



GREEN  
CLIMATE  
FUND

Independent  
Evaluation  
Unit



TRUSTED EVIDENCE.  
INFORMED POLICIES.  
HIGH IMPACT.

# INDEPENDENT EVALUATION OF THE GCF'S COUNTRY OWNERSHIP APPROACH

## Inception Report



GREEN CLIMATE FUND  
INDEPENDENT EVALUATION UNIT

# Independent Evaluation of the GCF's Country Ownership Approach

---

INCEPTION REPORT

*02 MAY 2019*



## CONTENTS

Abbreviations .....	v
I. Introduction.....	1
A. Purpose and scope of the evaluation.....	1
B. Key roles and responsibilities for the evaluation.....	1
II. Background on country ownership.....	2
A. History of country ownership in development cooperation, the UNFCCC and climate finance .....	2
B. GCF mandate and context .....	9
C. Existing evaluative evidence on country ownership from GCF IEU studies.....	17
III. Methods .....	21
A. Process followed to date .....	21
B. Methodological approach .....	23
C. Detailed methods .....	27
IV. Workplan .....	33
A. Key deliverables .....	33
B. Detailed workplan .....	34
References and documents consulted.....	35
Appendix I: Evaluation matrix.....	41
Appendix II: Draft analytical framework.....	50
Appendix III: Draft outline for the Evaluation Report.....	55

## TABLES

Table 1	Principles, elements and dimensions of country ownership .....	7
Table 2	Coverage areas, subcriteria and indicative assessment factors for the country ownership criterion.....	16
Table 3	Key evaluation questions .....	24
Table 4	Analytical framework for country ownership.....	26
Table 5	Stakeholders to be consulted.....	29
Table 6	Selected country cases and key attributes.....	31
Table 7	Summarized planning guidance for country protocol.....	32
Table 8	Key deliverables and deadlines.....	33
Table 9	Detailed workplan for the evaluation.....	34



## ABBREVIATIONS

<b>AE</b>	Accredited Entity
<b>AF</b>	Adaptation Fund
<b>AMA</b>	Accreditation Master Agreement
<b>APR</b>	Annual Performance Report
<b>CIF</b>	Climate Investment Funds
<b>CN</b>	Concept Notes
<b>CO</b>	Country Ownership
<b>COA</b>	Country Ownership Approach
<b>COP</b>	Conference of the Parties
<b>CP</b>	Country Programme
<b>CSO</b>	Civil Society Organization
<b>DAE</b>	Direct Access Entity
<b>DCP</b>	Division of Country Programming
<b>DMA</b>	Division of Mitigation and Adaptation
<b>DP</b>	Delivery Partner
<b>EDA</b>	Enhanced Direct Access
<b>ESS</b>	Environmental and Social Safeguards
<b>FAA</b>	Funded Activity Agreement
<b>FGD</b>	Focus Group Discussion
<b>FP</b>	Focal Point
<b>FPR</b>	Forward-looking Performance Review
<b>GCF</b>	Green Climate Fund
<b>GEF</b>	Global Environment Facility
<b>GHG</b>	Greenhouse Gas
<b>GO</b>	Government Organisations
<b>GPEDC</b>	Global Partnership for Effective Development Cooperation
<b>IAE</b>	International Accredited Entity
<b>IEU</b>	Independent Evaluation Unit
<b>IRM</b>	Independent Redress Mechanism
<b>iTAP</b>	Independent Technical Advisory Panel
<b>KII</b>	Key Informant Interviews
<b>LDC</b>	Least Developed Country
<b>LAC</b>	Latin American and Caribbean
<b>MLF</b>	Multilateral Fund for the Implementation of the Montreal Protocol
<b>MR&amp;E</b>	Monitoring, reporting, and evaluation
<b>NAMA</b>	Nationally Appropriate Mitigation Actions
<b>NAP</b>	National Adaptation Plan
<b>NAPA</b>	National Adaptation Plans of Action
<b>NDA</b>	National Designated Authorities
<b>NDC</b>	Nationally Determined Contribution
<b>NoP</b>	No-objection Procedure
<b>OECD</b>	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
<b>OED</b>	Office of the Executive Director
<b>OGC</b>	Office of General Counsel
<b>OPM</b>	Office of Portfolio Management
<b>ORMC</b>	Office of Risk Management and Compliance
<b>PPF</b>	Project Preparation Facility

<b>PSF</b>	Private Sector Facility
<b>PSO</b>	Private Sector Organisations
<b>RA</b>	Regional Advisor
<b>RACI</b>	Responsible, Accountable, Consulted, and Informed
<b>RMF</b>	Results Management Framework
<b>RPSP</b>	Readiness and Preparatory Support Programme
<b>SAP</b>	Simplified Approval Process
<b>SD</b>	Structural Dialogue
<b>SDG</b>	Sustainable Development Goal
<b>SIDS</b>	Small Island Developing States
<b>UNDP</b>	United Nations Development Programme
<b>UNFCCC</b>	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change



## I. INTRODUCTION

### A. Purpose and scope of the evaluation

The Green Climate Fund (GCF) was created in 2010 to support the efforts of developing countries to respond to the challenges of climate change. It advances and promotes a paradigm shift towards low-emission and climate-resilient development pathways in developing countries. As a designated operating entity of the Financial Mechanism of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), the GCF provides equal funding for climate change mitigation and adaptation projects and programmes to developing countries, and particularly to those most vulnerable to the adverse effects of climate change.

In pursuing these objectives, the GCF, as one of its core principles, is driven by countries' needs and priorities. The principle of country ownership and country drivenness is reflected in the Governing Instrument and various Board decisions (see section II.B). Country ownership can be considered both a principle of climate finance in the GCF and an outcome objective; as something that can be strengthened through the provision of readiness and preparedness support and climate finance support.

This independent evaluation of country ownership will examine the extent to which the GCF has conceptualized and operationalized the principle of country ownership, as well as the extent to which country needs and country ownership have been incorporated into both the design and the implementation of GCF policies and practices. It will also analyse the main factors that enable and detract from country ownership in terms of what works, why and where (including success stories), and what does not work. A third objective for the evaluation is to draw lessons from how country ownership is being interpreted and

implemented in different contexts, and to use such lessons to inform the development of policies and programmes, stakeholder engagement and country programmes. Selectively benchmarking GCF's experience with country ownership models and approaches of other climate finance institutions and entities will also inform the evaluation. Finally, the country ownership evaluation will also inform the forward-looking performance review (FPR) of the GCF, carried out by the GCF Independent Evaluation Unit (IEU).

The principle of country ownership will be considered in the context of all GCF operational modalities and relevant related policies, including the Readiness and Preparatory Support Programme (RPSP) and the Project Preparation Facility (PPF), the proposal approval process, including the simplified approval process, the accreditation process, the direct access modality, and the overall project cycle, while recognizing that country ownership is an evolving and continuous process, and a principle that requires flexibility.

### B. Key roles and responsibilities for the evaluation

The IEU leads this evaluation, and the consultancy firm ICF was selected through a competitive procurement process to carry out the evaluation in partnership with the IEU and will support the IEU. The overall evaluation team consists of IEU staff and ICF colleagues. The ICF country ownership approach (COA) evaluation team was responsible for developing this inception report, which uses the evaluation matrix and the approach paper developed by the IEU. The overall team consisting of IEU HQ and ICF members will be responsible for data collection and analysis and preparing the final evaluation report, under the oversight of and in full collaboration with the IEU. The IEU will bear full responsibility for the evaluation.

## II. BACKGROUND ON COUNTRY OWNERSHIP

### A. History of country ownership in development cooperation, the UNFCCC, and climate finance

The concept of country ownership gained prominence with the aid effectiveness agenda in the late 1990s. It has become a cornerstone of climate finance now, particularly with the 2015 Paris Agreement. As repeatedly highlighted during the negotiations around the UNFCCC, development cooperation and climate finance are distinct in many ways (development cooperation and climate finance respectively focus on eliminating poverty versus mitigation objectives, public versus private nature of financing, narrower Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development [OECD] constituencies versus broader UNFCCC ones). However, there are also some close similarities and potential lessons to be gained from decades of development cooperation (both development cooperation and climate finance depend on public sources of finance, complementarity between poverty alleviation and building resilience) that may be useful for climate finance delivery and country ownership.

#### Country ownership in development cooperation

With an increase in development aid stemming from the Millennium Development Goals agreed in 2000 and the Monterrey Consensus in 2002, the focus of the international aid architecture began to shift from a one-way donor–recipient relationship,

with donor-driven decision-making, towards empowering recipient countries and greater partnership. The First High-Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness was held in 2002 in Rome. In 2005, the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness formalized five fundamental principles for making aid more effective and marked the first-time donors and recipients agreed to commitments and to holding each other accountable for achieving those commitments. The Accra and Busan Forums<sup>1</sup> in 2008 and 2011 took stock of progress against these commitments and set the agenda for further improvement. The Global Partnership for Effective Development Cooperation (GPEDC), which was agreed to at Busan and jointly managed by the OECD and the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), institutionalized and regularly monitors the implementation of the now four crystallized country ownership and aid effectiveness principles:<sup>2</sup>

- Ownership of development priorities by developing countries
- Inclusive development partnerships
- Focus on results
- Transparency and accountability to each other

The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, adopted at the United Nations Sustainable Development Summit in 2015, has continued to highlight the complex and interdependent global challenges to address, and set much more ambitious goals for both developed and developing countries in partnership, notably through Sustainable

---

<sup>1</sup> The Busan Partnership Agreement (2011) emphasized the engagement and accountability structures and processes at country level, promoting more inclusive (including private sector and civil society engagement) and transparent dialogue and joint action. Busan introduced the concept of “democratic ownership” as a broader concept that encompasses the whole of society, beyond the government alone. The Busan Forum also formally recognized climate finance as a core development finance issue, with an objective to “support national climate change policy and planning as an integral part of developing countries overall national

development plans, and ensure that – where appropriate – these measures are financed, delivered and monitored through developing countries’ systems in a transparent manner.”

<sup>2</sup> The five original Paris Declaration aid effectiveness principles were (1) support for national ownership of the development process, (2) promotion of donor harmonization, (3) alignment of donor systems with national systems, (4) management for results and (5) mutual accountability between donor and recipient.

Development Goal (SDG) 17, Partnership for the Goals.<sup>3</sup>

### Country ownership in climate finance and UNFCCC

In the area of climate change and climate finance, similar discussions have ensued regarding the relative responsibilities of developing and developed countries, which are relevant to the concept of country ownership. While climate finance principles derived from various texts emanating from the UNFCCC negotiations have not obtained the same degree of international acceptance as

the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness, they nevertheless do carry significant political weight.<sup>4</sup> Box 1 summarizes some of the respective principles, including national ownership.

#### *Box 1: Principles of climate finance*

Polluter pays  
Additionality  
Transparency  
Accountability  
Equitable representation  
National ownership  
Timeliness  
Appropriate  
Fair distribution  
Complementarity

*Source:* Bird and Glennie, 2011.

The UNFCCC holds a core principle of “common but differentiated responsibilities and respective capabilities” of countries in addressing climate change;<sup>5</sup> simply said, the “polluter pays.” The original United Nations climate treaty divided countries into two groups, and only countries classified as Annex I (generally developed) countries were obliged to take new commitments to reduce their emissions. This approach changed at the Conference of the Parties (COP) in Durban in 2011, where it was agreed that the process to sign a legally binding agreement in Paris in 2015 would be under the Convention (meaning including its annexes and principle of differentiated responsibilities and

capabilities) but would also be “applicable to all” (meaning obligations for all Parties).

The historic 2015 Paris Agreement tried to achieve this fine balance by better considering national capabilities and vulnerabilities and taking a bottom-up approach by allowing countries to individually determine their contribution to addressing greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions through a Nationally Determined Contribution (NDC). At COP24, differentiation remained the major sticking point between developed and developing countries, particularly emerging economies. Likewise, there was distrust about the sufficiency and predictability of financial support to developing countries that

<sup>3</sup> GPEDC does the formal monitoring of targets 17.15 (Respect national leadership to implement policies for the SDGs), 17.16 (Enhance the global partnership for sustainable development) and 5.c., which measures the

adoption and strengthening of policies and enforceable legislation for gender equality.

<sup>4</sup> Bird and Glennie, 2011

<sup>5</sup> United Nations, United Nations, and Canada, 1992, 1

manifested particularly in debates about Article 9.5 (indicative information on the provision of finance) and the process to establish a new long-term finance goal. The final Paris Agreement rulebook agreed in Katowice, Poland, in December 2018 balanced more uniform and mitigation-centric NDC guidance with improved processes for financial support for developing countries.<sup>6</sup>

The common but differentiated concept remains a point of tension, as do other related issues such as equity in terms of historic versus current responsibilities for climate change. These tensions carry over into climate finance and are relevant for understanding the broader context of country ownership in the GCF.

### *Concept and definition*

The UNFCCC considers that country ownership remains a critical factor in the delivery of effective climate finance. A broad concept of ownership encompasses the “consistency of climate finance with national priorities, the degree to which national systems are used for both spending and tracking, and the engagement of a wide range of stakeholders, from ministries and other governmental bodies, as well as from the private sector and civil society.”<sup>7</sup> Further, according to the Paris Agreement Article 11, capacity in countries should be built to take effective climate change action, including implementing both adaptation and mitigation actions. Each of these dimensions is discussed in turn below.

### *Consistency of climate finance with national priorities*

In terms of mitigation targets, the Paris Agreement rulebook has now enshrined the shared commitment of all countries to defining their NDC, versus separate, differentiated demands on developed versus

developing countries, which had been supported by the Like-minded Developing Countries and Arab Group.<sup>8</sup> A 50:50 balance was negotiated for the GCF in terms of allocations for mitigation versus adaptation, and the GCF also aims to ensure that at least 50 per cent of adaptation funding goes to particularly vulnerable countries, including the least developed countries (LDCs), small island developing States (SIDS) and African States. Tension remains between the resources assigned for mitigation versus adaptation, with developing countries rallying particularly for additional support to the latter efforts.

### *Using national systems for accountability, results and financial tracking*

With greater ownership by national institutions come obligations related to responsibility and accountability, which need to be fulfilled, too, in order to ensure that the funds achieve maximum impact.<sup>9</sup> For the Paris Agreement, the principle of pledge-and-review, with the accompanying global stocktake every five years, is the main mechanism for progress monitoring. Transparency is considered a key mechanism of accountability, although underlying assumptions have been questioned by some.<sup>10</sup>

On financial accountability, according to the UNFCCC, “there has been a greater commitment by ministries of finance and planning to integrate climate finance into national budgetary planning, this is often not done fully.”<sup>11</sup> Relevant national institutions, such as ministries of finance and planning, can still play a greater role in managing climate finance, such as through domestic tracking systems. NDCs that require further financial resources to fully implement are emerging as a platform that governments can

---

<sup>6</sup> IISD, 2018

<sup>7</sup> UNFCCC, 2018, 11

<sup>8</sup> IISD, 2018

<sup>9</sup> UNFCCC, 2018

<sup>10</sup> See, for example, Gupta and van Asselt, 2017

<sup>11</sup> UNFCCC, 2018, 11

use to stimulate engagement and strengthen national ownership of climate finance.<sup>12</sup>

With regard to accountability for results, while reporting on concrete deliverables has increased, their influence on outcomes, and the ultimate impact upon beneficiaries remains a challenge. The reduction of GHG emissions remains the primary impact metric for climate change mitigation.

