

CGIAR RESPONSE TO REQUESTS FOR COMMENTS ON THE REVIEW AND UPDATE OF THE GREEN CLIMATE FUND STRATEGY PLAN

Introduction

As an accredited entity, CGIAR welcomes the inclusive approach GCF has adopted for the development of the 2024-2027 Strategic Plan. Please find below some consolidated comments from CGIAR in response to the specific questions proposed by GCF.

GCF QUESTION	CGIAR RESPONSE
Does the GCF's long-term strategic	The vision of promoting the paradigm shift remains very relevant to the current context. Following
vision – of promoting paradigm shift and	the UNFSS countries still are in need of financial and technical support in delivering upon NDC's,
supporting developing countries in the	NAPS etc. For the vision to stay ambitious and also following earlier review comments on the
implementation of the Paris Agreement	strategy it will be important to develop a theory of change linking project targeting/development
and UNFCCC – remain relevant and	and investments to clear outcome goals. It is insufficient to focus on 50% allocation between
ambitious? Has the GCF set out	mitigation and adaptation and insufficient to talk about significantly increased funding or portfolio
sufficiently clearly how it will deliver its	mobilization.
long-term strategic vision?	
What global, regional, national and	It will be important to take stock of the current success and failures of GCF funding and its
subnational developments, trends,	adaptability to other countries, regions at a global level. The cross learning between the countries
needs and opportunities relevant to	is key to further push the agenda on both mitigation and adaptation. There is insufficient learning
adaptation and mitigation programming	happening from ongoing investments to inform future investments.
in developing countries should the GCF	
take into account in preparing for its	There is a need to develop solutions to support countries in assessing trade-offs and synergies
second replenishment period? What	between mitigation and/or adaptation action in relation to current and future GCF investments
lessons can be learned from experience	and its impact on people and natural resources (land, water, biodiversity).
to date?	
	Climate security and with it the access of fragile and conflict affected states to GCF funding is
	important and underdeveloped. In a short LANCET commentary, we outline what countries to
	target and how to deploy GCF funds in fragile states (Läderach et al, 2021)
How should GCF further elaborate its	GCF could consider a new funding window for smaller catalytic funds to governments to enhance
role within the climate finance	climate mitigation/adaptation following larger multilateral banks/donor investments (e.g. the
landscape, in light of its comparative	World Bank and its climate focus) and increase significantly its funding to attract private sector
advantages? How should GCF seek to	paradigm shifts (where there is much less availability of climate fund access) aligned with public
differentiate its focus from other	investments (especially in countries with different levels of private sector investment/
sources of climate finance? Where are	development) - see further elaboration under the private sector question below.



the opportunities for complementarity, coherence and partnerships with others?	It will be paramount to earmark specific "sectors" and focus areas of water and energy along side agriculture to deliver. Currently the agricultural sector is receiving more mitigation/adaptation related funds with spillovers to the water and energy sector. It will be important to channel funds in a way to stimulate cross sectoral collaboration and increase mitigation/adaptation funds to the water (e.g. irrigation, storage, re-use) and energy sector (e.g. productive use appliances). Several agencies provide knowledge products (GCSA, CGIAR – CCAFS and new One CGIAR initiatives, WRI, UNFCCC, CCDR reports of World Bank) that could further help GCF to better target climate investments in particular countries. Developing an active database on current stocktaking and progress profiling would help GCF to continue to leapfrog higher risk investments where other actors are likely more willing to invest in "proven" or "less innovative" methods.
Do the GCF's strategic objectives and portfolio targets capture appropriate ambition for the second replenishment period? How could GCF evolve these in a way that sets clear, actionable, measurable programming goals aligned with its strategic vision?	Whilst the strategy document has identified clear areas for improvement and set clear goals it could be further strengthened with a Theory of change that sets out bold outcomes to be delivered through the second replenishment period and strengthening the monitoring and evaluation framework. It is unclear if the outcomes envisioned have been also updated.
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?	Blending GCF financing with current ongoing climate related investments or to be used as seed funds might enhance ownership of programming. The technical assistance should be rolled out in a way that there is consistent support during design and implementation stage. Moreover, the technical assistance should have a core capacity development component to ensure that governments, private sector and other stakeholders have increased capacity to design and implement and manage future GCF activities.
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	It would be important to look at the synergies and trade-offs between the agriculture and food security sector guide, forest and land use, energy, water, health etc and strengthen cross-sectoral investments instead of mono sectoral investments for through transformation. A good example is the water-energy-food nexus which requires increased financing arrangements to support implementation and ensure that climate related interventions deliver benefits on adaptation and mitigation across sectors.



programming processes, can the GCF	Following the UNFSS it is crucial to fund holistic food systems transformation to achieve a
capture?	paradigm shift. The UNFSS side event organized jointly with CGIAR, GCF and others is proposing
	clear entry points to do so (Läderach et al, 2021)
Building on its private sector strategy,	Whilst the strategy talks about private sector engagements it is likely targeting the larger
what actions and partnerships should	cooperations. For national governments to deliver on its climate goals it will be important for GCF
GCF pursue to catalyze private sector	to develop a financing mechanism to stimulate smaller SME's and businesses and not only the
finance at scale?	large international cooperations or the public-private partnership models. This would require
	significant simplification of the application processes to GCF funding.
What steps can GCF take, in	CGIAR supports the recent direction of GCF to provide a panel of technical experts with expertise
collaboration with its country partners,	in GCF processes that can provide support to AEs and DAEs for the development of Concept Notes
accredited entities and delivery	or SAPs.
partners, to ease and accelerate access	
to GCF resources, as well as strengthen	
the role of Direct Access entities?	
What enhancements or adjustments to	There needs to be a cross-sectoral review of new GCF applications with a strong emphasis on
operational modalities, policies or	cross-sectoral implementation.
institutional capacities might be	
required to support successful execution	
of the GCF's strategic vision and	
programming priorities?	