



44th Board Meeting of the Green Climate Fund

March 25-28, 2026, Songdo, Incheon, Republic of Korea

GCF Observer Network of Civil Society, Indigenous Peoples, and Local Communities

Intervention on

Co-chairs' Proposal on a Board Workplan

Access the document: <https://www.greenclimate.fund/document/gcf-b44-inf06-rev01>

We appreciate the Co-Chairs' proposal on a Board workplan and welcome the opportunity to comment on the Board's priorities, particularly from the perspective of a network that has institutional knowledge of many of these unfinished mandates, as well as curiosity about newly emerging ones.

First, we were disappointed to see the adoption of the GCF's own Environmental and Social Safeguards delayed for the fifth year in a row, now slated for 2027. We are beyond the point of trusting the now annual assurances that this item will be finalized next year, so long after in-depth work and consultation with the contracted consulting firm has been done. This deprives communities and landscapes of the standard of climate action that they should be able to expect from the world's largest multilateral climate fund. The GCF once endeavored to set the highest standard of climate action; at this time of charting the course for the next four years while stressing the impact achieved over the last ten, it would have been reassuring to see an indication of a return to that level of commitment and ambition.

We have questions about the harmonized results framework to be presented at the last Board meeting of the year, given the history of the integrated results management framework and its difficult adoption, coupled with the gaps and inadequacies in reporting on it. The IRMF decision requested the Secretariat to review the IRMF and if action is required as a result of the review, to present recommendations to the Board. We are curious if this item is originating from that process, and if so, what review of the IRMF will be offered, as best practice prior to an update, reform, or replacement of a policy is a full analysis of the prior policy. With the recognition that some agenda items require the in-depth Board discussion achieved only across multiple Board meetings, we would anticipate a new approach to results would merit planning and engagement across multiple meetings.

With the Information Disclosure Policy, another long-delayed item, finally on this year's agenda, we remind the Board and the Secretariat that fulfilling the current IDP and its principle of maximum access to information is always possible and does not have to wait on any update. For instance, in a year with particular attention and interest in gender, we remind the Board that not a single gender action plan of a single subproject has been publicly disclosed, despite long engagement with the Secretariat on this issue and an information request. And the choice to withhold every single private sector funding proposal annex, instead of giving the accredited entities the opportunity to choose to disclose them to the public or flag when there is specific proprietary information, remains not only intransparent, but also inefficient, as many AEs assume we have access to their documentation.



44th Board Meeting of the Green Climate Fund

March 25-28, 2026, Songdo, Incheon, Republic of Korea

Lastly, the policy on programmatic approaches has disappeared entirely from this workplan. At B.41, in February of last year, it was proposed for B.43, five months ago. However, it is still on the Secretariat's workplan for 2026, which the Board approved at B.43 as a deliverable. This policy gap must be addressed – and Board and Secretariat 2026 workplans reconciled – with urgency. As we continue to encounter the discrepancies, inefficiencies, and failings of rapidly scaling the now majority portion of the portfolio reliant on programmatic approaches, we call on the Board to remember its responsibilities and plan a coherent, cohesive approach to programmes.