

**Compilation of informal written inputs received from Parties on  
Review of the Functions of the Standing Committee on Finance**

## CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
1. ENVIRONMENTAL INTEGRITY GROUP (Inputs received 13 September 2021) .....	3
2. SLOVENIA AND THE EUROPEAN COMMISSION ON BEHALF OF THE EUROPEAN UNION AND ITS MEMBER STATES (Inputs received 16 September 2021).....	5
3. PHILIPPINES (Inputs received 17 September 2021) .....	7
4. BANGLADESH (Inputs received 19 September 2021) .....	8
5. LEAST DEVELOPED COUNTRIES (Inputs received 19 September 2021) .....	10
6. UGANDA (Inputs received 19 September 2021) .....	11
7. AFRICAN GROUP OF NEGOTIATORS (Inputs received 20 September 2021) .....	12
8. JAPAN (Inputs received 22 September 2021) .....	13
9. INDONESIA (Inputs received 27 September 2021) .....	14
10. SUBMISSION BY PERU ON BEHALF OF THE AILAC GROUP* (Inputs received 1 October 2021) .....	15

---

\* This submission is supported by Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Honduras, Guatemala, Panama, Paraguay And Peru.

## Submission of Environmental Integrity Group

### Written Input of the Environmental Integrity Group (EIG) on the Second Review of the Functions of the Standing Committee on Finance (SCF)

This informal written input is provided on behalf of the EIG comprising of Georgia, Liechtenstein, Mexico, Monaco, the Republic of Korea and Switzerland.

- *What are your general expectations for the second Review of the Functions of the Standing Committee on Finance, including with regards to the overall approach and the possible outcomes of the second review in Glasgow?*

According to the EIG, the 2<sup>nd</sup> Review of the SCF should:

- a) facilitate, if possible, the strengthening the work of the SCF,
- b) identify opportunities for increased efficiency and effectiveness,
- c) inform Parties on the extent to which the existing activities and working modalities of the SCF are sufficient for it to fulfil its mandate,
- d) and examine whether any gaps exist in the delivery of the work of the SCF and how they could be addressed.

The CMA and the COP should then be able to formulate recommendations to further improve the work of the SCF based on the outcomes of the Review.

- *What specific updates should be made to the ToRs in order to be able to adopt them and initiate the second Review at COP 26?*

The ToR should be technically updated and they should reflect the fact that by now the Paris Agreement has entered into force and the SCF is serving the Convention as well as the Paris Agreement.

Please find the EIG's detailed comments / amendments to the existing ToR in the annex to this document.

- *How should the separate mandate for the Review under the CMA (as set out in Decision 5/CMA.2, paragraph 17) interact with the Review under the COP?*

The Review under the CMA should be conducted as part of the Review under the COP and therefore the ToR should reflect the needs of both the COP and the CMA. In the view of the EIG, the CMA could then formulate its own recommendations based on the outcome of the review. The contact group to discuss the ToR for the 2<sup>nd</sup> Review of the SCF could be a joint contact group of the CMA and the COP to ensure that the draft decision text agreed by the contact group reflects the views of the Parties of the Paris Agreement and the Parties of the UNFCCC.

## Terms of reference for the review of the functions of the Standing Committee on Finance

### A. Objective

1. The objective of the review of the Standing Committee on Finance (SCF) is to review the functions of the committee, with a view to:

- (a) Strengthening the work of the SCF, as appropriate;
- (b) Identifying opportunities for increased efficiency and effectiveness;
- (c) Informing Parties on the extent to which the existing activities and working modalities of the SCF ~~will facilitate it to~~ fulfil its mandate to serve the Paris Agreement ~~and the Convention in line with decision 1/CP.21, paragraph 63;~~
- (d) Taking into account interrelated review processes, such as the sixth ~~seventh~~ review of the Financial Mechanism.

