

**Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund
41st Meeting of the CEPF Donor Council
In-Person, Tangier, Morocco, and Virtual Meeting
Monday 17 July 2023
8:00 a.m. – 11:00 a.m. Eastern Standard Time (EST)
1:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m. Tangier Time
2:00 p.m. – 5:00 p.m. Brussels and Paris Time
9:00 p.m. – 12:00 a.m (+1 day) Tokyo Time**

Proposed Changes to the CEPF Global Monitoring Framework to Incorporate Indicators Related to Climate Adaptation

Recommended Action Item:

The Donor Council is asked to approve the proposed modifications to the CEPF Monitoring Framework to incorporate indicators related to climate adaptation and approve changes to the CEPF Operational Manual to that end.

Background:

In June 2012, at the 21st meeting of the CEPF Donor Council, CEPF's Monitoring Framework (CEPF/DC21/5) was approved. This framework was informed by Working Group and Donor Council discussion and recommendations, as well as by evaluations undertaken in 2006, 2008 and 2010, all of which documented the need for CEPF to build a more robust impact evaluation framework.

After four years of implementation, and extensive review of the framework's indicators in 2016, the Secretariat recognized that some of the indicators were unclear; requesting data that were not readily attainable; measuring the state of the world rather than CEPF impact; not relevant to CEPF's impact; and impossible to aggregate. CEPF updated its monitoring framework to address its deficiencies. This revised Monitoring Framework was reviewed by the Working Group in April 2017 and approved in June 2017 at the 31st meeting of the CEPF Donor Council (CEPF/DC31/5).

The global monitoring framework comprises 16 impact indicators, grouped under four pillars: biodiversity, civil society, human well-being and enabling conditions (Annex 1). It has allowed CEPF to present an annual summary of results to the Donor Council in the form of the annual Impact Report. It has also allowed CEPF to report on the impacts of its investments against the Aichi targets. From 2023 onward, they will be reported against the targets of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework.

Since 2017, the impact of climate change on biodiversity and ecosystems has become a global threat of paramount concern. Now, in 2023, it is imperative that CEPF develop a set of indicators that articulates CEPF’s contribution to addressing the threat posed by climate change. This pertains not only to ensuring CEPF’s relevance to governments and stakeholders wanting to understand CEPF’s role and impact, but also to donors, such as the Green Climate Fund (GCF), which has already contributed funds to CEPF to support ecosystem-based adaptation to climate change.

This document reviews two current CEPF indicators that relate to climate change and proposes new indicators that will allow for monitoring of climate adaptation impacts. The Integrated Results Management Framework of the GCF ([B.29/01](#)) has been used as the basis for selection of new indicators. Adopted in 2021, this framework includes four core indicators and 16 supplementary indicators for reduced emissions and increased resilience.

The GCF core indicators have been reviewed and considered for incorporation into CEPF’s global monitoring framework based on their relevance to the work of CEPF grantees. Table 1 summarizes these proposed modifications and presents justifications that have been informed by the CEPF Working Group.

Table 1. Proposed Modifications to CEPF’s Global Monitoring Framework

Current Indicator	Proposal	Justification
CEPF Global Monitoring Framework		
Number of projects promoting nature-based solutions to combat climate change.	Keep this indicator.	This indicator has proven straightforward to report on, based on existing data in CEPF’s grant management system, ConservationGrants.
Amount of CO ₂ e sequestered in CEPF-supported natural habitats.	Remove.	This indicator is difficult, complex and expensive to measure and may not reflect CEPF’s actions. The data may also be unreliable, making this indicator a risky one because we will not be able to justify our results.
GCF Integrated Results Management Framework		
1. Greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions reduced, avoided or removed/sequestered (Unit: tons of CO ₂ e) (Disaggregation: results area)	Do not adopt.	This indicator is similar to CEPF’s CO ₂ e sequestration indicator. Due to its complexity, unreliability and cost, it is not recommended to adopt this indicator.
2. Direct and indirect beneficiaries reached	Report on a portion of this indicator using CEPF’s existing	CEPF already counts the number of people that receive a range of

