



*Empowered lives.
Resilient nations.*

**Consolidated Annual Report on Activities Implemented
under the Joint Programme
“Supporting a Green Economy Transition in Developing Countries and
LDCs: Building Towards Rio+20 and Beyond”**

**Report of the Administrative Agent
for the period 1 January - 31 December 2013**

Multi-Partner Trust Fund Office
Bureau of Management
United Nations Development Programme
[GATEWAY: http://mptf.undp.org](http://mptf.undp.org)

May 2014

PARTICIPATING ORGANIZATIONS



Empowered lives.
Resilient nations.

United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)



UNEP
United Nations Environment Programme

United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP)



UN DESA

United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs
(UN DESA)

CONTRIBUTORS



The Netherlands

Table of Contents

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	4
PART I: ANNUAL NARRATIVE PROGRESS REPORT	5
I. PURPOSE	7
1. INTRODUCTION	7
2. PROGRAMME PURPOSE	7
II. RESULTS	8
III. LESSONS LEARNED AND IMPLICATIONS FOR ONGOING WORK AND COMPLEMENTARY COLLABORATION	20
PART II: ANNUAL FINANCIAL REPORT	23
DEFINITIONS	24
2013 FINANCIAL PERFORMANCE.....	25

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This Consolidated Annual Report on activities implemented under the "Supporting a Green Economy Transition in Developing Countries and LDCs: Building towards Rio+20 and Beyond" Joint Programme covers the period from 1 January to 31 December 2013. This JP is funded by The Netherlands contribution amounting to US\$ 4,406,400. This report is in fulfillment of the reporting requirements set out in the Standard Administrative Arrangement (SAA) concluded between the Administrative Agent (UNDP MPTF Office) and the Contributor. In line with the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU), the Report is consolidated based on information, data and financial statements submitted by Participating Organizations. The report provides the Steering Committee with a comprehensive overview of achievements and challenges associated with the Joint Programme, enabling it to make strategic decisions.

In its second year, the UNEP-DESA-UNDP Green Economy Joint Programme (GEJP) continued Phase 1 activities and transitioned into Phase 2 work plans. In 2013, the GEJP: organized an inter-regional technical workshop on inclusive green economy tools in July (Output 2.1); commissioned a series of case studies for the Poverty and Green Economy Paper (Output 2.2), expanded support to post-Rio stakeholder consultations and assessments (Output 2.3 and 2.4), and supported national sustainable development policy frameworks (Output 2.5) and their measurement frameworks (Output 2.6) in, Indonesia, Ghana, Kenya, Mozambique, and Rwanda. In addition, the GEJP has worked to ensure stronger links between national, regional, and global policy forums, including the SDGs, post-2015 preparations, and post-Rio follow-up.

Experience and lessons learned through ongoing GEJP work-planning, implementation, monitoring and reporting has led to more effective and better coordinated GEJP efforts at the country level including its ability to align with and better influence national policy processes. It has also drawn on, informed, and strengthened complementary One UN Country Team programming, including the UNDP-UNEP Poverty-Environment Initiative, the Partnership for Action on Green Economy, the Green Growth Knowledge Platform, and broader partnerships with the African Development Bank, DfID, the World Bank, WWF, the Global Green Growth Institute, and Green Economy Coalition.

The Joint Programme uses the pass-through funding modality. The Multi-Partner Trust Fund Office (MPTF Office) of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) serves as the Administrative Agent of the Joint Programme. The MPTF Office receives, administers and manages contributions from the Contributor, and disburses these funds to the Participating UN Organizations in accordance with the decisions of the Steering Committee. The Administrative Agent receives and consolidates annual reports and submits to the Steering Committee.

This report is presented in two parts. Part I is the Annual Narrative Report and Part II is the Annual Financial Report.

PART I: ANNUAL NARRATIVE PROGRESS REPORT

<p>Programme Title & Project Number</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Programme Title: "Supporting a Green Economy Transition in Developing Countries and LDCs: Building towards Rio+20 and Beyond" MPTF Office Project Reference Number: 00082197 	<p>Country, Locality(s), Priority Area(s) / Strategic Results</p> <p>Global, with additional regional and national-level focus in Phase on: Bangladesh, Indonesia, Ghana, Kenya, Mozambique, Rwanda, and Colombia.</p>
<p>Participating Organization(s)</p> <p>UNDP UNDESA UNEP</p>	<p><i>Priority area/ strategic results</i></p> <p>1) enhanced political engagement and public support mobilized for the Rio+20 Conference and follow-up; 2) capacities built and advisory services strengthened on inclusive green economy policies in the context of sustainable development and poverty eradication; and 3) support for inclusive green economy approaches as a means to sustainable development integrated as a key element of One UN and UN Country Team programming.</p>
<p>Joint Programme Cost (US\$)</p> <p>JP Contribution from the Government of Netherlands (pass-through): 4,406,400</p> <p>TOTAL: 4,406,400</p>	<p>Implementing Partners</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> National counterparts: central ministries of planning/finance, ministries of environment, other UNCT sister agencies, other multilateral partners
<p>Programme Assessment/ Review/Mid-Term Eval.</p> <p>Assessment/Review <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Mid-Term Evaluation Report <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p>	<p>Programme Duration</p> <p>Overall Duration: 37 months</p> <p>Start Date¹: 01.12.2011</p>
	<p>Report Submitted By</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Name: Nik Sekhran, Title: Director, OIC, Environment and Energy Group, BDP Participating Organization (Lead): UNDP Email address: nik.sekhran@undp.org

¹ The start date is the date of the first transfer of the funds from the MPTF Office as Administrative Agent. Transfer date is available on the [MPTF Office GATEWAY](#)

Glossary

AfDB -	African Development Bank
CPD -	Country Programme Document
BAU -	business-as-usual
COMESA -	Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa
DANIDA -	Danish International Development Agency
DfID -	Department for International Development
ECOWAS -	Economic Community of West African States
EEA -	Experimental Ecosystem Accounts
EMG -	Environment Management Group
GDP -	Gross Domestic Product
GGCRS -	Green Growth Climate Resilient Strategy
GEJP -	Green Economy Joint Programme
GIZ -	German Society for International Cooperation
GGGI -	Global Green Growth Institute
HLCP -	High level Committee on Programmes
iGE -	inclusive Green Economy
ILO -	International Labour Organization
Ksh -	Kenya shillings
LDCs -	Least Developed Countries
MDG -	Millennium Development Goals
MPI -	Multidimensional Poverty Index
OECD -	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
PAGE -	Partnership for Action on Green Economy
PEI -	Poverty-Environment Initiative
QCPR -	Quadrennial Comprehensive Policy Review
SDGs -	Sustainable Development Goals
SEEA -	System of Environment and Economic Accounts
SIDA -	Swiss International Development Cooperation Agency
SIDS -	Small Island Developing States
SNA -	System of National Accounts
TEEB -	The Economics of Ecosystems and Biodiversity
UNCT -	United Nations Country Team
UNDAF -	United Nations Development Assistance Framework
UNDG -	United Nations Development Group
WAVES -	Wealth Accounting and Valuation of Ecosystem Services
WB -	World Bank
WWF -	World Wide Fund for Nature

I. Purpose

1. Introduction

Preparations for Rio+20 involved extensive consultations on how to achieve sustainable development at the global, national, and community levels, including through inclusive green economy approaches. These debates have helped highlight different perspectives on green economy policies within and across countries, institutions, and stakeholder groups. As recognized by the Rio+20 Outcome Document, inclusive green economy policies can be an important means to reducing poverty and supporting more sustainable development. At the same time, there are different green economy approaches, models and tools available to each country depending on context and needs.

