

Green Climate Fund



Initial Results Management Framework of the Fund



GCF/B.07/04

07 May 2014

Meeting of the Board
18-21 May 2014
Songdo, Republic of Korea
Agenda item 8

Recommended action of the Board

It is recommended that the Board:

- (a) Takes note of the information presented in document GCF/B.07/05 *Initial Results Management Framework of the Fund*; and
- (b) Adopts the draft decision presented in Annex I to this document.

Table of contents

I.	Introduction	1
II.	Overview and approach	3
III.	Logic models	3
	3.1 Mitigation logic model	4
	3.2 Adaptation logic model	5
IV.	Performance measurement frameworks	5
	4.1 Mitigation performance measurement framework	5
	4.2 Adaptation performance measurement framework	6
V.	Reporting responsibilities	6
	5.1 Measurement capacity	7
	5.2 Co-benefits	7
	5.3 Knowledge-sharing	7
VI.	Results-based allocation	8
	Annex I: Draft decision of the Board	9
	Annex II: Initial mitigation logic model	11
	Annex III: Initial adaptation logic model	12
	Annex IV: Initial mitigation performance measurement framework	13
	Annex V: Initial adaptation performance measurement framework	18

Initial Results Management Framework of the Fund

I. Introduction

1. The Governing Instrument for the Fund provides specific guidance on several key features of the results, performance indicators and results management framework (RMF) of the Fund:

Paragraph 2: *“The Fund will contribute to the achievement of the ultimate objective of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC). In the context of sustainable development, the Fund will promote the paradigm shift towards low-emission and climate-resilient development pathways by providing support to developing countries to limit or reduce their greenhouse gas emissions and to adapt to the impacts of climate change, taking into account the needs of those developing countries particularly vulnerable to the adverse effects of climate change.”*

Paragraph 3: *“... The Fund will be scalable and flexible and will be a continuously learning institution guided by processes for monitoring and evaluation. The Fund will strive to maximize the impact of its funding for adaptation and mitigation, and seek a balance between the two, while promoting environmental, social, economic and development co-benefits and taking a gender-sensitive approach.”*

Paragraph 57: *“The programmes and projects, as well as other activities, funded by the Fund will be regularly monitored for impact, efficiency and effectiveness in line with the rules and procedures established by the Board. The use of participatory monitoring involving stakeholders will be encouraged.”*

Paragraph 58: *“A results measurement framework with guidelines and appropriate performance indicators will be approved by the Board. Performance against these indicators will be reviewed periodically in order to support the continuous improvement of the Fund’s impact, effectiveness and operational performance.”*

2. At its October 2013 meeting, as part of its consideration of the Fund’s business model framework, the Board in decision B.05/03:

Paragraph (a): *Recalls decision B.04/04, paragraph (a), in which it noted convergence that the Fund will have a strategic focus on climate change mitigation and adaptation, and also seek to maximize sustainable development;*

Paragraph (b): *Recalls decision B.04/04, paragraph (b), in which it reaffirmed that country ownership will be a core principle of the business model framework of the Fund and that countries will identify their priority result areas in line with their national strategies and plans;*

Paragraph (c): *Noted convergence that ownership and access to Fund resources could be enhanced by inclusion of indicators capturing country-driven policies that have the potential to promote a paradigm shift towards low-emission and climate-resilient development pathways in the context of sustainable development as set out in the Governing Instrument;*

Paragraph (d): *Further notes convergence on key criteria that may be considered through the results management framework when measuring performance of Fund activities, where appropriate, in addition to the core performance indicators, including potential for paradigm shift towards low-emission and climate-resilient*

development pathways; development co-benefits; environmental co-benefits; potential for replication and scalability; cost-effectiveness; avoidance of lock-in to high-emission, low climate-resilient alternatives; and finance mobilized from non-public sources;

Paragraph (e): *Adopted the initial result areas of the Fund, as contained in Annex I to document GCF/B.05/23, as initial areas of funding, in order to enable low-emission and climate-resilient development pathways;*

Paragraph (f): *Adopted the initial performance indicators of the Fund, as contained in Annex II to document GCF/B.05/23;*

Paragraph (g): *Decided that the Fund's results management framework will:*

- (i) Enable effective monitoring and evaluation of the outputs, outcomes and impacts of the Funds' investments and portfolio, and the Fund's organizational effectiveness and operational efficiency;*
- (ii) Include measurable, transparent, effective and efficient indicators and systems to support Fund's operations, including, inter alia, how the Fund addresses economic, social and environmental development co-benefits and gender sensitivity;*

Paragraph (h): *Further decided that the Fund, as a continuously learning institution, will maintain the flexibility to refine its results management framework, result areas and performance indicators, based on Fund experience in implementation and monitoring, and as evaluation outcomes become available, and that the lessons learned will feed back into the design, funding criteria and implementation of Fund activities, based on results;*

Paragraph (i): *Further decided that the Fund will assess project and programme proposals in each result area using the same impact indicators;*

Paragraph (j): *Further decided that national and sector-wide indicators will be used only at the discretion of the recipient country;*

