

INDEPENDENT EVALUATION OF GGGI PROGRESS AGAINST THE STRATEGIC PLAN 2015-2020:

Update on implementation of evaluation recommendations

February 2018



INTRODUCTION

In 2017 GGGI commissioned an independent evaluation to assess its progress against the Strategic Plan 2015-2020. The evaluation, conducted by a team of independent evaluators and managed by the Impact and Evaluation Unit (IEU), was concluded in June 2017¹. The evaluation conclusions and recommendations together with the Management response were presented at the Management and Program Sub-Committee (MPSC) meeting in July 2017 and at the Council in October 2017.

As indicated in GGGI Evaluation Rules² (Art. 3.3), IEU has the mandate to monitor and report on the implementation status of the evaluation recommendations and related management responses.

The table below contains the recommendations from the evaluation, the related management response provided in July 2017 and an update on the implementation status as of February 2018.

¹ The independent evaluation report is available at <http://gggi.org/report/independent-evaluation-of-gggis-progress-against-the-strategic-plan-2015-2020/>

² GGGI Evaluation Rules available at <http://gggi.org/results-evaluation/evaluations/>

| RECOMMENDATIONS | MANAGEMENT RESPONSE July 2017 | STATUS OF MANAGEMENT RESPONSE February 2018 |
|---|---|---|
| OVER-ARCHING | | |
| <p>1</p> <p>GGGI should consider having a longer-term Strategic Plan</p> <p>The current Strategic Plan is linked to Agenda 2030 and the Paris Agreement that will come into effect in 2020 but only covers the period 2015 to 2020. Other international organizations in general have a long-term plan which allows them to shape international agenda and position their respective organization. Currently, GGGI is not able to position itself to influence global agenda. The Thought Leadership team could address this issue.</p> | <p>Agree.</p> <p>1.1 As part of the mid-term strategic review process, GGGI is updating its Strategic Plan and Corporate Results Framework (CRF) with 2030 targets against the revised strategic outcomes, to demonstrate GGGI’s longer term contribution in line with Agenda 2030.</p> <p>The potential to adopt a longer term Strategic Planning timeframe or develop a ‘Vision’ document will be assessed.</p> <p>Timeline: End 2019</p> | <p>Completed: GGGI has adopted six strategic outcomes in the Refreshed Strategic Plan 2015-2020, approved in October 2017 by its Council. These connect GGGI’s strategy and activities to the long-term commitments of its partner countries in the context of the Agenda 2030.</p> <p>Being actioned: Causal linkages of GGGI’s operational activities are being identified with the six strategic objectives with this work expected to be completed by end 2018.</p> <p>Planned: GGGI will commence preparation of its next strategy at the end of 2018 for approval in 2020.</p> |
| <p>2</p> <p>GGGI should consider alternative business models which will lead to long-term sustainability</p> <p>The current model of receiving donor funding for both core and earmarked has limited scope for growth. Alternative sources of funding such as</p> | <p>Agree.</p> <p>2.1 GGGI’s management recognizes this issue and has been exploring alternative models of funding.</p> | <p>Being actioned: GGGI is preparing a Resource Mobilization (RM) Action Plan for the endorsement of the Management and Program Sub-Committee in April 2018, which will look into short and long-term resource mobilization issues.</p> |

| RECOMMENDATIONS | | MANAGEMENT RESPONSE July 2017 | STATUS OF MANAGEMENT RESPONSE February 2018 |
|-----------------|--|--|---|
| | <p>fee for service, endowments, and commissions should be explored as part of long-term business models. The overall responsibility should be with Director General (DG) with input from different teams.</p> | <p>GGGI is currently ramping up its earmarked resource mobilization efforts with a central role for country teams in mobilizing resources to deliver the Country Planning Frameworks (CPFs).</p> <p>GGGI will hold further consultations with relevant partners and stakeholders and develop a clear strategy for moving toward a more sustainable funding model, incorporating alternative sources of financing.</p> <p>Timeline: April 2018</p> | |
| 3 | <p>For the next few years GGGI should consolidate as an organization.</p> <p>GGGI has been through many changes within a short period of time and is still growing rapidly. New teams including Green Investment Services (GIS), thematic experts and Office of Thought Leadership (TL) must be allowed to settle and contribute to</p> | <p>Agree.</p> <p>3.1 GGGI management is aware that the organization should be consolidating. It will focus on the implementation of the current Strategic Plan until end 2020 and consolidate the organizational structure and planned programmatic and non-programmatic work.</p> | <p>Being actioned: Work for identification of the causal linkages between the operational activities and the adopted six strategic objectives is under way and expected to be completed by the end of 2018.</p> <p>Being actioned: GGGI's primary focus is on delivering the priorities and results set out in its <i>Refreshed Strategic Plan 2015-20</i>. Through business process change, GGGI is implementing</p> |

