

ANNEX I - EXPERTS CONSULTED

Experts Interviewed and List of Participants from *Global Policy Roundtable: COVID Green Recovery and Small Enterprises*

Abu Saieed

Green Industry Expert, Department of Environment, UNIDO
<https://www.unido.org/>

Adriana Zacarias

Head and Global Coordinator, GO4SDGs, UNEP
<https://www.greengrowthknowledge.org/initiatives/global-opportunities-sdgs-go4sdgs>

Anbu Venkatachalam

Director of Research Strategy and Innovation, Economic Research Institute for ASEAN & East Asia ERIA
<https://www.eria.org/>

Annegret Brauss

Project Manager (T4SD), International Trade Centre
www.intracen.org

Arab Hoballah

Team Leader, SWITCH Asia
<https://www.switch-asia.eu>

Barbara Ntambirweki

Research Fellow, ACODE (Uganda GEC Hub)
www.acode-u.org

Chandi Makuyana

Private Finance and Advisory Network (PFAN) pfan.net
@ChandiMutubuki

Chris Hopkins

Policy Manager, Green Economy Coalition
www.greeneconomycoalition.org

Christian Jahn

Director, Inclusive Business Action Network (IBAN)
<https://www.inclusivebusiness.net>

Clara Axblad

Programme Officer, Partnership for Action on Green Economy (PAGE)
www.un-page.org
@_un_page

Diana Quezada

Lead for Green Recovery
Global Green Growth Institute
www.gggi.org

Dr Chipso Mukonza

Managing Director
RC Global Research Training and Development (South Africa)

Eco Matser

Program Manager
Hivos <https://hivos.org/>

Eddie Sembatya

SEED Hub Uganda
<https://seed.uno>

Elize Hattingh

Sustainable Trade Researcher, TIPS (South Africa GEC Hub)
<https://www.tips.org.za>
@TIPS_news

Emily Benson

Director of Engagement, Green Economy Coalition
www.greeneconomycoalition.org
@GECOalition

Enrico Botta

Green Growth Coordinator, OECD
www.oecd.org

Ernest Chitechi

Corporate Services Manager, Kenya Climate Innovation Centre
<https://www.kenyacic.org>

Fayçal Boureima

Green Jobs Regional Specialist for Africa, ILO
www.ilo.org

Gitika Goswami

Senior Programme Director, Development Alternatives (GEC India Hub)
www.devalt.org

Hannes Mac Nulty

Senior Industry Advisor – Green Industry Platform
<https://www.greenindustryplatform.org/>
@GGKP_Industry

John Okira

Research Officer, ACODE (GEC Uganda hub)
<https://www.acode-u.org>

Laura Kelly

Director, Shaping Sustainable Markets, IIED
www.iied.org
@iied @LauraKellyIIED

Leslie Forsyth

Executive Director, FNI (Peru GEC Hub)
www.fni.pe

Ludovic Suttor-Sorel

Research and Campaign Officer,
Finance Watch
<https://www.finance-watch.org>
@Lsuttors @forfinancewatch

Luis Miguel Prado

Head of Production, Libelula (GEC Peru Hub)
www.libelula.com.pe

Malini Balakrishnan

Coordinator (SEED India Hub), Senior Fellow (TERI);
SEED Hub India (hosted at The Energy & Resources Institute,
TERI)
<https://seed.uno/>; <https://www.teriin.org/>

Martin Lok

Deputy Director, Capitals Coalition
www.naturalcapitalcoalition.org

Marysol Goes

Amazon Green Economy Convenor, FAS Amazon GEC Hub)
<https://fas-amazonas.org>

Nicole Leotaud

Executive Director, CANARI (Caribbean GEC Hub)
www.canari.org

Nora Nisi

Assistant Coordinator, IIED
www.iied.org

Oliver Greenfield

Convenor, Green Economy Coalition
www.greeneconomycoalition.org
@GECOalition

Philippe Rudaz

Economic Affairs Officer, UNCTAD
<https://unctad.org/topic/enterprise-development>
<https://www.facebook.com/UNCTAD>
<https://www.linkedin.com/company/unctad/>
<https://twitter.com/#%21unctad>

Ritu Bharadwaj

Senior Researcher, IIED
www.iied.org
@iied

Stella George

Development Alternatives (GEC India Hub)
www.devalt.org

Tafadzwa Chirinda

National Project Coordinator
ILO Green enterPRIZE Project, Zimbabwe
<https://www.greenenterprize.org/>
@greeniloharare

Zeenat Niazi

Vice President, Development Alternatives
www.devalt.org

ANNEX II - METHODOLOGY

Survey Design, Data Collection of Self-Reported Information & Data Responses

Assessment-based interviews served as an elaborated tool to evaluate the contribution of each participating stakeholder to the key areas of green recovery. The survey consisted of 25 questions about the enterprise's social, environmental, and economic impact, and about general resilience criteria. These survey questions were self-reported by the participants.

