

CSO Active Observer coordinated CSO Input on the Further Development of Indicators in the Performance Measurement Frameworks (GCF/B12/13)

GCF Board decision B.12/31 invites submissions from Board members and alternate members, as well as active observers, on document GCF/B.12/13 “*Further development of indicators in the performance measurement framework*”. This submission by the CSO active observers Lidy Nacpil (representing developing country GCF accredited civil society organizations) and Liane Schalatek (representing developed country GCF accredited civil society organizations) responds to this call for input. This submission reflects the views of participating CSOs engaged in the efforts for a coordinated CSO input facilitated jointly by the two CSO active observers.

Mitigation performance measurement framework

Expected result	Refined Indicator * = Core	Comments/inputs
<i>Paradigm-shift Objective</i>		
Shift to low-emission sustainable development pathways	<input type="checkbox"/> PSM Degree to which the Fund is contributing to low-emission sustainable development	It should be specified that this means consistency with 1.5 degree objective set out in the Paris Agreement (NB. updated from the 2 degrees in B08/07). This should include assessment of whether GCF-funded activities avoid lock-in of long-lived, high emission infrastructure (e.g. in the case of power generation, projects should meet a highly ambitious CO2 emissions performance standard by fitting in and contributing to a path towards a national power mix with 0g CO2/kWh in 2050). This could be measured in an annual "1.5 degree compatibility assessment" of the Fund's portfolio.
<i>Fund-level Impacts</i>		
	<input type="checkbox"/> MCrC1 Co-benefits of mitigation actions	<p>Mirroring the investment framework, this might be sub-divided into environmental, social and economic co-benefits, and gender-sensitive development impact.</p> <p>The environmental criteria should start with on a “do no harm” basis – assessing the absence of negative environmental externalities, as well as checking for co-benefits in areas such as air quality, soil quality, conservation and biodiversity.</p> <p>Social co-benefits should include a qualitative assessment encompassing areas such as health and safety, delivery of pro-poor energy services, access to education, improved regulation and/or cultural</p>

		<p>preservation and reduction of inequalities (based on gender, race, age, etc.).</p> <p>Economic co-benefits include improvements in areas such as expanded and enhanced job markets, job creation for women and men (directly and indirectly in the technology cycle and management/finance roles) in compliance with decent work standards (ILO), increased and/or expanded involvement of local industries; increased collaboration between industry and academia; growth of private funds attracted; enhancement of home-grown/local technology development and utilization; contribution to an increase in productivity and competitive capacity; improved sector income- generating capacity, contribution to an increase in energy security; deployment of appropriate technology development and transfer especially from the developed to developing countries; change in water supply and agricultural productivity in targeted areas, etc.</p> <p>Gender-specific development impacts should include the role of the Fund in reducing gender inequalities in climate change impacts and/or equal participation by gender groups in contributing to expected outcomes, outlining specific measures by which these objectives have been achieved. A focus must be on increased gender parity in provision and benefit, as well as the acknowledgement, reduction and redistribution of unpaid domestic and care work.</p> <p>Sector-specific criteria should also be applied. For instance, the Fund's energy portfolio should be assessed according to its success in enhancing energy access across a range of attributes (usable energy service, including quality, affordability, safety, and reliability), eg, through applying the SE4All Global Tracking Framework.</p>
--	--	--

<p>4.0 Reduced emissions from land use, deforestation, forest degradation, and through sustainable management of forests and conservation and enhancement of forest carbon stocks</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> M4.1 Tonnes of carbon dioxide equivalent (t CO₂eq) reduced or avoided and/or GHG removals by sinks (including increased removals) —from REDD+ and other land use activities</p>	<p>The note attached to this result area for B.12 narrowly stated that estimations should seek consistency with the Lima REDD+ Info Hub. Perhaps a better framing would be “Estimations shall be consistent with the UNFCCC guidance on REDD+” and pay particular attention through complementary qualitative reporting to REDD safeguards and non-carbon benefits.</p> <p>The commentary in the notes column of the original document only discusses development of methodologies related to REDD+. A number of CSO groups felt that given the immense methodological difficulties of accounting, along with permanence issues of removals through other land use activities, the indicator might be revised to reflect what already is indicated in the note – that it should currently be limited only to REDD+ activities with possibility for broadening the scope of the indicator as science develops.</p> <p>Some CSO colleagues suggested that for a future indicator on other land use activities the land sector information on the results of REDD+ activities published in the Lima REDD+ Information Hub on the REDD+ Web Platform (UNFCCC decision 9/CP19) could be a starting point, but that further work was needed.</p>
<p><i>Outcomes</i></p>		
<p>Cross-cutting</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> MCrC2 Number of technologies and innovative solutions (including gender – friendly technologies and solutions) transferred or licensed to support low-emission development</p>	
<p>5.0 Strengthened</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> M5.1 Number of gender-sensitive</p>	<p>The number <u>and effectiveness</u> of policies etc.</p>

