



**GREEN
CLIMATE
FUND**

Meeting of the Board
8 – 10 March 2016
Songdo, Incheon, Republic of Korea
Provisional agenda item 20

GCF/B.12/13

1 March 2016

Further development of indicators in the performance measurement frameworks

Summary

This document presents the revision of some indicators of the GCF mitigation and adaptation performance measurement frameworks as requested by decision B.08/07. It also presents an initial evaluation policy and an initial results management framework for the Readiness and Preparatory Support Programme.

Table of Contents

I.	Introduction	1
II.	Refinement of indicators in the mitigation and adaptation performance management frameworks	1
III.	Initial evaluation policy	3
	3.1 Types of evaluations	3
	3.2 Learning and knowledge management	4
IV.	Operationalization of the initial monitoring and evaluation system	5
V.	Initial results management framework for the Readiness and Preparatory Support Programme of the GCF	5
	Annex I: Draft decision of the Board	6
	Annex II: Mitigation and Adaptation Performance Measurement Frameworks	7
	Annex III: Proposed Refinements to the Mitigation and Adaptation Performance Measurement Frameworks	17
	Annex IV: Initial evaluation policy	29
	Annex V: Initial Results Management Framework for the Readiness and Preparatory Support Programme of the GCF	32
	Annex VI: List of consulted institutions	33

I. Introduction

1. This document provides information and updates in response to the request from the Board of the GCF, in decision B.08/07 (para. (b)), that the Secretariat further develop the indicators marked as “noted, but further refinement needed” in the performance measurement frameworks (PMFs). The PMFs measure the performance of GCF-funded climate mitigation and adaptation projects and programmes and are integral parts of the initial results management framework (RMF) of the GCF (decisions B.07/04 and B.08/07). In particular, the PMFs include the indicators against which the results envisaged in the RMF are measured.
2. In the same decision (B.08/07), the Board affirmed two key features of the monitoring and evaluation framework of the GCF: (i) national, economic and sector-wide indicators will be used only at the discretion of the recipient countries (decision B.08/07, para. (e)); and (ii) the GCF is a continuous learning institution that should remain flexible, and refine its PMFs and indicators over time (decision B.08/07, para. (g)).
3. In addition, the Secretariat has taken into account the report of the Adaptation Committee to the twentieth session of the Conference of the Parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) and the related UNFCCC decision,¹ which specifically recommended the GCF to:
 - (a) Keep the indicators simple;
 - (b) Design indicators that are qualitative as well as quantitative;
 - (c) Design indicators in such a way as to capture the progress that countries are able to make in integrating adaptation into their development and sectoral planning, policies and actions; and
 - (d) Give countries sufficient flexibility to define their indicators in line with their national and local planning, strategies and priorities.
4. In complement, the Secretariat consulted experts from other climate funds under the UNFCCC, international organizations including climate finance institutions, academia, think tanks, and subject-matter experts in both developed and developing countries to obtain feedback in relevant areas of expertise. The list of the consulted institutions is provided in annex VI to this document.
5. This document takes into account the monitoring and accountability framework (MAF) adopted by the Board at its eleventh meeting.² Furthermore, it provides an initial evaluation policy for the GCF and proposes an initial RMF for the Readiness and Preparatory Support Programme.

II. Refinement of indicators in the mitigation and adaptation performance management frameworks

2.1.1 Indicators

6. The mitigation and adaptation PMFs contain the core indicators and performance indicators for the results of the GCF adopted by the Board at its seventh meeting.³ The PMFs

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

² Decision B.11/10, paragraph (a).

³ Decision B.07/04, paragraph (b).

outline reporting responsibilities of the accredited entities (AEs) and include explanations of the indicators, and other relevant background and methodological information, as needed.

7. Annex II to this document provides a proposed revised version of the mitigation and adaptation PMFs. Annex III provides information on the proposed refinements to the PMFs compared with the version reported to the eighth meeting of the Board.⁴
8. The Secretariat will develop PMF guidelines to support the AEs in the monitoring, reporting and evaluation process. The guidelines should include the following:
 - (a) methodologies for baseline information collection and analysis;
 - (b) methodologies for project-related data collection and analysis;
 - (c) roles, responsibilities and timelines; and
 - (d) other key guidance, such as assessing pertinent improvements of individual indicators, among others.
9. Since the indicators are disaggregated by gender, where possible, the monitoring and evaluation guidelines will reflect the guidance of the gender policy and gender action plan of the GCF.⁵ Gender disaggregation is also required for any additional specific project/programme indicators that can be gender disaggregated.

2.1.2 Reporting process

10. Based on decision B.08/07, the core indicators of the GCF will be measured for all projects/programmes for each type of intervention (adaptation, mitigation, cross-cutting). The other indicators adopted by the Board shall be reported on accordingly to the relevant result(s) of the GCF to which the specific project/programme contributes.
11. At the project and programme levels, participatory approaches for the monitoring and reporting of the project/programme indicators are encouraged, especially for those projects/programmes focused on community-based mitigation and adaptation interventions.
12. Based on decision B.11/10, the AEs of the GCF will submit annual performance reports (APRs) to report on the progress made towards the targets of the PMF indicators and any additionally identified project-/programme-level indicators. The APRs will also contain a narrative with updates on the progress of each output and outcome envisaged at the project/programme level. The APRs will include an update on the status of the achievement of the investment criteria. The Secretariat will develop guidelines to support the preparation of the APRs.
13. As requested by the MAF,⁶ the Secretariat will produce an annual portfolio performance report (PPR) on the status of GCF-funded projects and programmes that were under implementation at the end of the previous calendar year. The PPRs will analyse qualitative and quantitative information received from the AEs through the APRs and other sources of information (e.g. interim evaluations).
14. The PPRs will also include GCF-level indicators that can be aggregated through dashboards/scorecards which will be regularly updated and reviewed. Standard reports will be produced based on the APRs, PPRs and GCF-level dashboards, and published on the GCF website.

⁴ Annex VIII to decision B.08/07 (annex VIII to document GCF/B.08/45).

⁵ Annexes XIII and XIV to decision B.09/11 (annexes XIII and XIV to document GCF/B.09/23).

⁶ Decision B.11/10, annex I, paragraph 14.

15. Following the adoption of the PMFs by the Board, the Secretariat will develop methodologies to measure the indicators as detailed in section IV below.
16. The Readiness and Preparatory Support Programme will provide support for relevant monitoring and evaluation training to direct access AEs and national designated authorities (NDAs)/focal points.

III. Initial evaluation policy

17. Paragraph 23(j) of the Governing Instrument for the GCF entrusts the Secretariat with the responsibility of carrying out monitoring and evaluation.⁷
18. The objective of evaluations is to provide evidence and lessons learned from the implementation of projects and programmes, make recommendations, and improve the design and impacts of climate projects.
19. The MAF defines the overall role of the Secretariat, the accountability units, AEs, NDAs/focal points and local partners in evaluations.⁸ Notably, the MAF requires AEs to undertake interim and final evaluations of all projects/programmes,⁹ including an assessment of progress made towards the GCF investment criteria, intended results, and targets.
20. All evaluations will be guided by the following principles:
 - (a) independence and impartiality;
 - (b) transparency;
 - (c) participation of all the relevant stakeholders (first and foremost, communities and women);
 - (d) respect for the beliefs, culture and customs of the beneficiaries; and (e) credibility.
21. The standards, criteria, and specific roles and responsibilities for the different types of evaluations will be defined in the evaluation guidelines to be developed by the Secretariat.

3.1 Types of evaluations

3.1.2 Project-/programme-level evaluation

22. Interim evaluations will take stock of whether and how the project/programme implementation has performed against the agreed outcomes and investment criteria. At least one mid-term evaluation will be undertaken for each project and programme. Interim/mid-term evaluations will highlight any concerns or risks that require the attention of the AE and the GCF. In addition, the evaluations should recommend corrective actions to ensure that the climate results are delivered as expected.
23. The objective of the final evaluations is to learn lessons and apply those lessons in order to upscale and replicate successful projects/programmes. The final evaluations will examine the overall performance of the projects/programmes against the investment criteria and other evaluation criteria that will be defined in the evaluation guidelines.

