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

Consideration of Accreditation Proposals

Access the document: https://www.greenclimate.fund/board-document/gcf-b46-03-rev01

We welcome this first batch of accreditation applicants under the Revised Accreditation Framework and the last three under the old framework.

As we highlighted during the development and adoption of the Revised Accreditation Framework, the pass/fail screening process, without the option for applicants to become accredited with conditions, risks making accreditation more difficult rather than easier for Direct Access Entities. Also, with the timeline for this first batch of applicants, it has not been possible for any applicants to fail yet, and we might encounter our first reports of failed applicants at the next board meeting.

So we may now have an operational RAF, but we do not yet know its full impact on applicants, the composition of the full applicant pool that may be successful from the first window, and how many failed applicants may choose to re-apply within the two year timeframe. And we will only know how well the process for assessing the criteria now pushed to the programming-level will work once some of these applicants bring forward their first funding proposals, where those funding proposals should include an assessment of those specific screening requirements.

We are only at the beginning of this policy reform, and we must receive complete data on this process. The consideration document, while listing numbers, did not provide any charts or graphics to show the progress of applicants, and that will be necessary to track not only the journey from pre-screening to application window to AP pass/fail assessment, but the cascading journeys over time, as we understand which invited pre-screened applicants chose to apply during which later windows, noting the majority of the pre-screened invited applicants to the first window did not apply there.

As the Secretariat reports that the pre-screening enables them to guide potential applicants toward the “most suitable engagement pathways with the GCF”, it would also be helpful to have a breakdown of which pathways are recommended to those determined to not be a fit during the pre-screening, or if that is a generic set of guidance rather than tailored. Transparency in the system to understand if applicants might have been discouraged by the Secretariat to even pursue accreditation would be appreciated.

Additionally, while the updated monitoring and accountability framework retains the expectation that accredited applicants’ portfolios will shift toward lower emissions over time,

the failure to apply such a test at the moment of accreditation is already showing real-world consequences, as the GCF considers an applicant here that while seeking to bolster its green credentials through affiliation with the GCF is at the same time increasing its investment in fossil fuels, the very thing driving the climate crisis the GCF is designed to combat.