



Global Green Growth Institute

Eleventh Meeting of the Management and Program Sub-Committee

April 22-29, 2020 | E-Consultations and Virtual Meeting

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

Agenda 1. Opening of the Meeting and Adoption of the Agenda

1. The Eleventh Meeting of the Management and Program Sub-Committee (MPSC11) was attended by MPSC Members Australia, Republic of Korea, Paraguay, Rwanda and Mr. Ariyaratne Hewage (Non-State Actor Member of the Council), as well as observers including Ecuador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Hungary, Norway, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, United Kingdom, and Ms. Maria Kiwanuka (Non-State Actor Member of the Council).
2. The meeting was chaired by Australia, represented by Mr. Peter Elder, Director of Climate and Environment Funds, Global Development Branch, Multilateral Development and Finance Division, Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade.
3. Annex 1 provides the list of participants.
4. Annex 2 provides the list of sessional documents.
5. The MPSC adopted the Agenda [[MPSC/2020/AG/1/REV2](#)], circulated by the Secretariat on April 8, 2020.

Agenda 2. Summary of E-Consultations

6. Prior to the virtual meeting of the Eleventh MPSC Meeting, Members and observers held e-consultations on April 22-28, 2020 to discuss the following agenda items: 2019 Results Report; Overview of 2020 Programs; and Roadmap 2021-2025. The summary of the e-consultations is attached as Annex 3, and the full list of questions, comments and responses is attached as Annex 4.
7. Delegates commended the Secretariat for the successful process of the e-consultations and expressed their appreciation to the Secretariat for its rapid and considerate responses.
8. Members of the MPSC took note of the results and achievements of GGGI in 2019, GGGI's programs and programmatic trends in 2020, and the action plan and phased approach that GGGI Management will follow in implementing Strategy 2030.

Agenda 3. Director-General's Progress Report

9. The Director-General presented his Progress Report [[MPSC/2020/5](#)], highlighting the key achievements and trends in 2019, including the continued shift towards a larger share of earmarked funds from a growing number of donors. Also, the Director-General noted that GGGI is well prepared for its work to continue despite the COVID-19 pandemic, with its current financial position and efforts to strategically respond and adapt. The Director-General identified two key challenges in 2020: the risk of non-renewal of core funding by four contributing members due to make renewal decisions in 2020; and delays in the implementation of earmarked projects as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic. Delegates agreed that GGGI is well positioned to support Members with the greening of their post-COVID-19 recovery.
10. Delegates commended GGGI for its rapid adjustments, flexibility, and high level of functioning despite the recent challenges. Australia commended the Director-General for initiating the significant change process undertaken during his four-year tenure, including the implementation of iGROW and PIN process, as well as expanding GGGI's resource partners. Norway noted the importance of widening the donor base for the long-term stability of the organization. The Republic of Korea acknowledged the management's efforts concerning the safety of its employees over the course of the COVID-19 crisis.
11. Delegates noted that developing countries' economies will be particularly impacted by COVID-19 and commended GGGI for being proactive in working to green the recovery packages. The Secretariat informed that all GGGI country teams are paying close attention to supporting Members with their COVID-19 recovery, and GGGI has developed seven focused concept notes on greening Members' COVID-19 recovery with opportunities between USD1 million and USD3 million.
12. Paraguay noted that it will need strong post-COVID-19 support from GGGI and expressed its willingness to work towards a green recovery. Delegates and the Secretariat agreed on the need to focus on green growth as the world enters the COVID-19 recovery stage.
13. Mr. Ariyaratne Hewage noted that some countries are experiencing immediate problems with food insecurity and will face significant difficulties due to their large informal economies and small businesses. The Secretariat took note and shared it is working in the sector of climate smart agriculture.
14. Members of the MPSC took note of the Director-General's Progress Report.

Agenda 4. 2019 Financial Results

15. The Secretariat presented its 2019 financial results, including an overview of its comprehensive income and expenditures, statement of financial position, and operating expenditures. It also reported its current state of financial stability by highlighting two indicators: the number of reserve days and liquidity days [[MPSC/2020/6-1](#)].

16. Delegates expressed appreciation for a clear report and expressed confidence in the ongoing strong financial management demonstrated throughout 2019.
17. The Republic of Korea welcomed the increased number of reserve days and cash balance compared to 2018, noting its confidence that GGGI will be sustained throughout this year and the future. Nevertheless, the Republic of Korea noted the need to be mindful of the possibilities that contributions from Members may be reduced in 2020 as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic, asked management to adopt a conservative position, and that the 2020 budget should be further discussed (next agenda item).
18. The Chair inquired how the benchmarks of the financial indicators were developed (90-180 days for reserve days and 120-180 days for liquidity days) and GGGI's ideal position itself in this regard. The Secretariat explained that the benchmark based on an analysis of a range of international organizations, adding that the lower end of the benchmark represents the minimum. The delegates noted the Institute is in a good position per both indicators.
19. The Chair acknowledged GGGI's achievement in reducing costs concerning travel and consultants, which was discussed in previous meetings of governance organs, and expressed hopes for a continued focus on keeping these two costs down.
20. Members of the MPSC took note of GGGI's 2019 Financial Results.

Agenda 5. 2020 Operational Budget

21. The Secretariat presented the 2020 GGGI Operational Budget [MPSC/2020/7], prepared based on the Work Program and Budget (WPB) 2019-2020 approved by the Council on October 31, 2018 [C/2018/DC/9]. The presentation included an overview of expected income and expenditures, as well as an assessment of the risks to the 2020 budget, including non-renewal of core from some Members and the impact of COVID-19 on project implementation. As agreed with MPSC last year, management had prepared a balanced budget for 2020, but as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic, which is leading to both a slowdown in new contracts signed, and in a slowdown in project implementation, the latest projection after closing the books on the first quarter is that there may be a deficit estimated at USD 2 million.
22. Delegates thanked the Secretariat for a clear report and noted the importance of being prudent in forecasting the 2020 budget. The Secretariat responded that it is monitoring its expenditures and budget situation on a weekly basis and updating projections every month. The Secretariat added that there will be savings from travel and some operational costs, and that GGGI has adequate reserves, so that it will be able to manage the deficit that may arise under current projections.
23. Australia asked whether the US government has become a first-time resource partner for GGGI. The Secretariat responded positively, adding that it has received funding as a sub-grantee in conjunction with Conservation International from the US State Department.

Furthermore, the Secretariat informed that there is another proposal in its concluding stage with United States Agency for International Development (USAID) in India.

24. On Australia's inquiry regarding the Institute's fee for service, the Secretariat explained that GGGI is a partner, along with Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), in the ASEAN Catalytic Green Finance Facility (ACGF). According to the agreement, if GGGI sources projects that are picked up by ACGF, GGGI will receive a fee for service. However, the Secretariat added that the Facility is not yet operational, and involved partners are continuing to work on the specifics. The Secretariat noted that Australia has interest in this modality and that it will introduce its staff in the Green Investment Services team to Australian delegates.
25. Delegates asked to be kept regularly informed on the 2020 budget, particularly on issues around the risks associated with project implementation and staffing costs.
26. Members of the MPSC took note of GGGI's Operational Budget in 2020.

Agenda 6. Work Program and Budget 2021-2022 Planning Direction

27. The Secretariat presented its planning directions for the Work Program and Budget 2021-2022 [[MPSC/2020/8](#)]. The presentation included the introduction of the 10 programmatic solutions aligned with the five Global Operational Priorities (GOPs), indicative resource allocation for 2021-2022, and the key milestones and timeline for the process of developing WPB 2021-2022.
28. Delegates noted that the WPB 2021-2022 Planning Directions reflects well the 2030 Strategy, which was approved by the Council in October 2019, and welcomed the focus on providing support to Members for post-COVID-19 recovery.
29. The Republic of Korea noted that the Korean government and the international community are interested in greening COVID-19 recovery, and it expressed hopes for GGGI to stand out with its own character. The Chair added that he also hopes to see GGGI continue to operate in niche areas where it has comparative advantage can make the most impact. Agreeing to the delegates' comments, the Secretariat assured Members that GGGI has focused on projects that are highly relevant and that builds on the organization's current strengths. Furthermore, the Secretariat highlighted that its distinguishing factor is its capable staff in the field ready to implement right away once partners and donors are identified.
30. Norway welcomed the inclusion of a variety of themes well aligned with Strategy 2030 and commended GGGI for the awareness of the organization's risks as well as for its ownership. Norway expressed an interest to follow and participate in the planning process of WPB 2021-2022.
31. Referring to the indicative resource allocation, Australia asked for background information on the decreased amount of resources allocated to the Pacific. Rwanda also

inquired whether there is room for revision in the figures presented in the resource allocation. The Secretariat responded that what is presented are early indicative numbers, and a detailed budget exercise with country offices is in progress.

32. Rwanda noted the significance of programmatic solutions and how the GOPs align well with the country's priorities. It asked whether there is room to place urban resilience under programmatic solution 2 (climate action) or adding it to GOP 3 (achieving a sustainable and circular bioeconomy while securing healthy natural systems). The Secretariat responded that it will discuss internally on how urban resilience might fit in the current plan and come back with a response. The Chair requested that the Secretariat provide a written response before the next MPSC meeting.
33. The United Kingdom shared that it is in the process of reviewing the next core contribution to GGGI, which is delayed due to the COVID-19 pandemic, and hopes to complete the review and make the announcement very soon. MPSC Members thanked the United Kingdom for the update and reiterated their strong support for GGGI.
34. Members of the MPSC took note of the Planning Directions for the Work Program and Budget (WPB) 2021-2022.

Agenda 7. Risk Management Framework Roll-out Plan

35. The Secretariat presented the Risk Management Framework (RMF) Roll-out Plan to country and regional offices [[MPSC/2020/9](#)], explaining that while most of the risks identified in the RMF are common across all regions and offices, the roll-out intends to identify any additional risks that are either regional or country specific or have a higher country rating. The Secretariat said that it will provide an update to the MPSC in July as part of its regular RMF reporting.
36. Delegates welcomed the RMF being rolled out into the country and regional offices. Australia inquired whether there has been any updates or revision to the overarching RMF since the COVID-19 impact, to which the Secretariat responded that it will conduct a comprehensive update to the MPSC in July. The Secretariat added that it is actively managing its internal COVID-19 response as well, some activities including the operation of a crisis management committee, weekly town hall meetings and weekly messages from the Director-General to all staff.
37. The Republic of Korea inquired whether GGGI is considering the closing of operations in some countries, and whether this is being assessed through the RMF. The Secretariat responded that it is utilizing the Country Programming Criteria approved by the Council [[C/2019/DC/9](#)] as guidance and consulting with country offices on their host countries' membership and host country agreements, which are elements in the Criteria, together with the financial conditions that need to be met.
38. Members of the MPSC took note of GGGI's RMF Roll-out Plan and requested the Secretariat to make reference to COVID-19 associated risks in the next RMF report.

Agenda 8. Update on Travel Management

39. The Secretariat presented an update on its travel management, highlighting that all 10 internal audit recommendations have been implemented and are in full alignment with OIAI recommendations. Furthermore, the Secretariat informed that there will be two travel audits per year, with the first such travel audit to take place in the third quarter of 2020 .
40. The Audit Contact Points (Republic of Korea and Norway) noted that all recommendations were indeed followed according to the travel action plan and commended the efforts of the internal audit team and GGGI management for their work and responsiveness.
41. Australia thanked the Audit Contact Points for their efforts on reviewing this process, as well as the Secretariat for its responsive approach.
42. Norway welcomed the twice-yearly audit on travel management and noted that both the internal audit and monthly exceptions report will be important information for compliance in moving forward.
43. The Republic of Korea noted that it is satisfied with the results reported and sought to clarify if the Secretariat planned to conduct two audits this year. The Secretariat responded that, with the ongoing travel restrictions in place due to the COVID-19 pandemic, there will be only one audit in 2020 and twice a year starting in 2021.
44. Members of the MPSC took note that all recommendations in the Travel Audit Report Action Plan have been fully implemented.

Agenda 9. GGGI Support to Vulnerable Countries

45. The Secretariat presented its proposal for GGGI to adopt the definition of vulnerable countries of the United Nations Office of the High Representative for the Least Developed Countries, Landlocked Developing Countries and Small Island Developing States (UNOHRLLS) and to review GGGI's resource allocation priority to allocate at least 60 percent of its programmatic resources to these vulnerable countries [[MPSC/2020/11](#)].
46. Paraguay welcomed GGGI's proposal, noting that many landlocked developing countries (LLDCs) are in fact least developed countries (LDCs), and are very vulnerable not only due to difficulties in accessing the international market but also various environmental issues such as land and forest degradation. Australia also welcomed the proposal, as it provides a broader acknowledgement of diversity and the nature of vulnerabilities, and noted that it is well aligned to the objectives of GGGI.

47. Norway asked how the newly proposed percentage of resource allocation coincides with the Country Programming Criteria approved by the Council in 2019, expressing the importance of following the established criteria. The Secretariat reassured that the Country Programming Criteria adopted by the Council in 2019 is the main guidance for GGGI country operations and mutually complementary with GGGI support to vulnerable countries. Also it would be allocating 60 percent of its resources to vulnerable countries while maintaining the 50 percent allocation to LDCs. In this regard, delegates and the Secretariat agreed that the new proposal would allow prioritization and flexibility in country programming.
48. Members of the MPSC endorsed the proposal on GGGI Support to Vulnerable Countries and recommend it to the Council for approval.

Agenda 10. Any Other Business

49. The Secretariat provided an update on GGGI's recent engagement with the Korea Green Fund—an entity of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK)—with the aim to establish cooperation in the future. The Secretariat informed that all activities were communicated with and in line with the United Nations sanctions regime, and the Republic of Korea shared they (Ministry of Foreign Affairs) and the Ministry of Unification were indeed consulted and informed of the ongoing activities. Australia expressed hopes that the Institute continue to observe the legal requirements pertaining to activities with the DPRK and requested that Members be updated in writing at the next MPSC meeting in July. The Secretariat agreed.
50. The Republic of Korea provided an update on the P4G Summit that was previously scheduled for June 2020. It informed Members that the Summit has now been postponed to 2021 due to the COVID-19 pandemic but remains a priority event.
51. The Secretariat informed that the Ninth Session of the Assembly and Thirteenth Session of the Council (Joint Session) was confirmed to take place on October 28, 2020 in Seoul, Republic of Korea, in conjunction with several technical sessions and knowledge sharing workshops on October 27 and 29. Members and the Secretariat agreed the decision whether the meeting will be held in person or virtually due to the COVID-19 pandemic and related travel restrictions should be finalized by August at latest.
52. MPSC Members decided to hold the Twelfth Meeting of the MPSC on July 9, 2020, as a virtual meeting, as global travel restrictions are unlikely to be significantly relaxed in time for the meeting.
53. Members of the MPSC took note of the Institute's updates on activities with North Korea and the Republic of Korea's updates on the P4G Summit.
54. Members of the MPSC decided to hold the Twelfth Meeting of the MPSC as a virtual meeting on July 9, 2020.

55. Regarding the Joint Session of the Assembly and Council, MPSC Members decided to recommend the virtual or in-person options be considered and finalized by August 2020.

