



**GREEN
CLIMATE
FUND**

Meeting of the Board
28 June – 1 July 2021
Virtual meeting
Provisional agenda item 7

GCF/B.29/Inf.08

7 June 2021

Report on the activities of the Independent Evaluation Unit

Summary

This document provides a report of the Independent Evaluation Unit's (IEU) key activities for the period 1 January to 30 May 2021. It reports on the IEU's outputs and achievements in line with its Board-approved work plan for 2021.

I. Introduction

1. This document reports on the key activities and outcomes of the Independent Evaluation Unit (IEU) between 1 January and 30 May 2021. The objectives and key work plan activities of the IEU are presented in the Board-approved "Independent Evaluation Unit 2021 Work Plan and Budget and Update of its Three-year Objectives and Work Plan" (see document GCF/B.27/11). This activity report is organized as follows:

- (a) Section I: Introduction;
- (b) Section II: Overview;
- (c) Section III: Report on key activities;
- (d) Section IV: Budget and expenditure report;
- (e) Supporting annexes:
 - (i) Annex I: Management action report on the independent review of the GCF's results management framework;
 - (ii) Annex II: Learning-Oriented Real-Time Impact Assessment (LORTA);
 - (iii) Annex III: Initial set of guidelines for the effective functioning of the Independent Evaluation Unit; and
 - (iv) Annex IV: IEU communication materials.

II. Overview

2. At its twenty-seventh meeting, the Board by decision B.27/08 approved an overall budget allocation amount of USD 5,912,573 for the IEU for 2021.

3. More information about the IEU budget for 2021 is available in document GCF/B.27/11 section IV.

4. The IEU's key activities for the reporting period 1 January and 30 May 2021 were:

- (a) Evaluations;
- (b) Learning, advisory services and capacity strengthening;
- (c) Uptake, communications and partnerships; and
- (d) Building and strengthening the Independent Evaluation Unit.

III. Report on key activities

5. The IEU has commenced all of its planned activities for the period 1 January and 30 May 2021. While all key IEU activities have commenced, the IEU's persisting personnel shortage is likely to affect its delivery of some work items in varying degrees (see Section 3.4 for more details).

3.1 Evaluations

3.1.1 Evaluations undertaken in time for B.28

6. **The independent evaluation of the GCF's Country Ownership Approach:** The [evaluation](#) found that GCF lacks a consistent, Fund-wise definition of country ownership;

further, GCF's policies for realizing country ownership have limited reach beyond central-governments. Another finding from the evaluation is that GCF's Country Programmes have been unable to identify high-impact areas and develop country-owned pipelines, largely due to GCF not articulating the role of Country Programmes for countries and for itself.

7. **The independent evaluation of the GCF's environmental and social safeguards (ESS) and environmental and social management system (ESMS):** The [evaluation](#) found that GCF's current interim ESS standards have gaps, especially with regards to the aspect of human rights and gender considerations. Further, the evaluation says the GCF's current ESMS does not focus on how to achieve social and environmental outcomes in the design, approval and monitoring stages of funded activities.

8. **The independent assessment of the GCF's Simplified Approval Process (SAP) Pilot Scheme:** Among the [assessment's](#) many findings was the discovery that GCF's SAP project approval time is barely a month quicker than the GCF's regular approval processes (365 days versus 399 days). Another noteworthy finding from the assessment is that SAP projects have not reduced the burden for accredited entities and that they have not been conceived to meet countries' urgent needs.

9. **The independent synthesis of the Green Climate Fund's accreditation function:** Included in the [study](#) findings were a lack of interaction between the accreditation panel and the Board, lengthy delays in accreditation, and a bias in the GCF portfolio towards international entities. Further, the synthesis report notes that the GCF's lack of a strategy for its accreditation function has led to a mission overload for accreditation and the unrealistic expectation for accreditation to achieve a very diverse set of aims.

10. **The independent evaluation of the relevance and effectiveness of the Green Climate Fund's portfolio in the Small Island Developing States (SIDS):** The [evaluation](#) found that GCF modalities and processes are not meeting the urgent, unique climate challenges the SIDS face. The GCF's current business model based on accreditation, SAP and RPSP and the SIDS' limited human and technical capacity to develop concept notes impede the SIDS access to the GCF. The [evaluation](#) also concluded that the GCF's private sector approach is unsuited to the SIDS' local businesses and that, while many GCF policies can suit SIDS, they require a Board approval.

11. **The independent evaluation of the adaptation portfolio and approach of the GCF:** [The evaluation](#) found that the GCF, currently a small player in the broader climate finance landscape, can be more relevant in adaptation. There is also an opportunity for the GCF to channel more adaptation financing through regional DAEs and to diversify its adaptation instruments, such as equity, results-based payments and first-loss guarantees. The evaluation also concludes that the role of national designated authorities (NDAs) is crucial in successful adaptation project development, as they can facilitate multi-stakeholder engagement that adaptation projects require. Replication of innovation is not pursued, and the GCF lacks programmatic approaches for adaptation.

3.1.2. Ongoing evaluations

12. **Rapid assessment of the Green Climate Fund's request for proposals modality.** The GCF's request for proposals (RfP) modality is central to mobilizing support from the private sector. Of the USD 1.3 billion in the GCF pipeline earmarked for RfPs (B.24/Inf.05), USD 265 million had been allocated as of 31 August 2019. This assessment aims to examine the relevance of the modality to the GCF's mandate, study its effectiveness, and inspect the modality's implementation process. It has examined the RfP since its inception through to March 2021 to draw lessons from their implementation and find recommendations for the modality's improvement. The IEU will deliver the evaluation to the Board in June 2021. As the rapid

assessment progresses further, its assessment report, summaries and briefs will be made available in due course on the [RfPs evaluation page](#)¹ of the IEU microsite.

13. **Independent Evaluation of the GCF's Approach to the Private Sector.** Global climate finance flows are insufficient for action required under the Paris Agreement. While public finance is pivotal in creating climate action, the private sector is also needed to combat the climate change risks in developing countries. However, the GCF continues to face challenges engaging the private sector, particularly in adaptation. The evaluation aims to assess the relevance and effectiveness of the GCF's approach to the private sector. The IEU will submit the evaluation to the Board at the final Board meeting in 2021. As the evaluation progresses, its evaluation briefs and summaries will be made available in due course on the [private sector evaluation page](#)² of the IEU microsite.

14. **Independent evaluation of the effectiveness of the GCF's investments in the least developed countries.** The world's least developed countries (LDCs) emit minor amounts of global greenhouse gases but experience disproportionate climate change impacts. The GCF's Governing Instrument recognizes the urgent needs of vulnerable countries, such as the LDCs. It requests the Board to consider minimum funding levels, finance technology development and transfer and capacity building. This evaluation is examining whether the GCF's approach and investments in the LDCs are effective and sustainable in reducing their vulnerability to climate change impacts. The IEU will present the evaluation to the Board at the first Board meeting of 2022. As this evaluation progresses, its evaluation briefs, summaries, and other supporting materials will be made available on the [LDCs evaluation page](#)³ of the IEU microsite.

15. **Second Performance Review of the Green Climate Fund.** Subject to budget approval, a key IEU evaluation commencing in 2021 is the Second Performance Review of the Green Climate Fund ([SPR](#)). The Updated Strategic Plan of the GCF 2020-2023 states that the SPR will cover the GCF-1 programming period, and will analyse how effectively GCF programming and operations have evolved since the Fund's initial resource mobilization in delivering the 2020-2023 Strategic Plan's vision, objectives and priorities. The IEU, in consultation with the Budget Committee, prepared a multi-year budget and schedule. This budget and schedule was endorsed by the Budget Committee in time for publication for B.28, and are currently under consideration by the Board. (Further information about the SPR is available in the [Independent Evaluation Unit 2021 Work Plan and Budget and Update of its Three year Objectives and Work Plan.](#))

3.2 Learning, advisory services and capacity strengthening.

3.2.1 Learning papers and evidence reviews

16. The Evaluation Policy for the GCF provides that the IEU will disseminate lessons learned to promote learning and dialogue. Learning papers, working papers and evidence reviews are important tools in fulfilling this role. The IEU produced the materials listed below either alone or in collaboration with IEU partners.

17. **Learning paper: Assessing the likelihood for transformational change at the Green Climate Fund.** [This paper](#) reviews the project documents of GCF investments through March 2020. It uses bivariate statistics and multivariate cluster analysis to examine whether mitigation, cross-cutting or adaptation thematic areas show the greatest likelihood of contributing to transformational change. The paper shows that adaptation projects are most likely to be transformational. However, even this likelihood is modest as projects do not display

¹ <https://ieu.greenclimate.fund/evaluation/RfP2021>

² <https://ieu.greenclimate.fund/evaluation/Priv2021>

³ <https://ieu.greenclimate.fund/evaluation/LDC2022>

all eight components under consideration. During the reporting period, this paper was finalized and published.

18. **Learning paper: Behavioural science, decision making and climate investments.** [This paper](#) builds a bridge between how climate interventions are conceived and implemented and the nascent field of behavioural science as a practical, low-cost but potentially rewarding route for increasing the effectiveness of climate interventions. The paper shows that simple guidance tools to conduct early, formative investigations into the dispositional, social and cognitive factors that underpin decision-making may be used to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of climate interventions. During the reporting period, this paper was finalized and published.

