



**GREEN  
CLIMATE  
FUND**

**Meeting of the Board**  
26 – 28 February 2019  
Songdo, Incheon, Republic of Korea  
Provisional agenda item 9

**GCF/B.22/17**  
1 February 2019

---

# Synthesis of Board submissions on the update of the Strategic Plan of the Green Climate Fund

---

## **Summary**

By decision B.21/18, members of the Board were invited to submit inputs on the update of the Strategic Plan for the GCF. The Secretariat was requested to produce a synthesis of issues for consideration by the Board at its twenty-second meeting.

This document responds to that request. It clusters inputs under relevant issue headings relating to the Strategic Plan. The full text of the submissions is included in addendum 1 to this document.

Taking into account the submissions made, the document includes a draft decision for the Board's consideration to establish a process for updating the Strategic Plan.

## I. Introduction

1. By decision B.21/18, the Board reiterated its intention to review the Strategic Plan for the GCF as part of the first replenishment process, with a view to revising the Strategic Vision, if and as needed, and to update the core operational priorities and underlying action plan. By the same decision, members of the Board were invited to send inputs on the update of the Strategic Plan to the Secretariat by 30 November 2018 in order for the Secretariat to produce a synthesis of issues for consideration by the Board at its twenty-second meeting.
2. The Secretariat received eight submissions from members of the Board from the following countries and regional groups: Germany; Japan; Sweden; the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland; the United States of America; the small island developing States (SIDS); the Netherlands, Denmark and Luxembourg; and Finland, Hungary and Switzerland. The original submissions are included in addendum 1 to this document.
3. Submissions have been synthesized under issue-based headings relating to the Strategic Plan, while preserving the original language of the submissions as far as possible. Section 2.1 covers inputs on the Strategic Vision and proposed process of updating the Strategic Plan. Section 2.2 covers inputs relating to updating the Operational Priorities and Action Plan.
4. Taking into account the submissions made, the document includes a draft decision for the Board's consideration to establish a process for updating the Strategic Plan.

## II. Synthesis of issues for consideration

### 2.1 Updating the Strategic Vision for the GCF and further developing the Strategic Plan

#### 2.1.1. Structure of the Strategic Plan

5. In relation to the structure of the Strategic Plan, one submission indicated that the structure of having a Strategic Vision with Operational Priorities with an Action Plan to meet them should be maintained.

#### 2.1.2. Continuity of the Strategic Vision

6. In relation to the Strategic Vision for the GCF as set out in the Strategic Plan, a number of submissions highlighted that this Strategic Vision:
  - (a) Is still largely relevant and should focus on responding to the objectives outlined in the Governing Instrument for GCF;
  - (b) Should be fit for purpose for the implementation of the Paris Agreement and promoting the paradigm shift of directing financing towards low-emission and climate-resilient development pathways; and
  - (c) Should play to the comparative advantages of GCF, as articulated in the current plan.

#### 2.1.3. Updating the Strategic Vision to take account of new developments and the latest science

7. A few submissions noted the need to update the Strategic Vision to take account of developments since the adoption of Strategic Plan, mentioning:

- (a) The operational maturity of GCF and an increased focus on quality and impact;
- (b) That the Board and the Secretariat should be urged to consider the scientific findings and evidence contained in the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) special report, *Global Warming of 1.5°C* (Summary for Policymakers) that are relevant for enhancing understanding of the GCF mandate and objective when updating and implementing the Strategic Vision and core Operational Priorities for the next programming phase of GCF;
- (c) That there is a need for GCF to analyse how it can strategically adapt to the need to halve carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>) emissions within the next 10–15 years and at the same time support innovative approaches to mobilize resources for adaptation projects and the integration of adaptation measures into all investments; and
- (d) That projections of greenhouse gas pathways and future climate-related impacts as well as related system transitions, consistent with the Paris Agreement, provide new insight on:
  - (i) The nature, scale and time frames of “the urgency and the seriousness of climate change” and the “global efforts towards attaining the goals set by the international community to combat climate change”, as contained in paragraph 1 of the Governing Instrument;
  - (ii) The nature, scale and time frames of “low-emission and climate-resilient development pathways”, the “paradigm shift” towards such pathways, the related “context of sustainable development” and the “needs of those developing countries particularly vulnerable to the adverse effects of climate change”, as stipulated in paragraph 2 of the Governing Instrument;
  - (iii) The nature, scale and urgency of increased adaptation and mitigation investments;
  - (iv) The urgency for ambitious and transformational mitigation and adaptation actions and for increased adaptation and mitigation investments, as mandated in paragraphs 2 and 3 of the Governing Instrument;
  - (v) The urgency for enhanced international cooperation as a critical enabler for developing countries and vulnerable regions to strengthen their action for the implementation of climate responses consistent with the 1.5 °C goal, including through enhancing access to finance and technology and enhancing domestic capacities, taking into account national and local circumstances and needs; and
  - (vi) The urgency to rapidly shift financial flows towards development pathways consistent with the Paris Agreement.

