GREEN PORTS TOOLKIT

# Green Port Project Business Case

## Stage Gate 1: strategic case for board consideration

This template helps a port put a green port project in front of its board for a first decision. At Gate 1 the board is not approving the project. It is deciding whether the idea is worth the cost of investigating properly and releasing the budget to do that.

This template is guidance only. Using it, or the Green Ports Toolkit, does not imply ADB endorsement of, or funding for, any project.

| | |
|---|---|
| **Port or organization** | [Enter] |
| **Project title** | [Enter] |
| **Date of paper** | [DD Month YYYY] |
| **Board or committee** | [Enter] |

## How to use it

*Delete this page before you submit the paper.*

- Complete the toolkit aspect-level maturity assessment first. Section 3 depends on it.
- Replace the grey guidance text and anything in square brackets with your own content.
- Fill in every section. If one does not apply, write "not applicable" and one line saying why. The board should see that you considered it.
- Keep the completed paper to six to eight pages plus annexes. If a section runs long, move the detail to an annex.
- Be explicit about what is an estimate. Gate 1 costs are indicative and will move.
- Always include the base case (do nothing) in Section 5. A board cannot judge an option without it.
- Where you do not yet know a number, say so and say what it would take to find out. An honest gap is more useful to a board than a confident guess.

The four gates are set out in Annex A. Annex B repeats the maturity scale and Annex C lists the 17 green port aspects.

## Working in this template

*The shaded boxes are ordinary Word table cells. Click into one and type, or paste with Ctrl+Shift+V to keep the template formatting. Everything else uses the built-in Word styles: Heading 1, Heading 2, Heading 3, Normal and List Paragraph. To add a section, copy an existing heading and box, or pick the style from the Home tab style gallery.*

# 1. SUMMARY AND DECISION SOUGHT

*Write this section last. A board member who reads only this page should understand the project, the cost, and what you want from them.*

| | |
|---|---|
| **Port or organization** | [Enter] |
| **Project title** | [Enter] |
| **Project sponsor** | [Name, role] |
| **Paper prepared by** | [Name, role] |
| **Date of paper** | [DD Month YYYY] |
| **Board or committee** | [Enter] |

| | |
|---|---|
| **What the project is** | [Two or three sentences. What will physically or operationally change.] |
| **Why now** | [One or two sentences. The trigger: regulation, customer demand, asset condition, funding window, climate exposure.] |
| **Green port aspects addressed** | [List the toolkit aspects, for example: 8 Low-Emission Technology, 13 Resource Use and Waste Management] |
| **Maturity uplift** | [For example: Aspect 8 from Level 2 to Level 3] |
| **Recommended option** | [Option number and one-line description] |
| **Indicative total project cost** | [Range, with a confidence note] |
| **Funding requested at this gate** | [Amount for feasibility work only] |
| **Key risk** | [The one risk the board most needs to know about] |

## Decision sought

*Mark one. Delete the others or leave them for the board to select.*

- Approve progression to Gate 2 and release [amount] for feasibility work.
- Approve progression subject to the conditions set out below.
- Defer pending [what is needed].
- Do not proceed.

### CONDITIONS (IF ANY)

*[If the board approves with conditions, record them here.]*

# 2. STRATEGIC CASE

## 2.1 The problem or opportunity

*Describe the current situation and what is wrong with it, in evidence rather than adjectives. Use figures the port already holds: energy use, downtime, complaints, emissions, incident counts, throughput constraints.*

### CURRENT SITUATION

*[What is happening now, with the figures that show it.]*

### WHAT HAPPENS IF NOTHING CHANGES

*[Cost, risk or opportunity that grows if the port does not act.]*

## 2.2 Alignment

*Show the board that this project serves commitments the port has already made. Delete rows that do not apply.*

| DRIVER | HOW THIS PROJECT RESPONDS |
|---|---|
| **Port strategy or master plan** | [Reference the document and the relevant objective] |
| **National or regional policy** | [For example NDC, national ports or energy policy] |
| **Regulatory obligation** | [Current or foreseeable requirement] |
| **Customer or shipping line requirement** | [For example shore power, emissions reporting, green corridor] |
| **Financing or investor requirement** | [For example lender ESG conditions, green bond criteria, ASEAN Taxonomy alignment, GRESB] |
| **Community or workforce expectation** | [For example dust, noise, local air quality, employment] |