19. **Evidence review: Climate change mitigation interventions in the private sector in developing countries.** Based on the approach paper from November 2020, this evidence review examines the evidence base on private sector investments in mitigation. It shows that there is very little rigorous, causal evidence on private investments in mitigation. It shows that a large share of the available evidence is in the energy and industrial sectors, and within them, on the effectiveness of fossil fuel substitution and energy efficiency measures. The main gaps include evidence on building and urban planning, re/afforestation and anti-desertification measures. A final draft evidence gap map on this topic is currently under internal review.

20. **Evidence review: Transformational change.** The IEU has worked jointly with the [Climate Investment Funds](#) and the [Center for Evaluation and Development](#) on a review of evidence on [transformational change](#), integrating two evidence gap maps in sectors showing demonstrable progress in transformational change. The [Public Health Sector Evidence and Gap Map](#), which includes 24 Systematic Reviews and 113 Impact Evaluations. The [Energy Sector Evidence and Gap Map](#), which includes 4 Systematic Reviews and 69 Impact Evaluations. A final draft evidence gap map on this topic is currently under internal review.

Table 1: Summary of progress made in IEU evidence reviews

Evidence review	Status
Private sector investments in mitigation	Final draft gap map under internal review
Transformational change	Final draft gap map under internal review
Gendered interventions	Under procurement
Behavioral change interventions	Under procurement

3.2.2. Webinars

21. The Evaluation Policy and the Terms of Reference (TOR) of the IEU provide that the IEU will disseminate lessons learned. Webinars are an excellent tool for dissemination, and to increase the level of awareness of the IEU's work and its relevance to the GCF, encourage the exchange of ideas, and foster learning and empathy between stakeholders regarding their varying needs. During the six-month reporting period, the IEU presented several webinars to accommodate different time zones on each of four evaluations.

- (a) **Independent evaluation of the adaptation portfolio and approach of the Green Climate Fund** – webinars on the evaluation's findings and recommendations. [A video of the webinar is available online.](#)
- (b) **Rapid assessment of the GCF's request for proposals modality** – webinars covering the assessments' emerging findings.

- (c) **Independent Evaluation of the GCF's Approach to the Private Sector** – webinars outlining the evaluation's approach paper. [A video of the webinar is available online.](#)
- (d) **Independent evaluation of the effectiveness of the GCF's investments in the least developed countries** – webinars on the evaluation's approach paper. [A video of the webinar is available online.](#)

3.2.3. DataLab and BaD Lab evaluation and learning activities

22. **IEU DataLab:** The IEU's TOR provide that it will use internally generated data streams and analytical outputs, and apply the best evaluation norms and standards. The IEU DataLab provides high-quality data to support the IEU in its rigorous, evidence-based evaluations. It develops and maintains databases by extracting and updating quantitative and qualitative information from the GCF and external sources. A key DataLab activity for the reporting period has been its work on the IEU's adaptation evaluation. The DataLab has provided the evaluation with evidence built on exploring and triangulating data points drawn from over 20 datasets. Geospatial perspective in this evaluation explored the Readiness and Preparatory Support Program with respect to coverage and targeting of the GCF resources toward locations that experience high climate-related disaster losses. The DataLab, together with the IEU's communications and uptake workstream, are developing standalone materials such as maps and factsheets to further enhance stakeholder understanding of the IEU's evaluative work. The DataLab is undertaking quality assurance of the IEU's RfP evaluation data and making rapid progress with the exploratory stage of the IEU's private sector and least developed countries evaluations. Due to a substantial reduction in team size in the reporting period, a number of core data-related activities were put on hold. Data analysis guidelines, standardization, and capacity building are paused for optimizing resource allocation and to ensure that DataLab continues to provide timely input into IEU's evaluations first and foremost.

23. **IEU BaD Lab:** The IEU applies insights from behavioural science to the IEU's evaluations. During the reporting period, it provided a range of inputs for the IEU's adaptation evaluation, including assessing the GCF's institutional architecture and the incentive structure to support private sector adaptation projects. It also completed its second learning paper, [Behavioural science, decision making and climate investments](#). The BaD Lab initiated work on an online toolbox that will be used for the IEU's LORTA programme to strengthen project team understanding behavioural science insights into their project designs.

3.2.4. Learning-Oriented Real-Time Impact Assessment programme

24. **LORTA.** As provided in the Evaluation Policy for the GCF, the IEU manages the LORTA programme, which continues to support real-time impact evaluations of funded projects, so GCF can access accurate data on the programme's quality of implementation and likelihood of impact. Following the successful completion of LORTA's first Virtual Design Workshop last year, a third cohort of five projects entered the LORTA programme. The IEU introduced selected project teams to the programme through participatory inception workshops in Belize, Pakistan, Ecuador and the Philippines. The portfolio of projects has shown further progress. Project teams have finalized their baseline survey in Zambia and completed sampling, questionnaire design and logistical arrangements for baseline data collection in Guatemala, Uganda, Paraguay and Bangladesh. LORTA continues to implement the lessons learned during the programme's first three years of the programme; first, the importance of creating equal partnerships and mutual trust between accredited entities, projects teams and the IEU; secondly, the importance of flexibility; and thirdly, the importance of remaining committed to learning, uptake and use through partnerships.

25. **Capacity building.** Due to COVID-19 travel restrictions, IEU staff could not attend the usual range of key international events to give keynote addresses, participate in international

discussions or facilitate capacity building. To overcome this, the IEU actively utilized virtual tools such as Microsoft Teams and Zoom to engage with partners and stakeholders and participate in learning and capacity building activities. Several of these are noted in the preceding sections on “partnerships”, “attending seminars and discussions”, “hosting side-events” and “webinars”.

3.3 Uptake, communications and partnerships

26. The TOR of the IEU provide that the IEU will enter into relationship with partner organizations. Partnerships and collaboration are critical to ensuring the IEU delivers effective evaluations, contributes to its own and the GCF's learning, and builds the capacity of in-country agencies. Partners also provide the opportunity, depending on the stakeholders in question, to extend greater understanding, outreach and uptake of IEU recommendations and, critically, to better understand their perceptions of the IEU.

3.3.1. Partnerships

27. **Formal partnerships.** The IEU works with [a range of partners](#). It has MoUs and agreements with 20 accredited entities, national designated authorities, universities, research institutes, government ministries, civil society organizations, multilateral and bilateral agencies, and independent evaluation offices of accredited entities.

28. **Partners' meeting.** In April, the IEU hosted a virtual meeting with representatives from its partner organizations, including Seoul National University, Abdul Latif Jameel Poverty Action Lab, Development Bank of Southern Africa, Department of Environment of the Government of Antigua and Barbuda and International Centre for Integrated Mountain Development, among others. The goal of the meeting was for the IEU and its partners to share updates, develop networks and explore opportunities for collaboration. The meeting resulted in various ideas on how to leverage the network to address common challenges and create synergies. The IEU and partners will develop these ideas further throughout the year.

3.3.2. Hosting side-events and Board discussions

29. **Side-events for IEU's adaptation evaluation and evaluation policy.** As part of the IEU's pre-B.28 outreach, it convened online presentations of its adaptation evaluation and Evaluation Policy for the GCF. The adaptation event allowed various stakeholders to discuss the evaluation's outcomes, including the GCF's position in adaptation finance and the private sector's role, among other issues. [A video of the adaptation side-event is available online](#). The GCF evaluation policy side-event proved equally popular. Presenters and participants discussed the GCF's approach to and types of evaluations it conducts, among other topics. [A video of the evaluation policy side-event is available online](#). These side-events attracted more than 50 stakeholders from the GCF, accredited and executing entities, national designated authorities, civil society and private sector organizations and other climate finance actors.

30. **Co-Chairs convene IEU-Board discussion.** Prior to B.28, the Co-Chairs invited the IEU to present four of its most recent evaluations in a consultation session with the Board. The productive, two-hour session was moderated by Co-Chairs of the Board, Mr. Jean-Christophe Donnellier of France and his then Co-Chair, Ms. Brenda Ciuk of Mexico. Participants examined the key findings and recommendations of four IEU evaluations: the Independent synthesis of the Green Climate Fund's accreditation function, Independent assessment of the GCF's Simplified Approval Process (SAP) Pilot Scheme, Independent evaluation of the relevance and effectiveness of the GCF's investments in the small island developing States (SIDS) and Independent evaluation of the adaptation portfolio and approach of the GCF.

3.3.3. External events

31. **Global Green Growth Institute (GGGI) High-Level Business Round Table.** The IEU attended a round table, organized by [GGGI](#) in April on the theme of net-zero emissions. Opened by former Secretary-General of the United Nations and current President of the GGGI, Mr. Ban Ki-moon, the round table facilitated a discussion around the goal of net-zero greenhouse gas emissions by 2050 by the private sector. On this occasion, Mr. Reumann also discussed with Dr. Pranab Baruah, the Head of the Impact and Evaluation Unit of GGGI, possible future joint activities for evaluative and learning work.

32. **Twelfth meeting of the [UNECE's Task Force on Water and Climate](#).** The IEU presented on its learning at the [Twelfth meeting of the Task Force on Water and Climate](#) hosted in March by United Nations Economic Commission for Europe's [Working Group on Integrated Water Resources Management](#). Addressing the topic of "Adapting to climate change in transboundary basins," Mr. Reumann noted that the GCF's investments in adaptation, including water-related adaptation, are often hampered by the lack of local capacity to develop concept notes, along with the high cost to local entities of preparing climate data. He also noted the need for strong stakeholder engagement from the design stage of climate projects, to ensure local entities to bring a stronger country voice to climate response discussions.

