

Minutes from meeting in the Council for Development Policy
on 22 June 2023

- Members: Professor Anne Mette Kjær, University of Aarhus (Chair)
Deputy CEO and International Director Jarl Krausing, CONCITO (Deputy Chair) (agenda items 1-4, 6)
Head of Secretariat Lone Ilum Christiansen, The Danish Trade Union Development Agency (DTDA)
Political Consultant and Project Officer of DAPP Lucas Højbjerg, The Danish Chamber of Commerce
Senior Researcher Adam Moe Fejerskov, Danish Institute for International Studies (DIIS)
Secretary General Charlotte Slente, Danish Refugee Council (DFC)
Director Charlotte Flindt Pedersen, Danish Foreign Policy Society
Political Director Jonas Manthey Olsen, Danish Youth Council (DUF)
Chief Adviser Mattias Söderberg, DanChurchAid
Director for Global Development and Sustainability Marie Gad Hansen, Confederation of Danish Industries (DI), had shared written comments but did not take part in the meeting
- MFA: Under-Secretary for Development Policy Stephan Schönemann
Head of Department Tove Degnbol, Department for Evaluation, Learning and Quality, ELK
Deputy Head of Department Henrik Larsen, Department for Evaluation, Learning and Quality, ELK
Head of Section Josephine Mittag, Department for Evaluation, Learning and Quality, ELK
- Agenda item 2: Ambassador Winnie Estrup Petersen, Embassy in Dhaka (Online)
Deputy Head of Mission Anders B. Karlsen, Embassy in Dhaka (Online)
Head of Section Pernille Dueholm, Department for Asia, Latin America and Oceania, ALO (Online)
- Agenda item 3: Head of Department Karin Poulsen, Department for Green Diplomacy and Climate, GDK
Chief Adviser Charlotte Just, Department for Green Diplomacy and Climate, GDK
- Agenda item 4: Head of Department Karin Poulsen, Department for Green Diplomacy and Climate, GDK
Team Leader Tobias von Platen-Hallermund, Department for Green Diplomacy and Climate, GDK
- Agenda item 5: Head of Department Karin Poulsen, Department for Green Diplomacy and Climate, GDK
Team Leader Merete Villum Pedersen, Department for Green Diplomacy and Climate, GDK

Chief Adviser Morten Houmann Blomqvist, Department for Green Diplomacy and Climate, GDK

Head of Section Christian Knudsen, Department for Green Diplomacy and Climate, GDK

Agenda item 6: Head of Department Karin Poulsen, Department for Green Diplomacy and Climate, GDK

Chief Adviser Charlotte Laursen, Department for Green Diplomacy and Climate, GDK

Chief Adviser Fin Poulsen, Department for Green Diplomacy and Climate, GDK (Online)

Head of Department Hanne Findsen, Danish Ministry of the Interior and Health

Chief Adviser Trine Bargsteen, Danish Ministry of the Interior and Health

Agenda item 7: Deputy Head of Department Mads Stærk, Department for Green Diplomacy and Climate, GDK

Chief Adviser Mads Mayerhofer, Department for Green Diplomacy and Climate, GDK

Chief Adviser Fin Poulsen, Department for Green Diplomacy and Climate, GDK (Online)

Director International Partnerships (Brussels Office) Els Haelterman, the Sustainable Trade Initiative, IDH

Country Director (Côte d'Ivoire) Carole Attoungbre, the Sustainable Trade Initiative, IDH

Senior Manager Learning and Impact Violaine Berger, the Sustainable Trade Initiative, IDH

Senior Manager International Partnerships An-Heleen De Greef, the Sustainable Trade Initiative, IDH

Agenda item 8: Head of Department (Acting) Fenja Yamaguchi-Fasting, Department for Humanitarian Action, Civil Society and Engagement, HCE

Team Leader Carla Cecilia Baumann Greiber, Department for Humanitarian Action, Civil Society and Engagement, HCE

Chief Adviser Kit Clausen, Department for Humanitarian Action, Civil Society and Engagement, HCE

Chief Adviser Eva Brandt Broegaard, Department for Evaluation, Learning and Quality, ELK

Agenda item 9: Head of Department (Acting) Karen Grønlund Rogne, Department for Migration, Stabilisation and Fragility, MNS

Team Leader Nille Gry Kabel Olesen, Department for Migration, Stabilisation and Fragility, MNS

Head of Section Bertil Moesgaard Andersen, Department for Migration, Stabilisation and Fragility, MNS

Agenda Item No. 1: Announcements

The Chair of the Council welcomed Political Director Jonas Manthey Olsen, Danish Youth Council as a new Member of the Council.

Following up on the potential backlog in Denmark's Official Development Assistance (ODA), which had been discussed at the Council's meeting on 11 May 2023, the Under-Secretary for Development Policy informed the Council that data for 2022 were still not available. The Minister for Development Cooperation and Global Climate Policy had informed the political spokespersons about the potential backlog and the adjustment mechanism, which was used to ensure that Denmark's ODA represents 0.7% of the annual Gross National Income (GNI) calculated over a 3-years period.

The Under-Secretary briefed the Council about the criticism of the Danida Sustainable Infrastructure Finance (DSIF) projects in Ghana that had been discussed in the Danish media Ekstrabladet and Globalnyt. He stressed that the recent [Evaluation of Danida Sustainable Infrastructure Finance programme](#) was used by the MFA to improve DSIF.

Members of the Council emphasised the need for better preparation of the DSIF projects as highlighted by the Council in relation to the DSIF Project Development Facility.¹ Members of the Council also inquired about the use of workers from a prison in one of the DSIF projects. The Under-Secretary confirmed that a subcontractor to the implementing partner had used prisoners for construction in Ghana. He stressed that this was unacceptable and it had been put to a halt as soon as it was uncovered.

The Council was also presented with an overview, drafted on the Council's request, of the grants in Rwanda. The Council found it important to raise attention to whether an increased development cooperation in Rwanda is aligned with Denmark's Development Strategy which rests on a foundation of human rights and democracy.

An overview of the grants below DKK 39 million given by the Department for Green Diplomacy and Climate (GDK) would be presented at the meeting on 14 September 2023.