Paragraph (k): *Further decided that in designing a logical framework for results management, the Fund will develop indicators to measure the impact of the Fund on strategic improvements at a country level;*

Paragraph (l): *Further decided that in designing its results management framework, the Fund will use the experience of other relevant entities, and, where appropriate, align the framework and indicators with existing best practice models;*

Paragraph (m): *Requested the Secretariat to develop, for consideration by the Board at its second meeting in 2014, a detailed operational results management framework of the Fund, based on the initial result areas and core performance indicators and key criteria decided upon by the Board, taking into account the methodologies set out for illustrative purposes in Annex II of document GCF/B.05/03, input from technical expert bodies and the reporting capacity of countries;*

Paragraph (n): *Further requested the Secretariat to develop additional result areas and indicators for adaptation activities for consideration by the Board at its first meeting in 2014.*

3. A progress report on the Fund's initial results management framework was presented at the Board's February 2014 meeting as document GCF/B.06/04, and no decision was taken by the Board.

II. Overview and approach

4. Complementing decisions by the Board at its previous meetings, this document presents the elements required for the Board to approve the proposed initial RMF for the Fund. The proposed approach builds on the experiences and lessons learned from the Climate Investment Funds (CIF), Global Environment Facility (GEF), Adaptation Fund, UNFCCC programmes, and other relevant bilateral donors working on climate change issues. It is proposed that the Fund should draw on the many useful CIF, GEF and Adaptation Fund indicators, measurement tools and reporting procedures, and evolve synchronously with these and other programmes, drawing on lessons learned as they emerge. This approach avoids duplication of efforts and makes it easier for recipient countries to use the Fund systems by eliminating the need to learn new systems and enabling standardization across a broad range of activities to ensure a consistent knowledge sharing platform. The details associated with the reporting options, best practices and guidance would be made available on the Fund website.

5. The design of the RMF would facilitate a learning environment that focuses on the objectives of the Fund (see para. 4) for the benefit of a broad range of interests by the stakeholders. The indicators are designed to be gender-sensitive, balancing quantitative with qualitative measures as appropriate. The proposed RMF is designed to be a compromise between the complex nature of projects and programmes and the limited capacity of most countries to monitor and report on such interventions. The monitoring programme is designed for the active participation of stakeholders through a combination of quantifiable indicators complemented by periodic qualitative monitoring through focus groups, interviews and questionnaires.

III. Logic models

6. The logic model demonstrates how inputs and activities are converted to changes in the form of results achieved at the project/programme, country, strategic impact and paradigm shift levels. Table 1 describes each level of the logic model and indicates the estimated time required to achieve the relevant results from the time of project inception. Generally speaking, the attribution of Fund activities to results achieved becomes increasingly difficult as one moves from inputs to results achieved at the paradigm shift level.

7. The portfolio-level logic models demonstrate the results chains and the theory of change in a general sense. It is not possible to make them more precise at this very general level of abstraction and generalization. It is proposed, however, that each project holder's logic model would demonstrate the precise linkages between the results levels and the theory of change for its project/programme and the contribution to portfolio-level results.

Table 1: Levels of the logic model

Level	Description	Time required
Input level	Fund grants/concessional loans and human effort	start of intervention
Activity level	Direct services provided through Fund investments	short-term
Project/programme output level	Changes achieved as a result of project/programme outputs	short-term
Project/programme outcome level (country level)	Aggregate changes identified in country policy/planning documents	medium to long-term
Impact level (strategic level)	Aggregate changes achieved in the Fund's key strategic result areas	long term
Paradigm shift objective level	Changes achieved, i.e. all facets of society are demanding and integrating low-emission and climate-resilient approaches to sustainable development	long term (15 yrs+)

3.1 Mitigation logic model

8. Annex II presents the mitigation logic model. The purpose of the mitigation logic model is to summarize the steps required to create a shift towards low-emission development pathways. Measurements will also provide the feedback needed to improve programme design by focusing on the selection criteria proposed. This will be achieved through four strategic-level impact results collected from earlier documents discussed by the Board:

- 1.0 Increased low-emission energy access and power generation;
- 2.0 Increased access to low-emission transport;
- 3.0 Increased energy-efficiency in buildings, cities and industries; and
- 4.0 Sustainable land use and forest management, including REDD+.¹

9. These four strategic-level results draw on mitigation interventions in the GEF and CIF programmes in which emission reductions resulted from investments in renewable energies, energy efficiency and forestry projects.² The RMF is designed to provide feedback on two important mitigation aspects:

- (a) The effective technologies for meeting the emission reduction goals; and
- (b) The role of the Fund in reducing emissions. Underlying all of these interventions is the critical contribution of governments to ensure the sustainability of low-emission development.

10. The implementation of the country-driven policy agenda through its legal and regulatory framework is critical to achieving a paradigm shift. Actions would include:

- (a) Developing a policy document that outlines its mitigation strategy;
- (b) Changing the legal and regulatory framework to be consistent with the proposed policies;
- (c) Building the capacity to implement the proposed programme in government institutions provided with the funding needed to attract qualified staff;
- (d) Enabling the financing needed to support the development and implementation of mitigation projects; and
- (e) Establishing the monitoring and evaluation processes needed to support the evolution of the implementation programme. Implementing entities (IEs) and intermediaries would choose one or more of the results chains to monitor the impact of their intervention. Countries would be responsible for reporting at the thematic level through reports such as nationally appropriate mitigation actions (NAMAs).