⁷ Governing Instrument, paragraphs 3, 23(j) and 57–62.

⁸ Decision B.11/10.

⁹ Decision B.11/10, annex I, paragraph 11(b).

24. The Secretariat may provide technical support to AEs, in particular direct access AEs, for the design and implementation of their project-/programme-level evaluations.
25. Project-/programme-level evaluation reports will be submitted by AEs to the Secretariat, which will analyse these reports to inform the annual PPRs. The evaluation findings could also be used to identify the projects/programmes that will be subject to ad hoc checks.¹⁰
26. The Secretariat may carry out ex-post evaluations on a sample of projects/programmes to assess the achievement of the intended climate impacts, their sustainability and the potential for scalability and replication. The ex-post evaluation sample could be determined based on the type of intervention, the level of environmental and social risk, and the results/recommendations that emerge from the project/programme final evaluation reports.

3.1.3 Country portfolio, thematic- and GCF-level evaluation

27. Higher-level evaluations, such as GCF-level, thematic-level, and country portfolio level evaluations, and impact evaluations, will play a key role in assessing the effectiveness of the GCF in achieving long-term climate results and paradigm shifts towards low-carbon and climate-resilient development.
28. Country portfolio level evaluations will be conducted to improve the impact of GCF financing in relation to country-specific climate goals, and to enhance national climate policies and public and private climate investments. They will target the climate results and related sustainability achieved by a set of completed and ongoing projects/programmes at the country level. The selection of countries for this type of evaluation will be determined taking into consideration the number of GCF investments in a given country, the distribution of sectors, and other relevant factors.
29. Thematic-level evaluations will be conducted to improve the design of future climate projects/programmes in key climate sectors. Thematic-level evaluations will concern a sample of projects/programmes supported by the GCF in a particular sector or GCF result area. The selection of the sample will consider those projects/programmes where there is a high probability of learning relevant insights for the development of future projects.
30. GCF-level evaluations will be managed by the independent Evaluation Unit. The purpose of this type of evaluation is to learn lessons that can help to improve the financing efficiency and effectiveness of the GCF for future replenishment. They will assess the overall performance of the GCF in achieving climate results, including progress made towards paradigm shifts in mitigation and adaptation, and the climate-related institutional strengthening of GCF partner countries. The release of GCF-level evaluation reports will be synchronized with the replenishment cycle of the GCF.

3.2 Learning and knowledge management

31. The Secretariat will ensure that findings and lessons learned through the monitoring and evaluation exercises described above are captured by a GCF-wide knowledge management system, including its portfolio management system,¹¹ and shared with relevant stakeholders to support continuous learning and improve performance.

¹⁰ The sample could also be determined based on the type of intervention, the level of environmental and social risk, and the results/recommendations that emerge from the project/programme final evaluation reports as detailed in decision B.11/10, annex I, section III.

¹¹ The portfolio management system is one of the key deliverables of tools envisaged to be developed through the operationalization of the MAF (decision B.11/10, annex I, para. 36(a)).

32. As envisaged by the MAF, an online platform will be developed on the GCF website. The platform will contain a dynamic database/content management system where targeted users (both experts and non-experts) will be able to find evaluation reports, as well as both specialized and non-technical knowledge products and relevant GCF materials.

IV. Operationalization of the initial monitoring and evaluation system

33. The following tools should be developed for operationalizing the initial monitoring and evaluation system of the GCF:

- (b) Guidelines on monitoring and reporting, including methodologies for data collection and guidelines for reporting on PMF indicators; additional details on other reporting requirements (e.g. APRs); and a monitoring and reporting toolkit;
- (c) A monitoring and evaluation training package to build the results-management capacity of direct access entities, NDAs/focal points and local stakeholders (communities, civil society organizations, women's groups, etc.) through national/regional workshops and e-learning tools; and
- (d) Evaluation guidelines that define the standards, criteria, roles and responsibilities for project/programme evaluations, ex-post evaluations and higher-level evaluations (e.g. country-, regional-, thematic- and GCF-level).

34. The Secretariat will also review its RMF, possibly by the end of 2018, and seek the Board's view on possible improvements, as needed.

V. Initial results management framework for the Readiness and Preparatory Support Programme of the GCF

35. The Governing Instrument¹² mandates that the GCF shall support countries through readiness activities in order to build the capacity of their institutions and direct access entities in order to access GCF resources based on strategies and country pipelines of projects and programmes.

36. Decision B.08/11, paragraph (i), specifies four indicative activities and their envisaged outcomes for the Readiness and Preparatory Support Programme.

37. To appropriately assess the impact and measure the overall results that the Readiness and Preparatory Support Programme intends to achieve, an initial RMF for the Readiness and Preparatory Support Programme is presented in annex V to this document.

38. The initial RMF for the Readiness and Preparatory Support Programme is consistent with the overall initial RMF of the GCF and its PMFs. In particular, it is aligned with result 5¹³ of the GCF mitigation and adaptation RMF.

¹² Governing Instrument, paragraph 40.

¹³ Result 5 for mitigation is "Strengthened institutional and regulatory systems for low-emission planning and development", and for adaptation it is "Strengthened institutional and regulatory systems for climate-responsive planning and development" (annex VIII to document GCF/B.08/45).

Annex I: Draft decision of the Board

The Board, having considered document GCF/B.12/20 titled “Further development of indicators in the performance measurement frameworks”:

- (a) Adopts the mitigation and adaptation performance measurement frameworks as set out in annex II;
- (b) Requests the Secretariat to develop the methodologies related to the indicators of the mitigation and adaptation performance measurement frameworks;
- (c) Also requests the Secretariat to develop the necessary monitoring, reporting and evaluation training modules and products so as to build the capacity of accredited entities and national designated authorities/focal points;
- (d) Adopts the initial evaluation policy as set out in annex IV; and
- (e) Also adopts the initial results management framework and its logic model for the Readiness and Preparatory Support Programme of the GCF as set out in annex V.

Annex II: Mitigation and Adaptation Performance Measurement Frameworks

1. The mitigation and adaptation PMFs contain the core indicators and performance indicators for the Fund's results adopted by the Board at its seventh meeting.¹ The PMFs outline reporting responsibilities and include explanations on the indicators, and other relevant background and methodological information as needed.
2. Since the indicators are disaggregated by gender, where possible, the monitoring and evaluation guidelines will reflect the guidance of the Gender policy and Gender action plan of the GCF.² Gender disaggregation is also required for any additional specific project/programme indicators that can be gender disaggregated.
3. Based on decision B.08/07, the core indicators of the GCF will be measured for all projects/programmes for each type of intervention (adaptation, mitigation, cross-cutting). The other indicators adopted by the Board shall be reported on accordingly to the relevant Fund's result(s) the specific project/programme contribute to.
4. At project and programme levels, participatory approaches to the monitoring and reporting of the project/programme indicators are encouraged, especially for projects/programmes focused on community-based mitigation and adaptation interventions.
5. Based on decision B.11/10, the accredited entities (AEs) of the Fund will submit annual performance reports (APRs) to report on progress towards targets on the PMFs indicators and any additionally identified project/programme-level indicators.
6. On the basis of the APRs and project/programme level evaluation reports, the Secretariat will produce once a year, a Portfolio Performance Report (PPR) of the status of the projects and programmes that were under implementation as of the end of previous calendar year.
7. The following acronym are used for rapidly classifying the indicators: "PSM /PSA" (Paradigm Shift indicators for Mitigation or Adaptation), * (core indicators), MCrC/ACrC (cross-cutting indicators for Mitigation or Adaptation) and M/A (to indicate if the indicator concern Mitigation or Adaptation).