The Deputy Chair of the Council highlighted the key messages from the Conference on Integrating Sustainable Development and Climate Change, which took place on 19 June 2023 and was hosted by CONCITO and the Minister for Development Cooperation and Global Climate Policy. A Chair's summary would be shared with Members of the Council.

Finally, the Under-Secretary informed of a change of staff in the Secretariat. From 1 August 2023, Caroline Ullerup would take over from Josephine Mittag.

With reference to the Rules of Procedure for the Council for Development Policy regarding conflict of interests, Jarl Krausing announced a conflict of interest in relation to item 5 due to CONCITO's cooperation with the UN Environment Programme Copenhagen Climate Centre (UNEP-CCC).

¹ [Meeting in the Council for Development Policy on 11 May 2023 \(um.dk\)](#)

Agenda Item No. 2: Stocktaking of the Development Cooperation in Bangladesh (2022)

For information and discussion

Embassy in Dhaka

Summary:

The Stocktaking report for Bangladesh falls between the closure of the previous country programme (2016-2022) and the current bilateral development programme (2022-2028), which will be the last phase of a traditional development cooperation with Bangladesh. The report points to the fact that Bangladesh is one of the fastest growing economies in the world, despite challenges due to global economic uncertainties. Poverty has been reduced considerably over the past decades. However, there is a risk of political volatility up to the general elections in early 2024. Human rights violations, including towards the Rohingya refugees inside the world's largest refugee camp, continue to pose a major challenge. The overall objective of the Strategic Framework for Denmark's engagement with Bangladesh is to promote a green and socially sustainable economic transition and, furthermore, has the ambition of accelerating this transition from a traditional development partnership towards a partnership focused on economic diplomacy aligned with the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and climate agenda.

Referring to the Council's discussion of the Strategic Framework for Bangladesh, the Chair of the Council expressed hope that the position of the Council at the time had been helpful in view of the additional DKK 50 million that had been allocated to Bangladesh. With this, the Chair invited the Ambassador to introduce the Stocktaking Report.

The Ambassador noted that the report was retrospective as the Embassy was in an "in between" phase with projects under the new Bilateral Development Programme about to commence, while most engagements under the former Country Programme had been concluded. Three programmes were ready for implementation, namely (i) support to locally-lead climate adaptation in two districts in Chittagong Hills Tracts through the UN Development Programme (UNDP), (ii) support to decent work through the International Labour Organisation (ILO) in conjunction with the Netherlands, Sweden, and EU, and (iii) support to Water, Sanitation and Hygiene (WASH) interventions in the host communities in Cox's Bazar through a local organisation, HYSAWA. An additional programme focusing on greening production was under formulation with the International Finance Corporation (IFC, part of the World Bank Group) with expected implementation from 2024. The Ambassador confirmed that since the presentation to the Council for Development Policy in June 2022, an additional DKK 50 million as well as an extra year had been added to the phasing out of the current development cooperation with Bangladesh which was now set to end by 2028.

The Council was generally pleased with the Stocktaking Report and also expressed appreciation for the overview of results and lessons learned. The Council appreciated the clear focus on climate change and green activities in the new programme. It was noted that the approach to climate change could take on a regional dimension to consider the melting of the glaciers in the Himalayan mountains due to climate change, which affects Bangladesh, Nepal, India and Pakistan with disproportional flooding and devastation as a consequence.

Whilst acknowledging the many results achieved, the Council raised questions about the sustainability of achievements from previous engagements, such as the development of Farmer

Field Schools and One Stop Shops for women who had experienced violence and/or sexual assault, which had become success stories due to a long and persistent engagement. Would these initiatives continue? Additionally, the sustainability of agriculture projects was questioned given future extreme weather phenomena such as El Niño.

Members of the Council requested an update on the situation for the Rohingya refugees in Bangladesh. Members of the Council furthermore questioned whether there had been a genuine improvement of labour rights in Bangladesh and asked whether this could be documented. The analysis almost exclusively focused on the garments sector while many problems persisted in other sectors. Members of the Council also raised questions regarding possible post-graduation trade barriers and how this would impact job creation. It was emphasised that many political and economic issues in Bangladesh should be considered in a regional perspective.

The Council requested information about the purpose and results of the recent visit to Bangladesh by the Minister for Development Cooperation and Global Climate Policy.

Finally, Members of the Council enquired whether an evaluation was envisioned of the development cooperation with Bangladesh and the exit from this.

The Ambassador responded that steps had been taken to ensure sustainability. The concept of Farmer Field Schools had become national and would continue, e.g. with Danish funding through the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD). The “Violence against Women” One Stop Shops had continued in its entirety with government funding and monitoring by the UN Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women (UN WOMEN). For other interventions, e.g. in the area of governance and human rights, the Embassy had sought pooled funding arrangements for engagements to continue after Denmark’s phasing out.

The Ambassador acknowledged that workers’ rights continued to be an enormous challenge across the labour market in Bangladesh, but maintained that some progress, albeit modest, had been made. Moreover, the new Danish-supported ILO project would not only focus on the garment sector.

The risk of trade barriers after Bangladesh’s graduation from the group of least developed countries was a real one. As it stood, Bangladesh would not qualify for EU’s Generalised Scheme of Preferences (GSP+) for its garments export. It was hoped that a special measure would fall into place in 2028 after the two-year transition period following Bangladesh’s graduation in 2026.

The Rohingya situation continued to be very complex. Danish funding to the camps and the refugees was channelled through Danish organisations with Strategic Partnership Agreements, while the host communities were supported through the development programme.

The Under-Secretary for Development Policy stressed that Denmark would continue to support climate change related activities in Bangladesh also after the phasing out of the traditional development support. He also reported that during the recent visit, the Minister for Development Cooperation and Global Climate Policy had gotten a first-hand impression of the effects of climate changes by being in the affected areas and talking to people who suffered these effects. In terms of results, the Minister had signed the new agreement of support to UNDP and had

launched a joint Action Plan for the further strengthening of the green partnership between Bangladesh and Denmark. The Under-Secretary agreed that a regional approach was needed to address climate issues and pointed out that the Minister had continued to Pakistan following his visit to Bangladesh.

The Head of the Department for Evaluation, Learning and Quality (ELK) agreed that an evaluation of the development cooperation with Bangladesh would be relevant, but only in the course of a few years to be able to capture learning from this transition phase.

