



GEF CSO Network

Statement on Operational Improvements for LDCF & SCCF

[Presentation by GEF Secretariat GEF/LDCF.SCCF/02/SM2/01](#)

Oct 10, 2025

The GEF CSO Network welcomes the proposed Operational Improvements for the LDCF and SCCF.

We have some concerns about the current low level of national CSO engagement in LDCF/SCCF execution. According to the paper, there were only 2 national CSOs out of 162 executing agencies (less than 2%). This is not in line with the clear guidance from UNFCCC COP26 that called for *GEF to enhance the role of national agencies and CSOs as executing agencies in order to enhance country ownership of projects and programmes*.

What are the root causes of the low level of engagement of national CSOs in execution of LDCF/SCCF? As mentioned this morning, this needs to be addressed the Mini OPS to be conducted by IEO as well as by the Secretariat.

We strongly support the PrIA Option 1: Capacity Building Programme, but request that it does not confine itself only to organisations that have a proven track record as executing entities of GEF projects. Given the clear guidance from UNFCCC to enhance the engagement of national CSOs as executing agencies of GEF/LDCF/SCCF Projects; and the low level of current engagement, there is a need to enhance the capacity of CSOs that have not yet had the opportunity to execute GEF projects – so that they can in future execute LDCF/SCCF and GEF projects.

Similarly, does the requirement for prior full accreditation with GCF or AF in Para 180 apply for the capacity building under option1? This does not seem logical as we understand option 1 will not lead to designation as Implementing Agencies but only as executing partners.

Can criteria 5 in Para 163 for selection as candidate organisations for capacity building on “*demonstrated country ownership through improved project design process*” be clarified?

With regard to Whole-of-Society and the IEO finding that insufficient engagement of CSO, IPLC and youth is affecting sustainability - we encourage that the next version of the document includes a clear mechanism or process to ensure a Whole of Society approach and enhance monitoring and reporting on this.

We also call for the establishment of a dedicated window for community-based adaptation for engagement of CSOs, IPLC, Women and youth in direct action building on the success of the SGP under the GEF Trust Fund. Alternatively, LDCF or SCCF funds could be channeled through the existing GEF SGP mechanism for community-based adaptation.

With regard to Enhancement of LDC and SIDS representation in the governing bodies -we would like to suggest initial action to allow additional observers from LDC and SIDS to the LDCF/SCCF Council which may not need any change to the GEF instrument.

With regard to Paragraph 219 there is an inconsistency in regards to the reference to the PIF and the proposal to move to a unified one step approval process. Secondly, we urge that at least 2 of the core indicators are included in the project concept stage as the beneficiary indicator will apply to all projects. We also would like sub indicators on CSO, IPLC and youth engagement. Finally, the last sentence is hanging.

Overall, we are still concerned about access procedures being still complex and slow. We encourage the Secretariat and agencies to make them simpler and faster, with clear requirements for engagement of national and community partners.