| RECOMMENDATIONS | MANAGEMENT RESPONSE July 2017 | STATUS OF MANAGEMENT RESPONSE February 2018 |
|--|--|--|
| <p>organizational goals. The new outcomes should also be integrated into the programs/projects. GGGI should be selective about starting new initiatives.</p> | <p>At the same time, it must be recognized that GGGI's work is 'demand driven', and the organization must remain adaptable to changes in the operating context.</p> <p>Timeline: End 2020 (Strategic Plan timeframe)</p> | <p>operational business model adjustment to fully internalize the roles of the thematic groups, Green Investment Services, and Thought Leadership into the operations as integral to the development of country business plans and projects. Business process changes and business model adjustment are harnessed in the context of the Work Program and Budget 2019-2020.</p> |
| <p>4 In GGGI's country operations political issues need to be better understood and potential responses clearly defined.</p> <p>As GGGI's primary modality is to be embedded within the government departments, there are significant benefits as well as a constant danger that changes at the political level could disrupt its work program. GGGI should acknowledge this potential risk and formulate appropriate responses.</p> | <p>Agree.</p> <p>4.1 We are very much aware of the risk of disruption to our country programs from political change. Thus far, changes in government have not affected the continuation of our work in country. We have so far dealt with political risk by having a broad and deep engagement with government partners, and our partners view this as a strength. We will continue to focus on gaining support across different Ministries to mitigate the risk.</p> | <p>Being actioned: GGGI continues to have a broad and deep engagement with government partners. In some countries where GGGI has had an engagement with only one Ministry, a broadening of cooperation to also include other Ministries has been progressed, e.g. Mexico and Costa Rica.</p> <p>Political risks are regularly assessed and monitored as part of project, program and portfolio risk management, in particular by Country Representatives (CRs) and Head of Programs (HoPs).</p> |

| RECOMMENDATIONS | | MANAGEMENT RESPONSE July 2017 | STATUS OF MANAGEMENT RESPONSE February 2018 |
|-----------------|--|---|--|
| | | <p>Political risk is assessed in our project logframes, but more focused attention should be applied to this.</p> <p>Country political context is also now assessed in-depth in the Country Planning Frameworks.</p> <p>Timeline: End 2017</p> | |
| 5 | <p>GGGI align its risk appetite with its desire to innovate and encourage entrepreneurial behaviour.</p> <p>GGGI's desire to innovate and be entrepreneurial creates significant corporate opportunities but also implies risks. Currently, there is limited acceptance of failure and existing processes constrain flexibility and innovation. For example, the application of output-based budgeting should be designed to allow greater flexibility in areas such as resource re-allocation.</p> | <p>Agree.</p> <p>5.1 A working group with representatives from all divisions is currently developing proposals for a Work Program and Budget (WPB) 'revamp' with the objective of making programming in the next biennium more flexible and allow for innovation and implementation of new ideas during the biennium.</p> <p>Timeline: October 2018</p> | <p>Being actioned: The Work Program & Budget (WPB) process is being reformed to enable flexibility in project preparation and implementation and greater quality focus in project preparation process. The reformed WPB also enables integration of stronger partnerships and resource mobilization. WPB 2019-2020 will reflect these reforms and is expected to be approved in October 2018.</p> |

| RECOMMENDATIONS | | MANAGEMENT RESPONSE July 2017 | STATUS OF MANAGEMENT RESPONSE February 2018 |
|---------------------|---|---|--|
| | | <p>5.2 GGGI is also embarking on an organization wide Culture Change effort, with a focus on cultivating a more creative and innovative organizational culture, underpinned by the newly defined set of Core Values in the revised strategic plan.</p> <p>Timeline: Culture Change campaign rolled out by end 2017</p> | <p>Being actioned: Under the internal <i>iGROW</i> (business reform) initiative, work is progressing on finalizing a communication plan by March 2018. In addition, a Culture Change Working Group implementation plan is being developed for 2018.</p> |
| PROGRAM PERFORMANCE | | | |
| 6 | <p>GGGI should define clear points of exit from projects and host ministries.</p> <p>GGGI does not currently define clear exit points for many of its projects neither does it define the time of exit from host ministries. While it is recognized that GGGI staff are valued as trusted advisors they often are called upon to respond to ad hoc requests. GGGI should avoid institutional capture and ensure that</p> | <p>Agree.</p> <p>6.1 GGGI’s management agrees that it is important to define clear exit points from projects and allow exit from scoping point if necessary and re-allocation from projects that are not progressing as planned.</p> <p>Exit points will be defined in the CPFs in a systematic manner and inform our WPB, and Project Cycle Management (PCM), and be documented, for example in the</p> | <p>Being actioned: The transition for activities undertaken in Upper Middle-Income Countries (UMICs) from core funding to ear-marked funding and co-funding has been ongoing in 2017 and will be accelerated in 2018. By the end of 2018 very little core funding will be provided to UMICs.</p> <p>The same process has been taking place for Middle Income Countries (MICs) but some core funding will remain for MICs beyond 2018.</p> <p>This means that current core funded projects will be completed and phased out or continued with ear-marked funding or co-funding if the projects</p> |