#### 2.1.4. Process for updating the Strategic Plan

8. A number of submissions included comments relating to the process for updating the Strategic Plan, in particular:

- (a) Several submissions indicated that the Strategic Plan should consider recommendations from the GCF performance review to be conducted by the Independent Evaluation Unit;
- (b) Several submissions indicated that the process of revision should be iterative and inclusive and open for consultation to the Private Sector Advisory Group (PSAG), active observers and accredited observer institutions;

- (c) One submission indicated that the revision of the Strategic Plan should also consider Board discussions on institutional aspects, programming priorities and policy reforms;
- (d) Another submission proposed that the relevant draft decision for endorsing the updated Strategic Plan should request the Secretariat to prepare a proposal for ways to integrate findings from the IPCC special report, *Global Warming of 1.5°C*, and related decisions of the Conference of the Parties into the GCF operational policies and procedures beyond replenishment, including the strategy and policies on accreditation and reaccreditation, the project approval cycle and the performance management framework; and
- (e) One submission noted that the update should take account of relevant guidance from the Conference of the Parties.

## 2.2 Updating the Operational Priorities and related Action Plan

### 2.2.1. Updating the Operational Priorities and Action Plan for a more mature phase of operations

9. A number of submissions highlighted that the Strategic Plan's Operational Priorities and related Action Plan should be updated to reflect the more mature stage of GCF operations and the existence of a maturing portfolio in implementation.

10. Additional proposals included that:

- (a) The Strategic Plan should focus on making GCF a gold standard organization, setting the bar high through its policies, project selection criteria and effective as well as efficient project cycle management;
- (b) The Operational Priorities should continue supporting the implementation of the Paris Agreement within the evolving climate finance landscape and promoting the paradigm shift towards low-emission and climate-resilient development pathways; and
- (c) The updated Strategic Plan should aim to have an Action Plan that includes measurable actions around key indicators.

11. More detailed comments have been clustered under the following issues, some of which pertain to both the Operational Priorities and the Action Plan: (1) scaling up investments and programming resources (Operational Priorities 1 and 3, Action Plan A); (2) maximizing impact (Operational Priority 2); (3) responding to developing country needs, including through support for readiness, direct access and a proactive and strategic approach to programming (Operational Priority 4, Action Plan A and B); (4) enhancing accessibility and predictability, in particular simplifying access modalities (Operational Priority 5, Action Plan C); (5) maximizing the engagement of the private sector (Action Plan D); (6) GCF governance and institutional capabilities (Action Plan E); (7) advancing implementation, embedding lessons learned and reporting for results; and (8) complementarity and coherence.

### 2.2.2. Scaling up investments and programming resources

12. Several submissions highlighted that the initial Strategic Plan had a focus on operationalizing GCF investments, building the portfolio and driving pipeline development. They noted that the update of the Strategic Plan should shift focus towards the impact and quality of GCF investments and define clearer investment directions through a strategic approach to programming GCF resources.

13. On setting clearer programming directions, proposals included that:

- (a) Efforts should be guided towards strengthening the GCF pipeline and having more effective and efficient resources management, from the long- and medium-term view through pipeline management, prioritization and financial planning;
- (b) A strategic approach to programming resources is key to maximizing impact and it can be achieved through defining programming priorities while ensuring that GCF can use its funds more efficiently based on funding needs. This could include increasing the use of strategic programmatic approaches, including targeting activities (i.e. at the regional, economic sector or broad development theme level) where GCF funds can have the greatest effect (this could be informed by the analysis carried out for a paper on targeted investment (GCF/B.20/INF.15), a paper on the expected role and impact of GCF (GCF/B.09/06) and findings from the Climate Investment Funds' evaluation of their programmatic approach);
- (c) GCF should develop a comprehensive resource mobilization strategy informed by the latest science and urgent needs, especially of small island and low-lying coastal developing States; and
- (d) The Global Environment Facility System for Transparent Allocation of Resources has been beneficial for countries with lower capacities by levelling part of the playing field. GCF should consider which measures it could take to enhance predictability, fair distribution of resources as well as country ownership at the same time.

