



*Empowered lives.  
Resilient nations.*

**Consolidated Final Narrative 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 December 2011 - 31 March 2016**

**Multi-Partner Trust Fund Office**  
United Nations Development Programme  
<http://mptf.undp.org>

May 2016

## PARTICIPATING ORGANIZATIONS



Empowered lives.  
Resilient nations.

United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)



UNEP  
United Nations Environment Programme

United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP)



United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs  
(UNDESA)

## CONTRIBUTORS



The Netherlands

# Table of Contents

<b>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>PART I: FINAL NARRATIVE REPORT .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>I. Purpose.....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>1. Introduction.....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>2. Programme Purpose.....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>II. Results.....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>III. Lessons Learned and Implications for Complementary Collaboration.....</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>PART II: ANNUAL FINANCIAL REPORT .....</b>	<b>27</b>
<b>1. Sources and Uses of Funds.....</b>	<b>28</b>
<b>2. Contributions .....</b>	<b>29</b>
<b>3. Interest Earned.....</b>	<b>29</b>
<b>4. Transfer of Funds.....</b>	<b>29</b>
<b>5. Overall Expenditure and Financial Delivery Rates.....</b>	<b>30</b>
5.1 Expenditure Reported by Participating Organization.....	30
5.2. Expenditure Reported by Category .....	30
<b>6. Cost Recovery.....</b>	<b>31</b>
<b>7. Accountability and Transparency .....</b>	<b>32</b>

# EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This Consolidated Final 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 December 2011 to 31 March 2016. 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. This report is presented in two parts. Part I is the Final Narrative Report and Part II is the 2015 Annual Financial Report. The final certified financial report will be available in May 2017.

Over its four years of implementation, the UNEP-UNDESA-UNDP Green Economy Joint Programme (GEJP) has completed all Phase 1 and Phase 2 activities. In doing so, the GEJP has successfully advanced its three broader objectives and 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.

Experience and lessons learned throughout the four years of GEJP work-planning, implementation, monitoring and reporting have also advanced the Programme’s objectives and outcomes. These include more effective and better coordinated GEJP efforts at the country level 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 (PEI), Partnership for Action on Green Economy (PAGE), Green Growth Knowledge Platform, and partnerships with the African Development Bank, DfID, World Bank, the Global Green Growth Institute, the Green Growth Working Group of the Donor Committee on Enterprise Development, and Green Economy Coalition.

The Joint Programme used 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 disbursed 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.

## PART I: FINAL NARRATIVE REPORT

<p><b>Programme Title &amp; Project Number</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Programme Title: "Supporting a Green Economy Transition in Developing Countries and LDCs: Building towards Rio+20 and Beyond"</li> <li>MPTF Office Project Reference Number: 00082197</li> </ul>	<p><b>Country, Locality(s), Priority Area(s) / Strategic Results</b></p> <p>Global, with additional regional and national-level focus in Phase on: Bangladesh, Indonesia, Ghana, Kenya, Mozambique, Rwanda, and Colombia.</p> <p><i>Priority area/ strategic results</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>enhanced political engagement and public support mobilized for the Rio+20 Conference and follow-up;</li> <li>capacities built and advisory services strengthened on inclusive green economy policies in the context of sustainable development and poverty eradication; and</li> <li>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.</li> </ol>
<p><b>Participating Organization(s)</b></p> <p>UNDP UNDESA UNEP</p>	<p><b>Implementing Partners</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>National counterparts: central ministries of planning/finance, ministries of environment, other UNCT sister agencies, other multilateral partners</li> </ul>
<p><b>Joint Programme Cost (US\$)</b></p> <p>JP Contribution from the Government of Netherlands (pass-through): 4,406,400</p> <p><b>TOTAL: 4,406,400</b></p>	<p><b>Programme Duration</b></p> <p>Overall Duration: 40 months</p> <p>Start Date<sup>1</sup>: 01.12.2011</p>
<p><b>Programme Assessment/ Review/Mid-Term Eval.</b></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><b>Report Submitted By</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Name: Nik Sekhran,</li> <li>Title: Director, Sustainable Development Group, BPPS</li> <li>Participating Organization (Lead): UNDP</li> <li>Email address: <a href="mailto:nik.sekhran@undp.org">nik.sekhran@undp.org</a></li> </ul>

<sup>1</sup> 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
DCED -	Donor Committee on Enterprise 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
PEP -	Poverty Environment Partnership
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

# 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 four years of implementation, the UNEP-UNDESA-UNDP Joint Programme (GEJP) has completed its objectives. Activities at the global, regional and country level have drawn on a strengthened collaboration between UNEP, UNDESA, and UNDP. These activities included Phase 1 support for: Global 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 advanced the three development outcomes of the GEJP, i.e. they have: 1) influenced Rio+20 follow-up and preparations for the 2030 Agenda and Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) at all levels enhanced political engagement; 2) strengthened capacities and advisory services on inclusive green economy policies in the context of sustainable development and poverty eradication; and 3) promoted inclusive green economy approaches as a means to sustainable development integrated as a key element of One UN and UN Country Team programming, with direct links to PEI and PAGE programming.

Some initial work and timelines were adjusted in response to new opportunities and programming realities, including shifting development priorities in some partner countries, including Bangladesh. Since the Joint Programme was designed, complementary partner initiatives continued to evolve in the post-Rio context related to inclusive green economy, green growth, and the 2030 Agenda and SDG framework. Activities were designed to strengthen synergies with these initiatives. The timing of some activities was also shifted to ensure full ownership by government partners and greater engagement with agencies pursuing similar objectives. For these reasons the Joint Programme was extended until March 2016 at no cost.

A more detailed report on overall Phase 1 and Phase 2 implementation results and outcomes 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)

The Green Economy Joint Programme (GEJP) facilitated national platforms for dialogue, awareness raising and planning around inclusive green economy approaches in several countries including Bangladesh, Benin, Cape Verde, Ghana, Indonesia, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Mozambique, Rwanda, Sudan, The Gambia, and Yemen. This work encompassed three inclusive green economy assessments 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 national level. This work illustrates how the UN system can respond to country demand for inclusive green economy approaches.