### B. Scope

2. The scope of the review will cover the progress made to date and lessons learned in the fulfilment of the mandate of the SCF to assist the Conference of the Parties (COP) ~~and the CMA~~ in the exercise of its functions with respect to the Financial Mechanism. In this context, the review should:

- (a) Be based on the current mandate and functions of the SCF;
- (b) Be informed by the work on climate finance conducted by other entities;
- (c) Examine whether any gaps exist in the delivery of the work of the SCF and how they can be addressed.

3. The review should address the following elements:

- (a) Assessment of the extent to which the SCF has effectively delivered on its core functions and mandated activities as outlined in decision 2/CP.17, ~~1/CP.21, paragraph 63~~ and other relevant decisions and, in this regard, taking stock of past achievements of the SCF in terms of its concrete outputs and how they have been utilized;
- (b) Identification of the potential need for reorientation or reprioritization of the existing functions of the SCF;
- (c) Assessment of whether the working modalities of the SCF, ~~including the participation of its members~~, are fit-for-purpose for carrying out its functions;
- (d) Quality of outputs;
- (e) Linkages with the constituted bodies under the Convention;
- (f) Relations with relevant external stakeholders.

### C. Sources of information

4. The review shall draw upon, inter alia, the following sources of information:

- (a) Submissions from members of the SCF, Parties ~~of the Convention, Parties of the Paris Agreement~~ and the constituted bodies under the Convention ~~and the Paris Agreement~~, as well as external stakeholders involved in the activities of the SCF;
- (b) The annual reports of the SCF, including, in particular, annex [~~Placeholder for numbering of Annex~~] to its report to COP ~~26~~2;
- (c) The relevant decisions of the COP ~~and the CMA~~ related to the SCF;
- (d) Outputs delivered by the SCF, such as ~~the needs determination report and~~ the biennial assessment and overview of climate finance flows;
- (e) A self-assessment report of the SCF and recommendations on improving its efficiency and effectiveness;
- (f) The technical paper to be prepared by the secretariat in line with paragraph 5 of this decision.

### D. Criteria

5. The review shall take into account, inter alia, the following:

- (a) The effectiveness and efficiency of the SCF in the delivery of its functions;
- (b) The transparency of its decision-making processes;
- (c) The level and nature of stakeholder engagement;
- (d) The quality and added value of the outputs of the SCF, including how they were received by the COP, ~~the CMA~~ and external stakeholders, and in particular how its recommendations have informed and advanced the work of the COP ~~and the CMA~~;
- (e) The timeliness of the outputs of the SCF.



## **INFORMAL WRITTEN INPUT BY SLOVENIA AND THE EUROPEAN COMMISSION ON BEHALF OF THE EUROPEAN UNION AND ITS MEMBER STATES**

### **Review of the Functions of the Standing Committee on Finance**

16 September 2021

#### **1. What are your general expectations for the second Review of the Functions of the Standing Committee on Finance, including with regards to the overall approach and the possible outcomes of the second review in Glasgow?**

- Following the useful multilateral exchange of views, the EU and its Member States welcome the opportunity to provide informal written input on the review of the functions of the SCF.
- The EU and its Member States would be in favour of creating a common understanding among Parties on the timing of the review prior to COP26 as this will clarify the focus of our work during COP26.
- We see merit in a decision on the Terms of Reference (ToR) at COP26 and a decision on the review of the SCF functions at COP27.
- Following the original timeline, agreeing to the ToR at COP26 and performing the actual review of the SCF functions in an inclusive manner will contribute to an optimal and future proof functioning of the SCF.
- On the possible outcomes of the review of the functions:
  - The review should consider to what extent the SCF has delivered the elements raised at the 1st review as stipulated in decision 8/CP.23. Many elements of the 1st review should be considered at the 2nd review as well (e.g. stakeholder engagement).
  - The EU sees this review as an opportunity to assess how effectively and efficiently the SCF, within its available resources, has delivered against its mandate, as outlined in 1/CP.16, 2/CP.17 and subsequent decisions - which is to assist the Conference of the Parties in exercising its functions with respect to the Financial Mechanism of the Convention - with a view to identifying opportunities for increased efficiency and effectiveness.
  - Furthermore, with the adoption of the Paris Agreement, it is timely to consider whether the SCF could adopt a different approach to its existing functions (for example, taking into consideration Article 2.1c while respecting competences of other relevant bodies and institutions), or whether there is a need to reorient or reprioritize functions by focusing on where it adds value.
  - Finally, there is a need to clarify the mandate of the Constituted Bodies in the area of finance to avoid duplication of work.