institutional and regulatory systems for low-emission planning and development	policies, institutions, coordination mechanisms and regulatory frameworks that improve incentives for low-emission planning and development and their effective implementation	<p>should be considered. One well-designed comprehensive policy might be more effective than a large number of incoherent policies. Likewise, having a large number of institutions is not necessarily better.</p> <p>In addition to the (mostly quantitative) measures listed, this indicator should seek to assess the role of the GCF in strengthening collective learning and knowledge generation within institutions and the knowledge transfer they provide to empower people and communities in a gender-responsive way.</p> <p>In analogy to the adaptation PMF indicator A.5.1, the qualifier “gender-friendly” or “gender-sensitive” should be included here</p>
7.0 Lower energy intensity of buildings, cities, industries, and appliances	<input type="checkbox"/> M7.1(a) tCO ₂ eq emissions reduced or avoided due to improvements in building design and energy efficiency	<p><i>(the following applies to M7.1 (a)-(d), M.8-1 and M.8-2)</i>- The indicator should not just focus on reduced or avoided emissions, but in addition should seek to also measure the degree to which GCF funded activities have:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * reduced fossil fuel import requirements; * reduced overall indoor and outdoor pollution; * supported/improved upon the nationally best available technology; * contributed to the reduction and eventual phase-out of fossil fuel subsidies, beginning with producer subsidies, in a socially responsible manner; * contributed to the eradication of energy poverty countrywide; * supplemented and sought synergies with national policies for decarbonising the energy supply sector toward renewable energy; and * supported reviewing, strengthening of existing and/or establishing new national standards, regulations and legislation for energy-efficient processes and products in the country.
	<input type="checkbox"/> M7.1(b) tCO ₂ eq emissions reduced or avoided as a result of investments in climate-smart cities	See above (under M7.1 (a))
	<input type="checkbox"/> M7.1(c) tCO ₂ eq emissions reduced or avoided as a result of investments in lower-emission industry	See above (under M7.1 (a))
	<input type="checkbox"/> M7.1(d) tCO ₂ eq emissions reduced or avoided as a result of investments in energy-efficient appliances	See above (under M7.1 (a))
8.0 Increased use of low-	<input type="checkbox"/> M8.1 Increased female and male	See above (under M7.1 (a)). This indicator

carbon transport	passengers trips and freight using low-carbon transport	should also include a qualitative assessment that get to the heart of what is needed to increase a mode shift, such as transit-oriented development, affordability and safety of use/access (for example addressing gender violence)
	<input type="checkbox"/> M8.2 Increased fuel economy and decreased carbon intensity for passenger and freight vehicles	See above (under M7.1 (a))
9.0 Improved management of land or forest areas contributing to emissions reductions	<input type="checkbox"/> M9.1 Hectares of land or forests areas under sustainable management with recognised tenure and territorial rights, including traditional rights of indigenous peoples and local communities , or improved protection and management leading to reduced GHG emissions and/or enhancement of carbon stocks	<p>The suggested indicator is a clear example that a quantitative measurement (“hectares of land”) is not enough to get to a qualitative improvement of outcomes.</p> <p>For measuring expected results from improved management of land or forest areas contributing to emissions reductions, it is fundamental to include specific language that recognizes tenure and territorial rights including traditional rights of indigenous peoples and local communities when leading to reduced GHG emissions and/or enhancement of carbon stocks to effectively mitigate climate change.</p> <p>Furthermore, it is important to realize the GCF project/program will not be implemented in a blank space and therefore it is of crucial importance to map the existing forest management system, stakeholders, co-operations, conflicts and inequalities and the impact of GCF project/program on these dynamics.</p> <p>A number of studies have shown that forests managed by communities register less deforestation and store more carbon than other forests.</p>

Other noted, but not decided indicator removed because integrated in the refined indicators

