

56th GEF Council Meeting
June 11th -13, 2019
Washington, D.C.

EVALUATION OF GEF SUPPORT TO SCALING UP IMPACT

(Prepared by the Independent Evaluation Office of the GEF)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Introduction: Why Assess Scaling up in the GEF?	1
	Background.....	1
	Objectives and Key Questions.....	2
	Methods and Limitations	2
	A. Sources of evidence	2
	B. Case study selection and analysis	3
II.	Scaling up in the GEF Context.....	5
	Perspectives from the literature	5
	The GEF Strategy and Programming for Scaling up	6
	A. GEF 2020 Strategy	6
	B. GEF Programming Directions	6
	Perspectives from the GEF Partnership	7
	Defining Scaling Up.....	8
	Modes of Scaling	9
	A. Replication.....	9
	B. Mainstreaming	10
	C. Linking	11
	D. GEF Agency approaches to scaling up.....	12
III.	Profile of Cases and Results	14
	Profile of Cases	14
	Extent of GEF Support	17
	A. Piloting vs Scaling	18
	B. Modes of scaling.....	20
	Sequence of Scaling Support.....	20
	Results	23
	A. Biodiversity.....	23
	B. Climate change mitigation and adaptation.....	25
	C. Land degradation	26

D. Chemicals and waste.....	26
E. International waters.....	26
F. Gender-related outcomes.....	27
Monitoring Progress.....	28
Sustainability of Scaling up Initiatives.....	29
IV. Factors and Enabling Conditions Affecting Scaling up.....	32
Adoption of the Intervention	33
Contextual Factors: Ownership of intervention and evidence of benefits.....	33
Enabling Conditions: Participatory processes, knowledge and information dissemination, and incentives.....	35
Sustained Support for Scaling	37
Contextual Factors: Political priority, support of influencers, working through long-term structures, long-term outlook	38
Enabling Conditions: Individual and institutional capacities, policy framework and operating guidelines, sustainable financing.....	41
Learning for Adaptability and Cost-Effectiveness	42
Contextual Factors: Leveraging contextual conditions, continuity of staff, structures for local and global interaction	42
Enabling Conditions: Multi-stakeholder interactions & partnerships and systematic learning mechanisms	43
V. A Framework for Scaling up Impacts in the GEF	46
Applying the Framework.....	47
A. GEF-6 IAPs	48
B. GEF-7 projects	49
HIGHLIGHT: Scaling Up through the Small Grants Programme	51
GEF's Comparative Advantage in Scaling up.....	53
Scaling up Approaches in other Institutions	55
C. Conclusions.....	57
D. Recommendation	59
Bibliography	61

I. INTRODUCTION: WHY ASSESS SCALING UP IN THE GEF?

This chapter provides a background on how the GEF has historically approached the scaling up process, and the objectives, methods and limitations of this evaluation.

Background

1. **The GEF 2020 Strategy, published in 2014, sets a clear vision to support transformational change, and to achieve global environmental benefits (GEBs) on a larger scale.** It specifically aims to achieve this vision by, among others, supporting innovative activities that “are scalable across multiple countries, regions, and sectors through policy, market, or behavioral transformations”. In part, this was a response to a finding of the GEF Independent Evaluation Office’s Fifth Overall Performance Study (OPS5) that scaling up had taken place in only 20 percent of projects upon their completion, indicating the need for a longer-term approach to achieving impact at scale.
2. **Scaling up is not new to the GEF and in the last decade, all GEF focal areas have been shifting from site-level pilot projects towards projects or programs implemented at higher scales.** Based on a review of focal area strategies and interviews with the GEF partnership, the GEF has gradually shifted its focus from pilots to scaled-up interventions over the last 25 years. In part, this is because the GEF partnership has built up a much better understanding of what interventions work based on the portfolio of demonstration projects implemented during GEF’s early phases. As a more targeted response to the need to achieve impact at scale, the GEF introduced the Integrated Approach Pilots in GEF-6 and the Impact Programs in GEF-7, which have just begun implementation. However, the conditions under which scaling up has been successful or unsuccessful, and the processes by which impacts are scaled up, have not been systematically assessed. In addition, based on interview responses, there appears to be a varied understanding of scaling up across the partnership and how it is achieved in operational terms.
3. **This evaluation draws on the previous experiences of the GEF in scaling up to better understand and draw lessons on the processes through which scaling up occurs and the conditions under which it is effectively achieved.** The IEO has been tracking scaling up as one indicator of progress towards impact, reporting its prevalence in the GEF portfolio in the overall performance studies. Moreover, recent evaluations contributing to OPS6, such as those on transformational change and GEF’s support for legal and regulatory frameworks, note the importance of the scaling up process in achieving larger-scale impact. This is the first evaluation to systematically assess the scaling up process in depth, and the influencing factors and conditions. Using a purposive sampling approach, the evaluation conducted quantitative and qualitative analyses on both successful and less successful cases of GEF support to scaling up. Information was extracted from document reviews, interviews, and field visits to three countries. The evaluation provides lessons for the GEF in future support for scaling up throughout its portfolio, and for the GEF-7 Impact Programs in particular.

Objectives and Key Questions

4. In the absence of an explicit definition, this evaluation adopts a broad definition of scaling up by assessing the various perspectives from the literature and across the GEF partnership, based on the scaling up experience in various sectors and institutions. The objective of this evaluation is to assess the factors and conditions that have influenced the scaling up process through purposively selected projects.
5. Based on the findings, the evaluation has developed a framework that includes project-related and contextual aspects that influence scaling up, and which would inform the design and implementation stages of GEF projects and programs. The framework could also be applied ex-post to completed projects to assess the likelihood of scaling up after completion.

Specifically, this evaluation seeks to answer the following questions:

- (a) What are the ways through which scaling up has taken place through GEF support?
- (b) How does the scaling up process in the GEF compare to that in other sectors and institutions, especially in global partnerships?
- (c) What factors, conditions and project design characteristics contribute to, or hinder scaling up in GEF-supported interventions?
- (d) Under what conditions does GEF support have a comparative advantage to help scale up interventions?

Methods and Limitations

6. In the absence of a common understanding of scaling up across the GEF partnership, projects that aim to contribute to scaling up processes have not been specifically tagged or tracked as such in the GEF's project management information system. This has made it impossible to identify a complete portfolio of GEF projects that can be assessed for the extent to which they have achieved their objectives on scaling up. Thus, this evaluation does not address the extent to which GEF has or has not pursued scaling up, and instead assesses how the GEF has contributed to scaling up GEBs when and where this occurred, through a purposive sample of projects.

A. Sources of evidence

The evaluation draws its findings from the following sources of evidence:

7. **Literature review and synthesis.** A literature review was conducted to identify the different definitions and models of scaling up in various sectors and development institutions.
8. **Policy and programming document review.** GEF's most recent policy and programming documents were reviewed against findings from the literature review to assess the extent to which they address a systematic approach to scaling up in the GEF.

9. **Corporate-level interviews.** Interviews were conducted at the corporate level with staff of the GEF Secretariat and GEF Agencies. These included nine representatives comprising the GEF Secretariat management staff and leads of the five focal area teams, as well as leads of the integrated programs. These also included staff of nine GEF Coordination Units of the seven Agencies that responded to requests for interview, including the Small Grants Programme (SGP). GEF Agency interviews were designed to gather information on the experiences and perspectives of scaling up with GEF support in particular, and on the institution's approach to scaling up more broadly.

10. To provide a comparison of how similar partnerships approach scaling up, interviews were conducted with five global partnerships that are also vertical funds like the GEF. Three of them--the Global Fund, Global Financing Facility (GFF), and Global Partnership for Education (GPE)—are in the health and education sectors. The other two—the Climate Investment Funds (CIF) and the Green Climate Fund (GCF)—work mainly in the climate change mitigation and adaptation focal area.

11. **Field visits.** Visits to completed GEF-supported projects were carried out in three countries: Costa Rica, Macedonia and Mauritius. Key national- and local-level stakeholders – including civil society organizations (CSOs), private sector, and community beneficiaries – were interviewed during the visits. Countries were selected based on the existence of completed GEF projects that had been reported to have successful scaling up outcomes in the corporate-level interviews. Cases within countries were selected to ensure representation of the different focal areas.

12. **Project document review.** Quantitative and qualitative information on the extent of GEF support and related outcomes were extracted from project proposals and evaluations, as well as from publications on the projects that were published after their completion, where available. Projects were assessed using an initial scaling up framework developed on the basis of the literature review and corporate-level interviews, which provided information on the different modes of scaling up, and the factors and conditions contributing to, or hindering successful scaling up. The findings from the project document review were used to verify and refine the initial framework.

13. Program framework documents of the GEF-6 Integrated Approach Pilots and project information forms of GEF-7 projects approved by the Council as of December 2018 were analyzed to review whether enabling conditions and factors affecting the likelihood of scaling up were considered at the design stage.

B. Case study selection and analysis

14. A purposive sample of successful and less successful scaling up experiences was developed based on stakeholder inputs and a review of the GEF portfolio. The sample of cases assessed was selected from three sources: 1) examples provided by GEF Agencies in a written survey until May 2018; 2) examples provided by GEF Agencies and the GEF Secretariat in

interviews until May 2018; and 3) projects in the GEF portfolio that had “scale” or “scaling” in the title as of June 2018, and which had at least one associated pilot project with a terminal evaluation. It is expected that many more examples of both successful and less successful scaling up exist in the GEF portfolio that have not been captured through these sources. Each case consists of one or more GEF-supported projects.

15. The evaluation assessed a total of 20 cases wherein positive quantitative scaling up outcomes were reported and influencing factors could be identified. Priority was also given to cases for which information could be obtained beyond terminal evaluations, such as through evaluations by the GEF IEO and the World Bank’s Independent Evaluation Group (IEG). The 20 cases cover all focal areas and geographical regions and represent countries with large- and average-size GEF investments. Due to the difficulty of linking outcomes with factors and conditions at regional and global scales, only GEF-supported interventions at the national level are included in the 20 cases.

16. Apart from the 20 cases with complete information, 40 additional cases with varying degrees of quantitative and qualitative information available were included. These additional cases were drawn from case studies of previous IEO evaluations, stakeholder interviews in countries visited, and reviews of available project evaluations. Six of the 40 cases involve regional interventions, and 14 consist of SGP projects.

17. Of the total number of 60 cases used in this evaluation, 10 provided information on factors and conditions that influenced negative scaling up outcomes. In 6 cases, field visits were conducted to obtain information on the sustainability of scaling up initiatives supported by the GEF. In addition, other experiences of both GEF and non-GEF initiatives that were shared in through interviews have been used in this report.

Limitations

18. The selected cases are not statistically representative of the GEF portfolio; however, the findings have been assessed for consistency against the broader institutional experience of the GEF through stakeholder interviews, as well as with the findings of previous evaluations. This evaluation does not and cannot address the question on whether the GEF appropriately supports the scaling up process across the portfolio, but it provides useful information and lessons on the conditions and factors that affect scaling up where outcomes are known.

19. In addition to project documents, evidence is drawn from interviews with GEF stakeholders at the corporate, agency and country level. Aligned with the evaluation’s purposive approach, the information provided captures stakeholders’ most successful scaling up experiences, as well as their intentions and perceptions regarding scaling up. Therefore, findings from these interviews should not be interpreted to reflect the typical project implementation experience, or the current or previous practices of the institutions as a whole.

II. SCALING UP IN THE GEF CONTEXT

This chapter presents findings from the literature review on scaling up, scaling up experiences in comparable partnerships, and scaling up experiences within Agencies of the GEF partnership.

Perspectives from the literature

A literature review spanning more than 20 years shows that the term “scaling up” has consistently been associated with the expansion of benefits and impacts over a wider geographic area and a larger number of beneficiaries.

20. Many papers also define scaling up in terms of the quality of impact, such as efficiency (WHO 2007, WHO 2010, Indig et al. 2017), equity, adaptability and sustainability (IIRR 2000, Gündel et al 2001, CIAT 2004, World Bank 2005, Hartmann and Linn 2008, UNDP 2013, Agapitova and Linn 2016). More recently, organizations have emphasized the idea of scaling up as a process of leveraging resources and relationships (Enright 2014, IFAD 2017), as well as disseminating knowledge about successful approaches (GIZ 2014) to improve the quality of impact.

21. The literature on scaling up identifies different dimensions of scaling up. Geographical expansion is typically referred to as “horizontal scaling up”; expansion to include policy and institutional reforms at higher levels is referred to as “vertical scaling up” (Uvin 1995, Gündel et al 2001, CIAT 2004, GTZ 2011, WHO 2007, Tengberg et al. 2014, Begovic et al. 2017). In addition, some organizations recognize “functional scaling up” or expansion to include additional issues or types of activities as part of the intervention to be scaled up (Uvin 1995, GTZ 2011, GIZ 2014, Begovic et al. 2017).

22. Other organizations describe the dimensions of scaling up in terms of how or where it originates, such as top-down, bottom-up, spontaneous (Jonasova and Cooke 2012, World Bank 2012, WRI 2015). The MSI Scaling up Process Framework (Cooley 2016), on the other hand, describes scaling up in terms of who manages the scaling up process relative to who implements the pilot.

23. Cooley and Linn (2014) have distinguished the enabling factors and conditions for scaling up into two broad categories: drivers and spaces. Drivers are factors and conditions that catalyze the scaling up process and push it forward. Examples would be a clear vision of what and where to scale up, a champion who recognizes the need for and feasibility of scaling up, changes in political and economic conditions, and incentives for scaling such as competition and benchmarking. Spaces are those necessary for an intervention to expand into larger areas. Examples are sustainable financing, a legal and policy framework for implementation, the capacity to deliver resources and services, and partnerships for implementation.

24. Hancock (2003) further talks about the sequencing of interventions in the scaling up process that starts from innovation; followed by effectiveness or demonstrating impact at a local level; proceeded by efficiency or better use of resources as the intervention is

implemented across a greater population and geographical area; and then finally expansion or the replication and institutionalization of interventions for wider impact. As the extent of scaling increases, learning from the wider experience also expands, which at the same time builds evidence of what works and allows greater applicability of the scaling experience in new settings.

The GEF Strategy and Programming for Scaling up

The GEF strategy and programming directions have a vision to scale and indicate support for the necessary enabling conditions for scaling up. The intent to scale up varies according to the focal area or program.

A. GEF 2020 Strategy

25. The GEF 2020 Strategy calls for “developing a comprehensive approach towards scaling up the impact of its investments”. The Strategy contains important elements of an effective operational approach by proposing that large-scale impact can be achieved in three ways: through GEF interventions being scaled up by others, through market or behavioral transformation, and by the intervention working directly at a large scale.

26. The 2020 Strategy envisions the GEF’s contribution to scaling up to be through mainstreaming environmental priorities into broader policies, strategies, programs and actions; working on supply chains and with industry-wide approaches; implementing larger programs; and co-financing and leveraging via innovative financial instruments. The Strategy notes a number of enabling conditions for scaling up impact, including incentives, policies and regulations, institutions and institutional capacity, partnerships and coordination, financing, learning and M&E.

B. GEF Programming Directions

27. **The GEF-6 and GEF-7 Programming Directions have a clear vision of impact at scale articulated in all the focal area sections, in the Integrated Approach Pilots (IAPs) in GEF-6, and in the Impact Programs (IPs) in GEF-7.** In this regard, the documents appear to be distinct from, and more explicit in their scaling focus compared to the programming documents of other international development organizations.

28. The GEF-6 and GEF-7 Programming Directions present a common approach to addressing key opportunities and challenges in scaling up objectives. While the GEF-6 document articulates the scaling approach for the focal areas and Integrated Approach Pilots, GEF-7 offers a clear approach for scaling through Impact Programs; there is no specific scaling framework for the focal areas. GEF-7 also stresses that the Small Grants Program (SGP) will be more focused in supporting scaling up and replication.

29. The Operational Guidance for the IPs specifically states that countries will be asked to indicate their commitment to a national institutional framework that has an approach for

scaling up interventions, among other issues, with the end goal of promoting systems change. However, there are some differences among the programs and across the focal areas.

30. For example, in the climate change focal area, the GEF-7 Programming Directions stress the use of GEF support for reducing risks and addressing barriers rather than providing direct support for large-scale deployment and diffusion of mitigation options. The focal area strategy envisions scaling up to be financed by other actors, especially the private sector. The Sustainable Cities IP focuses on developing solutions with a potential for scaling by other actors.

31. The Sustainable Forest Management (SFM) and Food Systems IPs highlight the need to scale up the successes of GEF-supported pilots, particularly by addressing drivers of environmental degradation. The Food Systems IP will specifically support integrated solutions that generate multiple benefits at scale. Most important, financing from the IP will require “a clearly identified approach for converting results into larger scale impact in terms of geographies covered, financing mobilized, and number of actors influenced”. Multi-stakeholder initiatives and platforms are expected to help scale and replicate the results. These approaches build on previous efforts in the land degradation focal area as well as the SFM program to scale up impacts by integrating the objectives of multiple focal areas to address both environmental and economic issues, often through a programmatic approach.

32. In general, both GEF-6 and GEF-7 documents recognize the long-term nature of the scaling process and how it involves a sequence of actions that must go beyond a project-by-project engagement. The sequencing requirement is especially well-documented in the Programming Directions for climate change and for international waters in GEF-6 and for the IPs in GEF-7.

33. Both programming documents also require creating enabling conditions for effective scaling up of impact. These include support for changes in policies, laws and regulations; institutional capacity; and mainstreaming environmental concerns in public budgets. In addition, the Programming Directions for both GEF phases emphasize engagement with the private sector and the use of market-based mechanisms and incentives as important impact multipliers.

