



Funding Proposal Review Checklist for Measuring Impact

This checklist is intended to serve Funding Proposal appraisal teams in determining whether proposed projects are constructed to credibly measure and report on the impact attributable to the GCF investment. It looks at three key areas to help determine a proposal's impact evaluability.

I. Theory of Change

This is critical to the successful articulation of a programme, and for understanding if proposed activities can and will lead to favorable investment outcomes.

- The participation and engagement of key project team members and stakeholders' in developing TOC is ensured.
- The programme interventions and activities are clearly and explicitly defined.
- The programme's projected results are mapped to activities.
- Critical assumptions underlying pathways are listed.
- Critical bottlenecks are identified and considered with monitoring plans.
- Alternative transmission routes such as unintended consequences are identified, considered and accounted for (in the text).
- 'Quality evidence' in support of the efficacy of causal links is cited.
- 'Quality evidence' in support of the effectiveness of Theory of Change links is cited.
- The projected timeline for outcomes and impacts are discussed.
- (Preferably) there is a pictorial illustration of the Theory of Change.

II. Implementation Planning and Fidelity

Monitoring and Evaluation systems should help track and report on implementation and progress of programme activities. A well-defined implementation strategy lays the groundwork for any potential outcome or impact.

- Geographic areas in which the project will be implemented are defined, as well as the rationale are well documented (Why were certain regions or populations chosen? How were they chosen?).
- The implementation timeline is clearly laid out.
- Beneficiary selection criteria and targeting mechanisms are well-articulated.
- Qualitative data collection activities are planned



- It is ensured that indicators and measurements have the potential to inform results.
- Monitoring and data collection frameworks are defined with adequate provisions made for monitoring implementation
- Indicators and measurements are SMART and well-defined.

III. Impact Measurement

Impact evaluation requires rigorous methodology. Impact evaluations are imperative for examining if investments will be able to credibly report change caused by them (or whether the change would have occurred anyway) as well as to report cost-effectiveness.

- Rationale and justification for why an impact evaluation should take place is well-articulated (i.e., learning, donor reporting, evidence for innovation effectiveness/efficacy, learning if implementation is working, global evidence on effectiveness' etc.)
- Project questions and goals are well defined.
- Credible methods for measuring attributable causal changes are well-articulated:
 - Experimental methods, or
 - Quasi-experimental methods.
- There is some discussion of adequate sample size (and the variables that affect it such as effect size, intra cluster correlation and sample variance).
- There is expertise and sufficient staff for implementing and managing impact evaluation within the project team, or there are plans to hire this expertise externally.
- Baseline, mid-line and end-line data collection strategy is planned and discussed – both quantitative and qualitative.
- Areas of potential bias in data collection are discussed explicitly and are accounted for.
- Paradigm shift potential is identifiable and articulated.
- Budget lines for data collection are included and appropriate and sufficient.