Expected result	Other noted, but not decided indicator integrated in the refined indicators	Note	Comments/inputs
5.0 Strengthened institutional and regulatory systems for low-	5.2 Number and level of effective coordination mechanisms	The revised version of the previous indicator (M5.1) includes coordination	

emission planning and development		mechanisms. Therefore this indicator would be redundant.	
-----------------------------------	--	--	--

Other general comments/inputs

Adaptation performance measurement framework

Expected result	Refined Indicator * = Core	Comments/inputs
<i>Paradigm-shift Objective</i>		
Increased climate-resilient sustainable development	<input type="checkbox"/> PSA Degree to which the Fund contributes to climate-resilient sustainable development	Additional measures should include: Degree to which the activity avoids lock-in of long-lived, climate-vulnerable infrastructure; Expected reduction in vulnerability by enhancing adaptive capacity and resilience for populations affected by the proposed activity, focusing particularly on the most vulnerable population groups and applying a gender-sensitive approach; Number and type of institutions using climate information to inform policy and decision-making
<i>Fund-level Impacts</i>		
1.0 Increased resilience and enhanced livelihoods of the most vulnerable people, communities, and regions	<input type="checkbox"/> A1.1(a) Estimated change in losses of lives (for males and females) due to the impact of climate-related disasters	Neither indicator A1.1(a) or A1.1(b) are reflecting increased resilience or enhanced livelihoods . This is not trivial – you want indicators that can show change in a positive direction, not the absence of negative effects. To illustrate: for example DFID defines resilience as “the ability of countries, governments, communities and households to manage change, by maintaining or transforming living standards in the face of shocks or stresses, while continuing to develop and without compromising their long-term prospects.” This is not to privilege one definition of resilience over another, but to point strongly to the need for indicators to point in the direction of

		<p>increased ability to manage change, and maintain or transform living standards, rather than negative numbers on loss of life and assets.</p> <p>The currently proposed draft indicators A1.1(a) and A1.1(b) to not fulfill this mandate. They are much more appropriate to a disaster risk reduction agenda. DRR is not the main goal of GCF financing for adaptation – the goal is transformative change – how to identify that? Those are the types of indicators that should be sought.</p> <p>For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extent of diversification of income in regions affected by slow onset events <p>Loss of lives are just the most extreme form of impacts of climate-related disasters that are not reflective of a severity of an extreme climate event; instead, the focus should be on a reduction on the humanitarian case load (thus also capturing severe human impacts short of loss of life).</p>
	<p><input type="checkbox"/> A1.1(b) Estimated change in losses of economic assets (USD equivalent) due to the impact of extreme events and climate-related disasters.</p>	<p>Positive indicators could include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of persons covered by risk transfer and/or social protection instruments, tools, or programs • Increased ratio of at-risk households incorporated into safety net programmes <p>A focus on losses of economic assets (as an aggregate USD number) does not reflect the effect on loss of economic livelihood (which for an individual or a population group might be a low financial number); thus, the focus should be on securing (economic) livelihoods, not assets.</p>
	<p><input type="checkbox"/> A1.2 Number of individuals and percentage of population (and relative disaggregation of women and men) adopting climate-resilient livelihood options (including fisheries, agriculture, tourism, etc.)</p>	<p>It is important to not just focus on “head-counting”, but also empowerment, and especially the empowerment of women. A specific focus (for example in corollary qualitative reporting) should be on the use of traditional knowledge, technologies and seed-varieties etc.</p>

3.0 Increased resilience of infrastructure and the built environment to climate change threats	<input type="checkbox"/> *A3.a Number of physical assets constructed and/or made more resilient to climate variability and change <i>(proposed as core indicator, when applicable)</i>	The number of physical assets has not reflection on their utility/service provision for people and the impacts of these structures for bettering their lives. A better focus would be on “number of people affected positively/with improved resilience through physical assets constructed and/or made more resilient....”
	<input type="checkbox"/> *A3.b Value of physical assets constructed and/or made more resilient to climate variability and change <i>(proposed as core indicator, when applicable)</i>	This indicator without further qualifications and restrictions will set the wrong incentive as in the aggregate it could bias GCF adaptation investment in the build environment toward investment in costly assets over investment in useful/beneficial structures that might be a lot less expensive to either build or improve.
4.0 Improved resilience of ecosystems and ecosystem services	<input type="checkbox"/> A4.1 Extent of ecosystems strengthened, restored and protected from climate variability and change	<p>The note attached to this result area in Annex III of the document prepared for B.12 acknowledges the particular difficulty in measuring this desired outcome.</p> <p>The following language adjustments may improve the indicator: “Extent of ecosystems strengthened, restored and/or protected from to reduce the negative impacts of climate variability and change.”</p>
<i>Outcomes</i>		
Cross-cutting	<input type="checkbox"/> ACrC1 Number of technologies (including gender – friendly technologies) and innovative solutions transferred or licensed to promote climate resilience	
5.0 Strengthened institutional	<input type="checkbox"/> A5.1 Number of gender –	The number <u>and effectiveness</u> of policies