34. The Programming Directions also require leveraging partnerships with other development finance agencies, which is at the very core of GEF’s business model, but also with other relevant stakeholders, including CSOs and communities. Learning and knowledge management are key elements emphasized in the documents.

Perspectives from the GEF Partnership

Across the GEF partnership, there is a variable understanding of what scaling up is. However, most understand it as the geographical expansion of interventions that produces environmental benefits.

35. Interviews with members of the GEF partnership revealed that there are different interpretations to scaling up and the process through which it is achieved. When asked how their respective institutions defined scaling up, responses from 9 representatives of various GEF Secretariat teams and 9 GEF coordination units of GEF Agencies were varied and broadly included descriptions of the term, conditions related to the scaling up process, the types of interventions intended to result in scaling up, and what their respective institutions aimed to scale up. The most common description of scaling up, mentioned by nearly half of those interviewed, was the geographical expansion of interventions that produce environmental benefits. Other common descriptions of scaling up included an increase in financing, the broader adoption of interventions into government policies and institutions, and systemic or transformational changes. More than half of interviewees from the GEF Secretariat mentioned systemic or transformational change to describe scaling up, as compared with only two of the GEF Agencies.

36. Among the GEF Agencies, the most common description of scaling up referred to partnerships and collaboration among different institutions as an approach to implement an intervention at scale. This was mentioned by more than half of GEF Agencies interviewed. Only a third mentioned an increase in financing to describe scaling up.

37. The five interviewed global partnerships also did not appear to have explicit definitions of scaling up. However, in their descriptions, scaling was equated with an increase in positive socioeconomic and environmental impacts, as well as with an increase in financing. Like the GEF, they also approach scaling up of impacts by strengthening the underlying systems, addressing drivers, and removing barriers to delivering impact at scale. The two climate change partnerships (CIF and GCF) explicitly connect the concept of scaling up with their vision of transformation or paradigm shift toward low-carbon or climate-resilient development. In this way, they associate scaling up with changing economic systems.

38. The planning for, and process of scaling up varies across focal areas. Interviewees noted that many interventions in the biodiversity, land degradation, and chemicals and waste focal areas were assumed to be spontaneously adopted and replicated through knowledge dissemination, if the results of the pilot were successful. The climate change mitigation focal area has had a more concrete model for scaling that starts from piloting an innovation, which is then replicated incrementally at larger and larger geographical scales, until there is full market penetration. The international waters focal area is distinct in that prior to the GEF's broader shift towards scaling up, GEF support has typically first focused on examining the environmental issues to be addressed at the larger scale, and has then identified the interventions that need to be piloted at smaller scales, prior to eventually scaling up impact.

Defining Scaling Up

39. Drawing on the range of definitions and perspectives from the literature and interviews, this evaluation defines scaling up impacts in the GEF as: increasing the magnitude of global environment benefits (GEBs), and/or expanding the geographical and sectoral areas where they

are generated to cover a defined ecological, economic, or governance unit. In the process of scaling up GEBs, social and economic benefits may also be scaled up; in many cases, scaling up such benefits may be the means to removing barriers to scaling up GEBs. Scaling up is a continuous process which often takes place over longer time horizons, and as such, scaling up objectives need to be continually set and achieved until impacts are generated at the magnitude and scope of the targeted scale.

Modes of Scaling

Scaling up efforts in the GEF take the form of support for replicating, mainstreaming and linking interventions that are designed to generate global environmental benefits.

40. From the various ideas associated with the term “scaling up” in the interviews, three modes of scaling up, often interdependent, emerged: replication, mainstreaming, and linking. These terms, more specific to the GEF context, are analogous to the terms “horizontal”, “vertical” and “functional” scaling up, respectively, which are more commonly used in the scaling up literature. All three modes of scaling up are processes that may take place through one or more projects—whether in parallel or in sequence—that all contribute to generating a specific impact at a target scale.

41. Within the GEF 2020 strategy, replication and mainstreaming correspond broadly with the idea of GEF interventions being scaled up by others, while linking is associated with market or behavioral transformations, working directly at a large scale. In its previous evaluations, the IEO has assessed progress towards impact, specifically the broader adoption of GEF-supported interventions by other actors, in terms of processes similar to these modes. This current evaluation assesses these processes specifically in terms of how they contribute to scaling up impacts.

A. Replication

Analogous to definitions in the literature, scaling up in terms of geographic expansion is described as the replication of interventions beyond the project’s original geographic or administrative boundaries.

42. **Replication** refers to the implementation of the same intervention multiple times thereby increasing the number of stakeholders and/or covering larger areas, by leveraging finance, knowledge, and policy. That is, an intervention may be implemented across a wider area either through government or other funders investing more money for this purpose; through knowledge about the intervention motivating stakeholders to implement using their own resources; through a policy requiring or encouraging stakeholders to implement an intervention; or a combination of these. This evaluation defines replication as a mode of scaling up only where the expanded implementation of an intervention was clearly intended to reach a specific scale, such as a province or a country, rather than a simple repetition of an intervention.

43. For example, in Senegal, GEF supported the piloting of 10 Ecovillages (UNDP, GEF ID 4080). During the course of the project, initial successes allowed the national government to replicate the approach in an additional 84 villages without additional GEF funding, by reallocating GEF funds mainly towards training and livelihoods, and tapping civil society and private sector funds for renewable energy infrastructure. By the end of the project, the national government had scaled up the approach at the national level by initiating replication in an additional 400 villages through an agency created specifically for this purpose.

44. When high-impact, effective approaches already exist, the comparator global partnerships interviewed mentioned that they replicate such approaches at a larger scale. This was especially the case in the health sector. In the climate change sector, GCF seeks to scale up effective interventions that have been previously implemented by other institutions, including by the GEF. The GCF also aims to develop faster and more efficient approaches based on the experience of other institutions.

45. While replication is the most common form of scaling up in the literature, none of the institutions interviewed described scaling up exclusively in terms of replication. Other forms of scaling up included sectoral and institutional expansion through mainstreaming and linking.

B. Mainstreaming

46. **Mainstreaming** involves the integration of an intervention's implementation within an institution's regular operations, usually through a policy or legal framework. While mainstreaming typically happens within a specific national or local government agency, it may also occur simultaneously through multiple government sector agencies, or in other institutions, such as donors, civil society organizations, and the private sector. This evaluation defines mainstreaming as a mode of scaling up only where the adoption by institutions results in the intervention being implemented and expanded to reach a specific higher scale, such as a province, country or region.

47. For example, national governments, research institutions and private sector companies may all commit to applying integrated coastal management in their respective areas of work as signatories of the GEF-supported Sustainable Development Strategy for the Seas of East Asia (SDS-SEA). One national government may accomplish this by creating more marine protected areas; a research institution may develop and advocate for more sustainable fishing regulations; a private company may decide to switch to fishing technology that reduces bycatch. These interventions, applying the same management approach in different sectors and different contexts, in aggregate, contribute to increasing sustainable fisheries in the East Asian seas.

48. Four of the five interviewed global partnerships aim to systematically mainstream their approaches into the regular operations of implementing institutions by only supporting interventions that can be sustained through domestic financing. In the education sector, all GPE support is channeled through the national processes and policies. In the climate change sector,

the CIF support the mainstreaming of climate change mitigation and resilience considerations in government institutions and multilateral development banks, especially in their decision-making and budgeting processes.

C. Linking

49. Almost all GEF stakeholders interviewed described scaling up as the linking of interventions and actors across either different geographic locations, administrative levels, focal areas, or sectors and institutions, or a combination of these. **Linking** was often described as the implementation of multiple types of interventions that, by design, all contribute to the same impact at the scale of a system defined by environmental, economic, or administrative boundaries. Among the systems mentioned were a landscape, seascape, ecoregion, a value chain, supply chain, or a national government.

50. Within value and supply chains, linking takes place between interventions which address causes and effects; for example, through working both in countries where deforestation or wildlife poaching occurs, and countries where demand for the forest and wildlife resources is high. Market change, which the GEF IEO has tracked in previous evaluations to assess progress towards impact, may be one form of linking within value chains when it addresses both supply and demand sides.

51. When UNIDO and CAF engage in a country, they map out the activities of the various stakeholders to address issues in a particular value chain. Periodically mapping out existing interventions and resources in a logical chain or matrix helps them identify existing gaps. These agencies then design interventions to fill those gaps. The IW focal area uses a similar approach through its TDA-SAP methodology¹. Linking is also the basis for scaling up in the Integrated Approach Pilots in GEF-6 and Impact Programs in GEF-7.

52. Within national or sub-national administrative systems, scaling up through linking is done across different levels of governance, such as municipal, provincial and national government units, as well as across multiple sectors, such as agencies for environment, health, agriculture, and social welfare.

53. Scaling up through creation of links has also been referred to as implementing different interventions under a common theme or transboundary issue, such as water pollution or fisheries. This also includes implementing projects addressing multiple focal areas in an integrated manner within a specific geographic or ecological unit, such as under UNDP-SGP's current approach to approving grants in "graduated countries". The GEF's SFM program also identifies the implementation of multifocal area (MFA) projects, particularly those that link

¹ The TDA-SAP methodology refers to the focal area's approach of first defining the key environmental issues to be addressed in a large marine ecosystem or water basin through a transboundary diagnostic analysis (TDA), followed by a strategic action programme (SAP) endorsed by countries that outlines how each of them will address these issues to achieve GEBs at the scale of the transboundary water bodies.

livelihoods and food security to ecosystem services in production landscapes, as a strategy for “promoting large-scale transformation”.

54. Interventions are often linked through a programmatic approach. The GEF Programmatic Approach Paper, published in 2008, particularly identifies programs as a means of securing “larger-scale and sustained impact on the global environment through integrating global environmental objectives into national or regional strategies and plans using partnerships”. The scaling up approach through linking is consistent with GEF’s shift towards addressing drivers rather than symptoms of environmental degradation to achieve more sustainable impacts at scale, through the programmatic approaches, by providing more support to multi-stakeholder platforms at the regional and global levels than it did in its earlier phases.

55. Interviews confirmed that this shift is taking place within GEF Agencies as well. Increasingly, emphasis is placed on working across sectors and designing focused interventions within ecologically important areas, rather than on implementing several independent interventions in multiple locations. However, it was also clear from the interviews that this shift has not been influenced by the GEF, but part of an overall global move to maximize impact with limited funds, especially among international non-governmental organizations (NGOs), and technical UN Agencies, which typically have to work with smaller funding envelopes.

56. Four of the five global partnerships interviewed for this evaluation scale up through action plans and investments that link across sectors and subsectors, supply and value chains, and in some instances across common transboundary issues. For example, the CIF’s country investment plans set out strategically connected investments built around a transformative vision. These country investment plans are aligned with existing initiatives and focus on cross-sector linkages. The GCF has recently started using linking as a way of scaling up climate change impacts through its 2017 Framework for Complementarity and Coherence. This framework sets principles to strengthen the fund’s complementarity and enhance coherence with other climate finance institutions. As an application of the framework, national institutions and key stakeholders in Lao PDR met in February 2019 to explore synergies between proposed programming plans for GCF and GEF in the country.

D. GEF Agency approaches to scaling up

57. Interviews revealed that grant organizations such as UN agencies and international NGOs, scale up through linking by partnering with institutions across different sectors. In this way, they leverage the resources and comparative advantages of their partners. For example, in non-GEF projects, UNIDO demonstrates the potential impact and viability of a project through their technical assistance. This demonstration then leverages larger funds from the Asian Development Bank and the World Bank to implement the infrastructure component of the project, allowing an intervention to be scaled through replication. UNIDO may also partner with the Ministry of Finance, Ministry of Health, and bilateral donors to implement other types of interventions. Through linking, these grant organizations primarily play a convening and coordinating role to bring coherence to the multiple interventions, such as in UNIDO’s matrix

mapping. They may also scale up through replication, but mainly by leveraging co-financing from partners.

58. On the other hand, multilateral development banks (MDBs) such as the World Bank and Asian Development Bank provide larger amounts of funding through loans, and typically scale up through replication. Governments use the loans to duplicate successful pilots within a larger region or throughout the entire country. In addition to financing, MDBs provide technical expertise in ensuring standards are maintained.

III. PROFILE OF CASES AND RESULTS

59. This chapter presents a profile of the cases assessed for this evaluation and the outcomes of GEF support to scaling up for these selected cases. The evaluation reviewed 20 cases where quantifiable positive outcomes were reported, and where information on the factors influencing scaling up could be assessed. An additional 14 cases with information on financial support and quantitative outcomes were analyzed, and 26 cases with qualitative information were used to understand the factors influencing scaling up. Of the total sample of 60 cases, 10 provided information on factors and conditions that contributed to scaling up not being achieved or sustained, discussed further in the next chapter.

Profile of Cases

60. The 20 cases consist of 38 projects, with 65 percent of the cases comprising at least two projects each. Projects within each case are explicitly stated as being linked in the project documents and contribute to the same impact². The maximum number of projects in one case was 6 child projects under a single program. Seven cases had one project each. Most climate change mitigation (CCM) cases had one project. Table 1 presents the profile of these cases. The cases are not meant to be representative of the scaling up experience in each focal area, but rather demonstrate a range of interventions and results corresponding with the range of GEF support provided and the variety of contexts that the GEF works in.

Table 1. Profile of cases assessed

Name of Scaling up Case	GEF-supported Projects in Case	Focal Area	Scaling Targets	Target Geographical Scale
Bangladesh IDCOL	GEF ID 1209	Climate Change Mitigation	Expand access to solar home systems in rural areas	Country
Brazil ARPA	GEF ID 771; 4085	Biodiversity	Expand and consolidate the protected areas system	Amazon region
Brazil Rio Rural	GEF ID 1544	Land Degradation/ MFA	Demonstrate and increase adoption of biodiversity-friendly and climate-friendly agricultural practices through integrated ecosystem management	Northwest region of the state of Rio de Janeiro
China CHUEE	GEF ID 2624	Climate Change Mitigation	Develop partnerships and capacities for a commercially sustainable delivery mechanism for energy efficiency projects	Country

²Any projects that were not explicitly mentioned as being linked in project documents, but which may have contributed to scaling up the same outcomes within the same context, have therefore not been included in a case as there was no systematic way of identifying these projects. For the same reason, the analyses in this chapter also exclude support from and results of non-GEF initiatives.

China CRESP	GEF ID 446; 943; 4493	Climate Change Mitigation	Demonstrate and increase installed renewable energy capacity to reduce carbon emissions	Country
China DDT	GEF ID 2629; 2932	Chemicals & Waste	Dispose of DDT waste, eliminate production and consumption of dicofol, demonstrate and replicate integrated pest management technology, commercialize alternatives to DDT and TBT in antifouling paint	Country
China IEM	GEF ID 956; 2369; 3484; 3483; 3608; 3611	Land Degradation/ MFA	Demonstrate and establish enabling conditions for adoption of integrated ecosystem management in agricultural areas adjacent to protected areas	Dryland ecosystems
China Termite Control	GEF ID 2359	Chemicals & Waste	Eliminate production and consumption of chlordane and mirex by termite professionals	Country
Costa Rica PES	GEF ID 671; 2884	Biodiversity	Increase the area of forest under protection and sustainable management through payments for environmental services in private lands adjacent to protected areas	Country
Ethiopia SLM	GEF ID 2794; 5220	Land Degradation/ MFA	Increase area of agricultural land under sustainable land management	Vulnerable watershed areas in country
Indonesia COREMAP	GEF ID 116; 1829	Biodiversity	Demonstrate and establish framework for community-based coral reef management	Country
Macedonia PCB	GEF ID 1518; 2875	Chemicals & Waste	Demonstrate cheaper alternative for treating PCBs	Country
Mauritius POPs	GEF ID 1824; 3205	Chemicals & Waste	Dispose of DDT and PCB, treat contaminated soils, establish integrated vector management system as alternative to DDT	Country
Mexico Ilumex	GEF ID 575	Climate Change Mitigation	Demonstrate feasibility of energy-efficient lighting and replicate demand-side management	Country
Namibia NACOMA	GEF ID 1505; 4669	Biodiversity	Strengthen and finance the protected area system and mainstream biodiversity conservation in adjacent lands	Terrestrial and marine protected area systems
Philippines CCA	GEF ID 3243; 4967	Climate Change Adaptation	Build capacity for and promote adoption of weather-based insurance index	Country

Romania IW	GEF ID 1159; 2970	International Waters	Increase use of agricultural practices that reduce nutrient discharge to the Danube River and the Black Sea	Country
Senegal Ecovillages	GEF ID 4080	Multifocal Area	Demonstrate integrated approach to reduce carbon emissions, protect biodiversity, and create livelihood opportunities in rural areas	Country
Uganda PA	GEF ID 101; 1830	Biodiversity	Strengthen institutional capacity for long-term biodiversity conservation	Protected area system
Uruguay Wind Energy	GEF ID 2826	Climate Change Mitigation	Demonstrate wind power plant and remove barriers to commercial investments in wind energy	Country

61. The cases cover a time span of 20 years from the pilot phase to GEF-5, a third of the projects were approved under GEF-4 (Table 2). The earliest project, Mexico ILUMEX (GEF ID 5757), started implementation in 1994. The most recent project, the second phase of the Philippines CCA case (GEF ID 4967), started in November 2014. All projects have been completed, with the exception of the scaling up project in the Ethiopia SLM case (GEF ID 5220) and phase II of the China CRESP case (GEF ID 4493). Ongoing projects in the Brazil ARPA, Indonesia COREMAP and China IEM cases, have not been included in this analysis as they have not undergone midterm reviews.

62. In terms of GEF grants, GEF-2 has the largest share (29%), which includes a \$40 million China CRESP project (phase 1) and a \$30 million Brazil ARPA project.

