

Global Concessional Financing Facility Steering Committee Meeting

4-5 June 2024 Chişinău, Moldova.

Key Areas of Agreement / Decisions

- *The GCFF Steering Committee requested the preparation of a Technical Note on options for expanding the Private Sector Operations Modality. The Steering Committee further requested the Coordination Unit to prepare this Note in collaboration with the GCFF ISAs, to be presented for discussion at an upcoming Steering Committee meeting later in 2024.*
- *The Steering Committee requested the Coordination Unit to develop a GCFF Business and Investment Plan.*
- *The Steering Committee agreed that future updates to the GCFF Funding Plan should include prior consultations at country level (through the Country Coordination Committees, or equivalent) of Benefiting Country project pipelines to ensure their adequacy and prioritization in relation to GCFF objectives; and that future GCFF funding requests be discussed at country level (through the CCCs or equivalent) and in the TAG prior to formal submission to the Coordination Unit.*

Summary of Meeting

A meeting of the Global Concessional Financing Facility (GCFF) Steering Committee (SC) took place in Chişinău, Moldova on 4-5 June 2024. A two-day program (Annex-1) was structured with a half day of field visits to the Alecu Russo High School, Cojuşna, Străşeni supported by the Education Quality Improvement Project and meetings with Ministries of Finance, Labour, and Internal Affairs supported by the Emergency Response, Resilience and Competitiveness DPOs, followed by one and a half days of GCFF Steering Committee work sessions. Please see Participants List at Annex-2.

Day-1: Tuesday, 4 June.

1) Opening and Introductory Remarks

The Steering Committee meeting commenced with introductory and welcome remarks from HE **Petru Rotaru**, Minister of Finance of Moldova, followed by HE **Vahe Hovhannisyan** Minister of Finance of Armenia, then Mr. **Arup Banerji**, Regional Country Director ECA, followed by Ms. **Soukeyna Kane**, FCV Group Director, World Bank and in conclusion the GCFF Co-Chairs Mr. **Ion GUMENE** and Mr. **Warner ten Kate**.

HE **Rotaru** welcomed the participants to the SC meeting and expressed his delight in hosting the meeting in Chişinău, which provides an opportunity to share Moldova’s experience of managing the refugee crisis and discuss challenges in this regard. HE Rotaru noted that since the beginning of the war in Ukraine, Moldova has gone through several crises that have affected the economy. Despite the numerous economic and social challenges, the Republic of Moldova and its international partners remained determined to provide necessary support to refugees and the communities hosting them. HE Rotaru recognized the strong support that GCFF has provided to Moldova aimed at the stability and sustainability of services and economic opportunities for the affected communities. HE Rotaru concluded by reiterating his pleasure at the organization of the meeting in Chişinău and wished for a productive Steering Committee meeting.

HE **Hovhannisyan** thanked the Government of Moldova and the GCFF SC for inviting Armenia and organizing the meeting. HE Hovhannisyan stated that in the face of unprecedented global challenges, there is continued need and demand to support MICs as they grapple with humanitarian and development challenges. The GCFF is one such important instrument supporting several MICs hosting large number of refugees. HE Hovhannisyan informed that since Armenia joined the GCFF in December, the Facility quickly approved the Second Green, Inclusive and Sustainable Development Policy Operation assisting efforts of the Government in supporting the displaced people from Nagorno-Karabakh. HE Hovhannisyan looked forward to the continued partnership and support of the GCFF as Armenia reaffirmed its commitment to address global challenges and the refugee crises.

Mr. **Banerji** thanked the Government of Moldova for hosting the GCFF SC meeting and welcomed all participants. Mr. Banerji noted that the GCFF has proven itself as a force for positive change in supporting refugees and host communities’ country after country including Moldova. Mr. Banerji acknowledged the rapid and timely response that the GCFF has provided to its Benefiting Countries as they face refugee crises. Mr. Banerji also applauded GCFF’s Exceptional Grant Facility which can provide technical assistance and serve as a catalyst for spurring effective refugee related reforms. He encouraged the use of the Grant Facility for advancing crucial refugee related reforms and building capacity of front-line government agencies catering for refugees.

Ms. **Kane** provided an overview of the agenda for the meeting. Ms. Kane reflected on the accomplishments of the GCFF during 2023. The GCFF SC, added Armenia as the seventh BC in December 2023. In quick succession, the SC approved the IBRD supported Second Green, Inclusive and Sustainable Development Policy Operation with US\$16 million in GCFF grant funding that enabled US\$100 million in concessional loan financing from the IBRD in February 2024. Operations were also funded in Costa Rica and Jordan in the areas of refugee policy reform, sustainable infrastructure and expanding vital public services with \$159.36 million in grant allocations resulting in \$1.12 billion total lending on concessional terms. Ms. Kane noted that Jordan received \$104.36 million, Moldova \$35 million and Costa Rica \$20 million. Ms. Kane acknowledged the unwavering commitment and support of GCFF Supporting Countries. During 2023, the total donor contributions amounted to \$123 million, with Japan providing \$83.36 million, United States \$28.20 million, Netherlands \$10 million, and Canada \$1.27 million. Finally, Ms. Kane updated that the Technical Advisory Group has been operationalized with plans for Country Coordination Committees to become effective in 2024.

The two co-chairs of the meeting, Mr. **GUMENE** and Mr. **ten Kate**, welcomed all participants to the GCFF Steering Committee, including Excellencies Rotaru and Hovhannisyan. Mr. GUMENE expressed his appreciation for the in-person organization of the meeting and the opportunity for Moldova to share its challenges and successes in supporting refugees. Mr. ten Kate thanked the Ministry of Finance for organizing the field visits to GCFF funded projects and appreciated the value that the trips provided to the SC members. Mr. ten Kate concluded by thanking all participants for attending the meeting and looked forward to a productive one and a half days.

