



**GREEN
CLIMATE
FUND**

Meeting of the Board

4 – 7 October 2021

Virtual meeting

Provisional agenda item 10

GCF/B.30/Inf.03

10 September 2021

Report on the activities of the Independent Redress Mechanism

Summary

This report provides an update on the progress made with regard to the activities of the Independent Redress Mechanism (IRM). The reporting period is from 1 June 2021 to 31 August 2021 with budget utilization until 31 August 2021. The document summarizes the activities of the IRM based on the work plan and budget of the IRM for 2021 adopted by the Board at its twenty-seventh meeting.

I. Introduction

1.1 Background

1. The Independent Redress Mechanism (IRM) is mandated in paragraph 69 of the GCF's Governing Instrument. This paragraph states that "(t)he Board will establish an independent redress mechanism that will report to the Board. The mechanism will receive complaints related to the operation of the Fund and will evaluate and make recommendations." The IRM performs a key function within the GCF's accountability mechanisms. The IRM reports directly to the Board and is subject to the decisions of the Board. It is independent of the Secretariat of the GCF.

2. The report on the activities of the IRM provides an update on the progress made by the IRM. The report covers key priority initiatives identified in the work plan of the IRM for 2021 approved by the Board at its 27th meeting.¹ The reporting period is from 1 June 2021 to 31 August 2021 with the budget utilization until 31 August 2021.

3. The work plan of the IRM for 2021 identified the following overarching goals to help guide the work of the IRM:

- (a) Processing grievances and complaints (including those that are self-initiated), and requests for reconsideration of funding decisions; and
- (b) Operating the IRM.

II. Processing complaints and reconsideration requests

2.1 Complaints and requests for reconsideration of funding decisions

4. The IRM processes (a) complaints from persons adversely affected by GCF funded projects or programmes, and (b) requests from developing countries for reconsideration of funding denied by the Board.

5. The IRM received two complaints during the reporting period. The IRM received a new complaint with regard to FP146, Nicaragua, in June, and another complaint regarding FP018, Pakistan, in August. The IRM successfully concluded problem solving of the complaint received in relation to FP043, Morocco, and continued to monitor the agreement reached with the Secretariat from the self-initiated inquiry into FP001, Peru. The four complaints dealt with during this reporting period are discussed in further detail below:

- (a) *FP018: Scaling-up of Glacial Lake Outburst Flood (GLOF) risk reduction in Northern Pakistan:* The complainant(s) raised a concern that fees due to the complainant(s) had not been paid despite the completion of work under a consultancy contract with the Accredited Entity, the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). Following virtual meetings with the complainant(s) to gather more information and during the IRM's eligibility determination phase, the complainant(s) wrote to the IRM withdrawing the complaint. Accordingly, the IRM closed the case on 26 August 2021.
- (b) *FP146: Bio-CLIMA: Integrated climate action to reduce deforestation and strengthen resilience in BOSAWÁS and Rio San Juan Biospheres:* The complainant(s) of this case alleged that the project would harm indigenous and Afro-descendant communities as (a) there was no proper consultation with communities prior to the approval of the project, including no free, prior, and informed consent (FPIC); (b) the project will lead to

¹ Decision B.27/10.

environmental degradation and attacks by armed non-indigenous settlers; (c) the Accredited Entity's actions do not seem to comply with the GCF's policies, especially on participation and information disclosure; (d) the GCF Board conditions placed on the project, especially relating to the implementation of FPIC and to the selection of independent third party monitor(s), will not be defined and complied with effectively; and (e) the executing entity will not fulfil its obligations in the implementation of the Bio-CLIMA project. The complaint was declared eligible by the IRM on 21 July 2021, and the case is now in the initial steps phase, where the IRM's Case Lead is exploring the options of problem solving and compliance review with the complainant(s) and other stakeholders.