1.1 Mitigation performance measurement framework

= Decided

= Noted, but further refinement needed

Expected result	Indicator * = Core	Reporting responsibility (annual reporting)	Notes
<i>Paradigm-shift Objective</i>			
Shift to low-emission sustainable	<input type="checkbox"/> PSM Degree to which the Fund is contributing to low-emission sustainable	Secretariat/Ac credited Entities (AEs)	Based on analysis from the aggregation of the PMF indicators, APRs information, and project/programme evaluations. To be measured at the end of each GCF

¹ Decision B.07/04 paragraph (b).

² Annexes XIII and XIV to decision B.09/11 (annexes XIII and XIV to document GCF/B.09/23).

Expected result	Indicator * = Core	Reporting responsibility (annual reporting)	Notes
development pathways	development		replenishment cycle.
<i>Fund-level Impacts</i>			
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> *Tonnes of carbon dioxide equivalent (t CO ₂ eq) reduced	AEs	Aggregate summation of sector-specific t CO ₂ eq reduction indicators. Intended to be estimated ex-ante and calculated ex-post; reported annually.
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> *Cost per t CO ₂ eq decreased for all Fund-funded mitigation projects/programmes	AEs	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 and other material considerations.
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> *Volume of finance leveraged by Fund funding	AEs	“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.
	<input type="checkbox"/> MCrC1.Co-benefits of mitigation actions		Co-benefits related to social, economic, and environmental co-benefits associated with GHG reductions/low-emissions development pathways and sustainable development.
1.0 Reduced emissions through increased low-emission energy access and power generation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> M1.1 *Tonnes of carbon dioxide equivalent (t CO ₂ eq) reduced or avoided from gender-sensitive energy access and power generation	AEs	Methodologies likely to determine three sub-indicators: (i) on energy efficiency (ii) low-emission power (iii) energy access. Sex - disaggregation data and qualitative narratives related to gender to be collected where feasible:
2.0 Reduced emissions through increased access to low-emission transport	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> M2.1 *Tonnes of carbon dioxide equivalent (t CO ₂ eq) reduced or avoided from low emission, gender-sensitive transport	AEs	Disaggregated by gender where feasible.

Expected result	Indicator * = Core	Reporting responsibility (annual reporting)	Notes
<p>3.0 Reduced emissions from buildings, cities, industries and appliances</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> M3.1 *Tonnes of carbon dioxide equivalent (t CO₂eq) reduced or avoided – <i>buildings, cities, industries, and appliances</i></p>	<p>AEs</p>	<p>Sub-indicators can be identified (in the methodologies) for each sector (i) buildings/energy efficiency (ii) cities, (iii) industries and (iv) appliances.</p> <p>Gender disaggregation and other possible gender-relevant reporting to be included for each sector where feasible.</p>
<p>4.0 Reduced emissions from land use, deforestation, forest degradation, and through sustainable management of forests and conservation and enhancement of forest carbon stocks</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> M4.1 Tonnes of carbon dioxide equivalent (t CO₂eq) reduced or avoided and/or GHG removals by sinks (including increased removals) – from REDD+ and other land use activities</p>	<p>AEs</p>	<p>Estimations shall seek consistency with information on the results of REDD+ activities published in the Lima REDD+ Information Hub on the REDD+ Web Platform (UNFCCC decision 9/CP.19³)</p> <p>Methodologies to be developed in relation to by 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+. Gender disaggregation is to be researched and included if possible.</p>
<i>Outcomes</i>			
<p>Cross-cutting</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> MGrC2 Number of technologies and innovative solutions (including gender – friendly technologies and solutions) transferred or licensed to support low-emission development</p>	<p>AEs</p>	<p>This indicator may include number of technology transfer licenses, number of facilities created to produce local technologies, and/or projects/programmes that include transfer of technology and innovative solutions that support low-emission pathways.</p>
<p>5.0 Strengthened institutional and regulatory systems for low-emission planning and development</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> M5.1 Number of policies, institutions, coordination mechanisms and regulatory frameworks that improve incentives for low-emission planning and</p>	<p>AEs</p>	<p>The indicator language has been updated to allow a quantification of the results achieved and support AEs.</p> <p>The Readiness and Preparatory Support Programme may employ the indicator to measure its country-level results.</p>

³ This decision forms part of the Warsaw Framework for REDD-plus.

Expected result	Indicator * = Core	Reporting responsibility (annual reporting)	Notes
	development and their effective implementation		
6.0 Increased number of small, medium and large low-emission power suppliers	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> M6.1 Proportion of low-emission power supply in a jurisdiction or market.	AEs	Disaggregated by size of supplier. Proportion of low-emission energy sources as percent of total energy consumption in a jurisdiction or market can be a clearer explanation that can be provided in the methodologies.
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> M6.2 Number of households, and individuals (males and females) with improved access to low-emission energy sources	AEs	Disaggregated by males and females. Disaggregated by urban and rural. Assumes that it will typically 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.
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> M6.3 MWs of low-emission energy capacity installed, generated and/or rehabilitated	AEs	
7.0 Lower energy intensity of buildings, cities, industries, and appliances	<input type="checkbox"/> M7.1(a) tCO ₂ eq emissions reduced or avoided due to improvements in building design and energy efficiency <input type="checkbox"/> M7.1(b) tCO ₂ eq emissions reduced or avoided as a result of investments in climate-smart cities <input type="checkbox"/> M7.1(c) tCO ₂ eq emissions reduced or avoided as a result of investments in lower-emission industry <input type="checkbox"/> M7.1(d) tCO ₂ eq emissions reduced or avoided as a result of investments in energy-efficient appliances	AEs	Intensity to be measured as a ratio of energy consumption to sector-specific production compared to baseline. Can be identified for each sector: (i) energy efficiency in buildings, (ii) cities (iii) industries and (iv) appliances. Disaggregated by sex/gender (e.g. female – headed households, women led SMEs)
8.0 Increased use of low-carbon transport	<input type="checkbox"/> M8.1 Increased female and male passengers trips and	AEs	Disaggregated by gender. Freight is included because it comprises

Expected result	Indicator * = Core	Reporting responsibility (annual reporting)	Notes
	freight using low-carbon transport		nearly half of all transport-related GHG emissions. “Increase” reflects mode-shifts for passengers (rather than total number of passengers), covering shifts from baseline use of several other modes of higher-emission transport (e.g., buses, cars, trains, 2-3 wheelers) to lower-emission transport (e.g. buses, trains, bikes, pedestrian).
	<input type="checkbox"/> M8.2 Increased fuel economy and decreased carbon intensity for passenger and freight vehicles	AEs	This indicator reflects changes in the overall fuel economy and carbon intensity of vehicle fleets by vehicle class and fuel source (e.g., ethanol, electric) for passenger vehicles (public/private) and freight.
9.0 Improved management of land or forest areas contributing to emissions reductions	<input type="checkbox"/> M9.1 Hectares of land or forests areas under sustainable management or improved protection and management leading to reduced GHG emissions and/or enhancement of carbon stocks	AEs	Informed by work on Fund’s REDD+ performance measurement framework, Forest Carbon Partnership Facility Monitoring and Evaluation Framework, UN REDD, and UNFCCC guidance.
<i>Project/Programme Outcomes/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.]		

