



GREEN
CLIMATE
FUND

Further Development of the Initial Results Management Framework

GCF/B.08/07

06 October 2014

Meeting of the Board

14-17 October 2014

Agenda item 7 (a) and (c)-(g)

Recommended action by the Board

It is recommended that the Board:

- (a) Take note of the information presented in document GCF/B.08/07 *Further Development of the Initial Results Management Framework*;
- (b) Adopt the draft decisions presented in Annex I to this document.

Table of Contents

I.	Introduction	1
	1.1 Context	1
	1.2 Logic models: the core of the results management framework	2
II.	Mitigation and adaptation performance measurement frameworks	2
	2.1 Introduction	2
	2.2 Mitigation performance measurement framework	4
	2.3 Adaptation performance measurement framework	5
III.	Initial approach to gender in results management	5
IV.	Expected impacts and role of the Fund in achieving results	6
V.	Result areas and cross-cutting flagship projects for adaptation	7
	5.1 Result areas and indicators for adaptation activities	7
	5.2 Illustrative projects cutting across adaptation results	8
VI.	Initial approach to the monitoring and evaluation policy	8
	6.1 Introduction	8
	6.2 Monitoring and evaluation	9
	6.2.1 Monitoring	9
	6.2.2 Evaluation	10
	Annex I: Draft decision of the Board	11
	Annex II: Mitigation and adaptation performance measurement frameworks	12
	Annex III: Initial approach to the monitoring and evaluation policy	19
	Annex IV: Illustrative examples of projects cutting across adaptation results	22
	Annex V: Proposed methodologies for adopted core indicators	24

Further Development of the Initial Results Management Framework

I. Introduction

1.1 Context

1. This document was prepared in response to the Board's request made at its May 2014 meeting regarding the initial results management framework of the Board (see decision B.07/04, paragraph (j)). The request was for the Secretariat to further develop the mitigation and adaptation performance measurement frameworks of the Fund, engaging international experts as required, for the Board to consider at its third meeting of 2014, including an approach to gender, indicators on mitigation and adaptation, and methodologies, data sources, frequency, and responsibilities for reporting.
2. In paragraph (i) of the same decision, the Board also decided that the results management framework (RMF) should take a gender-sensitive approach and that the results should be disaggregated by gender where relevant. An initial approach to gender in results management is described in chapter III.
3. In paragraph (h) of the same decision, the Board affirmed that national and sector-wide indicators will be used only at the discretion of the recipient country.
4. Other topics covered in this document are in response to additional requests made in previous Board's meetings:
 - (a) Expected impacts and role and of the Fund;¹
 - (b) Additional result areas and indicators for adaptation activities;²
 - (c) Board flagship projects cutting across adaptation result areas;³
 - (d) Indicators capturing country-driven policies;⁴ and
 - (e) Monitoring and evaluation policy.⁵
5. The Secretariat's response to the request made in paragraph (k) to decision B.07/05 to develop a logic model and performance framework for ex-post REDD+ results-based payments is contained in a separate document (see document GCF/B.08/08).⁶
6. In accordance with the decisions of the fifth meeting of the Board, this document also recognizes that the Fund, as a continuously learning institution, will maintain the flexibility to refine its results management framework, result areas and performance indicators, based on the Fund's experience in implementation and monitoring, and as evaluation outcomes become available. It also recognizes the lessons learned will feed back into the design, funding criteria and implementation of Fund activities, based on results (see document GCF/B.05/23).

1 Decision B.04/04 (e).

2 Decision B.05/03 (n) and decision B.06/05.

3 GCF/B.05/02, Annex IV.

4 Decision B.05/03, para. (c).

5 GCF/B.05/20, page 7.

6 Decision B.07/04 (k) in GCF/B.07/11, page 8.

1.2 Logic models: the core of the results management framework

7. By its decision B.07/04, the Board adopted the Fund's mitigation and adaptation logic models. The levels of the adopted logic models and corresponding results (objective, impacts, and outcomes) form the primary organizing construct for the results management framework (RMF) and the indicators outlined in the more specific adaptation and mitigation performance measurement frameworks (PMFs) introduced in Chapter II below and detailed in Annex II.

8. The international donor community has been learning about results management and performance measurement through experience. One lesson learned is that results management, including the monitoring and reporting of results, is difficult in complex contexts, including and in particular with regard to climate change. The field is "learning by doing" and adapting along the way. Several funds have, for example, updated their performance measurement frameworks based on experience and are still in the early implementation/testing phases of their revised systems. The next few years will advance the field's collective ability to effectively measure performance and use this information to assess results and improve investments, strategies, implementation, and impact.

9. Consistent with the Board's guidance on continuous learning and experience in the field, the Fund may also wish to revisit its RMF and PMF in the future in order to ensure that they remain current and consistent with evolving best practices.

II. Mitigation and adaptation performance measurement frameworks

2.1 Introduction

10. Performance measurement frameworks are the performance measurement systems intended to monitor Fund results at the project, programme and aggregate portfolio levels. They are comprised of a set of indicators that measure progress toward intended results based on the paradigm-shift objective, Fund-level impacts and project/programme outcomes outlined in the Fund's mitigation and adaptation logic models.⁷ The indicators will be used as the basis for the monitoring, reporting and evaluation of the Fund's progress over time. The PMF does not include project/programme indicators at the output, activity or input levels because these are specific for each intervention and are to be determined on a case-by-case basis. Implementing entities will develop detailed plans, including intended results with specific indicators for each intervention.

11. In accordance with the respective decisions made at the seventh meeting of the Board, (1) indicators are to be disaggregated by gender where relevant; (2) indicators are to measure the impact of the Fund on strategic improvements at the country level; and (3) national and sector-wide indicators will be used only at the discretion of recipient country.

12. The proposed PMFs focus on results drawn from the logic models, indicators and reporting responsibilities. Implementation details such as technical definitions, baselines, calculating methodologies, data sources, reporting formats and targets can be added after the PMFs are adopted.

13. Initial definitions and methodologies for the four adopted core indicators are included in Annex V. The methodologies for the additional proposed indicators in the PMFs will be

⁷ The REDD+ logic model and related performance measurement framework is under development on a separate, parallel track (GCF/B.08/08).

identified and/or developed in line with the initial approach to the monitoring and evaluation policy as outlined in Annex III.

14. The development of the proposed PMFs below was informed by their relevance to the Fund logic models; practices, lessons learned and evaluations of the other climate funds and peer agencies⁸ and technical soundness. Among other details, further developed methodologies will provide guidance on specifics such as direct attribution of results to Fund-funded projects/programmes.

15. In addition, the intent of the PMFs is to have as few indicators as possible to track and learn from progress and results without creating a complicated, cumbersome or confusing system. The current set of adopted and proposed indicators include:

(a) The four core indicators below were adopted in the decision B.07/04 at the May 2014 meeting (see Box 1). Reporting on these indicators is required for projects/programmes;

Box 1. Adopted core indicators for mitigation and adaptation

Mitigation core indicators:

- Tonnes of carbon dioxide equivalent (t CO₂ eq) reduced as a result of Fund-funded projects/programmes
- Cost per tCO₂eq decreased for all Fund-funded mitigation projects/programmes
- Volume of finance leveraged by Fund funding (disaggregated by public and private sources)

Adaptation core indicator:

- Total number of direct and indirect beneficiaries; number of beneficiaries relative to total population

(b) Proposed indicators are to complement the adopted core indicators. These proposed indicators correspond with the paradigm-shift, impact and outcome levels of the logic models. Once the mitigation and adaptation PMFs are adopted, reporting on these indicators is required for all the relevant projects/programs that are expected to achieve the associated results. Some proposed indicators are applicable in certain circumstances (e.g. sector-specific) and will therefore only be reported on when appropriate; and

(c) Once the PMFs are adopted, the Secretariat will identify more specific definitions and methodologies for these indicators and will refine them as necessary based on experience gained and lesson learned over time.

16. Indicators 5.1 and 5.2 in the mitigation and adaptation PMFs, respectively, provide an opportunity to capture country-driven regulations and policies to address low-emission and climate-resilient planning and development. Furthermore, additional indicators could reflect country-driven policies on a case-by-case basis.⁹ At the same time, as previously noted in paragraph 3, the Board affirmed at the May 2014 meeting that national and sector-wide

⁸ Including the Climate Investment Funds (CIF), the Global Environment Facility (GEF) and its Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF) and Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF); the Adaptation Fund; several multilateral development banks (MDBs) and bilateral development banks; and international financial institutions (IFIs).

⁹ For example, policies put in place by national regulatory agencies to expedite the permitting process for low-emission power suppliers could contribute to increases in low-emission power suppliers. In the context of adaptation, government-developed drought-resistant hybrid varieties of maize supported by the incentives for farmers to participate in demonstration farms will reduce the vulnerability of small traditional farming communities to climate vulnerability and increase their maize yields so that they can participate in commercial markets.

indicators will be used only at the discretion of the recipient country; therefore the identification and use of indicators that reflect country-level policies and associated reporting will be ad hoc and discretionary.

17. The PMFs include select indicators that relate to the Fund's initial investment framework, specifically indicators related to paradigm-shift potential, impact potential, and (for mitigation) cost per unit of CO₂eq reduced, as this relates to cost-efficiency/effectiveness as outlined in the initial investment framework.

18. The mitigation and adaptation paradigm shifts will be measured using a combination of quantitative and qualitative information that goes beyond the simple aggregation of the results' indicators.¹⁰

19. Context-specific environmental, social and economic co-benefits can be identified on a project/programme case-by-case basis. Examples include improved public health, improved energy security and improved forest ecosystem health. Sustainable development potential, which entails co-benefits, is part of the investment criteria in the Fund's initial investment framework.