- (c) *FP043: The Saïss Water Conservation Project in Morocco:* This complaint centred around the insufficiency of the consultation conducted and the lack of information provided to the complainant(s) and others who are affected by this project. The IRM, with the support of a local mediator and an interpreter, was able to mediate the issue between parties, and the problem solving concluded on 26 August 2021 with agreements being reached between the complainant and the relevant Moroccan ministries and agencies. The problem solving memorandum was agreed to by the parties and published on the IRM website, and the Board was notified of the same by document GCF/IRM/2021/Inf.01 dated 26 August 2021.
- (d) *FP001: Building the Resilience of Wetlands in the Province of Datem del Marañón, Peru:* As previously reported, the IRM continues to monitor the outcomes of its preliminary inquiry into FP001, Peru. Out of the four undertakings provided by the Secretariat, three have been completed - the issuance of guidance on Free Prior Informed Consent (FPIC) requirements, and on risk categorization for projects involving Indigenous Peoples, and the completion of a legal assessment/opinion examining the potential impacts of the creation of the Áreas de Conservación Ambiental (ACA) on collective land rights of indigenous people who are part of the project. The IRM continues to monitor the fourth undertaking - which is for the GCF Secretariat to ensure that the consent documentation submitted by Profonampe for the establishment of the ACA is complete and compliant with the guidance. The GCF Secretariat's progress report from 15 June 2021² indicated that the AE had reported in its APR that a study was conducted and found that ACAs do not violate the rights of indigenous territories. Due to the movement restrictions posed by COVID-19, however, the AE was not able to undertake any activity regarding the establishment of any ACA, and the GCF Secretariat continues to await the AE's submission of the FPIC documentation.

6. The IRM also processed three pre-cases during the reporting period, two of which were escalated as complaints (details provided above), and one of which was closed. The total number of pre-cases processed by the IRM in 2021 so far is 6. A pre-case is a communication from an external party to the IRM and information received by the IRM that is registered in the Case Management System as a pre-case and may or may not mature into a complaint. A summary of such pre-cases received by the IRM is available in the table in the Annex to this report.

7. The IRM has not received any requests from developing countries for reconsideration of funding proposals denied by the Board during the reporting period.

² Available at: <https://irm.greenclimate.fund/sites/default/files/case/fp001-irm-progress-update-june-2021.pdf>

III. Operating the IRM

3.1 Progress on operating the IRM

8. **The implementation of the work plan and budget:** The terms of reference (TOR) of the IRM requires it to consult with the Ethics and Audit Committee (EAC) on the implementation of its work plan, as appropriate. As decided by the EAC, the IRM submits quarterly reports to the EAC regarding its work and the EAC provides valuable feedback. The IRM has presented the EAC with its first and second quarterly reports for 2021 but the EAC has not met this year to enable feedback to be provided to the IRM on its reports. In the circumstances, the Head of the IRM conducted one-on-one briefings with each individual member of the EAC to keep them abreast of the IRM's progress of work under the work plan and to receive their individual feedback.

9. **Administrative reporting to the Executive Director:** The TOR of the Head of the IRM provides that, for administrative purposes only, the Head of the IRM will report to the Executive Director (ED). This administrative reporting already happens practically through established systems for tracking and overseeing GCF-wide administrative and procedural requirements. However, some administrative actions falls outside of these systems. Since April 2021, the IRM has accordingly submitted monthly update reports to the ED to draw his attention to the reporting that already happens through established systems, and to highlight other actions that fall outside of these systems. The Independent Units and the Secretariat have developed a draft Protocol between the Secretariat and Independent Units setting out general principles that will help facilitate and promote effective cooperation, and it is expected to be finalized soon.

10. **Staffing:** The IRM is currently staffed with four full-time staff members, the Head of the IRM, the Compliance and Dispute Resolution Specialist, the Registrar and Case Officer, and the Team Assistant. The IRM is also supported by one intern. The IRM's Registrar and Case Officer, Ms. Christine Reddell, resigned with effect from 31 July 2021, and the IRM has recruited Ms. Preksha Krishna Kumar as her replacement. Ms. Preksha Krishna Kumar will assume office on 15 September 2021. The IRM staff underwent a Sexual Exploitation, Abuse and Harassment (SEAH) safeguarding investigations training in August 2021 conducted by BOND, a UK-based provider of international development training, for staff of Independent Accountability Mechanisms Network (IAMnet) member mechanisms. A new intern from Morocco will join the IRM in September 2021.

