

# 14<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Issue Management Group on Environmental Sustainability Management (IMG 14)

*Washington D.C. 27-28 February 2011*

## Meeting Report

The 14<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Issue Management Group on Sustainable Management in (IMG14) took place in Washington D.C. on 27-28 February, 2011. The meeting was attended by some 25 IMG focal points and observers in person, with another 14 participants joining in on-line. The meeting was held at the Headquarter (HQ) 2 building of the International Monetary Fund (IMF). A presentation and video of the reconstruction of the HQ 1 building of the IMF was also made, outlining some of the sustainable features.

### **Agenda Item 1: Opening**

#### **A. General Information**

The meeting group was welcomed by the IMF Director of Facilities Mr. Scott McMillan. The meeting was then opened by Elliot Harris the Director of EMG and the UNEP New York Office; a tour of the table ensued.

Isabella Marras, Coordinator of the SUN team, announced the departure of Florian Krautzer of the SUN helpdesk. Julie Mackenzie, the UN Secretariat (UNS) Focal Point is moving to Rome and will no longer be the UNS Focal Point; Julie was thanked for her assistance and support of the SUN team.

#### **B. Suggestions**

None.

#### **C. Outcomes/ Results/ Action Points**

The agenda was adopted.

### **Agenda Item 2: The 2012 inventory results and the fifth Moving Towards Climate Neutral UN Report launch**

### **Agenda Item 3: Feedback on the 2013 inventory process & plans for next report publication**

&

#### **A. General Information**

The report was shared both physically (to those present) and online. A record number of agencies (64) participated in the report. While there is a downward trend in the absolute magnitude of UN emissions, and a more pronounced reduction in the per capita emissions, these results are typically within the margins of error. The report has been well disseminated through various media, mostly electronically, but with a limited number of printed copies.

The SUN team is willing to help agencies with additional report copies and report launch efforts.

## **B. Suggestions**

IMG members provided the following suggestions/comments:

- A member of the IMG thanked the support of the SUN team in updating their page and helping them with the internal launch of the report.
- A number of agencies are looking to launch the report in their agencies and to organize for the sensitization of their senior management and staff.
- A suggestion was made to share the report with other networks such as the INFM, who have been kind enough to share a lot of the data used for the report.
- The report was printed on time, bearing in mind the constraint of having to empty the data base of the calculator from previous year's data. Would we be able to expedite this process even further?
- The next inventory exercise would also request agencies to disclose the level of completeness and boundary of their emissions. Further data is required to assess the trends and accuracy of data. DPKO's lack of reporting in the last few years is one of the reasons for a static overall picture as they are responsible for some 55 % of total UN emissions; they may have to be removed from the report in future years unless fresh data is obtained from them.
- Can we look at other ways to comment on our footprint as the absolute and per capita results are within the margin of error for the report. Perhaps, agencies confident with their data can report if they have reduced their footprint from their base-line, and only the number of such agencies can be reported.
- There have been methodological changes in the last few years in our calculations. The 2011 and 2012 are the best years to compare. The context of an agency that has "reduced" its emissions has to be within certain guidelines, it can't for example be due to a lack of completeness or loss of control of emission producing operations.
- We can perhaps discuss "trends", as opposed to straight numeric statistics.
- Other parameters to report can be: number of agencies that report, have emission reduction plans, have goals and who are climate neutral.
- What does the private sector do in this regard? Surely they have similar issues with margins of error. How do they report?
- All data has to be taken in context and with noted caveats, for example number of agencies have increased due to more reporting as well as groups reporting due to splitting of sub-agencies and reporting separately. A creative way of materially reporting this data is important.
- A simplified system wide IMP, looking at and disclosing head count and boundaries is required. It should also be noted that the GHG Protocol, on which we base our calculation, allows for uncertainty and this is part and parcel of the process. A total should therefore continue to be reported with disclosed caveats.
- Focusing on certain sources of emissions each year maybe a way to vary the story being told. This is already being done to some extent, as environmental efforts of agencies are highlighted in the report. This can create a common thread across offices.
- The report is well done, however, sustainability reports that we produce are stand alone. Can they be more mainstreamed in our organizations? This is happening to a great extent in the private sector.
- The issue of reporting is also tied to the matter of the new software for carbon accounting and EMS. The software's capabilities need to be defined.
- In many agencies focal points are trying to get the environmental sustainability report into the annual reports of agencies, and not just as a side publication. Might such an approach be possible in the UN overall and the Secretary General's annual report.
- Perhaps the EMG could be the venue for the raising the profile of this system-wide report. Not every agency is represented in the EMG, so the EMG would be used as an entrée to HLCM and the CEB.

