



---

**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. Hyoeun 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"> <li>Commend GGGI for a clear, concise report, with good presentation of information. The use of selected examples and 'highlight boxes' are a great addition.</li> </ul>	Noted
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Commend GGGI for progress on tracking social inclusion and safeguards data, with the addition of Output 6.</li> </ul>	Noted
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> </ul>	Please see this note: <a href="#">GGGI Responds to the COVID Crisis: Greening Stimulus &amp; Recovery</a> .
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Please find below more detailed comments/questions/suggestions (in order of page numbers):               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(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.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	-
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(p.19, Table 2) Would it be possible to include all results against all indicators (eg. output 3.2)? Or is</li> </ul>	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"> <li>○ (p.19, Table 2) It seems there may be some missing data (eg. output 7.5)?</li> <li>○ (p.19, Table 2) Regarding the targets not met (eg. output 4.1, output indicator 3.1) how will this be addressed?</li> <li>○ (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.</li> </ul>	<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"> <li>• Commend the GGGI for producing Results Report 2019 using Results Framework which is considered a recognized tool for planning and monitoring.</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• It may be useful to share this data with international media appropriately.</li> </ul>	<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"> <li>• (p.19, Table 2) It seems there may be some missing data (e.g. output 7.5)?</li> </ul>	<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 <a href="#">HERE</a>.</p>

April 22)		
Norway	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>	Table 2 will be revised to reflect this.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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"> <li>○ Reasons for not attaining certain targets in the corporate results framework (CRF)</li> <li>○ What contributed to the over fulfilment of other targets in the CRF</li> <li>○ 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%)?)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 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&amp;E and reporting.</li> <li>○ 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.</li> <li>○ 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.</li> <li>○ 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 &amp; Budget (WPB) 2021-2022; (iii) Annual assessment of the key assumptions</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• .It would be interesting to have more detailed information about how certain indicators were measured: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Outcome indicator 1.2: “Extent to which green growth policies adopted by governments are likely to lead to transformational change”</li> <li>○ Outcome indicator 1.3: “Extent to which green growth policies adopted by governments are aligned with the four elements of green growth”</li> <li>○ Outcome indicator 3.1 - in particular the elements “use of knowledge gained” and “skills and knowledge relevance and gain”</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<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"> <li>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?</li> <li>ii. Were resources allocated for the policy’s implementation?</li> <li>iii. Are there clear arrangements established or mapped out for the policy’s implementation?</li> <li>iv. Were specific actions or investments identified and prioritized under the policy?</li> </ul> </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"> <li>i. Will the policy support the generation of an economic activity or economic growth?</li> <li>ii. Does the policy have specific design measures that support poverty reduction?</li> <li>iii. Will the policy promote environmental sustainability or climate change mitigation?</li> <li>iv. Does the policy have design measures that support social inclusion including gender?</li> </ul> </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"> <li>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)?</li> <li>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?</li> <li>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?</li> <li>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?</li> <li>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?</li> </ol> <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"> <li>• Please find below more detailed comments (in order of page numbers): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ (p. 16, Chapter 5.2) Mismatch between text (SO4 = 14%) and figure (SO4 = 24%). Which one is correct?</li> <li>○ (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)</li> <li>○ (p. 37, Figure 16) Capacity building activities aligned to WPB 2017/18. Why not WPB</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Correction - SO5 (not SO4) has the least alignment at 14%</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• (Figure 16): this is a typing error and has been edited to align to WPB 2019-2020</li> </ul>

	<p>2019/2020? Typing error?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ (p. 41, Chapter 6.4) Typing error: Output 6.6 ought to be output 6.1</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This error has already been amended to output 6.1.</li> </ul>
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’ (<a href="#">LINK</a>) 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><a href="#">LINK</a> 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 &amp; 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 &amp; 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"> <li>• Thank you, the syntax error in para 1 in page 13 has been corrected.</li> <li>• Please see a higher resolution PDF file for Figure 2 <a href="#">HERE</a>.</li> <li>• Furthermore, please see revised <a href="#">2019 Results Report</a>, incorporating MPSC comments</li> </ul>

2. Overview of 2020 Programs		
Country	Question	Answer
Australia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>	Thanks for the suggestion and please see the revised <a href="#">Annex 1</a> .
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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?</li> </ul>	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"> <li>• 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"> <li>- 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.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	Please see this note: <a href="#">GGGI Responds to the COVID Crisis: Greening Stimulus &amp; Recovery</a> .

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Please find below more detailed comments/questions/suggestions (in order of page numbers): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ (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?</li> <li>○ (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?</li> <li>○ (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.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<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"> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>
--	---	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(p.6, para 18) We would be grateful for more information around the risk adjustment calculations.</li> </ul>	<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"> <li>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.</li> <li>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).</li> <li>Of the 42 projects, 10 projects are in the low risk category, 23 projects in the medium, and 9 high risk projects.</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(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'.</li> </ul>	<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"> <li>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.</li> <li>Recommend to elaborate agro-forestry with suitable plant species to promote food production and forestation.</li> </ul>	<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"> <li>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</li> </ul>	<p>Thanks for the suggestion and please see the revised <a href="#">Annex 1</a>.</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"> <li>• 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?</li> </ul>	<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"> <li>• 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"> <li>- 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.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>Please see this note: <a href="#">GGGI Responds to the COVID Crisis: Greening Stimulus &amp; Recovery</a>.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Please find below more detailed comments/questions/suggestions (in order of page numbers):</li> </ul>	<p>-</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ (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?</li> </ul>	<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"> <li>○ (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?</li> </ul>	<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"> <li>○ (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</li> </ul>	<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"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ (p.6, para 18) We would be grateful for more information around the risk adjustment calculations.</li> </ul>	<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"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• 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).</li> <li>• Of the 42 projects, 10 projects are in the low risk category, 23 projects in the medium, and 9 high risk projects.</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ (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’.</li> </ul>	<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"> <li>• Commend GGGI's prioritization of work related to the NDCs</li> <li>• 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)</li> <li>• 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?</li> </ul>	<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 &amp; 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 GOVID-19 recovery that "offers an opportunity to accelerate the green transformation, through greening the COVID019 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"> <li>• Commend the GGGI for the timely delivery of the Roadmap following the Strategy 2030 approval in October 2019.</li> </ul>	-
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>	<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 &amp; 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"> <li>○ 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.</li> </ul>	<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>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>	<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"> <li>• Please find below more detailed comments/questions/suggestions (in order of page numbers):</li> </ul>	-
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ (p.20, Figure 6b) A very useful visual representation of country programming and their alignment with the new Global Operational Priorities and Programmatic Solutions.</li> </ul>	-
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 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.</li> </ul>	<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"> <li>○ (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.</li> </ul>	<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"> <li>○ (p.31, table on Resource Partners) Another very useful visual representation of the current and anticipated resource partners.</li> </ul>	-
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ (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</li> </ul>	<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"> <li>▪ We would welcome more information on how GGGI anticipates this decision will impact on opportunities in the Pacific going forward, compared to 2019.</li> <li>▪ Further, if GGGI exits this space, are there other organizations GGGI could empower/work with to fill this gap?</li> </ul>	<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"> <li>• Commend the effort to create ownership of the Roadmap by involving the entire organization in its design and implementation</li> </ul>	Thank you, noted.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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?</li> </ul>	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"> <li>• 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</li> </ul>	<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"> <li>• 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?</li> </ul>	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.	