

Indigenous Peoples' Advisory Group (IPAG)¹ submission on the GCF UPDATED STRATEGIC PLAN

We thank you for the opportunity for the newly constituted GCF Indigenous Peoples Advisory Group (IPAG) to submit inputs to the review of the Updated Strategic Plan. We wish to recognize the secretariat for their hard work in facilitating the process of consultations of the Updated Strategic Plan and we look forward to working more closely in the further discussion of this, in its operationalization, monitoring and evaluation.

We welcomed how USP integrated key asks of indigenous peoples including but not limited to doing no harm but also ensuring environmental, gender and social outcomes and generating co-benefits (Para 31, a); enhancing engagement with indigenous peoples (para 31, c.) and inclusive stakeholders participation (para 31, d). In particular, we want to appreciate the efforts made in establishing the Indigenous Peoples Advisory Group (IPAG) as has been indicated in the US for 2020-2023.

Moving forward however, we wish to raise several elements that we believe the USP needs to integrate, strengthen and ensure, which we will discuss below. We chose not to answer the guide questions individually as some of our points are cross cutting several questions.

Increase level of Ambition for the GCF and recognition of the different needs of GCF stakeholders:

It is becoming increasingly clear that the initial \$ 100 billion target of the GCF will not be able to sufficiently support the needs of the developing countries according to the first report of the Standing Committee on Finance (SCF) on the determination of the needs of developing country Parties related to the Convention and the Paris Agreement. Thus, we support the call of the network of CSOs, Local communities and Indigenous peoples regarding the need to increase the level of ambition of the GCF both in terms of resource generation and in meeting the urgency of these needs. We also remind GCF of Art 9.3 of the Paris Agreement on the significant role of public funds, supporting country-driven strategies, and the need and priorities of developing country Parties, in mobilizing climate finance, and Art.4 on grant-based resources for adaptation. We believe that a 'country' and/or a 'Party' does not mean just a government of a country but includes the citizens including the indigenous peoples of the country– country-drivenness and country priorities must include indigenous peoples priorities and participation.

¹ For more information, please contact the Indigenous Peoples Advisory Group Members

Asia- main member: Tunga Rai (tungarai@hotmail.com); alternate: Helen Biangalen-Magata (len@tebtebba.org)

Latin America- main member: Juan Carlos Jintiach (juancarlos.jintiach@gmail.com); alternate: Viviana Figueroa (vivianafig20@gmail.com)

Africa- main member: Kimaren Ole Riamit (kimaren@yahoo.com); alternate: Balkisou Buba (balkisoububa2013@gmail.com)

The GCF should also look not only generically at the needs of the developing countries, the SIDS and LDCs but of the different groups of people or communities within these countries that are more vulnerable than others. Indigenous Peoples, for instance, have been recognized in the Paris Agreement to have contributed and will continue to contribute to mitigation and adaptation through their traditional knowledge but they remain invisible in the financing mechanism of the Convention. Effective participation of indigenous peoples and recognition of their knowledge helps to mitigate the maladaptation risk and adds value in climate action as reported by the IPCC Sixth Assessment Report (AR6).

Providing enhanced direct access for indigenous peoples to GCF finance

The GCF Governing Instrument recognizes the crucial input and the need for indigenous peoples to participate in the development and implementation of strategies and activities to be financed by the Fund (Para 71). In terms of resources allocation, the GCF IP Policy also gives weight to activities that are tailored to meet the needs of indigenous peoples, may target funds to support climate mitigation and adaptation initiatives of indigenous peoples and *may give weight to projects and programmes that prioritizes indigenous led solutions*, (Para 98) but this is yet to be given focus and real action in the operations of the GCF. We believe that promoting a paradigm shift towards low emission and climate development pathways in the context of sustainable development can be best achieved when indigenous led-solutions that have been proven to work through many generations in climate actions. These initiatives may include but are not limited to territorial management (including forest and water management), food and agriculture, ecosystems based management and other appropriate technologies and innovations.

This could be done by creating a dedicated small facility at the secretariat level to directly support indigenous peoples beyond what is currently possible under readiness. There are existing examples of how resources can be allocated to respond to specific needs of indigenous peoples and the GCF can learn from other funds (i.e. Dedicated Grant Mechanism for Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities of the Climate Investment Funds and the Indigenous Peoples Assistance Facility (IPAF) of the International Fund for Agricultural Development, capacity building support of the Forest Carbon Partnership Facility (FCPF) and the Inclusive Conservation Initiative of the Global Environment Facility (GEF), among others.

This could also be done through an RFP modality (Request for Proposals) under the current operational modality of the Green Climate Fund.

Strengthen and concretize monitoring how the safeguards are implemented

We strongly agree with the observer network of CSOs, Local Communities and Indigenous Peoples that the Strategic Plan needs to be hinged on a clear human-rights centered approach in its operations. The current USP is totally devoid of such framework and discussion which we wish to see improved in the next iteration of this living document. The GCF is the key finance

mechanism of the Paris Agreement that itself recognizes human rights, including the rights of indigenous peoples, must uphold this framework to ensure responsibility and accountability of the fund. Moreover, the Paris Agreement has laid a clear basis for countries and the GCF to support the knowledge of Indigenous Peoples in Adaptation (Art 7.5), and the non-carbon benefits in Mitigation (Art 5.2). We thus urge the GCF to apply a holistic and integrated adherence to all relevant elements and articles of the Paris Agreement in its USP.

