



## 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

## Reports from Committees, Panels, and Groups of the Board of the GCF

**Access the document:** <https://www.greenclimate.fund/board-document/gcf-b45-inf10>

We are glad to see that after the decision at B.44, the reconfigured committees seem to be functioning well, and we remind committees that observers are able to engage with their expertise whenever invited.

As the performance review of the members of the Accreditation Panel is considered, we have several concerns.

First, the methodology specified a 360-degree assessment but leaves out observers as an important group of stakeholders to be interviewed. We welcome the assurance by the Secretariat, after bringing this issue to their attention that they are committed to correcting this.

Secondly, Para. 6 of the methodology claims it is in line with the Panel's Terms of Reference, but gender has been left out of the list of technical expertise. The AP's Terms of Reference specifies, "gender, environmental and social safeguards, and environmental and social management systems."

Third, the essential competencies for the role as summarized remove consideration of the quality of application of that technical expertise, creating the impression that a good team player who meets deadlines could do well in the review even if their application of accreditation standards was inconsistent and/or inadequate.

The Terms of Reference of the Performance Review further create questions given the consultant is tasked with developing the criteria for reviewing performance. That seems to be incredible discretion for an outside consultant given we do have an AP Terms of Reference.

Furthermore, the four-week timeline for the consultant's work for a 360-degree review seems destined to leave many degrees untouched if those four weeks take place during any time with scheduling difficulties. A longer timeline must be built in if the consultant is to indeed speak to a comprehensive set of stakeholders, including observers. Setting up a 180-degree assessment does not serve these individual members nor the larger project of ensuring the Accreditation Panel is well-capacitated to perform its vital role.



## 45th Board Meeting of the Green Climate Fund

June 29 - July 2, 2026, Dushanbe, Tajikistan

Additionally, in response to the Budget Committee's discussion of rising costs for the Independent Redress Mechanism, where they apparently discussed the potential role of AE grievance redress mechanisms taking on complaints, we remind the Board that complainants choosing their option for redress is a best practice standard. Real costs to the GCF in terms of learning, reputation, and impact will only increase over time if the IRM cannot fully investigate and provide redress due to a shortsighted focus on cost-cutting.