



Adaptation Fund Board
Forty-fifth meeting
Bonn, Germany

Update to the Adaptation Fund Strategic Results Framework

Strategic Issues

- The Adaptation Fund's Strategic Results Framework (SRF) helps measure and report on adaptation initiatives, serving as a planning, management, reporting, and communications tool.
- The SRF was last amended in 2019, prior to the approval of the second Medium-Term Strategy (MTS 2023-2027). Since then, new areas of focus and several relevant global developments have emerged.
- The Secretariat conducted analyses and consultations to identify gaps and areas for improvement, incorporating diverse stakeholder perspectives and aligning with other adaptation funders' frameworks.
- Proposed revisions include new indicators for locally led adaptation, strengthened disaggregation by gender and vulnerable groups, and alignment with the Global Goal on Adaptation (GGA) targets, aiming to enhance the SRF's effectiveness in supporting adaptation initiatives and achieving MTS 2023-2027 objectives.

Purpose

1. This board paper presents for the Board's consideration and approval an update to the Adaptation Fund's Strategic Results Framework, including the addition of new indicators on locally led adaptation and innovation, and adjustments to the core, outcome, and output indicators.

Recommended Decision

2. The Adaptation Fund Board, having considered document AFB/B.45/8, including the development of specific indicators for the innovation and locally led adaptation portfolio, and aligning current indicators with the Global Goal on Adaptation (GGA) and other global developments, decides:
 - a) To approve the proposed revisions to the Strategic Results Framework (SRF) as contained in document AFB/B.45/8;
 - b) To request the Secretariat to develop a guidance document on the revised SRF and related revised project performance report templates, and to share them with the implementing entities (IEs);

- c) That this Framework comes into effect three months after the revised project performance report templates and guidance documents referred to above are shared with the IEs;
- d) To request the Secretariat, based on the evolving guidance under the GGA and consultations with IEs, and as necessary, to provide further guidance to IEs with regard to disaggregation of indicators to align better with the GGA and the needs and practical realities of the IEs.

Background

3. This document presents proposed revisions to the Adaptation Fund (the Fund) Strategic Results Framework (SRF) in the context of the Fund's second Medium-Term Strategy 2023–2027 (MTS II) and the UAE Framework for Global Climate Resilience (Global Goal on Adaptation or GGA).
4. The Fund's SRF was last amended in 2019,¹ following the approval of the first MTS in 2017. Since this revision, the Adaptation Fund Board (the Board) has approved the second MTS (2023-2027), the Fund's innovation portfolio has become more mature, and there is enhanced focus on locally based and locally led adaptation (LLA). Additionally, the Conference of the Parties serving as the Meeting of the Parties to the Paris Agreement, at its fifth session (CMA 5) adopted the UAE Framework for Global Climate Resilience to improve countries' ability to measure progress on the GGA and maintain accountability. The CMA further requested the Fund to provide updates on its activities in relation to assisting developing country Parties in their efforts toward the implementation of the UAE Framework for Global Climate Resilience, including achieving the GGA targets (Decision -/CMA 6 on Matters relating to the Adaptation Fund).
5. Acknowledging these developments, and as outlined in the implementation plan of the MTS 2023–2027 (AFB/B.40/5/Rev.1) adopted by the Board in March 2023, the Secretariat has been working to revise the Fund's SRF including the development of specific objectives and indicators for the innovation and LLA portfolios, and aligning current indicators to the extent possible with the GGA and other global developments. An update on this process was presented to the Board, as outlined in document AFB/EFC.34/Inf.5.
6. The Secretariat has conducted analyses and broad consultations to inform the proposed revisions to the Fund's SRF for Board review. These revisions have been proposed with the intention to better enable the SRF to act as a planning, management, reporting, and communications tool. The revised Fund-level SRF will better serve the reporting needs of MTS II, as well as better support the Fund in reporting on its efforts towards the GGA.
7. This paper provides a summary of the process adopted to determine the revisions, a summary of the findings from the analysis and consultations, and the proposed revisions to the Fund's SRF. Annex A compares the indicators in the current and proposed SRF, provides more details on the rationale for the changes, and demonstrates how the revisions improve alignment with the MTS II, GGA, and other multilateral climate funds (MCFs). Annex B shows how the current and proposed SRF align with the MTS II cross-cutting themes, while Annex C shows how the current and proposed SRF enable reporting against the GGA targets.
8. Due to insufficient time, the Board was unable to consider this agenda item at its 44th meeting in April 2025.

¹ <https://www.adaptation-fund.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/10/Adaptation-Fund-Strategic-Results-Framework-Amended-in-March-2019.pdf>

Process to Determine Revisions

9. The Secretariat took several steps to identify gaps and areas for improvement in the Fund's SRF. The revisions were determined through a multi-phase approach that ensured that diverse stakeholder perspectives were incorporated. These steps included:
- a) **Analysis of alignment between the SRF and MTS II and between the SRF and GGA**, based on an initial mapping of the current SRF indicators to the MTS pillars and cross-cutting themes, including locally based and locally led adaptation, and to the GGA targets and dimensions of the iterative adaptation cycle. This analysis (Annexes B and C) provided insights into gaps and opportunities to better align the SRF with these frameworks.
 - b) **Analysis of the SRFs from other adaptation funders and initiatives** to identify opportunities for enhancing coherence of the SRF with other climate funds and for building on their good and best practices for monitoring and reporting of adaptation project and portfolio level results. The analysis included mapping the SRF indicators to those of the Green Climate Fund's (GCF) Integrated Results Management Framework (IRMF), the Global Environment Facility (GEF) Updated Results Framework for Adaptation to Climate Change for the Least Development Countries Fund (LDCF) and Strategic Climate Change Fund (SCCF), and the Multilateral Development Bank (MDB) Common Approach to Measuring Climate Results, to identify commonalities and differences, as presented in Annex D. Indicators used to measure progress under the World Meteorological Organization's (WMO) Early Warnings for All initiative and the Sendai Framework were also reviewed for good practice opportunities and enhanced alignment.
 - c) **Analysis of monitoring and reporting challenges and promising practices at the Adaptation Fund** based on input from the Secretariat and the Implementing Entities (IEs) as the end-users of the SRF. Initial IE input was collected through in-person consultations at the 2023 Annual National Implementing Entity (NIE) seminar, and an electronic survey, which received responses from 24 of 55 IEs contacted (44% response rate).
 - d) **Consultations with external sectoral and thematic experts** to identify best practices for climate finance reporting, including related to innovation and locally led adaptation, and opportunities to enhance SRF alignment with the GGA.
 - e) **Multiple workshops at the Secretariat level** to understand the current challenges and experiences and inform the initial development of revisions to the SRF, as well as to validate, refine, and ensure feasibility and relevance of the proposed revisions to the SRF.
 - f) **Testing of changes with the IEs** through an interactive webinar to validate the proposed revisions to core indicators and determine areas where further guidance or training for IEs may be necessary.

Summary of the Findings from the Analyses and Consultations

10. The key findings from the analyses and consultations are summarized below. These findings form the basis for the proposed revisions to the SRF, which aim to identify opportunities to strengthen the SRF's effectiveness in supporting adaptation initiatives and achieving the MTS objectives. Detailed changes to the SRF and the rationale for those changes are provided in Annex A.
11. **Overall, the SRF is aligned with the MTS II objectives, with opportunities for better alignment with the MTS cross-cutting themes.** In the current SRF, multiple outcome and output indicators align with the three strategic pillars of Action, Innovation, and Learning and Sharing. In addition,

current SRF core indicators cover beneficiaries, household income, and ecosystems, aligning with the MTS goal statement to adequately protect “people, livelihoods, and ecosystems” from the adverse impacts of climate change. The current SRF only partially aligns with MTS crosscutting themes, however. The analysis identified opportunities for enhancement through greater emphasis on locally based and led adaptation, disaggregation of results by gender and vulnerable groups, and minor revisions to strengthen coherence with other adaptation funders. Annex B shows the alignment of the current and proposed SRF with the MTS cross-cutting themes. In addition, some specific changes related to locally based and led adaptation and disaggregation are further described below.

12. **Given the Fund’s locally led adaptation funding modality, the SRF needs an enhanced focus on locally led and locally based adaptation.** The Board decided, at its 42nd meeting, to request the secretariat to develop indicators for LLA projects and programmes for consideration by the Board. The gap analysis and consultations found that some current SRF indicators can capture certain aspects of adaptation results achieved through locally based and led approaches. However, gaps were identified with respect to some of the key principles of locally led adaptation, including devolving decision-making to the lowest appropriate level, addressing structural inequalities faced by vulnerable and marginalized groups, and investing in local capabilities to leave an institutional legacy. These findings led to the inclusion of several new locally led adaptation focused indicators in the proposed SRF revisions, as detailed in Annex A. In addition, the analysis identified opportunities to enhance the SRF’s ability to capture results of locally led and based adaptation activities by further disaggregating reporting on existing indicators, such as those related to strengthened policies, strategies, and plans.
13. **Multiple indicators in the SRF could be formulated for disaggregation to better capture the Fund’s results in benefitting women and vulnerable groups.** Doing so would help align the SRF with MTS II cross-cutting objectives related to empowering and benefitting the most vulnerable people and communities and advancing gender equality. Multiple output and outcome indicators in the SRF focus on people or households, offering opportunities for disaggregated reporting on the basis of gender and vulnerable groups. While the current Project Performance Report (PPR) provides for some disaggregation beyond what is in the current SRF, explicitly including disaggregation expectations in the revised SRF will help ensure that projects are designed to meet these reporting needs. Future guidance on operationalizing the revised SRF will need to define these groups and provide clear instructions on how to consider membership in them.
14. **Sectoral disaggregation can be incorporated to bolster coherence with GGA targets.** The GGA targets are organized by seven sectors/thematic areas (decision 2/CMA.5 paragraph 9) and four dimensions of the iterative adaptation cycle (decision 2/CMA.5 paragraph 10). The GGA sector and dimensions approach contrasts with that of the Fund’s SRF, which is organized by Outcome areas, some of which cover multiple sectors. Aligning the SRF to the GGA sectoral approach would require a significant restructuring that would disrupt ongoing project implementation and reporting. Instead, the Secretariat proposes retaining its sector-agnostic approach, while enhancing alignment by incorporating sectoral disaggregation through revisions in multiple outcome and output indicators of the SRF, including those related to beneficiaries, institutional capacity, and development sector services and infrastructure. There are also opportunities to make minor changes to current indicators to better align with the exact language of GGA dimensions targets on impact, vulnerability and risk assessment, and planning. The Secretariat also considered the consolidated list of indicators for the GGA targets

(FCCC/SB/2025/3) in making recommendations on strengthening alignment. See Annex C to see how the proposed and current indicators map to the GGA targets.

