



**GREEN
CLIMATE
FUND**

Meeting of the Board

1 – 4 July 2018

Songdo, Incheon, Republic of Korea

Provisional agenda item 14(d)

GCF/B.20/Inf.01

28 May 2018

Update on the further development of some indicators in the performance measurement frameworks

Summary

This document provides a summary of principles and approaches, a comparative analysis of indicators across global climate finance mechanisms, and a workplan for the further development of indicators in the performance measurement frameworks of GCF. It also presents an illustrative list of revised mitigation and adaptation indicators and associated measurement, reporting and verification systems for the Board's information.

Table of Contents

I.	Guiding principles and approaches	1
II.	Initiative on comparing key performance indicators across different climate finance mechanisms	2
III.	Next steps: workplan for the finalization of indicators in the performance measurement frameworks	2
	Annex I: Further development of mitigation and adaptation indicators in the performance measurement frameworks	4

I. Guiding principles and approaches

1. In accordance with paragraph 58 of the Governing Instrument for the GCF, a results management framework with guidelines and appropriate performance indicators will be approved by the Board. Performance against these indicators will be reviewed periodically to support the continuous improvement of the impact, effectiveness and operational performance.
2. The Board, through decision B.05/03, adopted the initial result areas and performance indicators of the GCF and decided that the GCF's results management framework (RMF) will "enable effective monitoring and evaluation of the outputs, outcomes and impacts of the Fund's investments and portfolio, and the Fund's organizational effectiveness and operational efficiency". The Board further decided that in designing its RMF, "the Fund will use the experience of other relevant entities, and, where appropriate, align the framework and indicators with existing best practice models".
3. Following from decision B.05/03, the Board, through decision B.07/04, further adopted the elements of the initial GCF RMF after reviewing document GCF/B.07/04 titled "Initial Results Management Framework of the Fund".
4. As per decision B.08/07, and relating to the proposed mitigation and adaptation performance measurement frameworks (PMFs), the Board decided on certain indicators and took note of other indicators that require further refinement. Two documents, GCF/B.12/13 and GCF/B.13/26, both titled "Further development of indicators in the performance measurement frameworks", were then published and presented to the Board at its twelfth meeting and thirteenth meeting, respectively; neither of the decisions presented in the documents were adopted.
5. Subsequently, the Board, by decision B.17/01 paragraph (b)(x), decided to defer consideration of the further development of some indicators in the PMFs as contained in document GCF/B.13/26, titled "Further development of some indicators in the performance measurement frameworks" and requested the Secretariat to present this for consideration by the Board at the earliest possible opportunity.
6. In considering further development of indicators, the Secretariat considered the report of the Adaptation Committee to the twentieth session of the Conference of the Parties (COP) to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) and the related UNFCCC decision¹, which specifically recommended that GCF:
 - (a) Keep the indicators simple;
 - (b) Design indicators that are qualitative as well as quantitative;
 - (c) Design indicators in such a way as to capture the progress that countries are able to make in integrating adaptation into their development and sectoral planning, policies and actions; and
 - (d) Give countries sufficient flexibility to define their indicators in line with their national and local planning, strategies and priorities.
7. The Secretariat has also considered COP decision 8/CP.23 18, which encouraged the Board to include in its annual report to the COP information on projects approved by the Board that support the innovation and/or scaling up of climate technologies. This was requested with a view to informing the Technology Mechanism of the UNFCCC as the Board undertakes further work on climate technology innovation by including technology related indicators in the PMFs. These indicators would then track activities supporting climate technologies in mitigation and adaptation projects/programmes in the GCF portfolio.

¹ UNFCCC decision 4/CP.20, annex, paragraph 4.

8. Based on the above guiding principles, the Secretariat, from the first quarter of 2018, endeavoured to further develop indicators in the PMFs by comparing its own with those of different climate finance mechanisms. This approach is in line with decision B.17/04 where the Board adopted the operational framework on complementarity and coherence and which addresses the streamlining of monitoring and evaluation approaches across different climate finance delivery channels.

II. Initiative on comparing key performance indicators across different climate finance mechanisms

9. The Secretariat conducted a comparative analysis of adaptation and mitigation key performance indicators (KPIs), associated targets, and systems on measurement, reporting and verifications (MRVs). Accordingly, the Secretariat compared, contrasted and harmonized – as part of the complementarity and coherence approach – adaptation and mitigation KPIs and MRVs with that of other climate finance mechanisms (such as the Adaptation Fund [AF], Climate Investment Funds [CIF], Global Environment Facility [GEF], and the Nationally Appropriate Mitigation Action [NAMA] Facility). The analysis contained the following:

- (a) A one-on-one comparison of indicators, including both those that are in use as well as those that are obsolete, between the GCF and other climate finance mechanisms on adaptation and mitigation;
- (b) Development of a theme-based indicator matrix that endeavours to harmonize adaptation and mitigation indicators of GCF with those of other peer organizations that allows the identification of common result areas addressed by different organizations; and
- (c) Key findings of the comparison and harmonization exercise along with illustrative examples of adaptation and mitigation KPIs and MRVs that could be adopted by the Board.

10. The overall goal is to ensure that GCF is using indicators that are relatively easy to measure, report and verify, and are not unnecessarily inconsistent with those used by other climate finance mechanisms. Based on lessons learned from peer institutions that have done away with a number of indicators – primarily because of related quality and capacity challenges – the Secretariat proposes the further development and streamlining of indicators, targets and MRVs at the GCF, country and project/programme levels.

III. Next steps: workplan for the finalization of indicators in the performance measurement frameworks

11. The Independent Evaluation Unit (IEU) will assess the RMF and PMFs and provide recommendations to the Board at its twenty-first meeting. The assessment will take account of evidence of global best practices on climate change mitigation and adaptation indicators as well as the comparative analysis of indicators undertaken by the Secretariat through a complementarity and coherence approach across major climate finance mechanisms, as outlined in Annex I.

12. Following the assessment and recommendations made by the IEU on the RMF and PMFs at B.21, the Divisions of Mitigation and Adaptation, Private Sector Facility, Country Programming and other relevant divisions/units along with the Office of Portfolio Management will be involved in a cross-divisional effort to review, update and finalize the RMF and PMFs. The finalization of the RMF and PMFs will also consider learnings that emerge from the review

process that will be undertaken by the IEU. The finalized RMF and PMFs will then be presented to the Board at its twenty – second meeting.

13. Following this status update on the further development of indicators in the PMFs to the Board at its twentieth meeting and the receipt of any comments from Board members on this document, further consultations on the indicators and MRVs in the PMFs will be initiated with experts and relevant organizations.

14. The finalized RMF and PMFs will be the primary tools for annual performance reports (APRs)² and inform assessments of funding proposals including investment criteria indicators to ensure coherence throughout the process.

