Action Points and Recommendations

- Workshop participants emphasized the need for increased consultation in the project implementation process to include a varied range of stakeholders in climate finance discussions.
- Participants agreed to create and work in synergy between accredited and yet-to-be-accredited for peer learning and sharing of lessons.
- Technical Clinics conducted by the AFB and GCF were beneficial and recommended for all similar workshops.
- Continuous consultation between workshop participants and the AFR and GCF are encouraged.
- Increased coordinated efforts at all levels; national, regional and grassroots levels amongst all relevant actors to be scaled up.
- The NDAs as both the focal and coordinating entity to provide effective leadership in the process.
- ECOWAS member states are encouraged to ensure appropriate organisational and governance arrangement for the success of the process.
- ECOWAS Commission commits to tracking the progress made after the workshop to ascertain the impact in the respective countries.

Feedback from workshop participants indicates the following as the most beneficial outcomes:

1. The opportunity to engage with GCF and Adaptation Fund Secretariat representatives during the clinic sessions;
2. Success stories shared by accredited Implementing Entities;
3. Detailed overview of accreditation process as well as the lessons learnt from the challenges in the accreditation process;
4. Discussions on the role of the private sector and modalities for their engagement within the climate finance dynamic provided useful insight;
5. Useful insight on the requirements to demonstrate institutional capacity in order to leverage available funds for climate adaptation was highlighted;
6. Process for development of country strategic framework for coordination and multi stakeholder engagement;

Participant feedback also highlighted the following as areas for improvement:

- That there is need to engage diverse speakers on variety of other topics and the sharing of more country experiences.
- More practical insights into project designing would be helpful.
- Details of the GCF project implementation processes would have been useful.
- Need for clarity on the roles of CSO should be demonstrated;
- The workshop included too many presentations and few opportunities for interactive sessions;
- More information of country engagement in establishing NIE is required;
- A field visit would have been useful.

Background and Objectives of the Regional Workshop

Against the background that only two countries are accredited to the Adaptation Fund and the inability of many countries particularly in the West African sub-region to access international climate financing, the ECOWAS Commission in collaboration with the Heinrich Böll Stiftung (HBS) and the Adaptation Fund Board secretariat organized a three-day regional workshop for ECOWAS member countries, accredited entities, private sector players and civil societies. The West Africa Climate Finance Workshop took place from the 21st to the 23rd of September 2015 at the Ieto Hotels, in Abuja Nigeria. The workshop was part of Phase II of the Adaptation Fund’s Readiness Programme and the third organized in the African region.

Specifically, the workshop sought to sensitize participants on the readiness process for Direct Access Modality under the AF and GCF; facilitate a forum where learning and open dialogue can build confidence and capacity, and enhance best practice that strengthens gender-responsive climate finance flows in the programming of direct access modalities for the region. This included institutional transformation, gender-responsive stakeholder engagement and in-country coordination of funding priorities as a prerequisite for enabling direct access, participatory monitoring and rapid and decentralized disbursement of climate finance; encourage regional and in-country cooperation, coordination, networking and exchange in climate finance access and disbursement in a gender-responsive and participatory manner within the region. This included drawing on lessons learnt from implementing entities of the AF in the Fund’s processes and project implementation as well as readiness response for the anticipated flow of larger sums of climate finance from the GCF; and exchange experience on broader strategies to increase the flow of climate finance to complement direct access in the ECOWAS region.
Despite continued efforts to enhance the capacity of countries to access international climate financing, findings from the Workshop indicates:

The ability to meet the fiduciary standards of AF and GCF still remains a challenge to many member countries. There are seemingly unwillingness and difficulties of financing adaptation projects as well as balancing public and private interests to ensure that such projects benefit the most vulnerable.

That risk, perceived and potential remains eminent and there is need to apply various innovative tools to mitigate these risks.

The private sector is not yet fully motivated in financing adaptation. Creating the necessary appetite for finance adaptation by the private sector is imperative.

Create opportunities for paradigm shifts and divestments from further investments in brown projects to clean development.

