

Submission by the Republic of Senegal on behalf of the Least Developed Countries Group (LDCs) on views and recommendations on elements of guidance for the Green Climate Fund

The LDC Group welcomes the invitation to provide views and recommendations on elements of guidance for the Green Climate Fund, as expressed in decision 6/CP.26, paragraph 16.

The LDC Group welcomes progress made in delivering important policy documents, especially the *Updated Accreditation Framework and Project Specific Assessment Approach* (decision B.31/06); *Update of the Simplified Approval Process* (decision B.32/05); *Private Sector Strategy* (decision B.32/06), *Steps to enhance climate rationale* (decision B.33/12) and *Guidance on the approach and scope for providing support to adaptation activities* (decision B.33/14).

Although progress has been made in some areas, several issues remain. Also, further actions are expected to be implemented as part of GCF adopted decisions. In this context, the following additional elements are provided as views and recommendations for developing guidance for the Green Climate fund.

Topic	Views and recommendations	Comments
Access to finance and simplification of application processes, especially for DAEs.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Requests to increase the capacity of GCF and continue implementing efforts for making access to GCF and funding simpler and faster, including by timely implementation of the updated Simplified Approval Process and the Project Specific Assessment Approach. – Concern about the low number of projects being presented through Direct Access entities, including those projects currently in the pipeline – Urges to take effective measures to increase the number of projects of DAEs 	<p>Of the 200 projects in the GCF portfolio, 156 (78%) are from international access entities. Only 26 (13%) are from national entities and 18 (9%) are from regional entities. The number of funding proposals from DAEs represents a 30% of the total of proposals in the pipeline.</p> <p>Of the total 113 entities accredited, 71 are Direct Access Entities (DAEs), and 42 are International Access Entities (IAEs).</p> <p>Of 53 AEs with approved projects, 27 are IAEs and 26 are DAEs. Most of the funding is channelled through IAEs, with a share of 80% of the total.</p> <p>A 20% of GCF funding is channelled through DAEs.</p>

<p>Replenishments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Concern that by July 2022 a number of developed and developing country Parties have still not confirmed their pledges made during the Initial Resource Mobilisation phase. Urges those Parties to do so as a matter of urgency. – Welcomes the launching of the GCF-2 replenishment process in B.33. – Encourages countries to commit and deliver ambitious pledges for an impactful GCF second replenishment process in line with the article 9 of the Paris agreement 	
<p>Support for adaptation</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Concern about the reduced number of adaptation proposals submitted for consideration of the Board, especially during the period January – July 2022 and the relatively small amount of funding requested for adaptation projects in the GCF pipeline. – Strongly urges to continue to enhance support for the implementation of adaptation projects and programmes, informed by national adaptation plans and other planning processes, and adaptation communications, including those submitted as components of nationally determined contributions, as applicable. – Requests to implement and to continue efforts to achieve the balance in the allocation of resources between adaptation and mitigation. – Urges to make further efforts to advance concept notes and funding proposals for adaptation projects and increase overall funding towards adaptation, including through the participation of national and regional accredited entities. 	<p>Before B.33 (July 2022) the pipeline of funding proposals shows that 18.4% of amount requested is for adaptation projects, with 27.7% for mitigation, and 53.9% for cross-cutting projects.</p> <p>Nominal funding amount for adaptation is 38% and 62% for mitigation. In grant equivalent terms, 49% of funding is for adaptation and 51% for mitigation.</p>

<p>Readiness and project preparation support</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Encourage the use of the readiness programme and the project preparation facility (PPF) and request to make further efforts to facilitate access and timely implementation of support. 	<p>The IEU “evaluation of the relevance and effectiveness of the GCF’s investments in the LDCs” indicates that more than half of LDCs have not accessed the PPF. Long and burdensome process would be discouraging applications.</p>
<p>Accreditation</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Request further efforts to increase accreditation of regional and national entities, especially in those countries that have not been accredited. – Request further efforts to facilitate effective support from IAEs to DAEs in their accreditation and reaccreditation processes. 	<p>The IEU “evaluation of the relevance and effectiveness of the GCF’s investments in the LDCs” indicates that DAEs in LDCs find it difficult to meet accreditation standards and require more time and support to enhance the necessary technical and institutional capacities.</p>
<p>Loss and damage</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Requests GCF to further increase and enhance support for activities relevant to averting, minimizing and addressing loss and damage. 	
<p>Technology</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Encourage to continue to enhance support towards the development and implementation of readiness and PPF support to promote and facilitate technology focused funding proposals. 	<p>As of 31 May 2022, 56 climate technology-focused proposals have been approved, for a total commitment of USD 28.66 million in GCF support.</p> <p>Of these grants, GCF has committed USD 18.22 million for 26 grants with other delivery partners, in addition to committing USD 10.43 million for 30 grants with the Climate Technology Centre and Network (CTCN) delivery partners.</p> <p>Thirteen additional technology readiness proposals were approved over the reporting period from multiple delivery partner other than CTCN.</p>
<p>Complementarity and coherence</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Encourage to continue exploring and enhancing collaboration options with 	<p>During 2021 -2022, the Secretariat continued to lead implementation of the</p>

	<p>other constituted bodies and delivery partners, including GEF, CTCN and the WIM ExCom.</p>	<p>operational framework on complementarity and coherence, focusing on the collaboration with the Global Environment Facility (GEF), including the Least Developed Countries Fund and Special Climate Change Fund, Climate Investment Funds and the Adaptation Fund, as well as engaging with the NAMA Facility.</p>
<p>Response to evaluations</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Encourage the Board to consider and adopt the findings and recommendations from evaluations and assessments made to GCF work and policies. 	