The Chair concluded that the presentation and discussion of the Annual Stocktaking Report had been very useful.

Agenda Item No. 3: Partnering for Green Growth and the Global Goals (P4G) Phase 2 (2023-2027)

For discussion and recommendation to the Minister

DKK 178 million

Department for Green Diplomacy and Climate, GDK

Summary:

The Partnering for Green Growth and the Global Goals (P4G) is a multi-stakeholder initiative hosted by World Resources Institute with the aim of contributing to in-country climate transitions in ODA-eligible countries in three sectors. It does so by: (i) providing grants, technical assistance, and government support to green growth partnerships to become investment ready, (ii) strengthening partner countries' capacity to improve the enabling systems, and (iii) sharing learning with P4G countries and beyond. The initiative began in 2018 and is supported by three donors (Denmark, the Netherlands, and the Republic of Korea). Each partner country (Colombia, Denmark, Ethiopia, Indonesia, Kenya, the Republic of Korea, the Netherlands, South Africa, and Vietnam) has established a National Platform, which engages relevant public and private stakeholders and progress partnerships.

The Council for Development Policy recommended the Partnering for Green Growth and the Global Goals (P4G) Phase 2 (2023-2027) for approval by the Minister for Development Cooperation and Global Climate Policy. The Council stressed that it was important that Danish funding are spent at country-level and it was clear that this is the last phase of Danish support. The Council looked forward to discussing the Mid-Term Review in 2025.

The Council noted the changes from phase 1 to 2, including the strengthened emphasis on the local level vis-a-vis partnerships and national platforms. It was found important that the Partnering for Green Growth and the Global Goals (P4G) became less focused on activities in Washington and instead supported specific activities at country level. Some concern was raised related to the budget allocations, as Members of the Council found the allocated 60 percent of the support to partnerships low and enquired about the use of the remaining funds and the seemingly top-heavy organization of the programme. The underspending in the Partnership Fund was noticed, and Members of the Council asked for an explanation.

The Council remarked that since 2018, no new donors had come on board. This was considered a sign of limited success, and Members of the Council asked if P4G had scaling potential? The Council found it difficult to see from the documents if Denmark would continue to fund the

programme after 2027 and also wanted to know if it was expected that other donors would continue the programme after a possible Danish exit.

Concern was expressed in relation to the choice of partner countries. Members of the Council found that most activities in middle-income countries could have taken place without Danish support, while only activities in Ethiopia did not have a clear commercial potential. The poverty-orientation of the programme was questioned, and Members of the Council asked what was done to monitor poverty alleviation.

Members of the Council found that the reporting on the programme mainly focused on mitigation activities and enquired about the balance between mitigation and adaptation. It was noted with regret that the previous focus on sustainable cities had been dropped.

The Council asked for elaboration on the role of civil society partners as it appeared that the programme had mainly private company partners. Did civil society have a role in identifying new projects? It was noticed that unions were not part of national platforms, and Members of the Council suggested that workers' rights should be part of the criteria for support. Particular questions were raised concerning media reports from 2018 about Ali Baba in China receiving support and about the reason for not including the Central Organisation of Trade Unions in Kenya (COTU) despite the fact that the organisation was supporting electrification of busses.

Concerning the involvement of the private sector, Members of the Council asked why only start-ups were considered and not the established private sector. Finally, it was suggested that the programme should link up with incubators in universities with a view to gathering learning which could provide the basis for upscaling programme activities.

The Head of the Department for Green Diplomacy and Climate (GDK) provided a brief background to the process of developing the current phase. The initial appraisal had not recommended an approval of the programme. A thorough reflection process had led to a more solid programme, and major changes had taken place at strategic, organisational, administrative, and budget level. The World Resources Institute (WRI) had shown a strong engagement and ownership of P4G, and a second appraisal recommended the programme for approval. The combination of COVID-19 and the protracted formulation of phase 2 led to the decision not to pursue any further fund raising. WRI's fundraising team would take up the matter during phase 2, and activities such as P4G Summits and the COPs (Conferences of the Parties to the 1992 United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change) would be leveraged for fundraising.

The Head of GDK confirmed that phase 2 would be the last phase of Danish support. An exit strategy had been devised with partnership application rounds only in 2023-2025, while the last two years were planned for orderly exit. Danish withdrawal after phase 2 had been communicated to P4G, WRI, donors and in response to the comments from the Council, it would also be written explicitly into the programme document. Importantly, the Danish exit did not preclude the programme continuing if financing could be obtained from other sources.

Concerning the budget allocation of 60 percent directly to partnerships, it was explained that the remaining 33 percent would be utilised to support partnerships (e.g. technical assistance, workshops, etc.), national platforms, monitoring, and communication, while only 7 percent

would be allocated to WRI for administration and overhead. Almost all funds would be utilised at local level as P4G staff would be deployed in-country with only three staff remaining in WRI headquarters in Washington.

The role of civil society would be to support framework conditions by advocating green activities and poverty-oriented activities such as access to water and electricity. Civil society organisations would also support the commercialisation of partnerships by providing training, technical assistance, and Monitoring, Evaluation, Accountability, and Learning (MEAL) expertise. National platforms would consist of a government and national business association representative, and could also include a union representative where relevant. It was stressed that P4G had not entered into an agreement with Alibaba in China in 2018 and that no funding had been provided to the company.

In phase 2, P4G would continue with the same partner countries as in phase 1, except for Chile that was not any longer eligible for ODA (Official Development Assistance), and Bangladesh and Mexico where it had continuously been difficult to engage the private sector and/or government representatives. In the case of Bangladesh, a national platform still had not been launched after five years. A MEAL system had been established, which would allow the monitoring of climate mitigation and adaptation as well as poverty-related indicators.

It had been decided to focus on three Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) in phase 2. Although SDG11 on sustainable cities would not be part of these, a large part of the partnerships would take place in cities and SDG11, therefore, would be covered indirectly. Cooperation with research organisations in phase 1 had proven difficult and would be discontinued as part of the attempt to focus activities.

The Chair of the Council concluded that the Council recommended the Partnering for Green Growth and the Global Goals 2030 (P4G) Phase 2 (2023-2027) for approval by the Minister for Development Cooperation and Global Climate Policy. She stressed that it was important that Danish funding was spent at country-level. Also, that it was clearly noted in the programme document that this would be the last phase of Danish support for P4G. The Council looked forward to discussing the Mid-Term Review in 2025.