Mr. **Spyros Demetriou**, Program Manager, GCFF Coordination Unit (CU) provided an overview of the agenda.

2) Item for Presentation

Overview of Refugee Trends, Challenges, Opportunities, and Priorities by UNHCR.

Mr. **ten Kate** introduced the presentation item. Mr. **ten Kate** recognized the important advisory role of UNHCR in the GCFF and the value of the presentation in informing the SC on current and potential refugees' crises around the world, areas of possible GCFF support, and potential of GCFF as forced displacement crises continue to unfold around the world.

Mr. **ten Kate** invited the representative of UNHCR, Ms. **Betsy Lippman**, Deputy Director Resilience and Solutions to deliver the presentation. *(Please find copy of presentation in attachment).*

Following the presentation, Mr. **ten Kate** invited the Steering Committee to ask questions and comment on the presentation.

Discussion

The United Kingdom asked about the nature of dialogue on refugee issues with host country governments particularly Jordan and Lebanon.

The United States enquired about the kinds of additional incentives that could advance dialogue with host country governments on policy which the GCFF may consider.

The Netherlands asked how the UNHCR could contribute to improving the quality of GCFF projects.

Denmark expressed interest in learning how the UNHCR's Refugee Policy and Protection Review (RPPR) could help the SC in its deliberations on BCs.

Germany noted that the situation in Lebanon is complex and there needs to be a separation between humanitarian aid and development cooperation. Germany's funding to Lebanon supports both refugees and host communities and it is important that this targeting of beneficiaries is continued in the public and private sector projects that the GCFF supports. In general, there is a need to prove whether private sector projects are appropriate for achieving the goals of the GCFF.

Remaining resources in GCFE are limited and have to be used in the most effective way. Therefore, SC decided to evaluate the results of the Jordan project before making final decisions on further private sector projects.

Japan appreciated the presentation and asked how the UNHCR could help in improving the impact of GCFE supported projects.

UNCHR informed there is continuous dialogue with the Government of Lebanon on refugee related issues, however, the compounded crises have affected both refugees and host communities which necessitates that humanitarian and development interventions target the local population and refugees. Instruments like the GCFE and IDA Window for Host Communities and Refugees (WHR) provide avenues for dialogue and discussion beyond financing which helps advance discussions even in the most challenging situations like Lebanon where the dialogue continues.

Regarding additional incentives, and role of RPPRs, these provide an entry point for identifying key areas for dialogue on the policy front with all stakeholders at the country level. These Reviews unlock and can guide prioritization for investment and interventions by development partners and the GCFE.

In response to how the UNHCR could contribute to improving the quality of GCFE projects, one option could be to engage upstream with prospective task teams in the development of projects by providing input on the country context, needs of refugees and host communities.

In conclusion, the UNHCR expressed its willingness in helping to improve the impact of GCFE supported projects if there is interest in utilizing its experience and expertise.

Mr. **ten Kate** thanked the UNHCR and members for a productive session and closed the agenda item.

3) **Item for Presentation**

Presentation of the OECD Development Finance for Refugee Situations 2020-21 Report

Mr. **GUMENE** introduced the presentation item. Mr. **GUMENE** noted that the Global Compact on Refugees (GCR) in 2018 affirmed the importance of provision of high degree of concessionality to low- and middle-income refugee host countries (LICs and MICs). To complement this global ambition and understand the extent and quality of official development assistance (ODA) and other official flows (OOF) for refugee situations in LICs and MICs, the OECD has conducted and published refugee financing surveys in 2018, 2020 and 2023. Given the increasing importance of understanding the development finance landscape for refugee situations, and institutional expertise of the OECD, a presentation on the Development Finance for Refugee Situations in Low- and Middle-Income Countries, Years 2020-21, carried out in 2023 will be made by the OECD.

Mr. **GUMENE** turned to Mr. **Jens Hesemann**, Senior Policy Advisor, OECD for the presentation.

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

Discussion

The Netherlands observed that humanitarian aid to protracted refugee situations is not sustainable and there needs to be discussions on how ad-hoc humanitarian aid can graduate to sustainable social protection support delivered through national systems.

The United States enquired if there have been any discussions on financing and policy for displacement caused by climate change which evolves more slowly than forced displacement caused by conflict.

The OECD reflected that transitioning from humanitarian responses to development programs can be very challenging. Phasing out emergency services provided by humanitarian actors for sustainable development support through national systems and development organizations must be a coordinated effort amongst humanitarian/development partners and the government.

Regarding forced displacement caused by climate change, a first step would be to include mobility/displacement in Climate Adaptation Plans. This can then be linked to policy and financing.

The UNHCR added that while social protection systems are useful, the focus should be on making refugees and host communities self-reliant through employment opportunities, access to labor market, MSMEs etc. GCFF support for productive projects that facilitate economic inclusion can decrease reliance on humanitarian aid and social protection.

Mr. **GUMENE** thanked the OECD and members for a productive session and closed the agenda item.

In conclusion the GCFF Co-Chairs Mr. **GUMENE** and Mr. **ten Kate** ended the first day of the Steering Committee meeting.

4) Closed Door Meeting of Supporting Countries

GCFF Co-Chair Netherlands led discussions on sustained resources and support from existing and potential Supporting Countries. Key take-aways to be discussed in GCFF Future Directions and Priorities, 2024-2026 session on Day 2.