Likewise, developed countries have an obligation to follow through on their Paris commitments and provide sufficient funding to tackle climate change. COP24 saw fewer announcements of new climate finance than at previous COPs, which some Parties felt signaled reduced commitment by developed countries to support the ambition of developing countries.

Finally, there is a need for donor coordination, to ensure that multilateral, bilateral and philanthropic organizations complement rather than substitute or duplicate UNFCCC efforts in relation to key gaps and needs.<sup>13</sup>

### *Stakeholder engagement*

Following COP15 in Copenhagen in 2009, there was a fundamental change in the scope and depth of civil society engagement on climate policy and finance. “Civil society was more effective in exercising multiple channels of influence around the negotiations for the Paris Agreement in 2015.”<sup>14</sup> The effective implementation of the Paris Agreement will require a recalibration of the role of civil society to increase global coordination, as well as effective engagement at country level, particularly around the revision of the NDCs by 2020.<sup>15</sup>

### *Capacity-building*

Article 11 of the Paris Agreement explicitly calls for national ownership of capacity-

building efforts in developing countries, particularly LDCs and SIDS. Like ownership, capacity-building has no agreed definition of conceptual framework, but stems from the post-WWII experience with the Marshall Plan and belief that “development could be pursued in the newly decolonised developing countries through building and strengthening their national institutions.”<sup>16</sup> Over time, the following key lesson has been reinforced: “[e]ffective capacity building is an endogenous process, which must grow from within the country. International actors can play a supporting and facilitative role, but not an ownership or managerial role.”<sup>17</sup> The Paris Agreement Article 11 instructs that capacity-building “should facilitate technology development, dissemination and deployment, access to climate finance, relevant aspects of education, training and public awareness, and the transparent, timely and accurate communication of information.”

### **The case for country ownership**

Evidence from both decades of official development assistance and more recent work on climate finance effectiveness indicate that country ownership – including dimensions such as alignment with country priorities and plans, stakeholder engagement, use of country systems, appropriate capacities, institutional arrangements, and accountability systems – is critical for more effective development results and the deployment of finance towards low-carbon, climate-resilient development.<sup>18</sup>

Based on the experience from development cooperation, while there has been progress in establishing robust development strategies and multi-stakeholder consultation processes, partner countries have struggled in their actual operationalization into prioritized programmes and budgets. Partner countries have also faced challenges in defining measures, standards of performance and

---

<sup>12</sup> UNFCCC, 2018

<sup>13</sup> Khan, M., Sagar, A., Huq, S., and Thiam, P.K., 2016

<sup>14</sup> Guy, 2018, 1

<sup>15</sup> IISD, 2018

<sup>16</sup> Khan et al., 2016, 5

<sup>17</sup> Khan et al., 2016, 3

<sup>18</sup> Brown, Polycarp, and Spearman, 2013; Zou and Ockenden, 2016; Lundsgaarde, E., Dupuy, K., Persson, A., 2018.



accountability in public financial management, procurement, fiduciary standards, and environmental assessments. These tendencies were echoed through more recent, although less comprehensive, climate change reviews. Climate considerations have been integrated to a much lesser degree in broader development planning and national budgeting processes.<sup>19</sup> Technical and managerial capacity constraints were a major concern, but progress was also inhibited by larger forces, including corruption and external crises.<sup>20</sup>

In development cooperation, according to the Paris Declaration evaluation, donors have made substantially less progress in implementing the country ownership principle, hence the need for donor harmonization and mutual accountability. Donors remained reluctant to use planning and budget preparation systems, with often legitimate concerns about the quality of recipient country systems and concerns about corruption. Data from the OECD shows that budget support (the primary aid instrument that uses country systems by default) has decreased to less than half the amount disbursed in 2009.<sup>21</sup> While donors had made substantial efforts to support ownership capacity, these were not well coordinated, with minimal results to date, according to the Paris Declaration evaluation. Apparently, country strategies and priorities for capacity-building have not been clear, donors have identified their own related priorities and there has been a frequent turnover of staff.

Sequencing time horizons and programming cycles were also identified as a substantial concern by the Paris Declaration evaluation. Program-based approaches and multi-donor trust funds facilitated alignment. Not everyone agrees, however. Critics see harmonization among donors as a potential recipe for “ganging up”, with negative

consequences for domestic decision-making processes and country ownership.<sup>22</sup>

### **Towards a conceptual framework for country ownership**

Although many agreements and organizations have considered the concept of country ownership, there is no agreement on a single definition, core elements or measurable indicators for the concept. Essentially, it deals with the inequalities in the power and capacity between countries to influence and benefit from global governance. A long-standing assumption of both climate finance and development aid has been the equitable sharing of resources between the developed and developing countries.

To support the development of a conceptual framework for country ownership for this evaluation of the GCF COA (see section III.0), a wide range of international agreements and academic and grey literature was reviewed. Principles, elements, and dimensions of country ownership are presented in Table 1 below for key sources identified.

---

<sup>19</sup> Brown et al., 2013.

<sup>20</sup> Brown et al., 2013; Zou and Ockenden, 2016.

<sup>21</sup> Koch, S., Leiderer, S., Faust, J., and Molenaers, N. 2017.

<sup>22</sup> Booth, 2011.

**Table 1 Principles, elements and dimensions of country ownership**

SOURCES	UNFCCC AND PARIS AGREEMENT	PARIS, ACCRA AND BUSAN PRINCIPLES: GLOBAL PARTNERSHIP FOR EFFECTIVE DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION	WATSON-GRANT, XIONG, AND THOMAS (2016)	BROWN ET AL. (2013)
Description and rationale of source	Qualitative analysis of the Paris Agreement, as well as COP proceedings	A multi-stakeholder platform that brings together all types of development actors to advance the effectiveness of their development efforts, to deliver results that are long-lasting and to contribute to the achievement of the SDGs. The five key principles from Paris (2005) have been condensed into four, agreed at Busan (2011).	Meta-analysis of 30 peer-reviewed and grey publications on country ownership and development, based on systematic literature search and inclusion criteria	Working paper on climate finance informed by research and seven consultative workshops and events with developing countries
Core principles	<b>Consistency with national priorities and capabilities:</b> Commitment to the definition of the NDC and equal treatment of adaptation and mitigation	<b>Ownership of development priorities by developing countries:</b> Partnerships for development can only succeed if they are led by developing countries. Implementing approaches that are tailored to country-specific situations and needs.	<b>Power and legitimacy:</b> Country governments have the power and legitimacy (the right) to set priorities and make decisions that are respected by the donors. Other national actors (e.g. civil society) participate.	International climate finance is aligned with recipient country strategies and priorities.
	<b>Stakeholder engagement:</b> Engagement of, particularly, civil society in negotiation and implementation of the Paris Agreement Principle of “common but differentiated responsibilities and respective capabilities”	<b>Inclusive development partnerships:</b> Openness, trust, mutual respect, and learning lie at the core of effective partnerships, recognizing the different and complementary roles of all actors.		Decision-making responsibilities are vested in recipient country institutions.
	<b>Capacity-building:</b> Enhancing the capacity of developing country Parties (particularly LDCs and SIDS)	<b>Focus on results:</b> Development efforts must have a lasting impact on eradicating poverty and reducing inequality, and on enhancing developing countries’ capacities, aligned with their own priorities.		
			<b>Commitment and responsibility:</b> Political stakeholders in recipient countries commit to take responsibility for aid-funded programmes that address an identified need.	
			<b>Capacity:</b> Donors and recipients have the capacity to sustain initiatives and programmes.	

SOURCES	UNFCCC AND PARIS AGREEMENT	PARIS, ACCRA AND BUSAN PRINCIPLES: GLOBAL PARTNERSHIP FOR EFFECTIVE DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION	WATSON-GRANT, XIONG, AND THOMAS (2016)	BROWN ET AL. (2013)
	<p><b>Accountability, results and financial tracking:</b> Developing countries commit to tracking results of adaptation and mitigation efforts, as well as spending. Donors to provide sufficient funding to tackle climate change.</p>	<p><b>Transparency and accountability to each other:</b> Mutual accountability and accountability to the intended beneficiaries of development cooperation, as well as to respective citizens, organizations, constituents, and shareholders is critical to delivering results. Transparent practices form the basis for enhanced accountability.</p>	<p><b>Accountability:</b> Recipients and donors are accountable to each other and to their citizens for programmes, systems, and strategies.</p>	<p>National systems are used for ensuring accountability in the use of climate finance.</p>



## B. GCF mandate and context

The principle of country ownership and country drivenness is reflected in the Governing Instrument of the GCF, guidance from the COP to UNFCCC, as well as numerous Board decisions, discussions, and documents. These mandates and history are traced below, to provide context for the evaluation.

simplified and improved access to funding, including direct access; support for programmatic approaches in accordance with country strategies and plans; and national designated authorities (NDAs). The specific guidance by paragraph is provided in Box 2.

### Governing Instrument

The Governing Instrument provides specific guidance on several country-ownership-related features of the GCF, including involvement of relevant stakeholders;

#### *Box 2: Guidance on country ownership from the GCF Governing Instrument*

Paragraph 3: “The Fund will pursue a country-driven approach and promote and strengthen engagement at the country level through effective involvement of relevant institutions and stakeholders.”

Paragraph 31: “The Fund will provide simplified and improved access to funding, including direct access, basing its activities on a country-driven approach and will encourage the involvement of relevant stakeholders, including vulnerable groups and addressing gender aspects.”

Paragraph 36: “The Fund will support developing countries in pursuing project-based and programmatic approaches in accordance with climate change strategies and plans, such as low-emission development strategies or plans, nationally appropriate mitigation actions (NAMAs), national adaptation plans of action (NAPAs), national adaptation plans (NAPs) and other related activities.”

Paragraph 46: “Recipient countries may designate a national authority. This national designated authority will recommend to the Board funding proposals in the context of national climate strategies and plans, including through consultation processes. The national designated authorities will be consulted on other funding proposals for consideration prior to submission to the Fund, to ensure consistency with national climate strategies and plans.”

Paragraph 47: “Recipient countries will nominate competent subnational, national, and regional implementing entities for accreditation to receive funding. The Board will consider additional modalities that further enhance direct access, including through funding entities with a view to enhancing country ownership of projects and programmes.”

Paragraph 53: “The Fund will have a streamlined programming and approval process to enable timely disbursement. The Board will develop simplified processes for the approval of proposals for certain activities, in particular, small-scale activities.”

### COP guidance

Launching the GCF at its seventeenth meeting, the COP requested (decision 3/CP.17) that the GCF Board “develop a transparent no-objection procedure to be conducted through national designated authorities referred to in paragraph 46 of the Governing Instrument, in order to ensure

consistency with national climate strategies and plans, and a country-driven approach, and to provide for effective direct and indirect public and private sector financing by the Fund.”<sup>23</sup>

Subsequent decisions have emphasized the country-driven approach. The nineteenth COP requested the GCF “to pursue a country-

<sup>23</sup> At the eighteenth COP, the GCF Board was requested to report on implementation of the above decision.

driven approach” and “to consider important lessons learned on country-driven processes from other existing funds” (decision 4/CP.19). The COP at its twentieth meeting requested the GCF Board to accelerate the operationalization of the private sector facility through several actions, including “emphasizing a country-driven approach” (decision 7/CP.20).

Some COP decisions have also focused on the NDAs. The COP has invited “developing country Parties to expedite the nomination of their national designated authorities and focal points as soon as possible, as well as the selection of their national and subnational implementing entities, to facilitate their engagement” with the GCF (decision 7/CP.20). At its twenty-second meeting, the COP also invited NDAs and focal points (FPs) “to utilize the readiness and preparatory support programme, and to collaborate with accredited entities to use the project preparation facility, where appropriate, to prepare adaptation and mitigation proposals of increasing quality and impact potential” (decision 10/CP.22).

### **Board decisions and discussions**

At its third meeting, in March 2013, the GCF Board noted convergence that the GCF should “recognize that a country-driven approach is a core principle to build the business of the Fund” (decision B.01-13/06). This principle of country ownership has been reaffirmed and refined in numerous Board decisions, and is interwoven into many aspects of the GCF business model and GCF modalities, policies and procedures.

In particular, the principle of country ownership was carried through to many of the elements of the business model framework that were discussed beginning at the fourth meeting of the Board, including those related to the GCF structure and organization; access modalities; objectives, results and performance indicators; allocation and proposal approval process; modalities for readiness and preparatory support; and gender

and indigenous peoples policies. In addition to weaving country ownership into these aforementioned areas, country ownership has also been a stand-alone agenda item at many Board meetings, which focused initially on NDAs/FPs and no-objection procedures but has broadened to cover operational modalities, country programmes, and structured dialogues. The history of Board decisions and deliberations in each of these areas are traced below.

### *Country ownership*

At its fourth meeting, in discussing country ownership as a component of the business model, the Board reaffirmed this core principle, noted convergence on the importance of readiness and preparatory support for country ownership practices, and provided guidance around NDAs. The Board noted that countries may designate an NDA or a country FP to interact with the GCF while confirming that establishing an NDA was not mandatory and that countries retain flexibility in terms of the location, structure, operation, and governance of NDAs or FPs. The Board also set out guidance on some of the functions and actions of an NDA. The initial functions of the NDA or FP were originally set out in decision B.04/05 (and were further expanded in best-practice guidelines and the monitoring and accountability framework described further below):

- (i) recommend to the Board funding proposals in the context of national climate change strategies and plans, including through consultation processes;
- (ii) facilitate the communication of nominations of entities to the Fund;
- (iii) seek to ensure consistency of funding proposals from national, subnational, regional and international intermediaries and implementing entities with national plans and strategies;

- (iv) implement the no-objection procedure; and
- (v) act as the focal point for Fund communication.

At its fifth meeting, the Board reviewed guidelines for a no-objection procedure (NoP) and provided guidance to the Secretariat to revise the document in view of that guidance (decision B.05/06). The Board's concerns were related to the full incorporation of the spirit of paragraph 7 of decision 3/CP.17, whether a separate NoP was needed for intermediaries, and what would be the subject of the NoP, such as individual projects, bundles of activities and nominations for accreditation.

The Board continued deliberations on country ownership at its sixth meeting, where a proposed revised NoP and best-practice guidelines for establishing NDAs and FPs were presented in document GCF/B.06/07. Many Board members expressed a view that country ownership should not be reduced to an NoP but should also include bottom-up approaches; several Board members emphasized strengthened stakeholder consultation in the guidelines. There were divergent opinions around the proposed tacit no-objection and the possibility of separate public and private NoPs. Following this discussion, the Board requested four Board members/Alternate Board members to continue deliberations and report back (decision B.06/10).