11. **Consultancies and Professional Services:** During the reporting period, the IRM's high-level communications consultant assessed the IRM's previous communications strategies and developed a three-year communications strategy for the IRM. This is the IRM's third communications strategy and the first one developed by a communications professional. She has started implementing some of the strategies. The social media consultant has also created and managed content on the IRM's social media channels, and the IRM has observed an increased number of people interested in virtually engaging with the IRM. The IRM is also processing the hiring of a mediator to help with its Nicaragua case. In addition, the IRM hired two interpreters and a translator from its roster to support its forthcoming virtual outreach event for civil society representatives in the West Africa region. Furthermore, the IRM contracted Consensus Building Institute (CBI), a consultancy firm, to execute the IRM's mandate to build the capacity of the Grievance Redress Mechanisms (GRMs) of GCF's Direct Access Entities (DAEs). They will be providing training for participants from Asia and the Pacific, Africa, and Latin America and the Caribbean, updating the online training modules, and providing one-on-one GRM support to GRMs of eight DAEs. The IRM is also finalizing its procurement of two individual consultants to provide company-community mediation training to a selected number of GRMs of the GCF's DAEs. Lastly, the IRM is in the process of hiring six translators in Spanish, French, Arabic, Russian, Portuguese and Swahili to assist with its ad-hoc translation or

interpretation needs and to translate the IRM's website for increased accessibility of its stakeholders.

12. **Guidelines for Board consideration of IRM reports:** While adopting the Procedures and Guidelines (PGs) of the IRM at B.22 in February 2019, the Board requested that the Head of the IRM, in consultation with the EAC, consider options to facilitate the Board's consideration of reports from the IRM containing its findings and recommendations relating to requests for reconsideration and grievances or complaints. The IRM prepared the Guidelines in consultation with the Office of General Counsel and through numerous meetings with the EAC and subsequently the Board. The Guidelines was thereafter presented to the Board for adoption at the 29th meeting of the Board. Further amendments were made to the draft following a comment made by one Board member, and the Guidelines were adopted without a Board meeting³ and consequently, two provisions of the PGs were also amended.⁴ The Guidelines stand out as a beacon to other financial institutions with regard to the standards that the Board will adopt when considering case reports from the IRM.

13. **Supporting Operating Procedures (SOPs) for the IRM:** All 21 modules of the IRM's SOPs have been issued and are in daily implementation, thus concluding the task of issuing SOPs. The IRM continuously considers whether improvements and adjustments are necessary, as these are living documents. In the last quarter of 2021, the IRM plans to incorporate gender considerations into its SOPs.

14. **Gender Strategy Note:** The IRM's Gender Strategy Note is in implementation by initiating the short-term commitments.⁵ The IRM staff received training on conducting SEAH investigations and has started collecting data about the genders of stakeholders involved in its activities. As mentioned earlier, the IRM will review the SOPs to include gender considerations in all its activities with the aim of mainstreaming gender in the IRM's operations.

3.2 Communications strategy

15. As highlighted above, the IRM's High-Level Communications Consultant and a Social Media Consultant have been delivering their services to the IRM and have already demonstrated improvement in the IRM's communications efforts. By distributing a communications survey and conducting several rounds of interviews, the Communications Consultant assessed the status of the IRM's stakeholders' awareness, understanding of and access to the IRM. By July, the Communications Consultant submitted the IRM's communications strategy and three-year communications plan, which is now in the implementation phase. The communications strategy and plan both identify the critical need of the IRM to have a full-time communications specialist on its staff in order to fulfil its outreach mandate. Outreach and communications forms a fundamental part of a redress mechanism's functions. Stakeholders who are affected by GCF projects must know how to reach the IRM. In addition, the IRM has continued to implement many of its existing strategies and undertook the following activities during the reporting period:

- (a) **Civil Society Outreach:** The IRM did not hold any outreach events during the reporting period, but it began preparing for the next outreach events, which will be held in September and October 2021 in collaboration with Oxfam and Natural Justice.
- (b) **COP26 participation:** The IRM began planning for its two side events at the United Nations Climate Change Conference in November 2021 (COP26). One is being prepared

³ Available at: <https://irm.greenclimate.fund/document/guidelines-facilitate-board-consideration-irm-reports-reconsideration-requests-grievances>

⁴ Available at: <https://irm.greenclimate.fund/document/2019-procedures-and-guidelines-irm>

⁵ Available at: <https://irm.greenclimate.fund/news/irm-s-efforts-make-its-gender-actions-speak-louder-its-gender-strategies>

in partnership with the Strathclyde Centre for Environmental Law and Governance at the University of Strathclyde and the One Ocean Hub,⁶ and the other in partnership with the GCF's Independent Evaluation Unit and Independent Integrity Unit.

