GREEN CLIMATE FUND Independent

Evaluation

Unit



Experience with Evidence in the Independent Evaluation Unit of the Green Climate Fund

Archi Rastogi, Ph.D. Independent evaluation unit (IEU) Green climate fund (GCF) @GCF_Eval @archirastogi

TRUSTED EVIDENCE. INFORMED POLICIES. HIGH IMPACT.



1. INDEPENDENT EVALUATION UNIT

- "... the Board will establish an operationally independent evaluation unit as part of the core structure of the Fund. The head of the unit will be selected by, and will report to, the Board."
 - Governing Instrument of the GCF

- IEU objectives:
 - Informing decision-making by the Board providing strategic guidance;
 - Conducting periodic independent evaluations of GCF performance;
 - Providing evaluation reports to the COP
- COP guidance on the function of the IEU: "The reports of the GCF should include any reports of the independent evaluation unit, including for the purposes of the periodic reviews of the financial mechanism of the Convention" (UNFCCC decision 5/CP19, annex, paragraph 20).

2. DEFINING THE GOAL

GCF mandate is "to promote a paradigm shift towards lowemission and climate-resilient development pathways"



 $\left| \right\rangle$

TRANSFORMATIONAL CHANGE: OTHER CLIMATE FINANCE AGENCIES



ATTRIBUTE OF T- CHANGE	CIF Transformational	WB Transformational Engagement	GEF LDCF/SCCF	UKCIP	IFAD
Measured T-change?	No	Maybe	No	No	Yes
Specific/consistent indicators	No	No	No	No	Yes
Demonstration project logic (TOC)/catalytic	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No
Removing barriers/lower costs	Yes	No	Yes	?	No
Scale effects (spatial)	?	Yes	Yes	?	Yes
Research and learning	Yes	No	Yes	?	No
Systems and across sectors	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Long-term change	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Behavior change	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
Capacity building	No	No	Yes	No	No

TRANSFORMATIONS INCLUDE

- Permanence of the change
- Behavioral and system changes



IN THE GCF

Paradigm shift is **not defined.**

Paradigm Shift is also an investment criteria: "degree to which the proposed activity can catalyse impact beyond a one-off project or programme investment".

Ambiguous treatment in proposals

3. BUILD FOR MEASUREMENT

16-39% projects rely on assumptions not verified and/or where indicators are vague

	ADAPTATION	MITIGATION	CROSS-CUTTING
To what extent is paradigm shift p	potential identifiable and me	asurable in the proposal?)
% low risk (may be measured – but isn't necessarily planned for)	24	44	64
% medium risk (some information available)	37	33	20
% high risk (will not identified or measured)	39	22	16



3. BUILDING FOR MEASUREMENT

Learning oriented real time impact assessments (LORTA):

- In GCF investment: What works? For whom? Why? Under what circumstances? How will we know?
- Engagement, theory of change, build measurement systems, incorporate this into GCF investment





4. Use of Evidence





Evidence Gap Maps – adaptation

		Uptake Shocks and stressors			Adaptiv	e capacity	Enabling Environment					
Climate change adaptation		Adoption	Decreased Exposure	Decreased Impacts/Risks	Social benefits	Economic benefits	Environmental systems	Socio- economic systems	Institutional systems			
Sectors	Interventions (below) /Outcomes (->)		Population affected by extreme weather events	Proactive and reactive risk management; climate related illness; deaths; food security	Skills acquired, access, awareness	Livelihood diversification, productivitiy gains, access	Area protected, ecological services improved	Social capital enhanced, overall poverty measurements	Policy changes, regulations approved, institutional reform			
Water	Nature-based options			•								
Forestry, fishing and agriculture	Built infrastructure/structural Technological options											
Land-use and built environment	Informational/educational Institutional/planning/poli cy/laws/regulations											
Society, economy and health	Financial/market mechanisms Social/behavioural											

GREEN CLIMATE FUND

IEU Evidence Reviews

Adaptation EGM

Evidence gap map		Uptake			Shocks and stressors				Adaptive capacity							Enabling environment						
Sectors	Intervention type/ outcome category		Adopt	ion	Exposure	5	Impacts	/risks		Social bene	fits		Econom	ic benet	fits	Enviror	nmental	lsystem	s l	ocioeconomic /stems	Institutiona systems	al
	Study design	Е	0	N S	E Q	N S	E	~		z Q	N	s	E	0 1	v 3		<u> </u>	N	5 Е	Q N	S E Q N	s
	Nature-based options										1			2	1	2	1					
	Built infrastructure/structural			1		1		3	8		2			4	5	1	1	1		1 1		
	Technological options							1					1					1				
Water	Informational/educational			2			1	1	1						1	1						7
	Institutional/planning/policy			1				1	2		1			2								
	Financial/market mechanisms			4					1								2					
	Social/behavioural			1					1			1		1		1						
	Nature-based options		1		4 1	4 5		1	2 1		1			2	1		1		1	1		
	Built infrastructure/structural			2 1	2	1 1		1	3				1		4		1	1	1	1		
Land-use and built	Technological options								1							2	1					
	Informational/educational			3				1	3			1						3				
environment	Institutional/planning/policy			1 1	2	1			2			1		2	2		2	1	1	1	1	2
	Financial/market mechanisms			1 1					2			1						2				
	Social/behavioural		1			1		1	4		1	2			2			2		1		
	Nature-based options		1	2	1	1		14	1 3 2			2	35	33	29 9	20	4	6	4	34	1	
	Built infrastructure/structural		3	8				2	2 1			1	2	2	4 1	1						
Forestry, fishing and	Technological options		3	4	1	1	1	8	9 1			2	33	30	34 4	12	3		1	4 2		
agriculture	Informational/educational		16	59 2	1		3	1	4		2	7	1	10	7 1	1	1	2	1	2 2	1	
-0	Institutional/planning/policy		6	8				1	2			1		2	3					1 2		
	Financial/market mechanisms	1	7	36	2			1	5		1	3	1	8	4 2		1	2	1	32	1	
	Social/behavioural	1	6	29					5			3	1	6	11 1		1	1	2	2 1		Ц
	Nature-based options			1			1		1 1			1										
	Built infrastructure/structural			1				4	5					1	2							
Society, economy and health	Technological options							1	5 2											1		
	Informational/educational	4	2	3		3	2	5	4	4	3	1		1	1					1		
	Institutional/planning/policy		1	1		1		4	82					2	2					1	1	2
	Financial/market mechanisms	1		4		1	5	6	1 4 1			1		5	7 2			1		1 3	1 1	
	Social/behavioural	2	3	8		2	2	5	1 3 5		2	1 2		3	13 1			1		1 2 2	1 1	2



Conclusions

- **1**. Independent systems
- 2. Setting clear targets
- 3. Establishing systems of measurement
- 4. Use of credible and rigorous evidence





GREEN
CLIMATE
FUNDIndependent
Evaluation

Thank you

arastogi@gcfund.org @GCF_Eval @archirastogi

TRUSTED EVIDENCE. INFORMED POLICIES. HIGH IMPACT.

TRUSTED EVIDENCE. INFORMED POLICIES. HIGH IMPACT.

