

Consideration of Accreditation Proposals

Access the document: <https://www.greenclimate.fund/document/gcf-b43-03>

We overall welcome the batch of five new accreditation applicants, all of which are DAEs, including four that will be the first national DAEs in their respective countries of Tunisia, Kazakhstan, Trinidad and Tobago, and Vanuatu. These are some of the last applicants coming to the Board under the previous accreditation framework before the transition starts to a revised accreditation framework offering only the pass/fail pathway to accreditation. The steady stream of new accreditation applicants, the majority of them DAEs, coming up for Board consideration this year under the old accreditation approach is particularly welcome given that we were told that DAEs would only come forward and be able to complete their accreditation once major reforms were in place to unclog the pipeline. As always, it will be critical that, once accredited, there is a focus on these entities being able to bring successful funding proposals to make progress against the goal of the USP-2 to not only double the number of DAEs with approved funding proposals but to finally also increase the share of GCF-approved funding channeled through DAEs, which is stuck at too low a level, approximately 20%, without progress for several years.

We notice that all of the applicants are recommended for accreditation with conditions, which is allowed under the current accreditation framework, but will no longer be the case under the revised accreditation framework. In several cases, institution-level weaknesses in policies, frameworks and management systems are highlighted, which would have caused these applicants to fail the initial screening requirements under the new RAF, and many of the identified gaps would have been impossible to address within the now approved two months application window. We are curious to see if indeed, as promised, it will be easier for DAEs to become accredited in the future.

Lastly, we notice the upgrade request to allow JICA to on-lend and blend loans and equity with concessional GCF resources. The Board might recall that Japanese and international CSOs opposed JICA's original accreditation on the grounds that its massive support of fossil fuel projects was in direct conflict with the GCFs' mandate to promote a paradigm shift to low-emission and climate-resilient development. Unfortunately, this remains the case with JICA at the time of this update request. This reminds us also that the revised accreditation framework also abolished re-accreditation requirements, including the one that would have assessed an accredited entity like JICA for the extent to which its entire portfolio had shifted away from fossil fuels during its partnership with the GCF as a yardstick for whether this partnership should have been continued.