's mandate is thus firmly rooted in international standards/international law.

The Mission informed that the budget for the Organisation was needs based and growing in light of the increased number of refugee emergencies and protracted crisis. The needs based budget model was instituted in 2010 by then HC António Guterres to highlight the needs of the persons of concern to the organisation. The budget for 2017 had reached an all-time peak of USD 7.9 billion, including supplementary appeals, of which it is expected that USD 4 billion would be covered. The size of the budget should serve as an important reminder for the international community of the vast needs of persons displaced. The Mission informed that Denmark is currently UNHCR's 10<sup>th</sup> largest donor, while the US has traditionally been UNHCR's largest donor by far with 40 % of UNHCR's revenue, while the EU and its member states together make up 30 %.

The Mission underlined that the importance of the New York Declaration of 19 September 2016 on Refugees and Migrants and particularly the Comprehensive Refugee Response Framework (CRRF) contained therein. The Mission highlighted the CRRF as an expression of the humanitarian development nexus in practice. The CRRF will form part of the Global Compact on Refugees, which will be negotiated in the spring of 2018 in view of adoption by the UN General Assembly. The Mission mentioned that the two main issues are 1) to strengthen the national systems of refugee host countries to enable them to better integrate refugees in their national systems, including when it comes to health and education, allowing the refugees access to the labour market and moving away from encampment policies, and 2) to find political solutions for the return of refugees in safety and dignity to their countries of origin. The Mission further mentioned that it is crucial that the international community helps fund the "global public good" provided by refugee host countries. Moreover, better access to third country solutions, including resettlement, would be of utmost importance.

The Mission highlighted that access to the local labour market was key in the CRRF and in finding durable solutions. Moreover, the Mission recognised the need for continuing the already established dialogue with the organisation regarding girl's access to education. Furthermore, the Mission underlined the good and close cooperation Denmark has with the UNHCR, strategically through the partnership agreement, and finally, the Mission mentioned the fact that the UNHCR maintains one of its three headquarters in the UN City in Copenhagen allowing for a fruitful dialogue with the organisation on innovation.

The Vice Chair concluded that the Council supported the strategy, highlighting the following points as areas of particular concern in Denmark's future cooperation with the organisation: The organisation's agility and efficiency not least regarding implementing partners, local partners, involving the labour market partners and ILO, the organisation's advocacy for the rights of refugees with local governments and gender- and age specific issues, including gender equality. Finally, the Council proposed the use of further benchmarks including from CHS certification. In this regard, the Mission underlined that any use of further benchmarks is a UN wide issue and should be dealt with through the ongoing UN reform process.

#### **Agenda item no. 5: Peace and Stabilisation Response 2018-2022**

DKK 150 million

*For discussion and recommendation to the Minister*

(Department for Stabilisation and Security Policy, SSP)

##### *Summary:*

*The Peace and Stabilisation Response (PSR) is a Danish stand-by roster aimed at deploying civilian experts for international assignments, typically through the EU and OSCE, in fragile and conflict-affected areas. The grant of DKK 150 million will allow for the annual deployment of approximately 150-180 civilian experts from 2018-2022. Timely and effective deployment of civilian experts can build local capacity to manage and prevent conflict, enhance the operational capacity of the multilateral organisations, and deepen Denmark's presence in fragile environments. The PSR is therefore essential in Denmark's ability to contribute to the stabilisation of fragile states and apply a comprehensive approach to stabilisation and security policy as outlined in Denmark's Strategy for Development Cooperation and Humanitarian Action (2017) as well as the Foreign and Security Policy Strategy (2017).*

The Council for Development Policy recommended the grant proposal for approval by the Minister for Development Cooperation.

The Council found that the PSR was a useful tool for Danish engagements in fragile and conflict-affected areas and an essential contribution to the Danish stabilisation agenda. The Council recognised the efforts made in using lessons learned to further sharpen the PSR, including strengthening the geographical and thematic focus of the deployments and ensuring complementarity and synergy with other Danish instruments and engagements.



The Council recognised the challenges in obtaining full gender balance in deploying civilian experts through the PSR, while acknowledging efforts made to increase the amount of female deployments. In addition, the Council encouraged similar efforts to ensure good representation of youth in the PSR.

The Council supported the strengthened strategic orientation of the deployments as an important means to ensure greater impact. In addition, the Council pointed to the potential challenges linked to having outsourced the daily administration of the PSR to a private contractor and the need, therefore, to maintain the current practice of keeping the management of the strategic and political prioritisation of the PSR within the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

Furthermore, the Council highlighted the need to actively collect and apply lessons learned from the deployed personnel through the PSR in a systematic manner. At the same time, the Council recognised the continuous challenges in measuring the effect of each individual deployment through the PSR vis-à-vis the effect of the mission as a whole.

The SSP department explained how a strong strategic dimension had been added to the civilian deployments. More than ever before, the deployments reflected the Danish priorities as outlined in the current development, foreign and security policy strategies. This made the PSR not only an important contributor to the Danish stabilisation agenda - it also ensured complementarity and synergy with other Danish instruments and engagements.

SSP agreed with the Council that deployment of young civilians was a relevant objective to look into. At the same time, SSP pointed to the fact that the PSR was just one among other tools by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs to deploy civilian experts. For instance, the Ministry provided for a number of civilians to be deployed each year through the United Nations Junior Professional Office Programme - a mechanism that had an explicit focus on the education of younger diplomats.

SSP confirmed that the private contractor of the PSR carried out administrative and practical tasks related to the civilian deployments by the PSR. However, the strategic deliberations and decisions were indeed left to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs – a distinction important to maintain.