Agenda Item No. 4: Global Water Security and Sanitation Partnership (GWSP)

For discussion and recommendation to the Minister

DKK 80 million

Department for Green Diplomacy and Climate, GDK

Summary:

The programme document presents a 4-year contribution of DKK 80 million to the Global Water Security and Sanitation Partnership (GWSP), the World Bank's Trust Fund on water. The development objective of GWSP is to achieve a water secure world for all by sustaining water resources, delivering services, and building resilience. GWSP supports client governments to achieve water-related Sustainable Development Goals and develop climate-resilient water management through the generation of innovative global knowledge and the provision of country-level support, while leveraging the World Bank's financial instruments and promoting global dialogue and advocacy with key partners to increase reach and impact. GWSP aims to influence the quality, sustainability, and innovation

of the World Bank's lending operations related to water as well as to leverage the lessons learned from the World Bank's country operations to a global knowledge platform and think tank that shapes the global debate on water.

The Council for Development Policy recommended the Global Water Security and Sanitation Partnership (GWSP) programme for approval by the Minister for Development Cooperation and Global Climate Policy. However, the Council requested that baselines and targets were included in the results framework, the link between biodiversity and water resource management was strengthened, and it was elaborated how GWSP applied a Human Rights-Based Approach to projects related to water access.

The Council recognised the relevance and importance of the proposed programme with its objective of supporting governments to achieve water-related Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and develop climate resilient water management.

Members of the Council questioned how the Danish Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA) would influence the priorities of GWSP and the water portfolio of the World Bank. What was needed to influence the operations of the World Bank, and did the MFA have the necessary capacity to do so? Members of the Council also asked about the management setup of GWSP, including how the Trust Fund was integrated into the larger Global Water Practice of the World Bank and the rationale behind the establishment of GWSP. The importance was underlined of having clear Danish priorities and of pursuing these in the GWSP Council meeting and in the broader dialogue with the GWSP management team and other donors. Members of the Council found it important to include a Danish secondment to GWSP to support the work.

Members of the Council stressed that water was a human right and underlined the importance of ensuring a Human Rights-Based Approach to water management. Access to water in Africa often focused on supply, whereas inclusive water management was key to development. Thereby, achieving positive results for vulnerable groups. It was noted that recommendations by the appraisal concerning water rights had not been followed up.

Concern was raised about the lack of baselines and targets for the indicators in the results framework. It was difficult to see how much of the support was allocated to development of policies and to projects on the ground. Related to this, Members of the Council asked how principles on gender equality and inclusion of indigenous peoples would be put into practice. Which concrete results had been achieved and what were expected? Did female leaders in water associations have real influence?

Members of the Council underlined the important link between biodiversity and water resource management and found that the programme document did not sufficiently address due diligence, including how the World Bank ensured protection of the environment and biodiversity in water projects (following the “Do No Harm”-principle).

Finally, Members of the Council asked how GWSP worked with capacity development of recipient countries and project beneficiaries. The role of civil society was questioned, and Members of the Council also asked for elaborations on the meaningful engagement and influence of citizens.

The Head of the Department for Green Diplomacy and Climate (GDK) thanked the Council for the questions and comments. She explained that GWSP was uniquely positioned to advance the SDG 6-agenda and the Trust Fund provided access to a wealth of knowledge, tools, and analytical work for actors working within the water sector, including the Danish embassies. Thus, the main objective was to support GWSP's production of innovative global knowledge, which could be used to influence the portfolio of the World Bank. Furthermore, the Head of GDK underlined that GDK was actively engaged in the GWSP Council and sought to promote Danish priorities such as further integration of climate change into the water portfolio of the World Bank.

The Head of GDK informed that a Danish employee in GWSP would support the work instead of a Danish secondment. There was a wish to promote more dialogue and cooperation with the Danish resource base through e.g. GWSP visits to Denmark.

The Chief Adviser from GDK informed that the targets and baselines were currently being discussed and updated versions would be included in the final programme document.

He explained that GWSP was fully integrated with the Global Water Practice of the World Bank, which enabled GWSP to support client governments' actions and investments to achieve water-related SDGs through generation of innovative global knowledge. Additionally, the GWSP Program Management Team could influence the selection of new projects. The allocations for activities were made based on: (i) GWSP's priorities, (ii) feedback from the Council during the annual Council meeting, and (iii) demands at the country-level.

The Chief Adviser from GDK agreed with the importance of applying a Human Rights-based Approach when investing in water supply systems. He explained that GWSP supported analytical work on inclusion, which sought to identify and quantify the drivers of exclusion in water and identify ways to progress towards greater inclusivity.

Finally, the Head of GDK acknowledged that the important link between biodiversity and water should be further strengthened in the final programme document.

Reacting to the responses, Members of the Council requested to have a thorough discussion about trust funds in a later meeting, preferably based on a review or an evaluation of the issue. They wanted more information about the impact at country level of the many trust funds supported by Denmark and whether this is a modality well suited to influence other organisations.

The Chair of the Council concluded that the Council recommended the Global Water Security and Sanitation Partnership (GWSP) for approval by the Minister for Development Cooperation and Global Climate Policy. However, the Council requested that baselines and targets were included in the results framework, the link between biodiversity and water resource management was strengthened, and it was elaborated how GWSP applied a Human Rights-Based Approach to projects related to water access.

Agenda Item No. 5: UN Environment Programme Copenhagen Climate Centre (UNEP-CCC)

For discussion and recommendation to the Minister

DKK 15 million²

Department for Green Diplomacy and Climate, GDK

Summary:

The support for the UN Environment Programme Copenhagen Climate Centre (UNEP-CCC) 2023-2025 builds on more than 30 years of experience hosted by Danish research institutions, Risø and DTU (the Technical University of Denmark). The partnership with DTU ended in 2022. Since April 2022, UNEP-CCC has been a fully integrated Centre in UNEP at UN City Copenhagen, but with the administrative management delegated to the UN Office for Project Services (UNOPS). The purpose of the Centre is to provide scientific and technical support to UNEP and to assist in the delivery of UNEP's Programme of Work with a focus on climate change and the needs of developing countries. This is achieved by delivering technical assistance and analytical work to developing countries and by further developing the capacity and unique position of the Centre in the international climate architecture, in particular the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC). This allows UNEP-CCC to contribute to UNEP's mandate by providing compelling science-policy advice, technical assistance, and capacity building for developing countries to move on to low carbon and climate-resilient development pathways.

