



**GREEN  
CLIMATE  
FUND**

**Meeting of the Board**  
28 – 30 June 2016  
Songdo, Incheon, Republic of Korea  
Provisional agenda item 21

**GCF/B.13/26**

10 June 2016

---

# Further development of some 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.

## Table of Contents

I.	Introduction	1
II.	Refinement of indicators in the mitigation and adaptation performance measurement frameworks	2
	2.1 Indicators	2
	2.2 Reporting process	3
III.	Initial evaluation policy for GCF- funded project/programmes	3
	3.1 Types of evaluations	4
	3.2 Learning and knowledge management	6
IV.	Operationalization of the initial monitoring and evaluation system	6
	Annex I: Draft decision of the Board	7
	Annex II: Mitigation and adaptation performance measurement frameworks	8
	Annex III: Proposed refinements to the mitigation and adaptation performance measurement frameworks	22
	Annex IV: Initial evaluation policy	40
	Annex V: List of consulted institutions	43

## I. Introduction

1. This document provides information and updates in response to the request from the Board, in decision B.08/07, paragraph (b), that the Secretariat further develop the indicators marked as “noted, but further refinement needed” in the performance measurement frameworks (PMFs). 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, PMFs include the indicators against which the results envisaged in RMF are measured.

2. In decision B.08/07, the Board affirmed and reiterated two key features of the monitoring and evaluation framework of the GCF: (a) national, economic and sector-wide indicators will be used only at the discretion of the recipient countries (decision B.08/07, para. (e)); and (b) 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. Following decision B.12/33, the Secretariat invited submissions from members of the Board (hereinafter referred to as Board members) and alternate members of the Board (hereinafter referred to as alternate members), as well as active observers on document GCF/B.12/13 titled “Further development of indicators in the performance measurement frameworks”. The Secretariat has received 19 submissions<sup>1</sup> and, in compliance with the decision, facilitated technical consultations through teleconferences.

4. 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,<sup>2</sup> which specifically recommended the GCF to consider:

- (a) Keeping the indicators simple;
- (b) Designing indicators that are qualitative as well as quantitative;
- (c) Designing 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) Giving countries sufficient flexibility to define their indicators in line with their national and local planning, strategies and priorities.

5. In order to complement this, the Secretariat consulted experts from 35 institutions. This included other climate funds under the UNFCCC, international organizations, including climate finance institutions, academia and think tanks, and subject-matter experts in both developed and developing countries in order to obtain feedback in relevant areas of expertise. The list of the consulted institutions is provided in annex V.

6. The performance measurement frameworks set the indicators that the GCF and its accredited entities will use in order to measure the climate results envisaged in the initial results management framework of the GCF. The frameworks are also related to the following operational policies already adopted by the Board or envisaged to be adopted in the future:

- (a) Initial investment framework: activity-specific sub-criteria and indicative assessment factors (annex III to decision B.09/05 (annex III to document GCF/B.09/23));

---

<sup>1</sup> See GCF/B.12/35

<sup>2</sup> UNFCCC decision 4/CP.20, annex, paragraph 4.

- (b) The Initial monitoring and accountability framework for accredited entities, including the guidance provided for monitoring environmental and social safeguards and gender issues connected to GCF- funded activities (annex I to decision B.11/10);
  - (c) The Gender policy and Gender action plan (annexes XIII and XIV to decision B.09/11 (annexes XIII and XIV to document GCF/B.09/23));
  - (d) The initial logic model and performance measurement framework for REDD-plus results-based payments (annexes X and XI to decision B.08/08 (annexes X and XI to document GCF/B.08/45)); and
  - (e) The Initial evaluation policy (presented in annex IV below).
7. The indicators of the PMFs are aligned with the targets set by the Sustainable Development Goals, specifically Sustainable Development Goal 13 on climate action.<sup>3</sup>

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

### 2.1 Indicators

8. 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.<sup>4</sup> The PMFs outline the reporting responsibilities of the accredited entities (AEs), and include explanations of the indicators and other relevant background and methodological information, as needed.
9. Annex II 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.<sup>5</sup>
10. The Secretariat will develop PMF guidelines to support the AEs in the monitoring, reporting and evaluation process. These guidelines should include the following:
- (a) Methodologies for baseline information collection and analysis;
  - (b) Methodologies for project-related metrics, data collection and analysis;
  - (c) Roles, responsibilities and timelines; and
  - (d) Other key guidance, such as assessing pertinent improvements of individual indicators, among others.
11. 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.<sup>6</sup> Gender disaggregation is also required for any additional specific project/programme indicators that can be gender disaggregated.

---

<sup>3</sup> See <<http://www.un.org/sustainabledevelopment/climate-change-2/>>.

<sup>4</sup> Decision B.07/04, paragraph (b).

<sup>5</sup> Annex VIII to decision B.08/07 (annex VIII to document GCF/B.08/45).

<sup>6</sup> Annexes XIII and XIV to decision B.09/11.

## 2.2 Reporting process

12. 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 and cross-cutting). The other indicators adopted by the Board shall be reported on according to the relevant result(s) of the GCF to which the specific project/programme contributes.
13. 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.
14. Based on decision B.11/10, AEs of the GCF will submit annual performance reports (APRs) in order to report on the progress made towards the targets of the indicators in PMFs and any additionally identified project-/programme-level indicators. APRs will also contain a narrative with updates on the progress of each output and outcome envisaged at the project/programme level. 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 APRs.
15. As requested by the monitoring and accountability framework for accredited entities (MAF),<sup>7</sup> 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. PPRs will analyse qualitative and quantitative information received from AEs through APRs and other sources of information (e.g. interim evaluations).
16. 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 APRs, PPRs and GCF-level dashboards, and published on the GCF website.
17. Following the adoption of PMFs by the Board, the Secretariat will develop methodologies to measure the indicators as detailed in chapter IV below.
18. The Readiness and Preparatory Support Programme may provide support to direct access AEs and national designated authorities (NDAs)/focal points for capacity building in monitoring, reporting, evaluation and learning.

## III. Initial evaluation policy for GCF- funded project/programmes

19. There are a number of previous decisions that deal with evaluations. This section takes stock of those decisions in order to consistently frame an initial approach to the evaluation. In addition, it takes into consideration the inputs shared in the submissions received from Board members, alternate members and active observers in line with decision B.12/33. Among the previous decisions that have implications for the evaluation function of the GCF are the following:
  - (a) Paragraph 23(j) of the Governing Instrument for the GCF entrusts the Secretariat with the responsibility of carrying out monitoring and evaluation. In addition, chapter VIII of the Governing Instrument focuses on evaluation and indicates that the independent Evaluation Unit (IEU) of the GCF will determine the frequency and types of the evaluation in agreement with the Board;<sup>8</sup>
  - (b) Decision B.06/09 adopted the terms of reference of the IEU (annex III to decision B.06/09 (annex III to document GCF/B.06/18). The terms of reference also define the type of evaluations that the IEU should be engaged in;

<sup>7</sup> Annex I to decision B.11/10 paragraph 14.

<sup>8</sup> Governing Instrument, paragraphs 3, 23(j) and 57–62.

- (c) Decision B.08/07 took note of an initial monitoring and evaluation policy; and
- (d) Decision B.11/10 adopted MAF (annex I to the decision), which defines the overall role of the Secretariat, the accountability units, AEs, NDAs/focal points and local partners in evaluations. Notably, MAF requires AEs to undertake interim and final evaluations of all projects/programmes,<sup>9</sup> regardless of their size and strategic importance, including an assessment of the progress made towards the GCF investment criteria, intended results and targets.
20. What commonly emerges from the above-mentioned policies is that the objective of evaluations is to provide evidence gained and lessons learned from the implementation of projects and programmes, to make recommendations, and to improve the design and impacts of climate projects.
21. Evaluations will be guided by the following principles:
- (a) Independence and impartiality;
- (b) Transparency;
- (c) Participation of all the relevant stakeholders (first and foremost local/disadvantaged communities, women and indigenous people);
- (d) Adherence to ethical standards within the evaluation with respect for the beliefs, culture and customs of the beneficiaries; and
- (e) Credibility.
22. The minimum standards, roles and responsibilities and evaluation criteria should be defined in the evaluation guidelines to be developed following the adoption of this initial evaluation policy. The evaluation criteria will take into consideration the industry practices such as the criteria of the Development Assistance Committee of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development as well as the specific peculiarities of the GCF such as its six investment criteria adopted by decision B.09/05.