| RECOMMENDATIONS | MANAGEMENT RESPONSE July 2017 | STATUS OF MANAGEMENT RESPONSE February 2018 |
|--|--|--|
| <p>all work programs have clear deliverables and timeframes.</p> | <p>project Memorandum of Understanding (MOU).</p> <p>However, a key comparative advantage for GGGI in delivering long term impact is its embedded relationship with government. GGGI should remain flexible and responsive to needs, meaning GGGI may in certain circumstances need to remain engaged beyond the point of exit to ensure that the project is implemented.</p> <p>Thus far, there are a few examples of phasing out in UMICs where GGGI has achieved its objectives and strengthened capacity. Some of these countries graduate to self-funding programs and funding other countries. This model should be replicated.</p> <p>There are also good examples where GGGI have moved across different host ministries and level of government. In India, GGGI moved</p> | <p>are prioritized by the government partners and funders.</p> <p>Within country programs, projects are regularly completed and replaced by other new high priority projects responding to the needs of government partners.</p> <p>All deliverables in the WPB have clear targets and timeframes and the progress of implementation is monitored on a monthly basis. Individual staff members' targets and Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) are based on this and taking up other ad-hoc tasks is discouraged.</p> <p>The 2019-20 WPB will enable GGGI's work to be more clearly defined, both in terms of scope, deliverables and timelines. This will be achieved by instituting an ongoing proposal development cycle for both core and earmarked funding, where start and end dates of projects will not have to align with the WPB biennium.</p> <p>In as far as it concerns GGGI's work in the business of developing projects and funds to the point of bankability, discussions of "exit" are defined and relevant once GGGI has stopped working on that particular deal. That said, it is</p> |

| RECOMMENDATIONS | | MANAGEMENT RESPONSE July 2017 | STATUS OF MANAGEMENT RESPONSE February 2018 |
|-----------------|---|--|--|
| | | <p>from working at the State level to the Federal level. In China, GGGI moved from working at the State level to the Ministry of Environment and is now working with the National Development and Reform Commission (NDRC) with respect to knowledge sharing.</p> <p>Timeline: End 2017</p> | <p>sometimes the case that even though GGGI may have achieved investor commitment by means of letters of interest, MoUs or financing agreements, engagement with the country may continue due to a larger program between GGGI and that country. GGGI points of “exit” are being defined more explicitly – with clear deliverables and timeframes - with investment projects.</p> |
| 7 | <p>GGGI should find ways to gain better recognition for their contribution to green growth.</p> <p>GGGI’s collaboration with the government is crucial but the relationship is so close that external stakeholders may not distinguish GGGI’s distinct contribution. GGGI staff should be encouraged to seek formal recognition for their work through publishing reports, co-branding, awards, etc. Top management should emphasize the</p> | <p>Agree.</p> <p>7.1 GGGI will explore options available to the organization to gain better recognition for its contributions to green growth.</p> <p>The Office of Thought Leadership team (TL), the Investment and Policy Solutions Division (IPSD), and the Green Growth Planning and Implementation Division (GGPI) will develop publications and promotional materials on our work in coordination with GGGI’s Communications unit and build a</p> | <p>Being actioned: Under the guidance of the GGGI Publications Committee, the Office of Thought Leadership updated the Publications Guidelines in early 2018 to underscore that all flagship publications should emphasize GGGI experiences, success stories, best practices, and lessons learned as a core element of their narratives.</p> <p>In addition, the institute continues to showcase the results of its work through a number of channels including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Hosting GGGWeek2017 in Addis Ababa which was attended by over 500 green growth |