33. **Gobeshona Global Conference.** Hosted by the Stockholm Environment Institute in January, the online [Gobeshona Global Conference](#) brought together researchers, practitioners and supporters of Locally – Led Adaptation Action (LLA) to discuss findings from interviews and a literature review on developing a fund for climate-related loss and damage. The IEU's representatives shared the lessons learned from the IEU's recent [evaluation of the relevance and effectiveness of the GCF's investments in the small island developing States \(SIDS\)](#).

34. **Discussion with the Pacific Regional Infrastructure Facility (PRIF).** PRIF is an infrastructure development facility that partners with major bi- and multilateral donors operating in the Pacific by identifying infrastructure projects and acting as a knowledge hub to promote infrastructure solutions. In March 2021, PRIF invited the IEU to present its [Independent Evaluation of the Relevance and Effectiveness of the Green Climate Fund's Investments in SIDS](#).

3.3.4. Other communication products

35. **2020 IEU Annual Report.** [This 50-page report](#) provides an overview of the IEU's 2020 evaluations, evidence reviews, budget and expenditure, advisory services, stakeholder engagement, partnerships, capacity building, communication and uptake, media activities, evidence reviews and other IEU publications. The IEU developed the report for consideration by Board at B.28.

36. **Overview of major communication and uptake products:** In addition to the communications outlined in other sections of this report, the IEU uses the media such as the IEU microsite, print and online publications, summary briefs, videos, podcasts and social media. The key aim of these outreach materials is to fulfil the unit's learning and advisory function by providing the GCF and a broad range of climate finance actors with information on what works best, for whom and why in responding to climate change. Appropriate outreach materials also play a key role in supporting the IEU's capacity building activities, such as IEU-led workshops, training courses and informational events at the Conference of the Parties, GCF Board Meetings and other fora.

37. **Communicating IEU's evaluative work and learnings in different languages.** Leading up to B.28, the IEU published all its evaluation summary briefs in Spanish. This is part of the IEU's efforts to strengthen its capacity by better serving the various language and communication needs of the GCF's global stakeholders. In addition to Spanish, the IEU, at the

time of writing this report, is finalizing the preparation of these evaluation summary briefs in two other languages – French and Arabic.

38. **IEU microsite analytics:** Up to 17 May 2021, the IEU microsite had close to 29,000 page views compared to just over the 6,000 noted in the B.27 Activity Report. Visitors to the site in the reporting period numbered 6,363, and nearly all of them were new users, from across the globe. Among the most frequented pages visited during the period were ‘Meet the Team’, ‘Evaluations’ (general), ‘Jobs’ and the SIDS evaluation page.

39. **Social media analytics:**

(a) **Twitter:** [The IEU’s Twitter account](#) has 1,140 followers and earned 90,000 impressions (the number of times a tweet appears to users in their timeline or search results).

(b) **LinkedIn:** [The IEU’s LinkedIn](#) followers have increased to more than 1,250.

(c) **YouTube:** [The IEU’s YouTube channel](#) is home to 146 videos that provide information about virtually all aspects of the IEU’s work. These videos are effective means of communicating the findings and lessons learned from the IEU’s evaluations, attracting more than 4,000 views from around the world. Subscribers to the channel number 192.

(d) **Anchor:** [The IEU’s podcasts hosted on Anchor](#) total 13 in number. Six were produced during the reporting period. The IEU podcast has attracted 1,258 listeners who tune in worldwide.

3.4 Building and strengthening the Independent Evaluation Unit.

40. **Evaluation Policy for the GCF.** As stated in its Terms of Reference, the IEU has developed the [Evaluation Policy for the GCF](#) and, together with the Secretariat, clarified and delineated the roles and responsibilities therein. The policy sets out the GCF’s evaluation approach, identifies the types of evaluations the GCF conducts and defines stakeholder roles in these evaluations. As a GCF-wide policy, it guides the Secretariat, the IUs, accredited entities and national designated authorities and focal points. The IEU and the Secretariat held a technical session with the Board in February, where they recorded Board comments and updated the policy for inclusion in the B.28 agenda. The Policy was adopted by the Board on 4 May 2021 as a between Board Meeting (BBM) decision B.BM-2021/07.

41. **Staffing:** In the Board approved 2021 IEU work plan and budget, the Board authorized the appointment of five new staff positions: three additional staff positions and two consultant-converted positions by the end of 2021. Additionally, the IEU needs to fill four existing positions that became vacant in late 2020. Furthermore, following the resignation of the IEU Head in November 2020 and subsequent delays in appointing a Head a.i. in her place, hiring processes for three staff that had commenced in mid-2020 were delayed and only finalized in February 2021, with the staff members joining the IEU in March-April 2021.

42. In accordance with the ToR of the IEU and the Head of IEU, the IEU adheres to the GCF Secretariat’s administrative processes and the OHR undertakes the IEU’s recruitment according to the HR administrative guidelines. This close collaboration is particularly important in resolving the kinds of staffing challenges the IEU currently faces. During the reporting period, the OHR has informed the IEU that, for several reasons, it is also currently understaffed and trying to manage a challenging workload. These reasons include: a) declining human resource capacities at the OHR, b) an increase in GCF Secretariat staffing needs to deliver the mandates of the updated strategic plan and c) the recruitment needs to cope with the retention challenges posed by COVID-19 that the entire GCF currently faces. The current situation made it challenging for the OHR to complete the recruitments planned for the IEU in 2021. This is because the recruitment process includes advertising, outreach, long-listing, online interviews, administrative support and reference checks, to name a few.

43. The IEU is currently devising mitigation actions to best navigate the shortage of personnel, while finding measures that ensure the IEU works optimally towards fulfilling most, if not all, objectives in its 2021 work plan. While the full extent of the effect of the IEU's staff shortage will fluctuate in response to results of the OHR's recruitment processes, the IEU anticipates that the following work items may be affected in varying degrees.

Table 2: IEU Activities

Activities	Main outputs for the relevant time period	Anticipated delays
I. BUILD THE IEU		
1. IEU staffing	IEU recruitment completed	Delayed
2. IEU activity reports	Engagement & final report	On track
3. Evaluation standards and guidelines	Guidelines and standards for approval	Delayed
II. UNDERTAKE AND DELIVER HIGH-QUALITY EVALUATIONS TO THE GCF BOARD		
4. Relevance and Effectiveness of GCF investment in LDCs	Engagement & final report	Partially delayed
5. Evaluation of Private Sector	Engagement & final report	Partially delayed
6. Evaluation of GCF's Request for Proposal (RfP) approach	Engagement & final report	On track
7. LORTA	Report from baseline data	On track
8. Second Performance Review of the GCF	Inception engagement	Delayed
III. EVALUATION-BASED ADVISORY SERVICES, LEARNING & CAPACITY STRENGTHENING		
9. LORTA related advice	Tracking systems	Delayed
10. Capacity Building Advisory services	Behaviour Science	Delayed
11. Database development	GIS data and IEU DataLab	Delayed
IV. COMMUNICATIONS, BUILDING STRATEGIC PARTNERSHIPS AND ENGAGEMENT		
12. Evaluation findings uptake	Engagement & joint work	Delayed
13. IEU partnerships	Engagement & joint work	Delayed
14. IEU Communications	Strategy for each evaluation prepared	Partially delayed
15. Evidence review papers	Gendered impact/ behavioural intervention	Delayed

44. **Training to prevent money laundering and counter-terrorism financing.** All IEU team members attended a GCF-organized training course on preventing money laundering and

countering terrorism financing. Safeguarding against such threats is an essential part of the global fight against criminal and terrorist threats.

45. **Training in managing conflict.** On its own initiative, the IEU participated in a training course to better understand workplace communication and deal with conflict in the workplace. The course also included participants from the other Independent Units as well as from the Secretariat's Division of Mitigation and Adaptation and Office of the Executive Director. Moderated by the GCF Ombudsperson, Mr. Kevin Brown, the 15-hour course over five days helped participants assess their own approach to conflict and the causes of conflict. With this information, the trainees then learned different strategies for avoiding and resolving conflict. The course provided participants with a better understanding of the psychology of conflict and a set of tools for dealing with office-related confrontations.

46. **Lab Reports for evaluation of the GCF's approach to the private sector.** Noting the need for communicating some early findings from this evaluation, the IEU is developing and sharing 'Lab Reports'. From April through to July 2021, the evaluation team will continue to produce these substantive briefs. Importantly, it should be noted that these briefs are for information only and do not constitute the findings or recommendations, which will be contained in the final evaluation report.

47. **Updating the IEU's Terms of Reference.** As stated above, in May 2021, the Board adopted the Evaluation Policy for the GCF and requested the IEU to present at B.29 an amendment including an updated TOR of the IEU. To this end, the IEU prepared for consideration by the Board, an updated TOR of the IEU constituting an amendment to the Evaluation Policy for the GCF. On 3 June 2021, the IEU organized a technical session for consultation on the updated TOR of the IEU.

48. **Guidelines for the effective functioning of the IEU.** The IEU developed and shared a draft of the Guidelines for the effective functioning of the IEU with the Co-chairs. The draft is provided as an annex to this Activities Report.

49. **IEU to support development of evaluation capacity.** The [Evaluation Policy for the GCF](#) provides that the IEU will support the development of evaluation capacities, particularly of direct access entities. It also requires the IEU is to develop evaluation standards for the GCF, in consultation with the Secretariat. Delays are expected in this work in relation to the IEU's staffing challenges and capacity constraints (described above).