### 3.1 Types of evaluations

23. Four types of evaluations are outlined below, based on previous decisions and guidance.

#### 3.1.1 Project-/programme-level evaluations

24. This type of evaluation, except for the ex-post evaluations, should be administered by AEs and carried out by independent evaluators, or, if applicable, the independent evaluation office or unit of the accredited entity.
25. The Secretariat may provide technical support to AEs, in particular direct access AEs, for the design and implementation of their project-/programme-level evaluations.
26. 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 AE and the GCF. In addition, the evaluations should recommend corrective actions in order to ensure that the climate results are delivered as expected.
27. 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

---

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

overall performance of the projects/programmes against the investment criteria and other evaluation criteria that will be defined in the evaluation guidelines.

28. Independent project/programme evaluations will take stock of not only whether and how the project/programme implementation has performed against the agreed outcomes and investment criteria, but also whether and how it has caused unintended impacts and other co-benefits.

29. Project-/programme-level evaluation reports will be submitted by AEs to the Secretariat, which will analyse these reports in order 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.<sup>10</sup>

30. The Secretariat may carry out ex-post evaluations on a sample of projects/programmes so as 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 by the Secretariat 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.

### 3.1.2 Country portfolio, thematic- and GCF-level evaluation

31. 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.

32. Country portfolio level evaluations will be conducted in order 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. In doing so, they will also report progress made towards country-specific goals in relation to the intended nationally determined contributions. The selection of countries for this type of evaluation will be determined by taking into consideration the number of GCF investments in a given country, the distribution of sectors and other relevant factors.

33. Thematic-level evaluations will be conducted in order to improve the design of future climate projects/programmes in key climate sectors. Thematic-level evaluations will be concerned with a sample of projects/programmes supported by the GCF in a particular sector or GCF result area. The selection of the sample, determined by the Secretariat and the IEU, will be based on those projects/programmes where there is a high probability of learning relevant insights on the development of future projects.

34. GCF-level evaluations will be managed by the IEU. 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 replenishments. They will assess the overall performance of the GCF in achieving climate results, including progress made towards paradigm shifts objectives 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.

---

<sup>10</sup> 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, chapter III.

## 3.2 Learning and knowledge management

35. 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,<sup>11</sup> and shared with relevant stakeholders in order to support continuous learning and improve performance.

36. As envisaged by MAF, an online platform enabling prompt release of all GCF operation related information, including evaluation reports for transparency and mutual lesson learning between multi-stakeholders 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

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

- (a) Guidelines on monitoring and reporting, including methodologies for data collection and guidelines for reporting on indicators in PMFs; additional details on other reporting requirements (e.g. APRs); and a monitoring and reporting toolkit;
- (b) 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
- (c) Evaluation guidelines that define the standards, criteria, roles and responsibilities for project/programme evaluations, ex-post evaluations and higher-level evaluations (e.g. at the country, regional, thematic and GCF levels).

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

---

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

## Annex I: Draft decision of the Board

The Board, having considered document GCF/B.13/26 titled “Further development of some 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, as it further develops the performance measurement frameworks and methodologies for indicators, to explore options for a mechanism that will draw on appropriate scientific and technical advice, as initially envisaged by decision B.04/09, paragraph (d);
- (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; and
- (d) Adopts the Initial evaluation policy as set out in annex IV;

## Annex II: Mitigation and adaptation performance measurement frameworks

1. The mitigation and adaptation performance measurement frameworks (PMFs) contain the core indicators and performance indicators for GCF results adopted by the Board at its seventh meeting.<sup>1</sup> 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.<sup>2</sup> 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 and cross-cutting). The other indicators adopted by the Board shall be reported on according to the relevant result(s) of the GCF to which the specific project/programme contributes.
4. At project and programme level, 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 of the GCF will submit annual performance reports in order to report on progress made towards targets of the indicators in PMFs and any additionally identified project/programme-level indicators.
6. On the basis of the annual performance reports and project/programme level evaluation reports, the Secretariat will produce an annual portfolio performance report on the status of the GCF-funded projects and programmes that were under implementation at the end of previous calendar year.
7. The following acronyms are used for 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 concerns mitigation or adaptation).
8. Responding to decision B.12/33, the indicators “noted, but further refinement needed” were refined taking into consideration the inputs shared by the members of the Board, alternate members of the Board and active observers.

### 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>			

<sup>1</sup> Decision B.07/04, paragraph (b).

<sup>2</sup> 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
Shift to low-emission sustainable development pathways	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>PSM</b> Degree to which the Fund is contributing to low-emission sustainable development	Secretariat primary with data from Accredited Entities (AEs)	<p>The indicator can be assessed 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, the degree to which knowledge and learning are achieved, the extent to which the enabling environment is created or enhanced, and the extent to which the regulatory framework and policies are strengthened.</p> <p>As part of developing a methodology for the PSM, the GCF will define a reference scenario/pathway as well as a target scenario describing what "low-emission sustainable development pathways" would look like. This will be derived from cost-efficient emissions trajectories for reaching the long-terms climate goals included in the Paris agreement (Article 2.1 (c)). Based on these scenarios, the magnitude of the GCF's contribution can be defined</p> <p>The PSM is envisioned as a scorecard that reflects the analysis of the aggregation of indicators across the portfolio and includes findings from evaluations. To be measured at the end of each GCF replenishment cycle.</p>
<i>Fund-level Impacts</i>			
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> * <b>Tonnes of carbon dioxide equivalent (t CO<sub>2</sub>eq) reduced</b>	AEs	Aggregate summation of sector-specific t CO <sub>2</sub> eq reduction indicators. Intended to be estimated ex-ante and verified ex-post;
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> * <b>Cost per t CO<sub>2</sub>eq decreased for all Fund-funded mitigation projects/programmes</b>	AEs	Intended to help understand anticipated costs (ex-ante) as well as trends in reducing costs of mitigation over time. Costs per t CO <sub>2</sub> eq reduced are expected to vary based on sector, technology, programme/project context, time scale, risk, etc.

Expected result	Indicator * = Core	Reporting responsibility (annual reporting)	Notes
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>*Volume of finance leveraged by Fund funding</b>	AEs	<p>“Leveraged” considered synonymous with the term “mobilized” (used by other funds).</p> <p>Calculations to be disaggregated by public and private sources; prorated by amount of co-financing;</p> <p>Informed by CIF, International Finance Corporation (IFC), and others.</p>
	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>MCrC1</b> _Co-benefits of mitigation actions by sector and type (i.e. economic, social, environmental)	AEs	<p>Projects/programmes will report on priority co-benefit indicators (quantitative or qualitative). The AE and stakeholders should select a few co-benefits to develop specific indicators (e.g. job creation, health benefits, savings, etc.) for performance measurement at the project level Those indicators will be standardized to the extent possible, through the development of methodologies and guidelines by the GCF.</p> <p>Since co-benefits are indicated in the funding proposals as part of the investment criteria any methodologies/guidelines developed will align with the investment criteria.</p>
<p><b>1.0</b> Reduced emissions through increased low-emission energy access and power generation</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>M1.1</b> *Tonnes of carbon dioxide equivalent (t CO <sub>2</sub> eq) reduced or avoided from gender-sensitive energy access and power generation	AEs	<p>Methodologies likely to determine three sub-indicators: (i) on energy efficiency (ii) low-emission power (iii) energy access.</p> <p>Gender disaggregated data and qualitative narratives related to gender to be collected where feasible</p> <p>Energy access:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Based on gender-sensitive methodologies used by CIF’s Program for Scaling Up Renewable Energy in Low Income Countries (SREP) core indicator 2.</li> </ul> <p>Power generation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 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</li> </ul>

Expected result	Indicator * = Core	Reporting responsibility (annual reporting)	Notes
			DFID GHG appraisal guidance and the Fund's 2013 energy efficiency guidelines.
<p><b>2.0</b> Reduced emissions through increased access to low-emission transport</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>M2.1</b> *Tonnes of carbon dioxide equivalent (t CO<sub>2</sub>eq) reduced or avoided from <i>low emission, gender-sensitive transport</i></p>	<p>AEs</p>	<p>Public transport: - 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 Gender where feasible <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><b>3.0</b> Reduced emissions from buildings, cities, industries and appliances</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>M3.1</b> *Tonnes of carbon dioxide equivalent (t CO<sub>2</sub>eq) 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. Gender disaggregation and other possible gender-relevant reporting to be included for each sector where feasible; reported annually <i>Buildings:</i> Informed by MDB/IFI GHG accounting harmonization work on energy efficiency <i>Cities:</i> Informed by the Global Protocol for Community- Scale Greenhouse Gas Emissions and by the Cities Alliance (currently being developed). <i>Industries:</i> Informed by MDB/IFI GHG accounting harmonization work on energy efficiency. <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>

