

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>	<p><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).</p> <p><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.</p>
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>	<p><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.</p> <p><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.</p>
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>	<p><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.</p> <p><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.</p>

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 climate change 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>	<p>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.</p> <p>Reporting should be disaggregated by female-headed households, 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.</p>		 	
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>	<p>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</p> <p>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.</p>	 	 	

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>			
Outcome 7: Improved policies and regulations that promote and enforce resilience measures	Indicator 7: Climate change priorities are integrated into national development strategy	Indicator 7: Policies, strategies, and/or plans adopted, implemented, and/or enforced that integrate climate risk and resilience considerations <i>[#, disaggregated by scale and by policy step, i.e., developed,</i>	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	 		

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.			