15. The RMF and PMFs, once finalized, will inform the GCF replenishment process as they will serve as guiding tools for key contributors, internal and external stakeholders, and potential non-government grant-making bodies regarding the GCF portfolio-level results chain and associated impacts, outcomes and outputs.

16. Additionally, to ensure the reliability of data and information received from APRs, proper systems should be in place to support the training of GCF staff, accredited entities (AEs), and national designated authorities (NDAs) on the value and relevance of the RMF and PMFs. The finalized RMF and PMFs, along with lessons learned from peer institutions, will also help GCF to develop the necessary monitoring, reporting and verification training modules to build the capacity of AEs and NDAs.

Table 1: Summary of work plan for the finalization of indicators in the RMF and PMFs

Timeline	Q1 2018	Q2 2018	Q3 2018	Q4 2018	Q1 2019
	Comparative analysis of key performance indicators and MRVs for adaptation across major climate finance mechanisms	Comparative analysis of key performance indicators and MRVs for mitigation (contd. task)	Status update on further development of indicators in the PMFs at B.20 Comments from Board members, experts and relevant organizations including AEs and consultations as needed	Assessment of the RMF and PMFs by the IEU to the Board at B.21 Cross-divisional consultations	Cross-divisional consultations (contd. task) Presentation of the finalized RMF and PMFs by the Secretariat at B.22

Notes: Q = quarter; PMFs = performance measurement frameworks; MRVs = measurement, reporting and verifications; B.20 = twentieth meeting of the Board; B.21 = twenty-first meeting of the Board; B.22 = twenty-second meeting of the Board

² During the first quarter of 2018, the Secretariat received 17 APRs, and the number will only continue growing from the next reporting cycle with increased approvals of funding proposals and first disbursements to follow.

Annex I: Further development of mitigation and adaptation indicators in the performance measurement frameworks

I. Introduction

1. The current mitigation and adaptation performance measurement frameworks (PMFs) contain core indicators and performance indicators for the GCF's results areas adopted by the Board at its seventh and eighth meetings as well as additional indicators that needed further refinement for the Board's consideration. The PMFs outline reporting responsibilities and include explanations on the indicators and other relevant background and methodological information as needed. However, except for four core indicators – three mitigation indicators and one adaptation indicator – the current PMFs do not contain robust system on measurement, reporting and verifications (MRVs) against which adequate and timely measurement, reporting and verification of indicators can happen.
2. The refinement of the PMFs reflects the trend among climate finance mechanisms of reducing the number of indicators and focusing on core indicators that are easier to track with quality assurance. Numerous sets of indicators previously used by other climate finance mechanisms with a longer monitoring history were found to be difficult to verify through the use of actual data on the ground and proved arduous to use in terms of maintenance of proper quality assurance.
3. While the GCF is unique among climate funds, the underlying study is based on the proposition that several of the existing climate finance delivery channels that have similar structures and characteristics as GCF may have experience that can be used by the GCF in the further development of its monitoring frameworks. Accordingly, those institutions selected as references for indicator comparison included the Global Environment Facility (GEF), Adaptation Fund (AF) and Climate Investment Funds (CIF). GEF, together with GCF, is an operating entity of the financial mechanism for the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC). The AF was established under the Kyoto Protocol of the UNFCCC to support climate adaptation and resilience activities. The CIF, hosted by the World Bank, have four programmes under their management funding climate mitigation and adaptation activities. The Secretariat is concurrently collaborating with these organizations as part of the work under the GCF operational framework on complementarity and coherence. Finally, for mitigation indicator comparison, the Nationally Appropriate Mitigation Action (NAMA) Facility, a financial mechanism whose main aim is to contribute to the impact of transformation towards a low-carbon society in line with a 2 °C increase in global temperature limit, was chosen as an additional comparable institution since the coverage by AF is only focused on adaptation activities.
4. Based on decision B.11/10, accredited entities (AEs) will submit annual performance reports on progress made towards targets of the indicators in PMFs and any additionally identified project/programme-level indicators.

II. Principles of further refinement of indicators in the performance measurement frameworks in line with the recommendations of the Adaptation Committee report to UNFCCC

5. The principles for further refinement of indicators in the PMFs are as follows:
- (a) Indicators should be consistent with the SMART principle,³ i.e. specific, measurable, achievable, relevant and time-bound;
 - (b) Both qualitative and quantitative indicators should be included in the framework;
 - (c) Each result area will have a minimum number of relevant indicators unless the subject result addresses more than two thematic or sectoral areas;
 - (d) Indicators should consider the principle of complementarity and coherence with other climate finance delivery mechanisms and consistent with at least one other comparable organization to the extent possible for inclusion, retention or elimination in the PMFs;
 - (e) Country level indicators should be introduced per Decision B.05/03 (k) considering Decision B.08/07 (e) with respect to their use;
 - (f) The reference document used for the tables below is the same one that was presented to the Board at its eighth meeting (Decision of the Board – Eighth Meeting of the Board, 14-17 October 2014, Annex VIII: Mitigation and adaptation performance measurement frameworks, GCF/B.08/45).

III. Key findings and summary

6. The most recent work on the further development of some indicators in the PMFs builds on previous efforts to address indicators that were noted by the Board but needed further refinement by comparing indicators, along with relevant methodologies on MRVs, across major climate finance mechanisms. It also revised the categorization of indicators from a 2-tier to 3-tier system that allows the impacts and outcomes to be measured at GCF, country, and project/programme levels. For example, indicators 5.1 and 5.2 in the mitigation and adaptation PMFs have been revised to be measured and tracked at the country level. Thematically, based on the guidance at COP 23, a technology-related indicator has been introduced for adaptation in addition to mitigation.

7. The indicators that were removed from the current list of indicators in other comparable organizations – GEF, AF, CIF, NAMA Facility – have also been considered during the development and refinement of the PMFs. These indicators not only showed a trend for indicator tracking in the climate finance landscape but also provided GCF with a few meaningful indicators to consider.

8. Finally, the MRV section of the PMFs has been elaborated from previous versions. In the current PMFs, proper methodological guidelines for MRVs are almost non-existent with some proposed methodologies addressed in the Board document GCF/B.08/07. The measurement section for some indicators benefited from definitions and methodologies used by other comparable organizations, which has yet to be improved further through additional technical review and consultation. The reporting and verification section articulates the requirements from AEs addressed in the monitoring and accountability framework (MAF).

³ First developed by Peter Drucker in “The Practice of Management” first published in 1915.

