

**GCF Observer Network of Civil Society, Indigenous Peoples, and Local Communities**

Intervention on

## **Consideration of Accreditation Proposals**

**Access the document:** <https://www.greenclimate.fund/board-document/gcf-b45-03>

Our comments here are our only ones to be made on accreditation - we will not be intervening on individual applicants.

Overall, we welcome this batch of nine new accreditation applicants, six of which are DAEs, including one that will be the first national DAE from Ecuador. According to the overview over the pipeline of applicants, these are 9 of the 21 applicants that have elected to continue their accreditation under the previous accreditation framework, leaving just three applicants under the old system to come to B.46, after which the transition period to the revised accreditation framework ends. This makes it likely that B.46 will see applicants under both the old and new accreditation systems, with 10 known for consideration under the RAF at B.46, and we look forward to the side-by-side to shed light on how they compare in terms of the thoroughness of the assessment.

Notably, all nine applicants are recommended for accreditation with conditions, which will no longer be possible under the revised accreditation framework. Several continue to have issues regarding inadequate grievance redress mechanisms, and we reiterate the importance of ensuring access to redress, not simply the presence of a policy that is not operationalized or designed for actual users. As the new accreditation assessment requires all outstanding issues to be resolved before Board approval and does not allow for conditional approvals, these applicants would presumably either fall short under the new system or there is a danger that standards might be relaxed.

Among the applicants for Board consideration this time, we noticed that in two cases the private sector applicants are partly or wholly owned by existing GCF accredited entities. In the case of APL176, PT Indonesia Infrastructure Finance is 100% owned by five entities that are all GCF accredited already, but this is not mentioned in the accreditation assessment. In the case of APL179, Climate Fund Managers, the partial ownership by the FMO is at least mentioned. We would therefore ask for some consistency in application assessments and suggest that such ownership relationships are explicitly stated in the accreditation documents when it involves a substantial share. In the case of APL179, Climate Fund Managers, which is an international access entity, we are also wondering what the added value of their partnership with the GCF is, given that their track record in managing sustainable development and climate change related projects lists 4 projects, 3 of which are already GCF-funded through different entities. We would instead like to see a prioritization of DAEs that could bring new relationships and new approaches to GCF partnership.



## 45th Board Meeting of the Green Climate Fund

June 29 - July 2, 2026, Dushanbe, Tajikistan

In this context, it is encouraging to see that the interest in partnering with the GCF is strong: according to the information provided by the Secretariat, 83 applicants have submitted and paid their accreditation fee during the first pilot application window under the RAF. We are pleased to learn that 58 of those are DAEs, including 9 civil society organizations, and 18 from countries so far without DAEs, adding - if accredited - to increasing the diversity of the partner pool.

As always, it will be critical that, once accredited, there is a focus on supporting newly accredited DAEs in bringing successful funding proposals to the Board to make progress against the goal of the USP-2 to not only double the number of DAEs with approved funding proposals but also to increase the share of GCF-approved funding channeled through DAEs.