/End

ANNEXES

1. List of Participants
2. List of Sessional Documents
3. Summary of E-Consultations
4. Full List of Questions/Comments and Responses for E-Consultations

ANNEX 1. List of Participants

Australia (MPSC)

Mr. Peter Elder, Director of Climate and Environment Funds, Global Development Branch, Multilateral Development and Finance Division, Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade

Ms. Selina Hughes, Policy Officer, Multilateral Development and Finance Division, Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade

Republic of Korea (MPSC)

Mr. Changsoo Kim, Director, Global Environment and Science Division, Ministry of Foreign Affairs

Mr. Hyuk Jeon, Second Secretary, Global Environment and Science Division, Ministry of Foreign Affairs

Paraguay (MPSC)

H. E. Raul Silvero, Ambassador, Embassy of the Republic of Paraguay to the Republic of Korea

Mr. Luis Molinas, Counsellor, Embassy of the Republic of Paraguay to the Republic of Korea

Rwanda (MPSC)

Ms. Fatina Mukarubibi, Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Environment

Ms. Patricie Uwase, Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Infrastructure

Non-State Actor (MPSC)

Mr. Ariyaratne Hewage, Expert/Non-State Actor Member of the Council of GGGI

Norway (ACP)

Mr. John Erik Storskogen Prydz, Senior Advisor, Climate Change Department, Norwegian Ministry of Climate and Environment

Ms. Ingelin Årseth Ladsten, Senior Advisor, Department for Climate, Energy and Environment, Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation

Ms. Anne Seim-Haugen, Senior Advisor, Department of Quality Assurance, Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation

Ecuador (observer)

Mr. Johnny Dagobert Reinoso Vasquez, Chief of Mission, Embassy of Ecuador to the Republic of Korea

Ethiopia (observer)

Mr. Kasahun Wakoya Nikusa, Head of Commission Office, Environment, Forest and Climate Change Commission

Fiji (observer)

Mr. Joreti Dakuwaqa, First Secretary, Embassy of Fiji to the Republic of Korea

Hungary (observer)

Ms. Kinga Csontos, Climate Policy, Desk Officer, Climate Policy Department, Ministry for Innovation and Technology

Papua New Guinea (observer)

Ms. Helen Aitsi, First Secretary, Embassy of Papua New Guinea to the Republic of Korea

Peru (observer)

Mr. Jean Carlo Breña Alegra, Foreign Officer, Embassy of Peru to the Republic of Korea

Philippines (observer)

Ms. Flora Sherry Basquinez-Samaniego, Legal Staff, National Economic and Development Authority

United Kingdom (observer)

Mr. David Markey, Head of Business Environment & Climate Diplomacy, Embassy of the United Kingdom to the Republic of Korea

Non-State Actor (observer)

Ms. Maria Kiwanuka, Expert/Non-State Actor Member of the Council of GGGI

Secretariat

Dr. Frank Rijsberman, Director-General

Ms. Hyeon Jenny Kim, Deputy Director-General, Head of GGP&I

Mr. Gerard O'Donoghue, Assistant Director-General, Finance and Corporate Services

Ms. Susanne Pedersen, Assistant Director-General, Head of IPSD

Ms. Jae Eun Ahn, Senior Strategy Officer

Mr. Hakku Bang, Results Officer

General Distribution

MPSC/2020/13

Ms. Inhee Chung, Rwanda Country Representative

Mr. Dave Kim, Governance Lead

Ms. Jinyoung Kim, Director of Asia

Ms. Nayoung Moon, Governance Officer

Mr. Siva Muthusamy, Director of Finance

Ms. Kyuhwa Park, Senior Associate, OED

Mr. Lasse Ringius, Director and Head of GIS

Ms. Alexandra Stephenson, Governance Intern

Mr. Mahamadou Tounkara, Director of Office of the Director-General

Mr. Sakiusa Tuisolia, Strategy Lead

Ms. Dagmar Zwebe, Uganda Country Representative

ANNEX 2. List of Sessional Documents

MPSC/2020/1	2019 Results Report
MPSC/2020/2	Analysis on the Trend of GGGI's Policy Works and Investment Projects (Programmatic Progress Report)
MPSC/2020/3	Five-year Roadmap 2021-2025
MPSC/2020/AG/ 1/REV2	Provisional Agenda
MPSC/2020/4	Summary of E-Consultations
MPSC/2020/5	DG Progress Report
MPSC/2020/6-1	2019 Financial Results Report
MPSC/2020/6-2	2019 Audited Financial Statements
MPSC/2020/6-3	Management Letter from PWC
MPSC/2020/7	2020 Operational Budget
MPSC/2020/8	WPB 2021-2022 Planning Direction
MPSC/2020/9	Risk Management Framework Roll-out Plan
MPSC/2020/10	Update on Travel Management
MPSC/2020/11	GGGI Support to Vulnerable Countries
MPSC/2020/12	Note on 2020 Governance Organ Meetings

ANNEX 3. Summary of E-Consultations**Summary of E-Consultations of the Eleventh Meeting of the MPSC**

1. The e-consultations for the Eleventh Meeting of the Management and Program Sub-Committee (MPSC) took place on April 22-28, 2020. Below is a summary of the e-consultations, while the full list of questions and responses are attached as an Annex to this summary.

2019 Results Report

2. Members commended the GGGI Secretariat for a clear and concise [2019 Results Report](#) with good presentation of the information. Members also welcomed GGGI's achievement to ensure that green growth is at the center of development for its Members.
3. Australia commended GGGI for making progress on collecting data for social inclusion and safeguards, as well as tracking capacity building activities to collect gender disaggregated data, while there remain some gaps. The Secretariat responded that the gaps will be addressed in a lessons learned report to be ready in May, and that it has introduced an evaluation form for workshops and trainings which will allow GGGI to collect gender disaggregated data starting from this year.
4. Rwanda expressed its appreciation for GGGI's delivery model, moving from policy to implementation, the latter being where Rwanda's needs are most. It also noted that GGGI's Strategic Outcomes are well aligned with the SDGs, as well as its national policies and NDCs.
5. In response to a request from Australia for further analysis that frames the 2019 results in a way that demonstrates how GGGI's expertise and relationships in these key areas make GGGI well-positioned as a COVID-19 recovery partner, the Secretariat shared its report, [GGGI Responds to the COVID Crisis: Greening Stimulus & Recovery](#).
6. Mr. Ariyaratne Hewage recommended GGGI to share data with relevant national institutions and policymakers, as well as international media. The Secretariat responded that the results will be included in its 2019 Annual Report, a public document that will be available on GGGI's website in May. Also, media messaging and communications activities will be conducted for GGGI's results and achievements in 2019.
7. Norway suggested to include in the Report the reasons for exceeding of some targets and not reaching several others as indicated in the Corporate Results Framework (CRF). The Secretariat responded that the 2019 Results Report has been revised to reflect this. Furthermore, the Report on Lessons Learned will also cover these elements.
8. Norway further inquired on the varying levels of project alignment for the different strategic outcomes (SOs) between 2018 and 2019 Results Reports. The Secretariat explained that GGGI's projects are demand driven and reflect the priorities of Members and partners, resulting in a variance of SO alignment. The 2018 and 2019 Reports also represent two different biennium's with different sets of projects except for the ongoing

ones. The Secretariat added that the annual assessment of the SOs and other key results will be conducted as part of the annual results reporting cycle.

9. The Republic of Korea requested the Secretariat to provide the outcomes and notable successes in accordance with the SOs for a clearer picture. The Secretariat responded that GGGI published its [Strategic Outcomes Guideline](#) at the end of 2019, which outlines the concepts, approaches and methodologies for measuring expected SO ex-ante impacts of projects and country-level contribution/attribution. While the concept of SOs was introduced in 2017 in the Revised Strategy 2020, Strategy 2030 is the first time that GGGI has set quantitative SO targets. WPB 2021-22 is the first cycle to introduce such targets at country level and to start reporting against those. The Secretariat has prepared a novel country reporting approach, including development of country-level impact pathways, which it will present to MPSC at the next meeting (as the IEU agenda was dropped from this meeting due to the changes resulting from the COVID-19 pandemic).
10. Members of the MPSC took note of the results and achievements of GGGI in 2019.

Overview of 2020 Programs

11. Members commended GGGI for its prioritization of work related to the NDCs, as well as for the concise report on the [Overview of 2020 Programs](#) with good presentation of information, particularly [Annex 1](#) (updated as per Members' comments).
12. Australia suggested the Secretariat to provide more information on how investments may align with a COVID-19 economic response, to which the Secretariat asked to refer to the report, [GGGI Responds to the COVID Crisis: Greening Stimulus & Recovery](#). To Australia's inquiry on whether GGGI is tracking the impact of COVID-19 on its policy/project work in 2020, the Secretariat explained that a review by country teams is undergoing, and information on risk assessment and responding actions will be presented at the next MPSC meeting. Australia further noted that GGGI's nimbleness, expertise and strong links with partner governments should position the organization well as a partner in COVID-19 economic response, and to ensure that this response builds resilience in partner economies.
13. The Republic of Korea asked whether GGGI has a projected conservative scenario, program and budget for 2020 considering that COVID-19 will have a significant impact on all aspects of GGGI's work. Furthermore, the Republic of Korea expressed its hope that GGGI can engage in work related to COVID-19 recovery, which would offer opportunities to accelerate green growth transformation through greening of the COVID-19 recovery packages. The Secretariat responded that GGGI is currently assessing the possible risks due to COVID-19 project by project, after which it will develop responding actions and will present its initial assessment in this MPSC meeting. The Secretariat has also developed nine concept notes on greening post-COVID-19 recovery to date on: (1) greening tourism in the Pacific; (2) restoring forests and building climate resilient agriculture systems in Africa; (3) Pacific Green Entrepreneur Network; (4) Caribbean green Entrepreneur Network; (5) Kiribati Climate Smart Agriculture; (6) Vanuatu solar and energy efficiency technologies; (7) Fiji solar and energy efficiency technologies; (8) Burkina Faso Solar Powered irrigation systems and Climate Smart Agriculture; and (9) Senegal Solar Powered Irrigation Systems and Climate Smart Agriculture. The Secretariat is exploring donor interest in developing these ideas further and is inviting expressions of interests from its Members for this work.

14. Australia asked for further information on GGGI's approach in coastal resilience programs, as it will have relevance in the Pacific. The Secretariat informed that it aims to develop a mangrove protection and restoration program to build coastal resilience of communities, particularly in the Asia-Pacific region, and that it would like to discuss this with the Australian government.
15. In response to Australia's request to clarify on the possible consequences for "GGGI will reduce the number of smaller projects when feasible," the Secretariat explained that this ambition will not affect any country program negatively. The Secretariat further informed that it aims to avoid earmarked projects smaller than USD 0.5 million, except for specific strategic opportunities due to high development costs for small earmarked project proposals. It added that smaller projects are developed at lower development cost with core resources through GGGI's internal PIN process.
16. The Republic of Korea requested elaboration on the difference in transaction costs between core and earmarked projects. Also, it emphasized the greater importance of quality, than quantity, of projects. The Secretariat explained that development of earmarked projects, large or small, take very considerable time and effort to prepare. Development of an earmarked project often takes 18-24 months from concept development to contract signing and can cost more than \$50K per project through multiple missions and proposal revisions. Furthermore, concurring that quality is more important than quantity, the Secretariat further noted that this is the reason for its focus on specific programmatic solutions where GGGI can bring transformation, replicate, and scale up. While recognizing that not all countries are able to sustain and finance large-scale green growth investment projects, the pre-feasibility analysis and due diligence work necessary to prepare investment projects regardless of their size is more or less the same, which calls for trying to focus on larger projects.
17. Mr. Hewage suggested that the 2020 Program be shared with national-level agencies to incorporate it into their green accounting processes. He further recommended to elaborate in the agro-forestry sector on how suitable plant species can promote food production and forestation. The Secretariat agreed that agroforestry is a useful tool for sustainable landscapes and forest restoration, and will be applied where appropriate.
18. To Norway's inquiry on GGGI's projects and activities contributing to intermediate outcome 3 (improved multidirectional knowledge sharing and learning and capacity building), the Secretariat responded that knowledge sharing and learning, capacity development, and social inclusion are cross-cutting issues in GGGI's programs. It further informed that most of GGGI policy and investment projects include these components in both design and implementation.
19. Members of the MPSC took note of GGGI's programs and programmatic trends in 2020.

Roadmap 2021-2025

20. Members commended the GGGI Secretariat for the timely delivery of the comprehensive [Roadmap 2021-2025](#) following the Strategy 2030 approval in October 2019, and for its efforts to create ownership by involving the entire organization in its design and implementation. Members also welcomed GGGI for taking a strategic approach to secure financial sustainability as outlined in the Roadmap.

21. Australia suggested greater consideration of COVID-19 in the Roadmap, and an inclusion of how GGGI is going to leverage the opportunities presented to support green growth. The Secretariat agrees. According to the Secretariat, the Roadmap is a living document and there is an annual review built in to review the key assumptions in a process aligned with the annual results reporting, where necessary adjustments can be made. The Republic of Korea also noted that GGGI needs to be prepared to equip Members with advisory policies aimed to facilitate green growth as a post-COVID-19 strategy.
22. Australia asked for further information on how the Risk Management Framework will be considered as part of the Roadmap processes. According to the Secretariat, the next immediate step of the Roadmap is the preparation of the 2020 transition stage, WPB 2021-2022, and new or revision of Country Planning Frameworks. It also noted that the rollout of RMF in all countries will strengthen the ongoing risk assessments.
23. Mr. Hewage recommended to use the Roadmap as a rolling plan, introducing appropriate changes from time to time. The Secretariat agrees. The Secretariat shared that a Change Management Plan (CMP) is also being prepared to guide the smooth and effective implementation of the Roadmap and its change management process. Furthermore, the Secretariat informed that the Roadmap will be reviewed in year 2023 and evaluated in 2025, which will inform the next five-year Roadmap for 2026-2020. Meanwhile, there will also be regular WPB project quarterly reviews, end of year results reporting, and project evaluation—which will provide feedback to improving project implementation and Strategy 2030 implementation.
24. To Australia's request for more clarity on the CMP, the Secretariat shared it will start in 2020 and focus on managing key change components and related challenges. Once the plan is launched in June, a task force and the Management Team will oversee the implementation and track/report the monthly delivery of the plan. The identified changes will not drastically reorient GGGI's business model, but it is expected to bring more efficiency and greater alignment with Strategy 2030, as well as systematic integration of the Impact Pathway Approach with our planning processes.
25. Norway suggested GGGI to consider external evaluation at some point. The Secretariat responded that while it is more practical to keep the mid-term review of the Roadmap in year 2023 internal, it will consider having an external evaluation in 2025 when we will have the end of the first five-year roadmap coinciding with the mid-term of Strategy 2030.
26. Members of the MPSC took note of GGGI's action plan and phased approach that GGGI Management will follow in implementing Strategy 2030.

/End



Eleventh Meeting of the MPSC (E-Consultations)
April 22-28, 2020

Questions/Comments Received and Responses

1. 2019 Results Report		
Country	Question	Answer
Australia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Commend GGGI for a clear, concise report, with good presentation of information. The use of selected examples and 'highlight boxes' are a great addition. 	Noted
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Commend GGGI for progress on tracking social inclusion and safeguards data, with the addition of Output 6. 	Noted
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We note the results show substantial leveraging of investment and green job creation, key elements needed for the COVID-19 response and recovery. We would welcome further analysis that frames the 2019 results in a way that demonstrates how GGGI's expertise and relationships in these key areas make GGGI well-positioned as a COVID-19 recovery partner. 	Please see this note: GGGI Responds to the COVID Crisis: Greening Stimulus & Recovery .
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Please find below more detailed comments/questions/suggestions (in order of page numbers): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (p.6) We are pleased to see capacity building activities collecting gender disaggregated data. We note the results show a significant gap remains. We would be grateful to know if GGGI is considering addressing this as a lesson learned. 	-
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (p.19, Table 2) Would it be possible to include all results against all indicators (eg. output 3.2)? Or is 	GGGI is preparing a report on lessons learned to be ready in early May to round off the 2019 results reporting exercise. One of the lessons learned is to address the gaps in results data collection for example relating to capacity building activities. A workshop and training evaluation form was developed and introduced in the second of half of 2019 for all participant at workshops and training events to complete from 2020 onwards. This will ensure that all relevant data on value adding of capacity building activities including gender disaggregated data will be collected and reported in 2020 and beyond
		Outcome indicator 3.2 was not reported in Table 2 because the collected data was incomplete since some projects had failed to answer the corresponding question.

