

Global Concessional Financing Facility

Steering Committee Meeting

May 2-3, 2023, Amman Jordan

Key Areas of Agreement / Decisions

- *The GCFF Coordination Unit will prepare proposals related to adjustments to the GCFF Results Framework, strengthening knowledge and lessons learned from project implementation, and suggestions for enhancing support and guidance to ISAs and BCs on preparation of funding requests and progress/results monitoring. These proposals will be tabled for discussion at the next meeting of the Steering Committee.*
- *The Steering Committee agreed that the concessionality methodology remained fit for purpose and that there was no need for any revision. The Steering Committee also agreed that future GCFF reporting would highlight where the availability of funds results in lower concessionality than the cap would allow. The Steering Committee further requested the Coordination Unit to conduct a sensitivity analysis on the impact of possible further increases in interest rates on the levels of GCFF support to produce the equivalent of IDA concessionality.*
- *The Steering Committee with respect to the EBRD proposal on Advice for Small Businesses Program in Lebanon and Jordan agreed to further reflect on the proposal to consider if the proposed approach could be considered under the Exceptional Grant Facility. The Steering Committee will provide supplementary comments to the GCFF Coordination Unit for sharing with the EBRD to inform further development of the proposal*
- *The Steering Committee requested the GCFF Coordination Unit to enter into dialogue with BCs to identify priority projects which would inform the forward-looking country pipelines and facilitate individual Supporting Countries future contributions to the GCFF. An updated GCFF Funding Plan, updated on this basis, will be presented in the next Steering Committee meeting*
- *The Steering Committee agreed to provide written comments on the draft ToRs for the proposed country level and technical committees to the Coordination Unit based on which a new draft will be presented for the Steering Committee's consideration at its next meeting.*

Summary of Meeting

A meeting of the Global Concessional Financing Facility (GCFF) Steering Committee (SC) took place in Amman, Jordan, on May 2-3, 2023. A two-day program (See Annex) was structured with a half day of field visits to GCFF funded projects, followed by one and a half days of GCFF Steering Committee work sessions.

Day-1: Tuesday, May 2, 2023.

1) Opening and Introductory Remarks

The Steering Committee meeting commenced with introductory and welcome remarks from Her Excellency **Zeina Toukan**, Jordanian Minister of Planning and International Cooperation (MOPIC), followed by Mr. **Jean-Christophe Carret**, World Bank Country Director, Mashreq Region, then Ms.

Soukeyna Kane, FCV Group Director, World Bank and in conclusion the GCFF Co-Chairs Ms. **Luz Stella Campillo Hernandez** and Mr. **Richard Teuten**.

Ms. **Toukan** welcomed the participants to the Steering Committee meeting. Ms. Toukan recognized the strong support that GCFF has provided to Jordan and its value to Jordan and other Benefiting Countries who are hosting large numbers of refugees. Ms. Toukan observed that the GCFF has provided over US\$ 755 million in concessional financing which has leveraged over US\$ 6.1 billion in total project financing to countries in three different regions of the world. This support has been critical in helping host communities and refugees with provision of services and economic opportunities. In Jordan flexible work permits for migrants and refugees have been granted, home-based businesses have been enabled and female participation in the economy has been increased by breaking barriers and facilitating women. Ms. Toukan stated that as the Facility moves forward and with the World Bank's Evolution Roadmap, there needs to be a continued focus on global public goods. The demand for financing is multiplying, which requires the continuity of the Facility, particularly as new crises emerge around the world. Ms. Toukan observed that despite the many challenges that Jordan faces, there is a success story to share. Jordan continues to prioritize reforms, especially on water and electricity sectors. Jordan's new economic vision for the next ten years envisions ways to create jobs for one million Jordanians. At the same time, Jordan has witnessed a drop in funding for support to Syrian refugees. 33% of needs for Syrians in Jordan were funded last year, but the figure was only 6% this year (to date), with no predictability for the coming years and this has impacted the most vulnerable Syrian refugees. Ms. Toukan hoped that the forthcoming Brussels Conference would provide some predictability in this important area. Ms. Toukan informed that Jordan has an ambitious pipeline of projects for the GCFF and looks forward to its presentation particularly the Jordan Water Sector Efficiency Project. Ms. Toukan concluded by reiterating her pleasure at the organization of the meeting in Jordan and wished for a productive Steering Committee meeting.

Mr. **Jean-Christophe Carret**, World Bank Country Director, Mashreq Region informed that GCFF's support in Jordan and Lebanon has been substantial and far reaching for both host communities and refugees. This is evident from the 13 projects in Jordan that range from provision and access to health and education, to creating economic opportunities and policy development amounting to US\$ 450 million and leveraging US\$ 2.73 billion in total project financing. Similarly in Lebanon there have been four projects in health, transport and social protection receiving US\$ 92 million in GCFF financing which has leveraged over US\$ 432 million in total project financing. Mr. Carret noted increased demand for GCFF support reflected in the pipelines presented by Jordan and Lebanon. Mr. Carret concluded that in a context of deepening global crises where countries hosting large number of refugees continue to provide global public goods, innovative approaches like the GCFF need to be strengthened and expanded to promote efficient, inclusive and sustainable development responses to refugee crises.

Ms. **Soukeyna Kane**, FCV Group Director, provided an overview of the agenda for the meeting. Ms. Kane reflected on the accomplishments of the GCFF since the last meeting in December 2022. The Costa Rica Climate Resilient Recovery and Territorial Development Project was approved in February with WB as ISA amounting to US\$ 370 million including US\$ 20 million from the GCFF. Similarly, the Moldova Emergency Response, Resilience and Competitiveness DPO2 with the WB as ISA valuing US\$ 125 coupled with US\$ 25 million from the GCFF was approved in April. Second funding request for Moldova focusing on development interventions in education with the WB as an ISA is currently under consideration with the Steering Committee. Ms. Kane acknowledged the major contribution of US\$ 83.36 million to the GCFF by the Government of Japan to support refugees and hosting communities in Jordan, Lebanon, and Moldova. Ms. Kane recognized the contributions of all Supporting Countries which enable the GCFF to respond efficiently and effectively to the needs of Benefiting Countries.

The two co-chairs of the meeting, Ms. **Luz Stella Campillo Hernandez**, Deputy Director of Multilateral and Bilateral Financing, Ministry of Finance, Representative of Colombia, and Mr. **Richard Teuten**, Head of Economic Growth Department Foreign, Commonwealth & Development Office (FCDO), Representative of the United Kingdom, welcomed all participants to the GCFE Steering Committee, including HE Zeina Toukan, Minister of MOPIC. Ms. Hernandez expressed her appreciation for the in-person organization of the meeting and the opportunity to represent Latin American region and Colombia. Mr. Teuten thanked MOPIC for organizing the field visits to GCFE funded projects and appreciated the value that the trips provided to the SC members. Mr. Teuten concluded by providing an overview of the meeting agenda over the next one and a half days.

2) Item for Presentation

Overview of refugee trends, challenges, opportunities, and priorities. Presentation by UNHCR.

Mr. **Teuten** introduced the presentation item. Mr. Teuten recognized the important advisory role of UNHCR in the GCFE and the value of the presentation in informing the Steering Committee on current and potential refugees' crises around the world, areas of possible GCFE support, and potential of GCFE as forced displacement crises continue to unfold around the world. Mr. Teuten invited the representative of UNHCR, Mr. **Sajjad Malik**, Director Resilience and Solutions to deliver the presentation.

Mr. **Malik** made a presentation on current and potential refugees' crises around the world, areas of possible GCFE support, and potential of GCFE in this context. *(Please find copy of presentation in attachment).*

Mr. **Teuten** invited the Steering Committee to ask questions and comment on the presentation.

Discussion.

Mr. **Syed Husain Quadri**, Islamic Development Bank (IsDB), appreciated the presentation and asked if there are any concrete examples of success stories in forced displacement that international organizations can learn from. Mr. **Malik** informed that forced displacement takes place in adverse and complicated situations, with people having next to nothing while fleeing as can be seen from what is happening in Sudan. However, in terms of what can be done, ideally addressing the root causes of forced displacement would be the starting point. In reality contingency planning and preparedness is one area of attention. For example, UNHCR is currently working with Chad, Egypt, and Ethiopia, to prepare for the influx of refugees from Sudan. In the forced displacement response cycle, initial support is centered around emergency aid as the refugees arrive, but as the crises becomes protracted, the focus shifts to humanitarian and development support as is the case with Ukrainian refugees (education, employment). There are some examples of this, and we can share these.

