List of Questions and Answers
GCF Webinar on the launch of the Revised Readiness guidebook and Readiness proposal template
Day 2 (25 April 2023)

The Q&A below are corresponding to the focuses of the webinar day 2 as follows:

- Readiness Results Management Framework – Grant output level Indicator Reference Sheet (IRS)
- The Theory of Change (ToC) of the Readiness Proposal
- The Logframe Template of the Readiness Proposal
- Readiness Grant implementation and management system

Nº	QUESTION	ANSWERS
LIVE QUESTIONS		
1.	Regarding the TOC diagram, I believe there was a mention of only needing to include those risks rated medium to high. Did I hear this correctly? If so, please confirm that there is no longer a need to show all risks identified in Sub-section 5.3 in the TOC diagram, as was in the previous Readiness template. Does this rule apply to the TOC narrative section as well?	In case of too many risks were identified in section 6.3 of the Readiness proposal, it is recommended to include only risks that are categorized with at least one medium or high for either probability of occurrence and/or for impact level in the ToC (both diagram and narrative parts).
2.	It is noticed that there is a one-to-one mapping of Indicator to Output. However, for best practices in RBM framework, this has often been identified as "risky" and sub-optimal in capturing and measuring results of an intervention. In using the template, can you explain if there is scope to include additional indicators (to have at least 2 in total) or why is GCF recommending the selection of only 1 output indicator?	The grant output level indicator reference sheet of the Readiness Results Management Framework contains indicators that allow results tracking and reporting. The indicators included in the IRS were developed based on different natures of readiness interventions, and usually, there are multiple indicators per output which could be picked up by DP during the proposal development, and reporting during the grant implementation. The selection of single or multiple indicators depends on how well the indicators are relevant to the anticipated results/changes or interventions. However, only indicators listed for each output of the RRMF's IRS could be selected.
3.	What is the difference in strengthening of multistakeholder mechanisms and institutional coordination mechanism between 1.3.2 and 1.1.2 or IRMF. If the objective is to strengthen existing multistakeholder coordination mechanism to include private sector engagement. Where exactly should this sit? 1.3.2 or 1.1.2	Output 1.1.2 focuses on the establishment and/or strengthening of coordination mechanisms at the NDA level with accredited entities, DAEs, focal points for other climate funds and multilateral environment agreements. However, output 1.3.2 focuses on development and/or strengthening of coordination with stakeholders, for example, private sector, to support planning, programming, and implementation of GCF funded activities. Multistakeholder mechanism under (output 1.1.2) is about the interinstitutional coordination at the NDA level, which helps the NDA to bring together the relevant stakeholders necessary to support the NDA role or function with GCF for example with the AEs, other climate funds and multilateral funds.

Nº	Question	Answers
		In addition, you will note that any coordination mechanisms on adaptation should not be covered under this output 3.1.3 under objective 3 as we treat the NAP grant independently. In general, please note that the RRMF Indicator reference sheet particularly, column G on indicator definition provides these kinds of clarifications, on the scope and the differences between the outputs and their corresponding indicators. We encourage our partners to review the IRS thoroughly while setting out to develop a proposal.
4.	Could you please provide some examples of the ideal 'goal statements'?	It is hard to present a good goal statement without clearly understanding the country's situation and barriers. Therefore, this sample of goal statement is made based on a brief case where country X is challenging with climate change impacts on the livelihoods of its vulnerable population due to its limited access to climate finance. Therefore, this readiness proposal aims to contribute to better resource mobilization for climate actions in the country. However, country x still has a number of barriers that need to be addressed for the country to achieve this goal. Those include 1. Limited technical skills among NDAs and relevant stakeholders such as the private sector on GCF tools and process to access GCF's climate finance; 2. Limited capacity of NDA to manage stakeholder programming; 3. Limited stakeholder engagement in climate action and financing; 4. Lack of quality pipeline. Based on this case, here below a sample of goal statement using the IF… THEN … BECAUSE structure. **IF** the country X NDA focal points and other stakeholders have better understanding on their roles, responsibilities, and GCF's tools and processes, **IF** the stakeholders, particularly the private sector actors, actively engage in dialogue in programming, planning and implementation of climate finance initiatives, and **IF** good quality of concept notes are developed and submitted to GCF, **THEN**, the country X will be able to increase its climate finance to address climate change mitigation and adaptation, **BECAUSE** relevant policies, processes, and systems will be in place, and pipelines of concept notes meet the quality standards of GCF and will be successfully converted into quality funding proposal for GCF's financing considerations.
5.	[logframe macro file] I am using Window 11, and there is no box for 'unblocked'	Usually, if the detailed instructions to enable macro provided in section 4 of the proposal template are followed, the "unblocked" option should appear. Anyways, if it is still the case, please send an email to: RRMF@GCFUND.ORG
6.	[Logframe] There are some indicators which targets are 'yes' or 'no'. but the target can be No..?	The target for all binary indicators has to be "Yes". The reason is that the indicators are formulated mostly in a question format with a positive forward-looking, therefore, the target cannot be "No".
7.	Is readiness only for NDAs and DPs? What support do you have for NIE or AEs	The readiness is not only for NDAs and DPs. NIEs or Direct Access Entities (National and Regional AEs) can benefit from the readiness programme, notably through outcome 1.2 for DAEs and outcome

