



## THE IEU'S INDEPENDENT REVIEW OF THE GCF'S RESULTS MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK — A SUMMARY\*

### BACKGROUND

The purpose of the Green Climate Fund's (GCF) results management framework (RMF) is to enable effective monitoring and evaluation of the outputs, outcomes and impacts of the Fund's investments and portfolio, as well as the Fund's organisational effectiveness and operational efficiency. The RMF is also expected to include measurable, transparent, effective and efficient indicators and systems to support the Fund's operations, including how the GCF addresses economic, social and environmental development co-benefits and gender sensitivity. Lessons learned from the RMF should feed back into the design, funding criteria and implementation of GCF activities.

### PURPOSE OF THE REVIEW

At its nineteenth meeting, the GCF Board requested the IEU to carry out a review of the Fund's RMF that would:

1. Assess the design, implementation, and utility of the RMF.
2. Develop recommendations based on the find-

*\*The IEU's RMF review was submitted to the GCF Board at its twenty-first meeting.*

ings to help inform subsequent adaptive management.

### RECOMMENDATIONS

The IEU's review offers the following recommendations:

**First**, the GCF Secretariat should **develop and operationalize theories of change** for key thematic areas and integrate these into project proposals early.

**Second**, the Secretariat should **update the RMF and Performance Measurement Frameworks (PMF), address deficiencies and develop protocols that provide guidance on what, who, when, and how** indicators can and should be measured. Furthermore, the Secretariat should harmonize critical concepts and indicators and develop standards and methods for new indicators for mitigation and adaptation projects **through collaboration with other key agencies and stakeholders**. Attention should be given to identifying a **reliable core indicator of adaptation**.

**Third**, the GCF Secretariat should develop a trans-



parent **web-based portfolio management system** that allows different stakeholders to view project related information and progress in real-time.

**Fourth**, 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 and implementing entities. The distinction between the roles of accredited entities and implementing entities also needs to be clarified.

**Fifth**, the Secretariat should initiate a dialogue with the National Designated Authorities (NDAs), Accredited Entities (AEs) and other key stakeholders to define the appropriate role of the NDAs throughout the project cycle. And, where possible, GCF indicators should **link with country monitoring indicators and SDG reporting**.

**Sixth**, The Secretariat should **clarify roles and responsibilities internally** and ensure that during project preparation, sufficient attention is paid to the design and budgeting of a project monitoring and evaluation system prior to project proposal approval.

**Seventh**, as was undertaken for this review, **the 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.

**Eighth**, the IEU should prepare **guidelines** for project evaluations.

**Ninth**, on approval from the GCF Board, the IEU should conduct **an independent review of the accreditation process** that considers the extensive deficiencies in the evaluability and likelihood of credible reporting identified by this review across the portfolio of approved projects.

**Tenth**, the Secretariat should revise its indicators on gender to more fully address other aspects of **social**

## Box: METHODS

The review was carried out from March to September of 2018. First, a desk review and analysis of key documents were undertaken to provide information on the elements of the GCF's RMF, and on corresponding performance measurement frameworks.

The review also built on a review of international experience, which identified the main challenges in the design of results management experienced by other international organisations. The review team has also consulted more than 100 stakeholders through key informant interviews and focus group discussions, including with staff from the GCF Secretariat, NDAs, and AEs.

The team also carried out a portfolio analysis of the GCF's approved projects, an analysis of available annual progress reports that had been submitted to the GCF Secretariat. It also built on another portfolio review done by the IEU, that looked at the quality at entry of GCF proposals.

The review team also undertook three country evaluation missions in Kenya, Rwanda, and Viet Nam to capture first-hand relevant experience and insights into processes and capacities related to the implementation of the RMF at a regional, national and local level.

**inclusion** and integrate these into the RMF. The Secretariat should also clarify the Fund's gender- and social-inclusion impact and outcome priorities, especially regarding mitigation. 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.

### CONTACT THE IEU:

Independent Evaluation Unit  
Green Climate Fund

175, Art center-daero, Yeonsu-gu,  
Incheon 22004, Republic of Korea

(+82) 032-458-6428 ieu@gcfund.org ieu.greenclimate.fund



GREEN  
CLIMATE  
FUND

Independent  
Evaluation  
Unit