Expected result	Indicator * = Core	Reporting responsibility (annual reporting)	Notes
<p><b>4.0</b> 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"/> <b>M4.1</b> Tonnes of carbon dioxide equivalent (t CO<sub>2</sub>e<sub>q</sub>) emissions reduced or avoided and/or GHG removals by sinks from forestry and land use activities</p>	<p>AEs</p>	<p>Estimations shall be consistent with information on the results of REDD-plus activities published in the Lima REDD-plus Information Hub on the REDD-plus Web Platform (UNFCCC decision 9/CP.19<sup>3</sup>)</p> <p>Methodologies to be developed in relation to work by the GCF on the performance framework for REDD-plus, the Forest Carbon Partnership Facility Methodological Framework (Dec. 2013), UN REDD, and emerging United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) guidance on REDD-plus.</p> <p>Gender disaggregation is to be researched and included if possible.</p>
<i>Outcomes</i>			
<p>Cross-cutting</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> <b>MCrC2</b> Technologies introduced (including gender –sensitive technologies) to effectively implement mitigation actions</p>	<p>AEs</p>	<p>The indicator methodology might include number of technology transferred-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>This indicator was refined to include qualitative aspects on their application and access and alignment with the language adopted by the Paris agreement (article 10).</p> <p>How to assess the degree of effectiveness of the application of the technology transferred or licensed or its inclusivity in access, will be elaborated in the methodology.</p> <p>This indicator will track the type of technology targeted. An effectiveness scorecard will be developed to measure effective implementation</p>
<p><b>5.0</b> Strengthened institutional and regulatory systems for</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> <b>M5.1</b> Degree to which gender-sensitive policies, institutions,</p>	<p>AEs</p>	<p>The indicator will be qualitative with the development of a scorecard that requests reporting on development, adoption, enforcement and other metrics for</p>

<sup>3</sup> This decision forms part of the Warsaw Framework for REDD-plus

Expected result	Indicator * = Core	Reporting responsibility (annual reporting)	Notes
low-emission planning and development	coordination mechanisms and regulatory frameworks are effective for low-emission planning and development		<p>assessing their effectiveness and gender sensitivity.</p> <p>The methodology can provide details on a scale that guides AEs on how to consider the effectiveness of a policy supported by a GCF funded activity and its implementation.</p> <p>Indicator initially informed by GEF –CCM Indicator 5 as well as by the World Bank’s RISE (Readiness for Investment in Sustainable Energy) work.</p>
6.0 Increased number of small, medium and large low-emission power suppliers	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>M6.1</b> Proportion of low-emission power supply in a jurisdiction or market.	AEs	<p>Disaggregated by size of supplier.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Informed by MDB/IFI GHG accounting harmonization work on renewable energy, UNEP renewable energy indicator and CIF SREP RE indicators</p>
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>M6.2</b> Number of households, and individuals (males and females) with improved access to low-emission energy sources	AEs	<p>Disaggregated by males and females.</p> <p>Disaggregated by urban and rural.</p> <p>Data will be linked to off-grid access (e.g., solar panels) and mini-grid systems as well as grid-scale systems</p> <p>Informed by CIF SREP 2</p>
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>M6.3</b> MWs of low-emission energy capacity installed, generated and/or rehabilitated	AEs	Informed by CIF CTF and SREP indicators.
7.0 Lower energy intensity of buildings, cities, industries, and appliances	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>M7.1(a)</b> tCO <sub>2</sub> e emissions reduced or avoided due to investments in reduced energy usage building design and energy efficiency <input type="checkbox"/> <b>M7.1(b)</b> tCO <sub>2</sub> e emissions reduced or avoided as a result of	AEs	<p>Intensity to be measured as a ratio of energy consumption to sector-specific production compared to baseline (the methodology for this indicator will consider whether it is more appropriate to use a global standard, a country specific standard, or even a city specific one.).</p> <p>Can be identified for each sector: (i) energy efficiency in buildings, (ii) cities</p>

Expected result	Indicator * = Core	Reporting responsibility (annual reporting)	Notes
	<p>reduced energy use in climate-smart cities</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <b>M7.1(c)</b> tCO<sub>2</sub>eq emissions reduced or avoided as a result of reduced energy use in industry</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <b>M7.1(d)</b> tCO<sub>2</sub>eq emissions reduced or avoided as a result of reduced energy use through appliances</p>		<p>(iii) industries and (iv) appliances.</p> <p>For buildings: results will need to be disaggregated between retrofitting of existing buildings, and newly designed and built buildings.</p> <p>For cities: results will need to be disaggregated by sector (i.e. transport, buildings etc.)</p> <p>Disaggregated by sex/gender (e.g. female – headed households, women led SMEs)</p> <p>Informed by MDB/IFI GHG accounting harmonization work on energy efficiency; can also be informed by IEA and SE4ALL Global Tracking Framework where relevant.</p>
<p><b>8.0</b> Increased use of low-carbon transport</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> <b>M8.1(a)</b> Passenger km traveled via low-carbon transport</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <b>M8.1(b)</b> Proportion of freight tons made by low-carbon transport</p>	<p>AEs</p>	<p>The indicator focuses on km traveled and overall market share of freight transport. The developed methodology will provide definitions of low-carbon transport.</p> <p>Freight is included because it comprises nearly half of all transport-related GHG emissions. The mode-shifts for km traveled will be tracked (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, electric vehicles).</p> <p>Indicator will track “mode” of transport, for example, Bus Rapid Transport systems, cycle or pedestrian paths, etc.</p> <p>Informed by CIF CTF indicator 4, ongoing work by IFIs Working Group on transport GHG accounting harmonization as well as TEEMP model (GEF)</p>
	<p><input type="checkbox"/> <b>M8.2(a)</b> Energy required per passenger km and per vehicle km (MJ/km)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <b>M8.2(b)</b> Emissions rates per km traveled (tCo<sub>2</sub>eq/km)</p>	<p>AEs</p>	<p>To calculate emissions from the transport sector various factors that include intensity metrics accounting for various transport modes, distance travelled, energy required per km travelled and energy intensity of fuel used for the particular transport mode are all required. The indicator captures the changes in the emission and energy intensity per passenger km and per</p>

Expected result	Indicator * = Core	Reporting responsibility (annual reporting)	Notes
			vehicle km. Informed by work of the International Energy Agency (Road Map Model) and the International Council on Clean Transportation.
<p><b>9.0</b> Improved management of land or forest areas contributing to emissions reductions</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> <b>M9.1</b> Total hectares of land or forests areas and percentage of land in relevant jurisdiction (by type) under improved protection and management leading to reduced GHG emissions and/or enhancement of carbon stocks respecting environmental and social safeguards</p>	<p>AEs</p>	<p>Informed by work on GCF's REDD-plus performance measurement framework, Forest Carbon Partnership Facility Monitoring and Evaluation Framework, UN REDD, and UNFCCC guidance. UK International Climate Fund (ICF) is in the process of refining a methodology for an indicator on 'number of hectares where deforestation and degradation have been avoided' which could inform the development of this indicator</p>
<p><i>Project/Programme Outcomes/Outputs</i></p>	<p>[Defined for each project/programme on a case-by-case basis.]</p>		
<p><i>Activities</i></p>	<p>[Defined for each project/programme on a case-by-case basis.]</p>		
<p><i>Inputs</i></p>	<p>[Defined for each project/programme on a case-by-case basis.]</p>		

## 1.2 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"/> <b>PSA</b> Degree to which the Fund contributes to climate-resilient sustainable development	Secretariat /Accredited Entities (AEs)	<p>The indicator can be assessed 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, the extent to which the enabling environment is created or enhanced, and the extent to which regulatory frameworks and policies are strengthened.</p> <p>As part of developing a methodology for the PSA, the GCF will define a reference scenario/pathway as well as a target scenario describing what "climate-resilient sustainable development pathways" would look like.</p> <p>The GCF will also further define "resilience" potentially by using existing accepted definitions from other funds/international organizations.</p> <p>The indicator is envisioned as a scorecard that will reflect an analysis of the aggregation of indicators across the portfolio and include findings from evaluations. To be measured at the end of each GCF replenishment cycle.</p>
<i>Fund-level Impacts</i>			
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>*Total Number of direct and indirect beneficiaries; Percentage of beneficiaries relative to total population</b>	AEs	<p>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.</p> <p>Disaggregated by gender.</p> <p>The second part of the indicator previously indicated "Number of beneficiaries relative to total population"</p>

