GCF WATCH

46th Board Meeting of the Green Climate Fund

October 26-29, 2026, Songdo, Incheon, Republic of Korea

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

Intervention on

Board Effectiveness (Co-chairs' Report)

Access the document: https://www.greenclimate.fund/board-document/gcf-b46-18

While we appreciate the intent behind efforts to improve Board effectiveness, any effort that fails to center transparency, accountability, and the rights and voices of rightsholders to inform decision-making will ultimately undermine effectiveness and lasting impact in favor of speed.

As an operating entity of the UNFCCC financial mechanism, the GCF must remain accountable to the COP and CMA and uphold its mandate, including through a Governing Instrument that recognizes that transparency and accountability walk hand in hand with efficiency and effectiveness and that stakeholder participation should shape strategy.

The ability of civil society and Indigenous Peoples to be *on the record* with feedback and channeling the voices of affected people must continue to be a hallmark of a fund intentionally designed to deliver climate finance in a way that prioritizes the most vulnerable actors. Participating in environmental decision-making is a human right, as elaborated in the Aarhus Convention and the Escazú Agreement, and considering funding proposals in a forum that allows public discussion and accountability builds public trust and maintains public support for the GCF and its allocation of public funds.

While decisions between-Board meetings *could* be designed to reflect key features of transparency and accountability, this proposal fails to demonstrate how decisions on funding proposals or accreditation would preserve the same standards of public scrutiny, meaningful participation, and accountability as formal Board meetings. Originally, the between-board meeting approach was adopted only after a guarantee that it would *not* be used for decision-making on funding decisions and yet here, we see further violations of previous decision-making. The Information Disclosure Policy mandates 21 days for funding proposal review, but the proposed procedures would effectively cut this time to 14 days for Board members to decide whether a funding proposal should be presented at a Board meeting.

We are also concerned that Board documents are increasingly streamlined to the point where they lose important data, cut out underlying analysis for proposed approaches or policy changes, and neglect context and policy linkages. Board documents are lasting records of Board proceedings and testament to the level of due diligence it applies in making its decisions. Nor are standard reports "non-strategic" - a fundamental understanding of Fund operations, dynamics, and challenges informs all decision-making. Due diligence is not served with the oversimplification of Board documentation, and any removed data, analysis, and information should remain easily, publicly accessible.

Ultimately, if speed is a main argument, board effectiveness must also be measured by how much and how quickly approved funding reaches communities and delivers meaningful results.

We therefore urge the Board to engage in further consultation to ensure that any reform strengthens, rather than weakens, the GCF's transparency, accountability, and inclusive governance. The credibility of the Fund depends not only on the decisions made, but also how those decisions are made.