

Minutes from meeting in the Council for Development Policy
on 28 October 2021

- Members: Professor Anne Mette Kjær, University of Aarhus (Chair)
International Director Jarl Krausing, CONCITO (Vice Chair)
Senior Researcher Lars Engberg-Pedersen, Danish Institute for International Studies
Head of International Department Jens Kvorning, SMEdenmark
Executive Director Rasmus Stuhr Jakobsen, CARE Denmark
Private Advisor Morten Lisborg, Migration Management Advice
Vice President Bente Sorgenfrey, Danish Trade Union Confederation
Director for Global Development and Sustainability Marie Gad, Confederation of Danish Industries
International Director Marie Engberg Helmstedt, The Danish Youth Council
General Secretary Birgitte Qvist-Sørensen, DanChurchAid, had shared written comments but did not take part in the meeting
- MFA: Head of Department Tove Degnbol, Department for Evaluation, Learning and Quality, ELK
Special Advisor Anne Marie Sloth Carlsen, Department for Evaluation, Learning and Quality, ELK
Head of Section Josephine Mittag, Department for Evaluation, Learning and Quality, ELK
- Agenda item 1: Head of Department Signe Skovbakke Winding Albjerg, Department for Africa, Policy & Development, APD
- Agenda item 2: Head of Department Marianne Kress, Department for Migration, Stabilization and Fragility, MNS
Chief Advisor Jakob Rogild Jakobsen, Department for Migration, Stabilization and Fragility, MNS
Head of Department Signe Skovbakke Winding Albjerg, Department for Africa, Policy & Development, APD
Chief Advisor Kristian Kirkegaard Edinger, Department for Africa, Policy and Development, APD
Special Advisor Anders Stuhr Svensson, Department for Financial Management and Support in Relation to Development, FRU
Chief Advisor Anne-Catherine Legendre, Department for Evaluation, Learning and Quality, ELK
- Agenda item 3: Ambassador Morten Jespersen, Geneva
First Secretary Lea Rasmussen, Geneva
Head of Department Mette Thygesen, Department for Humanitarian Action, Civil Society and Engagement, HCE
Chief Advisor Katrine Siig Kristensen, Department for Humanitarian Action, Civil Society and Engagement, HCE

Agenda item 4: Ambassador Merete Juhl, Beirut
Chief Advisor Thomas Thomsen, Beirut
Programme Manager Karin Eriksen, Beirut
Danida Senior Advisor Katrine Plesner, Beirut
Head of Department Marianne Kress, Department for Migration, Stabilization and Fragility, MNS
Chief Advisor Jakob Rogild Jakobsen, Department for Migration, Stabilization and Fragility, MNS
Head of Department Signe Skovbakke Winding Albjerg, Department for Africa, Policy & Development, APD
Chief Advisor Esther Lønstrup, Department for Evaluation, Learning and Quality, ELK
Special Advisor Mads Wegner Hove, Department for Evaluation, Learning and Quality, ELK

Agenda Item No. 1: Announcements

The Head of the Department for Evaluation, Learning and Quality (ELK) informed the Council that following consultations in parliament, the Minister for Development Cooperation had approved that the DKK 100 million additional climate assistance included in the Finance Act of 2021 be allocated to the Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF) under the Global Environment Facility (GEF). With reference to the current (2018-2022) organization strategy for the GEF/LDCF, the funding would top-up the additional grant allocated to the LDCF of DKK 210 million in 2020. A new organization strategy for the GEF/LDCF would be prepared in 2022.

The Council took note of the information and Members of the Council welcomed the allocation to the LDCF and commended the timing.

The Head of ELK also briefed the Council about the procedures for processing grants and the quality assurance purpose of the associated steps and documentation including the role of the Programme Committee and the appraisal. The Appraisal Summary provided an important overview for the Council of the final revisions made to the programme design before presentation of a strategy or programme document to the Council. She underlined that while the Council's comments did not immediately lead to further revisions of a document prior to the approval by the Minister for Development Cooperation, the feedback from the Council was important for a possible subsequent inception phase and/or preparation of underlying projects and for the design of future strategies and programmes.

The Council welcomed the briefing and Members of the Council asked clarifying questions about the generation of ideas and processing prior to presentation to the Programme Committee and the revision of documents following the recommendations of the Programme Committee and appraisal. Members of the Council also pointed to funding decisions that were not presented to the Council, such as the recent decision to provide DKK 2 billion state guarantees via the Investment Fund for Developing Countries (IFU).

