



**GREEN  
CLIMATE  
FUND**

**Meeting of the Board**

16 – 19 March 2021

Virtual meeting

Provisional agenda item 11(a)

**GCF/B.28/09/Add.01**

4 March 2021

---

# Integrated Results Management Framework – Addendum I

## Consultation summary note

---

### **Summary**

This note aims to summarize the comments provided by Board members, alternate Board members and advisors on the Integrated Results Management Framework (IRMF) during bilateral consultations organized by the Secretariat held on and between 25 January to 18 February 2021.

The consultations focused on discussions on comments shared by Board members on the draft of the IRMF presented at B.27; issues that have been identified as still outstanding and warranted further consultations and consensus building amongst Board members and their respective constituencies; and obtaining feedback on any outstanding concerns from the various Board members. It also provides the Secretariat's responses and actions to address the comments received.

## I. Introduction

1. This note aims to summarize the comments provided by Board members, alternate Board members and advisors on the Integrated Results Management Framework (IRMF) during bilateral consultations organized by the Secretariat held on and between 25 January to 18 February 2021. It also provides the Secretariat's responses and actions to address the comments received.
2. The consultations have focused on:
  - (i) Comments shared by Board members on the draft of the IRMF presented at B.27;
  - (ii) Issues that have been identified as still outstanding and warranted further consultations and consensus building amongst BMs and their respective constituencies; and
  - (iii) Obtaining feedback on any outstanding concerns from the various Board members.

## II. Recent history of Board consideration and Board/AE consultations

3. The IRMF document was presented for Board consideration at the previous Board meeting (B.27) following consultations held with the Board and accredited entities (AEs) as well as an informal session prior to B.25 on the previous version.
4. Post B.27, the Secretariat, in consultation with the Co-Chairs of the Board, conducted a series of bilateral meetings with Board members to gain a better understanding on their views of the document.
5. Accordingly, the Secretariat held 15 consultations with Board members and alternate Board members: Tobias VON PLATEN-HALLERMUND, Terje KRONEN, Nadia SPENCER-HENRY, Jeremiah Garwo SOKAN, Marta MULAS ALCÁNTARA, Alison CARLIN, Ayman SHASLY, Philip WEECH, Reina SOTILLO and Tlou Emmanuel RAMARU, and advisers to Board members and alternate Board members Josceline WHEATLEY, Ashufta ALAM, Hans Olav IBREKK, Heike HENN, Susan KROHN, Tlou Emmanuel RAMARU, Leonardo CLEAVER DE ATHAYDE and Wael Ahmed Kamal ABOUL-MAGD.

## III. Comments from the Board on the IRMF and the Secretariat's responses

6. This section is a summary of feedback provided by Board members during the bilateral consultations and the Secretariat's responses and actions to those comments.
7. The comments are classified by subject rather than by each session with a view to providing the Co-Chairs and Board members with a clear summary of overall discussions that took place during the consultations.

**Table 1: Comments on document structure and language**

Comments collected during consultations
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>The IRMF document is too technical and should be simplified to an extent possible.</i></li> <li>• <i>Clarify upfront what has been changed from the initial RMF to the IRMF as this is still unclear.</i></li> <li>• <i>Clarify what is meant by ‘Integrated Results Management Framework’ Consider renaming the framework to make it clearer.</i></li> <li>• <i>Numbering of mitigation vs. adaptation result areas in the document should be revised to ensure the adaptation result areas are labeled or placed equal to the mitigation result areas.</i></li> </ul>
Response from Secretariat
<p>The Secretariat has simplified and reduced the length of the IRMF document while keeping core information. Please see the latest IRMF document published as of 23 February 2021.</p> <p>The Secretariat has revised the document to clarify upfront the main changes introduced under the IRMF. Refer to paragraph 12, section III of the background policy paper for a summary of the changes proposed.</p> <p>“Integrated” means that multiple results frameworks are merged into one framework. These multiple frameworks are the initial results management framework (RMF) and mitigation and adaptation performance measurement frameworks (PMFs). The IRMF is also designed to be in alignment with the initial Investment Framework (IF). What this means is that the IRMF enables ex-post assessment of GCF investments based on the six investment criteria provided in the initial IF while the initial IF supports an ex-ante assessment of GCF investment. The Secretariat stands ready to be guided by the Board to rename the framework as required.</p> <p>The numbering of mitigation and adaptation result areas by 1-8 has been modified. Now the mitigation result areas (MRA) are labeled as MRA 1-4; and adaptation result areas (ARA) as ARA 1-4 to ensure they are placed at the same level.</p>