- 15. Slight modifications to the SRF can better support complementarity, coherence, and synergies with other adaptation funders and actors—potentially reducing burden for countries and IEs.** The indicator mapping analysis highlighted many commonalities and differences among the indicators in the Adaptation Fund SRF and other adaptation funders’ strategic results frameworks (see Annex D). In proposing revisions to the SRF, opportunities to better align with other funders’ strategic results frameworks were considered. Consultations with other adaptation funders also helped to clarify which of their indicators were serving as reliable and meaningful measures of adaptation results, and which indicators were posing challenges for validation and aggregation, for example. In the revised SRF, minor language modifications are proposed to better align with other funders, while an additional supplementary indicator is proposed to better align with the WMO Early Warnings for All Initiative.
- 16. Consultations pointed to the need to revise the innovation indicators based on experience from the piloting phase.** In decision B.37/39, the Board requested the Secretariat to pilot the use of the indicators set out in document AFB/B.37/6. The piloting of these indicators was expected to lead to recommendations on a revision of Outcome 8 in the SRF pertaining to innovation in AF projects and programmes. Based on consultations internally and with key innovation partners, including the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) and the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), as well as a review of linkages with MTS II, the revisions to Outcome 8 would more closely align the indicators with the Innovation strategy and objectives: to accelerate, encourage and enable scaled-up innovation for effective, long-term adaptation to climate change. The proposed innovation indicators are based on established “stages of innovation,” namely innovation identification, piloting, and scale up. The revised indicators now explicitly relate to innovation for long-term adaptation to climate change by demonstrating local innovation participation and/or local innovation benefit, also enhancing alignment with the MTS focus on locally based and led adaptation. Enhanced IE institutional capacity for innovation is addressed through a new output indicator on innovation knowledge products disseminated and/or learning events facilitated. As such, the proposed innovation indicators represent a significant re-orientation of the previous pilot indicators.
- 17. Remaining challenges need to be addressed through activities that lie outside the domain of the revisions to the SRF.** Consultations and the IE survey identified several capacity gaps and procedural challenges hindering the effectiveness of the SRF, including limited data availability, measurement and attribution challenges, and IE monitoring and evaluation (M&E) capacity. In some project contexts, data availability is a key constraint to collecting quality baselines and some metrics are considered impossible to measure in decentralized countries such as Pacific SIDS. IEs also report some difficulties in attributing changes to the projects funded through the AF because beneficiaries may participate in multiple ventures beyond a project’s interventions. Clearer methodological guidance is needed to improve reporting, especially on the beneficiaries core indicator, and this guidance should be flexible to meet local data conditions and realities.
- 18.** Informants also noted the need to strengthen capacities of IE national and local M&E teams, including through improved communication and collaboration with the Secretariat. Enhanced communication from a project’s inception would help ensure that both institutions’ interests and perspectives are incorporated, and that M&E teams clearly understand the Secretariat’s definitions and preferred methods of measurement. There is also opportunity for collaboration

between the Secretariat and M&E teams to promote the use of more participatory approaches for data collection.

Proposed Revisions to Strategic Results Framework

19. The AF core indicators allow the Fund to aggregate quantitative indicators for a portfolio that is, by nature, diverse (including agriculture to water management, coastal management, rural development, food security, and disaster risk reduction, among others). Based on the findings presented above, minor revisions are recommended to the core indicators to:
 - a) Support better alignment with the MTS II, GGA, and other adaptation funders' results frameworks through introducing disaggregation and slight modifications to indicator language.
 - b) Improve the ability of IEs to report on the core indicators and the ability of the Secretariat to aggregate results by modifying the units of measurement for indicators related to income and physical infrastructure assets, addressing key challenges identified through consultations.
 - c) Introduce a new core indicator on policies, strategies, and/or plans, given that the Secretariat is already reporting aggregated results on this theme and given the alignment with the GGA planning dimension of the iterative adaptation cycle.
20. The table below presents the current and proposed AF core indicators, along with the rationale for each proposed change.

Current core indicator	Proposed core indicator	Rationale for proposed changes
Number of beneficiaries (direct and indirect)	Number of beneficiaries <i>[# of people, disaggregated by direct and indirect beneficiaries, by gender, by vulnerable groups, and by sector]</i>	<p><i>Recommended changes.</i> Minor changes recommended for disaggregation. Additional guidance will need to clarify the distinction between direct and indirect beneficiaries, while seeking to harmonize, as feasible and advisable, with other multilateral climate funds' definitions. Guidance will also need to define the vulnerable groups and sectors to be reported.</p> <p><i>Alignment.</i> Number of beneficiaries is a common core adaptation indicator among multilateral climate funds, including the GCF, GEF, and CIF, which supports the MTS complementarity and coherence theme and may reduce entity and country burden. The indicator also addresses the “people” part of the MTS II goal. Recommended disaggregation will support alignment with the MTS cross-cutting themes on gender, most vulnerable people, and LLA. Indicator is relevant for reporting on GGA implementation dimension of the iterative adaptation cycle.</p>
Number of Early Warning Systems	Early warning systems established or improved <i>[# of systems, disaggregated by hazard and scale]</i>	<p><i>Recommended changes.</i> Minor changes recommended to clarify that the early warning systems reported would be those that are newly established or improved through Adaptation Fund activities. Minor changes recommended for disaggregation by hazard (including multi-hazard systems) and scale (such as local, sub-national, national, and regional). Projects reporting on this core indicator should also report on the indicator “People covered by new or improved early warning systems [# of people, disaggregated by gender].”</p> <p><i>Alignment.</i> Indicator is highly relevant for reporting on the GGA impact, vulnerability, and risk assessment dimension. “People covered” indicator is also consistent with the WMO Early Warnings for All Initiative and GCF IRMF Outcome 2.4, which supports the MTS complementarity and coherence theme and may reduce entity and country burden.</p>
Assets produced, developed, improved, or strengthened	Physical assets improved or constructed to withstand climate variability and change <i>[disaggregated by km of linear infrastructure and # of point infrastructure, and by sector]</i>	<p><i>Recommended changes.</i> Changes to the indicator language are recommended to use more streamlined and specific language. “Produced” and “developed” capture the same concept, as does “improved” and “strengthened.” Reporting on physical assets should be disaggregated by asset type for more meaningful reporting.</p> <p><i>Alignment.</i> Indicator is relevant for reporting on GGA implementation dimension of the iterative adaptation cycle and GGA target (e) on infrastructure and human settlement. In revisions to the project performance reports (PPRs) and reporting guidance, the Secretariat will explore the option of a further disaggregated approach, requiring reporting by specific asset types, such as: no. of public buildings, no. of irrigation or water structures, no. of fishery or aquaculture structures, no. of bridges, ports, or landing sites, km of roads, km of riverine or coastal assets. More disaggregated reporting could also support GGA sector-specific reporting such as (a) water, (b) food and agriculture, and (c) health.</p>

Increased income, or avoided decrease in income	Households with increased income, or avoided decrease in income <i>[# of households, disaggregated by # of female-headed households]</i>	<i>Recommended changes.</i> Recommend revising this indicator to respond to Secretariat challenges in reporting on the current indicator in an aggregated way and feedback received from IEs through the survey and consultation workshop. The IE consultation recommended revising this indicator to count number of households with increased income, which could be measured through surveys and interviews frequently done at the household level. Forthcoming guidance will consider the reporting frequency for this indicator (e.g., only at mid-term or final reporting). <i>Alignment.</i> Disaggregated reporting is consistent with the MTS II gender theme. Indicator enables reporting against GGA target (f) on poverty eradication and livelihoods and GGA implementation dimension of the iterative adaptation cycle.
Natural assets protected or rehabilitated	Ecosystems and natural resources brought under protection, restoration, or improved management in response to climate variability and change <i>[# of hectares, disaggregated by land, marine, coastal, and cultural heritage area]</i>	<i>Recommended changes.</i> Changes to the indicator language recommended to reflect common strategies for enhancing ecosystems and natural resources, including protection, restoration, and improved management. Reporting on number of hectares should be disaggregated by land, marine, coastal, and cultural heritage area, to help with more meaningful interpretation of area values, as well as enable reporting under the GGA. <i>Alignment.</i> Including language of “improved management” is consistent with similar indicators in the GCF IRMF, MDB Common Approach, and GEF LDCF. Ecosystems and natural resources would be inclusive of terrestrial, inland water, mountain, marine and coastal areas, consistent with GGA target (d) on ecosystems. Disaggregated reporting will enable Fund reporting against GGA target (g) on cultural heritage. Indicator is also relevant for reporting on GGA implementation dimension of the iterative adaptation cycle and addresses the “ecosystems” part of the MTS goal.
N/A	Policies, strategies, and/or plans developed or adjusted to integrate climate risk considerations <i>[# of policies, strategies, and/or plans, disaggregated by scale]</i>	<i>Recommended changes.</i> Recommend adding this core indicator. The Fund has already been tracking aggregated policy-related results in the Annual Performance Report. Over 70 percent of IE survey respondents supported including a policy indicator in the Fund’s list of core indicators. <i>Alignment.</i> Promoting adaptation planning is in line with the delivery model highlighted in MTS II. The proposed indicator language of “policies, strategies, and/or plans” is directly aligned with that of the GGA planning dimension of the iterative adaptation cycle.

