



## INDEPENDENT EVALUATION OF THE GCF'S RESULT AREA "HEALTH AND WELLBEING, AND FOOD AND WATER SECURITY" (HFWW)

### BACKGROUND

In 2024, the IEU undertook the Independent Evaluation of the GCF's Result Area "Health and Wellbeing, and Food and Water Security" (HFWW) in line with its Board-approved 2024 work plan.

This evaluation was launched in March 2024. The final evaluation report was submitted in January 2025 in time for B.41.

### EVALUATION SCOPE

The scope of the evaluation was two-pronged. First, it assessed the actual and likely achievements of the HFWW result area-tagged GCF investments and key factors that enable or hinder the achievement of results. Second, it examined the value of the Fund's overall result areas (RA) approach and investments through a close examination of the HFWW result area itself.

Out of the 286 GCF projects approved as of B.40 in October 2024, 153 projects were tagged with the HFWW RA. HFWW RA-tagged projects were selected based on RA percentage data currently available for GCF-financing in the Secretariat's Integrated Portfolio Management System (iPMS). The RAs are not mutually exclusive. Therefore, multiple RAs could be identified in any single funding proposal.

### CONCLUSIONS

#### Conclusions relating to the HFWW RA, specifically

**C1:** The investments made as HFWW RA-tagged projects are recognized by GCF stakeholders for their **high degree of relevance and value**. Their emerging results can be linked to paradigm-shifting trends in multiple countries.

**C2:** Results obtained from HFWW RA-tagged projects and the larger contributions made to low-carbon, climate-resilient development have been associated with the GCF's use of the HFWW RA in a limited manner only. The **RA approach** itself was found to be **inconsequential** in their achievement.

**C3:** HFWW RA-tagged projects generate social, economic and environmental co-benefits, while other projects not tagged under HFWW RA also generate **co-benefits** and results relevant to the aspects of health and wellbeing, food, and water security. However, there is **no systematic approach to aggregate these co-benefits at the Fund level** to date. Furthermore, gaps are observed in reporting some areas of co-benefits from HFWW RA-tagged projects.

**C4:** Encompassing three expansive sectors while also suggesting a "nexus" orientation, the HFWW RA formulation itself introduces an uncertainty of expectation for an organization that is primarily sector oriented. **The cross-sectoral orientation suggested in the term "Health and Wellbeing, and Food (Security) and Water Security" is at odds** with the GCF's sector-oriented makeup as an organization.

**C5:** The absence of a tracking indicator under the GCF's integrated results management framework (IRMF) for health-related impacts is inconsistent with the growing recognition of the **"health-climate change" nexus**, which demands increased attention.

#### Conclusions relating to all RAs, broadly

**C6:** At a foundational level, the **purpose and role of GCF RAs are insufficiently articulated and understood** across the GCF's stakeholders, which raises a question about their continued utility.



## RECOMMENDATIONS

**R1: The Board should rearticulate the purpose and use of RAs across the entire GCF system and, in collaboration with the Secretariat and on the basis of this rearticulation, reformulate them as a set.**

- The Board should consider revisiting the RAs as part of the review of the IRMF, scheduled for 2026. The review should examine the fundamental roles of RAs in the entire GCF ecosystem.
- The Board should identify and reconcile competing or overlapping concepts and frameworks related to results management practice at the GCF and streamline communications accordingly.
- The Board should mandate an expert-led, multi-stakeholder working group to review the existing set of eight RAs on three levels: their consistency in formulation and their relationship to GCF indicators housed in the IRMF to support monitoring and reporting, their operational coherence as a set in relation to the GCF's strategic ambitions, and their compatibility with larger global and regional commitments.
- The Board should inform its review of GCF RAs (purpose, use, reformulation) and the systems supporting their use on the basis of an understanding of the practices of other climate finance actors related to results-focused monitoring and reporting.

**R2: Based on the review of RAs by the Board and the rearticulation of the roles of RAs, the Secretariat should provide comprehensive guidance on the use of the RAs internally and revisit the results reporting system accordingly.**

- Based on the rearticulation of the roles of RAs, the Secretariat should draft guidance internally for the GCF Secretariat on how the RAs should be considered throughout the project cycle, while taking into account existing manuals and guidelines (i.e. the Programming Manual, Appraisal Guidance, sectoral guides, and draft Results Handbook).
- Apart from the review of RAs, the Secretariat should conduct a quality check of the data registered in the results management system regularly.

**R3: The GCF should find ways to operationalize the uses of RAs at the country level and for AEs, if the GCF wishes to keep the current RA approach.**

- Once the purposes and uses of RAs are stabilized and confirmed, the Secretariat should communicate their "high-level" purpose and use to NDAs/focal points and AEs. This communication should aim to bring clarity on the role of RAs in country programming and on programme/project and accreditation pipeline development.
- As part of operationalizing the Board's guidance, the Secretariat should examine the value that RAs could add to country programming across the mitigation–adaptation spectrum and to programme/project and accreditation pipeline development. Given the country-driven approach of the GCF, the RA approach should be conceptually integrated into the country programme and into country-level programmatic approaches.
- The Secretariat should establish the common practice of engaging with NDAs/focal points and AEs using RAs in the origination of projects, based on such external guidance.

**R4: The Secretariat should advance its monitoring and reporting practices in relation to addressing the GCF's cross-cutting priorities and to capturing co-benefits generated through the GCF's investments.**

- The GCF should review practices and organizational capacities relevant to the monitoring and reporting of co-benefits associated with gender dimensions, Indigenous Peoples and ESS.
- The GCF should provide capacity-building support to AEs for effective monitoring and reporting of co-benefits.
- The GCF should develop a pool of experts, or provide support for securing the services of experts, skilled in mainstreaming these cross-cutting priorities, drawing on (among other things) the support of the GCF's readiness and preparatory support programme (RPSP).

**R5: The Secretariat should take note of global calls for a greater integration of health in climate finance programming and reflect such in its updated articulation of purpose and use.**

- The Secretariat should consider having one or more health-related result indicators in the IRMF.
- The Secretariat should develop a uniform approach to capturing health-related results in other adaptation and mitigation RAs. In doing so, it should align with practices across all RAs for monitoring and reporting on co-benefits.

## CONTACT THE IEU

Independent Evaluation Unit  
Green Climate Fund  
175, Art center-daero, Yeonsu-gu  
Incheon 22004  
Republic of Korea

(+82) 032-458-6450  
ieu@gcfund.org  
ieu.greenclimate.fund



GREEN  
CLIMATE  
FUND

Independent  
Evaluation  
Unit

