

GCF regional presence feasibility study

Scope and function of the study



- The study is a feasibility tool further to decision B.36/15 for the Board to aid its consideration of the issue of regional presence.
- The consultants completed their work on 27 September and will now present their key findings to the Board.
- The Secretariat will assess the findings and plans to present its views at the B.38 meeting in order to complete this mandate.

The study identified nine options by mapping the models and mandates; the impact and feasibility assessment resulted in four priority options

Overview of the GCF regional presence options assessed

Mandate	Models		
	Regional Networks	Regional Outposts	Regional Offices
Engagement mandate	Option 1: Network of seconded staff that focuses on external engagement activities	Option 4: Hubs of GCF staff with local and regional engagement responsibilities	Option 7: GCF offices focusing on external engagement activities
Early-stage programming mandate	Option 2: Network of seconded staff that provides ad-hoc project support and expertise (<i>closest to current model</i>)	Option 5: Hubs of GCF staff reporting to headquarters with multifunctional capabilities providing project programming support	Option 8: GCF office with a multifunctional team reporting to a Regional Head and fully dedicated to project programming support
Full programme support mandate	Option 3: Network of staff seconded to different organisations to provide project support and engage partners	Option 6: Hubs of GCF staff reporting to headquarters with multifunctional capabilities providing project programming and delivering support with local and regional engagement roles	Option 9: GCF office with a multifunctional team reporting to a Regional Head with multifunctional capabilities providing full project programming and delivering support with local and regional engagement roles

Summary of feasibility assessment findings

Dalberg applied the six criteria outlined in the ToR¹ to assess the regional presence options resulting in the following:

- Feasibility of different models depends upon the mandate adopted
- Options based on early-stage programming and full programme support mandates ranked highest on impact criteria
- The office model is most suited to deliver more impactful mandates, while the outpost model can help address specific regional needs, e.g., SIDS
- There is no one-size-fits-all solution, and a hybrid model would be most fit-for-purpose

(1) Dalberg grouped the criteria suggested in the ToRs into impact and feasibility categories. The impact criteria include (i) effectiveness, (ii) efficiency, and (iii) field feedback. The feasibility criteria include (iv) promote collaboration, (v) minimize the costs, and (vi) minimize complexity

The potential impact of a regional presence extends across the full programme cycle

USP 2 objectives

Potential impact of a regional presence

Programmatic

Regional presences can contribute to increase quality of proposals and projects at entry by:

- Providing NDAs with targeted support in the development of readiness proposals
- Building capacity, particularly in areas that often create bottlenecks in the proposal review process
- Contributing to identify truly paradigm-shifting projects

Operational

Regional presences can help make GCF a more accessible partner. Proximity to countries and stakeholders, both in terms of time zones and geographical distance, would allow regional presences to increase GCF's accessibility and visibility, and provide more clarity on GCF's requirements, ways of working, and type of support available

Institutional

Regional presences can help de-risk portfolios and contribute to better knowledge sharing, particularly on country needs to facilitate:

- Risk management and M&E throughout the project implementation phase by acting as early warning systems that can detect potential issues on the ground
- knowledge-sharing of local intelligence as well as reflections from on-the-ground programme implementation experiences

Implementing regional presences will require tailoring the model to regional contexts

The priority models do not provide one-size-fits-all solutions and how they should be implemented will depend on specific regional needs:

- Each region will have different needs in terms of institutional capacity building and addressing barriers to accessing GCF funding and support
- GCF's current portfolio, pipeline and future growth ambitions will also influence what objectives a regional presence should help achieve

The analysis showed a mix-model would be most fit-for-purpose:

- An office with a full programme support mandate (Option 9) would be most suited for regions where GCF already has a significant volume of work and wants to enhance its ability to deliver it
- Smaller outposts with programming mandates (Options 5 and 6) could be embedded within an office model to address the unique circumstances of particular sub-regions, such as SIDS
- An office with an early-stage programming mandate (Option 8) would be most relevant in regions where GCF wants to build or grow a stronger future presence