The Head of ELK replied that ideas were generated and driven by the responsible units in countries and at headquarters based on the Strategy for Development Cooperation and allocations in the Finance Act. Presentation of ideas in the form of early drafts to the Programme Committee was strongly recommended. She confirmed that allocations in some areas, such as humanitarian aid and through civil society, were not presented to the Council for comments.

The Chair of the Council thanked for the briefing and highlighted the importance of the Council's thematic discussions in areas that were not presented to the Council for recommendation to the Minister for Development Cooperation. The thematic discussions provided an opportunity for the Council to see the bigger picture.

Agenda Item No. 2: Climate Change, Conflict, Displacement and Irregular Migration in Sahel 2021-2024

For discussion and recommendation to the Minister

DKK 800 million

Department for Migration, Stabilization and Fragility, MNS

Summary:

The objective of the new regional programme on Climate Change, Conflict, Displacement and Irregular Migration in Sahel is to increase the resilience of vulnerable populations to the impacts of climate change by building their adaptive capacities, as well as those of national and regional partners, to address the root causes of fragility driving conflict, forced displacement and irregular migration. The focus is on social protection expanded to groups most affected by climate change with a focus on youth and gender; climate-smart agriculture expanded to vulnerable demographic groups; strengthened conflict sensitivity in climate adaptation; and enhanced coherence between climate policy and programmes through a shared evidence base to enhance understanding and tackle linkages between climate change, fragility, conflict and forced displacement.

The Council for Development Policy recommended the framework programme for Climate Change, Conflict, Displacement and Irregular Migration in Sahel 2021-2024 for approval by the Minister for Development Cooperation. The Council, however, expressed concern about the validity of the basic assumptions about the causal relations between climate change and migration in the region and questioned the justification for the labelling as a climate action programme. Furthermore, the Council expressed concern about the relationship between the Theory of Change described in the document and the individual projects. On this background, the Council asked to receive information about the programme after the inception phase and to be kept informed about the three projects that would be up for approval in 2022.

The Council commended the programme document for addressing a very relevant thematic complex in a region dependent on donor funding, and for aiming to bridge the silos between climate change, humanitarian, development and peace and stabilization initiatives. This ambitious approach, however, also made the document extremely complex based on too many assumptions and with too many objectives. The Council would therefore have appreciated an approach that more clearly connected the Theory of Change (ToC) to the underlying projects, their relevance and interlinkages. Members of the Council found that the document's description of the envisaged activities was generally too abstract and that it was difficult to see how the different activities would contribute to a coherent programme.

While appreciating the Doing Development Differently (DDD) approach, Members of the Council pointed out that the approach cannot be used as a way to postpone key decisions about the design of a programme. Concern was raised in this relation to the unallocated funds of the 200 million DKK (25% of total amount), which were not well explained in the programme document.

The Council also questioned the assumptions about climate change as a driver of conflict and irregular migration from the region. Members of the Council pointed to other drivers such as dysfunctional governance, violation of rights, political dynamics and instability and suggested that the design was too driven by Danish political priorities and left out analyses of the specific development problems on the ground. Members of the Council also commented that the Sahel region was not the right region for focusing on irregular migration as it is characterised by internally displaced people, but not of significant outmigration towards Europe. Syria was mentioned as an example of a region where conflict and migration was related to the effects of climate change. Members of the Council also pointed to some very simplified assumptions about the links between lack of jobs, migration of young people and extremism.

The Council also expressed concern that the programme would be calculated as 100% climate financing and warned of greenwashing and climate washing. As examples of underlying initiatives relevant for climate financing, Members of the Council pointed to climate resistant agriculture, biomass and renewables and suggested that if climate adaptation was the primary objective of the programme, it should have focussed on other parts of Sub-Saharan Africa.

