



**GREEN
CLIMATE
FUND**

Meeting of the Board
21 – 24 October 2024
Songdo, Incheon, Republic of Korea
Provisional agenda item 6(a)

GCF/B.40/13/Add.01

3 October 2024

Co-Chairs proposal on increasing the efficiency and effectiveness of Board Committees – Addendum I:

Matrix of comments received and responses to comments

Summary

This document contains the response matrix for Board comments received on the draft document titled “Co-Chairs proposal on increasing the efficiency and effectiveness of Board Committees”.

Response matrix for Board comments received on the draft document “Co-Chairs proposal on increasing the efficiency and effectiveness of Board Committees”

Topic/ Paragraph of Proposal	Board Seat	Comment	Response
Substitute for absent Committee Members (paragraph 17(b) of proposal – paragraph 8 of Annex II)	Netherlands, Luxembourg, Denmark	We especially welcome allowing for substitutes if a Committee member is unable to participate in a Committee meeting. However, for the sake of the continuous improvement of the functioning of Board Committees, we would like to raise the following issue: We would also support allowing advisors to be able to substitute if a Committee member is unable to participate.	Your comment and proposal are appreciated and well noted. The Secretariat has pointed out, however that paragraph 30 of the Rules of Procedure states that “ <i>The Board may establish such committees from among its members and/or alternate members.</i> ” Given this language, the proposed change could not be accommodated without an amendment to the Rules of Procedure.
Substitute for absent Committee Members (paragraph 17(b) of proposal – paragraph 8 of Annex II)	Japan	Paragraph 8 of Annex II states that “If a Committee member is unable to participate in a Committee meeting, that member may be represented by her/his Board member or Alternate Board member (depending on the status of the corresponding Committee member) for that meeting.” Regarding this part, since it has been difficult to meet the quorum requirement due to the fact that proxy attendance was not permitted in the absence of a Committee member, we welcome the fact that the current proposal is in the direction of allowing proxy attendance. On the other hand, the draft stipulates that only his/her Board member/Alternate Board member can serve as a substitute for the committee member, but it is assumed that there may be cases where both the Board member and the Alternate board member	Please see response above.

Topic/ Paragraph of Proposal	Board Seat	Comment	Response
		have difficulty in attending the meeting. Therefore, the description should be changed so that an advisor can also serve as a proxy, referring to the following texts of other organizations, which are listed in the comparative analysis of the substitution after P.21 of the Co-chairs proposal.	
Substitute for absent Committee Members (para 17(b) of proposal – para 8 of Annex II)	Spain, Ireland, New Zealand	We believe that the GCF should explore the possibility to strengthen the role of advisors, as they are very well qualified on many specific issues dealt with by the committees.	Please see response above.
Quorum (Paragraph 17(c) and paragraph 27 of Annex II)	Spain, Ireland, New Zealand	A key problem is lack of quorum which slows down the business and has real impacts on real people in the case of EAC and POC, not to mention the impact on GCF staff who are trying to organise the meetings and support the work to be done. We would like to point out and support some ideas such as reducing the quorum of the Committees from the current two thirds.	Thank you for your comment.
Quorum/ Committee size (Paragraph 17(c) and paragraph 27 of Annex II)	Spain, Ireland, New Zealand	Given that reaching quorum is an outstanding issue, we would propose to increase committees' size. For example, the POC is too small (only 4), which poses real quorum problems.	Thank you for your proposal. The Co-Chairs believe that increasing the maximum allowable size of Committees to eight would be prudent. This would allow any specific changes to increase the size of Committees to be considered in the context of Committee restructuring, which we are recommending be taken up through Board agreement on a continuing mandate to the next Co-Chairs (Annex I – draft Board decision, point (b))

Topic/ Paragraph of Proposal	Board Seat	Comment	Response
Quorum (Paragraph 17(c) and paragraph 27 of Annex II)	Germany	With regards to changing rules of quorum we agree with the suggestion to reduce it to one-half. However, we do not see the need in introducing a new rule having both constituencies (para 27). It should rather be practice for each member that cannot attend to send someone on behalf. At the same time, it is in our view important that committee members make sure they can attend the meetings and bring their views to the whole group.	Thank you for your comment. The existing guidelines call for Committees to have an even number of members from developing and developed countries. With the existing 2/3 quorum, there is assurance of both developed and developing country participation in committee deliberations. The proposed provision on having both constituencies present maintains the assurance of both developed and developing country participation in the context of a 50% quorum threshold.
Quorum/ Committee size (Paragraph 17(c) and paragraph 27 of Annex II)	Georgia for rotating seat	In accordance with the current guidelines, committees can be comprised with a minimum of four and a maximum of six committee members, if the quorum will be lowered it means that in some cases, committee will be able to held meetings only with the participation of 2 members. If the replacement of a committee member will become possible (by a board/alternate board member), it might be reasonable to re-consider the necessity of lowering the quorum. In the comparative study, the quorum for the meetings is either 4 members or a simple majority.	Thank you for your comment. While we are hopeful that the substitution of the Committee member by their seat counterpart would reduce the number of times Committees have to cancel meetings due to lack of quorum, we believe that chances for having meetings could be greatly increased by also lowering the quorum level to 50%. We do recognize that would mean that the one standing Committee with four members (the POC) could meet if the Chair or Vice Chair and one member representing the opposite constituency of the Chair/Vice Chair was present. We do believe, however, that a meeting with such representation could still advance the Committee's work and share results with the other members by email, a practice that is already in use in some Committees. Given that, the Co-Chairs are predisposed to maintaining their proposal, but would welcome further discussion on this issue.
Committees report to the Board -	Germany	We do understand the interest of board members in committee work (para 18).	Thank you for your comment. The written "Report from the Committees Panels [and Groups] of the Board" to each

