

QUESTIONS

KEY CONCLUSIONS AND FINDINGS

RECOMMENDATIONS

Q1

What are the expected results of SAP projects?

- F1**
Conclusion 1. The implementation of SAP has been partially satisfactory.
- F1-1**
 The SAP portfolio of 13 projects (in 12 countries) corresponds to USD 115 million, which represents 16% of the total projects approved.
- F1-2**
 LDCs and African States are well represented; SIDS are underrepresented (only two projects); 11 projects are adaptation and public sector grants; three projects use a private sector entity or scheme.
- F1-3**
 Almost no value added for the private sector.
- F1-4**
 SAP has not contributed to bringing in 'new' entities to the GCF.
- F1-5**
 The Secretariat's dedicated SAP team is effective and proactive.
- F1-6**
 SAP project proponents have appreciated the guidelines, online tutorials and the direct hands-on support provided by the SAP team.
- F1-7**
 The Secretariat's review of the SAP focused on the SAP processes and did not examine the value-added or the strategic fit of the SAP for the GCF.

R1

- The **Secretariat** should develop a strategy for SAP.
- **The strategy should include pathways that show how SAP brings value to the GCF**, such as:
 - financing innovative approaches and creative implementation modalities;
 - supporting proposals that respond to *urgent* climate change issues;
 - supporting proposals from countries that are engaging with the GCF for the first time.

Q2

Has there been acceleration and simplification with SAP?

- F2**
Conclusion 2. SAP has not translated into simplified requirements nor accelerated the project cycle process.
- F2-1**
 The median time to process a project through SAP is only 8% shorter than for comparable projects through the regular PAP*, and 13% shorter compared to higher ESS category projects.
- F2-2**
 SAP review processes include multiple stages and duplications and are neither predictable nor transparent. Only two stages have business targets.
- F2-3**
 Secretariat and iTAP* reviewers have not changed their review practices and frequently have to deal with missing information.
- F2-4**
 Intra-Secretariat incentives to review and process projects through SAP are lacking.

R2

- The **Secretariat** should focus on accelerating and simplifying SAP.
- **Accelerate:** Develop accelerated processes for post-approval phases of SAP projects; enforce transparent and predictable business standards for every step of SAP process; and provide one set of consolidated comments for each Concept Note (CN) and Funding Proposal (FP).
 - **Simplify:** Enhance the clarity of guidance on review criteria; better define key GCF concepts, such as 'scale-up' and 'climate rationale'; and further simplify documentation requirements.

PAP*: Project Approval Process | iTAP*: independent Technical Advisory Panel

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.

