



**Environment Management Group**  
**2<sup>nd</sup> Meeting of the Peer Review Body – part 2/2**  
11.06. 2014  
Web-conference  
Time: 2-5 P.M GVA time

EMG/PRB02/  
14 July 2014  
Distribution: PRB members

## Report

### I. Summary of Proceedings

The second session of the 2<sup>nd</sup> meeting of the Peer Review Body (PRB) was convened on 11 June by web conference, under the co-chairmanship of Mr. Stefano Bologna, Director Operational Support Services of UNIDO, and Mr. Elliott Harris, Director of EMG Secretariat and the UNEP New York office. This meeting conducted an assessment of the pilot phase of the Peer Review process and considered recommendations for the Second Phase of the Peer Review process. Following opening remarks and a recap of the peer review process provided by the co-chairs, the Peer Review Body (PRB) engaged in a frank discussion on the strengths and shortcomings of the Peer Review process thus far and its views of the Peer Review process going forward. Agencies interested in being peer reviewed in the possible next phase were encouraged to step forward.

The Agenda of the meeting and the list of participants are provided in Annex I and II of this report.

### II. Considerations and Recommendations of the PRB

#### 1. Opening Session

The opening session heard introductory remarks by Mr. Elliott Harris, Director of EMG and the UNEP New York office.

#### 2. Adoption of the Agenda

Mr. Elliott Harris, Director of EMG and the UNEP New York office, briefly introduced the agenda, and the PRB adopted it with no changes.

#### 3. Introduction to the Peer Review Process and the overall findings so far

The substantive sessions of the meeting started with a brief introductory presentation of the Peer Review process thus far.

#### 4. Assessment of the pilot phase of the Peer Review process including benefits and challenges

##### 4.1 Discussion of the strengths of the first three review reports of WMO, UNIDO and UNEP

Mr. Stefano Bologna, Director Operational Support Services of UNIDO, encouraged the PRB to express their views on the strengths of the piloting review reports of WMO, UNIDO and UNEP.

Mr. Shoa Ehsani, UNEP, highlighted the significant depth of the reports on the management of facilities and operations in a comprehensive and systematic manner. The depth of the review is vital to identify learning opportunities and make recommendations, making the availability and richness of data a necessary condition for the effectiveness of the review and its continuity.

Mr. Elliott Harris, UNEP/EMG, firstly confirmed that the reviews greatest advantage resides in it being an in-depth analysis based on information provided by the agencies, enabling facilities managers to take a comprehensive approach and see the overall impacts of the facilities and their operations, rather than a narrow focus on particular aspects of a given problem. Secondly, the participation of external agencies in the reviewing team was considered as an advantage, since it produced mutual learning and raised critical issues. Thirdly, the voluntary nature of the review was represented as a further strength of the process, as it allowed for a greater openness by the reviewed agencies.

Ms. Liisa-Maija Harju, OECD, noted that external auditors would not be able to understand issues relevant to the agencies as far as other colleagues did, thus the composition of the reviewing team represents a strength of the process and should be maintained.

Ms. Teresa Garcia-Gill Cuellar, UNIDO, emphasized the independence of the reviewing team from auditors, industries, engineering team, etc. as a key strength of the Peer Review, enabling a more open approach to the global challenges that agencies are facing. The Peer Review process also is a motivational driver for the building management team, who in this way felt to be integral part of the UN system, and the host governments, who were keen to work together and show their environmental sensitivity—the process created a successful platform for the agencies to work together with the host government. Finally, the consistency of the review report represented an important advance over the disaggregated documents usually produced.

Ms. Anne-Claire Blet, UPU, agreed on the importance of the motivational aspect of the review process. This was even more important for the top management, as it offered a justification of their mandate. Finally, a further strength was identified in the helpfulness of the initial questionnaire sent before the on-site visit.

#### **4.2 Discussion of the shortcomings of the first three review reports of WMO, UNIDO and UNEP.**

Mr. Shoa Ehsani, UNEP, recalled the challenges of the UNEP review process and preparation of the needed data as UNEP was not in charge of managing the facilities it occupies. UNON as the landlord might not always have the same priorities as UNEP the tenant. The Peer Review should take into account the level of cooperation with external parties, particularly landlord agencies, and provide a platform for resolution. The EMG may advise on how to tackle this particular aspect.

Mr. Elliott Harris, UNEP EMG, stressed the difficulty of considering external parties in the review process as they did not volunteer to the process. Another important area of improvement would be for the the recommendations to propose a timeline, which would facilitate choice and prioritization of areas of action, and also justify the subsequent increase in costs based on scientific evidence.

