



**GREEN  
CLIMATE  
FUND**

**Meeting of the Board**

28 June – 1 July 2021

Virtual meeting

Provisional agenda item 10

**GCF/B.29/12/Add.01**

25 June 2021

---

# Integrated Results Management Framework – Addendum I

---

## **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 Co-Chairs'-led consultations held between 20 May to 2 June 2021 as well as written comments received following the consultations.

The consultations focused on issues that have been identified as still outstanding and warranted further consultations and consensus building amongst Board members and their respective constituencies. The document also provides the Secretariat's responses and actions taken to address the comments received.

## I. Introduction

1. This note aims to summarize the comments provided by Board members (BMs), alternate Board members and advisors on the integrated results management framework (IRMF) during Co-Chairs' led consultations between 20 May and 2 June 2021 and additional written comments received following the consultations. It also provides the Secretariat's responses and actions to address the comments received.

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

2. The IRMF document was presented for Board consideration at the previous Board meeting (B.28) following bi-lateral consultations held with the Board between 25 January to 18 February 2021 as well as an informal session held on 9 March 2021. The document was not approved at B.28.

3. Post-B.28, the GCF Board Co-Chairs organized and led three consultation sessions with BMs between 20 May – 2 June to discuss the outstanding issues on the IRMF document.

4. The three sessions covered the following main issues:

- (a) Financial and technical support to accredited entities (AEs) including the timeline and contents of the results handbook;
- (b) Measurement of paradigm shift and systemic change; and
- (c) Application of IRMF vis-à-vis initial Investment Framework (initial IF).

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

5. This section summarizes the feedback provided by BMs during the Co-Chairs' led consultations as well as comments received after the consultations and the Secretariat's responses to those comments.

6. The comments are classified by subject rather than by each session with a view to providing a clear summary of overall discussions that took place.

**Table 1: Paradigm Shift, systemic change and IRMF result architecture**

Comments made	Responses provided
<p>The agreed language from the initial investment framework (IF) was changed in the IRMF document including figure 1 of the IRMF background paper and through the new notion introduced as 'systemic change'.</p> <p>To rectify these issues and align the IRMF with the initial IF, the following modifications to the IRMF results architecture were proposed by the AGN group (refer to the updated summary of AGN concerns received by the Secretariat as of 4<sup>th</sup> June and circulated as of 9 June for further details):</p>	<p>The Secretariat clarified that there was no intent to change the Board approved initial IF through the development of the IRMF. The IRMF document published for B.29 reflects the following key modifications to respond to the concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Systemic change has been reframed as 'enabling environment' to be in line with the language from the initial IF. However, enabling environment has been kept at the outcome level of the IRMF result architecture rather than moved to 'project/programme' level based on the view that enabling conditions and environments (i.e. strengthened institutional and regulatory frameworks) cannot be achieved by projects/programmes alone.</li> <li>• Assessment criteria for the IRMF impact results level have been modified to <i>scalability, replicability and co-benefits</i> (from <i>scale, depth and sustainability</i>) to be in line with coverage areas and activity specific sub-criteria of the</li> </ul>