IV. Budget and expenditure report

50. Table 3 shows the IEU's 2021 budget and expenditure report as of 30 April 2021 in USD.

Table 3: IEU Budget and Expenditure report

Budget Category	2021 Board approved budget	Actuals	Commitments	Sub-total	%	Remaining Budget
Staff, Consultants, Interns						
Full-time Staff	3 015 569	538 339		538 339	18%	2 477 230
Consultants/Interns	582 200	113 085	356 019	469 103	81%	113 097
Sub-total	3 597 769	651 424	356 019	1 007 442	28%	2 590 327



Travel						
General	218 915	570	-	570	0%	218 345
Sub-total	218 915	570	-	570	0%	218 345
Contractual services						
Professional services	1 678 000	25 244	725 645	750 889	45%	927 111
Other operating costs	47 000	4 760	-	4 760	10%	42 240
Sub-total	1 725 000	30 004	725 645	755 649	44%	969 351
TOTAL	5 541 684	681 997	1 081 664	1 763 661	32%	3 778 023
Shared cost allocation	370 889	123 630	-	123 630	33%	247 259
Grand Total	5 912 573	805 627	1 081 664	1 887 291	32%	4 025 282

Annex I: Management action report on the independent review of the GCF's results management framework

1. Following the evaluation policy, the Board “*receives management action reports prepared by the IEU.*”¹ Management action reports tracks the progress made in the adoption of recommendations made by IEU evaluations.
2. For each recommendation made by the IEU evaluation, this management action report provides a rating and commentary prepared by the IEU. The rating categories for the progress made regarding the adoption of recommendations are as follows:
 - (a) High: Fully adopted and fully incorporated into policy, strategy or operations.
 - (b) Substantial: Recommendation largely adopted but not fully incorporated into policy, strategy or operations as yet.
 - (c) Medium: Adopted in some operational and policy work, but not to a significant degree in key areas.
 - (d) Low: No evidence or plan for adoption, or plan and actions for adoption are in a very preliminary stage.
 - (e) Not rated: ratings or verification will have to wait until more data is available or proposals have been further developed.
 - (f) N/A: Not applicable.

Table 4: Evaluation recommendations for the Secretariat

No	IEU recommendations for the Secretariat	Management response and outlined key action	IEU Ratings	IEU Comments
1	The Secretariat should develop and operationalize theories of change for key thematic areas and integrate these into project proposals early.	Agreed The Secretariat will develop and operationalize TOCs for thematic areas for GCF funding proposals more consistently in accordance with the existing requirements of the independent (TAP.DCP, OPM, DMA, PSF)	Low	The Secretariat's work in developing TOCs for key thematic areas has been progressing. However, it has not yet resulted in operationalizing and integrating TOCs into the GCF funding proposal development.
2	The Secretariat, at the request of the Board, should update the RMF and PMFs, address deficiencies and develop protocols that provide guidance on which, when and how indicators can and should be measured and how they should be aggregated. Furthermore, the Secretariat should collaborate with other key agencies and stakeholders to harmonize critical concepts and indicators and to develop standards and methods for new indicators for mitigation and adaptation projects when pertinent.	Agreed The Secretariat will revise and update the RMF/PMFs applying a harmonized approach with peer climate finance mechanisms and in consideration of the M&E and reporting requirements of AEs. It will develop RMF/PMFs indicator protocols, guidance and tools for AEs to apply these in funding proposal log – frames and related methodologies for aggregation and credible reporting of mitigation and adaptation results at the portfolio level.	Low	Upon adoption of the integrated results management framework-reference GCF/B.28/09 (IRMF), by the GCF Board, the Secretariat plans to develop a Results Handbook by B.30, which will include the comprehensive guidance and tools on IRMF implementation.

¹ Decision B.BM-2021/07

No	IEU recommendations for the Secretariat	Management response and outlined key action	IEU Ratings	IEU Comments
	Attention should be given to identifying a reliable core indicator of adaptation.	(OPM)		
3	There should be a transparent web-based portfolio management system that allows different stakeholders to view project-related information and progress in real time. This should be developed by the Secretariat.	<p>Partially agreed</p> <p>The Secretariat will further develop, based on the online Integrated Portfolio Management System (IPMS), a complementary online, voluntary, real-time reporting system for AEs. The Secretariat will also develop a portal to facilitate the submission of annual performance reports (APRs) by AEs.</p> <p>The Secretariat will continue its efforts to expand the scope of its web-based systems to increase access to the information contained in its systems to all stakeholders and report progress on its efforts to do so by the twenty-fourth meeting of the Board (B.24).</p> <p>(ICT, OPM)</p>	Substantial	The Secretariat has developed of a web-based Portfolio Performance Management System (PPMS). The PPMS will act as the main platform for tracking portfolio management status and performance checks and facilitates the submission of ARs by AEs. However, some key functions have not yet been implemented, such as the real-time reporting system for AEs.
4	The Secretariat should develop a technical guide that integrates in a clear and coherent manner all relevant Board decisions and policies related to results management. While continuing to develop the risk management system, the Secretariat should give special attention to the roles and responsibilities of accredited entities and implementing entities, which needs to be clarified.	<p>The Secretariat will endeavor to take an integrative approach to address results management to ensure that expected/planned results highlighted in different Board approved frameworks (for example, the RMF/PMFs/IF) or other relevant policies are not reported separately but in an adequate, more comprehensive, coherent and holistic manner. It will do so by further refining the IF adopted through decision B.09/05 and aligning it more closely with the RMF/PMFs.</p> <p>(DMA, OPM)</p>	Low	<p>The Secretariat has developed the draft of the integrated result management framework (IRMF), (GCF/B.28/09), and held extensive consultations with the GCF Board, AEs and other key stakeholders.</p> <p>The draft was presented for Board consideration at B.27 and B.28. It was not adopted by the Board.</p>
5	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 Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) reporting.	<p>Partially agreed</p> <p>The Secretariat will explore ways to pragmatically link and improve reporting towards SDGs in the update of the RMF/PMFs even while keeping in mind that there are apparent linkages between GCF result areas in the mitigation and adaptation models with those of some of the key SDGs.</p> <p>The Secretariat and the Board should explore ways to further promote collaboration between AEs and NDAs to provide</p>	Low	<p>The Secretariat continues to engage with NDAs, AEs, and other key stakeholders, this has not yet resulted in linking country monitoring systems, SDG reporting and the GCF result areas.</p> <p>The draft IRMF also addresses some of the concerns linking SDG indicators with the GCF result areas.</p>



No	IEU recommendations for the Secretariat	Management response and outlined key action	IEU Ratings	IEU Comments
		information on monitoring. The Secretariat will continue to enhance dialogue with NDAs and AEs on such collaboration. (DCP, OPM)		
6	The Secretariat should clarify roles and responsibilities internally and ensure that during project preparation, sufficient attention is paid to the design and budgeting of project monitoring and evaluation (M&E) systems prior to project proposal approval.	Partially agreed The Secretariat, based on the consideration of best practices followed by peer organizations, will provide AEs with specific guidance on allocating M&E costs in funding proposal budgets as part of the improvements to ensure credibility of results reporting. (DCP, DMA, PSF, OPM)	Medium	The GCF Board has adopted the Addressing gaps in the current portfolio for measurement - policy in decision GCF/B.28/02. The policy set outs the approach to remediate M&E gaps as they relate to measurement and improving the capacity of the GCF to credibly report results from its investments in the initial resource mobilization period. This policy has not yet been implemented. The Evaluation Policy for the GCF adopted in decision BB.M-2021/07 further outlines the roles and responsibilities for different stakeholders.
7	The Secretariat should revise its indicators on gender to more fully address other aspects of social inclusion and integrate these into the RMF. The Secretariat should also clarify the GCF gender and social inclusion impact and outcome priorities, especially regarding mitigation. The further development of the PMFs and the RMF will need to ensure that existing systems for including gender in project planning and M&E are given due consideration.	Agreed The Secretariat will continue to update the RMF/PMFs contained in document GCF/B.20/Inf.01 taking into consideration the IEU summary and narrative recommendations in document GCF/B.21/20 with respect to indicators on gender and social inclusion. The Secretariat will also take into strong consideration the gender-responsive results framework and associated indicators that are illustrated in the gender and climate change toolkit and, to the extent possible, integrate some of these into the finalized version of the RMF/PMFs. (DCP, OPM)	Low	The Secretariat has developed the draft of the integrated result management framework (IRMF), (GCF/B.28/09), and held extensive consultations with the GCF Board, AEs and other key stakeholders. The draft was presented for Board consideration at B.27 and B.28. It was not adopted by the Board.
8	The Secretariat should develop, theories of change for its support to the adaptation, mitigation, and REDD+ thematic areas . These theories of change should clearly define what is meant by the paradigm shifts to low carbon resilient sustainable development and should outline a framework that identifies enabling conditions to a paradigm shift, mechanisms for the broader adoption and expansion of change and the	No direct response, linked to other responses.	Low	The Secretariat's work on developing TOCs for its support to the adaptation, mitigation, and REDD+ thematic areas is progressing, but has not yet produced clear results.



