

TECHNICAL NOTE
Recommendations for the Next Phase of the GCFF

June 9, 2021

Abbreviations and Acronyms

BC	Benefitting Country
CU	Coordination Unit
EBRD	European Bank for Reconstruction and Development
EIB	European Investment Bank
GCFE	Global Concessional Financing Facility
IE	Independent Evaluation
IOM	International Organization for Migration
ISA	Implementation Support Agency
IsDB	Islamic Development Bank
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MDB	Multilateral Development Bank
MIC	Middle-income Country
PPG	Private Portfolio Guarantee
PSOs	Public Sector Operations
RF	Results Framework
RM	Risk Matrix
SC	Steering Committee
UN	United Nations
UNHCR	United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees

Table of Contents

Abbreviations and Acronyms	2
Section 1: Background	4
Section 2: Context	4
Section 3: Proposals	6
<i>Proposal 1: Reinforcing the Focus on Results</i>	6
<i>Proposal 2: Improving the Application Review Process</i>	8
<i>Proposal 3: Strengthening the Role of the development partners and UNHCR</i>	8
<i>Proposal 4: Enhancing Country-level Coordination</i>	9
<i>Proposal 5: Optimizing Reporting and Outreach</i>	10
<i>Proposal 6: Introducing a Risk Matrix</i>	11
Section 4: Items raised by the Steering Committee membership	12
Annex: Recommendations of the Final Report of the Independent Evaluation.....	15

Section 1: Background

The GCFF was established in 2016 to provide concessional financing to support middle-income countries (MICs) that provide a global public good by hosting large numbers of refugees. The Facility is a partnership initially sponsored by the World Bank, the United Nations, and the Islamic Development Bank Group to enable eligible MICs to borrow at concessional rates for MDB projects (including EBRD, EIB, IBRD and IsDB) that benefit both refugees and host communities. It does so by using donor contributions to effectively reduce the cost of MDB loans for these projects to concessional (or IDA-like) levels. Doing so helps host countries more affordably address a refugee influx and helps overcome the disincentive that often discourages host governments from using scarce development resources for the benefit of non-nationals.

Initially designed as a coordinated response by the international community to the Syrian refugee crisis, the GCFF expanded to the global level to help MICs address refugee crises wherever they occur. Currently it counts four benefitting countries – Jordan, Lebanon and, since 2019, Colombia and Ecuador. Overall, the GCFF helps bridge the gap between humanitarian and development assistance and enhances the coordination between the UN, donors, multilateral development banks, and benefitting (hosting) countries. The GCFF is currently supported by Canada, Denmark, the European Commission, Germany, Japan, Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, the United Kingdom, and the United States, all part of the GCFF Steering Committee.

To date, the GCFF has approved US\$658 million in concessional amounts, which, due to the leveraging factor of the Facility, has unlocked more than US\$4.8 billion in concessional financing for development projects aiming to improve the lives of refugees and their host communities. Supported projects cut across a range of sectors¹, including job-creation, expanding vital public services (such as health and education), and developing sustainable infrastructure.

Section 2: Context

In 2020, the GCFF commissioned the firm Ipsos MORI to carry out an independent evaluation of the GCFF after its first four years of operation. The independent evaluation was to inform discussions about the Facility’s potential extension and to identify improvements to its operations to maximize impact in future years. The evaluation was both **retrospective** – evaluating GCFF’s performance and impact against its stated objectives, and assessing its effectiveness and efficiency –, **and forward looking** – recommending potential adjustments to enhance development impact based on identified strengths and lessons learned.

¹ For more information on projects, please see the latest GCFF Annual Report, available at: https://globalcff.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/11/GCFF_Annual-Report_19-20_FINAL_DIGITAL_Singlepgs.pdf

The independent evaluation recognized that the GCFF has been successful in achieving its targets. It has also highlighted that GCFF funding has had an impact on maintaining the political will to support refugees and maintain the protection space, in addition to providing much needed fiscal support to hosting countries. Monitoring of the GCFF's targets at Facility level was found to be efficient and effective, as has been fundraising and the process of adding new Benefiting Countries (BCs). The project portfolio was found to be relevant and the process for selecting funded projects was found to be effective. A key strength of the program was utilizing existing Implementation Support Agency (ISA) policies and procedures, thus reducing costs of managing the loans. The GCFF's governance and management structures were also largely considered effective. Finally, the independent evaluation found that the GCFF has been successful in responding to the critical financing needs of BCs, as was the concessional finance model with regard to meeting BCs financial needs.