Comments made	Responses provided
<p>a) <b>GCF impact level</b> should cover not only paradigm shift potential but also sustainable development potential;</p> <p>b) <b>GCF outcome level</b> should cover climate impact potential - reduced emissions and increased resilience only without systemic change; and</p> <p>c) <b>Project/programme level</b> should cover contribution to the paradigm shift at the project level (including four core indicators currently framed as systemic change, country ownership, needs of the recipient, and efficiency and effectiveness.</p> <p>In addition, the proposal included revising relevant figures in the IRMF document to ensure the approved language from the initial IF remains the same in the IRMF.</p>	<p>two key investment criteria in the initial IF, namely paradigm shift and sustainable development potential.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The text and relevant figures in the document (including figure 1, 2 and 3 of the IRMF background paper and figure 1 of the IRMF policy document) have been replaced and or edited to reflect the above changes as well as to clarify that enabling environment (formerly ‘systemic change’) is being applied to both mitigation and adaptation projects/programmes at the outcome result level, rather than at the GCF portfolio in its entirety.</li> <li>• The remaining investment criteria (i.e. country ownership, needs of the recipient and efficiency and effectiveness) were not added to the IRMF results architecture due to the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Efficiency and effectiveness expressed in indicators such as co-financing ratio and amount of privately mobilized finance will be measured by the Secretariat, rather than by accredited entities (AEs) through the results tracking tool (RTT). The current RTT contains these indicators hence there is no need to duplicate them in the IRMF.</li> <li>ii. Country ownership and needs of recipients were not added to the project/programme result level of the IRMF architecture since these are considered more relevant and important criteria for the time when investment decisions are made (ex ante), noting also that the scope of the IRMF focuses on actual results attained (ex post). These criteria can be covered as part of evaluations to be undertaken by projects/programmes or at the Secretariat level as required.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<p>The scope of paradigm shift mentioned in paragraph 11c of the IRMF background paper circulated as of 1 June is too narrow and further clarification was sought in relation to the definition of paradigm shift available in the initial IF.</p>	<p>The Secretariat has modified relevant paragraphs in the latest paper published for B.29 (paragraph 12c, 16, 18, 19 of the background paper and paragraph 10 and 11 of the policy paper) to address the concern on the narrow scope and to ensure the language is aligned with that of the initial IF including the definition of paradigm shift. The previous version was an attempt to respond to comments received from other BMs that the IRMF should measure how GCF <u>promotes</u> paradigm shift in a country driven manner rather than <u>contribute</u> to paradigm shift. The latest version reflects the Secretariat’s attempt to take the middle ground of various comments received to date. As a result, the latest IRMF assesses at its impact result level how and to what extent the GCF has promoted paradigm shift towards low emission and climate-resilient development pathways in the context of sustainable development in line with the definition of paradigm shift provided in the initial IF.</p>
<p>Two layers of results introduced in paradigm shift are unclear and the document requires elaboration.</p>	<p>As noted above, the two layers were introduced to capture both “promotion of” and “contribution to” paradigm at impact result level of the IRMF architecture to address concerns raised by other BMs. The two layers have been removed from the latest document to ensure the IRMF is aligned with both the language in the initial IF as well as the Governing Instrument.</p>
<p>One size fits all approach put forward by the Secretariat in assessing paradigm shift and systemic change is</p>	<p>The Secretariat clarified that the assessment of paradigm shift and systemic change (now enabling environment) will be done in relative terms, not absolute terms and that</p>

Comments made	Responses provided
problematic. Consideration should be given to country specificity.	paragraphs 15 and 33c of the IRMF document have been updated to clarify this. Further clarification on application of IRMF taking into account country context/specificities can be made available in the Results Handbook.
IRMF seems too focused on GCF's role to change policies rather than to fund and implement mitigation and adaptation projects.	GCF provides funds to mitigation and adaptation projects/programmes and does not impose policy reforms nor make funding contingent on any policy reforms in countries where the GCF funds are channeled to. Core indicator 5 (related to strengthening institutional and regulatory frameworks) as well as its relevant text has been updated in the latest document: 1) to emphasize GCF's approach towards promoting country ownership; 2) to ensure that the language is aligned with that of the initial IF and; 3) to clarify that 'enabling environment' indicators (previously 'systemic change') are derived from the mitigation and adaptation performance measurement frameworks (PMFs) adopted by the Board (decision B.08/07 paragraph (a)). Core indicator 5 will be applicable and relevant only to those projects that include activities that target strengthening of institutional and regulatory frameworks.
Clarification was sought on whether the assessment of paradigm shift and systemic change will factor in financial challenges caused by the COVID-19 pandemic as part of the broader context.	The Secretariat clarified that IRMF took into account country and context specificities which would include challenges posed by the COVID-19 pandemic or such a similar occurrence. This could be done during the funding proposal design and implementation phases through setting targets that are realistic for projects/programmes given various operational contexts.
Core indicator 5-8 should be accompanied by a factor identification analysis, or cause-effect analysis, which identifies and categorizes the sources of each evaluated degree of the indicator.	The Secretariat will ensure that the assessment tools for paradigm shift, sustainable development potential and enabling environment are simple but robust enough based on solid methodologies. However, the Secretariat does not expect AEs to undertake any rigorous studies, evaluations, or verifications to establish cause-effect relationship between projects/programmes and paradigm shift /or enabling environment considering their focus on delivering results unless these studies were embedded during the project/programme design stage. Such exercises can be undertaken by the Secretariat as required or recommended by the Board.

