

## ANNEX 1

### TERMS OF REFERENCE

#### Consultancy Services for Independent Evaluation of GCF's Approach to and Portfolio of Climate Information and Early Warning System Interventions

##### I. Introduction

###### A. Aims

At the fortieth meeting of the Green Climate Fund (GCF) Board (B.40), held in Songdo, Korea, from October 21–24, 2024, the Board approved the IEU workplan and budget and update of its three-year rolling objectives<sup>1</sup>. This workplan includes the undertaking of an evaluation of the GCF's approach to and portfolio of climate information and early warning system (CIEWS) interventions, as well as the IEU's mandate to submit the evaluation report by the first Board meeting of 2026. Accordingly, this document outlines the context, scope, methods, phases and timelines, and deliverables planned for this evaluation. Please note that the methods and timelines are considered iterative and may be revised during the evaluation.

###### B. Background of GCF and IEU

The Green Climate Fund (GCF) is a multilateral fund established in 2010 to support developing countries' efforts to respond to the challenge of climate change. Paragraph 2 of The Governing Instrument (GI)<sup>2</sup> states that the Fund will contribute to achieving the objectives of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC). The GCF promotes a paradigm shift towards low-emission and climate-resilient development pathways in developing countries. As an operating entity of the Financial Mechanism of the UNFCCC, the GCF supports climate change mitigation and adaptation projects and programs in developing countries. The GCF also serves the Paris Agreement on climate change under Article 9, Paragraph 8 of the Agreement, and to pursue efforts to limit global temperature rises to 1.5C, and to keep it "well below" 2.0C above those recorded in pre-industrial times<sup>3</sup>.

The Independent Evaluation Unit (IEU) was established by the GCF Board to provide objective assessments of the performance and results of the Fund by conducting independent evaluations of the GCF's activities to guarantee its accountability and synthesize learnings from high-quality and rigorous evaluations to support GCF's effectiveness and efficiency. The IEU is mandated to discharge a dual accountability and learning function<sup>4</sup>, central to the GCF as a learning organization. This dual accountability-learning function is also laid out in the GI and the Updated Terms of Reference of the IEU (Updated TOR).<sup>5</sup>

###### C. Context

###### *Global context*

The Paris Agreement adopted in December 2015 and under Articles 7 and 8 specifically mentions early warning systems as key elements of climate change adaptation measures to enhance adaptive capacity, strengthen resilience, reduce vulnerability of communities, and minimize losses and damages associated with the adverse effects of climate change.<sup>6</sup> The need for early warning systems is also captured in the

---

<sup>1</sup> GCF/B.40/14.

<sup>2</sup> As annexed to decision 3/CP.17 presented in UNFCCC document FCCC/CP/2011/9/Add.1.

<sup>3</sup> Article 2 (a)

<sup>4</sup> Decision B.BM-2021/07, Annex I.

<sup>5</sup> Decision B.BM-2021/15, Annex I.

<sup>6</sup> [https://unfccc.int/sites/default/files/english\\_paris\\_agreement.pdf](https://unfccc.int/sites/default/files/english_paris_agreement.pdf)

Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction adopted in March 2015, where the availability and accessibility of multi-hazard early warning systems (MHEWS) was included as one of the seven global targets within the Framework along with six concrete global level indicators to track progress against the target.<sup>7</sup> Furthermore, under the 2030 Agenda, early warning systems are considered crucial for achieving goal 3 (health and well-being) and goal 13 (climate action) of the UN Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) even though no explicit goal or indicator on early warning systems is provided in the SDGs.

Subsequently, the Early Warnings for All initiative (EW4All) launched in March 2022 by the UN Secretary General António Guterres triggered a global attention to deliver climate justice to those at the frontlines of the climate crisis. As a follow up to the EW4All, 2023 Global Status of Multi-Hazard Early Warning Systems report produced by the United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction (UNDRR) and the World Meteorological Organization (WMO) finds that while 101 countries now have an early warning system, which is double the coverage since 2015, only half of countries worldwide have adequate MHEWS, and one third of the world's population is still not covered.<sup>8</sup> Moreover, the report notes that parties located in Africa, Least Developed Countries (LDCs), Caribbean, Latin America, and Small Island Developing States (SIDS) suffer the greatest gaps in data and finance for implementing early warning systems with only 46 percent of LDCs and 39 percent of SIDS reported the existence of MHEWS.

At COP28, the UAE Framework for Global Climate Resilience was adopted with a view to enhancing adaptation action and support for all Parties including establishing the MHEWS by 2027.<sup>9</sup> Furthermore, developing indicators against global goal on adaptation covering early warning systems is currently ongoing through UAE-Belém work programme on indicators and due for adoption at COP30/7<sup>th</sup> Conference of the Parties Meeting as Parties to the Paris Agreement (CMA7) in November 2025. The discussion on early warning systems continued at COP29 given that large financial, knowledge and communication gaps still exist in developing countries to implement the CIEWS.

### *GCF context*

Since its establishment, GCF has made significant investments in CIEWS-related interventions in developing countries. The portfolio of projects related to CIEWS has grown over years beginning with the approval of the first two projects related to CIEWS in 2015: FP002: Scaling up the use of Modernized Climate information and Early Warning Systems in Malawi<sup>10</sup>; and FP004: Climate Resilient Infrastructure Mainstreaming in Bangladesh.<sup>11</sup> As of November 2024, based on the current information on the GCF portfolio of projects/programmes, the GCF has invested or will have invested an estimated USD 1.2 billion in climate information and or early warning system interventions across 84 projects/programmes globally covering 87 countries, including 22 SIDS, 33 LDCs, and 28 African States<sup>12</sup>. See Annex 2 for the tentative list of CIEWS related projects/programmes within the current GCF portfolio of funded activities.

In GCF policies and documents, the term "early warning systems" (EWS) first appeared in 2014 within the institution's results frameworks, known as the GCF Initial Results Framework (IRF)<sup>13</sup> and the GCF Mitigation and Adaptation Performance Measurement Frameworks<sup>14</sup>. These Board-approved policy documents noted a CIEWS indicator as needing "further refinement" for the purpose of performance

---

<sup>7</sup> <https://www.preventionweb.net/sendai-framework/sendai-framework-indicators>.

<sup>8</sup> UNDRR and WMO, Global Status of Multi-Hazard Early Warning Systems.

