**Global Green Growth Institute**
Ninth Session of the Assembly and
Thirteenth Session of the Council (Joint Session)
October 12-23, 2020 | E-Consultations

# Summary of E-Consultations of the Ninth Session of the Assembly and Thirteenth Session of the Council (Joint Session)

1. The e-consultations for the Ninth Session of the Assembly and Thirteenth Session of the Council (Joint Session) took place on October 12-23, 2020. Below is a summary of the e-consultations, while the full list of questions and comments from delegates and responses from the Secretariat is attached as an **Annex** to this summary.

## Director-General's Progress Report

2. Delegates congratulated Dr. Frank Rijsberman for his reappointment as Director-General, and expressed appreciation for his comprehensive report. Delegates thanked GGGI for its instrumental role in supporting its Members and partners work towards achieving the Sustainable Development Goals and green growth under the leadership of the Director-General. The Secretariat thanked the delegates, and reconfirmed GGGI's commitment to enhance and strengthen its efforts to assist its Members and partners accelerate their green transformation.

3. Delegates commended GGGI for delivering solid results, particularly its achievements in mobilizing green investments, despite the challenges of COVID-19. Delegates further commended GGGI for its agility and ingenuity in adapting to the COVID-19 context, and endorsed its focus on green recovery and to "Build Back Better." The Secretariat highlighted GGGI's early and proactive response to the COVID-19 crisis, and stressed that it will continue to strengthen its support for the green recovery of its Members, which will be at the heart of GGGI's green growth solution in the coming years. The Secretariat also shared that GGGI's strategy for green recovery will focus on green job creation from renewable energy investments, supporting young green entrepreneurs, and developing climate smart agriculture, among other efforts.

4. The Director General would like to make two points in response to several other questions related to multiple documents in the e-consultations:

    a. ***It takes four to five years from idea to impact***. In response to delegate questions the Director general points out that the normal timeline from the first submission of a Concept-Note to a donor to signing of a grant agreement is often around two years (e.g. KOICA submissions this year are for the 2022 funding cycle). In addition, donors often request submission of a proposal based on GGGI's earlier work. For example, the grant agreement with the EU for Uganda signed this year, implements the Uganda green growth strategy GGGI worked on in 2016-17, and will lead to

impact in 2022-23. Similarly, GGGI adopted the idea of six Strategic Outcomes in 2017, set GGGI wide targets in 2019 in Strategy 2030, and country levels targets in the 2021-22 WPB. It will take several more years before we can evaluate whether GGGI is over- or underperforming against these targets. Likewise, GGGI is able to quickly propose effective green COVID recovery projects today, because it has worked on green jobs assessments, green entrepreneurship and innovation, or green bonds for several years. That enables grants to be signed today targeting impact in 2021-23. Thus, the time from ideas to impact is realistically four to five years.

b. ***The WPB scenarios cannot be an up-to-date reflection of the most recent donor decisions***. The scenarios provide the upper and lower bands projections within which Council is requested to approve management's actions. They reflect the best information available to management at the time these projections were made, but cannot reflect every donor decision taken thereafter. We do not update the Scenarios whenever we learn of a new decision, because inevitably other decisions will follow subsequently. Instead, management believes that the MINUS, BASE and PLUS scenarios are a useful guidance to the environment in which it expects to operate, and recommends them to Council for approval on that basis. It is the operational budget for 2021, prepared by management subsequently, based on Council guidance through the WPB, that is based on donor decisions.

5. Members of the Assembly and the Council took note of the Director-General's progress report.

**Report on Programs and Operations**

6. Delegates welcomed GGGI's first Mid-Year CRF Progress Report, and commended GGGI for its efforts to communicate with Members on the progress of its projects. Delegates further positively noted that GGGI has exceeded its targets for the number of advisory outputs completed and green growth policies adopted, and showed remarkable performance in catalyzing green investment commitments, despite the challenges of COVID-19. The Secretariat thanked the delegates, and agreed that GGGI is ready to set more ambitious targets for its advisory outputs and green growth policies, considering its outperformance in these areas in 2019 and 2020.

7. Delegates inquired how the barriers of green investment mobilization may be addressed, and the Secretariat shared that GGGI follows a two-pronged approach to green investment mobilization: first, to create a favorable policy and regulatory environment for investors; and second, to develop a pipeline of bankable green investment opportunities to match with investors looking to invest in green projects and sectors, tapping into large amounts of private capital. The Secretariat informed that it is projecting to reach the USD 2 billion milestone in terms of green and climate finance mobilized by the end of 2020, which supports the validity of the GGGI model.

8. Members of the Assembly and the Council took note of the Secretariat's report on programs and operations.

**Membership, Accession and Country Programming**

9. Delegates and the Secretariat welcomed the Kyrgyz Republic and Cote d'Ivoire as the 37th and 38th Members of GGGI. Delegates shared their expectations that GGGI continue its efforts to enhance its financial capacity and operational efficiency to ensure impact at the country level. The Secretariat agreed, and informed delegates of its efforts to sustain, strengthen and diversify its funding sources since 2017; the amount of newly signed earmarked commitments have increased over the years from USD 0.7 million in 2016 to USD 37.1 million in 2019 and USD 52.4 million in 2020 as of October.

10. Delegates noted the three broad criteria to guide GGGI country programming, approved by the Council in October 2019 [C/2019/DC/9]. On delegates' inquiry on how the criteria could reflect the needs of vulnerable countries, the Secretariat responded that in June 2020, the Council decided to prioritize resource allocation to vulnerable countries as maintained by UNOHRLLS, to allocate at least 60% of its programmatic core resources to vulnerable countries (SIDS, LDCs, LLDCs), while maintaining support of at least 50% to LDCs [C/2020/DC/6].

11. Members of the Assembly and the Council took note of the updates on membership, accession and country programming.

**GGGI Staff Council**

12. Delegates expressed appreciation to the Staff Council for representing GGGI staff members, and commended the constructive communication and engagement between the Staff Council and Management. Delegates also commended GGGI for establishing the Crisis Management Committee to monitor the well-being of staff during the COVID-19 crisis.

13. Delegates asked regarding the involvement of the Staff Council in the decision-making process of GGGI. The Staff Council responded that its role in GGGI's decision-making has expanded markedly over the last few years. While there used to be very limited interaction, now the Staff Council meets with Management four to five times a year. While the extent of the Staff Council's influence over GGGI decision-making may vary, in recent years it has had meaningful influence on several areas including Host Country Agreements, 360-degree performance feedback, and performance improvement processes.

14. Delegates commended GGGI for making the staff engagement survey results available to all staff, improving transparency, and requested the Management to also share the results with Members to enhance their understanding on staff members. Furthermore, delegates suggested to conduct a survey focusing on the effects of salary reduction for staff members. The Secretariat responded that the next annual staff engagement survey will be held before the end of 2020, of which an integral part will be staff feedback on compensation. Furthermore, Management is proposing to commission a comprehensive global compensation survey in 2021 (last survey was undertaken in 2017), to ensure that GGGI compensation is well aligned with that of comparable organizations.

15. Members of the Assembly and the Council took note of the updates from the GGGI Staff Council.

**Work Program and Budget 2021-2022 (Part 1)**

16. Delegates commended GGGI for the inclusion of greening COVID-19 recovery packages for Members and partners in its Work Program and Budget (WPB) 2021-2022 and encouraged GGGI to continue enhance and strengthen its efforts to help Members and partners' to recover COVID-19 and transition towards a low carbon and resilient economy. The Secretariat noted that most key components of GGGI's COVID-19 recovery response underpin the core areas of GGGI's service offerings including greenhouse gas reduction, creation of green jobs, energy efficiency, sustainable agriculture, sustainable circular bioeconomy, and climate mitigation action. Furthermore, the Secretariat highlighted that the core areas of its support for COVID-19 recovery align with its priority strategic areas indicated in its Strategy 2030–to promote sustainable and socially inclusive economies. The Secretariat also agreed with delegates' comments that it should be more proactive in reinforcing and creating greater awareness of its unique position in dealing with COVID-19 recovery in the global green growth space.

17. Delegates acknowledged and encouraged continued alignment with 2030 Strategy and Roadmap 2021-2025. Delegates additionally encouraged GGGI to implement integrated and holistic programs with a focus on Members' needs and the local context. The Secretariat agreed, and emphasized that GGGI's country programs are developed in close consultation with Members through the Country Planning Framework (CPF) process, and is demand driven based on their needs and priorities. Furthermore, to the delegates' inquiry on how resources are allocated across varying thematic areas, the Secretariat reiterated that they reflect the demands of Members and partners, as well as the decisions of donors in GGGI's earmarked project portfolio. At the same time, the Secretariat will continue to ensure alignment of its programs and projects to strategic directions under Strategy 2030, Roadmap 2021-2025, 5-year CPFs, 2-year Country Business Plans (CBPs), national priorities and country needs in respective Member and partner countries.

18. Delegates acknowledged the Secretariat's efforts to include the MINUS case scenario in the WPB 2021-2022, as requested by MPSC Members at their Twelfth Meeting in July. Delegates encouraged and the Secretariat agreed to strategically allocate any additional core resources aligned with the directions set in the WPB 2021-2022 once approved by the Council.

19. Delegates further commended GGGI for the newly signed earmarked project agreements in 2020. Furthermore, delegates expressed that they look forward to the programmatic earmarked funding model newly introduced to GGGI. The Secretariat informed that programmatic earmarked funding enables the donor to align its funds more directly to its own policy objectives, while allowing GGGI more flexibility in implementation. Thus, it can play an important middle ground between pure core and pure earmarked funds, and address some of the key challenges experienced with the mobilization of core resources. The Secretariat expressed appreciation to Denmark and New Zealand for allocating programmatic earmarked funding to GGGI.

20. Delegates positively noted GGGI's steady reduction in actual overhead, and expressed support for GGGI to propose and consult with the MPSC concerning the "full cost accounting" model and revised methodology for overhead calculation. The Secretariat shared that the overhead rate will be continuing to be reduced and is on track to reach the

15% target by 2023. It plans to reach this target in two ways: first, by continuing to reduce actual costs in the Office of the Director-General and Office of Enabling Division by further streamlining their operations; and second, by increasing the total annual expenditures (increase in the denominator used to calculate the overhead rate). The Secretariat also explained that the new method for defining overhead will be established in close consultation with the MPSC and the Council, and it will be submitted to the Council for approval in accordance with GGGI's financial rules and regulations.

21. Members of the Assembly and the Council took note of the WPB 2021-2022, and also noted that the Council will decide to approve the WPB 2021-2022 at the hybrid meeting on October 28, 2020.

**Corporate Results Framework 2021-2025**

22. Delegates commended GGGI for preparing the Corporate Results Framework (CRF) 2021-2025, and noted the Secretariat's efforts to align the CRF with the six Strategic Outcomes (SO) outlined in Strategy 2030. The Secretariat said that the six SOs have become the hallmark of setting GGGI's impact targets and measuring its overall performance under Strategy 2030.

23. Delegates requested clarification on the causal links between the SOs, Intermediate Outcomes (IOs) and outputs in CRF 2021-2025. The Secretariat explained that each output is linked to each IO with corresponding numbers, and IOs 1-4 contribute to the achievement of one or more of the six SOs. The Secretariat further explained that the CRF 2021-2025 is closely aligned with the new Theory of Change in Strategy 2030, that links the five outputs with the five IOs, which are linked to the six SOs (refer to page 20 of Strategy 2030).

24. Delegates also discussed the importance of gender disaggregated data, to which the Secretariat agreed. The Secretariat added that the collection of gender disaggregated data is already provided in the new CRF 2021-2025 for IO 4, indicator 4.2, and will also be a core feature of the new Gender Strategy 2021-2025 currently being developed. The Secretariat added that more substantive indicators such as those on girls, disability inclusion and indigenous peoples will be included once GGGI first has the capacity to effectively design, implement, collect, monitor, and report on gender disaggregated data.

25. Members of the Assembly and the Council took note of the CRF 2021-2025, and also noted that the Council will decide to approve the CRF 2021-2025 at the hybrid meeting on October 28, 2020.

**Update on GGGI Efforts to Track and Report on Impacts**

26. Delegates commended GGGI for setting targets and reporting at impact-level rather than short-term outputs. The Secretariat thanked the delegates for their positive feedback, and informed that it published its SO Guideline in January 2020 providing the methodology to calculate estimated impacts for GHG reduction, and introduced the Impact Pathway Approach (IPA) to guide country program design, implementation and reporting. The Secretariat also informed that its methodologies, tools and systems used to measure and estimate impact will be regularly reviewed and improved to ensure the quality of GGGI's

reporting on SO targets and impacts.

27. Delegates further commended GGGI for piloting its new impact pathway framework in Mongolia and Vietnam, and positively noted that results reported at the country-level rather than project-level will make it easier for donors to follow progress in relevant country programs over time.

28. Delegates also inquired whether GGGI could explore if impact pathway chains could be adopted beyond country contexts for global programs. The Secretariat responded that while the IPA is currently designed to support results reporting for country programs, the potential for applying this approach for global programs can be explored in the future.