### 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**

The GEJP also organized a series of global and regional events as a contribution to Rio+20 debates, as well as post-Rio follow-up. Working in close collaboration, UNEP, DESA, and UNDP advisors in HQ, regional, and country offices facilitated three global events and one regional event before Rio+20, and several global and regional events afterwards. These events brought together more than 400 government and civil society representatives from over 40 developing countries, as well as UN, bilateral and multilateral partners.

It is our assessment that these events, combined with the national platforms described above, succeeded in creating an informal forum outside of Rio+20 negotiations to share perspectives on the inclusive green economy concept and country-driven efforts to move towards greener economies. These events helped strengthen Rio+20 and subsequent 2030 Agenda debates, and have informed future Joint Programme activities by identifying country implementation gaps, and demand for support from UN Country Teams and partners. These activities have drawn on and fed into the UNDP-UNEP Poverty-Environment Initiative (PEI), DESA support to national SD mainstreaming, Green Growth Knowledge Platform, [Green Growth Best Practices](#), Global Green Growth Institute (GGGI), UNSD advisory services and the work of the National Sustainable Development Strategy (NSDS) Programme, UNSD, the G20, OECD, the Green Economy Coalition and Stakeholder Forum.

## 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

Two regional tools workshop - Asia-based workshop completed, see 2012 Report  
Africa-based workshop completed, see 2013 report

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 preparations for the evolving post-2015 Sustainable Development Goals agenda.

In this context, the UNDESA Division for Sustainable Development (DSD), with UNEP and UNDP, organised the workshop on Bridging the Implementation Gap for Rio+20 workshop in New York on 2-3 July 2014. This activity reviewed how GE approaches help reduce poverty, inequality, and vulnerabilities while ensuring environmental sustainability. The sessions highlighted co-benefits across the energy, food and water nexus, drawing from interaction among panellists and participants. Twenty officials from Asia, Africa, Latin America, Middle East and SIDS, including GEJP partner countries, participated to this two-day workshop, while forty attended a complementary side event organized at the HLPF just after the workshop, with resource persons from UNDP, DSD and UNEP, as well as partners from the Green Economy Coalition and Green Growth Best Practice Initiative, see [website here](#) for more details.

An additional workshop was organized by DSD from 14-15 October 2015 in Geneva, in collaboration with UNEP, who hosted the event, and UNDP, with the participation of national counterparts from Colombia, Ghana, Indonesia and Mozambique, as well as experts from academic, research and non-governmental organisations. The workshop responded to the need to assist stakeholders with a system-approach framework, strengthening integrated policy-making, and map policy-support tools already available. Both framework and tools are central to revealing linkages across SD dimensions, sectors and institutions, while defining needs for tools of specific policy design and implementation, institutional arrangements, as well as iterative monitoring, evaluation, and reporting. The workshop validated the ongoing development of a SD Transition Toolbox being prepared by DESA in collaboration with UNEP, UNDP, and GEJP partners.

The impact of these activities is significant and already tangible. As highlighted in several sections of the 2030 Agenda Resolution (A/RES/70/1), integration (in its different meanings from SD mainstreaming to vertical coordination, horizontal coherence, and thematic inter-linkages across specific nexus or the entire range of SDGs) is at the heart of sustainable development and key to reaching the SDGs. The policy tools workshops organised under the GEJP provided all stakeholders, including the implementing agencies, an opportunity to understand the various aspects of integration, while developing and testing strategies for related capacity development work among participating countries. This was of direct benefit to those pilots, who are among the forerunners of implementing the 2030 Agenda. For example, the GEJP activities involved the Indonesian actors in government and UNDP that are building the KT-GEM data modelling programme, both learning from their experience and sharing it with the other GEJP participants. Those activities are also now informing and guiding the latest programming of UNDP, UNEP and DESA in out-scaling integrated policy support to other countries, notably through the PAGE initiative, the

Mainstreaming, Acceleration and Policy Support (MAPS) Reference Guide to UN Country Teams, and the upcoming SD Transition Toolbox.

## Output 2.2 Report on Poverty and Inclusive Green Economy Approaches

### Output 2.2 Status

Poverty and Green Economy Report - finalized

The GEJP drew on its experiences over Phase 1 and Phase 2, as well as the work of complementary initiatives and research, to finalize a “Report on Poverty and Inclusive Green Economy Approaches” (Output 2.2). The report includes 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 informed GEJP work at the national, regional, and global level. Findings from the report and case studies were shared at the global PAGE Workshop in Dubai in March 2014, and were used to inform the work of PAGE and the 2015 Poverty Environment Partnership (PEP) meeting. The Report has been translated into Spanish and French, and continues to be disseminated, including the 2016 PEP meeting.

## Output 2.3 Inclusive Green Economy Joint Assessments

### Output 2.3 status:

Three joint Green Economy studies - completed in 3 partner countries, Ghana, Kenya, and Rwanda

Three green economy studies 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. 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 studies 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 studies 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, supported 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, as well as stakeholder capacity building, to facilitate the transition to a green economy. 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 to develop the energy sector; contribute to socio-economic development, and improve environmental stewardship. The report draws on qualitative and quantitative analyses, SWOT analysis and stakeholder engagements to make prioritized policy recommendations. Important opportunities include: improving competitiveness with affordable energy; improving resource efficiency by implementing good housekeeping practices; empowering rural poor citizens through activities such as the One Cow Programme; increasing private sector participation in GE initiatives; building partnerships to achieve inclusive GE goals; and mainstreaming issues related to GE.

## Phase 2

Phase 2 activities 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 included efforts to link national, regional, and global policy forums, including post-2015 SDG framework preparations, and the high level forum on Sustainable Development.