- The timing of the publication of the report can also help the profile of the report if we can get it out earlier. The issue of cost-benefit may be a sensitive subject if included in the report, we have to be mindful of this.
- Given the work needed on the calculator, Flat Files can be shared by April 1<sup>st</sup>, 2014. Upload can follow soon after. Having the data and the efforts made by agencies on environmental sustainability belong to the same time period is also of benefit, right now these are reported in the same report and yet belong to different time periods.
- Field agencies that have the most office files to upload can live up to an earlier deadline for reporting. Having the ability to use old files to gather data early is also of use (and transferring these into the newer files when available). Many of these needs are being considered for the new software. The ICAO calculator will still be used, although it uses a data base that is updated 6 months after the year in which flights took place; nevertheless the older data bases support a capture majority of flights.
- The issue of staff count and what it represented needs clarification as does the reporting of flights for example as a lot of this includes participants and not just staff.
- “Staff” is defined as ASG, USG, D, P, L, UNV and consultant. We have to report within the boundary of our control and this includes participant travel, so travel footprint should not be seen as the amount of staff travels, but the carbon cost of doing business given the technological means chosen within an organization.
- The splitting up of staff and participant travel may also help resolve the above; this would give a more accurate and differentiated picture.
- It seems that agencies are using different methods of counting “staff”: some are using the total occupants of a building, others only count permanent staff (not consultants) and some agencies have different staff categories. Payrolls and security rosters were also good ways to get staff numbers. Consistency in counting staff is important.

**Can the inventory process be postponed for a year to allow us to better understand the boundaries and caveats of what we are measuring, and to implement a new system? This can help with accuracy of the report in years to come.**

- The one agency that spoke supported this idea, as rehashing the same inventory data is fraught with reputational risks.

#### **C. Outcomes/ Results/ Action Points**

- Elliot Harris will see if the Moving Towards Climate Neutrality report can be reviewed by the HLCCM with the possibility of including a modified version of it in the UN annual report.
- This year, the reporting of our GHG data will be pushed forward. Dates and deadlines for this exercise will be communicated. The objective is to have the report finished and printed before the year’s end.
- In regard to the postponement of the inventory process for a year, a “Survey Monkey” questionnaire will be used to capture IMG sentiments.

### **Agenda item 4: Next generation software for UN emissions**

#### **A. General Information**

Shoa Ehsani, Climate Neutral Officer, UNEP made a presentation on the effort of the IMG Software Working Group to develop or procure a new software for the UN GHG Inventory and for reporting

other environmental impacts. The software currently being used for the Inventory has its limitations and no ability to handle other environmental aspects for the EMS. Hence it became essential to look at new software.

The working group also reviewed a 440,000 USD SUN proposal to the HLCM, which has as its main component a request for funds to obtain, install, train and implement the new reporting system. This proposal has now been forwarded to the HLCM for a decision at their next meeting.

A summary of the proceedings and results of the recent face to face meeting of the group on 24 February in Washington D.C., which included presentation by the working group members on the softwares being used by them and also a presentation by the World Resources Institute. The differences, advantages and disadvantages of the following softwares were discussed: Credit 360; Archibus: FAO's calculator developed in-house; and UNFPA's calculator developed in-house. He further discussed the advantage and disadvantage of building the software in-house or procuring it from outside.

## **B. Suggestions**

- The GHG Management Institute has recommended 4 softwares, 3 of which have not been looked at by the Working Group. Enablon in France also has a system, which could be looked into.
- The Inter-American Development Bank (IADB) has been using Credit 360, but is now looking at other options, including Encompass from Canada, which is based on ADEME's (French design) system of GHG accounting.
- ICAO informed that it would like to be part of the Working Group and would like to support any effort to integrate the ICAO air travel calculator into the new reporting system.
- To ensure that the HLCM proposal goes through, SUN requested each IMG member to lobby their HLCM Steering Committee members.
- IMG members should be informed who is there on the HLCM Steering Committee.
- ICAO confirmed that if needed, they can develop a modified interphase to the ICAO calculator, apart from the Excel based interphase currently provided. They already have many different interphases provided as per requirements.
- UNFPA mentioned that it took around 6 months for a software programming consultant, with subject expertise provided by staff member (Olivier Buehler), to develop their own calculator.
- For off the shelf products, there were the following concerns:
  - Will agencies be happy with the degree of control that they will have over the product.
  - How would such a system integrate with the UN's ERP system, if synchronisation will be allowed.
  - Bandwidth issues are still an issue, if used from a remote location.

## **C. Outcomes/ Results/ Action Points**

- IMG to communicate to the Working Group their needs/ wants for such a software to design a solution that satisfies the maximum number of agency needs.
- ICAO to be included in the Working Group.
- SUN to inform IMG members on who are the members of the HLCM Steering Committee on support for proposal.