**Table 2: Comments on inputs related to IEU**

Comments collected during consultations
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>The use of the RMF/PMF review undertaken by the GCF Independent Evaluation Unit (IEU) as the basis for making the changes/updates to the IRMF is not accurate.</i></li> </ul>
Response from Secretariat
<p>The document has been updated to clarify that the IRMF is to respond to the Secretariat’s own experience and lessons learned during the implementation of the initial RMF/PMFs in addition to IEU’s recommendations. Refer to Section I, II, and III of the background paper for the challenges experienced by the Secretariat during the implementation of the initial RMF/PMFs as well as issues and implications of the existing results management frameworks.</p>

**Table 3: Comments on contextualization of the IRMF**

Comments collected during consultations
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Clarify linkage with other policy papers developed by the Secretariat such as the Sector Guides.</i></li> <li>• <i>Clarify linkage with Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) while it is understood that the IRMF covers standalone GCF activities and is not directly called for by the SDGs.</i></li> <li>• <i>There is no reference to REDD+ results-based payments projects in the IRMF. Please clarify why.</i></li> <li>• <i>It is recommended that the IRMF contextualize the current pandemic situations and implications.</i></li> </ul>
Response from Secretariat
<p>Sector guides currently being developed by the Secretariat will provide additional support for AEs to define paradigm shift relevant to its projects/programmes during the funding proposal development stage as the guides will present the main drivers of paradigm shift for each sector. The clarification on the linkage between the Sector Guides and IRMF has been added onto the IRMF document as a footnote. Refer to paragraph 18 of background paper and section 3.2 Results Levels of the policy document (Annex II).</p> <p>The linkage with SDGs has been clarified on the document. Refer to paragraph 23 of the background paper. The IRMF is aligned with some climate change related indicators in the SDGs such as measuring GHG emissions (SDG indicator 13.2.2); and installed renewable energy capacity (SDG indicator 7.b.1). In addition, core indicator 5 (institutional and regulatory framework) of the IRMF is linked to the SDG target 13.2 and 13.3 which focus on improving national policies, strategies, planning as well as building institutional capacity. The linkage allows an assessment of GCF investment results vis-à-vis SDGs, although this is not directly called for by the Paris Agreement.</p> <p>It should be clarified that all GCF-funded REDD+ results-based payment projects fall under the governance of performance measurement framework for REDD+ results-based payments (decision B.08/08). However, the IRMF indicators do overlap with those indicators covered under the REDD+ framework. For example, core indicator 1 (GHG emissions reduced, avoided or removed/sequestered) and core indicator 4 (hectares of natural resource assets brought under improved low emission and /or climate-resilient management practices) cover results from interventions to reduce deforestation and forest degradation. Accordingly, reference to the REDD+ has been added as a footnote onto these indicators.</p> <p>The Secretariat takes note that the current situations with the global pandemic affect implementation of GCF-funded projects/programmes. However, the IRMF's focus is to provide a structure and tools to assess climate-related results of GCF-funded projects/programmes. In this respect, the pandemic does not affect the results structure or measurement tools which are proposed in the document.</p>

**Table 4: Comments on alignment with Investment Framework**

Comments collected during consultations
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>The IRMF will replace the Investment Framework and be used to pre-select GCF's projects/programmes based on the actual performance of projects/programmes.</i></li> <li>• <i>Clarify how the vulnerability criterion of the IF will be applied /assessed in the IRMF.</i></li> </ul>

Comments collected during consultations

Response from Secretariat

The IRMF will be applied in a similar manner to the current RMF/PMF i.e., as a tool to help monitor and track project/programme progress against expected results rather than a screening tool for selecting funding proposals. The linkage between the IRMF and IF has been clarified in the document. Refer to section III of the background paper.