Transitions to more inclusive, greener economies can be made without having to choose between strong growth, social progress, or environmental sustainability. Through careful planning, greener economies can be designed in ways that limit any potential harm, while increasing access to new economic investments, reducing inequalities and promoting social well-being. To ensure that countries can achieve these goals they need to be informed by the best available information and analysis. Decision-makers need access to a practical set of policy tools and measures that respond to the needs of different country contexts. The Rio+20 Outcome Document recognizes these needs and encourages UN agencies and partners to help meet this demand by coordinating information on toolboxes, best practice models, and methodologies to track the success of inclusive green economy approaches.

2. Programme Purpose

The UNEP-UNDESA-UNDP Joint Programme for “Supporting a Green Economy Transition in Developing Countries and LDCs: Building towards Rio+20 and Beyond” Joint Programme (GEJP) has been designed to contribute to three sustainable development outcomes: 1) enhanced political engagement and public support mobilized for the Rio+20 Conference and its follow-up; 2) capacities built and advisory services strengthened on inclusive green economy policies in the context of sustainable development and poverty eradication; and 3) support for inclusive green economy approaches as a means to sustainable development integrated as a key element of One UN and UN Country Team programming.

II. Results

After nearly two years of implementation, the UNEP-DESA-UNDP Joint Programme (GEJP) remains broadly on track to meet its complementary Phase 1 and Phase 2 objectives. Activities at the global, regional and country level have been organized and/or are progressing as planned, drawing on a strengthened collaboration between UNEP, DESA, and UNDP. These activities included Phase 1 support for: Regional Tools Workshops and National Assessments; and Phase 2 support for: Expanding Support to Post-Rio Consultations (2.4), Development and Adoption of Sustainable Development Enabling Policy Frameworks and Tailored Roadmaps (2.5), and Helping Countries Build Measurement Frameworks (2.6). These efforts have influenced Rio+20 follow-up at all levels, including through successful efforts to ensure better coordinated UN Country Team work.

Some work and timelines continue to be adjusted in response to new opportunities and programming realities, including shifting development priorities in some partner countries. Since the Joint Programme was designed, complementary partner initiatives continue to evolve in the post-Rio context at all levels related to inclusive green economy, green growth, and the post-2015 framework. Activities are underway to strengthen synergies with these initiatives. The timing of some activities has also been shifted to ensure full ownership by government partners and greater engagement with agencies pursuing similar objectives. For these reasons a final no-cost extension of the Joint Programme into June 2015 is likely to be recommended.

A more detailed update on Phase 1 and Phase 2 implementation progress follows.

Phase 1

Outcome 1 Enhancing Political Engagement and Mobilizing Public Support in the Run-up to the Rio+20 Conference and its follow-up

Output 1.1 Providing Countries with National Platforms for Dialogue and Awareness Raising on the Key Themes of Rio+20

Output 1.1 status:

Partner countries supported -

completed, see 2012 Annual Report

Bangladesh, Benin, Ghana, Indonesia, Kenya, Mozambique, Rwanda, Sudan, Yemen

national consultations supported in 3 non-partner countries (Kyrgyzstan, Cape Verde, The Gambia)

Output 1.2 Advocacy and Outreach for Green Economy at Regional and Global Level

Output 1.2 status:

Three global/regional conferences – completed in Phase 1, see 2012 Annual Report

Outcome 2. Improved Advisory Services on Green Economy in the Context of Sustainable Development and Poverty Eradication

Output 2.1 One Regional Workshop on
Economic Tools for Inclusive Green Economy Approaches

Output 2.1 Status

One regional tools workshop - Asia-based workshop completed, see 2012 Report
Africa-based workshop completed in July 2013

UNDP, UNEP, and UNDESA organized an “Inter-regional Technical Workshop on Tools and Measures to Inform Inclusive Green Economy Policies” in Nairobi, Kenya from 2-4 July. This Workshop provided a forum for over 100 officials and experts from 25 countries, a majority from Africa, representing ministries of finance, planning, and environment, and civil society. UN agencies and multi- and bilateral development partners, including the WB, AfDB, GIZ, DANIDA, the Green Growth Best Practices Initiative and Green Economy Coalition also participated.

Participants shared experiences on implementing inclusive green economy approaches as a means for reducing poverty and ensuring more equitable sustainable development. Break-Out Groups assessed the strengths and weaknesses of integrated assessment and modeling tools, fiscal reforms, and measurement frameworks. The workshop also helped identify how the UN system and partners can better respond to country demand for inclusive green economy approaches.

As follow-up, the UN and partners are integrating workshop recommendations into ongoing inclusive green economy programming. Workshop activities were informed by and also feed into the [Green Growth Knowledge Platform \(www.ggkp.org\)](http://www.ggkp.org) and Green Growth Best Practice Initiative, as well as the work of the [UNDP-UNEP Poverty-Environment Initiative.](#)

Some of the key Messages that emerged from the workshop include the following:

- Rio+20 debates have helped highlight different perspectives on inclusive Green Economy (iGE) approaches within and across countries and public, private, and civil society institutions, and their links to the MDGs and post-2015 discussions. As the Rio+20 Outcome Document notes, iGE policies can be an important means to reducing poverty and supporting more sustainable development.
- While there are tradeoffs, iGE approaches do not mean choosing between growth, social progress, or environmental sustainability. With strong cross-sector planning and policy frameworks and a “whole-of-governance” approach, inclusive green economies can be designed in ways that limit harm for groups or sectors, and increase access to investments, while increasing equality and social well-being. The social and inequality dimensions of iGE approaches in particular require greater focus.
- To ensure that the design and implementation of integrated iGE approaches are informed by the most relevant information, decision-makers and partners from civil society and the private sector require access to and understanding of a more advanced yet practical set of policy tools, measures and methodologies that can be adapted and respond to the needs of different country contexts.
- Country contexts differ widely with respect to development starting points and priorities; political will and stability; institutional capacities; technical, financial, and natural resources; economic structure and position within regional and global markets, etc. Depending on these needs and other factors, there can be many different sustainable development pathways and iGE tools to support them.
- The Rio+20 Outcome Document recognizes these needs and encourages UN agencies and partners to help respond to country demand by coordinating information on iGE tools and good practices. These can be divided into closely-linked sets of decision-making tools, policy instruments, measurement frameworks, and broader inclusive stakeholder consultation and capacity development tools:
 - **Integrated decision-making tools** to assess cross-sectoral social, environmental, and economic synergies and trade-offs over the medium and long-term. These include long-term macro-economic models, e.g. Threshold-21, Computable General Equilibrium, Systems Dynamics, Cost Benefit Analysis, as well as integrated diagnostics, e.g. Strategic Environmental Assessments, Poverty Social Impact Analysis, MDG Simulations, and Labour Market and Economic Assessments.
 - **Policy instruments** to encourage a shift to iGE approaches that consider impacts on different sectors and groups, including women, youth, and indigenous peoples. These include environmental fiscal reform, public climate and environmental expenditure reviews, social protection, including public works programmes, micro-credit, adaptive social protection and conditional cash transfers, public-private partnerships, and green employment and trade policies.

- **Measurement frameworks** to inform, advocate and assess progress towards iGE objectives, with links to the emerging post-2015 framework and SDGs. These include the UN System of Environmental-Economic Accounting (SEEA) and the Wealth Accounting and Valuation of Ecosystem Services (WAVES) programme, composite indices, such as the Multi-dimensional Poverty Index (MPI), and a range of indicators, statistics and quantitative and qualitative data.
 - **Inclusive Capacity Development approaches** to ensure that policies and inter-ministerial and public-private partnerships are informed by stakeholder knowledge and needs, to address political economy issues, and to strengthen governance and institutional capacities needed to better apply the iGE tools outlined above. These include stakeholder engagement techniques, and capacity assessments and programmes, e.g. Institutional Context Analysis and Collaborative Capacities.
- For these tools, policy instruments, and measures to be effective, they must be applied and institutionalized across the larger national policy and budgeting cycle. iGE approaches rely on a combination of tools and policy instruments - there is **no one-size-fits-all iGE toolkit**. National decision-makers can select and adapt from the full range of tools and policy instruments available.
 - To help inform the selection of iGE tools, the UN system and partners will continue to facilitate **knowledge platforms, toolkits, and South-South learning** events such as this Technical Workshop. UN Country Teams and partners will also support broader country-led iGE initiatives to reduce poverty and maximize social, environmental, and economic benefits over the medium- and longer-term.

The Workshop Report has been disseminated widely across development networks, and has been used to inform GEJP implementation in other areas. The full set of workshop materials, including concept note, agenda, presentations, summary, and participants is available on the MPTF Office website at <http://mptf.undp.org/document/download/11593>.

Additional Global and Regional Events

As recommended by the JP Steering Committee, collaboration with UNDESA and additional groups at the global, regional, and national levels was deepened as part of ongoing Rio+ 20 follow-up and to support implementation of the UN System of Environmental and Economic Accounts (SEEA) and links to green economy.

From November 25-27, 2013, the UNDESA Division for Sustainable Development and Statistics organized the “Beyond the WASH Agenda Workshop on Strengthening Capacity for Water Resource Management in the Post-2015 Development Agenda” in New York. The technical workshop brought together senior water managers, economic planners and statistical experts to:

- Share experiences and lessons on, and identify the challenges to, linking Integrated Water Resource Management to national planning, budgeting and priority setting;
- Improve understanding of why managing and developing water resources wisely is key to the MDGs, and why a more holistic water agenda beyond WASH (WASH-Plus) is crucial for the post-2015 development framework;
- Explore how existing initiatives progressing measures beyond GDP, specifically those in natural capital accounting using the System for Environmental-Economic Accounting (SEEA) methodologies, support linking IWRM and national development planning process; and
- Identify actions and capacity development needs for implementing a WASH-Plus agenda, including for implementing SEEA to support development and tracking of indicators for reporting on a WASH-Plus agenda in the post-2015 development framework.

GEJP links to SEEA have also included: 1) ongoing advocacy around SEEA; 2) support for its integration into the post-2015/SDG process; 3) integration into regional and national development policy processes and capacity development initiatives; and 4) linking to complementary programming around inclusive green economy, as well as the poverty-environment nexus, biodiversity, and green commodities.

Programming experiences and policy demand for SEEA implementation were shared through engagement in several global and regional processes linked to the post-2015/SDG and SIDS. These included: technical inputs into SEEA Energy and SEEA water; collaboration and technical inputs around SEEA through post-2015 consultations, side events and preparations of SDG Open Working Group Issue Briefs; advocacy for SEEA through the February meetings of the UN Statistical Commission; co-organization of the 17 June International Conference on Global Implementation of the System of Environmental-Economic Accounting; engagement in the 16-20 September SEEA Workshop in Brazil; inclusion of SEEA, WAVES and TEEB sessions in the 2-4 July Inclusive Green Economy Tools workshop; engagement in the November 18-20 Ecosystem Accounting workshop on models and tools for SEEA EEA; support for the 9-11 December "Developing a Programme for the Implementation of the 2008 SNA and Supporting Statistics for ECOWAS and COMESA Workshop"; and co-organization of the February 2014 Caribbean SEEA Implementation Workshop in St Lucia.

Output 2.2 Report on Poverty and Inclusive Green Economy Approaches

Output 2.2 Status

Poverty and Green Economy Report - under preparation

The GEJP is drawing on its experiences over Phase 1 and Phase 2, as well as the work of complementary initiatives and research, to prepare a “Report on Poverty and Inclusive Green Economy Approaches” (Output 2.2). The report includes a focus on case studies relevant to GEJP partner country contexts. This research draws on existing literature, policy reviews and programming experience, as well as several newly commissioned GEJP case studies that assess links between poverty eradication, jobs and livelihoods, and inclusive green economy policy approaches in areas of: energy, natural resource management including forests, waste management, eco-tourism, employment generation programmes, and environmental fiscal reform.

This work continues to inform evolving GEJP work at the national, regional, and global level. The following initial findings from the draft report and case studies were shared at the global PAGE Workshop in Dubai in March 2014.