21. The table below presents the proposed revised SRF of the AF. Annex A provides a more detailed presentation of these revisions, including the current and proposed indicators, as well as the rationale for each proposed change. Please note the 8 outcomes areas are largely staying the same, with most of the changes to the indicators but not the outcome areas.

STRATEGIC RESULTS FRAMEWORK OF THE ADAPTATION FUND	
EXPECTED RESULTS	INDICATORS
Goal: Assist developing country Parties to the Kyoto Protocol and the Paris Agreement that are particularly vulnerable to the adverse effects of climate change in meeting the costs of concrete adaptation projects and programmes in order to implement climate-resilient measures.	
Impact: Increased resiliency and reduced vulnerability at the community, national, and regional levels to climate variability and change.	
Outcome 1: Reduced exposure to climate-related hazards and threats	Indicator 1: People using improved climate-related threat and hazard information <i>[# of individuals, by gender]</i>
Output 1.1: Risk and vulnerability assessments conducted and updated	Indicator 1.1.1: Risk and vulnerability assessments conducted or updated <i>[# of assessments, by sector and scale]</i>
Output 1.2: Targeted population groups covered by warning and advisory services for climate-related hazards and threats	Core Indicator 1.2.1: Early warning systems established or improved <i>[# of systems, disaggregated by hazard and scale]</i>
	Indicator 1.2.2: People covered by new or improved early warning systems <i>[# of people, disaggregated by gender]</i>
Outcome 2: Strengthened institutional capacity to reduce risks associated with climate-induced socioeconomic and environmental losses	Indicator 2: Institutions with strengthened capacity to understand and better address climate risks and resilience <i>[# of institutions, disaggregated by scale and sector]</i>
Output 2.1: Strengthened capacity of institutions to understand and better address climate risks	Indicator 2.1.1: Institutions supported to strengthen capacity to understand and address climate risks and resilience <i>[# of institutions, disaggregated by scale and sector]</i>
Output 2.2: Increased readiness and capacity of national and sub-national entities to directly access and programme adaptation finance	Indicator 2.2.1: Local organizations receiving funding or other direct support under the locally led adaptation modality <i>[# of institutions]</i>

Outcome 3: Strengthened awareness and ownership of adaptation and climate risk reduction processes	Indicator 3.1: People with strengthened awareness of climate change risks and how to better address them <i>[# of people, disaggregated by gender]</i>
	Indicator 3.2: People implementing new or improved adaptation actions <i>[# of people, disaggregated by gender]</i>
Output 3.1: Targeted population groups participating in adaptation and risk reduction awareness activities	Indicator 3.1.1: People participating in activities to improve awareness of climate risks and how to address them <i>[# of people, disaggregated by gender, and by vulnerable groups]</i>
Output 3.2: Strengthened capacity of national and subnational stakeholders and entities to capture and disseminate knowledge and learning	Indicator 3.2.1: Climate resilience knowledge products and/or tools developed and shared with stakeholders <i>[# of products/tools]</i>
Output 3.3: Increased ownership of adaptation and climate risk reduction processes	Indicator 3.3.1: Number of local institutions and/or communities responsible for decision-making over how adaptation solutions are defined, prioritized, designed, and/or implemented <i>[# of local institutions and/or communities]</i>
Outcome 4: Increased adaptive capacity within relevant development sector services and infrastructure assets	Core Indicator 4: Physical assets improved or constructed to withstand climate variability and change <i>[disaggregated by km of linear infrastructure and # of point infrastructure, and by sector]</i>
Output 4.1: Vulnerable development sector services and infrastructure assets strengthened in response to climate change impacts, including variability	Indicator 4.1.1: Development sector services strengthened to respond to climate variability and change <i>[# of sector services, disaggregated by sector and scale]</i>
Outcome 5: Increased ecosystem resilience in response to climate change and variability-induced stress	Core Indicator 5: Ecosystems and natural resources brought under protection, restoration, or improved management in response to climate variability and change <i>[# of hectares, disaggregated by land, marine, coastal, and cultural heritage area]</i>
Output 5.1: Vulnerable ecosystem services and natural resource assets strengthened in response to climate change impacts, including variability	Indicator 5.1.1: Ecosystems and natural resources targeted by activities to improve protection, restoration, and/or management <i>[# of resources, by type]</i>
Outcome 6: Diversified and strengthened livelihoods and sources of income for vulnerable people in targeted areas	Indicator 6.1: People adopting improved and/or new climate-resilient livelihood practices <i>[# of people, disaggregated by gender]</i>

	<p>Core Indicator 6.2: Households with increased income, or avoided decrease in income</p> <p><i>[# of households, disaggregated by # of female-headed households]</i></p>
Output 6.1: Targeted individual and community livelihood strategies strengthened in relation to climate change impacts, including variability	<p>Indicator 6.1.1: People receiving targeted support for new and/or improved livelihoods to manage climate risk</p> <p><i>[# of people, disaggregated by gender and by type of support]</i></p>
Outcome 7: Improved policies and regulations that promote and enforce resilience measures	<p>Indicator 7: Policies, strategies, and/or plans adopted, implemented, and/or enforced that integrate climate risk and resilience considerations</p> <p><i>[#, disaggregated by scale and by policy step, i.e., developed, adopted, implemented, enforced]</i></p>
Output 7.1: Improved integration of climate-resilience strategies into country development plans	<p>Core Indicator 7.1.1: Policies, strategies, and/or plans developed or adjusted to integrate climate risk considerations</p> <p><i>[# of policies, strategies, and/or plans, disaggregated by scale]</i></p>
	<p>Indicator 7.1.2: Policies, strategies, and/or plans formulated through the participation of one or more vulnerable groups</p> <p><i>[# of policies, strategies, and/or plans, disaggregated by scale]</i></p>
Outcome 8: Innovation for effective, long-term adaptation to climate change accelerated, encouraged, and enabled to scale up	<p>Indicator 8.1: Innovations successfully reaching scale up that demonstrate local innovation participation and/or local innovation benefit</p> <p><i>[# of innovations]</i></p>
	<p>Indicator 8.2: Institutions created and/or enabled that lead on innovation for adaptation to climate change</p> <p><i>[# of institutions, disaggregated by scale]</i></p>
Output 8.1: Innovations identified and piloted that collectively enhance local innovation capacity and contribute to the development of local, national and regional adaptation innovation ecosystems	<p>Indicator 8.1.1: Innovations identified that demonstrate local innovation participation and/or local innovation benefit</p> <p><i>[# of proposed innovations]</i></p>
	<p>Indicator 8.1.2: Innovations piloted that demonstrate local innovation participation and/or local innovation benefit</p> <p><i>[# of innovations]</i></p>

Output 8.2: Innovations identified and piloted which build the adaptation innovation evidence-base and institutional capacity	Indicator 8.2.1: Innovation-focused knowledge products disseminated and/or learning events facilitated that support and enable innovation capacity at a local, national, and/or regional level <i>(# of knowledge products disseminated and/or learning events facilitated)</i>
---	--

Next Steps

22. Upon approval of the revisions to the SRF by the Board, the Secretariat will:

- (a) **Revise PPR templates and develop a guidance note on how to implement the revised SRF:** Develop a comprehensive guidance document to assist stakeholders in understanding and implementing the revised SRF. The guidance document will provide clear instructions on how to report and track the new indicators, disaggregation methods, and alignment with GGA targets. The PPRs will be revised to reflect the changes to the SRF.
- (b) **Organize capacity development workshops for Implementing Entities:** Organize virtual and in-person training sessions for IEs to familiarize them with the revised SRF and its new components. Offer ongoing support to IEs to ensure they can effectively implement the revised SRF in their projects.
- (c) Based on the evolving guidance under the GGA, and the consultations with IEs during steps (a) and (b) above, the Secretariat may provide further guidance with regard to disaggregation of indicators to align better with the GGA and the needs and practical realities of the IEs, ensuring that the reporting burden on IEs is not increased through these changes to disaggregation.

Annex A: Detailed Proposed Changes to the SRF

The table below shows the proposed changes to the SRF and includes detailed explanations of the revisions. The right-most columns indicate whether, compared to the current SRF, each revision improves the way the Fund reports on MTS cross-cutting themes and GGA dimensions and targets, and if the revision better aligns the SRF with the approach taken by other MCF results frameworks. The following key explains the icons presented in the columns.

KEY	
<p><u>MTS Cross-cutting Themes</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">  Promote locally based or locally led adaptation  Enhance access to climate finance and long-term institutional capacity  Empower and benefit the most vulnerable people and communities as agents of change  Advance gender equality  Enable the scaling and replication of results  Strengthen complementarity, coherence, and synergies with other adaptation funders and actors 	<p><u>GGA Dimensions and Targets</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">  GGA Dimensions  GGA sector-based targets <p><u>Alignment with other MCFs</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">  Alignment with GEF results framework and/or GCF IRMF

Current Result	Current Indicator	Proposed Indicator	Explanation of Proposed Revisions	Improved alignment		
				MTS	GGA	MCF
Goal: Assist developing country Parties to the Kyoto Protocol and the Paris Agreement that are particularly vulnerable to the adverse effects of climate change in			No changes recommended.			