The Council for Development Policy recommended the UN Environment Programme Copenhagen Climate Centre (UNEP-CCC) for approval by the Minister for Development Cooperation and Global Climate Policy.

The Chair of the Council opened the discussion by explaining that the support to the UN Environment Programme Copenhagen Climate Centre (UNEP-CCC) initially had been scheduled for the Council's meeting in October 2022 but had been postponed due to the General Election. In December 2022, DKK 68 million of the support had been approved by the Minister for Development Cooperation and Global Climate Policy through a fast-track procedure in order to meet Denmark's target of 0.7 percent of the Gross National Income in Official Development Assistance. The Council would discuss the remaining grant of DKK 15 million and the broader Danish support to UNEP-CCC.

The Council welcomed the support to UNEP-CCC. The support was found relevant, further emphasised by the recent Conference on Integrating Sustainable Development and Climate on 19 June 2023, hosted by CONCITO and the Minister of Development Cooperation and Global Climate Policy.

Members of the Council stressed the importance of building synergy between supporting a systemic green transition and the need to build skills and create green and decent jobs. The trade unions had a key role to play in this regard.

The Council also recognised the relevance of the Gap Reports and the role that UNEP-CCC played at the international climate negotiations. The Council asked why it was explicitly stated in the programme document that the Gap Reports should be better targeted and promoted to a

² Due to the General Elections in 2022, the first grant of DKK 68 million was administratively approved by the Minister for Development Cooperation and Global Climate Policy through a fast-track procedure in December 2022.

Danish audience. It was also recommended that the Centre could extend this work to include a Loss and Damage Gap Report. Furthermore, questions were asked about the balance between mitigation and adaptation which seemed to be leaning much towards mitigation.

Members of the Council asked about the impacts of the transition process as UNEP-CCC was an integrated part of UNEP and no longer hosted by a Danish research institution. Why had UNEP been selected and what did the administrative cooperation with the UN Office for Project Services (UNOPS) entail? A question was also raised concerning why there was a need to support UNEP-CCC in addition to the core contribution to UNEP.

Members of the Council also asked how the Centre would reach the poorest and most marginalised groups with a relatively technocratic work approach?

The Head of the Department for Green Diplomacy and Climate (GDK) thanked the Council for the questions and comments and underlined that the continuation of 30 years of experience at the Centre had been critical to the MFA, and that it was a unique opportunity for Denmark to host UNEP-CCC in UN City Copenhagen. It was explained that the transition from the UNEP-DTU Partnership to UNEP-CCC had been a complicated one, but that it was now complete. A temporary manager of the Centre had been instated and most staff had been offered new UN contracts allowing for continuity. The Centre had become a priority for the Danish Executive Director of UNEP and would become a vital part of a new Climate Change Division from January 2024. The transfer of administrative management to UNOPS had made some processes heavier due to necessary additional safeguards.

The Chief Adviser from GDK confirmed the importance of building synergies between a green transition and workers' skills and would bring this topic up in the Steering Committee. The balance leaning most towards mitigation was recognised and Denmark was pushing this balance towards more adaptation, while also underlining the importance of safeguarding the expert knowledge that had been built on mitigation.

Concerning the focus on promoting the knowledge of the Gap Reports to a Danish audience, the Team Leader from GDK explained that many Danish stakeholders were not aware that the Gap Reports were produced by the Centre in Denmark, and that this seemed to be a missed opportunity. However, the main target group of the Gap Reports continued to be a global audience and the chief climate negotiators. The relevance of a Gap Report on Loss and Damages was recognised, but it was also important to understand the high cost of producing these. Finally, the Team Leader from GDK explained that UNEP-CCC engaged local stakeholders at the country level to support the implementation of the Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs), which gave the Centre creditability in the international negotiations. The Team Leader from GDK added that the Centre had also supported specific work targeting indigenous people.

The Chair of the Council concluded that the Council recommended the UN Environment Programme Copenhagen Climate Centre (UNEP-CCC) for approval by the Minister for Development Cooperation and Global Climate Policy.

With reference to the Rules of Procedure for the Council for Development Policy regarding conflict of interests, Jarl Krausing announced a conflict of interest in relation to the discussion due to CONCITO's cooperation with the

UN Environment Programme Copenhagen Climate Centre (UNEP-CCC). Jarl Krausing had therefore left the meeting room during the discussion of Agenda item 5.

Agenda Item No. 6: Framework Programme for the Strategic Sector Cooperation with the Ministry of the Interior and Health (2023-2027)

For discussion and recommendation to the Minister

DKK 60 million

Department for Green Diplomacy and Climate, GDK

Summary:

The Framework Programme with the Ministry of the Interior and Health (MIH) follows the concept of the Strategic Sector Cooperation 2.0. The health sector cooperation with the five countries (Brazil, China, India, Mexico, and Vietnam) aims to enable partner countries to increasingly ensure healthy lives and promote well-being for everyone at all ages in three thematic areas: (i) Coherent, efficient, and quality healthcare services for non-communicable diseases (NCD), (ii) regulation of pharmaceuticals and medical devices, and (iii) combatting health threats from infectious diseases and Antimicrobial Resistance (AMR).

The Council for Development Policy could not recommend the Framework Programme for the Strategic Sector Cooperation with the Ministry of the Interior and Health (2023-2027) for approval by the Minister for Development Cooperation and Global Climate Policy. The Council for Development Policy requested adjustments of the Framework Programme in the following areas: (i) changes of the result framework to reflect the broader development purpose of the programme in the form of indicators on poverty-orientation, (ii) a clearer description of criteria for selecting new countries, including selection of at least one African country during the framework period, (iii) more convincing arguments for focusing on non-communicable diseases. The changes will be presented to the Council at the next Council meeting on 14 September 2023.

The Council pointed out the importance of supporting health and agreed with the concept of strategic sector cooperation (SSC) but expressed reservations concerning the design of the framework programme.