**2. What specific updates should be made to the ToRs in order to be able to adopt them and initiate the second Review at COP 26? We encourage Parties to make reference to the existing ToRs in providing their responses to this question, and to be precise in noting any textual updates that would be needed in order for their substantive priorities to be addressed.**

- The EU believes the previous ToR serves as a good basis for the 2<sup>nd</sup> review, but a modest update is required to allow for some technical adjustments:
  - To define the role/interaction with the CMA. Since the SCF also serves the Paris Agreement, the review has to consider how the functions of the SCF respond not only to the objectives of the Convention but also to the long-term goals of the Paris Agreement, including Art. 2.1c. It also means that the EU sees a need to allow the CMA to respond to the outcomes of the review.
  - To stipulate the timing of intersessional work (submissions, technical paper, mandate of the SBI in upcoming sessions).
  - To update references to interrelated review processes.
  - To take into account other sources of information (e.g. NDR).
  - To have a focus on the role of the SCF in the Global Stocktake.

**3. How should the separate mandate for the Review under the CMA (as set out in Decision 5/CMA.2, paragraph 17) interact with the Review under the COP?**

- The SCF serves the Paris Agreement in line with its functions and responsibilities established under the COP. The CMA therefore necessarily has a role in conducting the review of the functions of the SCF and the content of the review should also address the role of the CMA.
- There should be a joint COP/CMA decision (both on ToR and the review itself), prepared by a joint agenda item under the SBI.

## **Informal Written Inputs of the Functions of the Standing Committee on Finance**

*Submission by the Philippines*

17 September 2021

**1. *What are your general expectations for the second Review of the Functions of the Standing Committee on Finance, including with regards to the overall approach and the possible outcomes of the second review in Glasgow?***

The Standing Committee on Finance was established based on the recognition that Finance, as the main element for undertaking critical climate response actions, merits a dedicated body to ensure that not only it flows in a sustainable manner until the climate change problem is mitigated and solved but also that financial resources commensurate to their increasing needs are mobilized and relatively freely provided.

To date, the SCF's main functions and terms of reference remain not only relevant but critical to the optimal functioning of the Climate Change Agreement. Most importantly, the SCF as a dedicated body on climate finance, is critical to the attainment of the goal of a stabilized climate system for this planet.

The Second Review, therefore, should result in the identification of gaps in the SCF's powers and functions, with a view to the body's strengthening, optimal functioning, and increased effectiveness in helping increase the financial resources for the Convention and its Protocols' effective functioning and responsiveness to the developing country Parties' needs.

Moreover, the SCF should identify and recommend operational actions that can address the need for increased participation of developing countries in financial resources under the Convention and the Paris Agreement, such as the Green Climate Fund (GCF). The GCF's structure is arduous and indirect, which has made it difficult for highly vulnerable developing countries from efficiently accessing funding for climate responsive programmes and projects. We deem that this does not align with the Fund's vision of addressing funding gaps.

**2. *What specific updates should be made to the ToRs in order to be able to adopt them and initiate the second Review at COP 26?***

For now, the original ToRs could remain generally the same, except for the addition of the following under the criteria: 2

- The SCF's effectiveness in consolidating operational recommendations in relation to the functioning of the Operating Entities and having these acted on by COP in terms of guidance.

**3. *How should the separate mandate for the Review under the CMA (as set out in Decision 5/CMA.2, paragraph 17) interact with the Review under the COP?***

The Paris Agreement, for all intents and purposes is not yet fully operational. Hence, the CMA can only draw from the Convention implementation learnings of the Parties. At this time when the full resources extent and flow, including modalities, are still being debated under CMA, it is really not in a position to do its own separate review of the SCF, except perhaps, in an anticipatory context.\_\_\_\_

## **Informal Written Inputs on the Review of the Functions of the Standing Committee on Finance to COP 25 Presidency and the Incoming COP 26 Presidency from Bangladesh**

The Government of Bangladesh welcomes the opportunity to provide its views on the Review of the Functions of the Standing Committee on Finance.

