

## **Report on the Activities of the Secretariat**

**Access the document:** <https://www.greenclimate.fund/document/gcf-b42-inf08>

We appreciate the efforts by the Secretariat to submit more concise reports, but wonder to what extent this might mean leaving out relevant information for the Board and the broader public to know. We are also struck by a framing in the paper, which posits the ED's '50by30' ambition on equal footing with the Board approved USP-2 and its widely consulted and negotiated benchmarks.

The report highlights a number of ongoing efforts by the Secretariat to [quote] "drive a more truly country-led GCF pipeline". These include the commencing of work on the update to the country ownership guidelines, for which we are expecting consultations to also include the observer network and would appreciate learning about the timetable of the process, as well as efforts to advance country platforms. However, the "comprehensive guidance" on country platforms that the Secretariat references is in fact only a six-page brochure, which does not make mention of Indigenous Peoples and mentions civil society once, with no mention of stakeholders that may represent gender, youth, people with disabilities or other rightsholders or stakeholders.

Based on these glaring oversights, the Secretariat would benefit from such consultation with observers. How the GCF is conceiving of and supporting country platforms, including with any operational guidance beyond this brochure, and how this work relates to country ownership is pertinent, especially at a time when concept notes and funding proposals are being cleared out of the pipeline with questions about how NDAs are engaged in each of those conversations. We are also curious if there has been any guidance to AEs with withdrawn concept notes and funding proposals about how to share that information with the communities with whom they already engaged and created expectations of future activities and benefits. This accountability measure must not be overlooked.

As usual, we do learn from reading the report about a number of operational or policy framework changes for which further information would be appreciated. The launch of the readiness results management framework is mentioned, but it is unclear whether the KPIs for readiness are differentiated between results achieved under the "old readiness" and new readiness approaches; curiously, in reporting on readiness outcomes, the demand for placement of experts is highlighted over everything else, whereas we would like more insight on countries seeking and being approved for the new multi-year programs, though we appreciate the Secretariat's attempts to share some information in our meeting with them.

Likewise, the report highlights the implementation of a new concept note screening process as well as an update to the funding proposal template but without giving any detail on how these updates compare with and improve upon their predecessors.

The Secretariat's report also mentions the completion of a framework for locally-led climate action. We are surprised to read that this is complete: this would seem an especially pertinent framework to engage civil society on throughout its development. Initial information was shared on the sideline of the last board meeting and some rudimentary consultation conducted, but no further. On the LLCA framework in particular we would like to understand its application better – will it be integrated as a mandatory consideration in funding proposal development? How will its integration be supported by the new readiness programme?

We are also astonished to read that the co-investment model approach, which Board members had explicitly rejected for inclusion in the USP-2 several years ago, seems to make an unmandated comeback in the Secretariat.

The report also mentions the use of artificial intelligence to better compile data on climate impacts, but this effort seems to be undertaken without a critical analysis of the severe environmental impacts due to the energy needs of the AI technology, which a climate fund such as the GCF should at least critically consider and discuss as a trade-off before undertaking decisions to expand the use of AI.

We are also curious to read about several of the KPIs detailing progress against the Secretariat's results framework. For example, a draft of the new monitoring and accountability framework was only made available in May, putting the claim of "extensive consultation with stakeholders" into a time-limited context. And while we are glad to learn that Annual Performance Reports are now being enhanced with regards to more differentiated reporting on sub-projects and country-specificity for multi-country programmes, the claim of verified consistency between ex-ante and ex-post emissions report for the 2024 APRs seems dubious in light of previous inconsistencies in methodologies and related reporting.

We do appreciate the reference to the upcoming GCF Global Conference on Indigenous Peoples in Malaysia and welcome the annexed report by the Indigenous Peoples Advisory Group, highlighting the important role that Indigenous Peoples play as key stakeholders in ensuring the GCF fulfills its mission. In this context we would encourage that the upcoming flagship GCF Private Sector Conference in October also invites the selected input and participation of representatives from the GCF Observer Network of civil society organizations, Indigenous Peoples, and local communities.