



CLIMATE FINANCE ADVISORY SERVICE

## SUMMARY BRIEFING

### 30th Green Climate Fund Board Meeting

4-7 October 2021

Dear Friend of the Climate Finance Advisory Service (CFAS),

This is the CFAS Summary Briefing. Produced at key meetings and negotiations by the CFAS expert team, the Summary Briefing tries to provide a concise, informative update on key discussions that have taken place at each meeting and give an overview of substantive points of action or progress. Please note that this is an independent summary by CFAS and not officially mandated by the GCF.

Previous daily briefings and other CFAS analyses are available on the CFAS website [www.cfas.info](http://www.cfas.info).

The CFAS Team

## Summary from 4-7 October 2021

From 4 to 7 October 2021, the Board of the Green Climate Fund (GCF) convened for its 30th meeting. Due to the ongoing challenges imposed by the global COVID-19 pandemic, the meeting was conducted once again in a virtual setting, focussing on procedural and administrative matters, as well as a couple of policy items, such as the Update of the Simplified Approval Process. Furthermore, the Board considered the approval of thirteen funding proposals (requesting US\$ 1,206.6 million of GCF funding) and the re-accreditation of four implementing entities.

### Opening of the meeting, adoption of the agenda and adoption of the report of the twenty-ninth meeting of the Board

The Co-Chairs, Mr. José de Luna Martínez (Mexico) and Mr. Jean-Christophe Donnellier (France) opened the meeting by welcoming all new and previous Board and Alternate Board Members, the GCF Secretariat, Active Observers and other stakeholders following the virtual Board meeting.

The first half of the first day of the meeting circulated around compliance with the Rules of Procedure (RoP). Several Board members stressed in an intense discussion that an objection to an intersessional decision was not handled properly according to the RoP. Some Board Members raised a Point of Order to stop further discussion on the agenda before that specific issue was sorted out. The Co-Chairs interpreted their action to be broadly consistent with the RoP and referred to their intensive consultations with the

objecting Board Members ahead of B.30. Thus they convened a constituency meeting break followed by a disapproval of the Point of Order by the Co-Chairs while promising to aim for a higher compliance with the RoP in upcoming meetings.

During the following discussion on the agenda, several Board Members stressed the need to better reflect the evaluation results of the Independent Evaluation Unit. The Co-Chairs explained that, at the request of Board members, three evaluations were added to the agenda, including the evaluation of the Simplified Approval Process (SAP), but that other urgent issues also needed to be prioritised. To move forward, the Co-Chairs proposed having a discussion on the topic of evaluations while discussing the evaluation of the SAP. However, not all Board members agreed with this proposal, considering that the topic they wanted to discuss was the whole cycle of policy evaluations and updates, and not a specific evaluation. Their proposal was to discuss how the Board should engage with evaluations in the future, and consider their outcomes and recommendations when making decisions on GCF policies. Several Board members agreed that the best way to move forward with this matter was to add a new agenda item, to discuss the Board's engagement and consideration of the results of evaluations in their decisions. Finally, agreement was reached and an agenda item was added, on matters related to evaluation functions, after which the agenda was adopted.

Following the discussion of the agenda, the Co-Chairs presented the report of B.29 and remarked that one comment was received ahead of B.30 and addressed. Thus they called for the adoption which was confirmed without any objections.

## Decisions proposed between the twenty-ninth and thirtieth meetings of the Board

Since B.29, the following four decisions have been adopted by the Board until 1st of October 2021:

- Guidelines to facilitate Board consideration of IRM reports on reconsideration requests, grievances or complaints
- Additional administrative budget for Phase I of the remedial activities addressing monitoring and evaluation gaps in the GCF portfolio
- Revisions to the Green Climate Fund's Environmental and Social Policy to reaffirm the Fund's commitment to addressing Sexual Exploitation, Sexual Abuse, and Sexual Harassment
- Accreditation of observer organizations

Additional four decisions have been proposed but objected thus they were transmitted to the Board for discussion.