# 3. MATURITY POSITION AND UPLIFT

*This section links the project to the port's assessed position. Complete the toolkit aspect-level maturity assessment before writing it. Scores run from Level 1 (none or ad hoc) to Level 4 (advanced or integrated). Annex B repeats the scale.*

## 3.1 Current position

*List only the aspects this project affects, usually two to four. Add rows if needed.*

| # | ASPECT | CURRENT LEVEL | EVIDENCE FOR THE CURRENT SCORE | TARGET LEVEL |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| [ ] | [Aspect name] | [1-4] | [What you observed] | [1-4] |
| [ ] | [Aspect name] | [1-4] | [What you observed] | [1-4] |
| [ ] | [Aspect name] | [1-4] | [What you observed] | [1-4] |
| [ ] | [Aspect name] | [1-4] | [What you observed] | [1-4] |

## 3.2 How the project creates the uplift

*A level moves only when something durable changes. State which of these the project delivers, and how. Assets alone rarely move a score: a port that installs equipment without a procedure, an owner and data is still at Level 2.*

| WHAT CHANGES | HOW THIS PROJECT DELIVERS IT |
|---|---|
| **Assets and technology** | [What is built, bought or installed] |
| **Systems and procedures** | [What is documented, and where it is embedded] |
| **Data and monitoring** | [What gets measured, how often, by whom] |
| **People and capability** | [Roles, training, accountability] |
| **Governance** | [Reporting line, review cycle, board visibility] |
| **External verification** | [Certification, audit or disclosure the uplift enables] |

## 3.3 What this project does not address

*Name the low-scoring aspects this project leaves untouched, and when they will be picked up. This protects the board from assuming the project fixes more than it does.*

**ASPECTS LEFT FOR LATER, AND WHY**

*[Low-scoring aspects this project does not touch, and when they will be picked up.]*

# 4. PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND SCOPE

## 4.1 What the project is

**DESCRIPTION**

*[What will be built, bought, changed or introduced, and where.]*

## 4.2 Scope boundary

*Be strict here. Most cost growth between Gate 1 and Gate 3 comes from scope that was never written down as excluded.*

| IN SCOPE | OUT OF SCOPE |
|---|---|
| [List] | [List] |

## 4.3 Indicative timeline

| STAGE | INDICATIVE TIMING | KEY OUTPUT |
|---|---|---|
| **Feasibility (Gate 2)** | [Dates] | [Study, concept design, cost plan] |
| **Detailed business case (Gate 3)** | [Dates] | [Investment decision paper] |
| **Delivery** | [Dates] | [Asset or capability in service] |
| **Benefits review** | [Dates] | [Maturity re-assessment] |

## 4.4 Dependencies

*Other projects, approvals, grid or utility connections, land tenure, or partner decisions this project relies on.*

**DEPENDENCIES**

*[Other projects, approvals, utility connections, land tenure, partner decisions.]*

# 5. OPTIONS ASSESSED

*Include the base case as Option 0 and at least two real alternatives. Options that were considered and dismissed early can be listed in one line each under 5.3. A board is entitled to see the option you rejected as well as the one you want.*

## 5.1 Options compared

| OPTION | DESCRIPTION | INDICATIVE COST | MATURITY UPLIFT | MAIN RISKS |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **0. Base case (do nothing)** | [What continues as is, and at what cost] | Nil capital | No change | [What gets worse] |
| **1. [Name]** | [Description] | [Capital range, operating impact] | [Aspect, level to level] | [Top two] |
| **2. [Name]** | [Description] | [Capital range, operating impact] | [Aspect, level to level] | [Top two] |
| **3. [Name]** | [Description] | [Capital range, operating impact] | [Aspect, level to level] | [Top two] |

