

26<sup>th</sup> LDCF/SCCF Council Meeting  
June 13, 2019  
Washington, D.C.

Agenda Item 08

**LDCF/SCCF ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT: JUNE 2019**  
(Prepared by the Independent Evaluation Office of the GEF)

**Recommended Council Decision**

The Council, having reviewed document GEF/LDCF.SCCF.26/ME/01, "LDCF/SCCF Annual Evaluation Report: June 2019," approves the annual budget of \$93,000 for the Independent Evaluation Office for fiscal year 2020 for the proposed work program:

- a) \$69,000 from the LDCF and
- b) \$24,000 from the SCCF.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary.....	iv
Introduction .....	1
Special Study of Completed Projects .....	1
Progress Report and Four-Year Work Program .....	4
Assessment of Terminal Evaluations.....	5
Fund Program Evaluations .....	5
Special Studies and Other Assessments.....	6
Adaptation in the Seventh Comprehensive Evaluation of the GEF (OPS7) .....	6
Policy and Guidance .....	6
Knowledge Management .....	6
Multiannual Evaluation Budget .....	7
The Management Action Record .....	8

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1. This is the first consolidated LDCF/SCCF Annual Evaluation Report (AER) prepared for and presented to the LDCF/SCCF Council by the GEF Independent Evaluation Office (IEO). It is intended to be the main report from the IEO and incorporates the formerly separate work program and budget document. The purpose of including the work program and budget in the AER is to streamline IEO reporting to the LDCF/SCCF Council.
2. The AER reports on the LDCF/SCCF Special Study of Completed Projects that analyzes outcome, sustainability and M&E ratings, innovative approaches, gender considerations, countries' fragility and lessons learned. The full report of the special study is submitted to the LDCF/SCCF Council in the information document GEF/LDCF.SCCF.26/ME/Inf.01/Rev.01.
3. While the IEO continues to provide quality evaluations on the performance and results of the LDCF and SCCF for accountability purposes, the FY20-23 LDCF/SCCF indicative work program is organized around the three objectives of *2018-2022 GEF Programming Strategy on Adaptation to Climate Change for the LDCF and SCCF*. The LDCF/SCCF AERs will continue to report on the performance of the LDCF and SCCF through assessment of completed projects using information from terminal evaluations. The IEO will also report on special studies in the AER. Potential additional topics to report on are multi-trust fund projects, engagement with the private sector, and systemic impact.
4. As part of the four-year work program the IEO proposes to update the 2016 program evaluation of LDCF in FY20 and the 2017 program evaluation of the SCCF in FY21. The updates will include an assessment of the GEF programming strategy on adaptation and will provide evaluative evidence on the progress towards LDCF/SCCF objectives and for future revision of the adaptation strategy.
5. The IEO will also synthesize conclusions and evaluative evidence on adaptation to climate change in the Seventh Comprehensive Evaluation of the GEF (OPS7). OPS7 will bring in evaluative evidence from the AERs prepared during FY19-22, the updates of the program evaluation of the LDCF and the SCCF, and from GEF Trust Fund evaluations conducted by the IEO during GEF-7.
6. The estimated FY20-FY23 multiannual budget to cover the proposed activities is a total of \$340,000. This amount reflects a 6 percent increase from the FY16-19 budget. The IEO work program has been tailored so that the approved budgets will allow for an effective and efficiency delivery of the proposed evaluation work. The amounts shown for the activities cover the cost of a Senior Evaluation Officer from the IEO to manage and contribute to the activities, and the cost of other IEO staff to carry out the activities.
7. The AER ends with a summary of the GEF Management Action Record tracking of the level of adoption of two LDCF/SCCF Council decisions: June 2016 decision on recommendations of the Program Evaluation of the LDCF; and May 2017 decision on recommendations of the

Program Evaluation of the SCCF. The progress of adoption of both decisions is rated as substantial and the IEO will continue to track the adoption of both decisions.