Members of the Council enquired why a regional approach had been chosen and why so many elements had been combined in one programme instead of several programmes, which could have been presented separately. This made the programme quite incoherent. The very relevant DKK 190 million for the World Bank's Social Protection Programme was sizeable in itself. Regarding this programme, Members of the Council asked how corruptive practices and politicisation of funds channelled through state institutions would be avoided. Members of the Council underlined the complementarity to the Danish country programmes in Burkina Faso and Mali, but would have appreciated more information as to how the Ministry would use the linkages and build on and maybe upscale what had already been achieved at country level. It was suggested to include success stories to document the realism of achieving the objectives. Members of the Council also noted that it was difficult to see whether activities would be carried out mainly in Mali or whether they were truly regional. Also, the Council asked about the risks involved in such a fragile context and, with reference to recent experiences in Afghanistan, what would happen if e.g. France would pull its troops out of Mali.

Members of the Council appreciated the priority placed on shared learning and evidence through all separate projects, the Monitoring Evaluation and Learning (MEAL) component as well the Team Europe Initiative (TEI). The TEI was interesting and a concept with potential. Members of the Council, however, suggested that prior research into root causes and inter-linkages by Team Europe/Action Research would have benefitted the design of the programme and furthermore that the emphasis on learning and leadership should focus on institutions at country level. Regarding the MEAL component, Members of the Council expressed concern about allocating DKK 20 million to external consultants and stressed the need for in-house learning.

Finally, Members of the Council also underlined the need to include civil society organizations in the Sahel, as they were the ones anchored locally and delivering on the ground. They therefore questioned the relatively low budget allocation for Netherlands Development Organisation (SNV - Stichting Nederlandse Vrijwilligers /“Foundation of Netherlands Volunteers”)-project, compared to the much more substantive funding allocated to multilateral organizations such as the World Bank, the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD) and the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). It was noted that multilateral components took up a very big part of the entire programme. Regarding the latter, Members of the Council asked for clarification about the meaning of providing support to a Meteorological Institute and working with religious and traditional leaders within the same programme. Members of the Council also wondered why the responsibility for a programme of this nature rested with the MFA headquarters and not an embassy in the region. This was, in particular, seen as a challenge given the substantial sum of unallocated resources which, according to the Doing Development Differently (DDD) approach, should be spent on new opportunities identified on the ground.

The Head of the Department for Migration, Stabilization and Fragility (MNS) responded by underlining that it was a new and ambitious initiative developed over the past almost two years. While the Head of MNS appreciated the comments and concerns raised by Members of the Council on the ToC, it was evident that the linkages between climate change, conflict, displacement and irregular migration were real with climate change being a so-called threat multiplier. Having said that, much more evidence was needed, and the focus on learning was a key element in the new programme. Proposed partners had all agreed to focus on the learning agenda and Denmark had an opportunity to enable, not least through the TEI, more nexus thinking and programming in Sahel. It was very important to see this regional programme as complementary to the bilateral programmes which had a stronger focus on governance and the regional stabilization programme. Furthermore, the regional programme had been prepared in close collaboration with the embassies in Mali and Burkina Faso who would also be responsible for implementing parts of the programme.

The Chief Advisor pointed out that the process of selecting partners had been rigorous. Potential partners had been assessed according to agreed principles and priorities, and their on-the-ground experience had been an important selection criteria. Multilateral organizations also worked on the ground. The World Bank and IFAD projects had been under implementation for several years. Danish funds would support new expanded phases of the two initiatives. The UNDP and the Dutch SNV projects were new projects in the Danish context. Unallocated funds could be allocated to SNV and UNDP if the initiatives were successful. UNDP already had a programme in the region on climate and security and a key role in civil search and stabilization. Other relevant partners, such as the International Organization for Migration (IOM) and the World Food Programme (WFP), had not been selected, because Denmark already had close partnerships with these organizations in the region. They would, however, be linked to the programme and would remain key partners for Denmark.

The Council for Development Policy recommended the framework programme for Climate Change, Conflict, Displacement and Irregular Migration in Sahel 2021-2024 for approval by the Minister for Development Cooperation. The Council, however, expressed concern about the validity of the basic assumptions about the causal relations between climate change and migration in the region and questioned the justification for labelling it as a climate action programme.

Furthermore, the Council expressed concern about the relationship between the Theory of Change described in the document and the individual projects. On this background, the Council asked to receive information about the programme after the inception phase and to be kept informed about the three projects that would be up for approval in 2022.