Expected result	Indicator * = Core	Reporting responsibility (annual reporting)	Notes
			<p>Since this is technically the expression of a percentage, the indicator was corrected accordingly.</p> <p>Informed by Adaptation Fund (core-1); CIF (core-5)</p>
<p><b>1.0</b> Increased resilience and enhanced livelihoods of the most vulnerable people, communities, and regions</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> <b>A1.1</b> Extent to which lives and livelihoods of the most vulnerable groups are enhanced and made more resilient to climate related hazards in the geographic area that can be attributed to GCF intervention.</p>	<p>AEs</p>	<p>Disaggregated at project/programme level by vulnerable group. Vulnerable groups can include women, children, elderly and disabled individuals.</p> <p>This indicator is envisioned to be measured in the form of an index, composed by a set of sub-indicators. The methodologies, to be developed, can be informed by similar indicators adopted by AF, LDCF/SCCF, PPCR, GIZ and ICF among others.</p> <p>Sub indicators composing this index would look at specific aspects of what constitute resilience and well-being such as access (to services and resources), reduced risk of losses (economic, health, lives, etc.) and enhanced production/productivity (in agriculture, livestock, and other economic activities)</p>
	<p><input type="checkbox"/> <b>A1.2</b> Percentage of population (and relative disaggregation of women and men) adopting climate-resilient livelihood practices /options by sector (fisheries, agriculture, tourism, etc.)</p>	<p>AEs</p>	<p>Disaggregated by gender; to consider equitable sharing of benefits.</p> <p>Appropriate measures will be devised for each sector as well as defining “climate-resilient livelihoods” (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 livelihood options over the total number of project beneficiaries (which is already captured by AEs as core indicator).</p> <p>Methodology will examine inclusion of relevant sub-indicators (i) integration of appropriateness and effectiveness of adapted options and (ii) identification of measures put in place to ensure that actors involved in climate-sensitive sectors (like fisheries and agriculture) are improving their capacity to identify and manage climate risk.</p>

Expected result	Indicator * = Core	Reporting responsibility (annual reporting)	Notes
			<p>A specific focus (for qualitative reporting) can include the use of traditional knowledge, technologies and seed-varieties etc.</p> <p>Informed by Adaptation Fund 6.1, 6.2; LDCF/SCCF 3.</p>
	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>A1.3</b> Percentage of population benefitting from effective adaptation to fish stock migration and depletion due to climate change	AEs	<p>From the consultations this indicator emerged as highly relevant to SIDS related adaptation projects and programmes. Compared to the previous version it is refined to allow project level data collection.</p> <p>The percentage of the population can be further disaggregated by gender and/or other vulnerable groups.</p>
<b>2.0</b> Increased resilience of health and well-being, and food and water security	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>A2.1</b> Number of males and females benefitting from introduced health measures to respond to climate-sensitive diseases	AEs	<p>Disaggregated by health measure, disease</p> <p>Disaggregated by gender</p>
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>A2.2</b> Number of food-secure households (in areas/periods at risk of climate change impacts)	AEs	<p>Disaggregated by male and female-headed households</p> <p>Informed by CIF PPCR A1.1.</p>
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>A2.3</b> Number of males and females with year-round access to reliable and safe water supply despite climate shocks and stresses	AEs	<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>Informed by CIF PPCR A1.4</p>
<b>3.0</b> Increased resilience of infrastructure and the built environment to climate change threats	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>*A3.1a</b> Number of physical assets constructed or modified to increase resilience to climate variability and change	AEs	<p>Assets will be disaggregated by sector, type of asset, action (constructed or strengthened). The methodology will delineate an assessment of the extent and quality of the constructed/modified asset depending on asset type (Coastal erosion defenses constructed to withstand impacts of climate change (km); ; Road constructed to withstand impacts of climate change (km)).</p>
	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>*A3.1b</b> Value (US\$) of the investments in physical assets constructed,		

Expected result	Indicator * = Core	Reporting responsibility (annual reporting)	Notes
	<b>improved or modified to increase resilience to climate variability and change</b>		<p>This indicator has been proposed by some constituencies as a core indicator for adaptation projects that will deliver resilient infrastructure.</p> <p>Informed by Adaptation Fund (core-3), LDCF/SCCF 2.</p>
<b>4.0</b> Improved resilience of ecosystems and ecosystem services	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>A4.1</b> Extent of ecosystems and ecosystem services restored, protected, or made more resilient to reduce negative impacts of climate change	AEs	<p>Methodology will examine sub-indicators by ecosystem type and intervention, to better clarify and define “extent” (for example geographic reach, landscape connectivity/fragmentation)</p> <p>Under methodology will clarify that “restored” is only applicable in cases where the prior conditions were climate-adaptive.</p> <p>Informed by Adaptation Fund (core-4); LDCF/SCCF 2.</p>
	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>A4.2</b> Value (US\$) of ecosystem services generated or protected in response to climate change		<p>The methodologies for this indicator will consider the work and experience gained from valuing ecosystem services and their utility by other international organizations and institutions such as the International Climate Fund (ICF).</p> <p>Informed by LDCF/SCCF 2 and ICF</p>
<i>Outcomes</i>			
Cross-cutting	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>ACrC1</b> Technologies introduced (including gender – sensitive technologies) to effectively implement adaptation actions	AEs	<p>The indicator methodology might include number of technology transferred-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.</p> <p>This indicator was refined to include qualitative aspects on their application and access and alignment with the language adopted by the Paris agreement (article 10).</p> <p>How to assess the degree of effectiveness of the application of the technology transferred or licensed or its inclusivity in access, will be elaborated in the methodology.</p>

Expected result	Indicator * = Core	Reporting responsibility (annual reporting)	Notes
<p><b>5.0</b> Strengthened institutional and regulatory systems for climate-responsive planning and development</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> <b>A5.1</b> Degree to which gender-sensitive policies, institutions, coordination mechanisms and regulatory-frameworks are effective for climate resilience.</p>	<p>AEs</p>	<p>The indicator measures the institutional, policy, and regulatory systems that improve incentives for climate resilience and are accompanied by evidence of their effective implementation.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>It has been reformulated to improve its quantification capacity and inclusivity.</p> <p>The methodology can provide details on a scale that guides AEs on how to consider the effectiveness of a policy supported by a GCF funded activity and its implementation.</p> <p>The Readiness and Preparatory Support Programme may employ the indicator to measure its country-level results.</p> <p>Informed by Adaptation Fund 7.1; LDCF/SCCF 12.</p>
<p><b>6.0</b> Increased generation and use of climate information in decision-making</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> <b>A6.1</b> Number of effective climate information products/services for 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>Number will be disaggregated by type. Methodology for a scorecard will be developed to capture effectiveness. In addition, 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's methodology will also capture efforts to reach different population groups with specific information needs (i.e. Indigenous Peoples, local communities, etc.), and gender-sensitive information climate information products/services.</p>

Expected result	Indicator * = Core	Reporting responsibility (annual reporting)	Notes
<b>7.0</b> Strengthened adaptive capacity and reduced exposure to climate risks	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>A7.1</b> Number of vulnerable households, communities, businesses and public-sector services using tools, instruments, strategies, and activities to respond to climate change and variability	AEs	<p>This indicator is qualitative and quantitative in nature The qualitative aspect of “use” will require an analysis (survey) or a scorecard approach to determine the extent of use.</p> <p>Households: disaggregated by male-headed and female-headed</p>
	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>A7.2:</b> Number of males and females reached and utilizing climate-information and early warning systems-established/strengthened to reduce their exposure to climate risks	AEs	<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. Disaggregated by hazard and geographical coverage. Disaggregated by gender, youth and other vulnerable groups</p> <p>The reformulation of this indicator is 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.</p> <p>Informed by Adaptation Fund Core-2, 1.2 and 1.2.1; LDCF/SCCF 2.3</p>
<b>8.0</b> Strengthened awareness of climate threats and risk-reduction processes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>A8.1:</b> Number of males and females made aware of climate threats and related appropriate responses	AEs	<p>Disaggregated by gender.</p> <p>Informed by Adaptation Fund 3.1, 3.2</p>
<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 tables below indicate the refinements made to the indicators in the mitigation and adaptation performance measurement frameworks for the indicators marked as “noted, but further refinement needed”.<sup>1</sup> The changes are marked compared to the version of the performance measurement frameworks presented in annex VIII to decision B.08/07.
2. To allow for comparison with the adopted version,<sup>2</sup> added language is underscored and deleted text is indicated in strikethrough.
4. A few minor editorial corrections have been proposed for the decided indicators based on the feedback received from experts and accredited entities. These are only meant to improve language clarity. Among the edits proposed were 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 to ensure a more concise definition and in consideration of the fact that technical guidance for attribution will be addressed in the indicator methodologies; and
  - (c) Concerning the mitigation indicators that adopt the same unit of measure as the core indicator “Tonnes of carbon dioxide equivalent (t CO<sub>2</sub> eq) reduced” it is proposed to eliminate the word “subindicator”, since these indicators are considered individual indicators rather than “subindicators”.
5. The “reporting responsibility” and “notes” columns have been updated as necessary.