and regulatory systems for climate-responsive planning and development	friendly policies, institutions, coordination mechanisms and regulatory frameworks that improve incentives for climate resilience and their effective implementation.	<p>etc. should be considered. One well-designed comprehensive policy might be more effective than a large number of incoherent policies. Likewise, having a large number of institutions is not necessarily better.</p> <p>In addition to the (mostly quantitative) measures listed, this indicator should seek to assess the role of the GCF in strengthening collective learning and knowledge generation within institutions and the knowledge transfer they provide to empower people and communities in a gender-responsive way.</p>
6.0 Increased generation and use of climate information in decision-making	<input type="checkbox"/> A6.1 Number of climate information products/services in decision-making in climate-sensitive sectors developed, delivered, and used	As important as the number of climate information products/services is the number of people reached as well as efforts to reach different population groups with specific information provision needs (f.ex. Indigenous Peoples, women), many of which rely on non-written information provision in native/local languages. Thus, a qualitative assessment must complement quantitative measurement.
7.0 Strengthened adaptive capacity and reduced exposure to climate risks	<input type="checkbox"/> A7.1 Use by vulnerable households (including number of female beneficiaries), communities, businesses and public-sector services of Fund-supported/developed tools, instruments, strategies, and activities to respond to climate change and variability	A7.1 and A7.2 do not adequately capture adaptive capacity nor exposure.
	<input type="checkbox"/> A7.2: Number of males and females reached by climate-related early warning systems and other risk reduction measures established/ strengthened	Focus should not just be on the number of people reached, but on the number of people with access to and the ability to use such early warning systems and risk reduction measures, focusing in particular on the empowerment some of the most marginalized population groups. Suggested further disaggregation beyond male/female.

Other noted, but not decided indicator removed because integrated in the refined indicators

Expected result	Other noted, but not decided indicator integrated in the refined indicators	Note	Comments/inputs
1.0 Increased resilience and enhanced livelihoods of the most vulnerable people, communities, and regions	1.3 Number of Fund-funded projects/programmes that supports effective adaptation to fish stock migration and depletion due to climate change	This indicator cannot be reported at the level of the AEs. Nonetheless, on the number of projects/programmes that the Fund is supporting in fisheries/fish stock (and other sector) will be provided by the Secretariat in its annual Portfolio Performance Report (PPR).	
4.0 Improved resilience of ecosystems and ecosystem services	4.2 Value (US\$) of ecosystem services generated or protected in response to climate change	Based on the feedback received from several experts and financial institutions, measuring this indicator is often impractical due to the high cost and level of technical expertise needed. In addition, this type of information can be included as ad-hoc study at the stage of the feasibility study and measured using the same methodology at the stage of evaluations. Rather than be a PMF-level indicator, specific projects/programmes focused on ecosystem services can build an indicator of this type into their individual reporting.	CSOs agree that measuring a US\$ value of ecosystem services is impractical (and can be a poor guide) Instead an indicator – even at the specific project/program level – should look at the utility of ecosystem services generated or protected in response to climate change for the livelihood of natural-resource dependent peoples and communities. Such an indicator should be disaggregated looking specifically at Indigenous Peoples, and men/women affected.
5.0 Strengthened institutional and regulatory systems for climate-responsive planning and development	5.2 Number and level of effective coordination mechanisms	The revised version of the adaptation indicator A5.1, includes coordination mechanisms. Therefore this indicator would be redundant.	

Other general comments/inputs

The effort by the Secretariat and the Board over several iterations to improve the performance measurement indicators is noted and CSOs in particular appreciate the work by the Secretariat in including gender-sensitive indicators throughout the framework. However, most of these indicators focus mostly on quantitative accomplishments (“head-counting”) without addressing sufficiently underlying issues, such as the existing power-relationships and the question of access to resources and wealth.