<https://www.undrr.org/media/91954/download?startDownload=20241110>

<sup>9</sup> UNFCCC decision /CMA5 on Glasgow–Sharm el-Sheikh work programme on the global goal on adaptation referred to in decision 7/CMA.3; [https://unfccc.int/sites/default/files/resource/cma5\\_auv\\_8a\\_gga.pdf](https://unfccc.int/sites/default/files/resource/cma5_auv_8a_gga.pdf)

<sup>10</sup> [FP002: Scaling up the use of Modernized Climate information and Early Warning Systems in Malawi | Green Climate Fund](#).

<sup>11</sup> [FP004: Climate Resilient Infrastructure Mainstreaming \(CRIM\) | Green Climate Fund](#)

<sup>12</sup> The funding amounts directed to CIEWS were estimated by taking the sector-based percentage breakdowns available in the GCF's system known as Integrated Portfolio Management System (IPMS) for each project/programme and multiplying these by the GCF funding amounts for corresponding projects/programmes. Note projects/programmes without the sector-based percentage breakdown information were excluded from the CIEWS list/calculation.

<sup>13</sup> Decision B.07/04.

<sup>14</sup> Decision B.08/07.

tracking of GCF investments. Then the second results framework of the GCF, known as the Integrated Results Management Framework (IRMF), adopted by the GCF Board in 2022<sup>15</sup>, included a supplementary indicator specific to CIEWS interventions: Supplementary Indicator 2.4 tracks the number of beneficiaries (female/male) covered by new or improved early warning systems. As of November 2024, out of 95 projects/programmes approved by the GCF Board under the IRMF, 30 projects/programmes (7 private and 23 public), with an estimated USD 556 million, will have interventions related to CIEWS, according to current GCF data<sup>16</sup>.

Furthermore, the Climate Information and Early Warning Services Sectoral Guide, developed by the GCF Secretariat in 2022<sup>17</sup>, serves as a guiding document for GCF's accredited entities (AEs) in formulating GCF funding proposals. It outlines three paradigm-shifting pathways for achieving CIEWS that can be integrated into both mitigation and adaptation interventions. These pathways are: 1) strengthening climate information services (CIS); 2) promoting impact-based multi-hazard early warning systems (MHEWS) and early action; and 3) leveraging CIEWS for uptake, investment and financial decisions beyond adaptation interventions including in transport, renewable energy and energy efficiency sectors among others.

Yet another development is the launch of GCF-SAP CREWS Scaling-up Framework for early warning<sup>18</sup> in 2023. This is a joint framework of the GCF and the Climate Risk and Early Warning Systems (CREWS)<sup>19</sup> to fast-track access to the GCF finance through its Simplified Approval Process (SAP)<sup>20</sup> for countries with ongoing or recently completed CREWS projects. Currently the framework is in piloting and gap-filling phase with some CREWS-supported projects under the SAP pipeline.

Building on the development of these GCF policies, resources and partnerships, the Strategic Plan for the Green Climate Fund 2024–2027 was adopted at the thirty-sixth meeting of the Board (B.36). It provides 11 indicators with targeted results to be achieved during the strategic period. This includes Target 3 on CIEWS: protecting 50 to 60 developing countries particularly vulnerable to the adverse effects of climate change with new or improved early warning systems. Table 1 below provides, in chronological order, the list of GCF policies and operational resources relevant to CIEWS, as well as GCF programming and results-based management more broadly, as pertinent to this evaluation.

**Table 1 – List of GCF policies and operational resources relevant to this evaluation**

Type of document	Name of Policy and or Operational document
Policy	Initial results management framework of the Fund <sup>21</sup>
Policy	Initial Investment framework <sup>22</sup>
Policy	Mitigation and adaptation performance measurement frameworks (PMFs) <sup>23</sup>
Policy	Further development of the initial investment framework: sub-criteria and methodology <sup>24</sup>
Policy	Initial monitoring and accountability framework for accredited entities <sup>25</sup>
Policy	Guidelines for enhanced country ownership and country drivenness <sup>26</sup>
Policy	Evaluation policy for the GCF <sup>27</sup>
Policy	Strategic planning for 2020–2023: Update to the Strategic Plan of the GCF <sup>28</sup>
Policy	Integrated results management framework (IRMF) <sup>29</sup>

Operational document	IRMF draft results handbook <sup>30</sup>
Operational document	Sectoral guide: Climate information & early warning systems <sup>31</sup>
Policy	Principles for demonstrating the impact potential of GCF-supported activities <sup>32</sup>
Policy	Strategic Plan for the Green Climate Fund 2024–2027 <sup>33</sup>
Operational document	GCF-SAP CREWS Scaling-up Framework for early warning <sup>34</sup>

## II. Objectives

The overall objectives of the evaluation are:

1. To assess the relevance, coherence and complementarity of GCF approach to the overall EWS initiative(s);
2. To assess GCF's efficiency and innovativeness in leveraging its funding windows such as GCF's Readiness Preparatory Support Programme (RPSP); Project Preparation Facility (PPF) and funded activities including standard proposal approval process (PAP) and simplified approval process (SAP) for supporting CIEWS interventions; and
3. To establish and assess the evidence of (both realized and potential) impacts and effectiveness of the CIEWS portfolio of projects/programmes based on an agreed analytical framework as well as to evaluate additionality and contribution of GCF investments to the overall EWS initiatives.

<sup>15</sup> Decision B.29/01.

<sup>16</sup> The data was extracted from Integrated Portfolio Management System (IPMS) – GCF's portfolio management application. The estimated funding amounts relevant to CIEWS interventions were calculated based on sector-based percentage breakdown information made available for approved projects/programmes in the IPMS. Note some information in the IPMS may not be fully up to date and subject to review by the GCF Secretariat. In addition, some countries are overlapping across LDCs, SIDS and or African States.