### 1.1 Proposed refined mitigation performance measurement framework

**Table 1.1: Mitigation performance measurement framework**

= Decided

= Noted, but further refinement needed

Expected result	Indicator * = Core	Reporting responsibility (annual reporting)	Notes <sup>3</sup>
<i>Paradigm-shift Objective</i>			
Shift to low-emission sustainable development pathways	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>PSM<sup>4</sup></b> Degree to which the Fund is <del>achieving</del> <u>contributing to</u> low-emission sustainable development <del>impacts</del>	Secretariat <u>primary with data from Accredited Entities (AEs)</u>	<del>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</del>

<sup>1</sup> The previously adopted version of the mitigation and adaptation performance measurement frameworks is reported in annex VIII to decision B.08/07 (annex VIII to document B.08/45).

<sup>2</sup> Decision B.08/07, paragraph (b).

<sup>3</sup> Notes are provided by the Secretariat for information purposes only.

<sup>4</sup> For practical categorization purposes, a new renumbering of the indicators is proposed.

Expected result	Indicator * = Core	Reporting responsibility (annual reporting)	Notes <sup>3</sup>
			<p>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.</p> <p><u>The indicator can be assessed 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, the degree to which knowledge and learning are achieved, the extent to which the enabling environment is created or enhanced, and the extent to which the regulatory framework and policies are strengthened.</u></p> <p><u>As part of developing a methodology for the PSM, the GCF will define a reference scenario/pathway as well as a target scenario describing what "low-emission sustainable development pathways" would look like. This will be derived from cost-efficient emissions trajectories for reaching the long-term climate goals included in the Paris agreement (Article 2.1 (c)). Based on these scenarios, the magnitude of the GCF's contribution can be defined</u></p> <p><u>The PSM is envisioned as a scorecard that reflects the analysis of the aggregation of indicators across the portfolio and includes findings from evaluations. To be measured at the end of each GCF replenishment cycle.</u></p>
<i>Fund-level Impacts</i>			
	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/>* Tonnes of carbon dioxide equivalent (t CO<sub>2</sub>eq) reduced as a result of Fund-funded</p>	<p>Implementing entities (IEs)/ AEs/intermediaries</p>	<p>Aggregate summation of sector-specific t CO<sub>2</sub>eq reduction indicators. Intended to be estimated ex-ante and <u>verified</u></p>

Expected result	Indicator * = Core	Reporting responsibility (annual reporting)	Notes <sup>3</sup>
	<del>projects/ programmes</del>		<del>ex-post;</del>  Methodologies tailored to each sector—see specifics below.
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> *Cost per t CO <sub>2</sub> eq decreased for all Fund-funded mitigation projects/programmes	<del>Es</del> AEs/ intermediaries	Intended to help understand anticipated costs (ex-ante) as well as trends in reducing costs of mitigation over time. Costs per t CO <sub>2</sub> eq reduced are expected to vary based on sector, technology, programme/project context, time scale, risk, etc
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> *Volume of finance leveraged by Fund funding	<del>Es</del> AEs/ intermediaries	“Leveraged” considered synonymous with the term “mobilized” (used by other funds).  Calculations to be disaggregated by public and private sources; prorated by amount of co-financing;  Informed by CIF, International Finance Corporation (IFC), and others.
	<input type="checkbox"/> <del>MCR C1</del> Social, environmental, economic co-benefit index/indicator at impact level  <u>Co-benefits of mitigation actions by sector and type (i.e. economic, social and environmental)</u>	<u>AEs</u>	<u>Co-benefit indicator related to GHG reductions/low-emissions development pathways and sustainable development.</u>  <u>Specifics to be determined</u> <u>Projects/programmes will report on priority co-benefit indicators (quantitative or qualitative). The AE and stakeholders should select a few co-benefits to develop specific indicators (e.g. job creation, health benefits, savings, etc.) for performance measurement at the project level</u> <u>Those indicators will be standardized to the extent possible, through the development of methodologies and guidelines by the GCF.</u> <u>Since co-benefits are indicated in the funding proposals as part of the investment criteria any methodologies/guidelines developed will align with the investment criteria.</u>

Expected result	Indicator * = Core	Reporting responsibility (annual reporting)	Notes <sup>3</sup>
<p><b>1.0</b> Reduced emissions through increased low-emission energy access and power generation</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <del>1.1</del><b>M1.1</b> *Tonnes of carbon dioxide equivalent (t CO<sub>2</sub>eq) reduced or avoided as a result of Fund-funded projects/programme from gender-sensitive energy access and power generation (sub-indicator)^</p>	<p><del>Es</del><b>AEs/intermediaries</b></p>	<p><u>Methodologies likely to determine three sub-indicators: (i) on energy efficiency (ii) low-emission power (iii) energy access.</u></p> <p><u>Gender disaggregated data and qualitative narratives related to gender to be collected where feasible</u></p> <p><i>Energy access:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Based on gender-sensitive methodologies used by CIF's Program for Scaling Up Renewable Energy in Low Income Countries (SREP) core indicator 2.</li> </ul> <p><del>Disaggregated by gender.</del></p> <p><i>Power generation:</i></p> <p>Methods to be informed by multilateral development banks' / the 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.</p>
<p><b>2.0</b> Reduced emissions through increased access to low-emission transport</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <del>2.1</del><b>M2.1</b> *Tonnes of carbon dioxide equivalent (t CO<sub>2</sub>eq) reduced or avoided as a result of Fund-funded projects/programme from low emission, gender-sensitive transport (sub-indicator)^</p>	<p><del>Es</del><b>AEs/intermediaries</b></p>	<p><i>Public transport:</i> 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)</p> <p><u>Disaggregated by gender where feasible.</u></p> <p><i>Vehicle fuels (fuel economy standards):</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- [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</li> </ul>

Expected result	Indicator * = Core	Reporting responsibility (annual reporting)	Notes <sup>3</sup>
			in Transportation Committee of the US Transport Research Board.
<p><b>3.0</b> Reduced emissions from buildings, cities, industries and appliances</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <del>3.1</del><b>M3.1</b> *Tonnes of carbon dioxide equivalent (t CO<sub>2</sub>eq) reduced or avoided as a result of Fund-funded projects/programme+—<i>buildings, cities, industries, and appliances sub-indicator</i><sup>^</sup></p>	<p><del>Es</del><b>AEs/intermediaries</b></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; reported annually</u></p> <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 by 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><del>Gender disaggregation is to be researched for each sector and included where possible.</del></p>
<p><b>4.0</b> Reduced emissions from land use, deforestation, forest degradation, and through sustainable management of forests and</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> <del>4.1</del><b>M4.1</b> Tonnes of carbon dioxide equivalent (t CO<sub>2</sub>eq) reduced or avoided and/or GHG removals by sinks (including increased removals) as a result of Fund-funded projects/programme+—<i>forest and land use sub-</i></p>	<p><del>Es</del><b>AEs/intermediaries</b></p>	<p><u>Estimations shall be consistent with information on the results of REDD-plus activities published in the Lima REDD-plus Information Hub on the REDD-plus Web Platform (UNFCCC decision 9/CP.19<sup>5</sup>)</u></p> <p><u>Methodologies to be developed</u></p>

<sup>5</sup> This decision forms part of the Warsaw Framework for REDD-plus.

Expected result	Indicator * = Core	Reporting responsibility (annual reporting)	Notes <sup>3</sup>
conservation and enhancement of forest carbon stocks	<del>indicator</del> <u>from forestry and land use activities</u>		<p><del>in relation to work by Informed by CIF FIP Indicator 1, pending Fund work the GCF on the performance framework for REDD-plus, the Forest Carbon Partnership Facility Methodological Framework (Dec. 2013), UN REDD, and emerging United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) guidance on REDD-plus.</del></p> <p>Gender disaggregation is to be researched and included if possible.</p>
<i>Project/Programme-Outcomes<sup>6</sup></i>			
<u>Cross-cutting</u>	<p><del>□ MCrC2</del> <u>Number of technologies and innovative solutions introduced (including gender-sensitive technologies) to effectively implement mitigation actions transferred or licensed to support low-emission development as a result of Fund support.</u><sup>+</sup></p>	<del>Es</del> <u>AEs/intermediaries</u>	<p><u>The indicator methodology might include number of technology transferred 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.</u></p> <p><u>This indicator was refined to include qualitative aspects on their application and access and alignment with the language adopted by the Paris agreement (article 10).</u></p> <p><u>How to assess the degree of effectiveness of the application of the technology transferred or licensed or its inclusivity in access, will be elaborated in the methodology.</u></p> <p><u>This indicator will track the type of technology targeted. An effectiveness scorecard will be developed to measure effective implementation</u></p>
5.0 Strengthened institutional and regulatory	<p><del>□ 5.1</del> <u>M5.1 Degree to which gender-sensitive effective policies.</u></p>	<del>Es</del> <u>AEs/intermediaries</u>	<p><del>Details on this indicator are to be determined in the methodologies.</del> Although this</p>