Topic/ Paragraph of Proposal	Board Seat	Comment	Response
Paragraph 18 of guidelines		However, we think that a requirement for reports of every committee at every board meeting might not be efficient as it is very time consuming for board meetings and should not be institutionalized.	meeting of the Board has been submitted to the Board every meeting since B.09. Until this point, if a Board member was not on a committee, the report has been the primary way for Board members to know what the Committees were working on. That said, the related agenda item is rarely opened for discussion – and when the Co-Chairs do decide to open it, it is usually to address issues thought to be of importance and/or broad interest. The language in paragraph 18 of the guidelines has been in place for over two years and it has not affected this practice.
General	Spain, Ireland, New Zealand	It should be noted that the 2019 report might be slightly outdated and that the specificities of GCF have to be taken into account. Board members are non-resident, which makes it difficult to draw conclusions in benchmarking with comparators such as MDBs.	Your points are well taken. That said, many of the issues raised in the 2019 report, and particularly those addressed in the Co-Chairs proposals are enduring issues noted both before and after the 2019 report. In addition, the benchmarking review looked at an equal number of MDBs and non-MDBs and an equal number of organizations with resident and non-resident Boards, and it found that the prevalence of the use of many of the actions being proposed was widespread and not limited to any one type of institution or Board framework.
Dealing with absence of Committee consensus (paragraphs 17(f) and paragraph 25 of Annex II)	Spain, Ireland, New Zealand	We would like to point out and support some ideas such establishing a procedure for cases where the Committees cannot reach consensus, requesting the Chairman to present a report to the Council outlining the different points of view.	Thank you for your comment.

Topic/ Paragraph of Proposal	Board Seat	Comment	Response
Dealing with absence of Committee consensus (paragraphs 17(f) and para 25 of Annex II)	Finland-Switzerland-Hungary-Monaco-Liechtenstein	We welcome the point on bringing issues back to the Board in case the committee cannot reach consensus . However, perhaps it would be useful to clarify that the determination of not reaching consensus is up to the Committee Chair (/Vice Chair) but this should happen in any case, if the Committee cannot decide on a recommendation to the Board after a certain period of time or a number of committee meetings. One possibility would be to use the Board Meeting by which the Committee was supposed to present its proposal as a hard deadline, after which the Board may decide to grant the Committee more time to deliberate on the matter. In the current text <i>“the Committee Chair shall report the members’ diverse views to the next meeting of the Board”</i> it is unclear what is meant by ‘the next meeting’	Thank you for your comment. The text of the current guidelines state that “In the event that the Committee is unable to reach consensus on a decision, the Committee Chair shall report this to the next meeting of the Board.” The intent of the proposed change to this language was to leave it to the Committee Chair to determine the absence of consensus and the timing of reporting to the Board on diverse views, and we still believe that is appropriate. Therefore, if the historic language that you quoted “to the next meeting” confuses the matter, we could consider its deletion. That said, we believe that the mandate to report diverse views in the absence of consensus, combined with the enhanced visibility of Committee documents will enable the Co-Chairs and the Board to take an informed decision on what direction it would like to take in moving forward specific issues that have been pending Committee recommendations.
Committee Chair and Vice Chair (paragraphs 12 and 13)	Georgia for rotating seat	[Text currently says Chair of a Committee shall alternate between developed and developing country.] What about the Vice-Chair? Is it possible that the chair and the vice-chair can both be developed or developing country members? It might be reasonable to clarify this in the guidelines.	Thank you for your comment. We agree and have included language clarifying this point in the proposal (see paragraphs 12 and 13 of annex I).
Committee membership (paragraphs 8 and 9 of Annex II)	Georgia for rotating seat	In accordance with the GCF Governing Instrument, Board members and alternate members are eligible to serve additional terms as determined by their constituency, it might be reasonable, for more clarity, to define the cases	Thank you for your comment on this issue. Taking into account past Board engagement on this issue, the Co-Chairs decided not to propose changes to the existing guideline text that leaves it up to the constituencies to decide the selection of their Committee members.