<sup>17</sup> [Sectoral guide: Climate information & early warning systems | Green Climate Fund.](#)

<sup>18</sup> [GCF-SAP CREWS Scaling-up Framework for early warning | Green Climate Fund](#)

<sup>19</sup> [CREWS](#)

<sup>20</sup> [Simplified Approval Process | Green Climate Fund.](#)

<sup>21</sup> Decision B.07/04: [Initial results management framework of the Fund | Green Climate Fund](#)

<sup>22</sup> Decision B.07/06: [Investment framework for GCF-1 | Green Climate Fund](#)

<sup>23</sup> Decision B.08/07: [Mitigation and adaptation performance measurement frameworks | Green Climate Fund](#)

<sup>24</sup> Decision B.09/05: [Initial investment framework: activity-specific sub-criteria and indicative assessment factors | Green Climate Fund](#)

<sup>25</sup> Decision B.11/10: [Monitoring and accountability framework for Accredited Entities | Green Climate Fund](#)

<sup>26</sup> Decision B.17/21: [Guidelines for enhanced country ownership and country drivenness | Green Climate Fund](#)

<sup>27</sup> Decision B.BM-2021/07 [Evaluation policy for the GCF | Green Climate Fund](#)

<sup>28</sup> Decision B.24/03: [Updated Strategic Plan for the Green Climate Fund 2020-2023 | Green Climate Fund](#)

<sup>29</sup> Decision B.29/01: [Integrated results management framework | Green Climate Fund](#)

<sup>30</sup> [Draft results handbook | Green Climate Fund.](#)

<sup>31</sup> [Sectoral guide: Climate information & early warning systems | Green Climate Fund](#)

<sup>32</sup> Decision B.33/12: [Principles for demonstrating the impact potential of GCF-supported activities | Green Climate Fund](#)

<sup>33</sup> Decision B.36/13 (a): [Strategic Plan for the Green Climate Fund 2024–2027 | Green Climate Fund](#)

<sup>34</sup> <https://www.greenclimate.fund/document/gcf-sap-crews-scaling-framework-early-warning>

### III. Scope and Approach

The IEU seeks the services of a firm to undertake the 'Independent Evaluation of the GCF's approach to and portfolio of Climate Information and Early Warning System Interventions (CIEWS)'. The scope of the services is provided below.

#### A. *Scope of projects/programmes and related data under this evaluation*

This evaluation is a portfolio-level evaluation of the GCF CIEWS interventions but also to assess GCF's approach to supporting CIEWS and should be utilization focused (i.e. useful and usable for GCF stakeholders). In terms of data coverage, any additional projects/programmes with CIEWS components approved by the GCF Board during the evaluation exercise will need to be incrementally added into the portfolio-level analyses<sup>35</sup>.

Regarding the third objective of the evaluation, which aims to establish and assess the impacts and effectiveness of the GCF's CIEWS portfolio, this evaluation will focus on CIEWS projects/programmes that submitted an Annual Performance Report (APR) for the 2024 cycle or the final annual performance report, also known as the Project Completion Report (PCR), covering the period on or before the cut-off date of 31 December 2024. This will help determine the realized as well as potential impacts at the portfolio level but also allow the IEU to categorize these CIEWS projects/programmes into clusters of interventions to analyse and better understand successful approaches and practices relevant under each cluster. Note that the data cut-off date of 31 December 2024 will be the latest ex-post (realized) data available within the GCF Secretariat during the evaluation exercise.

#### B. *Analytical scope*

This evaluation involves developing analytical framework(s) based on a literature review of existing studies, academic articles and documents from COP and climate funds on climate information and early warning systems as well as broader discussions on disaster risk reductions, integrated climate risk management and climate change adaptation measures including minimizing losses and damages from the adverse effects of climate change. Based on a thorough review of the existing literature, combined with a review of the GCF portfolio of CIEWS-related projects/programmes, the selected firm is expected to propose the most suitable analytical and evaluative framework(s) for this evaluation to address the key evaluation objectives noted above. While the selected firm is welcome to propose innovative ways to analyse the GCF approach towards CIEWS as well as GCF's portfolio of CIEWS interventions, the main existing framework likely to be useful will be the four components of effective and inclusive EWS, as shown in Figure 1 below. Additionally, the selected firm should consider GCF Sectoral guide: Climate information & early warning systems<sup>36</sup> which outlines the GCF's approach to mainstreaming CIEWS across and beyond adaptation interventions and results areas.

---

<sup>35</sup> See annex 2 for the tentative list of the current GCF portfolio of CIEWS related projects /programmes.

<sup>36</sup> [Sectoral guide: Climate information & early warning systems | Green Climate Fund](#)

**Figure 1 Four components of an early warning system<sup>37</sup>**



**C. Review of the pilot GCF-SAP CREWS Scaling-up Framework for early warning**

This evaluation will also include a formative assessment of the pilot GCF-SAP CREWS Scaling-up Framework for early warning<sup>38</sup>. As noted in the GCF context, there is a joint framework between the GCF and CREWS<sup>39</sup> to fast-track access to GCF finance through its Simplified Approval Process (SAP)<sup>40</sup> for countries with ongoing or recently completed CREWS projects. These CREWS projects focus on directly supporting early warning actions in SIDS, LDCs, and fragile and/or conflict-affected situations. Currently, the framework is in the piloting and gap-filling phase, with some CREWS-supported projects in the SAP pipeline. Therefore, this evaluation will include an assessment of the existing and future roles that the GCF SAP modality can play in supporting CIEWS interventions, as well as identifying existing gaps and providing related recommendations for the framework.

**D. Synthesis of relevant IEU evaluations**

The evaluation exercise will include a brief synthesis of previous evaluations and evidence reviews conducted by the IEU to inform the overall GCF context discussions that will be included in the main evaluation report. Table 2 below provides a list of previous IEU evaluations relevant to this evaluation. These evaluations, led by the IEU, are also available on the IEU's website.

**Table 2 – List of relevant IEU Evaluations previously undertaken by the IEU**

#	Report Title
1	Independent Evaluation of the Relevance and Effectiveness of the Green Climate Fund’s Investments in the SIDS (SIDS2020)
2	Independent evaluation of the adaptation portfolio and approach of the Green Climate Fund (Adapt2021)

<sup>37</sup> The UN Global Early Warning Initiative for the Implementation of Climate Adaptation Executive Action Plan 2023-2027. [EARLY WARNINGS FOR ALL](#)

<sup>38</sup> [GCF-SAP CREWS Scaling-up Framework for early warning | Green Climate Fund](#)

<sup>39</sup> [Climate Risk and Early Warning Systems \(CREWS\)](#)

<sup>40</sup> [Simplified Approval Process | Green Climate Fund.](#)

