



## 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

# Independent Evaluation of the GCF's Approach to and Portfolio of Climate Information and Early Warning System Interventions

**Access the document:** <https://www.greenclimate.fund/document/gcf-b44-07>

<https://www.greenclimate.fund/document/gcf-b44-07-add01>

We welcome the IEU's evaluation, which confirms several concerns that civil society has consistently raised regarding the GCF's approach to climate information and early warning systems. Beyond its technical insight, the evaluation points to deeper structural challenges in how CIEWS investments are currently designed, implemented, and assessed.

First, the finding on the absence of programmatic approaches policy has had direct and systemic consequences for the effectiveness of CIEWS implementation. It shows that, in the absence of such a framework, investments remain fragmented, with limited strategic direction, leading to uncertainty during funding proposal formulation, delays in implementation, and inconsistencies in reporting. This may lead to structural governance weakness affecting how GCF defines priorities, allocates resources, and ensures accountability across its portfolio. In practice, the lack of clear guidance has resulted in programmatic approaches being shaped largely by AEs rather than by a coherent vision anchored in the Fund's mandate.

Second, we note the IEU's finding on the ability (or lack thereof) of these interventions to reach the last-mile marginalized and vulnerable communities. The evaluation highlights that communities targeted by CIEWS investments often prioritize immediate survival needs such as food security, livelihoods, and shelter above longer-term resilience objectives, and that stand-alone early warning interventions are unlikely to achieve lasting impact unless embedded within a broader response to vulnerability. This is not only a question of outreach, but of how systems are designed in the first place, and whether they are aligned with the lived realities of the communities they intend to serve.

The failure to reach last-mile communities is further compounded by the Fund's second-level due diligence model, which the IEU finds to be limited in its ability to ensure meaningful inclusion at the community level. We stand by the identified need to adopt cross-sectoral and participatory approaches from the start of project design, and reiterate our call for the Fund's due diligence model to be better resourced and to move beyond desk-based review toward genuine on-the-ground engagement with the communities it is meant to serve. This limitation

is further reinforced by the limited integration of indigenous and local knowledge systems in practices.

Evidence consistently shows that the inclusion of indigenous and local knowledge systems enhances the relevance, credibility, and uptake of climate information at the community level. However, current approaches continue to treat these knowledge systems as complementary, rather than as foundational elements of effective CIEWS design. Without this, CIEWS interventions risk remaining externally driven and structurally disconnected from local design-making processes, ultimately undermining their ability to deliver meaningful and sustained impact.

We concur on the importance of participatory assessments, as core obligations already embedded within the Gender Policy and Indigenous Peoples Policy, and should not be understood as additional requirements. This challenge is not the lack of a framework, but the persistent gap between policy commitments and their consistent application in practice, including the need to ensure context-specific analysis.

Addressing these challenges will require a fundamental shift in how the GCF understands effectiveness, moving beyond delivery and technical outputs towards approaches that are grounded in community realities, participation, and sustained institutional capacity. In this context, we emphasize that participatory design, improved measurement of outcomes, and stronger attention to community-level realities are essential conditions for ensuring that CIEWS investments are able to deliver meaningful and sustained results.