Phase 2 activities focused on five partner countries: Indonesia, Ghana, Kenya, Mozambique and Rwanda. In addition, initial inclusive green economy work was supported in one non-partner country, Colombia, given its strong candidacy and political importance to the Netherlands.

### Output 2.4 Expanding Support to Post-Rio Consultations

**Output 2.4 status:** three green economy assessments were completed in Indonesia, Mozambique, and Ghana

The GEJP has completed and published Green Economy Assessments for Indonesia, Ghana and Mozambique. UNEP and UNDP strengthened the assessment methodology and its links to follow-up advisory services by expanding their social and equity dimensions and adapting to country context. This was done by revising and adapting the Terms of Reference to expand on the social and equity issues, and by considering a broader set of national partners with whom to engage. Further improvements were made by utilizing UNEP's guidance manuals on Green Economy, including 'A Guidance Manual for Green Economy Policy Assessment' and 'Using Models for Green Economy Policymaking', which was published in 2014. Later studies draw on relevant sectoral and cross-cutting reviews completed by other bilateral and multilateral partners. UNEP and UNDP staff at HQ, regional and country levels were engaged in the design and implementation of each study.

As part of longer-term capacity development goals and promoting stakeholder engagement, UNEP partnered with national academic institutions in each country to develop the materials and inputs in close consultation with government and other national stakeholders. The studies were reviewed and validated through a series of national consultations and workshops. Throughout the process, additional members of the UN Country Team were consulted, as well as other development agencies, including the World Bank and regional banks, OECD, and GGGI.

More detailed information for each of the three assessments follows:

## Indonesia

The integrated assessment yielded results that paved the way for several policy initiatives to help Indonesia transition toward a “Green Economy”. For example, the UNEP-UNDP collaboration helped develop two decision support tools under the Low Emissions Capacity Building (LECB) project. The first was an integrated national and provincial green economy model, implemented in three provinces: Jakarta, Central Kalimantan, and Papua. The second was the implementation of capacity building activities in the area of systemic macroeconomic modeling.

These tools have contributed to the Government of Indonesia’s efforts to integrate green economy approaches into the next Mid-Term National Development Plan (2015-2019). The GE model introduces three macro indicators: Green GDP (to measure adjusted GDP by environmental degradation and depletion); GDP of the Poor (to measure income dependency of the poor on environmental resources/services); and Green decent Jobs (to measure number of green jobs as part of total employment). The GE model helps local governments to simulate various development scenarios. For example, they can assess the social, economic and environmental impact of issuing new policies such as a forest moratorium, or from the expansion of palm oil plantations, or the application of fiscal incentives for environmental protection. The indicators can be expanded to cover other issues of interest such as the SDGs and fiscal indicators. Collecting and building upon provincial level data, these three indicators are calculated by the Indonesia Green Economy Model (I-GEM) to help Indonesia to establish development strategies and incorporate changes into relevant national and sub-regional policies, reflecting the social and environmental needs and realities of the thirty-four provinces.

## Mozambique

Building on the Green Economy Action Plan released in October 2013, the GEJP conducted a Green Economy Assessment study in 2015 to quantify the policies and investments recommended in the action plan. The report was commissioned by the Ministry of Environment (MITADER) in partnership with UNEP and undertaken by the Center for Policy Analysis (CAP), Eduardo Mondlane University. The assessment report was reviewed and approved by UNEP, the technical council of MITANDER, and strengthened by the technical institute. It offers a quantitative assessment of potential green investments in the energy, agriculture, forestry, fishery, aquaculture and mining sectors. The report shows that green investments can lead to considerable income increase and poverty reduction in Mozambique, while at the same time ensuring the sustainability of the economy, contributing to a more resilient future.

The report has helped promote the green economy action plan in a more pedagogical manner to stakeholders in Mozambique. For example, the simulation of green economy policies with a system dynamics model identified an urgent need to invest in reversing trends of overfishing to preserve Mozambique’s fish stocks and avoid a fishery collapse from damaging the quality of life for many citizen reliant on fishing for sustenance and disrupting the economy. A particularly important sector for the implementation of green economy policies is energy, with demand increasing by 146% from 2000-2010, according to the modelling. Investment in improved energy supply and efficiency would result in cumulative net returns of USD 1.2 billion by 2030 while reducing emissions by 10% from the business as usual scenario. In addition to reducing costs and emissions, investing in energy efficiency can increase employment.

The report also found that reducing deforestation and increasing reforestation would lead to higher forest area coverage and carbon storage, allowing an increase of timber production. Further, the impact of extractive industries on the environment is a growing concern for the rapidly growing mining sector in Mozambique. Finally, with regard to water contamination, projections show that the total annual amount of water being contaminated from mineral toxic waste would be 40% lower under the green economy scenario in 2035 than the business as usual scenario, reducing water bills for households around mining areas by 30%. Waste reuse programs could also reduce costs to mining companies by 3 %.

The government of Mozambique has embraced the results of the green economy assessment in its Five Year Government Plan (2015-2019) as part of broader efforts to mitigate the environmental challenges and focus on the four strategic sectors, while ensuring continued economic growth and promoting inclusive sustainable development.

### Ghana

UNEP together with the Ministry of Environment, Science, Technology and Innovation (MESTI) commissioned the Green Economy Assessment study to the Institute of Statistical, Social and Economic Research (ISSER) at the University of Ghana. The priority sectors and policies were selected in December 2013 at a 3-day national consultation workshop. The priority sectors identified were agriculture, energy, and forestry. Following this, training of the Ghana T21 model was undertaken over a period of 5 days in August 2014 by the Millennium Institute supported by UNEP. The workshop helped train national participants how to use the T21 model as a long-term national planning tool to assess the impact of green economy investments. The study quantitatively assessed the economic, social, and environmental impacts of green investments and policy scenarios in agriculture, energy, and forestry.

