



Global Green Growth Institute

Sixth Meeting of the Management and Program Sub-Committee
July 4-5, 2017; Oslo, Kingdom of Norway

Summary of the Sixth Meeting of the Management and Program Sub-Committee

Opening of the Meeting

1. The Sixth Meeting of the Management and Program Sub-Committee (MPSC) was attended by participants from Australia, Costa Rica, Denmark, Korea, and Norway, as well as by observers from Hungary and the United Kingdom.
2. The meeting was chaired by the Republic of Korea, represented by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.
3. Annex 1 provides the list of participants.
4. Annex 2 provides the list of sessional documents.

Adoption of Agenda Items

5. Delegates adopted the Agenda [MPSC/2017/AG/2], circulated by the Institute on June 20, 2017.

Progress Report from the Director-General

6. The Institute provided an overview by highlighting the external evaluation commissioned by the Institute, the appraisal and review of Denmark and the United Kingdom, joint work across the Investment and Policy Solutions Division (IPSD) and Green Growth Planning and Implementation (GGP&I) divisions, a more flexible budgeting method for Work Program Budget (WPB) 2019-2020, the start of a stable period of development strategically, and some notable results achieved to date in 2017.
7. Delegates commended the results of the evaluation reports and achievements to date and expressed support for future flexibility in both budgeting and workplan.
8. Delegates encouraged the Institute to maintain its agility and focus on innovation and expressed support for the Institute's idea of a longer-term strategic plan, despite the inherent challenges as a rapidly changing organization in a rapidly changing space.

This document is intended for deliberation in a closed session of a Council sub-committee and, in accordance with GGGI's Disclosure Policy [[C/5/DC/2](#)], it is not for public disclosure.

9. Delegates took note of the Director-General's Progress Report contained in MPSC/2017/21.

Update on Bankable Projects and National Financing Vehicles

10. The Institute presented an update on the portfolio, including those in Cambodia, Columbia, Fiji, India, Indonesia, Jordan, Mongolia, the Philippines, Rwanda, Senegal, Thailand, Vanuatu, and Vietnam, and explained how it is diversifying its portfolio based around the four thematic approaches.
11. Delegates commended the advances made on projects and asked how the Institute monitors projects and whether knowledge is shared across countries. The Institute explained that (a) it is often asked to stay on after completion, allowing it to monitor; (b) some projects imbed monitors, and (c) it will consider monitoring more in the future, as well as that it is trying to capture and share knowledge more strategically.
12. Delegates also suggested a “traffic light” reporting system—red, yellow and green color codes—on the progress of individual projects could prove useful, to which the Institute expressed agreement and explained that it was utilizing such a system internally but that it was not ready to employ externally.
13. Delegates took note of the updates on bankable projects and national financing vehicles contained in MPSC/2017/22.

Update on Country Planning Frameworks

14. The Institute presented updates on Country Planning Frameworks (CPFs) by highlighting the revised methodology and recent progresses made, including specific examples of new CPFs for Thailand and Vanuatu. The Institute was joined in the presentation by the Country Representatives Thailand and Vanuatu and government counterparts of Thailand.
15. Delegates took note of the updates on Country Planning Frameworks contained in MPSC/2017/23.

Update on Draft Evaluation Rules

16. The Institute presented the draft *Evaluation Rules* based on the deliberations of the Fifth Meeting of the MPSC on April 19-20, 2017—highlighting a proposal for MPSC oversight—and updates on key evaluation activities planned for the second half of 2017.
17. Delegates welcomed the Institute's initiative and raised questions and/or suggestions regarding (a) the need to guarantee independence of evaluations and (b) the potential role of MPSC in evaluations.
18. The Institute and delegates together discussed and noted the measures in place—engaging external consultants for evaluations and maintaining the separate budget line for the

Institute's Impact and Evaluation Unit (IEU)—along with the proposed measure of utilizing the MPSC and/or an Evaluation Advisory Groups in some functional oversight role, will further strengthen the independence of evaluations. Other ideas and issues raised during deliberations included: the degree to and scope of which MPSC will function in the oversight role, the option of creating a separate advisory group under the Council, the relationship between evaluations and monitoring functions, and role of Thought Leadership team in developing the evidence base of green growth.