20. Where applicable, mitigation projects/programmes that also generate adaptation results should report on adaptation indicators (and vice versa for adaptation projects/programmes with mitigation results). For example, a project that primarily intends to improve land and forest areas contributing to emission reductions (result 9.0 in the mitigation PMF) and, by doing so, also contribute to increasing the resilience of the ecosystem (result 4.0 in the adaptation PMF) would report on the relevant indicators for both mitigation and adaptation.

21. The PMFs include notations where indicator screening based on the experience of other funds to date suggests that gender can be an integral part of reporting and analysis through disaggregated reporting (by men and women). In some cases, gender-based data are not typically available or feasible to collect; however, as part of the further development of the indicator methodologies, additional analysis on where gender can be integrated explicitly into additional indicators will be conducted. Furthermore, as described below in chapter III, any additional work on the PMFs will take into consideration the Fund's draft Gender Policy and Action Plan, which is being developed at this time (to be GCF/B.08/19).

2.2 Mitigation performance measurement framework

22. The proposed mitigation performance measurement framework (PMF) in Annex II (Table 1) is aligned with the mitigation logic model. The proposed associated indicators are listed next to their corresponding objective/impact/outcome. The notes provide information on the proposed methodology, disaggregation and relationship to indicators used by peer funds/agencies. Gender disaggregation for the indicators will be applied where applicable.

23. The high-level PMF table format is intentionally simple: it does not include specifics that can be added later once the PMF is adopted, such as technical definitions, baselines, data sources, calculation methodologies, reporting format and targets.

24. Initial methodologies for the three adopted mitigation core indicators are included in Annex V. Once the Board adopts the proposed indicators in the PMF, detailed methodologies, including more specifics on gender, can be identified for these indicators.

¹⁰ Elements that are expected to be considered include: overall contribution to low-carbon development pathways consistent with a temperature increase of less than 2 degrees (mitigation), overall achievement in contributing to sustainable climate-resilient development pathways (adaptation), the degree to which knowledge and learning are achieved, extent to which the enabling environment is created or enhanced, and extent to which the regulatory framework and policies are strengthened.

25. Some of the indicators in this PMF (particularly 1.1, 3.1 and 7.1) involve combining data across sectors so that the indicator matches with the intended results as articulated in the logic model. In these cases, each sector's data will be calculated separately according to methodologies suited for that sector and then totalled.

2.3 Adaptation performance measurement framework

26. The proposed adaptation performance measurement framework (PMF) in Annex II (Table 2) is aligned with the adaptation logic model. The proposed associated indicators are listed next to their corresponding objective/impact/outcome. The notes provide details of the proposed methodology, disaggregation and equivalency with indicators used by peer funds/agencies.

27. When applicable, an indicator measuring additional financing from public and private sources on adaptation activities can be tracked and reported during project/programme implementation on a case-by-case basis. This indicator would not serve as a decision-making factor when assessing a funding proposal for adaptation.

28. An initial methodology for the adopted adaptation core indicator is included in Annex V. Once the Board adopts the additional proposed indicators in the PMF, detailed methodologies, including more specifics on gender, can be identified for these indicators.

III. Initial approach to gender in results management

29. The Fund's RMF gender-sensitive approach is consistent with the Fund's mandate on gender sensitivity laid out in the Governing Instrument. It integrates gender-sensitivity at the Fund's portfolio level through gender actions and performance as well as programmes and project-level gender-based performance objectives, impact and outcome indicators, and reporting (where relevant).

30. As highlighted in chapter II, quantitative indicators will be disaggregated by gender where relevant and feasible; several of these have already been noted in the proposed PMFs. Quantitative indicators will be complemented with qualitative indicators where relevant. Additional information on the indicators that will have a specific gender-sensitive approach and disaggregation will be developed over the coming months in alignment with the parallel work on the Fund's gender policy and the further technical development of the PMF indicators.

31. At its portfolio level, the Fund can track gender actions and performance that are to be aligned with the Fund's proposed Gender Policy and Action Plan. For instance, two portfolio indicators are proposed:

- (i) The percentage of adaptation and mitigation projects that include specific gender elements and gender-sensitive implementation arrangements; and
- (ii) The number of gender-related complaints resolved by IEs and EEs.

32. Additional illustrative indicators are included in the Gender Policy and Action Plan (GCF/B.08/19). Once these indicators are adopted by the Board and if they fit within the design of the mitigation and adaptation PMFs at the paradigm-shift, impact or outcome levels, they can be added to the PMF at that time.

33. The Gender Policy and Action Plan (GCF/B.08/19) outlines additional activities and commitments in support of the principles¹¹ outlined in the proposed Gender Policy. As the specifics of the Gender Policy and Action Plan implementation develop further, they can, where relevant and appropriate, be integrated into the results management framework (and within that the PMFs).

IV. Expected impacts and role of the Fund in achieving results

34. At the March 2013 Board Meeting, the Board decided to consider at a future meeting the role and expected impacts of the Fund in achieving results.¹² This section evaluates the critical global need for funding to enhance climate resilience and reduce emissions, and the Fund's central role in addressing that need and achieving results.

35. Developing countries face enormous challenges in participating in the global effort to limit temperature rise below 2°C and de-carbonize their economies. Reducing the carbon footprint of key economic sectors (power, industry, transport, buildings, waste, forestry and agriculture) to sustainable levels is possible, but will require substantial resources. The IPCC estimated in 2013 an average incremental investment in key mitigation sectors to be around US\$ 350 billion per annum from 2010 until 2029.¹³

36. For reference purposes, the Climate Investment Fund's Clean Technology Fund has approved project and programme funding of approximately US\$ 3.3 billion and secured co-financing totalling US\$ 27.5 billion as of 31 March 2014. The expected results, in the form of reduced and avoided GHG emissions, is 1,038 million tonnes of carbon dioxide equivalent (Mt CO₂ e) over the lifetime of the portfolio of 57 projects.¹⁴ To achieve a 2°C temperature rise limit within this century, the UNEP report *Bridging the Emissions Gap*¹⁵ suggests that emissions should be kept no higher than 44 Gt CO₂eq in 2020. For comparison, the emissions were approximately 48 Gt CO₂ eq in 2010. These figures shows that a transformational shift leading to a significant "decarbonization" of major economic systems and consumption patterns is required to achieve the 2°C target.¹⁶

¹¹ The proposed Gender Policy is anchored on six fundamental principles: (1) Commitment to gender equality and equity; (2) Inclusiveness in terms of applicability to all the Fund's activities; (3) Accountability for gender and climate change results and impacts; (4) Country ownership in terms of alignment with national policies and priorities and inclusive stakeholder participation; (5) Competencies throughout the Fund's institutional framework; and, (6) Equitable resource allocation so that women and men benefit equitably from the Fund's adaptation and mitigation activities (GCF/B.08/19).

¹² Decision B.04/04, para. (e).

¹³ IPCC, 2014: Contribution of Working Group III to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change - Chapter 16: Cross-cutting Investment and Finance Issues, page 3. (http://report.mitigation2014.org/drafts/final-draft-postplenary/ipcc_wg3_ar5_final-draft_postplenary_chapter16.pdf).

¹⁴ Climate Investment Funds, 2014: CTF Semi-Annual Operational Report, Annex III. (https://www.climateinvestmentfunds.org/cif/sites/climateinvestmentfunds.org/files/CTF_13_3_Semi_Annual_Operational_Report.pdf).

¹⁵ UNEP (2011). *Bridging the Emissions Gap* – a UNEP synthesis report, United Nations Environment Programme. Available at: (http://www.unep.org/pdf/UNEP_bridging_gap.pdf).

¹⁶ STAP (2012). *Climate Change: A Scientific Assessment for the GEF*. A STAP Information Document by N.H. Ravindranath, R.E. H. Sims, D. Ürge-Vorsatz, M. Beerepoot, R. K. Chaturvedi, and L. Neretin. Global Environment Facility, Washington, DC. (<http://www.stapgef.org/climate-change-a-scientific-assessment-for-the-gef/>).

37. Concerning adaptation, there is also a significant gap between the currently available resources¹⁷ and the global adaptation financing needs of US\$ 70-100 billion per annum by 2050, as estimated by IPCC¹⁸ based on a study published in 2010 by the World Bank.¹⁹

38. The mismatch between current climate finance and climate funding needs represents the “funding gap” and the opportunity space for the Fund. With the goal of becoming the main global fund for climate change, the Fund is expected to play a significant role in channelling concessional climate finance. It is intended to operate at a larger scale than other climate funds. The larger scale and central role will open up opportunities to coordinate and collaborate with a range of partner agencies across a fragmented climate finance landscape. The Fund will therefore reduce fragmentation and operate in a manner that seeks to ensure country ownership of the activities supported by the Fund.

39. Opportunities also extend beyond the Fund’s engagement with the public sector. The private sector will be a critical partner in addressing the funding gap in climate finance. The Fund has a dedicated facility that aims to scale up private-sector investments in low-emission and climate-resilient activities by bridging the viability gap for such activities, including through the promotion of enabling environments and the reduction of risk to the private investor, both real and perceived.

40. In order to bridge the viability gap for low-emission and climate-resilient activities, the Fund will allocate a significant share of its resources to finance private-sector activities, both directly and indirectly, as well as proactively promote the participation of local private sector actors, including small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs), and support effective public-private partnerships.

