

Green Climate Fund Draft Integrated RMF: Indicator sheets

The proposed indicator methodologies are detailed within the indicator guidance sheets shown in this document. The sheets provide further detail on the suggested units of measurement, indicator definitions, rationales, disaggregation possibilities, data sources, baselines, reporting frequency, reporting responsibilities and reporting formats.

The indicator sheets for those indicators that existed in the previous system are grounded in GCF's original guidance (Annex V of B.08/07). All indicator sheets will be revised and further refined once the final version of the RMF is agreed upon.

Impact	 <p>Paradigm shift / transformational change in developing countries toward low-emission, climate resilient development pathways, in line with the goals of the UNFCCC & Paris Agreement</p>
---------------	--

Indicator I1	Tonnes of carbon dioxide equivalent (tCO₂eq) reduced as a result of GCF investments
Unit	Tonnes of carbon dioxide equivalent (tCO ₂ eq)
Definition	<i>Note: the definition will be grounded in the GCF's original guidance (Annex V of B.08/07), but will be amended according to the final methodology.</i>
Rationale	<p>This has been a core GCF indicator since 2014, is routinely reported on through Board meetings, and continues to be a central measure of the GCF's impact. It is tightly aligned with core indicators of numerous other climate finance mechanisms, and with the objectives of the UNFCCC and Paris Agreement.</p> <p>The Fund promotes low-emission and climate-resilient development pathways by providing support to developing countries to limit or reduce their greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions and to adapt to the impacts of climate change. Monitoring the level of GHG emissions abated from Fund projects is a key indicator of progress and results of Fund projects/programmes. The indicator will report on the net change in GHG emissions measured in tonnes of carbon dioxide equivalent (t CO₂eq), estimated relative to the assumed business-as-usual emissions trajectory, and will reflect abatement results directly attributable to Fund mitigation and related REDD+ projects over the lifetime of the projects.</p>
Disaggregation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • tCO₂eq reduced by sector • tCO₂eq reduced by region, country and country grouping (LDCs, SIDS)
Methodology	<p><i>Note: The methodology will build on the GCF's original guidance (Annex V of B.08/07) but will need to take into account the GCF's sector strategies, including any sector-specific guidance and approaches to calculations of emission reductions. It is likely that AEs will be able to choose from a GCF-prescribed 'basket' of globally accepted methodologies, with any sector-specific requirements to be defined through sector-level indicator sheets. All data will be reported through the relevant sector-level indicators, with <u>this</u> impact indicator (I1) aggregating all that data into a single figure covering all GCF investments. The necessary conversions and reconciliations of data (e.g. across different methodologies) would be undertaken in-house by GCF Secretariat.</i></p> <p><i>This implies that – as with the 2014 RMF – every GCF sector should have a</i></p>

Indicator I1	Tonnes of carbon dioxide equivalent (tCO₂eq) reduced as a result of GCF investments
	<p><i>corresponding mandatory indicator focused on emission reductions (e.g. 'tCO₂eq reduced as a result of GCF-funded transport projects', 'tCO₂eq reduced as a result of GCF-funded forestry projects' etc.). Every project would then be required to report against that sector-level indicator.</i></p> <p>All data to be reported through the relevant sector-level indicators, with this impact indicator (I1) aggregating all that data into a single figure.</p>
Data Sources	<i>Dependent on sector-specific requirements.</i>
Baseline	<i>Dependent on final methodology.</i>
Frequency	Project duration, updated annually.
Reporting Responsibility	Underlying data reported by AEs, then aggregated by GCF Secretariat (OPM).
Reporting Format	Underlying data provided via APRs, then aggregated and reported via GCF website and to the Board.
Additional Notes	

Indicator I2	Cost per tCO₂eq decreased for all GCF investments
Unit	USD \$ per tCO ₂ e
Definition	<i>The definition will be grounded in the GCF's original guidance (Annex V of B.08/07), but will be amended according to the final methodology.</i>
Rationale	<p>This has been a core GCF indicator since 2014 and continues to be a central measure of the GCF's impact. It is tightly aligned with core indicators of numerous other climate finance mechanisms, and with the objectives of the UNFCCC and Paris Agreement.</p> <p>To ensure that the Fund is guided by efficiency and effectiveness. Mitigation technologies – and the declining costs of many of these technologies – have the potential to significantly reduce the cost of abating climate change. At the same time, marginal cost curve analyses demonstrate that mitigation costs vary substantially – often by orders of magnitude. Some of the most important mitigation investments may also be the most expensive, long-term investments needed to make large-scale reductions over time. In addition, context (e.g. enabling regulatory environment, grid capacity) can also affect project/programme costs substantially, generating costs that exceed those of mitigation technologies or other project-specific costs.</p> <p>The intent of using this indicator is to understand the cost-effectiveness of mitigation projects/programmes, including whether costs per CO₂eq reductions are decreasing over the course of the project/programme. It can also be used to compare the cost-effectiveness of alternative project proposals, particularly those that propose to use the same mitigation technologies to achieve similar benefits.</p>
Disaggregation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cost per tCO₂eq decreased by sector • Cost per tCO₂eq decreased by region, country and country grouping (LDCs, SIDS)

Indicator I2	Cost per tCO ₂ eq decreased for all GCF investments
Methodology	<p><i>Note: the methodology will build on the GCF's original guidance (Annex V of B.08/07) but will need to take into account the GCF's sector strategies, including any sector-specific guidance and approaches to calculations of emission reductions, and calculations around the cost of emission reductions. However, it is likely there will be single GCF-prescribed approach to calculating the cost of emission reductions, with any sector-specific requirements to be defined through sector-level indicator sheets. All data will be reported through the relevant sector-level indicators, with <u>this</u> impact indicator (I2) aggregating all that data into a single figure covering all GCF investments. This implies that every GCF sector should have a corresponding mandatory indicator focused on the cost of emission reductions (e.g. 'cost per tCO₂eq decreased within GCF-funded transport projects', 'cost per tCO₂eq decreased within GCF-funded forestry projects' etc.). Every project would then be required to report against that sector-level indicator.</i></p>
Data Sources	Fund programme data on costs plus data from the indicator on tonnes of CO ₂ eq reduced.
Baseline	<i>Tbc, depending on final methodology.</i>
Frequency	Project duration, updated annually.
Reporting Responsibility	Underlying data reported by AEs, then aggregated by GCF Secretariat (OPM).
Reporting Format	Underlying data provided via APRs, then aggregated and reported via GCF website and to the Board.
Additional Notes	

Indicator I3	Total number of direct and indirect beneficiaries
Unit	Number of people, households or companies (<i>tbc, depending on final methodology</i>)
Definition	<i>Note: the definition will be grounded in the GCF's original guidance (Annex V of B.08/07), but will be amended according to the final methodology.</i>
Rationale	<p>This has been a core GCF indicator since 2014, is routinely reported on through Board meetings, and continues to be a central measure of the GCF's impact. It is well aligned with core indicators of numerous other climate finance mechanisms.</p> <p>This indicator seeks to measure the number of people who have received an input of support from Fund projects as a proxy for increasing adaptive capacity and resilience to climate change.</p>
Disaggregation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Tbc, depending on final methodology • Direct and indirect beneficiaries (individuals, households or companies). • Where individuals are measured, disaggregation by gender • Where individuals and/or households are measured, disaggregation by income if possible • Beneficiaries by sector • Beneficiaries by region, country and country grouping (LDCs, SIDS)

Indicator I3	Total number of direct and indirect beneficiaries
Methodology	<p><i>Note: The methodology will build on the GCF's original guidance (Annex V of B.08/07) but will need to take into account the GCF's sector strategies, including any sector-specific guidance on calculating beneficiary numbers. However, it is likely there will be single GCF-prescribed definition of 'beneficiary', with any sector-specific requirements to be defined through sector-level indicator sheets. All data will be reported through the relevant sector-level indicators, with <u>this</u> impact indicator (I3) aggregating all that data into headline figures covering all GCF investments. This implies that every GCF sector should have a corresponding mandatory indicator focused on beneficiaries (e.g. 'number of beneficiaries using low-carbon transport', 'number of beneficiaries with improved access to low-emission energy sources' etc.). Every project would then be required to report against that sector-level indicator.</i></p>
Data Sources	Dependent on sector-specific requirements
Baseline	<i>Tbc, depending on final methodology.</i>
Frequency	Project duration, updated annually.
Reporting Responsibility	Underlying data reported by AEs, then aggregated by GCF Secretariat (OPM).
Reporting Format	Underlying data provided via APRs, then aggregated and reported via GCF website and to the Board.
Additional Notes	

Indicator I4	Extent to which GCF investments have delivered transformational change in developing countries
Unit	<p>The extent of transformational change will be reported against a four-point scale (full definitions below):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High degree of transformational change • Reasonable degree of transformational change • Limited degree of transformational change • No transformational change
Definition	<p>The indicator will be used to measure the extent to which the GCF's support is actually delivering transformational change. This will be undertaken by measuring the extent of transformational exchange delivered through every GCF project, then aggregating these project-level results to determine portfolio level performance.</p> <p>Recognising that transformational change is context-specific (dependent, for example, on country size and economic profile), the indicator is based on a context-neutral rating scale that ensures each project can be assessed according to its own operating context. The rating scale is derived from the Initiative for Climate Action Transparency's (ICAT) guidance on transformational change, which identifies four drivers of change: technology, agents, incentives and norms & behaviour. These drivers are well-aligned with the GCF's own TOC and portfolio outcomes:</p>