The objective of the review of the functions of the Standing Committee on Finance (SCF) should include:

1. Strengthening the work of the SCF;
2. Identifying opportunities for increased efficiency and effectiveness of climate finance;
3. Informing Parties on the extent to which the existing activities and working modalities of the SCF will fulfill its mandate to serve the Paris Agreement;
4. Taking into account interrelated review processes, such as the seventh review of the Financial Mechanism.

The scope of the review of SCF should include:

2. The mandate and functions of the SCF;
3. Examine whether any gaps exist in the delivery of the work of the SCF and how they can be addressed.

The review should address the following elements:

- Assessment of the extent to which the SCF has effectively delivered on its core functions and mandated activities and other relevant decisions of COP and CMA. So, the review should cover all the four elements of the ToR that the SCF was established with. Bangladesh is of the view that the last element of the ToR, i.e. the MRV of support through assessment of BRs is being carried out more effectively, compared to other three elements of the ToR.
- Identification of the potential need for reorientation or reprioritization of the existing functions of the SCF. Bangladesh suggests that the SCF may strengthen its function of ensuring coordination and coherence of provision of climate finance by many different agencies, which compromises the effectiveness of climate finance at the receiving end. This will require reaching an agreement on defining climate finance, with a set of concrete criteria. Further, the SCF may prioritize on its ToR of mobilizations of climate finance including through alternative sources.

The review should consider the following source of information:

- Submissions from members of the SCF, Parties and the constituted bodies under the Convention, as well as external stakeholders involved in the activities of the SCF;
- The relevant decisions of the COPs and CMA related to the SCF;



- Outputs delivered by the SCF, such as the biennial assessment and overview of climate finance flows;
- A self-assessment report of the SCF and recommendations on improving its efficiency and effectiveness.

---

## LDCs Written Inputs on the Second Review of the Functions of the Standing Committee on Finance

1. What are your general expectations for the second Review of the Functions of the Standing Committee on Finance, including with regards to the overall approach and the possible outcomes of the second review in Glasgow?
  - LDCs expect the second review to assess the functions of the SCF in relation to its mandate whether the SCF is functioning as per its mandate or if there is a need for the SCF to focus on or prioritize some areas of work as per its mandate; and/or if there is a need for its mandate to be updated- particularly with regard to **resource mobilization**.
  - LDCs propose for the SCF to have a clear mandate to **work on definitions of climate finance by further elaborating on the work it is currently undertaking**.
  - The review should recommend how SCF can deliver on these specific mandates in the future.
2. What specific updates should be made to the ToRs in order to be able to adopt them and initiate the second Review at COP 26? We encourage Parties to make reference to the existing ToRs in providing their responses to this question, and to be precise in noting any textual updates that would be needed in order for their substantive priorities to be addressed.
  - The previous ToR, as set out in Decision 9/CP.22, can establish the basis for a holistic review of the SCF functions with some consideration of updates. For instance, the scope should consider to what extent the SCF has fulfilled all its mandates and if there is a need for its mandate to be updated as needed.
3. How should the separate mandate for the Review under the CMA (as set out in Decision 5/CMA.2, paragraph 17) interact with the Review under the COP?
  - There should be separate reviews by the CMA and the COP as mandated.