Table 2: Review of existing mitigation indicators in line with complementarity and coherence approach

Expected result	Indicator ⁴ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> = Decided <input type="checkbox"/> = No change to undecided indicator <input type="checkbox"/> = Revised <input type="checkbox"/> = Newly added <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> = Removed * = Core	Level (GCF, country, project/ programme)	Reporting responsibility (annual reporting)	Measurement, reporting and verification (MRV)	Rationale	Similar indicators (GEF/CIF/ NAMA Facility)
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> * tCO ₂ eq reduced as a result of GCF-funded projects/programmes	GCF level	AEs/intermediaries	<p>M: Determine the baseline counterfactual emissions trajectory (what would be expected to occur in the absence of the project).</p> <p>- Calculate the net change in emissions/energy savings/land use compared to the baseline counterfactual. Both direct and, where applicable, indirect emissions should be counted. Calculations will be in original units (e.g. MW saved, tCO₂eq, tCH₄).</p> <p>- Convert to tCO₂eq where appropriate.</p> <p><i>*Source: GCF/B.08/07</i> <i>*For emissions calculation methodology, refer to the IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories (2006); other calculation standards might be considered if deemed justifiable and compatible with IPCC Guidelines.</i></p> <p>R: Reported in the Annual Performance Report (APR)</p>	<p>Adopted by the GCF Board.</p> <p>Same or similar indicators used in all three climate finance mechanisms.</p>	<p>GEF: Core Indicator 6</p> <p>CIF: CTF Core Indicator B1 FIP indicator B1-3</p> <p>NAMA: Core Indicator M1</p>

⁴ = Decided: Adopted by the GCF Board
 = No change to undecided indicator: Remain as in the PMFs (GCF/B.08/45)
 = Revised: Changed from the PMFs (GCF/B.08/45)
 = Newly added: Added to the PMFs (GCF/B.08/45)
 = Removed: Deleted from the PMFs (GCF/B.08/45)
 * = Core: Adopted as core indicator by the GCF Board

Expected result	Indicator ⁴ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> = Decided <input type="checkbox"/> = No change to undecided indicator <input type="checkbox"/> = Revised <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> = Newly added <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> = Removed * = Core	Level (GCF, country, project/programme)	Reporting responsibility (annual reporting)	Measurement, reporting and verification (MRV)	Rationale	Similar indicators (GEF/CIF/NAMA Facility)
				V: First verification to be done by AEs on primary data/information from intermediaries/executing entities and second verification to be done by the GCF on data/information calculation from AEs; an expert panel could be hired by the GCF on a rolling basis for a third-party verification		
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> * Cost per tCO ₂ e decreased for all GCF-funded mitigation projects/programmes.	GCF level	AEs/intermediaries	<p>M: Costs of specific components of a project/programme, such as training, stakeholder consultation, or capacity-building, may be further analysed. These components may add to overall costs but do not directly influence the costs of the technical mitigation approach (e.g. renewable energy technology) itself. In other words, cost comparisons should consider both the direct implementation costs of mitigation and overarching projects costs.</p> <p>*Source: GCF/B.08/07</p> <p>R: Reported in the Annual Performance Report (APR)</p> <p>V: First verification to be done by AEs on data/information from intermediaries/executing entities and second verification to be done by the GCF on data/information from AEs.</p>	Adopted by the GCF Board	None

Expected result	Indicator ⁴ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> = Decided <input type="checkbox"/> = No change to undecided indicator <input type="checkbox"/> = Revised <input type="checkbox"/> = Newly added <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> = Removed * = Core	Level (GCF, country, project/programme)	Reporting responsibility (annual reporting)	Measurement, reporting and verification (MRV)	Rationale	Similar indicators (GEF/CIF/NAMA Facility)
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> * Volume of finance leveraged by GCF funding. (to be updated in line with PSF initiative to refine the indicator)	GCF level	AEs/intermediaries	<p>M: Total finance leverage:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Identify GCF finance contribution. 2. Identify total financing from non-GCF sources. 3. Identify the amount of total co-financing that would have been provided in the absence of GCF funding – financing that is truly additional or diverted from other sources. This relies on the expert judgment of the project/programme officers. 4. Subtract (3) from (2). The remainder provides a measure of the leveraged finance. The ratio of (1) to (3) (e.g. 1:1.4) can also be an expression of leveraged finance. <p>Public/private finance disaggregation: Follow same instructions considering only public/private funding sources; e.g. for public sources:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Identify GCF finance contribution. 2. Identify total financing from non-GCF public sources. 3. Identify the amount of total public co-finance that would have been provided in the absence of GCF funding – financing that is truly additional or diverted from other sources. This relies on the expert judgment of the project/programme officers. 	<p>Adopted by the GCF Board.</p> <p>Same or similar indicators used in two climate finance mechanisms.</p>	<p>CIF: CTF Core Indicator B2; FIP indicator B2-3</p> <p>NAMA: Core Indicator M4, M5, Output 3</p>

Expected result	Indicator ⁴ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> = Decided <input type="checkbox"/> = No change to undecided indicator <input type="checkbox"/> = Revised <input type="checkbox"/> = Newly added <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> = Removed * = Core	Level (GCF, country, project/programme)	Reporting responsibility (annual reporting)	Measurement, reporting and verification (MRV)	Rationale	Similar indicators (GEF/CIF/NAMA Facility)
				<p>4. Subtract (3) from (2). The remainder provides a measure of the leveraged public finance. The ratio of (1) to (3) (e.g. 1:1.4) can also be an expression of leveraged public finance.</p> <p>In some instances, both public and private co-financing may apply and each may need to be disaggregated separately. Note that financial analysis, including internal rate of return (IRR) and other project selection considerations, will be considered as part of the GCF investment criteria.</p> <p><i>*Source: GCF/B.08/07</i></p> <p>R: Reported in the Annual Performance Report (APR)</p> <p>V: First verification to be done by AEs on data/information from intermediaries/executing entities and second verification to be done by GCF on data/information from AEs.</p>		
1.0 Reduced emissions through increased low-emission	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1.1 * tCO ₂ eq reduced or avoided as a result of GCF-funded projects/programmes –	GCF level	AEs/intermediaries	<p>M: The basic steps to calculating tCO₂eq are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Determine the baseline counterfactual emissions trajectory (what would be 	<p>Adopted by the GCF Board.</p> <p>Same or similar indicators used in all</p>	<p>GEF: Core Indicator 6</p> <p>CIF: CTF Core Indicator B1</p>