Table 2. Distribution of projects and financing in assessed cases by GEF replenishment phase

GEF replenishment phase	No of projects	% of total selected projects	Sum of GEF grants (USD)	% of total GEF grants
GEF - 1	5	13%	56,600,000	17%
GEF - 2	7	18%	97,567,000	29%
GEF - 3	8	21%	71,273,900	21%
GEF - 4	13	34%	62,332,250	18%
GEF - 5	4	11%	41,215,000	12%
Pilot Phase	1	3%	10,000,000	3%
Grand Total	38	100%	338,988,150	100%

Extent of GEF Support

Based on the evidence, GEF support to scaling up activities varied widely in terms of grant amount, time frame, and project modality, but typically lasted for longer than 5 years and leveraged higher co-financing ratios at the scaling up stage.

63. The amount of GEF support provided for the scaling up process ranged from \$0.95 million to \$100.5 million. On average, this translates to \$16.9 million in GEF grants per case, with the median at \$10.3 million. This was complemented by an average of \$129 million in co-financing, with a median of \$35.8 million. Combining GEF and co-financing funds, the average amount of funds invested for the scaling up process in each case was \$145.9 million (median of \$46.1 million).³

64. As with the over-all GEF portfolio, the CCM cases received the largest amount of GEF funding and co-financing on average (Table 3).

Table 3. Total GEF funding and cofinancing for scaling up processes by focal area

Focal area	No of cases	Total GEF funding per case (USD \$ Million)				Total Cofinancing per case (USD \$ Million)				Total cost per case			
		Min	Max	Mean	Total	Min	Max	Mean	Total	Min	Max	Mean	Total
BD	5	6.8	46.0	18.5	92.3	29.7	121.5	78.2	390.9	36.5	167.4	96.7	483.5
CCM	5	0.95	100.5	27.2	136.2	6.0	1,021.4	253.0	1,265.2	7.0	1,121.9	280.3	1,401.3
CW	4	1.3	16.4	8.4	33.4	1.0	23.9	10.0	40.0	2.3	40.3	18.4	73.5
LD/MFA	3	6.7	28.8	19.2	57.5	8.2	590.4	240.7	722.1	14.9	619.2	259.9	779.6
CCA	1	6.0				66.7				72.7			
IW	1	10.7				81.8				92.4			
MFA	1	2.9				13.2				16.1			

65. The median time period over which the GEF provided support was 10 years, with some scaling up outcomes achieved in as short a time as 3.5 years, which is about the span of one medium-sized project, and some in as long as 18 years (Table 5). Other cases reviewed for this evaluation received GEF support for as long as 25 years or more, with higher targets for the scale of outcomes and geographic area. This confirms the broader experience in the literature

³Calculations in most cases include the full GEF grant and cofinancing amounts; few cases distinguished between activities contributing to the piloting and scaling stages, both of which are part of the same scaling up process within each case. The analyses in this chapter assume that all project activities contributed directly or indirectly to achieving the reported results.

and stakeholder interviews that successful scaling up takes about 10 to 15 years of sustained effort.

Table 4. Years of GEF support by focal area

Focal area	No of cases	Elapsed time (years)		
		Min	Max	Mean
BD	5	10	15	12.8
CCM	5	3.5	16.5	8.9
CW	4	5.5	12.5	8.9
LD/ MFA	3	6.5	14	9.7
CCA	1	7.5		
IW	1	15.5		
MFA	1	6		

A. Piloting vs Scaling

66. GEF support for the piloting and scaling up stages were identified through explicit references in project titles, objectives, or project components. While piloting was carried out through different project modalities, all scaling up support was provided through full-sized projects (Table 5).

Table 5. Project modalities used for piloting and scaling up stages

Project Type	Piloting	Scaling up
Enabling Activity	2	0
Medium-sized Project	3	0
Full-sized Project	24	13
Total	29*	13*

*Four full-sized projects are counted twice, as each has piloting and scaling up components within the same project.

67. **GEF grants were higher during the pilot stage.** The GEF provided an average of \$8 million for the pilot stage, ranging from \$0.95 million (Uruguay Wind Energy) to \$35 million (China CRESPI) (Table 6). The Uruguay Wind Energy case had the smallest amount of GEF funding because it only had one medium-sized project. However, in the other cases reviewed for verification, the GEF grant at pilot stage was as low as \$45,000, which came through an SGP project.

68. An average of \$5.5 million in GEF funds was invested for the scaling up stage (n=11, for cases where GEF support at this stage could be distinguished). In some cases, information on GEF funding was only available for the pilot stage, as the scaling up stage was funded by government or other donors. The China CRESPI case has the largest amount of GEF funding for the scaling up stage (\$65.5 million), which is the sum of the grants for two full-sized projects.

Table 6. GEF funding for piloting and scaling up stages by focal area

Focal area	No of cases	GEF funding for piloting (USD \$ Million)				GEF funding for Scaling up (USD \$ Million)			
		Min	Max	Median	Total	Min	Max	Median	Total
BD	5	4.1	30.0	8.0	57.0	0	16.0	8.8	35.3
CCM	5	0.95	35.0	10.0	70.7	0	65.5	NA	65.5
CW	4	1.3	11.1	6.0	24.5	0	1.6	0.8	2.3
LD/MFA	3	6.7	28.8	9.0	44.6	0	13.0	NA	13.0
CCA	1	5.0				1.1			
IW	1	5.2				5.5			
MFA	1	2.4				0.2			

Note: Fewer projects are included in the calculations for the scaling up stage, as GEF support was only for the pilot stage in several projects or has just started for the scaling stage. In three cases, calculations for the pilot stage include only the amounts allocated for piloting in the project components; for all other cases, the full GEF project grant amounts were used.

69. For the 11 cases with available data, the median ratio of GEF grants allocated for piloting compared to scaling is 1.9, i.e. almost double the funding was invested at the pilot stage than in the scaling up stage. This is reflective of higher upfront costs of establishing the appropriate enabling conditions and also reflects a learning curve during pilots. The pilot-to-scaling ratios vary greatly across projects ranging from 0.5 (China CRESPI, indicating more resources for scaling up) to 14.2 (China Termite Control, wherein piloting had more resources). The China CRESPI case has two full-sized projects in the scaling up stage, but only one full-sized project as pilot. The China Termite Control case was one project that included both piloting and scaling up, with a small portion of its project funding targeted at scaling up, specifically for the

development of a national replication program. Most of the funds were used to demonstrate integrated pest management in three provinces through the pilots.

70. **Higher levels of co-financing were achieved during scaling up.** The median ratio of co-financing for piloting to scaling up is 0.7, indicating higher co-financing leveraged per GEF dollar at the scaling stage. In general, the co-financing ratio for GEF projects was higher during scaling than for piloting. GEF grants leveraged up to 12.6 times more co-financing in the scaling up stage, with an average of about double the co-financing ratio during scaling relative to that for piloting, which is the opposite observed in GEF grant amounts. This suggests that as a result of GEF-supported pilots and enabling conditions, other donors contributed more resources to support the scaling up process.

B. Modes of scaling

71. **In 95 percent of the cases, scaling up was achieved by replicating interventions over a wider geographical area.** At the same time, 16 of the 20 cases also aimed to mainstream the implementation of interventions within plans and programs at different levels of government, and in some cases across different government agencies. Only 4 cases used linking in addition to the two other modes to scale up impact. These 4 cases addressed specific environmental issues through multiple sectors, although linking was not planned from the beginning in all cases. This is not surprising and reflects earlier GEF project designs, as it was only in 2014 when GEF introduced a greater focus on scaling up through linking interventions across sectors.

Sequence of Scaling Support

GEF has provided scaling up support in four distinct ways, with most investments in scaling contingent on the positive results of pilots.

GEF supported the piloting and scaling up stages in the cases examined in four different ways:

- (a) Piloting and scaling up were planned for and implemented within the same project through different components;
- (b) Piloting and scaling up were planned for at the design stage of the pilot project, and implemented through multiple consecutive or parallel projects;
- (c) Piloting and scaling up were implemented through consecutive GEF projects based on results of the pilot stage;
- (d) Piloting was supported by GEF projects, while the scaling up stage was funded through other sources based on results of the pilot stage.

72. The BD and LD/MFA cases, focusing on protected area system and integrated ecosystem management, were mainly scaled up through piloting and scaling up occurring through a series of sequential projects, whether planned or unplanned. These types of interventions typically rely on community members and government field staff to implement activities on the ground

through incremental expansion over a progressively wider geographical area (Table 7). On the other hand, most CCM cases were scaled up with government or other resources after the GEF supported piloting through a single project. In these cases, GEF support was used to test the technical and financial feasibility of a certain technology, as well as support the establishment of enabling conditions for scaling up by other stakeholders. While only one IW case was assessed for this analysis, under the the TDA-SAP approach GEF supports both piloting and scaling up stages before governments and other donors fully support further scaling. The IW focal area study in 2016 showed that GEF-supported projects in LMEs such as the Yellow Sea that are linked by the TDA-SAP approach have scaled up outcomes to some extent through long-term GEF funding. Due to the purposive sampling approach, the 20 cases assessed do not necessarily represent the typical scaling up experience in each focal area.

73. In most cases, scaling up was not planned and budgeted for at the outset, but was contingent on the success of the pilots. While the case study analysis revealed that 19 out of 20 cases had a vision to scale up, as indicated in their project documents, Table 7 shows that 75% of cases (15 out of 20) did not allocate a budget for the scaling up stage at the outset. This suggests that support for scaling up was often contingent on the success of pilots, making use of adaptive learning rather than fixed plans.

Table 7. Different sequence types of how the GEF provided support to scaling up processes

Type of scaling up sequence	No of Cases							Total
	BD	CCM	CCA	LD/MFA	IW	Chem	MFA	
Piloting and scaling up were planned for and implemented within the same project through different components	0	0	0	0	0	China DDT China Termite Control	Senegal Ecovillages	3
Piloting and scaling up were planned for at the design stage of the pilot project, and implemented through multiple consecutive or parallel projects	Brazil ARPA Indonesia COREMAP	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

Piloting and scaling up were implemented through consecutive GEF projects based on results of the pilot stage	Costa Rica PES Namibia NACOMA	China CRESP	Philippines CCA	Ethiopia SLM China IEM	Romania IW	0	0	7
Piloting was supported by GEF projects, while the scaling up stage was funded through other sources based on results of the pilot stage	Uganda PA	Bangladesh IDCOL China CHUEE Mexico Illumex Uruguay Wind Energy	0	Brazil Rio Rural	0	Macedonia PCB Mauritius POPs	0	8
Total	5	5	1	3	1	4	1	20

74. The piloting stage may consist of a pilot intervention to test effectiveness in a specific context, followed by pilots at a larger scale to test their viability for scaling up. In most cases (17 out of 20), GEF first implemented pilots at a small scale, followed by support for pilots and enabling conditions at a larger scale (Table 8). In 3 cases, bilateral funding was used to test the viability of the intervention in the country. In all cases, GEF was involved in creating or strengthening the enabling conditions for scaling up pilots that had previously shown results at a smaller scale.

Table 8. Scaling up stages at which the GEF provided support

PERIOD OF GEF SUPPORT	NO. OF CASES	(n=20)
Piloted intervention within specific context	17	85%
Piloted for scaling / established enabling conditions for scaling	19	95%
Actual scaling of intervention	4	20%

75. For example, in Brazil, a project was originally designed to introduce SLM practices within one of the poorest regions of the state of Rio de Janeiro (GEF ID 1544). The project did not have a scaling objective, yet created enabling conditions such as a multi-stakeholder partnership of different state agencies, which subsequent World Bank projects used for further expansion.

76. The GEF has continued to support scaling processes beyond the establishment of enabling conditions in 4 out of 20 cases – Brazil ARPA, China IEM, Indonesia COREMAP and Namibia NACOMA. The Brazil ARPA and Indonesia COREMAP cases are long-term programs funded by multiple donors with clear objectives to scale up from the beginning.

Results

In general, GEF support generated higher outcomes per dollar per year during the scaling up stage as compared to the piloting stage, reflective of cost-efficiencies and higher co-financing leveraged for scaling up activities.

77. In 5 cases where results were reported separately for the piloting and scaling stages, outcomes during the scaling up stage were larger per dollar of GEF grant per year than in the piloting stage. This suggests not only greater cost-effectiveness through learning from pilots and potential economies of scale, but also higher co-financing leveraged for scaling per GEF dollar.

78. Outcomes in the scaling up stage ranged from being 1.1 to 74.5 times larger than those in the piloting stage within the same cases, with a median of 4.6. Outcomes are not meant to be representative of the results of each focal area, but rather show a range of results corresponding with the range of GEF support provided and the variety of contexts that the GEF works in.

79. Results have been standardized and are reported here as the magnitude of environmental outcomes achieved per million dollars of GEF grant per year. Standardized outcomes were calculated by dividing total reported outcomes by the total GEF grant amount and by the total number of years of implementation of all projects within each case. The figures represent the combined outcomes of the pilot and scaling up stages where GEF provided support for both. Given the difficulty in systematically tracking scaled-up outcomes beyond GEF funding, the calculations only include results reported in terminal and midterm evaluations and may underestimate the outcomes catalyzed by GEF support.

80. The following analysis illustrates the various types of interventions supported by the GEF in each focal area, and the corresponding results that contribute to each focal area's objectives within their specific contexts. It shows environmental results with common units of measurement across and within cases, within a focal area. In at least two cases, common indicators could not be found between projects within the same case or with other cases within a focal area. Having at least one common indicator within and across cases is necessary to measure progress in scaling up at the project as well as portfolio level.

A. Biodiversity

Standardized outcomes were as much as 74.5 times higher in the scaling up stage than in the piloting stage within the same case.

81. All BD cases aimed to increase biodiversity conservation through various types of interventions. In two of the BD cases, results at the piloting and scaling up stages were reported separately (Table 9).

Table 9. Comparison of outcomes between piloting and scaling up stages for biodiversity cases

Case	Environmental Outcome Measured	Piloting Stage (ha/million \$/yr)	Scaling up Stage (ha/million \$/yr)
Brazil ARPA	new PAs created	133,333	64,077
Brazil ARPA	existing PAs consolidated	5,211	387,894
Costa Rica PES	forest under PES contracts	2,727	3,018

82. In the Brazil ARPA case, two major activities implemented were the creation of new protected areas and the consolidation of existing protected areas. During the piloting stage, a total of \$30 million in GEF grants helped to create 24 million ha of new PAs and consolidate 0.94 million ha of PAs in 6 years. In the scaling up stage, \$15.9 million in GEF grants contributed to the creation of 5.6 million ha of PAs and consolidation of 33.9 million ha of PAs in 5.5 years. The scaling up project was able to consolidate an area 74.5 times larger than the pilot project for the same cost within the same amount of time (Table 11).

83. On the other hand, the scaling up project was able to create less than half the area of new PAs as the pilot project for the same amount. This is likely due to political changes during the scaling stage that led to Congress freezing the budget and degazetting PAs, instead of increasing the government budget for scaling up, which was key to the project's exit strategy. Because of this unexpected political change, international donors and the national government's executive branch decided to maximize the funds by maintaining the existing PAs rather than expanding to new areas.

84. In the Costa Rica PES case, the first project brought 130,900 ha of land under PES contracts in 6 years with \$8 million in GEF grants. The second project placed another 166,004 ha of land under PES contracts in 5.5 years with \$10 million in GEF grants. The rate at which forests were protected under PES contracts was at a minimum 11% higher during the scaling up stage compared to during the pilot (Table 11). However, the bulk of the GEF grant for the second project (\$7.5 million) was used to capitalize a biodiversity trust fund, which did not generate outcomes until after the project ended in 2014.

85. In effect, only \$2.5 million in GEF funds was used to generate the results in the second project, increasing the rate to 12,073 ha/million \$/yr or 4.4 times higher than in the piloting

stage. The higher outcome per GEF dollar may be attributed to the increase in co-financing from \$41.2 million in the first project to \$118.1 million in the second project. The actual co-financing was about \$30 million higher than what had been committed during the second project's design stage. The benefits of the approach demonstrated by the first project convinced the national government to invest more, illustrating the leverage made using GEF grants. As of 2017, 1.2 million ha were reported to be under PES contracts, not including the area benefiting from the biodiversity trust fund.

B. Climate change mitigation and adaptation

86. Annual CO₂ emission reduction was the common indicator in 4 out of 5 CCM cases. Of the 5 cases, only the China CRESP case received GEF support for scaling up beyond one project. The pilot project demonstrated the viability of large-scale wind and photovoltaic technology with \$35 million in GEF grants over 9 years. The scaling up project and its second phase currently under implementation has focused on wind energy, totaling \$65.5 million in GEF support over an expected implementation period of 12 years. China CRESP used a second indicator that was common among its three projects, measuring the increase in installed renewable energy capacity in MW (Table 10). While the rate of annual CO₂ emission reduction decreased by 25% from piloting to scaling, likely due to the second scaling project currently still under implementation, the installed capacity increased 8.6 times during the same period.

Table 10. Comparison of outcomes between piloting and scaling up stages for climate change mitigation and adaptation cases

Case	Environmental Outcome Measured	Piloting Stage (per million \$/ yr)	Scaling up Stage (per million \$/ yr)
China CRESP	installed renewable energy capacity	19.0 MW	164.5 MW*
China CRESP	annual carbon emission reduction	80,808 tons CO ₂ /yr	55,203 tons CO ₂ /yr*
Philippines CCA	farmers covered by weather index-based insurance	18.8 users	766 users

*includes results reported at midterm

87. The only CCA case, implemented in the Philippines, tracked the number of farmer beneficiaries in both piloting and scaling up projects (Table 13). In the pilot project, 607 people benefited over 6.5 years with \$5 million in GEF grant, while the scaling up project covered 2,413 beneficiaries in 3 years of implementation with USD\$ 1.1 million GEF grants. The rate of beneficiaries covered during the scaling up project is almost 40 times higher than that during the pilot project.