Current Result	Current Indicator	Proposed Indicator	Explanation of Proposed Revisions	Improved alignment		
				MTS	GGA	MCF
meeting the costs of concrete adaptation projects and programmes in order to implement climate-resilient measures.						
Impact: Increased resiliency at the community, national, and regional levels to climate variability and change.			<p>Recommend revising impact statement to “Increased resiliency and reduced vulnerability at the community, national, and regional levels to climate variability and change.”</p> <p>This change better aligns the SRF impact statement with the goal of the MTS by focusing on both strengthened resilience and reduced vulnerability.</p>			
Outcome 1: Reduced exposure to climate-related hazards and threats	Indicator 1: Relevant threat and hazard information generated and disseminated to stakeholders on a timely basis	Indicator 1: People using improved climate-related threat and hazard information <i>[# of individuals, by gender]</i>	<p>Recommend revising indicator to focus on people using improved threat and hazard information and to disaggregate by gender consistent with MTS gender theme. Use – rather than generation and dissemination – of climate information services is better aligned with an outcome of reduced exposure (i.e., people must use the information they receive to inform decision-making and behavior, in order to reduce their exposure).</p> <p>Indicator is highly relevant for reporting on GGA impact, vulnerability, and risk assessment dimension.</p>	 		
Output 1.1 Risk and vulnerability assessments conducted and updated	Indicator 1.1.1: No. of projects/programmes that conduct and update risk and vulnerability assessments	Indicator 1.1.1: Risk and vulnerability assessments conducted or updated	Recommend revising indicator to count the number of risk and vulnerability assessments rather than the number of projects that conduct them, as a more accurate measure of results achieved.			

Current Result	Current Indicator	Proposed Indicator	Explanation of Proposed Revisions	Improved alignment		
				MTS	GGA	MCF
		<i>[# of assessments, by sector and scale]</i>	Reporting should be disaggregated by sector and scale (e.g., local, sub-national, national, regional) to enhance interpretation of this result. Indicator is highly relevant for reporting on GGA impact, vulnerability, and risk assessment dimension.			
Output 1.2 Targeted population groups covered by warning and advisory services for climate-related hazards and threats	Indicator 1.2.1: No. of early warning systems (by scale) and no. of beneficiaries covered	Core Indicator: 1.2.1 Early warning systems established or improved <i>[# of systems, disaggregated by hazard and scale]</i>	Minor changes recommended to clarify that the early warning systems reported would be those that are newly established or improved through Adaptation Fund activities. Indicator is highly relevant for reporting on the GGA impact, vulnerability, and risk assessment dimension. Reporting on the number of systems should be disaggregated by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hazard, including multi-hazard systems. • Scale, such as local, sub-national, national, and regional/transboundary. Projects reporting on this core indicator must also report on the following indicator 1.2.2.			
		Indicator 1.2.2: People covered by new or improved early warning systems <i>[# of people, disaggregated by gender]</i>	Indicator recommended to stand alone, disaggregated by gender consistent with MTS gender theme. Indicator is highly relevant for reporting on GGA impact, vulnerability, and risk assessment dimension. Indicator is also consistent with the WMO Early Warnings for All Initiative and GCF IRMF Outcome 2.4, which supports the MTS complementarity and coherence theme and may reduce entity and country burden.	 		
	Indicator 1.2.1: Percentage of target	Indicator 1.2.1: Percentage of target	Recommended to remove. Indicator is partly duplicative with 1.2.2, and is also not currently			

Current Result	Current Indicator	Proposed Indicator	Explanation of Proposed Revisions	Improved alignment		
				MTS	GGA	MCF
	population covered by adequate risk-reduction systems	population covered by adequate risk-reduction systems	included in the PPR. IE consultations suggested challenges with defining “adequate” risk reduction systems.			
Outcome 2: Strengthened institutional capacity to reduce risks associated with climate-induced socioeconomic and environmental losses	Indicator 2: Capacity of staff to respond to, and mitigate impacts of, climate-related events from targeted institutions increased	Indicator 2: Institutions with strengthened capacity to understand and better address climate risks and resilience <i>[# of institutions, disaggregated by scale and sector]</i>	<p>Recommend focusing on strengthened institutional capacity at the outcome level and adjusting language away from “response” to suggest building capacity for a more strategic, planned, and proactive approach. Recommend shifting away from a narrower focus on climate “events” to a broader focus on climate risks and resilience.</p> <p>Reporting should be disaggregated by scale (e.g., local, sub-national, national, regional), which will also align with LLA principle 4 (investing in local capabilities to leave an institutional legacy) and would support reporting on the MTS LLA theme. Disaggregation by sector may also help with reporting on GGA sector-based targets. Guidance will need to define the sectors and may consider including climate information services as a sector to align with the GGA impact, vulnerability, and risk assessment dimension.</p>			
Output 2.1 Strengthened capacity of institutions to understand and better address climate risks Strengthened capacity of national and sub-	Indicator 2.1.1: No. of staff trained to respond to, and mitigate impacts of, climate-related events (by gender)	Indicator 2.1.1: Institutions supported to strengthen capacity to understand and address climate risks and resilience <i>[# of institutions, disaggregated by scale and sector]</i>	<p>Recommend revising this Output result description, which is narrowly focused on rapid response to extreme events. A broader result and indicator should focus on the capacity of institutional staff to understand and better address climate risks, including but not limited to those related to extreme events.</p> <p>Projects reporting on this indicator should also report on the number of staff trained to understand and better address climate risks and</p>			

Current Result	Current Indicator	Proposed Indicator	Explanation of Proposed Revisions	Improved alignment		
				MTS	GGA	MCF
national centers and networks to respond rapidly to extreme weather events			<p>resilience [<i># of people, disaggregated by gender, sector, and scale</i>].</p> <p>Disaggregation by scale of institution (e.g., local, sub-national, national, regional) will support reporting on the MTS LLA theme. Disaggregation by sector may also help with reporting on GGA sector-based targets.</p> <p>Recommend revising Output 2.1 result language to read: “Strengthened capacity of national and subnational institutions to understand and address climate risks and resilience”</p>			
	Indicator 2.1.2: No. of targeted institutions with increased capacity to minimize exposure to climate variability risks	Indicator 2.1.2: No. of targeted institutions with increased capacity to minimize exposure to climate variability risks	Recommend deleting this indicator, since it is duplicative with the outcome indicator and revised output indicator above.			
<p>Output 2.2. Increased capacity of national and sub-national entities to directly access and programme adaptation finance</p> <p>Increased readiness and capacity of national and sub-national entities to directly access and programme adaptation finance</p>	Indicator 2.2.1: No. of targeted institutions benefitting from the direct access and enhanced direct access modality	<p>Indicator 2.2.1: Local organizations receiving funding or other direct support under the locally led adaptation modality</p> <p><i>[# of institutions]</i></p>	<p>Revisions recommended to capture the results of Fund projects and programmes, rather than readiness activities. The number of direct access entities should be measured in the AF corporate results framework, rather than in the SRF.</p> <p>Revised indicator will measure the number of local institutions supported through the LLA modality, supporting reporting on the MTS LLA theme and MTS access theme on enhancing access to climate finance and long-term institutional capacity.</p>	 		

Current Result	Current Indicator	Proposed Indicator	Explanation of Proposed Revisions	Improved alignment		
				MTS	GGA	MCF
Outcome 3: Strengthened awareness and ownership of adaptation and climate risk reduction processes	Indicator 3.1: Percentage of targeted population awareness of predicted adverse impacts of climate change, and of appropriate responses	Indicator 3.1: People with strengthened awareness of climate change risks and how to better address them <i>[# of people, disaggregated by gender]</i>	<p>Recommend adjusting to measure number of people, which is consistent with the approach taken already in the PPR and better supports aggregation (i.e., percentages cannot be added). The revised reporting guidance should clarify that this indicator is meant to focus on capacity in local communities, rather than institutions, which is the focus of Outcome 2.</p> <p>Reporting should be disaggregated by gender, consistent with MTS gender theme.</p> <p>In revisions to the PPR and reporting guidance, the Secretariat will explore the feasibility of providing guidance on a further disaggregated approach, including disaggregating awareness by sector, which could help with reporting on GGA sector-based targets. This could be inclusive of health (e.g., people with strengthened awareness / capacity to prevent, detect, and respond to climate-related health emergencies), which has limited coverage in the SRF. The Secretariat will also explore the feasibility of providing guidance on further disaggregation in the PPR by other vulnerable groups (e.g., youth, children, people with disabilities, displaced people, Indigenous Peoples and marginalized ethnic groups), in line with MTS themes on most vulnerable people and LLA and LLA principle 2.</p>	 		
	Indicator 3.2: Increase in application of appropriate adaptation responses	Indicator 3.2: People implementing new or improved adaptation actions	<p>Recommend adjusting to measure number of people, which better supports aggregation (i.e., percentages cannot be added). As with Outcome 2, recommend adjusting language away from “response” to “actions,” to suggest building capacity for a more strategic, planned, and proactive approach than reactive response.</p>	 		

Current Result	Current Indicator	Proposed Indicator	Explanation of Proposed Revisions	Improved alignment		
				MTS	GGA	MCF
		<i>[# of people, disaggregated by gender]</i>	<p>Reporting should be disaggregated by gender, consistent with MTS gender theme.</p> <p>In revisions to the PPR and reporting guidance, the Secretariat will explore the feasibility of providing guidance on further disaggregation by other vulnerable groups (e.g., youth, children, people with disabilities, displaced people, Indigenous Peoples and marginalized ethnic groups), in line with MTS themes on most vulnerable people and LLA and LLA principle 2. The Secretariat will also explore the feasibility of providing guidance further disaggregation by sector, which could help with reporting on GGA sector-based targets.</p>			
Output 3.1: Targeted population groups participating in adaptation and risk reduction awareness activities	Indicator 3.1.1 No. of news outlets in the local press and media that have covered the topic	<p>Indicator 3.1.1: People participating in activities to improve awareness of climate risks and how to address them</p> <p><i>[# of people, disaggregated by gender, and by vulnerable groups]</i></p>	Recommend replacing the current indicator, which is not commonly reported, with new output indicator that more logically leads to the outcome of people implementing new or improved adaptation actions.	  		
Output 3.2: Strengthened capacity of national and subnational stakeholders and entities to capture and disseminate	Indicator 3.2.1: No. of technical committees/ associations formed to ensure transfer of knowledge	Indicator 3.2.1: No. of technical committees/ associations formed to ensure transfer of knowledge	Recommend deleting this indicator, which is prescriptive in implying that technical committees or associations would be an optimal project approach to ensure transfer of knowledge.			
	Indicator 3.2.2: No. of tools and guidelines developed (thematic, sectoral, institutional)	Indicator 3.2.1: Climate resilience knowledge products and/or tools	Minor revisions to broaden to include any type of knowledge product and to specify that the product focuses on climate resilience.			