29. Members of the Assembly and the Council took note of the update on GGGI's efforts to track and report on impacts.

**Provisional Dates and Format for 2021 Sessions of Governance Organs**

30. The Secretariat shared the provisional dates and format for the sessions of governance organs in year 2021: April 29, 2021 for the Thirteenth Meeting of the MPSC in the format of e-consultations and hybrid meeting; July 8, 2021 for the Fourteenth Meeting of the MPSC in the format of e-consultations and hybrid meeting; and October 28, 2021 for the Tenth Session of the Assembly and Fourteenth Session of the Council (Joint Session) in the format of e-consultations and hybrid meeting.

31. Members of the Assembly and the Council took note of the provisional dates and format for 2021 sessions of governance organs.

/End

Annex. Questions and Comments Received on October 12-22 and Responses

## Annex. Questions and Comments Received on October 12-22 and Responses

**October 20, 2021**

| 1. Director-General's Progress Report | | |
|---|---|---|
| **Member** | **Questions/Comments** | **Response** |
| Republic of Korea | The ROK congratulates Dr. Frank Rijsberman on his reappointment as the Director General of GGGI. We appreciate that under his leadership GGGI has developed its expertise and programs as an international organization instrumental in helping developing countries to achieve SDGs and green growth. We expect that GGGI continues to enhance and strengthen its efforts to help developing countries to recover from Covid-19 and transition towards a low carbon and resilient economy. | Thank you.<br><br>GGGI has responded early and pro-actively to the COVID-19 crisis. See, among others, our technical reports 12 and 13, as well as Insight Brief #3 on Green Deals to Accelerate Climate Action Post-COVID-19, and furthermore produced a number of project proposals to support members to recover from COVID-19.<br><br>The first such projects are now being funded and will start implementation shortly.<br><br>We agree GGGI should enhance and strengthen its efforts to help developing countries recover from the COVID-19 crisis, strengthen climate action, and generally accelerate the green transformation. |
| | As the Covid-19 pandemic is posing unprecedented challenges and its fallout is highly likely to last for a long period, the ROK would like to suggest that the strategy 2030 be refreshed accordingly so as to reflect on the changing conditions and needs of developing countries. In particular, we request GGGI to revisit the thematic areas in the strategy and consider whether it is necessary to include new areas in accordance with the article 2(c) of the establishment agreement which stipulates: 'creating and improving the economic, environmental and social conditions of developing and emerging countries ...'. It would be helpful if the Secretariat could provide a timeline for the revision of the strategy. | Growth and more importantly green growth is at the heart of the Strategy 2030 design. The current and post-COVID expectations to build back greener and better are primarily targeting employment and greening the recovery. GGGI's Strategy 2030 is designed to focus on those key areas such as the creation of green jobs, ambitious climate actions, access to sustainable services and of course the mobilization of green investments for our Members. Therefore, we believe that the key impact areas defined in Strategy 2030 are already well aligned with the expectations support our Members to green the COVID recovery and make it an integral part of the climate action.<br>From to more long-term to a medium and short-term planning, GGGI has designed the Roadmap 2021-2025 and the WPB 2021-2022 with a |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | special emphasis on the support to members to green their COVID recovery efforts.<br><br>In short, we believe the Strategy 2030, Roadmap and WPB 2021-22 provide a strong basis for greening the COVID-19 recovery and do not see a need for a Strategy Refresh |
| NSA/Expert Ariyaratne Hewage | The report is quite comprehensive and has covered all relevant areas and also is precise. | Thank you. |

| **2. Report on Programs and Operations** | | |
|---|---|---|
| **Member** | **Questions/Comments** | **Response** |
| Republic of Korea | We commend that GGGI continues to ramp up its efforts to communicate with member countries on the progress of projects. We also take note that GGGI has exceeded targets in some areas and made successful achievement in green investment despite the Covid-19 pandemic. | |
| | The volume of investment in the solar PV project of India (USD 145 million) draws our attention to the number of green jobs created by the project. Please confirm the number of jobs created. | It is estimated that 200 additional green jobs will be created for the project by realizing $145M investment in the Solar PV installation.<br><br>Other projects, such as the 4 that have been approved by QFFD, on Greenpreneurs support in Pacific and Caribbean, climate smart agriculture in Kiribati and solar irrigation in Senegal target green job creation on the order of several tens of thousands new green jobs. |
| | As far as the impacts of Coivd-19 are concerned, we are happy to share with you that the Korean government has presented its 2021 budget bill to the National Assembly with an increase of the same amount that was cut in 2020 core contribution. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs will be actively engaged in the relevant process so that the National Assembly approves the increased contribution of 2021 to GGGI. | This is excellent news for which we are grateful. |
| NSA/Expert Ariyaratne Hewage | The programs undertaken in India, Indonesia, Japan and Vietnam are very encouraging. I particularly like the results framework presented. Can the programs undertaken in the above for countries also be shown in a diagram of Results Framework? It would then be easy to | We assume you mean Jordan rather than Japan. We will produce country-based results reporting for all countries going forward, starting with the results over 2020. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | comprehend. | |

| 3. Membership, Accession and Country Programming | | |
|---|---|---|
| **Member** | **Questions/Comments** | **Response** |
| Republic of Korea | We welcome that Kyrgyz Republic and Cote d'Ivoire have joined GGGI and the increased number of member countries represents that GGGI has been recognized as an international organization instrumental in helping developing countries to achieve SDGs and green growth. We also expect that GGGI continues its efforts to enhance its financial capacity aligned with the expansion of organization. | GGGI is pleased to welcome Kyrgyz Republic and Cote d'Ivoire as members.<br><br>We agree GGGI should continue its efforts to enhance its financial capacity, as we have done very effectively, diversifying our donor base and building up a strong portfolio of earmarked projects, in the last several years.<br><br>In more detail: GGGI's Strategy 2030 identifies "Developing a sustainable, stronger, and more diversified funding for GGGI operations" as a non-programmatic operational priority. This follows efforts since 2017 to sustain, strengthen and diversify funding for GGGI's operations.<br><br>GGGI has sought to retain its resource partnerships with its existing resource partners, including Denmark, Korea, Norway, and the United Kingdom that provide core funding, and is in continued dialogue with Australia with a view that it may provide core funding again in the future. GGGI has also made significant progress in securing earmarked funding, with new signed earmarked commitments increasing from USD 0.7 m in 2016, to USD 4.7 m in 2017, USD 30.7 m in 2018, USD 37.1 m in 2019, and USD 52.4 m as of October 20, 2020, with a further (probability weighted) resource mobilization pipeline of USD 63.4 m.<br><br>In parallel, GGGI has diversified its funding base in recent years to include, among others, Belgium, Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, European Union, Luxembourg, NAMA Facility, Netherlands, New Zealand, Sweden, and United States. These achievements have been supported by a number of elements including,<br>(1) high-level organizational resource mobilization targets that have been cascaded into divisions, departments, and units, with |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | regular communication and discussion between management and staff on resource mobilization,<br>(2) attention to resource mobilization within GGGI's risk management framework, with clearly identified mitigating actions, and risk owners, that is reviewed by the Institute twice a year and discussed with the MPSC,<br>(3) an account management framework with dedicated staff assigned to explore partnership opportunities with different resource partners and assure prioritization and coordination internally with the Institute, and supporting CRM system;<br>(4) established business processes, responsibilities, and supporting project management systems to approve resources to develop and subsequently to approval submission of projects to resource partners, to ensure alignment with GGGI's priorities and assure quality of project design;<br>(5) inclusion of resource mobilization into the job descriptions of programmatic teams, with a Partnership Unit providing organizational wide support for strategic opportunities and programmatic teams identified as requiring additional support;<br>(6) working group on business development and resource mobilization chaired by the ADG and comprised of programmatic Directors and Deputy Directors, and the Head of Partnerships to monitor and escalate issues to the management team;<br>(7) established business processes, responsibilities, and supporting project management systems to support compliance with grant obligations.<br>The country programming criteria approved by the Council is guiding GGGI's operations in new countries, where one of the key emphasis is on the availability of resources. GGGI has been deploying structure and strategic efforts in resource mobilization with clear targets set each year to guide the integrated efforts from various parts of the Organization. The increasing success in resource mobilization is the result of such efforts. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| NSA/Expert Ariyaratne Hewage | Membership seems expanding which is an encouraging factor. However, it may be necessary to identify country specific strategies to involve the member countries in a more active manner and to benefit from being a GGGI member. | Agreed, GGGI develops 5-year country specific strategies for each country (so called Country Planning Frameworks), agreed and signed with each country in which it has operations, and further detailed in 2-year Country Business Plans that underpin the WPB. |

| **4. GGGI Staff Council** | | |
|---|---|---|
| **Member** | **Questions/Comments** | **Response** |
| Republic of Korea | We appreciate that the GGGI Staff Council represents staff members and communicates on their behalf with Management. Good management is all about motivating staff members and the active engagement of the staff forms an integral part of motivation. | Agreed. |
| | We take note that the full survey results were made transparently available to all staff members since it will further facilitate communication between staff members and Management. We request Management to share the survey results with member countries in order to enhance our understanding on GGGI's staff members, too. | The full survey results will be made available to all member countries. |
| | We highly appreciate that all staff members shared the challenges of budget reduction in the face of Covid-19 pandemic. We would like to suggest to the Secretariat that a survey focusing on the effects of salary reduction for staff members be conducted to reflect on the changing working conditions of staff members. | Management plan to undertake the next annual staff engagement survey before the end of 2020. An integral part of the survey is a request for staff feedback on compensation. We would expect that the impact of the salary reductions will be fed back as part of staff responses. To ensure comparability with results from earlier surveys, management do not recommend arranging a separate or special survey outside the annual staff engagement survey process.<br><br>In addition, management is proposing to commission another comprehensive global compensation survey in 2021, in which the overall staff compensation package is benchmarked against a group of comparator organizations, to ensure GGGI compensation is well aligned with that of comparable organizations. The compensation survey is undertaken by a reputable external expert organization (the last such survey was undertaken in 2017). |
| NSA/Expert | Contributions of GGGI staff for the effective delivery of planned | Thank you. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Ariyaratne Hewage | outputs and outcome should be appreciated. Best wishes to all. | |