Nº	Question	Answers
		1.3 (output 1.3.1) for NIEs and any other relevant national institutions for engagement with the GCF. Please note that DPs are not the beneficiaries of the readiness programme. They are selected by NDAs to support the design and implementation of the readiness requests.
8.	[Outputs timeline] I cannot find the output timeline in the template. I am afraid I might have missed it. where can I input the outputs timeline in the template?	Please note that the previous implementation plan (Gantt Chart) has been replaced by a much simpler table, which can be found in the excel sheet file along with the budget and procurement plans. In the new simplified table, DPs need to indicate the months in which an output is expected to start and end the implementation. Further guidance can be found in the template document as well as in the revised Readiness guidebook.
9.	I have a question about the logframe. If we choose output 3.1, for example, do we have to choose all the indicators under the output 3.1? I assume not, but just needs to be confirmed.	The indicators should be selected only if they are relevant for the intervention. As such, some cases all indicators or fewer ones could be selected per output.
10.	Les rapports de readiness doivent être soumis à travers la plateforme. Est-ce que l'agence d'exécution, par exemple l'UNOPS, peut-elle demander à recevoir directement ce rapport ? [Translation]: Readiness reports must be submitted through the platform. Can the executing agency, for example UNOPS, request to receive this report directly?	It's worth clarifying that UNOPS' role is limited to managing Readiness and PPF grants on behalf of the GCF Secretariat and not to function as a delivery partner. As the new PPMS system has been rolled out, all Delivery Partners, including those that are managed by UNOPS, will be required to submit Progress, Completion, and Audit reports through the PPMS system. After reports are submitted, the respective portfolio manager (either the GCF's Division of Portfolio Management team (DPM) or UNOPS will review the submitted reports.
11.	"DPs shall not expend any remaining resources except for liquidating already existing commitments that were made prior to that grant expiry date" - question is whether this applies to all grants, even grants that were approved several years ago.	If the grant has already expired, then the delivery partner should not be expending any remaining resources on new commitments or projects. Instead, they should focus on liquidating any existing commitments that were made prior to the grant expiry date. However, it's important to note that this statement may not necessarily apply to all grants, especially if they were approved several years ago. The specific terms and conditions of each grant may vary, and it's important to review the grant agreement to determine the requirements and limitations. If DPs have specific questions or concerns about a particular grant, it may be helpful to consult with the GCF Secretariat to seek advice.
12.	If the NDA is not satisfied with the performance of the DP or has a complaint, to which division should it be informed?	NDAs are encouraged to keep informed their respective GCF regional desks of any performance related issues they may have with the implementation of the readiness grants.

Nº	Question	Answers
		However, please note that the GCF has an Independent Integrity Unit and any complaints in relation to Prohibited Practices in GCF-funded activities should be directed to that Unit.
13.	Have you thought about automating the readiness grant process, that the proposal in an online system? In this way the information would be online and ready to link to the reporting process.	O GCF decided not to use the PPMS for the proposal submission for the countries who prefer to work offline. Instead, we developed the macro-word proposal template.
14.	Is the RRMF process supposed to reduce the turnaround time for Readiness proposals?	Yes, it is one of the purposes. With the new logframe template, the selection of result statements and indicators will be done in more consistent manner which facilitates quick review process.
15.	So we are not supposed to create our own Output(s) but rather follow the suggested Outputs. Am I understanding correctly?	DPs and NDAs are required to use the standard output statements same for the indicators for standardization and consistency purpose. However, you may encounter a situation where you cannot find an exact match of an output statement or an indicator to what the proposed project expects or wishes to monitor, but that is fine. What you need to do is to find the one that is very close to what the proposed plans to achieve (output statement) or to monitor (indicator). Some output statements are quite similar in terms of description, but their focus is different. Therefore, please review the IRS thoroughly to select the most relevant outputs and indicators for your proposal.
16.	We have only 3 outputs in the log frame. Can we define any new outputs if existing options do not work for us?	We encourage you to first review the RRMF -IRS very well to fully understand the newly defined outputs and their indicators. However, if you still find the retrofitted outputs may not be the best match to your grant, please contact your portfolio manager at GCF and we will advise on the way forward.
17.	Another question on use of IRMF for readiness proposal development. Is it ok to change the sequencing of some outputs in Log frame due to logical flow of the theory of change. For example- Under objective 2.4- Strategies for transforming and attracting private sector investment for low emissions and resilience developed and being used. If we are planning to develop climate responsive investment plans or roadmaps for attracting private sector financing under 2.4.2 (strategies/roadmaps/plan), ideally they should be sequentially before the business model development under 2.4.1. As business models will be developed with respective to strategic	Yes, the sequencing of the outputs and indicators is not restricted as long as the results are relevant for the readiness interventions.