The final report of the independent evaluation presented a number of recommendations (see Annex) in order to inform and enhance the next phase of the GCFF. The main findings showed that the GCFF would benefit from a stronger focus on results, including a new Results Framework (RF) that would allow for the aggregation of results. The report also found that there was scope for improvement with regards to information sharing and reporting on projects and results, including an improved and more informative GCFF website. The report recommended improved stakeholder coordination and collaboration at the national level, including with UNHCR. The report also recommended an improved funding application process, with enhanced sharing of information on the project pipeline and increased sharing of documents.

The report and its findings were presented at the Steering Committee (SC) meeting on April 26, 2021, during which the SC tasked the Coordination Unit (CU) with conducting stakeholder consultations in order to discuss the recommendations and the path forward for the GCFF. In May 2021, the Coordination Unit conducted stakeholder consultations with Benefiting Countries, Implementing Support Agencies and partners, as well as with Supporting Countries². This Technical Paper outlines the proposals of the CU based on the recommendations of the independent evaluation and the subsequent stakeholder consultations. These proposals are to be shared with the Steering Committee for endorsement at the next SC meeting in June 2021. In line with the guidance from that meeting, the CU will share the final technical note with the SC. The note will inform the relevant amendments to the Operations Manual (OM) that will be submitted to the Steering Committee for approval before the end of the calendar year.

² Stakeholder consultations with ISAs and partners were conducted on May 18, with BCs on May 18, and with Supporting Countries on May 19.

Section 3: Proposals

Proposal 1: Reinforcing the Focus on Results

The final report of the independent evaluation put forward a number of recommendations focusing on monitoring and reporting. The recommendations to improve M&E and the GCFE Results Framework received strong support from SC members. In order to enhance GCFE monitoring and evaluation, the CU proposes the following:

- *Revise the GCFE theory of change and fund-level results framework*

As a first step, a theory of change for the GCFE will be developed, which will form the foundation for a new fund-level results framework. The theory of change will seek to demonstrate the causal pathways between GCFE support, project-level results, and impact on the policy environment and international coordination. The theory of change presented in the independent evaluation provides a useful starting point and will be refined further in consultation with ISAs.

A new fund-level results framework will be developed in alignment with the theory of change. The new results framework will primarily reflect fund-level achievements but will also include aggregated project-level indicators. The new fund results framework will need to be:

- 1) *Outcome oriented*, demonstrating progress toward achieving fund objectives and the impact of the GCFE on refugees, host communities, and relevant policies.
- 2) *Two-tiered* to reflect both Fund-level results and key, aggregated project-level results.
- 3) *Reflective of both quantitative and qualitative dimensions*, given the GCFE's contribution to supporting the design or implementation of policies affecting refugees and host communities.
- 4) *Flexible* to allow for aggregation of results from different ISAs that use their own M&E systems, as well as application to different product types (e.g. investment project financing, development policy financing, etc.).

Indicators for the new results framework will be informed by consultations with ISAs and UNHCR, comparable fund-level results frameworks (for example, those of World Bank Umbrella Trust Funds that likewise report both fund and aggregate project results), and the results measurement system for IDA19, in particular Tier 2 indicators that report results aggregated from all IDA19 operations. Initial recommendations for the new results framework are:

- *Fund-level indicators/measures*: The first three indicators in the current results framework will be carried forward since they reflect core objectives of the Facility and will allow to track progress since GCFE inception. The fourth indicator on coordination will be reconsidered and may be revised to reflect in-country consultations (in line with proposal 4). Additional indicator(s) will be considered pertaining to other aspects of GCFE beyond funding contributions and disbursements, such as improved coordination across the humanitarian-development nexus, satisfactory project performance, leveraging ratio of GCFE financing, and contributions to knowledge sharing and policy discussions.