- (c) **Communications materials:** The IRM published the seventh issue of its newsletter, "Redress Counts," in August.⁷ This newsletter was widely distributed to all Board members, Advisors and stakeholders on the IRM's growing stakeholder database, which is regularly updated and maintained.
- (d) **Inreach:** In June, the IRM held a Dialogue and Learning Forum event, which focused on the benefits of preventing and resolving disputes relating to GCF projects/programmes, and the roles of different stakeholders as part of that process. More than 40 GCF colleagues joined, and some important questions about company-community mediation were raised.
- (e) **Increased transparency of project/programme information:** The IRM has endeavoured to alert the Secretariat about the need for improved transparency of GCF project and programme related information. The IRM, together with other units within the Secretariat, established an informal working group to discuss issues concerning transparency and improving access to GCF project, sub-project and programme information.

3.3 Providing advice

- 16. The IRM had developed a draft terms of reference for an advisory report concerning its mandate to entertain requests for reconsideration of funding proposals. Following consultations with Secretariat colleagues, the IRM has decided not to pursue an Advisory report in this matter and will instead produce a background note for the Board as part of its five-year review in 2022.
- 17. During the reporting period, the IRM has also provided feedback to the Secretariat on other numerous issues.

3.4 Capacity building of direct access entities' grievance mechanisms

18. As previously reported, the IRM formed the Grievance Redress and Accountability Mechanism (GRAM) partnership in 2019 together with other relevant organizations, to offer leadership, a learning and knowledge platform and a meeting space to an increasing number of GRAMs that are emerging in different spheres, particularly in DAEs. As planned in the GRAM partnership members meeting in January, Accountability Counsel, an NGO member of the GRAM partnership, hosted the second GRAM partnership webinar in July 2021 with logistical support from the IRM. This second webinar was on the topic of accessibility and retaliation risks, and included speakers from the Independent Accountability Mechanism of the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development⁸ and the Center for International Environmental Law.⁹ The IRM's other capacity building plans for 2021 include the upgrading of the IRM's online learning modules, capacity building workshops pitched at the introductory level, individualized support to DAEs, and advanced training on the topic of project/community mediation. Consensus Building Institute has been selected to offer the first three services, and two reputed academics in the field will be contracted to deliver the advanced training. The IRM has produced a blog summarising the two GRAM partnership community of practice webinars that have taken place

⁶ Available at: <https://irm.greenclimate.fund/sites/default/files/document/cop-side-event-poster.pdf>

⁷ Available at: <https://mailchi.mp/gcfund/newsletter-of-the-independent-redress-mechanism-of-the-gcf-summer-2021-4197033>

⁸ EBRD is an accredited entity of the GCF.

⁹ CIEL is an accredited observer of the GCF.

in 2021.¹⁰ The next webinar will be hosted by the United Nations Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR) in October 2021.

19. As mentioned above, the IRM has been raising the issue of the GCF's and the IRM's visibility with various divisions within the GCF Secretariat, including the Division of External Affairs, the Office of Portfolio Management, and the Office of Risk Management and Compliance. In these discussions, the IRM has urged the GCF to improve its monitoring and enforcement of legal obligations in the Accreditation Master Agreements (AMAs) that AEs sign, requiring them to publicize the existence of the IRM and their GRM to local stakeholders.

20. Additionally, according to the IRM's review of 94 signed AMAs, 16 AEs (17%) were required to notify the IRM/GCF once they had either established or upgraded their GRMs. The IRM has received no such notifications and has raised this issue with both the Office of the General Counsel (OGC) and the Office of Portfolio Management (OPM). OGC has confirmed that there is no obligation on the IRM to follow up or to monitor compliance with this AMA clause, and that monitoring must be done by the Secretariat (OPM). The IRM has raised this issue with OPM and is in conversations with the Secretariat on this matter.

3.5 Independent Accountability Mechanisms Network (IAMnet)

21. The IRM has continued to be active within the IAMnet community and has engaged with IAMnet members on its community of practice plans for second generation practitioners. As mentioned earlier, staff of IAMnet members were trained on conducting SEAH safeguarding investigations, where they shared their IAM's practices and experiences of handling complaints and grievances. IAMnet members continue to remain in contact with each other to learn the best practices of other members to handle their cases more effectively. The next IAMnet annual meeting is scheduled for September 2021 and will be conducted virtually.