Ms. **Feda Gharaibeh**, Jordan, thanked the UNHCR for the comprehensive presentation and pointed out that although economic and social inclusion are seen as durable solutions to forced displacement, third country resettlement is another option that has not been given enough consideration especially by the international community. Moreover, on the economic potential and positive impact of refugees on host countries and communities is there any data to substantiate this? And finally on certain policy restrictions imposed on refugees, Jordan believes that in the absence of some policy measures, there could be socio-economic consequences. Mr. **Malik** responded that the best option for refugees is to return home, as most refugees want to go back, but due to an un-enabling environment cannot do so. Third country resettlement

is a viable option, but the numbers will always be less, and it is not a substitute for return and reintegration. National laws are important, but we have seen over the years that if refugees are provided education, they will contribute to their host country. There is evidence of this, particularly from the analytics provided by the UNHCR-WB Joint Data Centre. In Kenya we have an example through the Kenya Marshall Plan, where refugee camps are being converted into municipalities by the combined efforts of refugees and local authorities as the economic contributions of refugees has increased. Refugees are hardworking and can become productive members of society if given the space to develop. Human development should not stop because of forced displacement.

Mr. **Teuten**, United Kingdom, inquired if there are any examples of return success stories in the last 20 years. Additionally, is the “win-win” of refugee economic inclusion based on certain political constraints being overcome, or are there determinant conditions that need to be in place for such best practices to thrive? Mr. **Malik** informed that there are a few examples of successful returns such as Mozambique and more recently Ivory Coast where the repatriations were conclusively completed. In the case of Ivory Coast some refugees were integrated in the neighboring countries like Liberia. However most forced displacement situations remain cyclical where there is a recurrent of movement between returns and displacement. Afghanistan, Darfur and South Sudan are some examples.

Ms. **Angela Spilsbury**, United Kingdom, asked if the UNHCR is undertaking any analysis on the possible effects of climate change on forced displacement, noting that His Majesty King Abdullah of Jordan put forward the Climate/Refugee Nexus Initiative for countries hosting large number of refugees at COP27 in Egypt in 2022. Mr. **Malik** pointed out that link between climate change and forced displacement is evident in several situations as recently witnessed in the flow of refugees from Somalia into Kenya due to drought and conflict. Mr. Malik assured that the UNHCR is working with partners in this regard and analyzing National Adaptation Plans and Climate Action Framework for inclusion of refugees.

Mr. **Thomas Thomsen**, Denmark, remarked that burden sharing remains at the heart of the Global Compact on Refugees. With the Global Refugee Forum taking place in December and discussions on the future direction of the GCFR, what are some lessons that we can take forward? Mr. **Malik** informed that burden sharing is critical and countries like Jordan and Lebanon need continued assistance from the international community. In discussions with partners, we have received pledges and it is important that the pledges materialize and match the growing requirements of countries hosting refugees. Dedicated financing instruments like the GCFR, IDA window for host communities and refugees, along with bilateral financing such as the BMZ(Germany) enable us to work closely with host countries for refugee advocacy. UNHCR will focus discussions on expanding and strengthening these instruments during the Global Refugee Forum.

Ms. **Nabila Assaf**, World Bank commented that under a resource program on forced displacement within the Fragility, Conflict and Violence Group, an overview study based on literature review of 49 studies on economic impact of refugees was undertaken. The gist of which was the short-term negative impact of unskilled labour was outweighed by the increased economic activity generated by the refugees. Ms. Assaf will share the study for the benefit of the participants and with the government of Jordan. Mr. **Malik** thanked Ms. Assaf for the information and agreed that there are several studies that point to the positive impact of economic inclusion of refugees and that the UNCHR will be happy to share these.

Mr. **Felipe Munoz**, Inter-American Development Bank (IaDB) added that the situation in Haiti is worth noting as there is a mass influx into the Dominican Republic and other countries in Latin America and Caribbean (LAC) region due to economic and political tensions. Further there is strong evidence about the

benefits of migration in LAC, the IaDB, IMF and WB have documented this, and these studies can be shared. Finally, Mr. Munoz, shared that the IaDB also has a dedicated concessional financing facility Grant Facility (GRF) for supporting countries hosting large number of refugees in LAC.

Mr. **Malik** thanked Mr. **Munoz** for sharing the information on LAC region and praised the progressive policies that are a lodestar for other regions and countries.

Ms. **Paula Andrea Rossiasco**, World Bank, commented that forced displacement as a result of climate change is an increasingly important issue in the LAC region and a recent study undertaken by the World Bank indicated that by 2050, nearly 70 million people would be displaced because of climate change. Additional analytical work is being undertaken in the Dominican Republic, Honduras, and Mexico to investigate the links between climate change and forced displacement. Moreover, discussions with Colombia and Mexico on ideas for a climate related visa for the region are also being conducted.

Mr. **Malik** agreed on the importance of collecting more data and carrying out analysis on the relationship between climate change and forced displacement.

In conclusion Mr. **Malik** thanked the Government of Jordan for hosting the GCFF SC meeting and hoped to see them participate in the GRF where their excellent hospitality could be showcased. He further thanked the GCFF Steering Committee for organizing the session and looked forward to continued engagement with the GCFF.

Mr. **Teuten** thanked the UNHCR for a productive session and closed the agenda item.

3) Item for Presentation

Presentation of the 2022 GCFF Annual Report

Ms. **Hernandez** introduced the presentation item. Ms. Hernandez explained that the Annual Report 2021-22 highlights the significant progress made towards achieving the goal of providing concessional financing to middle-income countries (MICs) hosting refugees. Further Ms. Hernandez noted that the Annual Report, focuses on the impact and results of GCFF-supported projects over the past six years, as well as key developments and results in the reporting period highlighting progress and how the Facility contributed to improving the lives of refugees and host communities.

Ms. **Hernandez** first turned to Ms. **Nabila Assaf**, Practice Manager FCV Group, World Bank to provide an overview of the Annual Report.

Ms. **Assaf** noted that the preparation of the Annual Report was a collaborative effort and represents the generous contributions and guidance of the ISAs, BCs, UNHCR, the Co-Chairs and the Coordination Unit. Ms. Assaf added that the Annual Report reflects the global nature of the GCFF as it has expanded to six countries around the world. Further this Annual Report focuses on results and how host communities and refugees are benefiting from the investments made by the Facility.

Following this introduction, the floor was given to Mr. **Spyridon Demetriou**, and Ms. **Sarah Craig** GCFF Coordination Unit, for the presentation. *(Please find copy of presentation in attachment).*

Following the presentation Ms. **Hernandez** opened the floor for comments and questions.

Discussion.

Dr. **Anna-Maria Schneider**, Germany, welcomed the Annual Report as an important step forward in measuring and reporting results. Germany is interested in seeing sections that focus on the challenges and lessons learned to inform future GCFF funding decisions, for example related to the use of the private sector operation modality in Jordan or to the implementation and achievements of the Lebanon Wheat Supply Emergency Project.

Mr. **Eric Meyer**, United States, noted that it would be helpful to catalogue lessons learned from projects that are being implemented by ISAs to serve both as resources for countries hosting refugees and also as an input to guidance/toolkits for BCs, ISAs and the broader international community. Mr. Meyer added that collection of qualitative and quantitative data for wider sharing should be a service and resource of the GCFF and thanked the Coordination Unit and ISAs for implementing the revised Results Framework. The Results Framework marks a significant transition point of the Facility from the initial reporting of results. Mr. Meyer recognized the hard work of all stakeholders that has led to the maturity of the Facility and acknowledged the upstream engagement of the Coordination Unit with Task Teams during project development. This engagement has resulted in well-articulated projects that are aligned with the GCFF vision being submitted to the Steering Committee lending to the quality and sustainability of the projects.

Mr. **Warner ten Kate**, Netherlands inquired if there is any exchange of information with other similar funding windows supporting refugees, for example the IDA Window for Host Communities and Refugees.

Mr. **Thomas Thomsen** Denmark recognized the merit of the Results Framework not only for reporting and showcasing the value of the GCFF, but also as a tool for project consultations and development for incorporation into the country pipelines. Mr. Thomsen also voiced support for including lessons learned in the Annual Report, using it as a communications medium to spotlight lessons from specific country level operations which can feed into discussions of the proposed country coordination platforms and the technical advisory group. Mr. Thomsen observed from the Annual Report that a large portion of the GCFF funding is allocated to projects in service delivery (health, education etc.) as compared to livelihoods which should be taken into consideration for future GCFF funding decisions.

Mr. **Andreas Berkhoff**, EIB appreciated the constructive engagement with the GCFF Coordination Unit, and the positive working relationship developed among GCFF partners as it endeavors to support host communities and refugees. Mr. Berkhoff mentioned that there are a number of coordination platforms among MDBs that can be of benefit to the GCFF in terms of results measurement and coordination, for example the MDB working groups on results measurement and the MDB platform on migration and forced displacement.

Ms. **Kari M. Bjørnsgaard**, Norway, appreciated the field visits to the GCFF funded projects and welcomed the participation of the UNHCR and the value addition that the UNHCR brings to the GCFF. Ms. Bjørnsgaard requested the Coordination Unit for future reference to share meeting related documents well in advance of the meeting to enable preparation. On the Annual Report Ms. Bjørnsgaard, praised the quality and recognized the effort in bringing the results and impact to the fore and hoped that future editions will continue to focus on highlighting the results.