C. Land degradation

88. Increased area under SLM was an indicator used by two out of three LD/MFA cases to measure scaled-up environmental outcomes. The Ethiopia SLM case was the only LD/MFA case where results of GEF support for both piloting and scaling stages have been reported. The pilot stage lasted for 5 years, bringing 2,734 ha of land under SLM per million dollars per year. In the 3.5 years of scaling up following the pilot thus far, this has increased 4.6 times, to 12,674.5 ha/million \$/yr (Table 11).

Table 11. Comparison of outcomes between piloting and scaling up stages for a land degradation/ multifocal area case

Case	Environmental Outcome Measured	Piloting Stage (ha/million \$/yr)	Scaling up Stage (ha/million \$/yr)
Ethiopia SLM	area under SLM	2,734	12,675*

*results reported at midterm

D. Chemicals and waste

89. All CW cases except one eliminated 100% of targeted chemicals by the end of the project. Among other indicators, projects in this focal area measure environmental outcomes in terms of the percent elimination of the total amount of chemicals identified in national inventories and national implementation plans supported by the GEF. In this focal area, either piloting and scaling up were completed within the same project, or scaling up took place after GEF support ended, therefore outcomes for the two stages cannot be compared.

90. Post-project information on the Macedonia PCB case illustrates how GEF grants may be leveraged to scale up outcomes beyond the project period. The case includes an Enabling Activity and a medium-sized project, which together spanned an implementation period of 11.5 years. Almost 22% of identified PCBs (167.25 out of 764 tons) was eliminated by the end of the medium-sized project in 2013, resulting in a standardized outcome of 1.32% of PCBs eliminated per million dollars of GEF support for every year of implementation. The Enabling Activity that preceded it established a POPs Unit within the Ministry of Environment. The POPs Unit has now built the capacity to manage all chemicals-related projects in the country. As of July 2018, PCB elimination in Macedonia had increased to 87% without further GEF support, or an additional 67% within 5 years post-project. This translates to a standardized outcome of 3.63%/million \$/yr, or almost three times higher than at project end. Financial challenges have led to slow progress in treating the few remaining transformers with PCBs (see section on Sustainability of Scaling up Initiatives).

E. International waters

91. The International Waters Focal Area Study and other sections of this report have recognized the positive outcomes of scaling up in regional IW interventions through the TDA-

SAP approach. The PEMSEA series of projects, which the GEF's IW focal area has been supporting for more than 25 years, has scaled up integrated coastal management from a few pilot sites to a region-wide intervention largely through multi-stakeholder partnerships. Among the activities it has supported to this end are: regional networks for local governments, research institutions, and legal experts; regional governance structures such as a high-level forum composed of environmental ministers of participating countries in the region, and a "partnership council" with representatives from the national and local governments, communities, NGOs, research and educational institutions, the private sector, and regional and international organizations; and the triennial East Asian Seas Congress that allows regional stakeholders to have dialogues, share lessons, and formally endorse regional targets that each of them contribute to.

92. The Romania IW case in this study did not have environmental indicators or units of measurement common to its two projects, making it difficult to track progress in scaling up. The most similar environmental indicators found between its two projects involved areas under management. The first project tracked increased percentage of area under nutrient management systems, while the follow-on project tracked hectares under sustainable management (Table 12). The World Bank started implementing a follow-on scaling up project without GEF support in 2017, the same year the first scaling up project ended. Among other environmental outcome indicators, this project also tracks hectares under sustainable management.

93. The main environmental objective of this case was to reduce nutrient discharge into water bodies. While a reduction of 255.5 tons of nitrogen per year was achieved by the end of the second project, allowing the country to comply with the EU Nitrate Directive, this indicator was not tracked in the first project. As in other cases in the other focal areas, other project outcomes are not presented here due to a lack of common indicators between the piloting and scaling up stages.

Table 12. Environmental outcomes of international waters case with no common indicator between piloting and scaling projects

Stage	Type of Land Management Measured	Standardized scaling up outcome (per million \$/ yr)
Piloting	area under nutrient management systems	1.2%
Scaling up	area under sustainable management	290 ha

F. Gender-related outcomes

Six cases identified results separately for women.

94. In the Bangladesh IDCOL case, the availability of rural electricity through solar home systems (SHS) increased women's empowerment. A 2012 impact study found that these homes had statistically better empowerment outcomes, specifically general decision-making and

economic decision-making, than households without SHS. It also found that women had increased mobility and increased feelings of security due to lighting. Village women were also getting trained on assembling SHS components; these women then became entrepreneurs running their own technology centers.

95. Nearly half of the farmer beneficiaries (46%) in the Philippines CCA case were women. The risk insurance payout supported their income to defray school expenses, food, labor to help with land, and debt from previous seasons.

96. Low-carbon income sources in the Senegal Ecovillages case employed 73% of women beneficiaries, such as in the making of clay stoves, processing of nontimber products, and soap production. Their time available for earning income also increased in part due to the reduced need to collect firewood. During interviews, women in one village said that they could now solve problems without waiting to ask men for money.

97. In the Brazil Rio Rural case, efforts at gender equality were made through the implementation of 9% of almost 3,000 subprojects under the direct leadership of women, such as in small-scale agro-industries, crafts, and clothes-making. An increase in beneficiaries through scaling up was not available as GEF support did not continue beyond the piloting stage, although within this project, replication of the approach exceeded its original target.

98. Similarly, a deliberate preference for women beneficiaries in the Costa Rica PES case has resulted in 15% of 16,712 PES contracts being issued to female landholders as of 2017.

99. Almost half (48%) of beneficiaries in the China IEM case were women. They were encouraged to participate in project management, decision-making, Village Implementation Groups, and public affairs. This was a big change in some rural areas where historically women did not have access to education. However, interviews found that traditional tasks such as managing the household continued to prevent women from participating in the activities, as these barriers were not addressed by the pilot projects.

Monitoring Progress

GEF projects or programs typically do not set or monitor quantitative targets relative to the scale of the environmental issues being addressed.

100. While GEF-supported projects typically set quantitative targets to be achieved, it is less common for these targets to be monitored and reported relative to the scale of the environmental issue that needs to be addressed in a specific ecological, economic or governance unit, such as the total number of hectares of a threatened biome that needs to be protected in a country or region.⁴ One exception is the CW focal area, where outcomes are

⁴ Such indicators are more common in the health and education sector, where scaling up often refers to increasing reach, and data on the total population of persons to be treated or educated within a country are available.

measured against the total amount of chemicals in the country that need disposal or treatment. The GEF provides funding through Enabling Activities to help countries build inventories of chemicals specified in the Stockholm and Minamata Conventions. The target is then typically set to eliminate 100% of the total tons of chemicals in an inventory, whether this is to be accomplished within the project period, or beyond, without GEF support.

101. In the GEF's Guidelines on Core Indicators and Sub-Indicators (2018), the core indicators relate to absolute numbers, e.g. area, tons, number of systems. They specify quantitative corporate targets for GEF-7 relative to the funding envelope available, but there is no reference to the total magnitude of each global problem being addressed, which would allow the GEF to assess how large or small the targets are relative to the global or other relevant scale, and the resources that would be needed to achieve impact at those scales.

102. The terminal evaluation guidelines require GEF Agencies to report on progress towards impact, which includes the extent to which interventions and results have been scaled up. However, these outcomes are often not reported in quantitative terms.

Sustainability of Scaling up Initiatives

In cases where scaling up activities continued beyond GEF support, the GEF contributed to their sustainability by catalyzing or establishing sustainable sources of financing and strengthening institutional capacities. However, long-term sustainability of scaling up activities is subject to risks arising from political and economic changes.

103. Cases that were assessed through previous evaluations have demonstrated mechanisms that promoted the sustainability of scaling up efforts beyond GEF support. For example, in the Uganda PA case, the financial management system set up by the GEF-supported projects that ended in 2010 (GEF IDs 101 and 1830) continues to be used and has allowed the government to allocate both tourism revenues and any incoming donor funds according to the needs of individual protected areas in the national system.

104. In the Bangladesh IDCOL case, the World Bank-implemented project (GEF ID 1209), managed by the Infrastructure Development Company Limited (IDCOL), developed a market for microfinance institutions to compete for customers for sales and servicing of the Solar Home Systems (SHS). A combination of microfinancing and declining subsidies for SHS, as well as the use of the local microfinance institutions that enjoyed high consumer trust, helped increase the demand for SHS. At the same time, the project also helped to develop the supply for SHS, batteries, and related equipment. By its completion in 2012, the project far exceeded its initial target of 50,000 SHS, installing 1.88 million SHS and bringing clean energy to 6% of the nation's population (IEG 2014). After project completion, with support from other donors, the market continued to grow. By December 2017, IDCOL had installed 4.13 million SHS, bringing solar energy to 12% of the entire Bangladesh population (IDCOL 2017). However, since late 2014, the rate of SHS installations in Bangladesh has slowed down, partly due to the rapid acceleration of grid connections in the government's push to achieve its target of universal electricity access by

2021. In response, IDCOL is taking several steps to keep microfinance institutions on the market, by providing financing to engage in other renewable energy programs, such as solar irrigation, improved cookstoves, and solar mini-grids (WBG 2018).

As part of this study field visits were conducted in Costa Rica, Macedonia and Mauritius to delve into the sustainability of scaled up projects.

Costa Rica

105. The payment for environmental services (PES) program in Costa Rica has been running for 5 years since GEF ended support in 2014 (GEF IDs 671 and 2884). It continues to be funded by revenues from a fuel tax and water tariff that are intended to offset carbon emissions from fossil fuel use and costs of maintaining watersheds that provide water to municipalities, respectively. At the same time, GEF capitalized a trust fund to provide payments specifically for protecting biodiversity, as the government had no existing funding source for that purpose. This currently generates a guaranteed annual return of 5%, which is used to fund operations and the biodiversity payments.

106. While these and other smaller revenue sources have allowed the program to continue, the program is always oversubscribed, and beneficiaries interviewed said that payments are not enough to replace income. The program itself has no specific scaling up targets, as its coverage depends entirely on the amount of funds available for distribution.

107. Since the government has made a strong push towards decarbonization, revenues from the fossil fuel tax are expected to eventually end. Private companies that used to be another source of revenue for payments, such as hydroelectric power plants and bottling companies, have also stopped participating in the program as it was no longer financially viable for them. As of 2018, the newly elected government was in discussions over new possible revenue sources.

Macedonia

108. In Macedonia, the GEF funded the purchase of equipment to treat polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) through a medium-sized project (GEF ID 2875). The equipment was operated by Rade Koncar, a private company that has an existing network of clients in the country as well as in the larger Balkan region. Since the equipment was provided at no cost, providing PCB treatment services is a profitable venture for Rade Koncar, and is also affordable for the client companies that are required by law to have their transformers treated.

109. Both the GEF and the government did not need to provide additional support for PCB treatment activities to continue beyond the project. The project's original plan was for the use of the equipment to be expanded in neighboring countries, but this has not taken place yet, as PCB inventories need to be completed in those countries. Not all transformers with PCB in Macedonia have been treated, in part because the companies that own them have gone bankrupt and cannot pay for the treatment. This limitation was known before the project

ended but has not been addressed so far. In contrast, a similar GEF-supported project in Mongolia has established a PCB treatment facility run by the government. As it is public-owned, the government has introduced financing schemes for bankrupt companies to have their PCBs treated.

110. The GEF, through the World Bank, has supported both the piloting of small-scale hydropower plants (GEF IDs 32 and 637) and the establishment of a financing facility for energy efficiency and renewable energy investments (GEF ID 2531). While these projects were said to have demonstrated the feasibility of new technologies and a financing mechanism, the country's renewable energy targets are driven by requirements for EU accession. After completion of these GEF-supported projects, the World Bank, especially IFC, has helped sustain the growth of investments in renewable energy through technical advisory services. The continued expansion is mainly supported by government subsidies in the form of feed-in tariffs and premiums.

Mauritius

111. An octopus fishing ban in Mauritius that was scaled up from an outer island to the national level is now currently funded by the national government. The GEF and other donors invested in awareness campaigns and community training programs through multiple consecutive SGP projects. However, the outcomes so far have been much lower than in the pilot, in part because the larger area needs a higher investment in enforcement efforts, and in part because legislation at national level did not apply the ban to the entire supply chain, which was done in the pilot.

112. The national government of Mauritius has also funded its own interim storage hazardous waste facility after an Enabling Activity (GEF 1824) and medium-sized project (GEF ID 3205) built capacity to eliminate DDT and other POPs. The government is in the process of establishing a cost-recovery mechanism that makes hazardous waste generators liable to pay for management and safe disposal of such waste. It is expected that once the cost-recovery mechanism is operational, it will serve as an incentive to private companies to properly manage hazardous waste, as well as contribute to the long-term sustainability of the facility.

IV. FACTORS AND ENABLING CONDITIONS AFFECTING SCALING UP

113. This chapter discusses the factors and enabling conditions for scaling up and GEF's contributions towards establishing or improving these factors and conditions. The analysis of factors is based on interviews and the evaluation's larger sample of 60 cases. Of the 60 cases, 10 provided information on how scaling was not achieved or sustained when these factors and conditions were absent.

114. GEF funding was most frequently used to support three enabling conditions for scaling up: knowledge and information that motivated stakeholders to adopt an intervention; incentives that addressed barriers to adoption; and strong institutional and individual capacities for stakeholders to adopt an intervention at scale. GEF support was less frequently used to establish systematic mechanisms for learning that would allow the scaling up process to adapt to changing contexts. Table 13 shows the number of cases in which the GEF contributed to establishing or strengthening each enabling condition, as well as the number of cases where the GEF was not found to provide any support.

115. The enabling conditions are grouped according to the three main components of the scaling up process that they contribute to: adoption of the intervention, sustained support for the scaling up process, and learning for adaptability and cost-effectiveness.

Table 13. Enabling conditions for scaling up supported by the GEF and other institutions

No. of Cases				
Enabling Conditions for Scaling	Where the GEF provided support	Where only other institutions provided support	Where no support was found during implementation	% of cases where GEF provided support
Adoption of the Intervention				
Knowledge and information dissemination	16	0	4	80%
Participatory processes	12	0	8	60%
Incentives and disincentives	18	1	1	90%
Institutional and individual capacities	20	0	0	100%
Sustained Support for Scaling				
Policy framework and operating guidelines	15	4	1	75%
Sustainable financing	10	5	5	50%

<i>Learning for Adaptability and Cost-Effectiveness</i>				
Multi-stakeholder interactions & partnerships	10	0	10	50%
Systematic learning mechanisms	6	4	10	30%

116. In most of the cases, a long-term outlook and support for scaling up came from the government, primarily due to their existing plans and legal obligations. However, in many cases, GEF support influenced contextual factors to be more favorable towards scaling up by establishing the appropriate enabling conditions, choosing the right people and institutions to work with, and seeking opportunities to leverage contextual conditions at the right time.

Adoption of the Intervention

The GEF helped increase stakeholders' willingness to adopt an intervention by engaging them through participatory processes that increased ownership, and through knowledge and information initiatives which provided evidence of benefits.

Contextual Factors: Ownership of intervention and evidence of benefits

117. **Stakeholder ownership has been identified by the IEO's previous portfolio- and country-level evaluations as a key contributing factor to broader adoption.** Having ownership means stakeholders find meaning and usefulness in a program's vision within their respective contexts. Buy-in to the intervention in some cases was inherent due to **cultural norms**, such as a high environmental consciousness in Costa Rica, or the pride that companies in Macedonia took in fulfilling their corporate social responsibility. In some cases, it was inevitable due to **pressing needs** that required urgent solutions, such as electricity shortages in Bangladesh, lack of rural livelihood options in Senegal and Ethiopia, river flooding in China due to soil erosion, environmental and health hazards due to improper chemicals storage in Mauritius, and nitrate poisoning of infants in Romania. In these cases, the willingness to adopt an intervention did not depend on the presence of a GEF-supported project.

118. **In all 20 successful scaling cases, stakeholders were motivated to adopt the intervention because they saw the benefits of doing so.** Gains were usually in the form of higher income, cost savings, or new business opportunities; losses avoided were usually in the form of penalties, legal liabilities, or decreasing income due to a degraded natural resource base.

119. In some cases, adopting the intervention had the synergistic effect of both creating gains and avoiding losses. For example, in Brazil and China, the introduction of integrated ecosystem management and sustainable land management practices increased income from livestock by providing more nutritious fodder. At the same time, these practices allowed former

pasture areas to regenerate and thus provide ecosystem services that benefited farms over the long term. In Macedonia, a cheaper alternative for PCB decontamination together with the risk of penalties for non-compliance created mutual reinforcement for private companies to decontaminate their equipment.

120. **In at least 5 cases, specific pilot activities were not successfully scaled up because the gains were not sufficient to either overcome the losses or the costs of changing the status quo.** For example, in the Romania IW case, a GEF-supported project introduced the planting of buffer strips and pasture rehabilitation with trees as part of managing nutrient pollution in the Danube River. The pilot was successful, yet did not scale in a subsequent project, in part due to state subsidies for pastures that left little incentive to include forestry activities in land management. However, other components of the intervention that demonstrated benefits, such as reduced manure in waterways, were successfully scaled up and continue to be scaled up without GEF support.

121. In Mauritius, the POPs project was initially scaled up through replication when national stakeholders supported the costs of disposing additional quantities of the chemicals as well as managing a larger class of hazardous wastes. However, one of the main barriers for further scaling is the lack of liability for private companies that improperly store hazardous wastes. The national government is currently updating the regulations to obligate private companies to use the interim storage hazardous waste facility and pay for their safe management.