Key policy issues in making inclusive green economy approaches work for the poor

- Maintaining growth and reducing emissions for the economy, while also promoting the creation of jobs and other economic opportunities in sectors that employ the poor: Efforts to ensure green economy approaches benefit the poor require bringing together growth and environmentally sustainability policies with clear emphasis on green jobs for the poor
- Generating adequate amounts of public revenues to allow investment in quality services with equitable access by the poor: This means reprioritizing public (green) revenues through environmental fiscal reform for social investments in health, education, access to more efficient renewable energy, water and sanitation resources, and better targeted approaches to empower communities and reach vulnerable groups.
- Retaining biodiversity and ecosystem services, while seeking sustainable supply of food as well as livelihoods of the poor who depend on them: For example, policy mechanisms can be used to maintain and improve ecosystem services in ways that help create and protect livelihoods.
- Enhancing energy and resource efficiency in the economy, including through the equitable access to energy by the poor and the promotion of its efficient use: Potential trade-offs between policies promoting a shift from conventional energy to renewables and those designed to increase energy access can be addressed in ways that create new community livelihood opportunities for poor men and women while still promoting cleaner growth.

- Ensuring resilience to environmental (and other) risks through developing adaptive capacities including through social protection: Social protection policies can be designed to contribute to sustainability by strengthening safety nets that help the poor to adapt to such risks.

Output 2.3 Inclusive Green Economy Joint Assessments

Output 2.3 status:

Three joint assessments - completed in 3 partner countries, see 2012 Report
Ghana, Kenya, Rwanda

Three inclusive green economy assessments have been delivered in Ghana, Kenya and Rwanda to explore the potential impacts of green investments and related policy reforms to promote inclusive growth, poverty reduction, job creation and environmental sustainability at the national level. A study was also initiated in Mali, but was postponed due to unforeseen political events. The studies are based on policy goals and priorities contained in national development strategies and plans such as Vision 2030 in Kenya, and Ghana's Shared Growth and Prosperity Agenda, to ensure policy relevance and articulation with national sustainable development objectives. The assessments have been conducted by national technical institutions designated by national governments in consultation with UN agencies. Inter-ministerial committees on green economy set up in each country and facilitated by ministries of environment with the effective participation of ministries of economy, planning, and sectoral agencies have served as a steering body for producing the reports. National multi-stakeholder green economy workshops were held to initiate the studies and validate results. UN agencies, development partners, civil society and private sector representatives took part in these workshops and initial reviews of the report findings. Staff from UNEP and UNDP contributed to reviewing assessment reports and participated in review and validation workshops, enhancing inter-agency cooperation and coordination in the process. For example, the UN Resident Coordinator and UNDP Resident Representative contributed to the study in workshops in Ghana.

The assessments have revealed that inclusive green economy approaches could offer these countries new opportunities for sustained economic growth, energy saving, agricultural productivity, progress on the MDGs, and create green jobs for a growing young population. For example, findings from the assessment in Kenya indicate that the country would achieve faster economic growth with an average annual real GDP growth rate of 5%, as compared to 3.7% under business-as-usual (BAU) between 2010 and 2030. Real per capita national income would rise to Ksh 57,000 – 64,000 in 2030 compared to Ksh 40,000 in 2010 and Ksh 53,000 in 2030 under the BAU scenario. This would contribute to reducing the proportion of the population below poverty line by about 3 per cent more than in a BAU scenario. Agricultural output would exceed the baseline scenario by about 23 per cent, as green economy measures help reduce the impact of climate change. A composite indicator of MDG progress is projected to increase from 0.54 in 2010 to 0.67 – 0.72 in 2030 compared to 0.63 under BAU. To realize the potential of this inclusive green economy approach, several key challenges need to be addressed including political, social, economic, financial and technical

barriers. Building on the results of this assessment, the GEJP in collaboration with the African Development Bank, ILO, and other UN agencies, will support the formulation of a national inclusive green economy roadmap linked to Kenya's Medium Term Plan for 2013-2017.

In Ghana, three sectors have been adopted for more detailed analysis: agricultural sector, forestry and logging and industry. Although the country is endowed with abundant natural resources, environmental degradation costs the nation about 10% of GDP. The scoping study came up with a number of policy enabling conditions. First, the study notes the importance of sound regulations and standards to facilitate the transitioning to Green Economy especially for the agricultural sector. In this regard, the study not only recommends strict enforcement of existing regulations and standards but also calls for more specific ones for different sub-sectors. Secondly, the study also calls for the strengthening of economic and fiscal policy instruments to facilitate the transition to a Green Economy. In addition, the study recommends capacity building among different stakeholders to support the transition to Green Economy in the country. This study will be followed by a quantitative assessment to model more Green Economy scenarios in Ghana.

The Rwanda energy report assesses the green economy-related initiatives and policies, pertaining to the energy sector in line with Vision 2020 and other strategies that are committed to the development of the energy sector; with the aim of contributing to socio-economic development as well as improving environmental stewardship of the country.

Phase 2

As agreed during the Joint Programme Technical retreat of January 2013, the Steering Committee meeting in April 2013, and regular discussions with the Government of the Netherlands, Phase 2 work plans have drawn and built on the results and lessons from Phase 1. These include findings from global, regional, and national events, workshops, reports and programming supported by the Joint Programme and complementary initiatives, including the UNDP-UNEP Poverty-Environment Initiative and the Green Growth Knowledge Platform.

Phase 2 activities have focused on three Outputs: Expanding Support to Post-Rio Consultations (2.4), Development and Adoption of Sustainable Development Enabling Policy Frameworks and Tailored Roadmaps (2.5), and Helping Countries Build Measurement Frameworks (2.6). In addition, Phase 2 activities have included efforts to link national, regional, and global policy forums, including post-2015 SDG framework preparations, and high level forum on Sustainable Development.

The Steering Committee and Government of Netherlands agreed to focus Phase 2 activities in six partner countries: Bangladesh, Indonesia, Ghana, Kenya, Mozambique and Rwanda. In addition, initial inclusive green economy work is being supported in one non-partner country, Colombia, given its strong candidacy and political importance to the Netherlands.

These countries were selected against a range of criteria including: government capacities, commitment, and status of national planning frameworks and GE initiatives; Phase One GEJP experiences; links to other UNCT supported national and sector initiatives such as PEI; status of UNDAFs, CPDs, UNCT capacities and interest; and opportunity to explore different GEJP country contexts and modalities. Although country context and demand for GEJP services varies in each country, the following activities are being supported:

- strengthening capacities for long-term planning within and across sectors and related diagnostics and monitoring systems that track opportunities for “triple wins”, as well as social protection, benefit-sharing and distribution schemes needed to address trade-offs, particularly for vulnerable groups;
- related tools and policy discussions linking social protection, environmental assets and vulnerability;
- distributional impacts of inclusive green economy public finance through public expenditure reviews;
- natural wealth accounting measures based on the System of Environment and Economic Accounts; and
- facilitating South-South experiences that can be tailored to different country contexts.