Plot No.3-7 Kabalega Crescent, Luzira  
Tel: +256 414-237690  
Fax: +256 414-346530  
[www.ccd.go.ug](http://www.ccd.go.ug)

IN ANY CORRESPONDENCE ON THIS  
SUBJECT PLEASE QUOTE: ADM 10/120/01



THE REPUBLIC OF UGANDA

MINISTRY OF WATER AND  
ENVIRONMENT,  
CLIMATE CHANGE  
DEPARTMENT  
P.O. BOX 28119, KAMPALA  
UGANDA

## UGANDA'S SUBMISSION TO THE SECOND REVIEW OF THE FUNCTIONS OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

1. *What are your general expectations for the second Review of the Functions of the Standing Committee on Finance, including with regards to the overall approach and the possible outcomes of the second review in Glasgow?*

### Response

- Uganda expects the second review to assess the functions of the SCF in relation to its mandate.
  - This will assist Parties ascertain whether the SCF is functioning as per its mandate or if there is a need for the SCF to focus on or prioritize some areas of work as per its mandate; and/or if there is a need for its mandate to be updated- particularly with regard to resource mobilization.
  - Regardless of the foregoing, Uganda appreciates the critical role of the SCF in providing advisories to GCF and this has an impact on access to funds needed
  - We see this work out by giving a clear and definite mandate to the SCF to work on definitions of climate finance by further elaborating on the work it is currently undertaking. A time frame should be given in which this mandate will be delivered.
2. *What specific updates should be made to the ToRs in order to be able to adopt them and initiate the second Review at COP 26? We encourage Parties to make reference to the existing ToRs in providing their responses to this question, and to be precise in noting any textual updates that would be needed in order for their substantive priorities to be addressed.*

### Response

- The previous ToRs, as set out in Decision 9/CP.22, can establish the basis for a holistic review of the SCF functions with some consideration of updates. For instance, the scope should consider the extent to which the SCF has fulfilled all its mandates and if there is a need for its mandate to be updated as needed.
- We see a need to include tasks that deals with the effectiveness of the SCF operations in its work. Unpacking the operations of the SCF to identify whether there is need any need for alterations.

### Way forward

Uganda stresses the need to strengthen these and many more other needs around the functionality of the financial mechanism with reaffirmation that we are happy to further engage and elaborate on the various elements listed in these responses.

## **AGN views on the SCF review**

In relation to the **Standing Committee on Finance** (SCF-review), the AGN notes that the SCF is constituted under the Convention, and the COP has the sole discretion to assess its performance, and review its functions and mandates. While COP agreed that the SCF will serve the PA, it did not assign any review functions to the CMA. We do not agree that there are two reviews- one under the COP and one under the CMA. Our expectation is that the SCF-review will enhance the SCF standing as the primary body for addressing climate finance and for supporting the COP in its function to mobilize resources for developing country Parties. Furthermore the SCF review will look at the appropriateness of its support to the COP in exercising its functions in relation to the Financial Mechanism of the Convention, particularly on inter alia; a) improving coherence and coordination in the delivery of climate change financing, b) rationalization of the Financial Mechanism, c) mobilization of financial resources, d) measurement, reporting and verification of support provided to developing country Parties. SCF standing as the primary body for addressing climate finance and for supporting the COP in its function to mobilize resources for developing country Parties. The COP should invite Parties submissions, which may also include submissions from Parties of the Paris Agreement.

## **Japan's Informal Inputs to the Review of the Standing Committee of Finance**

### ① general expectation for the Review of the SCF

- ✓ The review should be an opportunity to verify if the SCF functions properly, with respect to the objectives of the Convention and the Paris Agreement and if the SCF addresses adequately the expectations by the Parties on the SCF.
- ✓ We expect the Review of the SCF to discuss the frequency of the SCF meetings, the number and type of its mandates, and the activities so that the performance of the SCF is further improved.

### ② Specific updates to the TORs of the Review

- ✓ The TORs used in the last SCF review were only applied to the Convention. Since the SCF serves the Convention and the Paris Agreement, thus the TORs for the review should be revised accordingly.

### ③ Interaction between the Review under the CMA and the Review under the COP

- ✓ Since COP 25, Matters related to the SCF were deliberated under the COP and CMA respectively and the decisions were adopted separately. So this agenda item should be discussed and adopted both under the COP and CMA separately. It is necessary, however, to develop well the working modalities so as to avoid the overlap of deliberation on the same issues.

