

GEC Steering Group, Thursday 23rd March 2017– MINUTES and ACTIONS

Attendees: Steve Bass, Mick Blowfield, Oliver Greenfield, Aban Marker Kabraji, Thibaut Portevin, Holger Schmid, Steven Stone, Mike Wilson, George Varughese



Graham Webb – consultant author of our GEC Future study, joined for item 3.

Apologies: Peter Poschen-Eiche

Agenda 23rd March 2017:

1. January Minutes
2. Welcome to Holger Schmid, MAVA Foundation
3. GEC Future (2 papers attached).
4. New Member applications (3 applications attached)

1. January Minutes – SG Signed off

2. Welcome to Holger Schmid, MAVA Foundation

Holger leads the Sustainable Economy Programme for MAVA. MAVA have partnered with GEC for Measure what matters, match funding for the EC dialogue programme – with a specific interest in Senegal’s green economy and sustainable fisheries, and now the Natural capital programme. SG welcomed Holger to the GEC steering group.

[Holger’s biog.](#)

3. GEC Future – distributed delivery, independence, continued hosting at IIED.

OG presented the RATIONALE for GEC Future study – the need for permanence, growth of activities and increased empowerment of its network:

1. **Permanence - Moving from being a project to being an institution.** When GEC was set up Green Economy was mostly just an idea. GEC was established as a collaborative programme to help organisations engage with this idea and share and learn. Now GE is a tangible transition with programmes, initiatives and institutions. GEC plays a strong role in this work, and has an essential niche within the GE&GG institutional map. GEC’s niche is that it is a different sort of organisation, one that empowers the engagement of its network partners and thereby supports a more inclusive Green economy transition. Given the transition context and GEC important role, GEC is justified in considering moving from a collaborative programme to being an institution.
2. **Growth of activities. GEC’s strategy and programme of work is about systems change.** The work areas¹ are not intended as standalone activities. They are designed to work together and mutually reinforce². This means that we are targeting growth for all our policy areas – up to around £1m per year, and greater number of national dialogue processes (to match PAGE/& GGGI country policy work), and stronger communications and network activities.
3. **Increased empowerment of its network.** The growth of activity cannot and should be undertaken just by the GEC secretariat. A new operating model will be needed that empowers our partners, but still

¹ GEC work areas are: 5 global policy areas (Measurement, finance reform, greening sectors, Inequality and economics for nature), and the 3 cross cutting enablers: our communications (transition stories), our national dialogues (Country GE implementation support), and our GEC movement (the network gets bigger and more influential)

² GEC’s assumption is the emergence of a transformative new economic system will be stimulated by having the right measures, the right investment, the right sector solutions, strong societal engagement, the refreshed relationship with nature, and multiple nation’s leading this transition, all set within a holistic, global and vocal campaign. In other words - it is by having all five GEC policy programmes active, that GEC can hope to play a significant role in stimulating the emergence of the new economic system.

retains policy and communication's coherence. To this end we have evolved the '**Distributed delivery model**³'.

Therefore the potential of permanency, the growth of GEC activity and the emergent new delivery together creates complexities, opportunities and risks, and therefore, we needed to understand three questions about the GEC's future:

1. Is the distributed delivery model fit for purpose?
2. What are the longer term implications for GEC's independence and legal identity (currently hosted by IIED)?
3. And what does this mean for the ongoing hosting relationship with IIED?

The Study presented answers these questions:

1. Distributed delivery is fit for purpose. It clarifies GEC secretariat core roles, empowers coalition partner contributions and gives more fundraising potential

The Steering group was asked if they were happy with the report finding that the distributed delivery model is the right model for GEC.

- SG asked how it worked in detail and understood both EC and Nat Cap programmes largely fit this model.

SG Decision: GEC Steering group conclude that this model looks right.

Action OG to trial it on Nat cap project and see how it goes

2. The report concluded that the coalition partners are best served by an independent GEC with its own legal entity. However this independence presents an additional operational burden on the GEC secretariat, new responsibilities, changing roles for the GEC steering group, the need for new governance. The report also recommended that these were worth the pain, as independence was strategically valuable to the coalition's growth and impact. However, the report also identified the financial implications of independence, and concluded the volatility of GEC project funding and its lack of core or reserves, means that independence is too high a risk without core funds, of a minimum of £300K pa – preferably more.

The Steering group was asked if they agreed with the report's conclusions. Summary of main comments/questions:

- Didn't hear clearly – why the need?
 - GE is no longer ephemeral discussion, policies, etc. It is a real thing, with institutions and plans. The GEC is a new kind of institution with a place in this arena as an enabler, broker so it has a separate, distinct role. Therefore it needs more permanency. It also needs to grow and is starting to be big for its host. It also needs to be better at representing all of its members. Strategic fit in any host organisation is always going to be partial because of having 50+ members. In addition, concern about the association with IIED reducing the appeal of GEC to developed countries. Expect that the changing mandate will increase new opportunities in developed countries.
- Recommendations make sense – many benefits of independence if GEC continues to be successful – question on how it works when funding channelled through partners e.g. FW versus direct funding and need for due diligence
- Likes what's in the paper. It is time to go independent. But independence not without risks. Implications for the steering group of course and maybe it needs a different group of people more oriented towards BOT role
- If move to independence then we have to be hyper aware that the space is incredibly broad so that there is a risk for mandate creep and becoming impossibly broad.