- *Aggregated project-level indicators/ measures:* The fund-level results framework will include indicators related to impact on refugees and host communities, with results aggregated from supported projects. This aggregate view is not included in the current results framework and so this will be an important addition to showcase the fund's overall impact. New indicators expected to be included in the fund-level reporting include *Direct project refugee beneficiaries (number), of which female (percentage)* and *Direct project host community population beneficiaries (number), of which female (percentage)*. In addition, a qualitative indicator or measure(s) related to policy dimensions supported through GCFE projects could also be included in the results framework for aggregation across projects.

The CU will report results achieved, including quantitative and qualitative, on an annual basis through the annual report. Many aspects of success for the GCFE are not easily measured in or captured by quantitative indicators, and project-level achievements cannot always be aggregated at the fund-level, so qualitative reporting will be important to fully reflect the multidimensional nature of the GCFE.

- *Prepare recommended project-level results indicators linked to fund-level indicators*

At the project level, each operation has its own tailored results framework that is developed and implemented by the ISA, and the ISAs maintain responsibility for monitoring and reporting results. Given the challenges of standardizing indicators and measurements across projects, sectors, and ISAs, a fixed set of project-level indicators will not be required. However, the menu of recommended project-level indicators in the Operations Manual will be reviewed and revised in line with the revised fund-level indicators. Project teams will be encouraged to use or adapt one or more of the indicators in their project results frameworks whenever possible to facilitate aggregation and comparability of results. The current list of recommended indicators will be reviewed in consultation with ISAs to identify what is and is not working and learn from each other's best practices and experiences. The updated menu of recommended indicators will also draw from the M&E frameworks of current and pipeline GCFE projects, the IDA19 results measurement system, and the Refugee Policy Review Framework which was elaborated in partnership with UNHCR and can inform relevant indicators related to the policy environment (for example, *Policies introduced or changed that advance socio-economic inclusion or development of refugees*). Project teams will also be advised to disaggregate all relevant indicators by gender and by refugee and host beneficiaries wherever possible. Even with the same indicators, different projects and ISAs may have different measurement approaches that complicate aggregation efforts. The methodology used for the IDA19 results measurement system may be useful in this regard, given its similar need to aggregate results from disparate projects and countries with varying timelines and its established approach for quality assurance and validation.

- *Update the Operations Manual and provide guidance to ISA teams*

The Operations Manual will be revised to reflect the updated theory of change, fund-level results framework, and menu of recommended project-level indicators. Guidance for project teams on results measurement and M&E will be developed, including the definitions and measurement approaches for the mandatory and recommended indicators to support consistency of reporting and, in turn, aggregation. The guidance will incorporate experiences and best practices from past and current GCFE projects and from ISAs to provide practical case studies of designing and implementing M&E systems. It will also be informed by the IDA19 Window for Host Communities and Refugees, which includes guidelines related to results reporting. Given GCFE's engagement when projects are still in preparation, this additional guidance will support improved project design and development of appropriate and robust project-level M&E systems.

Proposal 2: Improving the Application Review Process

In line with the findings of the independent evaluation and subsequent stakeholder consultations, the Steering Committee members highlighted to the CU the need to see the project pipeline at an earlier stage, with more documents shared and more information provided by BCs during SC meetings. The 14-day review period was also discussed during the stakeholder consultations and it was agreed by all stakeholders that this review period should be maintained, as it offers a balance between the ability to be responsive and the necessary review period needed by SC members to assess the underlying operations. Based on the above considerations, the stakeholders supported the following proposals by the CU:

- *The OM will codify the practice of presenting the pipeline of projects planned to be submitted to the SC as early as possible in the project preparation process to give the SC an opportunity to ask questions and provide early feedback. This will also entail including on the project dashboard links to any public documents available during preparation.*
- *The CU will include as a standing agenda item at each (regular) SC meeting (and, if relevant, at intersessional meetings of the SC) an update by ISAs/BCs on the pipeline.*
- *More time will be provided at SC meetings to BCs to formally present the project pipeline*
- *The 14-day review period will be maintained.*

