

2nd Meeting of the SPREP Member Working Group to Assess Recommendations of the 3rd Independent Corporate Review and Mid-Term Review of the SPREP Strategic Plan 2017-2026

Wednesday 8 June 2022
1.00-2.30pm (Samoa Time)

Prioritisation Criteria: Questions to Consider

Inputs to Date

1. At its first meeting, the Working Group agreed to develop criteria for prioritisation of recommendations. The following list of draft criteria was proposed, to generate inputs and feedback from the Working Group:

- a. Impact or change to the core business of SPREP
- b. Impact on leadership, management and structure;
- c. Impact on resources – does it require additional resourcing;
- d. Impact on delivery of priorities; and
- e. Impact on governance arrangements of SPREP – relationship of Members with the Secretariat.

2. Ensuing feedback from some of the Working Group members expanded on the initial draft prioritisation criteria and included framing the criteria around questions to measure (positive) impact, and a scoring system to support subsequent assessment and ranking. Additional criteria were also included to reflect the importance of the strategic position of SPREP in the region. The following revisions were shared with the Working Group:

- a. What positive impact would this recommendation have on the strategic position of SPREP in the region?
- b. What positive impact would this recommendation have on the core business of SPREP?
- c. What positive impact would this recommendation have on the leadership, management, and structure of the Secretariat?
- d. What positive impact would this recommendation have on the delivery of SPREP priorities?
- e. What positive impact would this recommendation have on the governance arrangements of SPREP (thinking specifically of the relationship between members and the Secretariat)?

3. The following table example outlines a proposed format for the scoring and assessment of the recommendations.

Recommendations	+ve impact on SPREP strategic position	+ve impact on core business	+ve impact on leadership, mgmt & structure	+ve impact on delivery of priorities	+ve impact on governance arrangements	Total	Resourcing implications
	1 (none) – 5 (major/significant)						1 (none) – 5 (significant new resources required)

4. The application of the above format proposes that the Working Group members score each of the recommendations, from which an average score is determined across the membership. Finalising priority recommendations is proposed to be carried out through a facilitated discussion among the Working Group.

Thematic Framing of Recommendations

5. An added consideration in framing the prioritisation criteria may include grouping recommendations around key action-oriented themes. The intent is to add to the assessment lens and prioritisation criteria of the Working Group, towards framing the recommendations into potential action areas.

6. In reviewing the thirty-six recommendations the following action oriented thematic areas are being proposed for the Working Groups consideration [*Annex 1 provides the detailed grouping of recommendations against the proposed thematic areas*]

- a. Covid-19 Recovery
- b. Strategic Engagement
- c. Integrated Planning, Financial Management, Monitoring Evaluation & Learning
- d. Strengthened Governance & Management
- e. Regionalism
- f. Sustainable Financing
- g. Gender Empowerment
- h. People Strategy & Culture

Additional Prioritisation Criteria Questions

7. SPREP's Strategic Plan 2017-2026 outlines a set of enabling principles for prioritisation, as a guide to its approach in the delivery of its key tasks and priorities. There may be merit in adapting these principles to inform the Working Groups consideration of the prioritisation criteria. Adapting the principles could combine the proposed set of criteria questions (in paragraph 2) with some of the enabling principles – examples of potential prioritisation criteria questions could include:

- a. What positive impact would this recommendation have on *improved environmental management and sustainable development*?
- b. What positive impact would this recommendation have on *SPREP's return on investment*?
- c. What positive impact would this recommendation have on enabling *SPREP's strategic, environmental technical expertise, experience, and regional relationships*?

8. These are guiding and facilitatory questions for the Working Group to consider, with the intent to prompt and evoke thought and discussion during the meeting. It is anticipated more comprehensive ideas, discussion and decisions will be shared during the meeting.