11. NAMAs will be drawn on to provide strategic context. The results of mitigation projects and programmes will be aggregated to provide insight on sector-wide performance. As evidence of a paradigm shifts becomes apparent, it is proposed that a set of country case studies would be undertaken to review the incentives that enabled such success with a view to sharing this so that this knowledge could be shared.

¹ Countries would have the option of selecting land-use interventions if they decide it would be in their interest to do so.

² Low-emission projects are expected to primarily consist of renewable energy options. Fuel switching to lower-emissions options may also be considered.

3.2 Adaptation logic models

12. Annex III introduces the adaptation logic model. The highest level of achievement – paradigm shift – refers to “increased climate-resilient sustainable development”. This global objective will be attained after the following four inclusive strategic-level impacts are achieved:

- 1.0 Increased resilience and enhanced livelihoods of the most vulnerable people, communities and regions;
- 2.0 Increased resilience of health and well-being, and food and water security;
- 3.0 Increased resilience of infrastructure and the built environment to climate change threats; and
- 4.0 Improved resilience of ecosystems.

13. Country-level outcomes are purposefully broad and designed to accommodate country-identified priority outcomes from their national adaptation plans (NAPs).

IV. Performance measurement frameworks³

14. A performance measurement framework (PMF) includes a set of indicators that measure progress towards results.⁴ For each indicator, the PMF will also include guidance on data sources and methods for collecting relevant data such as baselines, targets, metrics to be used, frequency of data collection, and other relevant information. Such guidance will be validated and fine-tuned by the Secretariat once the Board has approved the initial RMF.

15. Interventions that have both adaptation and mitigation benefits – such as afforestation or hydropower plants with reservoirs – are expected to use both the adaptation PMF and the mitigation PMF to measure progress. This is common practice among multilateral agencies.

4.1 Mitigation performance measurement framework

16. The mitigation performance measurement framework (Annex IV) includes three core indicators (M.1, M.2 and M.3; see table 2 below) that would be applied to all mitigation interventions. The project proponent would recommend other indicators from the list (3.1, 6.1, 8.1 or 9.1) depending on the particular focus of the intervention. The project and programme information generated through Fund interventions, complemented by similar information from the Clean Technology Fund, GEF and other sources, would be used to develop a global marginal abatement curve (MAC). A global MAC could provide useful guidance regarding cost-effective approaches to greenhouse gas (GHG) emission reduction. National and sector-wide⁵ statistics will draw on information provided to the UNFCCC to help guide the assessment of paradigm shifts.

Table 2: Mitigation paradigm shift indicators

M.1	Tonnes of greenhouse gas emissions produced (intention is to reduce these emissions)
M.2	Cost per tonne of CO ₂ -equivalent reduced (intention is to reduce costs of mitigation)
M.3	Volume of public and private funds catalysed by the Fund
3.1.	Annual energy savings (GWh) as a result of Fund interventions
6.1.	MW of capacity from low-emission sources

³ These PMF are to serve as initial frameworks. Results and indicators will evolve as lessons are learned.

⁴ Indicators are neutral; they are intended to measure both positive and negative performance (increases/decreases, improvements/deterioration, etc.). Statements on results indicate direction through terms like “enhanced”, “increased” or “improved”.

⁵ By its decision B.05/03, paragraph (j), taken at its October 2013 meeting, the Board decided that “national and sector-wide indicators will be used only at the discretion of the recipient country”.

8.1.	Number of passengers (disaggregated by gender if feasible) using low-carbon transportation as a result of Fund funding
9.1.	Rate of net deforestation and forest degradation

4.2 Adaptation performance measurement framework

17. Annex V outlines the proposed initial adaptation PMF, the primary reference tool for measuring the Fund's adaptation results. The indicators presented here were developed following consultation with key performance measurement staff at CIF, GEF, and the Adaptation Fund. While each of these agencies has its own particular focus and portfolio size, a general observation is that measuring the strength of resilience or adaptation to climate risk continues to present challenges. For a variety of reasons, all of these agencies have not measured impact-level (i.e. strategic-level results, see Annex III). The lack of measurement at this level is in part due to the complexity of doing so and in part due to the fact that GEF projects have not reached mid-term yet. In addition, the Adaptation Fund has only recently adopted a results-oriented approach in 2010, and CIF, despite praiseworthy efforts to measure changes in national government policy and capacity, does not think that the CIF monitoring function has the resources, capacity or time horizon to measure its adaptation impact-level results.

18. The CIF performance measurement team would like to see a stronger role played by its evaluation group, with particular focus on the tracking of long-term adaptation results. It is proposed that the Fund also explore using the Independent Evaluation Unit (IEU) to do the same for the Fund investments. The recommendations for IEU involvement are provided in the 'Assumptions/notes' column of the PMF.