Indicator I4	Extent to which GCF investments have delivered transformational change in developing countries																																		
	<table border="1" data-bbox="443 331 1385 568"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="443 331 906 365">GCF Portfolio Outcome</th> <th data-bbox="906 331 946 365"></th> <th data-bbox="946 331 1385 365">ICAT Driver of Change</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="443 365 906 432">Transformational Planning & Programming</td> <td data-bbox="906 365 946 432">≈</td> <td data-bbox="946 365 1385 432">Agents</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="443 432 906 465">Catalyzing Climate Innovation</td> <td data-bbox="906 432 946 465">=</td> <td data-bbox="946 432 1385 465">Technology</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="443 465 906 499">Mobilizing Investments at Scale</td> <td data-bbox="906 465 946 499">≈</td> <td data-bbox="946 465 1385 499">Incentives</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="443 499 906 568">Expansion and Replication of Knowledge</td> <td data-bbox="906 499 946 568">≈</td> <td data-bbox="946 499 1385 568">Incentives</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="443 568 906 568"></td> <td data-bbox="906 568 946 568">=</td> <td data-bbox="946 568 1385 568">Norms and behaviour</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p data-bbox="443 600 1342 696">For GCF impact indicator I4, the following rating scale should be applied to assess the extent to which a project is delivering – or has delivered – transformational change:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="443 728 1385 1059"> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="443 728 820 801">High degree of transformational change</td> <td data-bbox="820 728 1385 801">The project has had a tangible, significant influence on all four drivers of change</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="443 801 820 875">Reasonable degree of transformational change</td> <td data-bbox="820 801 1385 875">The project has had a tangible, significant influence on at least two drivers of change</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="443 875 820 949">Limited degree of transformational change</td> <td data-bbox="820 875 1385 949">The project has had some tangible influence on at least one of the drivers of change</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="443 949 820 1059">No transformational change</td> <td data-bbox="820 949 1385 1059">No evidence that the project has influenced any of the four drivers of transformational change</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p data-bbox="443 1093 1385 1256">(A detailed guidance note for independent evaluators will be developed, including far more detailed definitions for each rating). Based on aggregation of all these project-level assessments, impact indicator I4 then reports a portfolio wide average against the same scale, albeit with the following definitions:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="443 1288 1385 1688"> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="443 1288 820 1397">High degree of transformational change</td> <td data-bbox="820 1288 1385 1397">On average, GCF investments have delivered a tangible, significant influence on transformational change</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="443 1397 820 1507">Reasonable degree of transformational change</td> <td data-bbox="820 1397 1385 1507">On average, GCF investments have delivered a tangible, significant influence on some drivers of transformational change</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="443 1507 820 1617">Limited degree of transformational change</td> <td data-bbox="820 1507 1385 1617">On average, GCF investments have delivered only a limited influence on transformational change</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="443 1617 820 1688">No transformational change</td> <td data-bbox="820 1617 1385 1688">On average, GCF investments are not influencing transformational change</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	GCF Portfolio Outcome		ICAT Driver of Change	Transformational Planning & Programming	≈	Agents	Catalyzing Climate Innovation	=	Technology	Mobilizing Investments at Scale	≈	Incentives	Expansion and Replication of Knowledge	≈	Incentives		=	Norms and behaviour	High degree of transformational change	The project has had a tangible, significant influence on all four drivers of change	Reasonable degree of transformational change	The project has had a tangible, significant influence on at least two drivers of change	Limited degree of transformational change	The project has had some tangible influence on at least one of the drivers of change	No transformational change	No evidence that the project has influenced any of the four drivers of transformational change	High degree of transformational change	On average, GCF investments have delivered a tangible, significant influence on transformational change	Reasonable degree of transformational change	On average, GCF investments have delivered a tangible, significant influence on some drivers of transformational change	Limited degree of transformational change	On average, GCF investments have delivered only a limited influence on transformational change	No transformational change	On average, GCF investments are not influencing transformational change
GCF Portfolio Outcome		ICAT Driver of Change																																	
Transformational Planning & Programming	≈	Agents																																	
Catalyzing Climate Innovation	=	Technology																																	
Mobilizing Investments at Scale	≈	Incentives																																	
Expansion and Replication of Knowledge	≈	Incentives																																	
	=	Norms and behaviour																																	
High degree of transformational change	The project has had a tangible, significant influence on all four drivers of change																																		
Reasonable degree of transformational change	The project has had a tangible, significant influence on at least two drivers of change																																		
Limited degree of transformational change	The project has had some tangible influence on at least one of the drivers of change																																		
No transformational change	No evidence that the project has influenced any of the four drivers of transformational change																																		
High degree of transformational change	On average, GCF investments have delivered a tangible, significant influence on transformational change																																		
Reasonable degree of transformational change	On average, GCF investments have delivered a tangible, significant influence on some drivers of transformational change																																		
Limited degree of transformational change	On average, GCF investments have delivered only a limited influence on transformational change																																		
No transformational change	On average, GCF investments are not influencing transformational change																																		
Rationale	<p data-bbox="443 1697 1362 1861">Delivering transformational change and paradigm shift are central to the GCF’s goal and operations. While the other three impact indicators provide strong <i>proxies</i> of the GCF’s contribution to transformational change, a complete picture necessitates deeper measurement of the extent and nature of transformational change.</p> <p data-bbox="443 1895 1362 2018">The indicator provides an aggregation of independent, detailed, project-by-project, context-specific evaluations of transformational change. So even though the indicator returns a ‘simple’ summary of Fund-level performance on transformational change, the underlying project evaluations will help the</p>																																		

Indicator I4	Extent to which GCF investments have delivered transformational change in developing countries
	GCF and its partners to develop a rich, detailed data set that – in turn – can help to build understanding and learning around where and why transformational change is (or is not) being delivered.
Disaggregation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extent of transformational change by sector • Extent of transformational change by region, country and country grouping (LDCs, SIDS)
Methodology	<p>Every GCF project will be rated against transformational change during their mid-term reviews and final evaluations, using the four-point scale defined above. When commissioning these independent mid-term reviews and final evaluations, AEs should therefore ensure that – within evaluation terms of reference – application of the transformational change rating scale is a mandatory requirement for independent evaluators to deliver (a detailed guidance note for independent evaluators will be developed).</p> <p>Once the independent mid-term reviews and final evaluations are submitted to the GCF Secretariat by AEs, the Secretariat will undertake quality assurance to ensure that the rating scale is being applied consistently across AEs and evaluations. Once project ratings are quality assured, they will then be aggregated to provide a Fund-level rating, reported through <u>this</u> impact indicator (I4).</p> <p>It will also be complemented with a collective assessment in the country annual assessment workshop. AEs, NDAs, the GCF Secretariat and other stakeholders will ultimately assess collectively each element of transformational change rating scale.</p>
Data Sources	Project-level independent mid-term reviews and final evaluations.
Baseline	A baseline can be generated after the first year of the rating approach being applied within mid-term reviews and final evaluations of GCF-supported projects.
Frequency	<p>Ratings aggregated during project duration at mid-term and completion.</p> <p>Collective assessments at annual country workshops.</p>
Reporting Responsibility	<p>Project mid-term reviews and final evaluations are commissioned by AEs but undertaken by independent evaluators. Once the independent evaluations are submitted by AEs, these independent reports will be quality assured by the GCF Secretariat to ensure that the transformational change rating scale is being applied consistently across all project evaluations.</p> <p>AEs, NDA and GCF Secretariat will participate in country annual workshops.</p>
Reporting Format	<p>Underlying data provided via mid-term reviews and final evaluations, then aggregated and reported via GCF website and to the Board.</p> <p>Country annual assessment report.</p>
Additional Notes	These assessments will be complemented with testimonies from the field highlighting the paradigm shift that has been achieved through GCF interventions at the beneficiary level. Other assessments of transformational change include ex-post evaluations and impact evaluations conducted by IEU to measure how much GCF has contributed to the paradigm shift. These evaluations will assess who has benefited, over what timeframe, exogenous factors that contributed to the paradigm shift, and others.

Portfolio
Outcome 1



Transformational planning and programming

Strengthened developing country capacity to identify, design and implement transformational climate investments and enabling frameworks to realize their NDCs, NAPs and prioritized climate actions

Indicator P1.1	Country capacity to identify, design and implement transformational climate programming
Unit	Each country's capacity is measured and reported against a six-point scale, where 0 = no capacity, and 5 = high capacity.
Definition	<p>The indicator is used to measure whether and how country capacity for transformational planning and programming is changing over time. A country's 'capacity' for transformational planning and programming is defined through a series of elements that are assessed using a scorecard-based approach. These elements include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The existence and quality of a national climate strategy or programme • The extent of cross-government involvement in delivery of the national strategy • The level of national resources allocated towards development, delivery and oversight of the national strategy / programme • The quality of mechanisms for engaging civil society and private sector in planning processes • Extent to which national strategy prioritises those actions with greatest potential for transformational impact <p>Based on assessment of all the above elements, the indicator provides a single 'score' for each country that can be tracked over time. Data for all countries can also be aggregated to provide 'scores' at the global level, on a regional basis, or according to country groupings (e.g. LDCs, SIDS etc.).</p>
Rationale	<p>Strengthening of developing country capacity to undertake transformational climate programming is at the heart of the GCF's transformational planning and programming outcome, so the GCF necessarily have to track changes and trends in country capacity. By using scorecards to track several elements of country capacity, this indicator can also support the GCF's own planning and prioritisation: for example, do the assessments show that specific elements of country capacity require more support or investment?</p> <p>The indicator is partly aligned to SDG indicator 13.3.2*, so the GCF could use data gathered here to potentially report on their contribution to SDG indicator 13.3.2 and SDG target 13.3. The GCF's scorecard exercise could also support and inform each country's own monitoring of indicator 13.3.2.</p> <p>The indicator is also well-aligned to the GCF's Investment Framework criterion 4 (country ownership and institutional capacity), sub-criteria 2 (coherence with existing policies) and 3 (capacity of implementing entities or executing entities to deliver), so data gathered through this indicator can be used to track and compare actual progress against initial proposals.</p>
Disaggregation	Scoring is undertaken at the country-level, so once all country assessments have been completed it will be possible to analyze trends for different country groups, according to analytical needs: for example, aggregate 'scores' could be calculated and tracked by region , for LDCs , for SIDS , for Readiness Program participants , etc.