| RECOMMENDATIONS | | MANAGEMENT RESPONSE July 2017 | STATUS OF MANAGEMENT RESPONSE February 2018 |
|-----------------|---|--|---|
| | importance of due recognition during interactions with country teams. | <p>stronger evidence base for the green growth approach.</p> <p>Timeline: Progress update by end 2017, and end 2018</p> | <p>policy practitioners and high level decision makers;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - (Co)Hosting 5 side events at UNFCCC COP23 presenting the impact and ongoing progress of the institute’s work to highly relevant audiences; - Launching a refreshed external website with individual country, thematic and project pages to provide detailed descriptions of GGGI’s value addition in each program; - Publishing 10 publications in 2017 (2 Technical Reports, 1 Technical Guideline, 2 Insight Briefs, 5 Peer-reviewed Journal Articles) and a plan to publish 23 publications in 2018 (10 Technical Reports, 2 Technical Guidelines, 4 Insight Briefs and 7 Peer-reviewed articles); |
| | | 7.2 In many instances, GGGI receives letters and public statements from | Being actioned: GGGI through its Communications Unit is reviewing opportunities |

| RECOMMENDATIONS | | MANAGEMENT RESPONSE July 2017 | STATUS OF MANAGEMENT RESPONSE February 2018 |
|-----------------|---|---|--|
| | | <p>Ministers appreciating its work. A greater effort must be made to document, publicize and circulate this recognition.</p> <p>GGGI's Communications Strategy addresses these issues and they will be further explored through discussions and capacity building with country staff.</p> <p>Timeline: End 2018</p> | <p>for attaining and publishing more systematically accreditations of its contributions.</p> |
| 8 | <p>GGGI should take a more active role in promoting South-South cooperation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> . The knowledge management should be centralized and facilitated. . GGGI should ensure linkage between its HQ driven capacity building activities and country programs . GGGI should seek opportunities for peer-to-peer learning through activities such as twinning arrangement, mentoring, | <p>Agree.</p> <p>8.1 GGGI is making progress in improving South-South cooperation and will continue to work on this. A large number of activities are happening at country level that would benefit from better documentation and presentation. TL will facilitate knowledge management at a central level. South-South cooperation can be integrated better in GGGI's work. Programs and communities of</p> | <p>Being actioned: GGGI has instituted a system of "Communities of Practice" (CoP) for each of the thematic areas. These CoPs meet once a month and see participation between 15 and 25 people each time, from across its country offices and HQ staff. This has proved to be an excellent forum to share knowledge amongst countries and between teams.</p> <p>During 2018, GGGI will be placing greater emphasis on promoting South-South cooperation through: knowledge sharing across countries through GGPI regional and country programs; support from the Green Growth</p> |

| RECOMMENDATIONS | | MANAGEMENT RESPONSE July 2017 | STATUS OF MANAGEMENT RESPONSE February 2018 |
|-----------------|---|--|---|
| | communities of practice and potential staff secondment. | <p>practice are being developed at sectoral level.</p> <p>Timeline: End 2018</p> | <p>Knowledge Platform for country, regional, and HQ-based programs (like Green Climate Fund readiness); support to multi-country bodies such as the Least Developed Countries (LDCs) Climate Change Group under the UNFCCC. A new program will also support capacity building for LDCs in partnership with the LDC University Consortium on Climate Change, primarily focused on Africa and Asia in green urban development and financing and in renewable energy planning and financing.</p> |
| | | <p>8.2 GGGI management will explore the possibility of a secondment program.</p> <p>GGGI currently has an intern exchange programs in place with Korea Electric Power Corporation (KEPCO) and management is working on extending to further programs.</p> <p>Timeline: End 2017</p> | <p>Completed: GGGI has recently agreed with the Government of Denmark for the funding of a seconded position that will be advertised shortly. GGGI will further explore more secondment opportunities.</p> |

| RECOMMENDATIONS | MANAGEMENT RESPONSE July 2017 | STATUS OF MANAGEMENT RESPONSE February 2018 |
|--|---|--|
| <p data-bbox="90 326 667 526">9 GGGI should have organizational structure, mechanism and process to ensure coordination and communication to ensure integrated delivery.</p> <p data-bbox="186 553 667 1354">There is still some concern about the integration of GGPI and IPSD, as IPSD staff members do not report directly to the country representative and the country team is not always kept sufficiently informed on the details of the IPSD projects. Investment work should complement work done by country teams and should be relevant to government priorities. There is a need for organizational structure, mechanism, and process to ensure coordination and communications between the GGPI and IPSD. We recommend that IPSD staff in-country should have a direct reporting line to the country representatives.</p> | <p data-bbox="758 326 848 354">Agree.</p> <p data-bbox="758 383 1203 537">9.1 GGGI has made progress on integration and continually strives to improve integration efforts further.</p> <p data-bbox="758 570 1230 1198">Management have instituted new integration meetings after the three external reviews and the internal mid-term review. Project Idea review meetings create a space where new project ideas for Green Investment Services (GIS) to work on towards bankability are reviewed together with GGPI. Sector review meetings are held to align GGPI and IPSD teams on thematic area work in countries and ensure that policy work supports investment work on existing meetings.</p> <p data-bbox="758 1227 1224 1382">These new efforts are in addition to the already ongoing monthly catch-up with Heads of Programs on the list of priority bankable projects,</p> | <p data-bbox="1320 326 1528 354">Being actioned:</p> <ul data-bbox="1320 383 1927 1398" style="list-style-type: none"> - Integrated targets in 2018: corporate targets and in-country delivery outputs are being shared between GGPI and IPSD with both divisions responsible for implementation; a target for resource mobilization is also shared between GGPI, IPSD and SPC (Strategy, Partnership and Communications Unit). Whilst the targets are common, different units in the organization will bear different functions in order to achieve them. - Cross-divisional meetings starting in 2017: regular cross-divisional meetings between thematic leads and the head of GIS and the heads of programs of GGPI are being held to compare notes on developments in country. - Reporting arrangements: GIS staff located in country offices have a dual reporting lines; a system that is expected to deepen as the organization moves towards a matrix-based management. - HR has recently reviewed and updated GGGI Organizational Chart which was communicated by ODG/Strategy, Partnership and |