No	IEU recommendations for the Secretariat	Management response and outlined key action	IEU Ratings	IEU Comments
	assumptions made during the process. Besides this, the Secretariat should address the lack of definition of paradigm shift potential as the key objective of the Fund.			
9	The Secretariat should also establish mechanisms to ensure methods are consistent for indicators across entities. Rules on how indicators will be aggregated should also be laid down. The Secretariat should give priority to acting on a Board decision that the Secretariat will establish a web-based reporting system to facilitate reporting and aggregation of indicators and other information pertinent to results.	No direct response, linked to other responses.	Medium	<p>The Secretariat has developed of a web-based Portfolio Performance Management System (PPMS). The PPMS will act as the main platform for tracking portfolio management status and performance checks and facilitates the submission of ARs by AEs.</p> <p>The Secretariat has developed the draft of the integrated result management framework (IRMF) and held extensive consultations with the GCF Board, AEs and other key stakeholders. The draft IRMF was presented for Board consideration at B.27 and B.28. It was not adopted by the Board.</p>
10	The Secretariat should collaborate with other key agencies and stakeholders to harmonize critical concepts and indicators and to develop standards and methods for new indicators for mitigation and adaptation projects when pertinent. Attention should be given to identifying a reliable core indicator of adaptation.	No direct response, linked to other responses.	Low	<p>At B.28 the Secretariat and the Accreditation Panel developed the methodology for establishing a baseline of GHG emissions and climate resilience for AEs portfolio(GCF/B.28/11/Add.02); however, the Board did not consider it at the meeting.</p> <p>The Secretariat is part of the International Financial Institutions Technical Working Group on harmonizing standards and approaches for quantifying the greenhouse gas (GHG) impacts of investments.</p>
11	While continuing to develop the risk management system, the Secretariat should give special attention to the roles and responsibilities of accredited and implementing entities . The distinction between the roles of accredited entities and implementing entities also needs to be clarified.	No direct response, link to other responses	Medium	The Secretariat has continued to develop the risk management framework, however the roles and responsibilities of AEs and executing entities needs further clarification.
Total: 11 recommendations				3 out of 11 recommendations rated as medium and 1 recommendation has rated as substantial

Table 5: Evaluation recommendations for the IEU

No.	IEU recommendations for the IEU	Management response and outlined key action	IEU Ratings	IEU Comments
1	As was undertaken for this review, IEU should carry out regular 'evaluability reviews' to assess the extent to which projects are likely to report and measure their impacts and outcomes credibly.	<p style="text-align: center;">Partially agreed</p> <p>The Secretariat requests IEU to continue to address evaluability reviews as part of its evaluations, particularly with respect to measuring impacts and outcomes. The Secretariat will continue to develop and refine impact methodologies and outcomes with other climate finance delivery mechanisms using the principle of coherence and complementarity and the services of a globally recognized consultancy firm with substantial experience working on climate change M&E issues and report on its efforts to do so at B.24. (IEU, OPM)</p>	Low	<p>The IEU has conducted the first evaluability assessment of the GCF's projects, and the RMF evaluation submitted at B.21 makes reference to this assessment.</p> <p>The IEU is currently updating and conducting the second evaluability assessment.</p>
2	IEU should prepare guidelines for project evaluations.	<p style="text-align: center;">Partially agreed</p> <p>The Secretariat will continue its efforts to develop internal guidance to review evaluations from AEs with the understanding that evaluations from AEs are mandated by AMAs. (IEU, OPM)</p>	Low	<p>The IEU has developed the evaluation policy for the GCF and it was approved by the Board as a between Board meeting B.BM-2021/07. However, the policy has not yet been operationalized.</p>
3	On the approval of the Board, IEU should also carry out an independent review of the accreditation process, taking into consideration the extensive deficiencies in the evaluability and likelihood of credible reporting that this review summarizes across the portfolio of approved projects.	<p style="text-align: center;">Neutral</p> <p>The Secretariat requests the Board to take a decision on the inclusion of an independent review of the accreditation process at the point of consideration for the IEU workplan(s). (IEU, DCP)</p>	Medium	<p>The IEU conducted the Independent Synthesis of the GCF's Accreditation Function and shared it with the Board at B.26.</p>
Total: 3 recommendations			1 out of 3 recommendations rated as medium	

Annex II: Learning-Oriented Real-Time Impact Assessment (LORTA)

Programme Activity Report for 1 January 2021 31 June 2021

1. In early 2021, the IEU's Learning-Oriented Real-Time Impact Assessment (LORTA) programme continued to embed real-time impact evaluations into funded GCF projects. LORTA is a technical assistance programme to build capacity, help projects/investments build high-quality datasets, and support real-time learning on implementation and the likelihood of causal impact. LORTA uses a theory-based approach to assess impact that includes experimental and quasi-experimental designs with 2–3 waves of survey data from beneficiaries and, where relevant, comparison populations. LORTA has continued to work extremely closely with AEs and project staff to demonstrate the benefits of impact evaluations. The IEU has strived to build these relationships with key actors who, in turn, can advocate, build and budget for impact evaluations within investment proposals.
2. In early 2021, a third cohort of projects entered the LORTA programme. From LORTA's Virtual Design Workshop, held from 21 September to 16 November 2020, five projects were shortlisted using a scorecard in terms of the feasibility of the impact evaluation design, commitment of the AE, budget considerations, and the level of innovation for LORTA and the GCF.
3. These five projects have been undergoing Phase I of LORTA – formative engagement and design during the reporting period. Here, project teams and accredited entities have been onboarded into the programme through initial engagements, a participatory inception workshop with a wide range of stakeholders, and are provided with a range of evaluation options in a three-page design brief. Phase I ends with the delivery of a full impact evaluation design report to the AE and project team. During the COVID-19 pandemic, all these activities have been conducted online. Participatory inception workshops have taken place with accredited entities and project teams in Belize, Pakistan, Ecuador, and the Philippines. The workshop with Kyrgyzstan is pending. The details of the five 2020 projects that are currently in Phase I are listed in Table 6.
4. In the Philippines, LORTA is working with a Direct Access Entity – the Land Bank of the Philippines. Here, the participatory inception workshop took place over three days and attracted over thirty participants. LORTA is focusing on the possible use of mobile applications and awareness-raising to increase the effectiveness of implementing people-centred forecasts and early action warning systems. The precise evaluation design is yet to be determined.
5. In Belize, LORTA is working with IFAD to evaluate two components of Resilient Rural Belize (Be-Resilient). It is evaluating a Matching Grant Fund that is introducing smallholder participation in selected value chains. The evaluation design for this component is difference-in-difference with matching. LORTA is also evaluating backyard garden interventions targeting rural, low-income households to foster food security through a phase-in experimental design.
6. In Pakistan, LORTA is working with the FAO. The participatory inception workshop is generating considerable engagement, with over thirty participants taking part over two days. LORTA aims to evaluate farmer training which will take place in the form of farmer field schools, including schools for women. The aim is to use a phase-in experimental design. In addition, LORTA aims to evaluate the provision of climate information to smallholders by assessing the extension messages received by farmers. The aim is to complete this using an experimental design.
7. In Ecuador, the participatory inception workshop attracted over thirty participants and took place over four days. Representatives from UNDP Ecuador, ProAmazonia and the Ministry of the Environment contributed to the discussions on the focus transition to sustainable

agricultural production systems. Much of the discussion focused on evaluating two components of the project: supporting the design and implementation of improvement plans and associated capacity building; and active and passive forest conservation and restoration. Both components show potential for experimental designs. The delivery of Phase 1 technical assistance to Kyrgyzstan is pending the completion of the Funded Activity Agreement.

8. From January to June 2021, the LORTA team has also made progress with the portfolio of projects within Phase 2 and Phase 3 of the programme (seven projects onboarded in 2018 and five in 2019). The baseline survey in Zambia has been completed. The LORTA team also has the sampling, questionnaire design and logistical arrangements for baseline data collection in Guatemala, Uganda, Paraguay and Bangladesh. The commencement of baseline surveys is dependent on local restrictions in terms of the COVID-19 pandemic.

9. In addition, the end line survey for the Malawi project has been completed. The LORTA teams supported capacity-building of the local UNDP country office especially with regards to cleaning data, creating variables, and data analysis. After revisions to both the dataset and draft report, the final report is now being finalized. The state-of-play for each of the LORTA projects in the portfolio are summarized in Table 6.

10. During the reporting period, LORTA has continued to practice the three lessons learnt during the first three years of the programme. First, LORTA identified the importance of creating equal partnerships and mutual trust between accredited entities, projects teams and the IEU. Second, LORTA helps underscore the importance of flexibility. This foundation has been especially important in 2020 as the COVID-19 pandemic has changed the landscape for all countries, including how technical assistance is offered and received. LORTA has maintained flexibility in terms of when baseline and end line activities can be conducted, the trade-offs and compromises that have to be made between rigorous evaluation designs and what is feasible and manageable on the ground. As a third lesson, LORTA has also maintained its commitment to learning, uptake and use through its range of partnerships. LORTA can help inform the evidence needs of the GCF and, most importantly, the climate needs of developing countries.