## **Agenda item 5: Ongoing Work in SUN**

### **Support being provided to DFS base in Entebbe**

Shoa Ehsani, UNEP, informed the IMG on the progress on the support being given by SUN to DFS for greening their Entebbe Support Base (ESB). This includes the support for reviewing the design of around 13 new and on going construction and guidance for any further developments. The original initiative came from a discussion between the top management of DFS and UNEP where SUN was asked to support this project. A 2-day mission was conducted in October 2013, and an initial review was done. The challenges were listed as: i) The design of some of the new buildings have some fundamental flaws, for example in terms of orientation; ii) Though the top management is enthusiastic and supportive, the staff at the Base do not have the same enthusiasm. The initial recommendations include broad suggestions such as using the traditional earth construction methods, and also more specific suggestions on energy efficiency.

### **Sustainable Procurement (SP)**

Isabella Marras, Coordinator SUN, briefly introduced the recent activities on Sustainable Procurement:

- SUN delivered a 2 day face to face training to the African Development Bank (AfDB) at their HQ in Tunis during November 2013. Over 20 participants attended, mostly from their Procurement Division. The training was very well appreciated.
- SUN is currently coordinating with ITC-ILO and UNOPS to coordinate, update and harmonise to the extent possible, their individual SP training packages. The 3 had coordinated initially on jointly developing the package.

### **Waste Management in UN offices based in developing countries**

Isabella Marras, SUN, introduced the proposed IMG work on waste management in UN offices, based in developing countries. Waste disposal in developing country duty stations where infrastructure, regulations and systems are lacking, is a real challenge and a risk factor for all UN centers. SUN is planning to deliver to the IMG a study on this issue.

Initial thoughts on the study were presented and indicated that some agencies have already shown interest in collaborating. The mechanics proposed were:

- Do a preliminary global assessment to understand the current status of waste management globally, especially to identify good practices
- Collect information from agencies who wish to collaborate, on the status of waste management in their different duty stations. SUN will send email to agencies to know which agencies are interested in collaborating

### **B. Suggestions**

- The work on waste management can be linked to the tutorial on sustainable facilities being developed by UNDP.
- IFC has been working waste issue already and the initial findings are not very encouraging.
- Guidelines being developed as a result of this project, should not be prescriptive.
- Waste management is also being reviewed, as part of the EMG peer review process

- DPKO also has done a similar study for their offices
- ILO has done an initial environmental review as part of the implementation of their EMS and this includes waste management data for several country offices. ILO could share this information.
- Many agencies work alongside each other in the same duty station, but have different waste management practices. Information sharing of good practices would help in such cases.
- It would be helpful to depict the results of the study in an interactive map.
- The study should also look at procurement practices, as it would affect the waste disposal.

### **C. Outcomes/ Results/ Action Points**

- SUN to revise initial project concept, based on inputs received.
- SUN to email IMG members to find their interest to collaborate in waste management work.

**Agenda Item 6: Question and answers session with Elliot Harris, (newly appointed EMG Director) on environmental sustainability in the UN system**

#### **A. General Information**

Elliott Harris congratulated the IMG for the progress it had made since its inception, noting that its work is specifically mandated by the CEB and is also part of range of issues being dealt with under the umbrella of the EMG. He considered SUN to be an unmitigated success, beyond UNEP's expectations, and he was very impressed by the sustained level of IMG commitment.

He highlighted his very positive experience with the recent Peer Review process, which had drawn serious engagement at senior levels and resulted in useful products and learning for all concerned. He would be informing UNEP senior management of the need to find the means to respond to higher demand for participation in and number of peer reviews in the future.

He also drew attention to the separate consultative process on environmental and social sustainability in the UN system, largely inspired by the World Bank's safeguards system and a growing call to be able to provide such assurances to funding bodies such as the GEF, other regional banks or member state donors. Recent work in this context had focused on simplifying and making more readily applicable a draft guide for implementation.

With respect to SUN and the IMG, he asked focal points to reflect on the arrangement's longevity. IMGs were meant to be time-bound. This IMG had been extended 3 times and would doubtless be extended again at the 2014 EMG Senior Officials meeting, but this could not continue indefinitely. What would be the criteria for deciding that the IMG had achieved enough and could disband? When environmental sustainability has been integrated into organizations' corporate planning? When there are dedicated sustainability personnel? When sustainability is among senior management's objectives? When the CEB has set system-wide targets? It would be useful, prior to the September 2014 EMG meeting, to have a sense of what would need to be achieved before the mode of working could be changed.

#### **B. Suggestions**

Comments and issues raised included the following:

- The IMG is an invaluable source of support for everyone's work. Even with 2 dedicated people at the World Bank, the environment sustainability work is not yet fully integrated after years, so IMG work would need to continue. Further awareness raising is necessary.
- At the IMF, the work is fully integrated, but there is still more to be done. The UN could learn from others, e.g., Unilever, which despite integration maintains a network of focal points in its various branches and offices.