The assessment report identified that in the agricultural sector, investments in an expansion of irrigated areas are expected to result in yield increases of 20% by 2030. In forestry, deforestation is expected to continue in all scenarios; however, reforestation efforts under GE scenarios will result in 11% more remaining forest than the BAU scenario. In the energy sector, emissions will be similar between BAU and greening scenarios due to higher economic growth and lower emissions intensity in the green economy scenario. The report expects that with investments of around 1.5% of GDP per annum, green sectoral policy targets will be met, including higher levels of household income, life expectancy, and HDI progress while lowering poverty rates. Generally, the findings show that green economy policies and investments in Ghana will bring about better overall performance in social, economic and environmental dimensions than the BAU scenario. At the macro-economic level, the average growth rate is estimated to be 5.9 percent between 2013 and 2030 under the BAU, while the GE rate is estimated to be 6.9 percent. Within the social sector, the implementation of green economy strategies will lead to the reduction of the proportion of population below the poverty line to around 5% by around 2030, which is 2% lower than the baseline by



2030. Green economy scenarios will create 0.4 million more jobs than the BAU scenarios. Drawing partly on the study, Ghana developed the Green Economy Action plan, which was validated in June 2015.

The green economy assessment has informed many policy documents. Ghana is undertaking policy reforms and green investment to mitigate against poverty and hunger, climate change and natural resources degradation, while simultaneously providing new and sustainable pathways to inclusive economic development and prosperity. Ghana has also created a new national development plan – the Ghana Shared Growth and Development Agenda II (2014-2017). Other initiatives incorporating green economy elements include the Environmental Fiscal Reform Policy (EFRP), National Climate Change Policy (NCCP), National Climate Change Adaption Strategy (NCCAS), and the National Climate Change Master Plan (NCCMP).

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

#### Output 2.5 status: work in four countries completed – Kenya, Ghana, Rwanda, and Colombia

The GEJP supported the development and adoption of sustainable development policy frameworks and roadmaps in four countries: Kenya, Ghana, Rwanda, and Colombia. GEJP responded to country demand for inclusive green economy approaches and helped advance cross-government planning and implementation. This progress reflects government commitment to advancing green economy approaches, and moving from strong rhetoric to strong planning and implementation.

More detailed information on the results and impact for each of the countries follows:

#### Ghana:

The **Ghana Fiscal Policy Scoping Study**, finalized in 2014, had the objective of identifying the potential fiscal space for investment in Ghana to support the transition to a more inclusive green economy. The study analyzed fiscal policy in Ghana including environmental fiscal reforms undertaken by the government, and identified opportunities for further environmental fiscal reform in key sectors of agriculture, fisheries, water, forestry, energy, waste, transport and mineral resources. The study shows that environmental fiscal reform will support the improvement of macroeconomic stability, environmental protection, and social wellbeing in Ghana. The study highlights environmental fiscal reforms already undertaken by the Government, such as the partial reform of fossil fuel subsidies and the introduction of specific environmental taxes. Reforms identified in the study include the introduction of additional environmental taxes and charges (e.g. pollution charges on oil and mining companies) and elimination of subsidies (e.g. on fossil fuel use, agricultural fertilizers, fishery equipment). Subsidy reform would create fiscal space to implement green economy initiatives such as incentive schemes to encourage private investment in renewable energy development and enable the shift towards more sustainable agricultural practices. The study recommends that environmental fiscal reforms are carefully designed with appropriate mitigating actions to protect vulnerable groups and ensure political acceptability.



Building on the identified priorities in the fiscal scoping study, a **Green Economy Fiscal Policy Assessment** of Ghana was completed in 2015. The study finds that despite progress and implementation of a number of green fiscal measures, Ghana faces several fiscal and environmental challenges. Further fiscal reforms could be considered to generate additional revenue and create fiscal space for financing the green economy. In particular, adverse subsidies could be removed and environmental taxes and other fiscal measures introduced in the energy and transport sectors including a reform of energy taxes (which would raise substantial revenues) and a reform of vehicle taxes. The results of the fiscal policy assessment were presented to national stakeholders at the PAGE Green Economy week in Ghana in December 2015.

The **Green Economy Action Plan for Ghana**, which was finalized in 2016, presents steps and a timeline for Ghana to transition to a greener more inclusive economy.. It draws on the Ghana Green Economy Assessment and Green Economy Scoping Study. MESTI organized two national workshops on the Green Economy Action Plan with participants representing government ministries and agencies, the private sector, key civil society groups, the donor community, and UN agencies in Ghana. The first workshop reviewed the first draft of the Green Economy Action Plan, and the second workshop validated it.

#### Kenya:

Kenya's objective to build a green economy is reflected in its Medium-Term Development Plan (2013-2017), which endorsed the development of a national green economy strategy. It includes a focus on green growth opportunities through renewable exploitation, carbon credits, clean production systems, and an integrated "Green Jobs Approach". In collaboration with the African Development Bank, the GEJP completed and validated a green economy roadmap that builds on the green economy assessment undertaken in phase 1. A public expenditure review was initiated in 2013 and draft recommendations were put forward in 2014, and finalized after extensive consultations in 2015. This work was done in collaboration with the UNDP-UNEP Poverty-Environment Initiative and a DfID programme on climate change and publication was completed in 2015. A green fiscal scoping study and assessment was completed in this work programme in order to identify the fiscal space in Kenya and the opportunities for environmental fiscal reform.

A **Green Economy Strategy and Implementation Plan (GESIP)** was also supported in 2014 by UNEP in collaboration with the AfDB, ILO, WWF, UNDP, DANIDA and other development agencies in Kenya. It was finalized through county consultation workshops in 2015 to identify thematic areas for green economy investment. The GESIP provides the overall policy framework to facilitate a green economy transition in line with the country's economic, social and environmental goals and a globally competitive low carbon growth path. The 47 counties were divided into 5 groups and workshops were held for each cluster of counties, including the private sectors and other relevant stakeholders. The issues captured during the county consultations were consolidated into and validated in a national stakeholders' forum. The National Validation workshop of the Green Economy Strategy and Implementation Plan was attended by representatives from development partners, line ministries and county governments. At the forum, the

Environment Secretary of Kenya spoke of the importance of the GESIP and investing in green economy as it would lead to an additional 3.1 million people being lifted out of poverty by 2030. It was also observed that GESIP would contribute to building a transformative development pathway to create more green jobs, accelerate poverty reduction, support sustainable growth and restore environmental health, quality and well-being, among others. Five thematic areas were identified through the consultative process: promoting sustainable infrastructure, building resilience, sustainable natural resource management, promoting resource efficiency, and social inclusion and sustainable livelihoods. Each focus area has strategic priorities that are mapped to macroeconomic, social and sectoral policies, which are supported by a range of programmes and activities, and targets. More details on the thematic area objectives and activities can be found in the 'Kenya Green Economy Strategy and Implementation Plan'.

