



---

**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"> <li>• Commend GGGI for a well-developed document.</li> </ul>	Thank you.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ We would welcome an organizational chart to more easily navigate the detailed written descriptions.</li> </ul>	Yes, we will include this <a href="#">organizational chart</a> for the final version of the WPB 2021-2022 document in chapter 7 (7.3.1).
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>	Thank you.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Please find below more detailed comments/questions/suggestions (in order of paragraph numbers):</li> </ul>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 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’.</li> </ul>	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"> <li>○ 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?</li> </ul>	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"> <li>○ 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.</li> </ul>	<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"> <li>○ Commend GGGI for the useful regional analysis of Programmatic Solutions Analysis (Section 4.3.2).</li> </ul>	<p>Thank you.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 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.</li> </ul>	<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"> <li>○ Commends GGGI’s achievement referenced in Appendix 1, Output 5, page 58, on equity. We would recommend rephrasing the explanatory sentence to be clearer.</li> </ul>	<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"> <li>● 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.</li> </ul>	<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"> <li>● Paragraph 10: Welcome update from Secretariat on any lessons learned from the first Country Office phase-out process (China, Mozambique and Thailand).</li> </ul>	<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"> <li>Commend GGGI for the good results recorded in the evaluation and valuable lessons learned.</li> </ul>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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?</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	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"> <li>The Green Investment Services Evaluation Brief is well-presented and a useful communication document.</li> </ul>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For future evaluations that include external evaluators, suggest noting upfront/possibly including branding, to demonstrate the independence of the evaluation.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	Thank you for this feedback, we will take this suggestion on board for future reports.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> </ul>	Under GGGI’s evaluation plan for 2020 (which can be found at <a href="https://gggi.org/results-evaluation/evaluations/">https://gggi.org/results-evaluation/evaluations/</a> ), <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"> <li>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.</li> </ul>	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 <sup>nd</sup> half of 2020.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>On Page 21 of the Mongolia Country Program Evaluation, it states some partners noted how other development partners</li> </ul>	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"> <li>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).</li> </ul>	<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"> <li>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.</li> </ul>	<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"> <li>We thank the GGGI Secretariat for the written documentation on this important issue.</li> </ul>	Thank you. The Secretariat is pleased to provide this note, as requested by MPSC Members during MPSC11.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> </ul>	<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 &amp; 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"> <li>The GGGI Work Program Budget is very comprehensive and I commend the contribution of all who were involved in the process.</li> </ul>	Thank you very much for your feedback.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Focusing on the delivery of six Strategic Outcome (SO) targets that are aligned with Member and partner countries Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs) and Strategic Development Goals (SDGs) is very appropriate and the preparation of th</li> </ul>	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"> <li>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.</li> </ul>	<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"> <li></li> </ul>	

2. Membership, Accession, and Country Programming		
Member	Question	Answer
<p>Ariyaratne Hewage (July 6)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> </ul>	<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"> <li>The document on evaluation is very informative.</li> </ul>	Thank you very much for your feedback.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> </ul>	Thank you for this suggestion.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> </ul>	GGGI develops an annual evaluation workplan which is reviewed by the MPSC (E.g.: <a href="#">2020 Evaluation Workplan</a> ). 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"> <li>The systems are appropriate and no further comments.</li> </ul>	Thank you.

**5. Update on Outreach to North Korea**

Member	Question	Answer
Ariyaratne Hewage (July 6)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposed programs on Outreach to North Korea are comprehensive and wish that the GGGI would achieve success in the implementation.</li> </ul>	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"> <li>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.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> <li>The impact pathway approach used by GGGI is framed by its value chain</li> </ul>

		<p>(policies &gt; financing &gt; investment &gt; 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"> <li>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?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> <li>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.</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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)</li> </ul>



	<p>intends to address this issue.</p>	<p>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.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> </ul>
	<p><u>WPB 2021-2022 Budget:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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”.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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%.</li> </ul>
	<p><u>WPB Compendium of Draft Country and Global Business Plans:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> </ul>
<p>Korea</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We would like to thank GGGI for the extensive documents</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Thank you for your positive feedback.</li> </ul>

	<p>on the WPB 2021-2022 that draws a holistic picture of the plans ahead.</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> </ul>

2. Membership, Accession, and Country Programming		
Member	Question	Answer
Korea	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>GGGI agrees with this statement.</li> <li>Membership does not automatically result into setting up the operations in the countries.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>The Establishment Agreement establishes the function of the Council to</li> </ul>

		<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"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Do you have SOPs in place for these procedures?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• In accordance with the Agreement on the Establishment of GGGI, a Member of GGGI that has provided a multi-year financial contribution of</li> </ul>

		<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"> <li>- positive overall conclusion of the evaluation, evidence that GGGI is valued and creates results</li> <li>- need for development of more formalized strategies for scaling up and enabling wider impact and increase private sector funding in support of the SDGs</li> <li>- 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.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Thank you for your feedback on the evaluation.</li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>
	<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"> <li>• <b>Progress update:</b> 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 <a href="#">Evaluation Rules</a>, the Impact and Evaluation Unit (IEU) conducts annual follow ups on the status</li> </ul>

	<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"> <li>• <b>Ranking of recommendations:</b> The evaluation team acknowledges the lack of ranking of recommendations according to their importance. This practice will be implemented in future evaluation reports.</li> <li>• <b>Responsible units and deadlines for management responses:</b> 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.</li> </ul>
	<p>More details from our assessment can be shared with GGGI.</p>	
<p>Korea</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Thank you for the feedback.</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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</li> </ul>

		<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"> <li>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.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. Thank you.</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. Thank you.</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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 &amp; communication, and work &amp; 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?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> <li>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’</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> </ul>
--	---	---

**5. Update on Outreach to North Korea**

**General Distribution**

**MPSC/2020/28**

<b>Member</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>Answer</b>
Korea	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We appreciate that GGGI is pursuing an opportunity to work with DPRK.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Thank you.</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Thank you. The Secretariat is in strong agreement.</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We also welcome that GGGI has been trying to secure resources other than the core budget for the possible projects with DPRK.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> </ul>