



# Global EbA Fund

## Monitoring and reporting core indicator framework

Pilot



Supported by:



Federal Ministry  
for the Environment, Nature Conservation,  
Nuclear Safety and Consumer Protection



based on a decision of  
the German Bundestag

**Contents**

- Introduction .....1
- Objective:.....1
- Reporting process:.....1
- Additional guidance information: .....1
- Core Indicators.....2
- Cluster I: Policy engagement, institutional strengthening and M&E .....2
- Indicator 1: Number of policies or policy instruments developed or influenced that include ecosystem-based approaches for adaptation as a result of project activities. ....2
- Indicator 2: Number of new or improved institutionalised coordination mechanisms established within or across sectors and at different scales (global, regional, national, sub-national) that address ecosystem-based approaches for adaptation to climate change as a result of project activities. ....3
- Indicator 3: Number of monitoring, evaluation and learning (MEL) instruments introduced or improved to monitor the effectiveness of ecosystem-based adaptation measures aimed to improve resilience of ecosystems and communities as a result of project activities. The indicator can be set at various scales (global, regional, national, or sub-national as well as sector/ecosystem-specific) depending on the scope of the project.....4
- Cluster II: Socio-economic development .....5
- Indicator 4: Number of people/beneficiaries supported by the project (directly and indirectly) who have increased their resilience on climate change adaptation through ecosystem-based approaches.....5
- Indicator 5: Number of supply chains made more stable through ecosystem-based approaches as a result of project activities. ....7
- Indicator 6: Number of value chain actors that have introduced a new or improved existing business model in support of ecosystem-based adaptation practices as a result of project activities.....7
- Indicator 7: Number of jobs created as a result of project activities. ....8
- Indicator 8: Number of people with increased income as a result of project activities. ....9
- Cluster III: Ecosystem health .....10
- Indicator 9: Area of ecosystems under improved practices for conservation, restoration and/or sustainable use as a result of project activities. ....10
- Cluster IV: Knowledge generation.....12
- Indicator 10: Number of evidence-based knowledge products, technical tools, and events developed as a result of project activities. ....12
- Cluster V: Financing for EbA.....13
- Indicator 11: Volume of private and/or public finance leveraged for ecosystem-based approaches for adaptation as a result of project activities.....13
- Indicator 12: Number of financing instruments developed/improved/under implementation as a result of project activities.....14

## Introduction

### Objective:

Overall, the core indicator framework aims to support the tracking and communication of the joint achievements of the projects under the Fund and the delivery of its objectives. These core indicators are complementary to the indicators in the individual logical frameworks developed by each project.

This core indicator framework will enable the Fund as a whole to (i) report and demonstrate progress to show accountability and performance towards all actors and donors, communicate results to the wider public, and mobilise political and financial support; and (ii) help assess and improve performance to inform the planning of calls for proposals and subsequent allocation of funds.

### Reporting process:

During the pilot phase, each project is requested to select at least three relevant indicators from the core indicators framework provided below, incorporate them in the individual project's logical framework, and report against them as indicated below.

Pilot phase of reporting against the indicators will start from the 2023 reporting cycle, where the grantees will:

- ✓ Undertake first reporting by 15<sup>th</sup> of August 2023
- ✓ Undertake subsequent reporting on an annual basis by the 15<sup>th</sup> of February each year

The reporting will be done against the indicators relevant to a respective project on the progress achieved by the time of reporting through a platform provided by the Fund Secretariat.

Where possible, the reporting should be disaggregated by gender, type of actor (e.g. government, local community, etc) and type of vulnerable group (e.g. youth, indigenous peoples, etc).

Annual reporting results will be compiled, analysed and presented to the Steering Committee as well as through the Fund's communication activities.

### Additional guidance information:

Achievements reported should be made during the reporting period. What has been reported in one reporting cycle, should not be reported again in the next.

Only completed activities can be reported against the selected indicators.

#### Quality assurance

Grantees need to ensure the quality of the data reported against the Core Indicators. The project's monitoring and evaluation officer, external consultants or operational staff can assume a quality assurance function.

The Global EbA Fund Secretariat will check the data reported by a project for plausibility. In doing so, the grantees might be asked to submit further documentation on reported data. A more detailed appraisal may take place for a selection of projects.

## Core Indicators<sup>1</sup>

### Cluster I: Policy engagement, institutional strengthening and M&E

#### Indicator 1: Number of policies or policy instruments developed or influenced that include ecosystem-based approaches for adaptation as a result of project activities.