**Table 2: Issues related to climate impact indicators (core indicator 1-4 and its supplementary indicators)**

Comments made	Responses provided
AGN group expressed concerns and proposed the followings regarding the existing climate impact indicators (core quantitative indicators 1-4): a) Add another core indicator to capture loss and damage associated with the adverse effects of climate change.	The Secretariat would like to clarify that supplementary indicator 2.7 and 3.1 already exist to capture the loss and damage aspects of the GCF funded activities' climate resilience work as follows:  <b>Supplementary indicator 2.7:</b> <i>Change in expected losses of lives due to the impact of extreme climate-related disasters in the geographic area of the GCF intervention;</i> and



Comments made	Responses provided
<p>b) Core indicator 4 on natural resources is too generic and does not address REDD+ matters.</p>	<p><b>Supplementary indicator 3.1:</b> <i>Change in expected losses of economic assets due to the impact of extreme climate-related disasters in the geographic area of the GCF intervention.</i></p> <p>It should also be noted that the main indicator to capture the results from REDD+ projects/programme is core 1 on measuring emission reduction, and core 4 is an additional indicator to capture areas of natural resources targeted by the REDD+ projects/programmes, as relevant.</p> <p>Furthermore, to avoid duplication /overlap between indicators, the scope of core indicator 4 and its supplementary indicators are set out as follows.</p> <p><b>Core indicator 4</b> (<i>Hectares of natural resource areas brought under improved low emission and/or climate resilient management practices</i> (unit of measurement: hectare)) covers: crop land; cultivated pasture; rangelands; aquaculture; mixed used landscapes such as agroforestry areas; forestry enterprise areas; and shrublands and woodlands for collection of wood and non-wood forest products.</p> <p><b>Supplementary indicator 4.1</b> (<i>Hectares of terrestrial-forest, terrestrial-non-forest, and freshwater and coastal-marine areas brought under restoration and or improved ecosystems</i> (unit of measurement: hectare)) covers both protected or non-protected areas and to be further disaggregated by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Terrestrial-forest including tundra, taigas, temperate deciduous forests, tropical rainforests;</li> <li>b) Terrestrial-non-forest including natural grass, shrublands and dry lands including deserts; and</li> <li>c) Coastal-marine areas<sup>1</sup> and freshwater including areas of intertidal or subtidal terrain; wetlands such as estuaries and mangroves, lake; and rivers.</li> </ul> <p>In addition to the above indicators, supplementary indicator 4.2 (<i>number of livestock brought under sustainable management practices</i>) and 4.3 (<i>tonnes of fish stock brought under sustainable management practices</i>) aim to capture live natural assets.</p>
<p>Regarding the last sentence in paragraph 25 of the IRMF background paper circulated as of 1 June, Sweden sought clarity as to why data gathered against supplementary indicators will not be aggregated to core indicators and requested that the Secretariat revise the sentence to allow for more flexibility in aggregating supplementary indicators to core indicators where applicable.</p>	<p>Paragraphs 29 and 30 of the latest IRMF background paper as well as paragraph 21 of the policy document have been updated to add further clarity. It should be noted that both core indicators and its supplementary indicators will be aggregated to portfolio level results <u>respectively</u> to give understanding of the results achieved at the portfolio level.</p>

<sup>1</sup> The indicator will not adequately apply to the open oceans/areas beyond national jurisdiction and should follow territorial waters (up to 12 nautical miles from the coast) as per the definition provided by United Nations Statistical Division related to marine areas in territorial waters.

Comments made	Responses provided
With regard core indicator 2 on number of beneficiaries, county specific outcomes should be measured in terms of citizen's or private sector's perceived level of satisfaction or benefits from the implementation of GCF's activities.	Core indicator 2 counts the number of both direct and indirect individuals benefited from adaptation projects/programmes funded by the GCF. As the indicator is quantitative in nature, the measurement scope does not go beyond aggregating the figures at the portfolio level. However, additional project/programme level studies or evaluations (if budgeted at the time of project design stage) could be undertaken to gain a deeper understanding on the level of satisfaction or benefits perceived by beneficiaries. The Secretariat will continue to encourage AEs to consider embedding these types of studies to generate further insights and lessons learnt.