Supporting countries held a meeting to discuss the future financing of GCFF. Many countries announced an intention to finance the GCFF again. Financing for all regions seems secured for this year, which is encouraging.

All participants agreed that it would be beneficial for the functioning of the GCFF if financing could be made more predictable, and more long-term. It is however challenging to achieve that. In the view of many participants, it is necessary for the GCFF to formulate a convincing business case that the Supporting Countries can present to their respective organizations. For that, it is also necessary to improve targeting and impact of interventions. The ‘first past the post’- method of selecting interventions should be replaced by a method that looks more to the quality of interventions and relevance for refugees. Furthermore, visibility for financing donors should be increased. Participants concluded by agreeing to ask the Coordination Unit to draft a paper for the next steering committee about these issues.

Day-2: Wednesday, 5 June.

1) Item for Presentation

Presentation of the 2023 GCFF Annual Report

Mr. **GUMENE** introduced the presentation item. Mr. **GUMENE** explained that the Annual Report 2023 highlights the significant progress made towards achieving the goal of providing concessional financing to MICs hosting refugees. Further Mr. **GUMENE** noted that while the Annual Report builds on last year’s focus on the results and impact of GCFF support, it further broadens its canvas, by collaborating with - the Inter-American Development Bank, the Joint IFC-UNHCR Initiative, OECD, and the UNHCR to better understand refugee and forced migration trends, issues, and the development finance landscape for refugee situations. These insightful contributions to the Report provide important contextual understanding to forced displacement and the role GCFF plays in it.

Mr. **GUMENE** 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 Annual Report focuses on the results and impact of GCFF support by drilling into how that support has translated into positive outcomes for host communities and refugees. Ms. Assaf explained that the section on GCFF’s development impact provides valuable insight on key country results and encouraged members to read the spotlight section on Policy Frameworks for Social and Economic Integration of Migrant and Refugees in Colombia, Ecuador, and Moldova.

Following the introduction, the floor was given to Mr. **Omer Khan** and Mr. **Hisham Esper** GCFF Coordination Unit, for the presentation. *(Please find copy of presentation in attachment).*

Following the presentation Mr. **Gumene** opened the floor for comments and questions.

Discussion

The United Kingdom asked if data could be disaggregated by age, disabilities etc to further highlight the impact of GCFF support. In addition, could the qualitative analysis provide some

direction on the which areas and what types of investments and interventions the GCFF should prioritize and focus on.

The United States suggested a resequencing of sections in the Report, by leading with the GCFF Development Impact to emphasize outcomes achieved, followed by quantitative data such as number of beneficiaries and rounded off with resources mobilized by the GCFF. This reordering would underline the impact of GCFF support.

The Netherlands appreciated the lessons learned and proposed deepening the qualitative analysis on policy interventions supported by the GCFF in the next Annual Report.

The UNHCR added that there are useful studies on social cohesion by the UNHCR-World Bank Joint Data Center on Forced Displacement and economic inclusion by IMF.

The OECD noted that the results show the impact of the GCFF and how it works directly with government budgets and national systems, which may not be the case with other instruments and providers. It is important to situate the GCFF in terms of the wider refugee response in a country as in some cases the GCFF accounts for more than 50 percent of financing for refugee support. It would be beneficial to see further analysis on whether GCFF support alleviates pressure on humanitarian actors, is there need for more coordination among development and humanitarian actors and can the GCFF be a model for responses to forced displacement globally.

Coordination Unit thanked members for feedback on the Annual Report and more broadly on the knowledge and learning agenda. With reference to further disaggregation, currently data collection is based on the Results Framework endorsed by the GCFF SC in 2021 which looks at gender disaggregated data. Due to legacy projects and constant refining of data from GCFF MDBs the focus will remain on this data set. Future iterations of the Annual Report, and knowledge products to be developed, will feature deeper analysis of policy measures and investment operations supported by the GCFF.

Ms. **Assaf** further explained that beyond the GCFF, there has been extensive research and analysis conducted by the Evidence Building Program on Forced Displacement. This body of work developed over several years includes sectoral findings and impact evaluations that provide a rich source of knowledge on interventions and programs in forced displacement settings.

Mr. **ten Kate** thanked the Steering Committee members for a productive session and commended the Coordination Unit on the preparation of the Annual Report.

2) **Item for Presentation**

GCFF Operational and Administrative Updates

Mr. **ten Kate** introduced the presentation items. This portion of the meeting will include updates on operationalisation of Country Coordination Committees and Technical Advisory Group, MENA regional review, Results, Knowledge, and Reporting Work Program and Funding Plan

and funding availability status and GCFE financial overview. The first presentation will be on GCFE Operational Update.

Mr. **ten Kate** introduced Mr. **Spyridon Demetriou**, Program Manager GCFE for the presentation on GCFE Operational Update. *(Please find copy of presentation in attachment).*

Following the presentation Mr. **ten Kate** opened the floor for comments and questions.

Discussion

Denmark saw merit in having separate Reviews with Jordan potentially serving as a role model for future discussions with the Government of Lebanon. Denmark noted the importance of dialogue between the GCFE donors and the UNHCR and further stressed the importance of operationalizing the Country Coordination Committees (CCCs) particularly in Lebanon.

European Commission endorsed the position of Denmark and underlined the importance of country-level coordination and input in the RPPR process (for example through a joint meeting of the CCC and Technical Advisory Group (TAG) to discuss the RPPR).

Japan encouraged the Supporting Countries to actively participate in the TAG and hoped for the operationalization of CCCs in BCs.

The United States expressed preference for a joint review given the similar nature of refugee issues that both Jordan and Lebanon face.