Mr. **Louis-Pierre Émond**, Canada endorsed the comments of other members on the quality of the Annual Report and recommended a future focus on gender disaggregated results being captured for projects in the Report.

Mr. **Teuten**, United Kingdom Co-Chair remarked that the Annual Report could perhaps be graded an A on the quality of the narrative about the role of the GCFF, B+ on the evidence of the directly quantifiable

results whilst it too soon to assess its ability to identify and learn lessons. On next steps Mr. Teuten observed to what extent can data gaps be filled, particularly on gender disaggregated data understanding that the Results Framework cannot be retrofitted on existing projects. Mr. Teuten also enquired on how the Steering Committee will resolve the approach to indicators in the Framework that do not seem to have been set appropriately and finally what are some opportunities for lesson sharing? Could lessons be disseminated sector/country/ISA wise and is there any aspiration to plan an event during the Global Refugee Forum?

Mr. **Demetriou** thanked the Steering Committee for feedback on the Annual Report. In terms of lessons identified the Coordination Unit can within the confines of its mandate consolidate and synthesize data provided to it across countries, projects and ISAs incorporating it into a section in the Annual Report. Moreover, as new projects and innovations that launched 2021-22 advance, those will be covered in future Annual Reports. Some examples of this are the Private Sector Operations (PSO) modality, country coordination structures and the technical advisory group to the Steering Committee. As a next step the Coordination Unit will articulate options discussed for both the Annual Report and Knowledge/Lessons Learning Stream for the Steering Committees consideration.

Ms. **Craig** welcomed the recommendations on using existing forums for data collection and lessons learning. To the point of collecting data particularly gender disaggregated data for projects predating the revised Results Framework, the Coordination Unit has tried to garner granular data on refugees and host communities, but not all projects are collecting this data as it was not mandatory at that time. Therefore, data reporting has seen mixed results. Going forward all projects approved after January 2022 must report on gender disaggregated data and we will see the fruits of this input in the forthcoming Annual Reports.

Ms. **Assaf** noted that in looking for lessons learned from the GCFF, these can be observed at two levels. Firstly, the GCFF itself as a modality and how we engage with it. The 2021 Independent Evaluation has driven a lot of change that positively impacted the working of the Facility, such as the revised Results Framework that led to more upstream interaction with ISAs and we see this collaboration intensifying to generate knowledge and improved projects. Secondly at the project level, we can invest more in learning from the evaluations conducted by ISAs. The suggestions discussed today are very helpful and through future knowledge activities will enable us to extract key information to strengthen the Facility.

Ms. **Paula Andrea Rossiasco** World Bank suggested adding an indicator on process (alignment of timelines/funding), which has been a determining factor for some Task Teams in including refugee/migrant related components and subsequently applying for GCFF funding. Similarly, some projects with refugee/migrant related components have not applied for GCFF funding because of issues associated with alignment of timelines/funding.

Ms. **Hernandez** thanked the Steering Committee members for a productive session and commended the Coordination Unit on the preparation of the Annual Report. In conclusion the GCFF Co-Chairs Ms. **Luz Stella Campillo Hernandez** and Mr. **Richard Teuten** ended the first day of the Steering Committee meeting.

Day-2: Wednesday, May 3

1) Item for Presentation

2023 World Development Report (WDR) on Migrants, Refugees and Societies: Presentation and Panel Discussion

Mr. **Teuten** welcomed participants back to the second day of the Steering Committee meeting. Mr. Teuten introduced the presentation item. Mr. Teuten noted the relevance of the WDR to the GCFF and how migration is a development challenge with 190 million people—2.5 percent of the world’s population—living outside of their country of nationality. Almost half in low- and middle-income countries. Mr. Teuten informed that the World Development Report 2023 will be presented by Ms. **Joyce Antone Ibrahim**, WDR Manager, and followed by a panel discussion which will showcase the findings of the report. The panelists included: Ms. **Feda Gharaibeh**, Senior Advisor on Refugees to the Minister of MOPIC, Ms. **Camila Veerman**, First Secretary Development Cooperation, Embassy of the Kingdom of the Netherlands in Jordan, Ms. **Amy Schmidt**, NRC Country Director and JIF Steering Committee Member and Mr. **Felipe Munoz**, Head of Migration Unit, IaDB.

Mr. **Teuten** turned to Ms. **Ibrahim**, Manager WDR 2023 for the presentation. *(Please find copy of presentation in attachment).*

Panel Discussion.

Ms. **Ibrahim** noted that Jordan has a long history of hosting refugees and requested Ms. **Feda Gharaibeh**, Senior Advisor on Refugees to the Minister of MOPIC to share Jordan’s experience of hosting refugees for the benefit of other countries who are in a similar position.

Ms. Gharaibeh welcomed the WDR and appreciated the focus on both migrants and refugees. Ms. Gharaibeh informed that Jordan has been hosting refugees since 1948 and since then there has been a regular stream from Palestine, Iraq, and of late Syria. Some lessons learned from this experience are, donor support tends to dissipate over time as other crises erupt. Host countries should plan and prepare for supporting refugees with minimal aid from the international community over a longer period of time. In Jordan, education and health is provided to all refugees, even as support from donors is decreasing. This not only places a burden on services but weakens service delivery. Ms. Gharaibeh continued that host countries need to think about medium term planning and support notably in the aftermath of Covid-19 pandemic and the global economic slowdown. Ms. Gharaibeh added that donor support is bracketed into humanitarian and development aid with different timelines and definitive financing mechanisms. However, to be of help to hosting countries there needs to be a blend of humanitarian and development support that covers the medium-long term, and this is where the humanitarian-development nexus comes into questions to ensure that the flow of aid is continuous. Ms. Gharaibeh added that in response to a refugee crisis, indicative planning and financing should cover the first year of operations and be discussed at the onset between host country and international partners. Ms. Gharaibeh noted that information and data about incoming refugees is key. It is important to know the characteristics of refugees: structure of the family, health, education level, skills etc. This information will enable the host country and development partners to formulate plans and policies accordingly and also facilitate integration. In conclusion, Ms. Gharaibeh stated that involvement of the private sector and incentivizing their role in supporting both host communities and refugees is also very important.

Ms. **Ibrahim** thanked Ms. **Gharaibeh** for sharing her thoughts.

Ms. Ibrahim next turned to Ms. **Camila Veerman**, First Secretary Development Cooperation, Embassy of the Kingdom of the Netherlands in Jordan on how international development partners can be further engaged to support host countries like Jordan and Lebanon.

Ms. **Veerman** thanked the forum for the invitation and opportunity to speak. Ms. Veerman informed that she would focus her comments on Jordan and how the international community may play a larger role in supporting this protracted refugee crises. Development support has to be savvy and clever so that it can reach both host communities and refugees alike. Some examples to build on are the Prospects Partnership that Netherlands is supporting. This partnership brings together IFC, ILO, UNICEF, UNHCR and WB working in eight countries in MENA and the Horn of Africa helping countries increase their resilience and self-reliance of host communities and refugees. Another example is the GCFF, which enables host countries to determine their own policies and programs in support of host communities and refugees while receiving support from the wider international community. Ms. Veerman ended by proposing the consideration of a possible grant facility along the lines of the Prospects Partnership complementing the GCFF for Jordan, which could become a multilateral endeavor.

Ms. Ibrahim thanked Ms. Veerman for sharing her thoughts.

Ms. Ibrahim next turned to Ms. **Amy Schmidt**, NRC Country Director and JIF Steering Committee Member for the NGO perspective on sustainability and efficiencies of refugee response and areas of cooperation between NGOs that has increased impact.

Ms. **Schmidt** thanked the forum on behalf of the NGO community for being a part of the panel. In terms of efficiencies there are examples in education and health, but less so in livelihoods and protection. In 2016, refugee children were allowed into the public school system which enabled NGOs to focus attention on the most vulnerable segments of the refugee population with learning needs and support. To ensure sustainability of support to refugees more funding is paramount in education and health, regardless of the delivery mechanism (government or NGOs). Ms. Schmidt noted an example of harmonizing NGO coordination, by monitoring access of refugee children to education at the school and district level through proper implementation of the waiver to documentation and reinforcing access. Going forward Ms. Schmidt stressed the need for continued funding and support to make sure the most vulnerable are integrated in country systems.

Ms. Ibrahim thanked Ms. Schmidt for sharing her thoughts.

Ms. Ibrahim next turned Mr. **Felipe Munoz**, Head of Migration Unit, IaDB to share experiences from the LAC region.