41. The resulting picture of the Fund is of a multilateral funding mechanism that stands at the centre of the international climate finance architecture. The Fund will set itself apart by placing equal emphasis on the allocation of resources for adaptation and mitigation; making the best investments viable with minimum concessionality; extending its reach by accrediting and providing readiness support to a wide range of subnational, national, regional and international implementing entities and intermediaries; mobilizing private sector investments; and finally, by maximizing the Fund’s impact of its funding by investing in activities that best realize its expected results.

V. Result areas and cross-cutting flagship projects for adaptation

5.1 Result areas and indicators for adaptation activities

42. Having considered document GCF/B.06/03, the Board, by its decision B.06/05, requested the Secretariat to further develop the proposals for adaptation result areas and indicators in conjunction with the Fund’s results management framework, taking into account the comments made by the Board.

¹⁷ For example, the current Adaptation Fund portfolio amounts to US\$ 184.3 million in approved funding. The Special Climate Change Fund received pledges at the amount of US\$ 333.1 million and the Least Developed Countries Funds at the amount of US\$879.8 million. The Pilot Program for Climate Resilience received pledges at the amount of US\$ 1,159 million.

¹⁸ IPCC (2014), Chapter 17: Economics of Adaptation. Adaptation and Vulnerability. Contribution of Working Group II to the Fifth Assessment Report. Chambwera, M. et al., final draft, page 15. (http://ipcc-wg2.gov/AR5/images/uploads/WGIAR5-Chap17_FGDall.pdf).

¹⁹ World Bank, 2010a: The Costs to Developing Countries of Adapting to Climate Change: New Methods and Estimates. 2010. World Bank, Washington DC.

43. As indicated in the introduction to this document, by its decision B.07/04, the Board adopted Fund mitigation and adaptation logic models. The six levels of the logic model (objectives, impacts, outcomes, outputs, activities and inputs) cover a broad range of result areas.

44. Review of results areas of other major multilateral climate funds²⁰ and inputs received from these funds indicate that the results reflected in the adaptation logic model are comprehensive and create a meaningful framework for adaptation activities. They have therefore addressed the prior requests for the consideration of additional result areas and indicators for adaptation activities (see document GCF/B.05/23, Annex I).

5.2 Illustrative projects cutting across adaptation results

45. Adaptation projects will employ an integrated approach to achieve the agreed results and contribute to the development goals of beneficiary countries and communities. Given the uncertainty in future climate scenarios, especially at the local scale, Fund-supported interventions will encourage adaptation investments through low-regret or no-regret solutions. A single project can contribute to multiple expected results. For example, an intervention designed to support the climate change adaptation needs of a rural community can support the expected result 2.0 “Increased resilience of health and well-being, and food and water security” by promoting irrigation schemes and sustainable agricultural practices. This also directly reduces disaster risks such as droughts and floods contributing to the expected result 7.0 “Strengthened adaptive capacity and reduced exposure to climate risks”. Annex IV lists several illustrative examples of projects that cut across multiple expected results indicated in the adaptation logic model.

VI. Initial approach to the monitoring and evaluation policy

6.1 Introduction

46. This section outlines and initial approach to the monitoring and evaluation (M&E) policy that will be undertaken by the Fund. M&E will be based on results-based management principles and standards.²¹ The main objectives of the M&E policy are to:

(a) Sustain the continuous learning process of the Fund. M&E will provide feedback and lessons to improve project/programme selection, design, implementation, efficiency and performance; and

(b) Promote the accountability of the Fund for results.

47. The M&E policy will serve the following purposes:

(a) Assess the relevance, efficiency, impact, sustainability and effectiveness of the Fund-supported projects/programmes;

(b) Track indicators and performance against intended results so that corrective measures can be undertaken in due time;

²⁰ Strategic Climate Fund (Pilot Program for Climate Resilience - PPCR), Adaptation Fund, Least Developed Countries Fund and Special Climate Change Fund.

²¹ Results-based management is defined as “a broad management strategy aimed at achieving improved performance and demonstrable results” UNEG, ‘The Role of Evaluation in Results-based Management’, 21 August 2007. Available at: http://www.unevaluation.org/papersandpubs/documentdetail.jsp?doc_id=87.

- (c) Identify the underlying conditions and drivers enabling successful, sustained and scaled-up projects/programmes and lessons learned through implementation;
- (d) Provide information on project/programme risk factors and risk management strategies; and
- (e) Develop the capacities of the IEs, intermediaries and relevant stakeholders in measuring, monitoring and reporting on the agreed results at the project/programme level.

48. The M&E policy shall define the concepts and role of M&E within the Fund and it will define the role and responsibilities of its IEs, intermediaries, EEs and other relevant partners in M&E. The policy will further elaborate the role and responsibilities between the Secretariat and the Independent Evaluation Unit (IEU). The IEU's functions have been defined in IEU terms of reference (ToR) adopted at the sixth Board meeting (see document GCF/B.06/18, Annex III).

49. The Secretariat will have the primary responsibility in developing the monitoring policy, incorporating the lessons learned from the Fund's portfolio monitoring, and reviewing the M&E requirements in the Fund-supported project and programme proposals. The IEU will be responsible for defining the evaluation policy and, together with the Secretariat, contributing to the Fund's knowledge management process.

6.2 Monitoring and evaluation

6.2.1 Monitoring

50. Monitoring is defined as a continuous process that collects and analyses data and information from the Fund-supported projects/programmes for the purpose of identifying progress on activities and expected results.

51. Monitoring will help provide the Fund with information regarding the extent to which a supported project or programme has achieved the agreed results and objectives. The information can be used for decision-making and taking corrective actions (adaptive management). It can also be fed into evaluations and overarching learning processes.

52. Monitoring will be carried out at all levels, from project/programme to portfolio level. The Secretariat will further elaborate monitoring guidelines, which will cover:

- (a) Definitions for relevant terminology;
- (b) Principles, standards, criteria and minimum requirements for results-oriented monitoring following the guidance of good practices adopted by other international organizations and funds;
- (c) Identification of the methodologies for the indicators agreed in the mitigation and adaptation PMFs; and
- (d) Design of the multi-level monitoring and reporting system identifying the flow of information from projects/programmes level to outcome, impact and paradigm-shift levels, including reporting responsibilities and how, where applicable, indicators will be aggregated;

53. The monitoring guidelines are intended to be a living document that will be updated as lessons learned and feedback from the implementation of projects/programmes becomes available.

54. The Secretariat will provide an online information management system that will support the overall capacity of the Fund and its knowledge management needs, including indicator tracking.

55. The Secretariat will provide, as needed, support for building the monitoring capacities of IEs, intermediaries and relevant partners involved in the implementation of Fund-supported projects/programmes. The Secretariat, as needed, can provide back-up services for conducting internal process evaluations to inform ongoing projects/programmes on corrective measures and areas that need attention.

56. The Secretariat will ensure that the lessons learned from the monitoring practice will feed into the organization's knowledge management for improved internal management performances, information/knowledge-sharing and continuous learning. This will support the design of future projects/programmes and further improvements to the results management framework.

6.2.2 Evaluation

57. Evaluation is defined as a systematic and impartial assessment of projects/programmes. Evaluations have a range of objectives, and for the Fund, they will focus on determining the relevance, efficiency, effectiveness and sustainability of its supported projects and programmes. Evaluation will draw upon the Fund's monitoring and may involve separate data collection and analysis for each specific evaluation case.

58. The IEU will be responsible for developing and updating the evaluation policy of the Fund, as indicated in its ToR. Although each evaluation will have a fit-for-purpose design intended to serve specific objectives; an overarching anticipated use for evaluations is to identify findings and lessons learned that can inform project/programme design and implementation to improve the quality of Fund programming and enhance results.

59. The types of evaluation, as envisioned in the IEU's ToR, include:

- (a) Country-portfolio evaluations;
- (b) Thematic evaluations of the different types of activities that the Fund will finance;
- (c) Evaluations of project-based and programmatic approaches in accordance with climate change strategies and plans; and
- (d) Independent assessment of the overall performance of the Fund commissioned by the Conference of Parties.

60. Additional uses of independent evaluation can be determined on a case-by-case basis. For example, formative (mid-course) evaluations can inform ongoing implementation and processes of a particular project; ex-post results-oriented evaluations would inform whether the results are in line with project goals, and portfolio-level evaluations would inform investment strategies.

Annex I: Draft decision of the Board

The Board, having considered GCF/B.08/07, *Further Development of the Initial Results Management Framework*,

- 1. Draft decision regarding the Green Climate Fund's mitigation and adaptation performance measurement frameworks, indicators for country-driven policies, and the Fund's monitoring and evaluation policy:**
 - (a) Adopts the proposed mitigation and adaptation performance measurement frameworks (PMFs) as indicated in Annex II to document GCF/B.08/07;
 - (b) Takes note that the Secretariat will further identify and/or develop the definitions and methodologies of the indicators and will refine them as necessary based on experience gained and lesson learned over time; and
 - (c) Adopts the initial approach to the monitoring and evaluation policy contained in Annex III to document GCF/B.08/07;
- 2. Draft decision regarding the Board's flagship projects that cut across adaptation results:**
 - (a) Takes note of the illustrative examples of projects cutting across adaptation results presented in Annex IV of document GCF/B.08/07; and
 - (b) Also takes note of the greater potential of such projects/programmes to contribute to the achievements of the Fund's objectives.
- 3. Draft decision regarding additional result areas and indicators for adaptation activities:**
 - (a) Affirms that the Fund's adopted adaptation logic model and PMF have addressed the prior requests in the decisions B.05/03 and B.06/05 for additional result areas and indicators for adaptation activities;
- 4. Draft decision regarding the role and expected impacts of the Fund in initial result areas:**
 - (a) Acknowledges the gap between current funding for climate mitigation and adaptation activities in developing countries and the related funding needs;
 - (b) Recognizes the role of the Fund in bridging this gap;
 - (c) Requests the Secretariat to present options for strengthening the role of the Fund in channelling new, additional, adequate and predictable financial resources.