Current Result	Current Indicator	Proposed Indicator	Explanation of Proposed Revisions	Improved alignment		
				MTS	GGA	MCF
knowledge and learning	and shared with relevant stakeholders	developed and shared with stakeholders <i>[# of products/tools]</i>	In revisions to the PPR and reporting guidance, the Secretariat will explore the feasibility of providing guidance on a sub indicator on the percentage of products shared with vulnerable groups (e.g., women youth, children, people with disabilities, displaced people, Indigenous Peoples and marginalized ethnic groups), in line with MTS themes on gender, most vulnerable people, and LLA and LLA principle 2.			
Output 3.3: Increased ownership of adaptation and climate risk reduction processes	N/A	Indicator 3.3.1: Number of local institutions and/or communities responsible for decision-making over how adaptation solutions are defined, prioritized, designed, and/or implemented <i>[# of local institutions and/or communities]</i>	New output and indicator recommended to support reporting on the MTS LLA theme. This output and indicator respond to the second part of the outcome result area focused on ownership.			
Outcome 4: Increased adaptive capacity within relevant development sector services and infrastructure assets	Indicator 4: Increased responsiveness of development sector services to evolving needs from changing and variable climate	Core Indicator 4: Physical assets improved or constructed to withstand climate variability and change <i>[disaggregated by km of linear infrastructure and # of point infrastructure, and by sector]</i>	Few projects report against the current indicator, and feedback from consultations suggests that the current indicator is not formulated in a way that is aggregable or useful for Fund-level reporting. Several alternative outcome-level indicators were considered for replacement, drawing on the GCF IRMF and MDB Common Approach indicators, including indicators measuring the value of infrastructure assets that integrate adaptation measures and reduced service disruption, reduced damage, or increased benefits due to climate resilient infrastructure services. However, consultations raised practical concerns about data reliability	 	 	

Current Result	Current Indicator	Proposed Indicator	Explanation of Proposed Revisions	Improved alignment		
				MTS	GGA	MCF
			<p>and intensity of data requirements for reporting, which may create significant burden for entities and countries. Another potential outcome measure of climate-resilient infrastructure assets and development sector services is people benefiting from these assets and services, and this is captured already in the core indicator “number of beneficiaries.” Thus, indicators in this area are recommended to focus on improvements to physical assets and sector services.</p> <p>Changes to the core indicator language are recommended to use more streamlined and specific language. “Produced” and “developed” capture the same concept, as does “improved” and “strengthened.” Indicator is relevant for reporting on GGA implementation dimension and GGA target E (infrastructure).</p> <p>Reporting on physical assets should be disaggregated by asset type for more meaningful reporting. At minimum, reporting should be disaggregated by linear infrastructure (km) and point infrastructure (#).</p> <p>In revisions to the PPR and reporting guidance, the Secretariat will explore the the feasibility of providing guidance on a further disaggregated approach, requiring reporting by specific asset types, such as: no. of public buildings, no. of irrigation or water structures, no. of fishery or aquaculture structures, no. of bridges, ports, or landing sites, km of roads, km of riverine or coastal assets. More disaggregated reporting could also support sector-specific reporting</p>			

Current Result	Current Indicator	Proposed Indicator	Explanation of Proposed Revisions	Improved alignment		
				MTS	GGA	MCF
			under GGA target A (water), target B (agriculture), and target G (cultural heritage).			
Output 4.1: Vulnerable development sector services and infrastructure assets strengthened in response to climate change impacts, including variability	Indicator 4.1.1: No. and type of development sector services to respond to new conditions resulting from climate variability and change (by sector and scale)	Indicator 4.1.1: Development sector services strengthened to respond to climate variability and change <i>[# of sector services, disaggregated by sector and scale]</i>	Recommend minimal changes only to align with formulation of other indicators (with units at the end of the indicator).			
	Indicator 4.1.2: No. of physical assets strengthened or constructed to withstand conditions resulting from climate variability and change (by sector and scale)	See above.	See above for recommended changes to the indicator.			
Outcome 5: Increased ecosystem resilience in response to climate change and variability-induced stress	Indicator 5: Ecosystem services and natural resource assets maintained or improved under climate change and variability-induced stress	Core Indicator 5: Ecosystems and natural resources brought under protection, restoration, or improved management in response to climate variability and change <i>[# of hectares, disaggregated by land, marine, coastal, and cultural heritage area]</i>	Changes to the indicator language recommended to reflect common strategies for enhancing ecosystems and natural resources, including protection, restoration, and improved management. Including “improved management” is also consistent with similar indicators in the GCF IRMF, MDB Common Approach, and GEF LDCF. Ecosystems and natural resources would be inclusive of terrestrial, inland water, mountain, marine and coastal areas, consistent with GGA target D (ecosystems). The indicator is also relevant for reporting on GGA implementation dimension and addresses the “ecosystems” part of the MTS goal. Reporting on number of hectares should be disaggregated by land, marine, coastal, and		 	

Current Result	Current Indicator	Proposed Indicator	Explanation of Proposed Revisions	Improved alignment		
				MTS	GGA	MCF
			cultural heritage area, to help with more meaningful interpretation of area values, as well as enable reporting against GGA target G (cultural heritage).			
Output 5: Vulnerable ecosystem services and natural resource assets strengthened in response to climate change impacts, including variability	Indicator 5.1.1: No. of natural resource assets created, maintained or improved to withstand conditions resulting from climate variability and change (by type and scale)	Indicator 5.1.1: Ecosystems and natural resources targeted by activities to improve protection, restoration, and/or management [# of resources, by type]	Minor changes recommended to align with how indicator is already measured in the PPR. Revised PPR and reporting guidance will need to specify the types of resources and how to count them.			
Outcome 6: Diversified and strengthened livelihoods and sources of income for vulnerable people in targeted areas	Indicator 6.1: Percentage of households and communities having more secure access to livelihood assets	Indicator 6.1: People adopting improved and/or new climate-resilient livelihood practices [# of people, disaggregated by gender]	<p>Recommend revising indicator to count number of people adopting new/improved livelihoods, which is easier to measure and aggregate than the increase in households and improvement level (per current PPR). Revised guidance will need to define “new and/or improved” livelihood practices, but these are expected to also encompass diversified livelihoods.</p> <p>Reporting should be disaggregated by gender, consistent with MTS gender theme.</p> <p>Indicator enables reporting against GGA target F (poverty and livelihoods). Indicator is relevant for reporting on GGA implementation dimension. This indicator is consistent with GCF IRMF indicator 2.1, which supports the MTS complementarity and coherence theme and may reduce entity and country burden.</p>	 	 	

Current Result	Current Indicator	Proposed Indicator	Explanation of Proposed Revisions	Improved alignment		
				MTS	GGA	MCF
	Indicator 6.2: Percentage of targeted population with sustained climate-resilient alternative livelihoods	Indicator 6.2: Percentage of targeted population with sustained climate-resilient alternative livelihoods	Recommend deleting this indicator. Intention is duplicative with indicator 6.			
	Core Indicator 6.1.2: Increased income, or avoided decrease in income	Core Indicator 6.2: Households with increased income, or avoided decrease in income <i>[# of households, disaggregated by # of female-headed households]</i>	Recommend revising this indicator according to feedback received from IEs through the survey and consultation workshop. The IE consultation recommended revising this indicator to count number of households with increased income, which could be measured through surveys and interviews (such as agricultural surveys and extensionist interviews), which are frequently done at the household level. Reporting should be disaggregated by female-headed households, consistent with MTS gender theme. Indicator enables reporting against GGA target F (poverty and livelihoods). Indicator is relevant for reporting on GGA implementation dimension.		 	
Output 6 Targeted individual and community livelihood strategies strengthened in relation to climate change impacts, including variability	Indicator 6.1.1: No. and type of adaptation assets created or strengthened in support of individual or community livelihood strategies	Indicator 6.1.1: People receiving targeted support for new and/or improved livelihoods to manage climate risk <i>[# of people, disaggregated by gender and by type of support]</i>	An asset-focused indicator may be duplicative with Output 4 indicator. Recommendation is to focus on people that benefit from livelihood resources provided through Adaptation Fund projects, such as technical, financial, and skill development-related support for new, improved, and/or diversified livelihoods The proposed indicator addresses the “livelihoods” part of the MTS goal. The indicator also enables reporting against GGA target F (poverty and livelihoods) and is relevant for reporting on GGA implementation dimension.	 	 	