Agenda Item No. 3: The Office of the UN High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) Organization Strategy 2022-2026

For discussion and recommendation to the Minister

DKK 510 million

Permanent Mission of Denmark to the UN in Geneva

Summary:

The organization strategy outlines the overall priorities for Denmark's financial support to and partnership with the UN High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) for the period 2022-2026. The strategy covers both un-earmarked and softly earmarked contributions. The overall objective of Denmark's support to UNHCR is to address needs in forced displacement contexts. The work of UNHCR contributes directly to the achievements of key priorities in the Danish Strategy for Development Cooperation. Particularly those related to protecting conflict-affected populations and addressing challenges related to conflict, fragility and forced displacement with the aim of finding durable solutions through inter alia a nexus approach to these challenges. Among the key focus areas for Denmark's support is addressing the needs of women and girls, access to education and livelihoods opportunities, localization, innovative approaches and continued improvement of organizational effectiveness and climate action within the organizations operations.

The Council for Development Policy recommended the UNHCR Organization Strategy 2022-2026 for approval by the Minister for Development Cooperation.

The Council found the work of the UN High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) highly relevant and well aligned with Danish priorities, and further found that Denmark as the top 6 donor should use its leverage to drive UNHCR's work further towards key Danish priorities. Given the substantial funds allocated for UNHCR it was questioned whether the organization strategy was sufficiently ambitious. At the same time, the Council highlighted some key observation points regarding the future cooperation.

Members of the Council emphasized the importance of climate action and pointed specifically to UNHCR's large-scale procurement, which could have a significant impact and be a driver of better procurement practices in terms of climate, environmental and social standards, including within the whole UN system. Members of the Council also asked about UNHCR's projections with regard to the impact of climate change on refugee and displacement matters, and what efforts UNHCR were putting in place to handle future climate challenges. Members of the Council questioned if UNHCR's efforts in this field had the right level of ambition. In this regard, Members of the Council underlined the importance of substantive Danish engagement on these issues in the cooperation with UNHCR.

While Members of the Council acknowledged that UNHCR had improved its cooperation with implementing partners, they also noted that there was room for further improvement. Both in terms of administrative efficiency and clarity in the field – in this regard the decentralization of UNHCR was a positive step, but the gains had yet to fully manifest themselves at

country/operational level as well as at the more strategic level. Members of the Council underlined the importance of developing strategic partnerships with large implementing partners, including Danish organizations, which could also be a vehicle for developing more innovative approaches to the humanitarian response. Members of the Council found that this should be a key element in Denmark's dialogue with UNHCR. Further, Members of the Council underlined the importance of continued push for furthering the localization agenda and for securing a focus on livelihoods.

Members of the Council also pointed out that dialogue with UNHCR related to mixed movements towards and in Europe and the implications thereof for the international asylum system was key given the situations in Eastern and South Eastern Europe. Further, Members of the Council asked if there was a discrepancy between Danish refugee policy and the support to UNHCR.

Members of the Council pointed to the growth of UNHCR's budget over the years and asked if UNHCR had the capacity to absorb this, and if funds were channelled efficiently to implementing partners and for the reasoning behind the softly earmarked parts of the support given that the document emphasises the importance of no earmarking. Members of the Council asked about the relatively large allocation of funds for innovation purposes and what results such funds had produced until now. Further, Members of the Council found that UNHCR's work on partnerships with the private sector could be further elaborated and more strategic, including in terms of a more structured market dialogue, to go beyond fund raising and develop innovative solutions.

The Ambassador informed that there were three key elements in Denmark's partnership and dialogue with UNHCR. 1) The core contributions outlined in the organization strategy, which formed the basis for Denmark's close dialogue with UNHCR on its work and Danish priorities in this regard. 2) Additional Danish funding throughout the year to emergency situations. 3) Dialogue on protection issues related to Danish policy priorities in close cooperation with the Ministry of Immigration and Integration. The Ambassador highlighted the longstanding and good partnership between Denmark and UNHCR and underlined the match between the organization's work and current Danish priorities. Further, the Ambassador pointed out that Denmark was a vocal proponent in support of UNHCR's work on international protection in accordance with international law, which made dialogue on the few issues where views differed constructive. The Head of the Department for Humanitarian Action, Civil Society and Engagement (HCE) added that Denmark played an active role in UNHCR's governing bodies to guide the policy directions of UNHCR.