Annex II: Mitigation and adaptation performance measurement frameworks

1. The mitigation and adaptation performance measurement frameworks (PMFs) have been designed to measure the results of the Fund.
2. The methodologies for the indicators identified in the PMF will be identified in line with the initial approach to the monitoring and evaluation policy as outlined in Annex III. Gender disaggregation for the indicators will be applied where possible.
3. The mitigation and adaptation paradigm-shift results will be measured using a combination of quantitative and qualitative information that goes beyond simply aggregating the results' indicators.¹
4. Context-specific environmental, social and economic co-benefits can be identified on a project/programme case-by-case basis. Examples include improved public health, improved energy security and improved forest ecosystem health. Sustainable development potential, which entails co-benefits, is part of the investment criteria in the Fund's initial investment framework.
5. Where applicable, mitigation projects/programmes that also generate adaptation results should report on adaptation indicators (and vice versa for adaptation projects/programmes with mitigation results). For example, a project that primarily intends to improve land and forest areas contributing to emission reductions (result 9.0 in the mitigation PMF) and, by doing so, also contribute to increasing the resilience of the ecosystem (result 4.0 in the adaptation PMF) would report on the relevant indicators for both mitigation and adaptation.
6. The PMFs include notations where indicator screening based on the experience of other funds to date suggests that gender can be an integral part of reporting and analysis through disaggregated reporting (by men and women). In some cases, gender-based data are not typically available or feasible to collect; however, as part of the further development of the indicator methodologies, additional analysis on where gender can be integrated explicitly into additional indicators will be conducted. Furthermore, as described below in chapter III, any additional work on the PMFs will take into consideration the Fund's draft Gender Policy and Action Plan, which is being developed at this time (to be GCF/B.08/19).
7. As pointed out in Board decision B.05/03,² the Fund is a continuously learning institution. The PMF results, indicators and associated methodologies will be refined and adapted as needed based on best practices and lessons learned.

I. Mitigation performance measurement framework

8. The proposed mitigation PMF in Table 1 is aligned with the mitigation logic model. The proposed associated indicators are listed next to their corresponding objective/impact/outcome. The notes provide information on the proposed methodology, disaggregation and relationship to indicators used by peer funds/agencies. Gender disaggregation for the indicators will be applied where applicable.
9. The high-level PMF table format is intentionally simple: it does not include specifics that can be added later once the PMF is adopted, such as technical definitions, baselines, data sources, calculation methodologies, reporting format and targets.

¹ Elements that are expected to be considered include: overall contribution to low-carbon development pathways consistent with a temperature increase of less than 2 degrees (mitigation), overall achievement in contributing to sustainable climate-resilient development pathways (adaptation), the degree to which knowledge and learning are achieved, extent to which the enabling environment is created or enhanced, and extent to which the regulatory framework and policies are strengthened.

² In GCF/B.05/23 (paragraph h, page 3).

10. Initial methodologies for the three adopted mitigation core indicators are included in Annex V. Once the Board adopts the proposed indicators in the PMF, detailed methodologies, including more specifics on gender, can be identified for these indicators.

11. Some of the indicators in this PMF (particularly 1.1, 3.1 and 7.1) involve combining data across sectors so that the indicator matches with the intended results as articulated in the logic model. In these cases, each sector's data will be calculated separately according to methodologies suited for that sector and then totalled.

Table 1: Mitigation performance measurement framework

Expected result	Indicator* = Core (adopted) - or - Proposed	Reporting responsibility (annual reporting)	Notes
<i>Paradigm-shift Objective</i>			
Shift to low-emission sustainable development pathways	Proposed: Degree to which the Fund is achieving low-emission sustainable development impacts	Secretariat	Proposed assessment based on a combination of quantitative and qualitative information that goes beyond simple aggregation of the results' indicators. Elements to be considered include the overall contribution to low-carbon development pathways, consistent with a temperature increase of less than 2 degrees, the degree to which knowledge and learning are achieved, extent to which the enabling environment is created or enhanced, and extent to which the regulatory framework and policies are strengthened.
<i>Fund-level Impacts</i>			
	*Tonnes of carbon dioxide equivalent (t CO₂eq) reduced as a result of Fund-funded projects/programmes	Implementing entities (IEs)/intermediaries	Aggregate summation of sector-specific t CO ₂ eq reduction indicators. Intended to be estimated ex-ante and reported annually and ex-post. Methodologies tailored to each sector – see specifics below and in Annex V.
	*Cost per t CO₂eq decreased for all Fund-funded mitigation projects/programmes	IEs/intermediaries	Intended to help understand anticipated costs (ex-ante) as well as trends in reducing costs of mitigation over time. Costs per t CO ₂ eq reduced are expected to vary based on sector, technology, programme/project context, time scale, risk, etc.
	*Volume of finance leveraged by Fund funding	IEs/intermediaries	“Leveraged” considered synonymous with the term “mobilized” (used by other funds). Informed by CIF, International Finance Corporation (IFC), and others. Calculations to be disaggregated by public and private sources; prorated by amount of co-financing.
1.0 Reduced emissions through increased low-emission energy access and power generation	1.1 *Tonnes of carbon dioxide equivalent (t CO ₂ eq) reduced or avoided as a result of Fund-funded projects/programmes – <i>gender-sensitive energy access power generation (sub-indicator)</i>	IEs/intermediaries	<i>Energy access:</i> - Based on gender-sensitive methodologies used by CIF's Program for Scaling Up Renewable Energy in Low Income Countries (SREP) core indicator 2. Disaggregated by men and women. <i>Power generation:</i> - Methods to be informed by multilateral development banks'/international financial institutions' (MDBs/IFIs) GHG accounting harmonization work on energy efficiency and renewable energy; where feasible, gender-disaggregated data to be collected. Can also consider DFID GHG appraisal guidance and the Fund's 2013 energy efficiency guidelines.

Expected result	Indicator* = Core (adopted) - or - Proposed	Reporting responsibility (annual reporting)	Notes
2.0 Reduced emissions through increased access to low-emission transport	2.1 *Tonnes of carbon dioxide equivalent (t CO ₂ e) reduced or avoided as a result of Fund-funded projects/programmes – <i>low emission gender-sensitive transport (sub-indicator)</i>	IEs/intermediaries	<p><i>Public transport:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Specifics to be informed by pending MDB/IFI work on transport GHG accounting harmonization; GEF's 2013 transportation project GHG calculation methodology developed by the Institute for Transportation Development Policy (ITDP) Disaggregated by men and women. <p><i>Vehicle fuels (fuel economy standards):</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - [If applicable to Fund investments] methods may be informed by the work of International Council on Clean Transportation (ICCT); and by the work of the Women's Issues in Transportation Committee of the US Transport Research Board.
3.0 Reduced emissions from buildings, cities, industries and appliances	3.1 *Tonnes of carbon dioxide equivalent (t CO ₂ e) reduced or avoided as a result of Fund-funded projects/programmes – <i>buildings, cities, industries, and appliances sub-indicator</i>	IEs/intermediaries	<p><i>Buildings:</i> Informed by MDB/IFI GHG accounting harmonization work on energy efficiency.</p> <p><i>Cities:</i> Informed by the Global Protocol for Community-Scale Greenhouse Gas Emissions and by the Cities Alliance (currently being developed).</p> <p><i>Industries:</i> Informed by MDB/IFI GHG accounting harmonization work on energy efficiency.</p> <p><i>Appliances:</i> Informed MDB/IFI GHG accounting harmonization work on energy efficiency where applicable. Can also draw upon the GEF's GHG accounting for standards and labelling; CLASP's/Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory's (LBNL) Policy Analysis Modelling System.</p>
4.0 Reduced emissions from land use, deforestation, forest degradation, and through sustainable forest management and conservation and enhancement of forest carbon stocks	4.1 *Tonnes of carbon dioxide equivalent (t CO ₂ e) reduced (including increased removals) as a result of Fund-funded projects/programmes – <i>forest and land-use sub-indicator</i>	IEs/intermediaries	<p>Informed by CIF FIP Indicator 1, pending Fund work on the performance framework for REDD+, the Forest Carbon Partnership Facility Methodological Framework (Dec. 2013), UN REDD and emerging United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) guidance on REDD+.</p> <p>May need to be further harmonized with a REDD+ indicator which is likely to be forest-only (not land use).</p>