19. The Fund will be larger in scale and wider in geographic and income scope than any of the existing Funds, and thus more likely to engage in a wider array of interventions. Indicators are therefore designed to accommodate this wider scope of intervention. It is proposed that the Fund's PMF incorporate, to the greatest extent possible, qualitative and quantitative adaptation indicators that have been successfully measured (e.g. the Pilot Program for Climate Resilience (PPCR) government policy and capacity indicators) or indicators that have been recently redesigned based on measurement experience (e.g. Adaptation Fund indicators and the GEF's proposed changes awaiting imminent approval by its Board). Many of these indicators come with field-tested measurement tools that can be adopted and fine-tuned by the Green Climate Fund.

20. It is proposed that all five indicators at the project/programme outcome level (numbers 5.1, 6.1, 6.2, 7.1 and 8.1 in Annex V) be considered as core indicators for the Fund's adaptation funding. These are broad-spectrum indicators and most should be tracked in recipient government plans. Strategic-level indicators are specific to the type of intervention funded. Therefore, in addition to the five core indicators, it is proposed that project holders should report on the indicators at the impact level (strategic level) that apply to their particular project theme (see also proposed IEU role mentioned in para. 23 below). The number of direct and indirect beneficiaries is included as an additional tracking measure for the scope and development potential of the Fund-funded projects and programmes.

V. Reporting responsibilities

21. The performance measurement process will require effort from the Secretariat, accredited IEs and intermediaries, and executing entities (EEs). Upon approval of the initial RMF by the Board, the Secretariat will develop, in consultation with the IEs and intermediaries, a performance-monitoring plan that clarifies the respective roles and responsibilities. IEs will have primary responsibility for reporting on the performance of the Fund-funded interventions on the ground. Each EE should be expected to prepare a work plan that includes a logic model and a PMF linked to the Fund's global logic models and PMFs; this work plan should indicate the

indicators that will be reported against. These will be the primary tools for annual performance reporting.

22. For many projects, and in particular the impacts of adaptation projects, meaningful results will often not be obtained within the time frame of the direct involvement of the IEs and EEs because many climate extremes that test the effectiveness of the Fund's interventions are infrequent and random. But these results are important to the effective role of the IEU, which may wish to make arrangements to conduct monitoring over longer time periods.

5.1 Measurement capacity

23. Experience with other low-emission and adaptation programmes has revealed that most countries and EEs have limited capacity to establish an effective performance monitoring system to track climate change mitigation and adaptation-related indicators. To ensure the reliability of performance measurement data, support for capacity-building on results measurement should be included in the Fund's activities. Systems should be put in place to support the Fund's staff, IEs, intermediaries, EEs, national designated authorities and focal points with guidance, coaching, training, and online toolkits and templates (see CIFs emerging lesson 9: monitoring and evaluation culture and capacity-building is vital.⁶). As indicated in the logic models, many promising measurement approaches currently exist and should be considered by the Fund. It is further proposed that the Fund should work jointly with other donors and agencies to develop measurement approaches, especially with regard to adaptation, by joining appropriate bodies such as the community of practice on performance measurement established by CIF.

5.2 Co-benefits

24. It is anticipated that virtually all adaptation benefits will contribute to strengthen socioeconomic development in recipient countries, regions and communities. Therefore, the identification of adaptation co-benefits is not critical. Given that the benefits of mitigation interventions are expected to provide additional regional and local benefits as well as global benefits, it is proposed that mitigation interventions funded by the Fund report on at least one co-benefit, as outlined in document GCF/B.04/03. Important co-benefits that are expected to be highlighted in mitigation include enhanced economic growth, improved health, greater and more equitable opportunities for men and women, greater biodiversity, and better access to electricity. It would be the responsibility of each project proponent to select the co-benefit or set of co-benefits on which they will report. Results and indicators for anticipated co-benefits should be identified in start-up plans.

5.3 Knowledge-sharing

25. Knowledge-sharing would draw on on-the-ground success cases and experiences and package these as case studies/promotional materials to be disseminated via Fund networks or, in a more consistent and focused way, via knowledge hubs or South-South exchanges. It is proposed that the full knowledge-sharing system be internet-based to the greatest extent possible and that it include:

- (a) Guidance from the Fund Secretariat to the stakeholders;
- (b) Reporting systems to be used by the IEs; and

⁶ CIF, "Emerging lessons from operationalizing the CIFs results frameworks". Available from <<https://www.climateinvestmentfunds.org/cif/measuring-results/sharing-experiences>>.

(c) Cross-country and technology-specific reports from the Fund Secretariat.

26. In addition, it is proposed that the Secretariat provide annual reports that summarize lessons learned from countries and projects to help guide Board decisions on the evolution of Fund allocations and to help clients design programmes and projects. The reports would be designed to help maximize the impact of the Fund and guide the countries constrained by multiple objectives. Traditional knowledge-sharing methods such as reports, meetings, seminars and conferences would also be employed.

VI. Results-based allocation

27. Where appropriate, allocation decisions would be made contingent on the achievement of results in programmes and projects. As further elaborated in document GCF/B.07/04, in the second tier of the allocation system (i.e. the actual approval of activities), the level of expected results of the activity will be one of the key criteria for allocating resources.