## INDONESIA

### **Informal Written Inputs on the Review of the Functions of the Standing Committee on Finance**

Regarding the review of the functions of the SCF, Indonesia views the SCF has a very important role and function in providing reports related to climate finance. Therefore, a review of the function of the SCF is crucial as an input in the operation of the SCF in the future.

Indonesia views that a review of the SCF function can be started with the support of the results of other works issued by the SCF, such as the Fourth Biennial Assessment and Overview Of Climate Finance Flows and the First Report on The Determination of the Needs of Developing Country Parties. These two documents could serve as references of the SCF's performance in carrying out its functions and serve as the basis for review to evaluate and provide direction for the SCF.

In relation to the possible Term of Reference for the second review, Indonesia views the previous Term of Reference as a good basis for discussion.

Given that the SCF is also now under the Paris Agreement, there needs to be a clear explanation on the role of both the COP and the CMA on the review. To ensure efficient process and to avoid overlapping, Indonesia views that a review process of one of them should suffice.

**SUBMISSION BY PERU ON BEHALF OF THE AILAC GROUP OF COUNTRIES COMPOSED BY CHILE, COLOMBIA, COSTA RICA, HONDURAS, GUATEMALA, PANAMA, PARAGUAY AND PERU**

**Review of the Standing Committee on Finance**

1. Following the invitation by the COP25 Presidency and the COP26 incoming Presidency, the AILAC group of countries welcomes the opportunity to provide views on the review of the Standing Committee on Finance, as per Decisions 6/CP.20, 6/CP.21, 1/CP.21, 9/CP.22, 8/CP.23, 5/CMA.2 and would like to express the following:
  - i. The work of the Standing Committee on Finance (SCF) continues to be of utmost relevance to the efficiency, coherence and delivery of the Financial Mechanism of the Convention and the Paris Agreement and their very implementation. Therefore, we recognise the added value that this Committee has in providing expert input and information, and praise in particular its work with the Biennial Assessment and Overview of Climate Finance Flows. We also see areas of improvement to the SCF work, in particular to improving coherence and coordination in the delivery of climate finance, including in the draft guidance and recommendations it provides to the operating entities of the Financial Mechanism.
  - ii. We look forward for the second review of the SCF to initiate at COP26 in Glasgow, with the adoption of updated terms of reference, on the basis of the annex of Decision 9/CP.22, and with a view to the review being completed by COP27/CMA5, so to assess the performance of the SCF in the last 4 years and inform improvements to its performance, as per its functions.
  - iii. As a result of the Glasgow Decision on this review, a call should also be made to the Secretariat to prepare a technical paper to this Review in 2022, as well as for submissions by Parties and observer organizations by April 2022 in relation to the Review and on the basis of the agreed terms of reference.
  - iv. This Review is interrelated to the Seventh Review of the Financial Mechanism of the UNFCCC and the Paris Agreement that will also be initiated in Glasgow and to be finished by COP27/CMA5.
2. As per the Presidencies' request, on the basis of Decision 9/CP.22, we are signalling the main changes we would like to see reflected in the cover mirror decisions by the COP and the CMA, and guidelines to be adopted in Glasgow (in gray background) below:

## **Decision X/CP.26 & Decision x/CMA.4**

### **Terms of reference for the second review of the functions of the Standing Committee on Finance**

*The Conference of the Parties,*

*Recalling decisions 6/CP.20, 6/CP.21, 1/CP.21, in particular paragraph 63, 9/CP.22, 8/CP.23 and 5/CMA.2 paragraph 17,*