Proposal 3: Strengthening the Role of the development partners and UNHCR

Partners play a key role under the GCFE framework, informing the eligibility process, providing inputs to the SC policy discussions, and to country level consultations. Most notably, on forced displacement, the UNHCR provides its unique expertise and experience. As an observer, the UNHCR provides important feedback on the nature and magnitude of refugee situations in Benefiting Countries. One such example is the letter sent by the Assistant High Commissioner to characterize the Venezuela crisis, in October 2018.

The World Bank partnership with UNHCR is multi-faceted and includes UNHCR's role in the assessment of the adequacy of the refugee protection framework, including under the GCFE (in line with Article 9b³ of the Operations Manual). The final report of the IE recommended enhancing the use of UNHCR's data and expertise on refugee protection and to introduce on-going commitments by Benefitting Countries' to maintain an adequate refugee protection framework.

Consultations highlighted the importance of UNHCR and other partners that are on the ground (e.g., the IOM in the Latin America and the Caribbean region). Engaging with partners improves predictability and strengthens the quality of project reviews. The unique expertise of UNHCR can be leveraged to identify potential future risks and opportunities for improving the protection framework in a given country. Consultations and coordination should be grounded in the country context and led by the BC and ISA teams working to develop those projects and, as relevant, leverage existing structures, based on what is beneficial to the project per the specificities and needs of the situation. It should also be noted that some BCs may take a holistic approach towards vulnerable populations, regardless of a legally recognized refugee status. For example, the policies in Jordan target all Syrians, regardless of whether they are registered as refugees and how long they have been in the country, and Colombia announced a series of progressive pro-refugee policies in February 2021.

In light of the above, the following is proposed:

- *Upon a country being deemed eligible, the UNHCR will be invited to share with the SC an assessment that covers both the refugee protection framework and forward-looking assessment of opportunities and risks. The CU will work with UNHCR to design the appropriate format. It is expected to draw upon good practices of both the Refugee Protection Assessment (RPA) and the Refugee Policy Review Framework (RPRF) which are used under IDA. The SC is entitled to ask for country updates when it deems them necessary.*
- *UNHCR and other development partners will be systematically invited to ad hoc country-level meetings. In-country consultations, including with the UNHCR and other partners, will be systematically detailed and documented in the Funding Request.*
- *UNHCR will be invited by the Steering Committee to co-organize an annual virtual workshop with SC members and partners to present and discuss international best practices on refugee policies.*

Proposal 4: Enhancing Country-level Coordination

The IE recommendation on enhanced country-level coordination was broadly supported by GCFE stakeholders. The ISAs proposed implementing this recommendation by leveraging existing structures at country level. The main rationale is to avoid creating additional channels for dialogue that are not well grounded into country frameworks and which are disconnected from the GCFE Steering Committee, which should remain the sole decision-making body. Projects should be

³ Article 9b outlines the commitment to pro-refugee policies required by Benefitting Countries.

presented upstream and supporting countries and partners should be engaged from the start. In order to enhance country-level coordination, the stakeholders supported the following proposals:

- *In partnership and coordination with the relevant Benefitting Country, the CU will plan country-level meetings on a regular basis throughout the year depending on the need for each country or at the request of SC members. The country-level meetings will be subsequently reported on at the SC meetings.*
- *Country-level coordination will be implemented by leveraging existing structures at respective country level.*
- *Country-level meetings should notably be used to present projects upstream to donors and partners during their preparation phase. These meetings should invite all representatives of SC members and partners, including relevant UN agencies.*

Proposal 5: Optimizing Reporting and Outreach

During stakeholder consultations, Supporting Countries, BCs and ISAs expressed the need to improve the GCFE outreach strategy, including improving the GCFE website and improved dissemination of information on results. Supporting Countries also suggested that strategies should be considered how to share good practices and lessons learned. All key GCFE stakeholders welcomed the following CU proposals on how to implement the outreach recommendations:

- *Improving website content: Hiring a communication and web expert to help improve the web content and use visual elements. This will include restructuring the content on the website and making the website more user friendly, creating a project dashboard, providing more information about funding, results, status of project implementation, adding hyperlinks to donors and partners, publishing stories from the ground on projects, etc.*
- *Engaging with new communications tools: The GCFE will also work to produce regularly updated one-pagers with information on projects and funding, and short videos highlighting success stories. These communication tools are intended to be used by donors and partners to showcase what the GCFE is, what it has achieved, and what projects it is currently supporting in order to help with fundraising.*
- *The CU will organize virtual annual events for SC members and other stakeholders to showcase the impact of different policy approaches, as well as exchange information on good practices and lessons learned in order to find out what has worked and what has not. This will contribute to the coordination agenda, support the focus of the GCFE to promote refugee positive policies, and is also expected to be helpful with fundraising.*

Proposal 6: Introducing a Risk Matrix

While the final report of the IE recommended introducing a Risk Matrix for the GCFF, views on the value of such a tool were mixed among stakeholders. Some Supporting Countries noted that some of the potential risks to the GCFF may not be easily mitigated. However, other stakeholders agreed that introducing a Risk Matrix is important from the point of view of a forward-looking risk horizon at the fund level. Ultimately, consensus seems to have emerged around the following approach:

- *A brief fund-level Risk Matrix shall be developed using a streamlined approach. The design of the Risk Matrix will be informed by lessons learned from similar financing instruments.*

Section 4: Items raised by the Steering Committee membership

Additional items raised during Stakeholder Consultations:

- **One Global Window and Fundraising:**

With reference to the evaluation report, a gradual un-earmarking of the GCFF was raised in the BC consultation to support more fundraising to the Global Window to the extent possible. During the next phase of the GCFF, donors will be encouraged, as much as possible, to provide funding to the Global Window, which will give the Facility the necessary flexibility and efficiency to respond quickly to emerging refugee crises in all benefitting countries. In the longer run, a consolidation of all the current GCFF country/regional windows into the Global Window could be explored, based on SC interest, by making current non-global windows dormant. The evaluation report cites fundraising as one of the clear successes of the GCFF, and fundraising will continue to be an important part of the role of the CU. Fundraising will be pursued for all GCFF windows, based on need. However, a special effort will be made to fundraise more for the Global Window where sufficient funding for projects has proven challenging to obtain. Besides current GCFF donors, the GCFF CU will endeavor to encourage new donors to join.

- **Provision that allows the use of grants under ‘exceptional circumstances’:**

During the stakeholder consultations, Supporting Countries requested information on grant considerations under the GCFF to be included in this technical note (this was also mentioned in the evaluation report). The CU takes this opportunity to emphasize that, by design, the main objective of the GCFF is to provide concessionality to financing from ISAs. With this in mind, the GCFF OM also provides that “traditional” grant financing may exceptionally be approved by the Steering Committee, based on a funding request submitted by a Benefitting Country, with the support of a designated ISA, in connection with an operation that does not involve a loan (paragraph 20 of the GCFF OM). GCFF ISAs include the designated MDBs that have entered into an FPA with the Trustee, as well as FAO, ILO, the UN-Habitat, UNDP, UNEP, UNESCO, UNFPA, UNOHCR, the United Nations Children’s Fund, UNIDO, UN-Women, UNOPS, WFP, and WHO that are eligible to accede to the UN Framework FPA.

Ultimately, it is for Supporting Countries to determine whether a funding request fulfills the exceptionality requirement. Paragraph 20 of the GCFF OM simply requires that the Benefitting County should “specify any justifications for providing grant funding instead of concessionality funding, including in light of other potential funding sources and in answer to why the request was not or could not be structured as a loan operation.” The grant operation may be ISA-executed (when the operation is suitable for direct execution by the ISA) or ISA-supervised (when the operation is implemented by the Benefitting Country to which the GCFF grant is extended). There is nothing in the OM language that precludes Supporting Countries from encouraging the ISAs (MDBs or UN agencies) to work with one or more Benefitting Countries in the preparation of a

funding request for a grant operation to be considered for approval in light of the exceptional circumstances that may make grant financing justified over a concessional loan.