Proposed refined adaptation performance measurement framework

= Decided

= Noted, but further refinement needed

Expected result	Indicator * = Core	Reporting responsibility (annual reporting)	Notes
<i>Paradigm-shift Objective</i>			
Increased climate-resilient sustainable development	<input type="checkbox"/> PSA Degree to which the Fund contributes to climate-resilient sustainable development	Secretariat /Accredited Entities (AEs)	Envisioned as a scorecard indicator that reflects an analysis from the aggregation of the PMF indicators, information from APRs, and project/programme evaluations. The scorecard would likely be measured at the end of each GCF replenishment cycle. Elements considered in the scorecard and methods for its assessment to be further developed.
<i>Fund-level Impacts</i>			
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> *Total Number of direct and indirect beneficiaries; Number of beneficiaries relative to total population	AEs	The indicator measures the number of people who have received support, where two dimensions of support are considered: targeted and intensity level. Based on these two dimensions, direct and indirect beneficiaries are identified. Disaggregated by gender. To improve clarity and consistency, it should be specified that the second part of the indicator "Number of beneficiaries relative to total population" can be specified as percentage consider a reformulation along these lines: " <i>Percentage of beneficiaries relative to total population</i> "
1.0 Increased resilience and enhanced livelihoods of the most vulnerable people, communities, and regions	<input type="checkbox"/> A1.1(a) Estimated change in losses of lives (for males and females) due to the impact of climate-related disasters	AEs	Disaggregated by vulnerable groups, and gender, and share of total population. Methodologies to be developed. The indicator is disaggregated in two. One indicator considers the estimated reduction in losses of lives and the other measures the estimated change in economic losses caused by the impact of climate-related disasters. Economic losses will be analyzed in relation to the size of economies.
	<input type="checkbox"/> A1.1(b) Estimated change in losses of economic assets (USD equivalent) due to the impact of extreme events and climate-related disasters.		Sub indicators can be identified (i) for

Expected result	Indicator * = Core	Reporting responsibility (annual reporting)	Notes
			number of lives and US\$) simplifies the analysis and provides more specific information on the impact.
	<input type="checkbox"/> A1.2 Number of individuals and percentage of population (and relative disaggregation of women and men) adopting climate-resilient livelihood options (including fisheries, agriculture, tourism, etc.)	AEs	Disaggregated by gender; to consider equitable sharing of benefits. Methodology to consider relevant sectors (e.g., climate-resilient agriculture, sustainable climate-resilient tourism, fisheries, green jobs, etc.) Indicator includes the possibility of expressing its measurement as percentage of those that are benefiting from diversified livelihoods options over the total number of project beneficiaries (which is already captured by AEs as core indicator).
2.0 Increased resilience of health and well-being, and food and water security	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> A2.1 Number of males and females benefiting from introduced health measures to respond to climate-sensitive diseases	AEs	Disaggregated by health measure, disease Disaggregated by gender
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> A2.2 Number of food-secure households (in areas/periods at risk of climate change impacts)	AEs	Disaggregated by male and female-headed households
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> A2.3 Number of males and females with year-round access to reliable and safe water supply despite climate shocks and stresses	AEs	Disaggregated by gender in relation to domestic, agricultural and industrial sources. Disaggregated by male and female-headed households for domestic sources.
3.0 Increased resilience of infrastructure and the built environment to climate change threats	<input type="checkbox"/> *A3.a Number of physical assets constructed and/or made more resilient to climate variability and change	AEs	Number will be disaggregated by sector, type of asset, action (constructed or strengthened), etc. To cover assets associated with climate-vulnerable sectors, such as tourism.
	<input type="checkbox"/> *3.b Value of physical assets constructed and/or		This indicator is proposed as core indicator for adaptation projects that will deliver resilient infrastructures.

Expected result	Indicator * = Core	Reporting responsibility (annual reporting)	Notes
	made more resilient to climate variability and change		Compared to the previous version, the indicator has been re-formulated as two sub-indicators (both to be reported). This change improves clarity and reporting. Human benefits are not included in this version. Human benefits are complex to value and are mainly assessed in qualitative terms. Human benefits will be captured by evaluations of projects/programmes.
4.0 Improved resilience of ecosystems and ecosystem services	<input type="checkbox"/> A4.1 Extent of ecosystems strengthened, restored and protected from climate variability and change	AEs	Disaggregated by ecosystem type. This indicator has been slightly re-worded to improve clarity.
<i>Outcomes</i>			
Cross-cutting	<input type="checkbox"/> ACrC1 Number of technologies (including gender – friendly technologies) and innovative solutions transferred or licensed to promote climate resilience	AEs	May include number of technology transfer licenses, number of facilities created to produce local technologies, and/or projects/programmes that include transfer of technology and innovative solutions that support climate adaptation and resilience. Disaggregated by type of technologies and innovative solutions
5.0 Strengthened institutional and regulatory systems for climate-responsive planning and development	<input type="checkbox"/> A5.1 Number of gender – friendly policies, institutions, coordination mechanisms and regulatory-frameworks that improve incentives for climate resilience and their effective implementation.	AEs	The indicator measures the institutional, policy, and regulatory systems that improve incentives for climate resilience and are accompanied by evidence of their effective implementation. The evidence may be 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. It has been reformulated to improve its quantification capacity and inclusivity. The Readiness and Preparatory Support Programme may employ the indicator to measure its country-level results.

Expected result	Indicator * = Core	Reporting responsibility (annual reporting)	Notes
<p>6.0 Increased generation and use of climate information in decision-making</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> A6.1 Number of climate information products/services in decision-making in climate-sensitive sectors developed, delivered, and used</p>	<p>AEs</p>	<p>Disaggregated by stakeholder (government, private sector, and general population).</p> <p>This formulation allows a clearer quantification and interpretation of the information required. Project/programme evaluations should complement this indicator and inform (for example through households and/or climate service providers surveys) on the impact on the decision making capacity of institutions and beneficiaries.</p> <p>The indicator will also capture gender – friendly information climate information products/services.</p>
<p>7.0 Strengthened adaptive capacity and reduced exposure to climate risks</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> A7.1 Use by vulnerable households (including number of female beneficiaries), communities, businesses and public-sector services of Fund-supported/developed tools, instruments, strategies, and activities to respond to climate change and variability</p>	<p>AEs</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>Households: disaggregated by male-headed and female-headed</p>
	<p><input type="checkbox"/> A7.2: Number of males and females reached by climate-related early warning systems-and other risk reduction measures established/strengthened</p>	<p>AEs</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>Disaggregated by hazard and geographical coverage.</p> <p>Disaggregated by gender.</p> <p>The reformulation of this indicator intended to reflect the recommendations of the Adaptation Committee to GCF for what concern simplifying the indicators so that they are specific and manageable in terms of measurement by different typology of AEs. As the geographic coverage of EWSs is usually a characteristic of the system (therefore already defined by the proposal) the</p>

Expected result	Indicator * = Core	Reporting responsibility (annual reporting)	Notes
			number of people reached is the most important element that should be captured.
8.0 Strengthened awareness of climate threats and risk-reduction processes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> A8.1: Number of males and females made aware of climate threats and related appropriate responses	AEs	Disaggregated by gender.
<i>Project/Programme Outcomes/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: Proposed Refinements to the Mitigation and Adaptation Performance Measurement Frameworks

1. The below tables indicates the refinements to the indicators in the mitigation and adaptation PMFs where the previous versions identified these indicators as “noted, but further refinement needed”¹.
2. To allow comparison to the adopted version², added language is underscored. Deleted text is strikethrough.
3. Few minor editorial corrections have been proposed for the decided indicators based on the feedback received from experts and AEs. This is only meant for improved language clarity. Among the edits proposed, there are the following:
 - (a) The numbering of the indicators has been updated.
 - (b) The wording “*as a result of project/programmes*” has been removed from some indicators. This is for a more concise definition and in consideration that technical guidance for attribution will be addressed in the indicator methodologies.
 - (c) Concerning the mitigation indicators that adopt the same unit of measure of the core indicator “Tonnes of carbon dioxide equivalent (t CO₂eq) reduced” it is proposed to eliminate the word “subindicator”, since these indicators are considered individual indicators rather than “sub indicators”.
4. The “reporting responsibility” and “notes” columns have been updated as necessary.

1.1 Proposed refined mitigation performance measurement framework

Table 2.1: Mitigation performance measurement framework

= Decided

= Noted, but further refinement needed

Expected result	Indicator * = Core	Reporting responsibility (annual reporting)	Notes ³
<i>Paradigm-shift Objective</i>			
Shift to low-emission sustainable development pathways	<input type="checkbox"/> PSM⁴ Degree to which the Fund is <u>contributing to</u> is achieving low-emission sustainable development impacts	Secretariat/ <u>A</u> <u>cc</u> credited <u>E</u> ntities (AEs)	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

¹ The previously adopted version of the mitigation and adaptation performance measurement frameworks is reported at page 71, in Annex VIII, of the Board document GCF/B.08/45 (Decisions of the Board – Eighth Meeting of the Board).

