

Annex1

TERMS OF REFERENCE

I. Background

1. The terms of reference (TOR) seeks to define the work needed for the revision and completion of the integrated results framework and to engage with a consultancy firm to further progress this work. Through decisions B.05/03 and B.07/04, the Board adopted result areas of the Fund and elements of the initial results management framework (RMF) and decided that the Fund, as a continuously learning institution, will maintain the flexibility to refine its results management framework, result areas and performance indicators and that lessons learned will feed back into the design, funding criteria and implementation of funded activities.

2. Through decision B.08/07, the Board adopted proposed mitigation and adaptation performance measurement frameworks (PMFs) and took note that the Secretariat will further develop methodologies, protocols for the indicators in consultation with relevant experts and thematic bodies and will refine them, as necessary, based on experience gained and lessons learned over time and further develop the PMF's gender-responsive approach. An initiative was undertaken by the Secretariat in 2018 to further develop indicators in the PMFs through a learning, coherence and complementarity approach.

3. Accordance with decision B.19/21, the Independent Evaluation Unit (IEU) carried out an independent review of the GCF initial RMF and presented it at B.22. Its findings and recommendations provide useful assessment on areas for improvement on the design of the RMF and PMFs, their potential integration and refinements, and call for a strengthening of adaptation metrics within GCF's operations, particularly a rethink on the adaptation core indicator. The relevant document on IEU's review can be found [here](https://www.greenclimate.fund/documents/20182/1424894/GCF_B.22_07_-_Results_management_framework_Independent_Evaluation_Unit_recommendations_to_improve_the_Results_Management_Framework_-_Final_Report.pdf/e65a3ff1-0b16-1224-ed73-840a6a7f2736). (https://www.greenclimate.fund/documents/20182/1424894/GCF_B.22_07_-_Results_management_framework_Independent_Evaluation_Unit_recommendations_to_improve_the_Results_Management_Framework_-_Final_Report.pdf/e65a3ff1-0b16-1224-ed73-840a6a7f2736)

4. At B.22, the Board requested the Secretariat to review and update the RMF and PMFs through an integrated approach by incorporating decisions, policies and frameworks that are relevant to the Fund's management for results architecture along with the recommendations by the IEU. This is one of the core initial policy frameworks of the Fund to be reviewed by the Board in 2019 along with other frameworks on accreditation, investment, and private sector modalities.

II. Objective

5. The consultancy firm will support the Secretariat's effort to define the Fund's 'fit-for-purpose' results management approach and complete the results architecture through the integration of the Results Management Framework (RMF), Performance Measurement Frameworks (PMFs) and relevant components of the Investment Framework (IF) under the guidance and supervision of the Secretariat. A 'fit for purpose' results management framework will allow the GCF to work with its accredited entities (AE) and countries to effectively define, measure and report the results of funded activities at the project level, allow for tracking of progress against portfolio level goals, and support an understanding of progress toward the Fund's overall objectives to promote paradigm shift towards low-emissions climate resilient development and implementation of the Paris Agreement and countries' Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs). It will provide further recommendation to refine the set of indicators used, bearing in mind the greater challenge of defining criterion to measure granularities associated with adaptation – type indicators. The cascading and integration of IF to RMF and PMFs will help provide a clearer and more coherent picture to determine the multiple causal pathway(s) cutting across impact areas to project/program level outputs to provide better assumptions/evidence of



how and why certain changes should occur in GCF funding activities, either through attribution or contribution. These efforts will build on lessons from comparable climate finance mechanisms and other institutions and be undertaken for GCF specific investment criterion, including paradigm shift potential, impact potential, sustainable development potential, country ownership etc.

6. On completion of the redesign of the framework, the firm will develop methodologies, protocols and guidelines for the integrated RMF to ensure AEs, executing entities (EEs) and other stakeholders can clearly understand and apply relevant methodologies and minimum standards to measure and report against progress made for each result area and corresponding key performance indicator(s) to improve monitoring and evaluation in a manner that allows aggregation and comparison, to the extent possible, at the portfolio level. In parallel, an action plan on how protocols and guidelines are to be applied to AEs will be developed considering varying degrees of measurement, reporting and verification systems (MRVs) and M&E capacity among the AEs.

7. The firm will also build the capacity and knowledge of the divisions and units within the Secretariat involved in the assessment and appraisal of funding and readiness proposals. This knowledge will support staff of divisions in creating high quality results frameworks/logical frameworks and adequate M&E plans to credibly track progress against the key result areas and performance enhancement standards, using objectively verifiable indicators, sex – disaggregated targets, appropriate, relevant methodologies, protocols, guidelines and a minimum set of benchmarks.

III. Methodology

Element 1: Design of an integrated RMF

8. The firm will assist the Secretariat in developing a design for an integrated results framework that (i) addresses relevant recommendations from the IEU’s evaluation of the RMF and lessons learned from the initial resource mobilization period (ii) is ‘fit-for-purpose’ and considers the evolving results management requirements of the Fund as it enters its first replenishment period.

9. The IEU’s recommendations to improve the RMF, adopted at the twenty-second meeting of the GCF Board, includes several findings and 10 key recommendations on how to further streamline the design of the RMF.

10. The revision of the RMF should address the 10 key recommendations of the IEU by pursuing an integrated management for results approach that will merge frameworks that are relevant to establishing the Fund’s results architecture, namely the IF, RMF and PMFs. Cascading these will allow the Fund to highlight, and apply, broader, clearer and more coherent causal linkages across the results chain starting from high impact areas to ones that cascade down to the more contextual outcomes and output areas.

11. In addressing recommendations to strengthen and build an integrated RMF, the firm should also review the robustness of the RMF for the Fund’s strategic objectives as it enters its first replenishment period. These include the requirement to track progress against its core mandate of achieving transformational change and a paradigm shift towards low-emission and climate resilient development, as well as promoting implementation of the Paris Agreement and countries NDCs, both of which are insufficiently articulated in the current design of the RMF.