- Is there a limit to improving sustainability without buy-in from both senior management and staff?
- Until donors make it a requirement, it will always be an option. Rio+20 gave us a license, but to what extent will member states require action?
- Even with internal support from both top and bottom, without a central support unit the UN system wide process would not work. An established high performing coordination mechanism would be necessary before the IMG would no longer be needed.
- Even should the IMG be shut down, eg, after integrating its work into implementation of the Framework for environmental and social sustainability, a network will continue to be needed.
- What are the tipping points for organizations? It often comes down to a certain person. Not sure the IMG can go out of business until the UN has a framework in place that says “this is the way we do business”.
- The IMF did not start with a Board mandate but with middle management interest and an outreach person. Together they sold the argument to senior management and staff, who now clamor for further improvements.
- IMF’s sustainability work is owned by FMS, so that FMS is the way the IMF does its business. FMS can therefore influence what change occurs.
- There is a limit to how much change can be expected from within. It comes down to the support of individual people and how sustainability considerations are integrated into hiring processes and the values sought. A top person needs to say it has to be done.
- At WFP, percent changes in GHG emissions are now part of the annual performance requirements for all country offices, meaning they have to think about it. Incorporation into planning and reporting has proven invaluable and created a domino effect (eg, greater use of remote training).
- An unsuccessful attempt was made last year to get environmental sustainability included in the performance compacts of USGs. What is the one thing that every manager should be able to do related to sustainability? Established at that higher level, the effect would trickle down.
- Is the prospect of savings generally the best way to sell proposals to facilities managers? What about the “right thing to do” argument? How to retain savings to invest in further sustainability projects?
- UNDP has a checklist of 5 impact areas for assessing sustainability investments and the emphasis varies depending on the audience.
- Sustainability can be sold as a problem solver.
- Could a fund for capital improvements be created? A collective fund?
- WFP’s approach has been to start with the issues most relevant in most locations and to focus on solutions that meet more than one need. Selling sustainability requires a multi-faceted approach, matching the message the audience, eg, risk management and energy security in the field. Environmental sustainability is change management. For resourcing, WFP has a model that involves competition, shared investment (50%) and full reward (retention of 100% of savings).
- Considerable information exists on how different organizations are approaching financial restrictions. The IMG would be more effective in getting changes to budget procedures if it took collective action. Now would be a good time to do that, in association with the post-2015 agenda. A proposal through the HLCM?
- In order travel less we need not only to make virtual meetings more feasible, but to change our business model. The effort needs to go beyond facilities. We need to understand UN behavior better: what motivates people to travel?
- Changing infrastructure is tangible, changing behavior is a lot harder.
- Should the IMG/SUN be looking at a series of themed publications? We have a body of evidence in many areas and could help create a climate for change by presenting our efforts collectively. If we talk about it more, it is more likely to happen, e.g., flexible working practices.

### **C. Outcomes/ Results/ Action Points**

IMG/SUN to reflect on

- Questions related to the future of the IMG and the need for a central coordinating mechanism (prior to September 2014 EMG);
- The development of an indicator for USG compacts;
- Options for overcoming budgetary restrictions, including the possibility of a collective proposal to the HLCM.

#### **Agenda Item 7: UNEP-UNDP tutorial & its launch plans; Other tutorials: facilities**

The work on the tutorial is almost complete and a demonstration was provided which was met with approval and applause by the IMG. The online training will be available for use by IMG agencies – possibly for a fee. It may be further tailored to the needs of an agency at their own cost, but any changes need the approval of the UNDP-UNEP creators lest the training be changed beyond content that is agreeable to UNDP and UNEP. The development team in India may be approached directly for additions. Information will be made available by UNDP. The launch date is envisaged to be late April/ May 2014.

The facilities tutorial is still in the planning/design phase. Any input/thoughts are welcome. The INFM will be contacted about content needs.

#### **Agenda Item 8: Environment Management Systems & Emissions Reduction Strategies**

##### **A. General Information**

Florian Krautzer from the SUN helpdesk conducted 26 interviews with IMG Focal Points on EMS & ERS. The results showed that:

- 20 of the 26 interviews had ERS. And 11 are approved by Senior Management.
- 21 are implementing the ERS.
- 3 organizations with approved ERS are not implementing. 4 organizations without an ERS are implementing.
- The main barriers are funding, senior management and staff resistance.
- Most FPs are working on implementing ER measures.
- Need for greater distinction between ER measures and offsetting.
- Need a better link between inventory process and emission reductions.

Mitch Hall, FAO, introduced the EMS Milestones Framework wiki on Unite. These provide comprehensive details on how to develop a Framework and people can share their experiences on Unite.

##### **B. Suggestions**

- Several organizations have introduced taxes on flights. The World Bank proposed that levies could be discussed in more detail at a future IMG.