At the Board's eighth meeting, the NoP and best-practice guidelines for NDAs and FPs were revisited. Differences of opinion between developing and developed country positions were noted, with the former in consensus on the need for a written NoP. A compromise was reached that clarifies what the GCF would do in cases where funding proposals were not accompanied by a no-objection letter – specifically that a 30-day period would be given to the NDA or FP to reply to the Secretariat, after which the project would be cancelled in the absence of a

no-objection letter. In decision B.08/10, the Board approved the initial NoP in Annex XII of the Meeting Report. The Board also endorsed the initial best-practice guidelines for establishing NDAs and FPs as contained in Annex XIII, as well as the initial best-practice options for country coordination and multi-stakeholder engagement, set out in Annex XIV. The NDA/FP guidelines address the following points:

- Placement of the NDA/FP in an institution that ideally has a mandate related to economic policy and development, with appropriate leverage over climate change and related priorities, strategies, and plans
- Ideal capacities of the NDA/FP, which include, among others, familiarity with mitigation and adaptation efforts and needs in the country (including other climate finance); capacity to facilitate country coordination mechanisms and multi-stakeholder engagement and to interact with other FPs and sources of climate finance; and the ability to monitor and evaluate according to Fund requirements, and the ability to interact with private sector actors
- The legal authority of the NDA/FP to be established at a senior level, and the responsibility for the NDA/FP to lead the country's efforts to prepare a country programme
- Funding for the establishment and operation of NDAs to be determined based on Board decisions on readiness and preparatory support

The best-practice options for country coordination and multi-stakeholder engagement cover the following:

- Encouragement for country coordination for an ongoing consultative process that uses existing country meetings or exercises; establishes a dedicated country coordination mechanism for the country's identification of its strategic framework in the context of the GCF, where possible; is integrated into other relevant national consultation or programming processes;

and is inclusive of all relevant actors within the government, the private sector, academia, civil society and other relevant stakeholder groups or sectors

- Country coordination and multi-stakeholder engagement in the development of funding proposals and ongoing monitoring and evaluation after approval, in alignment with GCF environmental and social safeguards (ESS); country coordination and multi-stakeholder engagement processes may facilitate forums, meetings or workshops to review progress against results frameworks, discuss best practices and challenges, identify opportunities for enhancing coherence, and integrate lessons learned into relevant plans and priorities

The Monitoring and Accountability Framework for Accredited Entities (B.11/10) also set out an expectation for the NDA/FP: “For participatory monitoring of the overall portfolio of GCF-funded projects and programmes in each country, the NDA or focal point is encouraged to organize an annual participatory review for local stakeholders, notably project-affected people and communities, including women and civil society organizations.”

Decision B.10/10 provided guidance to strengthen the role of NDAs/FPs, requested the Secretariat to prepare a proposal of guidelines to this effect and reaffirmed the role of the RPSP in supporting country ownership, as follows:

- (i) Recognizes the importance of enhancing country ownership, country drivenness and the role that NDAs/FPs can play in this regard;
- (ii) Affirms that all efforts should be undertaken to:
  - a. Strengthen the key role of NDAs/FPs in the formulation of country programme/project pipelines, the consideration of

implementation partners, and financial planning, and enhance capacity, including through the programme on readiness and preparatory support;

- b. Also, strengthen the role of NDAs/FPs in monitoring and providing feedback regarding the impact of Fund operations within countries in terms of the degree to which the Fund’s initiatives add value to national development priorities, building institutional capacity, and promoting a paradigm shift towards low carbon and climate resilient development; and
- c. Promote a central and leading role of NDAs/FPs in the coordination of the Fund’s engagements within countries while highlighting the importance of the differentiation of roles between the Secretariat, accredited entities and NDAs/FPs in relation to country programming;

(iii) Recognizes that NDAs/FPs should facilitate country coordination and engagement with representatives of relevant stakeholders such as the private sector, academia, and civil society organizations and women’s organizations, taking into account the best practice options adopted by the Board in decision B.08/10 and supported as needed by the Secretariat.

Consultation among Board members and preparation of the guidelines for enhanced country ownership and country drivenness continued to the seventeenth meeting of the Board, where such guidelines were adopted

through decision B.17/21, in Annex XX of the Meeting Report. The Board also requested the Secretariat, accredited entities (AEs), delivery partners, and NDAs/FPs to follow these guidelines, and the Secretariat to annually assess the experiences in applying these guidelines with a view to continually improving them. To that end, the Board decided to undertake a review of the implementation of the guidelines as needed, or at least every two years. These guidelines describe the following:

- Submissions from Board/Alternate members on important components of country ownership, such as flexibility in guidelines, importance of sufficient capacity, the need for country ownership to continue throughout the project cycle, and the importance of engagement and ownership by relevant national and subnational stakeholders, including private sector, local communities, academia and civil society organizations (CSOs)
- How to build country ownership through country programmes and structured dialogues
- Reflecting country ownership in operational modalities, including the RPSP, PPF, proposal approval process and accreditation process, as well as the key role of NDAs/FPs in these processes

### *Readiness and preparatory support*

In 2013, decision B.05/14 reaffirmed that GCF-related readiness and preparatory support is a strategic priority for the GCF to enhance country ownership and access during the early stages of its operationalization. The Board decided that the GCF will provide readiness and preparatory support for the following purposes:

- To enable the preparation of country programmes providing for low-emission, climate-resilient development strategies or plans
- To support and strengthen in-country, GCF-related institutional capacities, including for country coordination and

the multi-stakeholder consultation mechanism as it relates to the establishment and operation of national designated authorities and country focal points

- To enable implementing entities and intermediaries to meet GCF fiduciary principles and standards, and ESS, in order to directly access the GCF

At its fifth meeting, the Board also noted the importance of readiness and preparatory support for effective private sector engagement.

At its eighth meeting, the Board operationalized the RPSP and defined the modalities of the RPSP, which were updated at the thirteenth meeting. In subsequent years, at nearly every Board meeting, the GCF Board has discussed progress reported by the Secretariat and made further decisions about the programme's implementation, while reaffirming its principles. At its tenth meeting, the GCF Board affirmed that the RPSP is a mechanism to enhance country ownership.

Following the IEU's independent evaluation of the RPSP, as well as reviews by Dalberg and the Secretariat, a new strategy for the RPSP was approved at the twenty-second meeting of the Board. This revised strategy is aimed at guiding countries towards a longer-term approach by providing a vision and outcome-based objectives at the programme level, while moving away from siloed and input-based approaches. New or improved modalities were also introduced, including country readiness assessments and country readiness plans; multi-year allocation grants; standardized packages of readiness support; longer-term direct support to NDAs; enhanced institutional support to direct access accredited entities; and sector-specific planning and project preparation technical clinics.

### *Structure and organization*

Regarding GCF structure and organization, the Board's discussion at its fourth meeting



on options for the structure of the GCF and Secretariat touched on country ownership, with suggestions ranging from support for a specific country ownership unit to improve access, to integrating country ownership into the mitigation and adaptation units. The Board decided that the initial structure and organization should be thematic with a strong country and programmatic focus (decision B.04/09).

### *Access modalities*

At its fourth meeting, the Board (decision B.04/06) noted that, in accordance with the Governing Instrument, it would consider additional modalities that further enhance direct access, including through funding entities with a view to enhancing country ownership of projects and programmes; and that the GCF will provide for readiness and preparatory activities and technical assistance, and for in-country institutional strengthening in order to enable countries to directly access the G.10/04, the Board approved the terms of reference for a pilot phase to enhance direct access. Country ownership played a key role in the justification for such a modality: “Enhancing direct access is necessary mainly because decision-making on the specific projects and programmes to be funded will be made at the national or subnational level and such direct access is a means by which to increase the level of country ownership over those projects and programmes” (Annex I, Tenth Meeting Report).

In decision B.10/06, the Board further decided that, recalling decision B.08/03, all international entities, as an important consideration of their accreditation application, shall indicate how they intend to strengthen the capacities of, or otherwise support, potential subnational, national and regional entities to meet, at the earliest opportunity, the accreditation requirements of the GCF in order to enhance country ownership and that they report annually on these actions.

At its fourteenth meeting, the Board reaffirmed in decision B.14/08 the importance of direct access for country ownership in its strategy on accreditation, which states the following:

- Direct access entities are important for promoting country ownership and understanding national priorities and contributions towards low-emission and climate-resilient development pathways.
- The accreditation process can be an effective way of setting high standards in country ownership. NDAs are encouraged to engage with the Secretariat in order to identify which entities are a good fit to advance GCF objectives and which should be nominated in their countries. When reviewing their applications, the Secretariat should encourage NDAs to develop guidelines that facilitate inter-agency coordination and coherence at the national level, as well as to engage in effective and broad stakeholder engagement.
- Country ownership includes ownership by local communities, civil societies, private sector, women’s groups, indigenous peoples’ organizations, municipal-/village-level governments, etc. Meaningful input provided by such stakeholders should be used, as necessary, during the identification of entities to be accredited. This approach aims to ensure that AEs nominated by NDAs have a high potential to bring forward projects and programmes that demonstrate high country ownership, are consistent with country priorities and accurately reflect their commitments to climate change agreements.

### *Investment and results frameworks*

At its fourth meeting, the Board reviewed document GCF/B.04/03 that, among other topics, explored how operationalizing the principle of a country-driven approach interacted with other principles, such as co-benefits and paradigm shift, and proposed a series of options for later prioritization in the strategic foci of the GCF. Ultimately, the

Board reaffirmed country ownership as a core principle of the GCF business model and that countries will identify priority results areas in line with their national strategies and plans (decision B.04/04).

At its fifth meeting, the Board took multiple decisions that link country ownership to resource allocation and results. Decision B.05/03 “notes convergence that ownership and access to Fund resources could be enhanced by the inclusion of indicators capturing country-driven policies that have the potential to promote a paradigm shift towards low-emission and climate-resilient development pathways in the context of sustainable development.” Decision B.05/05 requested the Secretariat to develop and

present to the Board a resource allocation system that, among other objectives, facilitates a country-driven approach.

In decision B.07/06, the Board adopted an initial investment framework that includes six criteria, of which one is country ownership, defined as “[b]eneficiary country ownership of and capacity to implement a funded project or programme (policies, climate strategies and institutions).” At its ninth meeting, the Board adopted a more detailed investment framework, including sub-criteria and indicative assessment factors. Table 2 shows the coverage areas, activity-specific sub-criteria and indicative assessment factors that the GCF Secretariat uses for the country ownership investment criterion.

**Table 2** *Coverage areas, sub-criteria and indicative assessment factors for the country ownership criterion*

COVERAGE AREA	ACTIVITY-SPECIFIC SUBCRITERIA	INDICATIVE ASSESSMENT FACTORS
Existence of a national climate strategy	Country has a current and effective national climate strategy or plan, nationally appropriate mitigation action (NAMA), national adaptation plan (NAP) or equivalent, as appropriate	Proposal addresses the country's existing and effective climate priorities and national, local or sectoral plans, and attracts sustained high-level political support in implementing countries
Coherence with existing policies	Proposal has not been objected to by the country's NDA or FP	Proposal received no objection by NDA or FP in accordance with the GCF no-objection procedure
	Objectives are in line with priorities in the country's national climate strategy	Proposal demonstrates coherence and alignment with one or more priority areas identified in the country's national climate strategy, including in the context of NAMAs or NAPs, as appropriate and applicable  Degree to which the activity is supported by a country's enabling policy and institutional framework, or includes policy or institutional changes  Project/programme sponsor identified as a credible champion
Capacity of accredited entities (AEs) or executing entities to deliver	Experience and track record of the AE or executing entities in key elements of the proposed activity	Proponent demonstrates a consistent track record and relevant experience and expertise in similar or relevant circumstances as described in the proposed project/programme (e.g. sector, type of intervention, technology)
Engagement with civil society organizations and other relevant stakeholders	Stakeholder consultations and engagement	Proposal has been developed in consultation with civil society groups and other relevant stakeholders, with particular attention being paid to gender equality, and provides a specific mechanism for their future engagement in accordance with GCF ESS and stakeholder consultation guidelines  Proposal places decision-making responsibility with in-country institutions and uses national systems to ensure accountability

In decision B.11/11, the Board noted country ownership and effective stakeholder engagement as a common area where projects could provide a better demonstration of how they meet existing GCF policies and noted convergence on the need within the approval process to enhance country ownership, including by actively seeking the participation of NDAs/FPs and relevant stakeholders in the

early stages of the project cycle and beyond the provision of the no-objection letter.

In decision B.17/09, the Board considered the review of the initial proposal approval process and endorsed immediate actions by the Secretariat to improve the effectiveness, transparency and country ownership of the process – including encouraging and supporting NDAs to solicit AEs to support country programmes and the preparation of



the pipeline based on the principle of country ownership (Annex III). The Board also agreed, in the context of decision B.11/11, paragraph (p), to insert the following new stage into the project and proposal activity cycle: “On receipt of a concept note submission from an accredited entity, the Secretariat will seek confirmation from the national designated authority or focal point that the concept note fits under national priorities and country ownership.”

At its twenty-second meeting, the Board approved revisions to the investment criteria indicators, which for country ownership are (a) alignment with NDCs, relevant national plans, and/or enabling policy and institutional frameworks; and (b) explanation of engagement with relevant stakeholders, including NDAs.

### *Environment, social, gender and indigenous people's policies*

The GCF safeguards system is also relevant for country ownership and is the subject of a separate IEU evaluation.

The Environmental and Social Policy was approved in decision B.19/10 and applies to all GCF-financed activities. The policy sets out GCF requirements for ESS, while also allowing that “[a]dditional country requirements on environmental and social safeguards and sustainability may be integrated with GCF requirements at the activity level, provided that the accredited entities establish that the additional requirements are consistent with and at least as rigorous as the ESS standards of GCF and this policy.” The policy also requires broad multi-stakeholder support and participation throughout the lifecycle of GCF finance activities. Roles and responsibilities are described for the GCF Secretariat and AEs, including intermediaries.

In decision B.09/11, the Board adopted a gender policy (Annex XIII of the Ninth Meeting Report). The section of this policy on country ownership states:

- “The Fund informs national designated authorities (NDAs) and focal points (FPs) that proposed projects or programmes submitted to the Fund are required to be aligned with national policies and priorities on gender and with the Fund’s gender policy. The Fund requires that women and men be provided with equitable opportunity to be included in stakeholder consultations and decision-making during project and programme preparation, implementation and evaluation.”

The Board’s approved indigenous people’s policy also addresses elements of country ownership (decision B.19/11):

- “This Policy supplements the best practices for country coordination and multi-stakeholder engagement processes for developing national strategic frameworks and funding proposals and will apply to these and any future engagement processes of GCF. Specifically, this Policy informs national designated authorities and focal points that any consultative process through which national climate change priorities and strategies are defined must also consider applicable national and international policies and laws for indigenous peoples. Furthermore, the criteria and options for country coordination through consultative processes should include indigenous peoples in an appropriate manner. The requirements of this Policy form part of the relevant GCF ESS standards that accredited entities and states need to take into account when developing proposals, as well as ongoing monitoring and evaluation after approval.”

## **C. Existing evaluative evidence on country ownership from GCF IEU studies**

The recent IEU evaluations of the GCF RPSP and Results Management Framework (RMF) include several findings, conclusions, and recommendations that are highly relevant for

this COA evaluation. These are summarized below.

### **RPSP evaluation findings on country ownership**

The RPSP evaluation found that, overall, the RPSP has not yet strongly contributed to ensuring country ownership, but that the programme had some successes in strengthening the role of NDAs/FPs, on direct access entities (DAEs), stakeholder engagement and the NoP process. CSO participation and private sector support have been rudimentary so far.