Mr. **Felipe Munoz** congratulated the WDR team on publication and thanked the GCFF Steering Committee for the invitation to the meeting. Mr. Munoz appraised some characteristics of migration and refugees in the LAC region. Firstly, migration is increasing not only from Venezuela, but Haiti, northern triangle and parts of the Caribbean. Secondly, migration is becoming permanent with surveys indicating that the majority of migrants/refugees do not want to return to countries of origin. Thirdly, in many hosting countries, there are mass regularization programmes for migrants and refugees, namely in Belize, Colombia, Dominican Republic and Ecuador. Lastly with the continuing migration and influx of refugees, xenophobic sentiments are also starting to rise. Mr. Munoz continued that with these characteristics, the LAC region is facing issues related to “2nd generation’ challenges, such as capacities of host countries authorities, inclusion in labor markets and negative public perception towards migrants and refugees. Mr. Munoz concluded by saying that efforts to counter these problems are reflected in the areas of project

interventions that the IaDB focuses on such as housing, health, livelihoods and instruments like the GCFE help to facilitate this support.

Discussion.

Mr. **Teuten** thanked the panel for their remarks and opened the floor for questions and comments.

MOPIC thanked the panel for their comments and asked how the international development partners can assist the Government of Jordan with not only providing access to services (health and education), but also improving quality of services for both host communities and refugees.

The Panel in unison believed that the key to quality education is to invest more in the national public education system as 80% of Syrian refugee students study in state schools. There is need to assess the whole education system, pinpoint the gaps so that steps can be taken to improve the system for both Jordanian and Syrian children.

Mr. **Richard Teuten** United Kingdom/Co-Chair GCFE Steering Committee requested Mr. **Felipe Munoz** to share examples if any on how Governments in LAC have responded to rising xenophobia and were there any attempts at measuring these efforts?

Mr. **Munoz** appraised there are a number of challenges in the LAC region, but two policies that are helping to address issues of xenophobia are firstly the systematic integration of migrant/refugee students in the school system. In Colombia half a million students are in the school system, in Chile 6% of the students are from Venezuela and Ecuador also has open access for education. Secondly, cities are taking responsibility for refugees by themselves and integrating them into the workforce and social systems. The cultural aspect of speaking the same language, being from the same region also helps the integration process.

Mr. **Warner ten Kate**, Netherlands, congratulated the WDR team on a well written report. Mr. ten Kate observed that in the midst of discussions in Europe and other parts of the world where migration and asylum seekers are being discouraged it is interesting to note that Governments in LAC have mass regularization programmes for migrants and refugees, meriting further examination.

Ms. **Paula Andrea Rossiasco** World Bank observed that with the launching of the WDR, what discussions are taking place on a) shared responsibility beyond financing and b) what are the regional dimensions of the application of the WDR framework principally for MICs.

Ms. **Ibrahim** acknowledged that beyond financing the Report highlights regional cooperation as part of the answer, the Quito Process being a good example. In MENA, Jordan and Lebanon host the majority if not all Syrian refugees whereas in Europe, Ukrainian refugees have freedom of mobility thereby not burdening any one country. Another area that the Report speaks to is institutional planning and preparedness. Rather than waiting for the crises, we encourage governments to build and strengthening the policy environment, administrative frameworks, and technical capacities to be resilient and better prepared. The Report also focuses on socio-economic challenges and the need for migrants/refugee integration for social cohesion as well as the longer term needs of countries for migrants as the host populations age.

Mr. **Sajjad Malik**, UNHCR commended the WDR, and the close collaboration of the UNHCR with the WDR team in its preparation. Mr. Malik observed that the WDR shed light on a number of important areas that are pertinent to the refugee/migrant global dynamic and will no doubt lead to more discussions in the coming months. Some noteworthy points from the WDR, were improving development financing,

addressing displacement, strategic focus on engagement with the private sector, greater emphasis on data, and recognizing that refugees are more likely to return home given an enabling environment as compared to migrants.

Ms. **Kordula Mehlhardt** German Embassy in Jordan asked the panel what can be done to improve the efficiency of delivery mechanisms in supporting host communities and refugees.

United Nations office of Resident Coordinator, Jordan (UNORC) Representative inquired about the link between the WDR and the WB's Evolution Roadmap.

Ms. **Ibrahim** noted that it is too early to comment on the link between the WDR and the WB's Evolution Roadmap, as the WDR has recently been launched, but responding to global challenges is an integral part of the Roadmap including forced displacement and we hope going forward that it will be included in conversations.

UNFPA Representative asked the panel about possible measures to improve the large disparities among gender in the Jordanian labor force both for refugees and host communities.

Ms. **Veerman** observed that increasing female participation of both host communities and refugees in Jordan remains a challenge, even though there are policies in place and commitments have been made by the Government, however results have not been commensurate. It is important to have policies that are specific about the needs and incentives that go beyond issues like transportation and childcare to a more granular level which can unlock the untapped economic potential of females in the labor force.

Ms. **Angela Spilsbury**, British Embassy in Jordan inquired from the panel about ways to improve the role of the private, how to balance the import of labor vis a vis use of refugees and are there lessons from other countries that can be learned for application in Jordan?

The **Panel** collectively shared some points on the private sector. In LAC, a primary determinant for hiring refugees versus migrants in the private sector is their legal status. Another factor has been freedom of movement afforded to both migrants and refugees which not only allows refugees to work in different cities/sectors but shares the burden among different parts of the hosting country.

In Jordan the Lending Compact mistakenly had assumed that refugees would replace migrants, but this had not proven to be the case for a number of reasons. It is important to understand the business model, engage with the private so that their needs are understood to better include refugees in their operations.

Understanding gaps in skills and developing capacities of refugees will help their employment prospects. Similarly providing access to financing for the private sector with incentivize entrepreneurship and investments in youth and female labor force.

Investment is required in understanding what incentives can be created for the private sector to engage with refugees, keeping in mind that the labor market in Jordan is segmented due to regulations. It is also key to note the difference between the needs and working conditions that migrants, refugees and Jordanian workers will accept.

At the conclusion of panels responses, Mr. Teuten thanked Ms. Ibrahim for the presentation and also thanked the panelists for their valuable remarks and closed the agenda item.

2) Items for Presentation/Decision

GCFF Operational and Administrative Updates and Presentations

Ms. **Hernandez** introduced the presentation/decision items. Ms. Hernandez informed that this portion of the meeting will include the financial overview, update on concessionality approach and presentation on TORs for the Country Coordination Committees and Technical Advisory Group. The first presentation will be on the latest financial overview. *(Please note that the presentation on the TORs was moved to AOB due to time constraints)*

Ms. **Hernandez** turned to Ms. **Jane Mwebi** Trustee (World Bank) for the presentation.

Presentation of the GCFF Financial Overview (Please find copy of presentation in attachment).

Following the presentation Ms. Hernandez opened the floor for comments and questions. As there were no questions Ms. Hernandez thanked Ms. **Mwebi** for her presentation and thanked members for the productive discussion.

Presentation on the GCFF Concessionality Approach (Please find copy of presentation in attachment).

Mr. **Teuten** introduced the presentation item. Mr. Teuten noted that the Steering Committee had requested an annual update on the revised concessionality approach including the performance of the 25% cap on concessionality. Mr. Teuten acknowledged the importance of the concessionality approach to the value of the GCFF.

Mr. Teuten turned to **Ms. Concepcion Aisa**, Treasury Department, World Bank, for the presentation.

Discussion.

Following the presentation Mr. Teuten opened the floor for comments and questions and stated that although the agenda item was not presented for any decision, but for update, if the Steering Committee has any recommendations these can be taken on board.

Mr. **Andreas Berkhoff**, EIB recognized the efforts made on the concessionality formula and acknowledged the complications associated with it. Mr. Berkhoff made two observations; is there any thinking around increasing the concessionality amount especially as the focus of the GCFF is on supporting refugees and secondly the total size of interventions determines the concessionality. Correspondingly for a large project concessionality amount would be significant compared to a small project.

Mr. **Warner ten Kate**, Netherlands observed that GCFF financing aims to be a game changer for countries seeking support, however with variations in concessional financing to applicants, what are the determinants for fixing concessionality for different projects.

Mr. **Eric Meyer**, United States informed that one of the drivers for revision of the concessionality formula was to give a more equitable playing field to all ISAs and it would be useful of learn from the experiences of ISAs in this regard. Mr. Meyer commented that the move from a floor to cap in the concessionality formula has been helpful and at this point there is not enough data, experience and funding to look at revising the cap. Mr. Meyer suggested to highlight where relevant for projects that concessional financing was determined by the amount of resources available and not the concessional formula as a compromise between the BC and ISA. Mr. Meyer ended by asking if there was a modeling/analysis on potential implications of raising interest rates and how that might effect a representative sample of projects in terms of resource demand and what the GCFF may aspire to for resource mobilization.

Ms. **Paula Andrea Rossiasco**, World Bank noted that in the LAC region projects tend to be larger in size as compared to other regions, but BCs and project teams do not seek concessional financing in proportion to the total project financing due to limited funds available for the region. BCs in LAC would like to use the GCFE but need some predictability in terms of incentives, and what financing is available to them.