Topic/ Paragraph of Proposal	Board Seat	Comment	Response
		when the board members or alternate members are selected to serve additional terms, taking into account rotation between developing and developed country members.	
Transparency and efficiency (paragraph 17 (d) and paragraphs 30 and 31 of Annex II)	Spain, Ireland, New Zealand	We agree on the need to identify areas for improvement, including those related to transparency and efficiency... but we are aware that broadening participation could lengthen deliberation and delay decision-making, which is clearly counterproductive.	Thank you for your comment; it is well noted. We will seek further information on your comment prior to B40 to understand which aspect(s) of transparency and broadening participation you might be concerned with and respond accordingly.
Transparency and efficiency (paragraph 17 (d) and paragraphs 30 and 31 of Annex II)	Finland-Switzerland-Hungary-Monaco-Liechtenstein	We also welcome the proposal of the full Board having access to all committee documents and information, except those of a confidential nature. There should be a higher degree of transparency and standardization for committee work plans, meeting minutes and reporting. To avoid overflowing the Board's e-mail inboxes, our preference would be that the committees' minutes are uploaded on the Board portal, and only important committee documents are sent via e-mail to the Board.	Thank you for your suggestion. The Co-Chairs have asked the Secretariat to take related issues into account in implementing this part of the guidelines.
Transparency and efficiency (paragraph 17 (d) and paragraphs 30 and 31 of Annex II)	Finland-Switzerland-Hungary-Monaco-Liechtenstein	It is proposed to open up the committee meetings for other BM/ABMs as well as a limited number of advisers to increase transparency. We welcome this, but would like to include a reference to possible virtual participation.	Thank you for your comment. A proposal has been made to address the issue you have raised (see paragraph 30 of Annex II).

Topic/ Paragraph of Proposal	Board Seat	Comment	Response
Transparency and efficiency (paragraph 17 (d) and paragraphs 30 and 31 of Annex II)	Germany	With regards to open all meetings to every board member we are wondering if this changes the nature of current setting which allows very open discussions in a small round.	Thank you for your comment. Committee meetings are currently open to committee members and as many as 12 advisors as observers, and this has not appeared to have changed the nature of Committee deliberations. It is also noted that all comparators allow all Board members to at least observe open Committee meetings, and as with other comparators, the proposed language allows portions of Committee meetings discussing confidential matters to be closed from observers. Finally, given the small size of committees relative to the Board, and the related difficulties of Committee work being able to drive Board consensus, it is believed that allowing other Board members to observe will put them in a better position to engage on proposals when they come to the Board, making Board consideration more efficient.
Committee workplans Paragraph 23 and 29 of the guidelines calling on Committees to present their workplans to the Board	Germany	Not sure if every committee necessarily needs a workplan since most of them deal with obvious topics (para 23, 39). Furthermore, committees should be able to be agile and responsive to short term requests.	Thank you for your comment: Given the turnover of Board and Committee membership, a workplan serves as a way for the Committees and the Board to track the large number of outstanding mandates that have been assigned to the Committees. It also enables prospective Committee members to understand the workload of the Committees and take informed decisions on whether they wish to become members. In practice, when prepared, Committee workplans have generally been appended to the report of the Committee to the Board and have not been the subject of a separate presentation.
Continuing Co-Chairs mandate on	Germany	More generally, we are interested in discussing the existing set of committees and potential adjustments with regards to current needs	Thank you for your comments. They are well noted. We believe that the mandate included in the decision is broad enough to encompass a range of important issues.

Topic/ Paragraph of Proposal	Board Seat	Comment	Response
Committee efficiency and effectiveness (paragraph 19 and point (b) in Annex I draft decision)		(especially looking at other funds and their arrangements). Over all we see great merit in having targeted committees to support secretariat and board work. The objective of this exercise should be to reduce the work load of both.	
Continuing Co-Chairs mandate on Committee efficiency and effectiveness (paragraph 19 and point b in Annex I draft decision)	Finland-Switzerland-Hungary-Monaco-Liechtenstein	We welcome the work done by the Co-Chairs to prepare this proposal and the possibility to comment. The discussion and decision on efficiency and effectiveness of the committees are long overdue. We believe that these amendments are only the first step of much needed improvements. We are very much in favor of the new Co-Chairs continuing this work without delay and proposing changes on a regular basis	Thank you for your comment.
Flexibility of rules for differences in Committees	Spain, Ireland, New Zealand	We would like to allow flexibility and not set very strict common rules for the whole set of committees, as each committee could have its own particularities.	Thank you for your comment. As you know, GCF already has overarching Committee guidelines that apply to all Committees, and the benchmarking review suggested that having such overarching guidelines is most common for organizations' management of Committees. In many cases, the proposed changes to the current Committee guidelines reflect the existing Board Rules of Procedure.
Application of the guidelines to ad hoc committees	Germany	Regarding ad hoc committees we think that the guidelines should also be applicable and	Thank you for your proposal. As demonstrated with the approval of the TORs for the ad hoc committee on human resources matters, the Board may decide on a case by case

Topic/ Paragraph of Proposal	Board Seat	Comment	Response
Paragraph 5 of guidelines		therefore suggest to delete para 5 under I. Objective and scope.	basis to make the guideline applicable to ad hoc committees.