The RPSP scored seven attributes of country ownership and drivenness on a scale from 0 to 3. This was done in nine country case studies and for the following indicators: (i) the NDA/FP is established and functional; (ii) stakeholder consultations are organized by the NDA/FP; (iii) an NoP has been established and is operational; (iv) a country programme has been developed, includes a pipeline of concrete projects and is agreed upon with the major stakeholders; (v) one (or more) DAE(s) has/have been accredited; (vi) one (or more) DAE(s) has/have submitted funded project proposals and/or seen it/them approved; and (vii) (as of 2016) progress has been made on NAP planning and completion. The aggregate measurement index of country ownership showed three out of nine countries scoring in the upper tier (15–21 points), five in the medium tier (8–14 points) and one in the lower tier (0–7 points). The RPSP evaluation also points out that achievements may have occurred because of the presence of other support mechanisms beyond the GCF.<sup>24</sup>

In detail, the RPSP evaluation reported that the functioning of the NDAs/FPs is still frequently an obstacle to greater country ownership, despite progress. The evaluation often found weak staffing, with much time spent on project preparation and reporting, and there was “far greater need to further

strengthen NDA/FPs, their capacity and focus on GCF.” RPSP support for high-level political commitments and coordination mechanisms is not yet clear. Up to August 2018, the RPSP also had made limited contributions to finalizing GCF country programmes (CPs), although many are under preparation in various drafts. The goals of CPs under development remain unclear, and they often have vague climate rationales, particularly for adaptation. Moreover, the RPSP-supported CPs focused primarily on GCF engagement, not more broadly on climate change architecture, policies, priorities and climate finance.

RPSPs have been least effective on accreditation of DAEs, relative to other support areas, and international accredited entities (IAEs) retain a large role. On the other hand, one or more DAEs were accredited in six out of eight RPSP sample countries, although some of these entities benefited from prior experience with non-GCF support mechanisms. According to the RPSP evaluation, the particular RPSP support for DAEs has not always been clear, nor so the recommended number of DAEs per country. The accreditation process remains lengthy and complicated, despite well-appreciated support by PricewaterhouseCoopers in some countries. The RPSP provided more support for identifying and nominating candidates for accreditation than to the process of accreditation itself.

The evaluation also raised doubts whether overall RPSP support and project preparation funds were sufficient for transformative project pipeline development, particularly by DAEs, and to ensure innovation and scaling-up potential. This is an area that would require deeper examination, including in this evaluation of the COA.

RPSP support is seen as most effective in facilitating information-sharing events

---

<sup>24</sup> This Evaluation of the GCF Country Ownership Approach will build on these seven attributes from the

IEU RPSP evaluation; it will go in-depth and broaden them as discussed below in section III B. of this report.

through structured dialogues and other workshops, to enable country GCF engagement and sharing and learning from other countries' experiences. NAPs reportedly are progressing in many countries, but mostly do not provide sufficient evidence of country ownership yet. The report also wondered whether the provision of smaller amounts for learning events would potentially be more useful than the usual amount of US\$3 million provided under the fairly recent NAP window.

It is not yet clear whether compliance with country and GCF ESS is really happening ("once GCF funding proposals start to get implemented [things] will become clearer"). Little has been done through RPSP to improve the incentive environment for crowding in private sector investments and "government authority is supported over other stakeholders, thus marginalizing CSOs, with unintended effects on the political balance of power, causing some discord."

The GCF business model is based on partnership, but long delays in approvals and lack of clarity and consistency in GCF guidance caused frictions and inefficiencies in partnerships.

RPSP management is improving (e.g. the revised RPSP Guidebook and longer-term contracts for Regional Advisors) but processing times and Standard Operating Procedures are not yet sufficiently defined. There is no monitoring of RPSP achievements by the GCF's Division of Country Programming (DCP), and "it is highly challenging to report on country ownership across the portfolio."

### *Differences across countries*

The evaluation underlines the importance of country context (needs and capacities) in the country ownership principle and its application. It finds that readiness varies

greatly between countries (and so do RPSP results), depending on overall vulnerability, prior readiness support from other institutions, institutional capacity, and strength of national leadership and commitment at high levels of government. Prior financial and technical support helped some countries to engage with the GCF, including on DAEs. RPSP is least effective in LDC, SIDS and African States, but more effective with accreditation in SIDS. Gender-sensitive considerations have varied considerably among countries, with less integration in the GCF Africa portfolio than elsewhere.

### *Country flexibility to define and pursue country ownership*

The GCF is deliberately flexible in its RPSP support, including for country ownership, which reflects the variability in the context and situation of individual countries. It offers fairly standard instruments that promote country ownership.<sup>25</sup> The GCF has delegated many critical decisions on GCF-related country architecture and procedures to the countries themselves. Countries are free to decide on (and ask RPSP and other support for) the following: (i) choice of IAEs and DAEs and funding sources, depends on preferences of the country, although there is a GCF preference for DAEs; (ii) NDA/FP set up and location in government, as well as the composition of the coordinating body that attests on project no-objection and participates in nominating DAE candidates for accreditation; (iii) extent of involvement of CSOs; and (iv) operationalization of gender, indigenous peoples and other ESS considerations. Further, there is no requirement or template for CPs, nor a requirement for FP concept notes.

The RPSP evaluation notes that the less prescriptive approach of the GCF is also reflective of a relatively new fund, still to

---

<sup>25</sup> Three quarters of eligible countries (113 of 145) requested RPSP grants. Non-participation (n=35) has diverse reasons that are further explained in the report.

“define its policies in light of experiences gained and the demands of its member countries.” The evaluation suggests that in future, the GCF might consider other models on ownership, country coordinating mechanisms and firewalls, possibly similar with those in the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis, and Malaria.

With reference to the NDA/FP location in government, the RPSP evaluation found tensions between environment and finance ministries in some countries, and ineffectiveness and inefficiencies arising due

to potentially limited political influence of Ministries of Environment, lack of strong leadership to develop project pipelines, and influence with other line ministries. It notes that “it is almost only with the GCF that environment ministries play such a high-profile and coordinating role.”

On a different issue, the evaluation identifies limited flexibility in adjusting approved project plans to changing circumstances as an obstacle to country ownership.

### *Box 3: RPSP evaluation recommendations (summarized)*

#### **1 Administrative changes and enhanced in-country support**

- 1.1 Carry out various administrative changes and processes, including real-time project status monitoring.
- 1.2 Provide more in-country support for results-oriented CPs, accreditation and coordination mechanisms.

#### **2 Refining RPSP vision, strategy and results**

- 2.1 Better define “readiness” and how it is measured. Make choices whether RPSP should be oriented mainly for GCF interventions or broader.
- 2.2 Clearly determine RPSP role, comparative advantage and niche compared with other bi- and multilateral climate finance programmes.
- 2.3 Communicate better with countries.

#### **3 Move beyond “business-as-usual”**

- 3.1 Scenario 1: “Business-as-usual plus”: Focus RPSP on critical areas to ease access, decrease transaction costs and increase overall effectiveness and efficiency.
- 3.2 Scenario 2: Customize support and strategic focus to national needs, contexts and intended results, and provide differentiated services based on country needs and types.
- 3.3 Request countries to self-identify into several categories, based on needs and capacities.

### **RMF evaluation findings on country ownership**

The IEU’s evaluation of the GCF RMF points to several critical aspects with respect to country ownership, with strong reference to the respective roles of the GCF, AEs, NDA/FPs, and other country stakeholders in results-based programming and project management.

### *RMF indicator formulation and theories of change*

The RMF flexible menu of 43 core, impact, and outcome indicators to some extent assists countries in focusing their project proposals on result areas that the GCF “prizes”. But there is limited clarity and guidance for countries and AEs on how core RMF indicators are defined. Also, GCF Theories of Change are not yet well formulated, consolidated and finalized, including those for key thematic areas. The GCF has laid out specific objectives and desired results in

many frameworks and documents, but there is no single document that ties these together.

### *Alignment of GCF and country RMFs*

Usefulness and relevance of the GCF RMF are higher when aligned with local country RMFs and monitoring, reporting, and evaluation (MR&E) systems, to the extent possible. Currently, GCF RMF indicators do not inform and are not informed by national monitoring systems. The GCF RMF has not been instrumental for countries to develop their own climate change indicators.

### *Clarity of NDA role in MR&E throughout the project cycle*

The RMF evaluation notes, “although the RMF reaffirms that country ownership is an essential principle for Fund operations the GCF has not produced guidance for the NDAs’ role beyond granting non-objection letters.”<sup>26</sup> As a result, the NDA role in MR&E is marginalized, and NDAs are kept out of the loop in management of GCF-funded projects. The RMF does not provide an avenue for NDAs to manage or provide oversight for GCF investments. “This is critical since the NDAs are mandated to be central in ensuring that countries own the results of GCF investments. [...] This has become a source of confusion and tension between the NDAs and AEs and represents a loss of opportunity to improve coordination, use, management and reporting for results. Also, presently, results reporting systems for GCF projects completely bypass national monitoring and evaluation systems and capacities.”<sup>27</sup> In the short-term, this prevents GCF projects from being included in national systems reporting and long-term (sustainable) application of GCF project-initiated systems.

### *Involvement of multiple stakeholders*

The RMF evaluation concludes that the involvement of multiple stakeholders in countries is critical to ensure relevant project

objectives and indicators are formulated and achieved, including through country coordination and project mechanisms. The RMF evaluation recommends, among other things, that the Secretariat should initiate a dialogue with the NDAs, AEs and other key stakeholders to define the appropriate role of the NDAs throughout the project cycle, and where possible GCF indicators should link with country monitoring indicators and SDG reporting.

## III. METHODS

### A. Process followed to date

An initial kick-off call between the ICF COA evaluation team and the IEU was held on 14 February 2019.<sup>28</sup> The evaluation team immediately began initial document review, including relevant GCF Board decisions and documents as well as external academic and grey literature on country ownership, development aid and climate finance. An initially structured bibliography (list of documents consulted for the preparation of this inception report) is provided at the end of this report. The team also began reviewing GCF portfolio data to inform its country case study selection process.

From March 4 to 8, the ICF Team Leader and Deputy Team Leader for this evaluation (Detlev Puetz and Jessica Kyle) participated in a five-day inception mission at the GCF headquarters in Songdo, South Korea. This mission enabled the evaluation team to identify clear priorities for this evaluation, finalize key elements of the approach and methods, and generally establish a working relationship. During this week, a series of meetings were also held with GCF Secretariat and Independent Unit staff across numerous offices and divisions, including the Office of the Executive Director (OED), Office of General Counsel (OGC), Office of Governance Affairs, Office of Risk

---

<sup>26</sup> GCF IEU, 2018, viii

<sup>27</sup> GCF IEU, 2018, viii

<sup>28</sup> The contract was fully executed on February 11, 2019.



Management and Compliance (ORMC), Office of Portfolio Management (OPM), Department of External Affairs, Private Sector Facility (PSF), Division of Mitigation and Adaptation (DMA), DCP, Office of Internal Affairs, Independent Redress Mechanism (IRM), and Internal Audit Unit.

During this week and the one following, the evaluation team also held virtual consultations with two Regional Advisors and one active CSO observer<sup>29</sup> to inform the design of the evaluation matrix and identification of key issues and tensions.

---

***Box 4: Initial observations from the scoping phase to date***

---

Initial document review and scoping consultations indicated that country ownership is not only a fundamental principle and an outcome for the GCF but importantly is also a key instrument to achieve its major vision and strategic objectives. Country ownership is seen as playing a critical role in bringing out long-term institutional and behavioral transformational change and paradigm shift to low emissions and climate-resilient development, with broad participation and calculated risk-taking in the design of innovative projects that have optimal long-term climate change rationale and outcomes.

During the inception mission some key questions were raised as to what extent country ownership is compatible with these and other ambitious GCF objectives and principles, why country ownership may sometimes be in the way, and whether the GCF is effectively supporting the right institutional capabilities and capacities and applying the right business model for countries to assume full ownership and leadership for transformational change. Specifically, the following “pressure points” were identified, for further exploration:

1. Country ownership may not necessarily produce projects and other activities that maximize climate change **additionality, impact and paradigm shift**.
2. Country ownership that is vested too much in public authorities with limited strategic vision and convening power may not lead to the **multi-stakeholder participation model** for country ownership favored by the GCF that would bring together a broad coalition of stakeholders and partners, including relevant line ministries, CSOs, and the private sector.
3. Countries may prefer to have **faster and easier access to GCF resources** than GCF business processes and quality requirements for direct access accreditation and FPs permit. Capacity support may not be sufficient to accelerate access. This could lead to less interest in countries, and thus assumption of country ownership, in accessing the Fund and developing strategic GCF programmes and project pipelines.
4. Country ownership is apparently particularly critical, but still deficient, in **identifying and supporting private sector solutions** to climate change. Institutional cultures of public and private sector operations differ significantly.
5. A key question is around the added value of **GCF CPs** in ensuring country ownership and in turn delivering high-quality, innovative projects with paradigm shift potential.

In addition, the intersection of country ownership and ESS came up during inception meetings. ESS is currently the subject of another ongoing IEU evaluation; the COA evaluation will closely link up with this evaluation and address ESS issues mainly where they are raised by country partners.

This evaluation will analyze the relevance, importance and possible mitigation measures with regard to the five pressure points identified above and explore the evidence and success stories related to them. Related issues are also well reflected in the questions of the evaluation matrix and the evaluation’s analytical framework.

---

<sup>29</sup> Florence Richard for Africa; Binu Parthan for Asia; and Liane Schalatek of Heinrich Boell Foundation.

## B. Methodological approach

### Key evaluation questions and matrix

The evaluation questions are structured around four themes and areas of interest: GCF strategic and policy environment, country capacities and readiness, accreditation and direct access, and the project cycle (see Table 3). First, how is country ownership understood, operationalized and mainstreamed in GCF policies and instruments, access modalities and project cycle; how well are GCF and country climate change policies aligned and how well are GCF overall priorities aligned with country ownership; and how does the conceptualization and application of country ownership in the GCF compare with other climate finance institutions? Second, how is

country ownership for climate change understood and applied by recipient countries, how have critical country capacities for country ownership been supported by the GCF, and to what extent are country systems being used? Third, how relevant and effective are the GCF accreditation process and direct access modality for countries' needs and priorities, in view of country ownership? And fourth, how is country ownership operationalized throughout the project cycle, from origination to design to implementation to monitoring?

The themes of the private sector and multinational projects and country ownership implications are planned to receive special attention as cross-cutting themes. For a detailed evaluation matrix with key methods and source/type of data, see Appendix I.