Element 2: Protocols and guidelines

12. M&E and MRV protocols for the integrated RMF will be developed, to define the method, data requirement (how data for the indicator is compiled and how it is informed, by whom, with what frequency and unit, and the methods for calculations and reporting). The protocols (especially for adaptation) will be flexible and context-specific. Requirements for flexibility and a tailored approach are important considering the Fund’s endeavour to further streamline measurement protocols according to global standards, especially for adaptation related KPIs.



13. Guidelines will be produced to strengthen the capacity and knowledge of AEs/EEs/NDAs and other relevant partner institutions for application of GCF results management, reporting and enhanced M&E principles with a focus on integrating adequately the revised holistic RMF; particularly revised KPIs, MRVs and M&E into funding proposals (FP) to enhance results-based planning, design, implementation and management processes.

IV. Expected Deliverables

Considering the strategic programming work related directly to the first replenishment and its alignment with the management for results architecture, the consultancy firm, under the guidance of the Secretariat, shall:

In the short-term:

14. Complete a stock – take of gaps and opportunities to strengthen and streamline the Fund’s RMF, including intersections with the IF and other policy frameworks, and options for addressing these;

15. Review and revise the RMF and PMFs by merging the two while taking account Board decisions, policies and frameworks relevant to results management, including the IEU’s review: a) refine mitigation and adaptation logic models, KPIs and associated methodological guidelines on M&E and MRV protocols, starting with – but not fully restricted to – core mitigation and adaptation indicators; b) articulate GCF’s strategic objectives, including to promote paradigm shift towards low-emission and climate-resilient development, and advance implementation of the Paris Agreement and Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs), Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs); and c) publish a proposed revised RMF (incorporating PMFs) for the Board’s consideration at its twenty-fourth meeting, together with recommendations for any associated adjustments to other Fund policy frameworks (see the GCF process and timeline for [B.24 publication](#)).

In the medium- and long-term:

16. Further develop an integrated and ‘fit-for-purpose’ RMF for the Fund, that (i) addresses further development and completion of indicators (ii) cascades down from the IF to the combined RMF and PMFs, providing a clearer and more coherent picture to determine causal pathway(s) cutting across impact areas (iii) considers the unique results management requirements of the Fund, including potential interactions between country and project/program level results management.

17. Develop methodologies, protocols and guidance against mitigation and adaptation indicators in the IF and combined RMF and PMFs to ensure AEs/EEs are aware, and apply, global best industry practices related to MRVs/M&E systems.

V. Deliverables and Timeline

18. The table below shows the major deliverables under the terms of reference and their expected dates of completion.

Deliverable	Date
Stock – take of gaps and opportunities for an integrated and ‘fit-for-purpose’ RMF design	May – June 2019
A proposal for an integrated and ‘fit-for-purpose’ RMF, including a proposed for a merged RMF and PMFs	31 July 2019
A draft Board document addressing comments on the report through consultative processes with relevant internal/external stakeholders	24 August 2019
Publication of the draft Board document for B.24 including a proposal for a revised RMF (incorporating PMFs)	24 September 2019 (B.24 deadline)
Presentation by the Secretariat of the combined RMF and PMFs and proposal for an integrated RMF with support of the consultancy firm	B.24 (October 2019)
Secretariat’s roll out plan for the integrated and coherent RMF	December 2019
Development of further proposals to refine the RMF and development of protocols, guidelines, methodologies	April 2020

VI. Team Composition

19. Team Leader: Master’s degree in environmental science, climate change, environmental development, environmental engineering, business administration or related fields; extensive experience in multi – year strategy formulation together with some experience mobilizing resources based on a management for results architecture, organizational assessments and evaluation of climate and development programmes; familiarity with the global climate architecture, Paris Agreement and reporting frameworks; strong knowledge on climate change M&E systems; demonstrating key expertise on developing KPIs, corresponding MRVs, protocols and guidelines for mitigation and adaptation models; minimum 15 years of work experience. Strong leadership skills with demonstrated experience of leading competent and globally recognized team of experts in climate change M&E. Well recognized expert in the climate change M&E space. Good administrative and operational management skills.

20. Senior Mitigation M&E Expert: Master’s degree in environmental science, climate change, environmental development, environmental engineering, business administration or related fields. Extensive experience working on climate change M&E systems and strong applied knowledge of working, and demonstrating key expertise on, developing KPIs, associated MRVs, methodologies and protocols for mitigation models.

21. Senior Adaptation M&E Expert: Master’s degree in environmental science, climate change, livelihoods security, environmental development, or related fields. Extensive experience working on climate change M&E systems and strong applied knowledge of working, and demonstrating key expertise on, developing KPIs, associated MRVs, methodologies and protocols for granular and context – specific adaptation models.



22. Stakeholder Consultations Expert: Bachelor's degree (Master's preferred) in environmental science, climate change, or related fields. Extensive experience working on stakeholders' consultations, survey methodologies, analysis and synthesis. Strong knowledge with demonstrated experience in climate change and good interpersonal, facilitative skills and ability to bring together diverse stakeholders to reach consensus on complex climate change planning and implementation issues, using a broader buy – in, coherence and complementarity approach.

VII. Reporting Arrangements

23. The consultancy firm will report to the Secretariat with first-level engagement with the Office of Portfolio Management (OPM) and direct reporting line to the Head of OPM, and second-level engagement with the Division of Mitigation and Adaptation, Private Sector Facility and the Division of Country Programming. The consultancy firm will regularly, or as and when necessary, keep the Executive Director and Deputy Executive Director informed of progressed made and milestones achieved.