Indicator P1.1	Country capacity to identify, design and implement transformational climate programming																																																
	Using the same approach, it will also be possible to analyze individual elements of the scorecard: for example, what are the trends for the scorecard element that assesses the capacity of Direct Access AEs? Does scoring for this element vary across geographical regions or country groupings?																																																
Methodology	<p>Indicator measurement is undertaken through a scorecard-based approach, whereby various elements of national capacity for transformational planning and programming are assessed against a six-point scale. Annual assessments will be undertaken collectively by the AEs, NDAs and the GCF Secretariat, who will ultimately ‘score’ each element of national capacity, with values ranging from 0 (no capacity) to 5 (high capacity). This process is explained in further detail in a guidance note on the last page of this document. The full scorecard is as follows:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="456 730 1382 1413"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="456 730 775 779">No capacity</th> <th data-bbox="775 730 820 779">0</th> <th data-bbox="820 730 865 779">1</th> <th data-bbox="865 730 909 779">2</th> <th data-bbox="909 730 954 779">3</th> <th data-bbox="954 730 999 779">4</th> <th data-bbox="999 730 1043 779">5</th> <th data-bbox="1043 730 1382 779">High capacity</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="456 779 775 898">No national climate strategy or programme in place</td> <td data-bbox="775 779 820 898"></td> <td data-bbox="820 779 865 898"></td> <td data-bbox="865 779 909 898"></td> <td data-bbox="909 779 954 898"></td> <td data-bbox="954 779 999 898"></td> <td data-bbox="999 779 1043 898"></td> <td data-bbox="1043 779 1382 898">National climate strategy or programme in place, identifying priority actions and investment requirements</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="456 898 775 1016">No cross-governmental drive to develop or deliver a national climate strategy</td> <td data-bbox="775 898 820 1016"></td> <td data-bbox="820 898 865 1016"></td> <td data-bbox="865 898 909 1016"></td> <td data-bbox="909 898 954 1016"></td> <td data-bbox="954 898 999 1016"></td> <td data-bbox="999 898 1043 1016"></td> <td data-bbox="1043 898 1382 1016">All relevant government bodies are involved in development, delivery and oversight of the national strategy</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="456 1016 775 1158">No national resources are allocated to support development or delivery of a national strategy</td> <td data-bbox="775 1016 820 1158"></td> <td data-bbox="820 1016 865 1158"></td> <td data-bbox="865 1016 909 1158"></td> <td data-bbox="909 1016 954 1158"></td> <td data-bbox="954 1016 999 1158"></td> <td data-bbox="999 1016 1043 1158"></td> <td data-bbox="1043 1016 1382 1158">Sufficient national resources are allocated to support development, delivery and oversight of the national strategy</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="456 1158 775 1323">Civil society and private sector are not involved in planning processes</td> <td data-bbox="775 1158 820 1323"></td> <td data-bbox="820 1158 865 1323"></td> <td data-bbox="865 1158 909 1323"></td> <td data-bbox="909 1158 954 1323"></td> <td data-bbox="954 1158 999 1323"></td> <td data-bbox="999 1158 1043 1323"></td> <td data-bbox="1043 1158 1382 1323">Formal mechanisms are in place and implemented for engaging civil society and private sector in planning processes relating to national strategy</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="456 1323 775 1413">No prioritization of actions</td> <td data-bbox="775 1323 820 1413"></td> <td data-bbox="820 1323 865 1413"></td> <td data-bbox="865 1323 909 1413"></td> <td data-bbox="909 1323 954 1413"></td> <td data-bbox="954 1323 999 1413"></td> <td data-bbox="999 1323 1043 1413"></td> <td data-bbox="1043 1323 1382 1413">National strategy prioritizes actions with greatest potential for transformational impact</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>The process is to a large extent reliant on personal knowledge and professional judgement. Moreover, any two assessments will likely be approached in different ways, with perhaps different weights / importance placed on different aspects of capacity. In turn, there will invariably be a degree of subjectivity within assessments, and a potential for inconsistencies across assessments.</p> <p>It is unlikely that subjectivity can be entirely eliminated from the assessments, but a process of peer review and benchmarking can help to mitigate bias, improve consistency and allow reviewers to learn from each other. It is recommended that – once all annual assessments have been completed – some form of validation exercise be undertaken. This could involve an annual workshop that brings AE, NDA representatives and GCF Secretariat assessors together to compare assessments and approaches. Alternatively, a limited set of ‘challenge’ reviews could be undertaken, whereby assessment teams peer review a small sample of other teams’ assessments. A further alternative could be that a single lead assessor takes</p>	No capacity	0	1	2	3	4	5	High capacity	No national climate strategy or programme in place							National climate strategy or programme in place, identifying priority actions and investment requirements	No cross-governmental drive to develop or deliver a national climate strategy							All relevant government bodies are involved in development, delivery and oversight of the national strategy	No national resources are allocated to support development or delivery of a national strategy							Sufficient national resources are allocated to support development, delivery and oversight of the national strategy	Civil society and private sector are not involved in planning processes							Formal mechanisms are in place and implemented for engaging civil society and private sector in planning processes relating to national strategy	No prioritization of actions							National strategy prioritizes actions with greatest potential for transformational impact
No capacity	0	1	2	3	4	5	High capacity																																										
No national climate strategy or programme in place							National climate strategy or programme in place, identifying priority actions and investment requirements																																										
No cross-governmental drive to develop or deliver a national climate strategy							All relevant government bodies are involved in development, delivery and oversight of the national strategy																																										
No national resources are allocated to support development or delivery of a national strategy							Sufficient national resources are allocated to support development, delivery and oversight of the national strategy																																										
Civil society and private sector are not involved in planning processes							Formal mechanisms are in place and implemented for engaging civil society and private sector in planning processes relating to national strategy																																										
No prioritization of actions							National strategy prioritizes actions with greatest potential for transformational impact																																										

Indicator P1.1	Country capacity to identify, design and implement transformational climate programming
	<p>on the task of validating / peer reviewing every single assessment, with a view to ensuring consistency across the whole portfolio of assessments.</p> <p>Where countries have undertaken their own capacity assessments as part of their national monitoring and reporting against SDG indicator 13.3.2, those assessments could be used to directly inform this GCF scorecard assessment.</p>
Data Sources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NDA records and experience • National capacity assessments undertaken for SDG indicator 13.3.2 • Readiness Program progress and final reports • Project Preparation Facility progress and final reports • Project / Program APRs, mid-term reviews and final evaluations
Baseline	<p>The first scorecard-based assessment in any given country will provide the baseline value against which future scorecard assessments can be compared.</p> <p>The global baseline score can be calculated once all countries have completed their first scorecard assessments.</p>
Frequency	Project duration, updated annually.
Reporting Responsibility	<p>NDA, AEs and GCF undertake a collective assessment in a country-led workshop.</p> <p>Scorecards aggregated and further analysis (global, regional, country groupings) done by GCF Secretariat (OPM).</p>
Reporting Format	Country annual assessment report
Additional Notes	* SDG Indicator 13.3.2 : Number of countries that have communicated the strengthening of institutional, systemic and individual capacity-building to implement adaptation, mitigation and technology transfer, and development actions

Indicator P1.2	Number of countries supported by GCF to develop national climate strategies and investment plans
Unit	The headline figure is absolute number of countries supported , although disaggregated data (see below) will also support a more granular view.
Definition	<p>The indicator is used to measure the absolute number of countries that have been directly supported through GCF investments to develop national climate strategies and/or investment plans. The indicator records any country that received GCF support to develop any of the following UNFCCC / Paris Agreement-aligned documents:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National Adaptation Plans (NAPs) • Nationally Appropriate Mitigation Actions (NAMAs) • Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs) • Biennial Update Reports (BURs) • Technology Needs Assessments (TNAs) • Investment Plans aligned to any of the above
Rationale	One aim of the GCF's transformational planning and programming outcome is to support the development of stronger national climate strategies that are well-aligned to Paris Agreement objectives, and that can be translated into investment plans. This indicator provides a basic quantitative measure of the extent of the GCF's work on strengthening national climate strategies. The

Indicator P1.2	Number of countries supported by GCF to develop national climate strategies and investment plans
	<p>indicator's disaggregated data also allows the GCF to track and compare what <i>type</i> of strategy their investments are supporting (e.g. NAPs, NAMAs, NDCs), along with the geographic regions and country groupings (e.g. LDCs, SIDS) that their support is being deployed in.</p> <p>The indicator is closely aligned with SDG indicator 13.2.1*, thereby allowing the GCF to report their direct contribution to SDG indicator 13.2.1 and target 13.2.</p> <p>The indicator is also well-aligned to the GCF's Investment Framework criterion 4 (country ownership and institutional capacity), sub-criterion 1 (existence of a national strategy), so data gathered through this indicator can be used to track and compare actual progress against initial proposals.</p>
Disaggregation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of countries supported to develop strategies • Number of countries supported to develop strategies and investment plans • Can also disaggregate 'strategies' by: NAPs, NAMAs, NDCs, BURs, TNAs • Can also disaggregate countries by region and/or grouping (LDCs, SIDS)
Methodology	Countries should only be counted once for the main indicator, even if GCF investments supported the development of more than one strategic document. However, if GCF investments supported the development of more than one strategic document in a country, this data should also be recorded: this data will then support disaggregated reporting against the indicator.
Data Sources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Readiness Program progress and final reports • Project Preparation Facility progress and final reports • Project / Program APRs, mid-term reviews and final evaluations
Baseline	A baseline can be constructed through retrospective review of progress and evaluation reports generated by all previous and current GCF investments.
Frequency	Ongoing (updates could be reported at every Board meeting, if appropriate).
Reporting Responsibility	Data aggregated and reported by GCF Secretariat (OPM).
Reporting Format	Readiness Program progress reports, PPF progress reports, APRs.
Additional Notes	* SDG Indicator 13.2.1 : Number of countries that have communicated the establishment or operationalization of an integrated policy/strategy/plan which increases their ability to adapt to the adverse impacts of climate change, and foster climate resilience and low greenhouse gas emissions development in a manner that does not threaten food production (including a national adaptation plan, nationally determined contribution, national communication, biennial update report or other)

Indicator P1.3	Extent of country ownership of GCF investments
Unit	The extent of each country's ownership is measured and reported against a six-point scale / score, where 0 = no ownership, and 5 = high ownership.
Definition	The indicator is used to measure whether and how country ownership of GCF investments is changing over time. A country's 'ownership' of GCF investments is defined through a series of elements that are assessed using a scorecard-based approach. These elements include:

Indicator P1.3	Extent of country ownership of GCF investments																
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extent of alignment of GCF projects with national climate and/or development plans and priorities • Extent of involvement of NDAs in conceptualisation and design of GCF projects • Extent of alignment of GCF project monitoring systems with national monitoring systems • Extent of involvement of NDAs in the ongoing monitoring and review of GCF projects under implementation <p>Based on assessment of all the above elements, the indicator provides a single 'score' for each country that can be tracked over time. Data for all countries can also be aggregated to provide 'scores' at the global level, on a regional basis, or according to country groupings (e.g. LDCs, SIDS etc.).</p>																
<p>Rationale</p>	<p>Country ownership of GCF investments is an integral element of strong country capacity for transformational programming. Moreover, country-driven transformation is a GCF programming principle, and country ownership is a central GCF investment criterion. It is therefore important to track the extent to which country ownership is actually being realised through GCF programming.</p> <p>Elements of this indicator can also be used to promote and incentivise adherence to GCF best practice. For example, using the indicator to routinely measure and report on '<i>the extent of involvement of NDAs in the design of GCF projects</i>' could help to strengthen the depth of partnership between NDAs and AEs.</p> <p>The indicator is well-aligned to the GCF's Investment Framework criterion 4 (country ownership and institutional capacity), so data gathered through this indicator can be used to track and compare actual progress against initial proposals.</p>																
<p>Disaggregation</p>	<p>Scoring is undertaken at the country-level, so once all country assessments have been completed it will be possible to analyse trends for different country groups, according to analytical needs: for example, aggregate 'scores' could be calculated and tracked by region, for LDCs, for SIDS, for Readiness Program participants, etc.</p> <p>Using the same approach, it will also be possible to analyse individual elements of the scorecard: for example, what are the trends for the scorecard element that assesses the extent of NDA involvement in GCF project development? Does scoring for this element vary across geographical regions or country groupings?</p>																
<p>Methodology</p>	<p>Indicator measurement is undertaken through a scorecard-based approach, whereby various elements of country ownership of GCF investments are assessed against a six-point scale. Annual assessments will be undertaken collectively by the AEs, NDAs and the GCF Secretariat, who will ultimately 'score' each element of country ownership, with values ranging from 0 (no ownership) to 5 (high ownership). The full scorecard is as follows:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="443 1839 1374 2027"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="443 1839 767 1888">No ownership</th> <th data-bbox="767 1839 815 1888">0</th> <th data-bbox="815 1839 863 1888">1</th> <th data-bbox="863 1839 911 1888">2</th> <th data-bbox="911 1839 959 1888">3</th> <th data-bbox="959 1839 1007 1888">4</th> <th data-bbox="1007 1839 1054 1888">5</th> <th data-bbox="1054 1839 1374 1888">High ownership</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="443 1888 767 2027">GCF projects are not aligned with national climate and / or development plans and priorities</td> <td data-bbox="767 1888 815 2027"></td> <td data-bbox="815 1888 863 2027"></td> <td data-bbox="863 1888 911 2027"></td> <td data-bbox="911 1888 959 2027"></td> <td data-bbox="959 1888 1007 2027"></td> <td data-bbox="1007 1888 1054 2027"></td> <td data-bbox="1054 1888 1374 2027">GCF projects are fully aligned with national climate and /or development plans and priorities, including NDCs and NAPs</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	No ownership	0	1	2	3	4	5	High ownership	GCF projects are not aligned with national climate and / or development plans and priorities							GCF projects are fully aligned with national climate and /or development plans and priorities, including NDCs and NAPs
No ownership	0	1	2	3	4	5	High ownership										
GCF projects are not aligned with national climate and / or development plans and priorities							GCF projects are fully aligned with national climate and /or development plans and priorities, including NDCs and NAPs										