<sup>6</sup> 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 <sup>3</sup>
systems for low-emission planning and development	<p><u>institutions, coordination mechanisms Institutional and regulatory systems frameworks that improve incentives are effective for low-emission planning and development and their effective implementation</u></p>		<p>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) Climatescope 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 will be qualitative with the development of a scorecard that requests reporting on development, adoption, enforcement and other metrics for assessing the effectiveness and gender sensitivity.</u></p> <p><u>The methodology can provide details on a scale that guides AEs on how to consider the effectiveness of a policy supported by a GCF funded activity and its implementation</u></p> <p><u>Indicator initially informed by GEF –CCM Indicator 5 as well as by the World Bank's RISE (Readiness for Investment in Sustainable Energy) work.</u></p>
	<p><input type="checkbox"/> <u>5.2 Number and level of effective coordination mechanisms</u></p>	<p><u>IEs/AEs/ Intermediaries</u></p>	<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 (M5.1) includes coordination mechanisms. Therefore this indicator is now redundant.</u></p>

Expected result	Indicator * = Core	Reporting responsibility (annual reporting)	Notes <sup>3</sup>
<p><b>6.0</b> Increased number of small, medium and large low-emission power suppliers</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <del>6.1</del><b>M6.1</b> Proportion of low-emission power supply in a jurisdiction or market.</p>	<p><del>Es</del>AEs/ intermediaries</p>	<p><del>To be determined by recipient countries.</del> Disaggregated by size of supplier.</p> <p><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> <u>Informed by MDB/IFI GHG accounting harmonization work on renewable energy, UNEP renewable energy indicator and CIF SREP RE indicators</u></p>
	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <del>6.2</del><b>M6.2</b> Number of households, and individuals (males and females) with improved access to low-emission energy sources</p>	<p><del>Es</del>AEs/ intermediaries</p>	<p><del>Informed by CIF SREP 2.</del> Disaggregated by males and females. Disaggregated by urban and rural. <del>To be informed by SE4All.</del> <del>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 as well as grid-scale systems.</del> Informed by CIF SREP 2</p>
	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <del>M6.3</del> <b>M6.3</b> MWs of low-emission energy capacity installed, generated and/or rehabilitated as a result of GCF support<sup>+</sup></p>	<p><del>Es</del>AEs/ intermediaries</p>	<p>Informed by CIF CTF and SREP indicators.</p>
<p><b>7.0</b> Lower energy intensity of buildings, cities, industries, and appliances</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> <del>7.1</del><b>M7.1</b> Energy intensity improved efficiency of buildings, cities, industries, and appliances as a result of Fund support<sup>+</sup></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <del>7.1</del><b>M7.1(a)</b> tCO<sub>2</sub>e<sub>q</sub> emissions reduced or avoided due to investments in reduced energy usage building design and energy efficiency</p>	<p><del>Es</del>AEs/ intermediaries</p>	<p><u>Intensity to be measured as a ratio of energy consumption to sector-specific production compared to baseline (the methodology for this indicator will consider whether it is more appropriate to use a global standard, a country specific standard, or even a city specific one.).</u> <u>Can be identified for each sector: (i) energy efficiency in buildings, (ii) cities (iii) industries and (iv)</u></p>

Expected result	Indicator * = Core	Reporting responsibility (annual reporting)	Notes <sup>3</sup>
	<p><input type="checkbox"/> <u>7.1M7.1(b) tCO<sub>2</sub>eq emissions reduced or avoided as a result of reduced energy use in climate-smart cities</u></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <u>7.1M7.1(c) tCO<sub>2</sub>eq emissions reduced or avoided as a result of reduced energy use in industry</u></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <u>7.1M7.1(d) tCO<sub>2</sub>eq emissions reduced or avoided as a result of reduced energy use through appliances</u></p>		<p><u>appliances.</u></p> <p><u>For buildings: results will need to be disaggregated between retrofitting of existing buildings, and newly designed and built buildings.</u></p> <p><u>For cities: results will need to be disaggregated by sector (i.e. transport, buildings etc.)</u></p> <p><u>Disaggregated by sex/gender (e.g. female – headed households, women led SMEs)</u></p> <p>Informed by MDB/IFI GHG accounting harmonization work on energy efficiency; can also be informed by IEA and SE4ALL Global Tracking Framework where relevant.</p> <p><del>Will need to be calculated sector-by-sector; different methodologies apply to buildings, cities, industries and appliances.</del></p>
<p><b>8.0</b> Increased use of low-carbon transport</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> <u>8.1M8.1 Number of additional female and male passengers using low-carbon transport as a result of Fund support.+</u></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <u>M8.1(a) Passenger km traveled via low-carbon transport</u></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <u>M8.1(b) Proportion of freight tons made by low-carbon transport (by mode)</u></p>	<p><del>EsAEs/intermediaries</del></p>	<p>Disaggregated by gender.</p> <p>The indicator focuses on km traveled and overall market share of freight transport. <u>The developed methodology will provide definitions of low-carbon transport.</u></p> <p><u>Freight is included because it comprises nearly half of all transport-related GHG emissions. The mode-shifts for km traveled will be tracked (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, electric vehicles).</u></p> <p><u>Indicator will track “mode” of transport, for example, Bus Rapid Transport systems, cycle or pedestrian paths, etc.</u></p> <p>Informed by CIF CTF indicator 4, ongoing work by IFIs Working</p>

Expected result	Indicator * = Core	Reporting responsibility (annual reporting)	Notes <sup>3</sup>
	<p><input type="checkbox"/> <del>8.2</del><b>M8.2</b> <u>Vehicle fuel economy and energy source as a result of Fund support.*</u></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <b>M8.2(a)</b> <u>Energy required per passenger km and per vehicle km (MJ/km)</u></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <b>M8.2(b)</b> <u>Emissions rates per km traveled (tCo2eq/km)</u></p>	<p><del>Es</del><b>AEs/</b> intermediaries</p>	<p>Group on transport GHG accounting harmonization as well as TEEMP model (GEF). <del>Additional passengers – mode shift</del> To consider underlying reasons for mode shift, such as transit-oriented development.</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><del>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.</del></p> <p>To calculate emissions from the transport sector various factors that include intensity metrics accounting for various transport modes, distance travelled, energy required per km travelled and energy intensity of fuel used for the particular transport mode are all required. The indicator captures the changes in the emission and energy intensity per passenger km and per vehicle km.</p> <p>Informed by work of the International Energy Agency (Road Map Model) and the International Council on Clean Transportation.</p>
<p><b>9.0</b> Improved management of land or forest areas contributing to emissions reductions</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> <del>9.1</del><b>M9.1</b> <u>Total Hectares of land or forests areas and percentage of land in relevant jurisdiction (by type) under improved protection and effective management that contributes to CO<sub>2</sub> emission reductions leading to reduced GHG</u></p>	<p><del>Es</del><b>AEs/</b> intermediaries</p>	<p>Informed by work on GCF's REDD-plus 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. <u>UK International Climate Fund (ICF)</u></p>



Expected result	Indicator * = Core	Reporting responsibility (annual reporting)	Notes <sup>3</sup>
	<u>emissions and/or enhancement of carbon stocks respecting environmental and social safeguards</u>		<u>is in the process of refining a methodology for an indicator on 'number of hectares where deforestation and degradation have been avoided' which could inform the development of this indicator</u>
<i>Project/Programme Outcomes/Outputs<sup>7</sup></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.]		

<sup>7</sup> As per footnote 14

## 1.2 Proposed refined adaptation performance measurement framework

**Table 1.2: Adaptation performance measurement framework**

= Decided

= Noted, but further refinement needed

Expected result	Indicator * = Core	Reporting responsibility (annual reporting)	Notes <sup>8</sup>
<i>Paradigm-shift Objective</i>			
Increased climate-resilient sustainable development	<input type="checkbox"/> <u>PSA</u> Degree to which the Fund is <del>achieving a</del> <u>contributing to</u> climate-resilient sustainable development <del>impact</del>	Secretariat / <u>Accredited Entities (AEs)</u>	<p><del>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.</del></p> <p><u>The indicator can be assessed 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, the extent to which the enabling environment is created or enhanced, and the extent to which regulatory frameworks and policies are strengthened.</u></p> <p><u>As part of developing a methodology for the PSA, the GCF will define a reference scenario/pathway as well as a target scenario describing what "climate-resilient sustainable development pathways" would look like.</u></p> <p><u>The GCF will also further define "resilience" potentially by using existing accepted definitions from other funds/international organizations.</u></p> <p><u>The indicator is envisioned as a scorecard that will reflect an analysis of the aggregation of indicators across the portfolio and include findings from evaluations. To be measured at the end</u></p>

<sup>8</sup> Notes are provided by the Secretariat for information only.