IV. Budget utilization for the reporting period

22. The utilization of the IRM's 2021 budget up until 31 August 2021 is shown below, along with an explanation for the percentage of spending.

Independent Redress Mechanism Unit Budget Utilization as of 31 August 2021 (in USD)

		2021 Approved Budget	Actual expenditure to 31 August 2021	Balance	% spent
3.1	Staff, Consultants and Interns Costs				
3.1.1	Full-time Staff	845,959	432,387	413,572	51%
3.1.2	Consultants & Interns	164,705	16,265	148,440	10%
	Sub-total: Staff, Consultants and Interns	1,010,664	448,652	562,012	44%
3.2	Travel				
3.2.1	General	40,864	2,572	38,292	6%
3.2.2	Travel associated with complaints/request	62,289	-	62,289	0%
	Sub-total: Travel	103,153	2,572	100,581	2%
3.3	Contractual Services				

¹⁰ Available at: <https://irm.greenclimate.fund/news/gram-community-practice-gains-practical-knowledge>



		2021 Approved Budget	Actual expenditure to 31 August 2021	Balance	% spent
3.3.1	Professional Services	119,119	66,695	52,424	56%
3.3.2	Operating costs	83,950	5,164	78,786	6%
	Sub-total: Contractual Services	203,069	71,859	131,210	35%
	Total	1,316,886	522,227	794,659	40%
	Shared cost allocation	78,585	52,390	26,195	67%
	Grand total (1+2+3)	1,395,471	575,473*	819,998	41%*

* The expenses above do not include committed contracts signed for consultants and professional services, which amount to approximately USD 0.14 million. If incorporated, the actual expenditure and commitments as of August 2021 stand at 52 per cent.

Notes

Actual expenditure for the Independent Redress Mechanism during the reporting period totaled USD 575,473 against an approved 2021 total annual budget of USD 1,395,471 (41 per cent). However, the Board's attention is drawn to the fact that as stated in the 2021 Budget, 18 per cent of the IRM's budget (i.e. US\$ 252,240) constitute contingent costs which would be incurred only if complaints or reconsiderations requests are received by the IRM and other demand driven costs related to complaints and reconsideration requests, such as travel and accommodation etc arise. Most of the IRM's expenditure to date has been on non-contingent costs, with only a small amount paid to interpreters under the contingent costs budget.

The underspending in travel is due to continued GCF-wide prohibitions on mission travel as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic. Mission travel prohibitions have prevented the IRM from conducting necessary case-related travel for its now-concluded complaint in Morocco, and conducting outreach and capacity building related travel (for which only a small provision was made, with the understanding that COVID-19 travel restrictions would remain in place for most of 2021). Provision was also made for two staff members to travel to a Board meeting outside of the Republic of Korea, and for two staff members to travel to the Annual Meeting of the Independent Accountability Mechanisms Network. Given the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic, these events have all now been planned to happen remotely.

More than half of the IRM's 2021 travel budget is part of its contingent budget, meaning that they are dependent on spending associated with complaints received and needing to travel to site to conduct problem solving and investigative work related to those complaints. In light of the complexity of the IRM's ongoing case regarding a GCF project in Nicaragua, the IRM will be spending some of its case-related travel budgets in the last quarter. A portion of spending on the consultancy and operating costs budget is also dependent on complaints received. The IRM is currently processing payment for a mediator who worked on the IRM's Morocco complaint (received in 2020), and the IRM will be hiring additional consultant(s) to help with the further processing of its Nicaragua case. This results in a showing of underspending in the contingent category for the budget utilization until August 2021.

The IRM has recently concluded a number of procurement requests for consultancy and professional services. Most deliverables will be completed in the coming months, which will increase the IRM's spending in the last quarter. Underutilization of the consultancy budget is partially due to the item to item transfer of funds from Consultants to Professional Services, which were made to rationalize contracting and with the Budget Committee's knowledge.

Given the challenges associated with bringing new interns to Songdo at present as a result of COVID-19 and quarantine requirements in the Republic of Korea, the IRM has decided to only hire two interns this year (as opposed to four). These costs were also indicated in the contingent category in the 2021 budget.