28. This chapter recognizes that the PMF is an important tool for results-based or performance-based allocation,⁷ but that it cannot by itself provide the basis for allocation decisions. It is proposed that the Fund's resource allocation process should evolve over the course of the first few years of operation, drawing on its experience in generating results and its lessons learned.⁸ There are three major points in time for the collection of result information that could inform allocation decisions:

- (a) Regular performance measurement exercises conducted in-house and by the executing agency using its PMF to generate timely feedback on project progress for reporting and to enhance management decision-making;
- (b) An impact assessment at the end of a project or programme through which the results achievement over the life of an intervention is evaluated; and
- (c) An evaluation that normally covers multiple project or programme results. Like regular performance monitoring, this evaluation assesses the level of results achievement, but usually in a less biased way, while also addressing broader contextual matters, such as relevance, coherence, country context and efficiency of implementation over a longer timeframe.

29. It is proposed that all three forms of measurement be incorporated into ex-post allocation decisions. The first two – performance measurement and impact assessment – would produce results information that could be used as a guide for making subsequent allocations (extensions or new phases) upon the completion of a given project. All three forms could be used to do the same for programmes. Subsequent programme phases or extensions could be made contingent upon the achievement of a reasonable amount/level of results, as is done at the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria.

⁷ Results-based allocation and performance-based allocation are used synonymously.

⁸ It should be noted that allocations based on project results cannot be made at the outset of a new fund or programme, as there is no implementation or results experience to inform the relevant decision-making.

Annex I: Draft decision of the Board

The Board, having reviewed document GCF/B.07/04 *Initial Results Management Framework of the Fund*:

- (a) Affirms that the initial results management framework of the Fund contained in this document complements decision B.05/03, including the initial results areas of the Fund referred to in that decision, as contained in Annex I to document GCF/B.05/23, as well as the performance indicators of the initial result areas of the Fund also referred to in that decision, as contained in Annex II of document GCF/B.05/23;
- (b) Adopts the initial results management framework of the Fund as outlined hereunder:
- (i) Levels of the logic model:
 - 1) Paradigm shift objective
 - 2) Strategic impact
 - 3) Project/Programme outcome
 - 4) Project/Programme output
 - 5) Activity
 - 6) Input
 - (ii) Paradigm shift objective for mitigation:
Shift to low-emission sustainable development pathways;
 - (iii) Strategic level impacts for mitigation:
 - 1) Increased low-emission energy access and power generation;
 - 2) Increased access to low-emission transport;
 - 3) Increased energy efficiency from buildings, cities and industries;
 - 4) Sustainable land use and forest management, including REDD+;
 - (iv) Project/programme level outcomes for mitigation:
 - 1) Increased gender-sensitive low-emission development mainstreamed in government;
 - 2) More small, medium and large low-emission power suppliers;
 - 3) Lower country energy intensity trajectory;
 - 4) Increased use of low-carbon transport;
 - 5) Stabilization of forest coverage;
 - (v) Paradigm shift objective for adaptation:
Increased climate-resilient sustainable development;
 - (vi) Strategic level impacts for adaptation:
 - 1) Increased resilience and enhanced livelihoods of the most vulnerable people, communities, and regions;
 - 2) Increased resilience of health and well-being, and food and water security;
 - 3) Increased resilience of infrastructure and the built environment to climate change threats;

-
- 4) Improved resilience of ecosystems;
- (vii) Project/programme level outcomes for adaptation:
- 1) Strengthened government institutional and regulatory systems for climate-responsive development planning;
 - 2) Increased generation and use of climate information in decision-making;
 - 3) Strengthened adaptive capacity and reduced exposure to climate risks;
 - 4) Strengthened awareness of climate threats and risk-reduction processes;
- (c) Takes note of the illustrative information on inputs, activities, and outputs in initial mitigation logic model in Annex II to this document and the initial adaptation logic model in Annex III;
- (d) Acknowledges that the inputs, activities, and outputs will be defined for each project/programme on a case-by-case basis;
- (e) Takes note of the initial mitigation performance measurement framework in Annex IV to this document, and the initial adaptation performance measurement framework in Annex V to this document;
- (f) Requests the Secretariat to further develop the mitigation and adaptation performance measurement frameworks of the Fund for the Board to consider at its first meeting following the completion of the initial resource mobilization process.

Annex II: Initial mitigation logic model

Paradigm shift objective	Shift to low-emission sustainable development pathways			
↑	↑	↑	↑	↑
Impacts (Strategic level)	1.0 Increased low-emission energy access and power generation	2.0 Increased access to low-emission transport	3.0 Increased energy efficiency in buildings, cities and industries	4.0 Sustainable land use and forest management, including REDD+
↑	↑			
Project/programme outcomes (Country-driven from NAMAs, climate change strategies, mitigation policies, etc.)	5.0 Increased gender-sensitive low-emission development mainstreamed in government 6.0 More small, medium and large low-emission power suppliers 7.0 Lower country energy intensity trajectory 8.0 Increased use of low carbon transport 9.0 Stabilization of forest coverage			
↑	↑			
Programme / project outputs (to be defined by executing entities)	<u>Possible examples include:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More small, medium and large low-emission power suppliers; • Increased use of incentives and technologies for low-carbon transport; • Improved management systems of entities responsible for forests and protected areas; • Increased energy efficiency of building, industry and appliances. 			
↑	↑			
Indicative activities (to be defined by executing entities)	<u>Possible examples include:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Capacity-building to foster government support for policy reforms through training and knowledge-sharing; • Upgrading the legal and regulatory framework; • Increased investment in renewable energies; • Increased investment in energy efficiency; • Increased investment in low-emission transport; • Increased support for decreased deforestation and increased afforestation. 			
Inputs	Grants, concessional loans			