## INTRODUCTION

1. This is the first consolidated LDCF/SCCF Annual Evaluation Report (AER) prepared for and presented to the LDCF/SCCF Council by the GEF Independent Evaluation Office (IEO). It is intended to be the main report from the IEO and incorporates the formerly separate work program and budget document. The purpose of including the work program and budget in the AER is to streamline IEO reporting to LDCF/SCCF Council. This is in line with the IEO's report on the GEF Trust Fund to the GEF Council in the Semi-Annual Evaluation Report (SAER).

2. This consolidated AER presents a summary of the LDCF/SCCF Special Study of Completed Projects conducted to assess all projects completed so far. The full report of the special study is submitted to the LDCF/SCCF Council in the information document GEF/LDCF.SCCF.26/ME/Inf.01/Rev.01. The AER also includes the proposed four-year work program and budget for FY20-23 and the Management Action Record.

## SPECIAL STUDY OF COMPLETED PROJECTS

3. This special study is the first time the IEO has conducted an analysis of all the LDCF and SCCF projects completed so far as part of the LDCF/SCCF AER. The LDCF/SCCF special study, analyzes outcome, sustainability and M&E ratings, innovative approaches,<sup>1</sup> gender considerations, countries' fragility<sup>2</sup> and lessons learned. The objective of the study is to identify trends and linkages among rated variables and to find out which variables overall led to higher project outcome and sustainability ratings.

4. The special study reviewed terminal evaluations (TEs), terminal evaluation reviews (TERs), and other relevant project documentation of 53 completed projects,<sup>3</sup> having a combined grant value of \$173.21 million. There are 31 completed projects that received funding from the LDCF and 22 completed project that received funding from the SCCF. These projects account for \$95.85 million in LDCF funding and \$77.36 million in SCCF funding. Geographically, 30 projects are in Africa, 12 are in the Asia and Pacific region, five projects are in the Latin America and Caribbean region, two projects are regional, and four projects are global.

5. For statistical analysis the program R was used. Spearman's Rank-Order Correlation was used for identifying correlation among variables.<sup>4</sup> When this statistical analysis did not find strong correlations, similarity analysis using Jaccard Similarity Index was performed to test the

---

<sup>1</sup> See annex 1 of the LDCF/SCCF Special Study of Completed Projects (GEF/LDCF.SCCF.26/ME/Inf.01) for a working definition of innovation.

<sup>2</sup> According to the World Bank Group's annually released Harmonized List of Fragile Situations (World Bank 2017).

<sup>3</sup> Five terminal evaluations submitted to the IEO in the calendar 2018 are included in the special study.

<sup>4</sup> The sign of the Spearman Correlation indicates the direction of correlation between an independent variable (X) and dependent variable (Y). The Spearman correlation coefficient is positive if Y tends to increase when X increases. If Y tends to decrease when X increases, the Spearman correlation coefficient is negative. A Spearman correlation of zero indicates that there is no tendency for Y to either increase or decrease when X increases.

similarity between datasets of variables.<sup>5</sup> See annex 2 of the LDCF/SCCF Special Study of Completed Projects (GEF/LDCF.SCCF.26/ME/Inf.01/Rev.01) for complete calculations of Spearman's Rank Correlation and Jaccard Similarity Index.

6. Overall, the LDCF and SCCF funds performed well with respect to project outcomes and sustainability. Eighty-one percent of LDCF projects and 77 percent of SCCF projects received outcome ratings in the satisfactory range. A project in Bangladesh (GEF ID 3287, LDCF; IEO 2018a) which received a highly satisfactory rating, showed that including stakeholders at national and local levels empowered the proactive involvement of communities in the management of natural resources. A project in Guinea (GEF ID 3703, LDCF; IEO2018a), which received a moderately unsatisfactory outcome rating, determined that strong leadership is necessary to achieve the expected impact on the community.