Annex I: History of the IRM's Pre-cases

A pre-case is a communication from an external party to the IRM and information received by the IRM that is registered in the Case Management System as a pre-case and may or may not mature into a complaint. Pre-cases that have been escalated to complaints are recorded on the Case Register page of the IRM's website.¹

Year	Pre-case number	Summary of the communication	Status
2021	PC0023	The IRM received a communication about a dispute between the author of the communication and an AE unrelated to any project funded by the GCF. Appropriate information was provided to the person concerned that neither the IRM nor the IIU could intervene in the matter.	Closed
	PC0021	Following an IRM outreach event, one participant expressed interest in submitting a communication to the IRM regarding community displacement in a GCF funded project. The contact person said he/she/they would consult with the affected persons about the possibility and the benefit of a targeted IRM outreach event, and would get back to the IRM with how they would like to proceed.	Open
	PC0020	During media monitoring, the IRM identified an article alleging damage to community housing and building from flooding due to engineering failures in an infrastructure project funded by the GCF. The IRM reached out to an IRM stakeholder based in the region to obtain further information. The IRM made several attempts to contact people who might have further information but receiving no response, the IRM closed the matter.	Closed
	PC0019	A participant of one of the IRM's outreach events reached out to the IRM regarding the inadequacy of the new buildings in the participant's region. However, due to the absence of any linkage between the building and the GCF, the IRM provided further information about the IRM and closed the communication.	Closed
2020	PC0018	The IRM received an email about the unresponsiveness of one of the GCF's AEs to inquiries by the author of the email about the project. Since this communication did not fall within the mandate of the IRM, the IRM closed the communication.	Closed
	PC0017	The IRM received a communication about a labor dispute between the author of the communication and an NDA relating a contractual dispute over the quality of the services that the author had provided and payment for those services. The IRM informed the author of the communication that the dispute did not fall within the IRM's mandate. With consent from the author of the communication, this matter was referred to the IIU.	Closed
	PC0013	The IRM received a communication through the IIU about the lack of credibility of an AE and thus the need to delay or stop the consideration of a funding proposal at the following Board meeting. With the IRM's clarification of its mandate that the IRM cannot stop the consideration of the funding proposals or represent the author of the communication at the Board meeting, the author of the communication withdrew the communication.	Closed

¹ Available at: <https://irm.greenclimate.fund/case-register>

Year	Pre-case number	Summary of the communication	Status
	PC0012	The IRM received a communication relating to the illegal usage of the author's property by an agricultural company to grow crops. Since the concern did not relate to a GCF funded project, the IRM suggested that he/she/they approach the grievance redress mechanisms of the organization that was involved in funding the project.	Closed
	PC0011	During the IRM's media monitoring activities, an article highlighting serious concerns relating to a GCF project was brought up. The allegations included community displacement and human rights violations, corruption, etc. The IRM reached out to the writers of the article and was informed that they would get back to the IRM. Despite many follow ups, the writers of the article did not get back to the IRM.	Closed
	PC0008	During the IRM's media monitoring activities, the IRM came across a petition against a project which would allegedly harm the communities. When contacted by the IRM, the NGO organizing the petition clarified that they did not want to file a complaint. The IRM considered initiating a self-initiated inquiry, but due to the lack of specific locations where the programme would take place, the IRM decided to close the matter and continue to monitor the programme through media monitoring.	Closed
	PC0007	The IRM received an email communication about the unresponsiveness of an AE. The author of the communication later confirmed that the AE had been in touch. The IRM closed the matter	Closed
2019	PC0005	The IRM received an email communication about a Procurement issue. As procurement issues are excluded from the IRM's purview, the IRM forwarded the complaint to the GCF's Procurement Team.	Closed
	PC0004	During a regional workshop, the IRM became aware of a concern relating to Indigenous Peoples at a GCF project site. The people concerned were in communication with the grievance redress mechanism of the AE and was given the IRM's contact details in case they would like to reach out to the IRM. The affected person did not contact the IRM.	Closed
	PC0003	The GCF Secretariat forwarded to the IRM an email communication about illegal activities on the email author's property. Since the author's property and alleged illegal activities were not related to a GCF funded project, the IRM closed the communication.	Closed
	PC0002	The IIU referred to the IRM communications about why the country referred to in the email should not be receiving GCF funding. The IRM provided information about its mandate. The author of the communication stated that the information received from the IRM would be forwarded to another organization that had originally raised the issue. Since the IRM did not receive any further communication and the concern seemed unconnected to a GCF project, the IRM closed the communication.	Closed