1. *Adopts* the terms of reference for the second review of the functions of the Standing Committee on Finance contained in the annex;
2. *Takes note* of the report of the Standing Committee on Finance to the twenty-sixth session of the Conference of the Parties and in particular annex XXX thereto;
3. *Invites* members of the Standing Committee on Finance, Parties, the constituted bodies under the Convention and external stakeholders to submit, by April 2022, their views on the review of the Standing Committee on Finance based on the terms of reference contained in the annex, for consideration by the Subsidiary Body for Implementation at its fifty-xxx session (May 2022);<sup>2</sup>
4. *Requests* the Subsidiary Body for Implementation, at its fifty-xxx session, to initiate work on the second review of the functions of the Standing Committee on Finance in accordance with the terms of reference contained in the annex, taking into account the submissions referred to in paragraph 3 above;
5. *Also requests* the secretariat to prepare a technical paper on the second review of the Standing Committee on Finance, in accordance with the terms of reference contained in the annex, taking into account the deliberations and conclusions of the Subsidiary Body for Implementation at its fifty-xxx session and the submissions referred to in paragraph 3 above, for consideration by the Subsidiary Body for Implementation at its fifty-xxx session (November 2022);
6. *Further requests* the Subsidiary Body for Implementation to complete its work on the second review of the Standing Committee on Finance at its fifty-xxx session with a view to recommending a draft decision on the matter for consideration and adoption by the Conference of the Parties at its twenty-seventh session and the Conference of the Parties serving as the Meeting of the Parties at its fifth session (November 2022).

## **Annex**

### **Terms of reference for the second review of the functions of the Standing Committee on Finance**

#### **A. Objective**

1. The objective of the second review of the Standing Committee on Finance (SCF) is to review the functions of the committee, with a view to:

- (a) Strengthening the work of the SCF, as appropriate;
- (b) Identifying opportunities for increased efficiency and effectiveness;
- (c) Informing Parties on the extent to which the existing activities and working modalities of the SCF will fulfil its mandate to serve the Paris Agreement in line with decision 1/CP.21, paragraph 63;
- (d) Taking into account interrelated review processes, such as the seventh review of the Financial Mechanism.

#### **B. Scope**

2. The scope of the review will cover the progress made to date and lessons learned in the fulfilment of the mandate of the SCF to assist the Conference of the Parties (COP) and the Conference of the Parties serving as the Meeting of the Parties of the Paris Agreement (CMA) in the exercise of its functions with respect to the Financial Mechanism. In this context, the review should:

- (a) Be based on the current mandate and functions of the SCF;
- (b) Be informed by the work on climate finance conducted by other entities;
- (c) Examine whether any gaps exist in the delivery of the work of the SCF and how they can be addressed.



3. The review should address the following elements:

- (a) Assessment of the extent to which the SCF has effectively delivered on its core functions and mandated activities as outlined in decision 2/CP.17 and other relevant decisions and, in this regard, taking stock of past achievements of the SCF in terms of its concrete outputs and how they have been utilized;
- (b) Identification of the potential need for reorientation or reprioritization of the existing functions of the SCF;
- (c) Assessment of whether the working modalities of the SCF, including the participation of its members, are fit-for-purpose for carrying out its functions;
- (d) Quality of outputs;
- (e) Linkages with the constituted bodies under the Convention;
- (f) Relations with relevant external stakeholders.

#### **C. Sources of information**

4. The review shall draw upon, inter alia, the following sources of information:

- (a) Submissions from members of the SCF, Parties and the constituted bodies under the Convention, as well as external stakeholders involved in the activities of the SCF;
- (b) The annual reports of the SCF, including, in particular, annex xxx to its report to COP 26;
- (c) The relevant decisions of the COP related to the SCF;
- (d) Outputs delivered by the SCF, such as the biennial assessment and overview of climate finance flows;
- (e) A self-assessment report of the SCF and recommendations on improving its efficiency and effectiveness;
- (f) The technical paper to be prepared by the secretariat in line with paragraph 5 of this decision.

#### **D. Criteria**

5. The review shall take into account, inter alia, the following:

- (a) The effectiveness and efficiency of the SCF in the delivery of its functions;
- (b) The transparency of its decision-making processes;
- (c) The level and nature of stakeholder engagement;
- (d) The quality and added value of the outputs of the SCF, including how they were received by the COP and external stakeholders, and in particular how its recommendations have informed and advanced the work of the COP;
- (e) The timeliness of the outputs of the SCF.

6. AILAC looks forward to constructive discussions over this issue in Glasgow.

---