



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

Report on the Activities of the Secretariat

Access the document: <https://www.greenclimate.fund/document/gcf-b44-inf07>

Thank you, co-chair, and thank you to the Executive Director and the Secretariat.

We find this report to be largely narrative, lacking the level of detail and structured information that characterized previous versions. This is particularly problematic for a non-resident Board, as it limits the ability to effectively understand and oversee the Secretariat activities. The report also lacks clear, trackable and accountable reporting on key developments. This is illustrated by the integration of the Private Sector Facility into regional departments, mentioned briefly in the B.43 report; correspondingly, private sector activities are dispersed throughout this document, with limited clarity on how priorities are defined and implemented.

We are also concerned by the pre-eminence of the private sector throughout the narrative, often at the expense of other GCF priorities. For example, the acknowledgement that there are implementation delays across most of the portfolio, and many caused by AE delays in securing co-financing, is mentioned in passing, without outlining when the Secretariat analysis on the drivers or a strategic approach to address this with urgency will be released.

The report is increasingly defined by what it does not contain - the nine paragraphs on country ownership and access do not specify progress toward strengthening DAE proposals or increasing their share of funding, despite the USP-2 Target that continues to lag.

We remain eager to stay engaged in the consultations on country ownership, as we are concerned this concept is being developed and deployed with a narrow mindset oriented around business cycle thinking about financial transactions, rather than remaining rooted in the ideas of whole-of-country needs and priorities as determined by inclusive and iterative multi-stakeholder and rightsholder engagement, especially of local communities and Indigenous Peoples.

We recognize that the rollout of country platforms has begun to dominate the Secretariat's focus, but our understanding and reporting on them at the Board level is reduced to the few paragraphs within this document. Perhaps annexes on important and key initiatives, such as country platforms and the LLCA Framework and Guidance, could provide more insight into the progress and focus of Secretariat efforts.

When the Board adopted the updated Monitoring and Accountability Framework at B.42, it was asserted that, "all operational procedures, guidance, timelines, templates and tools" would be publicly available, and this information has become even more important as policies

44th Board Meeting of the Green Climate Fund

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

have remained at a high-level and are truly operationalized in follow-up guidance documents. As we are not alerted when these documents become available, it seems the Activities of the Secretariat report would be a key place to outline how these policy processes have proceeded, and what documents have become available. MAF operationalization receives only a mention of “new processes and templates” in Annex I and in paragraph 31 but does not give the Board or the public the accountability for these major policy overhauls adopted with such fanfare.

We would like to understand the impetus behind a new, likely costly branding, not simply an updated website to improve navigability and access to information that is crucial for a public fund. The emphasis on branding we would like to see most is at the project-level, ensuring beneficiaries know when projects are funded by the GCF, so they can seek engagement, accountability, and if need be, redress.

On the technology strategic plan, leveraging AI, with AI applications being deployed to “support decision-making,” it would be important to know more about in what processes this is happening. We would again ask that the Secretariat release an analysis of the environmental impacts and trade-offs of the use of AI. This information should be clear or annexed in this document. A display in the G-Tower is not accessible to the public and does not provide any level of accountability over time. Frankly, we find it irresponsible to continue at what appears to be a high level of AI usage in the world’s largest multilateral climate fund without disclosure of how it guides its analytical decision-making and an acknowledgement of its carbon footprint.

While we acknowledge and deeply value the work of the Indigenous Peoples Advisory Group, we wish to clarify its role as a strategic advisory body that supports the overall implementation of the Indigenous Peoples Policy and the GCF’s broader commitment to human rights and climate justice, not advisory to individual projects. We repeat that the IPAG is not a substitute for directly engaging with Indigenous Peoples in countries where projects are going to be implemented. The responsibility to implement the GCF Indigenous Peoples Policy lies with the Secretariat and the AEs.