| RECOMMENDATIONS | MANAGEMENT RESPONSE July 2017 | STATUS OF MANAGEMENT RESPONSE February 2018 |
|-----------------|---|---|
| | <p>National Financing Vehicles (NFVs) and financial instruments for the year and regular country-calls. GGGI is also in the process of developing a joint list of projects and project pipeline. Management is working toward implementation of joint outputs and KPIs and a budgetary system that supports an integrated approach</p> <p>The Management Team have discussed the issue of IPSD in-country staff reporting lines and reached a decision that in-country staff will have a dual reporting line, with a direct reporting to the relevant Thematic Lead and Head of GIS, and a direct line of reporting to the Country Representative. It was deemed that a dual reporting arrangement is most conducive to integration as it offers the staff in question specialized supervision in terms of in-depth sector knowledge, and the structure and</p> | <p>Communications on 22 February 2018 to all divisions and country offices.</p> |

| RECOMMENDATIONS | | MANAGEMENT RESPONSE July 2017 | STATUS OF MANAGEMENT RESPONSE February 2018 |
|---------------------------|---|---|--|
| | | <p>design of investments, while allowing for flexibility in GIS resource allocation.</p> <p>Timeline: End 2017</p> | |
| INSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT | | | |
| 10 | <p>GGGI should aim to increase staff retention levels to meet or exceed industry benchmarks</p> <p>GGGI’s key asset is its people. Staff turnover is high, creating obstacles to continuity and learning opportunities. GGGI should invest in training opportunities to help staff upgrade skills as well as creating clearer opportunities for advancement. As part of professional development provide for increased opportunities for rotation between country offices, as well as between country offices and HQ. Opportunities for staff recognition should also be identified.</p> | <p>Agree.</p> <p>10.1 It is important for GGGI to reach industry benchmarks on retention. The Management Team is keenly aware of this and is moving forward with several initiatives to improve staff engagement.</p> <p>These include staff engagement surveys and related action plans, an improved performance management process, staff awards training programs, management development programs, and a staff rotation system.</p> <p>Timeline: End 2017</p> | <p>Being actioned: GGGI has launched a staff rotation program in March 2018 for staff who have completed 3 years of service. This program was also open to staff who had completed two years of service and were willing to volunteer in the program. Re-assignment of staff will start in May and continue throughout the following months.</p> <p>GGGI has also started the following initiatives to contribute to increased retention:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Annual Staff engagement survey completed early March 2018; - Peer-to-peer award; - Design of a Leadership programme to be implemented in 2018 covering all people managers. |

| RECOMMENDATIONS | | MANAGEMENT RESPONSE July 2017 | STATUS OF MANAGEMENT RESPONSE February 2018 |
|-----------------|--|--|---|
| | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Design of a mentoring programme that will also give more empowerment to junior and female staff to be implemented in 2018; - 360-degree feedback from staff with managerial responsibilities from X11 and above completed in March 2018; - Effective feedback training delivered in February 2018; - Respectful and harmonious workplace environment training and employee focal group; - First event on International Women’s day to be held on March 08, 2018; - Informal women’s empowerment group; - Collection of more data on gender issues in the workplace <p>Job Swapping Program for staff in the Operations Enabling Division between HQ and Country offices with staff scheduled for swapping in Spring 2018.</p> |
| 11 | The pace of expansion should be determined by a rational balance between available resources, | <p>Agree.</p> <p>11.1 It is important to distinguish the issue of expansion of programs from the issue of Membership expansion.</p> | <p>Being actioned: WPB 2019-2020 will allocate resources in accordance with the strategic parameters approved in the Refreshed Strategic</p> |