19. Delegates and the Institute, on the recommendation of the Chair, agreed to revisit and further deliberate on the following day—Day 2 of the Sixth Meeting of the MPSC, July 5, 2017—and, in the meantime, for the Institute to incorporate delegates' comments and edit the language in the draft *Evaluation Rules* concerning the role of MPSC (see 46-47).
20. Delegates took note of the draft *Evaluations Rules* contained in MPSC/2017/24 and agreed to reopen and conclude discussions on Day 2.

External Evaluations and Reviews

21. The Institute's external evaluator presented the results of his team's evaluation of the Institute's progress against the *Strategic Plan 2015-2020* in four parts: (a) Program Performance, (b) Institutional Development, (c) Strategic Plan, and (d) Overarching Recommendations. The Overarching Recommendations presented include:
 - a. Consider developing a longer-term strategic plan or vision document;
 - b. Consider alternative business models which will lead to long-term sustainability;
 - c. The Institute should consolidate as an organization for the next few years;
 - d. In country operations, political issues need to be better understood and potential responses clearly defined; and
 - e. Align the Institute's risk appetite with the desire to innovate and encourage entrepreneurial behavior.
22. Denmark presented the *Appraisal of Danish Core Contribution to GGGI 2017-19*, which was circulated to MPSC members by the Institute on behalf of Denmark, highlighting the appraisal's positive conclusions and recommendations, including:
 - a. Denmark extending its contributions into 2020;
 - b. The Danish International Development Agency (Danida) leading or participating in another donor-led review in 2019;
 - c. The Institute giving priority to consolidating its activities over expanding new projects;
 - d. The Institute giving priority to ensuring integration between headquarters and country deliverables, country programs and bankable projects;
 - e. The Institute ensuring country projects are formulated and operating within a Theory of Change;
 - f. The Institute placing greater emphasis on political economic analyses in developing CPFs, projects and other activities to explore opportunities;
 - g. The Institute further clarifying the role of Thought Leadership and knowledge management and the relevance for country projects and Members;

- h. The Institute strengthening communications in line with the new communications strategy;
 - i. The Institute having further dialogue on how investigations of suspected mismanagement and corruption will be reported; and
 - j. The Institute developing and sharing a range of different budget scenarios and their associated risks and consequences.
23. The United Kingdom presented the *DFID Annual Review of GGGI 2017*. The report commended the Institute's progress against set milestones and offered comments and recommendations, including:
- a. Placing more focus on implementation and measuring progress;
 - b. Developing a strategic approach to knowledge work and demonstrating the impact of knowledge sharing;
 - c. Placing more focus on mobilizing both public and private finance and developing mechanisms to incentivize private finance; and
 - d. DFID participating in the donor-led review proposed by Denmark.
24. The Institute expressed agreement with all recommendations offered above and noted that all three reports are generally aligned, providing an affirmation of the future course of direction and allowing the Institute to focus on bringing in the recommendations operationally and developing a time frame.
25. Delegates invited the Institute to consider (a) the *Independent External Evaluation on the Progress against the Strategic Plan 2015-2020*, (b) the *Appraisal of Danish Core Contribution to GGGI 2017-2019*, and (c) the *DFID Annual Review of GGGI 2017*, along with the comments and recommendations made.

Review of *Strategic Plan 2015-2020*

26. The Institute presented draft revisions to the *Strategic Plan 2015-2020* to consult with delegates and to prepare the final draft *Revised Strategic Plan 2015-2020*, which will subsequently be presented to the joint Session of the Assembly and Council in October 2017.
27. Delegates noted that key elements of the revised *Strategic Plan* include (a) new strategic outcomes of direct relevance to green growth outcomes, (b) GGGI's core values fundamental to driving results, (c) an updated description of operational delivery model, (d) revised resource mobilization targets, (e) descriptions of risk management and anti-corruption policies, and (f) further recommendations from the above evaluations.
28. Delegates welcomed the Institute's efforts to proactively establish corporate culture, and delegates suggested the use of the phrase "we champion diversity" rather than "we respect diversity" and pointed out an outdated monetary figure in the report (*see p. 29 of the sessional document*).
29. The Institute promised to share a revised version with MPSC delegates for comments during the middle of August 2017.