122. **Existing legal commitments, such as Conventions, were identified as powerful motivators for adopting new technology or approaches, as these introduce both incentives (e.g. access to financing from government and/or donors) and disincentives (e.g. legal liabilities and penalties for non-compliance).** For example, the goal of EU accession has been a major motivation for Macedonia to comply with EU directives on PCBs and other chemicals. Similarly, Romania was driven to scale up GEF-supported agricultural waste management practices in order to comply with the EU Nitrate Directive, allowing it to become an EU member soon after. When such legal commitments are combined with a market that has economic incentives to invest in new technologies, scaling up can happen with not too many additional resources. When such legal commitments are combined with a market that has economic incentives to invest in new technologies, scaling up can happen with not too many additional resources.

123. One example is the IW GLOBALLAST program. It was first conceptualized when shipping companies were required to fulfill MARPOL's ballast water regulations, eventually ratified as a Convention. Due to the industry demand for new technologies created by these regulations, research-oriented companies then raced to develop cheaper and more efficient ballast water systems without need for government or donor financing. The international standards had the added benefit of saving shipping companies from having to comply with national regulations that differed from country to country, making them open to financing the new technology.

124. Another example is the motivation of multinational companies in Macedonia to maintain the same environmental standards in all the countries they do business in, even if Macedonia may have less strict regulations. As most of these multinationals are headquartered in EU countries, they were eager to participate in the GEF-supported PCB treatment activities, not only to protect their reputation, but also to avoid legal liabilities in their home countries.

125. Despite evidence of gains or avoided losses, cultural norms, cognitive and social biases, or simply resistance to change may still act as obstacles to adoption. For example, one SGP project successfully piloted composting in Mauritius, but faced difficulties during scaling up at the national level. Part of the reason was that the composting approach at the higher scale was changed to one that mixed farm waste and baby diapers, which the farmers refused to use. In addition, unlike during the pilot stage, training and awareness-building among the prospective users was insufficient.

126. In an IFAD project in Swaziland (GEF ID 3390), both government officials and younger chieftains had already shifted to more participatory GEF-supported approaches after seeing the benefits of doing so; some older chieftains, however, continued to refuse for fear of losing their authority. In recent years, development organizations have been applying findings from behavioral science in how they design interventions to overcome such barriers.

Enabling Conditions: Participatory processes, knowledge and information dissemination, and incentives

127. **Ownership may be developed by engaging stakeholders through participatory processes.** In at least 12 out of 20 cases, buy-in to and adoption of the intervention was attributed at least in part to participatory activities or mechanisms introduced through a GEF-supported project. Examples of such processes are public consultations during project preparation, village groups, and community-based natural resource management activities around protected areas.

128. In the LD/MFA cases, organizing community members into village-level groups increased their willingness to implement the agreed-upon solutions, as they themselves prioritized the issues to be addressed. In Ethiopia and China, for example, farmer beneficiaries were asked to come up with sustainable land management solutions after also themselves identifying the negative effects of land degradation. Both programs have been scaled up to at least sub-national levels

129. Similarly, in a suite of BD and MFA projects in Namibia, reduced poaching and increased support for protected areas was reported due to community engagement in developing policies and bills for biodiversity protection and tourism. In Indonesia, the COREMAP projects increased community and local government ownership by involving stakeholders in the planning and management of no-take zones in coral reef areas.

130. Participatory processes often involved stakeholders at different geographical and administrative levels. In China, the extensive preparation effort for the CRESPI project which

was funded by GEF's project preparation grant was cited as essential for achieving consensus and cohesiveness among key stakeholders about policy directions and reforms to be promoted by the project.

131. In at least 8 cases, frequent, positive interactions with the project management, NGOs, or government staff were cited as an important factor that led stakeholders on the ground to develop trust and ownership of the intervention. For example, in the IDCOL case in Bangladesh, the ongoing rural consumer support and on-the-ground presence of the micro-finance NGOs and private organizations generated trust and larger consumer uptake of Solar Home Systems.

132. In less successful cases, for example in an IFAD project in Comoros, the challenge of limited transport options between islands where with the project sites led to a lower level of interaction between project staff and beneficiaries, which reduced opportunities to build trust.

133. **Knowledge and Information Initiatives played an important role in the scaling up process to create awareness of the environmental problem and its consequences, and to disseminate information about the effectiveness and benefits of the intervention.** In at least 16 cases, knowledge and information initiatives in the form of scientific studies, public information campaigns, and educational workshops played an important role in scaling up.

134. For example, in Mauritius and Macedonia, GEF support in the CW focal area included extensive knowledge and information initiatives to increase awareness of the hazards of DDT and PCB among both government and private sector stakeholders. According to stakeholders, this prompted them to fund their own initiatives to train their staff. In China, the CHUEE project hosted, sponsored, and supported 152 events, and generated coverage in 1357 media reports that improved market awareness and public understanding of energy efficiency measures.

135. In at least 8 cases, increased awareness of the problem as a result of project preparation activities motivated adoption before the intervention generated any benefits. In China, a CW project (GEF ID 2629) raised farmers' awareness of the harm of dicofol to human health and the environment, creating a catalytic effect on farmers to apply integrated pest management (IPM) using their own funds.

136. **Incentives often created a business case for switching to solutions that generate GEBs, such as savings, lower costs, higher income, new sources of revenue, and access to financing.** In almost all cases (18 out of 20), GEF support was used to provide incentives that addressed individual and institutional barriers that were typically financial.

137. In the protected area system of Namibia, for example, GEF support provided adjacent communities the incentive to discontinue poaching activities through new income sources from wildlife tourism; in the Uganda case, incentives were provided for protected area management staff to enforce the laws by ensuring improved work benefits such as vacation time and field housing.

138. However, not all financial incentives were designed to be sustainable. In the Mauritius POPs project, integrated vector management was implemented with the participation of community volunteers in cleaning mosquito breeding sites as a malaria control measure. The project had difficulty mobilizing and retaining volunteers partially because incentives were not part of the project design. Eventually, the project started allocating small stipends that helped to mobilize volunteers and to demonstrate positive results of community-level integrated vector control. However, after the project, no funding was allocated to sustain the incentive and this component was discontinued due to low participation.

139. Disincentives, on the other hand, create or demonstrate social or economic penalties for not switching to solutions that generate GEBs, e.g. peer pressure, loss of operating license. In the 7 cases where disincentives to continue the status quo were applied, the disincentives were typically provided by an existing law through some form of penalty, rather than as part of the GEF-supported intervention.

Sustained Support for Scaling

GEF projects helped sustain support for scaling by building institutional capacity and sustainable financing sources, working with the appropriate people and institutions, and gaining political support through participatory processes.

140. According to Agency interviews, a time frame of between 10 and 20 years is necessary for scaling up to take place, and on occasion, the process could range from 3 to 5 years for interventions where markets were the main driver. This was confirmed through the cases reviewed by this evaluation (see Chapter 3). MSI (2016) also estimates scaling up to take place over at least 15 years, based on experiences in different sectors. The minimum amount of time that GEF has provided support is 3.5 years, which is about the typical approved duration for a medium-sized project. However, all 20 cases have received some form of support for longer than one project cycle mainly from the government. In fewer than half of the cases, project documents also report long-term support from GEF Agencies outside of GEF funding, or other organizations such as bilateral donors, CSOs, and sometimes even private companies.

141. Three factors emerged as important for ensuring long-term support for scaling up processes: scaling up becoming a political priority, gaining the support of political and economic influencers, and working through existing, long-term structures, all of which could be influenced by a project or program's appropriate choices of people and institutions to work with.

142. Table 14 shows the number of cases where the GEF and other institutions created conditions that favorably shifted institutional support for scaling up. Apart from these, enabling conditions such as building the individual and institutional capacities of influencers and long-term structures; establishing the policy framework and operating guidelines for scaling up; and setting up sustainable financing sources contributed to sustaining institutional support.

Table 14. Project-related conditions that influenced contextual factors towards scaling up

Project-related conditions that increased sustained institutional support for scaling up	No. of Cases	(n=20)
Evidence of benefits motivating support for scaling from other institutions through participatory processes and knowledge and information initiatives	7	35%
Appropriate choice of people and institutions facilitating scaling	*	*
<i>Working with existing long-term structures contributing to sustainability and cost-effectiveness of scaling up process</i>	14	70%
<i>Partnering with other actors to share costs of scaling activities</i>	14	70%
<i>Structure of supporting institutions promoting knowledge transfer across projects</i>	10	50%

*This information could not be directly obtained from project documents and interviews, but the conditions below it in italics are some of the ways this was demonstrated during implementation.

Contextual Factors: Political priority, support of influencers, working through long-term structures, long-term outlook

143. Interviews confirmed that when a national government takes ownership of an intervention by making it a priority, it invests a large amount of long-term funding. This investment signals a degree of stability which in turn attracts funding from other donors and the private sector. For example, under UNIDO's Program for Country Partnership, Ethiopia has invested \$900 million over 4 to 5 years for infrastructure projects, and is actively pushing the program's agenda. This has led to long-term partnerships with the European Investment Bank, FAO, Italy, Switzerland, and others.

144. **In almost all cases assessed, governments made scaling a priority because the intervention was part of their existing development plans and policies or was a response to urgent external events.** In at least 12 of 20 cases, this was explicitly mentioned as being partly due to existing legal obligations, such as their commitments to the global environmental Conventions, requirements for EU accession, national laws that they are mandated to implement, or even loans that need to be paid back to the World Bank and other financial institutions. In at least 7 cases, the political priority to scale up was further motivated by an external event such as a national crisis or international pressure to scale up interventions that would generate both environmental and social benefits. For example, in Bangladesh, a GDP growth of more than 6% created an increasing demand for electricity access. However, the electricity grid was growing slowly and often experienced supply shortages. This made the promotion of solar home systems a priority for the government.

145. **Despite shifting political and economic landscapes in 12 cases, high political priority pushed scaling up activities to continue.** In Brazil, for example, Congress voted to undermine the ARPA program's gains by degazetting federal protected areas in the Amazon in 2017. But pressure from national and international stakeholders, especially civil society, contributed to the president vetoing that decision in the same year. On the other hand, political shifts also

provided opportunities for the scaling up of new approaches to become a government priority in at least 5 cases.

146. Participatory processes and evidence of benefits disseminated through knowledge-sharing activities contributed to scaling up becoming a political priority. For example, in China's Hai Basin (GEF ID 1323), farmers in pilot counties earned more income from farming while reducing groundwater use from 420 to 265 m³/yr, as a result of GEF support introducing the use of remote sensing analysis to assess existing resources against water needs. Consequently, the government moved to scale up the intervention using additional GEF support. A similar phenomenon has been observed in other IW regional projects with country-level interventions, such as in the Livestock Waste Management in East Asia project and the subsequent Ningbo Water and Environment Project under the WB/GEF Partnership Investment Fund for Pollution Reduction in the LME of East Asia.

147. In the absence of participatory processes, scaling up did not happen. For example, an evaluation of the SIP Programs under TerrAfrica noted that none of them were very effective at engaging policy makers, or at communicating project results widely by engaging regional organizations, the media, and similar key institutions. This resulted in the desired policies not being mainstreamed at national level in many of the countries where the program was implemented. Similarly, despite a high level of engagement of farmers in India under the SLEM program, at least one project did not engage the district and state governments, leading to participatory land use plans not being incorporated into laws and guidelines. The program has likewise not achieved its objective of scaling up sustainable land management at the national level.

148. In one regional Chemicals & Waste program that took place in the Europe and Central Asia, Middle East and North Africa, and Africa regions, it was the seeming lack of government interest in the intervention (i.e., integrated vector management to eliminate DDT use for malaria outbreaks) that prevented the respective child projects from moving forward despite support coming in from multiple donors, and despite evidence that the intervention was viable and cost-effective. One of the reasons cited for this failure to scale was the insufficiency of awareness-raising activities for government officials and the wider public on the benefits of reducing DDT use. In contrast, a similar GEF-supported regional program in Latin America was more successful, with lessons being exchanged among countries through a regional network established by the program.

149. Advocates for implementation, at various administrative levels, ensure efforts are sustained. In Senegal, for example, the main champion for the Ecovillages initiative was the country's president himself; in Costa Rica having a technically competent champion in an appropriate position such as the minister of environment, has proven to be an important driver for sustaining scaling up support. Champions were also found within GEF Agencies.

150. Scaling up depends critically on working with the right people and institutions. For example, the SLEM Program in India chose to work through state-level land use committees to

develop land use plans. The terminal evaluation noted that these committees had no convening power, therefore mainstreaming did not happen in other government agencies as planned. The comparative advantages of the Agencies that the GEF has chosen to work with are also a factor in gaining the support of influencers.

151. The use of existing structures and mechanisms for implementing an intervention are important for sustainable scaling up. Such structures and mechanisms were used in 14 out of 20 cases. Examples are the network of termite control stations in China to help eliminate chlordane use, and the microfinance institutions already active in rural Bangladesh to promote solar home systems. Such structures and mechanisms typically have a long-term presence and wide geographic coverage. They therefore have the capacity and experience to implement and follow up on interventions over a large area beyond a project or program's lifetime. It is also more cost-effective. For example, when implementing Costa Rica's PES program, the government decided to make use of its protected area field offices to house the forest engineers who would be reviewing applications from landowners. In the Bangladesh IDCOL case, the existing network of micro-finance institutions was one of the decisive factors in the expansion of the solar home systems in rural areas.

152. Agencies interviewed indicated the importance of partnering with supporting institutions that have a long-term outlook to sustain the momentum of the scaling up process beyond one project. In 14 out of 20 cases, resources of other stakeholders supported scaling up initiatives. These included not only bilateral donors but also CSOs and private companies. ARPA and COREMAP are examples of how donors' long-term outlook from the beginning led to support that has helped sustain scaling up initiatives through severe political and economic crises, such as a presidential impeachment and budget freeze in Brazil, and the Asian financial crisis in the case of Indonesia.

153. UNDP highlights how the GEF's sustained strategic vision to eliminate invasive alien species over successive replenishment phases allowed GLOBALLAST to continue amidst the extended negotiation processes among governments and shipping companies over almost 20 years. Having a long-term outlook also allows partners to adapt how a project is implemented so that it remains consistent with the long-term scaling up objective despite temporary failures and unfavorable contextual conditions.

154. In the absence of sufficient financing, interventions planned with an explicit long-term outlook can fail. In Senegal, a GEF-supported project that introduced sustainable-use community nature reserves as part of the country's protected area system was designed to be implemented in three phases. The first two phases successfully established 26 community nature reserves that linked fragmented ecosystems across 270 villages, as well as a network of mutual savings groups that provided financing to local entrepreneurs. However, funding for the third phase fell through. Despite the initial socioeconomic benefits generated, many of the alternative livelihood activities were discontinued due to a lack of funds to purchase equipment that would allow community members to apply the training that they had received from the

first two phases. Operations at the community reserves continue at present but at a minimal scale.

Enabling Conditions: Individual and institutional capacities, policy framework and operating guidelines, sustainable financing

155. Working with long-term structures is only effective if they possess the capacities for scaling up. GEF support contributed to building institutional and individual capacities for scaling up in all 20 cases. This included establishing or strengthening government agencies that took on key roles for implementing an intervention at scale. This occurred in the Brazil ARPA case, for example, where very early GEF support helped establish FUNBIO, the organization that is now implementing GEF-supported projects on the ground. At the individual level, capacity-building has included training stakeholders on how to implement an intervention, for example, villagers in the use of solar panels for electricity, or staff of mining companies on careful handling of transformers with PCBs. However, interviewees also noted that GEF support helped build local capacities to understand environmental problems and was not just focused on implementing solutions.

156. In 75 percent of the 20 cases, the GEF helped develop a policy framework or operating guidelines for adopting an intervention at scale. In the CCM cases, this typically took the form of regulations for reducing the costs of investing in new technology for the private sector, as well as setting standards for manufacturing the technology. In BD and LD/MFA cases, GEF support to the policy framework allowed the mainstreaming of more sustainable approaches into plans at national and local government levels. In the IW focal area, the Strategic Action Program (SAP) approach provides a framework for the contribution of national-level activities to regional-level impacts, and through formal endorsement, gets commitment to actions from countries. A previous IEO study on GEF's support for legal and regulatory frameworks also found that this type of support has contributed to scaling up interventions.

157. Sustainable financing of scaling up efforts allows for the continuation of replication efforts, as well as the maintenance of other enabling conditions. In interviews, it was also cited as important for covering gaps in public or private investment to maintain the momentum of the scaling up process, particularly when priorities shift among stakeholders. Of the 20 cases, 15 had identified sustainable financing sources for scale-up at project completion. GEF contributions in half of these cases took the form of market-based mechanisms, trust funds, or a mainstreamed government budget allocation; in the other cases, sustainable financing was provided through government initiatives or other donor projects or other international donors. At the regional level, one recent example of a GEF-supported sustainable financing mechanism is the private sector partnership hub, which will allow integrated coastal management to be further scaled up in East Asian seas through the PEMSEA partnership.

Learning for Adaptability and Cost-Effectiveness

GEF support contributed to scaled-up outcomes by leveraging contextual conditions and by working with institutions that promoted continuity among staff as well as interactions at the local and global levels. GEF support was least frequently used to establish systematic learning mechanisms beyond project funding.

158. Three characteristics of supporting institutions contribute to scaling impacts even in the absence of plans or certainty in the scaling up process: the ability to leverage current contextual conditions to align with scaling up objectives, continuity of staff, and institutional structures which promote both local and global interaction. Enabling conditions such as multi-stakeholder interactions and partnerships, and systematic learning mechanisms helped scaling up processes to be adaptable and cost-effective where these were established.