| **5. Work Program and Budget 2021-2022 (Part 1)** | | |
|---|---|---|
| **Member** | **Questions/Comments** | **Response** |
| Republic of Korea | We commend that the list of new earmarked projects with a funding agreement in 2020 has been enriched. As far as our core contribution is concerned, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs will be actively engaged in the parliamentary process so that the budget bill of 2021 with the additional contribution can be approved by the National Assembly as presented. | Thank you for your comment and your firm support. |
| | We also commend that the Secretariat has prepared and included minus case scenario in the WPB 2021-2022 as requested in the last MPSC meeting. As the uncertainty of the Covid-19 pandemic will be lasting for a certain period of time, it is necessary to prepare a contingency plan. However, we noticed that the estimate of budget in minus case scenario(USD 131.9 million) is similar to that of the base case scenario(USD 132 million) presented in the last MPSC meeting. We would like the Secretariat to elaborate on this similarity and the relevance of this minus case scenario. | The MINUS case scenario was developed after the July MPSC meeting and reflects a decrease in managements minimum estimate of core funding for the biennial period, down to USD 36 million from USD 48.4 million in BASE. In addition, the estimation of earmarked funding increased during the same period, leading to the total funding as noted.<br><br>There are three essential differences between the Minus Case Scenario total of USD 131.9 million presented in September and the Base Case Scenario total of USD 132 million presented in July. Firstly, the estimation of core resources available in the minus scenario has been decreased to USD 36 million from USD 48.3 million in the Base Case. This represents a decrease of USD 12.3 million; Secondly the availability of program earmarked funding from Denmark and New Zealand has been included in the updated tables Minus scenario. This represents an increase of USD 6 million. Thirdly, the estimation of earmarked project funding was updated USD 83.7 million in July to USD89.6 million in September. This represents an increase of USD 5 million. The cumulative impact of these changes is to cancel each other out.<br><br>It should be noted, that based on past experience, some of the earmarked project funding included in the estimated revenue streams will either come on stream later than anticipated or will not materialize. At this stage of the cycle it is not possible to know which projects or for which |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | countries that is likely to be. Thus, the actual detailed operating budgets which will be developed for both 2021 and 2022 will likely be less than the overall total envelope approved by the Council. The Council decision de facto establishes an upper boundary for each country budget rather than a budget guarantee. The operational budgets for individual countries and units will be in line with the approved envelope with some country budgets being less because as noted above either the projected earmarked funding is delayed or has not been approved. |
| | We take note that the overhead recovery will reach USD 3 million. Given that the estimate of earmarked projects varies depending on the scenarios as described in 4.2, should there be different projections on the overhead cost? | As noted above it is likely that the actual operating budget for both 2021 and 2022 will be less than the overall approved envelope. Management's best estimate of likely overhead recovery has been set at USD 3 million as the most realistic likely outcome. |
| | Regarding Non-Programmatic Costs, we would like to ask the Secretariat to expand on the 'full cost accounting model' and explain the differences that the Secretariat expects with the adoption of new system compared to the current one. | The current definition GGGI uses to determine overhead is a simplified definition, counting the cost of ODG and OED as indirect cost or overhead, and IPSD and GGPI as direct costs.<br><br>There are different definitions of what constitutes overhead and different models of 'full cost accounting'. GGGI management will review the current system and prepare a proposal of which full accounting model to use during the next biennial. The primary purpose of a full cost recovery accounting model is to allocate in so far as possible all costs as direct project costs.<br><br>A more detailed "full cost accounting" method defines what are direct and indirect cost items at a much more detailed level, and can determine to assign the costs of, for example, IT support, or office costs as direct costs to projects (while these are currently included as lump sums in the overhead).<br><br>A new method for defining overhead will be established in close consultation with MPSC and Council, and will need Council approval as part of GGGI's financial rules and regulations. |
| | We are also interested in the details of Change Management Plan, which is for the implementation of Strategy 2030 as mentioned in 3.4. | Given the challenges and risks associated with implementing Strategy 2030, the Change Management Plan (CMP) was adopted by |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | since we consider that the strategy 2030 needs to be refreshed. We request the Secretariat to explain further on the details of Change Management Plan and share, if possible, the plan with member countries. | Management Team and to ensure a smooth transition and change process for GGGI. The proposed changes build on the success from the key changes implemented on GGGI business processes and systems over the past few years. The CMP encompasses all the key components of Strategy 2030 and Roadmap 2021-2025, how and who it will impact, and how the change process will be enabled to smoothen the strategy change, sustain business outcomes and ensure stakeholders 'buy-in'. The Plan outlines the strategy and procedures for dealing with change and includes the necessary actions, resource allocation, stakeholder management, communication, timelines, and responsibilities for change management. The CMP is being implemented in 3 phases: envisioning phase – creating the climate for change (2019); onboarding phase - engaging and enabling the organization (launch – Nov 2019-Dec 2021)); and drive value – implementing and sustaining for change (post launch - 2022-2025). Communication and awareness are an important component of change management to inform stakeholders and staff of what, why, how and the impact of the changes. The CMP is more of an operational tool, and we will be happy to share the progress in reporting processes already in place such as the annual reports. |
| NSA/Expert Ariyaratne Hewage | The Work Program and Budget for 2021 and 2022 seems to have been prepared in a more comprehensive manner. I wish to present my earlier suggestion again. As we have observed, many countries adopted various social, health and economic practices during the COVID-19 pandemic and they continue to carry on with such practices for the future as well. As a result of such practices, the environmental conditions including air quality, better ways of waste disposal, water quality and forest cover etc. have improved. It was also observed that the ozone layer was improving due to less emission of polluted air. Since there were import export restrictions, some countries started to cultivate their needs of food supply and also manufacturing items based on the availability of raw material in the respective countries. This trend would help countries to improve their socio-economic standards and the living conditions of the people. My recommendation for the GGGI is to undertake a scientific study to assess the benefits of such good practices in terms of economic and | The newly emerging development trends as a result of different countries responses to COVID 19 with varying impacts on the environment and ecosystem are being tracked and noted by GGGI. The organization has introduced support for greening COVID 19 recovery packages through the Roadmap 2021-2025 and WPB 2021-2022 and the policy measures that it supports are aligned with the range of COVID 19 responses that Member and partner countries have prioritized. Your recommendation is well noted, and we will include the lessons learned from good practices to process and see how best to incorporate in the review of WPB implementation. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | environmental costs and benefits and recommend as to how we could continue such good practices for the future. | |

| **6. Corporate Results Framework 2021-2025** | | |
|---|---|---|
| **Member** | **Questions/Comments** | **Response** |
| Republic of Korea | We commend that the Secretariat has been making efforts to align its CRF with the 6 SOs of strategy 2030. We expect that the 6 SOs will help enhance efficiency and scalability of GGGI's projects. | This is well noted. The 6 SOs have become the hallmark of setting GGGI's impact targets and measuring its overall performance under Strategy 2030. The CRF now includes SO targets for 2030, 2025 and 2022 to drive the implementation of Strategy 2030, Roadmap 2021-2025 and WPB 2021-2022 respectively. A GGGI SO Guideline was published in January 2020 which provides the methodologies for calculating projects SO attribution and contribution impacts. Using this Guideline, GGGI has developed project SO impacts estimations in the CBPs. GGGI has also begun the process of End of Year reporting of the achievement of the SOs in 2020 as a forerunner to reporting SO achievements during the 10-year implementation of Strategy 2030. Capacity building initiatives will target the training of programmatic staff on SO impact estimation and reporting. |
| NSA/Expert Ariyaratne Hewage | The corporate results framework is very comprehensive. | Well noted and thanks. |

| **7. Update on GGGI Efforts to Track and Report on Impacts** | | |
|---|---|---|
| **Member** | **Questions/Comments** | **Response** |
| Republic of Korea | We commend that the Secretariat considers adopting an overall approach focusing on medium and long-term outcomes instead of short-term outputs. Since GGGI is an international organization instrumental in helping developing countries achieve green growth, the new approach based on impact reporting is fit for the purpose of making GGGI's projects replicate and scale up. As we assume that it would be difficult to evaluate quantitative contributions of GGGI to some outcomes such as GHG reduction, GGGI needs to ensure that the new impact pathway builds on evidence-based approach. | Starting in 2020, GGGI will begin using a modified End of Year results reporting system that will elevate results reporting to the country program level focusing primarily on SO impacts and outcomes. The country program SO impacts will be reported in 2020 and future years. A new GGGI SO Guideline was published in January 2020 which provides the methodologies for calculating project SO attribution and contribution impacts including GHG reduction. The impact pathway approach (IPA) is being used to support the SO impact estimations. Country Teams are being trained on how to do their SO targets and impact estimation using IPA with the support of the Strategy Unit, Impact Evaluation Unit and Regional Portfolio Officers. The SO methodologies will be reviewed |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | and improved at the end of 2021.<br><br>The SO Guidelines and Methodologies will be constantly updated and improved in time ahead as more data become available and better ways of measuring impacts introduced. |
| | From management perspective, we would like to know how GGGI continues its report on the use of core contributions for projects after the change of reporting system, given that core contributions are also allocated to individual programs. | Core funding allocated to projects is governed by the Project Idea Note (PIN) review and approval process (PCM part 3). All allocations of core funding are tracked and reporting through GGGI's project management system.<br><br>As part of the annual reporting, all projects implemented by GGGI that are funded by core contributions and earmarked funding will now be reported at the country program level focusing primarily on the outcomes and SO impacts. These country level reports will be an aggregation of the project level results and achievements.<br>In addition to that, the project level reporting for all funding (including core) funded projects is done on monthly and quarterly basis and be accessed in GGGI Online corporate system. |
| NSA/Expert Ariyaratne Hewage | The track and report on impacts of GGGI efforts is very important and recommend sharing this information with the relevant agencies of member countries including Ministries of Finance, Planning Authorities etc. | Agreed. The dissemination of results is important.<br>GGGI's results and impacts will continue to be reported in the annual reports which is accessible to the Member and partner governments through the GGGI website.<br><br>In addition, GGGI reports to OECD and the International Aid Transparency Initiative (IATI) on an annual basis.<br><br>Communication efforts have been increasing and will continue to ensure greater visibility of GGGI achievements and donors' efforts. |

| **8. Provisional Dates for 2021 Sessions of Governance Organs** | | |
|---|---|---|
| **Member** | **Questions/Comments** | **Response** |
| NSA/Expert Ariyaratne Hewage | I agree with the provisional dates of Governance Organs. | Thank you. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | |

**October 21, 2021**

| **1. Director-General's Progress Report** | | |
|---|---|---|
| **Member** | **Questions/Comments** | **Responses** |
| United Arab Emirates | Based on the Progress Report, GGGI has been helping its member countries to "Build Back Better" from the COVID-19 pandemic by working on green recovery projects in Small Island Developing States (SIDS) and Least Developed Countries (LDCs). As the green recovery efforts will take several years, what is GGGI's overall strategy in this regard? What are the future activities in other countries or regions? | The COVID-19 pandemic sharply focuses attention on the health side of the sustainability crisis. For GGGI health had become a key issue when it started to focus on air pollution, in 2017, and it is clear that the health impacts of both sustainability challenges and green growth solutions will gain in prominence in GGGI's work going forward.<br><br>The most important focus of governments in building back better from the COVID-19 crisis it to create employment. GGGI's work to demonstrate green job creation as a result of renewable energy investments generally, and its projects to support green job creation through working with young green entrepreneurs, and to develop climate smart agriculture in general, and solar irrigation in particular, are at the heart of GGGI's strategy to support its members to green their recovery from COVID19.<br><br>GGGI has developed a number of project proposals, together with its members, to mobilize resources for such green recovery projects and today signed an MOU with QFFD to implement 4 projects totaling USD $10M in SIDS and LDCs that are targeting to create 30 thousand green jobs, as well as support climate smart agriculture and climate resilience.<br><br>Other project proposals are still under review by donors, but all country teams are working with their government partners to explore how GGGI can support a green recovery. This is reflected in the WPB 2021-22, and supported by several technical publications issued by GGGI. |
| Indonesia | Thanks to the Director-General for the comprehensive report provided to the Council members. We really appreciate it. | This is our joint desire. We appreciate the great efforts of the Government of Indonesia to enhance investment in green growth |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | Congratulations on your re-appointment as a Director-General. We hope our cooperation to achieve a green economy could be more strengthened. | development and are honored to be invited to collaborate in support of the government plans. |
| | We appreciate the DG to still manage solid results in the middle of the COVID-19 pandemic. We also appreciate his leadership to support Members to shape a greener COVID-19 recovery plan, which will generate green jobs, accelerate the green transition, and fight the climate crisis. | Thank you. As indicated in response to other questions, we expect that shaping a green recovery will be at the heart of GGGIs green growth solution development in coming years.<br><br>In Indonesia, we are currently in the inception phase of 3 months for the 3rd phase of our Green growth program collaboration, enabling consultation with our government partners at the national and provincial levels to take account of the shifting needs and priorities of the government to address the COVID-19 social and economic impacts as well as the related green growth opportunities. |
| | We are looking forward to the newly introduced "programmatic earmarked funding" to address some of the key challenges experienced in the mobilization of core resources. Regarding the reduced core funding, we encourage GGGI to refocus and reformulate the priorities into the most essentials type of support so that the limited resources could generate the most impactful outcomes. | We agree that limited core resources should be focused on the most impactful outcomes. Core resources also play a key role to enable GGGI to maintain a coherent and integrated agenda, tying together a portfolio of earmarked projects into a meaningful green growth program.<br><br>Programmatic earmarked funding can play an important middle ground between pure core and pure earmarked project support and we appreciate the allocation of such funding by New Zealand and Denmark.<br><br>The consideration by the Indonesian Government of providing programmatic earmarked funding support to GGGI, especially to strengthen the Indonesia program in the field of accelerating the development of renewable energy, is very much appreciated.<br><br>In Indonesia we have a 5 years strategy for our joint Green Growth Program, developed with our government partners under a hosting arrangement with the Ministry of National Development Planning (Bappenas). Financing for this program is partly earmarked based, including funding from Norway for a comprehensive project on forestry and land-use aiming at emission reductions, increasing investment and innovation and capacity building in line with Indonesia's 5-year medium term development plan. With other development partners we are |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | discussing a range of project proposals to help address Indonesia's priorities with regard to renewable energy and green cities development. |

| **2. Report on Programs and Operations** | | |
|---|---|---|
| **Member** | **Questions/Comments** | **Responses** |
| United Arab Emirates | Going forward, how can GGGI overcome the barriers in mobilizing green investment, thereby improving its performance in this area? | GGGI follows a two-pronged approach to green investment mobilization. On the one hand, we focus on creating a policy and regulatory environment in member countries that will meet the requirements of investors. Countries that offer predictability, consistency and stability in economic, social, policy, and legal terms could attract considerable flows of green investments. On the other hand, we prepare a pipeline of actual, concrete investment opportunities which we match with investors looking to making investments in green projects and sectors. Public funds that are used in innovative ways can leverage considerable amounts of private capital by reducing risks, lowering the costs of capital, and increasing investor returns. GGGI aims to develop and deliver a pipeline of financeable and bankable green climate project opportunities that could tap the large amounts of private capital that could be allocated to green projects, funds, bonds etc. in GGGI members.<br><br>Mobilizing green investment in this manner, independent of any particular form of capital, is, we believe, an innovative function in between public and private sources, domestic and international funding, and development and climate finance.<br><br>GGGI has not worked in this field for many years, but we are projecting to reach the USD 2 billion milestone in terms of green and climate finance mobilized by the end of 2020, with a significant share of this coming from the private sector. We believe this supports the validity of our GGGI model, but we agree we can learn from experience to date to scale up results in years to come. |
| Indonesia | We appreciate the Secretariat to develop this report. We extend our appreciation to the support and achievement in Indonesia. We encourage GGGI to increase the support to Member countries on the | Thanks for the encouraging words. We will accelerate our efforts to mobilize green investments. We are currently developing innovative financing structures and we fully agree that PPPs, public-private funds, |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | acceleration of innovative financing scheme adoption through public-private partnerships, blended financing, and also exploring other relevant financing structures that are needed to make this happen. | climate/green bonds and other innovative financing instruments and structures that blend public and private funds are required in order to mobilize significant flows of capital from the private sector into green projects and sectors. |
| | Regarding the actual budget performance, we encourage GGGI to accelerate the utilization of the remaining 64% balance before the end of this year. | Please note that the remaining WPB budget balance of 64% refers to Council's authority to GGGI management on expenditures. It does not refer to available revenue – available revenue is considerably lower than Council permission, and therefore GGGI cannot, and should not try, to spend "the remaining 64% balance of budget". GGGI will spend more than 100% of all available revenue in 2020, as management projects a deficit (expenditure greater than revenue). |