Expected result	Indicator ⁴ ☑ = Decided ☐ = No change to undecided indicator ▣ = Revised ■ = Newly added ☒ = Removed * = Core	Level (GCF, country, project/programme)	Reporting responsibility (annual reporting)	Measurement, reporting and verification (MRV)	Rationale	Similar indicators (GEF/CIF/NAMA Facility)
energy access and power generation.	gender-sensitive energy access power generation.			expected to occur in the absence of the project).	three climate finance mechanisms.	FIP indicator B1-3
2.0 Reduced emissions through increased access to low emission transport.	☑2.1 *tCO ₂ eq reduced or avoided as a result of GCF-funded projects/programmes – low emission gender-sensitive transport.	GCF level	AEs/intermediaries	- Calculate the net change in emissions/energy savings/land use compared to the baseline counterfactual. Both direct and, where applicable, indirect emissions should be counted. Calculations will be in original units (e.g. MW saved, t CO ₂ eq, tCH ₄). - Convert to t CO ₂ eq where appropriate. - Disaggregate by gender where possible.		NAMA: Core Indicator M1
3.0 Reduced emissions from buildings, cities, industries and appliances.	☑3.1 *tCO ₂ eq reduced or avoided as a result of GCF-funded projects/programmes – buildings, cities, industries, and appliances.	GCF level	AEs/intermediaries	*Source: GCF/B.08/07 *For emissions calculation methodology, refer to IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories (2006); other calculation standards might be considered if deemed justifiable and compatible with IPCC Guidelines.		
4.0 Reduced emissions from land use, deforestation, forest degradation, and through sustainable management of forests and conservation and enhancement	☑4.1 *tCO ₂ eq reduced or avoided (including increased removals) as a result of GCF-funded projects/programmes – forest and land-use.	GCF level	AEs/intermediaries	R: Reported in the Annual Performance Report (APR) V: First verification to be done by AEs on data/information from intermediaries/executing entities and second verification to be done by the GCF on data/information from AEs.		

Expected result	Indicator ⁴ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> = Decided <input type="checkbox"/> = No change to undecided indicator <input type="checkbox"/> = Revised <input type="checkbox"/> = Newly added <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> = Removed * = Core	Level (GCF, country, project/ programme)	Reporting responsibility (annual reporting)	Measurement, reporting and verification (MRV)	Rationale	Similar indicators (GEF/CIF/ NAMA Facility)
of forest carbon stocks.						
	<input type="checkbox"/> Social, environmental, economic co-benefit index/indicator at impact level. (to be refined after consultation with other relevant divisions/units)	GCF level	AEs/intermediaries	<p>M: Describe sustainable co-benefits (social, economic and environmental) generated and measure to the extent possible</p> <p><i>*Source: NAMA Facility</i></p> <p>R: Reported in the Annual Performance Report (APR)</p> <p>Information should be disaggregated by gender, by socio-economic vulnerability and/or other country-relevant criteria.</p> <p>V: First verification to be done by AEs on data/information from intermediaries/executing entities and second verification to be done by the GCF on data/information from AEs.</p>	Same or similar indicators used in three climate finance mechanisms.	<p>GEF: Core Indicator 11</p> <p>CIF: FIP indicator B2-2, B3-1, B3-2, B3-3</p> <p>NAMA: Output 6</p>
Technology	<input type="checkbox"/> Number and types of technologies and innovative solutions transferred or licensed to support low-emission development as a result of GCF support (noted, but further refinement needed; TBD by the Board).	Project/ programme level	AEs/intermediaries/countries	<p>M: Describe capacity building and technology development and transfer elements deployed in projects/programmes on innovative and scalable/replicable climate technologies as a result of GCF support.</p> <p>R: Reported in the Annual Performance Report (APR)</p>	COP 23 guidance to report progress on technology.	None

Expected result	Indicator ⁴ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> = Decided <input type="checkbox"/> = No change to undecided indicator <input type="checkbox"/> = Revised <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> = Newly added <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> = Removed * = Core	Level (GCF, country, project/programme)	Reporting responsibility (annual reporting)	Measurement, reporting and verification (MRV)	Rationale	Similar indicators (GEF/CIF/NAMA Facility)
	(to be updated after consultation with other relevant divisions/units).			V: First verification to be done by AEs on data/information from intermediaries/executing entities and second verification to be done by GCF on data/information from AEs.		
5.0 Strengthened institutional and regulatory systems for low-emission planning and development.	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PPCR Core Indicator A2.1 Revised: Degree of integration of climate change mitigation approaches in national and sector planning.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 5.1 Institutional and regulatory systems that improve incentives for low-emission planning and development and their effective implementation.</p>	Country level	AEs/intermediaries/countries	<p>M: Qualitative and quantitative assessment of the various strategies, policies, plans and documents; measurement will be at the national level and by way of standardized scorecard developed by AEs that shows baseline and target scores; data should be sourced from official policy planning documents.</p> <p>In addition, baseline information may be drawn from national repositories, qualitative in nature; defining clear scoring criteria will help make the subjective assessment more objective, reliable, and consistent.</p> <p>The agreed scoring criteria agreed upon by the GCF and different in-country stakeholder groups will provide a robust and objective assessment of the progress.</p> <p><i>*Source: PPCR</i></p> <p>R: Reported annually by AEs/intermediaries.</p> <p>V: First verification to be done by AEs on data/information from</p>	<p>Same or similar indicators used in two climate finance mechanisms.</p> <p>Indicator 5.1 removed: not specific nor measurable</p>	<p>CIF: PPCR Indicator A2.1 (core)</p> <p>CIF: FIP Indicator B2-1</p> <p>NAMA: Output 5</p>

Expected result	Indicator ⁴ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> = Decided <input type="checkbox"/> = No change to undecided indicator <input type="checkbox"/> = Revised <input type="checkbox"/> = Newly added <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> = Removed * = Core	Level (GCF, country, project/ programme)	Reporting responsibility (annual reporting)	Measurement, reporting and verification (MRV)	Rationale	Similar indicators (GEF/CIF/ NAMA Facility)
				intermediaries/executing entities and second verification to be done by the GCF on data/information from AEs.		
	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PPCR Core indicator B2 revised: Evidence of strengthened government capacity and coordination mechanism to mainstream low-emission planning and development.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 5.2 Number and level of effective coordination mechanisms.</p>	Country level	AEs/intermediaries/countries	<p>M: Evidence of measures taken for building institutional capacities, promotion of coordination among national and regional agencies, etc.; measurement will be at the national level and by way of standardized scorecard developed by AEs that shows baseline and target scores</p> <p>* <i>Source: PPCR</i></p> <p>R: Reported annually by AEs/intermediaries.</p> <p>V: First verification to be done by AEs on data/information from intermediaries/executing entities and second verification to be done by the GCF on data/information from AEs.</p>	<p>Same or similar indicators used in one climate finance mechanism.</p> <p>Indicator 5.2 removed: not specific nor accurately captures the extent of capacity and coordination</p>	CIF: PPCR Indicator B2 (core)
6.0 Increased number of small, medium and large low-emission power suppliers	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 6.1 Proportion of low-emission power supply in a jurisdiction or market	Project/ programme level	AEs/intermediaries/countries	<p>M: Increased number of reliable low – emission power suppliers across all ranges. Proportion of low emission power supply generated in a certain region, country, province/state.</p> <p>R: Reported in the Annual Performance Report (APR)</p>	<p>Adopted by the GCF Board.</p> <p>Allows to measure concentration risk of GCF financing and capture private sector participation</p>	

