

# CLIMATE INVESTMENT FUNDS

CTF-SCF/TFC.10/Inf.2  
April 10, 2013

---

Joint Meeting of the CTF and SCF Trust Fund Committees  
Washington D.C.  
April 29-30, 2013

## **PROGRESS ON MONITORING AND REPORTING IN THE CIF OCTOBER 2012 – APRIL 2013**

## I. INTRODUCTION

1. Monitoring and reporting on CIF program implementation and results are central to the mission of the CIF. Over the past year, the Administrative Unit has placed particular emphasis on advancing the measuring results agenda. This paper provides an overview of progress over the past few months and insights into how this translates into work in each CIF program.

## II. HIGHLIGHTS OF ACHIEVEMENTS OCTOBER 2012 TO APRIL 2013

2. The CIF has achieved the following milestones:

- a) **Revised results frameworks for Clean Technology Fund (CTF) and the Pilot Program for Climate Resilience (PPCR)** were approved at the CTF and PPCR governance meetings in October/November 2012. These complement the revised results framework for the **Scaling up Renewable Energy Program (SREP)**, which was approved in the SREP Sub-Committee meeting in May 2012.
- b) **Toolkits for monitoring and reporting on the Clean Technology Fund (CTF) and the Pilot Program for Climate Resilience (PPCR)** are currently under final review. The toolkits consist of clear and concise core indicator guidance sheets accompanied by a performance monitoring table or scorecard.
- c) **Clean Technology Fund (CTF) baselines and targets:** All data on expected results have been extracted from CTF project documents and consolidated into an overview table, which is consistent with the CTF core indicators.
- d) **Forest Investment Program (FIP):** In-depth work towards finding convergence and agreement on a set of core indicators is currently underway. A synthesis paper “Overview of Current Approaches to Measuring and Reporting Results in endorsed FIP Investment Plans” has been shared with the FIP Sub-Committee as an information document. **(FIP/SC.10/Inf.2)** In addition, all data on expected results has been extracted from FIP investment plans and approved project documents and consolidated into an overview table.
- e) **Program for Scaling up Renewable Energy in Low Income Countries (SREP):** All data on expected results have been extracted from SREP project documents and consolidated into an overview table, which is consistent with the SREP core indicators. In addition, the agenda for the forthcoming SREP pilot countries meeting in May 2013 plans to include a session on measuring energy access.
- f) **A paper on the use of evaluative approaches in CIF activities (CTF-SCF/TFC.10/4)** has been prepared for the joint CTF-SCF Trust Fund Committee meeting. It examines existing MDB monitoring and evaluation systems and their coverage of CIF activities in three sections: (i) monitoring and reporting in MDB project cycles; (ii) MDBs evaluation policies and practices; and (iii) evaluative approaches in CIF project implementation.

### **III. CIF WORK ON MEASURING RESULTS**

3. The three broad objectives for FY14 are to: (a) create a functioning CIF Monitoring and Reporting System; (b) to generate and analyze high quality data; and (c) to place learning at the center of all CIF activities.

4. The CIF Administrative Unit and the MDB Committee are working together to: (a) develop guidance and communicate the system for effective monitoring and reporting; and (b) coordinate reporting activities. Once data has been collected, the CIF Administrative Unit will aggregate quantitative data and synthesize qualitative information across programs to form a basis for continuous learning and improvement through analysis and lessons learned.

5. The CIF Administrative Unit has prepared a work plan for monitoring and reporting in order to clarify priorities and tasks as well as to promote shared ownership with all parties involved. (Summary: [https://www.climateinvestmentfunds.org/cif/sites/climateinvestmentfunds.org/files/CIF\\_M&E\\_work\\_plan\\_summary\\_2013-14.pdf](https://www.climateinvestmentfunds.org/cif/sites/climateinvestmentfunds.org/files/CIF_M&E_work_plan_summary_2013-14.pdf))

6. MDBs play a key role in working with countries on technical and organizational aspects of implementing the revised results frameworks.

7. Over the past six months a number of CIF partner MDBs have supplemented their M&E staffing at headquarters and in country.

8. At program level many CIF investment plans contain elements that cover project/program management and reporting, which includes M&E, often as a separate component. Nepal and Mozambique have hired, or are in the process of hiring, an additional M&E specialist to carry out that work. Other countries have clearly assigned the responsibility for monitoring and reporting to their staff.

9. The CIF Administrative Unit, working with the MDB Committees, steers two processes. The first is to build the system for effective monitoring and reporting by, for example, developing and communicating guidance. The second is to coordinate the reporting itself. Once data have been collected, the CIF Administrative Unit's role is to aggregate quantitative data and synthesize qualitative information across programs. Analysis and drawing lessons from the available evidence will form the basis for continuous learning and improvement within the CIF.

### **IV. COMMUNICATION AND BUILDING A NETWORK OF PRACTITIONERS FOR MEASURING RESULTS**

10. Over the past six months the CIF Administrative Unit has taken various steps to enhance communication, outreach and interaction on topics related to monitoring and evaluation and to build a network of practitioners. These include:

- a) M&E plenary session at the 2012 Partnership Forum;
- b) CIF Dialogue "Implementing CIF Results Frameworks in-Country: Experiences and Challenges" at the 2012 Partnership Forum;

- c) CIF M&E web page providing up to date information on M&E  
[https://climateinvestmentfunds.org/cif/monitoring\\_and\\_evaluation%20;](https://climateinvestmentfunds.org/cif/monitoring_and_evaluation%20;)
- d) Twitter feed @RoehrerC exclusively focusing on measuring results in a climate change context;
- e) Enhanced direct interaction, dialogue and learning with other specialists working on monitoring and reporting; and
- f) Creating the opportunity for country M&E specialists to participate in pilot country meetings.

