While we are not entirely happy with the project, we are concerned about some of the reasons the ITAP provided for rejecting the project.

The lack of contributions from the host governments should not be seen as inherently negative factor, especially in the context of very low-income countries, as is the case here, and when the grants require matching contributions from the local communities themselves.

Most importantly, we view the questions and criticisms regarding the small-grants facility is entirely misplaced in the ITAP assessment. In this case, the grant-based component is aimed at the poorest and most vulnerable populations in the context of low-income countries. This is an entirely appropriate use of the GCF's resources, BUT we would question why the World Bank is not using its own resources for this component.

Weaknesses in the project design NOT a reason to reject the utility of small grants approaches for GCF funding as the ITAP does. In our opinion, the inclusion of a grant facility in this project is a strength, not a weakness.