Expected result	Indicator ⁴ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> = Decided <input type="checkbox"/> = No change to undecided indicator <input type="checkbox"/> = Revised <input type="checkbox"/> = Newly added <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> = Removed * = Core	Level (GCF, country, project/programme)	Reporting responsibility (annual reporting)	Measurement, reporting and verification (MRV)	Rationale	Similar indicators (GEF/CIF/NAMA Facility)
				V: First verification to be done by AEs on data/information from intermediaries/executing entities and second verification to be done by the GCF on data/information from AEs.		
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 6.2 Number of households, and individuals (males and females) with improved access to low-emission energy sources.	Project/programme level	AEs/intermediaries/countries	<p>M: Improved access to electricity and/or fuels in people's homes, and in businesses and community services. Women and men include people of all ages. In addition, fuels refer only to fuels produced from renewable sources. Where households are counted instead of people, the assumptions about household size and gender ratio needed for disaggregation should be documented in the reporting table.</p> <p><i>*Source: SREP</i> <i>*Note: Measurement of reach might be easier to capture through off-grid energy projects rather than through on-grid.</i></p> <p>R: Reported in the Annual Performance Report (APR)</p> <p>V: First verification to be done by AEs on data/information from intermediaries/executing entities and second verification to be done by the GCF on data/information from AE.</p>	Adopted by the GCF Board. Same or similar indicators used in one climate finance mechanism.	CIF: SREP Indicator 2

Expected result	Indicator ⁴ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> = Decided <input type="checkbox"/> = No change to undecided indicator <input type="checkbox"/> = Revised <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> = Newly added <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> = Removed * = Core	Level (GCF, country, project/ programme)	Reporting responsibility (annual reporting)	Measurement, reporting and verification (MRV)	Rationale	Similar indicators (GEF/CIF/ NAMA Facility)
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 6.3 MWs of low-emission energy capacity installed, generated and/or rehabilitated as a result of GCF support.	Project/ programme level	AEs/intermediaries/countries	M: Total installed capacity of electricity or heat generation by renewable energy; include both grid-connected and off-grid systems. <i>*Source: CTF</i> R: Reported in the Annual Performance Report (APR) V: First verification to be done by AEs on data/information from intermediaries/executing entities and second verification to be done by the GCF on data/information from AEs.	Adopted by the GCF Board. Same or similar indicators used in one climate finance mechanism.	CIF: CTF Core Indicator B3
7.0 Lower energy intensity of buildings, cities, industries, and appliances.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CTF B5: Annual energy savings as a result of GCF interventions (GWh). <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 7.1 Energy intensity/improved efficiency of buildings, cities, industries and	Project/ programme level	AEs/intermediaries	M: When converting fuel savings to GWh, proper energy conversion factor should be used and explained. Total energy savings over the lifetime of the investment will be estimated (with explanation of assumptions), which in turn will be converted to tons of GHG emissions savings using appropriate emission factors. <i>*Source: CTF</i> R: Reported in the Annual Performance Report (APR) V: First verification to be done by AEs on data/information from	Same or similar indicators used in one climate finance mechanism. Indicator 7.1 was removed by CIF CTF: Energy intensity as it is addressed through revised indicator: annual energy savings	CIF: CTF Core Indicator B5

Expected result	Indicator ⁴ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> = Decided <input type="checkbox"/> = No change to undecided indicator <input type="checkbox"/> = Revised <input type="checkbox"/> = Newly added <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> = Removed * = Core	Level (GCF, country, project/ programme)	Reporting responsibility (annual reporting)	Measurement, reporting and verification (MRV)	Rationale	Similar indicators (GEF/CIF/ NAMA Facility)
	appliances as a result of GCF support.			intermediaries/executing entities and second verification to be done by the GCF on data/information from AEs.		
8.0 Increased use of low-carbon transport.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 8.1 Number of female and male passengers using low-carbon transport as a result of GCF support.	Project/ programme level	AEs/intermediaries	M: Since each GCF project focuses on different aspects and means of low-carbon transportation, it is important that each project should briefly explain the type of intervention and ToC when reporting data on the indicator can be collected through surveys, project reports, data from government agencies and other appropriate institutions. Estimating passengers using low-carbon transport will be compared against baseline <i>*Source: CTF</i> R: Reported in the Annual Performance Report (APR) V: First verification to be done by AEs on data/information from intermediaries/executing entities and second verification to be done by the GCF on data/information from AEs.	Same or similar indicators used in one climate finance mechanism. Additional/incremental number of passengers is difficult to measure due to shifting baselines and therefore could be misleading.	CIF: CTF Core Indicator B4
	<input type="checkbox"/> 8.2 Vehicle fuel economy and energy source as a result of GCF support (noted, but further refinement)	Project/ programme level	AEs/intermediaries	M: Compare with industry benchmarks such as Euro fuel standards R: Reported in the Annual Performance Report (APR)	Not used in reference climate finance mechanisms but useful in assessing private sector participation in vehicle fuel economy,	None

Expected result	Indicator ⁴ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> = Decided <input type="checkbox"/> = No change to undecided indicator <input type="checkbox"/> = Revised <input type="checkbox"/> = Newly added <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> = Removed * = Core	Level (GCF, country, project/programme)	Reporting responsibility (annual reporting)	Measurement, reporting and verification (MRV)	Rationale	Similar indicators (GEF/CIF/NAMA Facility)
	needed; TBD by the Board)			V: First verification to be done by AEs on data/information from intermediaries/executing entities and second verification to be done by the GCF on data/information from AEs.	especially in developing countries.	
9.0 Improved management of land or forest areas contributing to emissions reductions.	<input type="checkbox"/> 9.1 Hectares of land or forests under improved and effective management that contributes to CO2 emission reductions (noted, but further refinement needed; TBD by the Board). (to be updated by the methodological guideline from GEF-7 (currently being developed))	Project/programme level	AEs/intermediaries	M: Land or forest being preserved or under improved management and calculate the net change in CO2 emissions per hectare of land/forest covered. R: Reported in the Annual Performance Report (APR) V: First verification to be done by AEs on data/information from intermediaries/executing entities and second verification to be done by the GCF on data/information from AEs.	Same or similar indicators used in one climate finance mechanism.	GEF: Core Indicator 1, 3, 4

Notes: GEF = Global Environment Facility; CIF = Climate Investment Funds; CTF = Clean Technology Fund; SREP = Scaling Up Renewable Energy Program; FIP = Forest Investment Program; PPCR = Pilot Program for Climate Resilience; NAMA = Nationally Appropriate Mitigation Action; IPCC = Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change; ToC = Theory of Change; TBD = to be determined

Table 3: Review of existing adaptation indicators in line with complementarity and coherence approach