Indicator P1.3	Extent of country ownership of GCF investments						
	NDAs are unaware of GCF projects until they are presented for no objection						NDAs are fully involved in conceptualization and design of GCF projects
	GCF project monitoring systems are not aligned with national monitoring systems						GCF project monitoring systems are fully aligned with national monitoring systems
	NDAs have no involvement in the ongoing monitoring and review of GCF projects under implementation						NDAs are fully involved in the ongoing monitoring and review of GCF projects under implementation
<p>The process is to a large extent reliant on personal knowledge and professional judgement. Moreover, any two assessments will likely be approached in different ways, with perhaps different weights / importance placed on different aspects of ownership. In turn, there will invariably be a degree of subjectivity within assessments, and a potential for inconsistencies across assessments.</p> <p>It is unlikely that subjectivity can be entirely eliminated from the assessments, but a process of peer review and benchmarking can help to mitigate bias, improve consistency and allow reviewers to learn from each other. It is recommended that – once all annual assessments have been completed – some form of validation exercise be undertaken. This could involve an annual workshop that brings some NDA representatives and GCF Secretariat assessors together to compare assessments and approaches. Alternatively, a limited set of ‘challenge’ reviews could be undertaken, whereby assessment teams peer review a small sample of other teams’ assessments. A further alternative could be that a single lead assessor takes on the task of validating / peer reviewing every single assessment, with a view to ensuring consistency across the whole portfolio of assessments.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NDA records and experience • National capacity assessments undertaken for SDG indicator 13.3.2 • Readiness Program progress and final reports • Project Preparation Facility progress and final reports • Project / Program APRs, mid-term reviews and final evaluations 						
	<p>The first scorecard-based assessment in any given country will provide the baseline value against which future scorecard assessments can be compared.</p> <p>The global baseline score can be calculated once all countries have completed their first scorecard assessments.</p>						
	Project duration, updated annually.						
	<p>NDA, AEs and GCF undertake a collective assessment in a country-led workshop.</p> <p>Scorecards aggregated and further analysis (global, regional, country groupings, ownership elements etc.) done by GCF Secretariat (OPM).</p>						
	Country annual assessment report						

**Portfolio
Outcome 2**



Catalyzing climate innovation

Increased number of innovative, high-potential business models, technologies or practices demonstrated and adopted

Indicator P2.1	Number of Climate Change (CC) innovations demonstrated and tested.
Unit	Absolute number of innovations demonstrated and tested
Definition	<p>This indicator measures the number of CC innovations that have been developed and tested with GCF support.</p> <p>Developed innovations refers to CC innovations that are completely new or that are innovations from elsewhere that have been adapted to the specific country context in which it is tested.</p> <p>Testing relates to piloting the innovation in a more or less controlled environment to verify whether the innovation is suitable for the country context (in terms of relevance, effectiveness, acceptability and implementability).</p> <p>Note: the indicator does NOT only relate to innovations that have been successfully tested. Innovations that have been tested but with an unsuccessful outcome also count under this indicator (see under Rationale).</p>
Rationale	Innovation is a key aspect of GCF's strategic approach and risk taking to catalyse innovation and scale is an explicit element of GCF's strategic plan. It is important that risk taking is recognised in the RMF so as to incentivise GCF and AEs to support development of true innovations. This indicator therefore counts all innovations as supported by GCF whether a success or a failure. It shows that GCF is willing to take risks and to accept some level of failure to promote innovative climate change mitigation and adaptation actions that can contribute to transformational change.
Disaggregation	<p>This indicator will be disaggregated in successful innovations and innovations that were not successful. Successful innovations are those that are confirmed successful by AEs/EEs based on their own assessment and feedback received from beneficiaries.</p> <p>Further disaggregation is possible by sector and by type of innovation i.e. adaptation or mitigation or both.</p>
Methodology	<p>The number of innovations will be counted on a project-by-project basis. Projects will be required to report on the number of innovations they develop and test and which ones of those have been considered successful. For the latter they should obtain feedback from companies or people that were involved in the testing, either through a structured survey or through more semi-structured approached.</p> <p>Verification of this information can be done through mid term and end evaluation and may lead to an adjustment of the number of innovation reported and/or the assessment of whether an innovation was successful or not.</p>
Data Sources	<p>Research reports APRs Case studies</p>
Baseline	Not applicable, since this is about adoption of an innovation introduced by GCF supported projects.
Frequency	<p>Project duration updated annually. Verification at MTE and End evaluation</p>

Indicator P2.1	Number of Climate Change (CC) innovations demonstrated and tested.
Reporting Responsibility	Underlying data reported by AEs, then aggregated by GCF Secretariat (OPM). Evaluation teams verify and where needed correct the data.
Reporting Format	Underlying data provided via APRs, then aggregated and reported via GCF website and to the Board.
Additional Notes	

Indicator P2.2	Number of households and companies that have adopted GCF supported climate change innovations
Unit	Absolute numbers of households or companies
Definition	<p>This indicator measures in how far CC innovations are adopted by project beneficiaries. These can be companies or households.</p> <p>Through ex-post evaluations the indicator can also measure adoption by companies or households that were not direct project beneficiaries, in other words, a measure of success in replication and scaling up.</p> <p><u>Definition of GCF supported CC innovation</u>: a climate change related business model, technology, practice, service or product that was demonstrated (i.e. successfully tested) for the first time <i>in a country</i> with support from GCF. Innovations that had already been demonstrated elsewhere can be counted under this indicator.</p> <p><u>Definition of “Adopted”</u>: An innovation that is successfully transferred to beneficiaries at a scale and/or duration that goes beyond the directly GCF supported demonstrating. Example: a company or HH that was supported by GCF to pilot a CC business model or practice continues to apply that business model / practice beyond GCF support (except possibly some soft support such as advice).</p> <p><u>Household (HH)*</u>: The official definition as used in the country where the innovation was introduced should be used.</p> <p><i>* See also Additional notes at the end of this indicator sheet</i></p>
Rationale	<p>GCF will support research, development and demonstration of CC innovations, in line with UNFCCC article 10 and more in particular clause 10.2 – <i>“Parties noting the importance of technology for the implementation of mitigation and adaptation actions under this agreement and recognising existing technology deployment and dissemination efforts shall strengthen cooperative action on technology development and transfer”</i>.</p> <p>The indicator relates directly to the implementation of the Technology Framework as developed during COP.24 and directly contributes to the actions described therein such as III.A.8(c) – <i>“Promoting the development, deployment and dissemination of existing innovative technologies and accelerating the scale-up and diffusion of emerging climate technologies”</i>.</p> <p>The indicator measures in how far the transfer / dissemination of innovations is successful and leading to adoption by project beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries. This is a key measure for both the technical relevance and the socio-economic “implementability” / acceptability of the supported innovation.</p> <p>Adoption at scale of a relevant and successful CC innovation is an important milestone towards achieving transformational change.</p>

Indicator P2.2	Number of households and companies that have adopted GCF supported climate change innovations
Disaggregation	<p>The indicator has two main levels of disaggregation:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The type of beneficiary: household or company. 2. The sector of the innovation <p>A third possible disaggregation would be adoption by direct beneficiaries versus adoption by companies / HHs that were not directly supported i.e. a measure of replication. This can only be measured through an ex-post evaluation.</p> <p>The indicator is reported for each innovation promoted by projects. If a project supports more than one innovation it should report on each of those separately.</p> <p>At portfolio level the data can be analysed, aggregated and presented on the basis of the disaggregation levels and at geographical scales, allowing comparisons of adoption success between countries, between households and companies, and between different types of innovations.</p>
Methodology	<p>Household beneficiaries:</p> <p>a) A representative HH survey at the end of the project when direct project support (except advisory support) has been phased out. The survey should combine questions with observations to verify adoption.</p> <p>Company beneficiaries:</p> <p>a) Adoption by companies directly supported by GCF projects can be measured by using company records and through direct feedback from company staff. If that is somehow not possible (e.g. if company records are considered confidential), a representative survey should be undertaken.</p> <p>Measurement of replication i.e. adoption by companies or HHs not directly supported requires an ex-post evaluation. This could be considered a worthwhile investment for GCF to consider since adoption at scale is such a key measure towards achieving transformational change.</p> <p>Projects are only required to report on adoption by direct beneficiaries.</p>
Data Sources	<p><u>Adoption by direct HH beneficiaries:</u> Project HH surveys</p> <p><u>Adoption by direct company beneficiaries:</u> Company records and/or Project business survey</p>
Baseline	Not applicable, since this is about adoption of an innovation introduced by GCF supported projects.
Frequency	Project duration updated annually. Possible additional ex-post assessment at least one year after project closure.
Reporting Responsibility	<p>Executing Entity and Accredited Entity to collect the data. Underlying data reported by AEs, then aggregated by GCF Secretariat. MTE and End Evaluation teams should verify the results and confirm in the evaluation report. A possible ex-post assessment would likely require independent evaluators.</p>
Reporting Format	<p>Underlying data provided via APRs, then aggregated and reported via GCF website and to the Board. Evaluation reports for the validation.</p>
Additional Notes	<p>Note that we have used households rather than people as a unit for this indicator. Often the benefits of innovations like solar energy access for houses, or climate</p>

Indicator P2.2	Number of households and companies that have adopted GCF supported climate change innovations
	<p>smart agriculture practices will benefit whole households rather than an individual person.</p> <p>This requires further discussion given that the overall beneficiary indicator at impact level is referring to people instead of households.</p>

