

Highlights of the AC workshop on accessing the Readiness and Preparatory Support Programme of the Green Climate Fund

1 May 2018
Bonn, Germany



Lessons learned and good practices

- ❑ A more simplified approach to supporting countries engaging with and gaining access to the GCF is to serve as an NDA delivery partner of readiness activities, which does not require accreditation but a much simpler financial management capacity assessment (FMCA);
- ❑ In accessing the NAP support window, the use of national readiness delivery partners, which are chosen by each country's NDA and can be a public or private entity, or government or nongovernmental institution, including universities;
- ❑ The application of the 10 review criteria for proposals to the GCF for the formulation of NAP and other adaptation planning processes has increased the transparency and simplicity of the approval process;



Gaps, needs and challenges

- ❑ The duration of the process to apply for and gain accreditation is too long as the GCF currently faces a backlog of applications resulting in delays of over a year;
- ❑ The current GCF policy of accreditation operates on a first come, first served basis; however, the GCF Board may consider creating alternative approaches including modalities for project-based accreditation, that is to prioritize the accreditation of entities that actually have concrete funding proposals prepared;
- ❑ The lack of capacity and ownership among NDAs and direct access accredited entities, in particular in cases where consultants were preparing accreditation documents;
- ❑ Creating or mobilizing an effective country coordination mechanism and ensuring the active participation of sectoral stakeholders in readiness work was referred to by many;



Gaps, needs and challenges

- ❑ While the objective of the Readiness Programme is to increase national capacity, the procedures for accreditation are perceived by some as too complex;
- ❑ The lack of awareness that the FMCA modality could be used to access the different windows of the Readiness Programme;
- ❑ The lack of sufficient national resources and/or capacities to coordinate the envisioned adaptation planning and readiness work and to prepare high-quality proposals that would be accepted by the GCF, which results in an over-reliance on external entities and less country ownership;
- ❑ Understanding the latest requirements for GCF funding proposals, as the GCF is moving fast, in particular in changing guidance and updating templates, and in the process leaving countries behind;



Gaps, needs and challenges

- ❑ The need to ensure that proposals to the GCF for the formulation of NAPs and/or other adaptation planning processes are aligned with the guidance of the Conference of the Parties and NAP guidelines and address both objectives of the process to formulate and implement NAPs as well as the guiding principles;
 - ❑ Addressing support needs for a long-term process through limited project-type one-off funding over a fixed time frame;
 - ❑ Aligning adaptation project approaches and activities with country approaches and priorities;
 - ❑ The need to start with a comprehensive country vision (country programme) on how to use the GCF to realize a bigger vision of climate adaptation finance;
 - ❑ The need to improve the flow of information at the national level between different ministries to increase country ownership and build and maintain national capacities.
-



Overall reflections in relation to NAPs

- ❑ The formulation of NAPs serves as an important means to ensure coherence and consistency of GCF programming on adaptation by linking priorities articulated in country programmes and leading to the identification, prioritization and design of project concept ideas.
- ❑ There is high confidence that having undertaken the NAP, countries will have greater capacity to access GCF resources for the implementation of NAPs, including through the simplified approval process¹⁰ for micro-scale projects requiring up to USD 10 million.



Overall reflections in relation to NAPs

- ❑ Accreditation and access to resources are not an end in themselves but rather means to allow countries to better engage with stakeholders and be better prepared to deal with climate change impacts.
- ❑ The review criteria for the formulation of NAPs (and/or other adaptation planning processes) are useful and other areas of the Readiness Programme could benefit from having similar transparent review criteria.
- ❑ In order to have a truly simplified approval process, the funding proposal template needs to be simplified as well.
- ❑ Accreditation of direct access entities for implementing projects should be considered only when countries have concrete projects in mind, otherwise having national delivery partners might be more efficient.