Germany seconded the views of the United States. At the same time, the specific characteristics of each country must be reflected. CCCs do not work in the same intensity. It is important that the same requirements apply to all beneficiary countries. TAG will make an important contribution here.

Coordination Unit explained that the RPPR and GCFE dialogue with BCs are two separate processes. The UNHCR led RPPR is one input into the overall GCFE led dialogue with BCs and hence not the sole vehicle for the engagement. With regard to the RPPR being discussed at the CCC, the CU defers to the UNHCR, however within the broader GCFE dialogue process, discussions at the country level and with Governments, ISAs and the TAG are envisaged as additional input to the discussions in the SC.

The UNHCR informed that an update on the Review can be provided to the CCC prior to the completion of the RPPR.

Mr. **ten Kate** thanked members for the productive discussion and based on the discussions concluded that there will be a joint regional review for Jordan and Lebanon with the understanding that in the event of a significant development in either country adjustment can be made to the sequencing of the Reviews. Further the UNHCR will provide information on the RPPRs to the CCC. The CU will plan and coordinate the MENA Regional Review with the following timelines: discussions in TAG: September 2024 and discussions in SC: October 2024.

Mr. **ten Kate**, turned to Ms. **Jane Mwebi** Trustee (World Bank) for the presentation of the GCFE Financial Overview. *(Please find copy of presentation in attachment).*

Mr. **ten Kate** then turned to Mr. **Hisham Esper**, GCFE CU for the presentation on Results, Knowledge, and Reporting Work Program. *(Please find copy of presentation in attachment).*

Following the presentation Mr. **ten Kate** opened the floor for comments and questions.

Discussion

The Netherlands requested a discussion on the Results and Learning studies to be undertaken on investment finance and development policy operations in the TAG.

Mr. **ten Kate** thanked Mr. **Demetriou**, Mr. **Esper** and Ms. **Mwebi** for their presentations and thanked members for the productive discussion. Mr. **ten Kate** concluded the discussion by requesting the CU to organize a meeting of the TAG on the Results and Learning studies.

3) **Item for Presentation/Discussion**

Update on the Application of GCFE Concessional in 2023 and Future Options

Mr. **ten Kate** introduced the presentation item. Mr. **ten Kate** noted that the Steering Committee had requested an annual update on the application of the revised concessional approach including the performance of the 25% cap on concessional. Mr. **ten Kate** noted the importance of the concessional approach to the value of the GCFE.

Mr. **ten Kate** turned to **Ms. Concepcion Aisa**, Treasury Department, World Bank, for the presentation. *(Please find copy of presentation in attachment).*

Following the presentation Mr. **ten Kate** opened the floor for comments and questions.

Discussion

The United States asked why there is a perception that there are no standardized measures that can be linked to concessional financing.

Coordination Unit noted that linking incentives to concessional financing may result in projects having large number of beneficiaries with less benefits. Further the CU added that due to lack of funding, the objective of providing concessional financing at IDA levels is not being mirrored.

Ms. Aisa informed that predictable financing could help to ensure an even concessional spread across projects. 2023 saw projects availing different amounts of concessional due to the dearth of financing. With regard to having a floor for concessional, this will take away the option of partial concessional for BCs.

Mr. **ten Kate** thanked Ms. **Aisa** for her presentation and thanked members for the productive discussion. Mr. **ten Kate** added that predictable financing could help the GCFF adhere to its objective of bringing down the pricing of ISA loans to IDA equivalent levels.

4) Item for Presentation/Decision

Update on Private Sector Operations Modality

Mr. **ten Kate** introduced the presentation/decision item. Mr. **ten Kate** noted that the SC approved the inclusion of Private Sector Operations (PSO) and its associated modalities; along with an agreement to pilot the private sector approach within the GCFF, through the Jordan Private Sector Guarantee Facility (JPSGF), with the EIB as ISA. Mr. **ten Kate** added that the PSO modality aims to support private sector initiatives to facilitate economic inclusion of refugees and host communities complementing efforts made by the public sector. Currently the PSO modality is oriented around Partial Portfolio Guarantees (PPGs) which provides partial risk protection to financial intermediaries in form of guarantees on underlying debt-financing granted to MSMEs on a portfolio basis, encouraging lending underserved and vulnerable groups including women, youth, and refugees. With increasing interest and engagement of development organisations with the private sector in forced displacement settings, there is potential in expanding the GCFF PSO modality to include other instruments. Mr. **ten Kate** explained that following the presentation by EIB on the JPSGF, interventions will be made by the EIB, EBRD, IFC-UNHCR Joint Initiative, and Coordination Unit on a way forward for expanding the PSO modality.

Mr. **ten Kate** first turned to Mr. **Andreas Berkhoff** Senior Loan Officer for a presentation on the JPSGF. *(Please find copy of presentation in attachment).*

Following the presentation Mr. **ten Kate** requested the EIB, EBRD, IFC and Coordination Unit for views. *(Please find copies of presentations in attachment).*

Following the presentation Mr. **ten Kate** opened the floor for comments and questions.

Discussion

Germany expressed support for the PSO Modality in the GCFF and emphasized the need to focus on both host communities and refugees for inclusive support.

Denmark echoed the views of Germany and added that in challenging situations like Lebanon, where support for refugees through the Government may not be possible, the private sector is a viable option.

The United States noted that in thinking through the range of ideas for how the GCFF can support the private sector targeting, data and how beneficiaries are being reached will be important. The United States further added that most Supporting Countries already finance private sector programs in BCs and were the GCFF to expand the PSO Modality, it would be crucial to know what the value addition is and how that potential support (new instruments) go beyond what is presently being done.