#	Report Title
3	Independent Evaluation of the GCF's Approach to the Private Sector (Priv2021)
4	Independent evaluation of the relevance and effectiveness of the GCF's investments in the LDCs (LDC2022)
5	Independent evaluation of the relevance and effectiveness of the GCF's investments in the African States (AFR2022)
6	Second Performance Review of the Green Climate Fund (SPR2023)
7	Independent Evaluation of the GCF's Readiness and Preparatory Support Programme (RPSP2023)
8	Independent Evaluation of the GCF's 'Health and Well-being, and Food and Water Security' Result Area (HFW2024) - ongoing and to be submitted to the GCF Board in early 2025
9	Independent Evaluation of the GCF's Approach to Indigenous Peoples - ongoing and to be submitted to the GCF Board in early 2025

#### *E. Complementarity and Coherence across climate funds and other international organizations*

In 2017, the GCF Board approved the policy "Matters Related to Guidance from the Conference of Parties: Complementarity and Coherence"<sup>41</sup>, which initiated the establishment of a framework to strengthen complementarity and enhance coherence with the operations and processes of other climate finance institutions. In light of this, as well as ongoing global EWS initiatives such as EW4All, this evaluation will include a review of the CIEWS work of other climate funds and international organizations to assess how well these global actors are collaborating at the fund level, intervention level, and country level to enhance complementarity and coherence on CIEWS. Project information from the Global Environment Facility (GEF), Adaptation Fund (AF), and Climate Investment Fund (CIF) will be considered for review where available. Based on the desk review, and if deemed necessary, a short online survey may be administered among the global actors to better understand their work on CIEWS. The analysis and discussion on coherence and complementarity will be integrated into the main evaluation report.

#### *F. Field missions and production of country case studies*

To verify preliminary findings and address any data gaps identified during the desk review, the selected firm is expected to undertake country visits (around five countries) across geographical regions such as Latin America and Caribbean (LAC), Asia and Pacific, Africa and or Europe including those countries classified as LDCs and or SIDS. While the main objective of the country missions is to triangulate and inform evaluation findings, the selected firm is also expected to produce country case studies for the visited countries which will be annexed to the main report. These case studies should highlight key results/impacts relevant to CIEWS, their successes and lessons learned. Note that the country visits will be accompanied by IEU staff members who will be part of this evaluation.

The list of countries to visit will be agreed during the inception phase based on a combination of 1) preliminary findings and existing data gaps identified during desk review; 2) consideration of other country visits planned or undertaken for ongoing or past IEU-led evaluations; and 3) finding synergy with IEU's flagship Learning Oriented Real-time Impact Assessment (LORTA) program<sup>42</sup>. The LORTA programme includes several CIEWS projects with household survey data collected or to be collected directly from

<sup>41</sup> Decision B.17/04.

<sup>42</sup> [LORTA | Independent Evaluation Unit | Green Climate Fund.](#)

communities impacted by and or controlled for CIEWS related interventions<sup>43</sup>. Accordingly, this evaluation aims to leverage the available household survey data and emerging findings from quasi-experimental studies undertaken by the IEU LORTA team to provide more rigorous evidence of impacts for countries with CIEWS projects/programmes.

#### IV. Evaluation Questions

This evaluation will use the GCF evaluation criteria from the Evaluation Policy <sup>44</sup>. Evaluation questions linked to the respective GCF evaluation criteria are listed below. Key evaluation questions will be further refined or modified along with the development of sub-questions (where relevant), data sources, and methods of analysis during the inception phase. All evaluation questions are meant to be answered through the triangulation of traceable and relevant information, and data and observations collected from various sources.

#	GCF EVALUATION CRITERIA	EVALUATION QUESTION
1	Relevance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To what extent does the GCF portfolio of CIEWS interventions align with the needs and gaps faced by national and sub-national governments and communities in addressing climate vulnerabilities?</li> <li>To what extent GCF’s approach to CIEWS relevant to the global CIEWS initiatives?</li> </ul>
2	Effectiveness /Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To what extent has the CIEWS portfolio been successful or unsuccessful in terms of:               <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Enhancing or making climate information services available to communities with a view to reducing their climate vulnerabilities?</li> <li>Making MHEWS widely available, accessible and responsive to climate change-induced disasters, and promoting knowledge sharing and early actions and responses by national, sub-national governments and communities?</li> <li>Improving and leveraging CIEWS for investments beyond adaptation projects?</li> </ol> </li> <li>What are the key factors that have facilitated or hindered the progress or achievements of the CIEWS portfolio (i.e. any notable emerging strengths or limitations)?</li> <li>To what extent has the CIEWS portfolio successful in building effective collaboration/coordination mechanisms across regional, national, sub-national and local /community settings to address their climate information and disaster preparedness needs and priorities?</li> <li>What are the key visible changes (impacts) in terms of target communities’ knowledge and behaviours after the CIEWS interventions (this question is more applicable for country case studies with the use of LORTA /household survey data and findings).</li> </ul>

<sup>43</sup> For example, these include: [FP002: Scaling up the use of Modernized Climate information and Early Warning Systems in Malawi | Green Climate Fund](#); [FP068: Scaling-up Multi-Hazard Early Warning System and the Use of Climate Information in Georgia | Green Climate Fund](#); [FP087: Building livelihood resilience to climate change in the upper basins of Guatemala’s highlands | Green Climate Fund](#); and [SAP010: Multi-Hazard Impact-Based Forecasting and Early Warning System for the Philippines | Green Climate Fund](#).

<sup>44</sup> GCF/B.BM-2021/07, Annex 1. [Evaluation policy for the GCF | Green Climate Fund](#).