Guidance: This indicator aims to quantify the number of policies or policy instruments developed or influenced (i.e. engaged with/formally proposed or adopted/implemented) at different levels (global, regional, national, sub-national) that include ecosystem-based approaches for adaptation resulting from the support provided by the Global EbA Fund. Reporting should only be undertaken with regards to the policies/policy instruments directly targeted by the project funded through the Global EbA Fund.

“Developed” under this indicator is understood as policies and/or policy instruments drafted and approved at a relevant level as a result of project activities

“Influenced” under this indicator is understood through three options:

1. Policies/policy instruments engaged with, which implies at least one of the following:
  - Underwent analysis (review of existing policy/policy instrument and/or proposal of new policy/policy instrument);
  - Underwent public debate and/or consultation with stakeholders on the proposed new or revised policy/policy instrument. This can also include proposed repeal of an existing policy/policy instrument;
  - Were revised or otherwise engaged with.
2. Policies/policy instruments formally proposed / adopted, which refers to policies/policy instruments where the project has played an active part in its formal proposal or adoption.
  - “Formally proposed” means that a relevant government official or agency, organization, or non-governmental entity with decision-making authority has proposed the measure, according to established procedures, preferably publicly when this is appropriate to the given context.
  - “Formally adopted” means a new, revised, or repealed policy/policy instrument was officially approved, codified or enacted by a government, organization, or non-governmental entity with decision-making authority in its respective legal, regulatory, policy, or non-governmental system.
3. Policies/policy instruments implemented, which refers to policies/policy instruments where the project has played an active part in supporting implementation, for instance by providing evidence and knowledge.
  - “Implemented” means that a measure is in force or being executed by the relevant authority. Implementation implies that: 1) The policy must be in force in all intended geographic locations and at all intended administrative levels with all intended regulations/rules in place (“full”); 2) Any ongoing activities or tasks required by the policy (e.g., various kinds of inspection, enforcement, collection of documents / information / fees) are being executed with minimal disruptions (“effective”)

---

<sup>1</sup> Guidance and definitions build on “[Guidelines on Project Planning and Monitoring in the International Climate Initiative](#)”; “Indicators of Success” framework of the [One Planet network](#) as well as “[Ocean Risk and Resilience Action Alliance Indicator Guidance](#)”

To support the data reported under this indicator, the grantees are welcome to submit any documents related to the development of a policy/policy instrument such as launch/announcement documents, meetings minutes, consultation reports, etc.

Based on the definitions provided below, the grantee is asked to report the following data:

- ✓ Title of policy/instrument
- ✓ Type: legally binding; non-legally binding
- ✓ Level: global/regional/national/sub-national
- ✓ Type of action: Influence (engaged/formally proposed or adopted/implemented) or developed
- ✓ Type of support provided: capacity-building activities organized to develop policy/instrument; knowledge and tools made available to develop policy/instrument; drafting/updating of the policy/instrument; multi-stakeholder consultations organized etc.
- ✓ What is/are the institution(s) that will be implementing and/or enforcing the measure?
- ✓ Open description: overview of the support provided, processes undertaken, and stakeholders involved.
- ✓ Science used: please indicate references to evidence including scientific work used as the basis for influencing policy/policy instruments

Definitions for the purposes of this reporting:

- Policy is defined as a course of action that has been officially agreed by an entity or an organization (governmental or non-governmental) and aims to achieve specific objectives.
- Policy instruments refer to the means – methodologies, measures or interventions – that are used to achieve those objectives.

Policy instruments are distinguished in legally binding policies and non-legally binding ones.

Legally binding: a legally binding policy instrument refers to a system of rules, procedures and/or principles which are prescribed and enforced by a governing authority with the aim of requiring or preventing specific actions or providing incentives that lead to change in actions or preferences. It includes: laws, regulations, standards, by-laws, codes, etc. Non-legally binding: a non-binding policy instrument refers to a coherent set of decisions associated to a common vision, objective and/or direction, and to a proposed course of action to achieve these. It includes, for instance: action plans, strategies, programmes, and projects.

**Indicator 2: Number of new or improved institutionalised coordination mechanisms established within or across sectors and at different scales (global, regional, national, sub-national) that address ecosystem-based approaches for adaptation to climate change as a result of project activities.**

Guidance: This indicator aims to quantify the number of new or improved intra and inter-sectoral and/or multi-stakeholder coordination mechanisms that address ecosystem-based adaptation and result from the support provided by the Global EbA Fund. It also tracks the number of participating organisations.

The mechanism needs to be institutionalised at the level of governance it is developed at (global, regional, national, sub-national) and have a longer-term goal for it to be reported. Ad-hoc inter-sectoral and multi-stakeholder consultations are not considered under this indicator.