<i>Project/Programme Outcomes</i>			
5.0 Strengthened institutional and regulatory systems for low-emission planning and development	Proposed: 5.1 Number of regulations/policies introduced/adjusted to address low-emission planning and development	IEs / intermediaries	Informed by GEF Indicator 5. Can also be informed by the World Bank's RISE (Readiness for Investment in Sustainable Energy) work. Consideration should be given to what can be measured at different levels (city, regional, etc.) and what changes can be tied to the work of the Fund, either in an attribution or contribution sense.
6.0 Increased number of small, medium and large low-emission power suppliers	Proposed: 6.1 Number of small, medium and large low-emission power suppliers	IEs / intermediaries	Informed by MDB/IFI GHG accounting harmonization work on renewable energy, UNEP renewable energy indicator and CIF SREP RE indicators. Will likely require customization. Disaggregated by men and women.
	Proposed: 6.2 Number of households, women and men with improved access low-emission energy sources	IEs / intermediaries	Informed by CIF SREP 2. Disaggregated by men and women. Disaggregated by urban and rural. Assumes that it will not be possible to measure improved access from large-grid systems; therefore the data will be linked to off-grid access (e.g., solar panels) and mini-grid systems.
	Proposed: 6.3 MWs of low-emission energy capacity installed, generated and/or rehabilitated as a result of GCF support	IEs / intermediaries	Informed by CIF CTF and SREP indicators.
7.0 Lower energy intensity of buildings, cities, industries, and appliances	Proposed: 7.1 Energy intensity/savings of buildings, cities, industries and appliances	IEs / intermediaries	Informed by MDB/IFI GHG accounting harmonization work on energy efficiency; can also be informed by IEA and SE4ALL Global Tracking Framework where relevant. Will need to be calculated sector-by-sector; different methodologies apply to buildings, cities, industries and appliances.
8.0 Increased use of low-carbon transport	Proposed: 8.1 Number of additional female and male passengers using low-carbon public transport	IEs / intermediaries	Informed by CIF CTF indicator 4, pending work by MDBs and IFIs on transport GHG accounting harmonization. Disaggregated by men and women.
	Proposed 8.2: Sales of new vehicles by fuel economy and energy source	IEs / intermediaries	Trends in fuel economy by vehicle class (commercial and passenger plus subclasses by heavy/light duty, weight, etc.); also track alternative energy vehicle sales (e.g. hybrid and all-electric vehicles) Informed by work of the International Energy Agency, the International Council on Clean Transportation, and others
9.0 Improved management of land or forest areas contributing to emissions reductions	Proposed: 9.1 Hectares of land or forests under improved management contributing to emission reductions	IEs / intermediaries	Informed by work on REDD+ performance framework (currently being developed). Can draw on CIF Forest Investment Program (FIP) indicator guidance, Forest Carbon Partnership Facility Monitoring and Evaluation Framework, UN REDD, and UNFCCC guidance.
<i>Project/Programme Outputs</i>	[Defined for each project/programme on a case-by-case basis.]		
<i>Activities</i>	[Defined for each project/programme on a case-by-case basis.]		
<i>Inputs</i>	[Defined for each project/programme on a case-by-case basis.]		

II. Adaptation performance management framework

12. The proposed adaptation PMF in Table 2 is aligned with the adaptation logic model. The proposed associated indicators are listed next to their corresponding objective/impact/outcome. The notes provide details of the proposed methodology, disaggregation and equivalency with indicators used by peer funds/agencies.

13. When applicable, an indicator measuring additional financing from public and private sources on adaptation activities can be tracked and reported during project/programme implementation on a case-by-case basis. This indicator would not serve as a decision-making factor when assessing a funding proposal for adaptation.

14. An initial methodology for the adopted adaptation core indicator is included in Annex V. Once the Board adopts the additional proposed indicators in the PMF, detailed methodologies, including more specifics on gender, can be identified for these indicators.

Table 2: Adaptation performance measurement framework

Expected result	Indicator * = Core (adopted) - or - Proposed	Reporting responsibility (annual reporting)	Notes
<i>Paradigm-shift Objective</i>			
Increased climate-resilient sustainable development	Proposed: Degree to which the Fund is achieving a climate-resilient sustainable development impact	Secretariat	Proposed assessment based on a combination of quantitative and qualitative information that goes beyond simple aggregation of the results' indicators. Elements to be considered include the overall contribution to sustainable climate-resilient development pathways, the degree to which knowledge and learning are achieved, extent to which the enabling environment is created or enhanced, and extent to which the regulatory framework and policies are strengthened.
<i>Fund-level Impacts</i>			
	* Total Number of direct and indirect beneficiaries; Number of beneficiaries relative to total population	IEs / intermediaries	The indicator measures the number of people who have received an input of support, where two dimensions of support are considered: targeted and intensity level. Based on these two dimensions, a direct and indirect category of beneficiaries is identified. See Annex V for the methodology. Disaggregated by men and women. <i>Informed by Adaptation Fund (core-1); CIF</i>
1.0 Increased resilience and enhanced livelihoods of the most vulnerable people, communities, and regions	Proposed: 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	IEs / intermediaries /country	Disaggregated by vulnerable groups and gender, share of total population. <i>Informed by CIF PPCR A1.2.</i>
	Proposed: 1.2 Number of men and women benefiting from the adoption of diversified, climate-resilient livelihood options	IEs / intermediaries	Disaggregated by men and women. <i>Informed by Adaptation Fund 6.1, 6.2; LDCF/SCCF 3.</i>

Expected result	Indicator * = Core (adopted) - or - Proposed	Reporting responsibility (annual reporting)	Notes
2.0 Increased resilience of health and well-being, and food and water security	Proposed: 2.1 Number of introduced health measures to respond to climate-sensitive diseases	IEs / intermediaries	Disaggregated by type <i>Informed by: n/a.</i>
	Proposed: 2.2 Number of food-secure households (in areas/periods at risk of climate change impacts)	IEs / intermediaries	Disaggregated by male and female-headed households <i>Informed by CIF PPCR A1.1.</i>
	Proposed: 2.3 Number of people with year-round access to reliable and safe water supply despite climate shocks and stresses	IEs / intermediaries	Disaggregated by domestic, agricultural and industrial sources. Disaggregated by male and female-headed households for domestic sources. <i>Informed by CIF PPCR A1.4.</i>
3.0 Increased resilience of infrastructure and the built environment to climate change	Proposed: 3.1 Number and value of infrastructure or physical assets made more resilient to climate variability and change	IEs / intermediaries	Disaggregated by sector, type, action (constructed or strengthened) <i>Informed by Adaptation Fund (core-3), LDCF/SCCF 2.</i>
4.0 Improved resilience of ecosystems and ecosystem services	Proposed: 4.1 Coverage/scale of ecosystems protected/rehabilitated in response to climate variability and change	IEs / intermediaries	Disaggregated by ecosystem type <i>Informed by Adaptation Fund (core-4); LDCF/SCCF 2.</i>
	Proposed: 4.2 Value (US\$) of ecosystem services generated or protected in response to climate change	IEs / intermediaries	<i>Informed by LDCF/SCCF 2.</i>
<i>Project/Programme Outcomes</i>			
5.0 Strengthened institutional and regulatory systems for climate-responsive planning and development	Proposed: 5.1 Number of key targeted institutions with evidence of their strengthened capacity and coordination mechanisms to mainstream climate resilience	IEs / intermediaries /country	The indicator measures a number of key targeted institutions and is accompanied by evidence. The evidence is a qualitative assessment (e.g. through a standardized scorecard) of the various strategic plans and documents is needed at regular intervals to observe changes in terms of climate change streamlining and quality. <i>Informed by Adaptation Fund 7; CIF PPCR A2.1, B2</i>
	Proposed: 5.2 Number of effective regulations/policies introduced/adjusted to address climate change risks	IEs / intermediaries	Disaggregated by sector, scale. <i>Informed by Adaptation Fund 7.1; LDCF/SCCF 12.</i>
6.0 Increased generation and use of climate information in	Proposed: 6.1 Number of generated climate information products tailored to decision-makers	IEs / intermediaries	Disaggregated by sector, scale. <i>Informed by Adaptation Fund 1.1; LDCF/SCCF 6, CIF PPCR B3.</i>

Expected result	Indicator * = Core (adopted) - or - Proposed	Reporting responsibility (annual reporting)	Notes
decision-making	Proposed: 6.2 Evidence showing that climate information products/services are used in decision-making in climate-sensitive sectors	IEs / intermediaries	Disaggregated by stakeholder (government, private sector, and general population). This indicator is qualitative in nature and country-specific. It will require an in-depth analysis and/or a scorecard approach to capture the understanding of the political economy determining decisions. <i>Informed by CIF PPCR B3</i>
7.0 Strengthened adaptive capacity and reduced exposure to climate risks	Proposed: 7.1 Extent to which vulnerable households, communities, businesses and public-sector services use improved Fund-supported tools, instruments, strategies and activities to respond to climate change and variability	IEs / intermediaries	This indicator is qualitative and/or quantitative in nature and country-specific. The qualitative aspects will require an in-depth analysis or a scorecard approach to determine the extent of progress. Households: disaggregated by male-headed and female-headed <i>Informed by CIF PPCR B1</i>
	Proposed: 7.2 Number of structural measures established/strengthened	IEs / intermediaries	Disaggregated by category and hazard <i>Informed by n/a</i>
	Proposed: 7.3 Number of early warning systems and other risk reduction measures established/strengthened	IEs / intermediaries	An early warning system is perceived as a composite of four dimensions: (1) knowledge on risks, (2) monitoring and warning service, (3) dissemination and communication, (4) response capability. Disaggregated by hazard and geographical coverage <i>Informed by Adaptation Fund Core-2, 1.2 and 1.2.1; LDCF/SCCF 2.3</i>
8.0 Strengthened awareness of climate threats and risk-reduction processes	Proposed 8.1 Number of women and men made aware of climate threats and related appropriate responses	IEs / intermediaries	Disaggregated by men and women <i>Informed by Adaptation Fund 3.1, 3.2</i>
<i>Project/Programme Outputs</i>		[Defined for each project/programme on a case-by-case basis.]	
<i>Activities</i>		[Defined for each project/programme on a case-by-case basis.]	
<i>Inputs</i>		[Defined for each project/programme on a case-by-case basis.]	