30. Delegates invited the Institute to reflect the comments made in the subsequent phases of the Review of the Strategic Plan.

Partnerships

31. The Institute presented an update on partnerships activities and resource mobilization efforts highlighting the Green Climate Fund (GCF), private sector firms, think-tanks and research institutions, prospective members, and resource partners.

Green Climate Fund

32. The Institute updated delegates on GGGI—GCF strategic partnership developments, including the signing of the *Framework Readiness and Preparatory Support Grant Agreement*, a pipeline of readiness proposals with the Institute as the delivery partner, enhancing Direct Access Entity pre- and post-accreditation, and the signing of a *Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) on Administrative and Institutional Cooperation* to facilitate knowledge sharing and exchanges and secondments of staff.
33. Delegates welcomed the Institute's activities and direction thus far, noting the potential for significant mutual benefits, the great progress in a short span of time, the fact that Australia as co-chair of the GCF Board and Republic of Korea as host to both organizations strongly support the cooperation.

Partnerships with the private sector

34. The Institute presented the Rules of Private Sector Engagement being introduced on a pilot basis, highlighting the direct and indirect engagement models.
35. Delegates encouraged the Institute to proceed with engagement efforts with the private sector.

Knowledge partnerships

36. The Institute presented plans to engage research institutions, think-tanks and universities in a more centralized and systematic manner to facilitate knowledge sharing, highlighting the three goals (a) knowledge in, (b) knowledge out, and (c) long-term partnerships, as well as key updates with the Green Growth Knowledge Platform (GGKP).
37. Delegates commended the overall progress. It was suggested contacting the Paris Committee on Capacity Building as a good source on knowledge sharing and a delegate promised to help the Institute with a point of contact.

Membership expansion

38. The Institute presented updates on the membership accession framework, the expansion pipeline, and continued commitment to balance program expansion with resource mobilization, in line with recommendations of the aforementioned evaluations and appraisals.

39. Delegates commended the usefulness of the information presented and asked for more information on the program selection criteria. The Institute explained that developing the criteria is the function of the Council, and LDC expansion had been a central part of the criteria by the Council but the new approach is to consolidate and focus on those countries that seek out the Institute about potential membership.
40. The Institute also updated delegates on the European Union (EU) accession to GGGI membership, highlighting the positive recommendation from the EC to open negotiations with the Institute to become a Member. The Institute stated it is contemplating an information session in Brussels for EU members, and taking advantage of other diplomatic channels to convey positive messages such as the G20.
41. Delegates expressed strong support for the Institute's efforts to court EU membership and promised continued support in the future through proper channels and events.

Resource partnerships

42. The Institute presented on resource mobilization highlighting (a) the framework of resource partnerships, (b) recent resource mobilization results, (c) ongoing and planned activities to strengthen resource partnerships, including full cost of earmarked proposals, and (d) concurrence with recommendations related to resource mobilization from the recent evaluations.
43. The Institute assured that, aware of the Danish Appraisal, it will not allow core funds to subsidize earmarked funding. It also reiterated that the two types of sources can support each other with proper alignment of the two sources and an agreed upon guideline from Council.
44. The Chair aired three guiding questions to be commented on during tour de table:
 - (a) How has the Institute progressed in pursuing partnerships, based on the expectations of Members;
 - (b) What do Members see as the key areas of success for the Institute in pursuing partnerships in the future; and
 - (c) In what areas would Members like to see the Institute focus more for effective resource mobilization? In response,
 - a. Delegates encouraged the Institute to develop an action plan for resource mobilization;
 - b. Delegates encouraged the Institute to explore resource mobilization with multilateral institutions and philanthropic organizations;
 - c. Delegates touched upon the need to balance resource mobilization for middle income and low income countries; and
 - d. Delegates encouraged the Institute to pursue core funding from current and potentially new Members.
45. Delegates took note of the Institute's activities and invited the Institute to consider the comments and suggestions made.

Evaluation Rules Revisited (from 19-20)

46. The Institute continued discussions on the draft *Evaluation Rules* from Day 1 and presented the updated version of the same to delegates. Delegates deliberated and agreed that (a) the MPSC should provide oversight and advice to Council to avoid creating an additional line of reporting and (b) a review clause—mandating a review of the *Evaluation Rules* after two (2) years—should be included in the introductory paragraphs.
47. Delegates invited the Institute to revise the draft *Evaluation Rules* in consideration of the suggestions by the delegates prior to being shared with the Council and Assembly.