The vulnerability of target country, region or population is one of the criteria of the initial IF, namely “needs of the recipient”. Under the IRMF, a change in the vulnerability of a target population can be measured through the following new supplementary indicators. The Secretariat will develop and make available concrete measurement methodologies in the Result Handbook.

- ✓ **Supplementary indicator 2.7:** Change in expected losses of lives due to the impact of extreme climate-related disasters in the geographic area of the GCF intervention.
- ✓ **Supplementary indicator 3.1:** Change in expected losses of economic assets due to the impact of extreme climate-related disasters in the geographic area of the GCF intervention.

**Table 5: Comments on paradigm shift and systemic change**

Comments collected during consultations

- *The notion and measurement approaches of paradigm shift and systemic change are not clear.*
- *Clarify that annexes which relate to paradigm shift and systemic change are not part of the decision of the Board. It is requested that these annexes be discussed and refined further.*
- *Paradigm shift is a long-term view and does not happen within a project life cycle. Yet the IRMF requires results-based reporting from AEs on paradigm shift.*
- *The paradigm shift and systemic change indicators add significant reporting burdens to AEs.*
- *The additional reporting requirements with regard to paradigm shift and systemic change will increase M&E cost which should be spent for target beneficiaries and results rather than on consultants.*
- *Explore whether additional assessments of paradigm shift are possible to analyze the projects/programmes’ attribution as opposed to contribution to paradigm shift.*

Response from Secretariat

The IRMF document (both on the background paper and Annex II) has been updated to clarify the notion, measurement approaches and reporting requirements for paradigm shift and systemic change. The technical language is now kept at minimum, and the objective of measuring “contributions” to paradigm shift and “systemic change” as opposed to “attribution” has been clarified. In addition, the Secretariat stands ready to undertake further consultations with BMs on these IRMF result levels before and during the next Board meeting (B.28). Concrete examples on how to report against paradigm shift and systemic change along with templates will be made available in an accompanying Results Handbook.

The Secretariat added a paragraph in the draft decision paper (Annex I) which notes that the IRMF Annex III (measuring paradigm shift potential), IV (illustrative indicators guidance – reduced emissions and increased resilience) and V (illustrative indicators guidance – systemic change) are for an illustrative purpose only and not part of the decision of the Board. This will allow refinement of

### Comments collected during consultations

measurement approaches for these result levels following adoption of the document at B.28 and during the development of the accompanying Results Handbook.

The Secretariat recognizes that paradigm shift in most cases occurs beyond a project cycle as noted in the IRMF document. Yet, it is important to identify building blocks to paradigm shift from the start to the end of a project cycle to ensure project interventions are focused on the ultimate objective or contributions to a paradigm shift defined for that project. For this reason, AEs are requested to monitor contributions to a project-specific paradigm shift and systemic change during the project lifespan.

The document has been updated to clarify that the only additions to the reporting requirements for AEs under the IRMF are scorecard assessments for contribution to paradigm shift (twice during project lifespan as part of existing interim and final project/programme evaluations) and scorecard-based annual reporting on systemic change indicators as part of the Annual Performance Report (APR) process. The templates and accompanying guidance on how to complete the scorecards will be made available in the Results Handbook along with delivery of training and webinars to support the reporting process as noted in the IRMF.

The scorecard tools and reporting requirements are intended to be simple and structured to support AEs to report their projects/programmes' contributions to paradigm shift and systemic change. There are no expectations for recruitment of any consultants for the reporting requirements while such requirements can be elaborated where necessary during the project proposal development stage.

The Secretariat will ensure that the reporting tools for contribution to paradigm shift and systemic change are simple but robust based on solid methodologies. The Secretariat does not expect AEs to undertake any rigorous studies, evaluations, or verifications to establish evidence for attribution to paradigm shift or systemic change considering their focus on delivering results. However, such exercises can be undertaken by the Secretariat as required or recommended.

**Table 6: Comments on Results Handbook and implementation timeline**

### Comments collected during consultations

- *Clarify the plan for developing the Results Handbook including a plan for piloting the framework.*
- *Clarify the timeline for IRMF implementation.*

### Response from Secretariat

The Results Handbook will contain both the concept on results-based management as well as practical guidance on IRMF implementation to help stakeholders implement and apply the new results architecture. As noted previously, the Secretariat will endeavor to pilot the IRMF before its effectiveness date to a small number of selected AEs to ensure any practical challenges be addressed in the Results Handbook prior to implementation.

