



**Reviews & update of the  
Strategic Plan 2024-2027  
Democratic Republic of Congo**



**August 2022**

## I. INTRODUCTION

Reviews of 2020-2023 helped DRC to have an important pipelines in terms of readiness and programs, which elevates our country to take a lead in Central Africa region mostly in Congo basin. The strategy used by the country through the NDA was, getting closer to several accredited entities and delivery partners. The value of this pipelines estimated to almost 1 billion USD focusing mostly on the energy sector. We need to know that the immensity of this country that is today the center of interest in the field of both international trade and the fight of the climate changes need more attention from GCF. Unfortunately, the mechanism has still some barriers that our country needs to mobilize more. The GCF as an ambitious mechanism should be flexible towards countries where some issues will support the international community to reduce vulnerability and low emissions.

If the 2020-2023 period did not help DRC to implement all the accumulated of programs, for the coming period 2024-2027 should bring changes from procedures. Surely, some internal and over-administration are slowing down our development and implementation. We will concentrate our effort to the best practices to accelerate activities in the ground with the support of the GCF. The country to have its own accredited entities, until now only BCoCo (agency of a ministry of finance) is in the process to become the National Access Direct Entity. With the new NDC developed by the DRC, the portfolios will rely on this instrument that include five priorities which are sustainable agriculture, energy, forest and land management, transportations, and wastage management. Optimization of GCF processes and procedures are the key that this UNFCCC ambitious is targeting for country like DRC with its big territory, potential environmental, natural resources extraction, capacity to absorb pollutions, capacity to generate credit carbon, its biodiversity, and space to develop huge programs and projects.

## II. Vision

**Does the GCF's long-term strategic vision – of promoting paradigm shift and supporting developing countries in the implementation of the Paris Agreement and UNFCCC – remain relevant and ambitious?**

- (1) potential for scaling-up, replication and innovation.
- (2) contribution to regulatory frameworks and policies. Several policies were developed (adaptation policy and laws, gender, etc.)
- (3) contribution to the creation of an enabling environment, including sustainability of outcomes beyond completion of the intervention and market transformation.
- (4) potential for knowledge and learning including indigenous people who are currently proactive.
- (5) and overall contribution to global low greenhouse gas emissions and climate-resilient development pathways

**Has the GCF set out sufficiently clearly how it will deliver its long-term strategic vision?**

- (1) channeling new, additional, adequate, and predictable financial resources to developing countries and catalyzing climate finance, both public and private, and at the international and national levels;
- (2) strengthening the global response to the threat of climate change, in the context of sustainable development and efforts to eradicate poverty.
  - holding the increase in the global average temperature to well below 2°C above and pursuit 1.5°C ;

- increasing the ability and low greenhouse gas to save foods;
- making finance flows consistent with a pathway towards low emissions and climate resilient development is another key goal.

To help deliver this, the GCF intends that future programming will be aligned with the priorities identified by developing countries in their nationally determined contributions (NDCs), adaptation communications (ACs), national adaptation plans (NAPs), Technology Needs Assessments (TNAs), Technology Plans (TPs) and other national climate strategies and plans, as updated periodically to build ambition toward delivering the Paris Agreement, and further implementation of the Convention. Democratic Republic of Congo developed three NAPs only one submitted in the UNFCCC and two other under process, NDCs updated and submitted, Adaptation communications published, Technology Needs Plans and Technology underway, and other climate strategies and plans.

### III. Strategic objectives

What global, regional, national, and subnational developments, trends, needs and opportunities relevant to adaptation and mitigation programming in developing countries should the GCF take into account in preparing for its second replenishment period? What lessons can be learned from experience to date?

How should GCF further elaborate its role within the climate finance landscape, in light of its comparative advantages? How should GCF seek to differentiate its focus from other sources of climate finance? Where are the opportunities for complementarity, coherence, and partnerships with others?

#### **Promoting the paradigm-shift towards low-emission and climate resilient development pathways in the context of sustainable development.**

For this matter, the Democratic Republic of Congo is willing to reinforce its paradigm shift mostly through its ambitious activities the one aiming the prosperity of the economy. Vulnerability in DRC is deepening with no wise chosen solutions, and low emission remains the country' strategy to reduce natural casualty. The use of natural resources are key assets to support the policies that may help the world. However, nothing is showing that this country with important assets (peatland, rivers, mining, oils, forests, biodiversity, and other), must again sacrifice its own vulnerable population for the interest of the world.

#### **Supporting developing countries in the implementation of the Paris Agreement and United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change within the evolving climate finance landscape.**

There is a serious need of supporting the developing country to implement the Paris agreement. NDCs were the first support that several developing countries received funds to develop their priorities according to their challenges. As today, the DRC developed two NDCs one under the funding of UNFCCC. The country raises their goals from the first NDC in adding two more field transportation and wastage emissions, in keeping the first three identified at the first NDC, sustainable agriculture, energy, and forest and land use.