Indicator P2.3	Extent to which GCF supported institutions promote transfer/uptake of CC innovations
Unit	The level of promoting transfer / uptake of the innovations is measured and reported through a scorecard with a six-point scale, where 0 = no sign of promoting transfer of the innovation, and 5 = very actively promoting transfer of the innovations
Definition	<p>The indicator measures in how far promotion of transfer/uptake of GCF supported innovations has been embedded (mainstreamed) in the organisation of the AEs/EEs that received that support. Measurement is done through a scorecard (see Methodology).</p> <p>Innovation in this context is defined as: a climate change related business model, technology, practice, service or product that was researched and/or piloted and/or demonstrated for the first time in a country with support from GCF. Innovations that had already been (successfully) applied elsewhere also count.</p> <p>Promoting transfer/uptake can be done in monetary or non-monetary form. It may include marketing, capacity building, training, technical demonstrations, etc. It can be a commercial activity (e.g. a company selling an innovative energy efficiency solution that was developed with GCF support) or non-commercial (e.g. a CSO actively promoting uptake of a GCF supported innovative rainwater harvesting technique).</p>
Rationale	<p>Innovation is a key element towards GCF's aim of promoting a paradigm shift and transformational change. GCF will support the development and demonstration of CC innovations. It is however ultimately the transfer/replication of CC innovations that can lead to the desired transformational change. This indicator measures in how far the institutions supported in researching, developing and demonstrating CC innovations are promoting the actual transfer of the innovations in the country or countries where GCF supported the work.</p> <p>Depending on the type of innovations the promotion of transfer can target private or public sector or directly individual households.</p> <p>Support for research, development, demonstration and transfer of CC innovations is directly aligned with article 10 of the UNFCCC Paris agreement, and in particular article 10.1 – “Parties share a long-term vision on the importance of fully realizing technology development and transfer in order to improve resilience to climate change and to reduce greenhouse gas emissions” and article 10.2 “Parties, noting the importance of technology for the implementation of mitigation and adaptation actions under this Agreement and recognizing existing technology deployment and dissemination efforts, shall strengthen cooperative action on technology development and transfer.”</p>
Disaggregation	The scorecard will be applied for all institutions (AEs / EEs) that have been supported by GCF for the research, development and/or demonstration of CC innovations. The information will be disaggregated per type of institution supported: - public sector institution

Indicator P2.3	Extent to which GCF supported institutions promote transfer/uptake of CC innovations																																																
	<p>- private sector companies - civil society organisations - public / private research institutions</p> <p>Scoring on the individual elements of the scorecard will allow an analysis of strong and weak point and so provide a pointer for GCF on what support is needed to promote transfer and broad replication of successful CC innovations.</p>																																																
<p>Methodology</p>	<p>Indicator measurement is undertaken through a scorecard-based approach, whereby various elements of the level of promotion of transfer of innovation are assessed against a six-point scale. Annual assessments will be undertaken collectively by the AEs, NDAs and the GCF Secretariat, who will ultimately ‘score’ each element, with values ranging from 0 (low level of promotion of transfer of CC innovation) to 5 (high level of promotion of transfer of CC innovation). The full scorecard is as follows:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="408 757 1410 1209"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="408 757 759 848">Low level of promotion of transfer of CC innovation</th> <th data-bbox="759 757 807 848">0</th> <th data-bbox="807 757 855 848">1</th> <th data-bbox="855 757 903 848">2</th> <th data-bbox="903 757 951 848">3</th> <th data-bbox="951 757 999 848">4</th> <th data-bbox="999 757 1046 848">5</th> <th data-bbox="1046 757 1410 848">High level of promotion of transfer of CC innovation</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="408 848 759 904">No strategy in place to promote transfer of the CC innovation</td> <td data-bbox="759 848 807 904"></td> <td data-bbox="807 848 855 904"></td> <td data-bbox="855 848 903 904"></td> <td data-bbox="903 848 951 904"></td> <td data-bbox="951 848 999 904"></td> <td data-bbox="999 848 1046 904"></td> <td data-bbox="1046 848 1410 904">A focused strategy in place to promote transfer of the innovation</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="408 904 759 983">No budget to promote transfer of the CC innovation</td> <td data-bbox="759 904 807 983"></td> <td data-bbox="807 904 855 983"></td> <td data-bbox="855 904 903 983"></td> <td data-bbox="903 904 951 983"></td> <td data-bbox="951 904 999 983"></td> <td data-bbox="999 904 1046 983"></td> <td data-bbox="1046 904 1410 983">Sufficient budget to promote transfer of the innovation nation wide</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="408 983 759 1084">No promotional / dissemination activities / undertaken as yet</td> <td data-bbox="759 983 807 1084"></td> <td data-bbox="807 983 855 1084"></td> <td data-bbox="855 983 903 1084"></td> <td data-bbox="903 983 951 1084"></td> <td data-bbox="951 983 999 1084"></td> <td data-bbox="999 983 1046 1084"></td> <td data-bbox="1046 983 1410 1084">Transfer of innovation promoted in various ways amongst high number of companies / organisations / people</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="408 1084 759 1162">No training provided for uptake of the CC innovation</td> <td data-bbox="759 1084 807 1162"></td> <td data-bbox="807 1084 855 1162"></td> <td data-bbox="855 1084 903 1162"></td> <td data-bbox="903 1084 951 1162"></td> <td data-bbox="951 1084 999 1162"></td> <td data-bbox="999 1084 1046 1162"></td> <td data-bbox="1046 1084 1410 1162">High number of companies / organisations / people trained in uptake of the product</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="408 1162 759 1209">No staff time assigned to promote transfer of the innovation</td> <td data-bbox="759 1162 807 1209"></td> <td data-bbox="807 1162 855 1209"></td> <td data-bbox="855 1162 903 1209"></td> <td data-bbox="903 1162 951 1209"></td> <td data-bbox="951 1162 999 1209"></td> <td data-bbox="999 1162 1046 1209"></td> <td data-bbox="1046 1162 1410 1209">Sufficient staff assigned to promote uptake nation wide</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>The scorecard will be applied to all projects with an innovation component. The scoring exercise will be part of an annual performance assessment workshop. The scorecard will be part of the country annual assessment report, and there will be space provided next to each scorecard to provide additional information to justify each score.</p> <p>The scores should be validated by external evaluation teams.</p> <p>The assessment will only be done at the level of the AE/EE supported directly by GCF and not downstream i.e. not at companies or organisations that were supported by the AE/EE to pilot / adopt an innovation.</p> <p>The scores can be aggregated per country, and for the whole portfolio. It will help identify strengths and weaknesses across countries and AEs/EEs.</p>	Low level of promotion of transfer of CC innovation	0	1	2	3	4	5	High level of promotion of transfer of CC innovation	No strategy in place to promote transfer of the CC innovation							A focused strategy in place to promote transfer of the innovation	No budget to promote transfer of the CC innovation							Sufficient budget to promote transfer of the innovation nation wide	No promotional / dissemination activities / undertaken as yet							Transfer of innovation promoted in various ways amongst high number of companies / organisations / people	No training provided for uptake of the CC innovation							High number of companies / organisations / people trained in uptake of the product	No staff time assigned to promote transfer of the innovation							Sufficient staff assigned to promote uptake nation wide
Low level of promotion of transfer of CC innovation	0	1	2	3	4	5	High level of promotion of transfer of CC innovation																																										
No strategy in place to promote transfer of the CC innovation							A focused strategy in place to promote transfer of the innovation																																										
No budget to promote transfer of the CC innovation							Sufficient budget to promote transfer of the innovation nation wide																																										
No promotional / dissemination activities / undertaken as yet							Transfer of innovation promoted in various ways amongst high number of companies / organisations / people																																										
No training provided for uptake of the CC innovation							High number of companies / organisations / people trained in uptake of the product																																										
No staff time assigned to promote transfer of the innovation							Sufficient staff assigned to promote uptake nation wide																																										
<p>Data Sources</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AE / EE strategic plans and annual reports • Promotional material (training manuals, brochures, videos, newspaper articles etc) • Minutes of forums / training workshops and other events around the innovation • Project annual performance reports • Feedback from stakeholders as collected by the external evaluation team 																																																
<p>Baseline</p>	<p>The first scorecard-based assessment in any given country will provide the baseline value against which future scorecard assessments can be compared.</p>																																																

Indicator P2.3	Extent to which GCF supported institutions promote transfer/uptake of CC innovations
	The global baseline score can be calculated once all countries have completed their first scorecard assessments.
Frequency	Project duration, updated annually.
Reporting Responsibility	NDA, AEs and GCF undertake a collective assessment in a country-led workshop. Scorecards aggregated and further analysis (global, regional, country groupings, etc) done by GCF Secretariat (OPM).
Reporting Format	Country annual assessment report. Evaluation reports for the validation.
Additional Notes	

Indicator P2.4	Extent to which GCF supported successful CC innovations have been integrated in national policies, plans and budgets
Unit	The degree in which GCF supported CC innovations are mainstreamed in national policies and plans is measured and reported through a scorecard with a six-point scale, where 0 = no mainstreaming, and 5 = fully mainstreamed
Definition	<p>The indicator measures the extent to which GCF CC innovations are integrated into national policies and plans with the intent to promote their uptake nation-wide.</p> <p>National policies, plans and budgets refers not only to CC specific ones like NAPs, NAMAs and CC strategies and action plans, but also to overall national development policies, plans and budgets including national strategic plans, visions, annual plans and budgets, expenditure frameworks, etc.</p>
Rationale	<p>Broad uptake of CC mitigation and adaptation interventions that have proven to be successful in a specific country context is a key aspect of transformational change towards more climate compatible development. If such innovations are effectively mainstreamed in national policies, plans and budgets, prospects for broad uptake are considerably increased and through it the prospects of achieving transformational change.</p> <p>The indicator is aligned with the principles of the Paris agreement on technology development (article 10). It relates directly to the COP24 guidance on implementation of the technology framework, in particular article 10 under B. Implementation in Annex: “Actions and activities under this key theme should also facilitate the implementation of mitigation and adaptation action identified using planning tools and processes such as nationally determined contributions, long-term low greenhouse gas emission development strategies, technology needs assessments (TNAs), national adaptation plans, technology road maps and other relevant policies, and facilitate overcoming challenges by implementing such action, as appropriate.”</p> <p>It might seem there is overlap with indicators under outcome 1. However, this indicator looks specifically at mainstreaming of GCF supported and successfully demonstrated innovations in national policies, plans and budgets.</p>
Disaggregation	The indicator will be measured in each country where GCF has supported innovations. Comparisons can therefore be made between individual countries and categories of countries. A key disaggregation in this respect will be to distinguish between countries that received Readiness support and countries that did not receive Readiness support. The indicator will provide some insight in the effectiveness of Readiness support in promoting the replication and scaling up of CC innovations at national level.