Expected result	Indicator ⁵ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> = Decided <input type="checkbox"/> = No change to undecided indicator <input type="checkbox"/> = Revised <input type="checkbox"/> = Newly added <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> = Removed * = Core	Level (GCF, country, project/ programme)	Reporting responsibility (annual reporting)	Measurement, Reporting and Verification (MRV)	Rationale	Similar indicators (GEF/CIF/AF)
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> * Improved quality of lives of direct and indirect beneficiaries; number of beneficiaries relative to total population.	GCF level	AEs/ intermediaries	<p>M: Proxy indicators can be used such as material living conditions (income, consumption), Human Development Index, poverty index etc.; data should be expressed as number of people; a standard multiplier for household size based on the most-recent national census or nationally representative household survey should be used to convert number of households to number of people; disaggregated by gender.</p> <p><i>*Source: CIF</i></p> <p>R: Reported in the Annual Performance Report (APR)</p> <p>V: First verification to be done by AEs on data/information from intermediaries/executing entities and second verification to be done by the GCF on data/information from AEs.</p>	Adopted by the GCF Board but language changed to show real impact of GCF's projects on the lives of beneficiaries. Same or similar indicators used in all three climate finance mechanisms.	LDCF/SCCF: Indicator 1 CIF: PPCR Core Indicator A1.3 AF: Core Indicator

⁵ = Decided: Adopted by the GCF Board
 = No change to undecided indicator: Remain as in the PMFs (GCF/B.08/45)
 = Revised: Changed from the PMFs (GCF/B.08/45)
 = Newly added: Added to the PMFs (GCF/B.08/45)
 = Excluded: Deleted from the PMFs (GCF/B.08/45)
 * = Core: Adopted as core indicator by the GCF Board

Expected result	Indicator ⁵ ☑ = Decided ☐ = No change to undecided indicator ☒ = Revised ■ = Newly added ☒ = Removed * = Core	Level (GCF, country, project/programme)	Reporting responsibility (annual reporting)	Measurement, Reporting and Verification (MRV)	Rationale	Similar indicators (GEF/CIF/AF)
1.0 Increased resilience and enhanced livelihoods of the most vulnerable people, communities, and regions.	☐ 1.1 Change in expected losses of lives and economic assets (US\$) due to the impact of extreme climate-related disasters in the geographic area of the GCF intervention. (to be updated after consultation with other relevant divisions/units; also taking into account of removed indicator by PPCR: Number of lives lost/injuries from extreme climatic events)	GCF level	AEs/intermediaries/countries	M: Data should be based on climate models from IPCC or other reputable scientific organizations and expressed in dollar terms. Data on the measurement of mortality rates could be gathered from the World Health Organization and other comparable institutions, especially through climate and health assessment studies; this measurement can account for any impact of climate related disasters on human welfare, including impact through infrastructure and capital destruction; disaggregated by gender, where applicable. R: Reported in the Annual Performance Report (APR) V: First verification to be done by AEs on data/information from intermediaries/executing entities and second verification to be done by the GCF on data/information from AEs.	Same or similar indicators used in one climate finance mechanism. Recommend retaining the change in expected losses of lives as it can be measured in similar way to that of WHO's calculation of disability adjusted life-years (DALYs).	CIF: PPCR Indicator A1.2
	☐ 1.2 Number of males and females benefiting from the adoption of diversified, climate-resilient livelihood options.	GCF level	AEs/intermediaries	M: The number of people includes all members of households and groups that benefit from the adoption of more resilient livelihood options. Livelihood options refer to sources of income, expenditure and consumption patterns as well as subsistence rates; disaggregated by gender.	Same or similar indicators used in all three climate finance mechanisms.	LDCCF/SCCF: Indicator 3 CIF: Indicator A1.1 (optional)

Expected result	Indicator ⁵ ☑ = Decided ☐ = No change to undecided indicator ☒ = Revised ■ = Newly added ☒ = Removed * = Core	Level (GCF, country, project/programme)	Reporting responsibility (annual reporting)	Measurement, Reporting and Verification (MRV)	Rationale	Similar indicators (GEF/CIF/AF)
				<p><i>*Source: LDCF/SCCF</i></p> <p>R: Reported in the Annual Performance Report (APR)</p> <p>V: First verification to be done by AEs on data/information from intermediaries/executing entities and second verification to be done by the GCF on data/information from AEs.</p>		AF: Core Indicator 6.1.2
	☒ 1.3 Number of GCF-funded projects/programmes that supports effective adaptation to fish stock migration and depletion due to climate change.	GCF level	AEs/intermediaries	<p>M: n/a</p> <p>R: Reported in the Annual Performance Report (APR)</p> <p>V: First verification to be done by AEs on data/information from intermediaries/executing entities and second verification to be done by the GCF on data/information from AEs.</p>	Not used in reference climate finance mechanisms	None
2.0 Increased resilience of health and well-being, and food and water security.	☒ 2.1 Number of males and females benefiting from introduced health measures to respond to climate-sensitive diseases.	GCF level	AEs/intermediaries	<p>M: Number of people includes all members of households and social groups benefiting from improved health measures. Disaggregated by health measures, incidence of diseases and gender. Sourced from WHO's or any other comparable institution's climate change and health assessment reports.</p> <p>R: Reported in the Annual Performance Report (APR)</p>	<p>Adopted by the GCF Board.</p> <p>Not used in reference climate finance mechanisms</p>	None

Expected result	Indicator ⁵ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> = Decided <input type="checkbox"/> = No change to undecided indicator <input type="checkbox"/> = Revised <input type="checkbox"/> = Newly added <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> = Removed * = Core	Level (GCF, country, project/programme)	Reporting responsibility (annual reporting)	Measurement, Reporting and Verification (MRV)	Rationale	Similar indicators (GEF/CIF/AF)
				V: First verification to be done by AEs on data/information from intermediaries/executing entities and second verification to be done by the GCF on data/information from AEs.		
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 2.2 Number of food-secure households (in areas/periods at risk of climate change impacts).	GCF level	AEs/intermediaries	M: Number of people includes all household members and social groups. Disaggregated by male and female-headed households and vulnerable groups. R: Reported in the Annual Performance Report (APR) V: First verification to be done by AEs on data/information from intermediaries/executing entities and second verification to be done by the GCF on data/information from AEs.	Adopted by the GCF Board. Not used in reference climate finance mechanisms	None
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 2.3 Number of males and females with year-round access to reliable and safe water supply despite climate shocks and stresses.	GCF level	AEs/intermediaries	M: Number of people includes all household members and social groups. Measured also by quality and reliability criteria. Disaggregated by gender. R: Reported in the Annual Performance Report (APR) V: First verification to be done by AEs on data/information from intermediaries/executing entities and	Adopted by the GCF Board.	CIF Indicator A1.4 (optional)