The establishment or improvement of a coordination mechanism needs to result directly from the activities of the project funded through the Global EbA Fund.

This indicator focuses on coordination mechanisms which are either multi-stakeholder or inter/intra-sectoral or both.

To support the data reported under this indicator, the grantees are welcome to submit any documents related to the establishment and operations of the mechanisms, such as establishment document, meeting minutes, press releases, consultation reports, etc.

Based on the definitions provided below, the grantee is asked to report the following data:

- ✓ Title of coordination mechanism
- ✓ Level: global/ regional/ national/ sub-national
- ✓ Type of stakeholders involved: public/ private/ local communities/ vulnerable groups, etc.
- ✓ Functions of coordination mechanism: Coordinated policy implementation; Design of overarching or sectoral policies; coordination of actors within one sector; Identification of ad hoc opportunities for synergies and cooperation; Information and knowledge sharing; etc.
- ✓ Duration: open-ended; limited duration (indicate how long)
- ✓ Budget allocation: yes or no
- ✓ (if yes): amount and entity/ies allocating the budget
- ✓ Open description: overview of the support provided and processes undertaken

Definitions for the purposes of this reporting:

- An inter/intra-sectoral and/or multi-stakeholder mechanism for coordination can be defined as an assembly composed of governmental and/or non-governmental entities with various mandates and sectors of interventions, interacting on a regular basis, established with the objective of coordinating action in a coherent and sustained manner.  
The notion of coordination is very broad and could be measured through activities of diverse degrees of integration, from regular dialogues / information sharing sessions to shared plans of action or common policies resulting directly from the action of the mechanism.
- Improved coordination mechanism: an updated coordination mechanism that improves on an existing one and includes considerations on ecosystem-based approaches to adaptation (for example: an existing multi-stakeholder committee established at sub-national level that was established to coordinate the development and/or implementation of adaptation/climate change plans that has been updated to include ecosystem-based approaches to adaptation)

**Indicator 3: Number of monitoring, evaluation and learning (MEL) instruments introduced or improved to monitor the effectiveness of ecosystem-based adaptation measures aimed to improve resilience of ecosystems and communities as a result of project activities. The indicator can be set at various scales (global, regional, national, or sub-national as well as sector/ecosystem-specific) depending on the scope of the project.**

Guidance: This indicator aims to quantify the number of established MEL instruments by different stakeholders or multi-stakeholder mechanisms with the purpose to monitor the effectiveness of EbA measures to improve resilience of ecosystems and communities.

To be reported such instruments need to result from the support provided by the Global EbA Fund.

To be reported under this indicator, a new MEL instrument should have been established (or an existing one amended) to support the tracking of the effectiveness of EbA measures.

To be reported under this indicator, the project must clearly explain how these instruments will be maintained after the end of the project, and what resources have been allocated to ensure that they are maintained.

MEL instruments do not have the status of policy or coordination instruments but are rather used to monitor implementation of these. Hence, although they can be linked, information reported under this indicator cannot be similar to those reported under indicators 1 or 2.

To support the data reported under this indicator, the grantees are welcome to submit any documents related to the establishment of instruments, such as approval/establishment document, meeting minutes, press releases, consultation reports, etc.

Based on the definitions provided below, the grantee is asked to report the following data:

- ✓ Title of the instrument
- ✓ Level: global/regional/ national/sub-national
- ✓ Focus: sector; ecosystem; etc
- ✓ Established by: government; non-governmental organizations; private sector
- ✓ Description of the instrument:
- ✓ Open description: overview of the support provided and processes undertaken

Definitions for the purposes of this reporting:

- MEL instruments refer here to any voluntary or mandatory MEL scheme that is being used by a government, organisation, or a multi-stakeholder/inter-governmental mechanism to regularly measure and assess performance, results and impacts of defined EbA activities against an agreed set of criteria in support to ecosystem and community's resilience objectives.
- Improved MEL instrument: an updated instrument that improves on an original one and includes considerations on ecosystem-based approaches to adaptation (for example: an existing MEL instrument for climate change adaptation measures has been updated to include considerations on ecosystem and community resilience; or an existing MEL instrument applied in a new EbA-relevant context)

---

## **Cluster II: Socio-economic development**

**Indicator 4: Number of people/beneficiaries supported by the project (directly and indirectly) who have increased their resilience on climate change adaptation through ecosystem-based approaches.**

Guidance: This indicator aims to quantify the number of beneficiaries from a project (directly or indirectly) funded through the Global EbA Fund who have increased their knowledge and capacity on climate change adaptation through ecosystem-based approach.