Contextual Factors: Leveraging contextual conditions, continuity of staff, structures for local and global interaction

159. **A few Agencies pointed out that they could leverage the right contextual conditions at the right times towards scaling targets to maximize the effects of timing.** They do this by being on the lookout for developments in the social and ecological landscape that can be linked with the interventions' objectives. For example, in Ecuador, CI leveraged the president's socialist leaning to introduce payment for ecosystem services in forests as a poverty alleviation program for farmers, rather than as an environmental conservation program. In the Danube River and Black Sea, GEF support came at a time when two Conventions linked to the water bodies were just coming into force, the Soviet Union had just collapsed, and the countries bordering these two water bodies were preparing for EU accession. At the same time, the region had just experienced a hypoxia disaster. The combined political priorities of preventing another hypoxia disaster, enforcing the Conventions, and joining the EU attracted hundreds of millions of dollars in funding from development banks and other donors. Terminal evaluations of the various projects implemented in these water bodies report a decrease in livestock and increase in numbers of wastewater treatment plants, as well as an increase in crop productivity during the period between the mid-1990s and early 2000s, when these projects were completed.

160. **Timing within an Agency has also proven to be important.** The success of the GEF-supported Andean Biotrade Project (GEF ID 2391, UNEP) came just as CAF, its executing agency, was applying to be a GEF project agency. Thus, the agency was paying extra attention to organizing its M&E system, which then communicated the positive results of this project in multiple countries within the agency. During this same period, the environmental agenda became more salient among development banks, because the UNFCCC's COP 20 and the CBD's COP were both hosted in Lima, where the project was based. CAF's director became a champion for the initiative, convincing the bank's vice presidents to mainstream the concept of a green economy within CAF. As a result, CAF's green finance portfolio has increased from 5% to 20% in 2018. The project itself has scaled up in the form of a regional partnership forum

currently focused on cocoa, while spinoff projects are under implementation in Colombia and Peru.

161. In at least 11 cases and several interviews, continuity among implementing staff was cited as contributing to successful scaling up outcomes. In 9 of these cases, these staff members were either government employees, or were consultants on the project who later joined the government, often in technical positions and dedicated to working on implementing solutions through multiple election cycles or changes in GEF Agency staff. Such champions embedded and transitioning within institutions in their respective countries were key in establishing sustainable use regimes for Namibia's protected area system, and the market for energy efficient lighting in Mexico. In Macedonia where the minister of environment has changed every year for more than a decade, staff members of its POPs Management Unit that have remained since its creation in 2002 have built institutional memory and capacity that now also benefit other countries in the Balkan region.

162. Frequent interactions provide opportunities to exchange knowledge and information in real time, which translate to learning and adaptability in the midst of changing contexts. The structure of the UNDP-SGP is particularly conducive for such interactions due to its long-term national coordinators who are often local and are well-connected with key staff in government, CSOs and the academia. Stakeholders in smaller countries such as Mauritius and Costa Rica have also mentioned that their smaller geography and population make it easier to communicate among different agencies and offices, giving rise to solutions that may otherwise not have developed.

163. GEF Agencies with a wide geographic reach, geographical mobility among staff, and a multi-scale organizational structure build up institutional expertise on specific interventions and issues, and facilitate knowledge exchange and replication across regions. For example, UNDP's presence at country, regional and global scales provides a built-in structure for transferring knowledge and linking interventions from the ground to other locations and scales. The World Bank's requirement for staff to periodically move between regions is another example of a built-in mechanism for knowledge transfer. In several of the cases where the World Bank was the implementing agency, it was noted that its previous work in other countries or regions contributed to the improved design of projects included in the cases. UNIDO's focus on chemicals and long-term work in specific regions has allowed it to develop approaches that are replicable in different countries within the same regions.

Enabling Conditions: Multi-stakeholder interactions & partnerships and systematic learning mechanisms

In half of the cases, multi-stakeholder interactions and partnerships were cited as one of the enabling conditions that helped coordinate multiple mandates, objectives and activities among stakeholders, which was important to keep implementation at scale cost-effective.

164. In the China IEM and Senegal Ecovillages cases, regular discussions among government sector agencies allowed the delivery of training and services to villages to be streamlined, thus reducing financial costs from similar sectoral activities and conflicts in mandates. In the BD case in Namibia, similar discussions were critical in fostering collaboration among government and private sector stakeholders that otherwise would not have interacted. In the China DDT case, it was noted that it was unusual for the ministries of environmental protection and agriculture to collaborate, but this initiative was key to phasing out DDT, and mainstreaming integrated pest management throughout the Ministry of Agriculture.

165. The PEMSEA series of projects, which the GEF's IW focal area has been supporting for more than 25 years, has scaled up integrated coastal management from a few pilot sites to a region-wide intervention largely through multi-stakeholder partnerships. Among the activities it has supported to this end are: regional networks for local governments, research institutions, and legal experts; regional governance structures such as a high-level forum composed of environmental ministers of participating countries in the region, and a "partnership council" with representatives from the national and local governments, communities, NGOs, research and educational institutions, the private sector, and regional and international organizations; and the triennial East Asian Seas Congress that allows regional stakeholders to have dialogues, share lessons, and formally endorse regional targets that each of them contribute to.

166. In general, lessons from previous projects were used to significantly shape the design of subsequent projects, but the process was not systematic; in many cases, learning took place during implementation through trial-and-error or on a need basis through one-time commissioned studies.

167. Most of the assessed cases learned during project implementation, resulting in interventions being scaled up more cost-effectively and making it easier for stakeholders to adopt the intervention. However, only in 6 cases did GEF support this through a systematic process or mechanism for learning and adaptation. In 4 other cases, systematic learning mechanisms were supported by the government or projects funded by other donors. In half of the cases, no such mechanism was found.

168. Systematic learning mechanisms were usually in the form of knowledge exchange networks and regular multi-stakeholder meetings. A few cases integrated adaptability into project design by allowing flexibility to decide on which interventions to adopt and scale up during project implementation based on actual contextual conditions.

169. For example, the RERED project in Bangladesh integrated systematic learning in its design to scale up successful models adaptively. In addition to incorporating lessons from previous experience in Bangladesh and in other countries, the project design had a provision to scale up support for the model with the most promise. Throughout its implementation, the project continuously incorporated lessons from its own pilot approaches, and – as the national demand for the Solar Home Systems (SHS) grew -- the project shifted its focus to this component. Ultimately the project scaled up support to the most successful model, which used

micro-finance ownership rather than a fee-for-service approach. Within this model, the project also utilized M&E data from the field to incorporate new specifications and technologies (such as LEDs) in SHSs to better serve lower-income households, which in turn made SHSs more attractive to a larger population (IEG 2014).

170. At least 5 cases cited the use of midterm reviews and terminal evaluations as directly contributing to improvements in the scaling up process. In World Bank projects, these improvements typically corresponded with a loan restructuring. For example, in the Romania IW case, the restructuring led to a shift from an expensive concrete-based agricultural waste management platform to a cheaper and equally efficient plastic alternative, allowing more farmers to benefit. In the China Termite Control case, resulted in a decision to use a more cost-effective form of integrated pest management. The cost savings were reallocated towards additional technical training and public awareness-raising activities.

V. A FRAMEWORK FOR SCALING UP IMPACTS IN THE GEF

This chapter draws on the findings from the previous chapters and presents a revised framework of GEF support to scaling up impact.

171. The framework summarizes the scaling up process as observed in the GEF experience, particularly the key enabling conditions and factors that are important to consider when designing projects and programs that will contribute to a long-term scaling up process. Through these factors and conditions drawn from cases with known outcomes, the presence or absence of these same enabling conditions and factors are assessed in the GEF-6 IAPs and GEF-7 projects that have yet to report on their outcomes. The framework may be applied to projects and programs that are completed or under implementation to assess the extent to which they have addressed key factors and conditions and identify further actions that may improve the likelihood of scaling up.

172. Scaling up impacts is defined as increasing the magnitude of global environment benefits (GEBs), and/or expanding the geographical and sectoral areas where they are generated, to cover a defined ecological, economic, or governance unit. The process of scaling up impact includes three key components: the adoption of interventions that generate GEBs; the sustained support for enabling conditions that allow scaling up processes to continue; and learning to allow these first two components to be adaptable and cost-effective to meet scaling up targets in the face of shifting social-ecological contexts (Figure 1). Furthermore, these components typically need to be iterative beyond the duration of a single project to allow sufficient time for GEBs to be generated and become measurable at scale.

173. The GEF contributes to the scaling up process in two ways: 1) by funding the implementation—including the piloting—of interventions that generate GEBs, and 2) by supporting enabling conditions that allow these interventions to generate impact at scale. In the GEF, impacts are scaled up through the replication, mainstreaming and linking of interventions that generate GEBs. These three modes of scaling up are often interdependent.

174. While contextual factors affect each component of the scaling up process, GEF support is able to influence these factors through appropriate choices in people and institutions that it works with, and by leveraging changes in the social-ecological context to align with scaling up objectives. The GEF also influences contextual factors to be more favorable towards scaling up through the enabling conditions that it supports. Figure 1 shows which enabling conditions are most relevant for each component of the scaling up process to influence the corresponding contextual factors.




Figure 1. Framework for scaling up impacts in the GEF

Applying the Framework

GEF-supported projects and programs have a vision to scale, but projects would benefit from clearer articulation on how activities will result in scaled-up outcomes at project design.

175. To assess the extent to which current GEF projects consider scaling up in their design, the evaluation applied the framework to review the three Integrated Approach Pilots (IAPs) approved in GEF-6, and all 16 projects approved under GEF-7 as of December 2018. The program framework documents (PFDs) and project information forms (PIFs) of these programs and projects were assessed. These documents are reviewed by both the GEF Secretariat and STAP, and are the basis for approval or rejection by the GEF Council. While these reviews assessed the projects for technical soundness, this evaluation reviewed the same documents for the extent to which the projects identify their contributions to the scaling up process.

A. GEF-6 IAPs

176. For GEF-6, the evaluation focused on the IAPs because these programs were particularly designed “to further encourage early adoption and scaling up of projects and programs that overcome focal area silos” in their respective sectors: commodities and forestry, sustainable cities, and food security. The IAPs are also the precursor to the Impact Programs, which have similar scaling up aims under GEF-7.

177. A formative evaluation of the IAPs completed by the GEF IEO in 2018 reported that all 18 Commodities and Food Security child projects included measures for scaling up interventions into larger geographical areas, while 10 out of 12 Cities projects had the same. However, impact at scale is designed to be achieved through the programs rather than through individual projects, therefore the framework is applied to assess how this aim is operationalized at program level; individual projects that contribute to this impact may or may not aim to implement scaling up activities within their respective project scopes.

178. The Commodities IAP has a global scale, while the Food Security and Cities IAPs aim to generate impacts at the scale of the country and city, respectively. In its objective, only the Food Security IAP has a quantitative target of covering 10 million ha of production landscapes in 12 countries to benefit 2 to 3 million households. Beyond this, it aims to have impact at a regional scale through knowledge-sharing among the 12 countries.

179. The PFD template has a section titled “innovation, sustainability and potential for scaling up”. In this section, the Food Security IAP mentions its support for regional multi-stakeholder platforms in sub-Saharan Africa that are intended to be vehicles for expanding to other countries. It specifically tracks the “involvement of CSOs, farmer cooperatives and the private sector in pro-poor and pro-environment value chains to help smallholder farmers to scale up good practices”.

180. The Food Security IAP also has a specific program component for scaling up integrated approaches, with a GEF allocation of \$56.3 million or 53% of total GEF funding for the IAP, with the aim of large-scale transformation of agroecosystems. Apart from this, the PFD’s results framework also specifies how other program activities aim to contribute to scaling up, such as the establishment of multi-stakeholder and multi-scale institutional frameworks, including for multi-scale assessment and monitoring. These frameworks are intended to support policy and institutional reforms, which are then expected to scale up integrated natural resources management.

181. The Food Security IAP’s PFD defines scaling up as “expanding, adapting, and sustaining successful projects, programs or policies over time for greater development impact”, and identifies multiple pathways for scaling, including “a) scaling up by adaptation of an innovation; b) scaling up by diffusion of an innovation; c) scaling up by replication; d) scaling up by value addition; and e) temporal scaling up”. The other IAPs are not as explicit in their respective documents.

182. The Commodities IAP indicates support for “south-south cooperation and technology transfer to scale up the successes”, as well as an Adaptive Management and Learning component that is intended to expand knowledge-sharing and track areas where the program would need to expand geographically. Policy changes within countries and corporations are expected to expand the results of the IAP throughout the food and agriculture sectors beyond GEF support.

183. The Commodities IAP PFD further explains that interventions at the landscape level will be scaled up by mainstreaming pro-environment commitments throughout all landholdings of producer companies. Experiences at the landscape level will be used to inform policy support activities at a subnational or national level, as well as to influence international demand for reduced-deforestation production. Apart from private sector engagement, target engagements at the national level are also expected to lead to scaling up.

184. The Cities IAP did not have a response related to scaling up in this section, focusing instead on the innovative nature of the IAP. However, one of its selection criteria for child projects is the potential for impact and replication within the country and globally. Among the interventions it supports are national- and city-level policy reform to create an enabling environment for other cities.

B. GEF-7 projects

185. All approved GEF-7 projects had a vision to scale up impacts to a country or region either within or beyond the project implementation period.

186. The PIF template for GEF-6 and GEF-7 projects includes a specific question on scaling under the general heading of Project Description: “Briefly describe innovation, sustainability and potential for scaling up.” The documents are technically strong; however, guidance is limited on how to approach the scaling up dimension, and in particular whether the project envisages any specific steps to support a scaling up process (e.g., the development of sector strategies or scaling plans).

187. Of the 16 projects approved so far in GEF-7, only 2 provided concrete descriptions in this section of how the project would contribute to scaling up. Five noted that the enabling conditions to be established by the project would lead to scaling up, but did not elaborate on how this would take place, while others only either referred to the possibility of other actors scaling up the intervention after project completion or did not provide a response to the question. This reflects findings from interviews that some members of the GEF partnership expect scaling up to happen without recognizing the links between the project’s activities, its immediate outcomes, and the scaled-up impacts.

188. Half of the GEF-7 projects specified concrete activities that would contribute to scaling up in other sections of the PIF. These activities were in the form of financing, coordination and knowledge-sharing mechanisms, among others. The other half of the projects mentioned

“systematization” of knowledge and lessons from the project as a means of scaling up but did not mention any specific activity or the means by which this would take place.

189. Nine projects provided concrete information on scaling up plans to some degree; of these only one specified concrete scaling activities both in its project components and in the PIF’s scaling up section and 7 provided activities for scaling up elsewhere in the document. The 9 projects were assessed against the framework on the extent to which they considered and addressed enabling conditions and factors influencing scaling up processes.

190. All 9 projects support enabling conditions for scaling. Each one aims to contribute to at least 6 of the 8 identified enabling conditions. Common to all projects are disseminating knowledge and information, building institutional and individual capacities, and contributing to the development of policy frameworks and operating guidelines. Least common are the establishment of sustainable financing measures and systematic learning mechanisms, reflected in the design of 5 out of 9 projects. These results are similar to those found in the 20 successful scaling up cases. However, proportionally, more GEF-7 projects aim to put in place systematic learning mechanisms (Table 15).

Table 15. Enabling conditions supported by GEF-7 projects

ENABLING CONDITION SUPPORTED BY THE GEF	No. of projects	(n=9)
Knowledge and information dissemination	9	100%
Participatory processes	7	78%
Incentives and disincentives	7	78%
Institutional and individual capacities	9	100%
Policy framework and operating guidelines	9	100%
Sustainable financing	5	56%
Multi-stakeholder interactions & partnerships	7	78%
Systematic learning mechanisms	5	56%

191. Three of the projects specifically aim to establish enabling conditions for processes that would take place over the next 10 to 20 years, indicating a long-term outlook on scaling. Seven identified existing long-term structures to work with to deliver the intervention, through 4 of

which the government has implemented prior initiatives. Most multi-stakeholder partnerships for scaling up implementation were with the private sector and sectoral government agencies.

192. In 4 of the projects, the government and other stakeholders are identified as having strong ownership of the intervention by either previously implementing similar interventions or having a high awareness of the problem. At least one project had support from the country's president himself. In another 3, the PIFs identified the countries' global environmental commitments as being key to the governments making the intervention a priority. The presence or absence of other contextual factors was difficult to ascertain through the PIFs.

HIGHLIGHT: Scaling Up through the Small Grants Programme

193. **One GEF-supported initiative that has been given a mandate to scale up is the UNDP-implemented Small Grants Programme (UNDP-SGP).** The GEF Council in 2009 decided that countries with SGP portfolios between 5 and 15 years old "should be focusing on replication, scaling up, and mainstreaming of successful projects, as well as generating useful knowledge management products". While the SGP's grant ceiling is \$50,000 and the average grant is \$25,000, grants of up to \$150,000 are funded in cases that are deemed to have high potential for wider-scale benefits.

194. SGP's Annual Monitoring Report shows that 157 or 16% of completed projects were reported as having replicated or scaled up SGP interventions between July 2017 and June 2018, up from 113 or 15% in the previous reporting period. In part, this was done by linking the SGP projects with full-sized and medium-sized projects.

195. The UNDP-SGP defines scaling up as "the process of expanding the impact of a successful activity, program, model or approach of an SGP project, by adapting and applying it at a larger geographical scale, using larger budgets, involving more actors and reaching a greater number of beneficiaries."

196. Reporting, however, does not normally distinguish scaling up from simple replication, which is defined as "the process of copying a successful activity, program, model or approach of an SGP project, and re-applying it in a different location." An example of a case tracked under simple replication would be a technology used in one national park being adopted in one other national park.