### 2.2.3. Maximizing impact and realizing the transformational aspirations of GCF

14. A number of submissions noted that the update of the Strategic Plan would need to shift focus towards the impact and quality of GCF investments, including by refining policies, standards and targets, and communicating more clearly to countries and entities the types of investments that GCF would seek to make.
15. On refining the GCF unique value proposition, clarifying investment criteria and finalizing the policy framework, submissions included proposals to:
  - (a) Bring further clarity to the types of projects GCF will support and the priorities and terms it will employ to maximize the impact of GCF contributions to solutions that can overcome major climate change challenges. As recipient countries and implementing agencies need better indications about GCF scope and goals, selectivity in its focus (competitive advantage towards other funds) and clarity on what GCF does and what it does not finance is important;
  - (b) Prioritize proposals to ensure the most effective and efficient use of funds and to balance country demand with GCF objectives. The Board should develop relevant criteria for the Secretariat, while acknowledging that proposals should be evaluated on their merits. The prioritization would need to apply at the pipeline stage as well;
  - (c) Close remaining policy gaps, in particular guidelines for programmatic approaches as a top priority. GCF needs a strong programmatic approach policy to ensure that programmes are held to the same standards as projects at all stages of the GCF cycle, including proposal development, approval and implementation. This should provide clarity to those who will develop or submit proposals. A policy would help to improve the quality of the programmes submitted to GCF and ensure that there is policy continuity across the GCF proposal modalities;
  - (d) Adopt policies on co-financing, or develop a policy for programme-type funding proposals and guiding the efficient use of funds through guidance on concessionality; and

- (e) Clarify the financial terms of GCF investments and provide more guidance on which financial instruments and conditions fit best in different country circumstances.
- 16. On innovative approaches to climate financing, it was proposed that GCF could explore:
  - (a) New and innovative approaches to climate financing, such as debt for climate swaps and climate-related insurance mechanisms, among others, to promote the paradigm shift beyond GCF-funded activities, working towards mainstreaming low-emission and climate-resilient development criteria that are compatible with the 1.5 °C goal across its policies and procedures;
  - (b) A policy for issuing bonds, along with promoting non-grant instruments;
  - (c) Promoting private finance mobilization for REDD-plus activities in cooperation with bilateral and multilateral forest-related schemes;
  - (d) Supporting the phasing out of fossil fuel subsidies, building a green economy, CO<sub>2</sub> taxes and other (tax) incentives at the macro level, an increased focus on resource efficiency and especially energy efficiency;
  - (e) Focusing on not just cutting-edge climate technology but also cutting-edge reforms, among others, to influence the behavioural changes needed for low-carbon lifestyles (around one-tonne of CO<sub>2</sub> equivalent per capita/year); and
  - (f) Steps towards 'shifting the trillions', which can include: i) the ongoing baseline exercise which requires accredited entities (AEs) to shift their investment portfolios away from fossil fuels in order to be considered for reaccreditation; and ii) providing clear guidance to the Trustee on the financial management of funds held in trust.

**2.2.4. Responding to developing country needs, including scaling up support for countries through readiness, direct access and country programming**

- 17. Several submissions indicated that the Readiness and Preparatory Support Programme (hereinafter "Readiness Programme") should be strengthened to include a vision, a strategy and targets in line with recommendations from the Independent Evaluation Unit.
- 18. Other matters for considerations included that:
  - (a) The Readiness Programme is needed to empower developing countries and build institutional capacity to transform their national climate adaptation and mitigation plans, including nationally determined contributions (NDCs) and national adaptation plans (NAPs), into GCF investment plans and project pipelines with strong country ownership and a strong climate rationale;
  - (b) The Readiness Programme should have oversight in place to ensure that GCF operates with fiscal accountability and restraint and is able to achieve strong results;
  - (c) GCF should continue working closely with AEs and countries to ensure country ownership by establishing efficient procedures, by broad stakeholder participation in the development and implementation of projects and by capacity-building on the ground;
  - (d) Changes could be considered in the project development cycle to achieve country ownership and enhance linkage between the selection of project proposals and national NDC implementation plans;

- (e) There should be ongoing support for the development of NAPs under the Readiness Programme and of funding proposals that meet the GCF criteria based on national climate plans;
- (f) There should also be enhanced integration of the project preparation support in the Readiness Programme; and
- (g) There is a need to examine and evaluate country ownership and country needs.