The indicator requires grantees to monitor the absolute number of intended beneficiaries disaggregated by category (direct / indirect), gender as well as whether they belong to indigenous peoples, youth<sup>2</sup> or non-traditional organizations/groups., when possible

Projects can collect data at the level of individuals or households. Where data is collected at household level, data needs to be converted to the absolute number of people reached. To this end, grantees should use standard multipliers used in national census or household surveys.

---

<sup>2</sup> United Nations defines "youth" as persons between the ages of 15 and 24.

Grantees might reach direct and indirect beneficiaries. In this case, grantees should report on both levels individually.

Generally, grantees need to ensure that they avoid double counting within achieved cumulative totals: Individuals should not be counted twice within the cumulative total of either intended direct or indirect beneficiary.

Grantees should monitor intended direct beneficiaries based on project records (e.g. beneficiary lists, attendance sheets) or surveys. These supporting documents should be provided in the progress reports submitted to the Fund.

Grantees should monitor intended indirect beneficiaries in the same way if they provide medium intensity support at individual or household level and their records therefore provide information on the number of individuals reached. In cases where projects provide structural support to entire communities / administrative areas, grantees may draw on official and most recent census data to determine the number of individuals that might indirectly benefit from this support.

Participation in at least 80% of a training/capacity building activity is advised for a participant to be considered a direct beneficiary under this reporting.

For the purposes of this reporting, it is assumed that resilience to climate change impacts has increased for any intended beneficiary. A grantee is welcome to submit any proof of increased knowledge and capacity should the project foresee any tests and/or evaluations.

Based on the definitions provided below, the grantee is asked to report the following data:

- ✓ Number of direct beneficiaries (disaggregated by gender, indigenous peoples, youth, etc.)
- ✓ Number of indirect beneficiaries (disaggregated by gender, indigenous peoples, youth, etc.)
- ✓ Beneficiary type (for direct beneficiaries): government; farmer group; women association; youth association; etc.
- ✓ Type of support provided: training; provision and access to knowledge/early warning systems; etc.
- ✓ Open description: overview of the support provided, and processes undertaken
- ✓ Open description: Please, elaborate on livelihood improvements of the beneficiaries following the project activities

#### Definitions for the purposes of this reporting:

- People are considered intended direct beneficiaries if they are explicitly targeted by the project (i.e. support is provided to a selection of individuals / households aware of this support) and receive support that is of high intensity with potentially substantial effect on individual assets and capabilities
- People are considered intended indirect beneficiaries if they receive support of medium intensity. Medium intensity support includes but is not limited to the following examples: Individuals who gain access to information services such as, for example seasonal climate forecasting or harvest tips (without receiving additional services); communities living downstream if project targeted area is upstream and interventions would improve ecosystem services for the downstream community; etc.
- People are not counted if they receive support of low intensity such as being residents of an administrative area for which an adaptation-relevant policy or plan is being developed with support from a project or of areas governed by institutions receiving capacity development support.

- Support is understood here as direct assistance by the projects with the explicit objective of helping intended beneficiaries better adapt to climate change using ecosystem-based approaches. This support can come in varying forms. Examples include: capacity development schemes addressing important adaptive capacity needs; insurance schemes; climate services and information; the implementation of participatory research and participatory risk assessments in communities; provision of access to value chains and markets

**Indicator 5: Number of supply chains made more stable through ecosystem-based approaches as a result of project activities.**

Guidance: This indicator aims to quantify the number of supply chains that have been made more stable through the application of ecosystem-based approaches triggered by the project funded through Global EbA Fund. For example, this could refer to crop yields being made more stable through applying EbA.

With EbA interventions focusing on the improvement of ecosystem services, they contribute to less yield fluctuation in commodity production. This contributes to stabilizing the supply chains, especially those with high dependency on natural capital.

Based on the definitions provided below, the grantee is asked to report the following data:

- ✓ Type of commodity: for example, rice, cotton, banana, maize, etc.
- ✓ EbA practice: agroforestry; integrated water resource management; sustainable forest management; conservation agriculture; etc
- ✓ Open description: overview of the support provided and processes undertaken

Definitions for the purposes of this reporting:

- A supply chain is a system of organizations, people, technology, activities, information and resources involved in moving a product or service from supplier to customer. Supply chain activities transform natural resources, raw materials and components into a finished product that is delivered to the end customer. ([Life Cycle Initiative](#), UNEP)
- Commodities are products stemming from agricultural production or mining production that have not yet been transformed: agricultural products, tropical beverages, energy, minerals, ores and metals (UNCTAD)

**Indicator 6: Number of value chain actors that have introduced a new or improved existing business model in support of ecosystem-based adaptation practices as a result of project activities**

Guidance: This indicator aims to quantify the number of value chain actors that have introduced or improved their business model in support of ecosystem-based adaptation practices triggered by the project funded through the Global EbA Fund. For the purposes of this reporting value-chain actors are considered public or private entities involved in a given value chain.