| RECOMMENDATIONS | MANAGEMENT RESPONSE July 2017 | STATUS OF MANAGEMENT RESPONSE February 2018 |
|--|---|--|
| <p>contribution of member countries and activities.</p> <p>A balanced approach to expansion is important including LDCs and emerging economies. It is also important to encourage co-funding when working with emerging large economies. It is important for GGGI to see which countries can get more impact quickly. GGGI should focus on making long lasting effects in the countries they engage with, rather than doing too little in too many countries.</p> | <p>Any UN Member State can become a GGGI Member. GGGI management recognized that many countries would like to join the organization, and in each case, GGGI assesses the appropriate contribution and/or service model.</p> <p>Through our LDC expansion plan we are looking at alternative models of providing services to countries to setting up a country office.</p> <p>The WPB 2017-18 and related Planning Directions indicate a clear intent to move away from allocating core funding to non-Member Middle Income Countries (MICs), except in the case of strong South-South cooperation programs where Membership discussions are progressing.</p> <p>In the case of MIC programs, agreements should be made on graduation to a co-funding path.</p> <p>Timeline: April 2018</p> | <p>Plan 2015-2020, which require that at least 50% of resource to be allocated to LDCs.</p> <p>WPB 2019-2020 pursues co-funding with all partner countries, at minimum through in-kind contributions, by LDC governments and through financial participation of donors and Middle-Income Countries (MICs) governments, representing a move toward lower share of core allocations by GGGI to MICs.</p> |

| RECOMMENDATIONS | | MANAGEMENT RESPONSE July 2017 | STATUS OF MANAGEMENT RESPONSE February 2018 |
|-----------------|---|---|---|
| 12 | <p>GGGI must sharpen its approach to resource mobilisation</p> <p>Until relatively recently responsibility for resource mobilisation was diffuse. Progress in defining a clearer model for seeking new funding sources has been made but needs additional emphasis, resources and senior management time. GGGI should aggressively explore funding opportunities from non-traditional sources (foundations, High Net Worth Individuals and the private sector and university endowment funds, pension funds). GGGI should define a clear role for their Council in supporting fundraising efforts.</p> | <p>Agree.</p> <p>12.1 GGGI has started work on strengthening resource mobilization efforts, particularly in relation to increasing and strengthening earmarked funding efforts.</p> <p>Until recently, the Office of the Director General (ODG) was running all resource mobilization activities from the headquarters. GGGI is now moving to a more decentralized model of resource mobilization, with country teams responsible for resource mobilization efforts to deliver their CPFs. ODG will support resource mobilization efforts through coordination and capacity building.</p> <p>GGGI has not sought funding from private sector and High Networth Individuals (HNIs) in the past, therefore the organization is not currently geared in that direction.</p> | <p>Being actioned: GGGI is preparing a Resource Mobilization (RM) Action Plan by April 2018. This will outline the strengthened role of the country representatives in resource mobilization, through which GGGI will assess resource mobilization opportunities for all projects. The action plan will also review strategic partnerships and new opportunities with a view to longer term funding possibilities.</p> |

| RECOMMENDATIONS | | MANAGEMENT RESPONSE July 2017 | STATUS OF MANAGEMENT RESPONSE February 2018 |
|-----------------|---|---|---|
| | | <p>Management recognizes the need to explore alternative sources of funding and have already started to assess opportunities. GGGI will develop an approach to targeting private sector funding going forward, with careful consideration of conflicts of interests.</p> <p>Timeline: Table Resource Mobilization (RM) Action Plan by April 2018</p> | |
| 13 | <p>GGGI should invest in partnerships with organizations that recognize its added value and comparative advantage.</p> <p>GGGI has initiated formal and informal partnerships. It has not crystalized the opportunity to collaborate systematically with specific partners, especially in GGGI's role in project preparation. For partnership to be successful GGGI needs to clearly define its role and</p> | <p>Agree.</p> <p>13.1 The Management Team agrees that GGGI must improve efforts to obtain co-funding or payment for services. This is closely linked to the drive to increase earmarked funding. In cases where GGGI is the preferred provider of services relating to green growth, countries should fund or co-fund depending on their level of resources.</p> | <p>Being actioned: GGGI is preparing a Resource Mobilization Action Plan for the endorsement of the Management and Program Sub-Committee in April 2018, which will look into short and long-term resource mobilization issues. This plan includes a proposal for 'mandate' letter, under which its feasibility work would be refunded by the investor at cost.</p> |