	<p>there a reason that only a few have been selected?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ (p.19, Table 2) It seems there may be some missing data (eg. output 7.5)? ○ (p.19, Table 2) Regarding the targets not met (eg. output 4.1, output indicator 3.1) how will this be addressed? ○ (p.63-74/Annex 6 and 7) How many of the ongoing programs from 2017/2018 are delayed/overdue and is this impacting on other resourcing? It would be useful to have ‘project duration’ as part of the table to quickly assess the timing of program. 	<p>This could be attributed to the unfamiliarity with the new End of Year project questionnaire in GGGI Online. Against a total of 21 adopted policies and 23 green investments catalyzed, only 13 answered the question and reported benefitting from shared lessons and experiences from other countries.</p> <p>This data for output indicator 7.5 was not available. We will attempt to compile it and include it in Table2.</p> <p>Output indicator 4.1 in Table 2 which reported a 29% result against a target of 55% is due primarily to the lack of reporting. The mandatory completion of evaluation forms by capacity building activities participants from 2020 onwards will ensure full reporting in future.</p> <p>. The progress and status of the 2017 and 2018 green investment projects are summarized in section 6.2.1. GGGI has already exited these projects but is tracking their progress. There is no impact on the resourcing of other projects. The inclusion of the “project duration” as part of the table will be considered.</p>
Ariyaratne Hewage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Commend the GGGI for producing Results Report 2019 using Results Framework which is considered a recognized tool for planning and monitoring. • Recommend to share the data with relevant national institutions such as Department of Statistics and Central Bank in member countries. Such national institutions may be requested to incorporate the data appropriately and share with policy makers. • It may be useful to share this data with international media appropriately. 	<p>Noted.</p> <p>GGGI’s 2019 results are included in the 2019 Annual Report, a public document that will be ready in May and will be uploaded on GGGI’s website. Local and international institutions will have access to GGGI’s 2019 corporate results and achievements through the 2019 Annual Report. Country Offices can inform and promote GGGI’s 2019 results and achievements with local institutions through access to the Annual Report on GGGI’s website.</p> <p>GGGI will officially launch its 2019 Annual Report around May and do regular media messaging and communications on its 2019 results and achievements.</p> <p>GGGI also reports its data formally to the OECD DAC and the IATI donor transparency initiative.</p>
Australia (amended response for question on	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (p.19, Table 2) It seems there may be some missing data (e.g. output 7.5)? 	<p>With regards to output indicator 7.5 in Table 2, the 2019 total core budget allocated to vulnerable countries (UNOHRLLS definition) is 84% against a target of 60%. This data is now included in Table 2. Please see revised document HERE.</p>

April 22)		
Norway	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The reporting is more or less in line with CRF. To allow a rapid overview, it would be good if all outcome and output indicators were included in Table 2. 	Table 2 will be revised to reflect this.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For learning purposes, it would be useful to include in the report GGGI's assessment of the results achieved, e.g.: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Reasons for not attaining certain targets in the corporate results framework (CRF) ○ What contributed to the over fulfilment of other targets in the CRF ○ Reflections on the varying levels of project alignment for the different strategic outcomes, cf. figure 7. (Reasons for varying levels? Trends? Need for efforts to be done to increase level for e.g. SO5 (14%) and SO4 (24%)?) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A report on lessons learned on the 2019 results and reporting process is being prepared and will be ready in mid-May. It will incorporate the reasons for underperformance and exceeding of CRF targets. The analysis and findings will provide a loop-back to improve project design, resourcing, implementation, M&E and reporting. ○ The non-attainment of certain targets such as outcome indicator 2.1 - USD 600 million for green growth investments, has been explained in the report. In some cases, such as the proportion of capacity development activities and adopted policies/green investments that benefitted from sharing experiences and lessons from other countries were under reported because of Project Managers unfamiliarity with reporting under a new online results reporting system in GGGI Online. ○ The reasons contributing to results that exceeded targets will be covered in the Lessons Learned Report referred to above. However, GGGI's strong performance in output indicators 1.1, 2.1 and 3.1 for example reflect the high level of project activities in these areas and it is also obvious that their corresponding CRF targets were lower than the results achieved. The reasons the targets are low is because they relate to the trend where in the first year of the biennium, the results delivered are usually low since most projects are planned for a two-year duration and most results usually are delivered in the second year. ○ Projects implemented by GGGI are demand driven and reflect the priorities of Member and partner countries. This will reflect directly on the variances in the projects SO alignment. WPB 2019-2020 represents a new biennium and the implementation of a whole set of new projects in addition to ongoing projects which will vary their overall SO alignment compared to WPB 2017-2018. However, moving into Strategy 2030 implementation where for the first time GGGI has targets set for all SOs, the Roadmap implementation and monitoring is addressing this matter through: (I) SOs Targets set in the 5-year Roadmap; (ii) SOs estimates incorporated into the design and preparation of the Work Program & Budget (WPB) 2021-2022; (iii) Annual assessment of the key assumptions

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • .It would be interesting to have more detailed information about how certain indicators were measured: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Outcome indicator 1.2: “Extent to which green growth policies adopted by governments are likely to lead to transformational change” ○ Outcome indicator 1.3: “Extent to which green growth policies adopted by governments are aligned with the four elements of green growth” ○ Outcome indicator 3.1 - in particular the elements “use of knowledge gained” and “skills and knowledge relevance and gain” 	<p>including the SOs at the end of each year as part of the Annual Results Reporting and analysis; and (iv) Necessary adjustments in the assumptions and programming.</p> <p>The measurement of these indicators, as presented below, is fully explained in the guidelines at the back of the CRF 2019-2020.</p> <p>(Outcome indicator 1.2):</p> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px;"> <p>This indicator is measured using a 4-point scale balanced scorecard to assess the following elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Are the policy objectives aligned with one or more of the green growth elements, namely: economic growth, poverty reduction, environmental sustainability and social inclusion? ii. Were resources allocated for the policy’s implementation? iii. Are there clear arrangements established or mapped out for the policy’s implementation? iv. Were specific actions or investments identified and prioritized under the policy? </div> <p>These 4 questions are simply answered ‘yes’ for a score of 1 and ‘no’ for a score of 0 with a maximum score of 4. This indicator will be tracked with no set target. The target average score is 2+.</p> <p>(Outcome indicator 1.3):</p> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px;"> <p>This indicator is measured using a 4-point scale balanced scorecard to assess the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Will the policy support the generation of an economic activity or economic growth? ii. Does the policy have specific design measures that support poverty reduction? iii. Will the policy promote environmental sustainability or climate change mitigation? iv. Does the policy have design measures that support social inclusion including gender? </div> <p>These 4 questions are simply answered ‘yes’ for a score of 1 and ‘no’ for a score of 0 with a maximum score of 4. The target average core is 2+.</p>
--	---	--

		<p>(Outcome indicator 3.1):</p> <p>This indicator is measured using a 5-point scale balanced scorecard to assess the following questions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. In this project, did GGGI conduct capacity building activities related to green growth and climate change for government counterparts and local development agents (individuals)? ii. In this project, how many government counterparts and other participants, attended the capacity building event? How many were men and how many were women? iii. In this project, have those participants including government counterparts who attended the capacity building event demonstrated a gain in knowledge and skills from their training and learning? iv. In this project, did government counterparts and other participants use the knowledge gained to implement green growth or climate change policies, budgets or programs? v. In this project, did GGGI's implemented capacity building activities clearly align with the country specific objectives set out in the WPB 2017-2018? <p>These 5 questions are simply answered 'yes' for a score of 2, 'partially' for a score of 1 or 'no' for a score of 0 with a maximum score of 10. The target average score is 6+.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please find below more detailed comments (in order of page numbers): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ (p. 16, Chapter 5.2) Mismatch between text (SO4 = 14%) and figure (SO4 = 24%). Which one is correct? ○ (p. 37, Outcome indicator 3.1) OI 3.1 in the report is not identical with the indicator in WPB 2019-2020 (where Target 2019 is 6+ countries) ○ (p. 37, Figure 16) Capacity building activities aligned to WPB 2017/18. Why not WPB 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Correction - SO5 (not SO4) has the least alignment at 14% • Outcome 3.1: the target in the CRF 2019-2020 is a 5-point balanced scorecard assessment score of 6+ (not countries) out of a maximum score of 10. The average assessment score for 2019 capacity building activities was 5.5 which was below target. • (Figure 16): this is a typing error and has been edited to align to WPB 2019-2020

	<p>2019/2020? Typing error?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ (p. 41, Chapter 6.4) Typing error: Output 6.6 ought to be output 6.1 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This error has already been amended to output 6.1.
Rwanda	Pg10/We appreciate that GGGI delivery model is moving from Policy to Implementation where most of Rwanda’s needs are and given the fact that most of the key policies are in place	Thank you. This is well noted.
	Pg15/We commend the perfect alignment of GGGI’s Strategic Outcomes and the SDGs which very much speaks to Rwanda’s Green Growth and Climate Resilience Strategy and Rwanda’s NDCs	Thank you. This is well noted.
	Pg25/We commend GGGI’s consistency and clearly documenting what is done to ensure that green growth is at the center of development in member countries and we commend tremendous achievements in terms cumulative green investments mobilized from 2015-2019	Thank you. This is well noted.
	pg66/ Horizon Group, Cactus Park Development – Green City Pilot: how did GGGI support in mobilizing USD 60 million, was this funding secured by Horizon? If yes, where was it invested?	<p>GGGI supported and financed Horizon Group to develop the building typologies for the Horizon Cactus Park as well as the preliminary vision and parameters that sets up the development of the 620 hectares Green City Pilot (now referred to as “Green City Kigali”).</p> <p>This is a ‘flyer’ (LINK) for a construction conference in May 2019 showing how the Cactus Park development, to be built by Horizon – is still on the cards; as part of the bigger Kinyinya Hill green city development – feasibilities currently being funded for the wider geography by KfW.</p> <p>The work done in 2016 created a viable bankable model for a 410 dwelling housing estate and Horizon gave GGGI a letter (see attachment below) indicating that they would seek \$60m investment based on GGGI’s support.</p> <p>LINK to Horizon Letter</p>
	pg67/We will be pleased to see GGGI support the Government to ensure that the 4 projects concept notes developed during the GCF Readiness and Preparatory	This is well noted.

	Support to implement Green City Development Project in Rwanda's Secondary Cities be fully developed and support in mobilizing the required funds to implement such projects in the 3 secondary cities. This would ensure sustainability of both GGGI policy support and bring in green investments that will be catalyzed on by the Government in other secondary cities.	
Norway	<p>We have one follow-up question related to the 2019 Results Report and the Intermediate Outcome indicator 3.1. In the CRF consulted, IO indicator 3.1 reads: "Number of partner countries with capacity to develop and implement green growth policies and investments that are directly strengthened through GGGI capacity development activities (to be assessed based on a random sample of 10 activities using a 5-point scale balanced scorecard with a maximum score of 10)."</p> <p>Target 2019 (and 2020): 6+ countries.</p> <p>This is from the CRF in WPB 2019-2020 (A/2018/10 – C/2018/10) - but that is maybe not the last revised version of the CRF?</p>	<p>(Outcome indicator 3.1 under IO3): The description in the CRF 2019-2020 approved by Council is below:</p> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px;"> <p>3.1 Extent to which GGGI's capacity development activities have directly strengthened partner countries capacity to develop and implement green growth policies and investments. To be assessed on a 5-point scale balanced scorecard with a maximum score of 10.</p> <p>Target (2019): 6+</p> <p>Target (2020): 6+</p> </div>
Korea	Regarding the alignment of GGGI's projects to the six SOs, could you provide to members with the outcomes and notable successes in accordance with SOs in order to get a clearer picture? For example, each member may take advantage of the information related to SO2(Creation of green jobs). How many jobs were created where can be important evidence of GGGI in action.	<p>Through Strategy 2030 implementation, GGGI has for the first time set targets for all SOs, GGGI developed and published six the Strategic Outcomes (SOs Guideline at the end of 2019 which outlines the concepts, approaches and methodologies for measuring expected SO ex-ante impacts of projects and country level contribution/attribution including future impact targets.</p> <p>The mainstreaming of SOs estimations and assessments in our programming starting from 2020 through the estimation and measurement of SO impacts is work in progress and will be better known and reported from WPB 2021-2022 onwards. The 2019 results focused on the alignment with SOs, while future reports will be making the assessments of the progress against the targets. This is being addressed in the Roadmap implementation and monitoring through: (I) SOs Targets set in the 5-year Roadmap; (ii) SOs estimates incorporated into the design and preparation of the Work Program & Budget (WPB) 2021-2022; (iii) Annual assessment of the key assumptions including the SOs at the end of each year as part of the Annual Results</p>

	Reporting and analysis; and (iv) Necessary adjustments in the assumptions and programming.
<p>The report refers to "administrative burden" in the page 13 deriving from the increasing number of smaller projects. We assume that this burden has something to do with the reason why GGGI plans to avoid projects with a budget less than \$0.5M in the Roadmap. Thanks to Q & A btw Australia and GGGI we understand that the organization will continue smaller projects with core resources. Could you elaborate on the difference in the transaction costs btw core and earmarked projects. Also, we believe quality is more important than quantity and hope GGGI will focus more on the quality of projects.</p>	<p>(GGPI - Jenny/Gerry to respond to this)</p> <p>GGGI bears in mind its value added in project development and delivery. We also concur that quality is important. That's why we focus on specific programmatic solutions where GGGI is able to create transformation, replicate and scale up. Small projects (say \$70,000 when necessary and strategic) that are core funded will go through the PIN process, which is our internal review mechanism. However, the same project if it is earmarked funded, will require person-days much higher due to the requirements and efforts communicating with donors, preparing long applications for concept and later on proposal stage, etc. The time and efforts involved is often not far from what is needed for a \$0.5m project. More often, small earmarked projects tend to result into co-financing with core.</p> <p>While recognizing that not all countries are able to sustain and finance large-scale green growth investment projects, the pre-feasibility analysis and due diligence work necessary to prepare investment projects regardless of their size is more or less the same, which calls for trying to focus on larger projects.</p>
<p>We've heard from KOICA that there are two ongoing projects with GGGI, one in the Philippines and the other in Lao PDR respectively. While we can identify the latter as the project 48 in the Annex 3, there is no information on the project in the Philippines. Please share with us the status of the project in Mimaropa, the Philippines.</p>	<p>The project in the Philippines is titled "<i>Climate Resilient and Inclusive Green Growth for Poor Rural Communities: Accelerating Implementation in the Agriculture Value Chain in Oriental Mindoro (Mimaropa, Philippines)</i>". The project is designed to achieve three outcomes as following: 1) <i>Greater climate resilience of farmers, agribusinesses, and vulnerable local communities achieved through the implementation of evidence-based climate policies in Oriental Mindoro;</i> 2) <i>Design, financing, and operationalization of micro-enterprises and a Provincial Agricultural Center (PAC) in Oriental Mindoro;</i> and 3) <i>Improved capacity of government and non-government stakeholders to implement climate resilient, inclusive and green agriculture value chain projects in Oriental Mindoro.</i> GGGI has submitted a revised detailed implementation plan to KOICA in November 2019 after a series of due diligence field visits and analytical studies, and it is currently being reviewed by KOICA's technical review committee. Although the final review process in</p>

		KOICA has been delayed due to COVID-19, volcano, and other related matters, the current plan between the two organizations is to complete the review and sign a grant agreement in mid-May, and implement the project subsequently.
	Some minor comments on the editing. It is observed that there are some syntax errors in sentences such as para 1 in the page 13: "... outlined the in Refreshed Strategic Plan..." And we'd like to get Figure 2 with higher resolution since it schematize very well GGGI's operation procedures.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thank you, the syntax error in para 1 in page 13 has been corrected. • Please see a higher resolution PDF file for Figure 2 HERE. • Furthermore, please see revised 2019 Results Report, incorporating MPSC comments

2. Overview of 2020 Programs		
Country	Question	Answer
Australia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Commend GGGI for a concise report with good presentation, particularly of information at Annex 1. The clear presentation and breakdown of country and region data is very useful. If at all possible, would be very useful to have the total program funding broken down into core/earmarked, public/private mobilized in Annex 1. 	Thanks for the suggestion and please see the revised Annex 1 .
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Table 3 on page 6, provides useful information on COVID-19 impact on investments. Is there a similar table that is tracking the impact of COVID-19 across GGGI's other policy/project work in 2020? 	GGGI country teams are now investigating possible impact by covid-19 on policy/project work. It is a little early to make a judgement, because many developing countries still express strong willingness to continue. We will provide the information on risk assessment and responding actions at next MPSC.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We would welcome inclusion, perhaps by way of 'hooks', noting how investments may pivot to align with or leverage a COVID-19 economic response. We appreciate that thinking on this may still be developing as COVID-19 impacts unfold. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - GGGI's nimbleness, expertise and strong links with partner governments should position GGGI well as a partner in a COVID-19 economic response and to ensure this response builds resilience in partner economies. 	Please see this note: GGGI Responds to the COVID Crisis: Greening Stimulus & Recovery .