Ms. **Aisa** thanked the participants for their questions. The 25% concessional cap is based on a set formula stated in the GCFE OM. The unpredictability of the final level of grants and therefore concessional comes from the limited availability of grant funds and not the formula itself. Ms. Aisa agreed on the point of highlighting projects where the final concessional amount was determined by the resources available and not the concessional formula. Ms. Aisa clarified that there is no unpredictability in assessing the amount of concessional. Calculations are made on the basis of the financial terms and market conditions of the day. The final concessional amount can be ascertained to use as an estimation of the 25% cap/maximum amount that a BC can get. Ultimately all BCs get the IDA rate, the difference in concessional percentage for countries is based on the respective countries preference for longer term maturities as the Government of Lebanon favors. Ms. Aisa explained that on project financing, the calculations do not take into account total project amount, but factors in the ISA loan on which basis the concessional amount is established aiming to subsidize the loan from the ISA for the BC. Ms. Aisa agreed on the point raised by the EIB and added that longer maturity loans do add a certain amount of additional concessional, but ultimately the decision depends on the clients (BCs) preference and through this revised approach we are trying to manage the percentages. Ms. Aisa explained that the GCFE Coordination Unit engages with BCs and ISAs upstream and informs them of the availability of funds and potential concessional financing, which provides clarity to all parties. On revision of the 25% concessional cap, at present it is working well and if there is going to be any change, consideration has to be given to increasing donor contributions to the Facility. Ms. Aisa offered to carry out a sensitivity analysis for the BCs and ISAs and report back to the Steering Committee. In conclusion Ms. Aisa stated that the current concessional approach is working well, but more funds are required to ensure continuity of concessional support to BCs.

Mr. **Teuten** thanked Ms. Aisa for her presentation and thanked members for the productive discussion. Based on the discussions Mr. Teuten summed up the key take-aways. There was a recognition that larger projects were less likely to be granted full concessional due to the availability of funds. Ultimately it is the BC and ISA that decide on the level (small/large) of concessional to accept.

Decisions.

- *The Steering Committee agreed that the concessional methodology remained fit for purpose and that there was no need for any revision. The Steering Committee also agreed that future GCFE reporting would highlight where the availability of funds results in lower concessional than the cap would allow. The Steering Committee further requested the Coordination Unit to conduct a sensitivity analysis on the impact of possible further increases in interest rates on the levels of GCFE support to produce the equivalent of IDA concessional.*

3) Item for Presentation

Presentation of Country Project Proposals

Mr. **Teuten** introduced the presentation item. Mr. Teuten noted that this agenda item will include two presentations; the first one will be made by the EBRD on SME Support Projects in Jordan and Lebanon, to be followed by the joint MOPIC/WB presentation on the Water Efficiency Sector Program.

Presentation of the revised Advice for Small Businesses Program in Lebanon and Jordan with EBRD as ISA

Mr. **Teuten** noted that following EBRD's briefing to the Steering Committee in December 2022 on the Advice for Small Businesses (ASB) Program in Jordan and Lebanon, the Steering Committee received a revised version of the proposal which will be presented

Mr. **Teuten** turned to the representative of EBRD, Mr. **Khaled Alsaheb**, Principal Manager, SME Finance & Development in Jordan. *(Please find copy of presentation in attachment).*

Following the presentation Mr. Teuten requested Ms. **Nabila Assaf**, GCFE Coordination Unit, to summarize its advice on the funding modalities through which GCFE support could be considered.

Ms. **Assaf** informed that the Coordination Unit carried out a review of the EBRD's proposal under the different modalities available within the GCFE and a note on this has been shared with the Steering Committee (see attached document). Ms. Assaf summarized findings of the note. The proposal does not fall under the standard concessional financing modality as it is not attached to a loan operation. Under the PSO modality only Private Portfolio Guarantee (PPGs) are included and at present being piloted through the EIB Jordan Private Sector Guarantee Facility (JPSGF). For the proposal to be considered under the PSO modality, it would need to be expanded to include grant mechanisms and amend the Operations Manual. The exceptional grant-only modality has not been used up to now and was envisaged to be employed under exceptional circumstances and the additional nature of project. If this modality were to be used, it would need to be considered separately for Jordan and Lebanon.

Discussion.

Following the presentation and advice from the Coordination Unit, Mr. **Teuten** opened the floor for comments and questions.

Mr. **Thomas Thomsen**, Denmark, noted that it would be beneficial to learn how the project will provide complementarity to similar on-going efforts, while noting the different situations in Jordan and Lebanon.

Dr. **Anna-Maria Schneider**, Germany, expressed concerns about the latest developments in Lebanon related to the deportation of Syrian refugees and how that may have implications for GCFE support to Lebanon. On the proposal, Dr. Schneider echoed the views of Denmark on complementarities and further stated that in terms of support to refugees, targeting should be more robust. Dr. Schneider further questioned how additionality will be ensured in the Star Venture Programme, as it will not be appropriate to utilize GCFE financing to merely substitute the existing Star Venture Programme (SVP) funding.

Mr. **Eric Meyer**, United States, noted that the United States has been a supporter of the advisory services to small businesses and the approach EBRD has developed for this initiative but would like to understand more the complementarities with other efforts and initiatives in the same sector. Mr. Meyer inquired if there was any initial feedback on the pilot project with UNHCR that could potentially feed into a prospective funding request. Mr. Meyer thanked the Coordination Unit for listing the possible avenues of support for this project and indicated its preference for using the exceptional grant facility to finance the project.

Mr. **Teuten**, United Kingdom observed that while the principle is laudable, further guidance is needed on the additionality and what is it that is being done that cannot be supported by other instruments.

Mr. **Alsaheb** informed that the ASB program has been working since 2012 and has developed strong relations with all stakeholders in the sector. The program has been generously supported by the EU and

has partnered with ILO and GIZ. On additionality, Mr. Alsaheb noted that the experience and networks developed over the years in both Jordan and Lebanon, places the program in a unique position to help refugees. On selection criteria, the program has adopted an approach that focuses on refugees and host communities within an overall economic development perspective. Another aspect of the program's additionality is working directly with Jordanian SMEs that employ Syrian refugees which helps to alleviate tensions. Mr. Alsaheb noted that the focus of the ASB is to increase employment opportunities for both host communities and refugees through increased business, sales, and expansion. On the SVP, what initially started off as support to tech start-ups, has now grown to other sectors such as food security, green sector and a refugee track that will support start-ups that are either owned by Syrian refugees or employ refugees.

Ms. **Huda Saigh**, EBRD, complemented the remarks made by Mr. Alsaheb by adding that in Lebanon, the program works closely with all partners to ensure coordination and what makes the program unique is that it engages with individuals to identify their needs and links them to the appropriate services. Ms. Saigh acknowledged the late start of the pilot project with UNHCR, but progress is being made and results will be shared in due course of time with the Steering Committee.

Mr. **Teuten** commented that the presentation ably identified the experience and relationships that the program has developed over time. The focus on support to both refugees and host communities and attention to business expansion as a model is also aptly reflected. Mr. Teuten noted that on the basis on this presentation and any further information the Steering Committee may request in the coming weeks, the Steering Committee will reflect on the proposal and after taking a considered opinion will revert with additional comments which would be open to feedback from the EBRD.

Conclusion

The Steering Committee with respect to the EBRD proposal on Advice for Small Businesses Program in Lebanon and Jordan agreed to further reflect on the proposal to consider if the proposed approach could be considered under the Exceptional Grant Facility. The Steering Committee will provide supplementary comments to the GCFE Coordination Unit for sharing with the EBRD to inform further development of the proposal

Mr. Teuten thanked Mr. Alsaheb and Ms. Saigh for their presentations, the productive session and closed the agenda item.

Presentation of the Jordan Water Efficiency Program with IBRD as ISA

Ms. **Hernandez** introduced the presentation item. Ms. Hernandez noted that the Government of Jordan submitted a funding request for the *Jordan Water Sector Efficiency Program* with the WB as ISA on April 28 and is seeking concessional financing for the project. Ms. Hernandez added that the Steering Committee review process entails an informational session which usually takes place virtually, but taking advantage of the meeting, this is being done as a part of the Steering Committee meeting.

Ms. **Hernandez** turned to the Minister for water Mr. **Mohammed Al Najjar** for the presentation. *(Please find copy of presentation in attachment).*

Ms. **Hernandez** then turned to Ms. **Holly Welborn Benner**, Resident Representative World Bank Jordan and Ms. **Jacqueline Marie Tront**, Task Team Leader, IBRD for additional comments and observations on the funding request.

Discussion.

Following the presentation Ms. **Hernandez** opened the floor for comments and questions.

Mr. **Eric Meyer**, United States noted the importance of the sector and stated that the US will review the structure of the project from the angles of water security, efficiency, service delivery, fiscal sustainability, and linkages with other sectors for maximizing existing services.

Mr. **Richard Teuten** United Kingdom acknowledged the critical issues surrounding water and observed that the document appeared to suggest that only 80,000 refugees are direct beneficiaries out of 1.6 million which does not seem consistent with the total refugee population.