Annex III: Initial adaptation logic model

Paradigm shift objective	Increased climate-resilient sustainable development			
↑	↑	↑	↑	↑
Impacts (Strategic level)	1.0 Increased resilience and enhanced livelihoods of the most vulnerable people, communities, and regions	2.0 Increased resilience of health and well-being, and food and water security	3.0 Increased resilience of infrastructure and the built environment to climate change threats	4.0 Improved resilience of ecosystems
↑	↑			
Project/programme outcomes (Country-driven drawn from continuous planning as reflected in NAPs.)	5.0 Strengthened government institutional and regulatory systems for climate-responsive development planning 6.0 Increased generation and use of climate information in decision-making 7.0 Strengthened adaptive capacity and reduced exposure to climate risks 8.0 Strengthened awareness of climate threats and risk-reduction processes			
↑	↑			
Programme/project outputs (to be defined by executing entities)	<u>Possible examples include:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased knowledge of climate threats and coping mechanisms; Strengthened knowledge and awareness of climate-resilient options and technologies; Improved sector planning and coordination and information-sharing; Improved water and soil management; Increased climate-proofing of infrastructure. 			
↑	↑			
Indicative activities (to be defined by executing entities)	<u>Possible examples include:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Train, share experiences, revise/develop policy/standards; Identify and promote flagship themes; Transfer experience and technologies, with emphasis on “green” solutions; Identify and scale-up effective community-based adaptation; Establish knowledge hubs. 			
Inputs	Grants, concessional loans			

Annex IV: Initial mitigation performance measurement framework¹

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Expected results	Indicators (indicative)	Baseline data	Targets	Data sources and collection methods	Frequency	Responsibility	Assumptions/notes
Paradigm shift objective							
Shift to low-emission, sustainable development pathways	M.1 Tonnes of carbon dioxide equivalent (t CO ₂ eq) emitted by countries receiving mitigation funding	Assumed business-as-usual emissions trajectory measured in t CO ₂ equiv. emitted by countries		The Fund would coordinate with the UNFCCC data	Every five years	Fund Secretariat	
	M.2 Cost per t CO ₂ eq decreased for all Fund-funded mitigation projects	Not required		Executing entity (EE)/implementing entity (IE) results reports and energy balances	Every five years	Fund Secretariat	Provides information to help reduce the expected cost of mitigation
	M.3 Volume of public and private funds catalysed by the Fund (core indicator)			Project/programme proposals and end-of-project reports	Beginning and end of an investment	IEs	To effectively bring about a paradigm shift in the way that societies approach mitigation, the private sector must be engaged given its sizeable role in the energy sector. This indicator – consistent with the Fund's Governing Instrument – is a proxy indicator that measures catalysed funding, including private sector funding. It should be tracked by all projects and programmes.

¹ The relevant indicators of the Fund's mitigation performance management framework would be brought into line with those of the Sustainable Energy for All initiative chaired by the United Nations Secretary-General and the World Bank President, and its three targets on energy access, renewable energy and energy efficiency. Projects would also report on at least one co-benefit to address the broader potential impacts of mitigation interventions.

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Expected results	Indicators (indicative)	Baseline data	Targets	Data sources and collection methods	Frequency	Responsibility	Assumptions/notes
<u>Impacts (strategic level)</u>							
1.0 Increased low-emission energy access and power generation	1.1 Level of national/regional capacity (MW) from low emission sources (renewable energy).	Existing mix of power generation		Data from the transmission system operator or dispatch centre	Mid-term and end of investment	IEs	
2.0 Increased access to low-emission transport	2.1 Emissions levels from vehicles	Existing transport emissions		Data from Ministry of Transport	Annually	IEs	<u>Draw on data available from UNFCCC reporting</u>
3.0 Increased energy efficiency in buildings, cities and industries	3.1 Annual energy savings (GWh)	Energy balance data		Statistics office or Ministry of Energy	Mid-term and end of investment	IEs	

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Expected results	Indicators (indicative)	Baseline data	Targets	Data sources and collection methods	Frequency	Responsibility	Assumptions/notes
4.0 Sustainable land use and forestry management including REDD+	4.1 Forest area under improved management and reduced carbon emissions practices	Existing levels		Ministry of Forestry and remote sensing	Mid-term and end of investment	IEs	<p>The approach to the measurement of forestry management will draw on UNFCCC decisions 9/CP.19 to 15/CP.19 and related decisions regarding REDD+</p> <p>Decision B.05/03, Annex I, from the October 2013 Board meeting included</p> <p>(g) Sustainable land use management to support mitigation and adaptation; and</p> <p>(h) Sustainable forest management to support mitigation</p> <p>as initial result areas</p>
Project/programme outcomes							
5.0 Increased gender sensitive low-emission development mainstreamed in government	5.1 Number and gender sensitivity of policy, laws and sector strategies supported by the Fund	Existing legislation		Gender sensitive analysis of the low-carbon enabling environment	Annually	EEs	This indicator will measure the government's enabling environments for low-carbon development.
6.0 More small, medium and large low-emission power suppliers	6.1 MW of capacity from low emission sources	Existing set of low emissions suppliers		Data from the transmission system operator or dispatch centre	Annually	EEs	This will focus on solar, wind, geothermal and similar suppliers.