Additionally the gendered dimensions of the care and informal economy need to be considered in performance measurement, in particular through an aggregate look at how the burden of care was shared or redistributed (f.ex. via time-use surveys). This is relevant for both adaptation and mitigation performance measurement, but particularly relevant for adaptation sectors focusing on agriculture, food security, water and health.

In other areas, too, qualitative indicators are missing. For example, when looking at reducing emissions through increased low emission energy access and power generation, it is very important to include indicators that measure how communities, women, or Indigenous Peoples are enabled or empowered to address and provide for their own low-emission energy needs through distributed decentralized renewable and low carbon energy systems. Experience and studies have shown that renewable and low emission energy systems are best promoted and expanded in developing countries through community-based and community-managed energy systems through distributed systems rather than highly centralized large grid infrastructures. Community and distributed systems also democratize ownership and access to energy.

Therefore, qualitative indicators need to complement quantitative measurement for all projects and programs financed by the GCF to allow for an aggregate qualitative assessment at the portfolio level as well.

CSOs are of the opinion that performance measurement in both adaptation and mitigation in the GCF needs to be guided by a human rights framework approach focusing on men and women as rights-holders. There are existing sector-specific requirements stemming from such an approach (e.g. right to water and food) that then need to inform sector-specific performance measurement in the GCF context in line with UN-wide approaches, including the agenda 2030. The GCF as a fund under the UN system is not exempt from the human rights framework.

Comments/inputs in relation to the initial evaluation policy

The initial evaluation policy correctly identifies independence; impartiality; transparency; comprehensive and meaningful participation of all relevant stakeholders (including first and foremost communities, women and Indigenous Peoples); respect for beneficiaries' culture, customs and beliefs; and credibility as the guiding principles that must guide a GCF evaluation policy.

However, the proposed evaluation process falls short of some of these core principles. Looking at project/program level evaluation, the evaluation policy does not specify who will be performing the mid-term and final evaluations which have to be undertaken for each project and program. The principles of independence, impartiality and transparency would imply that those evaluations have to be performed by an independent third-party to avoid any conflict of interest in self-reporting by the accredited entity. It is for example best practice in the Adaptation Fund that in addition to a final evaluation report being submitted by the AE an independent third party final evaluation will be conducted with the costs to be borne by the AE. Likewise, the Secretariat should commit to carrying out at minimum a base number of ex-post evaluations. In Annex II, para. 10, the wording in the initial policy should therefore be changed from "may" to "shall".

When discussing the role of higher-level evaluations, such as pertaining to country-portfolio or thematic level evaluations, the initial evaluation policy does not clarify whether those evaluations will be conducted by the Secretariat or an independent third party; also since those evaluations are only to apply to a sub-set of country portfolios or particular sectors or results areas, more clarity is needed on who (Secretariat?, Board?) would determine the subset and selection criteria for further evaluation.

To enhance learning and knowledge transfer, all evaluation reports should be publicly disclosed on the GCF website to the general public (and not only to targeted users as suggested). It is incompatible with a high standard of transparency to seek to restrict access to evaluation reports (which can be redacted to safeguard proprietary or personal information in line with the presumption to disclose articulated in the GCF information disclosure policy and the best practice of pro-active disclosure).

Comments/inputs in relation to the initial results management framework for the Readiness and Preparatory support programme of the GCF

The initial RMF for the readiness and preparatory support programme of the GCF reflects the (current) four activity areas of the GCFs readiness and preparatory support programme as project/program outcomes. This needs to be adapted in light of possibly shifting activity areas for the GCF's readiness and preparatory support programme which is not a time-limited activity but an iterative process with needs of countries and country stakeholders changing or shifting over time. Thus, the RMF has to remain dynamic as well.

Under the description of "results", the focus should be on "strengthened NDA/focal point capacity to undertake GCF-related roles and responsibilities, and comprehensively engage national stakeholders" (add: "comprehensively").

It should be completed with indicators for each project/programme outcome (= activity area) that capture both quantitative and qualitative aspects of the readiness and preparatory support programme outcomes and its overall impacts. They need to capture in particular to what extent GCF readiness activities have increased the empowerment of all country-level actors and stakeholders to determine the country's priorities for engaging with the GCF.