The Council found it difficult to see the poverty orientation of the framework programme and was concerned that the results framework did not include development indicators, notably on poverty. The vision about reaching poor and marginalised population groups was not translated into a description of activities and a results framework, which made it unlikely that the vision would materialise. Concerning the three outcomes of the programme; capacity development, diplomacy, and support to Danish companies, respectively, the Council did not find it convincingly argued that capacity development was the main objective and that funds could not be used for the two last-mentioned and non-ODA eligible outcomes.

Concerning the thematic focus of the programme, Members of the Country questioned the assumption that better regulation of pharmaceuticals and medical devices would lead to improved access to medicine/treatment. Other important factors mentioned were the price of drugs and purchasing power of the population. Members of the Council also wondered why non-communicable diseases (NCDs) had been selected as one of three thematic areas of the Framework Programme and argued that e.g. water-borne and neo-natal diseases were much more widespread in poorer countries.

The Council expressed reservations concerning the choice of countries, some of which were upper-middle income countries, and particularly mentioned that so far no African countries had been included in the programme. Members of the Council wondered why Danish expertise in the field of health should not be used in poor countries and highlighted the need to support health capacities in Africa after the Covid-19 pandemic.

Members of the Council referred to the appraisal of the programme which found that “the already stretched Theory of Change becomes less credible in the countries chosen for the programme”. Security considerations and the absence of a level playing field for international companies were mentioned in relation to the choice of China. Finally, the point was made that the limited amount set aside was unlikely to influence the regulatory framework for pharmaceuticals and medical devices in countries such as China and Brazil.

The Head of the Department for Green Diplomacy and Climate (GDK) thanked the Council for the comments. Acknowledging the reservations by the Council concerning this and previous presentations of framework programmes, she suggested a future thematic discussion of the strategic sector cooperation as an instrument.

The Head of GDK stressed that the main outcome of the framework programme was capacity development, while improving diplomatic relations and promoting Danish companies were secondary outcomes. She stressed that development cooperation funds are not used for Danish companies and she offered to revisit the formulations in the document concerning the outcomes to make this absolutely clear.

The Head of the International Department of the Ministry of the Interior and Health (MIH) clarified that the partner countries had been selected as part of earlier processes and were not the result of the current programming. Identification of new partner countries would happen according to the criteria mentioned in the programme document, and MIH was interested in identifying a new partner country in Africa if this was supported by the preparatory analyses. She further underlined that it was prerequisite for the relevance of MIH’s support that there was a match between the demand/need from partner authorities and the strengths of Danish health authorities. It was a lesson learned from existing SSC projects that if there was a match, the demand-driven peer-to-peer model made it possible to impact health systems in large countries with relatively small projects.

These considerations had guided the choice of the programme’s three thematic areas. The Head of the International Department MIH explained that data and digital health were important elements in the Danish health system, but they were only a tool and not the focus of the framework programme. Cooperation would also be relevant in countries with lower levels of digitisation. In response to the question about NCDs, the strategic priority of supporting the capacity of health systems to tackle these diseases was in accordance with the World Health Organisation’s analysis of the detrimental impact of rising prevalence of NCDs in low- and middle-income countries, including for poor, rural, and marginalised groups in these countries. In this regard, the framework programme had a special emphasis on the need to strengthen primary healthcare in partner countries which might also contribute to tackling communicable

disease that continued to impact low-and middle income countries and was key in bringing healthcare services closer to disadvantaged groups.

After the responses, Members of the Council reiterated that they agreed with the concept of strategic sector cooperation but had issues with the thematic focus, the assessment of needs in potential partner countries, and the selection of countries included in the framework programme.

The Under-Secretary for Development Policy supported the proposal of a thematic discussion in the Council of the design of framework programmes.

The Chair of the Council concluded that the Council could not recommend the Framework Programme for the Strategic Sector Cooperation with the Ministry of the Interior and Health (2023-2027) for approval by the Minister for Development Cooperation and Global Climate Policy. The Council for Development Policy requested adjustments of the Framework Programme in the following areas: (i) changes of the result framework to reflect the broader development purpose of the programme in the form of indicators on poverty-orientation, (ii) a clearer description of criteria for selecting new countries, including selection of at least one African country during the framework period, (iii) more convincing arguments for focusing on non-communicable diseases. The changes will be presented to the Council at the next Council meeting on 14 September 2023.

Agenda Item No. 7: Orientation about the Partnership with the Sustainable Trade Initiative (IDH)

For information and discussion

Department for Green Diplomacy and Climate, GDK

Summary:

The Sustainable Trade Initiative (IDH) is a social enterprise that works with businesses, financiers, governments and civil society to realise the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and the Paris Agreement targets through sustainable production and trade. IDH has various programmes in support of systemic market transformation in selected global commodity sectors (soy, palm oil, coffee, cocoa, tea, horticulture, cotton etc.). In its meeting in September 2022, the Council for Development Policy recommended the approval of a grant of DKK 80 million to IDH. At the same time, a number of concerns were raised, and the Council requested information and a new discussion of the programme after some months. The discussion was based on a 3-page orientation with the title “Partnership with the Sustainable Trade Initiative (IDH) 2022-2025”.

The Council stressed the issue of additionality, which had also been raised in the meeting in September 2022. It was argued that the multinational companies, which the Sustainable Trade Initiative (IDH) was partnering with, would have to make the same sustainability commitments and investments in light of the coming EU legislation. Since the support was earmarked to selected international companies, of which most were big players on the international scene, the support provided by IDH implied giving an unfair market advantage vis-à-vis other, non-partnering companies.

The key assumption that the IDH support would incentivise the companies to act more sustainably was questioned by Members of the Council. It was asked how it could be avoided

that EU companies would not just flee the high-risk producer countries in the face of the coming EU regulations on corporate due diligence and deforestation. Could IDH help the producing countries prepare for and live up to the requirements of the regulation?

Referring to the UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights, Members of the Council asked for elaborations on the due diligence framework/standards that IDH was applying.

Finally, Members of the Council wanted to be updated about the relationship between IDH and the Danish Ethical Trading Initiative (DIEH). Like in September 2022, it was a concern that Danish companies and civil society organisations were not sufficiently included in the programme.