² Decision B.08/07 (b) at the October 2014 meeting of the Board,

³ Notes are provided by the Secretariat for information only.

⁴ For practical categorization purposes, a new re-numbering of the indicators is proposed.

Expected result	Indicator * = Core	Reporting responsibility (annual reporting)	Notes ³
			<p>are achieved, extent to which the enabling environment is created or enhanced, and extent to which the regulatory framework and policies are strengthened.</p> <p>Based on analysis from the aggregation of the PMF indicators, APRs information, and project/programme evaluations. To be measured at the end of each GCF replenishment cycle.</p>
<i>Fund-level Impacts</i>			
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> * Tonnes of carbon dioxide equivalent (t CO₂eq) reduced as a result of Fund-funded projects/programmes	Implementing entities (IEs)/ AEs/ intermediaries	<p>Aggregate summation of sector-specific t CO₂eq reduction indicators. Intended to be estimated ex-ante and <u>calculated ex-post</u>; reported annually.</p> <p>Methodologies tailored to each sector — see specifics below.</p>
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> *Cost per t CO₂eq decreased for all Fund-funded mitigation projects/programmes	IEs/AEs/ intermediaries	<p>Intended to help understand anticipated costs (ex-ante) as well as trends in reducing costs of mitigation over time. Costs per t CO₂eq reduced are expected to vary based on sector, technology, programme/project context, time scale, risk, etc and other material considerations.</p>
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> *Volume of finance leveraged by Fund funding	IEs/AEs/ intermediaries	<p>“Leveraged” considered synonymous with the term “mobilized” (used by other funds). Informed by CIF, International Finance Corporation (IFC), and others.</p> <p>Calculations to be disaggregated by public and private sources; prorated by amount of co-financing.</p>
	<input type="checkbox"/> MCrC1 Social, environmental, economic co-benefit index/indicator at impact level <u>Co-benefits of mitigation actions</u>		<p>Co-benefit indicator related to GHG reductions/low emissions development pathways and sustainable development.</p> <p>Specifics to be determined</p> <p><u>Co-benefits related to social, economic, and environmental co-benefits associated with GHG reductions/low-emissions development pathways and sustainable development.</u></p>
1.0 Reduced emissions through increased low-emission energy access and power generation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1.1M1.1 *Tonnes of carbon dioxide equivalent (t CO ₂ eq) reduced or avoided as a result of Fund-funded projects/programme + from gender-sensitive energy access and power generation (sub-indicator)^	IEs/AEs/ intermediaries	<p><i>Energy access:</i></p> <p>—Based on gender-sensitive methodologies used by CIF’s Program for Scaling Up Renewable Energy in Low Income Countries (SREP) core indicator 2.</p> <p>Disaggregated by gender.</p> <p><i>Power generation:</i></p> <p>Methods to be informed by the international financial institutions’ (IFIs) GHG accounting harmonization work on energy efficiency and renewable energy; where feasible, gender-disaggregated data to be collected. Can also consider the Fund’s 2013 energy efficiency guidelines.</p>

Expected result	Indicator * = Core	Reporting responsibility (annual reporting)	Notes ³
			<p><u>Methodologies likely to determine three sub-indicators: (i) on energy efficiency (ii) low-emission power (iii) energy access.</u></p> <p><u>Sex - disaggregation data and qualitative narratives related to gender to be collected where feasible:</u></p>
<p>2.0 Reduced emissions through increased access to low-emission transport</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 2.1M2.1 *Tonnes of carbon dioxide equivalent (t CO₂eq) reduced or avoided as a result of Fund-funded projects/programme + from low emission, gender-sensitive transport (sub-indicator)[^]</p>	<p>IES/AEs/intermediaries</p>	<p><i>Public transport:</i> Specifics to be informed by IFI GHG accounting harmonization; GEF's 2013 transportation project GHG calculation methodology developed by the Institute for Transportation Development Policy (ITDP)</p> <p><i>Vehicle fuels (fuel economy standards):</i> –[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.</p> <p>Disaggregated by gender where feasible.</p>
<p>3.0 Reduced emissions from buildings, cities, industries and appliances</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 3.1M3.1 *Tonnes of carbon dioxide equivalent (t CO₂eq) reduced or avoided as a result of Fund-funded projects/programme + – buildings, cities, industries, and appliances sub-indicator[^]</p>	<p>IES/AEs/intermediaries</p>	<p><i>Buildings:</i> Informed by 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.</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> <p><u>Sub-indicators can be identified (in the methodologies) for each sector (i) buildings/energy efficiency (ii) cities, (iii) industries and (iv) appliances.</u></p> <p><u>Gender disaggregation and other possible gender-relevant reporting to be included for each sector where feasible.</u></p>
<p>4.0 Reduced emissions from land use, deforestation, forest degradation, and through sustainable management of forests and conservation and enhancement</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> 4.1M4.1 Tonnes of carbon dioxide equivalent (t CO₂eq) reduced or avoided and/or GHG removals by sinks (including increased removals) as a result of Fund-funded projects/programme + – forest and land-use sub-indicator[^] from REDD+ and</p>	<p>IES/AEs/intermediaries</p>	<p><u>Estimations shall seek consistency with information on the results of REDD+ activities published in the Lima REDD+ Information Hub on the REDD+ Web Platform (UNFCCC decision 9/CP.19⁵)</u></p> <p><u>Methodologies to be developed in relation to 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</u></p>

⁵ This decision forms part of the Warsaw Framework for REDD-plus.

Expected result	Indicator * = Core	Reporting responsibility (annual reporting)	Notes ³
of forest carbon stocks	<u>other land use activities</u>		Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) guidance on REDD+. Gender disaggregation is to be researched and included if possible.
<i>Project/Programme Outcomes⁶</i>			
<u>Cross-cutting</u>	<input type="checkbox"/> MCrC2 Number of technologies and innovative solutions (including gender – friendly technologies and solutions) transferred or licensed to support low-emission development as a result of Fund support. ⁺	IES/AEs/ intermediaries	This indicator may might include number of technology transfer licenses, number of facilities created to produce local technologies, and/or projects/programmes that include transfer of technology and innovative solutions that support low-emission pathways.
5.0 Strengthened institutional and regulatory systems for low-emission planning and development	<input type="checkbox"/> 5.1M5.1 Number of <u>effective policies, institutions, coordination mechanisms</u> and regulatory systems <u>frameworks</u> that improve incentives for low-emission planning and development and their effective implementation	IES/AEs/ intermediaries	<p>Details on this indicator are to be <u>determined in the methodologies</u>. Although this can be informed by GEF Indicator 5, the World Bank's RISE (Readiness for Investment in Sustainable Energy) work, and Bloomberg New Energy Finance (BNEF) Climatesope work, consideration will be made to avoid country and sector-level requirements for this indicator. 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.</p> <p><u>The indicator language has been updated to allow a quantification of the results achieved and support AEs.</u></p> <p><u>The Readiness and Preparatory Support Programme may employ the indicator to measure its country-level results.</u></p>
	<input type="checkbox"/> 5.2 Number and level of effective <u>coordination mechanisms</u>	IES/AEs/ intermediaries	<p>Seeks to measure evidence of measures taken for promoting coordination and synergy at the regional and international levels, including between and among relevant agencies and with regard to other multilateral environmental agreements.</p> <p><u>The revised version of the previous indicator (M11) includes coordination mechanisms. Therefore this indicator is now redundant.</u></p>
6.0 Increased number of small, medium	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 6.1M6.1 Proportion of low-emission power	IES/AEs/ intermediaries	To be determined by recipient countries. Disaggregated by size of supplier.