- Information could be shared on Unite so FPs can find out how other organizations have gone about this.
- There is a need for greater ties between the ERS and EMS processes.
- The group discussed the need to differentiate between reduction activities and offsets.
- WFP has tariffs in place that are reinvesting in emission reduction work instead of offsets. WFP explained that country offices can apply for 50% funding in capital projects using the fund.
- UNS asked about the mechanics of getting approval for the levy in other agencies. Can it be done administratively or does it need to be approved by member states?
- A suggestion was made that all information on this should be shared on Unite.
- UNV and UNWomen pointed out that they don't have access to Unite.
- The EMS wiki can be copied and pasted into a word document and shared that way.
- Would the working group brainstorm for external parties experience with EMS who could share their experiences with the IMG.

### **C. Outcomes/ Results/ Action Points**

- SUN will make sure that all interested persons are invited to join EMS working group and have access to unite.
- Information on carbon taxation schemes to be presented at next IMG and also shared on Unite.

### **GRI Training for IMG members**

On Tuesday and Wednesday 25 and 26 February at UNEP Regional Offices a GRI training was delivered to interested Focal Points and was organized by Monika Kumar of the World Bank.

This is an extra agenda point that was added last minute to share the experiences and considerations several focal points have on the GRI reporting after the training.

Some of the elements of the GRI framework was briefly described: getting organizations to transparently, report activities in governance and the impacts of your business model. "Materiality", the identification of really important aspects to the business (which is determined by products, services, location etc) was introduced.

In GRI, emphasis is on non-financial information. Lots of indicators are provided for the organization to choose from. The emphasis is on materiality. The indicators that are most relevant to UN-like organizations were discussed, they generally fall under the environmental aspects. Agencies would then need to identify the most material ones. Possible approaches to identifying appropriate indicators include context, stakeholder concern and/or completeness.

Monika Kumar shared a number of indicators that the UN is already positioned to report on/might want to report on.

The group discussed whether the SUN team and the IMG should consider GRI as a reporting tool. IMF said they're keen to introduce it and it should be a relatively easy transition. The group discussed

if the MTCN report would need to change to become a GRI report. The discussion will continue in the working group.

### **Agenda Item 9: Peer reviews stocktaking exercise and IMG programme of work**

#### **A. General Information**

There have been previous short presentations on the Peer Review process in past IMGs. Two agencies have completed their reviews (WMO, UNIDO) with UNEP to follow. This process has to do about the assessment of the environmental performance of an agency by its peers, it doesn't have the weight of an audit and it falls under the mandate and has been coordinated by the EMG secretariat; SUN is implementing the actual review with the help of other volunteering agencies and their focal points. The recommendations and findings are non-binding, although the reviewed agencies do take ownership of the review report.

#### **B. Suggestions**

- The IMF participated in the review disclosure meeting and would like to participate in the review. Many of the challenges are long term and solutions and planning over the long haul is important (e.g. staff time programme). Being compared to our peers will also be useful
- The Peer Review Body meeting included many outside agency observers. Many who were skeptical of the process were very much taken aback by how great a process/ project this review can be; for some the most interesting/ useful meeting of the year in the UN. It is effectively getting a free/ subsidized assessment. To date, the organizations being reviewed do not have a field presence. This may change in the future if demand exists. Might these reviews be shared within the IMG?
- Some agencies are considering this process and outcomes as a wake-up call/ challenge the managers of our agencies. There is a lot of learning involved for actual reviewers.
- This exercise has drawn on the time and expertise (technical) of Jacob Kurian of SUN. The process has to be recorded/ scripted so future reviews can take place even if Jacob would not be available. The future of this process depends on the availability of human resources and financial requirements of such reviews; this should be made transparent (time and funds)
- In term of costs that will be shared later, and the training aspect of it maybe combined with the actual review. The costs aren't forbidding. There is also the aspect of using consultants instead of staff, but the system seems to work better if controlled directly within the UN family.

#### **C. Outcomes/ Results/ Action Points**

None.

### **Agenda Item 10: Quick Training on green events and discussion on green events experiences from IMG members**

#### **A. General Information**

Mimi Diez of IFC gave a presentation about efforts to green IMF meetings, providing various examples and scenarios and also discussing the particular challenges. Noteworthy was the fact that planning for the greening of large meetings, starts about a year earlier. Sometimes, when external hosts are involved, what can be done in terms of greening is limited.

## **B. Suggestions**

- Does this work only relate to meetings in DC? Mimi Diez explained that for overseas meetings it's more difficult as it requires asking questions of a host country that the host may not be able or want to answer.
- Measuring the footprint of meetings in other countries remains therefore a challenge.
- Rachel Madan asked what was easiest to implement. Answer: offsetting.
- Everything else requires footwork – looking into hotels, talking to stakeholders, follow up with actions, food choices and so on.
- In total, IMF meetings including side events, each meeting is a week long. There are two major meetings a year. IMF only offsets participant travel. World Bank also invites delegates for back to back meetings with IMF so there is a risk of double counting. They count the electricity for the meeting room but don't offset this.
- Greening is also undertaken for the IMF holiday party.