3	Efficiency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To what extent is GCF leveraging its funding windows such as the RPSP; PPF and SAP for supporting CIEWS interventions?</li> <li>• To what extent are the CIEWS interventions utilized across the portfolio of projects/programmes to address other sectoral issues (e.g. agriculture and food security, cities, building and urban systems, and water security issues etc.)?</li> <li>• How well are financial and technical resources utilized vis-à-vis intended outcomes (mentioned under effectiveness/impact)?</li> <li>• To what extent is the pilot GCF-SAP CREWS Scaling-up Framework to for early warning helping countries to reduce transaction costs and time to access funding for CIEWS?</li> </ul>
4	Sustainability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To what extent have good practices and results from CIEWS interventions been embedded and sustained without being reliant on additional and external funding and support?</li> </ul>
5	Coherence and complementarity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To what extent has the GCF been able to enhance international cooperation toward building accessible CIEWS both in countries and at international fora respectively?</li> </ul>
6	Country ownership	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How well do national and sub-national government stakeholders take ownership of and or implement CIEWS interventions funded by the GCF?</li> <li>• To what extent have government stakeholders taken ownership to engage with communities, civil society organizations (CSOs) and other relevant stakeholders such as women, indigenous groups and other vulnerable groups in CIEWS interventions (i.e. are target communities' integral part of the design of CIEWS?)</li> </ul>
7	Gender equity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To what extent is gender consideration factored into CIEWS interventions?</li> </ul>
8	Innovativeness	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What was done in an innovative way (this question is more applicable for country case studies)?</li> </ul>
9	Replication and scalability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To what extent are CIEWS interventions scalable and or replicable beyond intervention locations and stakeholder groups (any changes observed in replicability and scalability when compared to the design stage) (this question is more applicable for country case studies.)?</li> <li>• Is the pilot GCF-SAP CREWS Scaling-up Framework for early warning helping countries to increase the CIEWS geographical coverage and or address remaining early warning gaps in its value chain?</li> </ul>
10	Unexpected results, both positive and negative	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Where are the emerging unexpected positive and negative results across the CIEWS portfolio?</li> </ul>

## V. Methodology and Phases

This evaluation will employ mixed methods (both qualitative and quantitative) approach to strengthen the findings of the evaluation and its validity. The qualitative methods include: a) literature review including grey literature where relevant; b) focused group discussions (FGDs) and key informant interviews (KIIs) with GCF stakeholders via online and or in person meetings, and supplemented by a short online survey if deemed necessary; and c) qualitative observations through visits made to selected countries to produce country case studies (around 5 countries).

The quantitative approach includes a) analyses of existing GCF portfolio datasets; b) external data sources such as project information from other climate funds and country level data available from early warnings for all dashboards<sup>45</sup>; and c) household survey datasets produced by the IEU LORTA programme where relevant. Any other quantitative datasets and analyses required for this evaluation will be discussed and agreed between the evaluation lead/manager and the selected firm. When undertaking qualitative and quantitative analyses, perspectives for gender, indigenous peoples, and other vulnerable groups will be considered. Note also the extraction, tabulations/visualizations of portfolio level data available from GCF Secretariat systems will be performed by IEU to make good use of this in-house capacity.

In addition to visiting countries, team leader of the selected firm (along with key members if deemed necessary) might be asked to travel to the GCF Headquarters in Songdo, South Korea to meet with IEU team and CIEWS evaluation stakeholders and/or to agree on the overall structure and contents of the evaluation report. Work during the inception phase, as detailed below, will determine such travel requirements, including the list of countries to visit and travel to the GCF Headquarters. Please note that these travel costs including daily subsistence allowance, local travel costs, and air tickets (to Songdo, Korea if required, and country visits) will be reimbursed by the GCF IEU in accordance with the GCF travel policy.

The evaluation should consist of the following four phases:

### A. *Inception Phase (approach paper):*

The main objective of this phase is for the selected firm to deliver sound approach paper for this evaluation containing refined evaluation matrix, evaluation methodologies, and work plan including a travel plan for country case studies among others. See published approach papers from previous IEU evaluations available on the GCF IEU website for further reference.

Accordingly, under this phase, the selected firm is expected to first undertake a review of existing GCF and (both internal and external) CIEWS related documents and data through a desk-based review. The desk review materials include but are not limited to: CIEWS related literature including of other climate funds, previous IEU evaluations, GCF board documents and policies as provided under sections I and III above, legal documents such as funded activity agreements (FAA) and accreditation master agreements (AMAs), approved funding proposals (FPs), APRs/PCRs and interim /final evaluations submitted by accredited entities, CIEWS relevant documents produced from the RPSP and or PPF, quantitative and qualitative results and progress data reported against the PMFs/IRMFs and financial data (e.g. funding, disbursements, and expenditures), amongst other documents. The full list of review documents will be shared in the beginning of the inception phase. Portfolio data tabulations/visualizations will be done by the IEU as noted above.

The firm is then expected to develop overall analytical framework(s) for the evaluation, refine and finalize evaluation matrix containing evaluation questions and sub-questions, data sources, data collection methods in case of data collection needs. The firm will also develop qualitative data collection tools and identify stakeholders to be interviewed. The qualitative data tools include FGD and KII guiding questions for purposely selected key GCF stakeholders such as government stakeholders including GCF national

---

<sup>45</sup> [Early warnings for all dashboards.](#)

designated authorities (NDAs), AEs, GCF Secretariat staff, CSOs and communities alongside academics and subject experts. The selected firm should consider an appropriate representation of the FGD and KII participants including gender representation.

Under this phase, countries should also be selected and agreed with the IEU by taking into consideration synergy with IEU's LORTA programme, geographical representation of GCF CIEWS portfolio, countries classifications (e.g. SIDS and LDCs), and initial findings from literature review and analysis undertaken as part of the desk review. Country visits should be utilized strategically and effectively to fill in the data and information gaps faced by the evaluation team during the inception phase.

#### *B. Country case studies, data collection and initial analyses*

During this phase, the evaluation team, consisting of IEU members and the selected firm members, will visit selected countries for country case studies (around five countries) to collect additional data and information from GCF stakeholders on the ground to inform the evaluation findings. During these missions, the firm is expected to confirm and validate findings, as well as fill in any missing data gaps identified during the desk review.

Upon returning from the missions, the selected firm is expected to conduct quantitative and qualitative data analyses and triangulate findings from the desk review/analyses and country visits to answer the evaluation questions. Findings generated from the triangulated analyses should, in turn, inform key storylines and messages, which should be expanded upon in the factual draft report during the next work phase.

For the detailed portfolio review and analyses of GCF-funded CIEWS projects/programmes conducted during this phase, a protocol will be developed to ensure a consistent approach to extracting and assessing data on results and lessons learned from the CIEWS portfolio. All analyses undertaken should be traceable and replicable by the IEU.

#### *C. In-depth analyses, factual draft and summary of findings*

The third phase of the evaluation involves in-depth data analyses based on the initial findings from the previous phase, report writing, including the factual report and case studies, and delivering a presentation summarizing key evaluation findings. During this phase, trends and outliers in the quantitative data will be identified and triangulated with qualitative information collected and analyzed with respect to program activities, types of accredited entities, regions, LDCs/SIDS, and African states, among others, to formulate key findings. The draft factual report will need to be contextualized within the broader institutional and programmatic landscape of the GCF, compared to GCF's peer organizations, and aligned with key CIEWS-related debates occurring globally.

