

**Agenda item 6.4: Working Group for the Prioritisation of Recommendations of the 3<sup>rd</sup> Independent Corporate Review (ICR) and the Mid-Term Review (MTR) of the SPREP Strategic Plan.**

**Purpose of paper**

1. Provide an update on the progress made by the Working Group in its efforts to address three key deliverables under its Terms of Reference;
2. Seek SPREP Executive Board input and direction on the progress of the Working Group and remaining schedule of work

**Background**

3. Following its consideration of recommendations from the reports of the 3<sup>rd</sup> ICR and MTR in September and October 2021, SPREP Members established a Working Group to assess the combined recommendations and put forward a prioritised set of focus areas for Members to consider. Alongside consideration of these recommendations, the Working Group were also tasked with addressing the completed SPREP Remuneration Review.
4. The Working Group consists of SPREP Members: Australia, Cook Islands, New Zealand, Republic of Marshall Islands, Samoa and Tuvalu. The Working Group is also open to any Member who wishes to participate. The Terms of Reference of the Working Group is attached [WP.6.4/Att.1].
5. To provide the needed technical and administrative support to the Working Group, around convening, keeping meeting records, and in framing the prioritisation process and criteria, an External Facilitator was appointed.
6. To guide the assessment of the ICR and MTR recommendations, the Working Group adopted the following four prioritisation criteria.
  - a. What positive impact would this recommendation have on enabling the strategic and regional leadership of SPREP in supporting improved environmental management and sustainable development?
  - b. What positive impact would this recommendation have on enhancing the internal strategic expertise and environmental technical expertise to support the delivery of the core business of SPREP and its priorities?
  - c. What positive impact would this recommendation have on creating the conditions for robust management working arrangements and engagement at the Secretariat?
  - d. What positive impact would this recommendation have on creating the conditions for robust governance arrangements and engagement at SPREP?

7. Since its inception, the Working Group has progressed several of its key deliverables, including:
  - a. Confirming a work schedule in line with the timeframe to report back to the Executive Board as outlined in their terms of reference.
  - b. Determining the scope and parameters of the prioritisation process, including set questions, and scoring criteria to assist with individual member assessments of the recommendations.
  - c. Completed assessments of each recommendation, utilising a quantitative ranking score, to determine whether the recommendation is of 1. High Priority, 2. Medium Priority, and 3. Low Priority. This included a written rationale to support each assigned score.
  - d. An initial consolidation of the quantitative rankings of the recommendation, including consolidation of the individual rationale assigned to the quantitative ranking of recommendations.
8. The progress of the Working Group's efforts were impacted by the timing of annual high level regional meetings, which included the Pacific Islands Forum Leaders, Forum Officials Committee, and associated regional Dialogue with the private sector and civil society organisations. Representatives on the Working Group also held lead responsibility for their government's preparations for the annual high level meetings, and thus were unable to commit the full extent of time needed to complete assigned tasks outlined in their endorsed work schedule.
9. In response, the work schedule was adjusted to allow Members to give priority commitment to the high-level regional meetings. As a result, the momentum made in the listed deliverables above, while progressing, were delayed.
10. In addition, consolidating the quantitative scores together with the individual rationales, took longer than anticipated. The External Facilitator has to date, completed a consolidation of quantitative scores and has consolidated individual rationales provided for select recommendations (not all quantitative rankings had an associated rationale).
11. From the consolidated quantitative rankings, very preliminary "priority" recommendations are beginning to surface. However, without an analysis of the consolidated rationale placed alongside the quantitative scores, it would be presumptuous at this point to suggest a preferred set of key focus areas is taking shape.
12. For the Working Group to be fully informed and in a position to put forward a recommendation on key focus areas as required, more time and work is needed. The remaining scope of work, includes:
  - a. Analysis of the consolidated rationales provided for ranking of select recommendations, including identifying common themes within the rationales.
  - b. Ranking of recommendations under each of the prioritisation criteria using the analysis of combined quantitative scores and analysis of common themes within the rationale
  - c. Convene the Working Group to consider and decide on the combined analysis and proposed ranking of recommendations

13. As outlined in its initial work schedule, the Working Group will consider the recommendations of the Remuneration Review upon completion of its work in regard the recommendations of the ICR and MTR.

#### **Recommendation**

14. The Executive Board Meeting is invited to:
    - 1) **Note** the progress of the Working Group in regard the prioritisation of the ICR and MTR recommendations;
    - 2) **Endorse** that more time is required for the Working Group to complete all its deliverables;
    - 3) **Endorse** that the Working Group report on the priority recommendations and Key Focus Areas be submitted in an out-of-cycle paper to the full SPREP Membership, by the first quarter of 2023.
-