Output 2.4 Expanding Support to Post-Rio Consultations

Output 2.4 status: three assessments initiated in Indonesia, Mozambique, and Ghana

The GEJP has started three additional assessments in 2013. UNEP and UNDP have strengthened the assessment methodology and its links to follow-up advisory services, including by expanding their social and equity dimensions and adapting to country context. This has been done by revising and adapting Terms of Reference to expand on the social and equity issues that can be considered, and a broader set of national partners with whom to engage. In addition, these studies are drawing more fully on relevant sectoral and cross-cutting reviews completed by other bilateral and multilateral partners. UNEP and UNDP staff at HQ, regional and country have been engaged in the design and implementation of each study.

As part of longer-term capacity development goals, a national institution has been contracted by UNEP in each country to develop the materials and inputs for this work in close consultation with government and other national stakeholders. These studies are being reviewed and validated through a series of national consultations and workshops. Throughout the process, additional members of the UN Country Team are being engaged, as well as other development agencies, including the World Bank and regional banks, OECD, and GGGI.

A more detailed update on progress to date for each of the three assessments follows:

Indonesia

The UNEP-UNDP collaboration will lead to the development of two critical decision-support tools for the GOI - an integrated green economy model – national and provincial, in three provinces; Jakarta, Central

Kalimantan and Papua - as well as an indicators framework to measure progress towards an inclusive green economy. Capacity building activities in the area of systemic macroeconomic modeling are also being implemented. These tools will enable the Government of Indonesia to effectively integrate green economy approaches into the next Mid-Term National Development Plan (RPJMN 2015-2019), which is under development and expected to be adopted by mid-2014.

Mozambique

Building on the Green Economy Action Plan released in October 2013, the GEJP started a green economy assessment aiming at the quantification of the policies and investments recommended in the action plan. The modeling will be mainly sectoral and would serve as a basis to disseminate the green economy action plan in a more pedagogical manner to stakeholders in Mozambique. Support in the use of green economy indicators and measurement framework will also take place in Mozambique in synergy with the ongoing Poverty-Environment Initiative (PEI).

Ghana

Building on the scoping study for Ghana, a green economy assessment has been started in Ghana in order to assess the impacts of additional green investments and policies in agriculture, energy and forestry on the economic, social and environmental fronts. This macroeconomic assessment is complemented by a fiscal assessment aiming at estimating the fiscal space in Ghana and the benefits and tradeoffs of environmental fiscal reforms. A green trade opportunities assessment is also underway with the aim of quantifying the trade opportunities in green sectors. Capacity building activities at the subnational level have been prepared in 2013 to be implemented in 2014.

Output 2.5 Development and Adoption of Sustainable Development Enabling Policy Frameworks and Tailored Roadmaps

Output 2.5 status: work in three countries initiated – Kenya, Ghana, and Mozambique

The GEJP has supported the development and adoption of sustainable development policy frameworks and roadmaps in three countries in 2013, Kenya, Ghana, and Mozambique. This work will continue in 2014 and expand to include Rwanda, Bangladesh and Colombia. GEJP has responded to existing country demand for inclusive green economy approaches and helped advance cross-government planning and implementation. This progress to date reflects government commitment to green economy approaches, as well as some of the challenges in moving from strong rhetoric to strong planning and implementation. More detailed country updates follow.

Kenya:

In collaboration with the African Development Bank, the GEJP has started working on a green economy roadmap that is building on the green economy assessment undertaken in phase 1. A public expenditure review has been initiated in 2013 to be implemented in 2014. A fiscal assessment is also planned in this work

programme in order to estimate the fiscal space in Kenya and the opportunities for environmental fiscal reform. This work is being done in collaboration with the UNDP-UNEP Poverty-Environment Initiative and a DfID programme on climate change.

Ghana:

Building on the joint scoping study undertaken in Phase One, the GEJP has launched an ambitious work programme consisting of a green economy quantitative assessments and a measurement framework leading to a green economy action plan. In addition, the GEJP has supported a series of government-led national and sub-national capacity building and work planning events.

Mozambique:

In early 2013 UNEP and UNDP along with AfDB have supported and provided guidance to Mozambique for the design of its green economy action plan that was approved by the cabinet and released in October 2013. Following on this, the GEJP has initiated a quantitative assessment and a measurement framework in December 2013 to be continued in 2014.

Rwanda:

In July 2013, a joint UNEP-UNEP mission visited Rwanda in order to design the work programme to support Rwanda's transition to green economy. The government of Rwanda through its Environment Management Authority has expressed the need for the costing of their recent Green Growth Climate Resilient Strategy (GGCRS) to align it with and finance it through the national budget process and hence implement it. In this context, UNEP, UNDP and AfDB joined forces in September 2013 to design a joint work programme aiming at costing the GGCRS. This work programme was postponed in early 2014 until late spring at the request of the Government of Rwanda in order to ensure better government-wide coordination and to avoid overlap with the Genocide observations. This work is also being coordinated with the One UN Flagship Programme on Green Economy in Rwanda.

Activities in Colombia and Bangladesh are being designed and will be delivered in 2014.

Output 2.6 Helping Countries Build Measurement Frameworks

Output 2.6 status: work initiated in three countries – Indonesia, Ghana, and Mozambique

The GEJP is supporting the development and adoption of sustainable development policy frameworks, roadmaps and their measurement frameworks in six countries, three in 2013 and three in 2014. This measurement work is building on existing platforms and indicators that may have been developed through other activities such as the UNDESA Statistical Division, the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development, the World Bank, EUROSTAT, the European Environment Agency, the International Labor Organization, UNDP-UNEP PEI, UNDP's human development indices, and UNEP's Green Economy Indicators and International Resource Panel.

In Indonesia, Ghana and Mozambique activities to be carried out in this component of the project include: (1) Reviewing existing national statistics that could support measuring and monitoring of a green economy transformation; (2) selecting key indicators for agenda setting, policy formulation and policy impact evaluation; (3) identifying data gaps for further research (e.g., through surveys); (4) creating a time series (approximately 10 to 15 years) for all relevant indicators available and developed, if applicable; (5) analyzing trends (historical performance and future projections) of the relevant indicators, also considering cross-sectoral interdependencies.

In Mozambique, this work will contribute to broader efforts to revise the National Statistics Strategy, also being supported in collaboration with the UNDP-UNEP Poverty-Environment Initiative. It will also explore links between measures of multidimensional poverty, natural resource degradation, and climate vulnerability.

Similar support has been initiated in Rwanda but has been postponed at the request of the Government until late spring 2014. This work is being coordinated with the One UN Flagship Programme on Green Economy, the SIDA-funded Indicators Programme, and the WAVES programme led by the World Bank.

In Kenya, discussions are ongoing with the Government to add this component to the work programme.

