

THE INDEPENDENT ASSESSMENT OF THE GCF'S SIMPLIFIED APPROVAL PROCESS (SAP) PILOT SCHEME

BACKGROUND

At B24, the Board asked the IEU to conduct an independent assessment of the GCF's Simplified Approval Process (SAP) Pilot Scheme to be presented to the Board at B.26.¹

WHAT IS THE SAP MODALITY FOR GCF PROJECT PROPOSALS?

SAP was approved in B.18/06 (October 2017) to "reduce the time and effort needed in the preparation, review, approval and disbursement procedures for proposals of certain activities". To be eligible, each proposal needs to:

1. Require no more than USD 10 million of GCF contribution.
2. Have minimal to no environmental and social risks and impacts, i.e. an ESS category C/I-3.
3. Have the potential for 'scale up' and transformation while promoting a paradigm shift to low-emissions and climate resilient development.

The GCF's accredited entities (AEs) are eligible to apply for funding through SAP.

WHAT DID THE EVALUATION FIND?

1. What was the result of the IEU's assessment of the Secretariat's review of SAP?

The Secretariat's review of SAP contained 18 recommendations. The Table below captures whether these recommendations contained in the Secretariat's review of SAP were informed by valid findings.

Table 1. Overall sensitivity table of findings and recommendations in the Secretariat's SAP review

		Recommendations		
		Not valid	Valid	Total
Findings	Not valid	2	5	7
	Valid	1	10	11
	Total	3	15	18

Notes: Findings 'Not valid/valid' examines whether the findings flow from the evidence/data contained in the Secretariat's review of SAP. Recommendations 'Not valid/valid' examines whether the recommendations follow from the findings (irrespective of whether the findings themselves are valid).

¹ Gonzales, Margarita, Daisuke Horikoshi, Elangtlhoko Mokgano, Jyotsna Puri, and Claudio Volonte. (2020). Independent Assessment of the GCF's Simplified Approval Process (SAP) Pilot Scheme. Evaluation Report No. 7, June 2020. Independent Evaluation Unit, Green Climate Fund. Songdo, South Korea.




2. What has been the quality of the implementation of the SAP pilot?

2a. Overall, the Secretariat's implementation of SAP has been **partially satisfactory**.

2b. The SAP process **lacks transparency** and predictability with multiple layers and duplicative steps.

2c. The **median time** taken for SAP proposals to get approved by the Board is 365 days from the submission of Concept Note (CN) to approval. This is not significantly shorter than the time taken for projects processed through the regular Project Approval Process (PAP), as seen in Figure 1 below.

Figure 1. Days taken from CN submission to FP approval



2d. At the institutional level, there is a lack of incentives for GCF secretariat staff to process SAP proposals. There are no SAP-specific KPIs at the overall GCF level.

2e. Two crucial elements in the Board decisions have not been implemented yet: approvals in the absence of Board meetings, and, the review of proposals by the independent Technical Advisory Panel (iTAP) on a rolling basis.

3. What is the value-added of SAP?

3a. SAP projects approved so far **comply** with two of the three eligibility criteria. The definition of the “ready for scale up” criterion is unclear and has not been applied consistently.

3b. Most SAP projects support further testing and demonstration of ideas and approaches, but do **not support the “scaling up”** of successful ideas and approaches.

3c. None of the SAP projects support **research** on innovative ideas or proofs of concept. See Figure 2 and Figure 3.

3d. Project proponents have found it difficult to define or articulate “**climate rationale**” in SAP proposals.

3e. There are **very few SIDS projects**, processed through SAP.

3f. There is minimal presence of **private sector entities** in the SAP portfolio. No ‘new’ entities have come to the GCF because of SAP.

4. Is there an overall strategy for SAP?

4a. There is **no SAP strategy** that would help to define how SAP contributes to the overall mandate of the GCF.

4b. SAP projects **do not reduce the burden for AEs**. Neither are they specially conceived to meet countries’ urgent needs.

4c. The use of SAP by AEs has **not improved their understanding** of the GCF and its processes.

5. Are there comparable fast track mechanisms?

5a. There is **no international or industry standard** across development agencies or climate change financial institutions on how to simplify the project cycle, or on creating fast track or simplified processes.

5b. The GCF Board has previously supported **expedited procedures** for projects and decisions in the GCF, including delegation of authority.

5c. In most cases, institutions, including the GCF, have developed their **fast-track processes** in an incremental way, considering their stage of evolution and context.

