

## **CSO Comments on the Review of Performance of ITAP (BM21, October 2018)**

We welcome the paper on proposed improvements to the structure and the operations of the ITAP but we think the review misses an opportunity to discuss options on how to strengthen the ITAP's structural and financial independence from the Secretariat. For example, to allow ITAP members the flexibility for side visits or outreach to affected communities, CSOs and other stakeholders if deemed necessary, which seems discouraged now by the Secretariat on administrative grounds. It seems symptomatic that over the time of its existence the "Independent" in ITAP in Secretariat documentation went from being capitalized to now routinely presented in lower case.

We also note that in the projects proposed for this meeting that are relevant for or to indigenous peoples, the ITAP assessment did not seem to take into account the IP policy as a benchmark for project evaluation and no written evaluation of their consistency with the IP policy is made in ITAP assessment. In line with this, we recommend that ITAP's expertise be broadened to include, among others, on thematic issues and relevant safeguards, in particular on indigenous peoples and gender. Specific initiatives should be envisaged to improve ITAP capacity to operationalize the IP Policy in collaboration with the IP specialist and IPAG once operational.

We welcome some of the proposed mechanisms for quality assurance of the assessment, specifically options for more coherence in its assessment, or proposed regular debriefs by the ITAP with the Board and related stakeholders as well as the proposed IEU biennial evaluation of ITAP assessments and recommend that active observers be included as participants in these activities given civil society's role in bringing concerns and recommendations on GCF project and programme proposals to the Board.