⁶ Based on the feedback received by some AEs and results-management experts consulted during the refinement of the indicators in the PMFs, we propose this slight language change to improve clarity on the fact these are the outcomes related to GCF results-management framework.

Expected result	Indicator * = Core	Reporting responsibility (annual reporting)	Notes ³
and large low-emission power suppliers	supply in a jurisdiction or market.		<u>Proportion of low-emission energy sources as percent of total energy consumption in a jurisdiction or market can be a clearer explanation that can be provided in the methodologies.</u>
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> M6.2 Number of households, and individuals (males and females) with improved access to low-emission energy sources	IEs/AEs/intermediaries	Informed by CIF SREP 2. Disaggregated by males and females. Disaggregated by urban and rural. To be informed by SE4ALL. Assumes that it will typically 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.
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> M6.3 MWs of low-emission energy capacity installed, generated and/or rehabilitated as a result of GCF support ⁺	IEs/AEs/intermediaries	Informed by CIF CTF and SREP indicators.
7.0 Lower energy intensity of buildings, cities, industries, and appliances	<input type="checkbox"/> 7.1M7.1 Energy intensity improved efficiency of buildings, cities, industries, and appliances as a result of Fund support ⁺ <input type="checkbox"/> 7.1M7.1(a) tCO ₂ eq emissions reduced or avoided due to improvements in building design and energy efficiency <input type="checkbox"/> 7.1M7.1(b) tCO ₂ eq emissions reduced or avoided as a result of investments in climate-smart cities <input type="checkbox"/> 7.1M7.1(c) tCO ₂ eq emissions reduced or avoided as a result of investments in lower-emission industry <input type="checkbox"/> 7.1M7.1(d) tCO ₂ eq emissions reduced or avoided as a result of investments in energy-efficient appliances	IEs/AEs/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. <u>Intensity to be measured as a ratio of energy consumption to sector-specific production compared to baseline.</u> <u>Can be identified for each sector: (i) energy efficiency in buildings, (ii) cities (iii) industries and (iv) appliances.</u> <u>Disaggregated by sex/gender (e.g. female-headed households, women led SMEs)</u>
	<input type="checkbox"/> 8.1M8.1 Number	IEs/AEs/	Informed by CIF CTF indicator 4, pending

Expected result	Indicator * = Core	Reporting responsibility (annual reporting)	Notes ³
<p>8.0 Increased use of low-carbon transport</p>	<p>of additional <u>Increased female and male passengers trips and freight using low-carbon transport as a result of Fund support.</u>⁺</p>	<p>intermediaries</p>	<p>work by MDBs and IFIs on transport GHG accounting harmonization. Additional passengers – mode shift To consider underlying reasons for mode shift, such as transit-oriented development.</p> <p>Disaggregated by gender.</p> <p><u>Freight is included because it comprises nearly half of all transport-related GHG emissions. “Increase” reflects mode-shifts for passengers (rather than total number of passengers), covering shifts from baseline use of several other modes of higher-emission transport (e.g., buses, cars, trains, 2-3 wheelers) to lower-emission transport (e.g. buses, trains, bikes, pedestrian).</u></p>
	<p><input type="checkbox"/> 8.2M8.2 <u>Increased fuel economy and decreased carbon intensity for passenger and freight vehicles</u> Vehicle fuel economy and energy source as a result of Fund support.⁺</p>	<p>IEs/AEs/intermediaries</p>	<p>Trends in fuel economy by vehicle class (commercial and passenger plus subclasses by heavy/light duty, weight, etc.) and energy source (e.g. hybrid and all-electric vehicles)</p> <p>Focuses on vehicles in the private, commercial and government fleets (not public transport or non-motorized transport options). Details of methodology to be determined: may be by average fuel economy by vehicle class.</p> <p>Informed by work of the International Energy Agency, the International Council on Clean Transportation, and others</p> <p><u>This indicator reflects changes in the overall fuel economy and carbon intensity of vehicle fleets by vehicle class and fuel source (e.g., ethanol, electric) for passenger vehicles (public/private) and freight.</u></p>
<p>9.0 Improved management of land or forest areas contributing to emissions reductions</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> 9.1M9.1 Hectares of land or forests <u>areas under verified sustainable management or improved protection and effective management that contributes to CO₂ emission reductions leading to reduced GHG emissions and/or enhancement of carbon stocks</u></p>	<p>IEs/AEs/intermediaries</p>	<p>Informed by work on Fund’s REDD+ performance measurement 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.</p>
<p>Project/Programme</p>	<p>[Defined for each project/programme on a case-by-case basis.]</p>		

Expected result	Indicator * = Core	Reporting responsibility (annual reporting)	Notes ³
<i>Outcomes/Outputs²</i>			
<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.]		

2.2 Proposed refined adaptation performance measurement framework

Table 2.2: Adaptation performance measurement framework

= Decided

= Noted, but further refinement needed

Expected result	Indicator * = Core	Reporting responsibility (annual reporting)	Notes ¹
<i>Paradigm-shift Objective</i>			
Increased climate-resilient sustainable development	<input type="checkbox"/> PSA Degree to which the Fund is achieving a <u>contributes to climate-resilient sustainable development impact</u>	Secretariat / <u>Accredited Entities (AEs)</u>	<p><u>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.</u></p> <p><u>Envisioned as a scorecard indicator that reflects an analysis from the aggregation of the PMF indicators, information from APRs, and project/programme evaluations. The scorecard would likely be measured at the end of each GCF replenishment cycle. Elements considered in the scorecard and methods for its assessment to be further developed.</u></p>
<i>Fund-level Impacts</i>			
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> *A2 Total Number of direct and indirect beneficiaries; Number of beneficiaries relative to total population	<u>Es/AEs/ intermediaries</u>	The indicator measures the number of people who have received support, where two dimensions of support are considered: targeted and intensity level. Based on these two dimensions, <u>category of direct and indirect beneficiaries are identified.</u>

⁷ As per footnote 14

¹ Notes are provided by the Secretariat for information only.

Expected result	Indicator * = Core	Reporting responsibility (annual reporting)	Notes ¹
			<p>Disaggregated by gender.</p> <p><i>Informed by Adaptation Fund (core-1); CIF PPCR A1.3.</i></p> <p><u>To improve clarity and consistency, it should be specified that the second part of the indicator “Number of beneficiaries relative to total population” can be specified as percentage consider a reformulation along these lines: “Percentage of beneficiaries relative to total population”</u></p>
<p>1.0 Increased resilience and enhanced livelihoods of the most vulnerable people, communities, and regions</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> 1.1A1.1(a) <u>Estimated change in expected losses of lives and economic assets (US\$) (for males and females) due to the impact of extreme climate-related disasters in the geographic area of that can be attributed to the GCF intervention</u></p>	<p>EsAEs/ intermediaries /country</p>	<p>Disaggregated by vulnerable groups, and gender, and share of total population.</p> <p><u>Economic losses will be analysed in relation to the size of economies.</u></p> <p><u>Methodologies to be developed. The indicator is disaggregated in two. One indicator considers the estimated reduction in losses of lives and the other measures the estimated change in economic losses caused by the impact of climate-related disasters.</u></p>
	<p><input type="checkbox"/> A1.1(b) <u>Estimated change in losses of economic assets (USD equivalent) due to the impact of extreme events and climate-related disasters.</u></p>		<p><i>Informed by CIF PPCR A1.2.</i></p> <p><u>Economic losses will be analyzed in relation to the size of economies.</u></p> <p><u>Sub indicators can be identified (i) for number of lives and US\$) simplifies the analysis and provides more specific information on the impact.</u></p>
	<p><input type="checkbox"/> 1.2A1.2 <u>Number of males and females benefiting from the adoption of diversified, Number of individuals and percentage of population (and relative disaggregation of women and men) adopting climate-resilient livelihood options (including fisheries, agriculture, tourism, etc.)</u></p>	<p>EsAEs/ intermediaries</p>	<p>Disaggregated by gender; to consider equitable sharing of benefits.</p> <p>Methodology to consider <u>relevant sectors</u> (e.g., climate-resilient agriculture, sustainable climate-resilient tourism, fisheries, green jobs, etc.)</p>