The Ambassador underlined that climate was a key cross cutting Danish priority and a continuous focus in the dialogue with UNHCR, and informed about UNHCR's recent comprehensive strategy on climate action and ongoing discussions on allocation of Danish innovation funds to climate related initiatives. At the same time, the Ambassador pointed out that climate action was not the core mandate of UNHCR and, hence, not the key priority in the organization strategy, but assured the Council that Denmark – also as part of the wider push for UN reforms – continued its advocacy for thorough greening of UNHCR.

The Ambassador shared the Council's view, that despite progress, UNHCR's cooperation with implementing partners including local partners was an area that could be further improved. In this regard, the Ambassador ensured that this was a key focus in the ongoing dialogue with UNHCR at all levels, and that Denmark would continue to push for more efficient and strategic cooperation with implementing partners as well as for furthering the efforts related to localization. The Head of HCE further welcomed follow up dialogue on strengthening the partnerships with Danish organizations.

In terms of UNHCR's budget and organizational efficiency the Ambassador highlighted that the soft earmarking was a good tool for pursuing Danish priorities and that this type of funding was very valued by UNHCR compared to tightly earmarked funds. The needs based budget model was fully in line with the mandate given to UNHCR and the Ambassador found that UNHCR had the necessary mechanisms for prioritizing the core activities.

Regarding private sector funding and partnerships, the Ambassador underlined that this was a continued Danish focus. He highlighted that half of the private funding UNHCR received was un-earmarked. Further, the ambassador pointed out that while close engagement and joint innovation with the private sector were very important and a priority for UNHCR, they were - rightfully - very conscious about striking the right balance in order not to compromise their neutrality.

The Chair concluded that the Council recommended the UNHCR Organization Strategy 2022-2026 for approval by the Minister for Development Cooperation.

Agenda Item No. 4: Support to Syria and Syria's Neighbourhood, 2021-2023

DKK 600 million

For discussion and recommendation to the Minister

Danish Embassy in Beirut and the Department for Migration, Stabilization and Fragility (MNS)

Summary:

The Support to Syria and Syria's Neighbourhood, 2021-2023, aims to create access to protection, services and livelihoods for displaced persons and vulnerable host communities in Jordan, Lebanon and Syria. The programme does so through engaging with selected existing and new partners and programmes based on experience from earlier phases. Under the programme, opportunities for social protection, access to legal services, psychosocial support, enterprise development, and job-placement will be provided. Gender, climate and conflict sensitivity will be addressed as crosscutting themes. The programme constitutes a holistic response to vulnerability and fragility in the countries affected by the prolonged crises in Syria. The programme is expected to be managed by the Danish Embassy in Beirut.

The Council for Development Policy recommended the Support to Syria and Syria's Neighbourhood 2021-2023 for approval by the Minister for Development Cooperation. Due to the compressed quality assurance process and uncertainty by the Council about the linkages between the overall Theory of Change and individual projects, it requested an orientation after the inception phase and information about the projects to be approved during 2022, incl. the Regional Development and Protection Programme (RDPP).

The Council welcomed the Support to Syria and Syria's Neighbourhood, 2021-2023, as a continuation of previous phases and as a relevant response to the deteriorating situation in the

concerned countries. The Council commended the context analysis of the complex and dire situation.

However, recognising the time constraints under which the programme had been developed, the Council noted that the programme document seemed superficial in some places and specifically mentioned that it was difficult to see the links between the context analysis and specific interventions. The activities supported through the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), the French Development Agency (AFD) and the World Bank were praised for being very relevant and clearly described.

Members of the Council also questioned whether the relative focus on Lebanon and Jordan was justified, considering the scale of needs inside Syria, including among internally displaced persons. Building resilience inside Syria was important and it was strongly argued that the capacity and scope for such HDP-nexus interventions existed. What was the rationale for not implementing projects inside Syria?

With respect to the Regional Development and Protection Programme (RDPP), Members of the Council found it unclear what the engagements would consist in, how they would support enterprise development and what the volume of the final budget would be. Given the absence in the context analysis of any references to the private sector and relevant framework conditions, Members of the Council also noted that it was unclear how the private sector would be involved. Particularly in Jordan, it would be highly beneficial to improve the framework conditions of the private sector. Furthermore, Members of the Council asked why the Jordan Health Fund for Refugees was categorized as a livelihood intervention rather than being part of improving access to services.

Regarding the Call for Proposals, Members of the Council found that the overall line of reasoning was a bit unfocused and that it was unclear why the Call only targeted international NGOs. It was asked whether the transaction costs resulting from a call were fully justified as compared to a simplified procedure with direct selection of partners, and why the Call had been issued prior to actual appropriation of the funds.