There is a need to ensure that strong and robust policies of the GCF such as the Environmental and Social Policy, the Indigenous peoples Policy, and Gender Policy are really implemented, reported, monitored and measured against the GCF investment criteria. Likewise, monitoring and reporting of projects against GCF safeguards and policies including IP Policy, is crucial.

Indigenous Peoples Dialogues in the GCF: The GCF should also provide space dialogues for indigenous peoples to come together to learn from each other's experiences and contribute to the growing body of knowledge around GCF. We reiterate that country ownership goes beyond the ownership of national and regional ministries. We appreciate that indigenous peoples are sometimes invited in regional conferences or dialogues but thus far, this needs to be improved to ensure that they have their own spaces for discussions and dialogues. These dialogues should go beyond the IP Advisory Group (IPAG) which is tasked to provide advice to the secretariat or to the board as necessary. Indigenous peoples' dialogues will institutionalize partnership between the GCF and indigenous peoples and could contribute to the growing knowledge and lessons being generated by the GCF in its operations. One example of such dialogues that the GCF could learn from is the Indigenous Peoples Forum of the IFAD.

Indigenous Peoples disaggregated data

In relation to the UNFCCC processes, the Global stock take does not show how much finance is being accessed by women, indigenous peoples and local communities. This is the same in the Green Climate Fund. We believe that the GCF is in the position to lead this good practice of disaggregating and reporting how much is being accessed by the most vulnerable within countries. This could be done for instance by disaggregating the data on the result area of adaptation to show how much is channeled to indigenous peoples or to women organizations.

In addition, in line with the COP26 pledge from developed countries to support funding to indigenous peoples, the GCF should track how much financing is delivered to indigenous peoples communities as part of their projects.

Ensuring engagement of indigenous peoples in Readiness activities

While giving support for NDAs and DAEs is important, readiness programs should also look at the role that CSOs, women and indigenous peoples play at the national level. It is important not

to lump them with the private sector who might have totally different priorities. It will be helpful if in the Readiness funds, there is an allocation to ensure that national stakeholders (women, indigenous peoples, farmers, academe) are not just represented in national technical discussions and decision-making in the NAPs, NDCs and Country programmes. Readiness funds should also include for instance capacity building not only of government units but equally, of indigenous peoples in terms of national engagements with the government and AEs.

The GCF IP Policy provides that the *GCF will support specific capacity-building programs for indigenous peoples as part of readiness and preparatory support proposals or funding proposals to ensure their full and effective engagement with GCF at all levels. This support will include, at a minimum, activities related to consultation, advocacy, institutional building for project implementation and management, as well as the effective engagement of indigenous peoples in the formulation of project proposals and monitoring and evaluation;* (Para 97) and that *the states and accredited entities, particularly the direct access entities, may request readiness and preparatory support from GCF to enhance their capacity to implement this Policy* (Para 97).

We urge the board to ensure that these are tracked, reported and assessed in the new USP.

Smaller, locally led initiatives should be given focus. The GCF can continue to build its paradigm shifting portfolio in its net programming period by giving weight to small, locally- led adaptation initiatives that are proven to work. When we talk of scale, this should not only be measured by the geographical size and scale or the amount of investment as the GCF has been favoring through mobilizing funds at scale with the private sector with increasing use of equity and guarantee. Scale should also be measured qualitatively in terms of how it is transforming and empowering the grassroots, the women and indigenous peoples.

As such we support Para 29. b. that the *GCF will continue to streamline programming and approval processes... and will develop simplified processes for approval of proposals for certain activities, in particular small scale activities..”*

We wish to highlight under this section that there is a need to **ensure direct access** of climate finance including for indigenous peoples and a mechanism in place to monitor this. These smaller-scale activities could include but not limited to capacity building of DAEs on indigenous peoples and engagement of IPAG with DAEs and other accredited entities and delivery partners as well as support for climate mitigation and adaptation activities of indigenous peoples at the local level.

Climate rationale and indigenous science: indigenous science and their knowledge system embeds in a distinct world-views and the distinct realities of the ground– we suggest that indigenous science and knowledge systems should be accounted as distinct sources of climate information. Such knowledge system should not be assimilated nor be treated as subordinate to

the western science, rather supported as distinct and equally important climate science by the GCF strategies and financing.

Others:

There are a lot of initiatives by GCF observers (specifically the GCF observer network of CSOs, IPs and Local Communities) that could be supported, upscaled and/or replicated. For instance, Tebtebba has launched its Indigenous Peoples' Tracker on green Climate Fund projects. This tracker aims to establish a baseline information on and analysis of GCF-approved projects that will potentially impact indigenous peoples positively or negatively. The project is important to see how indigenous peoples' rights are being fulfilled in all climate actions, using its own IP Policy and the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples as standard.

The Observer network of CSOs, IPs and Local communities also has established a Southern CSO-led initiative established to help promote and accelerate Southern CSO readiness to engage the GCF as its operations shift to national arenas, in all the multi-faceted roles taken up by civil society, e.g. as project or Fund stakeholders, Fund or project and program monitors, participants considering to access the fund, or as providers of input to project planning, implementation or evaluation, the GCFWatch.

These are only some of the examples that can inform the GCF measuring and reporting its achievements apart from the Accredited entities self-reports (Annual Performance Reports, which are often not shared publicly).

Lastly, the Indigenous Peoples Advisory Group wishes to signify its interest to be engaged in the process going forward of the development of the Strategic Plan, including, but not limited to opportunity to submit intervention/s and participation in other consultation processes.