| RECOMMENDATIONS | | MANAGEMENT RESPONSE July 2017 | STATUS OF MANAGEMENT RESPONSE February 2018 |
|-----------------|--|---|--|
| | <p>avoid the pitfall of being perceived as providing “free consulting”.</p> <p>Furthermore, GGGI should leverage its status as UN observer to influence the green growth debate, at the global level and also to forge partnerships.</p> | <p>However, it must be recognized that GGGI is not equivalent to a consulting firm. As an international organization, it is important to remain neutral and independent.</p> <p>Timeline: Table RM Action Plan by April 2018</p> | |
| | | <p>13.2 Thus far, GGGI’s Observer Status has enabled participation. GGGI has a presence at the Conference of the Parties (COP) every year and has sponsored initiatives at the World Economic Forum (WEF) and Davos.</p> <p>GGGI is making a conscious effort to influence the green growth debate through a Climate diplomacy initiative, and initial work with Article 6. TL will be tasked with developing a body of evidence on green growth stories to stimulate discussion.</p> | <p>Being actioned: The Communications Unit maintains an annual listing of events to which GGGI contributes. Its posting to the website is imminent.</p> |

| RECOMMENDATIONS | | MANAGEMENT RESPONSE July 2017 | STATUS OF MANAGEMENT RESPONSE February 2018 |
|-----------------|---|---|--|
| | | <p>GGGI will utilize every opportunity, such as the High Level Political Forum, or other United Nations (UN) meetings to advocate green growth approaches to UN representatives. These could take the form of side-events, policy briefs, individual briefings, participation in drafting committees and other such high-profile opportunities.</p> <p>An annual listing of the key events and proposed contribution by GGGI will be kept up to date in the annual event calendar and posted on the website.</p> <p>Timeline: January 2018</p> | |
| 14 | <p>GGGI should recognize that some countries have greater potential to transition to green growth and should be given additional support and fast-track status.</p> <p>In line with above recommendations regarding innovation and</p> | <p>Agree.</p> <p>14.1 GGGI's management recognizes that in cases where countries are leaders in green growth the organization could enter at the 'right hand side' of the value chain.</p> | <p>Being actioned: GGGI is preparing a Resource Mobilization Action Plan for the endorsement of the Management and Program Sub-Committee in April 2018, which will look into short and long-term resource mobilization issues. This plan includes a proposal for trust fund, intended to serve as a challenge fund in support of countries that are prepared to take progressive and 'fast-</p> |

| RECOMMENDATIONS | | MANAGEMENT RESPONSE July 2017 | STATUS OF MANAGEMENT RESPONSE February 2018 |
|-----------------|---|--|--|
| | entrepreneurial behaviour, GGGI should recognize countries that meet the criteria for fast-track status and provide for additional resources through a global “challenge fund”. | <p>There is a sound argument in allocating additional resources to countries with strong commitment to green growth, while GGGI will continue to engage with all Member countries and countries of operation.</p> <p>There is a strong interest to further explore the “Challenge fund” concept, whereby GGGI could make additional resources available for ‘fast track’ countries. In this way, lagging countries could see such additionality as an incentive to expedite their green growth agendas and Member countries that are ready for immediate implementation of priority green growth activities can access resources.</p> <p>Timeline: April 2018</p> | tracked’ steps toward mainstreaming green growth solutions in their planning and investments. |
| 15 | GGGI should strengthen its Results Based Management with reference feedback mechanism from project | <p>Agree.</p> <p>15.1 GGGI’s PCM Manual sets out the mandatory internal processes, quality standards and responsibilities</p> | Being actioned: GGGI is in the process of revising its Program Cycle Management (PCM) policies and systems, with the aim of striking a better balance between staying focused on well targeted, measurable outcomes in the medium |

| RECOMMENDATIONS | MANAGEMENT RESPONSE July 2017 | STATUS OF MANAGEMENT RESPONSE February 2018 |
|---|--|---|
| <p>monitoring and evaluation to project design.</p> <p>GGGI should systematically capture lessons learned during project implementation and feed these into future project design. Periodically these lessons should be synthesized into guidance notes for project cycle management.</p> <p>With increased attention to green investment and GGGI's stated intention to not go beyond financial closure it is recommended that GGGI enters into some form of agreement with project implementing agencies on monitoring and feedback of results during and after implementation. GGGI should seek agreement from project funding bodies that staff who are involved in investment project design preparation should be allowed to participate in supervision missions</p> | <p>for managing projects throughout each stage of the life cycle. Implementation and review of projects is also governed by procedures in the PCM Manual relating to the monitoring, evaluation and reporting for all projects.</p> <p>GGGI is in the process of preparing an Evaluation Policy outlining our proposed approach to key issues such as governance arrangements, principles and standards, the types of evaluation products/services and implementation approaches, publishing and communication activities and mechanisms to facilitate the implementation of recommendations.</p> <p>Timeline: End 2017</p> | <p>term, and flexibility to adapt to changed circumstances and new opportunities in the short term.</p> <p>As part of this revision, work will remain to be done to ensure the new PCM policies/systems closes the learning loop from implementation of past or ongoing projects to design of new ones.</p> <p>A dedicated evaluation unit (IEU) has now been operational for a year, and 4 independent evaluations commissioned to date (1 completed at time of this update). This work is beginning to generate a body of lessons from internal experience, that can be fed back into the design of new projects.</p> <p>In addition, IEU has commenced work to develop an internal evidence base on green growth, to make impact-related lessons from outside GGGI more easily accessible within the organization.</p> |