Annex III: Initial approach to the monitoring and evaluation policy

I. Introduction

1. This section outlines and initial approach to the monitoring and evaluation (M&E) policy that will be undertaken by the Fund. M&E will be based on results-based management principles and standards.¹ The main objectives of the M&E policy are to:

- (a) Sustain the continuous learning process of the Fund. M&E will provide feedback and lessons to improve project/programme selection, design, implementation, efficiency and performance; and
- (b) Promote the accountability of the Fund for results.

2. The M&E policy will serve the following purposes:

- (a) Assess the relevance, efficiency, impact, sustainability and effectiveness of the Fund-supported projects/programmes;
- (b) Track indicators and performance against intended results so that corrective measures can be undertaken in due time;
- (c) Identify the underlying conditions and drivers enabling successful, sustained and scaled-up projects/programmes and lessons learned through implementation;
- (d) Provide information on project/programme risk factors and risk management strategies; and
- (e) Develop the capacities of the IEs, intermediaries and relevant stakeholders in measuring, monitoring and reporting on the agreed results at the project/programme level.

3. The M&E policy shall define the concepts and role of M&E within the Fund and it will define the role and responsibilities of its IEs, intermediaries, EEs and other relevant partners in M&E. The policy will further elaborate the role and responsibilities between the Secretariat and the Independent Evaluation Unit (IEU). The IEU's functions have been defined in IEU terms of reference (ToR) adopted at the sixth Board meeting (see document GCF/B.06/18, Annex III).

4. The Secretariat will have the primary responsibility in developing the monitoring policy, incorporating the lessons learned from the Fund's portfolio monitoring, and reviewing the M&E requirements in the Fund-supported project and programme proposals. The IEU will be responsible for defining the evaluation policy and, together with the Secretariat, contributing to the Fund's knowledge management process.

II. Monitoring and evaluation

2.1 Monitoring

5. Monitoring is defined as a continuous process that collects and analyses data and information from the Fund-supported projects/programmes for the purpose of identifying progress on activities and expected results.

¹ Results-based management is defined as "a broad management strategy aimed at achieving improved performance and demonstrable results" UNEG, 'The Role of Evaluation in Results-based Management', 21 August 2007. Available at: http://www.unevaluation.org/papersandpubs/documentdetail.jsp?doc_id=87.

6. Monitoring will help provide the Fund with information regarding the extent to which a supported project or programme has achieved the agreed results and objectives. The information can be used for decision-making and taking corrective actions (adaptive management). It can also be fed into evaluations and overarching learning processes.
7. Monitoring will be carried out at all levels, from project/programme to portfolio level. The Secretariat will further elaborate monitoring guidelines, which will cover:
 - (a) Definitions for relevant terminology;
 - (b) Principles, standards, criteria and minimum requirements for results-oriented monitoring following the guidance of good practices adopted by other international organizations and funds;
 - (c) Identification of the methodologies for the indicators agreed in the mitigation and adaptation PMFs;
 - (d) Design of the multi-level monitoring and reporting system identifying the flow of information from projects/programmes level to outcome, impact and paradigm-shift levels, including reporting responsibilities and how, where applicable, indicators will be aggregated;
8. The monitoring guidelines are intended to be a living document that will be updated as lessons learned and feedback from the implementation of projects/programmes becomes available.
9. The Secretariat will provide an online information management system that will support the overall capacity of the Fund and its knowledge management needs, including indicator tracking.
10. The Secretariat will provide, as needed, support for building the monitoring capacities of IEs, intermediaries and relevant partners involved in the implementation of Fund-supported projects/programmes. The Secretariat, as needed, can provide back-up services for conducting internal process evaluations to inform ongoing projects/programmes on corrective measures and areas that need attention.
11. The Secretariat will ensure that the lessons learned from the monitoring practice will feed into the organization's knowledge management for improved internal management performances, information/knowledge-sharing and continuous learning. This will support the design of future projects/programmes and further improvements to the results management framework.

2.2 Evaluation

12. Evaluation is defined as a systematic and impartial assessment of projects/programmes. Evaluations have a range of objectives, and for the Fund, they will focus on determining the relevance, efficiency, effectiveness and sustainability of its supported projects and programmes. Evaluation will draw upon the Fund's monitoring and may involve separate data collection and analysis for each specific evaluation case.
13. The IEU will be responsible for developing and updating the evaluation policy of the Fund, as indicated in its ToR. Although each evaluation will have a fit-for-purpose design intended to serve specific objectives; an overarching anticipated use for evaluations is to identify findings and lessons learned that can inform project/programme design and implementation to improve the quality of Fund programming and enhance results.

14. The types of evaluation, as envisioned in the IEU's ToR, include:
 - (a) Country-portfolio evaluations;
 - (b) Thematic evaluations of the different types of activities that the Fund will finance;
 - (c) Evaluations of project-based and programmatic approaches in accordance with climate change strategies and plans; and
 - (d) Independent assessment of the overall performance of the Fund commissioned by the Conference of Parties.
15. Additional uses of independent evaluation can be determined on a case-by-case basis. For example, formative (mid-course) evaluations can inform ongoing implementation and processes of a particular project; ex-post results-oriented evaluations would inform whether the results are in line with project goals, and portfolio-level evaluations would inform investment strategies.

Annex IV: Illustrative examples of projects cutting across adaptation results

The table below illustrates examples of types of projects that can achieve multiple expected results indicated in the adaptation logic model.

Illustrative example	Expected results	Proposed approach
<p>A project supports housing developers and construction companies in developing countries so that they can deliver water-secure and climate-resilient housing in addressing environmental degradation, sound ecosystem management and disaster risk reduction.</p> <p>A flagship initiative can demonstrate the commercial benefits of installing water management and efficiency measures in housing. This contributes directly to building climate resilience and promoting synergies with national authorities to achieve development objectives.</p> <p>Furthermore, vulnerable households and groups and small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) can access improved tools to respond to climate variability and climate change while raising their awareness of the importance of building climate resilience and demanding environmental protection in their communities.</p>	<p>2.0 Increased resilience of health and well-being, and food and water security. <i>(The action supports water security, preventing scarcity and assuring adherence to water quality and sanitation standards, especially for vulnerable segments of the population, such as the elderly, children and women).</i></p> <p>3.0 Increased resilience of infrastructure and the built environment to climate change threats. <i>(The project promotes disaster risk reduction, assuring that building standards are applied so that the impact of climate-related hazards is either prevented or reduced, saving high maintenance/reconstruction costs for communities and countries).</i></p>	<p>The Fund promotes a paradigm shift in approaching climate change adaptation that starts from applying innovative solutions to stimulate private sector investments in climate actions.</p> <p>The creation of public-private partnerships is not only centered on the concept of mutual benefits but also on the notion that private and public sectors shall start to share common values when approaching social responsibilities towards their communities and future generations.</p> <p>Enabling public-private sector partnerships based on shared values supports job creation, research and development opportunities and overall contributes to the countries' development goals and poverty reduction strategies.</p>
<p>A project develops new tools, business models and knowledge to support SMEs in adapting to climate change, better managing their climate-related risks and identifying markets and business opportunities related to adaptation.</p> <p>The project targets the value chains of farmers by providing the technological, financial and training resources necessary to improve climate resilience.</p> <p>It does so by (a) establishing partnerships with local credit providers to open credit lines for farmers who invest in resilience activities; (b) adjusting their financial models to take into account climate risks in their portfolios and promoting risk</p>	<p>1.0 Increased resilience and enhanced livelihoods of the most vulnerable people, communities, and regions. <i>(The action supports agricultural production and rural microfinance, and therefore contributes to income generation while improving livelihoods).</i></p> <p>6.0 Increased generation and use of climate information in decision-making. <i>(The project supports the provision of more efficient climate services to farmers and innovation for early warning systems through</i></p>	<p>The Fund applies an innovative approach promoting an integrated and multi-sectoral approach to adaptation blending micro-finance, climate services, risk-financing tools (insurance) and disaster risk management to sustain livelihoods, poverty reduction, food security and income generation.</p>

Illustrative example	Expected results	Proposed approach
<p>hedging tools such as parametric insurance; (c) providing support to climate service development (early warning systems) so that farmers can take informed decisions on investments and efficient agricultural practices.</p>	<p><i>mobile technologies and to insurance providers).</i></p> <p>7.0 Strengthened adaptive capacity and reduced exposure to climate risks. <i>(The project directly supports disaster risk reduction, enhancing the capacity of the rural communities in reacting to climate warnings with appropriate risk prevention measures).</i></p>	
<p>A project supports country-driven climate policies and implement nation-wide climate change adaptation strategies and plans.</p> <p>The project strengthens the integration of climate change adaptation and disaster risk management as a cross-institutional issue. It supports the effective creation of national climate adaptation platforms where climate actions are coordinated among different line ministries, local governments, civil society organizations, universities and academia, the private sector and utilities.</p> <p>This mechanism supports the governance and legal/regulatory framework of the government and boosts its capacity to reduce the risks posed by climate-related hazards.</p> <p>The presence in the climate adaptation platforms of the local authorities assures that national policies are relevant to local adaptation needs, build the capacity of local institutions, and contribute directly to promoting ad hoc activities for community awareness of climate change risks.</p>	<p>5.0 Strengthened institutional and regulatory systems for climate-responsive planning and development. <i>(The project works across sectors and institutions, creating a coordinating mechanism inclusive of different expertise. The climate adaptation platforms can inform national policy-makers on the needed institutional changes, regulatory frameworks and legislation that most effectively contribute to the implementation of sound climate change adaptation plans and risk reduction strategies).</i></p> <p>8.0 Strengthened awareness of climate threats and risk-reduction processes. <i>(The project specifically targets mayors and city councils as agents of change. It encourages them to embrace comprehensive local-level risk assessments and promote dissemination among the population on risks and appropriate behavioral changes on how to adapt to climate change).</i></p>	<p>The Fund applies an innovative approach to the governance of climate risks and supports the country-driven implementation of climate policies. It recognizes the need for an integrated multi-stakeholder approach that can only be effective if appropriate coordination mechanisms are in place. It also emphasizes that climate adaptation can only have an impact if tackled at the grassroots level and hence identifies the local stakeholders and decision-makers as the first agents of change.</p>

Annex V: Proposed methodologies for adopted core indicators

Notes:

- The final details of the methodologies for the four adopted core indicators will require additional technical review and consultation, as well as the further development of items such as the submission format and corresponding tools for the parties responsible for reporting.
- Methodologies will need to be developed for all additional indicators approved by the Board.