- Tenth Report of the Green Climate Fund to the Conference of the Parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
- Updated accreditation framework
- Dates and venue of the thirty-first meeting of the Board
- Updated guidelines for the operation of Board committees

After a short summary of the decisions and related objections, the Co-Chair invited Board Members for comments on the objected items. The first up for discussion was the Report of the GCF to the COP. Before the discussion on the content took place, some Board members raised concerns about the sequence of events to address the raised objections. Again, this discussion focused on the adequate application of the RoP. The interpretation of the Secretariat, requested by the Co-Chairs, supported the statement that an error in the sequence of events was evident. Thus, the Co-Chairs acknowledged an error in submitting a revised version of the Report before the Board discussion took place which violates the RoP and therefore suspended the agenda item until the next day.

## Matters related to the Simplified Approval Process

With regards to the update of the Simplified Approval Process (SAP), the Board considered two items. First, they debated the results of the Independent Evaluation Unit (IEU) on the SAP, followed by the updated SAP policy.

### (a) Independent assessment of the GCF's Simplified Approval Process Pilot Scheme

The Independent Evaluation Unit (IEU) presented the key findings of their independent assessment of the SAP, which showed that the current SAP had not accelerated the process and had not fully operationalised post-approval simplification, while still requiring the same level of scrutiny as the standard approval process. The IEU presented its recommendations for further simplification and acceleration of the process, while the Secretariat presented its response to the assessment, largely agreeing with many of the IEU's recommendations.

The Board discussed the implications of the IEU review. Some Board members highlighted that this served as a good practical application of how the IEU recommendations could be operationalized and proposed to directly include several IEU suggestions in the SAP update decision text. One Board member complained that the comparison between the proposal approval process (PAP) for regular funding proposals to the SAP is not properly presenting the differences and advantages of the SAP while others highlighted the potential trade offs between extending the SAP to e.g. higher risk categories which might contradict the intention to simplify the documentation. Questions were also raised by Board members on how recommendations targeted at Small Island Developing States (SIDS) had been incorporated into the proposed policy, to which the Secretariat responded by pointing at specific changes, like the voluntary nature of concept notes, the proposed change in SAP eligibility and others, that responded to the specific issues of SIDS.

Finally the Board members acknowledged the item 9(a), also referring to the broad and lengthy consultations among many constituencies ahead of B.30.

### (b) Update of the Simplified Approval Process

For the policy decision on the updated SAP, the Board and the Co-Chairs presented several potential options for simplification and expansion, including an approval of SAP proposals between Board meetings, non-mandatory submission of concept notes, an expansion of SAP activities to Environmental and Social Safeguards (ESS) risk category B or an increase of the eligible GCF SAP funding of up to US\$ 50 million.

While the majority of Board members agreed to some of the proposed adjustments, e.g. non-mandatory submissions of concept notes or an increase of the eligible GCF SAP funding of up to US\$ 20 million, there was dissent on the achieved simplifications in the approval cycle. One Board member objected to the current SAP update due to lacking simplification during the approval cycle, including pre- and post-approval, while another Board member objected to the option of approving SAP proposals between Board meetings. The Civil Society Observer also cautioned against increasing the ESS category and emphasized the need to guarantee sufficient information disclosure and options for comments from CSOs if an approval between Board Meetings is implemented. Further she stressed that adequate NDA, CSO and local community engagement should be required for the SAP.

The suggestion of applying a stepwise approach where a basic update of the SAP is approved at B.30 while further simplifications can be included at a later stage was rejected. Therefore, despite the wish of one Board member to apply for voting on the policy, the Co-Chairs finally deferred a decision on the Update of the SAP to the next GCF Board meeting.

## Work programmes and budgets of the Independent Units for 2022

As usual, the work programmes and budgets of the independent units were presented to the Board for approval.

The first work programme and budget to be presented to the Board were those of the **Independent Redress Mechanism (IRM)**. The proposed budget showed an increase, with two budget lines accounting for most of the increase: additional staff members and promotion of existing staff and shared costs' allocation.

Board members praised the work of the independent units and called for their budgets' approval. Some Board members asked for clarification as to why the budget for the independent Technical Advisory Panel (iTAP) was not included with all the other independent units. The Secretariat clarified that the iTAP is a panel, and not a unit, so their budget is included separately. Other members inquired as to why the IRM was not using their unused budget from the previous year to cover some of the new expenses. It was clarified that budgets are approved for one year, and that all savings are returned to the Fund at the end of each year.

After these short discussions, the budget and work programme of the IRM were approved.

The second work programme and budget to be presented to the Board were those of the **Independent Integrity Unit (IIU)**. During their presentation, the Head of the IIU highlighted a decline in cases dealt with by the unit.

