

Terms of reference for consultancy services for a broad review of the objectives, role, structure, governance and operational modalities of the Accreditation Panel in supporting Board decision-making under revised Accreditation Framework

Access the document: <https://www.greenclimate.fund/document/gcf-b44-10>

We recognize that with the adoption of the revised accreditation framework last year one of the outstanding questions has been the continued role of the Accreditation Panel as a Board appointed expert body; indeed, we as a network were some of the first to raise this issue when earlier versions of that reform package simply failed to mention the AP at all, effectively writing them out of existence without specific Board intention. What we want to ensure here is that the AP is indeed given an objective assessment of the needed updated mandate, not a leading review based on poor questions and an outcome bias.

The inclusion of a peer review in the objectives section of the ToR seems inappropriate in this context. GCF accreditation has long been considered as a gold standard. Post accreditation reform, the GCF accreditation process should continue to hold particular value in showcasing entities' abilities and helping to improve processes in ways that affect their overall portfolios, despite the discontinuation of reaccreditation. So the effort to now consider the AP in light of organizations whose partner structure and mission is different, with their accreditations thus playing inherently different and incomparable roles, risks downward harmonization. The AP's continued existence should not be dependent on the processes of its counterparts in other institutions, which the GCF's process was designed to stand above and apart from. Indeed, Question B should simply be removed from these framing questions.

We welcome the inclusion of "inclusive stakeholder engagement" that goes beyond a pure desk review in the scope of the work. Unfortunately, though, the listing of key stakeholders for interviews fails to list Active Observers or the Indigenous Peoples Advisory Group, much less any broader observer role connected to the Accredited Entities and with an understanding/appreciation of their functions. The AP has previously heard quality feedback from AEs about how their work, albeit challenging, strengthened the AE - we question where there is room for this in the current review. We would also seek clarification and confirmation that such an "inclusive stakeholder review" of course must include the members of the Accreditation Panel. The draft report should also be shared with them for comment, ideally to be integrated



44th Board Meeting of the Green Climate Fund

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

into the final report to be delivered for the consideration of the Board, or at least annexed to the assessment, as in the case of the ITAP assessment report.

Indeed, we do think the particular technical expertise and independence of the AP as a panel that reports to the Board and is not beholden to the Secretariat as employer, as are third-party consultants that the Secretariat retains as external experts for the PSAA assessment, should be one of the considerations to be included in the assessment of the AP's future role. We hope for a finding of the merits of their continued existence for their quality contributions to the GCF's future accreditation reviews.