Current Result	Current Indicator	Proposed Indicator	Explanation of Proposed Revisions	Improved alignment		
				MTS	GGA	MCF
			<p>Furthermore, this indicator is aligned with the MDB Common Approach and is broadly consistent with GCF IRMF indicator 2.1, which supports the MTS complementarity and coherence theme and may reduce entity and country burden.</p> <p>Reporting should be disaggregated by gender, to align with MTS gender theme. Reporting should also be disaggregated by type of support, such as technical support, capacity and skill development, and financial products and services (e.g., through financial intermediaries, including micro-finance institutions)</p> <p>In revisions to the PPR and reporting guidance, the Secretariat will explore the the feasibility of providing guidance on a further disaggregated approach, requiring reporting by vulnerable groups, such as youth, elderly, people with disabilities, displaced people, Indigenous Peoples and marginalized ethnic groups, in line with MTS themes on most vulnerable people and locally led adaptation.</p>			
<p>Outcome 7: Improved policies and regulations that promote and enforce resilience measures</p>	<p>Indicator 7: Climate change priorities are integrated into national development strategy</p>	<p>Indicator 7: Policies, strategies, and/or plans adopted, implemented, and/or enforced that integrate climate risk and resilience considerations</p> <p><i>[#, disaggregated by scale and by policy step, i.e., developed,</i></p>	<p>Recommend revising this indicator for (1) easier aggregation and (2) inclusivity of policy scales other than national development strategies. On (1), the PPR measures this indicator using a rating scale (e.g., none, some, most, all) for the level of integration. This approach seems to necessitate a national-level assessment that individual Fund projects may not be well-positioned to conduct. On (2), directing the indicator only at the level of national development strategies overlooks the value of integrating climate resilience into subnational</p>	 		

Current Result	Current Indicator	Proposed Indicator	Explanation of Proposed Revisions	Improved alignment		
				MTS	GGA	MCF
		<i>adopted, implemented, enforced]</i>	<p>and local level policies, plans, and strategies – which would be consistent with the MTS LLA theme.</p> <p>Reporting should be disaggregated by policy scale (e.g., regional/transboundary, national, sectoral, sub-national, local). In revisions to the PPR and reporting guidance, the Secretariat will also explore the feasibility of providing guidance on further disaggregated reporting by policy cycle progress (e.g., developed, adopted, implemented, enforced) and sector to align with GGA sector- and dimension-based targets.</p> <p>Recommend revising Outcome 7 result language to read: “Improved, policies, strategies, and plans that promote and enforce climate resilience measures”.</p>			
Output 7.1: Improved integration of climate-resilience strategies into country development plans	Indicator 7.1.1: No. of policies introduced or adjusted to address climate change risks (by sector)	<p>Core Indicator 7.1.1: Policies, strategies, and/or plans developed or adjusted to integrate climate risk considerations</p> <p><i>[# of policies, strategies, and/or plans, disaggregated by scale]</i></p>	<p>Recommend adding this core indicator. The Fund has already been tracking aggregated policy-related results in the Annual Performance Report. Promoting adaptation planning is in line with the delivery model highlighted in the MTS II and with the GGA planning dimension. Over 70 percent of IE survey respondents supported including a policy indicator in the Fund’s list of core indicators.</p> <p>The proposed indicator language of “policies, strategies, and/or plans” is directly aligned with the GGA planning dimension language. The modifiers “developed or adjusted” recognizes two common approaches, i.e., developing new policies/strategies/plans that address climate risk considerations or adjusting existing plans to</p>	 		

Current Result	Current Indicator	Proposed Indicator	Explanation of Proposed Revisions	Improved alignment		
				MTS	GGA	MCF
			<p>mainstream climate risk considerations into them.</p> <p>Reporting on number of policies, strategies, and/or plans should be disaggregated by scale (e.g., local, sub-national, national, regional). The Secretariat will explore the feasibility of providing guidance on further disaggregation by sector to align with GGA sector-based targets, in part through consultations with Implementing Entities.</p> <p>Recommend revising Output 7 result language to read: “Improved integration of climate resilience into policies, strategies, and plans”</p>			
	Indicator 7.1.2: No. of targeted development strategies with incorporated climate change priorities enforced	Indicator 7.1.2: No. of targeted development strategies with incorporated climate change priorities enforced	<p>Recommend deleting this indicator. Implementing or enforcing climate change actions in policies, strategies, and/or plans is often an outcome rather than an output. Recommend integrating elements of implementation and/or enforcement into the outcome indicator, as proposed above</p>			
		<p>Indicator 7.1.2: Policies, strategies, and/or plans formulated through the participation of one or more vulnerable groups</p> <p><i>[# of policies, strategies, and/or plans, disaggregated by scale]</i></p>	<p>Recommend adding an output indicator that better aligns with the MTS LLA theme and MTS most vulnerable people theme. This indicator would also support reporting under GGA planning dimension.</p> <p>The proposed indicator aligns with the second principle of LLA: addressing structural inequalities faced by marginalized groups. In revisions to reporting guidance, clearly defining “vulnerable groups” (e.g. women, youth, children, people with disabilities, displaced people, Indigenous Peoples and marginalized ethnic groups) will be critical. The Secretariat will</p>	 		

Current Result	Current Indicator	Proposed Indicator	Explanation of Proposed Revisions	Improved alignment		
				MTS	GGA	MCF
			also explore the feasibility of further disaggregation by sector to align with GGA sector-based targets.			
<p>Outcome 8: Innovation for effective, long-term adaptation to climate change accelerated, encouraged, and enabled to scale up</p> <p>Outcome 8: Support the development and diffusion of innovative adaptation practices, tools and technologies</p>	Indicator 8.1: No. of new, adapted or improved adaptation solutions developed contextually and with the inclusion of the communities most vulnerable to climate change	<p>Indicator 8.1: Innovations successfully reaching scale up that demonstrate local participation and/or local innovation benefit</p> <p><i>[# of innovations]</i></p>	<p>Recommend revising the outcome statement to align with the conceptual logic of successful innovation pathways and processes – identification, piloting and scale up – as key steps for creating successful adaptation innovation ecosystems. The corresponding indicator would measure the number of innovations that successfully reach scale-up, following innovation identification and piloting. The indicator also specifies that innovations should demonstrate local participation and/or local innovation benefit, to align with locally based and locally led adaptation. This will be further clarified in guidance but may reflect the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Local innovation participation – Scaled innovations that demonstrate they have been informed by the meaningful participation of target/priority groups defined as women, youth, children, people with disabilities and displaced people, Indigenous Peoples and marginalized ethnic groups and / or – Local innovation benefit – Scaled innovations that demonstrate they have enhanced the adaptive capacity of local institutions and communities to ensure they can understand climate risks and uncertainties, generate solutions and facilitate and manage adaptation initiatives 	 		


Current Result	Current Indicator	Proposed Indicator	Explanation of Proposed Revisions	Improved alignment		
				MTS	GGA	MCF
	N/A	Indicator 8.2: Institutions created and/or enabled that lead on innovation for adaptation to climate change [# of institutions, disaggregated by scale]	Recommend adding the proposed outcome indicator to capture successful adaptation innovation ecosystem development.	 		
	Indicator 8.2: No. of key findings on effective, efficient adaptation practices, products, and technologies generated and/or “learning and sharing” innovation initiatives undertaken	Indicator 8.2: No. of key findings on effective, efficient adaptation practices, products, and technologies generated and/or “learning and sharing” innovation initiatives undertaken	Recommend deleting this indicator. Identifying key innovation findings is at the output level and is covered by proposed output indicators on identifying and piloting innovations, as well as on generating and sharing knowledge.			
	Indicator 8.3: No. of individuals or organizations (disaggregated by gender) that submit an application to an innovation competition or challenge	Indicator 8.3: No. of individuals or organizations (disaggregated by gender) that submit an application to an innovation competition or challenge	Recommend deleting this indicator. The underlying rationale relates to scaled-up innovation for climate change adaptation through the support to create healthy innovation ecosystems through a simple innovation pathway or process: innovation identification – piloting – scale up. The current indicator does not directly relate to that rationale and is overly prescriptive on how that innovation pathway is pursued. As appropriate and relevant, individual projects and programmes could still use a similar indicator in project-specific results framework.			
Output 8.1: Innovations identified and piloted which collectively	8.1.1 No. of innovators supported (disaggregated by gender (male/female/other)	Indicator 8.1.1: Innovations identified that demonstrate local participation and/or local innovation benefit	Recommend replacing with new output indicator focused on innovations identified rather than number of innovators. This would be inclusive of innovations identified in the full AF project portfolio, and not just those identified through	 		

Current Result	Current Indicator	Proposed Indicator	Explanation of Proposed Revisions	Improved alignment		
				MTS	GGA	MCF
<p>enhance local innovation capacity & contribute to the development of local, national and regional adaptation innovation ecosystems</p> <p>Viabte innovations are rolled out, scaled up, encouraged, accelerated, and/or evidence base generated at regional, national, and/or subnational level</p>	and youth status (youth/non-youth)).	<i>[# of proposed innovations]</i>	the Innovation Facility. The outcome and output indicators are designed to follow a simple innovation pathway or process: innovation identification – piloting – scale up. This approach also requires revision to the output language, as shown.			
	Indicator 8.1.2: No. of innovation related partnerships leveraged for exchange of goods or services or ideas, consultations, and assistance between grantee and stakeholder/s	Indicator 8.1.2: Innovations piloted that demonstrate local participation and/or local innovation benefit. <i>[# of innovations]</i>	Recommend deleting and replacing with new output indicator focused on innovations piloted. The outcome and output indicators are designed to follow a simple innovation pathway or process: innovation identification – piloting – scale up.	 		
Output 8.2: Innovations identified and piloted which build the adaptation innovation evidence-base and	Indicator 8.2.1: No. of key findings generated from an innovation practice, tool, and/or technology	Indicator 8.2.1: Innovation-focussed knowledge products disseminated and/or learning events facilitated that support and enable innovation capacity at a local,	Recommend adding a new output area and replacing the output indicator. “Number of key findings” may be duplicative with the number of innovations identified and piloted, as proposed for the new innovation pathway structure. The proposed output indicator on innovation, new knowledge, and learning is a foundation for adaptation innovation capacity building.	 		

Current Result	Current Indicator	Proposed Indicator	Explanation of Proposed Revisions	Improved alignment		
				MTS	GGA	MCF
institutional capacity		national, and/or regional level <i>[# of knowledge products disseminated and/or learning events facilitated]</i>				
	Indicator 8.2.2: No. of learning and sharing initiatives undertaken, including communication initiatives	Indicator 8.2.2: No. of learning and sharing initiatives undertaken, including communication initiatives	Recommend deleting this indicator. The current indicator would be duplicative with the one above on number of knowledge products and/or learning events.			
	Indicator 8.3.1: No. of applications (individuals or organizations) to innovation calls under the project or programme	Indicator 8.3.1: No. of applications (individuals or organizations) to innovation calls under the project or programme	Recommend deleting this indicator. The current indicator is a process-oriented pre-cursor to identifying and piloting innovations, which are newly proposed output indicators. As appropriate and relevant, individual AF projects and programmes could still use a similar indicator in project-specific results framework.			