Nº	QUESTION	ANSWERS
	priorities under 2.4.2 and should come after 2.4.2.	
18.	In the case of NDAs requiring financing strategies, must the strategy solely support the NDC to satisfy Output 2.2.3? Or can a financing strategy be developed that includes support for NDC target realization, but more broadly supports other national priorities and targets?	The output 2.2.3 (*NDC updated or revised and/or financing strategy or related policies developed)* targets only strategic frameworks that support the operationalization of the NDC, including the financing strategy. However, if the project aims to support development of strategy to foster private sector financing, then the output 2.4.2 (*Strategies, road-maps, studies and policy incentives completed to foster private financing for Country Programme implementation and/or low-emissions climate resilient development*) should be the most relevant. If the project aims to include the two focuses, then it is strongly suggested to have both outputs.
19.	In the case of multi country readiness projects, activities with respect to Objective 5 on knowledge sharing, won't be specifically disaggregated by countries. Rather they would focus on south-south exchange, multi-country dissemination. Is that correct?	It can cover both national level information and south-south exchange
20.	Sometimes consultants are not up to the mark. What can an NDA focal point do in such cases? Is it possible to get involved during consultant appointment as observer to convey NDA's opinion?	NDAs are encouraged to engage with DPs during the procurement process to provide their opinions, including inputs to the ToRs. Please note that modalities for NDA's coordination and engagement with DPs should be fleshed out in the implementation arrangement in section 6 and NDAs are encouraged to provide their inputs at the design phase of the readiness requests
21.	Do DP need to update or report on output indicators on activities that have been previously reported before?	In case the output has been completed in previous reporting periods, DPs only need to provide a statement that the output has been completed in previous reporting periods and indicate the final indicator's values
22.	How flexibly can the template be tailored and adapted to multiple country needs and situations in case of multi-country readiness proposals?	In case of multi-country readiness proposals, country's specific needs and situations can be provided in the readiness proposal, for instance by inserting additional sub-headings for each country as necessary under the existing subheadings in section 2 or clarifying in the LF activities that apply only to some countries. However, please note that Regional Readiness proposals should be considered if there are strong commonalities in relation to the targeted objectives and thematic areas in the participating countries and therefore the deviation should be minimal. Please reach out to your respective GCF regional desks for details on a case-by-case basis.
QUESTIONS ASKED BY PARTICIPANTS DURING THE REGISTRATION		
23.	Why were output indicators selected instead of outcome indicators in the proposal's logframe template?	Output level results and their corresponding indicators are fully under the control of a readiness grant, while outcome level results and their indicators are more attributable to overall country's readiness portfolio, in which multiple readiness interventions will

№	QUESTION	ANSWERS
		contribute to. Therefore, only the RRMF grant output level results and their corresponding indicators are required for the readiness proposal development and grant reporting. The secretariat, in consultation with NDAs, will administer periodic assessment of the progress of RRMF outcome level results using the RRMF defined outcome indicators. Further guidance will be available in due course following necessary sensitization on the outcomes and outcome indicators.
24.	Does the Indicator Reference Sheet focus on Readiness reporting only?	The RRMF grant output level indicator reference sheet (IRS) is designed not only for the grant reporting, but it is also a key result-based measurement tool to be used in the readiness proposal development as you may see in more details in the IRS and logframe sessions.
25.	How detailed should the description of the project progress be in the light of the different outputs, especially regarding projects with more than one country?	Our sense is that Delivery Partner should always aim to provide information that is relevant and concise, which speaks to what has been achieved during the reporting period at the grant level. However, DPs are also expected to provide brief details on what has been achieved in each country targeted as guided by the RRMF indicators reference sheet.
PRE-IDENTIFIED QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS		
26.	Can NDAs/DPs identify and add additional output results, and additional indicators on top of those provided in the RRMF?	The creation of the output results statements of the RRMF is based on the collection and analysis of the experiences of the Readiness programme design and implementation over this past 5-year period. The Secretariat reviewed and analyzed all readiness grants' output statements and came up with a manageable number of standard output result statements that generally reflect the most immediate changes the readiness grants aim to achieve. This results in the fact that in some situations, NDAs and DPs might not find the exact match of the RRMF output results statement to be selected for their Readiness proposal, and it is also the purpose of establishing this list of standard output results statements. In this situation, NDAs and DPs are encouraged to thoroughly review the RRMF IRS outputs and their corresponding indicators to decide which output results statements are the most relevant to their expected changes and select them for the proposal. NDAs and DPs are not allowed to add any output results statements that are not currently listed in the RRMF IRS.
27.	When should NDAs and DPs start using this new RRMF aligned template for submission of new readiness proposal?	Only new proposals or proposals whose completeness and country ownership check have not been confirmed before 5th May 2023 are required to use or convert into the new template. If the proposals have been submitted in Fluxx and have their completeness and country ownership check confirmed before or on 5th May 2023 ARE NOT required to convert into the revised template. However, NDAs and DPs are encouraged to convert their proposals to the new template to avoid retrofitting requirement after they are approved, even though the proposals have significant advanced, for example, up to any inter-divisional reviews BEFORE or AFTER 5th May.