| RECOMMENDATIONS | | MANAGEMENT RESPONSE July 2017 | STATUS OF MANAGEMENT RESPONSE February 2018 |
|-----------------|---|---|--|
| | <p>and/or post-evaluation missions as part of staff capacity building.</p> <p>This mechanism should be defined in GGGI's Evaluation and Monitoring policy. This may also include guidance for project, sectoral and thematic evaluations.</p> | | |
| | | <p>15.2 The recommendation to include a mechanism for monitoring and feedback of results of green investment beyond financial closure will be considered and management will undertake scoping analysis for a mechanism.</p> <p>Timeline: April 2018</p> | <p>Being actioned: The success indicator for GGGI's work on mobilizing finance by making projects bankable is "proven investor commitment". GGGI is not engaged in projects until they reach financial closure, let alone project execution. This limits GGGI's ability to monitor the results of green investment, but GGGI will nevertheless strive to, in as many instances as possible, find ways to stay involved in the project such that monitoring can be possible. Such a scoping report will be produced in April 2018.</p> |
| STRATEGIC PLAN | | | |
| 16 | <p>Mid-term revision of Strategic Plan is recommended.</p> | <p>Agree.</p> <p>16.1 In the first draft revised Strategic Plan: six updated strategic outcomes</p> | <p>Completed: The Refreshed Strategic Plan 2019-2020 includes a clearer reference to the definition of policy vs investment project.</p> |

| RECOMMENDATIONS | MANAGEMENT RESPONSE July 2017 | STATUS OF MANAGEMENT RESPONSE February 2018 |
|--|--|--|
| <p>Some of the areas identified for inclusion in the revision, <i>inter alia</i>, are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Incorporation of the proposed six additional outcomes; b) Inclusion of updated CRF and grandfathering of earlier CRF and existing project log frames; c) Intended role of TL; d) Impact statement reflects global ambition as in vision (beyond member countries); e) Strengthen direction/clarity on partnership; and f) Differentiation of various aspects of implementation. | <p>have been included, the intended role of TL has been described and the direction and clarity on Strategic Engagement and partnerships has been strengthened.</p> <p>An updated CRF will be developed over the coming months and included in the final version of the revised Strategic Plan. Management agrees that the earlier CRF and existing project log frames should be grandfathered.</p> <p>The revision of the Impact Statement to reflect global ambition beyond Member countries makes sense and will be considered.</p> <p>The Strategic Plan will include a clearer definition of GGGI's role in implementation on policy projects vs. investment (bankable) projects in the next revision of the Strategic Plan.</p> <p>Timeline: October 2017</p> | <p>Being actioned: Corporate Results Framework will be updated in the context of the new WPB 2019-2020, for Council approval in 2018.</p> |

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

| | | | |
|--------|--|--------|--|
| CoP: | Community of Practice | LDCs: | Least Developed Countries |
| CPFs: | Country Planning Frameworks | MICs: | Middle-Income Countries |
| CRF: | Corporate Results Framework | MOU: | Memorandum of Understanding |
| CRs: | Country Representatives | MPSC: | Management and Program Sub-Committee |
| DG: | Director General | NDRC: | National Development and Reform Commission |
| GIS: | Green Investment Services | NFVs: | National Financing Vehicles |
| GGGI: | Global Green Growth Institute | ODG: | Office of the Director General |
| GGPI: | Green Growth Planning and Implementation | PCM: | Project Cycle Management |
| HoPs: | Head of Programs | RM: | Resource Mobilisation |
| HNIs: | High Net Worth Individuals | SPC: | Strategy, Partnership and Communications |
| IPSD: | Investment and Policy Solutions Division | TL: | Office of Thought Leadership |
| IEU: | Impact and Evaluation Unit | UMICs: | Upper Middle-Income Countries |
| KPIs: | Key Performance Indicators | WEF: | World Economic Forum |
| KEPCO: | Korea Electric Power Corporation | WPB: | Work Program and Budget |