7. Seventy-three percent of all SCCF projects had a sustainability rating in the likely range, while only 60 percent of rated LDCF projects had sustainability ratings in the likely range. A project in Ecuador (GEF ID 2931, SCCF; IEO 2016), which received a likely sustainability rating, found that designing field projects with the community created commitment on the part of all stakeholders by supporting actions towards sustainability with equity. A project in Djibouti (GEF ID 3408, LDCF; IEO 2018a), which received an unlikely sustainability rating, found that it would have been better to address sustainability in the project design stage so that activities can be focused on developing sustainability mechanisms.

8. The analysis found that 83 percent of projects with innovative elements had outcome ratings in the satisfactory range, while only 57 percent of non-innovative projects received outcome ratings in the satisfactory range. Statistically, there was a weak positive correlation between innovation and project outcomes. Therefore, similarity analysis was done and a high similarity (Jaccard Similarity Index of 0.76) between data on innovation and project outcome ratings was found. There is a similarity in the data, in the sense that projects identified as innovative tend to align with higher project outcome ratings. Innovation was found to be especially impactful in projects funded through the SCCF, in which 91 percent of the innovative projects had satisfactory project outcome ratings. This finding is positive but not surprising as innovation is one of the SCCF's main pillars. While innovation is important, these findings should be treated with caution given the heterogeneity of interventions; there are project specific factors—beyond innovation—potentially influencing and/or driving a project's outcome.

9. The project in Ethiopia (GEF ID 4222, LDCF; IEO 2018a) found that awareness generated from climate information bulletins helped beneficiaries increase productivity by 100 percent. This innovative project had the ability to scale-up through immediate, short- and longer-term adaptation measures linked to development goals, needs and actions. Despite innovative

---

<sup>5</sup> The Jaccard Similarity Index compares members for two sets to see which members are shared and which are distinct. It is a measure of similarity for the two sets of data, with a range from 0 percent to 100 percent. The higher the percentage, the more similar the two populations.

elements, the Ghana project (GEF ID 4368, SCCF) from the 2018 cohort failed to use a logical framework to help it track its achievements and stated outcomes.

10. Fragility of a country is not rated in the TE's or Annual Performance Reports but has been determined retrospectively based on the World Bank Group's (WBG) annually released Harmonized List of Fragile Situations (World Bank 2017). The GEF does not have a definition of fragility in an operational context nor a policy or special procedure for working in fragile states. GEF's work in fragile countries is focused primarily on SIDS and LDCs. The Sixth Comprehensive Evaluation of the GEF (OPS6) reported that compared to GEF-5 funding, support for fragile states increased from 8 to 10 percent, but OPS6 did not provide an assessment of the performance and results of such support. The World Bank harmonized list of fragile situations includes 24 of the 47 LDCs.

11. The analysis found that 83 percent of projects in non-fragile countries had outcome ratings in the satisfactory range. In comparison, only 71 percent of projects in fragile countries received outcome ratings in the satisfactory range. Note that all SCCF projects were implemented in non-fragile countries. While there was a very weak correlation between a country's fragility and a project's outcome rating, there was a high similarity (Jaccard Similarity Index of 0.63) between the variables country's non-fragility and project outcome rating. This could be interpreted that while there is no correlation, there might be a third variable through which the variables interact. A review of project documents revealed that risks associated with a country's fragility were rarely discussed.

12. The Congo DR project (GEF ID 3718, LDCF; IEO 2016), found that despite some difficulties that marred the project, the project helped to reduce vulnerability of rural populations in for selected sites. This project was one of the only projects that addressed risks, such as the country's difficult post conflict political-administrative situation, in the PIF. A coastal communities project (GEF ID 3733, LDCF; IEO 2018a) found that political instability can greatly alter project outcomes, as was observed in this project when department officers were replaced. The TE acknowledges that the sustainability of achievements for this project will greatly depend on the country's political context in the coming years.

13. Statistically, none of the variables in the regression analysis<sup>6</sup> were found to be correlated to the sustainability of project outcomes. However, there was a high similarity between project outcomes and sustainability (Jaccard Similarity Index of 0.76); outcomes ratings in the satisfactory range tend to align with sustainability ratings in the likely range.