Examples of what can be reported under this indicator include: a processing company that collaborates with and/or supports producers who adopt ecosystem-sensitive practices; a tourism destination that has adopted ecosystem-sensitive practices as a result of project activities; existing eco-label improved to include criteria on EbA considerations or new eco-label developed; trade or farmer association that promotes EbA considerations to its members.

Based on the definitions provided below, the grantee is asked to report the following disaggregated data:

- ✓ Name of the value chain: for example, agricultural (incl. specific commodities); textile; tourism; construction

- ✓ Actor of the value chain concerned: for example, tour operator; food processing company; eco-label issuing entity; city planning department; trade association; etc.
- ✓ New business model or improved business model
- ✓ Description of how the new/improved business model is related to EbA
- ✓ Type of support provided by the project to introduce/improve the business model
- ✓ Open description: please indicate the beneficiaries of the new business model

Definitions for the purposes of this reporting:

- The value chain is comprised of all the activities that provide or receive value from designing, making, distributing, retailing and consuming a product (or providing the service that a product renders), including the extraction and provision of raw materials, as well as the activities that are involved after its useful service life. In this sense, the value chain covers all stages in a product's life, from supply of raw materials through to disposal after use, and encompasses the activities linked to value creation such as business models, investments and regulation. At all stages in the value chain, and in the transport of intermediate and finished products between the value chain stages, raw materials and energy are required and emissions to the environment are produced. In addition, the value chain is also comprised of the actors undertaking the activities and the stakeholders that can influence the activities. **The value chain thus incorporates not only the physical processes, such as farms and factories, but also the business models and the way products are designed, promoted and offered to consumers.**" (UNEP, 2020a)<sup>3</sup>.
- Business model refers to conceptual description of how an entity creates value and describes the processes to achieve certain objectives.
- Improved business model an updated business model that improves on an original one and includes considerations on ecosystem-based adaptation (for example: an existing coffee eco-label that introduces an additional criterion that includes consideration on ecosystem-based approaches; a sustainable development strategy of a tour operator that has been refined to include ecosystem-based approaches in its operations, such as sustainable management of land and biodiversity, and with regards to its suppliers, such as the farmers they purchase produce from.

**Indicator 7: Number of jobs created as a result of project activities.**

Guidance: This indicator aims to quantify the number of jobs created as a result of activities funded through the Global EbA Fund.

For the purposes of this reporting economic activities related to ecosystems and ecosystems services are considered.

To be counted in this indicator, the jobs created must respect the basic human rights of workers and offer decent work conditions.

In this context a job created could relate to "eco-friendly" services (conservation, ecotourism, etc.); activities involving the sustainable use of natural resources, including agriculture, forestry and fisheries; activities relating to adaptation to climate change; new activities resulting from a changed business model.

Data collection for this indicator should be undertaken by implementing partners through census, or sampling of participating stakeholders and records.

---

<sup>3</sup> For more information on the value-chain approach and difference between value and supply chain, please refer to this [UNEP report](#).

Based on the definitions provided below, the grantee is asked to report the following disaggregated data:

- ✓ Type of a job created:
- ✓ Number of jobs:
- ✓ Is this a green job: yes/no
- ✓ If yes, please elaborate further based on the definitions provided below:
- ✓ Type of beneficiaries (who has the job): disaggregated by gender, indigenous peoples, youth
- ✓ Open description: overview of the support provided and processes undertaken

Definitions for the purposes of this reporting:

- According to International Labour Organization (ILO), Green jobs are decent jobs that contribute to preserve or restore the environment, be they in traditional sectors such as manufacturing and construction, or in new, emerging green sectors such as renewable energy and energy efficiency. For example, green jobs help: Minimize waste and pollution; Protect and restore ecosystems; Support adaptation to the effects of climate change; Improve energy and raw materials efficiency; Limit greenhouse gas emissions. Green jobs can result from either employment in production of green products and services, as well as employment in environmentally friendly processes. For more information refer to [ILO Green job page](#)
- The ILO defines decent work as “productive work for women and men in conditions of freedom, equity, security and human dignity”. In general, work is considered as decent when: it pays a fair income; it guarantees a secure form of employment and safe working conditions; it ensures equal opportunities and treatment for all; it includes social protection for the workers and their families; it offers prospects for personal development and encourages social integration; workers are free to express their concerns and to organise. For the purposes of this reporting it is assumed that the job is considered “decent” if it complies with all the provisions under the national labour law in a country where a project is taking place.