Current Indicator	Proposal	Justification
<p>(Unit: number of individuals) (Disaggregation: sex; and results area) Following the GCF supplementary indicators for this core indicator, beneficiaries can include individuals: (i) adopting improved and/or new climate-resilient livelihood options; (ii) with improved food security; (iii) with more climate-resilient water security; (iv) covered by new or improved early warning systems; (v) adopting innovations that strengthen climate change resilience; (vi) living in buildings that have increased resilience against climate hazards; and/or (vii) who do not lose their lives due to the impact of extreme climate-related disasters.</p>	<p>global indicators pertaining to cash and non-cash benefits.</p>	<p>benefits. This effort could be tailored to report on supplementary indicators i, ii and iii. The indicators iv-vii are regarded as challenging and complex, and are either not relevant to the work of CEPF or pertain to data that is not possible for grantees to collect.</p>
<p>3. Value of physical assets made more resilient to the effects of climate change and/or more able to reduce GHG emissions (Unit: value of physical assets in USD) (Disaggregation: type of physical assets; and results area)</p>	<p>Do not adopt.</p>	<p>This indicator is not relevant to most CEPF-supported activities.</p>
<p>4. Hectares of natural resource areas brought under improved low-emission and/or climate-resilient management practices (Unit: hectares) (Disaggregation: type of</p>	<p>Continue to report on the three existing CEPF global indicators pertaining to hectares and add a fourth based on the GCF supplementary indicator: Hectares of terrestrial forest, terrestrial non-forest,</p>	<p>CEPF's existing indicators already monitor improved management practices in KBAs and production landscapes. A new indicator on restoration would be useful to respond to requests on this topic. Data would be disaggregated by habitat.</p>

Current Indicator	Proposal	Justification
natural resource areas; and results area)	freshwater and coastal marine areas brought under restoration.	

Annex 1: Indicators used for the Current CEPF Global Monitoring Framework

Pillar 1: Biodiversity

Goal: Improve the status of globally significant biodiversity in critical ecosystems within hotspots.

CEPF measures its impacts on biodiversity via indicators focusing on species and sites.

Biodiversity indicators

- Number of globally threatened species benefiting from conservation action.
- Number of hectares of Key Biodiversity Areas with improved management.
- Number of hectares of protected areas created and/or expanded.
- Number of hectares of production landscapes with strengthened management of biodiversity.
- Number of protected areas with improved management.

Pillar 2: Civil society

Goal: Strengthen the capacity of civil society to be effective as environmental stewards and advocates for the conservation of globally significant biodiversity.

CEPF monitors its contribution to strengthening civil society impact through structured self-reporting by grantees, verified by spot checks by the CEPF Secretariat and regional implementation teams.

Civil society indicators

- Number of CEPF grantees with improved organizational capacity.
- Number of CEPF grantees with improved understanding of and commitment to gender issues.
- Number of networks and partnerships that have been created and/or strengthened.

Pillar 3: Human well-being

Goal: Improve the well-being of people living in and dependent on critical ecosystems within hotspots.

CEPF uses two categories of metric to monitor its impacts on human well-being at the global scale: 1) beneficiaries; and 2) climate. CEPF monitors the beneficiaries of its investments through structured self-reporting by grantees at the end of their projects, verified by spot checks by the CEPF Secretariat and RITs. CEPF monitors its contribution to combating climate change through self-reporting by grantees at the end of their projects, coupled with analysis of GIS data and carbon maps to calculate the amount of carbon stored at CEPF-supported natural habitats.

Human well-being indicators

- Number of people receiving structured training.
- Number of people receiving non-cash benefits other than structured training (such as increased access to clean water, increased food security, increased

access to energy, increased access to public services, increased resilience to climate change, improved land tenure, improved recognition of traditional knowledge, improved representation and decision-making in governance forums, improved delivery of ecosystem services, etc.).

- Number of people receiving cash benefits (e.g., increased income from employment, increased income from livelihood activities, etc.).
- Number of projects promoting nature-based solutions to combat climate change.
- Amount of CO₂e (carbon dioxide equivalent, a standard measure of greenhouse gas emissions) sequestered in CEPF-supported natural habitats.

Pillar 4: Enabling conditions for conservation

Goal: Establish the conditions needed for the conservation of globally significant biodiversity.

Three broad enabling conditions provide the framework for monitoring impacts at the global level under this pillar: 1) ensuring that public policies are in place that promote (or do not inhibit) conservation action; 2) ensuring sufficient capital and flow of financial resources for conservation; and 3) promotion of biodiversity-friendly practices in the private sector.

Enabling conditions indicators

- Number of laws, regulations, and policies with conservation provisions that have been enacted or amended.
- Number of sustainable financing mechanisms that are delivering funds for conservation.
- Number of companies that adopt biodiversity-friendly practices.