**Table 3: Aligning language with that of existing policies**

Comments made	Responses provided
A Board member noted that the decision text (i) related to financial support to direct access entities (DAEs) where <i>"most vulnerable countries"</i> are referenced should be looked into carefully to avoid creating a new concept that may not be in line with the existing policy documents such as the Governing Instrument.	The Secretariat took note of the recommendation and has replaced the reference with "LDCs, SIDS and African States" in the latest IRMF document published for B.29 to align with the language in the existing policy documents.
Some BM noted that inappropriate reference to paragraph 1-c of the Paris Agreement regarding financial flows - linked with the annual-based reporting requirements for accredited entities should be removed from the IRMF document. Rather, the document should focus on data relevant to the scope of GCF resources also considering that the GCF is still working on mobilizing enough resources to enable paradigm shift.  Other BMs expressed alternative views that GCF should measure not only the GCF-funded results but also its related outcomes with regard to global financing flows to recognize the GCF's role in aligning financing flows within the bigger system.	The Secretariat stands guided by the Board on this matter. In the latest document, the below new text for the paragraph in question was suggested by the Secretariat in line with the language in the Updated Strategic Plan.  <i>Paragraph 24: By annually collecting project and programme results, the GCF will aggregate, track, and analyse its portfolio level results, which will support making finance flows consistent with a pathway towards low GHG emissions and climate-resilient development.</i>
The language already agreed upon in the existing policy documents such as Governing Instrument, initial IF, Updated Strategic Plan for the Green Climate Fund: 2020-23 (USP), initial Result Management Framework (RMF) and PMFs should be correctly reflected in the IRMF.	The Secretariat updated the IRMF document further to ensure consistency of language with that of the initial IF, RMF/PMFs and USP and added the following references to the existing policy documents as footnotes.  a) In relation to paragraph concerning GCF's contribution to the global efforts towards attaining the goals set by the international community, added reference to "under the UNFCCC and Paris Agreement", consistent with the Board decision B.12/20 (h), B.13/10 (e) and

Comments made	Responses provided
	<p>paragraph 37 of the USP to which references have been added as footnotes.</p> <p>b) With regard to paragraphs referring to the initial IF, a footnote has been added to clarify the source - table 1 of the initial IF investment: activity-specific sub-criteria and indicative assessment factors (B.09/05).</p> <p>c) With regard to paragraphs concerning monitoring and results management arrangements, reference to paragraph 57 and 58 of the Governing Instrument has been added as footnotes.</p>
<p>The IRMF approach is focused on measurement and quantification. The use of different expressions of measurement should be considered including more clarity on the use of quantitative, qualitative approach or combination of those approaches.</p>	<p>The language has been updated across the document to add clarity for various assessment approaches. For example, the assessment approach for ‘enabling environment’ (previously framed as ‘systemic change’) has been clarified as a combination of qualitative and quantitative approaches. It should be noted that a proposal to introduce quantitative approach via scorecards (in addition to the existing qualitative approach) for paradigm shift and enabling environment (previously ‘systemic change’) originates from the intent to aggregate and analyze data and information at the portfolio level as it is difficult to try to gather and aggregate information when the information is reported in narrative format which is the current practice. The quantitative approach will complement the current narrative(qualitative) reporting which helps capture the knowledge and learning aspects.</p>
<p>IRMF should inform not only results measurement approaches but also the implementation dimensions of funded activities and be updated to this effect.</p>	<p>Paragraph 11c of the IRMF background document published for B.29 has been updated to include a footnote to this effect.</p>

**Table 4: Application of IRMF vis-à-vis Investment Criteria**

Comments made	Responses provided
<p>The Secretariat should make clear in the document that the ex post results to be collected via IRMF implementation will not be used by independent Technical Advisory Panel (iTAP) for selection of FPs.</p> <p>Another board member noted that even after clarifying the use of ex post results on the document, the concerns remain as to whether the IRMF will be used as conditionalities in iTAP’s assessment.</p>	<p>The Secretariat confirmed that ex post results to be collected via IRMF application will not be used differently than the current results management frameworks or serve as conditionalities or eligibility criteria for iTAP when selecting pipeline FPs and that the assessment of pipeline FPs will continue via the investment criteria with low-medium-high ratings, along with portfolio targets and climate rationale. Ex post results from IRMF application will help the GCF assess its impacts, effectiveness and operational performance as per paragraph 58 of the Governing Instrument. Paragraph (b) and (d) of the decision text has been updated accordingly.</p>
<p>Clarity is required on whether external evaluator’s assessment on paradigm shift will serve as another level of assessment or selection of projects.</p>	<p>The external evaluator’s assessment will be part of a projects/programmes’ interim and final evaluations. As often AEs commission these evaluations to an external evaluator, the scorecard assessment will be completed by the external evaluator rather than the AEs. The interim and final evaluations are stipulated in paragraph 11(b) of the monitoring and accountability framework (MAF) adopted by Board decision B.11/10. These interim and final evaluations are funded by the GCF and the budget reviewed and incorporated during the project appraisal phase. The</p>

Comments made	Responses provided
	idea to utilize interim/final evaluations to complete assessment of the IRMF impact result level comes from easing reporting requirements and burden from AEs. Paragraph 15, 33c and 33d of the IRMF policy document as well as annex V provide further clarity on roles and responsibilities of AEs under IRMF application.
A sentence that goes against quantitative measurement approach in the funding proposal template should be removed from paragraph 35 of the IRMF policy document (version circulated as of 1 June) since measurement approaches will depend on each case.	The Secretariat took note of the guidance and has removed the sentence.