### **Indicator 8: Number of people with increased income as a result of project activities.**

Guidance: This indicator aims to quantify the number beneficiaries, disaggregated by type who saw their income increase thanks to activities implemented by a project funded through the Global EbA Fund.

To be reported under this indicator, only income changes that can be proven will be counted.

To be reported under this indicator, only income generated from decent working conditions will be counted.

Based on the definitions provided below, the grantee is asked to report the following disaggregated data:

- ✓ % of increase from original income:
- ✓ Are these income generated by green activities (please refer to definitions under indicator 7): yes/no
- ✓ Number of beneficiaries who saw their income increase: disaggregated by gender, indigenous peoples, youth:

Definitions for the purpose of this reporting:

- According to the International Labour Organization (ILO), labour income is the amount that employed people earn by working (including self-employed people). Economists

use this concept to distinguish it from capital income. Owners of assets earn capital income due to their property. Assets include land, machines, buildings or patents.

- The ILO defines decent work as “productive work for women and men in conditions of freedom, equity, security and human dignity”. In general, work is considered as decent when: it pays a fair income; it guarantees a secure form of employment and safe working conditions; it ensures equal opportunities and treatment for all; it includes social protection for the workers and their families; it offers prospects for personal development and encourages social integration; workers are free to express their concerns and to organise.
- For the purposes of this reporting it is assumed that the job is considered “decent” if it complies with all the provisions under the national labour law in a country where a project is taking place.

---

### **Cluster III: Ecosystem health**

#### **Indicator 9: Area of ecosystems under improved practices for conservation, restoration and/or sustainable use as a result of project activities.**

Guidance: This indicator aims to capture the area of those ecosystems (hectares [ha]) or length of coastline (kilometres [km]) for which improved practices for conservation, restoration and/or sustainable use have been applied as a result of project activities funded by the Global EbA Fund.

The indicator is understood as increases in the quality of use or protection of a specific area of ecosystems resulting from the implementation of project activities and the delivery of outputs by grantees and project partners. This includes the maintenance of the quality of a specific area of ecosystems if this quality would have declined without the project intervention. Where available, future scenarios modelling should be provided.

All project effects need to occur during the course of the project. Notably, this covers the establishment, expansion or safeguarding of a protected area. While the safeguarding or increase in the quality of the ecosystem will most likely occur sometime after its designation, the measure is seen as creating a strong pathway for an increase in quality in the future.

The following examples of potential project measures illustrate possible pathways for safeguarding or increasing the quality of ecosystems as captured by this indicator: The establishment or expansion of a protected area; Effective management of protected areas, buffer zones or corridors (as well as other effective area-based conservation measures and sustainable land management); Sustainable management of areas under agricultural, aquaculture, fisheries, infrastructural and other extractive use; Avoided or reduced deforestation and forest degradation, as well as other REDD+ activities like the conservation and enhancement of forest carbon stocks restoration and sustainable forest management; Restoration measures in other important ecosystems like peatlands, coral reefs, seagrass and wetlands.

Grantees can choose the most appropriate methodology and means of verification to report against this indicator. In doing so, projects should avoid double-counting. For example, if an area of an ecosystem receives more than one measure of support by the project, it should only be counted once.

The choice of data sources is at the discretion of the grantees. However, official data is desirable. Area estimates could be based on, but are not limited to: evaluations of maps; photographs; remote sensing images and ground truthing; area surveys; forest operation and management plans, protected area statistics and other official documents; baseline & endline calculations.

Based on the definitions provided below, the grantee is asked to report the following data:

- ✓ Type of ecosystem:
- ✓ Area concerned by project measures (ha or km): ha terrestrial ecosystems (incl. freshwater); Ha marine and coastal ecosystems; km of coastline
- ✓ Overall area of the ecosystem in question (ha or km)
- ✓ Type of implementation measures: Restoration of ecosystems; Conservation of ecosystems; Protected area established or extended; Management of conserved area / area under sustainable use improved; Reforestation; Avoided deforestation; Agroforestry; Other
- ✓ If applicable, type of seeds used: local/imported.
- ✓ Territory of indigenous peoples and local communities: yes/no. If available, provide information on the size of that area, for instance if officially registered or nationally recognised
- ✓ If applicable, projects should indicate the number of ha pertaining to [IUCN Protected Areas Categories](#) and/or areas under [OECD](#)
- ✓ In addition to the above, projects should indicate whether they are contributing to the conservation of areas that fall under any of the following categories: Ha of [UNESCO Biosphere Reserves](#); Ha of [UNESCO World Heritage Sites](#) (only natural sites and mixed sites); Ha of [Ramsar Sites](#)
- ✓ Open description: overview of how the support provided and processes undertaken