Mr. **Thomas Thomsen**, Denmark, commented that in principle Denmark is supportive of the proposal, understands the benefits to both host communities and refugees and looks forward to reviewing the funding request.

Ms. **Benner** observed that on coordination, it will require a concert of interventions from multiple partners to address the issues in the water sector and look to improve on existing efficiencies in the sector.

Ms. **Tront** informed that the project employs a framework approach to screening areas that have a high refugee and host community population, positive financial returns and these figures particularly for refugees will be updated as the Government conducts more in-depth surveys during the implementation of the project.

With no further questions, Ms. Hernandez thanked the Minister for water Mr. Mohammed Al Najjar and WB/IBRD representatives for their presentation and thank members for the productive discussion.

4) Item for Presentation

Overview of pipelines landscape and line of sight on future projects (Coordination Unit) and Country Updates by BCs and ISA partners (ongoing and pipeline projects): Jordan, Lebanon, and Moldova

Ms. **Hernandez** introduced the presentation item. Ms. Hernandez noted that a Funding Plan for 2022-23 including country pipelines was developed by the GCFF Coordination Unit in close coordination with the Benefiting Countries and ISAs to facilitate adequate, predictable, and strategic financing from the GCFF. The presentations will provide an opportunity for Benefiting Countries to update members on their development responses for refugees and host communities and spotlight projects expected to be submitted for GCFF financing during CY 2023-2024, while also facilitating GCFF donor decisions on future contributions. Ms. Hernandez explained the sequence of presentations by respective Benefiting Countries to be preceded by the GCFF Coordination Units overview of the process.

Ms. **Hernandez** turned to Ms. **Nabila Assaf**, Practice Manager FCV Group, World Bank (Coordination Unit), for the overview of the presentations. Ms. Assaf noted that to assist forward looking priorities of BCs, a refreshed country pipelines exercise was undertaken by the Coordination Unit in collaboration with the BCs and ISAs. The aim to facilitate more predictability in availability of financing for BCs. Ms. Assaf further stated that the presentations would be consolidated into an updated Funding Plan as was developed in 2022. The new Plan in conjunction with the creation of new windows will enable strategic support to the BCs. Ms. Hernandez thanked Ms. Assaf for the overview.

Presentation on Jordan

Ms. **Hernandez** then turned to the representative of the Government of Jordan Mr. **Emad Shanaah**, Director of International Cooperation Department, MOPIC for their presentation.

(Please find copy of presentation in attachment).

Ms. **Hernandez** then turned to Ms. **Marion Hoenicke**, EIB Head of Division for operations in Neighboring Countries, for an update on the Jordan Private Sector Guarantee Facility project pipelines.

(Please find copy of presentation in attachment).

Following the presentations Ms. Hernandez thanked representative of the Government of Jordan, Mr. Shanaah and Ms. Hoenicke and opened the floor for comments and questions.

Discussion.

Mr. **Eric Meyer**, United States appreciated the presentations and inquired about timing of future projects for Jordan. This will be useful to factor in account resources mobilization for the GCFE.

Mr. **Richard Teuten**, United Kingdom inquired if the list of projects presented by the Government of Jordan are in order of priority keeping in mind that the total financing requirements for the Jordan pipeline exceed the current available funds.

Mr. **Shanaah** informed that most projects listed are to be implemented in 2023-24. There is need to create jobs and focus on economic growth and these projects aim to support those aims. On the list of projects, Mr. Shanaah clarified that these are presented in order of priority.

Ms. **Holly Welborn Benner**, Resident Representative World Bank Jordan, noted that the Jordan portfolio has matured in education, health, and economic opportunities. The next generation of projects being submitted to the GCFE from the WB side are in line with the GCFE and WDR focus.

Presentation on Lebanon

Ms. **Hernandez** then turned to the representative of the Government of Lebanon Mr. **Georges Marawi**, Director General, Ministry of Finance for their presentation. *(Joined virtually)* *(Please find copy of talking points in attachment)*. Mr. **Salim Rouhana**, World Bank Lebanon made a brief remark on the Green Agri-Food Transformation for Economic Recovery Project (GATE) which was complemented by Mr. **Salem Darwich**, Advisor to Agriculture Minister.

Discussion.

Following the presentation Ms. Hernandez thanked the representatives of the Government of Lebanon Mr. Marawi and Mr. Darwich and opened the floor for comments and questions.

Mr. **Thibaut Moyer**, Deputy Head of Cooperation, EU Delegation to Jordan observed that the importance of the project is noted, however some points to reflect on are linking reforms to the project components, how will refugees benefit from the project and lastly how will operational sustainability be maintained notably for the infrastructure component.

Mr. **Thomas Thomsen**, Denmark and Dr. **Anna-Maria Schneider**, Germany echoed the observations of the EU, and also acknowledged the coordination undertaken during project development with the different donors and looked forward to further discussions on the project.

Mr. **Salim Rouhana**, World Bank Lebanon thanked the Steering Committee members for their questions and informed that the revised project documents will take into account all comments and will be a comprehensive document in aligned with the GCFE eligibility criteria.

Presentation on Moldova

Ms. **Hernandez** then turned to the representative of the Government of Moldova Mr. **Ion Gumene**, Secretary of State for Finance for their presentation. *(Please find copy of presentation in attachment).*

Discussion.

Following the presentation Ms. Hernandez thanked the representative of the Government of Moldova Mr. Gumene and opened the floor for comments and questions. There were no comments/questions.

Conclusion.

Ms. **Hernandez** again thanked the governments for their presentations and thanked members for the productive discussion. Ms. Hernandez acknowledged the consultative process for developing the pipelines and the focus of the projects on addressing the development challenges being faced by Jordan, Lebanon, and Moldova. Ms. Hernandez concluded by reflecting that the pipelines reflect the right level of ambitions for further funding and informing dialogue on priorities for GCF support.

Item for Presentation

Country Updates by BCs and ISA partners (ongoing and pipeline projects) Colombia, Costa Rica and Ecuador.

Mr. **Teuten** continued the presentation item from the previous country presentations. Mr. Teuten explained the sequence of presentations by respective Benefiting Countries.

Presentation on Colombia

Mr. **Teuten** first turned to Ms. **Luz Stella Campillo Hernandez**, Deputy Director of Multilateral and Bilateral Financing, Ministry of Finance, representative of the Government of Colombia for their presentation. Ms. Hernandez was supported and complemented by Mr. **Francisco Zegarra**, IaDB, Mr. **Jeremy Veillard**, WB, Ms. **Diana Bocarejo**, WB and Ms. **Clemencia Catabali** Presidential Advisor for Gender Equality and Mr. **Peter Siegenthaler**, Country Manager, WB. *(Please find copy of presentation in attachment).*

Discussion.

Following the presentation Mr. Teuten thanked representative of the Government of Colombia Ms. Hernandez and opened the floor for comments and questions.

Mr. **Teuten** inquired what flexibility is built into these projects to account for economic migrants who will potentially return to Venezuela in the next 2-3 years?

Mr. **Felipe Munoz**, IaDB and Ms. **Paula Andrea Rossiasco** WB, informed that there are some returns, but these are comparatively small and most try to move to the southern border of the US. The Governments of Colombia and Ecuador need support in strengthening institutions to inform refugees about the staying in their countries. Projects in Colombia do not exclude any migrants and are open all based-on project eligibility criteria. Moreover, both WB and IaDB do not have operations in Venezuela or cater to movements to 3rd and 4th countries where the migrants may go. Therefore, the returnees do not receive any support there. However, the countries in the region are working together to help all kinds of migrants in the host countries.

Mr. **Warner ten Kate**, Netherlands inquired about the exact number of Venezuelan migrants and their movements into Colombia.

Ms. **Rossiasco** informed that there are around 1.8 million Venezuelans who reside in Venezuela but who go back and forth between the two countries for work or to access services. These migrants have been issued papers by the Government of Colombia, but it is not possible to calculate the exact number in this pendular situation. What is known is that this movement has burdened services especially Colombia's healthcare system.

Presentation on Costa Rica

Mr. **Teuten** then turned to the representative of the Government of Costa Rica Vice Minister and Director General of Migration, Ms. **Marlhen Luna** for their presentation. *(Joined virtually) (Please find copy of presentation in attachment).*

Discussion.

Following the presentation Mr. Teuten thanked the representative of the Government of Costa Rica Ms. Luna and opened the floor for comments and questions.

Mr. **Felipe Munoz** observed that Costa Rica is facing many challenges and is both a host and transit country. The IaDB is seeking US\$ 5 million in technical assistance to help strengthen the institutional capacities of the Government in responding to the refugee crises.

Ms. **Rossiasco** highlighted that the WB framework of support to the Government of Costa Rica is undertaken in close collaboration with the IaDB. Despite having open policies on migrants and refugees in the institutions in Costa Rica are strained. Currently the GCFE is supporting Costa Rica with the Climate Resilient Recovery and Territorial Development Project. The Government will be seeking more support in the future especially as it updates and fine tunes progressive refugee and migrant related policies.