**Table 3 Key evaluation questions**

AREAS	EVALUATION QUESTIONS
Country ownership in the strategic and policy environment	<p><b>GCF policies.</b> How does the GCF define and operationalize country ownership? How coherent and sufficient are GCF policies and investment criteria on country ownership? How well are GCF overall priorities (e.g., investment criteria) aligned with country ownership?</p> <p><b>GCF and country policy alignment.</b> To what extent are GCF and country level policies aligned, especially with respect to the GCF investment criteria? ? Do GCF CPs reflect country-level policies and strategies (NDCs, NAMAs, NAPs, etc.), as well as major GCF objectives and concerns, including the GCF investment criteria? To what extent are country policies and priorities given primacy?</p> <p><b>Roles and responsibilities.</b> Are institutional roles and responsibilities of NDAs/FPs, AEs, the GCF Secretariat and other stakeholders clearly and appropriately defined to support country ownership?</p> <p><b>Benchmarking.</b> What are we learning from the experiences of other climate finance organizations in terms of country ownership?</p>
Country capacities and readiness	<p><b>Recipient country understanding and operationalization of country ownership.</b> How do recipient countries understand and conceptualize country ownership and use it in formulating CPs, NAPs and other climate change related policies? How well is country ownership reflected in country governance (institutions, country coordinating mechanisms, technical consultations, etc.)? To what extent do CPs strengthen country ownership and support the achievement of other GCF objectives, such as paradigm shift?</p> <p><b>Overall GCF capacity-building.</b> To what extent have critical country capacities for country ownership been established and strengthened by the GCF (NDAs, NoPs, multi-stakeholder country coordinating mechanisms, national consultants, Structural Dialogue (SD), conferences, workshops, etc.)? Are they effective and efficient, and addressing country needs?</p> <p><b>Country systems.</b> To what extent are country-level systems for programme and project management used and supported by the GCF?</p>
Country ownership through accreditation and direct access	<p><b>Accreditation process.</b> How effective and efficient is the accreditation process in terms of country ownership and drivenness, and does it meet recipients' needs? To what extent do international AEs support the concept of country ownership, and how do they compare to DAEs?</p> <p><b>Direct Access.</b> How relevant and effective is Direct Access (and Enhanced Direct Access (EDA)) to countries' needs and priorities and in promoting country ownership? Do IAEs contribute to capacity-building for direct access, for public and private sector development projects and programmes?</p>
Country ownership in the project cycle	<p><b>Country stakeholder engagement in project origination.</b> How engaged are countries in initiating and supporting funding proposals, matching and nominating AEs, co-finance and broad stakeholder consultations? What role does GCF CPs play in this process?</p> <p><b>Funding proposal preparation and approval.</b> How well do funding proposals address the GCF investment criteria on country ownership and facilitate country ownership? How effective and efficient is the funding proposal preparation and approval process and related GCF support mechanisms (in particular PPF, Simplified Approval Process (SAP) and NoP), in view of country ownership?</p> <p><b>Country ownership in implementation.</b> How effectively and efficiently is country ownership applied throughout implementation, particularly in involving all relevant stakeholders at critical activities and stages?</p> <p><b>Monitoring, reporting &amp; evaluation.</b> To what extent does the GCF leverage and strengthen country MR&amp;E capacities? How well are GCF RMF and project MR&amp;E aligned with country systems? Are NDA roles and responsibilities in MR&amp;E well defined throughout the project cycle?</p>



## Analytical framework for assessing country ownership

In addition to the evaluation matrix, the evaluation team has developed a draft analytical framework for assessing country ownership, which is rooted in understanding and contextualizing the GCF COA in its broader landscape at the global and local levels. This framework sets out broad pillars and dimensions of country ownership, as shown in Table 4 below, based on a review of external literature and GCF documentation. It seeks to go into more depth and beyond the seven attributes of country ownership that were set out in the IEU RPSP evaluation as mentioned earlier, to provide a closer and more comprehensive look at the principle of country ownership, from the recipient country perspective.

The framework will serve multiple purposes over the course of the evaluation:

- It will be used to gauge stakeholders' perceptions on how country ownership is faring at the recipient country level. For this purpose, it will be adapted into a tool, with a scoring system, as is laid out in draft form in appendix II.
- It will also help inform broader analysis on the extent to which, and how effectively, GCF policies, processes and modalities currently support and strengthen each of the dimensions of country ownership, in partnership with other climate finance and development organizations. The framework can also

help inform an understanding of where there could be more emphasis of GCF support, to better contribute to GCF objectives.

- Finally, and importantly, the analytical framework can be used to try to disentangle the concept of country ownership for the GCF and contribute to an understanding that could be carried forward and possibly used in future to gauge or monitor progress towards this principle and outcome. The framework will be revisited and revised at the end of the evaluation, based on the learnings.

The analytical framework shown below was developed based on an in-depth review of the academic and grey literature on country ownership, the UNFCCC, and effective development aid, as well as a review of GCF documents. First, major attributes of country ownership were identified from key sources that represented either extensive international multi-stakeholder consultative processes or academic literature syntheses (see section II.A and Table 1 above). Then common themes were sought from among these attributes to develop the “pillars” of country ownership. The “dimensions” were further developed based on (1) an elaboration of the attributes in the literature reviewed, and (2) a mapping of attributes to key GCF elements (such as Fund-level objectives, policy alignment, CPs, NDCs, NAPs, accreditation and direct access, NDAs/FPs, NoP, RPSP, project cycle, and multi-stakeholder engagement), to ensure coverage.

**Table 4 Analytical framework for country ownership**

PILLARS OF COUNTRY OWNERSHIP	DIMENSIONS OF COUNTRY OWNERSHIP
<b>Leadership and consultation:</b> Country governments lead strategic programming and prioritization processes, ensuring policy alignment, and in broad consultation, through a multi-stakeholder participatory process	Recipient country leadership in strategic programming and prioritization for climate change and finance
	Alignment of GCF objectives, priorities, and support and national strategies and priorities
	Multi-stakeholder engagement including civil society and private sector
<b>Institutional capacity and commitment:</b> Country stakeholders commit to funded activities that address GCF objectives and priorities, and have the capacity to do so (and these are consistent with GCF priorities such as paradigm shift and impact)	Institutional capacity to plan, manage and implement climate activities that are country-owned and consistent with GCF priorities (such as paradigm shift and impact)
	Institutional commitment through pipeline development, country co-finance and local execution
	Use of country systems and expertise
<b>Globally shared responsibilities:</b> The GCF, accredited entities and recipient countries adopt global best practices in planning, delivery, and reporting, and are accountable to each other for these practices	Predictability and transparency of funding allocation
	Timeliness of commitment and disbursement of funding
	Sharing of results and experiences with national and international stakeholders

### Utilization-focused, participatory and collaborative approach

The evaluation will focus on the utility of both the evaluation process and products to key stakeholders, with the objectives of providing learning, informing decision-making and improving overall performance. Key planned actions are as follows:

- **Clearly identify and engage primary users at the beginning of the evaluation – and use that input to guide the evaluation.** As noted earlier in this section and in section A above, the evaluation team has sought and considered the input of the key GCF stakeholders in designing this evaluation.
- **Continue to engage with GCF stakeholders and evaluation users throughout the evaluation process** with the objective of a consultative and participatory process. Engagement is planned through several channels: through extensive consultation using interviews, focus groups, and surveys; and through evaluation team presence and active engagement at key GCF events (e.g. the twenty-third meeting of the Board).
- **Actively involve the NDAs/FPs in the conduct of the country case studies**, to support ownership, learning, and validation. NDAs/FPs will be engaged in the planning process, as well as have the opportunity to review the case study reports, to ensure factual accuracy and opportunity for improvement.
- **Actively engage with the team conducting the FPR**, as an important user of the country ownership evaluation (see also section IV.A.)
- **Write and share the evaluation findings and recommendations in a manner that promotes uptake and facilitates use** by a diverse audience. Findings and conclusions will be appropriately contextualized within the wider landscape of the GCF, and the evidence base for each finding will be clearly and systematically presented, to ensure credibility. Recommendations will be linked to the findings and actionable; this may include presenting scenarios for recommendation uptake and potential

change pathways that the GCF could follow to better support the principle and process of country ownership. A series of presentations/webinars on the emerging results of the review will be held, tailored to different audiences to support learning.

## C. Detailed methods

This section presents the methods for this evaluation, including document review, portfolio analysis, meta-analysis and benchmarking, stakeholder consultation (key informant interviews and survey) and country case studies.

### Document review

The evaluation team will conduct a comprehensive document review to inform our understanding and assessment of the COA in the GCF, drawing on the following documents:

- GCF policies, Board decisions, and meeting reports
- UNFCCC decisions and guidance to the GCF
- GCF Secretariat administrative/operational documents, audits, and reviews
- Readiness documents, including proposals, CPs, NAPs and progress reporting
- Accreditation documents, including nominations, proposals and entity workplans

- Project cycle documents, including concept notes, PPF proposals, FPs, Secretariat and the independent Technical Advisory Panel (iTAP) reviews, CSO comments, funded activity agreements, and annual performance reports
- External resources, including academic and grey literature on country ownership and climate finance, grey literature on country ownership and the GCF (such as reports and blogs prepared by NGOs), and country-level documentation for the case studies (such as NDCs, climate change policies and strategies, newspaper articles, national political economy assessments, and so on)

### Portfolio data analysis

Portfolio-wide data analysis will be critical evidence for this evaluation. The evaluation team will work closely with the IEU DataLab team to identify what data analyses could inform the key evaluation questions (see Box 5), what data would be needed for those analyses, and the respective roles and responsibilities of the evaluation team and the IEU DataLab. Data analysis will also be an important input into the interview process, using the data to identify trends and potential bottlenecks and the interviews to help understand and explain these findings.

The data sets to be used will be valid through 8 July 2019.

#### *Box 5: Examples of relevant data analyses*

- Analysis of key parameters of RPSP support
- Qualitative content analysis of SD and DAE workshop reports
- Key variable analysis of FP sections on country ownership (E5) and recipient needs (E4)
- Analysis of alignment of FP results/needs areas with CP priorities and NDC priorities/needs
- Analysis of the status and distribution of entities in the accreditation process
- Analysis of what direct access entities are accredited for and the sectors/areas in which they have experience; comparison against NDC priority areas for GCF priority countries
- Analysis of number and proportion of PPF grants being accessed and executed by entity type
- Project cycle time-lag analysis by AE type, NDA location, and other parameters
- Government co-financing analysis by AE type, project type, and other parameters
- Cross-tabular analysis of the iTAP and Secretariat review scores on country ownership and other investment criteria

## **Meta-analysis and benchmarking**

A meta-analysis and benchmarking exercise will be conducted to learn from the experience of other global climate finance organizations. The organizations to be reviewed are the Global Environment Facility (GEF), the Climate Investment Funds (CIF), the Adaptation Fund (AF), the Multilateral Fund for the Implementation of the Montreal Protocol (MLF), and the Global Fund.

A benchmarking tool will be developed to enable systematic extraction and comparative analysis of information from policy and operational documents, as well as through key informant interviews (KIIs). The tool will align with the key thematic areas in the evaluation matrix, including definitions and policies relevant to country ownership, access modalities, capacity support, and country ownership in the project cycle. Evaluative information will also be reviewed, to the extent that it exists and can inform a better

understanding of whether certain features (e.g. government FPs, country coordination mechanisms, local stakeholder consultation) are working well or not working well, and why.

## **Stakeholder consultation**

A wide range of stakeholders will be consulted via KIIs and surveys.

### *Key informant interviews*

To guide the interviews, semi-structured interview protocols will be developed, tailored by stakeholder type, and iteratively tested and improved. KIIs will be held in person when feasible, or via telephone or videoconference when not feasible. Interviewers will take detailed, typed interview notes, which will be anonymized and coded in Dedoose to facilitate qualitative analysis. Table 5 shows the types of stakeholders that will be consulted and the sampling approach.

**Table 5 Stakeholders to be consulted**

TYPE OF STAKEHOLDER	SAMPLING
GCF Board Members and Active Observers (CSOs, Private Sector Organisations (PSOs))	Approach all; 24
UNFCCC	Key actors; 2
GCF Secretariat Staff, across key offices and divisions, including DCP, DMA, PSF, IRM, OED, ORMC and OPM	Key actors, plus snowballing approach; approximately 20
NDAs/FPs	2 per country case study (14); purposive selection of 11 more NDAs for remote KIIs; all NDAs approached through an online survey
Entities that are nominated, or have achieved accreditation, for national and regional direct access (DAEs)	Selection on the basis of country case studies; 10 more DAE KIIs; all DAEs approached through an online survey
IAEs	Representative of approved projects; 6
Regional Advisors	One per region; 6
Delivery Partners (DPs)	Key actors; 10
Accreditation Panel	Key actors; 6
iTAP	Key actors; 6
Additional country-level stakeholders, including public and private implementing partners, accreditation stakeholders, CSOs, PSOs, potential beneficiaries, academia, UNFCCC focal point	Key actors, plus snowballing approach; minimum of 12 per country case study
Additional external actors and experts (e.g. GEF, CIF, MLF, AF)	Key actors, plus snowballing approach; approximately 10

### *Perceptions survey*

The evaluation team will administer two surveys.

A short perceptions survey will be administered through an online platform (Survey Monkey) to key GCF stakeholders, including NDAs/FPs, AEs, and CSOs/PSOs, using integrated skip logic to ensure questions are targeted to the specific audience. This online survey will be administered jointly with the survey planned for the IEU evaluation on ESS in the GCF.

A second short survey will be administered in person, during KIIs conducted as part of the country case study visits (see next section). The purpose of this survey will be to inform the measurement of some indicators in the

analytical framework, and it will be designed as part of the country protocol.

### **Country case studies**

Country case studies will be used to take a more intensive look at the conceptualization and operationalization of country ownership in GCF recipient countries. These case studies are not intended to be representative of the overall GCF portfolio or experience, nor will they be sufficient to make GCF-level conclusions on country ownership. Instead, the country studies will be important to inform a more in-depth and grounded understanding of how recipient countries view country ownership and its issues and tensions, as well as to provide compelling examples that can be used in the final

evaluation report to illustrate GCF-wide findings.

### *Country case study selection*

The terms of reference provide for five country case studies to be led by the COA evaluation team. These five countries will be complemented by two additional country studies being led by the FPR evaluation team and IEU in Rwanda and Grenada. In addition to these seven countries, 11 additional countries will be selected for remote KIIs.<sup>30</sup>

The five countries to receive evaluation team visits (Colombia, Fiji, Indonesia, Morocco, and Uganda) were purposively selected, according to the following criteria and considerations. Table 6 below shows the attributes of the countries selected against these key criteria.

- Ensure geographic coverage, including GCF priority countries, of two African States; one SIDS country; one country from Latin America and Caribbean (LAC); one country from Asia-Pacific.
- Exclude countries that do not yet have approved projects.
- Exclude the 12 countries selected by the FPR.
- Ensure diversity across key criteria, including whether a DAE has been accredited; whether countries have participated in the RPSP and whether they have a GCF country programme; where in the government structure the NDA/FP is located; and project dimensions, including public/private, national/multinational, and the IAEs (ensuring coverage of those that have the greatest volume of GCF projects to date).

---

<sup>30</sup> These countries will be purposively selected using similar criteria to those shown below for the five COA case study countries. In each country, the evaluation

team will approach at minimum the NDA and RPSP DP for remote KIIs.