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please find below more detailed comments/questions/suggestions (in order of page numbers): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ (p.2, para 5) States the target for 2020 is to achieve 20 green growth policies adopted by governments. This seems to be the same target as 2019? And in 2019 was surpassed (21). Would GGGI look to increase this in 2020? ○ (p.2, para 5) Notes 34 policies will be adopted and 37 will support increased NDC ambition, totaling 61, however the total remains 43 for 2020, are the remaining 18 due to be completed in 2021? ○ (3, para 8 and Figure 2) We note the current low number of Coastal Resilience programs, and that this programmatic solution would have particular relevance to the Pacific. Grateful for further information on GGGI's approach in this area. 	<p>-</p> <p>20 policies adoption is the same target with that in 2019 in line with our biennium WPB 2019-2020. In many cases, policy adoption depends on counterpart governments' political calendar, in spite of GGGI's efforts. However, GGGI is doing its best to achieve as many as possible. We will proactively consider increasing the ambition in next biennium, based on the results during 2019-2020.</p> <p>We are sorry that number of 34 is a typo. It should be 43. So, 43 policies adoption we expect and 37 out of 43 are related to increase NDC ambition. All policy works are expected to complete by the end of 2020.</p> <p>GGGI would welcome to discuss with the Australian government the opportunity to develop a transformational initiative on community-based mangrove management and restoration in the Pacific region.</p> <p>Mangroves and other coastal ecosystems act as a natural defense to reduce the risks from flooding, erosion, and natural disasters; as well as providing ecosystem services, such as fisheries, that are vital for local communities. Mangrove forests play a vital role in trapping sediments and stabilizing coastlands and protecting coral reefs. The world's mangroves are estimated to provide ecosystem services billions of USD per year. Protection and restoration of mangroves in the Asia-Pacific region is fundamental for long-term resilience of coastal communities in vulnerable locations around the world. Of importance are the mangroves in Asia-Pacific. GGGI aims to develop a mangrove protection and restoration program to build on coastal resilience of communities, particularly in the Asia-Pacific region.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Papua New Guinea is of global significance with the world's fourth largest area of mangrove ecosystems, with high species diversity and importance for coastal communities.
--	---	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fiji's, and other small Pacific Island mangroves, are essential for the countries long-term resilience to climate change, and important for fisheries, tourism, and disaster risk reduction.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (p.6, para 18) We would be grateful for more information around the risk adjustment calculations. 	<p>The risk adjustment applied is based on the project risk assessment for 2020 delivery as mentioned in paragraph 18. Following details are applied to arrive at the total figure of US\$527.3 million.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> GGGI's deal teams' assessments of the likelihood of reaching the initial green investment commitments are divided into three categories, namely high, medium, and low. A reduction of either 10%, 50%, or 75% in the size of individual investment is made in line with the probability assessment of the individual project (low, medium, high). Of the 42 projects, 10 projects are in the low risk category, 23 projects in the medium, and 9 high risk projects.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (p.7, para 20) We would be grateful for further details around the following sentence and which country programs this may affect 'GGGI will reduce the number of smaller projects when feasible'. 	<p>Development costs are high for small earmarked project proposals and we aim to avoid small projects and target projects with a minimum size of \$0.5M, except for specific strategic opportunities.</p> <p>Smaller projects can be developed at lower development costs with core resources through the GGGI internal PIN process.</p> <p>We do not believe this ambition will affect any country program negatively.</p>
Ariyaratne Hewage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> GGGI 2020 Program is comprehensive and it may be useful to share such programs with relevant national level agencies such as Ministry of Finance, CIMA etc. and request them to incorporate it to the green accounting processes. Recommend to elaborate agro-forestry with suitable plant species to promote food production and forestation. 	<p>Well noted.</p> <p>Agroforestry is a useful tool for sustainable landscapes and as part of forest landscape restoration and will be applied where appropriate.</p>
Australia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Commend GGGI for a concise report with good presentation, particularly of information at Annex 1. The clear presentation and breakdown of country and region data is very useful. If at all possible, would be 	<p>Thanks for the suggestion and please see the revised Annex 1.</p>

	<p>very useful to have the total program funding broken down into core/earmarked, public/private mobilized in Annex 1.</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Table 3 on page 6, provides useful information on COVID-19 impact on investments. Is there a similar table that is tracking the impact of COVID-19 across GGGIs other policy/project work in 2020? 	<p>GGGI country teams are now investigating possible impact by covid-19 on policy/project work. It is a little early to make a judgement, because many developing countries still express strong willingness to continue. We will provide the information on risk assessment and responding actions at next MPSC.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We would welcome inclusion, perhaps by way of ‘hooks’, noting how investments may pivot to align with or leverage a COVID-19 economic response. We appreciate that thinking on this may still be developing as COVID-19 impacts unfold. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> GGGI’s nimbleness, expertise and strong links with partner governments should position GGGI well as a partner in a COVID-19 economic response and to ensure this response builds resilience in partner economies. 	<p>Please see this note: GGGI Responds to the COVID Crisis: Greening Stimulus & Recovery.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Please find below more detailed comments/questions/suggestions (in order of page numbers): 	<p>-</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (p.2, para 5) States the target for 2020 is to achieve 20 green growth policies adopted by governments. This seems to be the same target as 2019? And in 2019 was surpassed (21). Would GGGI look to increase this in 2020? 	<p>20 policies adoption is the same target with that in 2019 in line with our biennium WPB 2019-2020. In many cases, policy adoption depends on counterpart governments’ political calendar, in spite of GGGI’s efforts. However, GGGI is doing its best to achieve as many as possible. We will proactively consider increasing the ambition in next biennium, based on the results during 2019-2020.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (p.2, para 5) Notes 34 policies will be adopted and 37 will support increased NDC ambition, totaling 61, however the total remains 43 for 2020, are the remaining 18 due to be completed in 2021? 	<p>We are sorry that number of 34 is a typo. It should be 43. So, 43 policies adoption we expect and 37 out of 43 are related to increase NDC ambition. All policy works are expected to complete by the end of 2020.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (3, para 8 and Figure 2) We note the current low number of Coastal Resilience programs, and that this programmatic solution would have particular relevance to the Pacific. Grateful for further information on GGGI’s approach in this 	<p>GGGI would welcome to discuss with the Australian government the opportunity to develop a transformational initiative on community-based mangrove management and restoration in the Pacific region.</p> <p>Mangroves and other coastal ecosystems act as a natural defense to reduce the risks</p>

	<p>area.</p>	<p>from flooding, erosion, and natural disasters; as well as providing ecosystem services, such as fisheries, that are vital for local communities. Mangrove forests play a vital role in trapping sediments and stabilizing coastlands and protecting coral reefs. The world’s mangroves are estimated to provide ecosystem services billions of USD per year. Protection and restoration of mangroves in the Asia-Pacific region is fundamental for long-term resilience of coastal communities in vulnerable locations around the world. Of importance are the mangroves in Asia-Pacific. GGGI aims to develop a mangrove protection and restoration program to build on coastal resilience of communities, particularly in the Asia-Pacific region.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Papua New Guinea is of global significance with the world’s fourth largest area of mangrove ecosystems, with high species diversity and importance for coastal communities. • Fiji’s, and other small Pacific Island mangroves, are essential for the countries long-term resilience to climate change, and important for fisheries, tourism, and disaster risk reduction.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ (p.6, para 18) We would be grateful for more information around the risk adjustment calculations. 	<p>The risk adjustment applied is based on the project risk assessment for 2020 delivery as mentioned in paragraph 18. Following details are applied to arrive at the total figure of US\$527.3 million.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GGGI’s deal teams’ assessments of the likelihood of reaching the initial green investment commitments are divided into three categories, namely high, medium, and low. • A reduction of either 10%, 50%, or 75% in the size of individual investment is made in line with the probability assessment of the individual project (low, medium, high). • Of the 42 projects, 10 projects are in the low risk category, 23 projects in the medium, and 9 high risk projects.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ (p.7, para 20) We would be grateful for further details around the following sentence and which country programs this may affect ‘GGGI will reduce the number of smaller projects when feasible’. 	<p>Development costs are high for small earmarked project proposals and we aim to avoid small projects and target projects with a minimum size of \$0.5M, except for specific strategic opportunities.</p> <p>Smaller projects can be developed at lower development costs with core resources through the GGGI internal PIN process.</p> <p>We do not believe this ambition will affect any country program negatively.</p>

Norway	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Commend GGGI's prioritization of work related to the NDCs • This overview presents projects and activities contributing to intermediate outcomes 1 and 2. We would be interested in activities related to intermediate outcome 3, including outputs 4 and 5, as well. (E.g. output indicator 4.1 had a weaker 2019 result (29%) than targeted (55%), so interesting to see what is being done to increase it in 2020 – although Secretariat's response to Australia indicates that the weak result might essentially be a reporting issue) • There are five ongoing projects under Sustainable Forests, cf. table 2. This domain is of particular interest for Norway. Are there more projects in the pipeline under this programmatic solution, with funding from other GGGI members or in other forest countries? 	<p>Well noted</p> <p>Knowledge-sharing and learning, capacity development and social inclusion are cross-cutting issues in GGGI programs. Most of GGGI policy and investment projects include capacity development and knowledge-sharing & learning as key components. Gender, poverty reduction and social inclusion are also considered as important components to address in relevant projects design and implementation.</p> <p>There are eight existing sustainable landscape projects, and six in the pipeline, including the extension to Norwegian funded Green Growth program (GGP3) in Indonesia and the Guyana REDD+ Investment fund (Norway funded). Sustainable landscape also includes projects in climate resilient agriculture, investment solutions and renewable energy which are not included in the above. Current projects also include supporting the Korean Government to design a Trust Fund for Environmental Peacebuilding; a global project with Conservation International on Forest Financing which may include Ethiopia, Colombia and Vietnam (core countries to be decided). Key future projects include a KOICA funded program in Ethiopia to look at restoring upland watersheds; a USA funded project in India to look at fiscal incentives for upland watershed protection and restoration.</p>
Korea	<p>We appreciate that in 2020 GGGI is set to carry out projects related to Climate Action as we prepared for the Paris Agreement implementation. Considering that COVID-19 will have a significant impact on all aspects of GGGI's work (development of progress, travel, delivery, and implementation to mention a few), we would like to know if there is a projected conservative scenario/program/budget. Furthermore, we hope that GGGI can engage in some works related to COVID-19 recovery that "offers an opportunity to accelerate the green transformation, through greening the COVID19 Recovery Packages."</p>	<p>GGGI is currently assessing possible risks due to Covid-19 project by project. We will complete the assessment soon and come up with responding actions. Addressing the significant impact GGG member countries are facing, we have developed several concept notes on greening post Covid-19 recovery, particularly for SIDSs and African LDCs. They are about greening tourism in the Pacific and restoring forest and build climate resilient agriculture system in Africa.</p>

3. Roadmap 2021-2025		
Country	Question	Answer
Australia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Commend the GGGI for the timely delivery of the Roadmap following the Strategy 2030 approval in October 2019. 	-
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In recognizing the real potential for COVID-19 and COVID-19 economic response to impact a significant part of the roadmap period, we would welcome greater consideration of this in the Roadmap. We would also welcome inclusion of how GGGI is going to leverage the opportunities presented to support green growth, including how this will likely shape a significant part of the 2020 ‘transition’ phase for GGGI. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ In suggesting the above, we note the dynamic nature of COVID-19 and the difficulty and risk of predicting its full impacts. At this stage, ‘consideration’ could be the placement of strategic hooks where the roadmap may benefit from further thinking rather than definitive statements on what GGGI will do. 	<p>Agreed and aligned on impact as well as the opportunities to leverage. In line with that, the first short-term implementation planning of the Roadmap is the Work Program & Budget (WPB2021-22) being prepared with countries now. One key component of the planning directions for GGGI is to support countries in the greening of COVID-19 Recovery package.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • COVID-19 has also demonstrated the importance of strong risk management. We would welcome further information on how the Risk Management Framework will be considered as part of the Roadmap processes. 	<p>The guiding principle in the Roadmap is that it’s a living document. In pre COVID-19 preparation of the Roadmap, we’ve built-in an annual review of the key assumptions in a process aligned with the annual results reporting to make the necessary adjustments.</p> <p>The year 2020 is the preparation phase for the implementation of the Roadmap. As such, given the COVID-19 context, such reviews of key assumptions will need to happen in a more dynamic and regular way to use this transition phase for GGGI to bring in the thinking around how best to support Members.</p> <p>Agreed, the pandemic impacts cut across various parts of GGGI Risk Management Framework (RMF). The Roadmap’s next immediate step is the 2020 preparation or transition phase that will translate into WPB 2021-2022, Country Planning Frameworks being revised, and new ones developed, projects documents prepared for donors etc.</p> <p>Countries have been undertaking the reviews of the risk managements for the ongoing projects. For projects prepared pre-COVID 19 and approved by donors but not yet implemented, GGGI plans to undertake a review to ensure that the design changes/ adjustments are made for the achievements of the commitments to donors and beneficiaries.</p> <p>The roll-out of the RMF in all countries will strengthen the ongoing risk assessment done, so that all the country planning processes will continue implementing with risk</p>

		management perspective integrated. The regular progress review of Roadmap implementation will feed into the global RMF reviews that take place twice a year.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please find below more detailed comments/questions/suggestions (in order of page numbers): 	-
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ (p.20, Figure 6b) A very useful visual representation of country programming and their alignment with the new Global Operational Priorities and Programmatic Solutions. 	-
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ We would be grateful for clarity on the Corporate Results Framework (CRF) - it notes on p.13, para 5.4 the CRF 2021-2025 will be tabled for Council approval in October 2020, however in p.23, para 13 it states the CRF 2021-2025 will be shared with Council for information. 	<p>The CRF is an operational document, to track the progress based on the agreed targets. The plan is to have the new CRF 2021-2025 presented at the Council for information and endorsement.</p> <p>We will make the correction in the text to align with that understanding.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ (p.29, para 15 and 16) Change Management Plan and Communication Plan – both are considered critical in making the transition a success however it notes that these plans will be reviewed ‘from time to time’. It suggests these plans are not considered part of the systematic Roadmap processes. We would be grateful for further clarity. 	<p>We are currently developing comprehensive Change Management Plan to enable the smooth and effective implementation of the Roadmap 2021-2025. It will start in 2020 and focus on managing key change components and its related challenges . Once the plan is launched in June, we will have the taskforce team and the Management team to overview the implementation and track and report monthly delivery of the plan. The changes identified are not intended to drastically reorient GGGI’s business model. As the Organization has invested significant effort in change management initiatives over the past few years, the identified changes will bring in more efficiency, greater alignment with Strategy 2030, and systematic integration of the Impact Pathway Approach into our planning processes.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ (p.31, table on Resource Partners) Another very useful visual representation of the current and anticipated resource partners. 	-
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ (p.31, para 3) Regarding the new requirement for Country Programs to focus on funding opportunities valued at or above USD 500,000. We understand from the documentation that this step has been taken as a way to address the 	<p>Same answer as above: Transaction costs are high for small earmarked project proposals and we aim to avoid small projects and target projects with a minimum size of \$0.5M, except for specific strategic opportunities.</p> <p>Smaller projects can be developed at lower transaction costs with core resources</p>