| **3. Membership, Accession and Country Programming** | | |
|---|---|---|
| **Member** | **Questions/Comments** | **Responses** |
| United Arab Emirates | As per GGGI's update, in Kuwait, the Cabinet approved accession and the agenda now is waiting for approval by the Parliament. As a fellow GCC country, the UAE is interested to learn more about GGGI's expansion in the Gulf and leverage the use of the GGGI UAE Country Office as a regional hub that oversees the expansion activities. As such, are there already preliminary programmatic plans in place for Kuwait and how does GGGI intend to engage its other member countries in the region such as UAE and Jordan in terms of designing the work program in Kuwait? | Thank you for UAE's interest and support to GGGI's increased engagement in Gulf region. GGGI and Kuwait have not yet started discussion on programming. Once the membership is confirmed, the two sides start substantive discussions about priorities and specific sector for collaborate. However, we understand that the achievements made in UAE was a key factor for Kuwait to seriously consider GGGI membership. Therefore, we will share the results produced in UAE and Jordan at future meetings on programs and discuss how to benchmark them. Also, we will promote sharing knowledge and success factors in the region. |
| Indonesia | The Government of Indonesia appreciates the State Criteria which establishes three broad criteria for the GGGI country guidance program. As the current GGGI Country Planning Framework (CPF) in Indonesia 2016-2020 will conclude by the end of this year, we urge GGGI to start the discussion for the next CPF. This new CPF should refer to development priorities we have set in our National Medium-term Development Plan 2020-2024 and would serve as a guideline for the next phase of the GGGI program in Indonesia. | GGGI fully agrees to start consultation with Indonesia on the next round of CPF. The new CPF will be in line with Indonesia's priorities and GGGI strategy by 2030. Building on the approval of the Green Growth Phase III program supported by Norway for the next biennium, GGGI Indonesia team is ready to start on consultations with the Government of Indonesia to set up the Framework for the next five years. |

| **4. GGGI Staff Council** | | |
|---|---|---|
| **Member** | **Questions/Comments** | **Responses** |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| United Arab Emirates | Would be great to hear from the Crisis Management Committee for COVID-19 about the lessons learned and best practices in terms of safeguarding the well-being of staff, especially their overall mental health and productivity, during the pandemic as the learnings would be useful for everyone. | Communication, flexibility and innovation have played key roles in maintaining staff and organizational resilience throughout the unprecedented challenges of Covid-19. The Crisis Management Committee met weekly throughout most of 2020 and held online calls twice a week, open to all staff. This enabled good and efficient flows of information, enhancing understanding of what was happening across different country offices and how best to respond. It also made it easier for staff perspectives, concerns or questions to be raised and dealt with quickly where possible. At country level, many Country Representatives took extra steps to ensure staff remain virtually connected on a regular basis, which has helped maintain a sense of social connection, especially in places where lockdowns or other restrictions have been in place. Increased flexibility in working arrangements (both inside and outside duty stations) have been helpful for staff, particularly for those with families. Last but not least, GGGI has generally encouraged and supported the trying out of new approaches to virtual collaboration and events, both internally and with external partners, which has led us to learn many new ways to get things done, despite the pandemic. |
| Indonesia | We hope and believe that the GGGI Staff Council can give some advice and perspectives to the Management especially in monitor the development of COVID-19 situation and propose actions to ensure the wellbeing of staff. | We recognize GGGI Management for taking the initiative to invite the Staff Council to join the Crisis Management Committee earlier in 2020. This action – together with other measures – has contributed to generally good communication flows between staff and Management on this matter. |
| | We support the Annual elections for new Staff Council members. We are confident that this process will run smoothly and transparently even during this pandemic. | Staff Council elections are usually organized virtually, so this should be relatively unaffected by Covid-19. |

| **5. Work Program and Budget 2021-2022 (Part 1)** | | |
|---|---|---|
| **Member** | **Questions/Comments** | **Responses** |
| United Arab Emirates | One unique feature of the Work Program and Budget 2021-2022 is the approach to green recovery plans development due to COVID-19. In this regard, what are the specific skill sets and expertise that GGGI can offer in this area? | The ambitions to build back greener and better that underline the COVID-19 recovery efforts require to support countries to develop creative policy and investment solutions on key areas such as the creation of green jobs, ambitious climate actions, access to sustainable services and of course the mobilization of green investments for our Members. These are areas where GGGI has been developing solid |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | expertise over the past few years.<br>Therefore, GGGI is already well placed where the core areas of its support for COVID-19 Recovery Plans reinforce and align with the priority strategic areas of its intervention in Strategy 2030 to promote sustainable and socially inclusive economies. GGGI has the in-house expertise to work in these priority areas where we will continue expanding to meet the demands of our Members. |
| | Specifically, considering the UAE government's long-term economic stimulus package promoting the convergence of digital and green economy as an overarching post-pandemic recovery strategy, how can GGGI potentially support the achievement of this goal? | Given how digitalization and green growth have become strong market forces reshaping the global economy, GGGI is pleased to know that UAE intends to maximize the opportunities from these trends as part of its post-pandemic recovery strategy. UAE is already in a very advantageous position considering its advanced digital infrastructure and the adoption of the National Artificial Intelligence Strategy. As a trusted advisor, GGGI can further accelerate the momentum towards the convergence of digital and green economy by providing technical assistance on analyzing the state of play, identifying gaps, sharing best practices, and providing policy and investment options. For example, GGGI's host country, the Republic of Korea, is one of the most proactive countries in both digitalization and sustainability. Leveraging relevant experience in these areas through knowledge sharing, technology transfer, and capacity building would enable both Korea and UAE to collaborate and learn from each other.<br>Also, recently, GGGI published "Green Deals to accelerate climate action post-COVID-19" and "Achieving green growth and climate action post COVID-19." We have proposed policy options and recommendations to make green deals focusing on creating green jobs and economic recovery. We will support countries to design policies and projects to achieve the goals. |
| Indonesia | We appreciate GGGI for providing this COVID-responsive WPB. We would love to see the implementation of integrated and holistic programming with a focus on the country's needs and local context. | Agreed. That's the essence of GGGI's programming approach, which consists of having the GGGI's country programs developed in close consultation with Members through the Country Planning Framework (CPF) process, and is demand driven based on the Members' needs and priorities as set out in their national development policies and sector policies. |
| | We also appreciate GGGI to continue prioritizing the development of | Agreed, and that is well aligned with GGGI's mandate and priorities. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | bankable projects in countries. We expect GGGI to guide those project proposals to get to the point of investment implementations to ensure the benefit of those projects to society. | |
| | We support GGGI to deliver those six global programs (Sustainable Solar Irrigation Pumping Systems; Forest Landscapes, People and Climate Changes; Waste; Sustainable Transport/E-mobility; Building Energy Efficiency; and Renewable Energy Auction). We recommend GGGI to show up the relevance of the projects in each Global Programs to the SDGs and Member countries NDC's to increase the engagement of the project. We also encourage GGGI to facilitate the learning process of best practices within and across countries to open the opportunity of upscaling and replication if it is found suitable. | Thank you for your support. The main purpose of Global Programs is to not only promote scaling up and replication of successful solutions, but also share lessons learned and experiences around the solutions across countries. The Global Programs will focus on high-priority, high-impact solution areas aligned to Strategy 2030, which aims to maximize NDC and SDG implementation of our Members.<br><br>Opportunities for in-country knowledge sharing initiatives will be very much welcome to develop as joint efforts GGGI-Government of Indonesia with other relevant stakeholders. |
| | As we shared before on DG's Progress Report, we are looking forward to the newly introduced programmatic earmarked funding to address some of the key challenges experienced in the mobilization of core resources. For all types of projects and programs (earmarked or core), especially to the newly-introduced programmatic earmarked funding, we encourage GGGI to ensure the alignment of those projects to the CPFs, CBPs, NDC's, national priorities, and the country need in respective Member countries. | Well noted. Programmatic earmarked funding enables the donor to tie the funding more directly to its own policy objectives while allowing GGGI more flexibility in implementation. This modality may address some of the key challenges experienced with the mobilization of core resources and GGGI will be aligning those projects to strategic directions under Strategy 2030 and their CPFs, CBPs, NDC's, national priorities, and the country needs in respective Members. |
| | We highly appreciate GGGI to put the effort to support Member countries' green COVID-19 recovery plans as a priority for the upcoming WPB. We also want to extend our appreciation for GGGI to determine any unforeseen COVID-related risks for projects that were designed pre-COVID. We encourage GGGI to extend the risks' assessment and mitigating actions needed to keep projects on track including the re-allocation of funds to new COVID response-related activities. We suggest that the recovery plan can be divided into 2 classifications, one is more like quick-recovery and the other is more fundamental to reinforce climate change mitigation and sustainable development in the long run. | Thanks for the encouragement. In the first half of 2020, one of GGGI's key programmatic actions consisted of reassessing all the programs and projects designed pre COVID-19 and under implementation. Then the current and future projects systematically build in the COVID-19 responses.<br><br>In addition to that, GGGI recently published "Green Deals to accelerate climate action post-COVID-19" and "Achieving green growth and climate action post Covid-19." We have proposed policy options and recommendations to make green deals focusing on creating green jobs and economic recovery. We will support countries to design policies and projects to achieve the goals, bearing in mind short-term options and long-term solutions. |
| | Regarding the reduced core contribution and other challenges in | GGGI's approach to this is twofold. First, to work with countries in |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | funding opportunity, as we stated before in the DG's report, we encourage the refocusing and reformulating effort of the priorities into the most essentials type of support to ensure the limited resources could generate the most impactful outcomes. Considering that the majority of Member countries is an emerging economy, recent fiscal pressure will give our green growth agenda a challenge. We suggest GGGI could provide extraordinary recovery packages to convince Member countries to seize the opportunity to accelerate the green growth transition rather than restarting the previous brown economy. | providing the policy and investment solutions that integrate the greening of COVID-19 responses in their stimulus recovery packages. Second, to work with countries to develop proposals with COVID-19 responses and bring it to potential donors.<br><br>These efforts are supported by knowledge products provided to countries as they design green COVID-19 recovery plans. GGGI is advising on a Green New Deal for the economy, reinforcing climate change and sustainable development and promotes a recovery package that combines COVID-19 recovery with climate action, by applying various policy measures. |
| | As stated in our new National Medium-term Development Planning, renewable energy is one of our main priorities for the next five years. We expect to see more demonstrations in this sector, and we invite GGGI to increase the renewable energy portfolio in the upcoming WPB implementation, specifically through the investment mobilization and the transition to cleaner technology. | GGGI is keen to respond to Indonesia's priority on expanding renewable energy, and is integrating such priority into the next biennium program by developing projects to bridge policy gaps and demonstrate business cases for investment mobilization. For example, a bioenergy project from palm oil production building on technical studies conducted for Central and East Kalimantan, is being prepared for the next biennium, |
| | Following the current pandemic situation, we understand and can accept that all budgets will be prepared as indicated in the MINUS scenario, with a note that additional resources will be allocated strategically, following the direction set in the WPB BASE and PLUS scenarios. | Thank you. The 2021 operational budget will be developed using the Minus Case Scenario as a starting point. This will be updated for management's best estimate of available core and both program and project earmarked funding for 2021. Additional core resources over and above what is in the Minus Case Scenario will be allocated strategically, aligned with the directions set in the WPB 2021-2022 once approved by Council. |

| **6. Corporate Results Framework 2021-2025** | | |
|---|---|---|
| **Member** | **Questions/Comments** | **Responses** |
| United Arab Emirates | Just to clarify, how does GGGI intend to measure air quality as one of the strategic outcomes when the targets are all unavailable? | The Strategic Outcome (SO4) impact target on "Air quality" was not determined in Strategy 2030 because the methodology for measuring air quality was not ready. GGGI aims to have the methodology for measuring improved air quality under SO4 by ready by end of 2020. An expert working group has been set up for this task. Once the new SO4 methodology is approved by Management, the next step will be to complete the outstanding SO4 attribution and contribution impact targets for 2030, 2025 and 2022. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | In sum, we agree that once the methodology has been established, first we need to agree on targets before we can measure progress towards them. |
| Indonesia | The Government of Indonesia appreciates the Secretariat to provide the new Corporate Results Framework (CRF) 2021-2022. We have been set several targets in our Medium-Term National Development Planning (RPJMN) for 2020-2024, especially in the energy sector. We are committed to achieving the portion of renewable energy in our national energy mix by 23 percent in 2024. To achieve that target, we need to mobilize green financing from both the public and private sectors. We hope GGGI can support our government in accelerating and mobilizing the green financing scheme for renewable energy development in Indonesia. | GGGI is committed to working with Government of Indonesia in realizing the country's ambitious renewable energy targets. Among others, a bio CNG project for Central and East Kalimantan is being prepared to unlock the investment potential in shifting to bioenergy from diesel. Through its country office, and in close consultation with the Government of Indonesia, GGGI will continue the efforts to develop catalytic renewable energy investment projects. |