Annex 1: Proposed Thematic Areas to Assist Prioritisation Criteria

<p>COVID-19 Recovery</p>	<p><u>Recommendation 1:</u> The SPREP Meeting consider that the Secretariat develop a comprehensive response plan to the COVID-19 Pandemic based on an assessment of likely scenarios for the remaining five years of implementation of the Strategic Plan. The response plan should include a review of the viability of new modalities that are proving effective and confirm their integration into the current and future Performance Implementation Plans (PIPs) and underlying workplans</p>
<p>Strategic Engagement</p>	<p><u>Recommendation 3:</u> The SPREP Meeting consider requiring that the Secretariat, using the Partnership Engagement and Resource Mobilisation Strategy (PERMS) and current Partnership Agreements as a foundation, further develop and strengthen its partnerships with CROP organisations including through established CROP mechanisms at the Deputy Director Level.</p>
	<p><u>Recommendation 4:</u> In the light of comments received during this Review, the SPREP Meeting may wish to revisit the proposal that the PCCC function independently of the SPREP work programme through a Chair and Governance Board.</p>
	<p><u>Recommendation 5:</u> The SPREP Meeting reconfirms their commitment to the development of Country and Territory Strategic Partnership Frameworks in collaboration with the SPREP Secretariat following the process that was endorsed at the 2020 Executive Board meeting. That the frameworks include a mutual bi-annual progress reporting requirement. That the Frameworks are developed and under implementation with all Island Members by the next SPREP Meeting.</p>
	<p><u>Recommendation 6:</u> The SPREP Meeting support the Secretariat to continue to explore and advance cost-effective opportunities to expand its subregional presence in the form of in-country SPREP representatives in all Island Member locations.</p>
<p>Integrated Planning, Financial Management, Monitoring, Evaluation & Learning</p>	<p><u>Recommendation 9:</u> The SPREP Meeting consider advising the Secretariat to prioritise fully establishing and implementing the Results Planning, Performance Reporting and Learning Framework as described in the Strategic Plan 2017-2026, particularly the “learning and continuous improvement” component, with a focus on the identification of “strategies and modalities that are most effective in supporting environmental sustainability.”</p>
	<p><u>Recommendation 19:</u> That the SPREP Meeting require the Secretariat to process-map and document the workflows of all its internal business processes and the associated data flows across the organisation. Building on this process mapping exercise recommendation, the Secretariat would implement a quality management system, while seeking to attain accreditation under ISO 9000 and/or other relevant international standards for operations (IT services and project management).</p>
	<p><u>Recommendation 20:</u> That the SPREP Meeting require the Secretariat adopt a single and standardised project methodology and apply this for all projects including a detailed fully costed risk assessment for all projects.</p>
	<p><u>Recommendation 21:</u> That the SPREP Meeting consider requiring the Secretariat to appoint an Ombudsman for procurement, who would be responsible for investigating complaints about procurement. The Ombudsman would report to the SPREP Board through the Audit Committee.</p>
	<p><u>Recommendation 10:</u> The SPREP Meeting consider: (i) reconfiguring the Executive Board as a permanent Board to oversee SPREP between SPREP meetings with virtual meetings (convened for up to a half-day) three times a year;</p>

Strengthened Governance & Management	<p>(ii) establishing a remunerated part-time position of Independent Board Chair who must have ample experience in senior roles and be of a different nationality than the DG or DDG and appointed on merit for one term of 4 years after which it must rotate to another SPREP Member; and, discontinuing the Troika and folding its functions into the Executive Board.</p>
	<p><u>Recommendation 11:</u> That the SPREP Meeting consider requiring the Secretariat to: (i) strengthen the Internal Auditor function by: (i) changing the reporting lines of the Internal Auditor to the Chair of the Board through the Chair of the Audit Committee; (ii) adding additional external resources to assist the Internal Auditor and Risk Manager to perform the assurance function; and, ensuring that the internal auditor's current role as an internal controller with internal sign off responsibilities should cease and revert to an assurance process based on review of processes.</p>
	<p><u>Recommendation 12:</u> That the SPREP Meeting consider requiring that the Secretariat transfers the primary responsibility for overseeing its major projects to a new and separate Technical Cooperation and Projects Programme with its own Director. This Programme would have its own income and cost centres that are separate from those associated with advisory services work. The Programme would manage and coordinate major projects through an "internal contract" basis with other SPREP Programmes and Departments wherein they negotiate and agree the time provided by their experts to each project (also see associated Recommendations 31 and 32). This Programme would also have responsibility for negotiating and securing new project funding</p>
	<p><u>Recommendation 13:</u> That the SPREP Meeting consider requiring the Secretariat restructure the corporate services departments into a single business unit called Business Support Unit reporting to a Chief Operating Officer or General Manager Business Support. This Unit would focus on internal administrative and business support functions.</p>
	<p><u>Recommendation 14:</u> That the SPREP Meeting consider providing the incoming Director General with a Letter of Expectations setting out the organisational outcomes that Members seek in his or her first term. This should include specific expectations on the corporate culture and management style that the Director General is expected to foster.</p>
	<p><u>Recommendation 15:</u> That the SPREP Meeting consider requiring the Secretariat to amend its delegations framework to ensure that: (i) the Board makes decisions on all future re-sizing of senior positions (over Band 13); (ii) the Chair of the Board reviews all senior management performance assessments in conjunction with the Chair of the Audit Committee; and the Board reviews all major funding agreements over US\$[2] million. The Chair of the Board would be authorised to sign these after obtaining authority from the full Board in and out-of-session process.</p>
	<p><u>Recommendation 16:</u> That the SPREP Meeting consider requiring the Secretariat to carry out a comprehensive review of its management structures and job sizes. The review should encompass an assessment of the span of control of staff with management and supervisory functions across the organisation (band 11 and above). The review should provide recommendations for a restructure so that there are generally 4-6 direct reports per manager. The review should require that all management positions should be reassessed to meet the new recommended structure.</p>
	<p><u>Recommendation 17:</u> That the SPREP Meeting realigns the responsibilities of the Executive so that the Director General is focused on managing external relations, and the Deputy Director General is focused service delivery to its' Members.</p>