Mr. Frank Harnischfeger, IMF, agreed with the usefulness of timelines in the Peer Review reports, however, underlined the difficulties to justify costs in an objective manner from a socio economic point of view.

Ms. Anne-Claire Blet, UPU, advocated more quantitative metrics, in order to assess the impact in terms of environmental and financial savings of recommended actions and other steps, such as shifting toward sustainable procurement.

Ms. Jeannie Egan, WB, suggested that quantity based metrics could also facilitate benchmarking between reviewed agencies, as for example per capita energy consumption. However, any benchmarking would need to consider the differences in climate conditions between agencies.

Mr. Andy Cole, WFP, highlighted the need to pull out generic recommendations that would be relevant for any agency, as for example recommendations on paper consumption.

#### **4.3 Comments on the format and the structure of the reports.**

The Peer Review Body agreed on the usefulness of the depth of the reports.

#### **4.4 Discussion of the issues that could be considered in a better way.**

Ms. Jeannie Egan, WB, Mr. Andy Cole, WFP, and Mr. Elliott Harris, UNEP EMG, referred to the importance of considering cost implication of the review process itself in terms of time and financial cost.

#### **4.5 Discussion of the challenges to contribute to the Peer-Review process including contribution to the reports and attendance to the respective meetings.**

Mr Jacob Kurian, UNEP EMG, reported that a common challenge has been the collection of the data.

Mr. Shoa Ehsani, UNEP, added that quantitative data, as for example electricity usage, was particularly difficult to collect, explaining why the review reports in parts took a more narrative form. On the other hand, Ms. Teresa Garcia-Gill Cuellar, UNIDO, suggested that this result may be due to the piloting nature of the review and may improve as the process becomes a regular exercise with standardised metrics.

### **5. Considerations for the Second phase of the peer-review process**

The Peer Review Body was invited by Mr. Elliott Harris, UNEP EMG, to formulate recommendations to present to SOM regarding the Second Phase based on the learnings from the First Phase recently concluded.

The Peer Review body agreed upon the following:

- The exercise is useful and represents a value added tool to identify areas of improvement and therefore should be continued.
- There is a need to understand the cost of the Peer Review process itself in terms of staff and financial resources. In this regard, the participants should provide data about the costs incurred to EMG Secretariat and EMG Secretariat will calculate its own cost, the cost of consultancies as well as any other financial expenditure undertaken, in order to determine the overall cost of the exercise.
- It would be useful to share within the peer review body the 3 questionnaires that were sent in advance to the on-site visits to the agencies. This information will provide an approximate idea of the costs to be undertaken by the agencies that were to volunteer to be reviewed.
- The decision to disseminate Peer Review results, including to member states through the governing bodies, should not be ex ante assumed, formalized or standardized. . It should be an ex post decision of the senior management whether and how to disseminate the Peer Review results.
- The Peer Review results should be shared within the reviewed organization. The facilities management, for example, would benefit from the result of the analysis and have more incentive to participate in the improvement process.

A concern was raised on whether it would be useful to have a statement of commitment demonstrating the engagement of the reviewed institution's senior management and of those directly engaged in the review process prior to beginning the review process in new agencies. In this regard the EMG Secretariat highlighted the voluntary nature of the peer-reviews and committed to send out the "Peer-Review Program" approved by the Senior Officials that sets the principles and boundaries of the process.

There was no objection to use of the peer review as a tool to benchmark agencies. It was thought particularly useful if agencies could assess their progress against a baseline in matters that they considered particularly relevant, and share information on their improvements within the Peer Review Body.

Finally, UPU, IMF, UNWOMEN and OECD expressed their interest to volunteer in the Second Phase of Peer Review process, subject to the dissemination of the costs of the piloting phase. Mr. Elliott Harris, UNEP EMG, suggested to circulate also information about the potential adjustments necessary to apply the process to more decentralized and/or larger agencies. No decision is expected by the above agencies before SOM20.

### **III. Conclusion and closure of the meeting**

The co-chairs concluded the second phase of the 2<sup>nd</sup> PRB meeting by thanking the Review Team for their work and all the experts and staff members who collaborated with the team in the development of the Peer Review. Participants were thanked for the emissions saved by not travelling to the meeting.

The co-chairs noted that there was unanimous agreement to recommend the continuation of the Peer Review process and the broadening of participation.

The co-chairs expressed and summarized the key messages from this Peer Review meeting by highlighting the access to the right type and level of data as the major challenge for the Second Phase. In this respect, EMG Secretariat will circulate a list of shortcomings in data collection and their impacts on the review process, in order to facilitate learning and improvement.