Board members praised this decline in cases, and many welcomed the IIU's investigations into cases of sexual exploitation, abuse and harassment. Given the reduction in cases, some Board members asked if the IIU still expected to conduct a planned study on the linkages between abuse of authority and remedial measures. The IIU replied that they would engage with the Secretariat to determine if this study was still pertinent or if they could conduct a study focused on the causes of the decrease in cases brought to the IIU.

After these short discussions, the budget and work programme of the IIU were approved.

The last work programme and budget to be presented to the Board were those of the **Independent Evaluation Unit (IEU)**. The Head of the IEU presented the main pillars of its programme for 2022 and a small increase in its budget.

Some Board members raised the issue of the timing of the IEU's work programme, especially the preparation of the Second Performance Review (SPR), whose final version was not expected until B.34 in 2023. Board members considered this review very important to inform the GCF's second replenishment (GCF-2) and suggested accelerating its timeline, to have it ready by the end of 2022 if possible. However, not all Board members agreed that the SPR was relevant for the second replenishment, arguing that its role is to inform the Board as a whole, and not the countries that contribute funding to the GCF. The IEU for its part explained that the timeline was reviewed and developed closely with the Secretariat, and with the teams working on programming and replenishment. They considered that moving forward the SPR would be unfeasible and unrealistic, and expose the IEU's team to a lot of pressure.

Some additional questions about the non-inclusion of the Learning-Oriented Real-Time Impact Assessment (LORTA) and the purpose of the Evaluation on the Effectiveness and Relevance of the GCF in African States were raised and answered by the IEU. However, since no consensus was reached on the timing of the SPR, the item was suspended. After adding an additional paragraph to the decision, requesting the IEU to deliver the outputs from the SPR in a timely manner to inform the review of the GCF Strategic Plan, the decision was finally adopted.

## Work programme of the GCF Secretariat and administrative budget for 2022

As usual, the GCF Secretariat presented the work programme for the upcoming year (in this case 2022) and the proposed administrative budget of the Secretariat, the Board and Trustee. While the 2022 work programme builds on many of the streams of work delivered under the Secretariat's 2021 programme and budget, it does so within the significant context of being the first Secretariat work programme developed after the Board's endorsement of the GCF Updated Strategic Plan for 2020-2023 (USP), which established new programming goals, strategic and institutional priorities for the first replenishment period (GCF-1). The six overall priorities of the work programme maintain significant

continuity with the 2021 priorities, evolved in light of the USP: (i) Supporting origination of country-driven, paradigm-shifting investments and enhancing direct access; (ii) Project development and appraisal to build a USP-aligned, impactful GCF portfolio; (iii) Management of portfolio implementation for results and knowledge; (iv) Supporting the Board and consolidation of GCF policy and governance frameworks; (v) Facilitating access and accelerating implementation by optimizing operational efficiency, effectiveness and transparency; and (vi) Consolidating institutional capacity, culture and performance in preparation for the GCF second replenishment.

The Board welcomed the presentation and thanked the Secretariat for their efforts and tireless work. Many Board members were pleased with the focus to align the portfolio with programming targets of USP, such as carrying on with private sector engagement and focussing on additional sources for adaptation. Some members highlighted that they would like to see increased efforts by the GCF Secretariat to identify areas where the GCF can support countries on the implementation of Article 2.1c of the Paris Agreement. Other members raised concerns about recruitment and retention at the GCF Secretariat and stressed the need to avoid overreliance on consultants. It was also pointed out that the GCF seems to have a systemic problem in prioritizing direct access proposals and struggles to support the local private sector and micro, small and medium enterprises (MSMEs). Last but not least, it was suggested to update the GCF staff salary scales, as this had not happened in recent years.

After reviewing the draft to include text on increasing the funding channeled through DAEs and support to the local private sector, through technical assistance and capacity development; contingency budget and updates to the Fund's salary scale and benefits, the decision was finally approved.

## Consideration of Funding Proposals

The Board considered thirteen funding proposals, requesting a total of US\$ 1,206.6 million of GCF funding, and representing a total value of US\$ 4,001.3 million when taking co-financing into account. Of the thirteen funding proposals considered, nine were public sector proposals, whereas four were private sector proposals. No proposals under the Simplified Approval Process (SAP) were considered. With the approval of these thirteen funding proposals, the total number of projects and programmes funded by the GCF would reach 190, with a total GCF funding amount of US\$ 10 billion and a total value of US\$ 37.2 billion when including co-financing.