Ms. **Assaf** informed that the JPSGF preceded the new results framework, and this should be considered when evaluating the project. More broadly it is important to differentiate between the objectives of private sector engagement on the refugee agenda and the modalities. On the intent of host community/refugee financial inclusion, that objective can be achieved through public sector projects with private sector components as seen in Jordan. Therefore, in conversations going forward on potential expansion of the PSO Modality, the focus should be on exploring what areas can be best supported through private sector entities for benefiting host community/refugees.

The UNHCR noted the importance of supporting the private sector in forced displacement settings and added that collaboration of IFIs in developing ideas for further support through the GCFF is a welcome step.

Coordination Unit based on discussions and interest of BCs, ISAs, and the SC, the CU will coordinate in partnership with ISAs the development of a Technical Note on options for expanding the PSO Modality. The Technical Note will be oriented around three key points: (i) Focus on benefiting host communities and refugees in accordance with the GCFF Results Framework, (ii) Value addition of GCFF support over and above existing interventions/programs and (iii) Exploring options that align with the leveraging function of the GCFF.

Mr. **ten Kate** thanked the EIB, EBRD, IFC and Coordination Unit for their views and thanked members for the productive discussion. Mr. **ten Kate** noted that while a detailed presentation on the EIB JPSGF would be given to the SC in autumn, there was sufficient interest in the SC to further explore options for expanding the PSO Modality.

The following decision was agreed by the Steering Committee

Decision

- *The GCFF Steering Committee requested the preparation of a Technical Note on options for expanding the Private Sector Operations Modality. The Steering Committee further requested the Coordination Unit to prepare this Note in collaboration with the GCFF ISAs, to be presented for discussion at an upcoming Steering Committee meeting later in 2024.*

5) Item for Presentation

Moldova Priorities and Pipeline

Mr. **ten Kate** introduced the presentation item. Mr. **ten Kate** noted that the agenda item will entail two presentations; the first one will be an overview of Moldova’s priorities for refugee and host community assistance; GCFE project pipeline, to be followed by a presentation on the Funding Request on Technical Assistance for Capacity Strengthening project under the Exceptional Grant Modality.

Mr. **ten Kate** first turned to Mr. **GUMENE** for a presentation on Moldova Priorities and Pipeline *(Please find copy of presentation in attachment)*.

Mr. **ten Kate** then introduced the second portion of the presentation item. Mr. **ten Kate** noted that the Government of Moldova submitted a funding request under the Exceptional Grant Modality for the *Technical Assistance for Capacity Strengthening project for Moldova* with the WB as ISA on 27 May and is seeking grant financing for the project. Mr. **ten Kate** added that this is the first funding request under the Exceptional Grant Modality. Mr. **ten Kate** explained that in line with the GCFE procedures the Steering Committee has 14 days to review and approve the Funding Request. As per practice this presentation will take the place of the information meeting taking advantage of the in-person meeting.

Mr. **ten Kate** then turned to Ms. **Ina Bogatîi**, Director of the Coordination of External Assistance and Project Management Department, Ministry of Internal Affairs (MOIA) for presentation on Technical Assistance for Capacity Strengthening project. *(Please find copy of presentation in attachment)*.

Following the presentation Mr. **ten Kate** opened the floor for comments and questions.

Discussion

Ms. **Assaf** noted the importance of qualitative analysis and quality policy measures that aim to support the integration of refugees.

Mr. **ten Kate** thanked Mr. **GUMENE** and Ms. **Bogatîi** for their presentations and thanked members for the productive discussion. Mr. **ten Kate** concluded by reminding SC members of the no objection decision required by 10 June.

6) Item for Presentation

GCFE Country Updates

Mr. **ten Kate** introduced the presentation item. Mr. **ten Kate** noted that agenda item will have two parts. The first portion will include updates on (i) Armenia priorities and GCFE project pipelines, (ii) Jordan GCFE priorities, (iii) Lebanon GCFE priorities and (iv) LAC GCFE priorities. The second portion will provide an update on Egypt’s potential eligibility for GCFE inclusion. Mr. **ten Kate** explained the sequence of presentations.

Armenia priorities and GCFE Project Pipeline (Please find copies of presentations in attachment).

Mr. **ten Kate** requested HE **Vahe Hovhannisyan**, Minister of Finance, Govt of Armenia for the presentation.

Mr. **ten Kate** then turned to Mr. **Don Lambert** Country Director Asian Development Armenia for his presentation. *(Please find copy of presentation in attachment).*

Mr. **ten Kate** requested Ms. **Carolyn Geginat** Country Manager World Bank Armenia for her brief. Ms. **Geginat** informed that the World Bank has a number of projects in the pipelines that aim to support refugees and host communities in Armenia and could potentially benefit from GCFE financing. These include (i) a scalable housing project which looks at financing mortgage-based relief measures, (ii) project to support the Government of Armenia's new employment strategy and (iii) a tourism project focusing on engaging the private sector.

Jordan GCFE priorities (Presentation to be shared soon).

Mr. **ten Kate** first turned to Mr. **Maher Abdelrahim**, Head of Division, World Bank Division, Ministry of Planning and International Cooperation to provide an update on Jordan's pipelines.

Lebanon GCFE priorities (Please find copy of presentation in attachment).

Mr. **ten Kate** introduced Ms. **Rania El Chaar**, Strategic Planning & Risk Management Ministry of Finance to provide an update on Lebanon's pipelines.

LAC GCFE priorities (Please find copy of presentation in attachment).