| **7. Update on GGGI Efforts to Track and Report on Impacts** | | |
|---|---|---|
| **Member** | **Questions/Comments** | **Responses** |
| United Arab Emirates | In terms of reporting broader impact, how can GGGI assess the extent in which its activities at the country level have contributed to the post-pandemic green recovery? | Most countries prioritize job creation in their post-pandemic recovery. GGGI will assess the extent to which our joint work contributes to the targets in terms of green job creation set by our member governments.<br><br>In addition, GGGI has begun implementing a modified End of Year Results Reporting system in 2020 which will elevate results reporting from the project level to the country program level focusing primarily on outcomes and SO impacts. GGGI will begin reporting on its SO attribution and contribution ex-ante impacts which depending on the availability of national objectives and national NDC targets will be able to measure a country programs contribution to these ambitions for example in GHG reduction, creation of green jobs, e-mobility, energy efficiency as well as catalyzing green investment commitments and projects.<br><br>Given that the key impact areas are well aligned with the expectations of countries to green the COVID-19 recovery, we believe that GGGI has the necessary tools to assess the achievements of the responses. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Indonesia | We encourage GGGI to maintain core support long enough for existing potentially high impact activities to reach their conclusions. | GGGI aims to ensure all country program activities demonstrably contribute to impact, and it is well recognized that this takes time and persistence. Through reforms to its business systems in recent years, as well as new M&E tools such as Impact Pathway Reviews, GGGI has made efforts to ensure core and earmarked resources are planned and managed together in a way that gives as much funding certainty/stability as possible to country programs to achieve their medium-term results. Part of the intent of these reforms has also been to make GGGI's programming both more impact-focused and flexible, meaning a greater ability to detect and adjust resource allocations when activities don't seem to be yielding (or on track to yield) the results originally hoped for. In the challenging areas, GGGI has chosen to exit these areas of work, allowing limited core resources to be allocated towards exploring for and testing other promising solutions. |
| | We suggest GGGI address key identified gaps in HQ services/tools that seem to be hindering in-country operations the most. | Management has commissioned a review to get feedback from users on how well its project management systems and supporting software platforms are serving user needs and what could be improved to make them more user friendly, effective and efficient. Feedback from staff is expected by the end of October and based on the feedback an action plan will be implemented in 2021. |

| **8. Provisional Dates for 2021 Sessions of Governance Organs** | | |
|---|---|---|
| **Member** | **Questions/Comments** | **Responses** |
| United Arab Emirates | The proposed dates are all well noted. | Noted |
| Indonesia | We agree with the timing and tentative agenda for the next meetings. | Noted |

**October 22, 2021**

| **1. Director-General's Progress Report** | | |
|---|---|---|
| **Member** | **Questions/Comments** | **Responses** |
| Norway | Our congratulations to reappointed Director General Frank | Thank you, much appreciated. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | Rijsberman. | |
| | Commend GGGI for agility and ingenuity in adapting to the COVID-19 context, both internally and in relation to member countries, with focus on Build Back Better and green COVID recovery. | Thank you for your support. |
| | We are pleased to note the alignment of the earmarked projects portfolio with the country planning frameworks, WPB and strategy. | Thank you. |
| Fiji | Fiji congratulates the re-appointment of the Director General of GGGI for a second 4-year term. | Thank you, much appreciated. |
| | We acknowledge the hard work of GGGI under the leadership of the DG, enabling the mobilization of over USD 1.5 billion in green and climate fiancé for green investments to implement green transition in the GGGI members. The grants in response to greening the recovery (Green Deals) in SIDS and LDCs is timely and is welcomed by Fiji. Wish GGGI all the best with the implementation of its Strategy 2030, the Roadmap (2021-2025) and Work Program and Budget 2021-22. | Thank you.<br><br>Yes, agreed that the timely preparation of project ideas with COVID responses for SIDS and LDCs is crucial. We will continue working with governments to pursue and expand on these efforts. |
| United Kingdom | It would be useful to bring out GGGI's response to COVID-19 more strongly and to understand how reports have been used in practice with a more tangible portrayal of how they have influenced national policies. If possible, a figure to say how many policies/countries have acted on reports/advice provided by GGGI would be useful as well as a deeper dive into the most prominent case. The report makes reference to GGGI being in the final stages of approval of a number of grants that directly respond to greening the recovery in SIDS and LDCs – it would be useful to explore this at slightly deeper level in the report, making a note of the aggregate value of the grants, the exact number of LDCs/SIDs and listing whether any priority nations have been reached. This is particularly pertinent as we have had feedback from FCDO country teams that while there are innumerable reports available to inform the decision making behind green recovery policies there is little bandwidth/capacity to act on them. | We agree it is important to follow up how reports have been used to influence government responses, but given that these COVID-response reports were published in recent months (June, July and October) – it is too early to assess impact on government policies.<br><br>We have developed project proposals emphasizing green COVID-recovery since March 2020, with the first 4 for SIDS/LDCs approved and agreements about to be signed – USD 10 million total value, targeting 30 thousand jobs, increased climate resilience and food security, with Qatar Fund For Development for 4 projects:<br>1. Greenpreneurs in Pacific (PNG, Fiji, Vanuatu, Kiribati, Tonga).,<br>2. Greenpreneurs in Caribbean (6 countries among OECS members).<br>3. Climate Smart Agriculture Kiribati.<br>4. Solar Irrigation Senegal.<br><br>Other proposals have been submitted with aggregate value of over USD 20 million; some still under evaluation others close to approval: NAMA (Nepal – e-mobility), KOICA (Nepal - agroforestry and Mongolia-residential |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | retrofitting), BEIS (Colombia-RE and Peru-green bonds), Denmark (Ethiopia, Uganda, Burkina Faso, RE and solar irrigation) |
| Denmark | Denmark congratulates GGGI for its robustness to operate and agilely adapt in very exceptional circumstances caused by the covid-19 pandemic. | Thank you, this is well noted. |
| Australia | Congratulates the Director General on his reappointment and to building on his leadership and the outcomes of his first four years. | Thank you, this is well noted. |
| | Commend GGGI's agility and response to the COVID-19 pandemic. Acknowledge that country-based staff remained at duty stations and headquarters-based staff moved to working from home. We thank the staff for their resilience in the face of this pandemic. | Thank you, this is well noted. |
| | We endorse the focus on insuring the COVID-19 response including the economic recovery 'build back better' to further pursue green growth and sustainable development. | Thank you, this is well noted. |
| | Note the GGGI's focus on financial management and planning against the reductions in core funding. | Thank you, this is well noted. |

| **2. Report on Programs and Operations** | | |
|---|---|---|
| **Member** | **Question** | **Answer** |
| Norway | We are pleased to have a Mid-Year CRF progress report, which is something Norway has advocated for, and welcome the informative and reader-friendly changes announced for the End of Year Results Report. Having noted the challenges and lessons learned from the production of this report, does the exercise seem altogether useful to GGGI? | Thank you for the endorsement. Yes, the Mid-Year CRF Progress Report was useful in helping Management and staff keep track of the progress of the delivery of results against our annual targets at mid-year and being able to take corrective actions where it is needed to expedite program/projects and results delivery. |
| | We have noted and commend that GGGI has already reached and exceeded targets for both developed and adopted green growth policies, i.e. the adoption of 11 policies to enhance climate resilient sustainable forest management in Indonesia. Concerning green growth investments, we think it might be useful to distinguish between investment funding provided by green sources (like GCF, FCPF, etc.) and "ordinary" sources. | This suggestion is well noted and will be taken into consideration. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Fiji | Fiji acknowledges and supports the rationale of including greening of COVID Recovery Packages as central piece in the WPB 2021-2022 into member and partner countries. This will certainly bring recovery plans and building climate resilience into action. | Thank you, this is well noted. |
| | The monitoring and reporting of all project progress is essential for accountability, transparency and good governance. Hence the online monitoring and reporting on a monthly basis is welcomed together with the idea of independent evaluation by Impact and Evaluation Unit. | Thank you, this is well noted. |
| | Good to note GGGI has maintained its overall strategic direction of achieving broad-based inclusive and sustainable economic development while minimizing environmental damage and the depletion of natural capital. | Thank you, this is well noted. |
| | The six strategic outcomes that GGGI aims to deliver through programs and projects are well noted. [(GHG emissions reduction), (creation of green jobs), (increased access to sustainable services, including clean affordable energy, improved sanitation, sustainable waste management, and sustainable public transport), (improved air quality), (sustained natural capital for the adequate supply of ecosystem services), (enhanced adaptation of climate change)]. | Thank you, this is well noted. |
| | The risk management plan used into the work plan is a safeguard. | This is well noted and thank you. |
| United Kingdom | Despite only being halfway through the year GGGI has achieved 49 (163%) completed advisory outputs that inform the development of government green growth policies and 24 (120%) green growth policies which were adopted by governments with GGGI's support. It is highly impressive that GGGI were able to vastly outperform annual targets within half the timeframe, however it would be useful to understand how these targets are set. Outperformance of targets at this scale and this early may suggest the results framework is not stretching/ambitious enough to truly measure what should be considered a success. Why are the annual targets for 2020 substantially lower than what has been historically achieved? E.g. Number of completed advisory outputs that inform the development of government green growth policies, 69 in 2019, | The targets for 2019 and 2020 were set in 2018 (when the WPB 2019-20 was developed), based on results through 2017, and considered realistic at the time.<br><br>We agree that more ambitious targets can be set for GGGI today, as we have demonstrated a considerably higher level of results in 2018, 2019 and in 2020, despite the COVID-19 pandemic. This is reflected in the new Corporate Results Framework proposed to the Council. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | 88 in 2018 and yet the target is 30 in 2020. | |
| | It may be worthwhile to add more detail as to how GGGI has reprioritized and reallocated funding in response to the opportunities and challenges presented by COVID-19 and what implication this has had on GGGI's capacity to hit targets. As an extension to this it would be useful to understand whether any targets have been set relating specifically to GGGI's response to COVID-19 i.e. number of green recovery policies have been influenced. Are there any case studies which clearly outlines how GGGI has support the development of green recovery plans? | The primary task for management was to reduce expenditures in July 2020, when confronted with the reduced core funding decisions by the UK and Korea. No funding was reprioritized or re-allocated, expenditures were reduced in all areas possible in the middle of a budget year, but particularly focusing on reducing overhead, to protect the activities in country to the largest extent possible.<br><br>It is still too early to present case studies on the development of green recovery plans, as we are still in the middle of the exercise, but this may be a useful question to answer in 2021. |
| | Is the short fall in green investments related to shrinkages caused by COVID-19? As economies reinvest in 2021 and beyond, should a higher more ambitious green investment target be set for future years? | Due to COVID-19, investment projects have generally been progressing at a slower pace in 2020. Most projects under development were affected to some degree and very few new projects were initiated. Despite this, the amount of investment commitments mobilized by mid-year were comparable to the total amount mobilized in 2019 and we are projecting to reach the USD 2 billion milestone since 2016 in terms of green and climate finance mobilized by the end of 2020, with a significant share of this coming from the private sector.<br><br>GGGI management has deliberately set aggressive / increasingly ambitious green investment targets because we believe this is a high priority need for our member countries. The, somewhat aspirational, targets for 2021-22 are set at USD 700 and USD 800 million, respectively. We do not believe these should be increased further. |
| Denmark | Denmark extends our thanks to GGGI for providing a first Mid-year CRF Progress Report and very much agree with the focus on results at country level. | Thank you. |
| | On the backdrop of the covid-19 pandemic, Denmark would be interested in learning more about GGGI's expectations in terms of expected consequences on impact and implementation. In addition, in the current situation, we would be grateful if GGGI would provide further detail on the expectation to execute 64% of the 2020 budget. | Please note that the remaining WPB budget balance of 64% refers to Council's authority to GGGI management on expenditures. It does not refer to available revenue – available revenue is considerably lower than Council permission, and therefore GGGI cannot, and should not try, to spend "the remaining 64% balance of budget". GGGI will spend more than 100% of all available revenue in 2020, as management projects a deficit (expenditure greater than revenue). |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | |
| | Saluting the remarkable performance in catalyzing green growth investments, Denmark would appreciate further information on the share of private investment in the catalyzed investment as well as the share of private investments in the green pipeline. | Thank you for the acknowledgement. Since 2017, the share of private investment out of the total annual green investment commitments has varied depending on the type of financing deals that were secured and the size of the projects. In 2017, 2018 and 2019, the private sector share has varied from 79%, to 10% and 29% respectively.<br><br>USD 226 million of investment commitments were mobilized in the first half of 2020. Out of this amount, 92%, or USD 208 million, were provided by the private sector.<br><br>The total pipeline of green investment projects in 2020 is valued at USD 888 million as reported in the Mid-year CRF Report. The share of private investments in this green investment project pipeline is forecasted to be USD 384 million, or 43%. |
| Republic of Korea | Thank you for confirming the number of additional green jobs that will be created by the project in India. We are wondering, however, whether this number is referring to all jobs created in the project with an investment of USD 145 million. As green Covid-19 recovery draws attention from the world for its economic feasibility and potential of creating jobs, it would be helpful if the Secretariat could provide us with the total number of jobs created with the investment in Solar PV installation. | The large project in India for USD 145 million refers to a large scale RE project with a relatively low number of green jobs (but a very considerable contribution to renewable energy production).<br><br>A better overview of the jobs created by renewable energy in general is provided by GGGI Technical Report #12 which provides in depth assessment of the green job creation in Mexico, Indonesia and Rwanda from the implementation of these countries respective NDCs. The overall conclusion is that $ for $ RE investment provide 2-5 times the green employment than their fossil fuel equivalents.<br><br>For projects deliberately designed to focus on green job creation, such as the 4 GGGI projects funded through QFFD, an investment of USD 10 million targets creation of 30 thousand jobs. |
| Australia | Paragraph 2: Commend the GGGI for exceeding the annual 2020 targets of complete advisory outputs and green growth policies. | Thank you, this is well noted. |
| | Paragraph 3: Note that 32% of the target has been mobilized. Note that the GGGI is projecting USD 600 million of the 700 million | We have a pipeline worth around USD 888 million which we are advancing despite COVID-19. We are prioritizing larger projects in the pipeline and at |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | target of green investments to be mobilized. Welcome further details on how the GGGI plans to reach its target of 700 million. | the same encouraging programmatic tools and approaches that can aggregate or package smaller projects in order to increase the overall deal size and reduce transaction costs. |
| | Paragraph 3: Congratulate the GGGI for developing a strong green investment pipeline. | Thank you, this is well noted. |
| | Results Report<br><br>Section 2: Noting capacity constraints in a number of GGGI's developing country partners, we would welcome further details on why the questionnaire that is completed by country and global teams for each projects takes 5 months to complete and any ideas to streamline this process. | In light of this capacity constraint and other challenges, the country and global teams take over 2 months from start of November to submit all project reports which was 131 in total in 2019. The Results Team in the Office of the Director-General takes 3 months to process these high volumes of reports, extract the results data, QA and validate it and produce the annual results report by end of February. This report then feeds into the preparation of the annual report in March and other donor reports up to middle of each year depending on when they are scheduled. The validation of 131 reports alone can take 2 months with multiple rounds of calls, checks and verification of data. The new country level reporting system that has just been introduced in 2020 will simplify and streamline this process and reduce the number of End of Year results reports to just around 35. This is expected to shorten the results process by a few weeks. |
| | Section 6 (v): Given the noted importance of Pacific Island countries to Australia, we particularly commend the GGGI for its work in the Pacific region to the critical importance of implementing NDCs across Kiribati, Tuvalu and Fiji. However, the last sentence ends without finishing. | Thank you. |
| | Section 11: Commend the GGGI for responding to the opportunity of providing support to the greening the COVID-19 recovery packages of member and partner countries. | Thank you, this is well noted. |