The evolving climate finance is challenging in DRC. The low level of investments and the engagement of the private sector actors are less interested to the green investments. The public funding priority is to support the country budget for the economy. Management of public funds

participate not enough to support resilient developed projects leaving communities organizing through cooperatives and NGOs. Funding from international communities (bilateral and multilateral) are the most that will help to breath a little bit of its financial limitations. The bottleneck coming from the instrument proposed to DRC are complicated to be affordable to the misery of vulnerable people in terms of guaranteed. Locally owned projects do not have support from government for them to develop more sustainable activities.

#### **IV. Strategic priorities**

- How can the GCF better respond to developing countries mitigation and adaptation needs and ensure country-ownership of programming? What role should the readiness and preparatory support programme, support for national adaptation planning, and country programmes play?
- How should GCF continue to build its paradigm shifting portfolio through its next programming period? What opportunities for adaptation and mitigation programming, and opportunities to improve the funds programming processes, can the GCF capture?
- Building on its private sector strategy, what actions and partnerships should GCF pursue to catalyze private sector finance at scale?
- What steps can GCF take, in collaboration with its country partners, accredited entities and delivery partners, to ease and accelerate access to GCF resources, as well as strengthen the role of Direct Access entities?

The GCF should be more imaginative to respond developing countries, like DRC. Mitigation and adaptation are not paying attention from GCF ensuring these countries that country-ownership that will rely more on the NDA, Stakeholders, public sector, and private sectors. Harmonization of the relationship between the four actors are the most essentials for a programming to be more relevant. Unfortunately, the GCF does not organize some global meeting on stakeholders.

The readiness and preparatory support programme in most time helped the National Adaptation Plans accommodate with the previous readiness and preparatory activities. In the case of the DRC, we innovated by creating three pools for stakeholders to be continually represented. Such approach the DRC to create what called the Technical Committee Inter-Institutional Evaluation (CIET). It accelerated any project to be discuss within this Technical Committee in these three pools (Kinshasa, Lubumbashi, Tshopo). In that point, the programming for the country became mostly relieve since the experts of each of these pools are involved and provide feedback from field and strong opinions. The same for the development of National Adaptation Plans will be set in using the CIET to collect data needed. Readiness and preparatory screen the field through stakeholders collecting ground realities that will nourish the development of programmes.

The GCF paradigm shift will still be necessary to support countries through the ambitious, impact, relevant, and field best practices. However, it will need more actions and the capacity building within the country. DRC is short of climate changes programmes expertise. It will be interesting for GCF to support developing countries, the example of the DRC NAP with BCoCo, GCF hired a consultant that support until the end of its engagement. GCF might extend such practices for these countries to increase capacity to have high quality programming.

## V. Conclusions

The 2020-2023 Strategic Plan sets out an ambitious programming and operational vision for the next phase of GCF, aiming high to match the urgency of climate change and positioning GCF to make a significant and ambitious contribution towards the goals of the UNFCCC and Paris Agreement. This ambitious vision and improved results potential were based on GCF being more than a financial pass-through entity: it was based on its serving developing countries as a convenor, capacity-builder, and adviser through effective partnerships. Unfortunately, several developing countries are struggling a quick remodeling of the mechanisms that will shorten procedures and processes. It will be interesting for the GCF to innovate than staying in status-quo seeing for example a DRC programs approved since 2018 (*89 million USD*) until today is still through the FAA phase, deepening the vulnerability for the population. This is a field to take care regarding the implementation of activities and not to grant accredited entities a royal status to postpone without contacting the country. Yet, management of these accredited entities are delaying the execution of the projects.

With a view to enhance delivery of the GCF strategic vision towards 2050, the second performance review of the GCF will incorporate a review of how effectively GCF programming and operations have evolved from the IRM period to deliver the vision, objectives, and priorities in the Strategic Plan for 2020-2023, complemented by a Secretariat-led review of the GCF policy frameworks. This will in turn inform work to further assess opportunities for GCF strategic programming in the second replenishment period (GCF-2), taking account of needs identified in country programmes and an evidence-based understanding of GCF programming potential. DRC is following the campaign of funds collections that might help the country to realize its ambitious programmes and projects. We are still raised the injustice our country two times regarding the withdrawal of a programme on REDD+ CER without interacting with even the NDA who was there neglected by some developed countries. The country loss was *120 million USD*. The second incident similar with the first on the Payment Based on the Results occurred in another board meeting. The country-ownership principles failed from the board members and leaving the most potential country's benefits of *80 million USD* for its population.

Findings of both the second performance review and strategic programming exercise will inform the Board's consideration of a further update to the Strategic Plan in 2023, covering objectives and priorities for 2024-27, with a view to this being in place before the commencement of GCF-2.

Kinshasa, 08/08/2022

**Dr. Hans Andre Lohayo Djamba**



National Designated Authority & FP

Green Climate Funds & Clean Development Mechanisms