	<p>lesson learned during 2019 - where the number of smaller projects took significant amounts of resourcing. We would welcome further analysis on how this will impact country programs, for example in the in Pacific.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ We would welcome more information on how GGGI anticipates this decision will impact on opportunities in the Pacific going forward, compared to 2019. ▪ Further, if GGGI exits this space, are there other organizations GGGI could empower/work with to fill this gap? 	<p>through the GGGI internal PIN process.</p> <p>We do not believe this will affect any country program negatively.</p>
Norway	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Commend the effort to create ownership of the Roadmap by involving the entire organization in its design and implementation 	Thank you, noted.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good to have reporting on program level. But it does not seem possible to shift entirely from project to program end-of-year reporting as donors would need reporting concerning earmarked funded projects? 	GGGI's corporate level results reporting against the CRF will be done at the country level. The country program level reporting will simply be an aggregation of country projects results. This will not preclude the reporting of earmarked funded projects at the project level. GGGI will continue to prepare project-specific reports for individual donors in line with contract agreements.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Workstreams 7 and 8 include internal mid-term review/evaluation of the Roadmap and the Strategy respectively. Might be useful to consider external evaluation at some point 	<p>The mid-term review of the Roadmap in year 2023 is more practical to keep it internal.</p> <p>In year 2025 we will have the end of the first 5-year Roadmap that will coincide with the mid-term of Strategy 2030. We take note of considering and external evaluation of the end of Roadmap / mid-term of the Strategy 2030.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For clarification: In figure 6b, under GOP 3, Programmatic Solutions 2021-2025 no 4 (Sustainable Forests), the country names of Indonesia and Colombia are in red, which represents future work. Isn't there already ongoing work in these countries under the category of Sustainable Forests? 	Yes, the table has been updated after it was submitted to MPSC and it now includes Indonesia and Colombia in black indicating that there are ongoing work under the category of Sustainable Forests.
Korea	<p>We are happy that GGGI is taking a strategic approach to secure financial sustainability as seen in the page 31. We really hope GGGI achieve the goals</p>	Thank you, this is well noted.

	accordingly and share with the member countries of the progress on a regular basis.	
	Since a vast amount of resources is likely to be spent as part of the COVID-19 recovery, GGGI needs to be prepared to arm the member countries with advisory policies aimed at facilitating green growth as a post-COVID-19 strategy.. In paticular, we would like GGGI to focus on the advantageous that green approach can bring vis-a-vis brown approach.	



Global Green Growth Institute

Twelfth Meeting of the Management and Program Sub-Committee

July 1-9, 2020 | E-Consultations and Virtual Meeting

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

Agenda 1. Opening of the Meeting and Adoption of the Agenda

1. The Twelfth Meeting of the Management and Program Sub-Committee (MPSC12) was attended by MPSC Members of Australia, Paraguay, Republic of Korea (ROK), Rwanda and Mr. Ariyaratne Hewage (Non-State Actor Member of the Council), as well as observers from Angola, Costa Rica, Denmark, Fiji, Indonesia, Norway, and Sri Lanka.
2. The meeting was chaired by Australia, represented by Mr. Peter Elder, Director, Economic Growth and Sustainability Division, Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade.
3. Annex 1 provides the list of participants, and Annex 2 provides the list of sessional documents.
4. The MPSC adopted the Agenda [[MPSC/2020/AG/2](#)], circulated by the Secretariat on May 18, 2020.

Agenda 2. Summary of E-Consultations

5. Prior to the virtual meeting of MPSC12, Members and observers held e-consultations on July 1-7, 2020 to discuss the following agenda items: Work Program and Budget 2021-2022 (Part 1), Membership, Accession, and Country Programming, Findings and Lessons from Recent Evaluations, Accountability and Safeguards Systems, and Update on Outreach to North Korea. The summary of the e-consultations is attached as Annex 3 and the full list of questions, comments and responses is attached as Annex 4.
6. Delegates commended the Secretariat for the innovative and efficient e-consultation process, and suggested the e-consultations could be utilized for future meetings even when in-person meetings can be convened again. Also, delegates expressed appreciation for the Secretariat's detailed responses to Members' comments and questions.
7. Regarding GGGI's process of phasing out from some countries, Australia expressed its wish to receive regular communication from the Secretariat. Also, Australia said that it looks forward to receiving the draft Gender Strategy and providing support to this process.

8. The ROK asked the Secretariat on the source of GGGI's budget for its activities concerning the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK). The Secretariat explained that it initially received USD 100,000 from SK Holdings (a private sector company in Korea) and will receive up to an additional USD 240,000 grant from a proposal it submitted to UniKorea Foundation. The spending to date has been covered by the SK Holdings' donation.
9. Members of the MPSC took note of the summary of the e-consultations attached as Annex 3 and the full list of questions, comments and responses attached as Annex 4. Members also took note of GGGI's evaluation on the Mongolia country program and green investment services and the Institute's commitment to transparency and accountability; updates on GGGI's membership, accession, and country programming; GGGI's progress for poverty, gender, and social inclusion, Rules on Prevention of Sexual Exploitation, Abuse, and Harassment, its staff engagement and HR due diligence measures, its ILO Administrative Tribunal, and the mechanisms to generate mid-year Performance Results Reports; and GGGI's activities with North Korea.

Agenda 3. Update on 2020 Operational Budget

10. The Secretariat presented an update on GGGI's Operational Budget in 2020 [[MPSC/2020/22/REV](#)] including the impact of reduction of core funding and the measures being planned by the Secretariat's management. The Secretariat informed that in 2020, the estimated income is USD 38.5 million, and expenditures are USD 45.25 million, which will result in an operating deficit of USD 6.75 million. The Secretariat shared that it is considering a number of additional cost-cutting measures, which would reduce the deficit to approximately USD 5.4 million. The Secretariat added that if there is a deficit of USD 5.4 million in 2020, the balance of reserves at the end of the year would amount to USD 13.2 million, which would decrease the working capital days to 106 days against an international benchmark of 90-180 days. Ahead of further discussions, delegates took note of the message from the United Kingdom (UK) to the GGGI Council received on July 7, 2020, that despite the likely fall in UK's ODA resources, the UK remains keenly committed to climate change issues and the work of GGGI and that it will take a decision concerning future core funding to GGGI in 2021.
11. The ROK asked the total amount of expenditures as of the end of June. The Secretariat informed that it is in the process of closing its books for June, and the current estimated expenditures for 2020 are approximately USD 45 million.
12. Australia requested clarification on the implications of replacing of core funding in the Pacific with programmatic earmarked funding from New Zealand. The Secretariat explained that programmatic earmarked funding is a new model (for GGGI) where the donor designates a region or sector for utilizing the funds, but without requesting a detailed budget as in a regular bilateral earmarked project. For example, New Zealand has agreed to provide NZD 4.7 million (approximately USD 3.2 million) as programmatic earmarked for low carbon development planning for countries in the Pacific. In discussion between Pacific countries, GGGI and New Zealand, this funding can be used for activities in the Work Program and Budget (WPB) that would otherwise have been funded by core (but the total amount is higher, meaning some of the New Zealand funding replaces core, while the remainder increases the total funding for the region). The Secretariat said that this new

funding model of programmatic earmarked can be attractive for both GGGI and potential donors (it is in discussion with Denmark, for example), as it allows closer alignment of funding with donor priorities and may increase the amount of funding available for GGGI's activities.

13. Members of the MPSC expressed their compliments to the Secretariat for considering various measures to save costs in these exceptional times of the COVID-19 pandemic. Members highlighted the importance of GGGI's sustainability and maintaining the reserves at a healthy level. If a salary reduction is to be implemented, delegates highlighted the importance of close consultations with its staff. The Secretariat responded that it is currently in consultations with the Staff Council, and details of the proposed measures are yet to be finalized. To delegates' inquiry on alternative measures to salary reduction, the Secretariat informed that it also has a list of non-salary measures prepared including demonetizing annual leave, and that it has some leeway in considering the views of staff and following guidance from the MPSC.
14. Delegates noted that, acknowledging the gravity and uniqueness of the recommendations and proposal for salary reduction measures, and the importance of maintaining GGGI reserves, they see reasonable to seek Council approval for the salary reduction measure.
15. Members of the MPSC took note of the updates of GGGI's 2020 Operational Budget as well as the estimation of the likely impact of COVID-19 on GGGI's financial performance for 2020 and proposed measures, and recommends the Management Team to proceed with the execution of non-salary related measures to address the unexpected 2020 core funding shortfall and to put before the Council the proposed salary reduction measures for approval.

Agenda 4. Work Program and Budget 2021-2022 (Part 2)

16. The Secretariat presented an overview of the Draft WPB 2021-2022 [[MPSC/2020/16](#)]. The Secretariat informed MPSC Members that it will be revising its projected resource allocations and business plans to reflect the changing budget figures, and the final draft will be presented to the Council for approval in October. The Secretariat also presented its new draft Corporate Results Framework (CRF) for 2021-2025, which reflects Strategy 2030 implementation and will measure all output, outcome and impact level results.
17. The Republic of Korea asked whether a "minus scenario" will be included in the WPB 2021-2022, and the Secretariat affirmed that it will be preparing a minus scenario in the next draft of the WPB.
18. Norway asked whether intermediary outcomes will be integrated into the CRF. The Secretariat affirmed that intermediate outcomes are already included in the CRF, and added that its future reporting will be at the country level focusing on intermediate outcomes and strategic outcomes.
19. Rwanda inquired whether urban resilience was considered as a separate programmatic solution. The Secretariat agreed that urban resilience is very important and Strategy 2030's Global Operational Priority 4, 'Making cities and communities sustainable, livable, and resilient through supporting green jobs, services, and green infrastructure' is a clear

orientation of GGGI's priority to build urban resilience through its operations. GGGI's Green Cities global program has urban resilience as a cross-cutting goal, inclusive of policy work and green investment interventions. Rwanda acknowledged that urban resilience is currently embedded in the urban programmatic solutions.

20. Members of the MPSC commended the Secretariat's work on the Draft WPB 2021-2022, and recommend the Secretariat to consider the discussions in MPSC12 to go forward in its preparation of the WPB 2021-2022 for presentation to the Council, along with the CRF 2021-2025.

Agenda 5. Update on Risk Management

21. The Secretariat presented an update on GGGI's Risk Management Framework (RMF) [[MPSC/2020/24](#)], which is designed to systematically identify the high and significant risks and to put in place controls for managing those risks so as to minimize their occurrence or minimize their impact on the ongoing operations of GGGI should they occur. In addition, Members were updated on the roll-out of the RMF to country and regional offices [[MPSC/2020/23](#)]. The current highest-level risk is the impact of COVID-19 on programmatic implementation, the finances of GGGI, and the health and well-being of staff. Management considers that the mitigation measure put in place to address the impact of COVID-19 are adequate to manage the on-going risk but will actively monitor the risk on a continual basis.
22. Australia thanked the Secretariat for its work on the RMF and its rollout to all country and regional offices.
23. Members of the MPSC took note of the key updates on risk management.

Agenda 6. Update on Upcoming Governance Organ Elections

24. The Secretariat gave an update on the election of Council Members for the term of 2021-2022, noting that there will be eight vacancies at the end of year 2020: three from contributing and five from participating members. The Secretariat also provided an update on the election of the two Vice Presidents of the Assembly and Vice Chairs of the Council for the term of 2021-2022, of which one Vice President/Vice Chair shall be a Contributing Member and one Vice President/Vice Chair shall be a Participating Member in accordance with the Rules of Procedures of the Assembly and the Council [[MPSC/2020/25](#)].
25. The Secretariat said that it will hold consultations with Members in August and September, and the elections of Council Members and Vice President/Vice Chairs will take place at the Ninth Session of the Assembly and Thirteenth Session of the Council (Joint Session) on October 28, 2020. Once the Council is elected, the Secretariat will invite Members of the Council to serve on the MPSC, which will be formed before the end of December.
26. The MPSC took note of the details on the upcoming elections of governance organs.

Agenda 7. Assembly and Council Joint Sessions

27. The Secretariat proposed an alternative format of the Ninth Session of the Assembly and Thirteenth Session of the Council (Joint Session) [[MPSC/2020/26](#)], which would be a combination of e-consultations and a hybrid virtual and in-person meeting (“hybrid meeting”), similar to the MPSC12. The e-consultations will take place on October 12-23, 2020 for two weeks, and the hybrid meeting will take place on October 28, 2020.
28. Members of the MPSC recommended that the Assembly and Council Joint Session take place as a combination of e-consultations on October 12-23, 2020 and a hybrid meeting on October 28, 2020.

Agenda 8. Any Other Business

Reappointment of the Director-General

29. The Chair informed Members that the President of the Assembly and Chair of the Council Mr. Ban Ki-moon asked the MPSC to discuss and consider the reappointment of Mr. Frank Rijsberman as Director-General. The Chair informed that a closed-door discussion among the MPSC Members will take place following MPSC12, after which he will report on behalf of MPSC Members to the President and Chair.

Green Innovation Fund

30. The Secretariat briefed the MPSC on its newly established Green Innovation Fund [[MPSC/2020/27](#)]. The Secretariat informed that this multi-platform Fund will address financial and non-financial constraints of entrepreneurs and startups to contribute to green growth, by providing seed capital, business plan development, financial management, hands-on coaching, and investor networks. This initiative is part of the Strategy 2030 approved by the Council in October 2019.
31. Members welcomed the establishment of the Fund, and asked about the Secretariat’s next steps. The Secretariat responded that it plans to share with all Members a note with more information on the Fund and to invite Members that wish to be involved in separate discussions. The MPSC thanked the Secretariat and recommended to share an updated note with a broader group of Members, for all potential donors and recipients to engage in the discussions.
32. The Chair asked whether this Fund is under the presumption of being grant-based. The Secretariat responded that while legally it would be providing grants (as other modalities are too complicated), the aim is to make the grants refundable, de-facto serving as zero-interest loans, so that it would become a revolving fund.
33. Norway asked on the expected size of the grants to entrepreneurs, and the Secretariat explained that the Fund’s target initial capitalization is USD 3 million and would provide grants on the order of USD 50,000-100,000 to start-ups, and that this is an extension of its current Greenpreneurs program.

34. Rwanda requested flexibility in the criteria and process of accessing the Fund, and emphasized the importance of streamlining the process and sharing information on the Fund with beneficiaries. The Secretariat agreed that flexibility in criteria and process needs to be applied.
35. Norway inquired on the oversight function of the Council and the MPSC in addition to the steering committee that will be established in accordance with the Fund's general terms and conditions. The Secretariat answered that the activities under the Fund will be part of GGGI's regular operations approved by the Council through the WPB and regular oversight processes, and the steering committee would be established in order to provide an additional platform where the donors of the Fund can have a voice. The Secretariat noted that the Fund is still in the start-up stage, and would welcome any advice from Members.
36. Members of the MPSC took note of the process of the Director-General's reappointment and the information on the Green Innovation Fund.