**2.2.5. Enhancing accessibility and predictability, in particular through further simplification of access modalities and accreditation reform**

19. A number of submissions highlighted the importance of reviewing and simplifying the GCF access modalities, including through consideration of reforming the accreditation framework. Matters raised for consideration included the following:

- (a) There is a need to ensure that a quality network of partner institutions is delivering professionally and efficiently on the GCF mandate. Given the complexity and cumbersomeness of the process of accreditation and the fact that a significant number of AEs have not yet presented any funding proposals, the accreditation system may require overall revision and streamlining;
- (b) The current path of an unlimited number of AEs is not sustainable. GCF should look at defining the kind of entities it will prioritize to collaborate with in order to maximize impact to deliver on its mandate of achieving true paradigm change. This could include guidance on whether there ought to be a limit on how many AEs GCF can work with without a negative impact on effectiveness and efficiency. GCF could also explore developing guidelines for further accreditation, including options for setting a ceiling on the number of AEs;
- (c) Reviewing which structures enable GCF to have effective and sustainable working relationships with, for example, the national designated authorities and allow efficient use of scarce resources. This would need to be done without any negative impact on effectiveness and efficiency;
- (d) Guidelines should be available for funding proposals jointly proposed by more than one AE;
- (e) The revised Strategic Plan should maintain a focus on direct access, including through the accreditation of national and regional direct access institutions and upgrading to higher accreditation categories. Prioritization should also be considered for direct access entities in SIDS; and
- (f) Priority should be given to simplified approval procedures and enhanced readiness support to allow efficient access to financial resources, in particular for SIDS and the least developed countries (LDCs) in the context of their national climate strategies and plans. An expanded simplified approval process should also be established based on the review of the simplified approval process pilot scheme, which covers both the project origination and development phase, as well as the Board's decision-making.

**2.2.6. Maximizing the engagement of the private sector**

20. A number of submissions noted the ongoing relevance of scaling up private sector engagement and more clearly defining the GCF risk appetite. Submissions noted that:

- (a) The private sector is a key element in delivering on the GCF targets of transformation and paradigm shift. The Strategic Plan should more directly promote sustainable financing structures and the efficient use of public sector funds while mobilizing private investments. A clear focus should be maintained on the ways in which GCF can lever additional finance from multilateral development banks, the private sector and other forms of co-financing;
- (b) GCF engagement with the private sector should be strengthened, including through consideration of the biggest gaps in private sector financing, having a strategic approach to attracting proposals that will be the most effective in addressing barriers, informed by PSAG recommendations;
- (c) An evolving private sector strategy should be developed. The Private Sector Facility, in collaboration with GCF senior management, should continually work to address institutional barriers to private sector engagement;
- (d) There is a need to address the PSAG recommendations on a variety of topics, including outreach, forestry, adaptation, LDCs and SIDS, access, the accreditation process, embedding of NAPs through readiness resources, and the acknowledgement of local currency issues by addressing the needs of direct access entities and reducing the transaction costs of submitting proposals. Incorporating PSAG recommendations would be key to improving efficiencies, valuing private sector engagement and catalysing private sector investment, with a view to making GCF a reliable, competitive and competent partner for the private sector;
- (e) Timely GCF decisions are of paramount importance for timely decisions of private financiers;
- (f) GCF should have a higher risk appetite than other funds, as achieving the paradigm shift requires GCF to balance risk management against high-impact transformative action. Defining the GCF risk appetite should be outlined in the Strategic Plan. This is especially pertinent for SIDS, which have unique and particular vulnerabilities. The physical exposure and vulnerabilities of SIDS to climate change impacts already negatively affect their debt sustainability and sovereign risk ratings, making it in turn more difficult to access concessional financing and more expensive to access funding at market rates; and
- (g) There is scope for influencing the large pension funds, insurance companies and other funds to exclude fossil fuel investments and integrate adaptation consideration into all their investments.

#### 2.2.7. Consolidating GCF governance and institutional capabilities

21. Most submissions included a focus on strengthening GCF governance structures, including improving the efficiency and effectiveness of processes, and improving and increasing the transparency of GCF governance mechanisms. Most also indicated the importance of improving decision-making, including Board decisions in the absence of consensus, consistent with best practice for governing bodies and the Governing Instrument.