Mr. **Meyer** appreciated the presentation and lauded the cooperation between IaDB and the WB in supporting Costa Rica. In terms of institutional strengthening and the joint use of the GRF and GCFE, it would be interesting to continue discussions in this notably as the exceptional grant facility has yet to be used.

Presentation on Ecuador

Mr. **Teuten** then turned to the representative of the Government of Ecuador HE Ambassador Ms. **Silvia Espindola**, Vice-Minister for Human Mobility for their presentation. *(Please find copy of presentation in attachment).*

Discussion.

Following the presentation Mr. Teuten thanked the representative of the Government of Ecuador Ms. Espindola and opened the floor for comments and questions.

Mr. **Meyer** thanked the Minister for the presentation and acknowledged that based on the country presentations made today, there is great demand for GCFE support. Mr. Meyer applauded the strong support provided by the ISAs to BCs, and the demand for more GCFE resources which may not be met in the current circumstances. Therefore, BCs and ISAs are urged to identify the highest value and direct linkages projects that prioritize refugees and migrants in a forward-looking pipeline to the GCFE as that would be helpful in resource mobilization.

Conclusion.

Mr. **Teuten** thanked the governments for their presentations and thanked members for the productive discussion. Mr. Teuten acknowledged the consultative process for developing the pipelines and the focus of the projects on addressing the development challenges being faced by Colombia, Costa Rica and Ecuador.

Mr. Teuten concluded that it is heartening to see the strong relationships between the BCs and ISAs and the needs of refugees. Going forward Mr. Teuten summarized the next steps.

- The presentations reaffirmed the case for international support to host countries to provide services and create livelihood opportunities for refugees.
- The GCFF Coordination Unit to enter into dialogue with BCs to identify priority projects which would inform the forward-looking country pipelines and facilitate individual Supporting Countries future contributions to the GCFF.
- Revised country pipelines to be presented in the next Steering Committee meeting
- The Coordination Unit will further review with the relevant ISAs those proposals related to the use of Exceptional Grant Modalities to ensure they are eligible under the existing guidelines

5) AOB/Outstanding issues

The two co-chairs of the meeting, Ms. **Hernandez**, Representative of Colombia, and Mr. **Teuten**, representative of the United Kingdom, informed that in addition to some comments on the forward agenda for the GCFF, future work on results and monitoring and update on Türkiye there will be a presentation on the draft Terms of Reference for the GCFF Technical Advisory Group and Country Coordination Structures by the Coordination Unit which could not be presented earlier. Prior to that the Government of Japan would like to make a statement.

Mr. **Shin Yamamoto**, Ministry of Finance, Japan thanked the WB and Government of Jordan in organising the meeting of the GCFF Steering Committee. Jordan is a keystone of stability in the Middle East and Japan resolves to support regional stability by supporting the Government of Jordan as it hosts large numbers of refugees. Japan has recently contributed US\$ 83 million to the GCFF out of which US\$ 67 million is for the Jordan/Lebanon window. Forced displacement is a global phenomenon and as shown in UNHCR's presentation, it is increasing. Through the GCFF, Japan aspires in concert to collectively address the global refugee crises and formulate durable solutions.

Mr. **Teuten** thanked the Government of Japan for their comments and recognized that valuable contribution that is appreciated by all members of the GCFF Steering Committee.

Mr. **Teuten** turned to Mr. **Spyridon Demetriou** for comments on the forward agenda. Mr. Demetriou informed that based on discussions there is an appetite and interest in refining results indicators and approaches and systematically trying to capture lessons learned to share the knowledge accumulated. The Coordination Unit will develop a paper for the consideration of the Steering Committee. On the TORs for the country coordination platforms and the technical advisory group the Coordination Unit seeks the Steering Committees initial reflections and will position the TORs in light of the feedback garnered which will then be presented in the next Steering Committee meeting. Finally on the pipelines, the report is almost complete, pending the BCs endorsement. However, taking into account the discussions on prioritization and availability of resources the Funding Plan to be shared with the Steering Committee at its next meeting be revised to focus on identifying priority projects and associated financial requirements, targets and gap.

Mr. **Teuten** noted that on Türkiye, the Steering Committee is still in the process of establishing if there is sufficient interest in generating noteworthy financial support to warrant approaching the Government of Türkiye.

Dr. **Anna-Maria Schneider** informed the meeting, that Germany would appreciate a decision in this regard which would enable mustering possible financing in case there is interest in supporting Türkiye. There are also some limitations on financing and associated windows which Germany would like to avoid in case there is no interest from the Türkiye authorities.

Mr. **Warner ten Kate** confirmed the Netherlands commitment to contribute to the GCFE in case the Facility were to support Türkiye.

Mr. **Teuten** concluded the discussion by thanking Germany and Netherlands for their interest in supporting Türkiye through the GCFE. As a next step The Coordination Unit may follow up with concerned stakeholders including the World Bank and other ISAs to get a sense of what is an appropriate amount to merit approaching the Türkiye authorities. This would also enable GCFE Supporting Countries to decide on the future course of action for the Facility. A follow-up meeting in this regard may be organized by the end of May or beginning of June.

Presentation of the draft terms of reference of the GCFE Technical Advisory Group (TAG) and Country Coordination Committees (CCC)

Ms. **Hernandez** introduced the presentation item. Ms. Hernandez appraised that based on the Steering Committee's endorsement in October 2022 to strengthen country level coordination between GCFE stakeholders and agreement to establish a standing GCFE Technical Committee to support the work of the Steering Committee, the GCFE Coordination Unit has developed and circulated draft TORs for the consideration of the Steering Committee in this meeting. These modifications are aimed at further strengthening the strategic support provided by the GCFE.

Ms. **Hernandez** turned to Mr. **Spyridon Demetriou**, Program Manager GCFE, for the presentation. *(Please find copy of presentation in attachment).*

Discussion.

Following the presentation Ms. **Hernandez** opened the floor for comments and questions.

Mr. **Teuten** observed that the country coordination structures were broadly fine, however it is important to ensure that BCs input is taken into consideration while developing and finalizing the committees. On the technical advisory committee, the draft presents a menu of options of what might be appropriate. As presented the TORs appear to heavy and may need to be made lighter. The Steering Committee will provide written comments on the proposed TORs.

Dr. **Anna-Maria Schneider**, Germany noted that the TORs were generally fine. Detailed feedback with a lens on capacities and timelines related to the work of the Steering Committee will be provided in writing to the Coordination Unit. In closing Dr. Schneider thanked the Coordination Unit and Co-Chairs for organizing the meeting and looked forward to attending future Steering Committee meeting in person.

Mr. **Thomas Thomsen**, Denmark informed that broadly speaking Denmark supports the TORs, but were concerned about the heaviness of the technical committee and will review the documents with a view at complementarities between the forums, capacities ensuring linkages to the informal dialogue between the

WB and participating stakeholders, while Mr. Thomsen commended the organization of the Steering Committee meeting and thanked the Co-Chairs and Coordination Unit for the arrangements.

Mr. **Warner ten Kate**, Netherlands commented that it would be useful to have more precise TORs for the two forums spelling out the exact functions. This would allow for a more thorough evaluation of the proposed TORs. Mr. ten Kate noted that this was his first in-person Steering Committee meeting and was pleased with the proceedings and organization.

Mr. **Sajjad Malik**, UNHCR recognized the level of discussions, engagement, interest on the subject of forced displacement and participation of stakeholders. Mr. Malik thanked the Co-Chairs and the Coordination Unit for organising the meeting and felt reassured that the discussions on refugees were progressing well and looked forward to the GCFF's participation in the Global Refugee Forum

Mr. **Teuten** summed up the discussion advising more precision in the exact roles of the committees, at the same time noting there needs to be flexibility in the roles when it comes to specific projects and issues. Mr. Teuten added that the Steering Committee will be provided an opportunity to supplement comments on the TORs which will lead to the next iteration of the proposed forums.

Decision.

The Steering Committee agreed to provide written comments on the draft ToRs for the proposed country level and technical committees to the Coordination Unit based on which a new draft will be presented for the Steering Committee's consideration at its next meeting.

Ms. Hernandez thanked Mr. Demetriou for his presentation and thanked members for the productive discussion.

Closing

The GCFF Co-Chairs Ms. **Luz Stella Campillo Hernandez** and Mr. **Richard Teuten** summarized the proceedings of the Steering Committee meeting:

- The field visits were instructive, showcasing how interventions can benefit host communities and refugees, while also raising some questions.
- There were two important contextual sessions, first the UNHCR provided sobering trends across the globe and in regions of interest while informing potential opportunities for the GCFF. The WDR panel shed light on experiences of host countries and the international community which provided us with much to consider as we go forward.
- The Steering Committee considered two projects; the Jordan Water Sector Efficiency Project on which we look forward to receiving more details and the EBRD Private Sector Project for Social Cohesion in Jordan and Lebanon. The Steering Committee noted that the EBRD had taken steps to show elements of additionality and the Steering Committee needs to further reflect on whether these are sufficient to warrant eligibility funding from the exceptional grant facility. The Steering Committee may provide more comments to EBRD before they are asked to respond.
- On the financial overview, it is noteworthy to point out that the total grants funds generated (grants provided plus interest on grants) is almost US\$ 1 billion which is a significant amount and cause to celebrate and is a tribute to the Supporting Countries.