/End

ANNEXES

1. List of Participants
2. List of Sessional Documents
3. Summary of E-Consultations
4. Full List of Questions/Comments and Responses for E-Consultations

ANNEX 1. List of Participants

Australia (MPSC)

Mr. Peter Elder, Director, Economic Growth and Sustainability Division, Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade

Ms. Selina Hughes, Senior Policy Officer, Economic Growth and Sustainability Division, Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade

Republic of Korea (MPSC)

Mr. Changsoo Kim, Director, Global Environment and Science Division, Ministry of Foreign Affairs

Mr. Hyuk Jeon, Second Secretary, Global Environment and Science Division, Ministry of Foreign Affairs

Paraguay (MPSC)

H.E. Raúl Silvero Silvagni, Ambassador, Embassy of the Republic of Paraguay to the Republic of Korea

Mr. Luis Molinas, Deputy Head of Mission & Counsellor, Embassy of the Republic of Paraguay to the Republic of Korea

Rwanda (MPSC)

Mr. Patrick Karera, Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Environment

Mr. Charles Kalinda, Head of Policy and Planning Division, Ministry of Infrastructure

Mr. Edward Kyazze, Division Manager, Ministry of Infrastructure

Non-State Actor (MPSC)

Mr. Ariyaratne Hewage, Expert/Non-State Actor Member of the Council of GGGI

Norway (Audit Contact Point)

Mr. John Erik Prydz, Senior Adviser, Ministry of Climate and Environment

Ms. Ingelin Ladsten, Senior Adviser, Department for Climate, Energy and Environment, Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation

Angola (observer)

Dr. Gabriel Guimaraes, Counsellor, Cooperation Sector, Embassy of the Republic of Angola to the Republic of Korea

Mr. Luizane Dias, Technician, Department of Environment, Ministry of Culture, Tourism and Environment

Costa Rica (observer)

Mr. Jorge Valerio, Chargé d'affaires a.i., Embassy of the Republic of Costa Rica to the Republic of Korea

Denmark (observer)

Ms. Tine Anbaek, Chief Advisor, Department for Green Diplomacy, Ministry of Foreign Affairs

Fiji (observer)

Mr. Joreti Vuaka Dakuwaqa, First Secretary, Embassy of the Republic of Fiji to the Republic of Korea

Sri Lanka (observer)

Mr. Mohamed Rifa Wadood Abdul Wadood, Director, International Relations, Ministry of Environment and Wildlife Resources

Secretariat

Dr. Frank Rijsberman, Director-General

Ms. Hyeon Jenny Kim, Deputy Director-General, Head of GGP&I

Ms. Susanne Pedersen, Assistant Director-General, Head of IPSD

Mr. Gerard O'Donoghue, Assistant Director General, Head of OED

Mr. Hyon Sang Ahn, Senior Specialist for External Relations and Outreach

Ms. Jae Eun Ahn, Senior Strategy Officer

Ms. Inhee Chung, Rwanda Country Representative

Mr. Dave Kim, Governance Lead

Ms. Jinyoung Kim, Director of Asia

Ms. Yeonjoo Lee, Governance Intern

Ms. Nayoung Moon, Governance Officer

Mr. Sivabalan Muthusamy, Director of Finance

Mr. Maricor Muzones, Sri Lanka Country Programme Lead

Ms. Kyuhwa Park, Senior Associate, OED

General Distribution

MPSC/2020/28

Mr. Lasse Ringius, Director and Head of GIS

Mr. James Sheppard, Head of Partnerships

Ms. Alexandra Stephenson, Governance Intern

Mr. Mahamadou Tounkara, Director of Office of the Director-General

Mr. Sakiusa Tuisolia, Head of Strategy

Ms. Mihwa Wi, Associate, SPC & Governance

Ms. Dagmar Zwebe, Uganda Country Representative

ANNEX 2. List of Sessional Documents

MPSC/2020/AG/2	Provisional Agenda of the Twelfth Meeting of the MPSC
MPSC/2020/16	Draft Work Program and Budget 2021-2022
MPSC/2020/17	Membership, Accession and Country Programming
MPSC/2020/18	Findings and Lessons from Recent Evaluations
MPSC/2020/19	Accountability and Safeguard Systems
MPSC/2020/20	Note on Outreach to North Korea
MPSC/2020/21	Summary of the E-consultations
MPSC/2020/22/REV	Update on the 2020 GGGI Operational Budget
MPSC/2020/23	Update on the Risk Management Framework Roll-Out Plan
MPSC/2020/24	GGGI Risk Management Framework
MPSC/2020/25	Update on Upcoming Governance Organ Elections
MPSC/2020/26	Note on Assembly and Council Joint Sessions
MPSC/2020/27	Note on the GGGI Green Innovation Fund

ANNEX 3. Summary of E-Consultations**Summary of E-Consultations of the Twelfth Meeting of the MPSC**

1. The e-consultations for the Twelfth Meeting of the Management and Program Sub-Committee (MPSC) took place on July 1-7, 2020. Below is a summary of the e-consultations, while the full list of questions and responses are attached as an Annex to this summary.

Work Program and Budget 2021-2022 (part 1)

2. Members commended the GGGI Secretariat for a well-developed Work Program and Budget (WPB) 2021-2022. Members noted that the WPB is well aligned with Member and partner countries' Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs) and the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). Australia also commended the GGGI Secretariat and Members for recognizing and advocating for a broader and diverse definition of vulnerability to include LDCs, LLDCs and SIDS.
3. Norway noted the importance of reporting on results, encouraging greater focus on intermediary outcomes (IO) to adequately measure the concrete activities of GGGI. Norway further noted the significance of reporting all along the results chain. The Secretariat agreed that IOs are an important part of the monitoring and reporting on GGGI's results, providing details on how GGGI's results chain in its results based management framework outlines the flow of results from project outputs to IOs, which have direct causal links and longer-term impacts represented by the six strategic outcomes (SO). The Secretariat further informed that it has adopted new methodologies to measure SO impact estimates and targets in Strategy 2030 following the publication of its new GGGI SO Technical Guideline at the end of 2019, and that the Impact Pathway Approach (IPA) used for the evaluation and being mainstreamed in the program planning phase has the IOs integrated into the process.
4. Mr. Ariyaratne Hewage suggested incorporating the Impact Pathway Approach (IPA) in the country planning process, and also be included in national planning and budgeting processes in respective countries. The Secretariat welcomed the idea of sharing the IPA with its counterparts for their consideration, but noted that IPA is a new tool recently adopted by GGGI, which will take some time to assess its effectiveness.
5. Regarding Australia's request for further information on the proxy indicator for gender and poverty results and impacts in the new Corporate Results Framework (CRF) 2021-2025, the Secretariat informed that due to limited resources, GGGI does not have a comprehensive system to undertake gender analysis. Therefore, it uses a proxy indicator, which is common for international development organizations for gender mainstreaming and gender results reporting.
6. Norway suggested to include a "minus scenario" in the WPB 2021-2022, and the Secretariat informed that its management has decided to work on a revised WPB budget scenario, which reduces the core budget by 25%.
7. The Republic of Korea (ROK) inquired on whether GGGI has plans to allocate its staff more strategically; noting that 73% of IPSD staff are located in the headquarters and 94%

of GGPI staff have country presence, the evaluation report on green investments points out that the strength of GGGI lies in its imbedded personnel in countries. The Secretariat responded that the percentage of IPSD staff located in the headquarters will be approximately 68% in 2020, down from 100% in 2017, and the MT is contemplating further relocations to the country offices as indicated in the response to the recent core funding reductions.

8. To Australia's inquiry on whether GGGI intends to document its transition to become a zero-carbon organization by 2050 or earlier and create a model for other international organizations, the Secretariat responded that it plans to share its experience with other organizations, and it will also be assessing and documenting its achievements as part of its annual results reporting cycle.
9. Members of the MPSC took note of the draft Work Program and Budget 2021-2022, which will be further discussed at the virtual meeting on July 9, 2020.

Membership, Accession, and Country Programming

10. The ROK positively noted that GGGI's increasing membership illustrates that green growth is well recognized globally. However, the ROK emphasized GGGI needs to manage its scope and reach so that it does not expand its programming and spread resources too thin. The Secretariat agreed, informing that Management's approach, as outlined in Strategy 2030 sees an increase in Members and country programs, but only if resource availability increases in sync, to enable a higher average budget (core plus earmarked) for each country, not spreading too thin. The Secretariat reiterated that membership does not automatically result in the establishment of country programs, and that Members may be supported by global and regional programs for project-specific interventions (such as the Pacific or Eastern Caribbean programs), leveraging core and programmatic funding from ongoing resource mobilization efforts – in line with the Council Decision on the Criteria for Country Programming [C/2019/DC/9].
11. Australia inquired regarding lessons learned from the phase out of country programs in China, Mozambique, and Thailand. The Secretariat responded that dialogue with countries about the phase out, based on the Decision on Criteria for Country Programming, has provided an opportunity to reactivate discussions on Membership, privileges, and immunities.
12. The ROK inquired whether GGGI has a standard operating procedure for phasing out country programming. The Secretariat noted there is no single "one size fits all" procedure, rather it will review each country program based on the Decision on Criteria for Country Programming and guidance from the Council.
13. The ROK queried whether the Secretariat considers it necessary to review the level and nature of contribution of a contributing member ahead of the upcoming governance organ elections. The Secretariat informed the MPSC that it is the mandate of the Assembly to review and make recommendations to adjust the level and nature of contribution required to qualify as a contributing member, and to date, the Assembly has yet to request a review. Dialogue during the formulation of the Agreement on the Establishment of GGGI envisaged a review would increase the minimum contribution to qualify as a contributing member "to support the growth of GGGI over time" (Article 3.a of the Agreement on the Establishment of GGGI).

14. Mr. Hewage recommended enhancing support to countries that lack professional capacity to develop bankable proposals. The Secretariat agreed, and informed the MPSC that the process of developing its pipeline of bankable projects for green investments and earmarked projects for resource mobilization is supported by capacity building of key government officials in Member and partner countries.
15. Members of the MPSC took note of the status of accession of UN Member States and Regional Integration Organizations to the Establishment Agreement; the progress in the negotiation of privileges and immunities and efforts to expedite the negotiation of such agreements; and the status of the application of the Country Programming Criteria.

Findings and Lessons from Recent Evaluations

16. Members commended the Secretariat for the good results recorded in the evaluation and the valuable lessons learned, and also GGGI's achievements on green investments. Members observed that there is evidence that GGGI is valued and creates results, and noted that GGGI's value comes from the combination of its expertise and local approach, as indicated in the [Evaluation Brief](#).
17. Norway suggested that the Secretariat rank the recommendations according to their importance and indicate the deadlines and responsible unit for a clearer structure to follow-up. The Secretariat agreed to rank the recommendations in its future reports and further informed that there has been progress in implementing all nine recommendations, which is led by the Green Investment Services team, and that a follow-up review exercise will take place after one year.
18. The ROK inquired on the effectiveness of GGGI's collaboration with P4G, such as the virtual acceleration workshop held in June 2020, for scaling up green investment. The Secretariat responded that it allowed engagement with various investors and it is the right direction towards building investor interests and identifying solutions to address the barriers to investments.
19. Mr. Hewage suggested to conduct a study on the various programs adopted during the COVID-19 pandemic that has helped improve the environment at large, and the Secretariat agreed to take this on board as part of its process to develop its 2021 Evaluation Workplan.
20. Members of the MPSC took note of GGGI's evaluations on the Mongolia Country Program and Green Investment Services.

Accountability and Safeguards Systems

21. Members commended the Secretariat for its continued efforts to improve its safeguards and facilitate its implementation, as well as the development and application of the Gender and Poverty Markers. To Australia's inquiry on the timeframe for enabling the measurement of results, the Secretariat shared that it aims to have marker applications meet an adequate standard by 2020, so that it can set corporate gender and inclusion targets in WPB 2023-2024. Norway further reiterated the importance of identifying indicators for the Corporate Results Framework, which can convey GGGI's impact on the lives of beneficiaries.
22. Australia noted that the Gender Strategy 2016-2020 is due for renewal. The Secretariat

informed that it will commence drafting the new Gender Strategy in September 2020, and a draft is expected by October 31, 2020. After several rounds of consultations across the organization, the draft Gender Strategy will be presented to MPSC for review.

23. Norway expressed positive views on the overall favorable engagement score of the Staff Engagement Surveys, which increased by 15% from 2016 to 2019, as well as the steady improvement of scores. In this regard, Norway asked whether the level of turnover has decreased. The Secretariat responded that the level of staff turnover decreased from 23% in 2016 to 20% in 2019 and 6% for 2020 to date. The Secretariat also informed that all areas in the engagement survey show an improving trend with no area showing a decrease.
24. Members of the MPSC took note of the updates on GGGI's Accountability and Safeguards Systems.

Update on Outreach to North Korea

25. The ROK expressed appreciation for GGGI pursuing an opportunity to work with the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK) and welcomed the Secretariat securing resources other than the core budget for possible projects with DPRK.
26. Members emphasized the importance of full compliance with the UN sanctions regime on DPRK when it advances with its cooperation with DPRK entities, and to engage with the 1718 Sanctions Committee early before any commitments are made. The Secretariat reassured that it is committed to avoiding any contravention of international sanctions, not to mention it is aware of the high level of sensitivities and need for discretion surrounding any potential work with or within the DPRK. It further informed Members that its consultations with the 1718 Committee dates back to August 2019, and consultations with ROK MOFA Export Control & Sanctions Division and the UN Resident Coordinator in Pyongyang go back as far as 2018.
27. Members of the MPSC took note of GGGI's outreach to DPRK.

ANNEX 4. Full List of Questions/Comments and Responses for E-Consultations

Questions/Comments Received on July 3 and Responses

1. Work Program and Budget 2021-2022 (Part 1)		
Member	Question	Answer
Australia (July 3)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Commend GGGI for a well-developed document. 	Thank you.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ We would welcome an organizational chart to more easily navigate the detailed written descriptions. 	Yes, we will include this organizational chart for the final version of the WPB 2021-2022 document in chapter 7 (7.3.1).
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Commend GGGI Secretariat and Members for recognizing and advocating for a broader and more diverse definition of vulnerability, to include LDC, LLDCs, and SIDs, of which the impact is evident throughout this paper. 	Thank you.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please find below more detailed comments/questions/suggestions (in order of paragraph numbers): 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Paragraph 11: Welcome further elaboration on GGGI’s leadership in the following the sentence, ‘together with the commitment of its members, GGGI is leading implementation of a new green growth development paradigm focused on a model of economic growth that is both environmentally sustainable and socially inclusive’. 	Yes, we can further elaborate GGGI’s leadership by adding the following sentence at the end: “GGGI’s operating model maximizes the potential to translate green growth strategies and policies into green investment plans, mobilizing green finance commitments needed to bolster support for low-carbon and climate-resilient economic development and strong institutional capacity development”.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Paragraph 14: Regarding GGGI ambition to become a zero-carbon organization by 2050 or earlier, we would welcome further information on whether there is an intention that GGGI could document this transition and create a model for other international organizations? 	To become a zero-carbon organization by 2050, GGGI targets to reduce its GHG emission per employee by 40% in 2030 over a 2015 baseline, both through targeting green office operations and lowering emissions through reduced GGGI’s travel. And Yes, GGGI plans to document the transition and create a model using our experience for sharing with other international organizations.	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Paragraph 29: We note the Strategy 2030 Change Management Plan is currently underway. Grateful further information on timeframes and if the Plan will be presented to MPSC/Council. 	<p>The aim is to finalize the Change Management Plan (CMP) in July 2020 for adoption by MT and subsequent implementation. The CMP involves 3 phases, namely: Phase 1 Envision Phase from July 2018 to October 2019, Phase 2 Onboarding phase from November 2019 to end of 2021, and Phase 3 Drive Value Phase from 2022 to 2025. Under these 3 phases, the CMP consists of 10 action items which represent the identified key areas of change management to successfully implement Strategy 2030 and the Roadmap. These 10 action items feature in the CMP Action Plan with specific timelines for implementation. Except for one core item under phase 1 which has been completed, the implementation of the other core action items will take place from the second half of 2020 until end of 2021. Some core items by their very nature such as resource mobilization, risk management and monitoring and evaluation are part phase 3 (drive value) and will be implemented throughout the 5-year period from 2021 to 2025.</p> <p>The CMP is essentially a management document for implementing Strategy 2030 and Roadmap and is not intended to be presented to MPSC/Council.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Commend GGGI for the useful regional analysis of Programmatic Solutions Analysis (Section 4.3.2). 	<p>Thank you.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Paragraph 91: We note that outcome and output indications have now been included in the new CRF 2021-2025 on gender and poverty results and impacts. Welcome further clarification around reference to the proxy indicator and limited resources in Appendix 1, Output 4, page 57. 	<p>The proxy indicator is being used at this point of introducing a specific gender indicator in the CRF since GGGI still does not have a comprehensive system, capacity and infrastructure to undertake gender analysis, develop baseline, design gender interventions and actions plans, and to track and report on implementation performance and results. Such a system will come with maturity and requires institutional capacity consisting of gender specialists present in country teams and regions to provide the lead for gender mainstreaming work which GGGI does not have the resources for. The use of such a proxy indicator is common for international development organizations such as MDBs as they begin to make inroads into gender mainstreaming and gender results reporting.</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Commends GGGI’s achievement referenced in Appendix 1, Output 5, page 58, on equity. We would recommend rephrasing the explanatory sentence to be clearer. 	<p>In response to this comment, the explanation has been rephrased as follows: “GGGI’s Member and partner countries do not have the same development standards with countries on the lower level of the development scale having greater needs and underlying development problems than those at the higher end of the scale. This equity is aligned with MPSC and Council decision to balance the distribution of core resources between Middle-Income Countries (MICs) and vulnerable countries including LDCs, LLDCs and SIDS (based on UNOHRLLS classification) that includes countries that are particularly vulnerable to the adverse effects of climate change, yet do not qualify for priority as they are not classified as LDCs. This indicator requires that 60% of GGGI’s annual core budget is allocated to vulnerable countries which includes LDCs, LLDCs and SIDS. The indicator accounts for the delivery of this target.”</p>
--	---	---