14. M&E implementation ratings and fragility were statistically found to be correlated with project outcome ratings. This finding is also supported by the similarity assessment. Fragility

---

<sup>6</sup> The variables being a country's fragility, project innovation, project outcome rating, M&E implementation rating, improvements in M&E rating from entry to implementation, and improvements in gender rating from entry to completion.

(Jaccard Similarity Index of 0.63) and M&E implementation ratings (Jaccard Similarity Index of 0.64) received high similarity scores in relation to project outcome ratings.

15. The analysis shows that projects that maintained or improved on M&E ratings—from M&E design to M&E implementation—had better outcome ratings overall. Most projects that maintained or improved M&E ratings already had M&E at entry ratings in the satisfactory range.

16. Analysis of a project in Bangladesh (GEF ID 3287, LDCF; IEO2018a) showed that efficient and systematic recording of relevant information and on progress of activities can lead to an increase in M&E ratings. The project in Sierra Leone (GEF ID 3716, LDCF) from the 2018 cohort, which received decreasing ratings from moderately satisfactory at M&E design to an unsatisfactory rating at M&E implementation, found that better monitoring and evaluation would have spotted underperforming activities and would have increased accountability and saved more money to be invested elsewhere.

17. Projects rated gender blind or gender aware at entry tend to maintain or improve their gender rating at entry during implementation, rating mostly similar or better at completion. Projects rated gender sensitive or gender mainstreamed at entry either maintain or decrease when compared to their gender rating at completion. Of the 15 projects rated gender sensitive at entry, only five maintained that rating while the remaining ten scored lower on gender at completion. The analysis shows that LDCF projects had a much higher rate of projects with declining gender rating from entry to completion (39 percent). For the SCCF projects, only 14 percent of projects had lower ratings from entry to completion.

18. The analysis shows that projects that maintained or improved on gender ratings had better outcome ratings overall. However, projects that maintained or improved gender ratings also had poorer at entry ratings on gender; since gender was not required to be included or reported on, there was room for improvement.

19. While many projects include gender as a component of their project activities, lessons learned regarding gender are not often addressed in the TE. However, a few projects offered interesting insights. Despite project activities that target women, the Haiti project (GEF ID 4447, LDCF; IEO 2018a) found that a lack of female staff represents a missed opportunity for the project and ultimately contributed to a decrease in gender rating from gender sensitive at entry to gender blind upon completion. The Cabo Verde project (GEF ID 3581, LDCF; IEO 2017), which was rated gender aware at entry and gender blind upon completion, found that the focus on gender cannot be limited to the number of female beneficiaries. A proper gender strategy should analyze gender roles and inequities and work with communities to transform these inequalities.

#### **PROGRESS REPORT AND FOUR-YEAR WORK PROGRAM**

20. In June 2018, the LDCF/SCCF Council approved a budget for the IEO of \$52,000 for FY19. During FY19 the IEO completed the activities of the annual work program, conducting the

special study of completed projects and preparing the LDCF/SCCF AER: June 2019. The IEO estimates that the budget will be fully used by the end of the fiscal year.

21. While the IEO continues to provide quality evaluations on the performance and results of the LDCF and SCCF for accountability purposes, the FY20-23 LDCF/SCCF indicative work program is organized around the three objectives of the *2018-2022 GEF Programming Strategy on Adaptation to Climate Change for the LDCF and SCCF*: 1) Reduce vulnerability and increase resilience through innovation and technology transfer for climate change adaptation; 2) Mainstream climate change adaptation and resilience for systemic impact, and 3) Foster enabling conditions for effective and integrated climate change adaptation. The IEO has delivered evaluative evidence and lessons to help refine the strategic priorities contained in the GEF programming strategy on adaptation.

