

July 12, 2023

36<sup>th</sup> Board Meeting of the Green Climate Fund (GCF)

*GCF Observer Network of Civil Society, Indigenous Peoples, and Local Communities*

## **INTERVENTION**

# **Intervention on the Readiness and Preparatory Support Programme**

Access the document: <https://www.greenclimate.fund/document/gcf-b36-inf05>

We appreciate the work of both the Secretariat and the IEU in identifying challenges and proposing specific solutions to improve the RPSP in the proposed revised strategy for 2024-2027. We know that effective readiness support is vital to the work of the GCF as well as for implementing the newly adopted Strategic Plan, so it is important to get this right. Unfortunately, we do not think this strategy proposes all the right solutions to the recognized issues.

An increase in resources is much needed and appreciated, but multi-year readiness funding for NDAs, greater funding for DAEs, and additional NAP support do not fully address fundamental concerns. Even with some specific support for stakeholder engagement, which is essential and necessary in understanding and documenting country needs and priorities and scaling up locally-led solutions in a country-owned manner, the proposed approach largely reinforces the mistaken idea that capacity is not in the developing countries, but rather with international consultants and firms.

The climate investment planning framework is fundamentally flawed from the beginning, as Step 1 starts not with the identification of country needs and priorities, but with the selection of entity partners, which will shape the scope of analysis—and the subsequent recommendations—in Step 2. Instead, NDAs should respond to the needs and priorities of developing countries, determined through nationally-led, inclusive, and participatory processes that include community-based organizations, Indigenous Peoples, women's rights organizations, and other marginalized groups.

Concerningly, the Objectives and Outcomes section has two explicit outcomes for private sector engagement and enhancing their role in implementation, but no equivalent stand-alone outcome related to civil society, Indigenous Peoples, women, and marginalized populations whose participation should be valued at the same level.

While the Secretariat and the IEU acknowledge the burden of accessing readiness funds, we see no clear proposal for streamlining readiness proposals beyond the change from single to multi-year. Efficiency is not only about GCF staff capacity for review and new guidance for overly complex processes; any new strategy must include a fundamental rethink of unjust, unnecessary levels of bureaucracy that reinforce the need for expert proposal writers. We

must stop creating a self-reinforcing loop about what climate finance expertise is and who climate finance experts are.

Though we recognize and appreciate the consultation process for this revised strategy, we feel more time and information is needed to appropriately engage with and improve it. The additional insights from a more complete IEU evaluation can advance the approach to readiness, and should be better integrated into the proposed strategy. While we know this is likely to be discussed at the beginning of next year, we think an additional update could be requested. We would recommend having a robust discussion here at B.36 and continued conversation and consultation with the Secretariat in the coming weeks, and to reflect on that and any new updates from the IEU evaluation in a new and improved draft to be adopted at B.37.

###