Indicator P2.4	Extent to which GCF supported successful CC innovations have been integrated in national policies, plans and budgets																																																								
<p data-bbox="204 972 379 1003">Methodology</p>	<p data-bbox="405 262 1430 454">Indicator measurement is undertaken through a scorecard-based approach, whereby various elements of integration of CC innovations in national policies, plans and budgets are assessed against a six-point scale. Annual assessments will be undertaken collectively by the AEs, NDAs and the GCF Secretariat, who will ultimately ‘score’ each element, with values ranging from 0 (no integration) to 5 (high integration). The full scorecard is as follows:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="405 486 1409 1126"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="405 486 759 517">Low integration</th> <th data-bbox="759 486 794 517">0</th> <th data-bbox="794 486 829 517">1</th> <th data-bbox="829 486 865 517">2</th> <th data-bbox="865 486 900 517">3</th> <th data-bbox="900 486 935 517">4</th> <th data-bbox="935 486 970 517">5</th> <th data-bbox="970 486 1409 517">High integration</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="405 517 759 618">No reference to GCF supported innovations in CC policies, strategies and plans</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td data-bbox="970 517 1409 618">All GCF supported innovations in the country are frequently referenced in CC policies, strategies and plans</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="405 618 759 741">No reference to GCF supported innovations in national and sectoral development plans and strategies</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td data-bbox="970 618 1409 741">All GCF supported innovations in the country are frequently referenced in national and sectoral development plans and strategies</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="405 741 759 842">National M&E systems have no indicators that relate to promoting uptake of GCF supported innovations</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td data-bbox="970 741 1409 842">National and sector M&E systems include indicators that relate to promoting uptake of all GCF supported innovations</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="405 842 759 920">There is no strategy to promote uptake of GCF supported innovations</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td data-bbox="970 842 1409 920">There is a clear strategy to promote uptake of the GCF supported innovations</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="405 920 759 1021">It is not clear who is responsible for promoting uptake of GCF supported interventions</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td data-bbox="970 920 1409 1021">There is clarity on roles & responsibilities in promoting uptake of the GCF supported innovations</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="405 1021 759 1126">There is no funding allocated in the national budget to promote uptake of the GCF supported innovations</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td data-bbox="970 1021 1409 1126">There is substantial funding allocated in the national budget to promote uptake of the GCF supported innovations</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p data-bbox="405 1167 1430 1323">The scoring exercise will be part of an annual performance assessment workshop. AEs and NDAs will agree on a score for each element in the scorecard. The scorecard will be part of an annual report, and there will be space provided next to each scorecard to provide additional information to justify each score. The scores should be validated by external evaluation teams.</p> <p data-bbox="405 1361 1430 1518">The process is to a large extent reliant on personal knowledge and professional judgement. Moreover, any two assessments will likely be approached in different ways, with perhaps different weights / importance placed on different aspects of ownership. In turn, there will invariably be a degree of subjectivity within assessments, and a potential for inconsistencies across assessments.</p> <p data-bbox="405 1556 1430 1713">It is unlikely that subjectivity can be entirely eliminated from the assessments, but a process of peer review and benchmarking can help to mitigate bias, improve consistency and allow reviewers to learn from each other. It is recommended that – once all annual assessments have been completed – some form of validation exercise be undertaken.</p>	Low integration	0	1	2	3	4	5	High integration	No reference to GCF supported innovations in CC policies, strategies and plans							All GCF supported innovations in the country are frequently referenced in CC policies, strategies and plans	No reference to GCF supported innovations in national and sectoral development plans and strategies							All GCF supported innovations in the country are frequently referenced in national and sectoral development plans and strategies	National M&E systems have no indicators that relate to promoting uptake of GCF supported innovations							National and sector M&E systems include indicators that relate to promoting uptake of all GCF supported innovations	There is no strategy to promote uptake of GCF supported innovations							There is a clear strategy to promote uptake of the GCF supported innovations	It is not clear who is responsible for promoting uptake of GCF supported interventions							There is clarity on roles & responsibilities in promoting uptake of the GCF supported innovations	There is no funding allocated in the national budget to promote uptake of the GCF supported innovations							There is substantial funding allocated in the national budget to promote uptake of the GCF supported innovations
	Low integration	0	1	2	3	4	5	High integration																																																	
No reference to GCF supported innovations in CC policies, strategies and plans							All GCF supported innovations in the country are frequently referenced in CC policies, strategies and plans																																																		
No reference to GCF supported innovations in national and sectoral development plans and strategies							All GCF supported innovations in the country are frequently referenced in national and sectoral development plans and strategies																																																		
National M&E systems have no indicators that relate to promoting uptake of GCF supported innovations							National and sector M&E systems include indicators that relate to promoting uptake of all GCF supported innovations																																																		
There is no strategy to promote uptake of GCF supported innovations							There is a clear strategy to promote uptake of the GCF supported innovations																																																		
It is not clear who is responsible for promoting uptake of GCF supported interventions							There is clarity on roles & responsibilities in promoting uptake of the GCF supported innovations																																																		
There is no funding allocated in the national budget to promote uptake of the GCF supported innovations							There is substantial funding allocated in the national budget to promote uptake of the GCF supported innovations																																																		
<p data-bbox="204 1816 379 1848">Data Sources</p>	<ul data-bbox="405 1727 943 1926" style="list-style-type: none"> • CC policies, strategies and plans • National development policies and plans • Sector policies and plans • Mid Term Expenditure Frameworks • National annual plans and budgets • National M&E systems 																																																								
<p data-bbox="264 1973 379 2004">Baseline</p>	<p data-bbox="405 1939 1430 2007">The first scorecard-based assessment in any given country will provide the baseline value against which future scorecard assessments can be compared.</p>																																																								

Indicator P2.4	Extent to which GCF supported successful CC innovations have been integrated in national policies, plans and budgets
	The global baseline score can be calculated once all countries have completed their first scorecard assessments.
Frequency	Project duration, updated annually.
Reporting Responsibility	NDA, AEs and GCF undertake a collective assessment in a country-led workshop. Scorecards aggregated and further analysis (global, regional, country groupings, etc.) done by GCF Secretariat (OPM).
Reporting Format	Country annual assessment report
Additional Notes	

Portfolio Outcome 3



Mobilization of investments at scale

Increased mobilization of public and private finance to scale up successful, high-potential climate-compatible investments

Indicator P3.1	Volume of finance leveraged by GCF funding
Unit	USD ^[1] _[SEP]
Definition	<p><u>Finance leveraged</u> Leverage (also referred to as “mobilized”): Additional financial resources attributable to the Fund that are applied to agreed-upon climate objectives or activities. In other words, the additional finance would not have been applied in the absence of the Fund’s participation. This concept of attribution is also referred to as “additionality”.</p> <p>Only finance associated with activities where there is a clear causal link between the GCF intervention and the (public or private) finance mobilized and where the activity would not have moved forward, or moved forward at scale, in the absence of the GCF intervention would be counted. Only finance secured and (at least 1st tranche) released should be reported.</p> <p><u>Public finance</u>: Finance from public (government) sources outside of the Fund, including other donors and partner governments, United Nations agencies, and multilateral or regional development banks and investment agencies.</p> <p><u>Private finance</u>: Finance from non-public (non-government) sources such as private banks, private companies, private philanthropy, Clean Development Mechanism financing, voluntary carbon credit market, insurance companies, and private savings.</p>
Rationale	<p>The Fund contributes to the achievement of the ultimate objective of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), including playing a key role in channeling new, additional, adequate and predictable financial resources to developing countries, and will catalyze climate finance, both public and private, at the international and national levels.</p> <p>The GCF Secretariat needs to ensure that it uses its money effectively and efficiently. The GCF Secretariat wants to ensure that the maximum amount of additional money is mobilized towards achieving GCF objectives, for each USD that the GCF Secretariat spends. This indicator measures direct finance investments leveraged through GCF funding from both public and private sources, as realized co-financing. The level of leveraged financing has a prominent function for understanding the success of GCF and features as an integral part of all GCF projects.</p> <p>This portfolio outcome is fully aligned with SDG indicator 13.A.1*, so the GCF could use data gathered here to potentially report on their contribution to SDG indicator 13.A.1 and SDG target 13.A. The target for SDG.13.A is: <i>“Implement the commitment undertaken by developed-country parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change to a goal of mobilizing jointly \$100 billion annually by 2020 from all sources to address the needs of developing countries in the context of meaningful mitigation actions and transparency on implementation and fully operationalize the Green Climate Fund through its capitalization as soon as possible”</i></p> <p>The indicator is also well-aligned to the GCF’s Investment Framework criterion 5 “Economic efficiency”, sub-criteria: Amount of co-financing. This indicator is included in the PMF as “Volume of finance leveraged by GCF funding”. This revised version provides more guidance for reporting. Data gathered</p>

Indicator P3.1	Volume of finance leveraged by GCF funding
	<p>through this indicator can be used to track and compare actual progress against initial proposals. This indicator is also aligned with CTF and SREP core indicators, and with NAMA Core Indicator M4, M5, Output 3.</p>
Disaggregation	<p>Mobilized finance will be reported with the following the disaggregation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Private finance leveraged - Public finance leveraged - Finance leveraged by sector - Further disaggregation (e.g. sources of finance) optional
Methodology	<p>It is mandatory for the AEs to report on this indicator if it is relevant to the project/program under implementation (from start to close). Project reporting covers realized co-financing during a 12-month reporting period determined by the start of the project and maintained over the life of the project. Reporting is done annually, and data is collected and reported using the APR form. Investment data must be disaggregated by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Private investments mobilized - Public investments mobilized - Investments mobilized per sector - Further disaggregation based on types of finance (e.g. grants, loans.) is optional. <p>-</p> <p>Each source and amount of leveraged finance should be specified to the extent feasible. The objective of data reported in this indicator is to generate a statement on the effectiveness of the chosen approach, i.e. its ability to mobilize public investment in the implementing country. The resulting leverage ratio (project finance compared to total investment, public and private) will be calculated by the GCF Secretariat.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Target setting^[1]_{SREP}: The target should be expressed as cumulative total for the entire project duration. - Calculation to report results: <p>-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Identify GCF finance contribution in the year under review. Only those investments that have been made (not those that only have been announced or pledged) should be considered.^[1]_{SREP} 2. Identify total financing from non-GCF sources.^[1]_{SREP} 3. Identify the amount of total co-financing that a) do not aim at climate change mitigation/adaptation; b) would have been provided in the absence of GCF funding (financing that is not additional). This relies on the expert judgment of the project/programme officers. 4. Subtract (3) from (2). The remainder provides a measure of the leveraged finance. Convert all amounts into USD. The ratio of (1) to (3) (e.g. 1:1.4) can also be an expression of leveraged finance. <p>Assessment of additionality (i.e. the extent to which money would or would not have been spent on the same purpose in the absence of GCF investments) will need to be done on a case-by-case basis and will require the judgment and reasoning of the project team.</p> <p><u>Public/private finance disaggregation:</u> Follow same instructions considering only public/private funding sources; e.g. for public sources:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Identify Fund finance contribution 2. Identify total financing from non-Fund public sources 3. Identify the amount of total public co-finance that would have been provided in the absence of Fund funding – financing that is truly additional or diverted