Mr. **ten Kate** requested Mr. **Felipe Muñoz Gomez**, Chief Migration Unit, Inter-American Development Bank to provide an update on LAC (Colombia, Costa Rica, and Ecuador) pipelines. This was followed by a brief on the LAC region by Ms. **Ana I. Aguilera** Senior Social Scientist World Bank.

Following the presentation Mr. **ten Kate** opened the floor for comments and questions.

Discussion

European Commission welcomed the Jordan pipeline and its complementarity with ongoing EU cooperation in the same sectors, and noted that additional investments in the water sector should take into consideration existing GCFE support, absorptive capacity and avoid duplication. On Lebanon, the European Commission observed that pipelines need to demonstrate concrete support for refugees.

Update on Egypt

Mr. **ten Kate** reminded the SC, that discussions surrounding the possible eligibility and candidature of Egypt as a GCFE BC have been held with partners in Cairo and discussed at the SC

level. Although there is interest in Egypt becoming a GCFF BC particularly as it hosts refugees from South Sudan, Syria, and other countries, due to insufficient financing, the matter of considering Egypt for the time being is closed with the understanding that any change in the country situation or renewed interest among the GCFF Supporting Countries, the matter can be revisited.

Mr. **ten Kate** thanked all presenters for the presentations and updates and closed the session.

7) Item for Discussion

GCFF Future Directions and Priorities, 2024-2026

Mr. **ten Kate** noted that there is continued strong demand for support from the GCFF and this is evidenced by the robust project pipelines from BCs. At the same time GCFF is facing funding gaps and imbalances across the regional windows. Mr. **ten Kate** explained that to discuss priorities for strengthening the GCFF, with a focus on securing predictable, flexible, and sustainable financing, a joint delegation comprising of the GCFF SC Co-Chair, CU, and UNHCR held meetings with key GCFF Supporting Countries in May. These discussions formed the basis for the closed-door meeting held yesterday among the Supporting Countries. Mr. **ten Kate** informed that the outcomes of these consultations have been positive and there is an expectation of funding for the GCFF to support all the regions soon. Mr. **ten Kate** added that as a result of meetings with the Spanish Agency for International Development Cooperation (AECID), there is interest in exploring potential membership of Spain in the GCFF, given the alignment with its assistance priorities for the LAC region. The CU will be following up with AECID for technical level discussions.

Mr. **ten Kate** further noted that as discussions on sustainable resource mobilization for the GCFF continue, it would be helpful to have a strategic business proposition note that presents the value addition of the Facility. This document could be used for fund raising within existing Supporting Countries and with potential Supporting Countries. To support fund raising efforts, highlighting the GCFF and providing visibility to its donors is another area that needs investment in. Finally, Mr. **ten Kate** stated that to improve targeting and impact of GCFF interventions, there has to be a shift from the “first passed the post” approach to a more strategic process grounded on better targeting of host communities and refugees aligned with the GCFF Results Framework, quality pipelines developed in consultation at the country level and pro-active engagement of the CCCs and TAG.

Following these remarks Mr. **ten Kate** opened the floor for comments and questions.

Discussion

The United States welcomed the idea of a business investment note that could be used for fund raising and guide developments within the GCFF until the end of the current End Approval Date of 2026.

The UNHCR offered to support the development of the proposition note with data and information.

Coordination Unit thanked the SC for the productive deliberations and guidance. Understanding the importance of graduating from a project-based approach to one oriented around strategic pipelines, it will be important to operationalize the CCCs and involve these structures and the TAG in discussions on country pipelines and Funding Requests. To formalize this, the CU will prepare an official communication outlining how this more strategic approach will be operationalized. The CU will also develop a GCFF Business and Investment Plan.

Mr. **ten Kate** noted that although this agenda item was for discussion, based on the deliberations the following decisions were adopted:

Decision

- *The Steering Committee requested the Coordination Unit to develop a GCFF Business and Investment Plan.*
- *The Steering Committee agreed that future updates to the GCFF Funding Plan should include prior consultations at country level (through the Country Coordination Committees, or equivalent) of Benefiting Country project pipelines to ensure their adequacy and prioritization in relation to GCFF objectives; and that future GCFF funding requests be discussed at country level (through the CCCs or equivalent) and in the TAG prior to formal submission to the Coordination Unit.*

Mr. **ten Kate** thanked the members for their inputs and closed the session.

AOB/Outstanding issues

Mr. **ten Kate** opened the floor for any outstanding issues and comments.

Mr. **Eric Meyer**, representative of the United States and Ms. **Anna-Maria Schneider** representative of Germany will be handing over responsibilities to new colleagues. Mr. James Catto will be the new focal point of the United States, while the representative of Germany will be notified in due course.

SC members thanked the out-going colleagues in unison and acknowledged the great collaboration, leadership and guidance provided by them. SC members further welcomed the incoming colleague and looked forward to working with them.

Ms Kari Bjørnsgaard representative of Norway has informed the meeting that after the SC meeting that she also will be handing over responsibility to new colleagues and the SC will be notified in due course.

Mr. Spyros Demetriou, GCFF Coordination Unit, proposed that the next SC meeting will be organized in late September/early October with the following agenda items:

- MENA Regional Review.
- Technical Note on PSO Modality.
- Updated Funding Plan.
- GCFF Business and Investment Plan.

Closing remarks

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 GCFF is making. **Ms. Kane** reflected on the linkage of the GCFF and World Bank Evolution which focuses on global challenges and provision of public goods. **Ms. Kane** thanked wished **Mr. Meyer**, and **Ms. Schneider** for their service. In conclusion **Ms. Kane** thanked organizers for convening the meeting acknowledged the excellent coordination among MOF, CMU and the GCFF Coordination Unit.