This Strategy recognizes that macroeconomic constraints may hamper the transition to a green economy. The macroeconomic framework underpinning the Green Economy Strategy requires that Kenya sustains high growth consistent with Vision 2030 and embeds the principles of sustainable development in the growth strategy. The framework builds on achievements realized during the First Medium Term Plan (MTP I) and MTP II for the Vision 2030. Major achievements include restoring growth, maintaining macroeconomic stability, re-aligning public expenditure towards energy and infrastructure development and provision of social economic services, structural reforms as part of the implementation of the Constitution of Kenya 2010 and financial sector deepening. The plan outlines the strategies for thirteen sectors important to the Kenyan economy and how to implement them, including possible funding. For example, strategies for the water sector include strengthening water sector governance, initiating market based instruments in conservation and expanding rainwater harvesting. This plan represents a strong indication of Kenya's commitment to greening its economy and speaks to the success of the GEJP in Kenya.

## Rwanda

UNDP and UNEP, in collaboration with the African Development Bank, worked to estimate the medium-term investment needs for advancing Rwanda's transition to more inclusive green growth, as defined in the national Green Growth and Climate Resilience Strategy (GGCRS). This exercise helped guide the Government in its budgeting process for the overall green-growth strategy, identify resource gaps, inform funding decisions, and attract funding from the donor community to help implement the GGCRS strategic vision. The Government identified three priority sectors for medium-term cost estimation purposes: Integrated Water Resources Management (IWRM), energy, and agriculture and natural resources. AFDB and UNDP retained consultants to develop separate reports for each of these sectors. The costing studies identified the main development targets in each sector, developed alternative pathways or scenarios for meeting these targets, and provided order-of-magnitude cost estimates for each scenario. The scenarios include business-as-usual (BAU) based on continuation of current trends and technologies, and two additional scenarios representing increased levels of 'greenness' based on indicators relevant to each sector. Total additional capital costs compared to BAU (cumulative to 2030) across all sectors amount to \$2.7 bn. In total, the green growth scenarios have lower O&M costs than BAU because of the fuel savings in

the energy sector, although the value of these savings vary considerably because of uncertainty over how costs of peat and methane fuels in the BAU will change by 2030.

### Colombia

The Colombian National Development Plan (2014 – 2018) mandates the Government, particularly the National Planning Department (DNP) and the Ministry of Environment (MADS), to develop a Long-Term Green Growth Policy (LTGGP). This LTGGP attempts to harmonize all efforts undertaken by the government on green growth. It provides a solid analytical basis for green growth interventions and promotes participatory approaches and inter-ministerial coordination for green growth planning and implementation. It has enabled the formulation of a comprehensive strategy that integrates economic, environmental, and social objectives in one framework, consistent with national development objectives and the new SDGs. In this context and with the aim of informing the LTGGP, UNEP in collaboration with the Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development supported the completion of a Green Growth Scoping Study and a validation workshop. The study identified three sectors: ecotourism; business in recycling, post-consumer use, and waste recovery; and sustainable construction, and proposes incentives and regulations that facilitate the transition to green growth in these sectors. These enabling conditions include: command and control instruments; sectoral sustainability strategies; market promotion of environmental goods and services; eco-innovation and entrepreneurship; and green jobs and training.

## **Output 2.6 Helping Countries Build Measurement Frameworks**

### **Output 2.6 status: work completed in Indonesia, Mozambique, Rwanda, and Ghana**

The GEJP supported the development and adoption of sustainable development policy frameworks, roadmaps and their measurement frameworks in four countries. This measurement work built on existing platforms and indicators that were 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 Mozambique, GEJP indicators and measurement support was conducted in synergy with the UNDP-UNEP Poverty and Environment Initiative (PEI). In 2015, the importance of GE indicators was highlighted in the GE Assessment Report for Mozambique, including for monitoring the energy, agriculture, forestry, fishery, aquaculture and mining sector policies and targets, as well as the social, economic, and environmental impacts due to the implementation of the green economy policies. In addition, UNDP supported the drafting of a new Statistics Strategy for Mozambique, integrating indicators relevant to the green economy. This Strategy was finalized in 2015

In Indonesia and Ghana activities that were carried out in this component 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); and when possible; (4) creating a time series (approximately 10-15 years) for all relevant indicators available and developed, if applicable; and (5) analyzing trends (historical performance and future projections) of the relevant indicators and cross-sectoral interdependencies. The work on indicators in Rwanda and Ghana was guided by the methodology presented in UNEP's 2014 manual, 'Using Green Economy Indicators for Policymaking'.

In Ghana, this work on developing indicators was linked to the GE Assessment Report and broader efforts to revise the National Statistics Strategies, also being supported in collaboration with the UNDP-UNEP Poverty Environment Initiative. It explored links between measures of multidimensional poverty, natural resource degradation, and climate vulnerability.

More information on the results and impact of this indicators and measurement work in Indonesia, Rwanda, and Ghana follows:

#### Indonesia

The report entitled 'The Use of Green Economy Indicators in the Indonesia Green Economy Model (I-GEM) was published in 2014, which examines the relevant indicators to be used in the ongoing system dynamic modelling projects in the provinces of Jakarta and Central Kalimantan. Specifically, the indicators address rural poverty alleviation, job creation, and sustainability in economic growth, respectively measuring 'GDP of the rural poor', decent and green jobs, and green accounting at the provincial level.