| **3. Membership, Accession and Country Programming** | | |
|---|---|---|
| **Member** | **Questions/Comments** | **Responses** |
| Fiji | GGGI is commendable for the excellent work done, achieving above the targets in most of the areas. | GGGI thanks Fiji for the commendation. |
| Philippines | On page 6, Figure 2, the Philippines is classified as a Member country that belongs to the mature phase (i.e. 2-5 yrs country program with a budget of USD 1.2 million). The Philippine delegations seeks clarifications on the parameters used by the | In the Strategy 2030 approved by the Assembly and Council in October 2019, one of the key components relate to the growth and expansion of countries over the next decade. Going from where the country programs are now, we have made assumptions and projections based some analysis to have |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | GGGI in classifying Member countries as belonging to "phase-in", "mature" or "expansion" phase, as well as the conditions that must be satisfied to reach the expansion phase (i.e. 6-10 years country program with budget of USD 3.6 million). | into 3 categories of countries in coming years. The 2 main parameters are the size of the operations and the duration (number of years).<br>"Phase-in" country operations refer to the programs which have budget below USD 1 million. Many of the new country programs of less than 2 years of operation likely also are in this category.<br>"Mature" country programs, in the case of the Philippines, refer to countries where the operations are growing and consolidating. In this category we have countries with budget higher than USD 1 million to USD 2 million per year. The expectation is that countries moving from "Phase-in" after 2 years of operations and with less than 5 years of operations also likely fit into this category.<br>"Expansion" phase groups the countries where the size of operations is USD 3 million or more per year, and the expectation is to have countries with more than 5 years of operations to aspire to move into this category.<br>Some countries may exceed these expectations, which will be great. |
| | On page 6 paragraph 9, it states that GGGI shall focus in-country programming in Members that have in place an effective agreement on privileges and immunities. We note that the Host Country Agreement (HCA) between PH and GGGI, which grants GGGI customary privileges, immunities and administrative arrangements that will help GGGI facilitate its operations and activities in the country, has been signed on 18 June 2020. However, for the HCA to enter into force, the HCA still needs to fulfill domestic legal requirements which include Presidential Ratification and Senate Concurrence. | It is noted. GGGI hopes that Presidential Ratification and Senate Concurrence process are completed in the near future, so that GGGI fully functions as an established entity in the country. |
| | The Philippines' Department of Foreign Affairs (DFA) is currently securing the endorsement of relevant national government agencies to facilitate the ratification of the President, for submission to the Senate for concurrence. | It is well noted. |
| | Pending the finalization of these domestic legal requirements, the Philippines looks forward to GGGI's continued support and assistance for ongoing projects and future collaborations in the country, as reflected in its Country Planning Framework (2021-2025) and Country Business Plan (2021-2022). | GGGI will provide continued support and assistance for ongoing projects and future collaboration being discussed. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | The Philippines notes since 2012, even without a formal HCA, the GGGI has been extending valuable support to the Philippines. Through its partnership with national government agencies and local government units, it has facilitated some USD10 million worth of financial and technical assistance to the country's green growth projects. | GGGI appreciates the recognition of our dedicated support from the Government of the Philippines. |
| United Kingdom | The three broad categories used to guide programming fail to take into account which nations are in most need of assistance i.e. there is no metric to guide programming decisions towards nations with the highest vulnerability. Furthermore, the other metrics namely a) Strong political commitment; (b) Transformative Potential; and (c) Adequate financial resource rely on the nation in question having strong financial and governance institutions, the most vulnerable states, who are often the most in need of the support provided by GGGI, lack the institutional strength required to satisfy GGGI's metrics. Hence for future programming it may be worthwhile to introduce a 4th category to guide programming based on a country's need for support. | These three broad categories complemented criteria already in place, most important of which has been to allocate at least 50% of programmatic core resources to LDCs.<br><br>In June 2020 GGGI's Council decided to further prioritize the resource allocation to vulnerable countries as maintained by UNOHRLLS to allocate at least 60% of its programmatic core resources to vulnerable countries (SIDS, LDCs, LLDCs), while maintaining support of at least 50% to LDCs .<br>The corporate results framework also has specific outputs and indicators for the organization performance that cover the vulnerable countries |
| Denmark | Denmark welcomes new members joining GGGI and congratulate GGGI with continued interest to join the organization. In order to ensure real impact at country level, we also expect that GGGI continues its efforts to enhance financial capacity and operational efficiency. | Thank you. We agree that GGGI shall continue its efforts to enhance financial capacity and operational efficiency. |
| Australia | Paragraph 9: Noting the December 31, 2020 is very soon to finalize privileges and immunities, any further information on how this will be managed would be appreciated. | We work on this very closely, country by country, following the process of each. This year we signed privilege and immunity agreements with the Philippines and Qatar, and expect to finalize same for Cote d'Ivoire and Nepal by the end of the year. This is a matter of high priority in all countries where such agreements are not yet in place, and has been emphasized by our President and Chair Ban in all high level bilaterals, and in letters from the President and Chair. |
| | Grateful for an update on what communication has there been around the phase out. | The country where we currently are discussing phase-out is Morocco, where this has been communicated to government on several occasions, most recently in a meeting with the Ambassador of Morocco to Korea. |

**4. GGGI Staff Council**

| Member | Questions/Comments | Responses |
|---|---|---|
| Norway | Commend the constructive dialogue between Staff Council and Management. We note the extra burden that Covid-19 has caused and commend staff's efforts. | Thank you. |
| | We would be grateful for further information on Staff Engagement Survey key theme "carbon footprint". | Under Strategy 2030, GGGI has committed to reduce GHG emissions per staff member by 40% by 2030 (from 2015 baseline). There was strong support and interest within members of Staff Council to work together with Management on this topic at the start of 2020. However, given COVID-19 and the significantly reduced travel arising from this, this topic assumed a lower priority for Staff Council during 2020. Collaboration between staff and Management on this topic will be revisited again in 2021 (after the new Staff Council is elected).<br><br>Management also notes that COVID-19 has also drastically reduced travel, the largest source of carbon emission at GGGI, through which – at least temporarily – the carbon emission reduction target is expected to have been met and exceeded. |
| United Kingdom | Would be useful if GGGI could draw out an example where the council has had a tangible positive impact on either the culture, morale, effectiveness and/or the impact of GGGI. It is unclear how the council has been involved within the decision-making process of GGGI and where they have influenced the decisions of senior management for example with regards to COVID-19 adjustments aside from some small adjustment it seems feedback had minimal impact on the measure proposed. | Taking a wider lens, it is worth noting the role of Staff Council in the GGGI's decision making has expanded markedly over the last few years, particularly since the arrival of the current DG. Prior to this, there was very limited interaction between Staff Council and Management and thus our sway on decisions was limited. By comparison, Staff Council has met with Management 4-5 times per year in recent years and useful dialogue is now taking place. It has also become common now for Staff Council to serve as a supplementary channel for staff to safely and anonymously provide views/questions to Management on significant decisions being proposed - a role which did not really exist a few years ago. It is true (but also expected) that the extent of Staff Council's influence over GGGI decision has varied. Examples of topics when we have had meaningful influence on changes include Host Country Agreements, 360-degree performance feedback and performance improvement processes. On other occasions we have had less influence. Regardless, our core focus is always trying our best to ensure staff voices are at least well represented and heard by Management. |
| Denmark | Denmark congratulates GGGI management and staff for their | Thank you, well noted. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | continued efforts to maintain high quality in very challenging circumstances for staff as well as families. | |
| Australia | Paragraph 6: Commend the GGGI for making the full survey results available to all staff, improving transparency. Grateful for an update on when divisional plans will be available. Will these plans be updated each year in response to the annual Staff Engagement Survey? | Detailed divisional action plans were developed by each division addressing the results from each division, and discussed in each team. These were developed in conjunction with staff. The Management Team reviewed these plans and made them available to all staff in June 2020 (as part of the MT documents which are accessible to all staff). MT recently reviewed implementation of the plans at an MT meeting in early October. Feedback will be provided to staff on the status of implementation before the next survey will be held. It is the intention of management to develop yearly plans in response to issues raised in the annual survey. |
| | Paragraph 8: Commend GGGI for the establishment of the Crisis Management Committee in February 2020 to help monitor COVID-19 and the wellbeing of staff at this stressful time. | Thank you. |
| | Paragraph 12: Recognize and acknowledge the contribution that staff made with the reductions in salary. On something as sensitive as this, we would hope that Secretariat communications would be as full and clear as possible given the risk of misinterpretation/misunderstanding. | Management had engaged and communicated with staff at every stage of the decision-making process to reduce salaries. We recognize the important contribution staff have made thought this salary reduction to the long-term financial stability of GGGI.<br><br>We agree communications on such sensitive issues should be as full and clear as possible, but also that not all stakeholders are affected equally and therefore a full consensus on such issues is unfortunately not possible. |