Definitions for the purposes of this reporting:

- Improvement of an area of an ecosystem is understood as a positive change compared to the initial or business-as-usual scenario brought about with contributions from the project in cooperation with its partners. The following positive changes in ecosystems are understood as examples of improvements that are covered by this indicator:
  - For all ecosystems:*
    - Restoration of area previously degraded, damaged or destroyed;
    - Conservation of an area which would otherwise have been degraded, damaged or destroyed (improvement compared to baseline of 'business-as-usual');
    - Achievement of an official protection status or a specific area;
    - Improvement of the management of a conserved area or area under sustainable use
  - In addition, for forests:*
    - Conversion of area into forest by reforestation;
    - Avoided deforestation and forest degradation within an area
- Conservation is defined as “the protection, care, management and maintenance of ecosystems, habitats, wildlife species and populations, within or outside of their natural environments, in order to safeguard the natural conditions for their long-term permanence.” As such, conservation efforts include the protection of areas, the implementation of other effective area-based conservation measures and the use of effective ecosystem management practices.
- Protected areas are classified according to the official IUCN Protected Areas Categories which differentiate areas according to their management objective
- Sustainable use " means the use of components of biological diversity in a way and at a rate that does not lead to the long-term decline of biological diversity, thereby maintaining

its potential to meet the needs and aspirations of present and future generations.” (CBD, Article 2)

- **Restoration:** Ecosystem restoration means assisting in the recovery of ecosystems that have been degraded or destroyed, as well as conserving the ecosystems that are still intact. Healthier ecosystems, with richer biodiversity, yield greater benefits such as more fertile soils, bigger yields of timber and fish, and larger stores of greenhouse gases. Restoration can happen in many ways – for example through actively planting or by removing pressures so that nature can recover on its own. It is not always possible – or desirable – to return an ecosystem to its original state. We still need farmland and infrastructure on land that was once forest, for instance, and ecosystems, like societies, need to adapt to a changing climate. (UN Decade for ecosystem restoration)

---

## Cluster IV: Knowledge generation

### **Indicator 10: Number of evidence-based knowledge products, technical tools, and events developed as a result of project activities.**

Guidance: This indicator aims to capture the number and type of knowledge and technical tools developed as a result of project activities funded by the Global EbA Fund as well as their uptake.

Under this reporting an executive summary or annexes which consist of a part of full document should not be counted separately.

The produced knowledge and tools will contribute to overcome the barriers to EbA by providing innovative ideas, curricula, best practices, recommendations, guidelines and evidences to the relevant stakeholders. This also includes existing knowledge products, technical tools or other publications that have been reworked, adapted and translated to be directly usable/useful for direct beneficiaries, at different levels (local, sub-national, etc).

Knowledge generated through testing an innovative approach should be reported under this indicator.

It is expected that, in addition to developing a knowledge item, means/operational plans for its application, use and adoption in order to influence decision-making and prompt EbA action will be undertaken. This should be captured in the reporting when possible.

Based on the definitions provided below, the grantee is asked to report the following data:

- ✓ Type of resource: Educational material; Fact sheet/brief/commentary; Guidelines; Journal article; Manual; Policy brief; Report; Technical tool; Event; online course; etc.
- ✓ Quantification of use (if available): number of users; occasions of use; number of downloads
- ✓ Type of documents where the resource is cited (if available): policy/ scientific publication/ brief, etc
- ✓ Has this knowledge product been applied (or is planned to be applied) to support decision-making processes on climate change: yes/no  
If yes:
  - Type of actor that applied the knowledge product: public institution/ financial institution/ private sector company, etc.
  - Description of how the knowledge product/tools supported decision-making/action on climate change of a given actor and what was the support provided by the project

- ✓ Knowledge gaps closed: Did the various knowledge products, events and tools fill the knowledge gaps previously identified in the project area? If so, please describe which gaps and how the project helped to fill them through this indicator.
- ✓ Did the knowledge item reported result from testing an innovative approach? Yes/No
- ✓ If yes, summarize the approach and the work undertaken
- ✓ Open description: overview of the processes undertaken by the project to support the activities under this indicator

Definitions for the purposes of this reporting:

- Knowledge and technical tools refer to resources that provide insights, scientific conclusions, frameworks, guidance; or resources that can foster or facilitate decision-making and that are scoped to promote EbA, based on scientific research and/or empirical evidence. This may include scientific articles, policy briefs, reports, guidelines, manuals, media products, software, tools and educational materials, and may include any format whether digital or physical.

