



CLIMATE
INVESTMENT
FUNDS

Measures to Further Improve the Governance of the Climate Investment Funds

*JOINT MEETING OF THE CTF AND SCF COMMITTEES,
May 11, 2015*





Presentation Structure

- Purpose and method
- Four Foundational CIF Characteristics
- Suggestions
- Discussion



Purpose of the Paper

- Develop practical suggestions in response to Independent Evaluation
- Focus on Governance and Management
- Accountability, Integrity, Transparency

- Phase One Team:
 - ✓ Tertius Eksteen (teksteen@phaseonecg.com)
 - ✓ Chris Durney (cdurney@phasonecg.com)
 - ✓ Daniel Rivera (drivera@phaseonecg.com)



Our Methodology

- Document review: CIF, comparators, research
- Stakeholder Interviews
 - ✓ 24 interviews from list prepared by CIF AU
- Comparative Analysis
 - ✓ Five in depth; others consulted issue-by -issue
- Consultation with CIF AU
- Series of drafts and reviews



Comparative Analysis

- Global Environment Facility (GEF)
- Consortium of International Agricultural Research Centers (CGIAR)
- Gavi, the Vaccine Alliance (“GAVI Alliance”)
- The Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria (“The Global Fund”)
- International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD)
- Others on an issue-by-issue basis



Four Foundational CIF Characteristics

- Fundamental aspects of the CIF which informed the rest of our investigation:
 - MDB collaboration
 - Consensus
 - Role of observers
 - CIF Administrative Unit



Our Suggestions



1a. Timing of Co-Chair Selection

- **Finding:** Current timing of Co-Chair selection delays preparation of new Co-Chairs.
- **Suggestion:** Change the timing of the Co-Chair selection process to occur at the close of the member seat selection process.
- **Rationale:** Additional preparation will contribute to meeting efficiency.



1b. Standard Process for Action Items

- **Finding:** Overly full CIF Committee Meeting agendas may result in a loss of focus on more strategic issues.
- **Suggestion:** Implement a standard process for assigning decisions either to meetings, decision-without-meeting, or to an appropriate CIF entity.
- **Rationale:** Providing other resolution pathways may allow more focus on strategic issues at CIF Committee meetings.



2. Decision-without-meeting process

- **Finding:** The decision-by-mail process is sometimes subject to delay, often due to last-minute input from members.
- **Suggestion:** Change current decision-without-meeting process to a more web-centered collaboration environment approach.
- **Rationale:** Collaborative environment offers potential for time saving and exploration of alternative procedures (e.g., lapse of time).



3. Stakeholder Engagement

- **Finding:** Some members appear to be only marginally engaged in Committee Meetings, possibly due lack of role clarity.
- **Suggestion:** Increase stakeholder engagement in meetings and boost awareness of integrity and accountability by increasing role clarity for co-Chairs, members, and observers.
- **Rationale:** Better role clarity will lead to greater stakeholder participation and understanding.



4. Rethinking the Partnership Forum

- **Finding:** The current large-scale model may not allow for lesson sharing in a way that affords different parties opportunity to participate .
- **Suggestion:** Rethink and restructure the Partnership Forum to make it more flexible and adaptable to the learning requirements of the CIF.
- **Rationale:** Smaller, more targeted events may reach out to more stakeholders and distill lessons beyond the core CIF constituents.



5a. Self-Selection Process

- **Finding:** Comparators use specific constituencies as a criterion in selection of members.
- **Suggestion:** Self-selection process for recipient countries should consider the possibility of developing a sense of programmatic constituency as the primary basis for selection.
- **Rationale:** Programmatic constituency (e.g., based on characteristics of CTF, FIP, PPCR, and SREP) gives Committee members a broader view to represent beyond their own interests.



5b. Self-Selection Process

- **Finding:** Comparators use regional balance, gender balance, and technical expertise as guidelines in Board and Committee member selection.

- **Suggestion:** Guidelines for the self-selection process for recipient countries should include:
 - Equitable regional (and biome) balance
 - Gender balance
 - Technical and/or policy expertise
 - Interest in promoting good governance of the program.

- **Rationale:** These guidelines provide a more robust expectation for member selection.



5c. Self-Selection Process

- **Finding:** Self-selection may be hindered by the linkage between the stakeholder selection consultations and the Partnership Forum.
- **Suggestion:** Decouple the seat selection process from the Partnership Forum and move it to a virtual environment.
- **Rationale:** A virtual seat selection process should allow all interested countries to participate.



6. Stakeholder Advisory Network


- **Finding:** Observers are critical to the CIF and need to be provided additional avenues for contributing.
- **Suggestion:** Develop a Stakeholder Advisory Network (SAN) to support and enhance observers' contributions to CIF discussions, strategies, projects, and learning efforts.
- **Rationale:** Extending past observers and others the invitation to participate in a broader support network should increase observer ability to contribute.



Discussion



CLIMATE INVESTMENT FUNDS

www.climateinvestmentfunds.org 

[@CIF_Action](https://twitter.com/CIF_Action) 

<https://www.youtube.com/user/CIFaction> 

<https://www.flickr.com/photos/cifaction/sets> 