22. In relation to **Board decision-making**, matters raised for consideration included the following:

- (a) The updated Strategic Plan should strive to strengthen governance and address challenges that affect the ability of GCF to meet its objectives as set out in the Governing Instrument. A more efficient, strategic and better functioning Board, with fewer and shorter meetings, as well as clear procedures for taking decisions in between meetings

- and when there is no unanimity in the Board, should be incorporated into the revised plan;
- (b) The Board must have an efficient and reliable way to conduct business between meetings. For time-sensitive matters, small and low-risk projects and non-controversial administrative decisions, there should be a mechanism to approve minor policies and projects by non-objection, thus focusing Board meetings more on institutional and strategic issues requiring Board-level discussion;
  - (c) A clearer division of responsibilities between Board and Secretariat should be fostered;
  - (d) Board members should also be allowed to designate advisers and subject matter experts to participate in committees on behalf of Board members as the current rules prohibit such participation, impeding the function of key committees. Board members are often unavailable or are not the subject matter experts most suitable for engaging during calls or meetings. Such a change would be in line with current practice at other, similar institutions and would strengthen the effectiveness of the Board and therefore the institution; and
  - (e) There should be a two-year advance selection of Board meeting dates as the Board has difficulty scheduling meetings and regularly changes meeting dates at short notice, and frequently schedules meetings over significant religious and national holidays. With meetings scheduled only weeks or months ahead, many Board members, advisers, AEs and observers struggle to attend, which is a threat to the smooth functioning of this institution.
23. On improving the **efficiency and effectiveness** of GCF processes, it was proposed that:
- (a) Efficiency of operations, and also of the functioning of the Board, should be a key factor in the revised Strategic Plan. Efficiency improvements in the procedures for funding proposals have begun but could be enhanced. The same could apply to Board procedures;
  - (b) Improving GCF processes and ensuring the efficiency of operations should be a matter of top priority, with a focus on accelerating the approval process of funding proposals, including by shortening the time between project approval and initiating implementation;
  - (c) GCF should learn from the findings of the Independent Evaluation Unit and make it a priority for the new programming period; and
  - (d) The Strategic Plan should look at reviewing the business model and inherent processes.
24. A few submissions indicated a need to maintain the highest standards in **transparency and safeguarding**. It was put forward for consideration completing the GCF Integrity and Safeguard Policies and the accompanying documents necessary for implementation to ensure that GCF is aligned with best practices of other similar institutions. This includes the Anti-Money Laundering and Countering the Financing of Terrorism Policy.
25. On other aspects of **institutional frameworks and policies**, submissions noted that:
- (a) GCF should close the policy on the two-stage approval process;
  - (b) GCF must complete all documents, including the standards and standard operating procedures, necessary for implementation; and
  - (c) Adopting the cancellation and restructuring policy is also a top policy priority.

26. On continuing to build **Secretariat capacity**, one submission emphasized the importance of ensuring that highly qualified staff continue to be engaged and motivated to work and continue working for GCF.

27. On the GCF potential for **knowledge management and thought leadership**, a couple of submissions noted the importance of incorporating this into the Strategic Plan and added that:

- (a) GCF must become a thought leader and create the conditions for this to happen, incorporate learning from its activities, developing best practices and identifying standardized practices which can be replicated and provide models for others;
- (b) GCF should publicize and encourage others to take up lessons learned through GCF activities; and
- (c) GCF should also promote the use of the best available science on climate impacts in financial decision-making.

#### 2.2.8. **Advancing implementation, embedding lessons learned and managing results**

28. A number of submissions noted that implementation and results management would be a new strategic focus area for GCF moving ahead. Submissions proposed the following:

- (a) In the first replenishment period, GCF should focus on the implementation and disbursement of the approved projects;
- (b) GCF should adopt a renewed focus on results, performance management, evaluation and harmonizing GCF and national monitoring systems, at both the institutional and the AE level. As part of this, the assessment of the capability of AEs to undertake rigorous monitoring and evaluation as part of the accreditation process is of strategic importance; and
- (c) Going forward this would not be just about innovative individual projects, but about developing lessons learned from project approaches and applying these at the portfolio level. Better tools are needed to share experiences across projects, along with developing best practices and benchmarks of compatibility with the Paris Agreement for specific project categories to examine new project proposals.