Proposed Methodology for Mitigation Core Indicator 1:

Tonnes of carbon dioxide equivalent (t CO₂eq) reduced as a result of Fund-funded projects/programmes

LEVEL: Fund-level Impact (core indicator)

RATIONALE: The Fund promotes low-emission and climate-resilient development pathways by providing support to developing countries to limit or reduce their greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions and to adapt to the impacts of climate change. Monitoring the level of GHG emissions abated from Fund projects is a key indicator of progress and results of Fund projects/programmes. The indicator will report on the net change in GHG emissions measured in tonnes of carbon dioxide equivalent (t CO₂eq), estimated relative to the assumed business-as-usual emissions trajectory, and will reflect abatement results directly attributable to Fund mitigation and related REDD+ projects over the lifetime of the projects.

TECHNICAL DEFINITIONS:

Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emissions: The cumulative amount of all 'Kyoto basket' GHGs which includes all carbon dioxide (CO₂), methane (CH₄), nitrous oxide (N₂O), hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs), perfluorocarbons (PFCs) and sulphur hexafluoride (SF₆) emissions.

Baseline: The estimated trajectory of anthropogenic GHG emissions that would occur in the absence of the Fund project/intervention. Static or frozen baselines are rare given the dynamic nature of emissions; baseline trajectories are therefore typically dynamic, as in emissions would be expected to shift over time in the absence of the intervention and not stay at one constant rate. Baselines are also at times referred to as business-as-usual (BAU) scenarios, counterfactuals, or reference scenarios.

Carbon dioxide equivalents (CO₂eq): A measure used to compare the emissions from various greenhouse gases based upon their global warming potential. The Fund expressed CO₂eq in metric tonnes (t). T CO₂eq for a gas is derived by multiplying the metric tonnes of the gas by the associated global warming potential.

Attribution: Reported CO₂eq reductions are to be based on reductions attributable to the Fund intervention alone. Where co-funding applies, a default calculation for Fund-attributable reductions of t CO₂eq should

be calculated as a pro-rata share of funding. For example, if the Fund is financing 10 per cent of a project that reduces GHG by 100 t CO₂eq, the Fund could claim that 10 t CO₂eq of these reductions are due to the Fund (unless another justification can be claimed). Attribution methodologies that diverge from the simple pro-rata rule above need to be approved.

Direct GHG emission reductions: Reductions achieved by project investments such as technology demonstrations and discrete investments financed or leveraged during the project's supervised implementation period (from the project start to the project closure). [Note: Global Environment Facility (GEF) definition]

Indirect GHG emission reductions: Indirect GHG emission reductions achieved, for example, as a result of market facilitation and development through project-supported policy and institutional frameworks, capacity building, information gathering, and replication effects of demonstration activities. [Note: GEF definition]

Direct post-project emission reductions: GHG emission reductions of Fund-supported revolving financial mechanisms that are still active after the project's closure (ex post). [Note: GEF definition]

DATA SOURCES:

Generally, project/programme-specific data are used; however, additional external data sources (e.g. publically available data from government sources) are used in some cases according to the specific methodologies for each sector.

BASIC METHODOLOGY:

The basic steps to calculating t CO₂eq are as follows:

- Determine the baseline counterfactual emissions trajectory (what would be expected to occur in the absence of the project).
- 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 CO₂eq, tCH₄)
- Convert to t CO₂eq where appropriate.

More specific methodologies and requirements are provided for each of the following sectors/subsectors:

- Appliances
- Buildings
- Cities
- Energy Access
- Industries
- Land Use and Forestry
- Power Generation
- Transport (vehicle fuels and transportation infrastructure including transit)

SPECIFIC METHODOLOGIES:

- [Notes: • Below are initial methods for each sector/category: These require additional technical review and consultation and will likely evolve.
• The descriptions below are high-level: final methodologies will have additional details and most will be accompanied by toolkits for measurement and reporting purposes.]

Appliances/Standards and Labelling: Where applicable, methods may be informed by the Multilateral Development Bank/International Financial Institution (MDB/IFI) GHG accounting harmonization work on energy efficiency. May also draw upon GEF (2013) GHG accounting for standards and labelling and the CLASP/Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory (LBNL) Policy Analysis Modelling System (PAMS), available: [here](#).

Buildings: Annual energy savings from the buildings sector is an aggregate of the changes in energy consumption in buildings of the residential and commercial/services sectors. Specifics are likely to be informed by the MDB/IFI GHG accounting harmonization work on energy efficiency. May also draw upon the GEF building code module, which covers both commercial and residential sectors.

Cities: The proposed methodology could be based on the final Global Protocol for Community-Scale Greenhouse Gas Emissions (GPC). The World Resources Institute (WRI), Local Governments for Sustainability (ICLEI) and C40 Cities Climate Leadership Group (C40) are jointly developing the GPC. In May 2012, the partners released the GPC Pilot Version 1.0, which was pilot tested in 35 cities around the world. The release of the final version is expected in late 2014. See: <http://www.ghgprotocol.org/city-accounting>. The work of the Cities Alliance may also inform development of the methodology.

Energy Access: Methodology to be informed by CIF's Scaling Up Renewable Energy Program in Low Income Countries (SREP) core indicator 2 and others, e.g. International Energy Agency (IEA) [link](#). Results to be disaggregated by gender.

Energy Intensity: (Versus energy efficiency or savings) is the quantity of energy required per unit output or activity. When less energy is required to produce a product, the energy intensity is lower. Energy intensity calculations are most often measured for industries but can also apply to other sectors or subsectors or to a country. The work of the joint MDB/IFI GHG accounting harmonization effort, the International Energy Agency (IEA), the European Environment Agency, and others can indicate where energy intensity (versus energy efficiency or energy savings) specifically will be applicable and which methodologies will be most suitable.

Industry: Proposed method: Energy intensity of industries broken down by subsector where applicable (e.g. steel, cement, paper, etc.). Specific methods used by IEA, World Energy Council, EnergyStar, etc. to be explored for relevance and applicability.

Land Use and Forestry: Data to be drawn from a combination of monitoring, reporting, and verification (MRV) systems where these are in place, ministries of forests, country-level REDD+ reporting, and desk reviews. Methodological details to be informed by the pending Fund performance framework for REDD+. Also consider the Forest Carbon Partnership Facility methodological framework (Dec. 2013), work underway by UN REDD, and emerging UNFCCC guidance on REDD+ [[link](#)].

Power Generation: GHG emissions reductions related to power generation (primarily electricity) at project/programme level. For electricity, the emission factor will likely reflect the CO₂eq of electricity generation based on generation displaced (counterfactual). The target results for the indicator will be based on expected changes in fuel consumption and emissions covering the full lifetime of the project/programme. The calculation methodology may be informed by the MDB/IFI GHG accounting harmonization work on energy efficiency and renewable energy. May also be informed by GEF's 2013 energy efficiency reporting guidelines, and others.

Transportation: (a) *Public transport:* CO₂eq reductions from use of low-carbon public transport as a result of Fund intervention. Consider the pending MDB/IFI work on transport GHG accounting harmonization and GEF technical guidelines on Calculating Greenhouse Gas Benefits of Global Environment Facility Transportation Projects.

(b) *Vehicle fuels/fuel economy standards:* CO₂eq reductions based on government-mandated changes in vehicle fuel consumption/efficiency. Informed by the work of the International Council on Clean Transportation (ICCT), and by the work of Women Issues in Transportation Committee of the United States Transport Research Board.

BASELINE: The default baseline is the amount of CO₂eq emissions that would be emitted in the absence of the project. Baselines are rarely static because emissions generally fluctuate over time; therefore an analysis of the baseline counterfactual emissions trajectory is generally required. Details are specific to the sector and project/programme context.

TIME PERIOD: Reductions to be estimated ex-ante for the project scoping/appraisal stage at the end of the project, and on an annual basis for multi-year projects. Exceptions may apply when, for example, project implementation takes years to begin and no emissions reductions could be expected during that time period. In some cases, the Fund may also wish to do a post-project GHG reduction appraisal 1-3 years after project completion.

REPORTING RESPONSIBILITY: Implementing Entity/intermediaries

REPORTING FORMAT: T.b.d. Likely to be in provided worksheets with calculation guidelines and supporting tools.