The timeline for IRMF implementation has been clarified in the IRMF document. If the IRMF is adopted at B.28, the Secretariat will update the funding proposal (FP) template with accompanying guidance by B.29 and develop the complete Results Handbook by B.30 which includes any potential piloting activities. All FPs including new projects/programmes and resubmissions for Board consideration at or after B.31 must use the new FP template aligned with the IRMF. This will enable all FPs in pipeline to transition gradually towards IRMF implementation.

**Table 7: Comments on evaluations**

Comments collected during consultations
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Do not agree with the large number and usage of evaluations recommended in the IRMF.</li> </ul>
Response from Secretariat
<p>There are minimal additional evaluations proposed in the IRMF (e.g., ex-post reviews and ex-post verifications to assess credibility of results achieved over the lifespan of an investment; and evaluations on specific aspects that have contributed to paradigm shift). These additional evaluations will <u>not be</u> led by AEs, but rather by the Secretariat in the form of portfolio level verifications and or reviews as clarified in paragraph 21 of the background paper and paragraph 12 (e) of the IRMF document (annex II).</p>

**Table 8: Comments on robustness of quantitative and qualitative indicators**

Comments collected during consultations
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Quantitative indicators require further refinement. For example, each indicator should have only one unit of measurement to avoid confusion during reporting and aggregation.</li> <li>Core indicator 3 and 4 are not clear and require refinement.</li> <li>Core and supplementary indicator 2: beneficiaries should be disaggregated beyond sex to follow the international standards.</li> <li>Core indicator 2: Clear definition is required for direct and indirect beneficiaries that can be applied practically.</li> <li>The phrasing of qualitative core indicators 6-8 is unclear.</li> <li>Core indicator 6 will need further refinement including a need to separate innovations and facilitated uptake of innovations, and to clarify if the indicator covers technology transfer.</li> <li>Why has the below indicator been removed? <i>Cost per t CO2eq decreased for all Fund-funded mitigation projects/programmes.</i> <i>An indicator to measure the performance of projects/programmes by grants or blend finance (type of instruments) should be added.</i></li> </ul>
Response from Secretariat
<p>The Secretariat has revised /fine-tuned quantitative indicators including core and supplementary indicators as presented in paragraph 17 of the IRMF document (annex II). Now each quantitative indicator contains only one unit of measurement. In addition, the indicators are refined to be more self-explanatory. The further refinement of indicator definitions with concrete examples is underway as part of the development of the Results Handbook.</p> <p>Core indicator 3 and 4 have been revised as follows to increase clarity.</p> <p><b>Core indicator 3:</b> Value of improved physical assets made more adaptable to the effects of climate change and or able to reduce GHG emissions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Thematic area: mitigation or adaptation</li> <li>✓ Unit: value of assets in USD</li> <li>✓ Disaggregation: type of physical assets; and result area</li> </ul>

### Comments collected during consultations

- ✓ Additional clarification: Physical assets referred here are man-made infrastructure or assets. The examples include renewable energy plants for mitigation projects; and irrigation and or transport infrastructure facilities for adaptation projects. More examples will be provided in the definition to be made available in the Results Handbook to increase clarity.

**Core indicator 4:** Hectares of natural resource assets brought under improved low emission and/or climate resilient management practices.

- ✓ Thematic area: mitigation or adaptation
- ✓ Unit: hectares of natural resource assets
- ✓ Disaggregation: type of natural resource assets; and results area
- ✓ Additional clarification: the improved management practices include protection, restoration, and or agricultural land management activities. The examples of natural resources include forest land to prevent deforestation /degradation or to conserve natural resources including biodiversity as well as non-forest land such as agricultural land to improve sustainable livelihood and food security options. More examples will be provided in the definition to increase clarity.

The sex disaggregation is proposed for core and supplementary indicator 2 to balance between views seeking to increase disaggregation beyond sex and others who have observations on any disaggregation. In addition, the Secretariat is of the view that the accuracy and reliability of disaggregated data beyond sex is likely not to be optimal for core indicator 2 which counts “indirect” beneficiaries who are not the direct recipients of GCF interventions. This consequently involves estimation work for the proposed disaggregation using available statistics or information outside of the GCF projects/programmes. For this reason, the Secretariat intends to focus on sex disaggregation in the IRMF. To the Secretariat’s knowledge, organizational results frameworks usually capture this level of disaggregation.