### **Assessment of Terminal Evaluations**

22. During FY16-18 the IEO reported on the performance of the LDCF and SCCF. AERs presented an assessment of the terminal evaluations of completed LDCF/SCCF projects that were submitted during the previous calendar year and reported on project outcomes and sustainability, and project M&E. AERs also reported on innovative approaches, gender considerations, and lessons learned. In 2108 only five terminal evaluations were received by the IEO which were not assessed separately for this current AER but were included in the special study of completed projects.

23. The LDCF/SCCF AERs during FY20-23 will continue to report on the performance of the LDCF and SCCF through assessment of completed projects using information from terminal evaluations. As the LDCF/SCCF portfolio matures the submission of an increasing number of terminal evaluations<sup>7</sup> will permit more detailed assessment of the portfolio's performance including project results, processes that may affect project results, M&E arrangements, gender consideration, innovative approaches, lessons learned and good practice.

### **Fund Program Evaluations**

24. As part of the four-year work program of the IEO approved by the LDCF/SCCF Council at its 18<sup>th</sup> meeting in June 2015 the IEO conducted the Program Evaluation of the LDCF<sup>8</sup> and the Program Evaluation of the SCCF<sup>9</sup> during FY16-17. The findings and conclusions of these evaluations contributed to the revision of the GEF programming strategy on adaptation to Climate Change. The number of closed projects has increased from 23 (13 LDCF, 10 SCCF) at the time of the evaluations to 53 today. The IEO proposes to update the LDCF program evaluation in FY20 and the SCCF program evaluation in FY21. The updates will include an assessment of the

---

<sup>7</sup> It is estimated that the number of terminal evaluations submitted will grow at an increasing rate.

<sup>8</sup> IEO, [Program Evaluation of the Least Developed Countries Fund](#), June 2016. LDCF/SCCF Council Document GEF/LDCF.SCCF.20/ME/02.

<sup>9</sup> IEO, [Program Evaluation of the Special Climate Change Evaluation](#), May 2017. LDCF/SCCF Council Document GEF/LDCF.SCCF.22/ME/02.

2018-2022 GEF programming strategy on adaptation and will provide evaluative evidence on the progress towards LDCF/SCCF objectives and for future revision of the adaptation strategy.

### **Special Studies and Other Assessments**

25. In this AER the IEO is reporting on the Special Study of Completed Projects, an analysis of all the LDCF and SCCF projects completed so far. During FY20-23 AERs will also report on special studies and other assessments, in line with the GEF programming strategy on adaptation. Potential additional topics to report on are multi-trust fund projects, engagement with the private sector, and systemic impact.

26. The AER will continue to present management action records to track adoption of the LDCF/SCCF Council's decisions across the GEF partnership.

### **Adaptation in the Seventh Comprehensive Evaluation of the GEF (OPS7)**

27. The IEO has synthesized conclusions and evaluative evidence on adaptation to climate change in OPS6 and OPS5. Adaptation to climate change will be included in the Seventh Comprehensive Evaluation of the GEF (OPS7) through various channels. OPS7 will bring in evaluative evidence from the AERs prepared during FY19-22, the updates of the program evaluation of the LDCF and the SCCF, and from GEF Trust Fund evaluations conducted by the IEO during GEF-7. Some of these evaluations will integrate adaptation to climate change, in particular, the ongoing strategic country cluster evaluations. Adaptation to climate change will also be included in special studies for OPS7 on, for example performance, strategies and approaches, and gender equality. The work of including adaptation in OPS7 is planned for FY21-22.

### **Policy and Guidance**

28. The *2010 Monitoring and Evaluation Policy* has been revised and the IEO is presenting a separate evaluation policy to the GEF Council in June 2019. Once the revised evaluation policy has been adopted, the *Guidance Document: Monitoring and Evaluation in the LDCF/SCCF* (2014)<sup>10</sup> will be updated to reflect the change to a separate evaluation policy. This guidance document discusses the fundamentals of M&E practices within the context of the Funds' M&E policies and requirements and provides guidance to apply the M&E Policy to LDCF/SCCF activities in accordance with GEF policies and practices. This work is planned for FY20.