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Expected results	Indicators (indicative)	Baseline data	Targets	Data sources and collection methods	Frequency	Responsibility	Assumptions/notes
7.0 Lower country energy intensity trajectory	7.1 Energy savings (GWh)	Existing energy use		Utilities are expected to be the primary source of data	Annually	EEs	This may require aggregating country-level statistics in key emitting sectors of each city.
8.0 Increased use of low-carbon transport	8.1 Number of passengers (disaggregated by gender where possible) using low emission vehicles	Existing transport use		Records of Ministry of Transport or licensing bureau	Annually	EEs	Assumes that a portion of investments will target vehicle fleets and possible car manufacturers.
	8.2 Modal share (by transportation type)	Existing transport use		Transportation household survey with sex disaggregated data	Annually	EEs	Survey would determine the predominant types of transportation used (pedestrian, bicycle, bus, rickshaw, collective taxi, rail, car, etc.) by women and men. Repeated over time to determine any movement to low-emission modes.

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Expected results	Indicators (indicative)	Baseline data	Targets	Data sources and collection methods	Frequency	Responsibility	Assumptions/notes
9.0 Stabilization of forest coverage	9.1 Rate of net deforestation and forest degradation	Existing levels of deforestation and degradation		REDD+ action areas compared to baseline using records of forest management agencies	Annually	EEs	<p>The approach to forestry measurement will draw on UNFCCC decisions 9/CP.19 to 15/CP.19 and related decisions regarding REDD+.</p> <p>Decision B.05/03, Annex I, from the October 2013 Board meeting included:</p> <p>(g) Sustainable land use management to support mitigation and adaptation; and</p> <p>(h) Sustainable forest management to support mitigation</p> <p>as Initial Result areas</p>
	9.2 Trend in women/men's livelihood from sustainable forestry	Current trend		Household surveys with sex-disaggregated data.	Annually	EEs	

Annex V: Initial adaptation performance measurement framework

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
<u>Expected results</u>	<u>Indicators (indicative)</u>	<u>Baseline data</u>	<u>Targets</u>	<u>Data sources and collection methods</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Responsibility</u>	<u>Assumptions/notes</u>
Paradigm shift objective: increased climate resilient sustainable development							
Impacts (strategic level)							
1.0 Increased resilience and enhanced livelihoods of the most vulnerable people, communities and regions	1.1 Percentage reduction in the number of people affected (c.f. CRED definition ¹) by climate-related disasters, including the differences between vulnerable groups (women, elderly, etc.) and the population as a whole.	Baseline already available through CRED		Third-party monitoring plus survey of targeted populations, disaggregated by sex and income levels	Annually	Implementing entities (IEs) / (Independent Evaluation Unit)	Direct measure of impact, but the results will depend on whether and when extreme climate events occur. An indicator over the long-term
	1.2 Number (percentage) of households adopting a wider variety of livelihood strategies/coping mechanisms	Pre-project/ programme assessment		Household survey of men and women	Mid-term and end of investment	IEs	Outcome based on Global Environment Facility (GEF) Outcome 1.3, and Pilot Program for Climate Resilience (PPCR) A1.1 (core), and Adaptation Fund Outcome 6 Indicator is consistent with GEF Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)/Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF) indicator 1.3.1.

¹ "People requiring immediate assistance during a period of emergency, i.e. requiring basic survival needs such as food, water, shelter, sanitation and immediate medical assistance. Appearance of a significant number of cases of an infectious disease introduced in a region or a population that is usually free from that disease." Taken from: Centre for Research on the Epidemiology of Disasters (CRED), "EM-DAT. The international disaster database". Available from <<http://www.emdat.be/glossary/9>>.