## **V. PROGRESS WITH IMPLEMENTING THE REVISED RESULTS FRAMEWORKS**

11. Revised results frameworks for CTF, PPCR and SREP, approved in 2012, each focus on a manageable number of core indicators. All pilot and partner countries are required to report on them annually, with support from the MDBs. The core indicators can be measured and aggregated consistently by all pilot countries, which will enable the CIF to meaningfully report on achievements at the country and fund levels over time. The CIF Administrative Unit administers and supports this reporting process. The results framework of the Forest Investment Program (FIP) does not contain core indicators, but work towards agreeing on a few such indicators is ongoing (see below).

12. Over the past months the CIF Administrative Unit in collaboration with the MDBs has produced toolkits for monitoring and reporting on the Clean Technology Fund (CTF) and the Pilot Program for Climate Resilience (PPCR). These toolkits consist of clear and concise core indicators guidance sheets, which are accompanied by performance monitoring tables or scorecards.

### **Clean Technology Fund (CTF)**

13. Data on expected results of the CTF projects are annexed to the CTF semi-annual operational report (CTF/TFC.11/3)

14. CTF annual performance monitoring data will be shared with the CTF-TFC and its meeting in November and posted on the CIF website. A synthesis report on CTF results will be included in the CIF annual report.

### **Pilot Program for Climate Resilience (PPCR)**

15. PPCR pilot countries have prepared a draft work plan for monitoring and reporting to be discussed at the PPCR Pilot Countries Meeting in May 2013.

16. PPCR pilot countries, in collaboration with the MDBs, will establish baselines and targets for the core indicators by August 2013. These will be shared for information with the PPCR Sub-Committee at its meeting in November and posted on the CIF website.

17. PPCR pilot countries, in collaboration with the MDBs, will report on an annual basis on SPCR outcomes in accordance with the core indicators of the revised results framework. These reports will be shared with the CIF Administrative Unit by July 30 each year, starting in 2014.

### **Forest Investment Program (FIP)**

18. At its meeting in November 2012, the Sub-Committee agreed that an overview of the current approaches to measuring results in endorsed investment plans would be a good starting point for development of a simplified FIP results framework. The Sub-Committee also agreed to use the pilot countries meetings as a forum to explore and identify a set of common core indicators.

19. The paper “Overview of Current Approaches to Measuring and Reporting Results in endorsed FIP Investment Plans” has been submitted to the FIP Sub-Committee as an information document (FIP/SC.10/Inf.2).

20. The paper confirms that there is no comprehensive and consistent approach to monitoring and reporting results across the eight endorsed investment plans. Each country has a country-specific objective for using FIP resources, ranging from a narrow set of activities (e.g. urban fuel wood consumption from peri-urban forests) to broad sector transformations such as sustainable land management, agricultural land rehabilitation, or low carbon agriculture in woodland ecosystems. The investment plans contain limited information on methods to be used for the collection of quantitative and qualitative data.

21. The paper suggests that despite this diversity there is potential to provide a common structure for FIP monitoring and reporting across all countries through core indicators which focus on elements of REDD+: deforestation, forest degradation, sustainable management of forests and enhancement of forest carbon stocks. Therefore the emphasis of FIP results monitoring and reporting would be on developing baselines and data collection at the project/program level as they relate to the elements of REDD+.

22. Over the next months, the CIF Administrative Unit, in collaboration with the MDBs, will discuss the results from the analysis in the overview paper with the eight FIP pilot countries to agree on a possible basis for simplifying the results framework.

### **Program for Scaling up Renewable Energy in Low Income Countries (SREP)**

23. Data on expected results of the SREP projects are annexed to the SREP semi-annual operational report (SREP/SC.9/3). Annual performance monitoring and reporting starts in 2014 with data to be shared for information with the Trust Fund Committee in October 2014.

24. Pilot countries and MDBs are required to report back in 12 months after the approval of the revised SREP results framework on: (a) how the results framework has been integrated in national M&E systems; and (b) how individual project/program interventions will be linked with SREP program outcomes at the country level.

25. The CIF Administrative Unit carried out a desk review of the results frameworks in endorsed SREP investment plans and approved projects. All SREP investment plans clearly indicate that national M&E will be used to track SREP outcomes with some plans giving more

details than others. In addition, the project results frameworks were found to be consistent with the results frameworks of the respective investment plans and the revised SREP results framework.

## **VI. CHALLENGES**

26. There is significant pressure to demonstrate results on an annual basis. Due to the nature of the projects, in particular in CTF and SREP, visible and measurable results will often only be achieved towards the end of the project, for example, when wind mills start producing electricity or when insulated energy-smart houses start to be used.

27. The multi-layered communication due to the CIF structure (CIF Administrative Unit, MDB headquarters, MDB task teams, M&E consultants in country, pilot/partner country focal points, CIF project managers) makes it difficult to ensure a smooth flow of information. Efforts are being made to address this through an MDB working group on M&E, and targeted communication and collaboration with persons in charge of monitoring and reporting in CIF pilot countries.

28. Resource and capacity constraints regarding the human and financial resources for monitoring and reporting are present at all levels, in particular in pilot countries.

29. The CIF results frameworks have to serve the need of a large number of constituents that have different expectations and demands regarding the shape and form of results measurement and reporting. In addition the value of monitoring, reporting and evaluation is often misunderstood. Frequently, the focus remains more on accountability than on learning. For CIF, which aims to pilot and scale up new approaches, the primary focus should be on learning, particularly in-country. Lessons should feed back into program management while ensuring appropriate attention to accountability.

30. Pilot and partner countries often have to report on a number of climate finance funding streams with each of those presenting different reporting requirements and deadlines. There is a clear need for enhanced donor coordination to streamline climate finance reporting requirements.