Finally, Members of the Council would like a stronger focus on gender issues throughout the document, but appreciated that the programme would be managed from the Danish Embassy in Beirut.

The Ambassador thanked the Council for the constructive comments and agreed that the process of finalizing the document had been somewhat hasty, partly due to the unavoidable circumstances of the lead consultant contracting Covid-19 during the last weeks of the assignment. Nonetheless, the document represented a solid and coherent programme that involved systematic learning and consultation with a wide range of potential partners and analysis of their interventions and approaches.

The Ambassador and her team explained that several factors challenged a greater focus inside Syria. First, the EU policy framework explicitly ruled out any kind of collaboration with the authorities in Damascus. Considering that a significant proportion of refugees in Jordan and Lebanon originated from areas under their control, the EU policy therefore effectively rendered

it impossible to build a coherent programme in support of longer-term return and reintegration of refugees from these countries. While there might be greater room for longer-term activities in North Eastern Syria, this would be less relevant as part of the response to the protracted refugee crisis affecting Jordan and Lebanon. Second, the relevant appropriation text in the 2021 Finance Bill specifically called for a focus on improving livelihoods and protection among refugees and host communities in countries neighbouring Syria. Third, while opportunities for supporting local level resilience activities in Syria would be continuously explored, only two programmes were currently testing approaches to local level resilience inside Syria. One was the UN Joint Resilience Programme, which would end in June 2022 without a new phase yet being in place. This programme also served to illustrate the challenges to longer-term activities in Syria as its activities in D'ara had been forced to a standstill by ongoing conflict during recent months. Another was the Syria Resilience Consortium made up of six prominent international NGOs and ending in December 2022. The Consortium was already supported by the ongoing phase of the Syria Neighbourhood Programme and could not absorb more funding for the time being.

The Ambassador and her team added that Denmark also to a significant extent responded to needs in Syria through humanitarian funds and through the Peace and Stabilisation programme. Hence, it should be recognized that the programme was only a part of much broader efforts and that significant coverage throughout the entire region was ensured through building coherence across different instruments.

The Ambassador and her team also provided details about the Call for Proposals, which was described as a way to identify and support innovative, sustainable and scalable approaches to strengthening protection at a time when it was becoming a certainty that the displacement crisis would continue for years to come. The exclusive focus on international NGOs was motivated by the fact that local NGOs would not have the capacity and expertise required to develop projects of the intended scale and quality. Scale was a basic requirement as the Embassy would not have sufficient resources to handle a large number of smaller grants to local NGOs. The Call for Proposals also reflected the changing opportunities for ensuring diversity in partner selection, now that some of the previous regional aid mechanisms, that Denmark had supported, were no longer available; the EU trust fund was being phased out and the World Bank's concessional lending mechanism was less relevant because neither Lebanon nor Jordan could absorb more concessional loans – each for their reasons.

While the Call for Proposals was focused on international NGOs, the Ambassador and her team highlighted the RDPP as a unique platform for localization, with more than 2/3 of its budget being allocated to local partners. It had a clear ability to generate results in terms of both protection and livelihoods, including through support for employment and enterprise development as also found by an ongoing EU result-oriented monitoring review of RDPP. The final review would be available by December and could be shared with the Council, if desired. While the outline of the next phase was broadly in place, further details on both programme content and budget size would only be available, when negotiations with other donors and actual programme formulation had been finalised in the second half of 2022.

On a final note, it was clarified that the Jordan Health Fund for Refugees should have been categorized under access to services but had mistakenly ended up under livelihoods. This would be corrected.

The Chair of the Council concluded that the Council recommended the Support to Syria and Syria's Neighbourhood 2021-2023 for approval by the Minister for Development Cooperation. It was noted that the verbal explanations provided to the Council had filled some of the gaps in the document in a consistent way, but due to the compressed quality assurance process, the Council asked to receive an orientation after the inception phase and to receive the projects not yet finalised, including the RDPP programme, when these were due.

Agenda Item No. 5: Rounding off the UPR Seminar Discussions

Members of the Council rounded off the UPR Seminar discussions. No issues were raised under this agenda item.

Agenda Item No. 6: Any Other Business

No issues were raised under this agenda item.