Table 6: Five projects undergoing Phase I of LORTA – formative engagement and design, early 2021

Proposal	Project Name	AE	Country	Theme	Sector	Evaluation Design Options
SAP010	Multi-Hazard Impact-Based Forecasting and Early Warning System for the Philippines	Land Bank (Direct Access Entity)	The Philippines	Adaptation	Public	Pending completion of participatory inception workshop. Possible focus on using mobile applications or awareness-raising to increase the effectiveness of implementing people-centered forecast and early action warning systems.
FP101	Resilient Rural Belize (Be-Resilient)	IFAD	Belize	Adaptation	Public	A Matching Grant Fund (MGF) that will introduce smallholder participation in selected value chains (difference-in-difference with matching) Backyard garden interventions targeting rural, low-income households to foster food security (phase-in experimental design)



FP108	Transforming the Indus Basin with Climate Resilient Agriculture and Water Management	FAO	Pakistan	Adaptation	Public	<p>Farmers training will take place in the form of farmer field schools (FFS), including women open schools (phase-in experimental design)</p> <p>Climate extension messages for farmers (encouragement experimental design)</p>
FP110	Ecuador REDD-plus RBP for results period 2014	UNDP	Ecuador	Mitigation	Public	<p>The transition to sustainable agricultural production systems.</p> <p>Tentative design of difference-in-difference with matching.</p>
FP116	Carbon Sequestration through Climate Investment in Forests and Rangelands in the Kyrgyz Republic (CS-FOR)	FAO	Kyrgyzstan	Cross-cutting	Public	<p>Pending completion of FAA and participatory inception workshop</p> <p>Focus on whether the project improved the lives of the target population in terms of income, assets or health.</p> <p>Tentative designs of phase-in experimental design or difference-in-difference with matching.</p>

Annex III: Initial set of guidelines for the effective functioning of the Independent Evaluation Unit

Introduction

1. The terms of reference² (TORs) of the Head of the Independent Evaluation Unit (IEU), which were approved by the Board of the Green Climate Fund (GCF) at its tenth meeting, include the request that *“detailed guidelines and procedures governing the work of the IEU to be approved by the Board. The procedures will be updated as necessary and approved by the Board so as to always ensure that the procedures allow for the work of the IEU to be carried out efficiently and in a cost-effective manner while meeting best international standards.”*
2. This document presents an initial set of guidelines for the efficient functioning of the IEU. The guidelines are based on the TORs for the IEU and the TORs for the Head of the IEU approved by the decision B.06/09 and decision B.10/05 (including decision B.24/15), respectively. They also take into account the Evaluation Policy for the GCF adopted by the Board in 2021.

The mandate of the IEU

3. The Governing Instrument, in Section VIII on Evaluation, provides that:
“59. There will be periodic independent evaluations of the performance of the Fund in order to provide an objective assessment of the results of the Fund, including its funded activities and its effectiveness and efficiency. The purpose of these independent evaluations will be to inform decision-making by the Board and to identify and disseminate lessons learned. The results of the periodic evaluations will be published.
60. To this end, the Board will establish an operationally independent evaluation unit as part of the core structure of the Fund. The head of the Unit will be selected by, and will report to, the Board. The frequency and types of evaluation to be conducted will be specified by the unit, in agreement with the Board.
61. Reports of the Fund’s independent evaluation unit will be provided to the COP for purposes of periodic reviews of the financial mechanism of the Convention.”
4. The IEU was established by the Board and its TORs were approved at the sixth meeting of the GCF Board³ with the following objectives, derived from the Governing Instrument:
 - (a) *Informing the decision-making by the Board and identifying and disseminating lessons learned, contributing to guiding the Fund and stakeholders as a learning institution, providing strategic guidance;*
 - (b) *Conducting periodic independent evaluations of Fund’s performance in order to provide an objective assessment of the Fund’s results and the effectiveness and efficiency of its activities; and*

² Annex V to decision B.10/05

³ Annex III to decision B.06/09

(c) *Providing evaluation reports to the Conference of the Parties (COP) to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) for purposes of periodic reviews of the financial mechanism of the Convention.*

5. In addition, the TORs provide for the independence of evaluation and role of the Board⁴:
- “3. According to the best-practice norms and standards for independent evaluation, the evaluation function should be located independently from the other management functions so that it can be free from undue influence. It needs to have full discretion in directly submitting its reports. The Head of the IEU will be appointed by, and report to, the Board, potentially through a designated Board committee. The appointment will be for a three-year term. The recruitment process will be conducted in a transparent manner and in consultation with the Board. The Head of the IEU can be removed only by decision of the Board. To preserve independence, upon termination of service as the IEU Head, he/she will not be eligible for staff positions within the Secretariat.*
- 4. The staff of the IEU will be subject to the Code of Conduct of Staff.*
- 5. The Board will review and approve the evaluation policy, three year-rolling evaluation work plans, the annual work programme and budget. It will also review, on an annual basis. The progress in the implementation of IEU recommendations.”*

6. To ensure independence of the Unit, as per the Governing Instrument and the TORs of the IEU, the Board adopted the TORs of the Head of the IEU⁵. The TORs of the Head of the IEU state: “To preserve operational independence, upon termination of service as the Head of the IEU, he/she shall not be eligible for any type of employment by the Fund within one year of the end of his/her appointment.” Further, the TORs of the Head of the IEU identify the following responsibilities to provide for operational and financial independence:

- (a) Proposing a budget for meeting the annual expenses of the unit, to ensure its financial independence, which will be considered and approved by the Board; and
- (b) Leadership and management of the unit, including the authority to make appointments and manage staff of the unit.

Role and Responsibilities of the IEU

Overall function of the IEU

7. The TORs of the IEU state that:
- “12. The IEU will be responsible for conducting, or managing by contracting consultants, the types of evaluations mentioned in Section V, using as much as possible internally generated data streams and analytical outputs, and applying the best evaluation norms and standards. The use of technical expert panels or similar mechanisms may be appropriate, as recommended in the case of the GEF by the peer review of its evaluation function. The IEU will ensure that evaluation team members do not have conflicts of interest with respect to the activities in whose evaluation they will be involved. Finally, the IEU will be responsible to develop and update the evaluation policy of the Fund.”*

⁴ Decision B.06/09

⁵ Annex V to decision B.10/05

8. To ensure independence of the Unit, as per the Governing Instrument and the TORs of the IEU, the Board adopted the TORs of the Head of the IEU.⁶ Accordingly, the Head of the IEU is selected by the Board, for a term determined by the Board, renewable once and the Heads's performance is assessed annually (which also determines performance-based salary increments), through a procedure for performance review developed by the Performance Oversight Committee of the Board.⁷ The Head reports and communicates directly with the Board and its Co-Chairs.

9. The TORs of the Head of the IEU identify the following responsibilities:

- (a) Conducting or managing, by contracting consultants, evaluations using as much as possible internally generated data streams and analytical outputs, and applying evaluation standards and practice in accordance with best international practice and standards. The use of technical expert panels or similar mechanisms may be appropriate, as recommended in the case of the Global Environment Facility by the peer review of its evaluation function. The Head of the IEU will ensure that evaluation team members do not have conflicts of interest with respect to the activities in whose evaluation they will be involved;
- (b) Ensuring the IEU contributes to the GCF knowledge management process, including communicating lessons and best practices as learned by the IEU⁸;
- (c) Developing and updating the independent evaluation policy of the Fund, in accordance with decision B.24/15, paragraph (c); and
- (d) Proposing detailed guidelines and procedures governing the work of the IEU to be approved by the Board. The procedures will be updated as necessary and approved by the Board so as to always ensure that the procedures allow for the work of the IEU to be carried out efficiently and in a cost-effective manner while meeting best international standards.

10. The IEU is the custodian of the Evaluation Policy for the GCF, which was approved by the Board in decision GCF/BB.M-2021/07. The Policy states that IEU will advise on the effective implementation of this Policy in cooperation with the Secretariat and shall periodically recommend updates to the Policy to the Board. The IEU shall develop standards that ensure the Fund is able to inform its overall results, successes and unintended consequences in a credible and measurable manner. And updating this Policy, the IEU will engage with stakeholders and draw upon their advice and feedback.⁹

11. The IEU shall, every five years present a report on issues related to the implementation of the Evaluation Policy for the GCF, along with any recommendations for changes to it. The report will include a review of evaluation budgets and lessons learned from the integrated results management framework (IRMF) implementation.¹⁰

Evaluations

12. Further to the objectives of the IEU identified in the TORs (para. 2) the terms of reference state the following responsibilities, among others:

"6. Should the COP commission an independent assessment of the overall performance of the Fund, the IEU would support the work involved in such assessment. An overall

⁶ Annex V to decision B.10/05

⁷ Decision B.21/13

⁸ Annex XXIX to decision B.24/15

⁹ Annex I to decision BB.M 2021/07, para. 50.

¹⁰ Annex I to decision BB.M 2021/07, para. 51.

performance study of the Fund could become a responsibility of the IEU, as has been the case with the Global Environment Facility (GEF) Evaluation Office since 2007.”

13. The TORs of the IEU further identify types of evaluation and the Fund’s result areas:

“13. Given that the Fund will pursue a country-driven approach, after its first years of operation the IEU may perform evaluations of the activities funded in different countries, i.e. country portfolio evaluations.

14. Furthermore, the IEU may also perform thematic evaluations of the different types of activities that the Fund will finance, such as those designed to enable and support enhanced actions on climate change adaptation or mitigation. With time, these thematic evaluations may cover all the results areas of the Fund.

15. In addition, as 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, the IEU may also perform evaluations of those project-based and programmatic approaches.