Linking National and Regional GEJP Work to Global Debates and Forums

Phase 2 has also worked to link national, regional, and global policy forums, including the evolving SDG and post-2015 framework preparations, and high level forum on Sustainable Development. Governments agreed in Rio to establish a new high level political forum for sustainable development. The forum, amongst other things, provides a dynamic platform for regular dialogue, stocktaking, and reviewing progress towards sustainable development. Through the GEJP, UNEP, DESA and UNDP are assist countries to share their experiences through the UN intergovernmental process. This includes preparations for a GEJP workshop and side-event on "Bridging the Implementation Gap" during the proposed high level political forum in July 2014 and preparation of tailored GEJP inputs into the SDGs and post-2015 process.

National Voluntary Presentations by member states to the High-Level Political Forum on Sustainable Development will include reporting on Sustainable Development Goals including key indicators on Green Economy and Poverty Eradication. While the Sustainable Development Goals are yet to be decided, the opportunity to report national progress to this forum will be initiated in the coming year coordinated by UNDESA. Integrating and harmonizing these processes will benefit national agencies in their efforts to make national progress and to share experience with others.

III. Lessons Learned and Implications for Ongoing Work and Complementary Collaboration

UNEP, DESA, and UNDP continue to gain a range of technical and operational insights through Joint Programme implementation at the global, regional, and national levels that are informing ongoing work and complementary areas of policy, programming and partnerships. These include opportunities to: build on areas that have already achieved strong results; respond better to national demand through programmatic UN Country Team capacity development and mainstreaming approaches, including a more targeted set of GEJP advisory services; and strengthen partnerships and coordination within and across agencies and partner initiatives.

Enhanced inter-agency coordination and external partnerships

The GEJP has succeeded in strengthening collaboration between UNEP, DESA, and UNDP leading to better and more sustainable programme results. Greater synergies have been achieved at all levels by drawing on the comparative advantages for coordination and technical advisory services of each agency. For example, due to this collaboration, country level activities have better used GEJP resources and expertise, and complemented additional relevant in-country programming. Expertise from HQ, regional, and country offices have been pooled to strengthen the inter-disciplinary focus of road maps and assessments in Indonesia, Mozambique, Rwanda, Kenya, and Ghana and greater coordination with national and international partners such as the African Development Bank, WWF, DfID, the World Bank, the Green Growth Knowledge Platform, and the Global Green Growth Institute in countries such as Mozambique, Kenya, and Rwanda.

Lesson Learned: This level of coordination needs to be maintained over the remaining phase of GEJP implementation. This includes GEJP Working Group mechanisms for more regular discussions and in-country work planning; as well as dedicated focal points for better day-to-day coordination and information sharing on complementary initiatives. Communication with other agency staff in HQ, regional centers, and country offices has also been strengthened.

Need to align with national processes and timelines

Work in 2014 has further highlighted the need to align GEJP activities with national processes and timelines. In most partner countries, this has meant extending the timelines originally developed as part of Phase 2 GEJP work plans. Government partners and UN Country Teams supporting them often face a range of parallel and shifting development priorities and policy agendas. To ensure national ownership, the timing of

some GEJP activities in Bangladesh, Indonesia, Rwanda, and Mozambique, have all, to varying degrees, been postponed. Part of this challenge arises from the need to consult with and facilitate coordination beyond ministries of environment to also include central ministries of planning, finance, and economy as well as other line ministries with relevant sector and social portfolios, in addition to other national stakeholders. This challenge also reflects the need to align GEJP activities with regular and ad hoc policy cycles annual budgeting, monitoring, reporting exercises, as well as reviews and updating of national poverty reduction and growth strategies, and sectoral plans. In addition, changes in individual government counterparts and broader challenges of national absorption of government assistance have also caused delays.

Lesson learned: GEJP work plans continue to require flexibility and realistic timelines will be carried into the next phase as part of broader efforts to work with countries at their pace to ensure national uptake and ownership. As a result, it will be necessary for a one-year no-cost extension of the GEJP to be requested through November 2014.

Responding to Country Demand through UN Regional and Country Team Programmatic Approaches

As part of these efforts to align with national processes and timelines, UNEP, DESA, and UNDP continue to refine the breakdown of each agency's technical advisory services that can be drawn on to respond to country demand.

At the same time, there is still a need to strengthen the programmatic mainstreaming nature of GEJP activities needs by drawing on the experience, expertise, and partnerships already established under the UNDP-UNEP Poverty-Environment Initiative (PEI) and similar programmes, including the expanding work of PAGE. Links between the GEJP and PEI programmes have been formalized in countries such as Indonesia, Kenya, Mozambique and Rwanda.

Lesson learned: To achieve this goal, ongoing efforts bringing in the governance, social equity, environmental, economic, and political economy issues key to the coordination of inclusive green economy policies need to be maintained. This work also opens the door for stronger engagement with UN regional and country teams drawing on respective mandates and comparative advantages in response to national demand in line with QCPR recommendations, and post-2015 agenda.

Opportunities to Expand GEJP Partnerships

UNEP, DESA and UNDP continue to strengthen collaboration and coordination of GEJP activities with a range of complementary initiatives and platforms by sister agencies and development partners at all levels.

These activities include ongoing work at the global level through various UN inter-agency mechanisms (HLCP, UNDG, EMG) and in individual agencies according to their mandates.

Preparations are also underway for UNDP to become a full member of PAGE in 2014. This engagement has become possible in part through the GEJP technical and operational lessons outlined above. These include the need to align more closely with national policy cycles through longer-term programmatic mainstreaming approaches; expanded partnerships with central ministries of planning, finance, and economy and other national stakeholders; greater emphasis on the social, governance, and capacity development aspects of inclusive green economy transitions; and options for ensuring better coordinated delivery of One UN Country Team technical and financial support, including through national trust funds and joint programmes.

PAGE work will continue to draw on GEJP experiences and vice versa, including in Ghana, which is both a PAGE and GEJP partner country, as well as other countries. For example, draft findings from the GEJP-supported Poverty Report were used to inform discussions at the first annual global PAGE workshop held in Dubai in 2014.

Similar partnerships have been established with the World Bank, UN Statistics Division, OECD, Green Growth Knowledge Platform and Best Practice initiative, and the Green Economy Coalition.

Lesson Learned: UNEP, DESA, and UNDP will continue to expand the existing collaboration and explore new partnerships at all levels with sister agencies, including through PAGE.

PART II: ANNUAL FINANCIAL REPORT

DEFINITIONS

Allocation

Amount approved by the Steering Committee for a project/programme.

Approved Project/Programme

A project/programme including budget, etc., that is approved by the Steering Committee for fund allocation purposes.

