



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

Consideration of Accreditation Proposals

Access the document: <https://www.greenclimate.fund/document/gcf-b44-03>

We overall welcome the batch of ten new accreditation applicants, six of which are DAEs, including one that will be the first national DAE from the state of Palestine. We express our solidarity with the Palestinian people, who continue to face profound challenges and extreme vulnerability. In this context, access to climate finance through a trusted national entity is not only important but also essential to ensure timely and context-specific support.

According to the overview over the pipeline of applicants, these ten are among the batch of 25 remaining applicants, which have elected to continue their accreditation efforts under the previous accreditation framework. The steady stream of new accreditation applicants, many of them DAEs, coming up for Board consideration this year under the old accreditation approach is welcome.

Notably, all ten applicants are recommended for accreditation with conditions, which will no longer be the case under the revised accreditation framework. In several cases, institution-level weaknesses are highlighted, including for the two DAE applicants that are applying for Cat.A/Intermediation-1 ESS risk projects. This includes in several instances conditions to address AP-noted absences of effective grievance redress mechanisms in place (with some having failed that effectiveness determination), and in some cases addressing that they currently have none at all. This would have caused these applicants to fail the initial screening requirements under the new RAF, and many of the identified gaps would have been impossible to address within the now-approved two-month application window.

We are curious to see the yet unclear trajectory unfold for those who after pre-screening had to be invited by the Secretariat to apply under the first accreditation window under the RAF. Full transparency will be important to understand how those submitting for application interest will be filtered out under pre-screening. We are also interested to see, given the potential review of the Accreditation Panel's mandate over the next few months if its terms of reference are adopted here, what the AP's role and timeline would be to bring new applicants under the RAF to the Board. As with many things related to the new RAF, many questions of the right sequencing remain unanswered for us.

As always, it will be critical that, once accredited, there is a focus on supporting newly accredited DAEs in bringing successful funding proposals to make progress against the goal of the USP-2 to not only double the number of DAEs with approved funding proposals but also to increase the share of GCF-approved funding channeled through DAEs.



44th Board Meeting of the Green Climate Fund

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

In this context, we are curious about a brief note in the Status report on GCF resources, portfolio and pipeline that the Africa Finance Corporation (AFC) accredited as an international private sector entity has been granted a change of its accreditation status from IAE to DAE by the Secretariat. We seek clarity on the procedure here: as AFC's accreditation was by a Board decision, wouldn't a Board decision similarly be needed for such an upgrade or major change to their accreditation status? And if not, can we foresee further reclassifications? What implications would this then have for the USP-2 DAE target?

Lastly, and contributing to further confusion during this accreditation framework transition period, there are still two already-accredited entities applying for an upgrade to the scale and use of financial instruments under the old framework, which requires a review by the AP and a decision by the Board. We wonder then how the Board would like to be informed about cases like the AFC's changed status, and the potential of other cases like this under the RAF that would likewise not come back as a decision by the Board. There could indeed be a clear role for the involvement of the Accreditation Panel as Board-appointed expert advisory body to guarantee some Board oversight.