16. The types of evaluation mentioned above will provide the Board and the COP with an independent assessment of the Fund’s operations. These evaluations could also be used as building blocks for an overall assessment of the Fund. To maximize the value added of IEU evaluations, the IEU will prepare its work plans after consulting with the Board and the Secretariat. All these evaluations will be performed mainly by independent consultants managed by the IEU”

14. The following evaluation criteria are identified in the TORs of the IEU:

- (a) Relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability of projects and programmes;
- (b) Coherence in climate finance delivery with other multilateral entities;
- (c) Gender equity;
- (d) Country ownership of projects and programmes;
- (e) Innovativeness in result areas (extent to which interventions may lead to paradigm shift towards low-emission and climate resilient development pathways);
- (f) Replication and scalability - the extent to which the activities can be scaled up in other locations within the country or replicated in other countries (this criterion, which is considered in document GCF/B.05/03 in the context of measuring performance, could also be incorporated in independent evaluations); and
- (g) Unexpected results, both positive and negative.

15. The TORs of the Head of the IEU state the following responsibilities:

- (a) Providing evaluation reports to the Conference of the Parties of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change for the purposes of periodic review of the Financial Mechanism of the Convention;
- (b) Preparing and submitting periodic progress reports to the Board, as and when required, and an annual report that will also be disseminated to the public;

- (c) The independent evaluation work is separate from the day-to-day monitoring and evaluation (M&E) work of the Secretariat as per paragraph 23 (j) of the Governing Instrument;
- (d) Making recommendations to improve the Fund's performance, in the light of the unit's evaluations, including in particular to the Fund's performance indicators and its results management framework; and
- (e) Attesting to the quality of the Fund's self-evaluations conducted by the Secretariat.
16. **Evaluation Advisory Group:** The IEU may establish an evaluation advisory group comprising leaders in the field of evaluation, and climate change. It is expected that the evaluation advisory group will consist of three experts who are not members of the GCF Board or otherwise involved with the governance of the GCF. The overall role of the evaluation advisory group is to provide additional technical information to the IEU, and to discuss the technical aspects of evaluations while also providing advice on the findings, conclusions, and recommendations of IEU evaluations. This advisory group is not a decision-making body but an advisory group whose members are volunteers. Advice provided by the group will be considered as additional inputs to inform the evaluative work of the IEU.
17. **Evaluation Expert Panels:** For each one of its evaluations, the IEU may invite external advisors to provide guidance and feedback on technical and thematic areas during the design and implementation of its evaluations. The panel composition (expertise and number) will be based upon the theme of the evaluation. In order to ensure that the evaluations provide independent assessments to the Board, the panels will not include Board members or advisors, or staff of GCF accredited entities. Advice provided by the expert panel will be considered as additional inputs to inform the content of the evaluation report.
18. **Performance Oversight Committee (POC):** As established in decision B.21/13, the performance oversight committee will assist the Board in discharging its responsibilities regarding the performance management of the Head of the IEU. Among other roles, the POC is responsible for setting objectives and monitoring the performance of Board Appointed officials.
19. As stated in the TOR, the IEU will exercise full discretion in directly submitting its reports to the Board. The IEU will have independence in development of evaluation reports, including design, drafting, and delivery. As such, the final reports of the IEU are shared with the Board.
20. As stated in the Evaluation Policy for the GCF all evaluations (or reviews or assessments) submitted by the IEU to the Board will have an official management response prepared by the GCF Secretariat (prepared in consultation with relevant GCF stakeholders) to inform Board decision-making. Ideally, this response should be presented to the Board at the same time as the evaluation. If time is insufficient, the management response may be presented no later than the next Board meeting.¹¹ After taking cognizance of evaluation reports and/or management responses, the Board may wish provide policy guidance, as appropriate.
21. As stated in the Evaluation Policy for the GCF, the IEU will assess how the Secretariat followed on from the Board decision related to the IEU evaluations, during relevant subsequent IEU evaluations and during the overall performance evaluation of the GCF. ¹² The IEU will submit management action reports accordingly.

¹¹ Annex I to decision BB.M 2021/07, para. 58.

¹² Annex I to decision BB.M 2021/07 para. 58.

Table 7: Timelines of IEU Independent Evaluations

Document	Action	By Whom	When
IEU workplan (the plan for IEU Independent Evaluations)	Board decision	Board of the GCF	Final Board meeting of the year
IEU Independent Evaluations/ Assessments/ Reviews	Submitted to the Board Shared with Secretariat	IEU	In time for the Board meeting, and in accordance with IEU workplan
Management Response	Submitted to the Board	Secretariat	No later than the Board meeting following submission of the Evaluation Report
Board Decision	Board decision	Board of the GCF	After consideration of the Evaluation Report and/or Management Response
Management Action Report	Submitted to the Board	IEU	One year after the Board decision

Advisory services, capacity building and learning

22. Associated with the learning function accorded to the IEU by the Governing Instrument and objectives of the IEU, the TORs identify the following responsibilities:

7. Furthermore, taking into account international experience, and in light of the results of its evaluations, the IEU will make recommendations to improve the Fund's performance indicators and its results management framework.

8. In addition, the IEU will attest to the quality of the Fund's self-evaluation conducted by the Secretariat.

10. The IEU will actively participate in relevant evaluation networks to ensure that it is at the frontier of evaluation practice and that it benefits from relevant initiatives undertaken by other evaluation units.

11. The IEU will establish close relationships with the independent evaluation units of the intermediaries and implementing entities of the Fund and will seek to involve them in their activities wherever feasible and appropriate.

23. The TORs of the IEU provide that:

"20. In the initial phase of its operations, the Fund will be exclusively be working through subnational, national, regional and international implementing entities and intermediaries. Thus, it will be of necessary to define the delineation of roles and responsibilities of the Fund's IEU and those of the independent evaluation mechanisms of implementing entities and intermediaries.

21. *The Fund's IEU should closely cooperate with the relevant departments or units of implementing entities and intermediaries and should seek to involve them in its activities wherever feasible.*

22. *The relationship between the IEU and the corresponding body of implementing entities or intermediaries will be covered by agreements which will be entered into by the Fund with these entities or intermediaries which will require these to cooperate with the Fund's IEU, where required.*

23. *The IEU will support the strengthening of evaluation capacities in subnational, national and regional IEs and intermediaries to enable evaluation of their Fund portfolio activities. Over time, in those countries in which there are sub-national, national or regional intermediaries or implementing entities with evaluation capacities, the IEU could involve them in Fund evaluations."*

24. The TORs of the Head of the IEU identify the following responsibilities:
- (a) Providing recommendations to accredited entities on how to design projects/programmes and monitoring of those activities so as to improve the ability of the IEU to provide quality evaluation of the Fund's activities;
 - (b) Establishing close relationships with the equivalent units of the accredited entities in order to avoid duplication of their respective activities, and sharing lessons learned to ensure continuous learning; and
 - (c) Developing plans to ensure that evidence informs learning across the Fund.

7. As stated in the Evaluation Policy for the GCF, the IEU will be responsible for guiding, assisting and advising on real-time impact assessments/evaluations, such as learning-oriented real-time impact assessments (LORTA), for a selection of the GCF funded activities portfolio. In managing LORTA, the IEU would select projects/programmes in coordination with the Secretariat, which will further participate in the implementation of LORTA for learning purposes.¹³ The IEU will receive all data and reports generated through these real-time impact assessments and also share these with the Secretariat.

8. As stated in the Evaluation Policy for the GCF, the IEU will also strengthen evaluation capacities in AEs (including DAEs) and intermediaries to enable evaluation of their Fund portfolio activities.¹⁴ To develop these capacities the IEU will undertake a capacity building program alongside LORTA. This capacity building and advisory services provided by the IEU would provide the AEs, NDAs and other local intermediaries with knowledge, capacity and tools, and help the GCF to ensure evaluability of the projects/programmes.

9. As stated in the Evaluation Policy for the GCF, the IEU will assume a leadership role in the evaluation community regarding climate change, and actively participate in relevant evaluation networks. Furthermore, the IEU will work on establishing and leading a community of practice of evaluators working in the climate change space.¹⁵ The IEU will seek membership of the United Nations Evaluation Group.

Synthesis and communication

25. The TORs of the IEU provide that:

¹³ Annex I to decision BB.M 2021/07, para.23

¹⁴ Annex I to decision BB.M 2021/07), para.55

¹⁵ Annex I to decision BB.M 2021/07), para.55

“9. The IEU will synthesize the findings and lessons learned from its evaluations to inform the Board and the Executive Director as well as stakeholders.”

26. The TORs of the IEU further provide for feedback and knowledge management:

“18. Independent Evaluation Unit evaluations will be published and reports will be provided to the COP for its periodic reviews of the financial mechanism of the Convention.

19. Evaluation results should feed back into the design phase, thus contributing to enhancing the quality of funded activities. To facilitate this process, the IEU will periodically prepare brief notes synthesizing lessons learned from evaluations.”

27. The TORs of the Head of the IEU identify the following responsibilities:

- (a) Synthesizing and sharing the findings and lessons learned from the unit’s evaluations with key internal and external audiences in order to inform decision-making by the Board and the Executive Director, as well as among accredited entities;
- (b) In addition to synthesizing the findings and/or lessons learned, disseminating/communicating results with relevant audiences;
- (c) Participating actively in relevant evaluation networks in order to ensure that the IEU is at the frontier of results, evaluation and learning practice and that it benefits from relevant initiatives undertaken by other evaluation units; and
- (d) Establishing close relationships with the independent evaluation units of the accredited entities of the Fund, and seeking to involve them in their activities and to share learning wherever feasible and appropriate.