The Deputy Head of the Department for Green Diplomacy and Climate (GDK) emphasised IDH's role as a relevant SDG17 partner of Denmark. Several reviews and evaluations had concluded that IDH was delivering high quality results.

The Chief Adviser of GDK highlighted the Theory of Change of IDH, which stipulated that impact at scale would best be brought about by systemic transformation in the sourcing practices of big, multinational companies. Nevertheless, the question of additionality was valid. In a perfect world, the companies would do it on their own. However, this was not the case and it was clear to see how sustainability commitments and investments had been reduced as a result of the war in Ukraine. The coming EU legislation could be seen as the necessary “push” that would supplement the voluntary “pull” nature of IDH programs. In terms of the risk of market distortion, IDH was not providing “free money” to companies but requested co-funding in a 1:2 relationship by the participating companies.

The Chief Adviser confirmed that the UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights were part of the regulations. Lastly, he made reference to the Mid-Term Review, scheduled for November 2023, where the reservations raised by the Council in the meeting and in 2022 would be in focus. Hence, the review would look at additionality, the market distortion issues and also whether companies were interested in engaging in IDH's programmes.

Concerning the cooperation with DIEH, the Director for International Partnerships at IDH informed the Council that a multi-stakeholder meeting had been held in Copenhagen in February 2023 and more events were envisaged.

She further explained that standards in IDH programmes were more far-reaching than the requirements of the EU legislation in terms of workers' rights. As an example of an IDH programme, which addressed requirements in the coming EU legislation, reference was made to successful reductions of the living wage gap amongst plantation workers in the Banana supply chain.

The Chair of the Council concluded that the Council was still concerned about the additionality and market distortion issues. It was positive that the questions raised by the Council would be part of the Terms of Reference for the upcoming Mid-Term Review. The Council requested to be informed about the findings and conclusions of the Mid-Term Review.

Agenda Item No. 8: Organisation Strategy for the UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA) (2023-2027)

For discussion and recommendation to the Minister

DKK 960 million

The Department for Humanitarian Action, Civil Society and Engagement, HCE

Summary:

The new Organisation Strategy outlines strategic considerations and specific goals for Denmark's engagement with the UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA) for the period 2023-2027. It forms the basis for Danish financial contributions and is the platform for dialogue with OCHA. The Organisation Strategy presents Danish priorities for OCHA within the framework established through OCHA's own Strategic Plan 2023-2026.

The Council for Development Policy recommended the Organisation Strategy for the UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA) 2023-2027 for approval by the Minister for Development Cooperation and Global Climate Policy. The Council further stressed the need to continuously focus on strengthening OCHA's coordinating role and the ongoing decentralisation of OCHA's budget and staff.

The Council acknowledged the key role of the UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA) as a partner for humanitarian assistance. Had OCHA's coordination function not existed, it would have been necessary to establish a similar mechanism to ensure the coherence of the humanitarian system.

The Council highlighted that the many actors for humanitarian action and the competition among UN agencies might make the coordination mandate of OCHA more challenging to implement in an effective way – did OCHA have the authority needed for this? The Council also highlighted the importance of the leadership of OCHA strengthening ties with other actors.

Localisation was also stressed by the Council as an important tool for more efficient use of resources in light of the growing funding gap for humanitarian action. The focus of the Organisation Strategy on localisation also reflected important aspects of the Grand Bargain. In promoting localisation, it was vital to ensure that flexible funding was passed on to local partners as part of sub-granting.

Members of the Council underscored the importance of field presence and decentralisation of resources for better humanitarian action and asked how OCHA was doing on these parameters, and whether Denmark could do more to promote this issue with OCHA?

The Council emphasised that the existing funding gap for humanitarian action was a reality and a fiercely burning platform, not just a risk factor.

In relation to the composition of the grant for OCHA and the Central Emergency Response Fund (CERF), Members of the Council noted the relatively higher portion of funding for the CERF and inquired about the rationale for this. Members of the Council emphasised the importance of the CERF as a mechanism for humanitarian funding and action, and underlined the way that the CERF might leverage further funding. Were there any recent evaluations available on the work and effects of the CERF? How could the focus of OCHA and the CERF

be moved further towards preventive and anticipatory action as a more effective way of working and a better way of using resources?

Members of the Council stressed that OCHA needed to work closely with partners that had a focus on longer-term development issues. How was the Humanitarian-Development-Peace (HDP) nexus integrated in OCHA's way of working?

Furthermore, Members of the Council pointed to the significance of the climate crisis and the question of loss and damages in relation to humanitarian action and asked for elaborations on the challenges in that context and about OCHA's approach. Members of the Council found that strengthening the links between OCHA and the existing global climate actors (e.g. the Green Climate Fund) would be useful, but warned against expanding OCHA's focus on the ground.

Finally, Members of the Council underscored that youth was an important resource, not least for resilience building. This could be better reflected in the draft Organisation Strategy. Similarly, the special vulnerabilities and needs of children in crisis situations could be elaborated.

The Head of the Department for Humanitarian Action, Civil Society and Engagement (HCE) stressed that OCHA delivered services that constituted public goods for the whole humanitarian system, e.g. in the form of coordination, funding, data, and analysis that were the basis for humanitarian action. OCHA also had an important role in relation to humanitarian access and had been instrumental in that regard in relation to the humanitarian crisis in Ukraine following Russia's invasion of the country. Furthermore, OCHA's convening and leading role in the Inter-Agency Standing Committee was essential for better delivery of humanitarian assistance.

The Head of HCE noted that working across the HDP nexus was challenging and that humanitarian actors such as OCHA were, in some instances, forced to continue their presence in crisis situations for a longer period than ideal because the bridge to development assistance was not established. This was aggravated by the fact that the number of crises was increasing and that crises tended to become more protracted. A priority for Denmark in its dialogue at headquarter-level and in-country was to help establish the bridges among actors across the nexus.

Denmark was continuously sending a common message to the UN agencies that they needed to collaborate and that competition among them was not acceptable. This also reflected the clear message from the top of the UN.

The Head of HCE highlighted that local leadership in humanitarian action was a key priority for Denmark since local partners worked more effectively because of their knowledge of the local context. They provided better and more cost-effective responses before, during, and after crisis situations. By nature, they worked well across the HDP nexus. Furthermore, localisation was a continued focus in Denmark's dialogue with OCHA, including the involvement of women's organisations and women-led organisations as well as gender issues in general.