Expected result	Indicator * = Core	Reporting responsibility (annual reporting)	Notes <sup>8</sup>
			of each GCF replenishment cycle.
<i>Fund-level Impacts</i>			
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> * <b>Total Number of direct and indirect beneficiaries; Percentage Number of beneficiaries relative to total population</b>	Es/AEs/ intermediaries	<p>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></p> <p>Disaggregated by gender.</p> <p><u>The second part of the indicator previously indicated “Number of beneficiaries relative to total population” Since this is technically the expression of a percentage, the indicator was corrected accordingly.</u></p> <p>Informed by Adaptation Fund (core-1); CIF PPCR A1.3 (core-5).</p>
<p><b>1.0</b> Increased resilience and enhanced livelihoods of the most vulnerable people, communities, and regions</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> <u>1.1A1.1 change in expected losses of Extent to which lives and livelihoods of the most vulnerable groups are enhanced and made more resilient to economic assets (US\$) due to the impact of extreme climate-related disasters hazards in the geographic area of that can be attributed to the GCF intervention</u></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <u>1.2A1.2 Number of males and females</u></p>	<p>Es/AEs/ intermediaries /country</p> <p>Es/AEs/ intermediaries</p>	<p>Disaggregated at <u>project/programme level</u> by vulnerable groups; <u>Vulnerable groups can include women, children, elderly and disabled individuals, and gender; share of total population.</u></p> <p><u>This indicator is envisioned to be measured in the form of an index, composed by a set of sub-indicators. The methodologies, to be developed, can be informed by similar indicators adopted by AF, LDCF/SCCF, PPCR, GIZ and ICF among others.</u></p> <p><u>Sub indicators, composing this index, would look at specific aspects of what constitute resilience and well-being such as access (to services and resources), reduced risk of losses (economic, health, lives, etc.) and enhanced production/productivity (in agriculture, livestock, and other economic activities)</u></p> <p><u>Analysis of loss of life is separate from analysis of economic losses (lives not to be valued)</u></p> <p><u>Economic losses will be analysed in relation to the size of economies</u> Informed by CIF PPCR A1.2</p> <p>Disaggregated by gender; to consider equitable sharing of benefits.</p>

Expected result	Indicator * = Core	Reporting responsibility (annual reporting)	Notes <sup>8</sup>
	<p>Percentage of population (and relative disaggregation of women and men) benefiting from the adoption of diversified, adopting climate-resilient livelihood practices/options by sector (fisheries, agriculture, tourism, etc.)</p>		<p>Appropriate measures will be devised for each sector as well as defining “climate-resilient livelihoods” (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 livelihood options over the total number of project beneficiaries (which is already captured by AEs as core indicator).</p> <p>Methodology will examine inclusion of relevant sub-indicators (i) integration of appropriateness and effectiveness of adapted options and (ii) identification of measures put in place to ensure that actors involved in climate-sensitive sectors (like fisheries and agriculture) are improving their capacity to identify and manage climate risk.</p> <p>A specific focus (for qualitative reporting) can include the use of traditional knowledge, technologies and seed-varieties etc.</p> <p>Methodology to consider relevant sectors (e.g., climate-resilient agriculture, sustainable climate-resilient tourism, fisheries, green jobs, etc.)</p> <p><i>Informed by Adaptation Fund 6.1, 6.2; LDCF/SCCF 3.</i></p>
	<p><input type="checkbox"/> 1.3 <b>A1.3</b> Percentage of population benefitting from Number of Fund-funded projects/programmes that supports effective adaptation to fish stock migration and depletion due to climate change</p>	<p>IEs/AEs/intermediaries</p>	<p>Details to be determined. From the consultations this indicator emerged as highly relevant to SIDS related adaptation projects and programmes. Compared to the previous version it is refined to allow project level data collection.</p> <p>The percentage of the population can be further disaggregated by gender and/or other vulnerable groups.</p>
<p><b>2.0</b> Increased resilience of health and well-being, and food and water security</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 2.1 <b>A2.1</b> Number of males and females benefiting from introduced health measures to respond to climate-sensitive diseases</p>	<p>IEs/AEs/intermediaries</p>	<p>Disaggregated by health measure, disease</p> <p>Disaggregated by gender</p> <p><i>Informed by: n/a.</i></p>
	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 2.2 <b>A2.2</b> Number of food-secure</p>	<p>IEs/AEs/intermediaries</p>	<p>Disaggregated by male and female-headed households</p>



Expected result	Indicator * = Core	Reporting responsibility (annual reporting)	Notes <sup>8</sup>
	households (in areas/periods at risk of climate change impacts)		<i>Informed by CIF PPCR A1.1.</i>
3.0 Increased resilience of infrastructure and the built environment to climate change threats	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>2.3A2.3</b> Number of males and females with year-round access to reliable and safe water supply despite climate shocks and stresses  <input type="checkbox"/> <b>3.1*A3.1 (a)</b> <b>Number and value of physical assets constructed or modified made more resilient to increase resilience to climate variability and change considering human benefits (reported where applicable)</b>	IEs/AEs/ intermediaries	Disaggregated by gender in relation to domestic, agricultural and industrial sources.  Disaggregated by male and female-headed households for domestic sources.  <i>Informed by CIF PPCR A1.4.</i>
	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>*A3.1 (b)</b> <b>Value (US\$) of the investments in physical assets constructed, improved or modified to increase resilience to climate variability and change</b>	IEs/AEs/ intermediaries	<u>Assets will be disaggregated by sector, type of asset, action (constructed or strengthened). The methodology will delineate an assessment of the extent and quality of the constructed/modified asset depending on asset type (Coastal erosion defenses constructed to withstand impacts of climate change (km); Road constructed to withstand impacts of climate change (km)).</u>  <u>This indicator has been proposed by some constituencies as a core indicator for adaptation projects that will deliver resilient infrastructure.</u>  Number will be disaggregated by sector, type of asset, action (constructed or strengthened), etc.  <i>Informed by Adaptation Fund (core-3), LDCF/SCCF 2.</i>  To cover assets associated with climate-vulnerable sectors, such as tourism.
4.0 Improved resilience of ecosystems and ecosystem services	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>4.1A4.1</b> <u>Coverage/scale Extent of ecosystems and ecosystem services restored, protected, or made more resilient to reduce negative impacts of and strengthened, in response to climate variability and change</u>	IEs/AEs/ intermediaries	Disaggregated by ecosystem type. <u>Methodology will examine sub-indicators by ecosystem type and intervention, to better clarify and define “extent” (for example geographic reach, landscape connectivity/fragmentation).</u> <u>Under methodology will clarify that “restored” is only applicable in cases where the prior conditions were climate-adaptive.</u>  To examine how impact on people can be captured.

Expected result	Indicator * = Core	Reporting responsibility (annual reporting)	Notes <sup>8</sup>
			<i>Informed by Adaptation Fund (core-4); LDCF/SCCF 2.</i>
	<input type="checkbox"/> 4.2 Value (US\$) of ecosystem services generated or protected in response to climate change	IEs/AEs/ intermediaries	<p>The methodologies for this indicator will consider the work and experience gained from valuing ecosystem services and their utility by other international organizations and institutions such as the International Climate Fund (ICF).</p> <p><i>Informed by LDCF/SCCF 2 and ICF.</i></p>
<i>Project/Programme Outcomes<sup>2</sup></i>			
Cross-cutting	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>ACrC1</b> Number of technologies introduced (including gender-sensitive technologies) and innovative solutions transferred or licensed to effectively implement adaptation actions climate resilience as a result of Fund support	IEs/AEs/ intermediaries	<p>The indicator methodology might include number of technology transferred 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.</p> <p><u>This indicator was refined to include qualitative aspects on their application and access and alignment with the language adopted by the Paris agreement (article 10).</u></p> <p><u>How to assess the degree of effectiveness of the application of the technology transferred or licensed or its inclusivity in access, will be elaborated in the methodology.</u></p>
5.0 Strengthened institutional and regulatory systems for climate-responsive planning and development	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>5.1A5.1</b> Degree to which gender-sensitive policies, institutions, coordination mechanisms Institutional and regulatory systems frameworks that improve incentives for climate resilience and their are effective for climate resilience implementation.	IEs/AEs/ intermediaries /country	<p>The indicator measures the institutional, policy, and regulatory systems that improve incentives for climate resilience and are accompanied by evidence of their effective implementation.</p> <p>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.</p> <p><u>It has been reformulated to improve its quantification capacity and inclusivity.</u></p> <p><u>The methodology can provide details on a scale that guides AEs on how to consider the effectiveness of a policy supported by a GCF funded activity and</u></p>

<sup>9</sup> As per footnote 14.