## **C. Outcomes/ Results/ Action Points**

Isabella Marras asked for IG participants who is interest in joining potential Sun work on Green events. A working group will be set up. SUN will start work on this as soon as possible/funds available. List of working group members in attachment

### **IMF presentations :**

- a) HQ1 Reconstruction presentation and video**
- b) IMF facilities and sustainability**

Ms. Carol Holland, Deputy Project Director, IMF HQ1 Renewal Program, and Mr. Scott McMillan , the IMF Director of Facilities presented on the revamping of HQ1 and the sustainable operation of IMF facilities respectively. The report and discussion on these presentations is provided in the appendix of this document.

### **Agenda Item 11: Debrief on the use of UNITE, the SUN Wiki and considerations on how the group can better work using (UN) social media**

#### **A. General Information**

This session was planned to look at the function and performance of the Unite system. The statistic for the Greening the Blue community which consists of 120 people (so a lot more than the focal points), we only had 19 people logging in to the community. This is worrisome as Unite is being used by SUN as a platform to share material.

The question to ask is then why aren't IMG members using this platform. Do we still want to use Unite? On a positive note the working groups used Unite extensively.

#### **B. Suggestions**

- Some focal points don't use it enough as they are not fully conversant with the system and what Unite contains. The sight is confusing and if attachments are emailed then there is no compulsion to log into Unite.
- Access issues are still a problem for some. The Unite IT people don't always manage to help focal points gain access. As long as one is invited by a community member, one should be able to be provided with access to Unite, one has to be persistent with Unite IT help desk though.
- Users can set their preferences on Unite on getting email alerts on Unite if material is uploaded. The frequency and levels of notification are customizable.
- Our list of focal points and their emails is current.
- Navigation on Unite is difficult; perhaps Unite can work on this and make it more user-friendly. It works well as a library. Tagging documents will help with navigability, feedbacks/ reactions seem to be scant.
- Unite seems to be the new way of working. Unless we want to go to another system hosted by an outside party, we should continue to work with Unite to its teething problems.
- There seems to be two problems at hand: one, the technical issues that should be resolved; second, the house-rules that allow everyone to understand the tools and the systems and what they are used for.

### **C. Outcomes/ Results/ Action Points**

- Ask Imogen/ Louise, SUN, to work on the Unite site, clean up the GtB group and communicate the house- rules.

<h2><b>Conclusions, next steps &amp; meetings</b></h2>
--

Ms. Isabella Marras, SUN, thanked IMF for hosting the meeting and for their hospitality. She also thanked the IMG members for their active participation and support. She then summarised the key decisions, before concluding the IMG meeting:

### **GHG Inventory**

- On the software, SUN will share:
  - The HLCM proposal
  - The ToR for the software
  - 1 -pager, to help Focal Points advocate the proposal to their HLCM focal point
- A survey will be done on the issue of pausing for a year, the GHG Inventory and the next edition of the Moving Towards a Climate Neutral UN report.
- After the survey, if the decision is to continue with the inventory, SUN will launch the next cycle of the inventory on 1 April 2014.

### **Proposed study on Waste management**

- SUN will share the ToR for the proposed study and will ask agencies if they want to participate in the collaborative study

### **Strategic discussions led by Mr.Elliot Harris, Director, EMG**

- Ms. Julie McKenzie, UNHQ, will help to summarise the discussions
- SUN, in consultation with the IMG, will also develop a message to be sent to the EMG Senior Officials Meeting, on the IMG transitioning into a longer term network under the EMG

### **Communication with the HLCM**

- UN will share with the HLCCM and its networks, including the HR network, the EMS framework, the Moving Towards a Climate Neutral UN report & the sustainability tutorial

#### **Peer Review**

- EMG will decide on the process and its continuation, and will communicate this to IMG.

#### **Green events**

- Many have joined to work on it and will try to link with IAMLADP SUN to call for a working group meeting as resources and time is available.

#### **Working Groups**

- A new Working Group on CER will be coordinated by UNFCCC. UNFCCC will communicate with the IMG on this.

#### **Next Online IMG meeting**

- This might be held during middle of June 2014. The focus would be on internal taxes.
- SUN would communicate the date to IMG.

#### **Next face to face IMG meeting in Bonn**

3 agencies in Bonn will jointly host the next meeting -UNCCD, UNV and UNFCCC during 16-17 October 2014. Working group meetings or trainings might be planned before and after the IMG. New topics for the Bonn IMG will include

- A session on internal taxes and budgets
- Target setting

Potential topics for training could include: ISO 14001, EMAS or sustainable events.