The CU recommends keeping the provisions laid out in the Operations Manual in order to maintain the existing flexibility to respond to a diversity of situations that may arise. Rather, the BCs and ISAs (including potential UN ISAs) should be encouraged to approach the SC where there are specific cases where the use of the grant mechanism may be beneficial. A follow up discussion on the nature of the exceptional circumstances will be suggested before the end of the calendar year.

- **The opportunity for Private Sector Operations (PSOs):**

Stakeholders also asked for additional information on the added value of adding PSOs to the GCFF. It should be noted that the Steering Committee considered the topic of “Leveraging Private Sector Investments for the GCFF” for the first time at the SC meeting in Washington, DC on April 20, 2017 and asked the CU to form an Informal Working Group to further explore this topic. Among the options discussed at the Steering Committee meeting in October 2017, the co-Chair recommended to investigate PPGs as the most promising option of financial instruments to develop a test case. In September 2019, the technical note entitled “Private Sector Support Framework: Partial Portfolio Guarantees and their impact” was endorsed by the Steering Committee. More recently, the first set of draft amendments to the OM were discussed at the GCFF Steering Committee of December 7, 2020.

Given the GCFF’s rapid operationalization and strong progress to date, there may now exist an opportunity to complement the support the GCFF provides to the public sector with an effort to crowd-in investment and expertise from the private sector. Just as the private sector is recognized as a key support to public efforts to achieve development goals in other settings, the establishment of an avenue for private sector operations would have the following benefits:

- i. Augment the effectiveness of scarce public resources impacted by refugee crises.
- ii. Create the necessary fiscal space for governments to channel public resources toward other pressing needs, particularly those for which private capital cannot be easily deployed.
- iii. Leverage the GCFF well-established structures, procedures and resources to focus on private sector development and job creation.
- iv. Complement bilateral efforts and contribute towards meeting a substantially larger demand.

Currently the GCFF resources are used to help public investments become commercially or financially viable. They could achieve a similar purpose in the private sector through de-risking investments. The ISAs currently participating in the GCFF have proven track records of using innovative financial mechanisms to crowd private investment into developing countries, including in difficult environments characterized by fragility, conflict, and violence. Through PSOs, drawing on this expertise would allow Benefiting Countries to capitalize on existing, yet untapped ISA capacity. Ultimately, leveraging GCFF resources, expertise, and coordination capacity to tap

private capital could reinforce government-backed operations and reforms funded by the GCFF, thereby amplifying its impact and the benefits it provides to refugees and host communities. It could strengthen an ecosystem of public and private sector interventions conducive to higher economic growth and sustainable development.

As previously agreed during the SC meetings on May 19 and December 7, 2020, the CU will circulate to the Steering Committee for approval a pilot Funding Request, submitted by the EIB for private sector activities in Jordan, together with the proposed amendments to the OM and FPA that are required in order to introduce the possibility of PSO financing under the GCFF.

- **Regional Steering Committees:**

The option of splitting up the SC into regional Steering Committees was raised, in line with the Final Report of the Independent Evaluation. It should be noted that while this issue was briefly mentioned in the final report, it was not translated into a recommendation.

Informed by stakeholder consultations, the CU recommends that the unified nature of the Steering Committee be retained. Splitting the GCFF into regional steering committees would dilute the nature of the Facility as a global platform and potentially weaken the added value of the GCFF. Rather, the CU recommends using the country-level coordination meetings to create opportunities for country-specific discussions.