Sustainability and Safeguards Rules

48. The Institute presented a proposal to enhance transparency, which includes a plan to share at the next MPSC meeting in April 2018 the progress on benchmarking and proposed revisions of the Disclosure Policy for comments. The Institute also presented a revision of the *Environmental and Social Sustainability and Safeguards Rules*, highlighting the ten (10) core safeguards standards, revisions to accountability and delivery process, and next steps planned.
49. Delegates welcomed and expressed support for the initiative to enhance transparency, as well as to revise and improve the *Sustainability and Safeguards Rules*, in particular with the inclusion of child protection.
50. Delegates invited the Institute to note and reflect the comments and suggestions made.

Staff Regulations and Rules Revisions

51. The Institute presented revisions to the *Staff Regulations and Rules* by highlighting (a) benchmarking of compensation package against competitors, (b) higher responsibility allowance, (c) non-discrimination on account of sexual orientation, (d) compensatory leave, and (e) expanded work-from-home arrangements.
52. Delegates expressed interest and/or concern regarding the impact of the elimination of tax reimbursement, what measures were being taken to address the current rate of staff turnover that is higher than desirable, the importance of feedback from the Staff Council, and the elimination of the age cap on retirement.
53. The Institute explained that benchmarking is expected to ensure the Institute's competitiveness and improvement efforts are underway to boost staff morale.
54. The Institute invited MPSC delegates to communicate directly with follow up comments or additional questions via email.
55. Delegates took note of the updates provided as contained in MPSC/2017/32 and invited the Institute to reflect the comments and suggestions made in the implementation of guidelines.

Provisional Agenda of the Sixth Session of the Assembly/Tenth Session of the Council and 2018 Meetings of the MPSC

56. The Institute provided the draft provisional agenda of the October 2017 joint Assembly and Council Meeting for suggestions or comments. The Institute also presented potential agenda items for MPSC in 2018 and asked whether the load of agenda items for discussions justifies holding only one (1) MPSC meeting in 2018.
57. Regarding the joint Assembly and Council Meeting, delegates (a) suggested holding the discussions on *Staff Regulations and Rules* during the closed sessions intended for Members only and (b) proposed including an agenda item on an action plan for resource mobilization.
58. Regarding MPSC meeting(s) in 2018, delegates (a) agreed to hold one (1) physical meeting during the last week of April of 2018 and, if necessary, a virtual meeting near the end of June/beginning of July 2018 and (b) suggested holding the physical meeting at the Institute's Seoul Headquarters rather than in Songdo.
59. Delegates invited the Institute to consider the suggestions and comments made and to revise the draft provisional agenda of the Sixth Session of the Assembly/Tenth Session of the Council accordingly, recommending the draft provisional agenda of the joint Assembly and Council Meeting to the Chair of the Council. Delegates of the MPSC took note of the discussions on potential MPSC meetings in 2018 and agreed to hold one (1) physical meeting during the last week of April, followed by a virtual meeting near the end of June or beginning of July. Delegates invited the Institute to consider the suggestions and comments made and to revise the MPSC agenda items accordingly.

Any Other Business

60. The Institute provided updates on the election of the Bureau, offering details on the progress of resolving the vacancy of the President of the Assembly/Chair of the Council in the following weeks and on the ongoing approval by Written Decision to elect Ethiopia as Acting President/Acting Chair as an interim measure. The Institute also updated the delegates on the preparations of the GGGWeek 2017 to be held in October 2017 and reported good progress.
61. Delegates welcomed the updates on the Bureau and the Institute's plans for GGGWeek 2017.
62. Korea, as one of the two Audit Contact Points of the MPSC with Norway, provided updates on its activities and plans as follows:
- a. In April 2017, Korea and Norway received the 2016 annual activity report and 2017 audit plans from the Office of Internal Audit and Integrity (OIAI);
 - b. On July 3, 2017, the Audit Contact Points received from OIAI the follow up report on OIAI's 2016 internal audit and the 2017 audit on the Institute's Indonesia country program and country office; and
 - c. The Audit Contact Points will review the reports, consult with OIAI and discuss the conclusions with the Institute Management.