Contributor Commitment

Amount(s) committed by a donor to a Fund in a signed Standard Administrative Arrangement (SAA) with the UNDP Multi-Partner Trust Fund Office (MPTF Office), in its capacity as the Administrative Agent. A commitment may be paid or pending payment.

Contributor Deposit

Cash deposit received by the MPTF Office for the Fund from a contributor in accordance with a signed Standard Administrative Arrangement.

Delivery Rate

The percentage of funds that have been utilized, calculated by comparing expenditures reported by a Participating Organization against the 'net funded amount'.

Indirect Support Costs

A general cost that cannot be directly related to any particular programme or activity of the Participating Organizations. UNDG policy establishes a fixed indirect cost rate of 7% of programmable costs.

Net Funded Amount

Amount transferred to a Participating Organization less any refunds transferred back to the MPTF Office by a Participating Organization.

Participating Organization

A UN Organization or other inter-governmental Organization that is an implementing partner in a Fund, as represented by signing a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the MPTF Office for a particular Fund.

Project Expenditure

The sum of expenses and/or expenditure reported by all Participating Organizations for a Fund irrespective of which basis of accounting each Participating Organization follows for donor reporting.

Project Financial Closure

A project or programme is considered financially closed when all financial obligations of an operationally completed project or programme have been settled, and no further financial charges may be incurred.

Project Operational Closure

A project or programme is considered operationally closed when all programmatic activities for which Participating Organization(s) received funding have been completed.

Project Start Date

Date of transfer of first instalment from the MPTF Office to the Participating Organization.

Total Approved Budget

This represents the cumulative amount of allocations approved by the Steering Committee.

2013 FINANCIAL PERFORMANCE

This chapter presents financial data and analysis of the Joint Programme “Supporting a Green Economy Transition in Developing Countries and LDCs: Building Towards Rio+20 and Beyond” using the pass-through funding modality as of 31 December 2013. Financial information for this Fund is also available on the MPTF Office GATEWAY, at the following address: <http://mptf.undp.org/factsheet/fund/JXAoo>.

1. SOURCES AND USES OF FUNDS

As of 31 December 2013, one contributor has deposited **US\$ 4,406,400** in contributions and **US\$ 2,086** has been earned in interest,

bringing the cumulative source of funds to **US\$ 4,408,486** (see respectively, Tables 2 and 3). Of this amount, **US\$ 4,362,332** has been transferred to three Participating Organizations, of which **US\$ 1,691,520** has been reported as expenditure. The Administrative Agent fee has been charged at the approved rate of 1% on deposits and amounts to **US\$ 44,064**. Table 1 provides an overview of the overall sources, uses, and balance of the JP as of 31 December 2013.

Table 1. Financial Overview, as of 31 December 2013 (in US Dollars)*

	Annual 2012	Annual 2013	Cumulative
Sources of Funds			
Gross Contributions	3,737,350	669,050	4,406,400
Fund Earned Interest and Investment Income	-	2,086	2,086
Interest Income received from Participating Organizations	-	-	-
Refunds by Administrative Agent to Contributors	-	-	-
Fund balance transferred to another MDTF	-	-	-
Other Revenues	-	-	-
Total: Sources of Funds	3,737,350	671,136	4,408,486
Uses of Funds			
Transfers to Participating Organizations	1,790,910	2,571,422	4,362,332
Refunds received from Participating Organizations	-	-	-
Net Funded Amount to Participating Organizations	1,790,910	2,571,422	4,362,332
Administrative Agent Fees	37,374	6,691	44,064
Direct Costs: (Steering Committee, Secretariat...etc.)	-	-	-
Bank Charges	-	25	25
Other Expenditures	-	-	-
Total: Uses of Funds	1,828,284	2,578,137	4,406,420
Change in Fund cash balance with Administrative Agent	1,909,067	(1,907,001)	2,066
Opening Fund balance (1 January)	-	1,909,067	-
Closing Fund balance (31 December)	1,909,067	2,066	2,066
Net Funded Amount to Participating Organizations	1,790,910	2,571,422	4,362,332
Participating Organizations' Expenditure	883,569	807,950	1,691,520
Balance of Funds with Participating Organizations			2,670,812

* Due to rounding of numbers, totals may not add up. This applies to all numbers in this report.

2. PARTNER CONTRIBUTIONS

Table 2 provides information on cumulative contributions received from all contributors to this Fund as of 31 December 2013.

Table 2. Contributors' Deposits, as of 31 December 2013 (in US Dollars)*

Contributors	Prior Years as of 31-Dec-2012	Current Year Jan-Dec-2013	Total
Government of Netherlands	3,737,350	669,050	4,406,400
Grand Total	3,737,350	669,050	4,406,400

3. INTEREST EARNED

Interest income is earned in two ways: 1) on the balance of funds held by the Administrative Agent ('Fund earned interest'), and 2) on the balance of funds held by the Participating Organizations ('Agency earned interest') where their Financial Regulations and Rules allow return of interest

to the AA. As of 31 December 2013, Fund earned interest amounts to **US\$ 2,086** and there is no interest received from Participating Organizations. Details are provided in the table below.

Table 3. Sources of Interest and Investment Income, as of 31 December 2013 (in US Dollars)*

Interest Earned	Prior Years as of 31-Dec-2012	Current Year Jan-Dec-2013	Total
Administrative Agent			
Fund Earned Interest and Investment Income	-	2,086	2,086
Total: Fund Earned Interest	-	2,086	2,086
Participating Organization			
Total: Agency earned interest	-	-	-
Grand Total	-	2,086	2,086

4. TRANSFER OF FUNDS

Allocations to Participating Organizations are approved by the Steering Committee and disbursed by the Administrative Agent. As of 31 December 2013, the AA has transferred **US\$ 4,362,332** to three Participating Organizations (see list below).

Table 4 provides additional information on the refunds received by the MPTF Office, and the net funded amount for each of the Participating Organizations.

Table 4. Transfer, Refund, and Net Funded Amount by Participating Organization, as of 31 December 2013 (in US Dollars)*

Participating Organization	Prior Years as of 31-Dec-2012			Current Year Jan-Dec-2013			Total		
	Transfers	Refunds	Net Funded	Transfers	Refunds	Net Funded	Transfers	Refunds	Net Funded
UNDESA	160,500	-	160,500	100,000	-	100,000	260,500	-	260,500
UNDP	993,760	-	993,760	945,371	-	945,371	1,939,131	-	1,939,131
UNEP	636,650	-	636,650	1,526,051	-	1,526,051	2,162,701	-	2,162,701
Grand Total	1,790,910	-	1,790,910	2,571,422	-	2,571,422	4,362,332	-	4,362,332

5. EXPENDITURE AND FINANCIAL DELIVERY RATES

All final expenditures reported for the year 2013 were submitted by the Headquarters of the Participating Organizations. These were consolidated by the MPTF Office.