Annex B: Mapping the Current and Revised SRF to the MTS II

The figure below maps the current and revised indicators in the SRF to the MTS II cross-cutting themes. As shown the revised SRF has more indicators that map to these themes, particularly on locally based or locally led adaptation and most vulnerable people.




Annex C: Mapping the Current and Revised SRF to the GGA

The figure below maps the current and revised indicators in the SRF to the GGA sectors/thematic areas in decision 2/CMA.5 paragraph 9. As shown the revised SRF has more indicators that map to multiple target areas and also now includes an indicator mapped to cultural heritage.




The figure below maps the revised indicators in the SRF to the GGA dimensions of the iterative adaptation cycle. As shown, indicators align with all four dimensions, with the majority focused on implementation, in line with the mandate of the Adaptation Fund.



Annex D: Comparative Analysis of other Climate Funds' and MDBs' Strategic Results Frameworks

1. The Secretariat conducted a comparative analysis focused on the alignment between the Fund's SRF and the GCF's Integrated Results Management Framework (IRMF), GEF Updated Results Framework (GEF RF) for Adaptation to Climate Change for the LDCF and SCCF, and MDB Common Approach to Measuring Climate Results.
2. All four frameworks include multiple levels of reporting to capture results. The AF SRF and GEF RF are most aligned structurally, as each framework has result areas and indicators specific to adaptation at the impact, outcome, and output levels. For adaptation, the GCF IRMF captures measures of paradigm shift potential at the impact level, along with core and supplementary indicators at the outcome level. The MDB Common Approach uses a slightly different results management structure, with different levels for global impact, operational outcomes, and institutional results related to adaptation and resilience. A separate component relates to country and client transitions, capturing results such as number of countries with gender-responsive national adaptation plans, policy instruments and planning processes or strategies.

Figure 1. Strategic Results Framework Structures of Other Adaptation Funders



3. These frameworks are somewhat aligned in terms of result areas at the outcome level, with similar focuses on people, socioeconomic, and ecosystem outcomes. Indicators such as beneficiary counts, hectares of natural resource area, and early warning systems are common across the funders. The GEF, GCF, and MDB frameworks include indicators related to most of the respective Fund's result areas, although there is variation across funds in terms of whether results are designated at outcome or output levels.

4. Figure 2 below summarizes the alignment of other adaptation funders' results frameworks with the Fund's SRF outcomes. The table further below provides a detailed mapping of outcome and output indicator alignment across adaptation funders.

Figure 2. Alignment of Other Climate Fund Frameworks' with Current AF SRF Outcomes

AF SRF Outcomes	GCF IRMF	GEF RF	MDB CA
1. Reduced exposure to climate-related hazards and threats	Outcomes aligned with AF SRF outcomes	Outputs or supplementary outcome indicators aligned with AF SRF outcomes	Outcomes somewhat aligned with AF SRF outcomes
2. Institutional capacity for climate risk reduction	AF SRF outcomes not in framework	Outcomes aligned with AF SRF outcomes	AF SRF outcomes not in framework
3. Awareness and ownership of adaptation processes	AF SRF outcomes not in framework	Outputs or supplementary outcome indicators aligned with AF SRF outcomes	Outcomes somewhat aligned with AF SRF outcomes
4. Resilient development sector services and infrastructure	Outputs or supplementary outcome indicators aligned with AF SRF outcomes	Outputs or supplementary outcome indicators aligned with AF SRF outcomes	Outcomes aligned with AF SRF outcomes
5. Resilient ecosystems	Outcomes aligned with AF SRF outcomes	Outputs or supplementary outcome indicators aligned with AF SRF outcomes	Outcomes aligned with AF SRF outcomes
6. Diversified and strengthened livelihoods and sources of income	Outputs or supplementary outcome indicators aligned with AF SRF outcomes	Outputs or supplementary outcome indicators aligned with AF SRF outcomes	Outcomes aligned with AF SRF outcomes
7. Policies and regulations that promote and enforce resilience	Outputs or supplementary outcome indicators aligned with AF SRF outcomes	Outputs or supplementary outcome indicators aligned with AF SRF outcomes	Outcomes aligned with AF SRF outcomes
8. Innovation for effective, long-term adaptation	Outputs or supplementary outcome indicators aligned with AF SRF outcomes	Outcomes aligned with AF SRF outcomes	Outcomes aligned with AF SRF outcomes

	Outcomes aligned with AF SRF outcomes		Outcomes somewhat aligned with AF SRF outcomes
	Outputs or supplementary outcome indicators aligned with AF SRF outcomes		AF SRF outcomes not in framework

5. The results frameworks diverge at the output level. Only the GEF RF includes explicit output-level indicators, although some outcome-level indicators of the GCF IRMF and MDB Common Approach map to AF SRF outputs. The AF SRF has 11 unique output indicators, many of which reflect the Fund's approach to raising awareness about climate change and fostering innovation (e.g., number of news outlets in the local press and media that covered the topic, number of applications to innovation calls). The AF SRF and GEF RF feature similar outputs related to institutional and individual capacity and application of appropriate adaptation measures, while the AF SRF and GCF IRMF have a common results area related to knowledge generation and sharing. The AF SRF less explicitly covers certain sectors, compared to the GCF IRMF supplementary indicators and the MDB Common Approach.
6. The AF SRF is least similar to the MDB Common Approach due to their unique structures. Improved coordination, governance, and capacity to manage climate risks are incorporated across four AF SRF outcomes and associated outputs, while the MDB Common Approach captures these results under a single indicator for number of countries supported in climate policy, legal and regulatory development and implementation. The MDB Common Approach separates sectoral adaptation and mitigation results from these kinds of country and client transition support results, which include climate finance mobilization and social impacts. Neither of these themes are prominent in the current AF SRF, which offers one output indicator for the number of targeted institutions benefitting from the AF's direct access modality and no output indicators related to just transitions.

Table 1. The following indicators are *aligned*, *somewhat aligned*, or *unique*.

Adaptation Fund SRF	GCF IRMF	GEF LDCF & SCCF RF (2022-2026)	GEF LDCF RF (2018-2022)	MDB Common Approach
Core Indicators				
Number of beneficiaries (direct and indirect)	Core 2 Direct and indirect beneficiaries reached	Core 1 Number of direct beneficiaries	Core 1.1 Number of direct beneficiaries	
Natural assets protected or rehabilitated	Core 4 Hectares of natural resource areas brought under improved low-emission and/or climate-resilient management practices	Core 2(a) Area of land managed for climate resilience (ha)	Core 1.2 Area of land under climate-resilient management (ha)	
		Core 2(b) Coastal or marine area managed for climate resilience (ha)		
Assets produced, developed, improved, or strengthened	Core 3 Value of physical assets made more resilient to the effects of climate change and/or more able to reduce GHG emissions			
		Core 4 Number of people trained or with awareness raised	Core 3 Number of people with enhanced capacity to identify climate risk and/or engage in adaptation measures	Percentage of people at high risk from climate shocks globally [%]
Number of Early Warning Systems				
Increased income, or avoided decrease in income		Sub-indicator 1.6 Increased income, or avoided decrease in income (per capita in \$ across all relevant beneficiaries)		
	Core 5 Degree to which GCF projects/programmes contribute to strengthening institutional and regulatory frameworks for low-	Core 3 Total number of policies, plans, and frameworks that will mainstream climate resilience	Core 2 Number of policies, plans or development frameworks that mainstream climate resilience	

Adaptation Fund SRF	GCF IRMF	GEF LDCF & SCCF RF (2022-2026)	GEF LDCF RF (2018-2022)	MDB Common Approach
	emission climate-resilient development pathways in a country-driven manner			
		Core 5 Number of private sector enterprises engaged in climate change adaptation and resilience action		
Outcome Indicators				
Outcome 4.1: Responsiveness of development sector services to evolving needs from changing and variable climate				Reduced service disruption, or reduced damage, or increased benefits provided due to climate resilient infrastructure services that integrate adaptation measures and/or enables adaptation
Outcome 5: Ecosystem services and natural resource assets maintained or improved under climate change and variability-induced stress	Core 4: Hectares of natural resource areas brought under improved low-emission and/or climate-resilient management practices		Output 1.1.4 Vulnerable ecosystems and natural resource assets strengthened in response to climate change impacts	Area of terrestrial and aquatic ecosystem under protection, conservation and/or enhanced management in response to climate variability and change
Outcome 6.1: Percentage of households and communities having more secure access to livelihood assets	Outcome 2.1: Beneficiaries (female/male) adopting improved and/or new climate-resilient livelihood options (number of individuals)	Sub-indicator 1.2: Number of direct beneficiaries with diversified and strengthened livelihoods and sources of income (sex disaggregated)	Output 1.1.2 Livelihoods and sources of income of vulnerable populations diversified and strengthened	Beneficiaries of livelihood resources to manage climate risk

Adaptation Fund SRF	GCF IRMF	GEF LDCF & SCCF RF (2022-2026)	GEF LDCF RF (2018-2022)	MDB Common Approach
Outcome 7. Climate change priorities are integrated into national development strategy	Core 5 Degree to which GCF projects/programmes contribute to strengthening institutional and regulatory frameworks for low-emission climate-resilient development pathways in a country-driven manner	3.3 Number of national climate policies and plans enabled, including national adaptation planning processes	Outcome 3.1 Climate-resilient planning enabled by stronger climate information decision-support services, and other relevant analysis	
Outcome 8.1. No. of new, adapted or improved adaptation solutions developed contextually and with the inclusion of the communities most vulnerable to climate change	Core 6 Degree to which GCF projects/programmes contribute to technology deployment, dissemination, development or transfer and innovation	2.16 Number of new adaptation technologies supported	Outcome 1.1 Technologies and innovative solutions piloted or deployed to reduce climate-related risks and/or enhance resilience Outcome 1.2 Innovative financial instruments and investment models enabled or introduced to enhance climate resilience	
Outcome 8.2. No. of key findings on effective, efficient adaptation practices, products, and technologies generated and/or "learning and sharing" innovation initiatives undertaken	Core 8 Degree to which GCF projects/programmes contribute to effective knowledge generation and learning processes, and use of good practices, methodologies and standards			
Outcome 2.1. Capacity of staff to respond to, and mitigate impacts of, climate-related events from targeted institutions increased		4.1 Number of people trained or made aware of climate change impacts and appropriate adaptation responses (sex disaggregated) at:	Outcome 3.2 Institutional and human capacities strengthened to identify and implement adaptation measures	