28. The Evaluation Policy for the GCF provides that the IEU will promote learning and dialogue, and disseminate lessons learned to Board members, AEs, the Secretariat and other actors. The IEU independent evaluations will also incorporate lessons learnt from research and prior IEU evaluations.¹⁶

29. Leading up to and during the preparation of its reports, the IEU may share emerging findings for feedback and fact-checking. Final IEU evaluation reports will be shared with the Board. The IEU may disseminate its reports after submission to the Board and will make them available on the IEU website. Approach papers for each evaluation will include plans for communication and review.

Workplan, budget and annual report of the IEU

30. According to paragraph 5 of the TORs of the IEU: “The Board will review and approve the evaluation policy, three year-rolling evaluation work plans, the annual work programme and budget. It will also review, on an annual basis. The progress in the implementation of IEU recommendations.” Further, paragraph 16 states: “To maximize the value added of IEU evaluations, the IEU will prepare its work plans after consulting with the Board and the Secretariat.”

31. In addition to consultations with the Board and the Secretariat, the IEU will take into account, *inter alia*, the following documents to prepare the workplan: Board workplan for the strategic period, Board policy and review cycle, and any other Board-approved documents defining the subjects and schedules of reviews. The subject and schedule of evaluations will contribute to the learning, accountability and dialogue function of evaluations.

¹⁶ Annex I to decision BB.M 2021/07, para.56.

32. The IEU will undertake periodic performance reviews of the Fund. The performance review will launch in the second year of GCF programming period and conclude in the fourth year, aiming to align with replenishment cycles and informing it. The Board may wish to provide guidance related to strategic direction and scope, ahead of the second year of the programming period, or within the strategic plan.

33. The Evaluation Policy for the GCF further provides that the IEU budget should be linked to the size of the GCF programming envelope since it represents the volume of operations that the IEU will evaluate in the future. It is anticipated that the overall annual budget for the IEU will not exceed 1 per cent of the programming envelope of the GCF, while ensuring that the IEU annual budget will be sufficient to cover the annual work plan of the IEU approved by the Board.¹⁷

Administrative matters

34. Staff of the IEU are subject to GCF Code of Conduct of Staff, according to paragraph 4 of IEU's TORs.

¹⁷ Annex I to decision BB.M 2021/07, para.58.

Annex IV: IEU communication materials

1. For the period between 1 January 2021 and the time of writing this report in late May, the IEU produced well over 100 communication products, mostly using its in-house capacity, in support of its evaluation, learning, engagement and capacity building activities. Each of these products is easily found in the [Newsroom section](#) of the IEU microsite.

Table 8: IEU communication materials

Product	Topic	Month
Blog	Designing an impact evaluation in six steps	Apr
Blog	In a race against time: Machine learning for the climate emergency	Feb
Blog	What the Green Climate Fund can teach us about multilateral organizations	Jan
Blog	Data Outlook: B.28, what would it mean for the GCF's portfolio?	May
Article	The overlooked role of secretariats in the success of environmental treaties	May
Blog	Designing an impact evaluation in six steps (Korean)	May
Board report	IEU Annual Report 2020 (digital)	Jan
Board report	IEU Annual Report 2020 (print)	Jan
Board report	Report on the activities of the Independent Evaluation Unit (B.29)	Jun
Board report	Adaptation Evaluation Executive Summary (digital)	Mar
Board report	Adaptation Evaluation Executive Summary (print)	Mar
Board report	Adaptation evaluation main report (digital)	Feb
Board report	Adaptation evaluation main report (print)	Feb
ESP*	Chart: Losses from climate change-related disasters and adaptation funding	Apr
ESP	Chart: Percentage of low-lying land in GCF-eligible SIDS	Apr
ESP	Private sector evaluation brief (French)	May
ESP	Private sector evaluation brief (Spanish)	May
ESP	Adaptation approach Paper	Mar
ESP	Adaptation evaluation brief	Mar
ESP	Adaptation evidence tree	Mar
ESP	Adaptation project deep dives	Mar
ESP	Adaptation virtual country case study reports	Mar
ESP	Chart: Coherence and complementarity between climate funds	May
ESP	Chart: Median travel time (hours) to urban centres in SIDS	May
ESP	Request for Proposal evaluation approach paper	May
ESP	Private sector evaluation brief (English)	Jan
ESP	Accreditation evaluation GEval Brief (Spanish)	Mar

Product	Topic	Month
ESP	Accreditation evaluation GEval Note (Spanish)	Mar
ESP	Forward-looking Performance Review evaluation Topical Brief (Spanish)	Mar
ESP	Forward-looking Performance Review evaluation Topical Brief (Spanish)	Mar
ESP	Forward-looking Performance Review evaluation Topical Brief (Spanish)	Mar
ESP	Forward-looking Performance Review evaluation Topical Brief (Spanish)	Mar
ESP	Country Ownership approach evaluation GEval Brief (Spanish)	Mar
ESP	Country Ownership approach evaluation GEval Note (Spanish)	Mar
ESP	Environmental and Social Safeguards and the Environmental and Social Management System evaluation GEval Brief (Spanish)	Mar
ESP	Environmental and Social Safeguards and the Environmental and Social Management System evaluation GEval Note (Spanish)	Mar
ESP	Simplified Approval Process Pilot Scheme evaluation GEval Brief (Spanish)	Mar
ESP	Simplified Approval Process Pilot Scheme evaluation GEval Note (Spanish)	Mar
ESP	Relevance and Effectiveness of the Green Climate Fund's Investments in the SIDS evaluation GEval Brief (Spanish)	Mar
ESP	Relevance and Effectiveness of the Green Climate Fund's Investments in the SIDS evaluation GEval Note (Spanish)	Mar
ESP	Learning-Oriented Real-Time Impact Assessment GEval Brief 2018 (Spanish)	Mar
ESP	Learning-Oriented Real-Time Impact Assessment GEval Note 2018 (Spanish)	Mar
ESP	Learning-Oriented Real-Time Impact Assessment GEval Brief 2019 (English)	May
ESP	Learning-Oriented Real-Time Impact Assessment GEval Note 2019 (English)	May
ESP	Learning-Oriented Real-Time Impact Assessment GEval Brief 2020 (English)	May
ESP	Learning-Oriented Real-Time Impact Assessment GEval Note 2020 (English)	May
Evidence gap map	Climate Change: Public Health Sector Evidence and Gap Map	Jan
Evidence gap map	Climate Change: Energy Sector Evidence and Gap Map,	Jan
Evidence review	Climate change mitigation interventions in the private sector in developing countries.	May
Evidence review	Results-based payments: evidence gap map and intervention heat map.	Jan
Evidence review	Access to credit as a determinant of autonomous adaptation to climate change - A meta-analysis of the evidence in low- and middle-income countries	
GCF Policy	Evaluation Policy for the GCF	Mar
In the news	IEU's Dr. Martin Prowse appears in UNEP Adaptation Gap Report 2020	Jan
Learning paper	Assessing the likelihood for transformational change at the Green Climate Fund	Mar
Learning paper	Behavioural science, decision making and climate investments	May



Product	Topic	Month
Learning paper	How to bridge the gap between complexity science and evaluation - A new analysis tool as a first step	Jan
News article	The IEU is turning 7!	Feb
News article	Announcing the new IEU Head ad interim, Mr. Andreas Reumann	Jan
News article	IEU at the Gobeshona Global Conference	Jan
News article	Press release: Does access to credit lead to more climate change adaptation?	Jan
News article	Results Based Payments for REDD+ under the GCF: Lessons on Safeguards	Jan
News article	Press release: New evaluation policy to enhance GCF's climate change response	May
News video	Spotlight: Evaluating the GCF's investments in the SIDS	Apr
News video	Spotlight: Evaluating the GCF's SIDS Portfolio	Apr
News video	Spotlight: Our reflections on GCF B.28	Apr
News video	Announcing the new IEU Head ad interim, Mr. Andreas Reumann	Jan
News video	Women of the IEU on International Women's Day 2021	Mar
Newsletter	What's new with the IEU?	Feb
Newsletter	What's new with the IEU?	Jan
Newsletter	What's new with the IEU?	Mar
Newsletter	What's new with the IEU?	May
Newsletter	What's new with the IEU?	Jun
Podcast	The Evaluator' Episode 9: GEO6 and freshwater	Feb
Podcast	The Evaluator' Episode 8: Waterbird conservation on an international scale	Jan
Podcast	The Evaluator' Episode 10: Convincing farmers to buy crop insurance for climate resilience	Mar
Podcast	The Evaluator' Episode 11: Evaluating the GCF's adaptation portfolio	Mar
Podcast	The Evaluator' Episode 12: Addressing gender and climate change together	May
Virtual Talk	Tackling Climate Change Through Digital Transformation: A Look at Korean Organizations & the SNU Smart Campus	Jan
Virtual Talk	Results-based Payments: What does the evidence say?	Feb
Virtual Talk	Gender in Climate Change: Perspectives from WOCAN and GCF	Mar
Virtual Talk	The Future of Climate Bonds	May
Webinar video	Webinar: Approach Paper of the Private Sector Evaluation	Apr
Webinar video	B.28 Virtual Side Event: Adaptation evaluation - findings & recommendations	Mar
Webinar video	B.28 Virtual Side Event: The Draft Evaluation Policy of the GCF	Mar
Webinar video	B.28 Virtual Side Event: Findings & recommendations from Adaptation evaluation	May
Webinar video	Webinar: Approach paper - Evaluation of the GCF's investments in the LDCs	May