The Secretariat clarified that this cycle included the first rolling review. Two batches of projects were presented, but none of the funding proposals from the first batch were endorsed by independent Technical Advisory Panel (iTAP), while thirteen out of fourteen were endorsed from the second batch, 6 from Direct Access entities (DAEs) and seven from International Access Entities (IAEs). These funding proposals included large private sector adaptation programmes that were seen to move the GCF to the achievement of its target of a balance between adaptation and mitigation, as well as mobilizing private finance. A large share of the funding also targeted ecosystems.

Many Board members praised the work of the Secretariat and iTAP and welcomed the stronger engagement of the private sector, the higher allocation to adaptation and to DAEs, as well as the focus on ecosystems. While also highlighting the lack of conflict analysis and insisting on the need for the GCF to improve transparency by publishing documents related to the funding proposals, as well as in the procurement processes of its funded activities. Some Board members were concerned about the high share of loans and insisted that the implementation of the UNFCCC objectives should not represent an additional burden to developing countries. Additionally, some Board members wanted to know what would happen to those proposals not endorsed by iTAP and therefore not presented to the Board. To this question, the Secretariat replied that these proposals would go back to the review cycle and continue to be assessed and presented at a future meeting, if appropriate. Finally, Board members requested that the Secretariat disaggregate their data further, to better reflect the share of funding going to Small Island Developing States (SIDS). Board members also voiced their concern at the number of proposals endorsed by iTAP with conditions, especially those presented by DAEs, arguing

that these conditions represented unnecessary additional burdens that could delay implementation of the approved activities. They argued that some of these conditions were redundant and had already been or could be addressed through the already planned activities; and inquired as to whether these conditions were consistent with GCF policy, with some arguing that specific conditions added to a project potentially contradicted the criteria of country ownership. A point of order was raised on the timing of Active Observer's (AOs) participation. The General Council clarified that for this participation to be meaningful, AOs should be allowed to speak before approval of any item, otherwise the subject would be moot.

To the issue of conditions, iTAP replied that conditions are added to raise the quality of funding proposals, so that they meet GCF standards, and often the choice is between adding conditions or not endorsing the proposal. Accredited Entities were brought to the discussions, and clarified that they had agreed to the conditions and considered them feasible, but some Board members argued that AEs are often presented with a take-it or leave-it decision, which they considered the wrong approach. They insisted that conditions should either be taken out or made contingent to second disbursements, to avoid delays in implementation.

Board members discussed conditions on a case by case basis, with many disagreements, which delayed the approval of some of the funding proposals. Discussions had to be taken further, and outside of the Board meeting, with the creation of a small group of Board members.

Regarding individual funding proposals, one Board member opposed FP174, but further consultations could sort out the issues and led to adoption of the proposal. Also FP177 was objected to since several Board members had concerns whether the intended cooling refrigerants were in line with the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer. Finally the Board agreed to adopt the proposal with additional conditions.

FP180 and FP181 represented two medium-scale funding proposals for private adaptation Funds that led to contentious discussion among Board members and observers. While the CSO observer expressed concerns on transparency, sufficient anti-corruption policies, adequate benefits for local communities, insufficient gender action plans and general doubts on the impacts of the projects due to the characteristic nature of "Investment Funds" for adaptation activities, the private observer and some Board members welcomed the innovative nature to mobilize private capital for adaptation and related technologies. Regarding FP180, some Board members had serious concerns on country ownership due to a lack of some No-Objection Letters from involved countries that could finally be sorted out. Thus, ultimately both FP180 and FP181 were adopted by the Board.

Overall, the Board approved all thirteen funding proposals:

- **FP169:** *Climate change adaptation solutions for Local Authorities in the Federated States of Micronesia*; Pacific Community; Micronesia (Federated States of); US\$ 16.6 million in GCF funding;
- **FP170:** *Enhancing climate resilience in Thailand through effective water management and sustainable agriculture*; United Nations Development Programme (UNDP); Thailand; US\$ 17.5 million in GCF funding;
- **FP171:** *Enhancing Early Warning Systems to build greater resilience to hydro-meteorological hazards in Timor-Leste*; United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP); Timor-Leste; US\$ 21 million in GCF funding;
- **FP172:** *Mitigating GHG emission through modern, efficient and climate friendly clean cooking solutions (CCS)*; Alternative Energy Promotion Centre (AEPC); Nepal; US\$ 21.1 million in GCF funding;
- **FP173:** *The Amazon Bioeconomy Fund: Unlocking private capital by valuing bioeconomy products and services with climate mitigation and adaptation results in the Amazon*; Inter-American Development Bank (IDB); Brazil, Colombia, Ecuador, Guyana, Peru, Suriname; US\$ 279 million in GCF funding;
- **FP174:** *Ecosystem-based Adaptation to increase climate resilience in the Central American Dry Corridor and the Arid Zones of the Dominican Republic*; Central American Bank for Economic Integration (CABEI); Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua, Panama; US\$ 174.3 million in GCF

- funding;
- **FP175:** *Enhancing community resilience and water security in the Upper Athi River Catchment Area*; National Environment Management Authority (NEMA); Kenya; US\$ 9.5 million in GCF funding;
  - **FP176:** *Hydro-agricultural development with smart agriculture practices resilient to climate change in Niger*; Banque Ouest Africaine de Développement (BOAD); Niger; US\$ 35.5 million in GCF funding;
  - **FP177:** *Cooling Facility*; World Bank; Bangladesh, El Salvador, Kenya, Malawi, North Macedonia, Panama, Sao Tome and Principe, Somalia, Sri Lanka; US\$ 157 million in GCF funding;
  - **FP178:** *Desert to Power G5 Sahel Facility*; African Development Bank (AfDB); Burkina Faso, Chad, Mali, Mauritania, Niger; US\$ 150 million in GCF funding;
  - **FP179:** *Tanzania Agriculture Climate Adaptation Technology Deployment Programme (TACATDP)*; CRDB Bank PLC; Tanzania; US\$ 100 million in GCF funding;
  - **FP180:** *Global Fund for Coral Reefs Investment Window*; Pegasus Capital Advisors; Bahamas, Belize, Brazil, Colombia, Comoros, Ecuador, Fiji, Guatemala, Indonesia, Jamaica, Jordan, Mexico, Mozambique, Panama, Philippines, Seychelles, Sri Lanka; US\$ 125 million in GCF funding;
  - **FP181:** *CRAFT - Catalytic Capital for First Private Investment Fund for Adaptation Technologies in Developing Countries*; Pegasus Capital Advisors; Bahamas, Brazil, Mexico, Rwanda, South Africa, Trinidad and Tobago; US\$ 100 million in GCF funding.

## Consideration of Accreditation Proposals

The Secretariat presented the status of the pipeline of entities currently seeking accreditation, as of 31 July 2021. Accordingly, 125 entities were seeking accreditation at the moment of which 114 were in Stage I and 11 in Stage II. Up until now, 113 entities have already completed accreditation (57% Direct Access Entities (DAEs)) of which 94 are in Stage III (legal agreements signed, 80 with effective legal agreement). The Secretariat also reported on some improvements made to the (re-)accreditation process itself, namely the successful launch of the Digital Accreditation Platform (DAP). Through this platform, Accredited Entities (AEs) can already apply for re-accreditation and submit reports. In addition, the Secretariat has also provided training and workshops on re-accreditation and supported National Designated Authorities (NDAs) in identifying DAEs and partner AEs for programming and Country Programme Guidance.

For B.30, no new entities were presented seeking accreditation. Nevertheless, the Board was invited to consider the re-accreditation of four implementing entities, namely:

- **RAPL008:** *Environmental Investment Fund (EIF)*; direct access; Namibia
- **RAPL024:** *Development Bank of South Africa (DBSA)*; direct access; South Africa
- **RAPL031:** *International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN)*; international access
- **RAPL007:** *United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)*; international access

Following the presentation by the Secretariat, the Board quickly approved the re-accreditation of Environmental Investment Fund (EIF), International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) and the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). Concerning the re-accreditation of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), conditions were added to the decision that satisfied all Board members, therefore the decision was approved.