Figure 2. *From innovation to replication and scale-up*




Figure 3. *Mapping of SAP portfolio on the innovation and replication continuum*

I. INNOVATION	II. PROOF OF CONCEPT	III. IMPLEMENTATION OF PILOTS	IV. DEMONSTRATION OF PILOTS	V. REPLICATION AND SCALE-UP OF COMPONENTS OF PROJECTS(*)																														
		<u>SAP004</u>	<u>SAP001</u> <u>SAP002</u> <u>SAP005</u> <u>SAP006</u> <u>SAP007</u> <u>SAP008</u> <u>SAP009</u> <u>SAP010</u> <u>SAP011</u> <u>SAP012</u> <u>SAP013</u>	<table> <tr> <td>Replication elsewhere</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr> <tr> <td>Replication in neighbouring country</td><td></td><td><u>SAP006</u>, <u>SAP007</u></td><td></td><td></td></tr> <tr> <td>Replication elsewhere in the country</td><td></td><td></td><td><u>SAP004</u>, <u>SAP005</u>, <u>SAP008</u>, <u>SAP013</u></td><td></td></tr> <tr> <td>Replication in same location</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr> <tr> <td>No replication</td><td></td><td></td><td><u>SAP012</u></td><td></td></tr> <tr> <td></td><td>Local</td><td>Sub-national</td><td>National</td><td>Multi-country</td></tr> </table> <p>Scale</p>	Replication elsewhere					Replication in neighbouring country		<u>SAP006</u> , <u>SAP007</u>			Replication elsewhere in the country			<u>SAP004</u> , <u>SAP005</u> , <u>SAP008</u> , <u>SAP013</u>		Replication in same location					No replication			<u>SAP012</u>			Local	Sub-national	National	Multi-country
Replication elsewhere																																		
Replication in neighbouring country		<u>SAP006</u> , <u>SAP007</u>																																
Replication elsewhere in the country			<u>SAP004</u> , <u>SAP005</u> , <u>SAP008</u> , <u>SAP013</u>																															
Replication in same location																																		
No replication			<u>SAP012</u>																															
	Local	Sub-national	National	Multi-country																														

KEY RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE IEU

For the Board

The GCF Board is requested to consider the following recommendations.

1. **Simplify** SAP review criteria and develop tailored investment criteria.
2. Consider **delegating authority** to the Executive Director for a faster approval of projects that meet the SAP eligibility criteria.

For the Secretariat

1. Further simplify and accelerate the **SAP review and post-approval processes**. Clearly explain the key GCF concepts, such as 'climate rationale' and 'ready for scale up'. Have a consistent set of guidelines for the Secretariat and iTAP review.
2. **Implement the following** elements of the Board decisions that have not been implemented yet: (i) simplified financial terms, (ii) approvals in the absence of Board meetings, (iii) iTAP review on a rolling basis, and (iv) robust monitoring systems in SAP proposals.
3. Include a **capacity development programme** to support Direct Access Entities in understanding simplified and accelerated procedures.
4. Develop a **strategy for SAP**, which clearly defines its value added and its fit into the overall GCF mandate including near-term objectives.
5. Include a **sub-strategy for the private sector** within the SAP strategy.
6. Consider developing **institution-level KPIs** to incentivize SAP proposals for Secretariat staff.

METHODS

The assessment employed a mixed methods approach, combining both qualitative and quantitative data collection and analysis of the GCF portfolio with a special focus on the SAP pipeline. The evaluation team conducted a deep dive analysis of all the 13 approved SAP projects. This entailed a nuanced look into the proposals and reaching out to the project managers of each of the SAP projects in the following countries: Bahrain, Namibia, Mongolia, Bangladesh, Zimbabwe, Haiti, Niger, Mozambique, Philippines, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Benin, and Kyrgyzstan.

A benchmarking exercise of roughly 12 organizations (Adaptation Fund, Korean Development Bank, Children's Investment Fund Foundation, etc.) was conducted.


While benchmarking is good, GCF's unique model of fast track modality/mechanism should not depend on whether there are comparable processes in other international organizations or climate funds. Semi-structured interviews and focus groups with stakeholders were also conducted.

A country visit to Kenya had been scheduled but due to the COVID-19 pandemic, the team could not travel. In response to the inability to travel and host in-person meetings, the team conducted virtual and phone call interviews. Where these failed, questionnaires tailored to each stakeholder group were sent out for completion.

CONTACT THE IEU

Independent Evaluation Unit
Green Climate Fund
175, Art center-daero, Yeonsu-gu
Incheon 22004
Republic of Korea

☎ (+82) 032-458-6450
✉ ieu@gcfund.org
🌐 ieu.greenclimate.fund



GREEN
CLIMATE
FUND

Independent
Evaluation
Unit