29. On consolidating the GCF performance framework and measurement, reporting and verification system and improving results reporting, it was noted that:

- (a) Fully operationalizing the results management and performance measurement frameworks is essential to enable the AEs and the Secretariat to measure progress at the project, programme and portfolio level. Projects under implementation need to be duly followed and lessons learned from the projects should feed into policy and project development;
- (b) As GCF operations mature, reporting on actual results (rather than expected results) becomes critical. This also has implications for reporting requirements (including on expected results against targets at the approval stage, and reporting on actual results at mid-term and at the end against targets);
- (c) Strengthening and completing GCF measurement, reporting and verification policies, procedures and metrics at each stage of the project cycle, from accreditation to proposal design, review, implementation and verification is essential, with a view to enabling GCF to effectively measure paradigm shift, and the transformational effects of its investments, in line with the governing instrument; and
- (d) Life cycle costs should be included in project assessments.

### 2.2.9. Complementarity and coherence in the climate finance landscape

30. A few submissions touched on the value of GCF working to improve complementarity and coherence in the climate finance landscape. Matters raised for consideration included that:
- (a) Improving coherence and complementarity of GCF within the broader multilateral climate financing architecture should be a priority. In this regard it is important to frame the Strategic Plan in a broader context. GCF is a strategically important element in the global climate financing architecture – by virtue of both its size and its political standing – but it does not operate in isolation from other actors. Thus, the role and the responsibilities of GCF vis-à-vis other climate financing deliverers need to be further defined; and
  - (b) GCF should also learn from the lessons of other institutions in the climate finance landscape that have experience with financing concrete, country-owned climate change projects and programmes and strengthening national and regional capacities. In future, GCF should go beyond other funds in enhancing complementarity, since more and more international organizations, especially with the multilateral development banks, deciding to scale up their climate investments.

## III. Recommended action for the Board

31. Taking account of the Board's stated intent, as captured in Decision B.21/18, to review the Strategic Plan of the GCF as part of the first replenishment process, the Board is requested to take note of the information represented in this document and adopt the Draft Decision in Annex I to establish a process for updating the GCF Strategic Plan.

## Annex I: Draft decision of the Board

The Board, having considered documents GCF/B.22/Inf.13 titled “Report on the implementation of the initial Strategic Plan of the GCF: 2015–2018”, GCF/B.22/17 titled “Synthesis of Board submissions on the update of the Strategic Plan of the Green Climate Fund” and GCF/B.22/Inf.12 titled “Strategic Programming for the Green Climate Fund First Replenishment”:

- (a) Takes note of the submissions made by Board and alternate members on the update of the GCF Strategic Plan (document GCF/B.22/17), as requested by decision B.21/18;
- (b) Also takes note of the information presented by the Secretariat in the comprehensive report on the implementation of the GCF initial Strategic Plan, which notes the substantial progress made by the Fund over its initial resource mobilization period (IRM) (2015-2018), as well as challenges, lessons learned and opportunities for consideration in future strategic planning;
- (c) Agrees that the Strategic Plan will continue to guide the GCF as a continuously learning institution in further developing its operational modalities and performance, with a view to achieving its overarching objective to promote the paradigm shift towards low-emissions and climate-resilient development pathways in the context of sustainable development, and in particular that an updated Strategic Plan will:
  - (i) Reflect the Fund’s mandate as outlined in its Governing Instrument and as an operating entity of the financial mechanism of the UNFCCC also serving the Paris Agreement;
  - (ii) Acknowledge that the Fund has reached a more mature stage of operations, and be informed by lessons learned from the IRM period;
  - (iii) Update the core operational priorities and underlying action plan with a view to continuous improvement of the GCF’s accessibility, efficiency, effectiveness, impact, scale and reach.
- (d) Requests the Secretariat, under the guidance of the Co-Chairs, to present an update to the initial Strategic Plan for consideration by the Board at its twenty-fourth meeting, and that this take into account:
  - (i) Consultation with Board and alternate members, as well as submissions made by members and views expressed during the twenty-second and twenty-third meetings of the Board;
  - (ii) An inclusive process of engagement with the Fund’s stakeholders, including NDAs/FPs, accredited entities, advisory groups, active observers and observer organizations; and
  - (iii) Findings from the performance review of the GCF and the outcome of the Board’s consideration of that review;
- (e) Invites Board and alternate members, as well as national designated authorities, representatives of accredited entities, members of the Private Sector Advisory Group, active observers and observer organizations to submit inputs on the update of the Strategic Plan to the Secretariat by 30 April 2019 to inform work under paragraph (d); and
- (f) Requests the Secretariat to publish all submissions on the Fund’s website.