	<p><u>Recommendation 18:</u> That the SPREP Meeting require the Secretariat to adjust the current reporting lines so that the Executive directly manage:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) Communications and outreach, (ii) the subregional offices (and in-country Project funded offices and the Accredited Entity function).
Regionalism	<p><u>Recommendation 7:</u> The SPREP Meeting consider requiring the Secretariat to develop a Communications Plan to focus, standardise and coordinate the Secretariat’s communications and advocacy outreach at all levels. This would include appropriately resourcing the Communications and Outreach Unit to develop and deliver this Plan with the support and engagement of staff across the Programmes and Departments of the Secretariat.</p>
Sustainable Financing	<p><u>Recommendation 29:</u> That the SPREP Meeting consider and decide to amend the Financial Regulations to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) give consideration to a regular adjustment strategy for assessing member contributions, (ii) clarify that assessed member contributions are mandatory, (iii) set a definitive date by which such fees must be paid, (iv) introduce graduated consequences for late payment of membership fees, and stipulate that arrears greater than 12 months should result in suspension of service unless that government has concluded a payment plan that is approved by the Board. <p><u>Recommendation 30:</u> That the SPREP Members require the Secretariat to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) amend the Financial Regulations to remove project management fees from miscellaneous income, and budget/account for this income and the associated expenses in a separate budget segment; (ii) identify which managerial and support staff are dedicated to supporting Project Implementation, and fund these staff from project administration charges; (iii) institute internal charges for cost recoveries between budget segments; and ensure that any advice provided by staff to a specific project that is not funded by that project is internally charged on the basis of work days or hours rather than full time employees. <p><u>Recommendation 31:</u> That the SPREP Meeting require the Secretariat to rationalise core expenditure to cover:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) essential policy advisory functions, and viable corporate business support function. <p><u>Recommendation 32:</u> That the SPREP Meeting consider and decide to amend its Financial Regulations to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) establish a Special Assessment Fund that can be used as required to fund any change process to meet the revised strategic direction should the Meeting adopt the recommended changes in this Review; (ii) introduce into the Financial Regulations a Capital Reserve Fund for asset replacement and major system upgrades, which can be replenished on a periodic basis through a separate capital assessment on Members; and establish a General Reserve Fund to allow for a minimum of four months operating expenses in the event of totally unforeseen circumstances. <p><u>Recommendation 33:</u> That the SPREP Meeting require the Secretariat to consider adopting the International Public Sector Accounting Standards over the next 2 or 3-year time frame.</p> <p><u>Recommendation 34:</u> That the SPREP Meeting amend the Financial Regulations to ensure that budgets are prepared on the same basis as Financial Statements.</p>

	<u>Recommendation 35:</u> That the SPREP Meeting require the Secretariat to consider adopting segment reporting to allow for greater budgetary control in matching the income and expenditure for the advisory services and project implementation work.
Gender Empowerment	<p><u>Recommendation 8:</u> The SPREP Meeting consider requiring that:</p> <p>(i) the SPREP Senior Leadership reinforce their commitment to the implementation of the SPREP Gender Policy, with one member of the Executive team identified as a Gender Champion to lead on its implementation;</p> <p>(ii) the work of the Gender Equity and Inclusion Mainstreaming Working Group be elevated to ensure it translates into the Secretariat’s management and decision-making systems and processes; and</p> <p>(iii) the Secretariat update the SPREP Gender Policy (2016) to reflect developments in GESI theory and practice in the Pacific Region. These updates would include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The recognition of the intersectionality of women and girls lives and other marginalised diverse groups including LGBTQI and people living with disabilities. • Specific policies in relation to responding to sexual harassment and family violence. • A commitment to train SPREP staff to enable them to effectively deliver all relevant aspects of the Gender Policy through their work with Island Members. • A systematic approach to planning, monitoring, evaluation and reporting on SPREP’s GESI work through programmes and projects.
People Strategy & Culture	<u>Recommendation 24:</u> That the SPREP Meeting require the Secretariat to put into place a Capability Development Framework that could be developed and implemented either as part of, or standalone from the People Strategy.
	<u>Recommendation 25:</u> That the SPREP Meeting consider requiring the Secretariat to establish an independent external dispute mechanism to provide a neutral forum for staff grievances to be addressed and adjudicated after other dispute settlement processes, such as in Staff Regulation 12, are exhausted.
	<u>Recommendation 26:</u> That the SPREP Meeting require the Secretariat to support the Staff Advisory Committee to reform itself as a single entity staff labour organisation with a higher level of independence, that operates in accordance with ILO standards.
	<u>Recommendation 27:</u> That the SPREP Meeting require the Secretariat to formulate a personal data protection policy. The policy should define a timeframe for retention of such data and procedures for how it is ultimately disposed.
	<u>Recommendation 28:</u> That SPREP Members ensure that their respective national pension/superannuation schemes remain available to their nationals while they are working at SPREP.