The co-chairs concluded that the outcome of this second session of the meeting should be clear recommendation to the SOM20. A summary of an assessment of the pilot phase, including its strengths and weaknesses, should be provided to the EMG Senior Officials Meeting in September 2014.

## Annex I



### UNITED NATIONS ENVIRONMENT PROGRAMME

Programme des Nations Unies pour l'environnement    Programa de las Naciones Unidas para el Medio Ambiente  
Программа Организации Объединенных Наций по окружающей среде    برنامج الأمم المتحدة للبيئة

联合国环境规划署



---

#### Peer Review Body Meeting

11 June 2014 - 3.00-5.00 (Geneva time)

Web-conference

EMG/PRB02/ 01

27 May 2014

## Provisional agenda and proposed organization of work

### A. Provisional agenda

1. Opening remarks by Co-chairs Mr. Stefano Bologna, Director of the UNEP New York Office and the EMG Secretariat and Mr. Stefano Bologna, Director Operational Support Services of UNIDO
2. Adoption of the agenda
3. Recap of the Peer review process and initial findings so far
4. Assessment of the pilot phase of the Peer Review process including benefits and challenges.
5. Considerations for the Second Phase of the Peer Review process
6. Conclusion and closure of the meeting

## Proposed organization of work on Wednesday 11 June 2014

15:00–15:05 p.m.	Provisional agenda item 1: Opening remarks by Elliott Harris, Director of UNEP New York Office and EMG and Stefano Bologna, Director Operational Support Services of UNIDO
15:05–15:10 a.m.	Provisional agenda item 2: Adoption of the agenda Chaired by Elliott Harris
15:10–15:30 a.m.	Provisional Agenda item 3: Recap of the Peer review process and initial findings so far chaired by Elliott Harris
15:30–16:15 p.m.	Provisional Agenda item 4: Assessment of the pilot phase of the Peer Review process including benefits and challenges: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>a) strengths of the first three review reports of WMO, UNIDO and UNEP;</li><li>b) shortcomings of the first three review reports of WMO, UNIDO and UNEP;</li><li>c) comments on the format and the structure of the reports;</li><li>d) issues that could be considered in a better way;</li><li>e) challenges to contribute to the Peer-Review process including contribution to the reports and attendance to the respective meetings.</li></ul>
16:15–16:55 p.m.	Provisional Agenda item 5: Considerations for the Second phase of the peer-review process
16:55– 17:00 p.m.	Conclusion and closure of the meeting by Co-chairs

## **Annex II**

### **List of participants**

*As of 11 June 2014*

- |            |                   |  |
|------------|-------------------|--|
| <b>1.</b>  | <b>FAO</b>        | <b>Mr. Mitchell Hall</b>   |
| <b>2.</b>  | <b>IAEA</b>       | <b>Mr. David Osborne</b>   |
| <b>3.</b>  | <b>ICAO</b>       | <b>Mr. Mike Romero</b>   |
| <b>4.</b>  | <b>ILO</b>        | <b>Ms. Carolina Ferreira</b>   |
| <b>5.</b>  | <b>IMF</b>        | <b>Ms. Frank Harnischfeger</b>   |
| <b>6.</b>  | <b>ITU</b>        | <b>Mr. Peter Ransome</b>   |
| <b>7.</b>  | <b>OECD</b>       | <b>Ms. Liisa-Maija HARJU</b>   |
| <b>8.</b>  | <b>UNEP</b>       | <b>Mr. Shoa Ehsani</b>   |
| <b>9.</b>  | <b>UNESCO</b>     | <b>Ms. Khadija Zammouri Ribes</b>  |
| <b>10.</b> | <b>UNHCR</b>      | <b>Mr. Alain Gonin</b>   |
| <b>11.</b> | <b>UN-HABITAT</b> | <b>Ms. Lilia Blades</b>  |
| <b>12.</b> | <b>UNIDO</b>      | <b>Ms. Teresa Garcia-Gill Cuellar</b><br><b>Ms. Michelle Rogat</b><br><b>Mr. Stefano Bologna</b> |
| <b>13.</b> | <b>UPU</b>        | <b>Ms. Anne-Claire Blet</b>  |
| <b>14.</b> | <b>WFP</b>        | <b>Ms. Georgina Stickels</b><br><b>Mr. Andy Cole</b>   |

15. WHO Ms. Donna Kynaston
16. WMO
17. World Bank Ms. Jeannie Egan  
World Bank Group Adam Rubensfield
18. DFS Mr. Moha Batta
19. UNEP EMG Mr. Elliott Harris  
Mr. Hossein Fadaei  
Mr. Jacob Kurian  
Prof. Brahmanand Mohanty  
Mr. Hugues Delcourt