

FP215: Community Resilience Partnership Program (ADB)

Access the funding proposal: <https://www.greenclimate.fund/document/gcf-b37-02-add06>

We recognize the potential of this program to respond to climate impacts specifically faced by countries in Asia and the Pacific. We also note the attempt to address the nexus between climate change, poverty, and gender—naming vulnerable communities, including women, as its targets.

However, we strongly believe that the concepts of “locally-led adaptation” and “agroecology” were misconstrued in the proposal. Civil society and communities have used these terms as an alternative to the currently dominant top-down approach to adaptation, and as counter to so-called climate-smart agriculture, which disadvantages smallholder farmers and fosters reliance on patented techniques over community approaches. We have been demanding a focus on “locally-led adaptation” and “agroecology” in climate action. While the indicative activities in the proposal claim to be locally-led and aligned with agroecology, they instead seem inconsistent with these concepts.

Like with other multi-country programs, we have identified potential gaps in governance structure and country ownership in this FP. Reiterating the assessment of the ITAP, there is an absence of specific executing entities for each country, as well as a weak stakeholder engagement plan.

Notably on the proposal, only one civil society organization, whose work and presence spans only three of the seven target country beneficiaries, seems to have been consulted in the conceptualization of the program design. The lack of engagement plan with other potential partner CSOs and relevant local actors will significantly hinder capacity development to holistically cater to the needs of the target beneficiaries and belie the title and intent of the program.

We urge the accredited entity to go beyond simply mentioning civil society organizations and Indigenous Peoples in the documents, and call for a more transparent and concrete institutionalization of local stakeholder engagement processes to maximize the program’s development, implementation, and long-term impact on local communities. We also recommend that the AE aligns its indicative activities with how local communities and civil society define real and responsive locally-led adaptation based on indigenous knowledge and agroecology.

Again, we recognize the potential of this proposal. The observer network, especially our colleagues based in Asia working with local communities, Indigenous Peoples, and other national civil society organizations, are willing to collaborate towards developing activities that will truly be responsive to the adaptation needs of Asian and Pacific communities.

###