Nº	QUESTION	ANSWERS
28.	What kinds of deliverables should be inputted into the revised logframe template for monitoring and reporting purposes?	The deliverables are no longer required in the logframe template; however, they are required for monitoring and reporting. With the application of the RRMF into the Readiness proposal template, result indicators and their Means of Verifications are considered as a replacement of deliverables which were required in the previous logframe template.
29.	What are the differences on the baseline and target information requirements between the old and the revised logframe template?	In the old logframe template the NDAs and DPs were required to provide a qualitative assessment of the outcome level baseline and propose a qualitative target. However, with the introduction of the RRMF, which provides sets of results indicators, the NDAs and DPs are required to set targets at the output indicator level in which has to be aligned with the type of indicators they choose, I.e., either, binary, numeric or scale indicator. Based on the nature of the indicators, NDAs and DPs do not need to provide baseline information, and this is because the baseline value for most of the grant-level output indicators are either no or zero.
30.	Which part of the Readiness proposal template should articulate the proposed interventions?	In the previous Readiness proposal template, the proposed interventions, which are inclusive of articulation of expected results and activities were required in section 2 of the proposal template. However, with the revised proposal template, the proposed interventions need to be articulated in the narrative part of the ToC, which is just a section following the situation analysis.
31.	Will the NDAs and DPs be able to modify the ToC – diagram template in the proposal?	The template itself could be modified by NDAs and DPs as long as it covers at least all elements of the ToC presented here. For example, NDAs and DPs may put the risks and assumptions on the sides of the diagram at different level of results they relate to.
32.	If NDAs and DPs have specific questions on the logframe, RRMF grant output level indicator reference sheet (IRS) or the ToC, who should they reach out to for advice and guidance?	The first point of contact is each GCF Regional Desk team member or send an email to RRMF@GCFUND.ORG
33.	If the NDA/DP needs technical support to comply with the RRMF since we have questions specific to our proposal, who do we reach out to? Will TA support impact our readiness budget cap?	If the NDA/DP needs support to develop a proposal in line with the new template, GCF has technical assistance available to support you. To access this TA, please reach out to your Regional Desk who can work directly with you to deploy TA. Please note that any use of TA is covered by the Secretariat and will not draw down from your annual readiness cap.
34.	Will the NDA also have access to the same reporting form to check the submitted report by the DP?	NDAs will be able to view the reports submitted by DPs, but will not be asked to review, modify, or provide comments in the system. We are planning to send the automated notifications from the system when the reports are submitted and available for NDAs' view.
35.	Will the reporting dates and review times by the Secretariat be the same as currently?	The reporting dates and review times will be as per the legal agreement with the DP/NDA.

Nº	QUESTION	ANSWERS
36.	Will the DP or NDA have to prepare and submit a Gantt chart separately?	No. There is no need for a Gantt chart preparation or submission.
37.	What if there are errors in the pre-populated “general information” in Section 1.	The information pre-filled in Section 1 in the PPMS reports module comes from the fluxx system. If you find any errors or things to revise, please submit a support request of the specific project in PPMS.
38.	Will there be no need for the NDA signature going forward?	There will be no need for the actual signature of the NDA on the progress reporting form going forward. However, DPs will still be required to share IPR/CR with NDAs in advance prior to the GCF official submission.
39.	Can DPs submit their annual audit reports in PPMS	Yes, DPs and NDA can and will submit all of their audit reports by uploading them as attachments