

GCF Accreditations

THE NEED FOR STRATEGIC CAPS AND BALLANCES

Submission to the GCF Board with regards to the Strategy on Accreditation

A 2016

B ,¹

18 A

()

submission of inputs on the strategy on accreditation in relation to the questions in the report of the Accreditation Committee on the progress on developing a strategy on accreditation.

A (. 2015) A , for reasons of efficiency and fairness, will need to pursue two strategic objectives, namely:

1. *achieving a fair balance between international and direct access entities, and*
2. *ensuring that the GFC is not suffocated by overwhelming numbers of accredited entities.*

, A :

- () *How should the Fund approach the question of limits and prioritization regarding the number and nature of organizations that can be accredited, especially taking into account applications from countries with no national entities accredited yet?*
- () *How should the accreditation process address the objectives of the Fund in terms of balance, i.e. what is balanced? What modalities may be needed in order to achieve the desired outcome?*
- () *When taking future accreditation decisions, how should the Fund incorporate geographic and thematic considerations?*

A , :

() , **a cap on numbers of accredited entities,**

() - , (**top priority accreditation to nation-wide entities submitting an EDA pilot proposal.**

¹ , ocp@ecbi.org

OCP GCF Focal Point:

, A , ocp@ecbi.org, +44 1865 284 413

1. Balance: The Status Quo

A (9 2016) 33 : 19
 , 5 _____ , 9
 (58% , 42%). B
 ?

(1).²
 100% , 81%

: A
 ,
 3 80%

A
 () .
 (68%) , 4 (18%) (.. /) 15
 7%

A
 B

2. The Need for Strategic Caps

(, , A _____ : _____)

. A ,
 ()
 (),
whether , **how**

A (),
 ,
 . B

2

3 : \$10 ; : \$50 ; : \$250 ; : \$250 .
 : 10 () ; 50 () ; 250 () ; 1250 () .

Table 1: Status quo accreditation size (im-) balance

	[Number of entities]										[Size]	
	(A) Total		(B.1) Micro		(B.2) Small		(B.3) Medium		(B.4) Large		(C) Size Index	
Total	33	100%	6		8		3		16		21210	100.0%
			18%		24%		9%		48%			
International	19	58%	1	17%	2	25%	3	100%	13	81%	17110	81%
ADB	P e	1	3%						1		1250	5.9%
AFC	N ge a	1	3%						1		1250	5.9%
AFD	F a ce	1	3%						1		1250	5.9%
De c e Ba AG	Ge a	1	3%						1		1250	5.9%
EBRD	UK	1	3%						1		1250	5.9%
IDB	USA	1	3%						1		1250	5.9%
KfW	Ge a	1	3%						1		1250	5.9%
W d Ba	USA	1	3%						1		1250	5.9%
AfDB	C e d I e	1	3%						1		1250	5.9%
C e d Ag c e	F a ce	1	3%						1		1250	5.9%
EIB	L e b g	1	3%						1		1250	5.9%
HSBC	UK	1	3%						1		1250	5.9%
IFC	USA	1	3%						1		1250	5.9%
CI	USA	1	3%				1				250	1.2%
UNDP	USA	1	3%				1				250	1.2%
IUCN	S e a d	1	3%				1				250	1.2%
UNEP	Ke a	1	3%		1						50	0.2%
WMO	S e a d	1	3%		1						50	0.2%
WFP	I a	1	3%	1							10	0.0%
Regional	5	15%	1	17%	2	25%	0	0%	2	13%	2610	12%
CAF	Ve e e a	1	3%						1		1250	5.9%
DBSA	S Af ca	1	3%						1		1250	5.9%
CCCCC	Be e	1	3%		1						50	0.2%
SPREP	Sa a	1	3%		1						50	0.2%
Ac e	USA	1	3%	1							10	0.0%

National		9	27%	4	67%	4	50%	0	0%	1	6%	1490	7%
NABARD	I d a	1	3%							1		1250	5.9%
MINIRENA	R a da	1	3%			1						50	0.2%
ADA	M cc	1	3%			1						50	0.2%
MOFEC	E a	1	3%			1						50	0.2%
UCAR	A ge a	1	3%			1						50	0.2%
CSE	Se ega	1	3%	1									

Table 2: Status quo accreditation capacity (im-) balance

		Capability Balance (re Fiduciary Standards)									
		(D.1) Basic		(D.2) Project management		(D.3) Grant award		(D.4) On-lending			
Total		33		33		19	16910	17	20010		
		100%		100%		58%		52%			
International		19	58%	19	58%	12	63%	77%	13	76%	81%
ADB	P e	1		1		1	1250	1	1250		
AFC	N ge a	1		1				1	1250		
AFD	F a ce	1		1		1	1250	1	1250		
De c e Ba AG	Ge a	1		1		1	1250	1	1250		
EBRD	UK	1		1		1	1250	1	1250		
IDB	USA	1		1		1	1250	1	1250		

National		9	27%	9	27%	4	21%	8%	1	6%	6%
NABARD	I d a	1		1		1		1250	1		1250
MINIRENA	R a da	1		1		1		50			
ADA	M cc	1		1							
MOFEC	E a	1		1							
UCAR	A ge a	1		1		1		50			
CSE	Se ega	1		1							
EIF	Na b a	1		1		1		10			
P f a e	Pe	1		1							
NEMA	Ke a	1		1							