Indicator P3.1	Volume of finance leveraged by GCF funding
	<p>from other sources. This relies on the expert judgment of the project/programme officers.</p> <p>4. Subtract (3) from (2). The remainder provides a measure of the leveraged public finance. The ratio of (1) to (3) (e.g. 1:1.4) can also be an expression of leveraged public finance.</p> <p>In some instances, both public and private co-financing may apply, and each may need to be disaggregated separately.</p> <p>GCF investments are expected take on financial risks (de-risk investments) that other funds/institutions are not able or are willing to take. An ex-post evaluation should assess how much financial de-risking the GCF investments were realized.</p>
Data Sources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project documents • Project / Program APRs, mid-term reviews and final evaluations • Loan/grant agreements • In case of a financial programme, private investments can be monitored via application documents and reports of recipients. • Reporting requirements in contracts should be included where necessary (e.g. if loans are on-lent).
Baseline	<p>The baseline will typically be zero given that the indicator will be measured from the outset of Fund-financing. If projects are already funded by external sources prior to Fund engagement, this prior funding will need to be taken into consideration when calculating the leverage additionality of Fund financing.</p>
Frequency	<p>Project duration, updated annually.</p> <p>Possible additional ex-post assessment at least one year after project closure.</p>
Reporting Responsibility	<p>Underlying data reported by AEs, then aggregated by GCF Secretariat (OPM). Further analysis (global, regional, country groupings, sector etc.) done by GCF Secretariat (OPM).</p> <p>A possible ex-post assessment would likely require independent evaluators.</p>
Reporting Format	<p>APR</p>
Additional Notes	<p>*The indicator 13.A.1 is: “Mobilized amount of United States dollars per year between 2020 and 2025 accountable towards the \$100 billion commitment”.</p>

**Portfolio
Outcome 4**



Expansion and replication of knowledge

Dissemination and uptake of good practices, methodologies and standards for transformational climate investment enabling replication and systemic change.

Indicator P4.1	Number of knowledge products documenting good practices, methodologies and standards
Unit	The headline figure is number of knowledge products developed and published , although disaggregated data (see below) will also support a more granular view.
Definition	The indicator is used to measure the number of knowledge products that have been developed and published through the direct support of GCF investments. These knowledge products should refer to the different types of innovation practices that have been identified and developed through GCF's support. Knowledge products includes publications, case studies, presentations in conferences, web posts, blogs, etc showcasing good practices, innovative methodologies and standards for transformational change to reduce GHG emissions and enhance climate resilience. The dissemination of these good practices is expected to enable their replication and promote systemic change.
Rationale	The GCF acknowledges that developing countries need sustained investment in knowledge, institutional and human capacities to realise their climate ambitions. One aim of the GCF is to build a global thought-leadership role, leveraging its knowledge and the knowledge of its wide partnership network to synthesize learning and enable replication of proven interventions that can, at scale, shift global financial flows in line with the Paris Agreement. The GCF is committed to becoming a knowledge leader in the field of climate finance. This indicator is aligned with target 13.3 "Improve education, awareness raising and human and institutional capacity on climate change mitigation, adaptation, impact reduction, and early warning". The indicator is also well-aligned to the GCF's Investment Framework criterion 2 (Paradigm shift potential), sub-criterion 1 (Potential for scaling-up and replication) and sub-criterion 2 (Knowledge and learning potential) so data gathered through this indicator can be used to track and compare actual progress against initial proposals.
Disaggregation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of written publications (case studies, reports, etc.) or video/radio content, broken down per innovation type • Number of presentations in conferences/outreach events, broken down per type of innovation practice • Number of web publications (posts, blogs, etc.), broken down per type of innovation practice
Methodology	Only knowledge products showcasing good practices, methodologies and standards for climate transformation provided through GCF investments should be reported. Reported knowledge products should correspond to the previous calendar year to the year the information is reported.
Data Sources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Publication sources (e.g. link to published case study or video) • Conference agenda, link to event presentations • Links to web publications
Baseline	Not applicable, since this is about adoption of an innovation introduced by GCF supported projects.
Frequency	Project duration, updated annually. ^[17]
Reporting Responsibility	Underlying data reported by NDAs and AEs, then aggregated by GCF Secretariat (OPM).

Indicator P4.1	Number of knowledge products documenting good practices, methodologies and standards
Reporting Format	APR
Additional Notes	* SDG Indicator 13.3.2 : Number of countries that have communicated the strengthening of institutional, systemic and individual capacity-building to implement adaptation, mitigation and technology transfer, and development actions

Indicator P4.2	Number of people trained in good practices and innovative technologies identified through GCF investments
Unit	Number of practitioners skilled in new practices / technologies
Definition	The indicator is used to measure the number of people that have been trained and skilled in good practices and innovative technologies identified through GCF investments.
Rationale	<p>The GCF acknowledges that developing countries need sustained investment in knowledge, institutional and human capacities to realise their climate ambitions. One aim of the GCF is to build a global thought-leadership role, leveraging its knowledge and the knowledge of its wide partnership network to synthesize learning and enable replication of proven interventions that can, at scale, shift global financial flows in line with the Paris Agreement. The GCF is committed to becoming a knowledge leader in the field of climate finance.</p> <p>This indicator is aligned with SDG indicator 13.3.2*, thereby allowing the GCF to report their direct contribution to SDG indicator 13.3.2 and target 13.3 “Improve education, awareness raising and human and institutional capacity on climate change mitigation, adaptation, impact reduction, and early warning”.</p> <p>The indicator is also well-aligned to the GCF’s Investment Framework criterion 2 (Paradigm shift potential), sub-criterion 1 (Potential for scaling-up and replication) and sub-criterion 2 (Knowledge and learning potential) so data gathered through this indicator can be used to track and compare actual progress against initial proposals.</p>
Disaggregation	Number of people trained should be disaggregated by the main training theme (e.g. innovation practice or methodology that the training focused on), and by gender.
Methodology	Reported number of practitioners trained and skilled in new practices/technologies should correspond to the previous calendar year to the year the information is reported.
Data Sources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Training records • NDA records and experience • Project / Program APRs, mid-term reviews and final evaluations
Baseline	Not applicable, since this is about adoption of an innovation introduced by GCF supported projects.
Frequency	Project duration updated annually ^[L] _[SEP]
Reporting Responsibility	Underlying data reported by NDAs and AEs, then aggregated by GCF Secretariat (OPM).
Reporting Format	APR

Indicator P4.2	Number of people trained in good practices and innovative technologies identified through GCF investments
Additional Notes	* SDG Indicator 13.3.2 : Number of countries that have communicated the strengthening of institutional, systemic and individual capacity-building to implement adaptation, mitigation and technology transfer, and development actions

Indicator P4.3	Extent of knowledge of good practices, methodologies and standards for transformational climate investment
Unit	The extent of each country's knowledge is measured and reported against a six-point scale / score, where 0 = no knowledge, and 5 = high knowledge.
Definition	<p>The indicator is used to measure whether and how country knowledge of innovative and good practices promoted through GCF for transformational climate investment is changing over time. A country's 'knowledge' of innovative good practices of GCF investments is defined through a series of elements that are assessed using a scorecard-based approach. These elements include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extent of knowledge about good practices and methodologies from GCF projects. • Extent of replication or upscale of good practices and methodologies from GCF projects • Extent of facilitation of peer knowledge exchange • Extent of facilitation on South-South knowledge sharing • Extent of involvement of NDAs in the knowledge exchange of good practices <p>Based on assessment of all the above elements, the indicator provides a single 'score' for each country that can be tracked over time. Data for all countries can also be aggregated to provide 'scores' at the global level, on a regional basis, or according to country groupings (e.g. LDCs, SIDS etc.).</p>
Rationale	<p>The GCF acknowledges that developing countries need sustained investment in knowledge, institutional and human capacities to realise their climate ambitions. One aim of the GCF is to build a global thought-leadership role, leveraging its knowledge and the knowledge of its wide partnership network to synthesize learning and enable replication of proven interventions that can, at scale, shift global financial flows in line with the Paris Agreement. The GCF is committed to becoming a knowledge leader in the field of climate finance.</p> <p>This indicator is aligned with target 13.3 "Improve education, awareness raising and human and institutional capacity on climate change mitigation, adaptation, impact reduction, and early warning".</p> <p>The indicator is also well-aligned to the GCF's Investment Framework criterion 2 (Paradigm shift potential), sub-criterion 1 (Potential for scaling-up and replication) and sub-criterion 2 (Knowledge and learning potential) so data gathered through this indicator can be used to track and compare actual progress against initial proposals.</p>
Disaggregation	<p>Scoring is undertaken at the country-level, so once all country assessments have been completed it will be possible to analyse trends for different country groups, according to analytical needs: for example, aggregate 'scores' could be calculated and tracked by region, for LDCs, for SIDS, for Readiness Program participants, etc.</p> <p>Using the same approach, it will also be possible to analyse individual elements of the scorecard: for example, what are the trends for the scorecard element that assesses the extent of facilitation in peer knowledge exchange? Does scoring for this element vary across geographical regions or country groupings?</p>