1. The factual report, that is also circulated to the GCF Secretariat and other relevant stakeholders.
2. Draft country case studies
3. Presentation of summary findings.

#### *D. Final reporting and communication/dissemination*

During the final phase of the evaluation, the selected firm is expected to deliver the final evaluation report and its associated products. After receiving comments on the factual report, the team will prepare the final evaluation report, which will include recommendations and annexes confirmed during the course of the evaluation.

This phase also involves the communication, dissemination, and uptake of the evaluation findings and recommendations through various channels. These may include webinars, presentations to the GCF Board by the IEU and other stakeholders, evaluation briefs, and organizing side-events during the GCF Board meeting. While the majority of the communication and dissemination work will be handled in-house by the

IEU evaluation team and the communication workstream, the selected firm is expected to remain available to support these processes as needed. Note that the IEU will present the evaluation, its findings, and recommendations to the GCF Board at the Board meeting, as well as in webinars organized for the GCF Secretariat and/or other GCF stakeholders (e.g., civil society organizations), with the support of the selected firm as required.

Deliverables at the end of this phase will include:

1. Final report, including recommendations, annexes of the report (and fully addressing of all comments and suggestions provided in different round of reviews)
2. Presentation of final evaluation findings and recommendations to relevant stakeholders within the GCF
3. Support for knowledge dissemination and communication product, and socialization of the evaluation.

## **VI. Ethical Considerations**

The evaluation process will adhere to ethical standards and also adhere to the Evaluation Standards of the GCF<sup>46</sup>, including informed consent and data privacy, in line with the GCF evaluation standards. The evaluation will develop and apply ethical protocols prioritizing protecting cultural, social, and individual rights and a culturally sensitive engagement with Indigenous Peoples if relevant.

## **VII. Advisory Group**

The evaluation will establish an Evaluation Advisory Group consisting of experts in subject matter and senior evaluators with knowledge in evaluation methods. This advisory group will play a consultative role in key stages of the evaluation process and provide an external review and advisory function for this evaluation.

## **VIII. Team Expertise**

The evaluation team should be formed based on a well-balanced combination of team members' evaluation experience, technical expertise on the subject matters (e.g. climate change mitigation and adaptation issues, preferably CIEWS interventions), educational backgrounds and language abilities (Spanish and or French or any other local languages) as well as and their network and access to local consultants based in developing countries.

The key experience and expertise of the team are elaborated below.

- The team's experience and expertise in undertaking portfolio review and or analyses, strategic evaluations and assessments of climate change portfolio at corporate level. Expertise and experience in undertaking evaluations of CIEWS portfolio and or multi-country portfolio evaluations in a multilateral setting are distinct advantages.
- The Firm's experience and expertise in undertaking mixed methods (qualitative and quantitative methods) evaluations including solid application of qualitative tools such as FGD and KII. The Firm's experience of handling household survey data including their knowledge of statistical analyses and software and or impact evaluation methods is a distinct advantage.

---

<sup>46</sup> <https://ieu.greenclimate.fund/document/green-climate-fund-evaluation-standards>.

The suggested team may consist of 3-4 members with the following roles:<sup>47</sup>

**Team Leader:**

- At least fifteen (15) years of solid experience and expertise in leading complex corporate, portfolio and performance evaluations, preferably of climate change mitigation/adaptation interventions. Experience of CIEWS related evaluations is a distinct advantage.
- Strong track record and proven capacity to lead and organize all the evaluation processes and to manage the team to deliver all required outputs within agreed timelines.
- Strong writing and analytical skills to compile and finalize a set of evaluation outputs specified in the TOR.
- The team leader's availability, commitment, and willingness to handle various feedback and queries in a positive and constructive manner.
- The proposal may elaborate on how the team leader has undertaken evaluations in tight timelines in the past.

**Evaluation team members:**

Two to three team members should be comprised of a minimum 7 – 10 years of experience in undertaking portfolio review and or analyses, strategic evaluations and assessments of climate change portfolio at corporate level with excellent and demonstrated writing/drafting as well as quantitative and qualitative data analysis skills. If the combination of both quantitative and qualitative data analysis skills is not possible, one member can have solid experience and expertise in handling quantitative data including good understanding of impact evaluation methods while the other member(s) can have strong expertise in conceptualization, qualitative analyses and excellent drafting skills.

**Sample team composition:**

**One Senior Evaluation Specialist** with expertise in evaluations and related practices, as well as a track record of conducting global and regional evaluations on CIEWS interventions or similar with strong qualitative analysis and drafting skills.

**One Evaluation Specialist** with solid experience in collecting and analysing quantitative data including household survey data using impact evaluation methods.

Such a composition of the team is only a suggestion and not a requirement. The team may propose an approach to undertake the evaluation and country case studies, either directly or with the use of nationally based consultants.

## **IX. Management arrangement of this evaluation**

The evaluation team will include both the members from the selected firm and the IEU staff. Together, the evaluation team will be under the direction and overall leadership and responsibility of the Principal Evaluation Officer as evaluation lead and the Head of the IEU. The contract with the selected firm will be managed by IEU staff. The approach paper, factual report and the final evaluation report will be drafted by the selected firm with written inputs, additions and feedback from the IEU members assigned to this evaluation to enhance the quality of the report. As such the report will be co-authored by the IEU and the selected firm. Apart from drafting work, the selected firm is expected to be actively involved in evaluation workshops and meetings; collecting and analysing additional data and information required. To ensure clear and effective communication throughout the assignment, routine catch up and update meetings will

---

<sup>47</sup> The proposed team structure is for suggestion only. IEU welcomes other proposed team structures, but the Firm should provide the justification for larger teams.

be organized between the selected firm and the IEU evaluation members where two parties will discuss and align progress of the assignment. If deemed necessary, the team will convene in-person workshops at the GCF Headquarters.

Given the above arrangement, the IEU via the evaluation lead will take full ownership of the evaluation and hold overall responsibility and accountability for the management and delivery of the evaluation up to and including approval of the final report. It will provide directions to the selected team throughout the implementation of the evaluation up to and including design, data collection, analyses, and drafting.