2. Membership, Accession, and Country Programming		
Member	Question	Answer
Australia (July 3)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Paragraph 8: Grateful for further information on the GGGI’s management ‘phase out plan’ and if MPSC/Council members will be notified of the decisions to phase out Country Programs ahead of the formal phase-out process. 	<p>In addition to phasing out country programs in China, Mozambique and Thailand since Q4 2019, GGGI is considering plans to focus more on on-going/earmarked projects implementation in India, Morocco, Myanmar and Nepal from Q3 2020 until country programming criteria to be satisfied and dependent on the availability of core resources to support country programming</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Paragraph 10: Welcome update from Secretariat on any lessons learned from the first Country Office phase-out process (China, Mozambique and Thailand). 	<p>Despite the phase-out, there is renewed progress on membership discussion with Mozambique. GGGI is currently implementing a GCF project in Mozambique. The Thai government also remains positive on MOU renewal and GCF project proposal development. Review based on the country programming criteria has provided opportunity to reactivate the discussions with those countries. GGGI has ended its operations in China without further consequences, but maintains relations with the China Council for International Cooperation on Environment and Development and several other organizations in China.</p>

3. Findings and Lessons from Recent Evaluations		
Member	Question	Answer
Australia (July 3)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Commend GGGI for the good results recorded in the evaluation and valuable lessons learned. 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Welcome further information around GGGI’s policy on providing a response to the findings. For example, is there a type of management response that summarizes actions/next steps GGGI will take in response to the findings? 	Thank you for the feedback. Yes, it is GGGI’s policy and normal practice for management responses to be included in all evaluation reports. These can be found in section 6 of the main report on green investment services, and in section 3 of the Mongolia report.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Green Investment Services Evaluation Brief is well-presented and a useful communication document. 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> For future evaluations that include external evaluators, suggest noting upfront/possibly including branding, to demonstrate the independence of the evaluation. 	Thank you for this feedback, we will take this suggestion on board for future reports.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Welcome update on when the 2020 Impact Pathways Reviews are due to be completed/published and if there have been any delays due to the COVID impact. 	Under GGGI’s evaluation plan for 2020 (which can be found at https://gggi.org/results-evaluation/evaluations/), <u>4 Impact Pathway Reviews were planned for 2020: Vietnam, Uganda, Fiji and Rwanda. The reviews of Vietnam and Uganda are expected to be completed in the coming months, but those for Fiji and Rwanda have been postponed until 2021. This is indeed due to the impact of COVID, which has generally made engagement with GGGI country teams and in-country stakeholders more difficult.</u>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Welcome update on evaluations more broadly, to provide an update on current evaluations underway and future planning. This information would be useful to share internally with country programs. 	Other than the update on Impact Pathway Reviews above, the Impact & Evaluation Unit is also progressing a thematic evaluation on Sustainable Landscapes. This was also part of GGGI’s evaluation plan for 2020. A TOR is currently being finalized and will be shared with GGGI Members later in July, as per normal practice. The evaluation is planned to be implemented in the 2 nd half of 2020.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On Page 21 of the Mongolia Country Program Evaluation, it states some partners noted how other development partners 	This risk is being primarily addressed through GGGI’s programming policies/processes, which require any proposal to pursue an earmarked funding opportunity to first be subject to a go/no-go decision. This	

	<p>pursing earmarked funding had become increasingly diverted from GoM priorities and cautioned GGGI to manage this risk carefully. Could GGGI elaborate on this finding and how GGGI intends to manage this risk.</p>	<p>decision is made based on several criteria, including alignment with priorities of partner countries. In some cases, this has indeed resulted in GGGI deciding not to pursue some earmarked funding opportunities.</p>
--	--	---

4. Accountability and Safeguards Systems		
Member	Question	Answer
<p>Australia (July 3)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Commend the GGGI for the development and application of the GGGI Gender Equality and Poverty Markers. Grateful for further clarity on the process and timeframes involved in enabling the measurement of results (paragraph 3). 	<p>The piloting of the Gender and Poverty Markers in 2019 has informed the inclusion of proxy gender indicators at outcome and output level in the Corporate Results Framework 2021-2025. This is a significant strengthening of GGGI’s results-based approaches to inclusion. Resources are scarce and capacity relatively low across the organization to effectively apply the markers. Further capacity building and guidance is needed to increase the understanding of what gender equality and poverty alleviations means in the context of GGGI’s work. This is where the Global Operational Priority 5 in Strategy 2030 provides a framework that will be fleshed out in the new Gender and Inclusion Strategy 2021-2025. Importantly the strategy will propose indicators relevant to GGGI’s Gender and Inclusion Impact areas outlined in the 2030 strategy. The launch of the strategy will come with further opportunity for capacity building in early 2021.</p> <p>The aim is that marker application will meet adequate standard by end of 2022 in order to set corporate gender and inclusion targets in the 2023-2024 WPB. These targets will likely link to % of projects that are marked for significant or principle gender and/or poverty outcomes?</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We note GGGI’s Gender Strategy 2016-2020 is due for renewal. Grateful for further information on this process and if MPSC/Council members will be provided a draft for review. 	<p>The drafting of the Gender Strategy will commence in September 2020, and a draft strategy is expected by October 31, 2020. The draft Strategy will have to undergo several rounds of consultations across the organization. It will then be presented to MPSC for review.</p>

5. Update on Outreach to North Korea		
Member	Question	Answer
Australia (July 3)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We thank the GGGI Secretariat for the written documentation on this important issue. 	Thank you. The Secretariat is pleased to provide this note, as requested by MPSC Members during MPSC11.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We note the short timeframe between providing advice to the 1718 committee and the proposed meeting with DPRK nationals. We would like to emphasize the importance of GGGI engaging early, often and in considerable detail with the 1718 committee on proposed activities. This should be done before any commitments/formal agreements with North Korean entities to ensure GGGI doesn't contravene, even inadvertently, any UNSC sanctions. 	<p>This comment is noted with much thanks.</p> <p>It should also be noted that the note verbale from the Secretariat to the 1718 Committee was merely the last formal communication in a series of direct correspondence with the 1718 Committee—including emails and letter from the Director-General—going back nearly four months (Aug 2, 2019) prior to the meeting with DPRK nationals. Furthermore, the Secretariat's consultations with the ROK MOFA Export Control & Sanctions Division and the UN Resident Coordinator in Pyongyang go back as far as 2018.</p> <p>Nevertheless, the Secretariat is appreciative of the comment and can assure that the Secretariat is also keen to avoid any contravention of international sanctions, not to mention it is aware of the high level of sensitivities and need for discretion surrounding any potential work with or within North Korea.</p>

Questions/Comments Received on July 6 and Responses

1. Work Program and Budget 2021-2022 (Part 1)		
Member	Question	Answer
Ariyaratne Hewage (July 6)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The GGGI Work Program Budget is very comprehensive and I commend the contribution of all who were involved in the process. 	Thank you very much for your feedback.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Focusing on the delivery of six Strategic Outcome (SO) targets that are aligned with Member and partner countries Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs) and Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) is very appropriate and the preparation of th 	Thank you and well noted.

	<p>e country programs guided by the Country Planning Frameworks (CPFs) on demand-driven basis is essential.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Incorporation of the Impact Pathway Approach (IPA) into country planning process may be encouraged and request that IPA be included in national planning and budgeting process of the respective countries. 	<p>Thank you for this suggestion. The Secretariat is incorporating the IPA in developing medium-term strategies (Country Planning Frameworks) for country programs. The process of the design and approval of new programs and projects for 2021-2022 is decoupled from WPB preparation and managed through a separate internal appraisal process. This process is governed by GGGI's Project Cycle Management (PCM), which aims to ensure a robust quality assurance process to foster coherency in GGGI's programs, whether funded by its core or additional earmarked resources. The PCM system provides a systematic five-step process upon which new project ideas are developed, designed, planned, implemented, monitored and evaluated, and reported. A new complementary approach to the PCM will be the incorporation of the IPA not key parts of GGGI's programming systems, particularly program-level planning and reporting. The IPA is an approach that demonstrates the intended key results of a country program and the programmatic pathways to get there. The IPA is a new tool that GGGI has adopted and over time we will be able to assess its effectiveness. Therefore, GGGI is not in a position at this early stage to recommend the use of IPA in the national planning and budgeting process of our Members and partner countries. In our role as a trusted advisor to Governments and embedded into Ministries, we will be pleased to share the IPA with counterparts for consideration.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 	

2. Membership, Accession, and Country Programming		
Member	Question	Answer
<p>Ariyaratne Hewage (July 6)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The program proposed on this subject is impressive. Recommend to enhance the support to relevant countries on preparation of fundable proposals as many such countries lack the professional capacity to do so. 	<p>Thank you for the suggestion. One of the key support areas is the development of a pipeline of bankable projects for green investments, and also a pipeline of earmarked projects for resource mobilization to fund project implementation. This is done using an approach that starts with the early stage scoping to identify the potential resource partners and the priorities of the countries in collaboration with government counterparts. This is a continued approach that is supported by capacity building of key</p>

		government personnel in project preparation. We will continue putting more efforts into it.
--	--	---

3. Findings and Lessons from Recent Evaluations

Member	Question	Answer
Ariyaratne Hewage (July 6)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The document on evaluation is very informative. 	Thank you very much for your feedback.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I wish to add another new subject in future programs. As we are all aware all countries in the world adopted good and environmentally desirable practices during the Covid 19 pandemic. These practices included reduction of the use of motor vehicles and other similar uses which helped to improve the air quality. Many countries also launched production related programs since they faced difficulties in importing agricultural and industrial products. The human friendly health practices including sanitization, washing hands and maintain social distance etc. helped improve the living conditions. There are various other programs adopted during this period which helped to improve the environment at large. 	Thank you for this suggestion.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> My recommendation is to collect all relevant data related to such practices and study the benefits gained in a quantifiable manner and launch a program to promote sustain such good practices as a part of social behavior in future. 	GGGI develops an annual evaluation workplan which is reviewed by the MPSC (E.g.: 2020 Evaluation Workplan). The various programs adopted during the COVID-19 pandemic is an important topic to study, and we will take this suggestion on board as part of the processes to develop the 2021 Evaluation Workplan.

4. Accountability and Safeguards Systems

Member	Question	Answer
Ariyaratne Hewage (July 6)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The systems are appropriate and no further comments. 	Thank you.

5. Update on Outreach to North Korea

Member	Question	Answer
Ariyaratne Hewage (July 6)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed programs on Outreach to North Korea are comprehensive and wish that the GGGI would achieve success in the implementation. 	Thank you, we hope to continue with necessary due diligence, discretion, and measured optimism.

Questions/Comments Received on July 7 and Responses

1. Work Program and Budget 2021-2022 (Part 1)		
Member	Question	Answer
Norway	<p><u>Comments and questions related to results reporting:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> For Norway it is important that it is possible to report on results. Our assessment, based on WPB 2021-2022 and CRF 2021-2025 as well as GGGI Strategic Outcomes guideline, is that the proposed indicators and results monitoring will not allow to adequately measure the concrete effects of GGGI’s activities. There seems to be a gap between outputs delivered at project level and the highest development impact one seeks to contribute to, i.e. the strategic outcomes. There are important results levels in-between which can show stepwise change. More focus on these intermediate outcomes seems essential. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> GGGI results chain in the RBM Framework outlines the flow of results from project outputs to Intermediate Outcomes (IOs 1, 2 and 3) with direct causal linkages and longer-term impacts represented by the six Strategic Outcomes (SOs). The achievement of project outputs and IOs is tracked and reported in the End of Year Results Report. The current CRF 2019-2020 includes indicators that attempt to measure the impacts of the IOs. For example, outcome indicator 1.3 is based on a balanced score that measures the extent to which green growth policies will lead to transformational change in Member countries. Outcome indicator 2.3 uses the balanced scorecard to measure alignment of GGGI’s green investment commitments mobilized with the four elements of green growth which supports Members green growth transformation. GGGI has taken a further step to measure SO impact targets in Strategy 2030 using the new SO Technical Guideline that it published at the end of December 2019. This has been cascaded down to the WPB 2021-2022 where the preparation of Country Business Plans and Global Business Plans have included the estimation of SO attribution and contribution ex-ante impacts and targets for every project as a starting point to measure GGGI’s project impacts. This is an extensive exercise where country and global teams have had to learn to use the new methodologies in the SO Technical Guidelines, and it will take some time to complete. The aim is to complete this exercise by end of August 2020 prior to the circulation of the WPB 2021-2022 to Council. The impact pathway approach used by GGGI is framed by its value chain