2.0 Increased resilience of health and well-being, and food and water security	2.1 Percentage of food-secure households (reduced food gaps)	Pre-project/ programme assessment		Household survey of men and women	Mid-term and end of investment	IEs	Variant of GEF LDCF/SCCF indicator 1.2.
	2.2 Percentage of households with year-round access to adequate water (quality and quantity for household use)	Pre-project/ programme assessment		Household survey of men and women	Mid-term and end of investment	IEs	Replication of PPCR indicator A1 (non-core)
	2.3 Climate induced disease incidence in areas where adaptation health measures have been introduced (% of population)	Pre-project/ program assessment		Hospitals and health centre records disaggregated by sex (Aid Agency records)	Mid-term and end of investment; and continuing (IEU)	IEs/IEU	This outcome is based on GEF Outcome 1.2 and PPCR A1.2 This indicator replicates the GEF (LDCF/SCCF) indicator 1.2.1 with a slight rewording for clarification. IEs would select from a range of indicators similar to those provided in GEF Outcome 1.2 and various tool kits. ²
	2.4 Area (ha) of agricultural land made more resilient to climate change through changed agricultural practices (e.g. planting times, new and resilient native varieties, efficient irrigation systems adopted)	Not required		Programme reports and records	Mid-term and end of investment	IEs	This is a fairly simple measure that tracks Fund-funded activities in this thematic area.
3.0 Increased resilience of infrastructure and the built environment to climate change threats	3.1 Value of infrastructure made more resilient to rapid-onset events (e.g. floods, storm surges, heat-waves) and slow-onset processes (e.g. sea level rise)	Not required		Replacement cost of infrastructure estimated to have been saved from weather events (weather intensity factored in)	Mid-term and end of investment	IEs	Must ensure that inflated property values not included in these calculations.

² Indicator measurement tools and methodologies exist for most PPCR, GEF, and Adaptation Fund indicators. Once indicators are approved, these tools and methodologies could be adopted and fine-tuned for Fund needs. Bilateral agencies such as the Department for International Development (United Kingdom), Japan International Cooperation Agency and the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency, etc. also offer useful indicators and approaches to monitoring adaptation.

	3.2 Number of new infrastructure projects or physical assets strengthened or constructed to withstand conditions resulting from climate variability and change (e.g. to heat, humidity, wind velocity and floods).	Not required		Programme reports and records	Mid-term and end of investment	IEs	Replication of Adaptation Fund Indicator 4.1.2
4.0 Improved resilience of ecosystems	4.1 Area (ha) of habitat or kilometres of coastline rehabilitated (e.g. reduced external pressures such as overgrazing and land degradation through logging/collecting); restored (e.g. through replanting); or protected (e.g. improved fire management; flood plain/buffer maintenance)	Not required		Programme reports and records	Mid-term and end of investment; with climate related damage to the project area continued to be monitored via IEU	IEs/IEU	Consistent with Adaptation Fund Outcome 5. These (process) indicators measure the interventions made but not the ability of ecosystems to withstand weather events. However, the area of ecosystems requiring rehabilitation or restoration due to recent events should decline as the project is implemented.
	4.2 Number and area of agroforestry projects, forest-pastoral systems, or ecosystem-based adaptation systems established or enhanced.	Not required		Programme reports and records	Mid-term and end of investment	IEs	From GCF IR8

Project/program outcomes (country-driven)							
5.0 Strengthened government institutional and regulatory systems for climate-responsive development planning	5.1 Degree of integration/mainstreaming of climate change in national and sector planning and coordination in information sharing and project implementation [Core indicator]	Pre-project/programme assessment		Quality scorecard with standards	Annually	Executing entities (EEs)	Indicator is consistent with the Climate Investment Funds (CIF)-PPCR indicator A2.1 (core) and Adaptation Fund Outcome 7
6.0 Increased generation and use of climate information in decision-making	6.1 Evidence that climate data is collected, analysed and applied to decision-making in climate-sensitive sectors at critical times by the government, private sector and men/women. [Core indicator]	Pre-project/programme assessment		Scorecards to measure climate information generation, analysis and communication	Annually	EEs	This indicator aligns with CIF-PPCR B3, but adds an additional component of “collecting and analysing” climate data, critical aspects of reliable climate information systems that must continuously assess climate variability.
	6.2 Perception of men, women, vulnerable populations, and emergency response agencies of the timeliness, content and reach of early warning systems [Core indicator]	Pre-project/programme assessment		Household survey and survey of managers of emergency response agencies with data disaggregated by sex.	Annually	EEs	Consistent with GEF Outcome 2.1
7.0 Strengthened adaptive capacity and reduced exposure to climate risks	7.1 Extent to which vulnerable households, communities, businesses, and public sector services use improved tools, instruments, strategies and activities (including those supported by the Fund) to respond to climate variability and climate change [Core indicator]	Not required		Programme reports and records	Annually	EEs	Replication of CIF-PPCR indicator B1 (Core) and linked to GEF Outcome 2.1

<p>8.0 Strengthened awareness of climate threats and risk reduction processes</p>	<p>8.1 Percent of target population aware of the potential impacts of climate change and range of possible responses [Core indicator]</p>	<p>Pre-project/ programme assessment</p>		<p>Survey of targeted populations, disaggregated by sex and income levels</p>	<p>Annually</p>	<p>EEs</p>	<p>Consistent with GEF Outcome 2.3.1 and AF Outcome 3</p>
<p>Additional tracking measure</p>							
	<p>Number of direct and indirect beneficiaries, disaggregated by sex and income level</p>	<p>Not required</p>		<p>Project records</p>	<p>Annually</p>	<p>EEs</p>	<p>Consistent with Adaptation Fund and PPCR tracking indicators <i>This measure tracks the scope and developmental potential of Fund-funded project and programmes by counting and categorizing the number of vulnerable people it supports.</i></p>

—