

16th LDCF/SCCF Council Meeting
May 27, 2014
Cancún, Mexico

Agenda Item 9

LDCF/SCCF ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT 2013

(Prepared by the GEF Independent Evaluation Office)

Recommended Council Decision

The Council, having considered document GEF/LDCF.SCCF/16/ME/02, “*LDCF/SCCF Annual Evaluation Report 2013*” welcomes the report and notes the information on the progress of the LDCF and SCCF. The Council requests the GEF Independent Evaluation Office to develop the AER as the portfolios mature to become a strong source of information and a tool for decision making.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary	1
Background	2
Assessment of Terminal Evaluations	2
Decentralization of Governance.....	3
Monitoring and Evaluation.....	4
LDCF: Implementation of NAPAs	5
Background	5
Conclusions	6
Progress of the SCCF.....	7
Methodology	8
Portfolio Composition and Evolution	8
Innovative Approaches.....	8
Management Action Record	11

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This document is the first LDCF/SCCF Annual Evaluation Report (AER) prepared by the Independent Evaluation Office. This report presents an assessment of the terminal evaluations of completed LDCF/SCCF projects that were submitted during the fiscal year 2013. The report includes findings of a quality-at-entry review of LDCF projects approved to implement National Adaptation Plans of Action (NAPAs) to assess the extent to which they respond to key issues identified by NAPAs and project design quality. It also reports on the progress of the SCCF and a Management Action Record (MAR) reporting on the follow up on the implementation of LDCF/SCCF Council decisions on recommendations of the SCCF Evaluation.

The completed projects show progress in addressing a number of themes deemed beneficial to overall project success including the involvement of local stakeholders in the decision making process, the inclusion of a focus on gender issues, and greater dissemination of information to the public of the projects and the underlying environmental issues that were being addressed. On the other hand, a lack of focus on monitoring and evaluation was also commonly noted. Of these issues, decentralization of governance, and monitoring and evaluation are discussed briefly in the report.

The evaluation of follow-up of the National Action Plans on Adaptation reaches five conclusions:

- (1) A large majority of the projects is aligned with their NAPA.
- (2) Agriculture is the key adaptation issue in NAPAs.
- (3) All Projects are found to be consistent with LDCF strategies, eligibility criteria, and priorities.
- (4) NAPA projects are mainstreaming gender into adaptation initiatives.
- (5) A large majority of NAPA implementation projects included wide stakeholder involvement and are assessing risks.

The update of the SCCF evaluation contains examples of the innovative approaches that have been applied in the completed projects.

The report also contains the Management Action Record on the level of adoption of the Council decisions on recommendations of the LDCF and SCCF evaluations. Two decisions of the Council have been fully implemented; one decision on increasing the visibility of LDCF/SCCF still needs further implementation and will be tracked again in the next Annual Report.

BACKGROUND

1. In June 2013, the LDCF/SCCF Council approved a work program for the Global Environment Facility (GEF) Independent Evaluation Office for FY 14 that included an LDCF/SCCF Annual Evaluation Report (AER) to report on the performance of the LDCF and SCCF, as well as on ongoing evaluation issues. This document is the first LDCF/SCCF Annual Evaluation Report (AER) prepared by the Independent Evaluation Office. This report presents an assessment of the terminal evaluations of completed LDCF/SCCF projects that were submitted during the fiscal year 2013. The report includes findings of a quality-at-entry review of LDCF projects approved to implement National Adaptation Plans of Action (NAPAs) to assess the extent to which they respond to key issues identified by NAPAs and project design quality. It also reports on the progress of the SCCF and a Management Action Record (MAR) reporting on the follow up on the implementation of LDCF/SCCF Council decisions on recommendations of the SCCF Evaluation.

ASSESSMENT OF TERMINAL EVALUATIONS

2. Four completed projects that received funding from the Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF) and one completed project that received funding from the Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF) are among the 160 completed projects in the Annual Performance Report (APR) 2013 cohort – marking the first time that projects supported by these funds are reported on in the APR. For fiscal year 2014, the GEF IEO has also begun reporting on evaluation issues in the LDCF/SCCF portfolio in this report. Going forward, the APR will continue to provide coverage on completed LDCF/SCCF projects, including several currently under implementation that are jointly funded from the GEF Trust Fund and the LDCF and/or SCCF funds.

3. Table 1 provides summary information and outcome and sustainability ratings for the five completed SCCF/LDCF projects. Given the small number of completed projects to date, these five projects are not representative of the full range of objectives and approaches of the two funds. Four are national projects focused on freshwater availability and management and the other is an economic analysis of adaptation options intended for a global audience.