Participating stakeholders represent a diverse sample of enterprises and organisations from different regions working at the national, regional and global level. The selection of participants was based on a number of criteria, such as active engagement in the green economy, green growth and green recovery agenda, and – in the case of support providers - dedication to a private sector or enterprise support angle in their work.

Out of a total of 55 enterprises, 65% (36) responded to the request for survey. The surveyed eco-inclusive enterprises are from the following countries: Ghana (2), India (3), Indonesia (5), South Africa (2), Uganda (1), Thailand (4), Malawi (8), Zambia (6), Zimbabwe (5). Of the non-responses:

- Five (5) were no longer operational as eco-inclusive enterprises at the time of the interview request.
- One (1) opted out due to health issues.
- Thirteen (13) did not reply to the interview requests, or did not show up for the scheduled interview, or could not complete the survey due to lack of internet access.

The 36 eco-inclusive enterprises in the sample were all recipients of SEED Awards 2019 and part of the cohort of SEED Catalyser and SEED Accelerator for 2019-2020. Information on their contribution to social, economic and environmental were reported as average between the years 2019 and 2020. Not all survey questions were mandatory and were not answered by every respondent. The total number of responses for information displayed is stated in the corresponding figure or graph (n).

The 15 cosystem support organisations consist of organisations who are currently providing direct enterprise support and/or working in the policy development space for eco-inclusive enterprises. These are organisations who are part of the [COVID-19 Recovery & Small Enterprises](#) Global Policy Roundtable hosted by the Green Economy Coalition. They include Development Alternatives, UNEP Eco-innovation, Inclusive Business Action Network (iBAN), Kenya Climate Innovation Center (KCIC), ACODE Environmental & Natural Resource Governance (Democracy) Programme, GEC Finance Dialogues Programme, GGGI Green & Resilience Recovery, HIVOS, ILO, OECD EU for Environment Project, PFAN Support, TERI, and UNPAGE Green Recovery Programme.

Data Screening, Feasibility & Analysis

Since the survey questions were self-reported by the participants, the obtained data was first screened to ensure data feasibility and quality. In this process, possible restrictions were also considered (it was not feasible to contact all survey respondents to validate all the information). Part of the initial data screening included for instance that zero's & blank responses were eliminated. To verify responses, we checked for inconsistencies between reported numbers under different categories. For example, if more women employees were reported than the total number of people employed, this was categorised as inconsistent data and was omitted in the final analysis. The remaining responses constituted the base for the analysis.

The collected data was transferred into an Excel sheet to run basic data analysis and generate aggregated descriptive statistics. Descriptive statistics were used to describe the basic features of the data and the distribution of enterprises with regards to several factors, such as the stage of development, social and environmental objectives pursued, etc. Sample summaries were established to gain insights on basic characteristics of the surveyed enterprises, and to shed light on "the big picture". In addition, graphs were developed to portray the results in an understandable, attractive manner.

Due to insufficient data to conduct a quantitative correlation analysis, the data was correlated visually, and while considering the possible limitations and biases, conclusions were drawn about existing differences among enterprise groups with different characteristics.

Limitations

Self-reported impact data accuracy and comparison is limited due to existing differences in the method of measuring, quantifying, and estimating impacts by surveyed enterprises. This limitation particularly applies to environmental impacts such as CO₂ reduction, pollutant emissions, energy, and water estimations.

Furthermore, the sample sizes when categorising the total sample into different groups resulted in a very low number of cases, which made it difficult to conduct a robust analysis (i.e. to test the statistical significance of a correlation or differences among groups).

Efforts were also undertaken to assess bias within the sample responses. Participating enterprises represented a variety of 'good performing' as well as 'struggling' enterprises. For non-responses, it was presumed that enterprises have paused or focused on alternative operations (e.g. unable to reply because they were too busy recuperating the business). Enterprises that continued in business were more likely to share information about their enterprise, leading to a bias in the success rate shown in this report.

Despite these limitations, the collected data was thoroughly screened, transferred, and analysed, and conclusions were drawn with caution.