The evaluation will go through a comprehensive quality assurance process. The draft approach paper and draft evaluation report will be circulated and validated before finalization through a feedback process both internally and externally. Note also the evaluation will be an IEU product. The IEU evaluation team is expected to finalize the report with support from the firm.

The IEU will also facilitate an Evaluation Advisory Group, which will provide an external review and advisory function for this evaluation. This practice has been found to be exceptionally beneficial to recent IEU evaluations.

The IEU will further facilitate access to GCF data. This will include GCF portfolio level data as noted above as well as facilitation of interviews with GCF Board Members, staff, and other internal and or external stakeholders, and access to GCF and IEU documents. The IEU will also facilitate first introductions with NDA/ Focal Points, in order to launch the country case studies. The IEU will lead a review of the evaluation draft report, including facilitating discussion and management responses.

## **X. Timeline and Deliverables**

The estimated length of the assignment is spread from January 2025 through December 2025. The report is currently expected to be complete by November 2025, with follow-up through December 2025. However, these timelines may undergo modest modification in consultation with the team. See Table 5 for the proposed timeline for this assessment:

The below timeline may be subject to change to accommodate procedural and emerging issues, especially in line with decisions to be made at the GCF Board meetings of 2025 and 2026, and a certain degree of flexibility is expected from the external team. The timeline should be agreed and finalized during the initial stage of the work in the approach paper. The external team will work closely with the IEU throughout the evaluation cycle and especially in the final drafting stage, which is expected to be iterative.

**Table 5 – Proposed Timeline for the Deliverables<sup>48</sup>**

					B.41			B.42				B.43					B.44	
		Dec-24	Jan-25	Feb-25	Mar-25	Apr-25	May-25	Jun-25	Jul-25	Aug-25	Sep-25	Oct-25	Nov-25	Dec-25	Jan-26	Feb-26	Mar-26	
Pre-contract	TOR advertised																	
	Selection and contracting																	
Stage 1	Inception																	
	Desk review																	
	Approach Paper																	
Stage 2	Data collection																	
	Preliminary analyses																	
	Case study missions																	
Stage 3	Analysis																	
	Drafting																	
	Factual report																	
Stage 4	Draft report																	
	Final report																	
	Communications and socialization																	

<sup>48</sup> To be determined during the inception phase.

*Table 6 – Deliverables for Payments<sup>49</sup>*

No	DELIVERABLES	EXPECTED DEADLINES OF THE DELIVERABLES	SUGGESTED PAYMENT (% OF CONTRACTUAL PRICE)
2	Final approach paper accepted by the IEU	31 March 2025	25%
3	Documentation of data collected and analyses undertaken	31 July 2025	15%
4	Factual draft report submitted	31 August 2025	25%
5	Final report and presentation with annexes accepted by the IEU	15 October 2025	25%
6	Communication/dissemination support and country case studies	3 December 2025	10%

---

<sup>49</sup> Payment for mission expenses will be made at the end of all missions.



***Annex 2: Draft list of GCF CIEWS portfolio as of November 2024)***

Below is a tentative list of GCF projects/programmes that include CIEWS interventions based on a desk review. Please note that this list will be updated before the start of the contract and will be shared with the selected firm during the inception phase. Additionally, any new projects/programmes with CIEWS components approved by the GCF Board during the evaluation exercise will need to be incrementally included in the portfolio-level analyses.

#	FP	PROJECT NAME
1	FP002	Scaling up the use of Modernized Climate information and Early Warning Systems in Malawi
2	FP004	Climate Resilient Infrastructure Mainstreaming (CRIM)
3	FP012	Africa Hydromet Program – Strengthening Climate Resilience in Sub-Saharan Africa: Mali Country Project
4	FP013	Improving the resilience of vulnerable coastal communities to climate change related impacts in Viet Nam
5	FP016	Strengthening the resilience of smallholder farmers in the Dry Zone to climate variability and extreme events through an integrated approach to water management
6	FP018	Scaling-up of Glacial Lake Outburst Flood (GLOF) risk reduction in Northern Pakistan
7	FP021	Senegal Integrated Urban Flood Management Project
8	FP024	Empower to Adapt: Creating Climate-Change Resilient Livelihoods through Community-Based Natural Resource Management (CBNRM) in Namibia
9	FP034	Building Resilient Communities, Wetland Ecosystems and Associated Catchments in Uganda
10	FP035	Climate Information Services for Resilient Development Planning in Vanuatu (Van-CIS-RDP)
11	FP037	Integrated Flood Management to Enhance Climate Resilience of the Vaisigano River Catchment in Samoa
12	FP053	Enhancing climate change adaptation in the North coast and Nile Delta Regions in Egypt
13	FP056	Scaling up climate resilient water management practices for vulnerable communities in La Mojana
14	FP066	Pacific Resilience Project Phase II for RMI
15	FP067	Building climate resilience of vulnerable and food insecure communities through capacity strengthening and livelihood diversification in mountainous regions of Tajikistan
16	FP068	Scaling-up Multi-Hazard Early Warning System and the Use of Climate Information in Georgia
17	FP069	Enhancing adaptive capacities of coastal communities, especially women, to cope with climate change induced salinity
18	FP072	Strengthening climate resilience of agricultural livelihoods in Agro-Ecological Regions I and II in Zambia
19	FP073	Strengthening Climate Resilience of Rural Communities in Northern Rwanda
20	FP074	Africa Hydromet Program – Strengthening Climate Resilience in Sub-Saharan Africa: Burkina Faso Country Project
21	FP075	Institutional Development of the State Agency for Hydrometeorology of Tajikistan
22	FP087	Building livelihood resilience to climate change in the upper basins of Guatemala's highlands