## 5.2 Recommended option

### RECOMMENDED OPTION AND WHY

*[Name the option and the two or three reasons it wins.]*

### WHY THE OTHER OPTIONS WERE NOT RECOMMENDED

*[One or two lines per option.]*

## 5.3 Options considered and discounted

*One line each. Optional.*

*[Option, and why it was ruled out.]*

# 6. CONTRIBUTION TO THE SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT GOALS

*Choose the two to four goals the project genuinely moves, and name the target beneath each goal rather than the goal alone. A long list of loosely connected goals weakens the paper. Where you cannot yet measure a contribution, say what would need to be measured. A good starting point is the SDGs already mapped to the toolkit practices this project draws on.*

| SDG AND TARGET | HOW THIS PROJECT CONTRIBUTES | HOW IT WILL BE MEASURED | PRIMARY OR SECONDARY |
|---|---|---|---|
| [For example SDG 7.3 energy efficiency] | [Direct, specific contribution] | [Indicator and data source] | [Primary] |
| [SDG and target] | [Contribution] | [Indicator and data source] | [Secondary] |
| [SDG and target] | [Contribution] | [Indicator and data source] | [Secondary] |

Goals most often relevant to port projects: 6 clean water and sanitation; 7 affordable and clean energy; 8 decent work and economic growth; 9 industry, innovation and infrastructure; 11 sustainable cities and communities; 12 responsible consumption and production; 13 climate action; 14 life below water; 17 partnerships.

## 6.1 Wider benefits

*Benefits that matter to the board but do not fit a goal: community relations, workforce safety, customer retention, regulatory standing, insurance position.*

**WIDER BENEFITS**

*[Community relations, workforce safety, customer retention, regulatory standing, insurance position.]*

# 7. RISKS

*Rate likelihood and impact before mitigation, then state the mitigation. Use the port's own risk matrix if it has one. Categories worth checking: delivery, cost, technology maturity, regulatory and permitting, environmental and social, climate and physical, market and demand, operational disruption, reputational.*

## 7.1 Key risks

| ID | RISK | LIKELIHOOD | IMPACT | RATING | MITIGATION | OWNER |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| R1 | [Risk] | [L/M/H] | [L/M/H] | [ ] | [Action] | [Role] |
| R2 | [Risk] | [L/M/H] | [L/M/H] | [ ] | [Action] | [Role] |
| R3 | [Risk] | [L/M/H] | [L/M/H] | [ ] | [Action] | [Role] |
| R4 | [Risk] | [L/M/H] | [L/M/H] | [ ] | [Action] | [Role] |
| R5 | [Risk] | [L/M/H] | [L/M/H] | [ ] | [Action] | [Role] |

## 7.2 Risk of not proceeding

*The base case carries risk too. Set it out plainly: stranded assets, regulatory exposure, lost customers, rising energy or compliance cost, climate damage, reputational harm.*

**RISK OF NOT PROCEEDING**

*[Stranded assets, regulatory exposure, lost customers, rising energy or compliance cost, climate damage, reputational harm.]*

## 7.3 Assumptions

*List the assumptions the case rests on. Each one that proves wrong changes the answer, so the board should see them.*

**ASSUMPTIONS**

*[List them. Each one that proves wrong changes the answer.]*

# 8. COST, FUNDING AND NEXT STAGE

*Gate 1 numbers are indicative. State the basis of each estimate (vendor quote, benchmark, comparable project, professional judgment) and the range.*

| ITEM | INDICATIVE AMOUNT | BASIS OF ESTIMATE | CONFIDENCE |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Feasibility budget requested at this gate** | [Amount] | [Basis] | [High/Med/Low] |
| **Indicative total capital cost** | [Range] | [Basis] | [High/Med/Low] |
| **Annual operating cost change** | [+ or -] | [Basis] | [High/Med/Low] |
| **Indicative payback or benefit period** | [Years] | [Basis] | [High/Med/Low] |