On behalf of the GCFF Co-Chairs, **Mr. ten Kate** once again thanked all members for a productive Steering Committee meeting and looked forward to the next meeting.

Annex-1

GCFF Steering Committee Meeting

Chişinău, Moldova – June 4-5, 2024

PROGRAM

Day-1: Tuesday, June 4 **Field Visit/Steering Committee Meeting**

	Time	Agenda Item	Description	Duration
1	8:30 am	Departure for project sites/meetings	Site visit and meetings with Government of Moldova (GoM): <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Visit to Alecu Russo High School, Cojuşna, Străşeni supported by the <i>Education Quality Improvement Project</i>.• Meeting with Ministries of Finance, Labour, and Internal Affairs supported by the <i>Emergency Response, Resilience and Competitiveness DPOs</i>. <p>Participants are requested to reach the Radisson Blu Hotel at 8:15am sharp from where the group will depart for the project site/meetings*.</p>	240 mins
2	12:30 pm	Departure from project sites/meetings	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Participants return to meeting venue (transportation provided)	10 mins
3	12:40 pm	<i>Lunch at Meeting Venue</i>		60 mins
4	1:40 pm	Opening and Introductory Remarks	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• HE Petru Rotaru, Minister of Finance, Govt of Moldova.• HE Vahe Hovhannisyan, Minister of Finance, Govt of Armenia• Mr. Arup Banerji, Regional Country Director ECA.• Mr. Ion GUMENE Secretary of State, Ministry of Finance, Govt of Moldova, GCFF Steering Committee Co-Chair	30 mins

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mr. Warner ten Kate Head of Migration and Displacement Division, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Govt of the Netherlands, GCFE Steering Committee Co-Chairs • Ms. Soukeyna Kane, Director, World Bank FCV Group. 	
5	2:10 pm	Group Photo		10 mins
6	2:20 pm	Overview of the Agenda	Presentation of the Agenda <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mr. Spyros Demetriou, Program Manager, GCFE Coordination Unit. 	10 mins
7	2:30 pm	Item for Presentation	Overview of Refugee Trends, Challenges, Opportunities and Priorities-Horizon Scanning (ECA, MNA, LAC). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presentation by Ms. Betsy Lippman, Deputy Director Resilience and Solutions UNHCR. Discussion	45 mins <i>(20 mins)</i> <i>(25 mins)</i>
8	3:15 pm	Item for Presentation	Presentation of the OECD Development Finance for Refugee Situations 2020-21 Report <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presentation by Jens Hesemann, Senior Policy Advisor Development Co-operation Directorate OECD. Discussion.	45 mins <i>(20 mins)</i> <i>(25 mins)</i>
9	4:00 pm	Coffee Break		30 mins
10	4:00 pm	Close of meeting		
11	4:30 pm		Meeting of GCFE Supporting Countries (closed meeting) <i>(Rose Meeting Room)</i>	60 mins
12	6:30 pm	Reception hosted by the Government of Moldova**		

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

*Timings may slightly vary depending on traffic arrival/departure.

** Please see Annex-1 for details.

Day-2: Wednesday, June 5 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	9:00 am	Item for Presentation	Presentation of the 2023 GCFE Annual Report (Coordination Unit). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presentations by Mr. Spyros Demetriou and Mr. Hisham Esper, GCFE Coordination Unit. • Additional remarks by IDB, IFC, OECD & UNHCR. Discussion	45 mins <i>(25 mins)</i> <i>(20 mins)</i>
2	9:45 am	Items for Presentation	GCFE Operational and Administrative Updates (Coordination Unit) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Operational Updates, Mr. Spyros Demetriou. 	40 mins

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Update on Results, Knowledge, and Reporting Work Program, Mr. Hisham Esper. Trustee Financial Overview Presentation by Ms. Jane Mwebi, Trustee, World Bank. Discussion 	(15 mins)
3	10:25 am	Item for Presentation/Discussion	Update on the Application of GCFE Concessional in 2023 and Future Options <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Presentation by Ms. Concepcion Aisa Otin, Treasury, World Bank. Discussion 	30 mins (20 mins) (10 mins)
3	10:55 am	Coffee		30 mins
3	11:25 am	Item for Presentation/Decision	Update on Private Sector Operations Modality (Update on pilot Jordan Private Sector Guarantee Facility (JPSGF) and discussion on future options). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Presentation by EIB on JPSGF, Ms. Marika Levena Senior Mandate Manager climate related Trust Funds Interventions by EBRD, IBRD and IFC PSO Modality-Way Forward presentation by Mr. Spyros Demetriou, GCFE Coordination Unit Discussion. 	60 mins (35 mins) (25 mins)
4	12:25 pm	Item for Presentation and Decision	Moldova Priorities and Pipeline <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Overview of Moldova priorities for refugee and host community assistance; GCFE project pipeline, by Mr. Ion GUMENE Secretary of State, Ministry of Finance, Govt of Moldova, Presentation and decision on the Funding Request on Technical Assistance for Capacity Strengthening project by Representative of Ministry of Internal Affairs and Ms. Oleksandra Shatyrko, Social Development Specialist, World Bank (TBC) Discussion 	30 mins (10 mins) (10 mins) (10 mins)
5	12:55 pm	Lunch		60 mins
6	2:00 pm	Item for Presentation	GCFE Country Updates <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Update on Armenia priorities and GCFE project pipeline HE Vahe Hovhannisyanyan, Minister of Finance, Govt of Armenia <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ADB perspectives, Mr. Don Lambert Country Director ADB WB perspectives, Ms. Carolin Geginat, Country Manager WB Update on Jordan priorities and GCFE project pipeline Mr. Maher Abdelrahim, MOPIC 	80 mins (30 mins) (10 mins) (10 mins)