| **5. Work Program and Budget 2021-2022 (Part 1)** | | |
|---|---|---|
| **Member** | **Questions/Comments** | **Responses** |
| Norway | Precision concerning core funding from Norway: Norwegian core funding is currently under consideration (WPB may convey the impression that only core funding level is under consideration). | Thank you, well noted. |
| | WPB Compendium of Draft Country and Global Business Plans: We have earlier suggested adding a column of "Proposed response" next to "Assumptions/Risks" but see that this might make the table overloaded and difficult to read. Are the different "Assumptions/Risks" elements included and mitigation measures proposed in the Risk Management Matrix? | This is well noted. After consideration, the new column was not included because the table was already overloaded. However, the individual project proposals when developed do include a section on risk management which proposes strategies and mitigation actions to address the project outcome and output risks identified in the project logframe. |
| | Commend steady reduction in actual overhead. Would be grateful if | GGGI currently defines overhead or non-programmatic costs as the costs |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | the Secretariat could share reflections on how to reduce further the coming years, cf. target of 15% by 2023. Support proposal to consult with MPSC concerning full cost accounting model and revised methodology for overhead calculation. | of the Office of the Director General and the Operations Enabling Division. The overhead rate will continue to be reduced in two ways. Firstly, by continuing to reduce actual costs in both ODG and OED through further streamlining of operations; Secondly by an increase in the denominator (total annual expenditures) used in the calculation of the overhead rate.<br><br>Management believes GGGI is on track to reach the 15% target by 2023.<br><br>Management also proposes to develop a more detailed definition of overhead, identifying all sources of direct and indirect costs, and to consult MPSC on such a more detailed definition. |
| Fiji | Coastal Resilience (mangroves as ecosystem for livelihoods, aquaculture, marine issues – fisheries, flood protection and pollution – Fiji is happy to see our nation considered as a part of this programme. | Thank you and well noted. |
| | Additionally, is there the possibility of expanding the definition of marine to include specifically reef and MPA management and include an awareness/ocean literacy component? | Coastal Resilience is a fairly new programmatic solution, which is why currently very few countries have interventions in this space. As we design future interventions based on the needs of the countries, we believe that issues related to awareness raising, capacity building to manage the resources, etc., will be key components to consider. |
| Philippines | The Philippines wishes to request clarification and/or further information on the reduction in the proposed budget for the Philippines for 2020-2021 from USD5.355 million, based from the April 2020 version of the Country Business Plan (CBP) that was shared by the PH-GGGI In-country Staff, to USD4.111 million in the final draft, including the omission of the following projects:<br><br>a. Preparation and demonstration of bankable, innovative renewable energy and energy efficiency projects; and<br><br>b. Policy analysis and outreach to improve enabling environment in two (2) Local Government Units (LGU) and Micro, Small and Medium Enterprises (MSMEs). | The MINUS case scenario was developed after the July MPSC meeting to reflect reduced UK core funding and the new Programmatic Earmarked funding from Denmark and New Zealand. At the same time, all the country business plans were revised to align with the new Minus case scenario figures from the Plus case scenario.<br><br>The 2021 operational budget will be developed using the Minus Case Scenario as a starting point. This will be updated for managements best estimate of available core and both program and project earmarked funding for 2021. Additional core resources over and above what is in the Minus Case Scenario will be allocated strategically, along the direction set in the WPB 2021-2022 once approved by Council.<br><br>Indicated projects were visible with original scenario, but as indicated |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | above, they were omitted from Minus case scenario. The proposal with these two projects were submitted to the grant funding window from International Climate Initiative (IKI) of the German Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety (BMU), together with WWF. If the proposal is approved, GGGI will implement the projects. |
| United Kingdom | How has the strategic plan of 2015-20 informed Strategy 2030? What are the key lessons learned and how is GGGI expanding its ambition beyond the upscaling of existing intervention types? It would be useful to understand how GGGI continues to innovate its approach to maximize impact in a rapidly changing environment. How has the overarching strategy been altered given the unique green growth opportunities, and challenges, provided by COVID–19? The report states that the overall strategic direction has not changed, is this appropriate given that the challenges of the next decade are markedly different to the challenges of the last 5 years? | When writing that the "... *the overall strategic direction has not changed...*" we are referring to the primary green growth orientation of GGGI's work. Thanks for spotting this out, as it may sound confusion. We will rephrase it for more clarity.<br><br>Strategy 2030 is built on the achievement and learnings from the Strategic Plan 2015-2020 that has guided the organization's efforts in supporting it Members in their transition towards a green growth economic development. From the mid-year review to the annual results analysis and various evaluations done by donors, GGGI has built on the lessons learned to have the Strategy 2030 is more ambitious as we have shifted from "transition" in the 2015-20 strategic plan to "Transformation of the economies into a green growth model."<br><br>The innovations are built into the design of the global operational priorities, the focused programmatic solutions, and the delivery approach, clearly defined targets for the six impact areas and the methodologies on how to measure them.<br><br>GGGI plans to prepare a review report on the implementation of GGGI Strategic Plan 2015-2020 which will be shared with MPSC and Council and Assembly in the first half of 2021. This review report aims to serve as the organization's primary product for communicating what GGGI achieved under its inaugural strategy.<br><br>GGGI has designed the Strategy 2030, Roadmap 2021-2025 and the WPB 2021-2022 with a special emphasis on the support to Members to green their COVID recovery efforts and we believe that the key impact areas defined in Strategy 2030 are already well aligned with the expectations |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | support our Members to green the COVID recovery and make it an integral part of the climate action. |
| | Should more emphasis be placed on cross country learning and global programmes which help diffuse knowledge across similar contexts? It is interesting to see no global programmes in place to share cross-country learning on green investments or climate action, given that these thematic areas make up the majority of GGGI's country projects. This is particularly pertinent given "estimates of the total investment amount required for supply-side energy system investments alone range from USD 1.6 trillion to USD 3.8 trillion annually up to 2050, while only USD 546 billion were invested in green projects in 2018." Should lesson learning of how to leverage private sector investment in similar contexts across the world be a priority? | The newly established global programs primary intent is to provide a new mechanism for a sharper focus on the programmatic solutions (than the very broad themes GGGI operated before).<br><br>In addition to these relatively small global programs, the two largest teams in IPSD are the Green Investment Services and Climate Action teams - and these are indeed responsible for cross-country learning in two key areas of GGGI's work, as you also suggest. |
| | The base scenario assumes a level of funding from the UK's government equal to 2019 level this is not the case 2020/21 and 2021/22 please update this analysis using confirmed funding levels across all three scenarios. Across all three scenarios it would be useful to understand what programmes/projects will be prioritized should the budget constraint be in the minus/base/plus scenarios and what each scenario means for the level of impact GGGI is forecasted to achieve – it may be worthwhile to link funding to the attributed impact targets. | The BASE scenario was developed early in 2020, and discussed with MPSC in April 2020, prior to the UK decision to discontinue core funding.<br><br>Following this decision, the MINUS scenario was developed in July to reflect this decision – and the BASE scenario was left unchanged for transparency.<br><br>These scenarios are projections – we do not (and should not) change them to accurately reflect every donor decision as it gets taken, but to reflect the best information available at the time of preparing them.<br><br>It is correct that with the UK decision to reinstate core funding for 2020-21 at a new level, communicated in October 2020, the most likely outcome in 2021 is a level of revenue between the MINUS and BASE scenario (in terms of core funding). We note also that other donor decisions, such as that of Norway, have not yet been finalized.<br><br>The scenarios are therefore no more or less than management's projections of the likely bandwidth of income and expenditures, within which the resulting revenue flows have to be managed. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | What evidence underpins the decision to allocate funding across varying thematic area i.e. why is waste management receiving more funding than sustainable mobility, solar PV and green industries combined? | The analysis of programmatic solutions indicates 'Planned' strategic choices of each country program and how GGGI's programmatic solutions will scale up across our Member and partner countries. These choices need to be derived from priorities expressed by its Members and partner countries though consultations and will be expected to be confirmed in CBP for 2021-2022 and more broadly, CPFs in a 5-year horizon. Therefore, they reflect the demands from the countries, as well as the likely decisions of donors in our earmarked project portfolio. |
| | It would be useful if GGGI included sensitivity tests around impact estimates from table 8 to establish minimum and maximum bounds of the expected impact achieved by GGGI within the year 2021-2022. Appreciate that incomplete data and the difficulties arising from COVID-19 may partially explain the poor performance against targets but on SO1, SO3.1, SO3.3 impact falls considerably short of targets. What factors have been the driving force behind this shortfall and how will GGGI solve these challenges moving forward? | Please note that the generation of ex-ante impact estimates for this WPB 2021-22 is the first time that such target estimates are produced at the country level. This methodology (but particularly the use of it across our country teams) is still under development. We are primarily pleased that we now are in possession of a first set of country level targets, and aim to further complete, mature and improve these data in the next several cycles.<br><br>We believe that having such impact data is a key step in our journey to introducing a result based management culture at all levels of the organization, and establishing a base line against which progress can be measured and evaluated (and as such is very important). It is an important – and quite radical - improvement over "counting outputs" (such as the number of advisory outputs that have driven our results to date, see your earlier questions).<br><br>On the other hand, we recognize that these data need further improvement and are incomplete. It is therefore too early to draw conclusions about performance against targets – noting also that these methods and targets apply to the new Strategy 2030, which comes into effect next year. |
| | The section on GGGI's response to COVID -19 is useful, however, the narrative around greening the recovery should be made much stronger across all reports – a clean, inclusive and resilient recovery in response to COVID-19 is a unique opportunity and the narrative from GGGI suggests this is currently secondary to re-establishing BAU workstreams. This report should outline how GGGI proposes to re-orientate their work to capture this opportunity to maximize | This is well noted and thank you for the suggestion. COVID-19 has uniquely been positive for GGGI in reinforcing its value offering to promote green growth that is sustainable and inclusive. Most of the key components of GGGI's COVID-19 recovery response to members actually underpin the core areas of GGGI's service offerings including GHG reduction, creation of green jobs, energy efficiency, sustainable agriculture – sustainable and circular bioeconomy and climate mitigation action. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | influence and impact and ensure green sectors are the new engines of growth, job creation and improved standards of living in participating countries. | GGGI will consider ways to be more proactive in reinforcing and creating greater awareness of its unique position dealing with COVID-19 fallout and recovery in the global green growth space. |
| | Risk management section makes no mention of COVID-19 – good to see how Risk Management Framework is being used to mitigate COVID-19 related risks. | The current Risk Management Framework identified the risks (programmatic, financial and staff health) as being high both for impact and likelihood. In the first half of the year, risk management strategies have been put in place to mitigate the impact of COVID-19 in all three areas. Management considers that the mitigation measures put in place adequately manages those identified risks. |
| Republic of Korea | We can see that GGGI has developed Global Programs along with Programmatic Solutions. Please share with us the details of the 6 approved global programs and their relationship with respective programmatic solutions. | Please be informed that Appendix 2 (p.63) includes summary of six global programs which also indicates related programmatic solutions. Attached Compendium of Business Plans also includes detailed business plans for all six global programs. |
| Australia | Commend the GGGI for the inclusion of the greening of COVID Recovery Packages of Member and partner countries.<br>We acknowledge and encourage continued alignment with 2030 strategy and roadmap. | Thank you. |
| | To what extent are ongoing revenue impacts of Covid-19 have been factored into the funding scenarios? | The ongoing revenue impacts of COVID-19 have been included to the best of our ability, i.e. using the most recent available information and our best judgement. |
| | While hopeful for a healthy budget, in any reduced budget scenario we would hope that relative priorities remain in place across the Pacific. | We agree. |