Indicator P4.3	Extent of knowledge of good practices, methodologies and standards for transformational climate investment																																								
<p>Methodology</p>	<p>Indicator measurement is undertaken through a scorecard-based approach, whereby various elements of country knowledge for transformational climate investments are assessed against a six-point scale. NDAs, AEs and GCF Secretariat will conduct collectively the scoring in an annual workshop. All parties will come to an agreement on the ‘score’ for each element, with values ranging from 0 (no knowledge) to 5 (high knowledge).</p> <p>The scoring exercise will be part of an annual performance assessment workshop. The scorecard will be part of an annual report, and there will be space provided next to each scorecard to provide additional information to justify each score. The full scorecard is as follows:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="416 618 1406 1137"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="416 618 767 667">No knowledge</th> <th data-bbox="767 618 815 667">0</th> <th data-bbox="815 618 863 667">1</th> <th data-bbox="863 618 911 667">2</th> <th data-bbox="911 618 959 667">3</th> <th data-bbox="959 618 1007 667">4</th> <th data-bbox="1007 618 1054 667">5</th> <th data-bbox="1054 618 1406 667">High knowledge</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="416 667 767 808">No knowledge about good practices and methodologies from GCF projects</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td data-bbox="1054 667 1406 808">High knowledge about good practices and methodologies from GCF projects</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="416 808 767 949">No in-country replication or upscale of good practices and methodologies from GCF projects</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td data-bbox="1054 808 1406 949">High in-country replication or upscale of good practices and methodologies from GCF projects</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="416 949 767 1025">No facilitation of peer knowledge exchange</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td data-bbox="1054 949 1406 1025">High facilitation of peer knowledge exchange</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="416 1025 767 1137">No involvement of NDAs in the knowledge exchange of good practices</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td data-bbox="1054 1025 1406 1137">High involvement of NDAs in the knowledge exchange of good practices</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>The process is to a large extent reliant on personal knowledge and professional judgement. Moreover, any two assessments will likely be approached in different ways, with perhaps different weights / importance placed on different aspects of ownership. In turn, there will invariably be a degree of subjectivity within assessments, and a potential for inconsistencies across assessments.</p> <p>It is unlikely that subjectivity can be entirely eliminated from the assessments, but a process of peer review and benchmarking can help to mitigate bias, improve consistency and allow reviewers to learn from each other. It is recommended that – once all annual assessments have been completed – some form of validation exercise be undertaken. This could involve an annual workshop that brings some NDA representatives and GCF Secretariat assessors together to compare assessments and approaches. Alternatively, a limited set of ‘challenge’ reviews could be undertaken, whereby assessment teams peer review a small sample of other teams’ assessments. A further alternative could be that a single lead assessor takes on the task of validating / peer reviewing every single assessment, with a view to ensuring consistency across the whole portfolio of assessments.</p>	No knowledge	0	1	2	3	4	5	High knowledge	No knowledge about good practices and methodologies from GCF projects							High knowledge about good practices and methodologies from GCF projects	No in-country replication or upscale of good practices and methodologies from GCF projects							High in-country replication or upscale of good practices and methodologies from GCF projects	No facilitation of peer knowledge exchange							High facilitation of peer knowledge exchange	No involvement of NDAs in the knowledge exchange of good practices							High involvement of NDAs in the knowledge exchange of good practices
No knowledge	0	1	2	3	4	5	High knowledge																																		
No knowledge about good practices and methodologies from GCF projects							High knowledge about good practices and methodologies from GCF projects																																		
No in-country replication or upscale of good practices and methodologies from GCF projects							High in-country replication or upscale of good practices and methodologies from GCF projects																																		
No facilitation of peer knowledge exchange							High facilitation of peer knowledge exchange																																		
No involvement of NDAs in the knowledge exchange of good practices							High involvement of NDAs in the knowledge exchange of good practices																																		
<p>Data Sources</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NDA records and experience • Training records • Conference/outreach event agendas • Publications/Training manuals/Dissemination materials • Project / Program APRs, mid-term reviews and final evaluations 																																								
<p>Baseline</p>	<p>The first scorecard-based assessment in any given country will provide the baseline value against which future scorecard assessments can be compared.</p> <p>The global baseline score can be calculated once all countries have completed their first scorecard assessments.</p>																																								

Indicator P4.3	Extent of knowledge of good practices, methodologies and standards for transformational climate investment
Frequency	Project duration, updated annually.
Reporting Responsibility	NDA, AEs and GCF undertake a collective assessment in a country-led workshop. Scorecards aggregated and further analysis (global, regional, country groupings, etc.) done by GCF Secretariat (OPM).
Reporting Format	Country annual assessment report
Additional Notes	

Indicator P4.4	Extent to which the GCF has facilitated knowledge dissemination and uptake around transformational climate investment
Unit	The extent of the GCF Secretariat's knowledge facilitation is measured and reported against a six-point scale / score, where 0 = no facilitation, and 5 = high facilitation.
Definition	<p>The indicator is used to measure whether and how the GCF Secretariat is leveraging the knowledge of its wide partnership network to synthesize learning and enable replication of proven transformational climate interventions.</p> <p>The GCF Secretariat's 'knowledge facilitation' of innovative good practices of GCF investments is defined through a series of elements that are assessed using a scorecard-based approach. These elements include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dissemination of innovative good practices for transformational climate investments. • Facilitation of South-South knowledge sharing. • Promotion of good practices and methodologies from GCF projects for replication or upscale <p>Based on an assessment of all the above elements, the indicator provides a single 'score' that can be tracked over time.</p>
Rationale	<p>The GCF acknowledges that developing countries need sustained investment in knowledge, institutional and human capacities to realise their climate ambitions. One aim of the GCF is to build a global thought-leadership role, leveraging its knowledge and the knowledge of its wide partnership network to synthesize learning and enable replication of proven interventions that can, at scale, shift global financial flows in line with the Paris Agreement. The GCF is committed to becoming a knowledge leader in the field of climate finance.</p> <p>This indicator is aligned with target 13.3 "Improve education, awareness raising and human and institutional capacity on climate change mitigation, adaptation, impact reduction, and early warning".</p> <p>The indicator is also well-aligned to the GCF's Investment Framework criterion 2 (Paradigm shift potential), sub-criterion 1 (Potential for scaling-up and replication) and sub-criterion 2 (Knowledge and learning potential) so data gathered through this indicator can be used to track and compare actual progress against initial proposals.</p>
Disaggregation	Scoring is undertaken at the GCF portfolio level.
Methodology	Indicator measurement is undertaken through a scorecard-based approach , whereby various elements of knowledge facilitation for transformational climate investments are assessed against a six-point scale. Annual assessments will be undertaken collectively by the AEs, NDAs and the GCF Secretariat, who will

Indicator P4.4	Extent to which the GCF has facilitated knowledge dissemination and uptake around transformational climate investment																																								
	<p>ultimately ‘score’ each element of the GCF’s knowledge facilitation role, with values ranging from 0 (no facilitation) to 5 (strong facilitation). The scoring exercise will be part of an annual performance assessment workshop. AEs, NDAs and the GCF Secretariat will agree on a score for each element in the scorecard. The scorecard will be part of an annual report, and there will be space provided next to each scorecard to provide additional information to justify each score. The full scorecard is as follows:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="416 517 1404 965"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="416 517 767 595">No knowledge facilitation</th> <th data-bbox="767 517 815 595">0</th> <th data-bbox="815 517 863 595">1</th> <th data-bbox="863 517 911 595">2</th> <th data-bbox="911 517 959 595">3</th> <th data-bbox="959 517 1007 595">4</th> <th data-bbox="1007 517 1054 595">5</th> <th data-bbox="1054 517 1404 595">Strong knowledge facilitation</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="416 595 767 685">No evidence that GCF-facilitated knowledge is being taken up</td> <td data-bbox="767 595 815 685"></td> <td data-bbox="815 595 863 685"></td> <td data-bbox="863 595 911 685"></td> <td data-bbox="911 595 959 685"></td> <td data-bbox="959 595 1007 685"></td> <td data-bbox="1007 595 1054 685"></td> <td data-bbox="1054 595 1404 685">Strong evidence that GCF-facilitated knowledge is being taken up and applied</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="416 685 767 797">No dissemination of innovative good practices for transformational climate investments</td> <td data-bbox="767 685 815 797"></td> <td data-bbox="815 685 863 797"></td> <td data-bbox="863 685 911 797"></td> <td data-bbox="911 685 959 797"></td> <td data-bbox="959 685 1007 797"></td> <td data-bbox="1007 685 1054 797"></td> <td data-bbox="1054 685 1404 797">High dissemination of innovative good practices for transformational climate investments</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="416 797 767 898">The GCF does not facilitate knowledge sharing between GCF stakeholders</td> <td data-bbox="767 797 815 898"></td> <td data-bbox="815 797 863 898"></td> <td data-bbox="863 797 911 898"></td> <td data-bbox="911 797 959 898"></td> <td data-bbox="959 797 1007 898"></td> <td data-bbox="1007 797 1054 898"></td> <td data-bbox="1054 797 1404 898">The GCF facilitates knowledge sharing between GCF stakeholders</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="416 898 767 965">No facilitation of South-South knowledge sharing</td> <td data-bbox="767 898 815 965"></td> <td data-bbox="815 898 863 965"></td> <td data-bbox="863 898 911 965"></td> <td data-bbox="911 898 959 965"></td> <td data-bbox="959 898 1007 965"></td> <td data-bbox="1007 898 1054 965"></td> <td data-bbox="1054 898 1404 965">High facilitation of South-South knowledge sharing</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>The process is to a large extent reliant on personal knowledge and professional judgement. Moreover, any two assessments will likely be approached in different ways, with perhaps different weights / importance placed on different aspects of ownership. In turn, there will invariably be a degree of subjectivity within assessments, and a potential for inconsistencies across assessments.</p> <p>It is unlikely that subjectivity can be entirely eliminated from the assessments, but a process of peer review and benchmarking can help to mitigate bias, improve consistency and allow reviewers to learn from each other. It is recommended that – once all annual assessments have been completed – some form of validation exercise be undertaken. This could involve an annual workshop that brings some NDA representatives and GCF Secretariat assessors together to compare assessments and approaches. Alternatively, a limited set of ‘challenge’ reviews could be undertaken, whereby assessment teams peer review a small sample of other teams’ assessments. A further alternative could be that a single lead assessor takes on the task of validating / peer reviewing every single assessment, with a view to ensuring consistency across the whole portfolio of assessments.</p>	No knowledge facilitation	0	1	2	3	4	5	Strong knowledge facilitation	No evidence that GCF-facilitated knowledge is being taken up							Strong evidence that GCF-facilitated knowledge is being taken up and applied	No dissemination of innovative good practices for transformational climate investments							High dissemination of innovative good practices for transformational climate investments	The GCF does not facilitate knowledge sharing between GCF stakeholders							The GCF facilitates knowledge sharing between GCF stakeholders	No facilitation of South-South knowledge sharing							High facilitation of South-South knowledge sharing
No knowledge facilitation	0	1	2	3	4	5	Strong knowledge facilitation																																		
No evidence that GCF-facilitated knowledge is being taken up							Strong evidence that GCF-facilitated knowledge is being taken up and applied																																		
No dissemination of innovative good practices for transformational climate investments							High dissemination of innovative good practices for transformational climate investments																																		
The GCF does not facilitate knowledge sharing between GCF stakeholders							The GCF facilitates knowledge sharing between GCF stakeholders																																		
No facilitation of South-South knowledge sharing							High facilitation of South-South knowledge sharing																																		
Data Sources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GCF records and experience • NDA records and experience • Training records • Conference/outreach event agendas • Publications/Training manuals/Dissemination materials • Project / Program APRs, mid-term reviews and final evaluations 																																								
Baseline	<p>The first scorecard-based assessment in any given country will provide the baseline value against which future scorecard assessments can be compared.</p> <p>The global baseline score can be calculated once all countries have completed their first scorecard assessments.</p>																																								
Frequency	Project duration updated annually ^[L] _[SEP]																																								

Indicator P4.4	Extent to which the GCF has facilitated knowledge dissemination and uptake around transformational climate investment
Reporting Responsibility	NDA, AEs and GCF undertake a collective assessment in a country-led workshop. Scorecards aggregated and further analysis (global, regional, country groupings, etc.) done by GCF Secretariat (OPM).
Reporting Format	Country annual assessment report
Additional Notes	