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Update on Lebanon priorities and GCFE project pipeline, Mr. Georges Marawi, Ministry of Finance • Update on LAC priorities and GCFE project pipeline, Mr. Felipe Munoz, IADB and Ms. Paula Andrea Rossiasco/ Ms. Ana I. Aguilera WB • Update on Egypt, Mr. Warner ten Kate • Discussion 	<p>(10 mins)</p> <p>(10 mins)</p> <p>(20 mins)</p>
6	3:20 pm	Item for Discussion	<p>GCFE Future Directions and Priorities, 2024-2026</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introduction and overview: GCFE Priorities, Options and Opportunities, Warner ten Kate and Ion Gumene, GCFE Steering Committee Co-Chairs • GCFE Way forward, Ms. Soukeyna Kane, FCV Group Director • Discussion. 	60 mins
7	4:20 pm	<i>Coffee Break</i>		20 mins
8	4.40 pm	AOB/Outstanding issues	Open discussion, remarks, and any other business GCFE SC Forward Agenda	20 mins
9	5.00 pm	Closing remarks	GCFE Co-Chairs and WB Directors	10 mins
10	5:10 pm	Close		

Annex-II

GCCF SC June Meeting

Participants List

S#	Name	Designation	Country	Attendance
1	Mr. Tomoki Nakai	Senior Deputy Director, MDBs, Ministry of Finance	Japan	In-person
2	Mr. Eric Meyer Mr. James Catto Ms. Corina Iovescu Ms. Robyn Prinz	Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Treasury for Africa and the Middle East, Dept of Treasury Director, International Development Policy (IDP) M: +1 202-961-8092, james.catto2@treasury.gov State Dept. Multilateral Development Bank Officer, Bureau of Population, Refugees and Migration, U.S. Department of State Refugee Coordinator, U.S. Embassy Chisinau	United States	In-person
3	Ms. Kari M Bjørnsgaard	Senior Adviser, Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs	Norway	Virtual
4	Mr. Warner Ten Kate Ms. Ana Uzelac	Head of Migration and Displacement Division, Ministry of Foreign Affairs Senior Policy Officer Development Approaches to Forced Displacement, Ministry of Foreign Affairs	Netherlands	In-person
5	Ms. Anna-Maria Schneider	Senior Policy Officer for Lebanon and Deputy Head of Division Middle East II at the German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development	Germany	In-person

6	Mr. Peter McDermott Ms. Pippa Bown	Acting Director Humanitarian, Migration and Food Security FCDO Humanitarian Adviser	United Kingdom	In-person
7	Ms. Magdalena MUELLER-URI Mr. Josip JURIC Ms Tuuli RÄTY Ms Elisabeth VAN RIJCKEVORSEL	Head of Cooperation of EU Delegation Programme Officer, EU Delegation Policy Officer – Middle East Unit Policy Officer – Middle East Unit	EC	In-person Virtual
8			Sweden	
9	Mr. Thomas Thomsen	Head of Cooperation - Danish Embassy in Beirut	Denmark	Virtual
10	Ms. Amal Azouz Mr. Tristan G. Garcia	Senior Program Analyst Middle East Development Programming Political Counsellor, Embassy of Canada	Canada	In-person
11	HE Vahe Hovhannissyan	Minister of Finance	Armenia	In-person
12	Mr. Maher Abdelrahim	Head of Division, World Bank Division International Cooperation Department Ministry of Planning and International Cooperation	Govt of Jordan	In-person
13	Mr. Alberto Carlei	Country Head Moldova	EIB	In-person
14	Mr. Don Lambert	Country Director Armenia	ADB	In-person
15	Ms. Marika Levena	Senior Mandate Manager climate related Trust Funds	EIB	In-person
16	Ms. Catarina Bjorlin Hansen Ms. Octavian Costas	Head of Moldova Office Associate Director, Senior Banker	EBRD	In-person
17	Mr. Jens Hessemann	Senior Policy Advisor	OECD	In-person
18	Ms. Betsy Lippman,	Deputy Director of the Division of Resilience and Solutions	UNHCR	In-person
19	Ms. Susanne Klink	Senior Livelihoods and Economic Inclusion Officer, Regional Bureau for Europe	UNHCR	In-person
20	Mr. Kaleab Zelalem,	Partnerships Officer	UNHCR	In-person
21	Mr. Bertrand Blanc	UNHCR Country Representative, Moldova	UNHCR	In-person
22	Mr. Hugo de Vries	UNCHR Senior Development Officer	UNHCR	In-person
23	Ms. Natalia Curnic	UNCHR Liaison officer	UNHCR	In-person
24	Mr. Andrew Painter	UNCHR Senior Protection officer	UNHCR	In-person
25	Ms. Soukeyna Kane	Director FCV Group	World Bank	In-person
26	Ms. Carolin Geginat	Country Manager Armenia	World Bank	In-person
27	Ms. Nabila Assaf	Manager FCV Group	World Bank	In-person
28	Ms. Inguna Dobraja	Country Manger Moldova	World Bank	In-person
29	Mr. Spyridon Demetriou	Program Manager GCFE Coordination Unit	World Bank	In-person
30	Ms. Jane Moraa Mwebi	Senior Finance Officer	World Bank	In-person
31	Ms. Jade Elena Garza Ndiaye	Senior Operations Officer	World Bank	In-person
32	Mr. Hisham Esper	Knowledge Specialist	World Bank	In-person
33	Mr. Omer Khan	Program Specialist	World Bank	In-person