Expected result	Indicator * = Core	Reporting responsibility (annual reporting)	Notes ¹
			<p><i>Informed by Adaptation Fund 6.1, 6.2; LDCF/SCCF 3.</i></p> <p><u>Indicator includes the possibility of expressing its measurement as percentage of those that are benefiting from diversified livelihoods options over the total number of project beneficiaries (which is already captured by AEs as core indicator).</u></p>
	<input type="checkbox"/> 1.3 Number of Fund-funded projects/programmes that supports effective adaptation to fish stock migration and depletion due to climate change	IEs/AEs/intermediaries	<p>Details to be determined.</p> <p><u>This indicator cannot be reported at the level of the AEs. Nonetheless, on the number of projects/programmes that the Fund is supporting in fisheries/dish stock (and other sector) will be provided by the Secretariat in its annual Portfolio Performance Report (PPR).</u></p>
2.0 Increased resilience of health and well-being, and food and water security	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 2.1A2.1 Number of males and females benefiting from introduced health measures to respond to climate-sensitive diseases	IEs/AEs/intermediaries	<p>Disaggregated by health measure, disease</p> <p>Disaggregated by gender</p> <p><i>Informed by: n/a.</i></p>
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 2.2A2.2 Number of food-secure households (in areas/periods at risk of climate change impacts)	IEs/AEs/intermediaries	<p>Disaggregated by male and female-headed households</p> <p><i>Informed by GIF PPCR A1.1.</i></p>
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 2.3A2.3 Number of males and females with year-round access to reliable and safe water supply despite climate shocks and stresses	IEs/AEs/intermediaries	<p>Disaggregated by gender in relation to domestic, agricultural and industrial sources.</p> <p>Disaggregated by male and female-headed households for domestic sources.</p> <p><i>Informed by GIF PPCR A1.4.</i></p>
3.0 Increased resilience of infrastructure and the built environment to climate change threats	<input type="checkbox"/> 3.1*A3.a Number and value of physical assets constructed and/or made more resilient to climate variability and change considering human benefits (reported where applicable)	IEs/AEs/intermediaries	<p>Number will be disaggregated by sector, type of asset, action (constructed or strengthened), etc.</p> <p><i>Informed by Adaptation Fund (core-3); LDCF/SCCF 2.</i></p> <p>To cover assets associated with climate-vulnerable sectors, such as tourism.</p>
	<input type="checkbox"/> *A3.b Value of physical assets constructed and/or made more resilient to climate variability and change		<p><u>Human benefits are not included in this version. Human benefits are complex to value and are mainly assessed in qualitative terms. Human benefits will be captured by evaluations of projects/programmes.</u></p>

Expected result	Indicator * = Core	Reporting responsibility (annual reporting)	Notes ¹
4.0 Improved resilience of ecosystems and ecosystem services	<input type="checkbox"/> 4.1 A4.1 Coverage/scale Extent of ecosystems protected and strengthened, restored and protected in response to from climate variability and change	IEs/AEs/intermediaries	Disaggregated by ecosystem type. <u>This indicator has been slightly reworded to improve clarity.</u> <u>To examine how impact on people can be captured.</u> <i>Informed by Adaptation Fund (core 4); LDGF/SCGF 2.</i>
	<input type="checkbox"/> 4.2 Value (US\$) of ecosystem services generated or protected in response to climate change	IEs/AEs/intermediaries	<i>Informed by LDGF/SCGF 2.</i> [Based on the feedback received from several experts and financial institutions, measuring this indicator is often impractical due to the high cost and level of technical expertise needed. Rather than be a PMF-level indicator, specific projects/programmes focused on ecosystem services can build an indicator of this type into their individual reporting.]
<i>Project/Programme Outcomes²</i>			
Cross-cutting	<input type="checkbox"/> ACrC1 Number of technologies (including gender – friendly technologies) and innovative solutions transferred or licensed to promote climate resilience as a result of Fund support	IEs/AEs/intermediaries	<u>May</u> might include number of technology transfer licenses, number of facilities created to produce local technologies, and/or projects/programmes that include transfer of technology and innovative solutions that support climate adaptation and resilience. <u>Disaggregated by type of technologies and innovative solutions</u>
5.0 Strengthened institutional and regulatory systems for climate-responsive planning and development	<input type="checkbox"/> 5.1 A5.1 Number of <u>effective gender – friendly policies, institutions, coordination mechanisms</u> institutional and regulatory systems frameworks that improve incentives for climate resilience and their effective implementation.	IEs/AEs/intermediaries /country	The indicator measures the institutional, <u>policy</u> , and regulatory systems that improve incentives for climate resilience and are accompanied by evidence of their effective implementation. The evidence may be 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. <u>It has been reformulated to improve its quantification capacity and inclusivity.</u> <u>The Readiness and Preparatory Support Programme may employ the indicator to measure its country-level results.</u> <i>Informed by Adaptation Fund 7; CIF PPCR A2.1, B2; Adaptation Fund 7.1; LDGF/SCGF 12.</i>
	<input type="checkbox"/> 5.2 Number and level of effective coordination mechanisms	IEs/AEs/intermediaries	Seeks to measure evidence of measures taken for promoting coordination and synergy at the regional and international levels, including between and among

² As per footnote 14.

Expected result	Indicator * = Core	Reporting responsibility (annual reporting)	Notes ¹
			<p>relevant agencies and with regard to other multilateral environmental agreements.</p> <p><u>The revised version of the adaptation indicator A5.1, includes coordination mechanisms. Therefore this indicator would be redundant.</u></p>
<p>6.0 Increased generation and use of climate information in decision-making</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Proposed 6.2A6.1 Use Number of climate information products/services in decision-making in climate-sensitive sectors <u>developed, delivered, and used</u></p>	<p>IEs/AEs/intermediaries</p>	<p>Disaggregated by stakeholder (government, private sector, and general population).</p> <p>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.</p> <p><i>Informed by CIF PPCR B3</i></p> <p><u>This formulation allows a clearer quantification and interpretation of the information required. Project/programme evaluations should complement this indicator and inform (for example through households and/or climate service providers surveys) on the impact on the decision making capacity of institutions and beneficiaries. The indicator will also capture gender – friendly information climate information products/services.</u></p>
<p>7.0 Strengthened adaptive capacity and reduced exposure to climate risks</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Proposed 7.1:A7.1 Use by vulnerable households (<u>including number of female beneficiaries</u>), communities, businesses and public-sector services of Fund-supported/<u>developed</u> tools, instruments, strategies, and activities to respond to climate change and variability</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 7.2A7.2: Number of males and females reached by for total geographic coverage of climate-related early warning systems and other risk reduction measures established/strengthened</p>	<p>IEs/AEs/intermediaries</p> <p>IEs/AEs/intermediaries</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>Households: disaggregated by male-headed and female-headed</p> <p><i>Informed by CIF PPCR B1</i></p> <p>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.</p> <p>Disaggregated by hazard and geographical coverage.</p> <p>Disaggregated by gender.</p> <p><i>Informed by Adaptation Fund Core-2, 1.2 and 1.2.1; LDCF/SCCF 2.3</i></p>

Expected result	Indicator * = Core	Reporting responsibility (annual reporting)	Notes ¹
			<u>The reformulation of this indicator intended to reflect the recommendations of the Adaptation Committee to GCF for what concern simplifying the indicators so that they are specific and manageable in terms of measurement by different typology of AEs. As the geographic coverage of EWSS is usually a characteristic of the system (therefore already defined by the proposal) the number of people reached is the most important element that should be captured.</u>
8.0 Strengthened awareness of climate threats and risk-reduction processes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 8.1A8.1: Number of males and females made aware of climate threats and related appropriate responses	IEs/AEs/ intermediaries	Disaggregated by gender. <i>Informed by Adaptation Fund 3.1, 3.2</i>
<i>Project/Programme Outcomes/Outputs³</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.]		