197. Previous IEO evaluations have observed that SGP projects can serve as pilots that can then be tested at a larger scale through full-sized and medium-sized projects. For example, the IEO's impact evaluation of GEF support to protected areas found that in Uganda, SGP projects provided the means to test collaborative management approaches between protected area management staff and adjacent communities that now are being used throughout the country. Similarly, an SGP project piloted Community Conservation Areas (CCAs) in wetlands, which at that time were not part of the country's protected area system. The viability of the CCAs were then demonstrated in a larger area by a medium-sized project, and subsequently planned to be scaled up at the national level through another GEF project.

198. From a review of UNDP-SGP reports and publications that aimed to document experiences of broader adoption from 2016 or earlier, this evaluation identified 65 cases in 50 countries where some extent of scaling up had occurred⁵. In many cases, scaling up occurred through replication, or was indicated as happening through the leveraging of funds from the government or other donors. In some, replication was funded by additional SGP grants or GEF projects. Geographic expansion ranged in scale from neighboring villages within a municipality to neighboring countries within a region.

199. This evaluation's framework could not be applied across the 65 identified cases, as information on factors and conditions contributing to scaling up was not provided by the reports and publications at the level of the cases. However, a 2016 study commissioned by UNDP-SGP in five countries, and field visits by this evaluation to three countries showed that the influencing factors and conditions are similar to those in the GEF's larger projects and programs. For example, the 2016 study mentions participatory multi-stakeholder processes at design stage, alignment with government priorities, and support beyond a single project as the key factors for mainstreaming. It also observes that clustering projects within the same geographical areas facilitates replication.

200. IEO evaluations, on the other hand, note the UNDP-SGP's long-term and local presence as crucial to providing continuity not only in financial but also technical and political support. For example, SGP support for fisheries management in Mauritius has continued over at least three consecutive grants and a medium-sized project. This allowed enough time for positive results to be demonstrated through the pilot and expanded piloting stages. These results led directly to the scaling up of a seasonal ban on octopus fishing to the national level through government funding.

201. Beyond the individual grants, the Grantmakers Plus funds allowed the SGP National Coordinator in Mauritius to organize a venue for stakeholders to reflect on how implementation at the higher scale could be adapted to improve outcomes. The government is currently reconsidering legislation to address the gaps. Regular multi-stakeholder meetings ensured everyone was informed and involved, which helped coordinate awareness-raising and enforcement activities among multiple actors. The SGP projects were particularly critical, as bilateral donor funds could not be used to provide grants to the NGOs who helped implement the intervention on the ground.

202. In Macedonia, the scaling of some SGP projects has become fully or partially self-sustaining due to the design and nature of the projects. For example, the population of autochthonic sheep increased from 200 to 7000 over 12 years due to farmers being required to pass on the offspring to other farmers for further breeding. Projects supporting energy efficiency at the municipal level require that energy savings be used to implement energy-efficient measures in more public buildings rather than going back to the municipal budget.

⁵ These exclude the larger GEF member countries of Brazil, China, India and Mexico.

203. In all three countries visited, the SGP National Coordinators were continuously in their positions for at least 10 years, frequently interacted with community beneficiaries on the ground, and liaised with government officials at higher scales to positively influence legislation.

204. In each country it operates in, SGP builds a multi-stakeholder network through a national steering committee composed of high-level representatives from government, academe, civil society and private sector. The process of participating in project proposal review and monitoring was noted to develop a sense of ownership in committee members to a point that they continue to volunteer in project management activities after their terms have expired. These individuals in some cases have also served as champions for scaling interventions in their respective institutional capacities.

205. In Costa Rica, SGP has supported the scaling up of organic agriculture and rural community-based tourism, among others. In the case of organic agriculture, SGP gave technical and financial support to farmers over 18 years through a national movement that created local associations. This contributed to the development of a national law for the promotion of organic agriculture as well as its corresponding regulations. However, due to a lack of resources in the Ministry of Agriculture, the initiative was not fully mainstreamed, and therefore did not continue.

206. SGP co-funded microentrepreneurs of rural community-based tourism as a response to the large foreign-run hotel industry that had taken over Costa Rica's Pacific Coast. The SGP-funded communities eventually scaled up to a national network of 40 microenterprises that built the capacity to negotiate with the government for more community-friendly tourism regulations, as well as self-fund trainings, product development, and marketing for its members. However, in 2018, the network's funds disappeared due to mismanagement, making its future uncertain.

207. In these two cases, SGP's long-term efforts towards scaling up were not sustained due to a lack of government priority, and lack of oversight, respectively. Subsequent grants can no longer be allocated towards these initiatives due to Costa Rica's upgraded status, as all new projects can only be within priority landscapes selected by the national government.

GEF's Comparative Advantage in Scaling up

208. Even prior to the GEF 2020 Strategy, GEF support has been used to demonstrate the benefits of pilot interventions, and to help establish the enabling conditions to scale up these benefits to larger contexts. In only 20 percent of cases did the GEF invest in further scaling up, while in 40 percent of cases, scaling up initiatives were done completely without GEF support.

209. The GEF 2020 Strategy identifies one of the GEF's key roles as "demonstrating innovative approaches and instruments that can be scaled up by other players". The GEF-7 Programming Directions further hone in on the GEF's role in primarily reducing risks, enhancing enabling environments, and convening different stakeholders such as the private sector, to

harness their ability to scale interventions rather than the GEF itself funding scaling up activities.

210. Interviews revealed that the GEF occupies a niche in the scaling up process of taking an intervention that has already shown some success in a limited environment, piloting it in contexts where the intervention has not been tested yet, and then expanding the pilot area while simultaneously establishing the enabling conditions for further expansion. Of the 20 cases assessed, GEF tested innovations in specific contexts in 19.

211. GEF support for further scaling was usually within the context of programs, where long-term financing from the GEF was earmarked at the outset and multiple other donors were involved under a larger initiative, such as in the cases of Brazil ARPA and Indonesia COREMAP.

212. The GEF helps generate evidence of benefits that motivate other stakeholders to support scaling up by funding interventions in contexts where benefits have not been demonstrated. All GEF Agencies interviewed noted that GEF support has a distinct value in terms of funding interventions that neither public nor private sector is willing to fund, particularly where no clear benefits or sources of revenue yet exist. This includes testing solutions where there is a risk of losses being greater than the potential gains. As a result, GEF resources tend to “unlock” other funds for scaling up by de-risking investments, such as those that encourage private sector participation in government programs. In the China CHUEE case, the project was credited for helping address the two key market barriers to sustainable energy financing in the Chinese banking sector: perceived market risks and technical risks.

213. While smaller relative to what other financial institutions can provide, GEF grants have the power to attract large amounts of financing from both the public and private sectors. According to an interview with the World Bank, \$5 million of GEF funding in Kazakhstan has catalyzed \$1 billion of climate change adaptation financing from a private Belgian insurance company. The GEF grant acted as a fallback that instilled confidence in the company in case the venture proved unprofitable.

214. The global partnerships interviewed similarly test innovative interventions to demonstrate their effectiveness in specific country contexts, but at a larger scale rather than at just a pilot site, while helping to establish enabling conditions for further scaling. This is particularly evident in the two climate change partnerships. For example, the CIF fill the financing gap for “first-mover” or “early stage” renewable energy and energy efficiency projects that make it easier and more cost-effective for investors to continue with follow-on projects.

215. The GEF attracts support for scaling up by providing flexible grants that adapt to stakeholder needs and changing contexts. Some Agencies mentioned that governments give more importance to GEF support due to its flexibility to align with the national agenda; in turn, this allows the GEF to influence the national agenda towards generating GEBs. Previous IEO evaluations have found that this flexibility coupled with the nature of GEF support as a grant

rather than a loan has motivated governments to allocate more of their budget towards biodiversity-related interventions that would also yield economic benefits.

216. In this way GEF funds can be strategically used for filling in spatial, temporal or institutional gaps. In a later phase of an IFAD project on dryland management, GEF funds were used to establish a national monitoring system, which no other donor had funded, and to implement interventions only in drylands where it is hard for the government or private sector to get financial returns. Small grants can keep the momentum going even when contextual conditions are not favorable so that impact can eventually be scaled up when the timing is right.

217. Having interventions aligned with national priorities creates greater ownership which, as previously mentioned, makes the government more likely to invest in scaling up. Agencies mentioned that the option of implementing multifocal area projects also adds to flexibility in the types of interventions that can be designed, therefore making them more attractive for scaling up.

218. Of the cases assessed, 12 out of 20 made use of the flexibility of GEF grants to reallocate resources as needed to adapt to changing circumstances and ensure that scaling objectives continued to be met. For example, in the Uruguay Wind Energy case, the project was able to cancel the acquisition of measurement towers upon realizing that their value-added was minimal, and instead reoriented the funds towards institutional strengthening.

Scaling up Approaches in other Institutions

The GEF's strategic orientation is more explicitly focused on scaling than many other international development institutions. Other global partnerships differ from the GEF mainly in the way they mainstream their investments into domestic financing and use performance-based financing to incentivize scaling up.

219. Looking at previous assessments of scaling up experiences and approaches in GEF Agencies such as IFAD, UNDP, the World Bank, ADB, AfDB and other international development institutions, the GEF's strategy and programmatic orientation appears to be focused more explicitly on scaling than many other international development finance institutions, but to some extent falls short like most others in translating its strategic scaling focus into systematic institutional practice. This is being addressed through the Impact Programs, but it is too early to evaluate the outcomes. While the evaluation's purposive sampling approach highlights several successful examples of scaling up in the GEF, it cannot assess the extent to which GEF has or has not achieved its intended scaling up objectives in the absence of a systematic approach.

220. Among the key take-aways from the operational experience of other development agencies to date is that the greatest challenges arise in moving from high-level mission and strategy statements focused on scaling to the practical and operational implementation of a scaling approach. Over the last decade, interest in addressing the scaling agenda has increased in the development assistance community. An increasing number of organizations have

incorporated some form of scaling objective—as indicated by terms such as “transformational”, “system changing”, “catalytic”— in their mission or strategy statements. The main questions that remain to be addressed by all institutions are: how to move from a predominant focus on innovation to a balanced focus on “innovation with impact at scale”; how to put scaling into practice; and, specifically, how to mainstream scaling within institutions so that they move beyond one-off interventions to a systematic scaling approach.

221. The five global partnerships interviewed have a systematic process for helping country stakeholders agree on the overall vision of impact at scale, linking their investments with systemwide reforms, and sustaining activities through domestic financing. For example, the GFF connects its five-year investments with a longer-term program of sustainable domestic financing and supports only interventions that can be sustained by countries in the medium- to long-term. The Global Fund, on the other hand, used to scale up priority interventions with its own financing. Now the fund is moving to a catalytic role where it aims to mobilize domestic financing to increase country’s ownership and leadership, and to trigger better budgeting, harmonization, and coordination between partners. Furthermore, the Global Fund advises countries on cost-effectiveness and better targeting of allocations to support key populations.

222. The two interviewed climate partnerships provide large-scale financing, relative to their respective country markets. By making available a large and predictable resource envelope, CIF programs aim to change perceptions of risk among investors and policymakers, lower technology costs through economies of scale, and help transform the markets.

223. Three partnerships (GFF, GF, GPE) use their financing to incentivize countries to increase domestic resource allocation to the target sectors and to harmonize donor financing. GFF financing is linked to IDA and IBRD financing to improve a country’s budget allocation to the health system. The Global Fund uses conditional financing to increase domestic allocations for priority diseases. Through one of its grant modalities, GPE incentivizes countries to either maintain the expenditure on education above 20% of the total public expenditure or to commit to progressively increase it toward this target. Similar to the GEF’s cofinancing ambition of 7:1, GPE also incentivizes low- and middle-income countries to leverage additional financing from other sources.

224. Three of the global partnerships (GFF, GF, and GPE) use performance-based financing as an incentive for countries to achieve agreed upon targets. Many GFF countries use facility-level performance-based financing to increase the uptake of health services. In the Global Fund, the approval of all follow-up funding is linked to a principal recipient’s performance evaluation. This approach creates a strong incentive for stakeholders to improve performance (Chandy et al 2013). In education, GPE has also recently introduced results-based financing by withholding the last 30% of one of its grant modalities, contingent on the achievement of selected national targets.

C. Conclusions

1. The GEF 2020 strategy and the programming directions set a clear vision and goal to scale up Global Environmental Benefits (GEBs). This has translated into a shift towards the Integrated Approach Pilots and Impact Programs to achieve impacts at scale, but the operational guidance is not consistently clear across all programs and projects.

225. Both the GEF 2020 Strategy and the GEF-7 Programming Directions set a clear vision and goal to scale up GEBs. The GEF's focus on scaling is more explicit compared to many other international development institutions, and clearly indicates support for the enabling conditions necessary for impacts to be scaled up. But like other institutions, the GEF's vision for scaling up is not consistently clear in the operational guidance across all programs and the GEF portfolio.

226. During project and program design, guidelines are absent on how interventions are expected to scale up outcomes. While technically sound, almost half of the approved GEF-7 projects do not clearly articulate concrete links between their activities, outcomes, the scaling up process and resulting impacts, even though they have a long-term scaling outlook.

2. In cases where the GEF has supported scaling up, it uses multiple modes, such as replication, mainstreaming and linking, to scale up interventions that generate global environmental benefits, drawing on the comparative advantages of the members of the GEF partnership.

227. The GEF contributes to scaling up efforts by helping replicate, mainstream and link interventions that generate GEBs. Replication refers to the implementation of the same intervention multiple times by increasing numbers of stakeholders and/or covering larger areas, typically by leveraging finance, knowledge, and policy. Mainstreaming involves the integration of an intervention's implementation within an institution's regular operations, usually through a policy or legal framework. Linking refers to the implementation of different types of interventions across multiple geographic locations, administrative levels, or sectors and institutions that comprise the different components of an ecological, economic, or governance system. All three modes of scaling up are often interdependent processes that may take place through one or more projects—whether in parallel or in sequence—that all contribute to generating a specific impact at a target scale.

228. Multilateral development banks (MDBs) such as the World Bank provide larger amounts of funding through loans, and typically scale up through replication. Other GEF Agencies with more limited funding, such as UN Agencies and international NGOs, are shifting more towards linking through partnership-building across multiple sectors to leverage the comparative advantages of other institutions. All GEF Agencies contribute to scaling up through mainstreaming.

3. The extent of GEF support to scaling up and the rate at which outcomes are scaled up vary across focal areas, but typically take place over more than 5 years, and generate higher outcomes per GEF dollar per year, during the scaling up stage as compared with the pilot stage. Indicators used between the pilot and scaling up stage were not always consistent, limiting the tracking of progress.

229. GEF support for scaling up processes ranged from grants of less than \$1 million to grants over \$100 million, with the period of GEF support ranging from less than 5 years to over 25 years. Typically, GEF support for scaling was provided for more than 5 years, or through more than one project, and was delivered through a variety of modalities including enabling activities, SGP projects, and medium-sized and full-sized projects.

230. Within cases where GEF support for piloting and scaling up stages could clearly be distinguished from project documents, measurable outcomes per dollar per year during the scaling up stage were between 1.1 to 74.5 times larger than during the pilot stage, indicative of achieving greater cost-effectiveness, and higher co-financing leveraged for scaling activities per GEF dollar. Outcomes were derived from project evaluations, and do not reflect scaled-up outcomes which were catalyzed by GEF support, including at least 40 percent of the cases where scaling up activities have been continued by other donors and institutions.

231. The GEF's results framework provides corporate targets for GEBs for the current replenishment period. These targets are not set or tracked relative to the specific spatial and temporal scales of the environmental issue that needs to be addressed, but to the amount of funding available for a project, program or replenishment period. This limits the ability of the GEF from assessing its progress relative the full magnitude and scope of the environmental problems it aims to address. Linked projects that contribute to the same scaling up target do not consistently use the same indicators or even units of measurement, making it difficult to track progress towards their specific environmental targets. The core indicators will address this to some extent, but projects often track other indicators as well, which are not consistent across linked projects.

4. GEF has supported scaling up by establishing enabling conditions, choosing the appropriate influencers and institutions to work with, and leveraging contextual conditions at the right time.

232. GEF funding was found to support eight types of enabling conditions that contribute to the scaling up process: 1) knowledge and information dissemination, 2) participatory processes, and 3) incentives and disincentives to motivate adoption of interventions; 4) institutional and individual capacities, 5) policy framework and operating guidelines, and 6) sustainable financing to allow sustained support for scaling; and 7) multi-stakeholder interactions and partnerships, and 8) systematic learning mechanisms to allow the scaling up process to be adaptable and cost-effective in the face of changing contextual conditions.

233. GEF support was most commonly used to support incentives and knowledge and information initiatives which increased the willingness of stakeholders to adopt interventions that generated GEBs and helped gain the support of influential persons and institutions to make scaling a political priority. In all cases assessed, GEF support was also used to strengthen institutional and individual capacities for scaling up interventions. Both support for capacities and sustainable sources of financing allowed scaling up activities to be sustained beyond GEF funding in the observed cases. However, these sustainable funding sources are subject to risks from changes in political and economic conditions.

234. In addition to supporting the appropriate enabling conditions, GEF support also contributed to scaling up by choosing the right influencers and institutions to work with, such as technically competent champions; individuals, government agencies and donor organizations with political and economic traction and a long-term scaling outlook; and long-term structures with wide geographic reach and implementation experience, continuity in staff, and opportunities for frequent local and global interaction. In some cases, GEF support facilitated scaling up by leveraging contextual conditions—such as existing legal obligations and political priorities, external events, and shifts in the political landscape—at the right time to align with scaling up objectives.