The re-accreditation of the Development Bank of South Africa (DBSA) was discussed at length without finding consensus among Board members. Some Board members wanted to attach conditions to the re-accreditation of DBSA. Inter alia, the DBSA was asked to provide evidence of the adoption and public announcement of a net-zero GHG emissions target across all its overall investment and loan portfolio by no later than 2050, as well as

the intermediate target in this regard for 2030. Furthermore, DBSA was asked to include a written progress report to demonstrate steps that have been taken to shift overall investment and loan portfolio away from carbon intensive activities into its annual self-assessment and mid-term reports required by the GCF Monitoring and Accountability Framework. Although the DBSA agreed to such conditions, as stated by the GCF Secretariat, Several Board members objected to the inclusion of such conditions, stating this was going too far and against the concept of common but differentiated responsibilities applied under the UNFCCC process. Furthermore, they expressed concerns about missing GCF policies that warrant such conditions. In addition, concerns were raised on transparency and equity, in particular in the context of individual Board members forwarding their preferred conditions to the Secretariat without prior consultation with the Board.

Since after further consultation between Board members consensus could not be reached, the Co-Chairs decided to defer a decision on the re-accreditation of DBSA to a decision in-between Board meetings.

## Review of the capabilities of the GCF to deliver increased programming and implementation over 2020–2023 in line with the updated Strategic Plan

Executive Director Yannick Glemarec presented a document presenting a review of the Secretariat's capabilities to deliver increased programming and implementation over 2020-23 in line with ambitions of the GCF updated Strategic Plan (USP), endorsed by the Board at its twenty-seventh meeting. In reviewing the Secretariat's capabilities, the document addresses two other mandates established in the USP to: (i) identify operational bottlenecks and examine the most effective ways to address these to speed up access, and (ii) undertake a cost-benefit assessment of needs and options for establishing a GCF regional presence. The Secretariat contracted an external firm, Dalberg Global Development Advisers, to conduct the review. The exercise included a review of eight key business processes to identify operational bottlenecks and associated efficiency and effectiveness reforms, an analysis of how regional presence options could help address bottlenecks and enhance the overall performance of the Fund, and modelling of Secretariat workload and capacity requirements to deliver the USP. Based on the findings, the paper recommends that to successfully manage the expected USD 15 billion GCF portfolio, the Secretariat pursue ongoing efficiency measures, and the Board consider agreeing a staged scale-up of Secretariat staff headcount.

For increasing the headcount, two scenarios were presented:

1. **Scenario 1:** Building staff headcount gradually over 2022 and 2023 in alignment with a 300 and 350 headcount cap; or
2. **Scenario 2:** Taking only the initial step of building staff headcount over 2022 in alignment with a 300 headcount cap, with staffing for 2023 to be determined as part of the 2023 budgeting process.

On regional GCF presence, the suggestion is the establishment of three to four GCF regional offices of up to 6-7 staff each, focused on upstream origination and project development support with on ground-presence to monitor project implementation and integrity risks; and liaison offices to support the GCF replenishments, contributor accountability and outreach.

Board members welcomed the presentation of the document. Many Board members thought positively of the option to establish regional GCF offices, in order to reduce some of the barriers that some countries and regions have in liaising with the GCF, such as language barriers and diverging time zones. Many Board members highlighted that they would like to see further feasibility assessment by the Secretariat in this regard.

In terms of increasing the capacity of the GCF Secretariat, many Board members stressed the need for the GCF to be able to fulfill its ambitious mandate set out in the Fund's Updated Strategic Plan and the urgent need to ensure a good work-life balance for GCF



staff. Many expressed their concern related to the increased workload for GCF staff and the dire need to increase staffing. Regarding the two optional scenarios, Board members expressed a slight preference for scenario 1, hence increasing staff headcount gradually over the years 2022 and 2023.

After some further consultations, a revised version of the document was again discussed by the Board. The Secretariat had incorporated a set of changes overnight that were proposed by the Board. After some joint and constructive final polishing of the formulations to improve and promote geographical and gender balance of the staff structure, the Board was able to approve the decision.

## Dates and venues of upcoming meetings of the Board

As the constituencies were unable to agree on an additional meeting for 2021, the Co-Chairs and the Secretariat suggested having four meetings in 2022. This suggestion was briefly debated by the Board. Ultimately, the Board decided that the 31st meeting of the Board would take place from 7 to 10 February 2022 in Songdo, Republic of Korea, should the COVID-19 pandemic allow for an in person meeting. The dates of the other three GCF meetings in May, June and October 2022 were agreed on a tentative basis, to be confirmed at subsequent meetings.

**[www.cfas.info](http://www.cfas.info)**



**Copyright © 2021 Germanwatch e.V., All rights reserved.**