The meeting ended at 1630 hours.

**14th Meeting of the Issue Management Group on Environmental Sustainability Management (IMG 14)**  
**27-28 February 2014, @ IMF, Washington DC (HQ2, Room : 1A-280)**

**IMG/ESM.14/**

Distribution:  
 IMG members

## List of participants

	Name	Organisation	UNIT	IMG Remote	IMG Face to face	Wants to join Green events WG
1	Isabella Marras	UNEP	Sustainable UN		X	
2	Shoa Ehsani	UNEP	Sustainable UN		X	
3	Jacob Kurian	UNEP	Sustainable UN		X	
4	Imogen Martineau	Consultant	Sustainable UN		X	
5	Louise Bloom	Consultant	Sustainable UN	X		
6	Florian Krauzer	Consultant	Sustainable UN	X		
1	Anne Jona	UNFCCC	Common support services		X	X
2	Drago Jovanovic	UNFCCC	Common support services	X		
3	Nives Costa	UNOPS	Sustainable procurement unit	X		
4	Elliot Harris	UNEP	Director EMG		X	
6	Susie Bolvenkel-Prior	UNAIDS	Facilities & services	X		
7	Georgina Stickels	WFP	Facilities management	X		X
8	Andy Cole	WFP	Facilities management		X	
9	Marina Maiero	WHO	Environment&health division	X		
10	Heidi Nabel-Meyer	UNV		X		
11	Karina Holm	OHCHR	Procurement division	X		
12	Oliver Buhler	UNFPA	Facilities management		X	
13	Anne-Claire Blet	UPU	Executive office	X		
14	Rachel Madan	IFC	IFC Footprint programme		X	X
15	Mitch Hall	FAO	Facilities management		X	X
16	Tina Mittendorf	FAO	Corporate environmental responsibility	X		
17	Ilary Ranalli	FAO		X		
18	Anne Fernqvist	UNDP	Sustainability advisor		X	X
19	Mimi Diez	IMF	Facilities Management		X	X
20	Adam Rubinfield	WB	Institutional services		X	

21	Monika Kumar	WB	Corporate responsibility program		X	
22	Jeannie Egan	WB			X	
23	Sonal Patel	WB			X	X
24	Kåre Pugerup	IFAD	Administrative services	X		
25	Julie Mackenzie	UNHQ	Division of Management		X	
26	Peter Ransome	ITU	Facilities Management		X	X
27	Somarajan Pillai	UNCDD	Finance Unit	X		
28	Violaine Haeringer	UNHQ	Division of Management		X	X
29	Emma Hackansson	Swedish EPA	International department	X		
30	Lena Gutermann	IDB	Climate Change and Sustainability		X	
31	Andrea Sabelli	IDB	CSR unit		X	X
32	Kim Veldman	IFAD	Administrative services	X		
33	Marianna Belsky	UNWOMEN	Administrative and facilities department		X	X
34	Lorenzo Gavilli	ICAO	Environment division	X		
35	Carolina Ferreira de Silva	ILO	Division of Facilities Management		X	X
36	Martijn Dalhuijsen	OCHA	Administrative management officer		X	X
37	Amanda Stevens	WRI	Research Analyst, Sustainability initiative		X	X
38	Sofia Benegas	PAHO	General service office (GSO)		X	X
39	Luiz Galvão	PAHO			X	
40	Paulo Teixeira	PAHO			X	
41	Michelle Rogat	UNOV		X		
42	Sachim Bhatt	UNESCO	Office of the Deputy Director General	X		

## **Sustainability initiatives in the IMF HQ1 renovation project**

Ms. Carol Holland, Deputy Project Director, IMF HQ1 Renewal Program gave a brief presentation on the sustainability initiatives in the ongoing renovation of IMF HQ1.

The 18 floor building was constructed in the 1970'. An extensive engineering analysis confirmed that most of the buildings infrastructure were at or beyond their useful life and IMF opted to renovate the building. The renovation was used as an opportunity to incorporate sustainability features. The renovation was done in phases. Procurement was concluded in 2012 and a 3.5 year construction phase was then initiated. The renovation aims for a LEED certification.

Interdisciplinary teams were formed and were involved in the early planning process. A Staff Advisory Committee (SAC) was involved from the design. A Design advisory group (DAG) now monitors the progress.

The goal of the renovation was to: bring in more daylight; reduce energy consumption; make it a net zero energy building; and provide better collaborative space. Ms Holland highlighted the challenges that the team faced in achieving these goals. The sustainability features include: building exterior and hardscape management plan; support for alternative commuting/transportation; green roof; water efficient landscaping; water efficient plumbing; green cleaning; improved access to daylight; daylighting controls; recycled compost in construction materials; recycling and composting; and the use of low and no VOC emitting materials. 420 tonnes of building material has been taken out and 85 % of it was recycled. Most of the demolition work done at night, to prevent disturbance to staff.

