



45th Board Meeting of the Green Climate Fund

June 29 - July 2, 2026, Dushanbe, Tajikistan

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/board-document/gcf-b45-inf12>

We appreciate the work of the Secretariat over the past months as documented in this report, in operationalizing new systems and frameworks, improving the monitoring of project implementation, and tracking portfolio progress. This showcases the intensity of the effort to position the Fund for a replenishment and programming cycle during which outflows are expected to triple, alongside other quality measures to deliver on the new collective quantified goal. To ensure impact, staff capacity is critical, and we note with concern that the staff count remains below the target of 350 full-time positions set several years ago.

While this seems to make the case for the use of artificial intelligence, which the Secretariat report refers to in efforts to increase the efficiency of Secretariat operations, at the same time, the use of artificial intelligence to supplement or replace staff tasks comes with trade-offs that should be clearly outlined and weighed before further decisions on expanding AI use are made. The Secretariat has established a partnership with the AI Centre of Excellence without details of selection procedure. And despite the emphasis on responsible use of AI and good outcomes, we are still lacking insight into the Fund's analysis of the environmental costs of its own AI use at a time when AI-driven data centers gobble up scarce land and water resources already depleted by climate change and drive up electricity prices for the most vulnerable. As AI is posited to be used to support concept notes and funding proposals as well as funded activity agreements, we are concerned about the potential for stripping key experience and expertise from processes that shape quality implementation as well as compliance, while incurring unquantified environmental impact.

We would like more information on the GCF Global Impact Conference and if this is indeed the programming conference, and how civil society and Indigenous Peoples' participation can be supported as this has been a good practice in the past and should continue.

We have concerns about the use of the new media tracking system and the reporting of media articles as positive/neutral vs. negative. Such a quantification focuses on the story the GCF is telling rather than on communities' experiences, and it does not acknowledge that even negative media attention can be a source of insight for the learning institution the GCF needs to be, highlighting opportunities to course-correct. Indeed, as we also consider the GCF Brand Refresh, we note that one of the most important aspects of the logo's heightened visibility is its potential to signal to beneficiaries where to access information as well as redress. Such a logo should serve not only to sell the Fund, but also as an entry point for community engagement, and unfortunately filing cases with the IRM and IIU is now less accessible in the new website.

Likewise, an orientation toward community experiences, which could have also informed the new website and should inform ongoing efforts such as the advancement of multilingualism, is critical to build real pathways toward impact through improvement. The digitization of the annual performance report, while an improvement for internal process, is worth mentioning in this regard - the APRs are the primary glimpse the public gets into implementation once a Board approves a funding proposal, and yet their reading experience was not considered, nor are any 2025 APRs yet posted on the website.

In the same vein, we welcome and support the recommendations of the Indigenous Peoples Advisory Group, especially in reflecting upon the conference, a crucial space for sharing of experiences and analysis of systemic and specific challenges. Taking these to heart requires more than ensuring the IPAG's voice is heard by the Board, but also ensuring substantial consultation of the policy package for a direct access funding approach for Indigenous Peoples to be brought at B.46, noting this engagement must move beyond socialization of the proposal.

As the Secretariat details work on other important and outstanding policy reforms in its results framework, we note the annex on the refined commitment authority framework. While in responding to the guidance from the COP the Secretariat should indeed prepare an analytical assessment on the need to review the Fund's commitment authority, slipping a *de facto* decision to move forward with a proposed accounting change into an information document to the Board is procedurally inappropriate. As we argued in a letter to the Board a few days ago, such a fundamental change should be shared and deliberated separately, as a policy document featuring the rationale, analyses and implications of this and other alternate options, and subject to iterative consultations including written input by not only Board members, but also observers.

In considering the substance of the change regarding the commitment authority, we are concerned about the implications of these calculations for driving down the grant share of GCF funding and thus significantly altering the Fund's nature and would ask what assurances are being put into place to avoid that possibility.

A suggested change of this magnitude needs formal Board consideration that cannot be substituted with mere Board socialization via an informal Board document.