Annex: Recommendations of the Final Report of the Independent Evaluation⁴

Recommendations

Monitoring and reporting

- Define objectives related to coordination.
- Include these in the Theory of Change to clearly articulate the causal pathway through which they are realized.
- Develop a measurement approach to assess progress made towards coordination objectives.
- Include the first two suggested indicators in the Operations Manual as mandatory across all GCFF funded projects.
 - *Direct project refugee beneficiaries (number), of which female (percentage)*
 - *Direct project host community population beneficiaries (number), of which female (percentage)*
- Specific guidance on measuring these indicators could be provided by the CU to ensure consistency in measurement across projects.
- Monitoring and reporting should remain the responsibility of the ISA, however the CU should assume responsibility for aggregating results across projects.
- Develop a more detailed outcome-based framework supported by a Theory of Change. This would enable the aggregation of a wider range of indicators across projects.
- The suggested indicators included in the Operations Manual (pg.32) should be a starting point for the indicators included in this framework which would be revised and further developed alongside a Theory of Change to ensure that the indicators selected best correspond to the scope of the GCFF.
- Specific indicators could be included as mandatory for projects in the corresponding sector, for instance projects related to ‘improved economic opportunities for host and refugee populations’ through the provision of work permits would mandatorily include the indicator; ‘Work permits issued to refugees (number), of which female (percentage)’, thus allowing for aggregation across similar projects.
- This would ensure that projects in the same sector consistently applied indicators.
- Responsibility for monitoring and reporting would remain with the ISA; however, the CU would assume responsibility for aggregating results across projects.
- Develop a monitoring data dashboard to provide an easy to access means of accessing the project monitoring information that is reported by ISAs.
- Explore the options for conducting more qualitative monitoring activities to support quantitative monitoring.
- Provide more regular project progress updates from Benefitting Countries and ISAs at Steering Committee meetings.

⁴ The recommendations are reproduced *verbatim* from the Executive Summary of the Final Report of the Independent Evaluation, pages 13-17.

Addressing the needs of refugees and Benefitting Countries

- Utilize UNHCR in project design. A requirement to consult with the UNHCR in the project design stage should ensure that the focus on refugees is included in each GCFF project.
- This would support the Coordination Unit in ensuring that all projects support the GCFF Scope as outlined in Article 7 of the Operations Manual.
- This would draw on the UNHCR's experience from the IDA 18 Refugee-Sub-Window and IDA 19 Window for Host Communities and Refugees.
- Explore options for better utilizing UNHCR throughout the project cycle for instance through better use of UNHCR's data and expertise in ensuring the refugee protection space.
- Explore the option for the GCFF to provide grant funding as outlined in Article 22 of the Operations Manual.

Country selection

- Introduce on-going commitments of Benefitting Countries' maintenance of an adequate refugee protection framework (as in the case in the IDA Refugee Sub-window) will help ensure that Article 9b of the Operations Manual is maintained over time.
- Explore options around pausing a Benefitting Country's membership to the GCFF in the case that they are no longer compliant with the scope of the Facility.

Fundraising and Mobilization

- Make more information on funded projects available on the GCFF website, particularly examples of project successes and other resources that can be used for advocacy.
- Explore the possibilities to conduct joint advocacy activities with the UNHCR.
- Explore the options around moving towards one Global Window. Consultations are necessary to explore the benefits and costs associated with moving towards one Global Window.

Funding Application Process

- Provide earlier sight of the project pipeline to give an opportunity to provide early feedback on the project design and other key factors, such as whether impact on refugees is prioritized at the design stage.
- Providing more time at Steering Committee meetings for Benefitting Countries to formally present the project pipeline, and increased sharing of documents with the Steering Committee at the early stages of the project design process based on clearer guidance on information required, will provide more transparency on upcoming projects.
- Consult with Supporting Countries to clearly define additional information requirements for the Funding Request Form.

Coordination

- Improve stakeholder coordination and collaboration at the national level - regular convening of the various GCFF actors at the national level should be used to discuss current developments on existing as well as prospective projects, as well as regarding wider contextual issues.

Global Policy Outreach

- Define the GCFF's objectives and approach in terms of policy outreach both nationally and internationally.
- Develop a knowledge dissemination or engagement strategy to formalize the GCFF's role in global policy discussion on refugee protection.

Governance and Management

- Develop a Facility level risk matrix to assess risks to the facility and put in place suitable mitigation strategies.
- Consult with Supporting Countries to develop an effective structure for Supporting Country meetings.