³ Distributed delivery model was first presented GEC steering group in [February 4th 2016](#), and for agreement on [27th July 2016](#)

- Is the core funding required annual or one off? What's the worst case scenario on low expectation fundraising? How does this affect GEC's mission? How is this affected by being independent or not?
- GEC also could be hosted in an institution while at the same time being independent? E.g. service contract.
- Operational risks associate with independence - would expect more than 2 additional people would be needed e.g. OG would need to spend half of his time in statutory/regulatory issues and the BOT or steering committee must ensure compliance in terms of the law which would reduce time for strategy and impact – So hosting is preferable.

In summary there was more voices for independence, some agnostic and one against. OG clarified this paper and conversation is testing the water for potential for independence. It is currently a theoretical conversation because without core funds it cannot happen – so the current recommendation to the Steering Group is to stay hosted with IIED.

- **SG decision: GEC continue to be hosted at IIED.**
- **Action: OG to finalise refreshed hosting agreement with IIED and seek core funds. Come back to Steering group if Core funds are found**

3. Report defined refreshed parameters for hosting at IIED. Mick confirmed IIED happy to continue to host GEC. He presented the outline for a new MOU.

- Hosting agreement – discussion around current hosting agreements – might want to look at other examples of more complex arrangements

- **SG decision: GEC to continue to be hosted at IIED and happy with outline defined. SG offered thanks to IIED for offer of continued hosting of GEC.**
- **Action: OG and Mick to finalise MOU between GEC and IIED.**

3. GEC New partners

There was an action from January 2017 to develop a partnership growth strategy 'that would expand both partner geographical diversity and thematic diversity'. It also need to address the 'how to go more mainstream – grow our influence AND maintain our niche identity'. It was agreed it should prioritise – 'Making contact with business networks active close to our agenda and partners for GMBF programme.'

This action is still outstanding, however, in the meantime we have been approached by 4 organisations all of which fit the emergent profile above and so, having completed satisfactory due-diligence, I submit all three for Steering group decision.

- [Stockholm Environment Institute \(SEI\)](#). **"We are an** international nonprofit research organization that has worked with environment and development issues from local to global policy levels for a quarter of a century. SEI bridges science and policy to find robust responses to the challenges of sustainability. **We combine** scientific research with policy analysis, connecting our work to decision-makers and civil society in global governance, national public policy, regional cooperation, local planning, and the private sector. We generate and share knowledge that catalyses action, and always take a highly collaborative approach: Stakeholder involvement is at the heart of our efforts to build capacity, strengthen institutions, and equip partners for the long term."

SG Decision – Invite SEI to join GEC

- **Agulhas: Open Knowledge. [Living the Dream](#).**

Agulhas: Open Knowledge is an innovative not for profit set up to deliver the Living the Dream programme. Living the Dream seeks to transform the narrative on sustainability in the UK with a language that is populist and aspirational, reaching a broad audience across the UK population. By curating this new narrative, we will be able to move 'beyond consumerism' towards more a sustainable economy.

SG decision – OG to investigate if Agulhas is a consultancy and develop better working relationships before partnership considered

- **European Bicycle Manufacturers Association, [EBMA](#)**
“EBMA is the Association of direct EU Producers of Bicycles and we are involved in the defence against unfair competition and promotion of SMEs and Green Industrial Jobs in Europe: we are firmly convinced that local EU Manufacturing, especially with capillary diffused SMEs like ours (in 20 of the 28 MS) can give a really sustainable Economy to Europe with more Green Jobs and less dangerous emissions. At present we can count on 70.000 Green Industrial Jobs and over 600 SMEs, so we are one of the largest employers of the EU Green Industries.”

SG decision – OG to undertake research project with EBMA on ‘positive impact of local Manufacturing in the EU by SMEs.’ On the basis of a successful collaboration partnership will be considered.

- **Christian Aid, “[Christian Aid](#)** has been committed to a ‘sustainable’ development agenda for many years, recognising that climate change and other environmental threats are hitting vulnerable communities the hardest, and that development pathways must change to avoid catastrophic climate change and environmental degradation.”

SG decision: Invite Christian Aid to join GEC.

4. AOB – strategic actions outstanding

Berlin PAGE ministerial.

- GEC secretariat has mobilised GEC members to be present and play active roles:
 - Institutional collaboration group
 - Representation in conference panels
 - Pioneers space – showcasing new leadership
 - Principles – PAGE requested GEC develop principles of inclusive GE for the conference.
 - Green Must be Fair messaging

GEC annual Conference

- Originally intended in late 2017 in South Africa. However, likely SA will host PAGE conference in 2018, which we should link to. Therefore we are exploring moving 2017 to Caribbean.

Outstanding actions:

- **OG to develop global SME plan**
- **OG to develop Partner Growth strategy**
- **OG to develop GMBF funding pipeline**
- **OG to clarify GEC summit asap**

NEXT GEC Steering group MEETING: Thursday, 23rd May, 12.30pm-2pm, UK.