Adaptation Fund SRF	GCF IRMF	GEF LDCF & SCCF RF (2022-2026)	GEF LDCF RF (2018-2022)	MDB Common Approach
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> National government (sex disaggregated) Local government (sex disaggregated) Extension services (sex disaggregated) Hydromet and disaster risk management agencies (sex disaggregated) 		
Outcome 3.1. Percentage of targeted population aware of predicted adverse impacts of climate change, and of appropriate responses		<p>4.1 Number of people trained or made aware of climate change impacts and appropriate adaptation responses (sex disaggregated) at:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Local community organizations (sex disaggregated) School children, university students, and teachers (sex disaggregated) Youth (15 to 24 years of age) 	Output 3.2.2 Increased awareness of climate change impacts, vulnerability and adaptation	
Outcome 3.2. Percentage of targeted population applying appropriate adaptation responses				Poor and vulnerable people actively engaging in adaptation decision-making
		3.4 Number of institutional partnerships or coordination mechanisms established or strengthened	Outcome 2.1 Strengthened cross-sectoral mechanisms to mainstream climate adaptation and resilience	

Adaptation Fund SRF	GCF IRMF	GEF LDCF & SCCF RF (2022-2026)	GEF LDCF RF (2018-2022)	MDB Common Approach
		3.6 Number of institutions with increased capacity to attract, and manage climate adaptation finance	Outcome 2.2 Increased ability of country to access climate finance or other relevant, largescale, programmatic investment	
Output Indicators				
Output 1.1.1 No. of projects/programmes that conduct and update risk and vulnerability assessments (by sector and scale)		3.8. Number of climate risk and vulnerability assessments conducted	Output 3.1.2 Risk and vulnerability assessments conducted and updated	
Output 1.1.2 No. of early warning systems (by scale) and no. of beneficiaries covered	Outcome 2.4 Beneficiaries (female/male) covered by new or improved early warning systems	1.3 Number of direct beneficiaries from the new or improved climate information services including early warning systems (sex disaggregated)		
Output 1.2.1. Percentage of target population covered by adequate risk-reduction systems	Outcome 2.7 Change in expected losses of lives due to the impact of extreme climate-related disasters in the geographic area of the GCF intervention		Output 1.1.3 Vulnerability to climatic hazards/variability is reduced through new or improved early warning systems /climate information systems	Beneficiaries of adaptation measures to manage water-related hazards
Output 2.1.1. No. of staff trained to respond to, and mitigate impacts of, climate-related events (by gender)			Outcome 3.2.1 Capacities strengthened to identify, implement and/or monitor adaptation measures	
Output 2.1.2 No. of targeted institutions with increased capacity to minimize exposure to climate variability risks (by type, sector and scale)		3.5 Number of institutions with increased capacity to plan, implement, monitor, and report for climate adaptation	Output 3.2.1 Capacities strengthened to identify, implement and/or monitor adaptation measures	

Adaptation Fund SRF	GCF IRMF	GEF LDCF & SCCF RF (2022-2026)	GEF LDCF RF (2018-2022)	MDB Common Approach
		3.2 Number of systems and frameworks established for continuous monitoring, reporting and review of climate adaptation impacts	Output 3.1.1 Systems and frameworks established for the continuous monitoring, reporting and review of adaptation	
Output 4.1.2. No. of physical assets strengthened or constructed to withstand conditions resulting from climate variability and change (by sector and scale)		2.7 Number of residential houses (managed for climate resilience) 2.8 Number of public buildings (managed for climate resilience) 2.9 Number of irrigation or water structures (managed for climate resilience) 2.10 Number of fishery or aquaculture ponds or cages (managed for climate resilience) 2.11 Number of ports or landing sites (managed for climate resilience) 2.12 Km of road (managed for climate resilience) 2.15 Km of stormwater drainage (managed for climate resilience)	Output 1.1.1 Physical assets made more resilient to climate variability and change	
Output 5.1. No. of natural resource assets created, maintained or improved to withstand conditions resulting from climate variability and change (by type and scale)	Outcome 4.1 Hectares of terrestrial forest, terrestrial non-forest, freshwater and coastal-marine areas brought under restoration and/or improved ecosystems	2.4 Hectares of forests (managed for climate resilience) 2.5 Hectares of marine area (managed for climate resilience) 2.6 Hectares of freshwater area (managed for climate resilience)		

Adaptation Fund SRF	GCF IRMF	GEF LDCF & SCCF RF (2022-2026)	GEF LDCF RF (2018-2022)	MDB Common Approach
		2.13 Km of riverbank (managed for climate resilience)		
		2.14 Km of coast (managed for climate resilience)		
Output 7.1. No. of policies introduced or adjusted to address climate change risks (by sector)		3.1 Number of policies/plans developed and strengthened that will mainstream climate resilience (regional, national, sub-national)	Output 2.1.1 Development/sector policies and plans integrate adaptation considerations	
Output 8.1. No. of innovators supported (disaggregated by gender (male/female/other) and youth status (youth/non-youth))		5.2 Number of entrepreneurs supported for climate adaptation and resilience (sex disaggregated)	Output 1.2.2 Investment models developed and tested	
		5.4 Number of MSMEs incubated/accelerated with technical assistance, financial matchmaking, and/or direct financing		
Output 8.1.2. No. of innovation related partnerships leveraged for exchange of goods or services or ideas, consultations, and assistance between grantee and stakeholder/s			Output 1.2.1 Innovation incubators and/or accelerators introduced	
	Outcome 2.2 Beneficiaries (female/male) with improved food security			Beneficiaries of improved or maintained access to food and nutrition due to adaptation measures
				Beneficiaries of climate adaptation measures in

Adaptation Fund SRF	GCF IRMF	GEF LDCF & SCCF RF (2022-2026)	GEF LDCF RF (2018-2022)	MDB Common Approach
				agriculture and food systems
	Outcome 2.3 Beneficiaries (female/male) with more climate-resilient water security			Beneficiaries with new or improved access to water, sanitation, or hygiene in a climate-related water-stressed context

Table 2. The following indicators are **unique** to each of the frameworks

Current Adaptation Fund SRF
Outcomes
Outcome 1. Relevant threat and hazard information generated and disseminated to stakeholders on a timely basis
Outcome 6.2. Percentage of targeted population with sustained climate-resilient alternative livelihoods
Outcome 8.3. No. of individuals or organizations (disaggregated by gender) that submit an application to an innovation competition or challenge
Outputs
Output 2.2.1 No. of targeted institutions benefitting from the direct access and enhanced direct access modality
Output 3.1.1 No. of news outlets in the local press and media that have covered the topic
Output 3.2.1 No. of technical committees/associations formed to ensure transfer of knowledge
Output 3.2.2 No. of tools and guidelines developed (thematic, sectoral, institutional) and shared with relevant stakeholders
Output 4.1.1. No. and type of development sector services modified to respond to new conditions resulting from climate variability and change (by sector and scale)
Output 6.1.1.No. and type of adaptation assets (tangible and intangible) created or strengthened in support of individual or community livelihood strategies
Output 6.2.1. Type of income sources for households generated under climate change scenario
Output 7.2. No. of targeted development strategies with incorporated climate change priorities enforced
Output 8.2.1. No. of key findings generated from an innovation practice, tool, and/or technology
Output 8.2.2. No. of learning and sharing initiatives undertaken, including communication initiatives

Output 8.3.1. No. of applications (individuals or organizations) to innovation calls under the project or programme
GCF IRMF
Outcomes
2.5 Beneficiaries (female/male) adopting innovations that strengthen climate change resilience (number of individuals)
3.1 Change in expected losses of economic assets due to the impact of extreme climate-related disasters in the geographic area of the GCF intervention (value in USD)
4.2 Number of livestock brought under sustainable management practices
4.3 Tonnes of fish stock brought under sustainable management practices
GEF LDCF & SCCF RF (2022-2026)
Sub-indicators
1.1 Number of direct beneficiaries from more resilient physical and natural assets (sex disaggregated)
1.4 Number of youth (15 to 24 years of age) benefiting from the project (sex disaggregated)
1.5 Number of elderly (over 60 years of age) benefiting from the project (sex disaggregated)
2.1 Hectares of agricultural land
2.2 Hectares of urban landscape
2.3 Hectares of rural landscape
3.7 Number of local community organizations benefitting from and/or engaged in institution strengthening, partnerships, or financing
5.1 Amount of investment mobilized (US\$) from private sector sources
5.3 Total financial value of lines of credit and/or investment funds
GEF LDCF RF
Outputs
Output 2.1.2 Global/regional/national initiatives demonstrate and test early concepts with high adaptation potential
Output 2.2.1 Barriers to climate finance access targeted
Output 2.2.2 Adaptation and resilience relevant financing coordinated for synergistic programming including with the private sector
MDB Common Approach
Outcomes
Volume of water made available in a climate related water-stressed context
Increased and/or maintained agricultural productivity (i.e. yields) with implementation of bad adaptation measures
People with strengthened capacity to prevent, detect and respond to climate-related health emergencies
Beneficiaries of adopted nature-based solutions for climate resilience

Beneficiaries of adaptive social protection programmes

Beneficiaries accessing financial products and services to manage physical climate risk

People with access to adaptation finance that promote gender equality and social inclusion