### **Knowledge Management**

29. Evaluative evidence and findings from the IEO work program under LDCF/SCCF will be disseminated through several knowledge products and activities. Findings and recommendations from the LDCF and SCCF program evaluations will be disseminated through graphically edited reports and knowledge products. These will be shared with LDCF/SCCF stakeholders and published on the IEO website. The IEO will report on the program evaluations

---

<sup>10</sup> <http://www.gefio.org/sites/default/files/ieo/evaluations/gef-me-ldcf-sccf-2014.pdf>

in the Report of the GEF to the Conference of Parties to the UNFCCC. Findings will also be shared through blog posts on Earth-Eval, an online community of practice hosted by the IEO.

30. Dissemination of findings from the IEO work program under LDCF/SCCF will also take place at Conferences. The IEO and the Earth-Eval Community of Practice in collaboration with the International Development Evaluation Association is organizing the Third International Conference on Evaluating Environment and Development that will take place in October 2019. Adaptation to Climate Change will be one of the themes of the Conference.

#### **MULTIANNUAL EVALUATION BUDGET**

31. The IEO introduced the first multiannual budget for IEO’s FY16-19 work program for LDCF/SCCF in June 2015. This is in line with the practice for the GEF Trust Fund and accommodates multi-year evaluations such as OPSs and knowledge sharing activities after the completion of evaluations. Table 1 presents the estimated budget by activity and fiscal year for a total of \$340,000 for FY20-FY23. This amount reflects a 6 percent increase from the FY16-19 budget. The IEO work program has been tailored so that the approved budgets will allow for an effective and efficiency delivery of the proposed evaluation work. The amounts shown for the activities cover the cost of a Senior Evaluation Officer from the IEO to manage and contribute to the activities, and the cost of other IEO staff to carry out the activities.

32. The IEO has estimated a budget of \$93,000 for FY20 to cover the proposed activities in the work program presented above.

**Table 1: Multiannual Budget of the Independent Evaluation Office of the GEF (thousands \$)**

<b>Evaluation Activity</b>	<b>FY20</b>	<b>FY21</b>	<b>FY22</b>	<b>FY23</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>LDCF</b>					
Annual Evaluation Report	20	21	22	23	86
LDCF Evaluation	45	10	0	0	55
Adaptation in OPS7	0	10	15	0	25
Policy and Guidance	4	0	0	0	4
<b>Sub-Total (A)</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>170</b>
<b>SCCF</b>					
Annual Evaluation Report	20	21	22	23	86
SCCF Evaluation	0	45	10	0	55
Adaptation in OPS7	0	10	15	0	25
Policy and Guidance	4	0	0	0	4
<b>Sub-Total (B)</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>170</b>
<b>Total (A+B)</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>117</b>	<b>84</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>340</b>

## THE MANAGEMENT ACTION RECORD

33. The GEF Management Action Record (MAR)<sup>11</sup> tracks the level of adoption by the GEF Secretariat and/or the GEF Agencies (together here referred to as GEF Management) of GEF Council and LDCF/SCCF Council decisions that have been made based on IEO recommendations. The MAR serves two purposes: “(i) to provide Council with a record of its decision on the follow-up of evaluation reports, the proposed management actions, and the actual status of these actions; and (ii) to increase the accountability of GEF Management regarding Council decisions on monitoring and evaluation issues.”<sup>12</sup>

34. The MAR for the LDCF/SCCF tracks two LDCF/SCCF Council decisions: June 2016 decision on recommendations of the Program Evaluation of the LDCF; and May 2017 decision on recommendations of the Program Evaluation of the SCCF.<sup>13 14</sup> In the MAR the IEO completes the columns pertaining to recommendations, management response, and Council decisions. Management is invited to provide a self-rating of the level of adoption of Council decisions on recommendations and to add comments as necessary. After management's self-rating, the Office verifies actual adoption and provides its own ratings and comments. The rating categories for the progress of adoption of Council decisions were agreed upon through a consultative process of the IEO, the GEF Secretariat, and GEF Agencies. Categories are as follows:

- (a) **High:** Fully adopted and fully incorporated into policy, strategy or operations.
- (b) **Substantial:** Decision largely adopted but not fully incorporated into policy, strategy or operations as yet.
- (c) **Medium:** Adopted in some operational and policy work, but not to a significant degree in key areas.
- (d) **Negligible:** No evidence or plan for adoption, or plan and actions for adoption are in a very preliminary stage.
- (e) **Not rated or possible to verify yet:** ratings or verification will have to wait until more data is available or proposals have been further developed.
- (f) **N/A:** Not-applicable.

35. For the LDCF evaluation the LDCF/SCCF Council decision stated that “the LDCF/SCCF Council, having reviewed document GEF/LDCF.SCCF.20/ME/02, Program Evaluation of the Least

---

<sup>11</sup> IEO, Management Action Record, June 2019.

<sup>12</sup> GEF, [Procedures and Format of the GEF Management Action Record](#), November 2005. Council Document GEF/ME/C.27/3.

<sup>13</sup> IEO, [Program Evaluation of the Least Developed Countries Fund](#), June 2016. LDCF/SCCF Council Document GEF/LDCF.SCCF.20/ME/02.

<sup>14</sup> IEO, [Program Evaluation of the Special Climate Change Evaluation](#), May 2017. LDCF/SCCF Council Document GEF/LDCF.SCCF.22/ME/02.

Developed Countries Fund,<sup>15</sup> and GEF/LDCF.SCCF/20/ME/03, Management Response to the Program Evaluation of the Least Developed Countries Fund,<sup>16</sup> took note of the conclusions of the evaluation and endorsed the recommendations taking into account the Management Response.”<sup>17</sup> The evaluation’s recommendations are as follows:

- (1) **Recommendation 1:** The GEF Secretariat should explore and develop mechanisms that ensure the predictable, adequate and sustainable financing of the Fund.
- (2) **Recommendation 2:** The GEF Secretariat should make efforts to improve consistency regarding their understanding and application of the GEF gender mainstreaming policy and the Gender Equality Action Plan (GEAP) to the LDCF.
- (3) **Recommendation 3:** The GEF Secretariat should ensure that the data in the Project Management Information System is up to date and accurate.

36. In regard to the adequacy and sustainability of the LDCF, the GEF Secretariat has been making concerted efforts: over FY18, the GEF Secretariat engaged in multiple consultations with donors and recipients of the LDCF to ensure the formulation of a GEF-7 strategy for climate change adaptation that would be well-aligned with donor and recipient priorities and in response to IEO findings, and thus well-positioned for adequate and sustained resourcing. The Secretariat’s efforts to ensure the predictable, adequate and sustainable financing of the LDCF are welcome. The IEO encourages the Secretariat to develop a more systematic mechanism. The IEO has rated Recommendation 1 as medium.

37. The GEF programming strategy on adaptation for the LDCF and the SCCF for 2018-2022 enhances gender responsiveness to further promote gender mainstreaming and women’s empowerment overall through targeted interventions, in line with GEF’s new Gender Policy, introduced in 2017. The proposed results framework includes relevant disaggregated indicators for men and women so that impacts and outcomes, and their gender relevance, can be tracked and analyzed. The IEO will track the implementation of the 2018 GEF Policy on Gender and Equality by LDCF. The IEO has rated Recommendation 2 as substantial.

38. Recommendation 3 continues to be addressed in the context of the overall upgrade from the project management information system to the GEF Portal. While much work has been done on the upgrade of the GEF project management information system it has not resulted in a clear picture of progress towards improving the quality of information. The IEO will continue to track adoption of this decision. The IEO has rated Recommendation 3 as medium.

---

<sup>15</sup> IEO, [Program Evaluation of the Least Developed Countries Fund](#), June 2016. LDCF/SCCF Council Document GEF/LDCF.SCCF.20/ME/02.