- The Steering Committee welcomed the changes in the concessionality methodology. At present there is no interest in revising the approach, but it will be useful to have some scenarios formulated for the benefit of the Steering Committee before next meeting.
- The Annual Report was well received and provided a stronger narrative on what the GCFE is achieving and the value of the new Results Framework. There has been an identification of a small number of indicators that need to be refined and the Coordination Unit is encouraged to examine if there are ways to identify gaps in data for older projects particularly in terms of gender.
- The Coordination Unit is also tasked to contemplate how best to disseminate the increasing body of evidence arising from GCFE projects and how this can be shared with the Committee and more broadly.

Ms. **Hernandez** once again thanked all members for a productive Steering Committee meeting, appreciated the arrangements made by the Coordination Unit, recognized the support of the WB Jordan CMU. Ms. Hernandez looked forward to hosting the next in-person meeting in Colombia.

Ms. **Soukeyna Kane**, FCV Director, thanked all the participants for a successful meeting. Ms. Kane observed that there is no substitute for an in-person meeting which provides opportunities for side discussions and more fruitful engagement. Ms. Kane appreciated the feedback on the Annual Report and endeavored to continue improving it to aptly reflect the impact that the GCFE is making. On the WDR session, Ms. Kane recommended that Steering Committee members should read the report as it is pertinent to the work of the GCFE and current global trends. Ms. Kane observed that hearing from BCs and ISAs, there is a strong demand for the GCFE, but at the same time there is need for more predictable and flexible financing especially when we see the lack of funds for the global and LAC windows, which is something that needs to be addressed. Going forward to look forward to the Steering Committees' endorsement of the TORs for the country coordination committees and the technical advisory group. Ms. Kane once again thanked the Co-Chairs, Jordan WB CMU, and all participants for making this meeting a successful one.

Annex-1

GCFE Steering Committee Meeting (May 2-3, 2023)

Amman, Jordan

Day-1: Tuesday, May 2 Field Visit/Steering Committee Meeting

In close coordination with the GCFE Co-Chairs, MOPIC, and the WB Jordan CMU, three GCFE funded projects benefiting refugees and host communities have been identified for the half day field visits. These include the *Jordan Emergency Health Project*, *Jordan Education Reform Support Program* and *Jordan Youth, Technology, and Jobs* respectively with the WB as ISA. Participants will be divided into two groups and visit two projects each with the aim of seeing as many projects as possible. Please note that all sites are in the greater Amman area.

	Time	Agenda Item	Description	Duration
1	9:00 am	Departure for project site (s)	To see first-hand progress and impact of GCFE funded Projects. <i>Participants will be divided into two groups. Detailed program and logistic arrangements provided in Logistics note.</i> Projects: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jordan Emergency Health Project (Al Bashir Hospital: 261 Ossamah Ben Zeid Street, Amman) • Jordan Education Reform Support Program (Princess Salma Secondary School for Girls 2 Yousef Al Athmeh Street, Amman) • Jordan Youth, Technology, and Jobs (Ruwwad Al-Tanmeya: 8 Nazmi Abd Al Hadi Street, Amman and Education for Employment EFE: Basement 2 floor at Abdali Mall, Suliman Al Nabulsi Street, Amman) 	210 mins
2	12:30 pm*	Departure from project site (s)	Participants return to meeting venue (transportation provided)	
3	1:30 pm	Lunch at Meeting Venue		60 mins
4	2:30 pm	Opening and Introductory Remarks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HE Ms. Ziena Toukan, Minister of planning and International Cooperation, Govt of Jordan. • Mr. Jean-Christophe Carret, World Bank Country Director, Mashreq Region • Ms. Soukeyna Kane, Director, World Bank FCV Group • GCFE Steering Committee Co-Chairs 	30 mins
5	3:00 pm	Overview of the Agenda	Presentation of the Agenda by the GCFE Coordination Unit by Mr. Spyros Demetriou Program Manager GCFE Coordination Unit.	5 mins
6	3:05 pm	Tea/Coffee Break		20 mins
7	3:25 pm	Item for Presentation	Overview of refugee trends, challenges, opportunities and priorities. Presentation by Mr. Sajjad Malik, Director Resilience and Solutions UNHCR.	45 mins
8	4:10 pm	Item for Presentation	Presentation of the 2022 GCFE Annual Report (Coordination Unit). Overview by Ms. Nabila Assaf, Practice Manager FCV Group, World Bank. Presentations by Mr. Spyros Demetriou and Ms. Sarah Craig, GCFE Coordination Unit Discussion	50 mins (5 mins) (20 mins) (25 mins)
9	5:00 pm	Close of meeting		
10	6.30pm	Reception hosted by Britain's Ambassador to Jordan HE Ms. Bridget Brind OBE		

Day-2: Wednesday, May 3 Steering Committee Meeting

Please note morning sessions will be recorded to enable SC members that are attending remotely to be able to see the presentations later on.

	Time	Agenda Item	Description	Duration
1	9:15 am	Item for Presentation	<p>2023 World Development Report (WDR) on Migrants, Refugees and Societies: Presentation and Panel Discussion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opening remarks and introduction of presenter and panelists. (5 mins) • Presentation on WDR 2023 by Ms. Joyce Antone Ibrahim, WDR2023 Manager. (25 mins) • Remarks by Panelists on the findings and conclusions of the 2023 World Development Report (WDR): (20 mins) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➢ Ms. Feda Gharaibeh, Sr. Advisor on Refugees, MOPIC, ➢ Ms. Camila Veerman, First Secretary Development Cooperation, Embassy of the Kingdom of the Netherlands in Jordan ➢ Ms. Amy Schmidt, NRC Country Director and JIF Steering Committee Member ➢ Mr. Felipe Munoz, Head of Migration Unit, IADB • Q&A (25 mins) 	75 mins
2	10:30 am		Group Photo	10 mins
3	10:40 am		Tea/Coffee Break	20 mins
4	11:00 am	Items for Presentation/Decision	<p>GCFF Operational and Administrative Updates and Presentations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GCFF Financial Overview. Presentation by the GCFF Trustee, Ms. Jane Mwebi, World Bank. (10 mins) • Update on the GCFF Concessionality approach. Presentation by Ms. Concepcion Asia Otin, Treasury, World Bank (10 mins) • Draft Terms of Reference for the GCFF Technical Advisory Group and Country Coordination Structures. Presentation by Mr. Spyros Demetriou Program Manager GCFF Coordination Unit. (30 mins) 	50 mins
5	11:50 am	Item for Presentation	<p>Presentation of Country Project Proposals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Private Sector Support for Social Cohesion Project in Jordan and Lebanon.</i> EBRD will present their revised proposal (Mr. Khaled Alsaheb, Principal Manager, SME Finance & Development in Jordan); GCFF CU to provide an overview of modalities for potential GCFF support. (20 mins) • <i>Jordan Water Sector Efficiency Program.</i> Joint presentation by MOPIC and WB on the Jordan Water Sector Efficiency Program. (20 mins) 	40 mins
6	12:30 pm		Lunch at Meeting Venue	60 mins
7	1.30 pm	Item for Presentation	<p>GCFF Funding Plan Update: Overview by Ms. Nabila Assaf, Practice Manager FCV Group, World Bank (Coordination Unit). (10 mins)</p> <p>Country Presentations by BCs and ISA partners: (90 mins)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jordan: Mr. Emad Shanaah, Director of International Cooperation Department, MOPIC. • Lebanon: Mr. Georges Marawi, Director General, Ministry of Finance. • Moldova: Mr. Ion Gumene, Secretary of State, Ministry of Finance 	10 mins
8	3.10 pm		Tea/Coffee Break	30 mins
9	3.40 pm	Item for Presentation	Country Updates by BCs and ISA partners:	90 mins

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Colombia: Ms. Luz Stella Campillo Hernandez, Deputy Director of Multilateral and Bilateral Financing, Ministry of Finance, Representative of Colombia • Costa Rica: Vice Minister and Director General of Migration, Ms. Marlen Luna. • Ecuador: HE Ambassador Silvia Espindola, Vice- Minister for Human Mobility. 	
10	5:10 pm	AOB/Outstanding issues	<p>Open discussion, remarks, and any other business</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GCFE SC Forward Agenda • Further work on GCFE results and reporting • Follow up to the discussion on Türkiye 	<i>20 mins</i>
11	5:30 pm	Closing remarks	GCFE Co-Chairs and WB Directors	<i>10 mins</i>