5. GEF support has catalyzed the scaling up process by de-risking innovations and demonstrating project benefits at the pilot stage. Systematic learning mechanisms for scaling up were not supported by the GEF in most of the earlier closed projects, but about half of the approved GEF-7 projects address learning more systematically.

235. GEF support contributes to scaling up by demonstrating the benefits of effective interventions in specific contexts and helps to establish the enabling conditions to scale up these benefits in larger contexts. GEF and other institutions' support for scaling was frequently contingent on the positive results of the pilot stage, indicative of a long-term scaling outlook anchored on adaptive learning. According to interviews, the GEF's comparative advantage lies in de-risking investments by piloting interventions that neither the public nor private sector is willing to fund and where no clear benefits have been demonstrated. Another comparative advantage is GEF's flexible grants, which attract more funding from government and other donors for scaling activities. Systematic learning allows projects and programs to leverage the right contextual conditions at the right time to align with scaling objectives. GEF funding was found to be least frequently used to establish systematic learning mechanisms in completed projects, where learning was more on an ad hoc basis. On the other hand, slightly more than half of GEF-7 projects include a budget and details on systematic learning mechanisms, which should be able to provide timely guidance on scaling up.

D. Recommendation

The GEF partnership needs to ensure that factors influencing scaling up are identified and taken into account, as appropriate, in project design and implementation, and their impact assessed at midterm and terminal evaluations.

236. A program or project should identify its contributions to the scaling up process, such as through its support for the appropriate enabling conditions, particularly systematic learning mechanisms, and addressing contextual factors that affect scaling up. While this evaluation found successful cases of scaling up in the absence of these guidelines, guidance may systematically increase the likelihood of outcomes being scaled up during and beyond project or program implementation, in line with the GEF's vision. The expectation is not for all GEF projects to achieve impact at scale, but to clearly articulate how each project contributes to the long-term vision for achieving results at larger scale.

237. Projects and programs implemented in parallel or in sequence that are explicitly linked by design must have common environmental indicators that use the same units of measurement to allow outcomes to be aggregated, and progress to be tracked. The GEF's current results framework provides common indicators which makes this possible at the portfolio level; but linked projects and programs must use common units of measurement and indicators for specific outcomes that are not tracked by the GEF's core indicators and sub-indicators.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Agapitova, N. and Linn, J. 2016. [Scaling Up Social Enterprise Innovations: Approaches and Lessons](#). Global Economy and Development at Brookings. Working Paper 95. Brookings Institution.
- Baker, D., Drazen, E., Metzel, R., Tolbert, S., Walton, A. 2016. Understanding the Factors of Scalable Success: Broader Adoption of Small Grants Programme Projects in Five Countries. Yale School of Forestry and Environmental Studies. The GEF Small Grants Programme. January 2016.
- Barker, P., Reid, A., Schall, M.W. 2016. [A framework for scaling up health interventions: lessons from large-scale improvement initiatives in Africa](#). In: Implementation Science (2016) 11:12. DOI 10.1186/s13012-016-0374-x
- Begovic, M., Linn, J., Vrbensky, R. 2017. [Scaling up the impact of development interventions. Lessons from a Review of UNDP Country Programs. Global Economy and Development](#). Global Economy and Development at Brookings. Working Paper 101. Brookings Institution.
- Bezanson, K., Isenman, P., Shakov, A. 2012 [Scaling up in Agriculture, Rural Development, and Nutrition. Learning from the Experience of Vertical Funds](#). IFPRI. Focus 19. Brief 18. June 2012. International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI).
- Bradach, J. and Grindle, A. 2014. Transformative Scale: The Future of Growing What Works. Nine Strategies to deliver impact at scale that truly meets needs. In: [Smarter Philanthropy for Greater Impact: Rethinking How Grantmakers Support Scale](#). Supplement for Stanford Social Innovation Review. February 2014. Pp. 7-10.
- Bartczak, L. 2014. Leveraging a Movement Moment. In: [Smarter Philanthropy for Greater Impact: Rethinking How Grantmakers Support Scale](#). Supplement for Stanford Social Innovation Review. February 2014. Pp 22-23.
- Chandy, L., Hosono, A., Kharas, H., Linn, J., eds. 2013. Getting to Scale. How to Bring Development Solutions to Millions of Poor People. Brookings Institution's Press, Washington, DC.
- CIAT (Centro Internacional de Agricultura Tropical). 2004. [Scaling up and out: Achieving widespread impact through agricultural research](#). / Edited by Douglas Pachico and Sam Fujisaka. CIAT Publication No 340: Cali, Colombia.
- CIF (Climate Investment Funds). 2019. [Transformational Change in the Climate Investment Funds. Summary of Findings from an Independent Evaluation and Evidence Synthesis](#). Climate Investment Funds.
- Cooley, L. 2016. [Scaling Up – From Visions to Large-Scale Change. A Management Framework for Practitioners. Third Edition](#). Management Systems International. Arlington, Virginia.
- Cooley, L. and Kohl, R. 2006. [Scaling Up – From Vision to Large-Scale Change. A Management Framework for Practitioners](#). Management Systems International, Washington, DC.

- Cooley, L. and Linn, J. 2014. [Taking Innovations to Scale: Methods, Applications and Lessons](#). Results for Development Institute (R4D), Management Systems International (MSI), Washington, DC.
- Cooley, L. and Ved, R. 2012. [Scaling Up – From Vision to Large-Scale Change. A Management Framework for Practitioners. Second Edition](#). Management Systems International. Washington, DC.
- Enright, K. P. 2014. What Would it Take? In: [Smarter Philanthropy for Greater Impact: Rethinking How Grantmakers Support Scale](#). Supplement for Stanford Social Innovation Review. February 2014. Pp. 3-6.
- FAO (Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations). 2018. [Scaling Up Agroecology Initiative. Transforming Food and Agricultural Systems in Support of the SDGs. A Proposal Prepared for the International Symposium on Agroecology](#). 3-5 April, 2018.
- GCF (Green Climate Fund). 2017. [Operational Framework on complementarity and coherence](#). GCF/B.17/08. Decision B.17/04. Songdo, Incheon, Republic of Korea.
- _____. 2018. [Annual Update on Complementarity and Coherence](#). GCF/B.20/05. Songdo, Incheon, Republic of Korea.
- GIZ (Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit). 2014. [Corporate evaluation: German Agency for International Cooperation. Corporate strategy evaluation on scaling up and broad impact](#). GIZ: Bonn, Germany.
- Global Fund (The Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria). 2017. [The Global Fund Strategy 2017-2022. Investing to End Epidemics](#). The Global Fund, Geneva, Switzerland.
- _____. 2018. [The Global Fund Results Report 2018](#). The Global Fund, Geneva, Switzerland.
- GPE (The Global Partnership for Education). 2018. [GPE Results Report 2018](#). The Global Partnership for Education, Washington, DC.
- GTZ (Deutsche Gesellschaft für Technische Zusammenarbeit). 2011. [Scaling up In Development Cooperation. Practical Guidelines](#). Eschborn, Germany.
- Gündel, S., Hancock, J., and Anderson, S. 2001. [Scaling up Strategies for Research in Natural Resources Management: A Comparative Review](#). Chatham, UK: Natural Resources Institute.
- Hancock, J., 2003. [Scaling up the Impact of Good Practices in Rural Development. A Working Paper to Support Implementation of the World Bank's Rural Development Strategy](#). Report Number: 26031. World Bank, Washington, DC.
- Hartmann A, and Linn J. 2008. [Scaling Up: A Framework and Lessons for Development Effectiveness from Literature and Practice](#). Wolfensohn Center for Development, Wolfensohn Center for Development at Brookings. Working Paper 5. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution.
- IDCOL (Infrastructure Development Company Limited). 2017. [Annual Report 2017. Highway to Progression](#). Dhaka, Bangladesh.

IEG (Independent Evaluation Group). 2010. [Assessing the Impact of IFC's China Utility-Based Energy Efficiency Finance Program. Energy Efficiency Finance](#). IEG Study Series. World Bank Group, Washington, DC.

_____. 2010. [Climate Change and the World Bank Group. Phase II: The Challenge of Low-Carbon Development](#). IEG Study Series. World Bank Group, Washington, DC.

_____. 2011. [The World Bank's Involvement in Global and Regional Partnership Programs: An Independent Assessment](#). World Bank Group, Washington, DC.

_____. 2014. [Rural Electrification and Renewable Energy Development Project \(IDA-36790 IDA-46430 IDA-50130 TF-51301\). Power Sector Development Technical Assistance Project \(IDA-39130 IDA-H0920\). Power Sector Development Policy Credit \(IDA-44360\). Project Performance Assessment Report. The Peoples' Republic of Bangladesh](#). Report Number 88546. IEG, the World Bank.

_____. 2016. [Supporting Transformational Change for Poverty Reduction and Shared Prosperity. Lessons from World Bank Group Experience](#). An IEG Category II Learning Product. IEG, World Bank Group.

_____. 2017. [Renewable Energy Scale-Up Program: Phase One. Project Performance Assessment Report](#). Report No. 117156. IEG, the World Bank, Washington, DC.

IFAD (International Fund for Agricultural Development). 2015. [Climate-resilient agricultural development. Scaling up note](#). Rome, Italy.

_____. 2015. [IFAD's Operational Framework for Scaling Up Results](#). Rome, Italy.

IFAD IOE (International Fund for Agricultural Development Independent Office of Evaluation). 2017. [IFAD's Support to Scaling Up of Results. Evaluation Synthesis](#). Report №4407. Document of the International Fund for Agricultural Development.

IIRR (International Institute for Rural Reconstruction). 2000. [Going to Scale: Can We Bring More Benefits to More People More Quickly?](#) The CGIAR-NGO Committee and the Global Forum for Agricultural Research. Silang, Cavite, Philippines.

Indig, D., Lee, K., Grunseit, A., Milat, A., Bauman, A. 2018. [Pathways for Scaling Up Public Health Interventions](#), In: BMC Public Health (2017): 18:68.

Itad. 2019. [Evaluation of Transformational Change in the Climate Investment Funds](#).

Jonasova, M. and Cooke, S. 2012. [Thinking Systematically about Scaling Up: Developing Guidance for Scaling Up World Bank-supported Agriculture and Rural Development Organization. The Case of Competitive Grant Schemes for Agriculture and Rural Development Operations](#). World Bank, Washington, DC.

Kato, T., Ellis, J., Pauw, P., Caruso, R. 2014. Scaling up and Replicating Effective Climate Finance Interventions. Climate Change Expert Group. Paper Number 2014 (1). OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/2227779X>

Linn, J. 2011. Scaling Up with Aid: The Institutional Dimension. In: Kharas, H., Makino, K.i and Jung, W., eds. 2017. Catalyzing Development: A New Vision for Aid. Washington, DC: The Brookings Institution, pp. 202-232.

Linn, J. 2015. [Scaling up in the Country Program Strategies of the International Aid Agencies: An Assessment of the African Development Bank's Country Strategy Papers](#). In: Global Journal of Emerging Market Economies. 7(3) 236-256.

OECD. 2013. Scaling up Finance Mechanisms for Biodiversity, OECD Publishing.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/9789264193833-en>

Tengberg, A., Radstake, F., Zhang, K., Dunn, B. 2014. [Scaling Up of Sustainable Land Management in the Western People's Republic of China: Evaluation of A 10-Year Partnership](#), In: Land Degradation & Development. 2014.

[The GloBallast Story: Reflections from a Global Family. GEF-UNDP-IMO GloBallast Partnerships Programme](#). GloBallast Monograph No. 25.

UNDP (United Nations Development Programme). 2013. [Scaling Up Development Programmes. Guidance Note](#). UNDP, New York, NY.

_____. 2016. [Scaling Up Community Actions for International Waters Management. Experiences from the GEF Small Grants Programme](#). UNDP, New York.

_____. 2017. [Community Approaches to Sustainable Land Management and Agroecology Practices](#). UNDP, New York.

_____. 2017. [Community-based Chemicals and Waste Management: Experiences from GEF Small Grants Programme](#). UNDP, New York.

_____. 2017. [Making Waves: Community Solutions, Sustainable Oceans](#). UNDP, New York.

_____. 2017. [South-South Community Innovation Exchange Platform: The experience of the Global Environment Facility Small Grants Programme](#), UNDP, New York.

_____. 2018. [Annual Monitoring Report. July 2016 – June 2017. GEF Small Grants Program](#). UNDP, New York.

UNDP/ GEF. 2012. [Catalyzing Ocean Finance. Volume I. Transforming Markets to Restore and Protect the Global Ocean](#). United Nations Development Programme, New York. Global Environment Facility, Washington, DC.

_____. 2012. [Catalyzing Ocean Finance. Volume II. Methodologies and Case Studies](#). United Nations Development Programme, New York. Global Environment Facility, Washington, DC.

_____. 2015. [Chemicals and Waste Management for Sustainable Development. Results from UNDP's Work to Protect Human Health and the Environment from POPs](#). United Nations Development Programme, New York. Global Environment Facility, Washington, DC.

_____. 2016. [Mercury Management for Sustainable Development](#). United Nations Development Programme, New York. Global Environment Facility, Washington, DC.

Uvin, P., 1995, [Fighting Hunger at the Grassroots: Paths to Scaling Up](#), In: World Development, Vol. 23, No. 6, pp. 927-939, 1995.

Uvin, P., Jain, P.S., Brown, L.D., 2000. [Think Large and Act Small: Toward a New Paradigm for NGO Scaling Up](#). In: World Development, Vol. 28, No. 8, pp. 1409-1419, 2000.

WHO (World Health Organization). 2007. [Scaling up Health Service Delivery: from Pilot Initiatives to Policies and Programmes](#). / Edited by Ruth Simmons, Peter Fajans, and Laura Ghiron. World Health Organization, Geneva, Switzerland.

_____. 2010. [Nine Steps for Developing a Scaling up Strategy](#). World Health Organization, Geneva, Switzerland.

_____. 2011. [Beginning with the end in mind. Planning Pilot projects and other programmatic research for successful scaling up](#). World Health Organization, Geneva, Switzerland.

World Bank. 2005. [Reducing Poverty on a Global Scale. Learning and Innovating for Development. Findings from the Shanghai Global Learning Initiative](#). / Edited by Blanca Moreno-Dodson. World Bank. Washington, DC.

_____. 2006. [Scaling Up Marine Management. The Role of Marine Protected Areas](#). The World Bank, Washington, DC.

_____. 2012. Lessons from Scaling Up. Lessons and Recommendations for Agricultural Practitioners. Agriculture and Rural Development Joint Notes. Issue 59. February 2012.

_____. 2018. [Bangladesh - Second Rural Electrification and Renewable Energy Development Project : additional financing](#). Report Number PAD 2636. March 20, 2018. World Bank Group.

World Bank Group/The Global Financing Facility (GFF). 2018. [Country-Powered Investments. For Every Woman, Every Child, and Every Adolescent. 2017-2018 Annual Report](#). World Bank Group, Washington, DC.

WRI (World Resources Institute). 2015. Appadurai, A.N., Chaudhury, M., Dinshaw, A., Ginoya N., McGray, H., Rangwala, L., Srivatsa, S. [Scaling Success. Lessons from Adaptation Pilots in the Rainfed Regions of India](#). World Resources Institute.

WWF (World Wildlife Fund). 2017. Developing Strategies to Achieve Transformational and Sustainable Change. In: [WWF Standards of Conservation Project and Programme Management \(PPMS\)](#). 30 June 2017. P. 27.

GEF and GEF IEO documents

GEF (Global Environment Facility). 2008. [From Projects to Programs: Clarifying the Programmatic Approach to the GEF Portfolio](#). GEF/C.33/6.

_____. 2014. [GEF 2020 -- Strategy for the GEF](#). GEF/A.5/10.

_____. 2014. [GEF-6 Programming Directions](#). Extract from GEF/A.5/07/Rev.01.

_____. 2017. [Guidelines on the Project and Program Cycle Policy](#). GEF/C.52/Inf.06/Rev.01

_____. 2017. [Guidelines for GEF Agencies in Conducting Terminal Evaluation of Full-Sized Projects](#).

_____. 2018. [Guidelines on Core Indicators and Sub-Indicators](#). ME/GN/02

_____. 2018. [GEF-7 Policy Recommendations](#). GEF/R.7/18.

_____. 2018. [GEF-7 Replenishment Programming Directions](#). GEF/R.7/19.

_____. 2018. [Project and Program Cycle Policy](#). OP/PL/01.

GEF IEO (Global Environment Facility Independent Evaluation Office; formerly GEF Evaluation Office). 2010. [GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy](#). Evaluation Document Number 4.

_____. 2014. [Climate Change Mitigation. GEF Support to Market Change in China, India, Mexico, and Russia](#). GEF Impact Evaluation. Evaluation Report Number 90. GEF IEO, Washington, DC.

_____. 2016. [Impact Evaluation of GEF Support to Protected Areas and Protected Area Systems](#). Evaluation Report Number 104. GEF IEO, Washington, DC.

_____. 2017. [Evaluation of the GEF's System for Transparent Allocation of Resources](#). GEF/ME/C.53/Inf.10. GEF IEO, Washington, DC.

_____. 2018. [An Evaluative Approach to Assessing GEF's Additionality](#). GEF/ME/C.55/inf.01. GEF IEO, Washington, DC.

_____. 2018. [Evaluation of GEF Support for Transformational Change](#). Evaluation Report Number 122. GEF IEO, Washington, DC.

_____. 2018. [Sixth Comprehensive Evaluation of the GEF: The GEF in the Changing Environmental Finance Landscape](#). Evaluation Report Number 110. GEF IEO, Washington, DC.

GEF OME (Global Environment Facility Office of Monitoring and Evaluation). 2005. [Third Overall Performance Study of the Global Environment Facility \(OPS3\): Progressing toward Environmental Results](#). Washington, DC: GEF OME.