#	FP	PROJECT NAME
23	FP092	Programme for integrated development and adaptation to climate change in the Niger Basin (PIDACC/NB)
24	FP094	Ensuring climate resilient water supplies in the Comoros Islands
25	FP101	Resilient Rural Belize (Be-Resilient)
26	FP107	Supporting Climate Resilience and Transformational Change in the Agriculture Sector in Bhutan
27	FP108	Transforming the Indus Basin with Climate Resilient Agriculture and Water Management
28	FP109	Safeguarding rural communities and their physical and economic assets from climate induced disasters in Timor-Leste
29	FP112	Addressing Climate Vulnerability in the Water Sector (ACWA) in the Marshall Islands
30	FP113	TWENDE: Towards Ending Drought Emergencies: Ecosystem Based Adaptation in Kenya's Arid and Semi-Arid Rangelands
31	FP124	Strengthening Climate Resilience of Subsistence Farmers and Agricultural Plantation Communities residing in the vulnerable river basins, watershed areas and downstream of the Knuckles Mountain Range Catchment of Sri Lanka
32	FP125	Strengthening the resilience of smallholder agriculture to climate change-induced water insecurity in the Central Highlands and South-Central Coast regions of Vietnam
33	FP127	Building Climate Resilience of Vulnerable Agricultural Livelihoods in Southern Zimbabwe
34	FP133	Resilience to hurricanes in the building sector in Antigua and Barbuda
35	FP141	Improving Adaptive Capacity and Risk Management of Rural communities in Mongolia
36	FP145	RELIVE – RESilient LIVELihoods of vulnerable smallholder farmers in the Mayan landscapes and the Dry Corridor of Guatemala
37	FP147	Enhancing Climate Information and Knowledge Services for resilience in 5 island countries of the Pacific Ocean
38	FP157	Coastal Resilience to Climate Change in Cuba through Ecosystem Based Adaptation - "MI COSTA"
39	FP160	Monrovia Metropolitan Climate Resilience Project
40	FP161	Building Regional Resilience through Strengthened Meteorological, Hydrological and Climate Services in the Indian Ocean Commission (IOC) Member Countries
41	FP162	The Africa Integrated Climate Risk Management Programme: Building the resilience of smallholder farmers to climate change impacts in 7 Sahelian Countries of the Great Green Wall (GGW)
42	FP165	Building Climate Resilient Safer Islands in the Maldives
43	FP171	Enhancing Early Warning Systems to build greater resilience to hydro-meteorological hazards in Timor-Leste
44	FP175	Enhancing community resilience and water security in the Upper Athi River Catchment Area, Kenya
45	FP182	Climate-smart initiatives for climate change adaptation and sustainability in prioritized agricultural production systems in Colombia (CSICAP)
46	FP183	Inclusive Green Financing Initiative (IGREENFIN I): Greening Agricultural Banks & the Financial Sector to Foster Climate Resilient, Low Emission Smallholder Agriculture in the Great Green Wall (GGW) countries - Phase I
47	FP184	Vanuatu community-based climate resilience project (VCCRP)
48	FP185	Climate Change: The New Evolutionary Challenge for the Galapagos

#	FP	PROJECT NAME
49	FP197	Green Guarantee Company ("GGC")
50	FP199	Public-Social-Private Partnerships for Ecologically-Sound Agriculture and Resilient Livelihood in Northern Tonle Sap Basin (PEARL)
51	FP201	Adapting Philippine Agriculture to Climate Change (APA)
52	FP202	Upscaling Ecosystem Based Climate Resilience of Vulnerable Rural Communities in the Valles Macro-region of the Plurinational State of Bolivia (RECEM-Valles)
53	FP203	Heritage Colombia (HECO): Maximizing the Contributions of Sustainably Managed Landscapes in Colombia for Achievement of Climate Goals
54	FP205	Infrastructure Climate Resilient Fund (ICRF)
55	FP206	Resilient Homestead and Livelihood support to the vulnerable coastal people of Bangladesh (RHL)
56	FP207	Recharge Pakistan: Building Pakistan's resilience to climate change through Ecosystem-based Adaptation (EbA) and Green Infrastructure for integrated flood risk management
57	FP215	Community Resilience Partnership Program
58	FP216	Scaling up climate resilient flood risk management in Bosnia and Herzegovina
59	FP222	Renewable Energy Performance Platform (REPP 2)
60	FP223	Project GAIA ("GAIA")
61	FP228	Cambodian Climate Financing Facility
62	FP234	Tonga Coastal Resilience
63	FP236	Basin Approach for Livelihood Sustainability through Adaptation Strategies (BALSAS)
64	FP240	Collaborative R&DB Programme for Promoting the Innovation of Climate Technopreneurship
65	FP242	Caribbean Net-Zero and Resilient Private Sector
66	FP247	Local Climate Adaptive Living Facility Plus (LoCAL+) – West Africa (Burkina Faso, Ivory Coast, Mali and Niger)
67	SAP001	Improving rangeland and ecosystem management practices of smallholder farmers under conditions of climate change in Sesfontein, Fransfontein, and Warmquelle areas of the Republic of Namibia
68	SAP002	Climate services and diversification of climate sensitive livelihoods to empower food insecure and vulnerable communities in the Kyrgyz Republic.
69	SAP007	Integrated Climate Risk Management for Food Security and Livelihoods in Zimbabwe focusing on Masvingo and Rushinga Districts
70	SAP008	Extended Community Climate Change Project-Flood (ECCCP-Flood)
71	SAP010	Multi-Hazard Impact-Based Forecasting and Early Warning System for the Philippines
72	SAP018	Enhancing Climate Information Systems for Resilient Development in Liberia (Liberia CIS)
73	SAP020	Climate resilient food security for farming households across the Federated States of Micronesia (FSM)
74	SAP022	Enhancing Multi-Hazard Early Warning System to increase resilience of Uzbekistan communities to climate change induced hazards
75	SAP027	Solomon Islands Knowledge-Action-Sustainability for Resilient Villages (SOLKAS) Project
76	SAP028	Women-Adapt: Enhancing the climate change adaptive capacity of smallholder farmer communities in the Poro Region, focusing on vulnerable women and youth

#	FP	PROJECT NAME
77	SAP030	Strengthening Climate Resilience of the Lao People's Democratic Republic (PDR) Health System
78	SAP033	Enhancing Climate Information Systems for Resilient Development in Sierra Leone
79	SAP034	Akamatutu'anga To Tatou Ora'anga Meitaki (ATOM): Building a healthy and resilient Cook Islands Community – one block at a time
80	SAP038	Climate Adaptation, Resilience and Engagement in Local Governments (CARE-LG)
81	SAP039	Integrated climate risk management for strengthened resilience to climate change in Buner and Shangla Districts of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa Province, Pakistan
82	SAP040	Climate Adaptation and Resilience in Thua Thien Hue Province Vietnam (CARE Hue)
83	SAP041	ALBAdapt – Climate Services for a Resilient Albania
84	SAP046	Strengthening Climate Information and Multi-Hazard Early Warning Systems for Increased Resilience in Azerbaijan