Expected result	Indicator * = Core	Reporting responsibility (annual reporting)	Notes <sup>8</sup>
			<p>its implementation.</p> <p>The Readiness and Preparatory Support Programme may employ the indicator to measure its country-level results.</p> <p><i>Informed by Adaptation Fund 7; CIF PPCR A2.1, B2; Adaptation Fund 7.1; LDCF/SCCF 12.</i></p>
<p><b>6.0</b> Increased generation and use of climate information in decision-making</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> <del>Proposed: 6.2A6.1</del> Use Number of effective climate information products/services <del>in</del> for decision-making in climate-sensitive sectors <del>developed, delivered, and used</del></p>	<p>IEs/AEs/ intermediaries</p>	<p>Disaggregated by stakeholder (government, private sector, and general population).</p> <p><u>Number will be disaggregated by type. Methodology for a scorecard will be developed to capture effectiveness. In addition, 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's methodology will also capture efforts to reach different population groups with specific information needs (i.e. Indigenous Peoples, local communities, etc.), and gender-sensitive information climate information products/services. 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.</u></p> <p><i>Informed by CIF PPCR B3</i></p>
<p><b>7.0</b> Strengthened adaptive capacity and reduced exposure to climate risks</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> <del>Proposed 7.1:A7.1</del> Use by Number of vulnerable households, communities, businesses and public-</p>	<p>IEs/AEs/ intermediaries</p>	<p>This indicator is qualitative and/or quantitative in nature. <del>and country-specific.</del> The qualitative aspects of "use" will require an <del>in-depth</del> analysis (survey) or a scorecard approach to</p>

Expected result	Indicator * = Core	Reporting responsibility (annual reporting)	Notes <sup>8</sup>
	sector services of Fund-supported using tools, instruments, strategies, and activities to respond to climate change and variability		determine the extent of <u>use progress</u> . Households: disaggregated by male-headed and female-headed  <i>Informed by CIF PPCR B1</i>
	<input type="checkbox"/> <del>7.2A7.2</del> : Number of males and females reached <u>and utilizing</u> <del>by [or total geographic coverage of]</del> climate-related <u>information</u> <u>and early warning systems and other risk reduction measures</u> established/strengthened <u>to reduce their exposure to climate risks</u>	<del>Es</del> AEs/ 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. Disaggregated by gender, <u>youth and other vulnerable groups</u> . <u>The reformulation of this indicator is 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>  <i>Informed by Adaptation Fund Core-2, 1.2 and 1.2.1; LDCF/SCCF 2.3</i>
<b>8.0</b> Strengthened awareness of climate threats and risk-reduction processes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <del>8.1A8.1</del> : Number of males and females made aware of climate threats and related appropriate responses	<del>Es</del> AEs/ intermediaries	Disaggregated by gender. <i>Informed by Adaptation Fund 3.1, 3.2</i>
<i>Project/Programme Outcomes/Outputs<sup>10</sup></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.]		

<sup>10</sup> As per footnote 14.

## Annex IV: Initial evaluation policy

1. There are a number of previous decisions that deal with evaluations. This section takes stock of those decisions in order to consistently frame an initial approach to the evaluation. In addition, it takes into consideration the inputs shared in the submissions received from Board members, alternate members and active observers in line with decision B.12/33. Among the previous decisions that have implications for the evaluation function of the GCF are the following:

- (a) Paragraph 23(j) of the Governing Instrument for the GCF entrusts the Secretariat with the responsibility of carrying out monitoring and evaluation. In addition, chapter VIII of the Governing Instrument focuses on evaluation and indicates that the independent Evaluation Unit (IEU) of the GCF will determine the frequency and types of the evaluation in agreement with the Board;<sup>1</sup>
- (b) Decision B.06/09 adopted the terms of reference of the IEU (annex III to decision B.06/09 (annex III to document GCF/B.06/18). The terms of reference also define the type of evaluations that the IEU should be engaged in;
- (c) Decision B.08/07 took note of an initial monitoring and evaluation policy; and
- (d) Decision B.11/10 adopted MAF (annex I to the decision), which defines the overall role of the Secretariat, the accountability units, AEs, NDAs/focal points and local partners in evaluations. Notably, MAF requires AEs to undertake interim and final evaluations of all projects/programmes,<sup>2</sup> regardless of their size and strategic importance, including an assessment of the progress made towards the GCF investment criteria, intended results and targets.

2. What commonly emerges from the above-mentioned policies is that the objective of evaluations is to provide evidence gained and lessons learned from the implementation of projects and programmes, to make recommendations, and to improve the design and impacts of climate projects.

3. Evaluations will be guided by the following principles:

- (a) Independence and impartiality;
- (b) Transparency;
- (c) Participation of all the relevant stakeholders (first and foremost local/disadvantaged communities, women and indigenous people);
- (d) Adherence to ethical standards within the evaluation with respect for the beliefs, culture and customs of the beneficiaries; and
- (e) Credibility.

4. The minimum standards, roles and responsibilities and evaluation criteria should be defined in the evaluation guidelines to be developed following the adoption of this initial evaluation policy. The evaluation criteria will take into consideration the industry practices such as the criteria of the Development Assistance Committee of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development as well as the specific peculiarities of the GCF such as its six investment criteria adopted by decision B.09/05.

---

<sup>1</sup> Governing Instrument, paragraphs 3, 23(j) and 57–62.

<sup>2</sup> Decision B.11/10, annex I, paragraph 11(b).

## 1.1 Types of evaluations

5. Four types of evaluations are outlined below, based on previous decisions and guidance.

### 1.1.1 Project-/programme-level evaluations

6. This type of evaluation, except for the ex-post evaluations, should be administered by AEs and carried out by independent evaluators, or, if applicable, the independent evaluation office or unit of the accredited entity.

7. The Secretariat may provide technical support to AEs, in particular direct access AEs, for the design and implementation of their project-/programme-level evaluations.

8. 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 AE and the GCF. In addition, the evaluations should recommend corrective actions in order to ensure that the climate results are delivered as expected.

9. 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.

10. Independent project/programme evaluations will take stock of not only whether and how the project/programme implementation has performed against the agreed outcomes and investment criteria, but also whether and how it has caused unintended impacts and other co-benefits.

11. Project-/programme-level evaluation reports will be submitted by AEs to the Secretariat, which will analyse these reports in order 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.<sup>3</sup>

12. The Secretariat may carry out ex-post evaluations on a sample of projects/programmes so as 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 by the Secretariat 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.

### 1.1.2 Country portfolio, thematic- and GCF-level evaluation

13. 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.

14. Country portfolio level evaluations will be conducted in order 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. In doing so, they will also report progress made towards country-specific goals in relation to the intended nationally determined contributions. The selection of countries for this

---

<sup>3</sup> 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, chapter III.

type of evaluation will be determined by taking into consideration the number of GCF investments in a given country, the distribution of sectors and other relevant factors.

15. Thematic-level evaluations will be conducted in order to improve the design of future climate projects/programmes in key climate sectors. Thematic-level evaluations will be concerned with a sample of projects/programmes supported by the GCF in a particular sector or GCF result area. The selection of the sample, determined by the Secretariat and the IEU, will be based on those projects/programmes where there is a high probability of learning relevant insights on the development of future projects.

16. GCF-level evaluations will be managed by the IEU. 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 replenishments. They will assess the overall performance of the GCF in achieving climate results, including progress made towards paradigm shifts objectives 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.

## 1.2 Learning and knowledge management

17. 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,<sup>4</sup> and shared with relevant stakeholders in order to support continuous learning and improve performance.

18. As envisaged by MAF, an online platform enabling prompt release of all GCF operation related information, including evaluation reports for transparency and mutual lesson learning between multi-stakeholders 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.

---

<sup>4</sup> The portfolio management system is one of the key deliverables of the tools envisaged to be developed through the operationalization of MAF (decision B.11/10, annex I, para. 36(a)).

## Annex V: List of consulted institutions

1. Experts from the following institutions and organizations were consulted in order to refine the indicators in the mitigation and adaptation performance measurement frameworks:
  - ✓ Climate Action Reserve;
  - ✓ Climate Analytics;
  - ✓ Climate Investment Funds;
  - ✓ Conservation International;
  - ✓ United Kingdom 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 Greenhouse Gases methodologies;<sup>1</sup>
  - ✓ 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 and Political Science;
  - ✓ 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; and
  - ✓ Wuppertal Institut für Klima Umwelt, Energie.

---

<sup>1</sup> The international financial institutions included in this initiative are the African Development Bank, the Agence Française de Développement, the Asian Development Bank, the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development, the European Investment Bank, the Global Environment Facility, the Inter-American Development Bank, KfW Development Bank, the Nordic Development Fund, the Nordic Environment Finance Corporation, the Nordic Investment Bank, the UK Green Investment Bank, and the World Bank Group.