| **6. Corporate Results Framework 2021-2025** | | |
|---|---|---|
| **Member** | **Questions/Comments** | **Responses** |
| Norway | General assessment:<br>Causal links between the result levels seem sound but we would suggest linking relevant outputs directly to relevant intermediate outcomes etc. to ease understanding. Might be considered to include a short Theory of Change narrative? (including assumptions as well as evidence to substantiate GGGI's ToC?) | This is well noted but please allow us to explain that the layout of the CRF may be confusing compared to the previous CRF 2019-2020 because the outcomes and outputs with causal links are not aligned vertically in the same columns.<br><br>It was not possible to present the new CRF in landscape format for all outputs and outcomes to be aligned in columns based on their causal linkages because there are now 5 IOs in the CRF 2021-2025 (reflecting |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | Strategy 2030 and the new TOC) compared to 3 IOs in the CRF 2015-2020.<br><br>We wish to add that the CRF 2021-2025 is closely aligned with the new TOC in Strategy 2030 that links the broad category of 5 outputs that GGGI delivers with the 5 IOs and 6 SOs. Similar to the new TOC, the new CRF has direct and clear causal links between its 5 outputs and 5 IOs. The option we took to make this causal link was by numbering the outputs to match with the numbering of the corresponding IOs. For example, Output 1 links with IO1 and Output 2 links with IO2, etc. |
| | Some result statements are a bit unclear, but more clarity is provided by the guideline and descriptions of the different indicators. | This is well noted and thanks. |
| | Intermediate outcome level: very broad result statements and sometimes unclear causal links to Strategic outcome level. We would recommend that GGGI consider revising some of the intermediate outcomes so that they better reflect what the planned effects are and what is in fact being monitored. If implementation of policies etc. are being monitored, then the result statement should not stop at strengthening policies but rather include the implementation of these policies. Since this is the result level where GGGI's main effects are monitored, then it should be clear from the result statements what these effects are. | This is well noted. We wish to explain that the intermediate outcomes are based on GGGI's value chain and align with the new TOC in Strategy 2030. They reflect the broad target areas of GGGI's green growth interventions which on the programmatic front include policy development, catalyzing green investment commitments, building national capacities on green growth, promoting poverty reduction and gender equality and social inclusion and the management of the business. The 4 programmatic intermediate outcomes (IOs 1-4) contribute to the achievement of one or more of the 6 SOs. The choice of projects to be implemented at the country and global level are based on the 4 programmatic global operational priorities (GOPs) adopted in Strategy 2030 and the 10 programmatic solutions. The project interventions generate outputs that have causal link and contribute to the intermediate outcomes which have a causal link to the 6 SOs. |
| | Specific comments:<br>• Strategic outcome 3:<br>o We suggest that the indicators include sex disaggregated data.<br>o Change in access is what is monitored according to the guideline. However, having access to a service does not necessarily mean that one can use it. For example, people with access to transport may not afford to use this transport. Would it not be relevant to also monitor and get some results information beyond access? | GGGI aims to collect sex disaggregated data for relevant projects in order to report on their gender impacts including those contributing to SO3. The collection of sex disaggregated data is already provided in the new CRF 2021-2025 for Intermediate Outcome 4 – indicator 4.2 This will be a core feature of the new Gender Strategy 2021-2025 that is currently being developed. This initiative will take progressive steps as we build capacity and train programmatic staff on gender and results reporting skills. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | • Intermediate outcome 2: Is "strengthened financing and institutional frameworks" being sufficiently monitored by budget allocation and project investment decisions? | GGGI is not only monitoring this outcome in terms of budget allocation and project investment commitments, but also in terms of green growth policies that encompass any formal government strategies, plans or policies; sectoral strategies; plans or policies; and changes to existing laws or administrative rules.<br><br>Projects are demand driven based on Members requests and the opportunities that arise. Once projects are initiated, they are managed through the PCM process and are monitored closely through to completion. GGGI is also committed to developing an ambitious investment pipeline that will support the development of investment projects and the achievement of final investment commitments. Although our exit point is at the sign off for investment commitments, we have also started monitoring our investment achievements since 2017 and reporting their progress and status in the annual results reports. |
| | • Intermediate outcome 3: The guideline states that the aim of this outcome is to complement IO1 and IO2 by developing capacity in member countries. If this is the case, then this result area would seem to be on a lower result level than IO1 and IO2. In addition, there seems to be some overlap between IO3 and output 3 in that both include capacity building being delivered to members. | IO3 is important on its own to build the short, medium and long-term capacity of Members to lead and manage their own green growth programs and transformation. In doing so, IO3 complements IO1 and IO2. Output 3 directly supports and contributes to IO3 where output 3 measures the scale of capacity building and knowledge products delivered by GGGI while IO3.1 seeks to measure the quality of the outcome in directly strengthening the capacity of Members. |
| | • Indicator IO4.2: "disaggregated by gender" seems superfluous since the indicator will monitor "number of women supported through GGGI's projects with targeted gender interventions". | This indicator is not superfluous since it aims to report on the number of women that benefit from GGGI's project interventions which includes a gender designed intervention such as the percentage of women to be trained in capacity building. Since GGGI does not have a gender specific project given the nature of our green growth interventions, the beneficiaries will always include men and women, so data collection has to be gender disaggregated to arrive at the number of women beneficiaries. Indicator IO 4.2 is not superfluous in this regard. |
| Fiji | It is worth noting that the creation of Blue Jobs could also be a key strategic outcome. The scope of which can be multiple from fisheries, marine tourism, ports and shipping and even marine biotechnology. Each will require significant capacity building, but few already have pockets of activities running locally. | We note this suggestion and wish to explain that blue jobs should qualify to be counted under SO2 on creation of green jobs. GGGI agrees that the creation of jobs in the development of sustainable and circular bioeconomies which represent priority economic sectors in Fiji for exports and job creation will contribute to SO2 and does not need to be a separate |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | strategic outcome. |
| | Inclusion of Blue investment commitments allowing accelerated access to climate finance via initiatives such as the Global Fund for Coral Reefs, Oceans 5, Clean and Sustainable Ocean Programme – Funded by the European Investment Bank, etc. | Thank you for the suggestion which is noted. The development of the blue economy and investments present real opportunities for SIDS and small island countries like Fiji. This is an area to be addressed during the development of SIDS CPFs and country programs and projects. |
| | The aforementioned can thus also streamline into expected outputs such as gender equality and poverty reduction through a sustainable blue economy lens. | We agree. All relevant projects implemented by GGGI will require poverty reduction and gender equality mainstreaming. We will take this suggestion into account in the development of the new GGGI Gender Strategy 2021-2025. |
| Philippines | The Philippines wishes to suggest to the GGGI to consider enhancing the CRF in such a way that the cause-effect linkages between and among the outputs, intermediate outcomes, strategic outcomes, and GGGI's global operational priorities for the Strategy 2030 are clearly defined. This is to help facilitate the identification of needed improvements in the design of the CRF (i.e., whether or not outputs and outcomes follow a logical flow), as well as guide the overall implementation and evaluation of GGGI's projects, programs and activities.<br>For instance, it is unclear how intermediate outcome 4 (Green growth solutions support Member partner countries in reducing poverty and achieving gender equality) contribute to any of the 6 strategic outcomes. In addition, the Philippines notes that the poverty reduction indicator could be considered as a higher-level outcome, even higher than some of the identified strategic outcomes, such as green jobs, such that jobs affect income and thus contribute to poverty reduction. | This is well noted but please allow us to explain that the layout of the CRF 2021-2025 may be confusing compared to the previous CRF 2019-2020 because the outcomes and outputs with causal links are not aligned vertically in the same columns. It was not possible to do the same and present the new CRF in landscape format for all outputs and outcomes to be aligned in columns based on their causal linkages because there are now 5 IOs in the CRF 2021-2025 (reflecting Strategy 2030 and the new TOC) compared to 3 IOs in the CRF 2015-2020.<br><br>We wish to add that the CRF 2021-2025 is closely aligned with the new TOC in Strategy 2030 that links the broad category of 5 outputs that GGGI delivers with the 5 IOs and 6 SOs. Similar to the new TOC, the new CRF has direct and clear causal links between its 5 outputs and 5 IOs. The option we took to make this causal link was by numbering the outputs to match with the numbering of the corresponding IOs. For example, Output 1 links with IO1 and Output 2 links with IO2, etc.<br><br>The 3 programmatic IOs (IOs 1-3) IO4 on poverty reduction and gender is a cross cutting outcome that does not contribute directly to the 6 SOs but indirectly. |
| United Kingdom | Adding a column to set out impact achieved from 2015-2020 will better place the strategic outcomes in the wider context of GGGI's growth as an organization and will allow the reader to better understand what the strategic outcomes are based on. | This is well noted. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | It is difficult to understand the rationale behind several of the targets within the framework, for example:<br>1. IO2.1, O2.1, O3.2 2020 targets are all well below historic results – why?<br>2. Does O5.3 suggest GGGI is seeking to reallocate funding away from LDCs, LLDCs and SIDS? What is the strategic thinking driving this shift? | 1. These targets were arrived at based on the previous year's baselines. For example, IO2.1 on adopted policies, GGGI achieved 32 in 2018 and 21 in 2019. The targets were set at 25 for 2021 and 30 for 2022. These targets can be revised to make them more ambitious.<br>2. No, the opposite. GGGI had a minimum target of 50% for LDCs, and has enhanced this to a minimum of 60% for LDCs, LLDCs and SIDS. The target of 60% for O5.3 was approved by Council and 40% is to be for MICs. GGGI well exceeded this target in 2019 at 84%. |
| Australia | For the next series it would be great to see the inclusion of women AND girls as well as indicators on disability inclusion and indigenous peoples. | GGGI's approach to gender mainstreaming is based on taking progressive steps that seeks to build the appropriate staff gender skills, capacity and systems to support the effective and meaningful inclusion of gender design features in our projects, its implementation and monitoring and reporting. The new GGGI Gender Strategy 2021-2025 that is currently being drafted will drive this initiative. The CRF has evolved over the last two years to now include gender outcome and output indicators. More substantive indicators will be included in future once the capacity to effectively design, implement, monitor, report and collect gender disaggregated data for gender actions is in place. Disability inclusion and indigenous peoples will also be taken into account. |
| | Acknowledge the decreasing figure of funding management and administration. Encourage further reductions if possible. | Thank you for the acknowledgement. This is a goal of management. |

| **7. Update on GGGI Efforts to Track and Report on Impacts** | | |
|---|---|---|
| **Member** | **Questions/Comments** | **Responses** |
| Norway | The methodology introduced to report more consistently on results in country programs have been tested for two country programs with apparently good results. Improved quality of information and results achieved in country programs replacing the project level reports will make it easier for donors to follow progress in relevant country programs over time. It is positive that GGGI has set targets at impact level and will report progress towards these targets on an annual basis. | Thank you for this feedback. |
| Philippines | With respect to the GGGI's plan to adopt and mainstream the impact pathway, the GGGI may consider to populate/share relevant technical/guidance notes to help inform/guide Members on the process of development of their respective country planning and | The use of the Impact Pathway Approach (IPA) is just being piloted in GGGI for project design and the setting of project SO ex-ante impact targets and for the SO impact reporting. The use of the IPA is covered in the new simplified Country Planning Framework (CPF) Guideline, which |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | programming documents. | was applied to the new CPF 2021-2025 development process for Philippines. The IPA is also explained in the Roadmap 2021-2025. GGGI circulated a draft of CPF with the National Government Agencies of the Philippines, including National Economic Development Authority (NEDA), Department of Trade and Industry (DTI), Climate Change Commission (CCC), Department of Energy (DOE), and Department of Foreign Affairs (DFA), and now is in the process of reflecting all the comments received into the final version of CPF 2021–2025. These guidelines can made available to members. |
| United Kingdom | Given the lack of reporting on GGGI's impact in old reports, with previous results frameworks focusing solely on output and outcome, is there scope to examine the impact achieved retrospectively? This will be a useful to set a benchmark and give insight into GGGI's progress as an organization. Will impact be available on a disaggregated scale by region, country income level, thematic area as well as policy type? Will historic impact achieved inform future programming decisions? | This is well noted and is being addressed. GGGI has already commenced implementing in 2020 the modified End of Year Results Reporting system which has elevated results reporting from the project level to the country program level focusing primarily on outcomes and SO impacts. As part of this initiative, GGGI will in this first cycle also round-up and report on the SO impact of project outcomes achieved from 2017 up to 2020. From this exercise, GGGI will have available a data base on its impact achievements since 2017 that can be disaggregated by region, country, thematic area, SO type, etc. |
| | Impact pathway chains are highly useful and should be adopted beyond country contexts – useful to see if these could be implemented for global programmes to help draw out the benefit from cross-country learning exercises. | At present, the Impact Pathway approach is designed mainly to support results reporting for country programs. However, we can explore the potential to apply the approach for global programs as well moving forward. |
| Republic of Korea | We are happy to see that GGGI is equipped with an adequate reporting system on a regular basis. Is the GGGI Online corporate system accessible to member countries? | GGGI Online is for internal use only and is not accessible to Member countries. |
| Australia | Paragraph 6: Congratulate the GGGI for moving towards impact level targets. This is a positive step-change. | Thank you for the acknowledgement. It is indeed a positive change and a big step for GGGI. It reflects the progressive work that has been going on behind the scenes over the last couple of years including the development of the new SO Guidelines that was published in January 2020 and the introduction of the new Impact Pathway Approach (IPA) to guide projects design, implementation and reporting. At the same time, this is only the beginning and the methodologies, tools and systems that we use to measure and estimate our SO impacts will be regularly reviewed and improved over time to ensure the quality of our reported SO impacts and targets. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | Paragraph 8: Note the fragmentation challenge. | As noted in the paper, the fragmentation of our results reporting is something GGGI has been aware of and seeking to address for some time now, and we trust Members have found the Impact Pathway approach a useful step forward in trying to solve this challenge. |
| | Paragraph 11/12/13: Commend GGGI for testing its impact pathway through pilots in Mongolia and Viet Nam. | Thank you, this is well noted. |
| | Paragraph 14: Commend the GGGI management for mainstreaming the impact pathway tool throughout GGGI's operations. | Thank you, this is well noted. |

| **8. Provisional Dates for 2021 Sessions of Governance Organs** | | |
|---|---|---|
| **Member** | **Questions/Comments** | **Responses** |
| Norway | No objection to suggested dates and format. | Noted. |

/End

## Annex 2: Draft Decisions on the Corporate Results Framework 2021-2025

**Global Green Growth Institute**
Ninth Session of the Assembly and
Thirteenth Session of the Council (Joint Session)
October 12-23, 2020 | E-Consultations
October 28, 2020 | Hybrid Meeting

# [Draft] Decision on the Corporate Results Framework 2021-2025

The Council,

*Recalling* Articles 2 and 4 of the Agreement on the Establishment of the Global Green Growth Institute (GGGI) regarding the objectives and activities of the GGGI;

*Recalling* Article 8(5)(b) of the Agreement on the Establishment of the GGGI that the functions of the Council include approving the GGGI's strategy, and reviewing the results, monitoring and evaluation framework;

*Recalling* GGGI Strategy 2030 [C/2019/DC/13] adopted at the Eighth Session of the Assembly and Twelfth Session of the Council (Joint Session) on October 24, 2019;

*Noting* the 5-Year Roadmap 2021-2025, which is an action plan adopted by the GGGI Management Team to guide the first five-year phase of the implementation of Strategy 2030;

*Taking note* of the discussions of the Management and Program Sub-Committee (MPSC) regarding the 5-Year Roadmap 2021-2025 at its Eleventh Meeting (MPSC11) held on April 29, 2020 [MPSC/2020/13), and the discussions and recommendations of the MPSC regarding Corporate Results Framework 2021-2025 at its Twelfth Meeting (MPSC12) held on July 1-9, 2020 [MPSC/2020/28];

*Further taking note* of the discussions of the Assembly and the Council regarding the Corporate Results Framework 2021-2025 during the E-consultations of the Ninth Session of the Assembly and Thirteenth Session of the Council on October 12-23, 2020 [A/2020/10-C/2020/10];

*Approves* the Corporate Results Framework 2021-2025 as attached in the Annex.

/End