Abstract citation ID: ckad160.1095
Green Climate Fund adaptation's interventions on food security: metrics and health outcomes

Davide Serli

D Serli[1], R Parrish[2], P Lauriola[3], A Zeka[4]
[1]Dipartimento Scienze Biomediche Neuromotorie, Univeristà di Bologna, Bologna, Italy
[2]NERC Doctoral Training Programme, United College London, London, UK
[3]RIMSA, ISDE, Arezzo, Italy
[4]Department of life Sciences, Brunel University, London, UK
Contact: serli.davide@gmail.com

Introduction:
The Green Climate Fund (GCF) is the largest public climate fund, it claims to use an innovative approach in climate adaptation actions, however, it has faced significant criticism since its inception. 2016-2025 is the Decade of Action on Nutrition and climate change's impact on food security is one of the biggest threats to human health. Current models predict that Africa will be the most affected continent. Food security is a polyhedric concept that requires definitions and indicators to acquire meaning and provide in-field applications.
Methods:
Among the GCF's projects the ones that address the result area ''health, food, and water security'' in the African countries have been selected. The means of verification (MoV) has been searched in every funding proposal, simplified approval process, and other relevant documents, if not found, were requested to the Fund and local managers. Projects have been divided into 'International' or 'Local' based on GCF's definitions. The study also sought to identify the food security definition adopted by the Fund and reviewed available food security indicators.
Results and discussion:
21 projects, amounting to an investment of $887.2 million, met the criteria. National projects accounted for 17% of the investment, while international projects comprised the remaining $733 million. 7 of the 21 projects (circa 40% of the funds invested) did not provide measurable food security outcomes. The majority of the projects provided some measurable outcome but it is rarely possible to know how this will be measured, as only 3 projects, all from the World Food Program (WFP), declared their MoVs. The GCF seems to not adopt a clear definition of food security. The WFP's indicators, while validated for caloric adequacy, are not consistently validated for micronutrient deficiencies and other health outcomes.
Conclusions:
Insufficient information on monitoring and evaluation may raise further concerns about the GCF's governance.
Key messages:
- Food security is a poliedric concept that requires defintions and indicators to acquire meaning and provide in-field applications, evaluation processes are essential to detect real adaptation.
- The Green Climate Fund is the largest public climate fund, it claims to use an innovative approach in climate adaptation actions but it seems to lack robust monitoring and evaluation processes.