Regarding decentralisation, OCHA was going through a process of moving staff from headquarter-level to the field. This was part of a general push for decentralisation as a key element of the ongoing UN reform processes. Denmark followed this process closely.

The Head of HCE agreed that the existing funding gap for humanitarian action was a reality and a fiercely burning platform. Denmark was focussed on delivering quality funding to ensure better humanitarian action. Flexible funding helped organisations provide rapid assistance for sudden-onset crises.

CERF received a larger share of core funding than OCHA itself because it was such an important and effective instrument for humanitarian action. It had a global reach that made it possible to provide aid for crises in remote areas that Denmark otherwise would not have the capacity to reach. The Chief Adviser from HCE explained that no recent evaluation of the results of the CERF's work was available, but thematic evaluations had been published and a recent report by the Multilateral Organisation Performance Assessment Network (MOPAN) included conclusions on the work of the CERF. Donors were aware of the need for a new in-depth evaluation and were discussing when to request OCHA to initiate this.

The Head of HCE noted that climate was not part of OCHA's mandate as such, but OCHA's new Strategic Plan highlighted the necessity of focussing on addressing the humanitarian effects of the climate crisis and on finding ways to make climate and humanitarian action and funding work together for better results. It was an ongoing process to develop this into more concrete actions, and Denmark had a dialogue with OCHA on how to support this. A special concern was the fact that very little climate finance reached those most in need in humanitarian crises. This was something that OCHA was keen to help change. OCHA was involved in the development of early and anticipatory action-approaches, which Denmark encouraged OCHA to pursue even further since it was such an effective way of working.

The Head of HCE agreed that youth was an important resource for humanitarian action and emphasised that Denmark had a continued focus on the vulnerabilities and the protection of children in humanitarian crises.

The Chair of the Council concluded that the Council recommended the Organisation Strategy for the UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA) 2023-2027 for approval by the Minister for Development Cooperation and Global Climate Policy. The Council further stressed the need to continuously focus on strengthening OCHA's coordinating role and the ongoing decentralisation of OCHA's budget and staff.

Agenda Item No. 9: Deployment Facility for Peace and Democracy (DFPD) (2023-2028)

For discussion and recommendation to the Minister

DKK 120 million³

The Department for Migration, Stabilisation and Fragility, MNS

Summary:

The new phase for the Deployment Facility for Peace and Democracy (DFPD) will enable the continuation of the DFPD for a five-year period from 2023-2028. It will allow the DFPD to annually second approximately 40 civilian advisors for crisis management missions and approximately 120 election observers. There are two new

³ Due to the General Elections in 2022 and the appointment of members of the Council for Development Policy for the period 2023-2025, the first grant of DKK 30 million was administratively approved by the Minister for Development Cooperation and Global Climate Policy in January 2023.

priorities for the period 2023-2028. Firstly, to explore and acquire more experience with crisis management secondments to the UN and on a long-term basis to other international organisations. Secondly, to update the DFPD's roster of election observers to increase diversity of the database and the standby roster and to enhance the sharing of information between the MFA and observers.

The Council for Development Policy recommended the Deployment Facility for Peace and Democracy (DFPD) (2023-2028) for approval by the Minister for Development Cooperation and Global Climate Policy.

The Council pointed out that the programme's key results were primarily focused on the deployments themselves rather than the actual or expected impacts of the deployments. What were the effect of the deployments? Questions were also raised regarding the type of missions, length of deployments, and specific competencies of the seconded advisors/observers. As the administration of the facility had been outsourced, the Council asked how the MFA worked to ensure that necessary learning from implementing the Deployment Facility for Peace and Democracy (DFPD) was not lost, not least in terms of whether the civilian crisis management advisors actually contributed to peace and/or stabilisation in the countries or areas they were deployed to. Members of the Council also asked about the preparation of and dialogue with the seconded advisors/observers before and during their deployment. Updating the roster was considered useful, but with questions on whether this was done on a continuous basis.

Members of the Council noted that a significant share of the grant was reserved for the administrator of the Deployment Facility for Peace and Democracy (DFPD) and asked whether this was necessary or whether the MFA had those competencies in-house.

Members of the Council asked how the deployments were aligned with the Danish Foreign and Security Policy, especially the focus on Africa, as the majority of the actual secondments were going to Eastern Europe. Some Members of the Council also suggested shifting the balance from election observers more towards the crisis management advisors as the needs were so enormous there.

Furthermore, Members of the Council asked whether it had been considered to cooperate with e.g. the Nordic countries in order to strengthen the flexibility and effectiveness.

Finally, Members of the Council asked whether the terms of the DFPD had changed due to recent crisis and geopolitical changes, and whether this called for civilian deployments with other countries.

The Head of the Department for Migration, Stabilisation and Fragility (MNS) took note of the comments regarding key results and agreed that the balance from focusing on the number of deployments and more towards their impact would be revised. Regarding the administrator, the specialised competencies needed for the administration of the DFPD were emphasised. It was considered efficient to outsource the administration to a private company with extensive experience in the area to ensure the selection of Danish candidates in different international organisations based on relatively complex selection processes. The MFA did not have the resources for this. Furthermore, the Head of MNS highlighted that the integration of DFPD under the Peace and Stabilisation Fund through an Advisory Support Facility was key to ensuring a loop of strategic decision making in the DFPD and that experiences from the deployments

were integrated in the DFPD's common knowledge. It was further noted that the DFPD arranged briefings before and after deployments as well as biannual briefings with all Danish deployed advisors to a certain crisis management mission.

In terms of the geographical focus, the Head of MNS informed that this depended on the specific situations as they arose. The focus on Africa had been stronger earlier on, but the situation today was different, e.g. in Sahel. Furthermore, it was emphasised that recent events in Ukraine had a clear impact on the DFPD, not least in the prioritisation of both the deployments in numbers and the desired goals of the deployed advisors.

The Chair of the Council concluded that the Council for Development Policy recommended the Deployment Facility for Peace and Democracy (2023-2028) for approval by the Minister for Development Cooperation and Global Climate Policy.

Agenda Item No. 10: Any Other Business

No issues were raised under this agenda item.