<sup>16</sup> GEF, [Management Response to the Program Evaluation of the Least Developed Countries Fund](#), June 2016. LDCF/SCCF Council Document GEF/LDCF.SCCF.20/ME/03.

<sup>17</sup> GEF, [Joint Summary of the Chairs 20th LDCF/SCCF Meeting](#), June 2016.

39. The overall rating of adoption of the LDCF/SCCF Council decision regarding the LDCF program evaluation is substantial. The IEO will continue to track the adoption of this decision.

40. For the SCCF evaluation the LDCF/SCCF Council decision stated that “the Council, having reviewed document GEF/LDCF.SCCF.22/ME/02, Program Evaluation of the Special Climate Change Fund<sup>18</sup> and GEF/LDCF.SCCF.22/ME/03, Management Response to the Program Evaluation of the Special Climate Change Fund,<sup>19</sup> takes note of the conclusions of the evaluation and endorses the recommendations taking into account the Management Response.”<sup>20</sup> The evaluation’s recommendations are as follows:

- (1) **Recommendation 1:** Reaffirming and strengthening a recommendation from the previous SCCF Program Evaluation in 2011, the GEF Secretariat should prioritize the development of mechanisms that ensure predictable, adequate and sustainable financing for the Fund, given its support for, and focus on innovation.
- (2) **Recommendation 2:** The GEF Secretariat should articulate and publicly communicate the SCCF’s niche within the global adaptation finance landscape, to include an explicit statement regarding the SCCF’s relation with—and complementarity to—the Green Climate Fund.
- (3) **Recommendation 3:** The GEF Secretariat should ensure that PMIS data is up to date and accurate.

41. In response to the IEO recommendation, key developments of mechanisms to ensure predictable and sustainable financing introduced for the GEF-7 period include: modification of access modality based on resource availability through a call for proposals for the Challenge for Adaptation Innovation; and provision of incentive for mainstreaming adaptation and resilience aligned with GEF Trust Fund programming. The Secretariat’s efforts to ensure the predictable, adequate and sustainable financing of the SCCF are welcome. The IEO encourages the Secretariat to develop a more systematic mechanism. The IEO has rated Recommendation 1 as medium.

42. SCCF’s uniqueness in the climate finance landscape has been on supporting innovation and promoting entrepreneurship-based solutions for adaptation as reflected in the new adaptation programming strategy. In consultation with donors to the SCCF and with the Green Climate Fund (GCF), the GEF programming strategy on adaptation for the LDCF and SCCF for 2018-2022 clearly outlines elements of complementarity with the GCF. For any country seeking SCCF resources, the GEF Secretariat will, at a minimum, require agencies to ensure that no duplication is occurring with ongoing or planned GCF-supported activities in those countries. The IEO acknowledges the SCCF’s niche within the global adaptation finance landscape

---

<sup>18</sup> IEO, [Program Evaluation of the Special Climate Change Evaluation](#), May 2017. LDCF/SCCF Council Document GEF/LDCF.SCCF.22/ME/02.

<sup>19</sup> GEF, [Management Response to the Program Evaluation of the Special Climate Change Fund](#), May 2017. LDCF/SCCF Council Document GEF/LDCF.SCCF.22/ME/03.

<sup>20</sup> GEF, [Joint Summary of the Chairs 22<sup>nd</sup> LDCF/SCCF Meeting](#), May 2017.

identified in the GEF programming strategy on adaptation for the LDCF and SCCF for 2018-2022 and will track its implementation. The IEO has rated Recommendation 2 as substantial.

43. Recommendation 3 continues to be addressed in the context of the overall upgrade from the project management information system to the GEF Portal. While much work has been done on the upgrade of the GEF project management information system it has not resulted in a clear picture of progress towards improving the quality of information. The IEO will continue to track adoption of this decision. The IEO has rated Recommendation 3 as medium.

44. The overall rating of adoption of the LDCF/SCCF Council decision regarding the SCCF program evaluation is substantial. The IEO will continue to track the adoption of this decision.