**Table 5: Funding proposal template and results handbook**

Comments made	Responses provided
Some BMs sought further clarity on what changes will be made on the funding (FP) proposal template as a result of IRMF adoption and asked that the Secretariat present the FP template for Board's approval.	To respond to the concerns, the Secretariat has updated the decision text (f) of the IRMF document to state that the FP template will be presented to the Board for approval.  As clarified during the sessions, however, there will not be major change to the FP template apart from alignment to the IRMF indicators and results levels in the existing logframe section of the FP template. To clarify this, paragraph 4, 5 and 37 of the IRMF policy document have been updated.
Several BMs requested that the results handbook be presented for Board's approval respecting paragraph 18(c) of the Governing Instrument.  Other board members voiced their opposition to this view highlighting the strategic role of the Board vis-a-vis the Secretariat's technical role.	The Secretariat stands guided by the final Board decision on this matter.

**Table 6: Comments on financial and technical support to AEs including the dedicated funding window for direct access entities (DAEs)**

Comments made	Response provided
A dedicated funding window is required for DAEs to implement the IRMF independent of the existing Readiness Programme scheme.	The dedicated funding window for DAEs will be part of the existing Readiness Programme scheme but will allow DAEs to directly apply for resources under the window and those resources will not be considered as contributing to the funding cap set for the Readiness, i.e. USD 1 million per country per year. The proposed decision text (j) in the IRMF document already clarifies this matter.

<b>Comments made</b>	<b>Response provided</b>
<p>The responsibilities of AEs under IRMF application should be clarified in the IRMF document and or the results handbook. The request relates to the concerns that some AEs from fragile contexts may not be able to meet the new reporting requirements which seem burdensome. Further clarity was sought on the Secretariat's capacity to support AEs.</p>	<p>To address the concerns expressed, the Secretariat has updated decision text (g) and (i) which relate to capacity building of AEs as well as consideration for capacity gaps in allocating additional resources to DAEs under the new funding window respectively. In addition, annex V has been added to the IRMF document to help clarify roles and responsibilities of respective stakeholders (i.e. NDAs, AEs, and the Secretariat) in IRMF application. Furthermore, a section for country / context specificity has been included in the indicative table of contents for results handbook circulated as of 1 June.</p> <p>Apart from the above actions already taken to try to address these concerns, the responsibilities of AEs will remain the same as those under the current framework based on the reporting responsibilities and arrangement specified in the MAF. AEs are expected and encouraged to include any M&amp;E cost for a project/program during the funding proposal development stages to cater to the capacity needs of AEs and thus any M&amp;E-related capacity building costs. Furthermore, the recently approved evaluation policy by the Board provides additional budgetary provision for capacity support to AEs based on their needs and context specificities.</p> <p>As required, the Secretariat stands ready to provide dedicated training to AEs based on context specificities.</p>
<p>The proposed transition period and timeline appears too short for small size AEs considering only two board meeting cycles for the transition related to the FP template. More time and capacity-building support is needed in this regard.</p>	<p>The three Board meeting cycles (from the adoption of the document) are expected to provide ample time for transition to the IRMF since the change in the FP template will be largely limited as noted in the previous table.</p> <p>Capacity constraints of AEs will continue to be assessed in the FP appraisal stage to ensure that adequate budget/resources are allocated to support AE in IRMF application. It should be noted that during the consultation with AEs, no comment was received with regard to burden to AEs.</p>
<p>A phased transition approach based on the size of AEs or a pilot period should be introduced.</p>	<p>The phased approach could cause complexity and confusion rather than simplifying the process as different entities could be reporting against different frameworks in parallel. Financial support such as the new funding window to be made available for DAEs along with the results handbook can help entities build their capacity for IRMF implementation.</p>
<p>Concerns over the new reporting requirements in the IRMF including RTT considering AE capacity.</p>	<p>The RTT is not applied at the AE but at the corporate level. For the RTT reporting, the Secretariat will aggregate result data reported by AEs through annual performance reports (APRs).</p>