

CSO Comments on the Monitoring and Accountability Framework (BM10, July 2015)

- **The Monitoring and Accountability Framework** should provide a complete picture of how the GCF will make accreditation decisions, supervise accredited entities, and ensure strong compliance with safeguards and the gender policy at the point of delivery. This way, all actors in the delivery chain will understand their roles and responsibilities and the criteria that they will be evaluated against. An updated and strengthened information disclosure policy will play a key role in this respect
- it should not only describe what the Secretariat will do to monitor, oversee, and ensure compliance, but also **set out the roles and responsibilities of each of the other actors in the GCF delivery chain—accredited entities, implementing agencies, expert panels, the Independent Redress Mechanism, etc.**
- The Framework, should be organized into three parts: (1) an overarching Sustainability Policy, (2) Implementation Procedures and (3) Monitoring and Accountability process.
- -the Board should also recognise that monitoring and accountability is essential for the Fund's and its partners **knowledge and learning**, beyond compliance, but this issue is hardly reflected in the paper on the table and must be strengthened.
- **ON PROCESS: there should be robust public consultations on all policies that have an important impact on the way that the GCF engages with external stakeholders or policies in which external stakeholders have a direct interest.** Such policies include the Monitoring and Assessment Framework, the policies implementing the Independent Redress Mechanism, the Environmental and Social Management System (ESMS) and the Fund's own Environmental and Social Safeguards (ESS). The Board here in Songdo should give the Secretariat the mandate to begin such outreach to stakeholders immediately after the Songdo meeting.
- A key point is the role of participatory monitoring and civil society engagement throughout the full range of monitoring and implementation activities. Participatory monitoring mechanisms, transparency, and public engagement will help ensure greater accountability and the stronger outcomes. We welcome that the paper contains some reference here and starts to pay attention to the GI's explicit mandate regarding participatory monitoring, but stress the need for clearer elaboration.

Some of us have made written recommendations on the specific elements of each of these components of a comprehensive framework, which we would be happy to share:

- The paper right now relies on self –assessment on compliance. This is not sufficient to determine compliance. There needs to be an independent assessment made
- Central monitoring requires resource capacity necessary for the Secretariat to discharge responsibilities. There is **no indication of the staff requirements** for this on the paper
- The paper does **not provide information or drawn on the experiences of peer institutions.** The document is purely descriptive when providing examples. The document should provide critical analysis of mechanisms at other institutions to see how these examples could be reflected when designing the GCF monitoring and accountability framework.
- On the **renewal of the accreditation, it is important that an accredited entity is found to be in compliance with the Funds accreditation requirements and the terms and conditions in its legal and formal arrangements with the Fund.** This is crucial for ensuring accountability of those entities that want to work with the GCF in the future.