#### Rwanda

The "Green Economy Indicators for Rwanda" report was completed after the study on Green Economy Indicators framework was undertaken to support implementation of the Green Growth and Climate Resilience National Strategy for Climate Change and Low Carbon Development. This work was coordinated with the One UN Flagship Programme on Green Economy, the SIDA-funded Indicators Programme, and the WAVES programme led by the World Bank. The report identified indicators for issue identification, policy identification, and policy assessment for the sectors of agriculture, forestry, water, energy, transport, mining, and sanitation. The study revealed that there are constraints in developing green economy indicators in Rwanda due to data and policy implementation constraints. Obtaining baseline data is an important step for developing green economy indicators. An evaluation of the net benefit of policies is also needed. This would include an analysis of the impact of the absence of policy action in one or more areas – e.g. investments in access to clean water suppliers will be undone by a lack of enforcement of guidelines relating to discharges from production facilities. Further, policy evaluation would need to take into account spatial and distributional issues, as well as aggregate outcomes linked to significant regional differences and disparities. Gender impacts also represent an important variable in the transition to a green economy. Therefore it would be useful to identify indicators that capture gender dimensions of the issues raised in this report. In turn these gender indicators should be taken into account during the formulation of sector

policies with the aim of attaining more equitable gender outcomes. To support Rwanda's transition to a green economy, development partners can help resolve specific technical questions – such as evaluation – and support the integration of environmental policies into development planning frameworks.

Examples from the agriculture sector illustrate the scope and detail of the report. Priority For the agriculture sector, the issue identification indicators include productivity, contribution of agriculture to deforestation, impact of fertilizers on water sources, impact of agriculture on water use, agricultural greenhouse gas emissions, and adaptation to climate change. The policy identification indicators centered on measures to stimulate productivity and measures related to environmental degradation, and climate change mitigation and adaptation. Lastly, the policy assessment indicators address the impact on changes to rates of deforestation as a result of increased productivity; , and to analyze the improvements to food security as a result of increased productivity, reduced losses, and improved resilience to climate shocks. Emphasis is placed on indicators that have cross-cutting effects, for example, increased agricultural productivity has implications for poverty reduction and reduces pressure on forest through land clearing; however, improved productivity as a result of high levels of inorganic fertilizer use also has negative environmental consequences. The report was endorsed by the Rwanda Environment Management Authority.

### Ghana

The country study on Green Economy indicators in Ghana was completed in 2014. The country study was led by the Ghana's Ministry of Environment, Science, Technology and Innovation (MESTI), the University of Ghana's Institute of Statistical, Social and Economic Research (ISSER), in collaboration with UNEP and an international expert. The results of the country study are summarized in UNEP's 'Indicators for Green Economy Policy Making: A Synthesis Report of Studies in Ghana, Mauritius and Uruguay', which analyzes how indicators can support green economy policymaking (indicators for issue identification, indicators for policy formulation, indicators for policy assessment and indicators for policy monitoring and evaluation). For Ghana, results are presented for forestry, agriculture and the energy sector. Ghana struggles with several agricultural challenges. The report outlines the work on indicators focuses on productivity, mechanization, and post-harvest losses, among others. In the forestry section, the report notes that deforestation occurs due to a failure to properly value forests and so the work on indicators includes a consideration of the range and value of forest ecosystem services. In the energy section, the report suggests that work on indicators focuses on the issues of reliability and affordability of access to electricity. Despite the existence of data for indicators, the study highlights the need for a more systematic collection of data and at a more disaggregated level. While Ghana has made great efforts in developing a statistical basis to support evidence-based policymaking, there were major difficulties to gather official data for the study. Overcoming these barriers and ensuring indicators are developed for sectoral and economy-wide strategies requires action at the institutional level. To move forward, authorities could use their experience in establishing steering groups for project formulation as a model for inter-ministerial cooperation.

## 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 intergovernmental negotiations on the 2030 development framework and the High-Level Political Forum (HLPF) on Sustainable Development, which was established following a member state agreement at Rio+20 in 2012. The intergovernmental negotiations on the 2030 development framework and the HLPF provide a dynamic platform for regular dialogue, stocktaking, and reviewing progress towards sustainable development. Through the GEJP, UNEP, UNDESA and UNDP assisted countries in sharing their experiences through the UN intergovernmental process. This included: i) the GEJP workshop and side-event on "Bridging the Implementation Gap" during the first inaugural HLPF meeting in July 2014; ii) preparation of tailored GEJP inputs into the SDGs and post-2015 development framework process; and iii) two workshops UNDESA organized in collaboration with UNDP and UNEP. The first was held from 27-29 May 2015 in New York titled "Integrated Approaches to Sustainable Development Planning and Implementation". The second was held in Geneva on October 2015 with a focus on integrated SD and GE planning tools. Both included the participation of governments from partner and additional countries

As noted above, collaboration with UNDESA and additional groups at the global, regional, and national levels was deepened as part of ongoing Rio+ 20 follow-up and preparations for the evolving 2030 Sustainable Development Goals agenda, including the Bridging the Implementation Gap for Rio+20 workshop in New York on 2-3 July 2014, see reporting above under 2.1.

National Voluntary Presentations by member states to the HLPF will include reporting on Sustainable Development Goals such as key indicators on Green Economy and Poverty Eradication. Now that the SDGs have been agreed, and their targets and indicators developed, the opportunity to report national progress to this forum will be initiated in 2016 coordinated by UNDESA. Integrating and harmonizing these processes will benefit national agencies in their efforts to make national progress and share experiences.

