

Annex II: List of conditions and recommendations

1. The approval of the funding proposals approved by the Board pursuant to decision B.33/08 shall be conditional upon the satisfaction of the conditions set out in tables 1 and 2.

FP number	Conditions
All proposals	(a) Signature of the funded activity agreement ("FAA") in a form and substance satisfactory to the GCF Secretariat within 180 days from the date of Board approval, or the date the accredited entity has provided a certificate or legal opinion set out in paragraph (ii) below, or the date of effectiveness of the accreditation master agreement ("AMA") entered into with the relevant accredited entity, whichever is later.
	Satisfaction of the following conditions prior to the signing of the FAA:
	(i) Completion of the legal due diligence to the GCF Secretariat's satisfaction; and
	(ii) Submission of a certificate or a legal opinion in a form and substance that is satisfactory to the GCF Secretariat, within 120 days after Board approval, or the date of effectiveness of the AMA entered into with the relevant accredited entity, whichever is later, confirming that the accredited entity has obtained all final internal approvals needed by it and has the capacity and authority to implement the proposed project/programme.

Table 2. Conditions specific to individual funding proposals

FP number	Conditions
FP187 (FAO Benin)	None
FP188 (FAO Gambia)	<i>independent TAP conditions</i> <u>Condition precedent to second disbursement by GCF under the FAA:</u> Delivery by the Accredited Entity to the GCF, in a form and substance satisfactory to the GCF Secretariat, of:
	(a) A monitoring and reporting framework document, with concrete set of baseline indicators that shall provide the basis for monitoring the outcomes and outputs of the project, together with national systems to monitor the changes over the lifetime of the project. The set of indicators shall include at least: the current status of fish catchments, income and prices, food loss measurements, level of food security of the direct beneficiaries,



	level of degradation/restoration of mangrove forest (e.g. t biomass/ha), leakages related to the restoration and protection of mangrove forests in selected project areas, level of water salinity, and social indicators and economic indicators of the selected beneficiaries; and
	(b) A document containing a policy analysis around artisanal fisheries development and social and economic welfare of the fisher communities in the host country, specifying the concrete policy changes required as per the theory of change set out in section B.2(a) of the Funding Proposal, with concrete expected outcomes in terms of the policies that the project will support.
FP189 (IDB E- Mobility)	None
FP190 (FMO Climate Investor Two)	None

2. In addition, it is recommended that, for all approved funding proposals, disbursements by the GCF should be made only after the GCF has obtained satisfactory protection against litigation and expropriation in the country where the project/programme will be implemented, or has been provided with appropriate privileges and immunities in that country.

3. It is also recommended that the accredited entity implements the following recommendations during the implementation of the relevant project or programme.

Table 3. Project-specific recommendations

FP number	Recommendations
FP187 (FAO Benin)	None
FP188 (FAO Gambia)	None
FP189 (IDB E- Mobility)	 (a) The independent TAP recommends that equity and/or in-kind contributions from the participating governments be confirmed; (b) The independent TAP recommends that the assessment of adaptation benefits be further developed. There is a need to develop and present a methodology used for identifying the adaptation benefits and the estimation of adaptation beneficiaries; and
	(c) The independent TAP also notes that the Program pipeline is indicative at this stage. The success of the Program will require



	participating countries to commit to e-mobility interventions and take on financing from the Program. This has yet to happen so
	 there is always some risk that the facility could be over funded if uptake is dampened. The independent TAP is aware that IDB has extensive experience in supporting e-mobility in the LAC region, and therefore it expects IDB to manage the pipeline well. However, the independent TAP recommends that the Secretariat consider flexible funding mechanisms in the future that allow it to deploy capital in tranches against actual capital needs and not just projected needs. This should provide for greater flexibility of GCF
FP190 (FMO Climate Investor Two)	funds and reduce fee obligations. None