## **Cluster V: Financing for EbA**

### **Indicator 11: Volume of private and/or public finance leveraged for ecosystem-based approaches for adaptation as a result of project activities.**

Guidance: This indicator aims to capture the amount of private and/or public capital made available for EbA, resulting directly (i.e. mobilised finance) and indirectly (i.e. catalysed finance) from the funding provided by the Global EbA Fund.

This indicator is relevant for projects that pursue private and public finance mobilisation and/or catalysation for EbA as an explicit primary objective.

The indicator requires projects to monitor the amount of financing (in USD) leveraged directly and/ or indirectly by projects for EbA purposes.

Grantees should collect data on the level of individual investments that were either mobilised through financial mechanisms or catalysed through technical assistance / capacity development measures.

Based on the definitions provided below, the grantee is asked to report the following disaggregated data:

- ✓ Finance mobilised or catalysed
- ✓ Amount in USD
- ✓ Type and source of finance leveraged: public, private, blended
- ✓ Description of ways finance was leveraged:
- ✓ Open description: overview of the support provided and processes undertaken

Definitions for the purposes of this reporting:

- According to the OECD, public finance is defined as “transactions [...] undertaken by central, state or local government agencies at their own risk and responsibility, regardless of whether these agencies have raised the funds through taxation or through borrowing from the private sector. This includes transactions by public corporations i.e. corporations over which the government secures control by owning more than half of the voting equity securities or otherwise controlling more than half of the equity holders’ voting power; or

through special legislation empowering the government to determine corporate policy or to appoint directors”.

- Private finance includes all transactions that are not classified as public in accordance with the OECD definition above. This includes but is not limited to transactions undertaken by banks, enterprises, pension funds, NGOs, charitable trusts, foundations as well as further private sources.
- Leveraged: Volume of public or private finance leveraged is the overarching term used for all finance that is either mobilised or catalysed through the project funded by Global EbA Fund
- The mobilisation of finance is understood as other funds leveraged directly by the project through the use of financial mechanisms / financial contributions. Based on the OECD methodology, the mobilisation of private and/or public finance can be measured for the following mechanisms: guarantees; syndicated loans; shares in collective investment vehicles; direct investment in companies; simple co-financing arrangements; credit lines; other.

An example of potential pathway of mobilisation:

Shares in collective investment vehicles: A Global EbA Fund project contributes to or creates a fund for EbA purposes. Due to this fund initiation or financial investment, other donors / private investors invest in the fund.

- The catalysation of finance is understood as other funds leveraged indirectly by the project through the use of technical assistance and / or capacity development measures. Examples of such technical assistance measures include but are not limited to: Providing specific evidence to investors (e.g. demonstration projects, feasibility studies); Improving finance readiness (e.g. capacity development of key actors and institutions, development of project pipelines, development of financial instruments); Providing specific policy advice

## **Indicator 12: Number of financing instruments developed/improved/under implementation as a result of project activities**

Guidance: This indicator aims to capture the number of financing instruments developed as a result of project activities funded by the Global EbA Fund as well as their impact where this data is available.

Examples of financing instruments could include but are not limited to: de-risking lending for EbA approaches; community incentive schemes; payments for ecosystem services; green, blue and resilience bonds for EbA; incentivising Public-Private Partnerships and investment in EbA; leveraging COVID-19 stimulus and recovery funds for EbA action; innovative insurance mechanisms; integration of the values of ecosystem goods and services and their economic benefits into public and private financial planning, etc.

Projects funded through the Global EbA Fund can develop/improve a financing instrument as well as support its implementation.

Based on the definitions provided below, the grantee is asked to report the following disaggregated data:

- ✓ Type of financing instrument:
- ✓ Status of financing instrument: developed/improved/under implementation (*max two options can be selected*)
- ✓ Stakeholders involved:
- ✓ Target beneficiaries (who benefits from the instrument): disaggregated by gender, indigenous peoples, youth
- ✓ Open description: overview of the support provided and processes undertaken

Definitions for the purposes of this reporting:

- A financing instrument is considered developed when its concept and operationalisation are defined and agreed upon by all stakeholders involved. The instrument is, therefore, ready to be implemented
- Existing financing instrument is considered improved when improves on an original one and includes considerations on ecosystem-based approaches to adaptation to climate change
- A financing instrument is considered under implementation when its operationalisation plan has been put into practice as a part of project activities.