



**GREEN  
CLIMATE  
FUND**

**Meeting of the Board**  
2 – 5 November 2015  
Livingstone, Republic of Zambia  
Provisional agenda item 9\*

**GCF/B.11/03/Corr.01**

**1 November 2015**

---

# Consideration of accreditation proposals – Corrigendum

---

## **Summary**

This document presents information related to documents GCF/B.11/03 titled “Consideration of accreditation proposals”, to be considered by the Board of the Green Climate Fund (GCF), and GCF/B.11/03/Add.02.

---

\* The agenda item number will be determined when the final sequence of items in the provisional agenda is confirmed by the Co-Chairs.

Paragraph 11 of document GCF/B.11/03 titled “Consideration of accreditation proposals” is replaced by the contents of document GCF/B.11/03/Add.02 paragraph 3 to 9:

3. As detailed in document GCF/B.11/03, disclosure of accreditation information is currently governed by the GCF’s Interim Information Disclosure Practice (IIDP).<sup>1</sup> The Board will be considering the “Information Disclosure Policy” (document GCF/B.11/10) at its eleventh meeting, which is intended to address disclosure across various aspects related to the GCF. Following inputs from Board members and other stakeholders in response to decision B.10/06, paragraph (k), which calls for the Secretariat to develop a proposal to increase transparency of the accreditation process, an amendment to the IIDP in document GCF/BM-2015/10 was proposed, in advance of the Information Disclosure Policy to be considered.
4. The amendment was proposed to disclose the names and countries of entities at the time that entities are recommended by the Accreditation Panel for accreditation in a public document published on the GCF website, rather than later at the time of the accreditation by the Board, as stated in the IIDP. The amendment was proposed for consideration by the Board as a decision between meetings on a no-objection basis.
5. An objection was raised during the period of consideration by one Board member on behalf of three Board members and therefore the amendment was not adopted as a decision and the IIDP continues to apply.
6. The nine applicants recommended for accreditation in document GCF/B.11/03 were consulted when the amendment to the IIDP was proposed, during the consideration period by the Board (i.e. when a decision had not been taken) and prior to the publication of the document GCF/B.11/03, on whether they would be agreeable to having the amendment, if adopted, apply to them. Most were in principle agreeable to releasing their names in this document at the time of their recommendation.
7. In accordance with paragraph 43 of the Rules of Procedure for the Board, the Co-Chairs worked through the objection with the Board member who had raised an objection. In these consultations, the Co-Chairs and the mentioned Board Member reached an agreement; it was decided that all nine applicants recommended for accreditation in document GCF/B.11/03 be consulted again on their willingness to voluntarily disclose their names prior to a decision by the Board rather than after, as per the IIDP. Following these additional consultations with the recommended entities, all nine entities have voluntarily agreed to publicly disclose their names and countries prior to a Board decision on accreditation.
8. Although as a general rule the GCF is not in a position to ask counterparties, such as applicant entities, to deviate voluntarily from Board approved GCF policies without Board approval, the current situation may be an exception to that rule. First, there appears to be a general wish to increase the transparency of the accreditation process. The upcoming broader amendment of the information disclosure policy is meant to emphasize that wish, amongst other transparency improvements. Second, the provisions in the IIDP of not disclosing the name, country or contact details of applicants until the entity is accredited is primarily meant to protect the interests of the applicant entities. If all of them agree to disclosure, a deviation from the IIDP may be warranted. This exception, however, shall not be considered as a precedent for any future deviation from GCF policies. This is an exceptional situation for which the Co-Chairs decided, in consultation with the Board member, to allow for a pragmatic solution.

---

<sup>1</sup> Decision B.05/15.



9. In view of the above, the Co-Chairs have decided to withdraw the proposed amendment to the IIDP and have requested the Secretariat to publish this addendum to document GCF/B.11/03 containing the names and countries of the applicants recommended by the Accreditation Panel for accreditation by the Board at its eleventh meeting.

\_\_\_\_\_