		<p>(policies > financing > investment > results) vs. the Programmatic Solutions. The intermediate outcomes are important part of the monitoring and reporting on results for GGGI.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We would be interested in results information on the changes GGGI's delivered outputs have led to, e.g.: Do those who have received capacity building do a better job afterwards? What is the effect of GGGI's presence in ministries? Have the new plans and strategies been implemented in a satisfactory manner? What is the impact of the implementation of these plans and strategies? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Changes achieved through the delivery of GGGI's outputs is currently assessed and reported through the program and projects evaluation done by IEU. IEU has an annual work plan that is approved by Management which consists of select projects to be evaluated. For example in 2019, IEU did an evaluation of the USD 1.2 billion in total green investment commitments that GGGI had mobilized then which confirmed that majority of the projects (2/3) were moving towards financing and implementation, the private sector has committed to raise 73% of the total financing, projects have demonstrated adoption of scaling up strategies and that GGGI serves a niche need in the market for green investments services and clients value its service offerings. In terms of capacity building, GGGI has introduced a new evaluation form in 2019 which seeks to report on the number and category of participants and how training and capacity building events will and can enhance their work in supporting green growth development. The results from these evaluation forms will be aggregated to report on the effectiveness of GGGI's capacity building events. GGGI's presence in the ministries has several effects, a few examples give here. First, our staff plays the role of trusted green growth advisor to the government on both the sectoral and national level policy and planning works. Second, GGGI makes the supports closer to where the needs are, in having the frequent, constant, and effective dialog and supports provided when and where they are needed. Third, GGGI works with key counterparts to develop pipeline of projects for earmarked as well as green investments. Forth, GGGI's presence has been effectively supporting in the building the readiness of governments to access climate finance such as from GCF. Fifth, integrating green growth perspectives into the strategies, planning tools and processes, and policies have been made much easier due to GGGI staff being embedded into ministries.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> GGGI might not have systems in place to monitor the effect of outputs, and it might necessitate evaluations, but Norway would welcome information about how GGGI 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As explained above, GGGI is committed and taking necessary actions to track and report on its program and project impacts. GGGI has in the WPB 2021-2022 introduced the use of the new Integrated Impact Pathway (IPA)

	intends to address this issue.	Approach to support the design and implementation of projects through the Project Cycle Management (PCM) process to deliver specific results and SO related impacts. These impacts are being estimated and measured for qualifiable projects in the WPB and will be monitored regularly through the projects monthly progress reporting in GGGI Online and quarterly reviews. The End of Year CRF Results Reporting will measure the delivery of these project impacts in addition to the evaluation of select projects under the IEUs annual work plan. The country program level results reporting that is being adopted will report on countries and their CRF results delivery and impacts achieved in future.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reporting on results all along the results chain, including this kind of results information at local and national level would be important to substantiate claims that GGGI probably has contributed to impact at strategic outcomes level - or alternatively, to explain why strategic outcomes are not achieved. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> GGGI introduced new methodologies for measuring its SO impact estimates and targets in Strategy 2030 following the publication of the new GGGI SO Technical Guideline at the end of 2019. Steps have now been taken in the WPB 2021-2022 to estimate project SO ex-ante impact estimates and targets and to monitor and report on the delivery and achievement of these impacts. GGGI has adopted a new reporting approach at the country program level which will commence with the Mid-Year CRF Results Report and continue with the End of Year 2020 Results Report. These new approaches will ensure the reporting of project results and impacts at the country program level. For example, it will be possible to measure the ex-ante GHG reduction impacts of GGGI's program interventions in various countries.
	<p><u>WPB 2021-2022 Budget:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The WPB 2021-2022 Budget contains a Base Case Scenario and a Plus Scenario. In the current situation, where we witness serious impacts of COVID-19 and the future seems more unpredictable than ever, it seems prudent to also present a "Minus Scenario". 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The MT had already taken the decision to work on a revised WPB budget taking into account potential reductions in core funding. We are working on a revised scenario which reduces the core budget by 25%.
	<p><u>WPB Compendium of Draft Country and Global Business Plans:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It would be useful if a column of "Proposed response" was added as an answer to the assumptions and risks identified in the Results Frameworks. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Thank you for your suggestion. We will make sure to include "Proposed Response" as well in addition to identifying "Assumptions and Risks" in the relevant column.
Korea	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We would like to thank GGGI for the extensive documents 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Thank you for your positive feedback.

	<p>on the WPB 2021-2022 that draws a holistic picture of the plans ahead.</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Given that GGGI's current operation shows that IPSD staff(73%) work in the headquarter, while GGPI staff have a strong presence(94%) in countries (section 6.2.) and noting that the evaluation report on the green investment points out, the strength of GGGI lies in the embedment of its personnel in countries, does GGGI have plans to make adjustments to the allocation of staff more strategically? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> GGGI's Investment and Policy Solutions Division (IPSD) used to have 100% of its staff at HQ, moving to 75% in 2019 and to approximately 68% in 2020. As can be seen from the document on GGGI Measures in Response to COVID-19 Core Funding Reductions, IPSD is contemplating moving additional staff to the countries.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On the corporate results framework with strategic outcomes amongst which GHG emission reduction is at the forefront, it would be helpful if there were more explanation on how GGGI projected its attributed outcome target for 2022 as 85MtCO2 and how it translates to the mid-term(2021-2025) and long-term(2017-2030) targets. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The 2022 SO attribution impact targets which includes 85MtCO2 for GHG reduction were estimated using the same top-down approach for calculating the 2025 and 2030 attribution impact targets. The 2030 attribution impact targets were first estimated in Strategy 2030. It was calculated using the approximation of cumulative targeted green investment commitments from 2021 to 2030 which was distributed across identified priority areas of investment activities by GGGI country programs and multiplied by the respective investment multipliers. Due to the lack of data and related projects, impact estimates for SO4 (improved air quality) were not carried out. The same approach was followed using the approximation of cumulative targeted green investment commitments for the period 2021 to 2022 to arrive at the SO1 GHG reduction target of 85MtCO2.

2. Membership, Accession, and Country Programming		
Member	Question	Answer
Korea	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The increasing number of GGGI's membership represents that the green values the organization is pursuing are well recognized in the world. We do need to manage our scope and reach so that we are not spreading too thin 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> GGGI agrees with this statement. Membership does not automatically result into setting up the operations in the countries. The Establishment Agreement states membership to GGGI is open to UN Member States and Regional Integration Organizations that are committed to the Institute's mission. Accession is not contingent on GGGI inviting a UN Member State or Regional Integration Organization to become a Member, nor can GGGI block a State or Organization becoming a Member. The Establishment Agreement establishes the function of the Council to

		<p>establish criteria for country programming, and where GGGI should focus its resources. The Council decided on Criteria on Country Programming [C/2019/DC/9] to ensure that GGGI does not spread its resources too thinly.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GGGI shall focus in-country programming in Members that have in place an effective agreement on privileges and immunities, providing a legal basis for GGGI and its officials to operate in country, together with secured multi-year earmarked funding – either self-financed by the Member or a development partner. • Members may also be supported by Global and regional programs to deliver project-specific interventions in Members and Partners. A regional program has already been established in the Pacific for several years, with a new program operating in the Eastern Caribbean since 2020. GGGI will further develop this approach in coming years, leveraging core and programmatic funding from ongoing resource mobilization efforts.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Further to Australia's comments, we would like to know more on where we are on the phase out process. Given that GGGI has operations based upon GCF projects in Mozambique and Thailand, what is the timeline for the phase out? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The “phase out” in China, Mozambique and Thailand was completed in early 2020. This meant that we have terminated the country program staff and closed the offices. In both countries we will maintain project operations if and when earmarked project opportunities arise, but we do not have a country representative / country office). A GCF readiness project is currently implemented in Mozambique. • On implementing GCF project scheduled to be completed in July 2021, GGGI keeps consulting with Mozambique about membership/HCA and other earmarked opportunities. For Thailand, we keep discussion about HCA while exploring a new model of engagement. One regional GIS staff is being placed in UNESCAP, with responsibility for developing investment projects in the Mekong region.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do you have SOPs in place for these procedures? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no one-size-fits-all procedure about phase-out. Under the umbrella of country program criteria and relevant Council’s guidance, we will review country by country in making such decisions.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regarding review of the Assembly on the level and nature of contribution to be qualified as a contributing member, which has yet to be conducted, does the Secretariat find it necessary to carry out a review in relation to the upcoming governance organ elections? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is the mandate of the Assembly to review the level and nature of contribution required to qualify as a contributing member. To date the Assembly has yet to request a review. • In accordance with the Agreement on the Establishment of GGGI, a Member of GGGI that has provided a multi-year financial contribution of

		<p>core funding of no less than 15 million USD over three years or 10 million USD over the first two years” will be considered a contributing member; and all other Members considered participating members (Article 3). The Establishment Agreement provides for the possibility that the Assembly may review the level and nature of contribution required to qualify as a contributing member “to support the growth of the GGGI over time” (Article 3(a)).</p>
--	--	---

3. Findings and Lessons from Recent Evaluations		
Member	Question	Answer
Norway	<p>Norad has assessed the major findings and the recommendations of the Green Investment Services evaluation and has the following key observations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - positive overall conclusion of the evaluation, evidence that GGGI is valued and creates results - need for development of more formalized strategies for scaling up and enabling wider impact and increase private sector funding in support of the SDGs - need to allocate scoping costs as project costs to reflect the true cost of projects. However, also recognizing that this may cause scoping activities to become investor driven rather than demand driven. Hence, rather than further drawing on core funds as GGGI suggests, Norway proposes that GGGI investigates alternative and neutral ways of allocating scoping costs to projects as a direct project cost, potentially using an allocation key in a similar manner as for indirect costs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thank you for your feedback on the evaluation. • Thank you for the suggestion regarding scoping costs. As noted in the management response to Recommendation 9, GGGI recognizes the need to seek possible earmarked funding opportunities to finance project origination considering the potential competition between country and investor needs.
	<p>The nine recommendations seem generally relevant and appropriate, with generally acceptable responses from the GGGI management, and we look forward to regular progress updates on GGGI’s implementation of these. It is a weakness of the report that the recommendations have not been ranked by the evaluators according to their importance, that deadlines for the</p>	<p>Noted and thank you for the feedback.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Progress update: The evaluation report was finalized in the first quarter of 2020 and there has been progress in the implementation of all 9 recommendations. In accordance with GGGI’s Evaluation Rules, the Impact and Evaluation Unit (IEU) conducts annual follow ups on the status

	<p>various management responses has been omitted, and also that the responsible unit for the various recommendations is missing. This should be included to provide GGGI and the board with a more solid structure that enables follow-up of the recommendations.</p>	<p>of implementation of management responses to prior evaluation recommendations. The follow up on the Evaluation of Green Investments Services is expected to take place in the first quarter of 2021 and GGGI can provide a progress update accordingly to MPSC members.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ranking of recommendations: The evaluation team acknowledges the lack of ranking of recommendations according to their importance. This practice will be implemented in future evaluation reports. • Responsible units and deadlines for management responses: The management responses were developed by the Green Investment Services (GIS) team and endorsed by the Management Team. The GIS team has lead responsibility in implementing all the management responses to the recommendations. As noted above, there has been progress in the implementation of all 9 recommendations and the IEU team will conduct a follow up exercise one year after the evaluation report was finalized.
	<p>More details from our assessment can be shared with GGGI.</p>	
<p>Korea</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We commend GGGI for its achievements on the green investments as the evaluation report indicates. As shown in the page 4 of Evaluation Brief, GGGI's values come from the combination between its expertise and local approach. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thank you for the feedback.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GGGI has sought effective ways to scale up the green investment through efforts such as acceleration workshops organized in close coordination with the P4G. Are these exercises(workshops) useful means to attract more investment? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The virtual acceleration workshops recently organized with P4G in collaboration with MOFA attracted institutional investors as well as asset managers and development banks. One of the key takeaways is that the format allowed to engage with financiers to build the understanding on the funding requirements, funding cycles and some best practices in applying for various funding options. They represent a good step in the right direction to access funding, in building the interests from investors for the business models being proposed and working with partners in identifying the solutions to address the barriers to investments.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The report says that the evaluation has been conducted on the 26 projects out of 38 and we would like to know what standard or method was used to select the 26 out of 38. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The evaluation covered GGGI's green investment services, which included bankable projects, financial instruments, and national financing vehicles. Initial investment commitments for these projects were secured from public or private sources. It also includes support provided to access international climate and carbon finance. The scope of this evaluation excluded policy

		<p>and planning related work which subsequently attracted allocations of partner government or ODA funds, as these are usually not the result of GGGI’s green investment services work. For example, the evaluation did not examine the project in Indonesia where a local (district) government budget allocation was secured in 2015 for interventions to implement two green growth strategies. The full list of 38 projects can be found on pages 16-18 in the Approach Paper to this evaluation.</p>
--	--	---

4. Accountability and Safeguards Systems		
Member	Question	Answer
Norway	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Commend GGGI’s constant effort to improve safeguards and to facilitate their actual implementation by incorporating rules and safeguards into the Project Cycle Management and risk management framework. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted. Thank you.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Thank you for the information in your reply to Australia about status and timeframe for the work that remains in order to enable the measurement of results concerning poverty reduction and gender equality. Norway welcomes these steps and encourages efforts to identify indicators for the CRF which can say something about the impact on the lives of the beneficiaries, cf. also comments under agenda point 1 above. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted. Thank you.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is encouraging that the overall favorable engagement score of the Staff Engagement Surveys has steadily increased, up 15% from 2016 to 2019, and that there has been steady score improvement in the organization’s confidence and managers, collaboration & communication, and work & life balance. Has the level of turnover decreased over the same period? Cf. the concern expressed in the Independent Evaluation of the Global Green Growth Institute’s Progress against the Strategic Plan 2015-2020 from 2017, which recommended that GGGI aim to increase staff retention levels to meet or exceed industry benchmarks. Are there areas where the trend is a decreasing, or stable low, score, which need to be addressed? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The level of staff turnover has decreased from 23% in 2016 to 20% in 2019 to 6% for the year to date in 2020. The 2019 percentage is an increase from 17% in 2018 and is primarily a result of a further restructuring in the back office functions (OED and ODG) to reduce overhead costs and also by reductions of staff in some large country offices; namely the Philippines and Colombia. All of the areas in the engagement survey show an improving trend with no area decreasing. The area of lowest score is ‘Feedback and Recognition’

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We're looking forward to GGGI's first Mid-Year Performance Results Report. It is said in the background document that the report will draw on the key CRF results data that are reported in GGGI Online and include only a few key CRF indicators. Could you give more information about the CRF results data and indicators that will be included in the report? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The 2020 Mid-Year Results Report is being implemented because of a Council request in 2019. Its purpose is to track and inform Management on the progress of the CRF results delivery at mid-year against the annual targets and for management to take timely and necessary actions and decisions to improve project performance and results delivery if required. Practically, however, it will not be possible to report against all CRF indicators like what is usually done at the end of the year because it will become an extensive and lengthy process that will take at least 4 months. This exercise usually requires a questionnaire to be completed in GGGI Online for all projects which is currently nearly 140 in total. The process of processing and cleaning up the results data, quality assurance and validation and drafting of the End of Year Results Report makes it a lengthy exercise running from November to end of March. For this reason, it is proposed to adopt an expedient approach which will focus on reporting on results against four key CRF results indicators drawing on data that is readily available in GGGI Online. These indicators include: output indicator 1.1 on advisory outputs that inform the development of green growth policies, outcome indicator 1.1 on policies adopted by governments with GGGI's support, output indicator 2.1 on completed advisory outputs that inform decisions on green investments, and outcome indicator 2.1 on green investment commitments mobilized. These indicators represent the core result areas of GGGI's intervention in supporting the green growth transformation of Members. GGGI will for the first-time pilot results reporting at the country program level and a country report template has been developed for this purpose. This country level reporting is intended to simplify the results reporting process and will be continued in the 2020 Results Report and future. The country report template will be populated by ODG using the online data and then shared with country and global teams for validation before it is compiled into the Mid-Year Results Report. This approach and narrowed scope will take around one month to prepare.
--	---	---

5. Update on Outreach to North Korea

General Distribution

MPSC/2020/28

Member	Question	Answer
Korea	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We appreciate that GGGI is pursuing an opportunity to work with DPRK. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Thank you.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We emphasize that the full compliance with the current UN sanctions regime on DPRK should be secured when GGGI advances its possible cooperation with DPRK. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Thank you. The Secretariat is in strong agreement.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We also welcome that GGGI has been trying to secure resources other than the core budget for the possible projects with DPRK. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Core budget has not been used for any outreach activity with the DPRK. The Secretariat is also pleased to share that, in addition to the \$100,000 previously received from the private sector, it received official notification on June 30 of a grant award from a Seoul-based NGO of up to \$240,000.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We do hope that the document on DPRK is dealt with care given its sensitivity and hope that it will not be disclosed to those outside of this MPSC participant group. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Secretariat appreciates the sensitivity and proposes the MPSC Chair—at the start of the MPSC12 virtual meeting—reiterates the sensitivities and requests that MPSC12 Participants not disclose or distribute said room document.