Considering lessons learned from the implementation of the initial RMF/PMF, it is the Secretariat’s intention to clarify the definition of indirect and direct beneficiaries in the Results Handbook with practical examples of how to apply and differentiate these levels of beneficiaries.

Core indicator 5-8 have been rephrased (see paragraph 30 of the background paper, and paragraph 23 of annex II). Now the indicators are clearly recognizable as “qualitative” rather than quantitative indicators. Each of the systemic change indicators will consist of assessment areas or dimensions. AEs will be required to report their project/programme’s contribution towards each assessment area using a 0–3-point scale rating with narratives to explain the rating per assessment area. The assessment per area or dimension will lead to the overall assessment for each indicator in question. The concrete reporting and assessment methodologies along with templates will be made available in the Results Handbook to help minimize assessment bias subject to this type of qualitative indicators.

Core indicator 6 is now framed as *degree to which GCF’s investments contribute to technologies and innovation not previously or widely demonstrated in a particular context*. Guidance to separate innovation and uptake of innovation, as well as to clarify technology transfer is well-noted. The Secretariat will ensure the assessment areas or dimensions will factor in these elements.

The cost efficiency analysis will be done as part of implementation of the Result Tracking Tool linked to the Updated Strategic Plan (USP) through the calculation of GHG abatement costs. Refer to annex IX, page 57. The indicator has been removed from the IRMF since it can be calculated by the Secretariat based on available data (e.g., GHG emission reduction figures to be received from AEs through core indicator 1 of the IRMF, and funded amount per programme/project available from approved funding proposals).

Comments collected during consultations

The IRMF focuses on measuring climate related results of GCF investments. However, the Secretariat recognizes the importance of assessing results performance by type of grants. Such analysis can be done at the GCF portfolio level by the Secretariat.

**Table 9: Comments on key terms such as gender, technology and innovation**

Comments collected during consultations

- *Gender terms that appear in the document should be revisited. Currently gender matters seem to appear prominently in paradigm shift and systemic change sections.*
- *Technology and innovation terms should be reviewed in line with the terms used by the Paris Agreement.*

Response from Secretariat

The Secretariat has reviewed gender terms for consistency and focus throughout the IRMF document including in the sections and annexes related to paradigm shift and systemic change.

Terms related to technology and innovation have been edited. Paragraphs referring to these terms were also reviewed by the UNFCCC to ensure language consistency.

**Table 10: Comments on IRMF review cycle and budget implications**

Comments collected during consultations

- *The IRMF review cycle proposed in the document should be revisited in line with clearer objectives of the review.*
- *Clarify the additional cost anticipated with regard to engaging national designated authorities (NDAs) for IRMF implementation.*

Response from Secretariat

The paragraphs related to IRMF review cycle have been made clearer to note that the IRMF will be reviewed by the Board in the third year of GCF's replenishment cycle, as part of the overall policy review cycle, starting from the GCF-2 policy review cycle in 2026. In addition, it has been clarified that monitoring the IRMF implementation will be done on an ongoing basis by the Secretariat and that it would report progress to the Board periodically through its regular reporting. Refer to paragraph 49 and 50 (section VII) of the background paper and paragraph 34 and 35 of the IRMF document (annex II) for the revised text.

Section 6.5 (budgetary implication) of the background policy paper has been redrafted to clarify the cost implications of IRMF implementation. Providing capacity support and training for AEs/NDAs will be part of the Secretariat's budget which will be increased over time through future annual work programmes and administrative budgets as necessary. In addition, it has been clarified that any M&E cost related to implementation of GCF-funded projects/programmes will be included in the project/programme budget at the funding proposal development stage by AEs. Refer to paragraph 47 and 48 for details. Furthermore, there already exists a provision within Readiness program to support country level portfolio review by the NDAs in line with the MAF. This is expected to be consistent even under IRMF and any additional resource requirements will be integrated in the Readiness program allocation requests.