**Table 6** *Selected country cases and key attributes*

COUNTRY	REGION	PRIORITY COUNTRY CATEGORY	NUMBER OF PROJECTS APPROVED	HAVE A DAE?	ACCESSED PPF?	ACCESSED RPSP?	HAVE SUBMITTED A CP?	HAVE PRIVATE SECTOR PROJECTS?	HAVE MULTI-NATIONAL PROJECTS?	NDA LOCATION	IAES WITH APPROVED PROJECTS
<b>Countries to receive visits from the COA evaluation team</b>											
Colombia	LAC	--	1	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	National Planning Department	UNDP
Fiji	Asia-Pacific	SIDS	1	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	Ministry of Economy	ADB
Indonesia	Asia-Pacific	--	2	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Ministry of Finance	FMO; World Bank
Morocco	Africa	African State	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Ministry of Energy, Mining, and Environment	FMO; AFD; EBRD
Uganda	Africa	African State; LDC	5	Yes (in pipeline)	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Ministry of Finance	FMO; AFD; EIB; UNDP
<b>Countries to receive visits from the FPR team, along with a GCF IEU COA evaluation team member</b>											
Rwanda	Africa	African State; LDC	2	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Rwanda Environment Management Authority	Acumen
Grenada	LAC	SIDS	4	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Ministry of Finance, Planning, Economic Development, and Physical Development	GIZ; EIB; IDB

Source: IEU DataLAB, February 2019



*Country protocol for planning, implementing, reporting and validation of country visits*

A protocol for the country case studies will be prepared to ensure that evaluators plan, implement, report and validate country visits in a consistent manner. The protocol will be piloted in one country first (Uganda), reviewed and refined, and then applied in the remaining four countries. The country protocol will cover the following aspects:

- **Planning** – Some of the planning elements to be covered in the country protocol, as well as the summarized guidance, are provided in Table 7 below.
- **Implementation** – The country protocol will cover how the ICF team should represent itself (i.e. as a representative for the IEU), the conduct of KIIs (according to the interview protocols), the requirement for typed interview notes, and the procedure for administration of a short survey, among other areas.
- **Reporting** – A template will be provided for the country case study reports, and will be aligned with the four thematic areas of the evaluation matrix. Annexes will include a brief overview of the GCF portfolio, documents reviewed, and stakeholders consulted, at minimum. The report for Uganda will be prepared first and shared with the rest of the team, as an example. Guidance will be provided on the timeline for preparation of a draft of the country case study (e.g. within two weeks of return to office).
- **Validation** – Draft country case study reports will be shared with the NDA for factual validation.

*Table 7 Summarized planning guidance for country protocol*

PLANNING ELEMENT	ABBREVIATED GUIDANCE
Country visit duration and timing	Five working days in-country
Fieldwork team composition	One ICF core team evaluator, plus a local consultant; IEU staff to join three of five visits
Notification approach	IEU to send out an official notification letter to the NDA/FP representative; ICF evaluators to follow up with the NDA/FP to confirm country visit timing
Document review	Review relevant GCF documents (readiness documents, CPs, accreditation proposals, entity work programmes, Concept Notes (CNs), PPF proposals, FPs, Secretariat, iTAP, and CSO/PSO comments on FPs, Annual Performance Reports (APRs) as well as external and secondary literature (e.g. NDCs, papers on climate change coordination or political economy)
List of key informants and interview scheduling	ICF evaluator to identify initial priority list of key informants based on the document review and request for suggestions to the relevant Regional Advisor; list should include GCF Board member (if applicable), NDA/FP, AE, implementing and executing entities, accreditation stakeholders, CSOs, PSOs, academia, potential beneficiaries, the UNFCCC focal point, among others; ICF evaluator to share initial list with the NDA for input; local consultant to work directly with the NDA to arrange the schedule of interviews
Site visit	Possibility for a site visit to an active GCF project to be assessed on a case-by-case basis, depending on logistical considerations (whether a project site can be reached and visited within one day) and the potential to speak with local beneficiaries that may have been consulted, for example, as part of project preparation or as part of a priority region in the country programme



## IV. WORKPLAN

The evaluation process has been divided into three general phases:

- **Inception and planning phase** (February–March 2019) – This phase involves the process followed to date (as described in section III.A) and culminates in the final Inception Report (see also Table 8 below).
- **Data collection and analysis phase** (March–June 2019) – This phase involves the planning and implementation of the data collection and analysis methods described above in section III.C.
- **Reporting phase** (June–October 2019) – During this phase, the evaluation report will be drafted, shared and socialized; feedback will be received and responded to, and the report will be finalized and widely communicated.

The key deliverables for the evaluation are described below, followed by a detailed workplan for the evaluation.

### A. Key deliverables

The evaluation team will produce three key deliverables, as shown in Table 8 below. In addition to these key deliverables, other work products will include tools and protocols (country case study protocol, interview protocols, benchmarking tool, analytical framework tool), online survey, data sets produced or analyzed in collaboration with the IEU DataLab, presentations, and learning products. All outputs produced by the evaluation team will go through a thorough quality assurance process prior to delivery to the IEU.

**Table 8** *Key deliverables and deadlines*

KEY DELIVERABLE	DESCRIPTION	DATE
Inception Report	Describes the approach, methods, and workplan for the evaluation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Draft Inception Report (15 March 2019)</li><li>• Final Inception Report (based on receipt of comments)</li></ul>
Written Input to the FPR	Provides the emerging findings in each key thematic area of the evaluation matrix, to support alignment between the FPR's findings on country ownership, and the COA evaluation  Draws on the two country case studies to be completed by end of April, among other evidence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Written Input to the FPR (3 May 2019)</li></ul>
Evaluation Report	Provides the evaluation's key findings, lessons learned, conclusions and recommendations; a draft outline for this report is provided in Appendix III  Will also include annexes that ensure the transparency of the evidence base, such as the list of stakeholders consulted, structured bibliography, country case study reports, portfolio analysis results, meta-analysis and benchmarking results, and survey results	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Zero-draft Factual Report (28 June 2019)</li><li>• Revised Report (based on receipt of comments)</li><li>• Final Report (30 August 2019)</li></ul>

## B. Detailed workplan

Table 9 presents a detailed workplan for the evaluation. In addition to these activities, the ICF evaluation team will hold weekly calls with the IEU throughout.

**Table 9 Detailed workplan for the evaluation**

ACTIVITIES		FEB.		MARCH				APRIL					MAY				JUNE				JULY					AUGUST			
		W 3	W 4	W 1	W 2	W 3	W 4	W 1	W 2	W 3	W 4	W 5	W 1	W 2	W 3	W 4	W 1	W 2	W 3	W 4	W 1	W 2	W 3	W 4	W 5	W 1	W 2	W 3	W 4
<b>Phase 1: Inception and planning</b>																													
1	Initial document review	■	■	■																									
2	Country case study sampling		■	■																									
3	Evaluation matrix and analytical framework development		■	■																									
4	Inception mission to Songdo			■																									
5	GCF stakeholder scoping interviews			■	■	■																							
6	Draft Inception Report and review process				•	■																							
7	Revision and submission of Final Inception Report						•																						
<b>Phase 2: Data collection and analysis</b>																													
8	Preparation of protocols and tools				■	■																							
9	Continued document review				■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■
10	Portfolio analysis						■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■
11	Key informant interviews							■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■
12	Meta-analysis and benchmarking							■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■
13	Team leader joins FPR mission to Rwanda				■																								
14	Pilot country visit to Uganda						■																						
15	Four additional country visits ( <i>to be confirmed</i> )									■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■
16	Written input to the FPR										■																		
17	Online survey												■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■
18	Data synthesis and triangulation														■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■
<b>Phase 3: Reporting</b>																													
19	Factual Draft Report and review process																■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■
20	Webinars, slide decks, and B.23 for socialization																	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■
21	Revised Draft Report and review process																			■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■
22	Final report to Board for B.24																										■	■	■

*Note:* Dark grey denotes review time; dots indicate deliverables.

## REFERENCES AND DOCUMENTS CONSULTED

### GCF Board Documents

- Green Climate Fund. (2013). *Meeting of the Board GCF/B.04/04. Business model framework: country ownership, 13 June 2013.*
- Green Climate Fund. (2013). *Meeting of the Board GCF/B.04/05. Business model framework: access modalities, 11 June 2013.*
- Green Climate Fund. (2013). *Meeting of the Board GCF/B.04/08. Business model framework: structure and organization, 10 June 2013.*
- Green Climate Fund. (2013). *Meeting of the Board GCF/B.05/06. Business model framework: countries' transparent no-objection procedure, 20 September 2013.*
- Green Climate Fund. (2014). *Meeting of the Board GCF/B.06/07. Country ownership, 11 February 2014.*
- Green Climate Fund. (2014). *Meeting of the Board GCF/B.08/09. Additional modalities that further enhance direct access, including through funding entities, October 2014.*
- Green Climate Fund. (2014). *Meeting of the Board GCF/B.08/22. Simplified processes for the approval of proposals for certain activities, in particular, small-scale activities, 6 October 2014.*
- Green Climate Fund. (2015). *Meeting of the Board GCF/B.09/07. Further development of the initial investment framework: sub-criteria and methodology, 23 February 2015.*
- Green Climate Fund. (2015). *Meeting of the Board GCF/B.09/05. Additional modalities that further enhance direct access: terms of reference for a pilot phase, 5 March 2015.*
- Green Climate Fund. (2015). *Meeting of the Board GCF/B.09/07. Further development of the initial investment framework: sub-criteria and methodology, 23, February 2015.*
- Green Climate Fund. (2015). *Meeting of the Board GCF/B.10/05. Additional modalities that further enhance direct access: terms of reference for a pilot phase, 21 June 2015.*
- Green Climate Fund. (2015). *Meeting of the Board GCF/B.10/Inf.06. Progress report on the Readiness and Preparatory Support Programme, 19 June 2015.*
- Green Climate Fund. (2015). *Meeting of the Board GCF/B.10/Inf.07. Country ownership, 16 June 2015.*
- Green Climate Fund. (2015). *Decision B.11/10. Agenda item 15: Initial monitoring and accountability framework for accredited entities, 13 October 2015.*
- Green Climate Fund. (2015). *Meeting of the Board GCF/B.11/17. Simplified processes for approval of proposals for certain activities, in particular, small-scale activities, 13 October 2015.*
- Green Climate Fund. (2015). *Meeting of the Board GCF/BM-2015/Inf.05. Revised report on Readiness and Preparatory Support Programme, 30 April 2015.*
- Green Climate Fund. (2015). *GCF/B.09/23. Annex III: Initial investment framework: activity-specific sub-criteria and indicative assessment factors, 16 April 2015.*
- Green Climate Fund. (2016). *Meeting of the Board GCF/B.13/13/Rev.01. Simplified processes for approval of proposals for certain activities, in particular, small-scale activities: Recommendations from the Co-Chairs, 28 June 2016.*
- Green Climate Fund. (2016). *Meeting of the Board GCF/B.13/14. Operational guidelines for the Project Preparation Facility, 23 June 2016.*

Green Climate Fund. (2016). *Meeting of the Board GCF/B.13/18. Programmatic approach to funding proposals*, 20 June 2016.

Green Climate Fund. (2016). *Meeting of the Board GCF/B.13/24. Progress and outlook report of the Readiness and Preparatory Support Programme*, 21 June 2016.

Green Climate Fund. (2016). *Meeting of the Board GCF/B.14/05/Rev.01. Country ownership guidelines*, 12 October 2016.

Green Climate Fund. (2016). *Meeting of the Board GCF/B.15/06. Country ownership guidelines*, 10 December 2016.

Green Climate Fund. (2016). *Meeting of the Board GCF/B.15/10. Review of the initial proposal approval process*, 8 December 2016.

Green Climate Fund. (2016). *Meeting of the Board GCF/B.15/Inf.09. Building country-driven pipelines: update on country programmes and entity work programmes*, 9 December 2016.

Green Climate Fund. (2017). *Meeting of the Board GCF/B.16/04/Add.01. Implementation of the initial strategic plan of the GCF – Addendum I: Update on country programmes and entity work programmes*, 20 March 2017.

Green Climate Fund. (2017). *Meeting of the Board GCF/B.16/06. Guidelines for enhanced country ownership and country drivenness*, 31 March 2017.

Green Climate Fund. (2017). *Meeting of the Board GCF/B.17/11. Implementation of the initial strategic plan of the GCF: Update on country programmes and entity work programmes*, 23 June 2017.

Green Climate Fund. (2017). *Meeting of the Board GCF/B.17/14. Guidelines for enhanced country ownership and country drivenness*, 30 June 2017.

Green Climate Fund. (2017). *Meeting of the Board GCF/B.17/18. Review of the initial proposal approval process*, 5 July 2017.

Green Climate Fund. (2018). *Meeting of the Board GCF/B.19/32/Add.01. Readiness and Preparatory Support Programme: Revised work programme for 2018 – Addendum I Final report from Dalberg on the initial review of the Readiness Programme*, 12 February 2018.

Green Climate Fund. (2018). *Meeting of the Board GCF/B.19/35. Consolidated country and entity work programmes*, 20 February 2018.

Green Climate Fund. (2018). *Meeting of the Board GCF/B.20/04/Add.01. Strategy to increase funding proposals from direct access entities – Addendum: Results of a survey of DAEs and NDAs in preparation of 2018 Enhanced Direct Access Workshop*, 8 June 2018.

Green Climate Fund. (2018). *Meeting of the Board GCF/B.20/11. Consolidated country and entity work programmes*, 8 June 2018.

Green Climate Fund. (2018). *Meeting of the Board GCF/B.20/Inf.02. Readiness and Preparatory Support Programme: progress report*, 1 June 2018.

Green Climate Fund. (2018). *Meeting of the Board GCF/B.21/11. Two-stage proposal approval process*, 25 September 2018.

Green Climate Fund. (2018). *Meeting of the Board GCF/B.21/31/Rev.01. Programmatic policy approach*, 27 September 2018.

Green Climate Fund. (2018). *Meeting of the Board GCF/B.21/Inf.07. Status of the GCF portfolio: approved projects and fulfillment of conditions*, 25 September 2018.

Green Climate Fund. (2019). *Meeting of the Board GCF/B.22/05. Investment criteria indicators*, 1 February 2019.

- Green Climate Fund. (2019). *Meeting of the Board GCF/B.22/08. Readiness and Preparatory Support Programme: strategy for 2019–2021 and work programme 2019*, 1 February 2019.
- Green Climate Fund. (2019). *Meeting of the Board GCF/B.22/17/Add.01. Synthesis of Board submissions for the review of the strategic plan of the Green Climate Fund – Addendum I: Compilation of Board submissions*, 1 February 2019.
- Green Climate Fund. (2019). *Meeting of the Board GCF/B.22/Inf.07. Status of the GCF portfolio: approved projects and fulfillment of conditions*, 1 February 2019.
- Green Climate Fund. (2019). *Meeting of the Board GCF/B.22/Inf.12. Strategic programming for the Green Climate Fund first replenishment*, 1 February 2019.
- Green Climate Fund. (2019). *Meeting of the Board GCF/B.22/Inf.13. Report on the implementation of the initial strategic plan of the GCF: 2015–2018*, 1 February 2019.
- Green Climate Fund. (2019). *Meeting of the Board GCF/B.22/08. Readiness and Preparatory Support Programme: strategy for 2019–2021 and work programme 2019*, 1 February 2019.
- Green Climate Fund. (2019). *Meeting of the Board GCF/B.22/Inf.15. Matters related to accreditation, including the framework review, and matters related to the baseline of accredited entities: baseline on the overall portfolio of accredited entities*, 6 February 2019.