Expected result	Indicator ⁵ ☑ = Decided ☐ = No change to undecided indicator ▣ = Revised ■ = Newly added ☒ = Removed * = Core	Level (GCF, country, project/programme)	Reporting responsibility (annual reporting)	Measurement, Reporting and Verification (MRV)	Rationale	Similar indicators (GEF/CIF/AF)
				second verification to be done by the GCF on data/information from AEs.		
3.0 Increased resilience of infrastructure and the built environment to climate change threats.	☐ * 3.1 Number and value of physical assets made more resilient to climate variability and change, considering human benefits.	GCF level	AEs/intermediaries	<p>M: Quantitative reporting – the number should represent the infrastructure/facilities where the production and strengthening works have been fully completed within the project duration period.</p> <p>Qualitative reporting - use scale (1-5) for summarizing extent to which all technical, environmental, social, and financial/economic aspects of assets have improved.</p> <p><i>*Source: AF</i></p> <p>R: Reported in the Annual Performance Report (APR)</p> <p>V: First verification to be done by AEs on data/information from intermediaries/executing entities and second verification to be done by the GCF on data/information from AEs</p>	Same or similar indicators used in all three climate finance mechanisms.	<p>AF Core Indicator 4.2</p> <p>LDCF/SCCF: Indicator 2</p> <p>CIF: Indicator A1.2 (optional)</p>
4.0 Improved resilience of ecosystems and ecosystem services.	☐ 4.1 Coverage/scale of ecosystems protected and strengthened in response to climate variability and change.	GCF level	AEs/intermediaries	<p>M: Describe the type of a natural asset or ecosystem under the project. To be disaggregated by ecosystem type. For example:</p> <p>1) Biological asset: measure through changes in population numbers and diversity.</p>	Same or similar indicators used in one climate finance mechanism.	AF: Indicator 5, Core Indicator 5.1

Expected result	Indicator ⁵ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> = Decided <input type="checkbox"/> = No change to undecided indicator <input type="checkbox"/> = Revised <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> = Newly added <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> = Removed * = Core	Level (GCF, country, project/programme)	Reporting responsibility (annual reporting)	Measurement, Reporting and Verification (MRV)	Rationale	Similar indicators (GEF/CIF/AF)
				<p>2) Land asset: measure changes in hectares or km that has been rehabilitated or restored.</p> <p>When using an absolute number is not feasible, use scale (1-5) for summarizing extent to which all technical, environmental, social, and financial/economic aspects of asset or ecosystem have improved.</p> <p><i>*Source: AF</i></p> <p>R: Reported in the Annual Performance Report (APR)</p> <p>V: First verification to be done by AEs on data/information from intermediaries/executing entities and second verification to be done by the GCF on data/information from AEs.</p>		
	<input type="checkbox"/> 4.2 Value (US\$) of ecosystem services generated or protected in response to climate change.	GCF level	AEs/intermediaries	<p>M: Measures the interventions made to withstand weather events</p> <p>R: Reported in the Annual Performance Report (APR)</p> <p>V: First verification to be done by AEs on data/information from intermediaries/executing entities and second verification to be done by the GCF on data/information from AEs.</p>	Same or similar indicators used in one climate finance mechanism.	AF: Indicator 5, Core Indicator 5.1

Expected result	Indicator ⁵ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> = Decided <input type="checkbox"/> = No change to undecided indicator <input type="checkbox"/> = Revised <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> = Newly added <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> = Removed * = Core	Level (GCF, country, project/programme)	Reporting responsibility (annual reporting)	Measurement, Reporting and Verification (MRV)	Rationale	Similar indicators (GEF/CIF/AF)
Technology	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> LDCF/SCCF Indicator 4 Extent of adoption of climate-resilient technologies/practices.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Number of technologies and innovative solutions transferred or licensed to promote climate resilience as a result of GCF support.</p>	Project/programme level	AEs/intermediaries	<p>M: Climate-resilient technology is understood broadly as tools and practices, including both hardware and software, that reduce the vulnerability of people, livelihoods, physical assets and natural systems to the adverse effects of climate change. This might include the number of technology transfer licenses, number of facilities and/or projects and programmes that include transfer of technology or innovative solutions that support climate adaptation and resilience. Where multiple technologies are transferred and where additional units of measurement are added, add rows and provide further information, especially in relation to the successful deployment of such technologies.</p> <p><i>*Source: LDCF/SCCF</i></p> <p>R: Reported annually by AEs/intermediaries.</p> <p>V: First verification to be done by AEs on data/information from intermediaries/executing entities and second verification to be done by GCF on data/information from AEs.</p>	<p>COP 23 guidance to report progress on technology.</p> <p>Same or similar indicators used in one climate finance mechanism.</p> <p>The existing indicator was taken out because simple numeric value does not provide much information at the level of adoption of technologies.</p>	LDCF/SCCF: Indicator 4

Expected result	Indicator ⁵ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> = Decided <input type="checkbox"/> = No change to undecided indicator <input type="checkbox"/> = Revised <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> = Newly added <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> = Removed * = Core	Level (GCF, country, project/programme)	Reporting responsibility (annual reporting)	Measurement, Reporting and Verification (MRV)	Rationale	Similar indicators (GEF/CIF/AF)
5.0 Strengthened institutional and regulatory systems for climate-responsive planning and development.	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PPCR Core Indicator A2.1 Degree of integration of climate change adaptation approaches in national and sector planning.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 5.1 Institutional and regulatory systems that improve incentives for climate resilience and their effective coordination</p>	Country level	AEs/intermediaries/countries	<p>M: Qualitative and quantitative assessment of the various strategies, policies, plans and documents; measurement will be at the national level and by way of standardized scorecard developed by AEs that shows baseline and target scores; data should be sourced from official policy planning documents.</p> <p>In addition, baseline information may be drawn from national repositories, qualitative in nature; defining clear scoring criteria will help make the subjective assessment more objective, reliable, and consistent.</p> <p>The scoring criteria agreed upon by the GCF and different in-country stakeholder groups will provide a robust and objective assessment of the progress.</p> <p><i>*Source: CIF PPCR</i></p> <p>R: Reported annually by AEs/intermediaries</p> <p>V: First verification to be done by AEs on data/information from intermediaries/executing entities and second verification to be done by the GCF on data/information from AEs.</p>	<p>Same or similar indicators used in all three climate finance mechanisms.</p> <p>Indicator 5.1 removed: not specific nor measurable</p>	<p>LDCAF/SCCF: Indicator 11, 12, 13</p> <p>CIF: PPCR Indicator A2.1 (core)</p> <p>AF: Indicator 7</p>