³ As per footnote 14.

Annex IV: Initial evaluation policy

1. Paragraph 23(j) of the Governing Instrument for the GCF entrusts the Secretariat with the responsibility of carrying out monitoring and evaluation.¹
2. The objective of evaluations is to provide evidence and lessons learned from the implementation of projects and programmes, make recommendations, and improve the design and impacts of climate projects.
3. The MAF defines the overall role of the Secretariat, the accountability units, AEs, NDAs/focal points and local partners in evaluations.² Notably, the MAF requires AEs to undertake interim and final evaluations of all projects/programmes,³ including an assessment of progress made towards the GCF investment criteria, intended results, and targets.
4. All evaluations will be guided by the following principles:
 - (a) independence and impartiality;
 - (b) transparency;
 - (a) participation of all the relevant stakeholders (first and foremost, communities and women);
 - (c) respect for the beliefs, culture and customs of the beneficiaries; and
 - (d) credibility.
5. The standards, criteria, and specific roles and responsibilities for the different types of evaluations will be defined in the evaluation guidelines to be developed by the Secretariat.

I. Types of evaluations

1.1 Project-/programme-level evaluation

6. Interim evaluations will take stock of whether and how the project/programme implementation has performed against the agreed outcomes and investment criteria. At least one mid-term evaluation will be undertaken for each project and programme. Interim/mid-term evaluations will highlight any concerns or risks that require the attention of the AE and the GCF. In addition, the evaluations should recommend corrective actions to ensure that the climate results are delivered as expected.
7. The objective of the final evaluations is to learn lessons and apply those lessons in order to upscale and replicate successful projects/programmes. The final evaluations will examine the overall performance of the projects/programmes against the investment criteria and other evaluation criteria that will be defined in the evaluation guidelines.
8. The Secretariat may provide technical support to AEs, in particular direct access AEs, for the design and implementation of their project-/programme-level evaluations.

¹ Governing Instrument, paragraphs 3, 23(j) and 57–62.

² Decision B.11/10.

³ Decision B.11/10, annex I, paragraph 11(b).

9. Project-/programme-level evaluation reports will be submitted by AEs to the Secretariat, which will analyse these reports to inform the annual PPRs. The evaluation findings could also be used to identify the projects/programmes that will be subject to ad hoc checks.⁴
10. The Secretariat may carry out ex-post evaluations on a sample of projects/programmes to assess the achievement of the intended climate impacts, their sustainability and the potential for scalability and replication. The ex-post evaluation sample could be determined based on the type of intervention, the level of environmental and social risk, and the results/recommendations that emerge from the project/programme final evaluation reports.

1.2 Country portfolio, thematic- and GCF-level evaluation

11. Higher-level evaluations, such as GCF-level, thematic-level, and country portfolio level evaluations, and impact evaluations, will play a key role in assessing the effectiveness of the GCF in achieving long-term climate results and paradigm shifts towards low-carbon and climate-resilient development.
12. Country portfolio level evaluations will be conducted to improve the impact of GCF financing in relation to country-specific climate goals, and to enhance national climate policies and public and private climate investments. They will target the climate results and related sustainability achieved by a set of completed and ongoing projects/programmes at the country level. The selection of countries for this type of evaluation will be determined taking into consideration the number of GCF investments in a given country, the distribution of sectors, and other relevant factors.
13. Thematic-level evaluations will be conducted to improve the design of future climate projects/programmes in key climate sectors. Thematic-level evaluations will concern a sample of projects/programmes supported by the GCF in a particular sector or GCF result area. The selection of the sample will consider those projects/programmes where there is a high probability of learning relevant insights for the development of future projects.
14. GCF-level evaluations will be managed by the independent Evaluation Unit. The purpose of this type of evaluation is to learn lessons that can help to improve the financing efficiency and effectiveness of the GCF for future replenishment. They will assess the overall performance of the GCF in achieving climate results, including progress made towards paradigm shifts in mitigation and adaptation, and the climate-related institutional strengthening of GCF partner countries. The release of GCF-level evaluation reports will be synchronized with the replenishment cycle of the GCF.

1.3 Learning and knowledge management

15. The Secretariat will ensure that findings and lessons learned through the monitoring and evaluation exercises described above are captured by a GCF-wide knowledge management system, including its portfolio management system,⁵ and shared with relevant stakeholders to support continuous learning and improve performance.
16. As envisaged by the MAF, an online platform will be developed on the GCF website. The platform will contain a dynamic database/content management system where targeted users

⁴ The sample could also be determined based on the type of intervention, the level of environmental and social risk, and the results/recommendations that emerge from the project/programme final evaluation reports as detailed in decision B.11/10, annex I, section III.

⁵ The portfolio management system is one of the key deliverables of tools envisaged to be developed through the operationalization of the MAF (decision B.11/10, annex I, para. 36(a)).



(both experts and non-experts) will be able to find evaluation reports, as well as both specialized and non-technical knowledge products and relevant GCF materials.

Annex V: Initial Results Management Framework for the Readiness and Preparatory Support Programme of the GCF

Level	Results			
Paradigm shift	Shift to low-emission sustainable development pathways and climate-resilient sustainable development			
Impacts (GCF level)	Strengthened GCF-related institutional capacities of NDAs/focal points and direct access entities ^a		Developed the GCF pipelines of projects and programmes that build on countries' strategic frameworks	
Project/programme outcomes (national or sub-national)	Strengthened NDA/focal point capacity to undertake GCF-related roles and responsibilities, and engage national stakeholders	Strengthened capacity of direct access entities to meet the accreditation standards of the GCF, and monitoring and accountability framework requirements	Developed strategic framework for engagement with the GCF, including a country programme, built on existing strategies and plans	Developed pipelines of projects and programmes aligned with the objectives and investment framework of the GCF
Programme outputs /activities (national or subnational)	To be determined by NDAs/focal points			

Annex VI: List of consulted institutions

Experts from the following institutions and organizations were consulted in order to refine the indicators in mitigation and adaptation performance measurement frameworks:

- ✓ Climate Action Reserve
- ✓ Climate Analytics
- ✓ Climate Investment Funds
- ✓ Conservation International
- ✓ UK Department for International Development
- ✓ Deutsches Institut für Entwicklungspolitik
- ✓ Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit
- ✓ EcoFor
- ✓ European Bank for Reconstruction and Development
- ✓ European Environment Agency
- ✓ Global Environment Facility
- ✓ Global Green Growth Institute Ethiopia
- ✓ Greenhouse Gas Management Institute
- ✓ Heinrich Böll Foundation/ Heinrich Böll Stiftung North America
- ✓ International Financial Institution Harmonization Working Group for Green House Gasses methodologies¹
- ✓ Inter-American Development Bank
- ✓ International Climate Initiative - Government of Germany
- ✓ International Energy Agency
- ✓ International Finance Corporation
- ✓ International Institute for Environment and Development
- ✓ International Renewable Energy Agency
- ✓ International Union for Conservation of Nature
- ✓ London School of Economics
- ✓ Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
- ✓ Partnership on Sustainable, Low Carbon Transport
- ✓ Renewable Energy and Energy Efficiency Partnership
- ✓ Stockholm Environment Institute / Stockholm Environment Institute – United States of America
- ✓ Adaptation Fund
- ✓ Clean development mechanism
- ✓ Multilateral Fund
- ✓ United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change secretariat
- ✓ World Bank
- ✓ World Resources Institute
- ✓ Wuppertal Institut für Klima

¹ The IFIs included in this initiative are the African Development Bank (AfDB), the Agence Française de Développement (Afd), the Asian Development Bank (ADB), the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EBRD), the European Investment Bank (EIB), the Global Environment Facility (GEF), the InterAmerican Development Bank (IDB), KfW Development Bank, the Nordic Development Fund (NDF), the Nordic Environment Finance Corporation (NEFCO), the Nordic Investment Bank (NIB), the UK Green Investment Bank, and the World Bank Group (WBG).