In March 2015, the 15<sup>th</sup> African Ministerial Conference on the Environment (AMCEN) provided a strong platform for GEJP participating countries to share their experiences and learn from one another's challenges and successes. AMCEN also held a panel event that marked the launch of a report by UNEP entitled 'Building Inclusive Green Economies in Africa: Experiences and Lessons Learned 2010-2015' which was supported by the GEJP and draws heavily on the experiences and examples offered by GEJP's participating African nations. This report brings international attention to the success seen in countries working with the GEJP to transition toward a green economy. Specifically, this report highlights the fiscal reform efforts in Ghana (previously mentioned under outcome 2.5) bringing exceptional steps like this to the forefront of regional and international awareness to further encourage such efforts.

Additionally, a pre-session workshop was held at AMCEN organized by UNEP ROA, UNECA and AfDB on the theme of 'Inclusive Green Economies for Poverty Reduction and Sustainable Development in Africa". This workshop discussed and shared experiences and lessons learned from bringing a green economy focus and policies into medium and long –term development plans, drawing on experiences from the GEJP.

Finally, in order to better display the work of the GEJP and share the successes and lessons learned with other interested countries, organizations, and the public, UNEP has added summaries of country activities and the aims of the GEJP on their Green Economy webpage: <http://www.unep.org/greeneconomy>.

# III. Lessons Learned and Implications for Complementary Collaboration

UNEP, UNDESA, and UNDP gained a range of technical and operational insights through Joint Programme implementation at the global, regional, and national levels that are informing complementary areas of policy, programming and partnerships in ways that have advanced the broader objectives and SD outcomes of the GEJP. 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 more targeted GEJP advisory services; and strengthen partnerships and coordination within and across agencies and partner initiatives.

Lessons from the GEJP and their contribution to GEJP objectives and outcomes are summarized below.

## Enhanced inter-agency coordination and external partnerships

The GEJP succeeded in strengthening collaboration between UNEP, UNDESA, and UNDP leading to better and more sustainable programme results. Greater synergies were 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 better used GEJP resources and expertise, and complemented additional relevant in-country programming. Expertise from HQ, regional, and country offices were 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, Green Growth Knowledge Platform, Poverty Environment Partnership, Green Economy Coalition, and Global Green Growth Institute in Mozambique, Kenya, and Rwanda.

Cooperation with similar ongoing projects in the participating countries allowed enhanced collaboration between projects to maximize synergies and bolster impacts in the region. For example, both the GEJP and the UNEP's project, 'Fostering a Green Economy Transformation and Social and Environmental Entrepreneurship in Africa', conducted activities in Ghana, Kenya, Mauritius, Mozambique, and Rwanda; as well as UNEP's Green Economy and Trade Opportunities project which works in Ghana which identifies opportunities for solar energy exports from Ghana to neighboring countries. The GEJP also strengthened collaboration with the UNEP's project "Measuring a green economy transformation" in Rwanda.

Lesson Learned: This level of coordination was maintained over the remaining phase of GEJP implementation. This included 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 was also strengthened. The success displayed through inter-agency coordination on the GEJP has laid the foundation for an even higher degree of collaboration on new projects such as the Partnership for Action on Green Economy (PAGE) which includes five participating agencies (UNEP, UNDP, UNITAR, UNIDO and the ILO). In 2014 Ghana one of the GEJP's countries became a PAGE country.

## Need to align with national processes and timelines

GEJP work highlighted the need to align GEJP activities with national processes and timelines. In most partner countries, this 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, Colombia and Mozambique, were all, to varying degrees, postponed. Part of this challenge arose 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 reflected 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 also caused delays.

Lesson learned: GEJP work plans required flexibility and realistic timelines as part of broader efforts to work with countries at their pace to ensure national uptake and ownership.

## 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, UNDESA, and UNDP refined the breakdown of each agency's technical advisory services that could be drawn on to respond to country demand.

At the same time, there was a need to strengthen the programmatic mainstreaming nature of GEJP activities 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 were formalized in countries such as Indonesia, Kenya, Mozambique and Rwanda.

Lesson learned: To achieve this goal, efforts were made to bring in the governance, social equity, environmental, economic, and political economy issues key to the coordination of inclusive green economy policies. This work also opened 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, UNDESA and UNDP strengthened 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 included ongoing work at the global level through various UN inter-agency mechanisms (HLCP, UNDG, EMG) and in individual agencies according to their mandates.

For example, the Geneva workshop of October 2015 was itself made possible through close collaboration between the three GEJP partners, being funded by the DESA allotment, hosted by UNEP, and substantively supported by several UNDP global and country experts. The workshop led to further activities (with funding from other sources) in developing a Sustainable Development Transition Toolbox by DESA, in collaboration with all GEJP partners and additional institutions, and linked to complementary UN-broad initiatives such as PAGE and the Mainstreaming, Acceleration and Policy Support (MAPS) guidelines on 2030 Agenda implementation for UN Country Teams.

UNDP became a full member of PAGE in 2014. This engagement became possible in part through the GEJP technical and operational lessons outlined above. These included the need to align more closely with national policy cycles through longer-term programmatic mainstreaming approaches; expand 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 better coordinated delivery of One UN Country Team technical and financial support, including through national trust funds and joint programmes.

PAGE work has drawn 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 its first annual global PAGE workshop held in Dubai in 2014 and subsequent global forum, including meetings of the Poverty Environment Partnership. The growth to six partner countries and high demand for PAGE's country level engagement speaks to the successes made throughout the GEJP.

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, UNDESA, and UNDP succeeded in expanding existing collaboration and new partnerships at all levels with sister agencies, including through PAGE and PEI.

# PART II: ANNUAL FINANCIAL REPORT

## 2015 ANNUAL FINANCIAL REPORT

This chapter presents financial data<sup>2</sup> and analysis of the Joint Programme funds as of 31 December 2015. The financial certified financial report for the project will be provided in May 2017. Financial information 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 2015, 1 contributor has deposited US\$ 4,406,400 in contributions and US\$ 2,103 has been earned in interest, bringing the cumulative source of funds to US\$ 4,408,503 (see respectively, Tables 2 and 3). Of this amount, US\$ 4,362,332 has been transferred to 3 Participating Organizations, of which US\$ 3,931,587 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 2015.