Expected result	Indicator ⁵ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> = Decided <input type="checkbox"/> = No change to undecided indicator <input type="checkbox"/> = Revised <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> = Newly added <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> = Removed * = Core	Level (GCF, country, project/programme)	Reporting responsibility (annual reporting)	Measurement, Reporting and Verification (MRV)	Rationale	Similar indicators (GEF/CIF/AF)
	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PPCR Core Indicator B2 evidence of strengthened government capacity and coordination mechanism to mainstream climate resilience.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 5.2 Number and level of effective coordination mechanisms.</p>	Country level	AEs/intermediaries/countries	<p>M: Evidence of measures taken for building institutional capacities, promotion of coordination among national and regional agencies, etc.; measurement will be at the national level and by way of standardized scorecard developed by AEs that shows baseline and target scores</p> <p><i>*Source: CIF PPCR</i></p> <p>R: Reported annually by AEs/intermediaries.</p> <p>V: First verification to be done by AEs on data/information from intermediaries/executing entities and second verification to be done by the GCF on data/information from AEs.</p>	<p>Same or similar indicators used in all three climate finance mechanisms.</p> <p>Indicator 5.2 removed: it was not specific nor could it accurately capture the extent of capacity and coordination</p>	<p>LDCF/SCCF: Indicator 9, 10</p> <p>CIF: PPCR Indicator B2 (core)</p> <p>AF: Indicator 2</p>

Expected result	Indicator ⁵ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> = Decided <input type="checkbox"/> = No change to undecided indicator <input type="checkbox"/> = Revised <input type="checkbox"/> = Newly added <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> = Removed * = Core	Level (GCF, country, project/programme)	Reporting responsibility (annual reporting)	Measurement, Reporting and Verification (MRV)	Rationale	Similar indicators (GEF/CIF/AF)
6.0 Increased generation and use of climate information in decision-making.	<p><input type="checkbox"/> CIF- PPCR B.3 Evidence that climate data is collected, analysed and applied to decision making in climate sensitive sectors.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Proposed: 6.2 Use of climate information products/services in decision-making in climate-sensitive sectors</p>	Project/programme level	AEs/intermediaries/countries	<p>M: Need of evidence that climate data and critical aspects of reliable climate information systems that continuously assess climate variability is available. Qualitative scorecard to measure climate information generation, analysis and communication.</p> <p><i>*Source: CIF PPCR</i></p> <p>R: Reported in the Annual Performance Report (APR)</p> <p>V: First verification to be done by AEs on data/information from intermediaries/executing entities and second verification to be done by the GCF on data/information from AEs.</p>	<p>Same or similar indicators used in one climate finance mechanism.</p> <p>The proposed indicator 6.2 is replaced by the reference indicator already in use by CIF PPCR.</p>	CIF: PPCR Indicator B.3
	<input type="checkbox"/> GEF Indicator 7 Number of people/ geographical area with access to improved climate information services	Project/programme level	AEs/ intermediaries	<p>M: 'Access' is understood as regular access to information over an extended period of time. 'Improved' can refer to more accurate, timely and/or more user-friendly climate information services; where qualitative methodologies are used to capture the degree to which climate information services are improved; disaggregated by gender.</p> <p><i>*Source: GEF</i></p>	Same or similar indicators used in all three climate financial institutions.	<p>LDCF/SCCF: Indicator 7</p> <p>CIF: PPCR Indicator B3</p> <p>AF: Indicator 1</p>

Expected result	Indicator ⁵ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> = Decided <input type="checkbox"/> = No change to undecided indicator <input type="checkbox"/> = Revised <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> = Newly added <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> = Removed * = Core	Level (GCF, country, project/programme)	Reporting responsibility (annual reporting)	Measurement, Reporting and Verification (MRV)	Rationale	Similar indicators (GEF/CIF/AF)
				R: Reported in the Annual Performance Report (APR) V: First verification to be done by AEs on data/information from intermediaries/executing entities and second verification to be done by the GCF on data/information from AEs.		
7.0 Strengthened adaptive capacity and reduced exposure to climate risks.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Proposed 7.1: Use by vulnerable households, communities, businesses and public-sector services of GCF-supported tools, instruments, strategies and activities to respond to climate change and variability.	Project/programme level	AEs/ intermediaries		Not used in reference climate finance mechanisms.	None
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> AF Core Indicator 1.2 Number of early warning systems (EWS).	Project/programme level	AEs/intermediaries	M: An EWS is perceived as a composite of four dimensions: (1) knowledge on risks; (2) monitoring; (3) dissemination; and (4) response capability. The indicator is expressed by an absolute number of a proper category of EWS and hazard targeted, geographical coverage, and number of municipalities. These parameters should be reported at the project level. It is possible for one project to invest into several categories	Same or similar indicators used in other two climate financial institutions.	LDCF/SCCF: Indicator 8 AF: Core Indicator 1.2

Expected result	Indicator ⁵ ☑ = Decided ☐ = No change to undecided indicator ☒ = Revised ■ = Newly added ☒ = Removed * = Core	Level (GCF, country, project/programme)	Reporting responsibility (annual reporting)	Measurement, Reporting and Verification (MRV)	Rationale	Similar indicators (GEF/CIF/AF)
	☒ 7.2 Number of males and females reached by [or total geographic coverage of] climate-related EWS and other risk reduction measures established/strengthened.			of EWS, in which case these should be reported separately. *Source: AF R: Reported in the Annual Performance Report (APR) V: First verification to be done by AEs on data/information from intermediaries/executing entities and second verification to be done by the GCF on data/information from AEs.	To keep minimum number of indicators as per principles highlighted in the document, indicator 7.2 is removed.	
8.0 Strengthened awareness of climate threats and risk-reduction processes.	☑ 8.1: Number of males and females made aware of climate threats and related appropriate responses.	Project/programme level	AEs/intermediaries	M: Describe the number of people who have received knowledge of climate threats and act on these where appropriate together with the type of knowledge shared, awareness-building mechanisms introduced and the impact these have had on the population/beneficiaries (direct/indirect). These people are not necessarily included among the direct beneficiaries or the number of people trained (see indicator 9), given that activities to promote people's awareness are not always associated with more in-depth	Adopted by the GCF Board. Same or similar indicators used in two climate finance mechanisms.	LDCF/SCCF: Indicator 5 AF: Indicator 3.1, 3.2

Expected result	Indicator ⁵ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> = Decided <input type="checkbox"/> = No change to undecided indicator <input type="checkbox"/> = Revised <input type="checkbox"/> = Newly added <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> = Removed * = Core	Level (GCF, country, project/programme)	Reporting responsibility (annual reporting)	Measurement, Reporting and Verification (MRV)	Rationale	Similar indicators (GEF/CIF/AF)
				training or measures directly seeking to reduce their vulnerability; population to be disaggregated by gender. <i>*Source: GEF</i> R: Reported in the Annual Performance Report (APR) V: First verification to be done by AEs on data/information from intermediaries/executing entities and second verification to be done by the GCF on data/information from AEs.		

Notes: GEF = Global Environment Facility; LDCF = Least Developed Countries Fund; SCCF = Special Climate Change Fund; CIF = Climate Investment Funds; PCR = Pilot Program for Climate Resilience; AF = Adaptation Fund; IPCC = Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change; TBD = to be decided