In conclusion, the Vice Chair acknowledged that the PSR, given its particular characteristics as a tool to deploy civilians, was different from other development programmes presented to the Council and it could be difficult to identify exactly how the PSR fitted into the Danida toolbox. Overall, the Council supported the programme as a relevant mechanism for deploying civilian experts to fragile and conflict-affected areas, thus making it a valuable component of the Ministry's comprehensive approach to the stabilisation agenda. The Council welcomed that an independent review of the PSR had been planned for 2020 and in this regard, it was recommended that the points raised during the discussion were included in the review, including focus on impact, efficiency, strategic priorities, synergies with other Danish activities and inclusion of young people.

## **Agenda item no. 6: Danida Business Finance Project Development Facility**

DKK 50 million

*For discussion and recommendation to the Minister*

(Department for Growth and Employment, VBE)

### *Summary:*

*The purpose of the Danida Business Finance Project Development Facility is to enable authorities in developing countries to prepare sustainable infrastructure projects proposals with a potential for financing with a concessional loan under the Danida Business Finance scheme. An additional outcome will be capacity development of sector authorities in developing countries notably in terms of formulation, preparation and implementation of sustainable infrastructure projects with a Life-cycle cost prospective. The Project Development Facility will be essential for Danida to reach the planned increased budget levels for Danida Business Finance and thereby to contribute to reaching the Sustainable Development Goals in developing countries.*

The Council for Development Policy recommended the project for approval by the Minister for Development Cooperation. However, the Council underlined that the Life-cycle cost principle as well as the SDG indicators required elaboration in the projects, which are to be prepared under the facility.

The Council noted that the pipeline of infrastructure projects for potential financing under Danida Business Finance (DBF) was not sufficient to meet the planned increase of the annual budget for DBF and asked what specific projects were in the pipeline. The Council further questioned the demand for infrastructure projects to be financed with concessional loans or whether the facility would create new projects. The Council asked how the proposed facility was connected with other facilities administered by IFU, and whether there were synergies, and in particular, the Council questioned the balance with the SDG Investment Fund. The Council drew attention to the dividing line between commercial IFU investments and projects funded with development funds. The Council called for a comprehensive overview of Danida's private sector partnership initiatives and a justification for many seemingly similar initiatives.

The Council appreciated that the Facility would ensure that proposed infrastructure projects would be subject to thorough preparation and that it was important to ensure that the partner countries would not be indebted because of the Danish financial support. The Council asked for a thorough review of the Life-cycle cost principle as well as a clear definition hereof, which should include a definition of the social and environmental externalities to be incorporated. The Council asked questions regarding the fact that the tied scheme was aimed at Danish suppliers while the untied scheme was aimed at other OECD countries, and whether or not it was possible for businesses in the developing countries to participate. The Council underlined that Danish presence in partner countries was important and pointed to the potential spinoff with the posted Growth Advisors.

The Council stressed the importance of the Decent Work Agenda and pointed out that it would have a direct impact on projects financed under DBF. In this regard, the Council drew attention to previous Danida guidelines regarding work environment in larger infrastructure projects,

which could supplement the UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights. The Council recommended revising the risk matrix and in this regard, the Council pointed out that political risks were likely in many countries where DBF is operating. The Council commended that the role of civil society had been included, however, it could be reflected even more prominently. The Council asked questions on how the facility was foreseen to support gender equality, and finally the Council asked whether a mid-term review of the facility was foreseen.

The VBE department explained that the Danida Business Finance facility was different from the SDG Investment Fund, which was based on investments in commercially viable projects, whereas DBF provides grants to projects that cannot be financed under market conditions. The transfer of the operational responsibility for DBF to IFU would open up for opportunities to take advantage of synergies between IFU's commercial activities and activities financed under the development cooperation budget. VBE underlined that financial support to DBF projects also in the future would be presented to the Council.

VBE noted that the previous feasibility facility had not been successful because it was driven mostly by commercial interests and with limited ownership by authorities in developing countries. The new facility was driven by demand in the developing country and with contributions from authorities in developing countries. Furthermore, the new facility would ensure a much more thorough preparation of the potential projects from feasibility to the elaboration of tender documents.

VBE acknowledged that political risks were likely and that the human rights situation was challenged in many of the relevant countries and the risk management matrix would be corrected accordingly. VBE further informed about the ongoing work to establish a Results Framework for Danida private sector initiatives and that a separate matrix would be prepared for infrastructure projects financed under DBF, where links to the SDG's will be a priority. VBE explained that the results framework for the Project Development Facility reflected the direct outcome and results of the facility, i.e. applications for DBF financing/local authorities capacitated. It would be difficult to define specific SDG's beyond the potential contributions as stated in the document. The specific Life-cycle concept would be further defined and would form part of the preparation of specific infrastructure projects and also be a specific issue to be looked at during the coming mid-term review of the facility. VBE pointed out that a mid-term review is planned and that the cost hereof is included in the budget.

The Vice Chair concluded that the Council supported the project development facility, but a number of points required attention. These included the pipeline for new infrastructure proposals and consequently the need to draw on the Embassies and the growth advisors, the importance of a result framework that relates to the SDG's, and finally a clearer definition of the Life-cycle cost principle including a more precise definition of the social and environmental costs to be incorporated.

**Agenda item no. 7: AOB.**

The Under-Secretary for Global Development and Cooperation informed the Council members about an extraordinary Council meeting scheduled for 31 October, reserved for a discussion of the use of the approximately DKK 1.8 billion, which would be transferred to other development activities due to the decreasing number of asylum seekers in Denmark. The background information for the programmes, which would be presented to the Council at this meeting, would be less developed than usual because many of the programmes would still be at the concept stage. As the preparation process had been relatively short, different measures regarding quality assurance had been taken into consideration (for example, inception reviews would be carried out in many of these new interventions). In this regard, the Council asked to receive a thorough overview regarding these new activities.