## 8.1 Funding sources

*Include green and sustainable finance options where relevant: green loans, sustainability-linked facilities, concessional or climate finance, grants, development bank funding, customer or tenant contribution. Toolkit Aspect 4 Financing (Green & Sustainable) has practice detail. Toolkit practices also show alignment to the ASEAN Taxonomy for Sustainable Finance where applicable, which helps test whether the project may qualify for green finance. If the port builds this project in the toolkit, ADB can see it and may identify relevant financing or technical assistance options.*

### FUNDING SOURCES BEING EXPLORED

*[Source, indicative share, and what it would require of the port.]*

## 8.2 What the next stage will produce

*Tell the board what they will receive at Gate 2, and when.*

| GATE 2 OUTPUT | OWNER | DUE |
|---|---|---|
| [For example concept design and cost plan] | [Role] | [Date] |
| [For example technical feasibility study] | [Role] | [Date] |
| [For example funding options assessment] | [Role] | [Date] |

# 9. RECOMMENDATION

*State the recommendation as a resolution the board can adopt as written.*

It is recommended that the Board:

- Notes the maturity assessment outcomes set out in Section 3.
- Approves progression of [project name] to Gate 2 feasibility.
- Approves expenditure of [amount] to complete the Gate 2 work described in Section 8.2.
- Notes the risks in Section 7 and the assumptions on which this case rests.
- Requests a Gate 2 paper by [date].

| NAME | ROLE | SIGNATURE | DATE |
|---|---|---|---|
| [Name] | Project sponsor | | |
| [Name] | [Role] | | |
| [Name] | Board chair | | |

# ANNEX A. THE STAGE GATES

*Gate 1 approval commits the port to feasibility work, not to delivering the project.*

| GATE | QUESTION THE BOARD IS ANSWERING | WHAT IS APPROVED |
|---|---|---|
| **1. Strategic case** | Is this worth investigating? | Budget for feasibility work |
| **2. Feasibility** | Is it technically and financially viable? | Budget for detailed design and full business case |
| **3. Investment decision** | Do we commit capital? | Project funding and delivery |
| **4. Delivery and benefits** | Did it deliver what we said it would? | Benefits realization and closeout |

# ANNEX B. MATURITY SCALE

*From the Green Ports Toolkit aspect-level maturity assessment. Score the level the port has genuinely reached, not the one it is working towards.*

| LEVEL | LABEL | WHAT IT LOOKS LIKE |
|---|---|---|
| **Level 1** | None or ad hoc | No formal approach. Handled reactively or not at all. |
| **Level 2** | Emerging | Basic or partial approach in place, applied inconsistently. |
| **Level 3** | Established | Systematic, documented approach applied across the port. |
| **Level 4** | Advanced or integrated | Fully embedded, optimized, and often externally verified or leading practice. |

# ANNEX C. GREEN PORT ASPECTS

*The 17 aspects, grouped by dimension. Use this numbering and wording in Section 3.*

| GOVERNANCE | DEVELOPMENT | OPERATIONS |
|---|---|---|
| 1 Regulatory Compliance | 5 Development Planning | 11 Maintenance |
| 2 Certification and Benchmarking | 6 Engineering Design | 12 Materials Handling |

| GOVERNANCE | DEVELOPMENT | OPERATIONS |
|---|---|---|
| 3 Risk Management | 7 Materials Selection | 13 Resource Use and Waste Management |
| 4 Financing (Green & Sustainable) | 8 Low-Emission Technology | 14 Biosecurity and Biodiversity Management |
| | 9 Digital Technology and Automation | 15 Social Licence and Community Engagement |
| | 10 Climate Adaptation | 16 Workforce Standards and Engagement |
| | | 17 Decommissioning and End-of-Life |