**Effective National Coordination on Climate Finance: The Senegalese Experience**

Effective coordination amongst relevant players and actors is key factor to both the accreditation of an entity and in project implementation. Senegalese experience provides a good example of an effective collaboration between the NDA, the NIE and implementing Entity (IE). The Direction de l'Environnement et des Establishments Classés/ Directorate of Environment and Classified Settlements (DEEC) as NDA with the Centre de Suivi Ecologique (CSE) as the NIE and Environment and Development Action (ENDA), a civil society organization engaged in programming of climate finance worked together to demonstrate the importance of coordination amongst the various actors in a project cycle for effective governance and good regulatory oversight. This has enabled the mainstreaming and prioritization of the climate change agenda into national priorities. It has galvanized coordinated efforts to achieve accreditation and the design of pipeline of projects, which can be supported under these Funds. Though there were initial concerns, open and transparent engagement among the actors helped reduced such concerns thus strengthening and improving the collaboration. The institutional arrangement and set up also provide the necessary political anchor for the collaboration making it easier to succeed.

**Background: The Green Climate Fund (GCF)**

- The success of an entity in accreditation process is highly dependent on its institutional arrangements.
- The accreditation process is not an end in itself.
- In additional to securing accreditation by either the AF or GCF, there are other benefits of going through the process which some of which include the strengthening of the institutional capacities as well as enhancing the governance. Imbuing the very high-level fiduciary standards certainly increase the capacity of any entity, which can be deployed to access funds other than the AF and GCF.
- Prospective NIEs must demonstrate efficient administrative and accounting systems in place as well as well documented managerial, procedural and social policies.
- Commitment and resilience to the accreditation process could pay off. Initial negative comments from either Fund should not be discouraging. Lessons from the AF experience showed they had to provide a stand-alone gender policy even though they had mainstreamed gender in other previous projects.
- The accreditation process is essentially a learning curve, because the experience gained in the accreditation with one Fund can be leveraged for another.
- Accreditation is an important first step to accessing some international climate finance and the institutional capacity built through the process is an additional benefit for the affected entity.
- Despite the obvious benefits of the accreditation process, real challenges still exist for some entities that include:
  (i) Language barrier for non-English speaking countries;
  (ii) Lack of supporting documentation or other evidence, and the lack of guidelines on how to demonstrate eligibility;

**Key Messages**

1. Environmental and social safeguards policy (as well as requirements for a stand-alone gender policy as in the case of the GCF), presents a challenge, as some entities may not necessarily have this policy formalized, despite their compliance with these safeguards and policy requirements in the past.
2. That Gender-responsive climate financing and funding processes are considered as human rights issue and a necessity to ensure that scarce funding for climate projects are spent in the most effective and equitable way by taking into account the differentiated roles, contributions and capabilities of men and women in responding to climate change impacts and addressing mitigation challenges.
3. Appropriate tools and methods for ensuring that project design and implementation processes are gender-responsive at various levels is imperative. Critically, institutions must incorporate best practices of social, gender and environmental safeguards that stipulate gender equality, and ensure regular audits and independent evaluation of gender impacts of fund allocations.
4. The National Designated Authorities (NDAs) should equally ensure country coordination and outreach efforts that include countries' existing gender machinery.
5. National Implementing Entities (NIEs) must ensure active inclusion of women and gender civil society groups as executing entities directly involved in the implementation of projects.
6. Comprehensive information disclosure and provision in a gender-responsive way is important particularly in the use of language. Implementing entities to develop gender expertise and in-house capacity as well as setting up participatory monitoring mechanisms for continuous feedback during project implementation.
7. Peer-to-peer learning through which already accredited entities could mentor entities seeking accreditation is advocated and encouraged to imbibe lessons learnt.
8. The autonomy of implementing entities is necessary to ensure the facilitation of accreditation and effectiveness of the procurement process.
9. Funding requirements and projects should align with country’s priorities.
10. Funding institutions should enhance and boost the capacities of implementing entities to ensure effective project implementation.
11. The GCF presents opportunities to create innovative green finance products as well as opportunities to manage the risks related to climate change mitigation projects.