### **GCF Board Meeting Reports**

- Green Climate Fund. (2013). *Meeting of the Board GCF/B.01-13/13. Report of the third meeting of the Board*, 13–15 March 2013.
- Green Climate Fund. (2013). *Meeting of the Board GCF/B.04/18. Report of the fourth meeting of the Board*, 26–28 June 2013.
- Green Climate Fund. (2014). *Meeting of the Board GCF/B.05/24/Rev.01. Report of the fifth meeting of the Board*, 8–10 October 2013.
- Green Climate Fund. (2014). *Meeting of the Board GCF/B.06/19. Report of the sixth meeting of the Board*, 19–21 February 2014.
- Green Climate Fund. (2014). *Meeting of the Board GCF/B.08/45. Decisions of the Board – Eighth meeting of the Board*, 14–17 October 2014.
- Green Climate Fund. (2015). *Meeting of the Board GCF/B.08/46. Report of the eighth meeting of the Board*, 14–17 October 2014.
- Green Climate Fund. (2015). *Meeting of the Board GCF/B.09/24. Report of the ninth meeting of the Board*, 24–26 March 2015.
- Green Climate Fund. (2015). *Meeting of the Board GCF/B.10/18. Report of the tenth meeting of the Board*, 6–9 July 2015.
- Green Climate Fund. (2016). *Meeting of the Board GCF/B.11/25. Report of the eleventh meeting of the Board*, 2–5 November 2015.
- Green Climate Fund. (2016). *Meeting of the Board GCF/B.13/33. Report of the thirteenth meeting of the Board*, 28–30 June 2016.
- Green Climate Fund. (2016). *Meeting of the Board GCF/B.14/18. Report of the fourteenth meeting of the Board*, 12–14 October 2016.
- Green Climate Fund. (2017). *Meeting of the Board GCF/B.15/25. Report of the fifteenth meeting of the Board*, 13–15 December 2016.
- Green Climate Fund. (2017). *Meeting of the Board GCF/B.16/24. Report of the sixteenth meeting of the Board*, 4–6 April 2017.

Green Climate Fund. (2017). *Meeting of the Board GCF/B.17/22. Report of the seventeenth meeting of the Board, 5–6 July 2017.*

Green Climate Fund. (2019). *Meeting of the Board GCF/B.21/35. Report of the twenty-first meeting of the Board, 17–20 October 2018.*

### **GCF IEU Documents**

Green Climate Fund. (2018). *Meeting of the Board GCF/B.21/28. Report of the independent evaluation of the Readiness and Preparatory Support Programme, 26 September 2018.*

Green Climate Fund Independent Evaluation Unit. (2018). *Independent review of the Green Climate Fund's Results Management Framework* (Evaluation Report No. 1/2018. Final Report). Songdo, South Korea: Author.

Green Climate Fund Independent Evaluation Unit. (2018). *Independent review of the Green Climate Fund's Results Management Framework* (Annexes, Final Report). Songdo, South Korea: Author.

### **External Documents**

Amerasinghe, N., Thwaites, J., Larsen, G., and Ballesteros, A. (2017). *The future of the funds: exploring the architecture of multilateral climate finance.* Washington, DC, USA: World Resource Institute.

Bird, N. and Glennie, J. (2011). *Going beyond aid effectiveness to guide the delivery of climate finance.* Overseas Development Institute. London, United Kingdom: Overseas Development Institute.

Brown, L., Polycarp, C., and Spearman, M. (2013). *Within reach: strengthening country ownership and accountability in accessing climate finance* (Working paper). WRI Climate Finance Series. World Resource Institute, United Nations Environment Programme.

Booth, D. (2011). *Aid effectiveness: bringing country ownership (and politics) back in* (Working Paper 336). London, United Kingdom: Overseas Development Institute.

Busan Partnership for Effective Development Cooperation. (2011). *Outcome document.* Fourth High-Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness, Busan, Republic of Korea, 29 November–1 December 2011.

E Co. Ltd. (2018). *GCF insight: Stakeholder engagement – GCF Board to on-the-ground realities* (GCF insight #10). United Kingdom.

Khan, M., Sagar, A., Huq, S., and Thiam, P.K. (2016). *Capacity-building under the Paris Agreement.* European Capacity Building Initiative.

Friends of the Earth United States and Institute for Policy Studies. (2017). *Green Climate Fund: a performance check.*

Global Environment Facility Independent Evaluation Office. (2013). *Meta-evaluation on country ownership and drivenness* (Technical Document #6). Fifth Overall Performance Study of the GEF.

Global Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation. (2018). *2018 Monitoring guide: for national co-ordinators from participating governments.*

Gupta, A. and van Asselt, H. (2017). *Transparency in multilateral climate politics: Furthering (or distracting from) accountability?: Transparency in climate politics.* Regulation & Governance, 13(3).

Guy, B. (2018). *The Role of Sub-state and Non-state Actors in International Climate Processes: Civil Society.* Chatham House.

- Josephson, P. (2017). *Common but differentiated responsibilities in the climate change regime – historic evaluation and future outlooks*. Stockholm, Sweden: Faculty of Law, Stockholm University.
- International Institute for Sustainable Development (IISD). (2018). *Earth Negotiations Bulletin: COP 24 Final*. Vol. 12 No. 747.
- Koch, S., Leiderer, S., Faust, J., and Molenaers, N. (2017). *The rise and demise of European budget support: political economy of collective European Union donor action*. Development Policy Review: 35(4), 455-4743.
- Lundsgaarde, E., Dupuy, K., and Persson, A. (2018). *Coordination Challenges in Climate Finance*. DIIS Working Paper 2018:3. Danish Institute for International Studies: Copenhagen, Denmark.
- Müller, B. (2013). *Delhi vision for the Green Climate Fund business model framework – some thoughts on access and disbursement*. Oxford Energy and Environment Brief, Oxford Institute for Energy Studies.
- Müller, B. (2014). *Enhancing direct access and country ownership: status quo and the way forward* (Discussion Note for the Sixth Meeting of the Green Climate Fund Board).
- Orenstein, K., Redman, J., and Tangri, N. (2012). *Global Alliance for Incinerator Alternatives. The Green Climate Fund's "no-objection" procedure and private finance: lessons learned from existing institutions*. Friends of the Earth – U.S., Institute for Policy Studies, and Global Alliance for Incinerator Alternatives.
- Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2011). *Policy brief No. 4: Country ownership of development: political correctness or a practical key to better aid? The Evaluation of the Paris Declaration*.
- Save The Children and OXFAM. (2017). *The local engagement assessment framework: A practitioner's guide to integrating country ownership into development projects*.
- Schalatek, L., Bird, N., and Watson, C. (2015). *Climate funds update – the Green Climate Fund*. Overseas Development Institute and Heinrich Böll Stiftung North America.
- Schalatek, L., Bird, N., and Watson, C. (2017). *Climate funds update – the Green Climate Fund. Climate finance fundamentals*. Overseas Development Institute and Heinrich Böll Stiftung North America.
- Soentoro, T., Rochaeni, N., Coltman, C., and Robben, D. (2016). *The Green Climate Fund: a CSO guide for engagement and local access – with a specific focus on the Indonesian context*. Aksi! for gender, social and ecological justice, The Samdhana Institute, and Both ENDS.
- United Nations Development Programme. (2011). *Direct access to climate finance: experiences and lessons learned* (Discussion Paper).
- United Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) (2018). *Summary and recommendations by the Standing Committee on Finance on the 2018 Biennial Assessment and Overview of Climate Finance Flows*. Bonn, Germany: Author.
- United Nations, United Nations, & Canada. (1992). *United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change*. New York: United Nations, General Assembly.
- Watson-Grant, S., Xiong, K., and Thomas, J.C. (2016). *Country ownership in international development – toward a working definition* (Working Paper). USAID and MEASURE Evaluation.
- Wood, B., Betts, J., Etta, F., Gayfer, J., Kabell, D., Ngwira, N., Sagasti, F., and Samaranayake, M. (2011). *The evaluation of the Paris Declaration* (Final Report). Copenhagen, Denmark.



Zou, S.Y, and Ockenden, S. (2016). *What enables effective international climate finance in the context of development co-operation?* (OECD Development Co-operation Working Paper 28).

## APPENDIX I: EVALUATION MATRIX

AREAS AND CATEGORIES	SUBQUESTIONS	METHODS	SOURCE/ TYPE OF DATA
Country ownership in the GCF strategic and policy environment			
<i>Evaluation criteria: relevance, coherence, gender equity, paradigm shift, recipient needs, impact potential, sustainable development</i>			
GCF policy environment and coherence	How does the GCF policy environment define and operationalize country ownership? How coherent is the operationalization of country ownership with the rest of the GCF, in terms of its priorities and objectives (including paradigm shift and the climate rationale)?	Desk review KIIs with Secretariat, NDAs, Board members and observers Analysis of Secretariat view on country ownership	Relevant Board documents, decisions, CSO and Government Organisations (GO) comments
	Are GCF policies sufficient and appropriate to deal with country ownership?	Desk review KIIs with Secretariat, NDAs, Board members and observers Policy gap analysis	Relevant Board documents, decisions, CSO and GO comments
GCF and country policy alignment	To what extent are GCF policies aligned with country-level policies (NDCs, NAMAs, NAPAs, NAP, SDGs, CPs, etc.), as well as major GCF objectives and concerns, including the GCF investment criteria?	Desk review KIIs with NDAs, Secretariat and other country-level stakeholders (gov't agencies, CSOs) Country case studies	GCF policies National climate strategies/plans of priority regions (SIDS, African States, LDC)

AREAS AND CATEGORIES	SUBQUESTIONS	METHODS	SOURCE/ TYPE OF DATA
	To what extent are country policies and priorities given primacy? Is this optimal? How well are country priorities aligned with GCF objectives?	Desk review KIIs with NDAs, Secretariat and other country-level stakeholders (gov't agencies, CSOs) Country case studies	GCF policies National climate strategies/plans of priority regions (SIDS, African States, LDC) CSO and GO comments
Clarity of roles and responsibilities	Are roles and responsibilities clear and appropriately defined (Secretariat, AEs, NDAs, Executing Entities/Development partners, other country stakeholders, such as CSOs)?	Desk review / Responsible, Accountable, Consulted, and Informed (RACI) matrix KIIs with NDAs, Secretariat, AEs, Executing entities/DPs, and other country-level stakeholders (gov't agencies, CSOs) Country case studies	Relevant Board documents and decisions Secretariat administrative instructions
Learning from other climate finance institutions	What are we learning from the experience of other climate finance organizations in terms of country ownership?	Desk review of various definitions of country ownership across institutions, including GCF IAEs Benchmarking/meta-analysis	Relevant document from global climate finance – GEF, AF, CIF, MLF, Global Fund, IAEs

AREAS AND CATEGORIES	SUBQUESTIONS	METHODS	SOURCE/ TYPE OF DATA
Country capacities and readiness <i>Evaluation criteria: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, gender equity, paradigm shift, recipient needs, impact potential, sustainable development</i>			
Recipient country understanding and operationalization of country ownership in policies and programming (CPs, NAPs, etc.)	How do recipient countries understand and conceptualize country ownership in climate change? How is country ownership supported through country policy commitment, climate change structures, processes, and stakeholder participation?	Desk review KIIs with NDAs, AEs and other country-level stakeholders (gov't agencies, CSOs), other international and national stakeholders, in-country academia Country case studies	National climate strategies/plans National climate change leadership and coordination structures
	To what extent does country programming strengthen country ownership? To what extent do CPs support the achievement of other GCF objectives, such as paradigm shift? Under what circumstances are such efforts effective and efficient? How has the RPSP contributed?	Desk review of submitted country programming documents; comparison of submitted projects to CPs Country case studies KIIs with NDAs, AEs other country-level stakeholders (gov't agencies, CSOs), Secretariat	Country programming documents (requested/approved/dispensed, time-lag data, country classification, region) RPSP data set
	To what extent have NAPs contributed to strengthening country ownership (e.g. through informing priority country-driven actions for GCF funding)? How has the RPSP contributed?	NAP portfolio analysis Time-lag analysis Desk review of NAP guidelines, Board meetings decisions KIIs with NDAs, AEs and other country-level stakeholders (gov't agencies, CSOs), Secretariat Country case studies	NAP proposals (requested/approved/dispensed, time-lag data, country classification, region) Available country plans/strategies for selected countries (NAMA/NAPA/NDC, policies) NAP guidelines, relevant documents
Establishing and strengthening capacities for CO	To what extent are NDAs established and functional? And how has the RPSP contributed to strengthening them?	Desk review/synthesis of RPSP evaluation report on NDAs KIIs with NDAs, AEs, Secretariat, Country case studies	RPSP data set

AREAS AND CATEGORIES	SUBQUESTIONS	METHODS	SOURCE/ TYPE OF DATA
	To what extent is an NoP established and functional and enhances country ownership?	Desk review/synthesis of RPSP evaluation report on NoPs KIIs with NDAs, AEs, other country-level stakeholders (gov't agencies, CSOs), Secretariat Country case studies	RPSP data set
	To what extent are multi-stakeholder coordination and consultation mechanisms established and effective? How has the RPSP contributed to strengthening them? How are different stakeholders represented in coordination mechanisms and are their roles clearly defined? Is there sufficient opportunity for multi-stakeholder participation and influence in programming in general?	Desk review/synthesis of RPSP evaluation report on coordination mechanisms KIIs with NDAs, AEs, other country-level stakeholders (gov't agencies, CSOs), Secretariat Country case studies	RPSP data set
	To what extent are country-level capacities leveraged at different levels with country/ regional engagement?	Desk review (synthesis of RPSP) KIIs with NDAs/FPs, DPs Country case studies	RPSP data sets KII: information on hired consultants for RPSP/FP/capacity-building (international/national)

AREAS AND CATEGORIES	SUBQUESTIONS	METHODS	SOURCE/ TYPE OF DATA
	To what extent are GCF capacity-building and engagement initiatives in the form of conferences, workshop, structural dialogue and online materials appropriate and sufficient to enhance the GCF country-driven approach?	Surveys during SDs/events KIIs with SD/event participants, NDAs/FPs, Secretariat, Regional Advisors (RAs) IEU data gathering Town Hall meeting at SDs/events Desk review of SD/event reports Desk review/synthesis of RPSP evaluation report Country case studies	SD/event reports SD coverage data (none) participant countries/regions) List of past events from Secretariat RPSP data sets KII key variables: Country baseline information (capacity level before GCF); type of engagement; alignment with needs, etc.
Country systems	To what extent are country-level systems used and supported by the GCF?	Desk review KIIs with NDAs, AEs, Secretariat, Executing Entities Country case studies	Funded Activity Agreement (FAA)
Country ownership through accreditation and direct access <i>Evaluation criteria: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, coherence, paradigm shift, recipient needs, impact potential, sustainable development</i>			
Accreditation process	How does the accreditation process affect the country drivenness of the GCF? Do accreditation processes meet recipients' needs? To what extent do international AEs support the concept of country ownership (CO)? How do they compare to direct access?	Desk review KIIs with NDAs, AEs, and Secretariat Country case studies	Meta-level question: all sources and findings from the evaluation to be used for triangulation

