

Review of the Independent Technical Advisory Panel (iTAP)

Access the document: <https://www.greenclimate.fund/document/gcf-b44-13>

We concur with the review that the iTAP is valuable in informing decision-making by the Board, and enhancing trust among stakeholders within and beyond the Fund, arising from the function of the iTAP in strengthening the Fund's due diligence procedures. While we may often disagree with elements of the iTAP's assessments, we consider the iTAP a key player in enabling accessible engagement with the technical details of the funding proposals as they relate to the GCF's investment framework, and in providing impartial insight for reviews which otherwise may be prone to a push for scaling up programming for approval as a performance criterion of the Fund, rather than delivering on the GCF's investment criteria.

In light of this, we are in support of proceeding with Option 1 and caution against any move to dissolve the iTAP in favor of a centralized review within the Secretariat. It would expose the GCF to great reputational risk to leave the sole responsibility of the second due diligence funding proposal review process with the Secretariat. Not only is the Secretariat not free from performance-driven pressures, conflating money out the door with impact on the ground, the regional reorganization, while having many benefits, means deep technical expertise in particular thematic areas is spread thin and not equally available in each regional department.

As an independent body, the iTAP lends a necessary critical eye and supports the assurance of integrity and accountability. The iTAP is also essential to transparency, and helps foster accessibility, understanding and meaningful engagement. Without an iTAP assessment, neither accredited observers nor any other stakeholder interested in the GCF's funding proposals would be able to access any assessment of private sector funding proposals, for the Secretariat assessments are not made publicly available. The absence of an iTAP assessment would also make it more difficult for the public to analyze funding proposals on technical grounds, as the iTAP's experts provide thorough, clear and condensed reviews of complex proposals, and their annexes, that often exceed hundreds of pages.

Finally, while we can understand the frustrations of the accredited entities regarding predictability of the review process or delays relating to the approval of funding proposals, we do not view the iTAP as the main obstacle to efficiency – not least since the review found that those delays have less to do with the iTAP and more to do with broader structural factors. Also, we consider the iTAP's quality assurance function a necessary feature that enhances the effectiveness of and trust in the world's largest multilateral climate fund and



44th Board Meeting of the Green Climate Fund

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

not a “gatekeeper” function that prevents proposals from reaching the Board. Even non-recommended funding proposals have unlimited opportunities to come back for another review, and strengthening proposals to deliver more assured impact is indeed a matter of effectiveness, a core directive for the GCF.