Additional studies are also ongoing on a few higher energy efficiency enhancements. An energy modelling exercise predicted a 47 % energy reduction through these measures. The energy saving features include: high efficiency boilers; high efficiency cooling tower motors; improved controls to optimize energy; high efficiency fans; demand controlled ventilation; 4-pipe fan coil units; energy efficient lighting (.75 w/sf); occupancy sensors in individual rooms; and partial heat recovery for some systems.

2 videos on the project were shown – one about the process and the other about recent updates.

### **Discussion**

- Though a zero energy building was an initial goal, achieving that entailed higher cost and hence it was not pursued.
- Communication and awareness raising of the renovation is being carried out through videos, intranet and website, and several additional measures.
- The renovation is aiming for LEED gold for construction and LEED Platinum for Operation & Maintenance
- The project budget is 400 million USD and there were discussions on whether to do retrofitting or a new construction. Based on studies, retrofitting was found to be most appropriate.
- Cost benefit analysis were based on Total Cost of Ownership.
- With more collaborative options there is less space for staff. Hence, staff space is being rationalised. Some sections like the print shop and the international training institute has been moved out.
- The flexible working space being incorporated also requires a cultural change.



## **IMF Facilities and Sustainability**

Mr. Scott McMillan, Director of the IMF Technology and General Services Department, presented about sustainability in IMF. IMF has offices in 103 countries and manages 5 million sq. ft. of assets internationally. In Washington DC, the main facilities are the HQ1 building (2.1Million sq. ft. ), the HQ2 building (900,000 sq. ft.) and the Concordia (95,000 sq. ft.), which is the Fund's extended stay facility.

Since its inception in 2004, the Sustainability program has achieved many milestones and continues to grow. The program, which focused more on the HQ facilities, has now started moving onto IMF's overseas offices.

Some of the key initiatives undertaken in HQ include: Sustainability metrics developed for performance monitoring; HQ1 chiller and cooling tower upgrades; Installation of green roof (HQ2); Update of bicycle facilities to promote alternative commuting(HQ1 & HQ2); Waste management initiatives (HQ2); Sub-metering of floors to track and reduce energy use (HQ2); LEED Platinum recertification (HQ2); LEED Gold certification (Concordia); HQ1 Renewal initiated; installed a data warehouse system; LEED gold certification (HQ1 & HQ2); and Green Procurement initiated. A recent achievement was the recertification of HQ2 as LEED Platinum from its initial LEED gold certification, for which a lot of modifications were done. Over the past year, both HQ facilities have worked diligently to reduce their environmental impact on natural resources. During FY13-FY14 there was a net 6.4% reduction in energy consumption for both HQ facilities normalised over degree days and in FY14, the HQ facilities diverted around 600 tons of waste.

The Data\$mart warehouse has allowed the Fund to collect and analyze the mass of data available in order to maximize building performance. It provides data at 15 minute intervals on weather, energy, equipment performance and maintenance history, interior temperature and humidity, client experience, and building engineer experience. This system, which is the largest data warehouse in IMF, is helping the IMF facility management to optimise work place experience, through provisions for maintenance and operations planning, resource optimisation and more personalised space and furniture planning. Environmental sustainability is at the heart of the Fund's HQ1 Renewal Project, for which IMF anticipates a 47% reduction in overall energy consumption.

The Concordia, the Fund's extended stay facility, underwent a complete renovation and has obtained LEED Gold Certification. In the construction, 92 % of the materials was recycled. Currently, the Fund's Sustainability approach focuses mainly on using LEED as a framework. The Fund is moving from a facility centric program to a broader, more holistic environmental sustainability approach. A video was shown of the sustainability features at the Concordia. Concordia, the funds extended stay facility went a complete renovation and has obtained LEED Gold certification. 92 % of the materials was recycled. Video of the Concordia was shown- energy efficiency, water efficiency, waste management,

IMF has developed a 2020 Vision for its facilities which aims at: Climate Neutrality for all greenhouse gas emissions; LEED Platinum campus; Long term natural resource reduction targets: and Transparency and engagement.

### **Discussion**

- Some of the sustainability efforts were challenging, including simple ones such as the relocation of waste bins from office rooms which initially faced resistance. A similar effort to relocate waste bins in ITU, was very challenging.

- The data warehouse system is from IBM. For the data warehousing, IMF had to install more sensors in many places.
- For improving usage of bicycles for commuting, a lot of infrastructure was provided such as bike racks, shelf racks etc and these measures were supported by the staff association.
- IMF has also started looking at green building rating systems apart from LEED, such as BREEAM, the Swedish and Indian systems. Each system has a different emphasis, for example the Swedish system emphasises indoor air quality, while the Indian system is more on water management.