ADDITIONAL NOTES: Measuring CO₂eq reductions is often an imprecise science particularly when the reductions are modelled/estimated or are not directly measured from sensors at industrial facilities, for example, where the margins of error are typically relatively low. Uncertainties and assumptions should be clearly articulated and the resulting measures considered accordingly.

Proposed Methodology for Mitigation Core Indicator 2:
Cost per Tonne of carbon dioxide equivalent (t CO₂eq) reduced as a result of Fund-funded projects/programmes

[Note: Below are initial details for this indicator. Additional technical review and elaboration of detail are recommended to finalize specifics and ensure alignment with the Fund's intended use of the indicator.]

LEVEL:	Fund-level Impact (core indicator)
RATIONALE:	<p>To ensure that the Fund is guided by efficiency and effectiveness. Mitigation technologies – and the declining costs of many of these technologies – have the potential to significantly reduce the cost of abating climate change. At the same time, marginal cost curve analyses demonstrate that mitigation costs vary substantially – often by orders of magnitude. Some of the most important mitigation investments may also be the most expensive, long-term investments needed to make large-scale reductions over time. In addition, context (e.g. enabling regulatory environment, grid capacity) can also affect project/programme costs substantially, generating costs that exceed those of mitigation technologies or other project-specific costs.</p> <p>The intent of using this indicator is to understand the cost-effectiveness of mitigation projects/programmes, including whether costs per CO₂eq reductions are decreasing over the course of the project/programme. It can also be used to compare the cost-effectiveness of alternative project proposals, particularly those that propose to use the same mitigation technologies to achieve similar benefits.</p>
TECHNICAL DEFINITIONS:	<p>The cost is the amount of US\$ needed for the entire project/programme. (Costs may be analysed in more detail as well – see discussion under Methodology.)</p>
DATA SOURCES:	Fund programme data on costs plus data from the indicator on tonnes of CO ₂ eq reduced.
METHODOLOGY:	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.
BASELINE:	The baseline will typically be zero given that the indicator will be measured from the outset of Fund-financing. If co-financing applies, additional analysis to pro-rate cost per CO ₂ eq reduced for overall project costs versus the Fund-funded component may be required.
TIME PERIOD:	Project duration, updated annually.
REPORTING RESPONSIBILITY:	Implementing Entity/intermediaries unless otherwise specified.
REPORTING FORMAT:	T.b.d. Likely to be in provided worksheets with calculation guidelines.

**Proposed Methodology for Mitigation Core Indicator 3:
Volume of finance leveraged by Fund funding (disaggregated by public and private sources)**

[Note: Below are initial details for this indicator. The concept and analytical frameworks surrounding finance leveraged are rapidly evolving within the international donor community. Additional technical review and elaboration of detail are recommended to finalize specifics and ensure alignment with the Fund’s intended use of the indicator.]

LEVEL: Fund-level Impact (core indicator)

RATIONALE: The Fund contributes to the achievement of the ultimate objective of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), including playing a key role in channelling new, additional, adequate and predictable financial resources to developing countries, and will catalyse climate finance, both public and private, at the international and national levels. Measuring the role of the Fund with respect to these resources is an integral component of understanding Fund effectiveness and impact.

TECHNICAL DEFINITIONS

The term “leverage” has not formally been defined by the UNFCCC, nor have related terms including “mobilization,” “financing,” and “co-financing.” Working definitions for these are provided below.

Working Definitions

Leverage (also referred to as “mobilized”): Additional financial resources *attributable to the Fund* that are applied to agreed-upon climate objectives or activities. In other words, the additional finance would not have been applied in the absence of the Fund’s participation. This concept of attribution is also referred to as “additionality”.

Public finance: Finance from public (government) sources outside of the Fund, including other donors and partner governments, United Nations agencies, and multilateral or regional development banks and investment agencies.

Private finance: Finance from non-public (non-government) sources such as private banks, private companies, private philanthropy, Clean Development Mechanism financing, voluntary carbon credit market, insurance companies, and private savings.

DATA SOURCES: Combination of Fund programme data and project/programme officers. EEs/IEs may supplement data on co-financing where necessary.

METHODOLOGY: *Total finance leverage:*

1. Identify Fund finance contribution
2. Identify total financing from non-Fund sources
3. Identify the amount of total co-financing that would have been provided in the absence of Fund 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.

Public/private finance disaggregation: Follow same instructions considering only public/private funding sources; e.g. for public sources:

1. Identify Fund finance contribution
2. Identify total financing from non-Fund public sources
3. Identify the amount of total public co-finance that would have been provided in the absence of Fund 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 public finance. The ratio of (1) to (3) (e.g. 1:1.4) can also be an expression of leveraged public finance.

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 Fund's investment criteria.

Additional details t.b.d.

BASELINE: The baseline will typically be zero given that the indicator will be measured from the outset of Fund-financing. If projects are already funded by external sources prior to Fund engagement, this prior funding will need to be taken into consideration when calculating the leverage additionality of Fund financing.

TIME PERIOD: Project duration, updated annually.

REPORTING RESPONSIBILITY: Implementing Entity/intermediaries unless otherwise specified.

REPORTING FORMAT: T.b.d. Likely to be in provided worksheets with calculation guidelines.

Proposed Methodology for Adaptation Core Indicator:

Total number of direct and indirect beneficiaries; number of beneficiaries relative to total population

LEVEL: Project/Programme Level Outcome (core indicator)

RATIONALE This indicator seeks to measure the number of people who have received an input of support from Fund projects as a proxy for increasing adaptive capacity and resilience to climate change.

TECHNICAL DEFINITIONS:

'Support' is defined as direct assistance from the project in question, with the explicit intention of helping people deal with climate change impacts. It could include, for example, financial resources, assets, agricultural inputs, training, communications (e.g. early warning systems) or information (e.g. weather forecasting).

'People Supported' should relate to populations or households identified by the project in question with a direct relationship to it.

'Effects of climate change' are defined as the effects of changes both in the mean state of the climate and in its variability. Normally resulting from the primary consequences of climate change: changes to precipitation, temperature and sea level rise, these may be sudden onset or gradual, and can include floods, droughts, storms, landslides, salinization, coastal inundation, heat or cold waves, and biodiversity loss.

Two dimensions of support²⁵ are considered:

1) Targeted: defined as whether people (or households) can be identified by the project as receiving direct support, can be counted individually and are aware they are receiving support in some sort. This implies a high degree of attribution to the project.

2) Intensity: defined as the level of support/effort provided per person on a continuum, but broad levels may be defined as:

- a) *Low:* e.g. people falling within an administrative area of an institution (e.g. ministry or local authority) receiving capacity-building support.
- b) *Medium:* e.g. people receiving information services such as flood warnings or weather forecast by text; people within catchment area of structural flood defenses; people living in a community where other members have been trained in emergency flood response; people within a catchment area or a river basin subject to a water resources management plan.
- c) *High:* e.g. house raised on plinths, cash transfers, agriculture extension services, training of individuals in communities to develop emergency plans.

²⁵ These dimensions of support are not completely exclusive; medium intensity support may be either targeted (e.g. early warning text messages) or not targeted (catchment area of a flood defense system). However, high intensity support should always be targeted, and low intensity support cannot normally be considered targeted. Low intensity support should not be reported for this indicator.

Based on these two dimensions, there are two categories for reporting:

- 1) **Direct:** Targeted and High intensity. Must fulfill both criteria; e.g. people receiving social protection through improved household assets, houses raised on plinths, agricultural extension services, training of individuals in communities to develop emergency plans and use early warning systems.
- 2) **Indirect** category covers the following:
 - a) *Targeted and medium intensity:* e.g. people receiving weather information and text messages early warnings.
 - b) *Not targeted and medium intensity:* e.g. people within the coverage of an early warning system, or catchment area of a large infrastructure project (e.g. flood defenses), or living in a discrete community in which others have been trained in emergency response.

DATA SOURCES: Efforts should be made to use recent data sourced from national systems (e.g. population data). Data may be available from the census bureau or other census information institution or public offices and institutions with development projects in the project area. Where recent data are not available in national systems, project specific surveys should be used to monitor the number of direct and indirect beneficiaries of each project.

Where social (vulnerability) baseline surveys and analyses have been conducted, monitoring will allow for the disaggregation of the number of poor, female and youth beneficiaries.

METHODOLOGY: The indicator is expressed in (a) absolute numbers of beneficiaries disaggregated by category of reporting (direct/indirect) and gender reported at the project level, and (b) as a share of total population of the country. It is possible for one project to reach both, direct and indirect beneficiaries, in which case these should be reported separately.

Monitoring data on direct and indirect beneficiaries can be collected at the level of the individual (number of people) or household (number of households). However, for reporting on total, direct and indirect beneficiaries, data should be expressed as the number of people and as a per cent of the total population. 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.

Efforts should be made to disaggregate the reported direct and indirect beneficiaries by gender, youth (age 15-24).

BASELINE: The baseline is set at 0, since no people were supported by the Green Climate Fund before the project was implemented.

TIME PERIOD: Project duration, updated annually.

REPORTING RESPONSIBILITY: Implementing Entity/intermediaries unless otherwise specified.

REPORTING FORMAT: The Secretariat is requested to develop a standardized project reporting sheet upon approval of the Methodology.

DATA SOURCES: Efforts should be made to use recent data sourced from national systems (e.g. population data). Data may be available from the census bureau or other census information institution or public offices and institutions with development projects in the project area. Where recent data are not available in national systems, project-specific surveys should be used to monitor the number of direct and indirect beneficiaries of each project.