63. Chair thanked Norway for the hospitality and generosity as host of the Sixth Meeting of the MPSC and all participants for the proactive participation and contributions.

/END/

List of Participants*Australia*

Ms. Ella Drake, Senior Policy Officer, Climate and Environment Funds, Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade

Costa Rica

Ms. Silvia Rojas, Coordinator, Sustainable Biodiversity Fund, Ministry of Environment and Energy

Denmark

Mr. Jesper Thomsen, Chief Advisor, Development Policy and Global Issues, Ministry of Foreign Affairs

Republic of Korea

Mr. Namhyuk Kim, Director for Green Economy and Environmental Diplomacy, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Republic of Korea (MPSC Chair)

Ms. In-hae Baek, Assistant to the Director for Green Economy and Environmental Diplomacy, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Republic of Korea

Norway

Ms. Vedis Vik, Senior Advisor, Department for Climate Change, Ministry of Climate and Environment

Ms. Kristine Stubberud, Senior Advisor, Department for Climate, Energy, Environment and Research, Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation (NORAD)

Ms. Anne Seim-Haugen, Advisor, Department for Quality Assurance, Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation (NORAD)

Hungary (Observer)

Dr. Zsolt Haraszti, Third Secretary, Embassy of Hungary to the Kingdom of Norway

United Kingdom (Observer)

Mr. Miguel Laric, Economist, Growth and Resilience Department, Department for International Development

Secretariat

Dr. Frank Rijsberman, Director-General

Mr. Robert Dawson, Deputy Director-General and Head of Operations Enabling Division (OED)

Ms. Mahua Acharya, Assistant Director-General and Head of Investment and Policy Solutions (IPSD)

Mr. Per Bertilsson, Assistant Director-General and Head of Green Growth Planning and Implementation (GGP&I)

Mr. Keeyong Chung, Director of Governance, ODG

Ms. Sirpa Jarvenpaa, Director of Strategy, Partnership and Communications, ODG

Mr. Dave Kim, Governance Officer, ODG

Mr. Warin Nitipaisalkul, Head of Impact and Evaluation, OED

Ms. Ingvild Solvang, Senior Gender and Social Development Specialist, GGP&I

Ms. Karolien Casaer-Diez, Program Development Manager, GGP&I

Ms. Margaret Kim, Green Growth Planning Specialist, GGP&I

Mr. Peter King, Green Growth Policy Expert, OED

Mr. Hubert Paulmer, Evaluations Team Leader, OED

Mr. Eric Plunkett, Analyst, IPSD

Mr. Dan Seddon-Daines, Green Investment Expert, OED

Mr. James Sheppard, Head of Partnerships, ODG

Mr. Nirmal Sinha, Head of Human Resources, OED

Ms. Cristina Traini, Senior Monitoring and Evaluation Specialist, OED

Ms. Anna van Paddenburg, Head of Land-use Sector, IPSD

Ms. Marijke Vermaak, Strategy Specialist, ODG

List of Sessional Documents

MPSC/2017/AG2	Agenda for the Sixth Meeting of the Management and Program Sub-Committee (MPSC)
MPSC/2017/21	Director General's Progress Report
MPSC/2017/22	Update on Bankable Projects, Risk-Reducing Financial Instruments and National Financing Vehicles
MPSC/2017/23	Progress Report on Country Planning Frameworks
MPSC/2017/24	Draft Evaluation Rules – Explanatory Note
MPSC/2017/25a	Independent Evaluation of GGGI's Progress against Strategic Plan 2015-2020
MPSC/2017/25b	GGGI Response to Independent Evaluation
MPSC/2017/26	GGGI Response to Danish Appraisal
MPSC/2017/28	Refreshed Strategy Plan 2015-2020
MPSC/2017/29	Update on GGGI Partnerships
MPSC/2017/30	Sustainability and Safeguards Rules
MPSC/2017/31	Enhancing GGGI's Transparency
MPSC/2017/32	Possible Revisions to Staff Regulations and Rules
A/2017/AG/1 – C/2017/AG/1	Provisional Agenda for the Joint Session of the Assembly and Council