AREAS AND CATEGORIES	SUBQUESTIONS	METHODS	SOURCE/ TYPE OF DATA
	What is the balance of composition in terms of types of entities (national, regional, international), sector (private and public) and portfolio focus (mitigation and adaptation)? What explains the balance of composition?	Desk review Process and time-lag analysis KIIs with NDAs, AEs, Secretariat (DCP, OGC) etc. Time-lag analysis Country case studies	Relevant Board documents, decisions, CSO comments for accreditation Accreditation data (country, region, category) Review of Accreditation Framework GCF/B.21/08 Performance review of the Accreditation Panel (GCF/BM-2017/03, GCF/BM-2018/02)
	How long does the accreditation process take from application to accreditation? Does the time vary by types of accreditation (e.g. DAE/International, private/public) and region?		
Access and EDA	Is Direct Access responsive to the needs and priorities of developing countries? Do IAEs contribute to capacity-building for direct access, for instance in private sector activities?	Desk review KIIs with DAEs at different stages of the accreditation process KIIs with accreditation stakeholders, Accreditation Panel, DCP KIIs with NDAs Process analysis Country case studies Survey	Relevant Board documents, decisions, CSO comments for Direct Access
	What are the DAEs' capacities and bottlenecks for developing FPs?	KIIs with Secretariat, DAEs, NDAs, RAs, other country-level stakeholders (gov't agencies, CSOs) Time-lag analysis Entity case studies Survey	Pipeline time-lag data (SAP phase timestamps)



AREAS AND CATEGORIES	SUBQUESTIONS	METHODS	SOURCE/ TYPE OF DATA
	Do DAEs meet the needs and priorities of developing countries? Does this vary for public versus private DAEs?	Portfolio analysis Time-lag analysis Desk analysis of CP priorities mapped against DAE key competencies/business areas Country case studies KIIs with DAEs, NDAs, RAs Survey	IEU data set (entity, accreditation time-lag analysis data) Submitted CNs, submitted FPs (pipeline), approved FPs + time stamps
	To what extent has EDA been successful at promoting country ownership?	Portfolio analysis Time-lag analysis Country case studies KIIs with DAEs	EDA concept notes EDA FPs APRs
Country ownership in the project cycle <i>Evaluation criteria: effectiveness, efficiency, paradigm shift, recipient needs, impact potential, sustainable development, gender equity</i>			
Country stakeholder engagement in project origination	What factors drive country-AE matching for FPs, i.e. origination? Is it in line with a country-driven approach (selection of AE/DPs etc.)? How does this relate to other GCF objectives, such as paradigm shift?	KIIs with NDAs, AEs, Regional Advisors, Secretariat, CSOs Desk analysis of CP priorities mapped against DAE key competencies/business areas Country case studies	IEU data set (country, entity, NDA) Concept note (entity/non)
	To what extent are countries co-financing projects?	Portfolio analysis	FP (Section B.2 Project financing information; type of institutions co-financing)
	To what extent are various country stakeholders involved in project origination?	KIIs with NDAs, AEs, country-level stakeholders (gov't agencies, CSOs), Regional Advisors, Secretariat, CSOs, PSOs Desk review to identify the roles and responsibilities of NDAs, AEs, Secretariat, other country stakeholders	Relevant Board documents, decisions, CSO comments

AREAS AND CATEGORIES	SUBQUESTIONS	METHODS	SOURCE/ TYPE OF DATA
FP preparation and approval (including PPFs, NoP, and SAP)	To what extent does PPF respond to and meet country needs and build country capacities?	PPF portfolio analysis Time-lag analysis Desk review of PPF guidelines, BM decisions KIIs with NDAs, Secretariat, DAEs Country case studies	PPF proposals (requested/approved/disbursed, time-lag data, country classification, region) PPF guidelines and corresponding Board Decisions
	To what extent are the funded projects coherent with national climate strategies, policies and plans (including post-implementation sustainability prospects)? How well do FPs address the GCF investment criteria on CO and facilitate CO? How do major IAEs understand CO in their operations?	Country case studies Desk review of the sampled countries' national plans and strategies Desk review of IAEs country ownership definitions and approach; KIIs with IAEs Portfolio analysis KIIs with NDAs, RAs, implementing partners (public), iTAP KIIs with country-level stakeholders (gov't agencies, CSOs)	FP data sets (requested/approved/disbursed, time-lag data, country classification, region, Section D “rationale for GCF involvement”, Section E.4 “recipient needs”, E.5 “country ownership”) Available country plans/strategies for selected countries
NoP	How effective and efficient is the NoP in determining whether the proposed project/concept notes are in line with country needs and priorities?	Desk review of relevant GCF documents KIIs with NDAs, Secretariat	Relevant Board documents, decisions, CSO comments on NoP
SAP	To what extent has the GCF succeeded at providing simplified access to funding through a country-driven approach?	Desk review of relevant GCF documents and Board decisions SAP portfolio analysis KIIs with Secretariat, SAP countries	SAP pipeline concept notes (iPMS variables) SAP funding proposals (requested/ approved/ disbursed amount, time-lag analysis data, country classification, region) SAP FAA, if available (conditions) Relevant Board meeting discussion documents, decisions, CSO comments from Board meeting reports

AREAS AND CATEGORIES	SUBQUESTIONS	METHODS	SOURCE/ TYPE OF DATA
Efficiency of the approval process	How long does it take to process funded project proposals for approval by the Secretariat and iTAP? Does the time vary by DAEs and non-DAE as well as by regions?	Portfolio analysis Time-lag analysis Desk (content/pattern) analysis of Secretariat and iTAP comments on FPs Country case studies KIIs with AEs, NDAs, RAs, iTAP	IEU data set (entity, accreditation time-lag analysis data) Submitted CNs, submitted FPs (pipeline), approved FPs + time stamps
Country ownership in project implementation	To what extent are CO principles and best practices upheld throughout the project cycle, such as in restructuring and extensions?	Desk review of GCF policies on restructuring/cancellation KIIs with NDAs, AEs, country-level stakeholders (gov't agencies, CSOs), Regional Advisors, Secretariat, CSOs, PSOs	
MR&E	To what extent does the GCF leverage and strengthen country MR&E capacities?	Desk review/synthesis of RMF evaluation Country case studies KIIs with implementing entities, DPs, OPM, NDAs, AEs Desk review of available GCF APRs	FPs Section H.2 Arrangement for MR&E Accreditation Master Agreements (AMAs') monitoring responsibilities FAA conditions (if any) on monitoring
	How well are GCF RMF and MR&E requirements aligned with country priorities, needs, and systems?	Desk review/synthesis of RMF evaluation Desk review of relevant GCF documents, APRs KIIs with OPM, NDAs, AEs, implementing partners, delivery partners	Relevant Board documents, decisions, CSO comments on reporting APRs AMAs monitoring clauses
	To what extent are the roles and responsibilities of NDAs defined in the MR&E processes?	Desk review/synthesis of RMF evaluation Desk review / RACI matrix KIIs with NDAs, AEs, Implementing Entities (IEs), OPM Country case studies	Relevant Board documents, decisions, CSO comments

## APPENDIX II: DRAFT ANALYTICAL FRAMEWORK

The table below presents an initial development of the analytical framework, with indicators, measurement protocols, and data sources intended to enable the framework to be applied as a type of scoring system tool during country case study visits. More work will be required during the protocol development stage to rationalize the number of indicators being measured, develop the instrumentation (e.g. in-country survey), and design an approach that can generate a meaningful composite score across dimensions and pillars, given the diversity of measurement techniques and the potential need for weighting.

It is critical to note that many, if not all, of the considerations raised in the pillars, dimensions, and indicators will also be explored through additional qualitative methods, including KIIs and desk analysis, and are key issues in the evaluation matrix. The approaches shown below are for the purposes of applying a scoring system approach.

PILLARS OF COUNTRY OWNERSHIP	DIMENSIONS	INDICATORS	MEASUREMENT	DATA SOURCES
<b>Leadership and consultation:</b> Country governments lead strategic programming and prioritization processes, ensuring policy alignment, and in broad consultation, through a multi-stakeholder participatory process.	Recipient country leadership in strategic programming and prioritization	• National climate change strategies and plans (NDCs, NAPs, NAMAs) are officially adopted.	• Binary	• Portfolio data
		• A GCF country programme or equivalent national programme is officially adopted.	• Binary	• Portfolio data
		• The government has effective policies and processes in place to guide prioritization in GCF programming.	• 5-point Likert scale (Strongly Agree; Agree; Neither Agree Nor Disagree; Disagree; Strongly Disagree)	• In-country survey administered during KIIs
		• The government's interministerial coordination mechanism is effective for GCF decision-making.	• 5-point Likert scale (Strongly Agree; Agree; Neither Agree Nor Disagree; Disagree; Strongly Disagree)	• In-country survey administered during KIIs
		• The government's multi-stakeholder consultation mechanism is effective for GCF decision-making.	• 5-point Likert scale (Strongly Agree; Agree; Neither Agree Nor Disagree; Disagree; Strongly Disagree)	• In-country survey administered during KIIs

PILLARS OF COUNTRY OWNERSHIP	DIMENSIONS	INDICATORS	MEASUREMENT	DATA SOURCES
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The GCF country programme provides clear strategic guidance for pipeline development.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5-point Likert scale (Strongly Agree; Agree; Neither Agree Nor Disagree; Disagree; Strongly Disagree)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In-country survey administered during KIIs</li> </ul>
	Alignment of GCF objectives, priorities, and support with national strategies and priorities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>GCF country programming strongly supports a paradigm shift.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5-point Likert scale (Strongly Agree; Agree; Neither Agree Nor Disagree; Disagree; Strongly Disagree)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In-country survey administered during KIIs</li> </ul>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>GCF country programming enables private sector participation.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5-point Likert scale (Strongly Agree; Agree; Neither Agree Nor Disagree; Disagree; Strongly Disagree)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In-country survey administered during KIIs</li> </ul>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>GCF-funded activities align with national climate change strategies and priorities.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5-point Likert scale (Strongly Agree; Agree; Neither Agree Nor Disagree; Disagree; Strongly Disagree)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In-country survey administered during KIIs</li> </ul>
	Multi-stakeholder engagement including civil society and private sector	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Stakeholders are engaged in the GCF country programming process.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RPSP evaluation CO scorecard (stakeholder)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Desk analysis</li> </ul>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Stakeholders are engaged in the direct access entity nomination process.</li> </ul>		
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Stakeholders are engaged in the project cycle, including processes for the NoL and project design.</li> </ul>		

PILLARS OF COUNTRY OWNERSHIP	DIMENSIONS	INDICATORS	MEASUREMENT	DATA SOURCES
<b>Institutional capacity and commitment:</b> Country stakeholders commit to funded activities that address GCF objectives and priorities, and have the capacity to do so.	Capacity to plan, manage and implement climate activities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Operational and institutional frameworks are in place to plan and manage activities.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Subset of RPSP evaluation CO scorecard (NDA, NoP, DAE, FP through DAE)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Portfolio data</li> </ul>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The NDA/FP has the institutional capacity and skills to do the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Take informed decisions on no-objection letters for funding proposals.</li> <li>Take informed decisions on entity nominations for direct access accreditation.</li> <li>Facilitate multi-stakeholder engagement in making no-objection decisions and nominating direct access entities.</li> <li>Support the formulation of the country's project pipeline.</li> <li>Interact with private sector actors to support the development of the project pipeline.</li> <li>Monitor and report on GCF-funded activities, including through annual participatory reviews.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Binary (location of the NDA in a central or line ministry)</li> <li>5-point Likert scale (Strongly Agree; Agree; Neither Agree Nor Disagree; Disagree; Strongly Disagree)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Portfolio data</li> <li>In-country survey administered during KIIs</li> </ul>

PILLARS OF COUNTRY OWNERSHIP	DIMENSIONS	INDICATORS	MEASUREMENT	DATA SOURCES
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The NDA/FP has the power, within the government, to provide leadership on GCF issues and processes.</li> </ul>		
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>DAEs have the capacity to develop projects that align with national and GCF objectives.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5-point Likert scale (Strongly Agree; Agree; Neither Agree Nor Disagree; Disagree; Strongly Disagree)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In-country survey administered during KIIs</li> </ul>
	Institutional commitment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Government co-financing is provided for public sector projects.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Continuous</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Portfolio data</li> </ul>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Readiness activities are locally executed.</li> <li>FPs are recipient executed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Binary</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Portfolio data</li> </ul>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>GCF activities use country financial and procurement systems.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Binary</li> </ul>	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>GCF activities use national monitoring and reporting systems.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Binary</li> </ul>	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>GCF activities use local consultants and DPs, when feasible and appropriate.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5-point Likert scale (Strongly Agree; Agree; Neither Agree Nor Disagree; Disagree; Strongly Disagree)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In-country survey administered during KIIs</li> </ul>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Measures and standards for performance and accountability in country systems are defined.</li> </ul>	<i>Not proposed to be measured.</i>	



PILLARS OF COUNTRY OWNERSHIP	DIMENSIONS	INDICATORS	MEASUREMENT	DATA SOURCES
<b>Globally shared responsibilities:</b> The GCF, AEs and recipient countries adopt best practices in planning, delivery, and reporting, and are accountable to each other for these practices.	Predictability and transparency of funding allocation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>GCF funding allocations are predictable.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5-point Likert scale (Strongly Agree; Agree; Neither Agree Nor Disagree; Disagree; Strongly Disagree)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In-country survey administered during KIIs</li> </ul>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The GCF project selection process is transparent.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5-point Likert scale (Strongly Agree; Agree; Neither Agree Nor Disagree; Disagree; Strongly Disagree)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In-country survey administered during KIIs</li> </ul>
	Timeliness of commitment and disbursement of funding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>GCF funding is committed in a timely manner.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Continuous</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Time-lag analysis</li> </ul>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>GCF funding is disbursed in a timely manner.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Continuous</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Time-lag analysis</li> </ul>
	International access entity shared responsibilities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>International access entities develop projects that are fully country-owned.</li> <li>International access entities contribute to capacity-building for national direct access.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5-point Likert scale (Strongly Agree; Agree; Neither Agree Nor Disagree; Disagree; Strongly Disagree)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In-country survey administered during KIIs</li> </ul>
	Sharing of results and experiences with national and international stakeholders	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Stakeholders are engaged in processes for MR&amp;E of GCF activities.</li> <li>Accounting systems are in place to monitor and report results and impact according to the GCF RMF.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RPSP evaluation CO scorecard (stakeholder)</li> <li>Binary</li> </ul>	

## APPENDIX III: DRAFT OUTLINE FOR THE EVALUATION REPORT

The draft report will start with introduction chapters, followed by four core findings chapters aligned with the four evaluation matrix sections, and substantial conclusions and recommendations chapter.

### Part I – Introduction and background

1. Introduction
2. Background on country ownership
  - A. GCF mandate and context
  - B. History of country ownership in development cooperation and climate finance
3. Methods
  - A. Process followed
  - B. Evaluation questions
  - C. Methodological approach

### Part II – Findings

4. Country ownership in the strategic and policy environment
  - A. GCF policies
  - B. GCF and country policy alignment
  - C. Roles and responsibilities
  - D. Benchmarking with other climate finance organizations
5. Country capacities and readiness
  - A. Recipient country understanding and operationalization of climate change
  - B. GCF capacity-building
  - C. Country systems
6. Country ownership through accreditation and direct access
  - A. Accreditation process
  - B. Direct access
7. Country ownership in the project cycle
  - A. Project origination
  - B. Funding Proposal preparation and approval
  - C. Country ownership in implementation
  - D. Monitoring, reporting, and evaluation

### Part III – Conclusions and recommendations

8. Conclusions
9. Recommendations

Independent Evaluation Unit  
Green Climate Fund  
175, Art center-daero, Yeonsu-gu,  
Incheon 22004, Republic of Korea  
Tel. (+82) 032-458-6428  
[ieu@gcfund.org](mailto:ieu@gcfund.org)  
<https://ieu.greenclimate.fund>



© Independent Evaluation Unit – the Green Climate Fund