5.1 EXPENDITURE REPORTED BY PARTICIPATING ORGANIZATION

As shown in table 5 below, the cumulative net funded amount is **US\$ 4,362,332** and cumulative expenditures reported by the Participating Organizations amount to **US\$ 1,691,520**. This equates to an overall Fund expenditure delivery rate of **39** percent. The agency with the highest delivery rate is UNDP (50%), followed by UNDESA (33%) and UNEP (29%).

Table 5. Net Funded Amount, Reported Expenditure, and Financial Delivery by Participating Organization, as of 31 December 2013 (in US Dollars)*

Participating Organization	Approved Amount	Net Funded Amount	Expenditure			Delivery Rate %
			Prior Years as of 31-Dec-2012	Current Year Jan-Dec-2013	Cumulative	
UNDESA ²	260,500	260,500	66,904	18,350	85,255	32.73
UNDP	1,939,131	1,939,131	372,539	601,584	974,123	50.24
UNEP ³	2,162,701	2,162,701	444,126	188,016	632,142	29.23
Grand Total	4,362,332	4,362,332	883,569	807,950	1,691,520	38.78

5.2 EXPENDITURE REPORTED BY CATEGORY

Project expenditures are incurred and monitored by each Participating Organization and are reported as per the agreed categories for inter-agency harmonized reporting. In 2006 the UN Development Group (UNDG) established six categories against which UN entities must report inter-agency project expenditures. Effective 1 January 2012, the UN Chief Executive Board (CEB) modified these categories as a result of IPSAS adoption to comprise eight categories. All expenditures incurred prior to 1 January 2012 have been reported in the old categories; post 1 January 2012 all expenditures are reported in the new eight categories. The old and new categories are noted to the right.

Table 6 reflects expenditure reported in the UNDG expense categories. Where the Fund has been operational pre and post 1 January 2012, the expenditures are reported using both categories. Where a Fund became operational post 1 January 2012, only the new categories are used.

In 2013, the highest percentage of expenditure was on Staff and personnel costs (58%) and the second highest expenditure was on Travel (19%).

2012 CEB Expense Categories	2006 UNDG Expense Categories
--	---

- | | |
|---|---|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Staff and personnel costs 2. Supplies, commodities and materials 3. Equipment, vehicles, furniture and depreciation 4. Contractual services 5. Travel 6. Transfers and grants 7. General operating expenses 8. Indirect costs | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Supplies, commodities, equipment & transport 2. Personnel 3. Training counterparts 4. Contracts 5. Other direct costs 6. Indirect costs |
|---|---|

² UNDESA expenditure delivery rate for the first tranche amounting to US\$ 160,000 (received in March 2012) was about 62 % prior to receipt of the second tranche of US\$ 100,000 (received in April 2013). After a workshop that will take place in July 2014, the expenditure delivery rate is expected to be 60%.

³ The displayed UNEP expenditures for 2013 understate the volume of projects in the pipeline as most of the expenditures materialized for technical reasons in early 2014. The delivery rate as of 13 May 2014 is 72%.

Table 6. Expenditure by UNDG Budget Category, as of 31 December 2013 (in US Dollars)*

Category	Expenditure			Percentage of Total Programme Cost
	Prior Years as of 31-Dec-2012	Current Year Jan-Dec-2013	Total	
Supplies, Commodities, Equipment and Transport (Old)	-	-	-	
Personnel (Old)	-	-	-	
Training of Counterparts (Old)	-	-	-	
Contracts (Old)	-	-	-	
Other direct costs (Old)	-	-	-	
Staff & Personnel Costs (New)	401,846	469,771	871,617	54.93
Suppl, Comm, Materials (New)	13,355	(13,355)	-	
Equip, Veh, Furn, Depn (New)	-	-	-	
Contractual Services (New)	-	54,102	54,102	3.41
Travel (New)	163,654	149,943	313,598	19.76
Transfers and Grants (New)	180,721	(11,515)	169,206	10.66
General Operating (New)	66,983	111,192	178,175	11.23
Programme Costs Total	826,558	760,138	1,586,696	100.00
Indirect Support Costs Total	57,011	47,812	104,823	6.61
Total	883,569	807,950	1,691,520	

Indirect Support Costs: The timing of when Indirect Support Costs are charged to a project depends on each Participating Organization's financial regulations, rules or policies. These Support Costs can be deducted upfront on receipt of a transfer based on the approved programmatic amount, or a later stage during implementation.

Therefore, the Indirect Support Costs percentage may appear to exceed the agreed upon rate of 7% for on-going projects, whereas when all projects are financially closed, this number is not to exceed 7%.

6. COST RECOVERY

Cost recovery policies for the Fund are guided by the applicable provisions of the JP Project Document, the MOU concluded between the Administrative Agent and Participating Organizations, and the SAAs concluded between the Administrative Agent and Contributors, based on rates approved by UNDG.

The policies in place, as of 31 December 2013, were as follows:

- **The Administrative Agent (AA) fee:** 1% is charged at the time of contributor deposit and covers services provided on that contribution for the entire duration of the Fund. In the reporting period **US\$ 6,691** was deducted in AA-fees. Cumulatively, as of 31 December 2013, **US\$ 44,064** has been charged in AA-fees.
- **Indirect Costs of Participating Organizations:** Participating Organizations may charge 7% indirect costs. In the current reporting period **US\$ 47,812** was deducted in indirect costs by Participating Organizations. Cumulatively, indirect costs amount to **US\$ 104,823** as of 31 December 2013.
- **Direct Costs:** The Fund governance mechanism may approve an allocation to a Participating Organization to cover costs associated with Secretariat services and overall coordination, as well as Fund level reviews and evaluations. These allocations are referred to as 'direct costs'. In 2013, there were no direct costs charged to the Fund.

7. ACCOUNTABILITY AND TRANSPARENCY

In order to effectively provide fund administration services and facilitate monitoring and reporting to the UN system and its partners, the MPTF Office has developed a public website, the MPTF Office Gateway (<http://mptf.undp.org>). Refreshed in real time every two hours from an internal enterprise resource planning system, the MPTF Office Gateway has become a standard setter for providing transparent and accountable trust fund administration services.

The Gateway provides financial information including: contributor commitments and deposits, approved programme budgets, transfers to and expenditures reported by Participating Organizations, interest income and other expenses. In addition, the Gateway provides an overview of the MPTF Office portfolio and extensive information on individual Funds, including their purpose, governance structure and key documents. By providing easy access to the growing number of narrative and financial reports, as well as related project documents, the Gateway collects and preserves important institutional knowledge and facilitates knowledge sharing and management among UN Organizations and their development partners, thereby contributing to UN coherence and development effectiveness.