**Table 1. Financial Overview (in US Dollars)**

	Annual 2014	Annual 2015	Cumulative
<b>Sources of Funds</b>			
Gross Contributions	-	-	4,406,400
Fund Earned Interest and Investment Income	6	10	2,103
Interest Income received from Participating Organizations	-	-	-
Refunds by Administrative Agent to Contributors	-	-	-
Fund balance transferred to another MDTF	-	-	-
Other Revenues	-	-	-
<b>Total: Sources of Funds</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>4,408,503</b>
<b>Use of Funds</b>			
Transfers to Participating Organizations	-	-	4,362,332
Refunds received from Participating Organizations	-	-	-
<b>Net Funded Amount to Participating Organizations</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>4,362,332</b>
Administrative Agent Fees	-	-	44,064
Direct Costs: (Steering Committee, Secretariat...etc.)	-	-	-
Bank Charges	0	0	25
Other Expenditures	-	-	-
<b>Total: Uses of Funds</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4,406,421</b>
<b>Change in Fund cash balance with Administrative Agent</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>2,082</b>
Opening Fund balance (1 January)	2,066	2,072	-
<b>Closing Fund balance (31 December)</b>	<b>2,072</b>	<b>2,082</b>	<b>2,082</b>
Net Funded Amount to Participating Organizations	-	-	4,362,332
Participating Organizations' Expenditure	686,953	1,553,114	3,931,587
<b>Balance of Funds with Participating Organizations</b>			<b>430,745</b>

<sup>2</sup> Due to rounding, total in the tables may not add up.

## 2. Contributions

Table 2 provides information on cumulative contributions received from the Government of the Netherlands as of 31 December 2015.

**Table 2. Contributions (in US dollars)**

Contributors	Prior Years as of 31-Dec-2014	Current Year Jan-Dec-2015	Total
Netherlands	4,406,400	-	4,406,400
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>4,406,400</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>4,406,400</b>

## 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 2015, Fund earned interest amounts to US\$ 2,103 and no interest was received from Participating Organizations. Details are provided in the table below.

**Table 3. Sources of Interest and Investment Income, as of 31 December 2015 (in US Dollars)**

Interest Earned	Prior Years as of 31-Dec-2014	Current Year Jan-Dec-2015	Total
<b>Administrative Agent</b>			
Fund Earned Interest and Investment Income	2,092	10	2,103
<b>Total: Fund Earned Interest</b>	<b>2,092</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>2,103</b>
<b>Participating Organization</b>			
<b>Total: Agency earned interest</b>			
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>2,092</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>2,103</b>

## 4. Transfer of Funds

Allocations to Participating Organizations are approved by the Steering Committee and disbursed by the Administrative Agent. As of 31 December 2015, the AA has transferred US\$ 4,362,332 to 3 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 2015 (in US Dollars)**

Participating Organization	Prior Years as of 31-Dec-2014			Current Year Jan-Dec-2015			Total		
	Transfers	Refunds	Net Funded	Transfers	Refunds	Net Funded	Transfers	Refunds	Net Funded
UNDESA	260,500		260,500				260,500		260,500
UNDP	1,939,131		1,939,131				1,939,131		1,939,131
UNEP	2,162,701		2,162,701				2,162,701		2,162,701
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>4,362,332</b>		<b>4,362,332</b>				<b>4,362,332</b>		<b>4,362,332</b>

## 5. Overall Expenditure and Financial Delivery Rates

All final expenditures reported for the year 2015 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 below, the cumulative net funded amount is US\$ 4,362,332 and cumulative expenditures reported by the Participating Organizations amount to US\$ 3,931,587. This equates to an overall Fund expenditure delivery rate of 90 percent.

**Table 5.1. Net Funded Amount, Reported Expenditure, and Financial Delivery by Participating Organization, as of 31 December 2015 (in US Dollars)**

Participating Organization	Approved Amount	Net Funded Amount	Expenditure			Delivery Rate %
			Prior Years as of 31-Dec-2014	Current Year Jan-Dec-2015	Cumulative	
UNDESA	260,500	260,500	132,842	53,918	186,759	71.69
UNDP	1,939,131	1,939,131	1,627,910	44,476	1,672,387	86.24
UNEP	2,162,701	2,162,701	617,721	1,454,720	2,072,441	95.83
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>4,362,332</b>	<b>4,362,332</b>	<b>2,378,473</b>	<b>1,553,114</b>	<b>3,931,587</b>	<b>90.13</b>

### 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.

Table 5.2 reflects expenditure reported in the UNDG expense categories.

## 2012 CEB Expense Categories

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

**Table 5.2. Expenditure by UNDG Budget Category, as of 31 December 2015 (in US Dollars)**

Category	Expenditure			Percentage of Total Programme Cost
	Prior Years as of 31-Dec-2014	Current Year Jan-Dec-2015	Total	
Staff & Personnel Cost	1,192,987	669,839	1,862,827	50.58
Suppl, Comm, Materials	-	-	-	
Equip, Veh, Furn, Depn	-	-	-	
Contractual Services	200,115	46,299	246,414	6.69
Travel	412,267	78,229	490,496	13.32
Transfers and Grants	169,206	657,700	826,906	22.45
General Operating	256,185	331	256,516	6.96
<b>Programme Costs Total</b>	<b>2,230,760</b>	<b>1,452,399</b>	<b>3,683,159</b>	<b>100.00</b>
Indirect Support Costs Total	147,713	100,715	248,428	6.74
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,378,473</b>	<b>1,553,114</b>	<b>3,931,587</b>	

## 6. Cost Recovery

Cost recovery policies for the Fund are guided by the applicable provisions of the Terms of Reference, 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 2015, 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\$ 0 was deducted in AA-fees. Cumulatively, as of 31 December 2015, 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\$ 100,715 was deducted in indirect costs by Participating Organizations. Cumulatively, indirect costs amount to US\$ 248,428 as of 31 December 2015.

## 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.