4. Four of the five completed projects had outcome ratings in the satisfactory range. One notable theme common to three of the projects with satisfactory outcome ratings (GEF IDs 2832; 3154; 3156) is the reliance upon decentralized governance and decision-making. In all three projects, governance of local water resources was established in part through a bottom-up process involving stakeholder forums that enhanced buy-in and participation and was reportedly critical to the success of the projects. The Economic Analysis of Adaptation Options project, (GEF ID 3679) which sought “to develop a framework and information base to support increased and innovative means of financing adaptation to climate change”, is rated as moderately unsatisfactory for overall outcomes. Key shortcomings cited in the terminal evaluation of this project were a disconnect between national planning and the project’s methodology, and the proprietary nature of project data and methodology, which is seen as limiting the long-term impact of the project.

5. In terms of sustainability of project outcomes, three of the five completed projects received ratings of moderately likely or higher. Failure to directly assess the financial viability of

the technologies introduced is seen as limiting the sustainability of the Coping with Drought and Climate Change in Ethiopia project (GEF ID 3154), whereas for the Economic Analysis of Adaptation Options project (GEF ID 3679), the lack of an open methodology and publically accessible project data, noted above, and the fact that the project's reporting failed to make an impact in peer-reviewed academic literature or country-driven strategies, were determinants in the project's moderately unlikely sustainability rating.

Table 1. Outcome and Sustainability ratings of completed SCCF and LDCF projects that are part of the APR 2013 cohort

GEF ID	Fund	Agency	Project Title	Country	GEF Funding (\$M)	Outcome rating ¹	Sustainability rating
2832	SCCF	UNDP	Mainstreaming Climate Change in Integrated Water Resources Management in Pangani River Basin	Tanzania	1	MS	ML
3154	SCCF	UNDP	Coping with Drought and Climate Change	Ethiopia	1	S	MU
3156	SCCF	UNDP	Coping with Drought and Climate Change	Zimbabwe	1	S	ML
3679	SCCF	UNEP	Economic Analysis of Adaptation Options	Global	1	MU	MU
3219	LDCF	UNDP	Reducing Climate Change-induced Risks and Vulnerabilities from Glacial Lake Outbursts in the Punakha-Wangdi and Chamkhar Valleys	Bhutan	3.4	S	L

6. The completed projects also show progress in addressing a number of themes deemed beneficial to overall project success including the involvement of local stakeholders in the decision making process, the inclusion of a focus on gender issues, and greater dissemination of information to the public of the projects and the underlying environmental issues that were being addressed. On the other hand, a lack of focus on monitoring and evaluation was also commonly noted. Of these issues, decentralization of governance, and monitoring and evaluation are discussed briefly in the following sections.

Decentralization of Governance

7. A common component to three of the five completed projects was an increased reliance on the decentralization of governance and decision making, which was reportedly critical to the success of the projects. Decentralization is identified as particularly relevant where government

¹ UNDP/GEF six-point rating scale: Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S), Marginally Satisfactory (MS), Marginally Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U), Highly Unsatisfactory (HU).

capacity for ownership of projects may be uncertain, and promotes ownership by the affected stakeholders. For example, the project entitled “Coping with Drought and Climate Change in Ethiopia” (GEF ID 3154 or Ethiopia Project) was delivered through a highly decentralized management system at the local community level including farmer groups. The selection of the beneficiaries, the implementation of bylaws, and related activities were conducted, in part, by development committees comprised of farmers, women, teachers, and extension agents. This inclusionary structure was reported to result in greater targeted benefits and enhanced participation.

8. Similarly, in the analogous project, Coping with Drought and Climate Change in Zimbabwe (GEF ID 3156 or Zimbabwe Project), a participatory community driven approach was utilized to determine priorities and local arrangements for government agency implementation. However, when compared to the project in Ethiopia, it was not as successful in promoting local ownership. While there are certainly benefits to the communities and stakeholders involved, a lack of management ownership of the program may create a slower or less systematic replication of benefits by the practices and information introduced. In the Pagani River Basin Management Project (GEF ID 2832 or Pagani River Basin Project), participatory forums were established to allow water users to actively manage water resources, and to design an operational framework for the regulation of conflicts. This approach, coupled with new information and projections of water resources, allowed the users to make the tough choices to decide the preferred water allocation strategy.

Monitoring and Evaluation

9. Two of the five projects were found to have satisfactory M&E, while three of the five projects were evaluated to have problems with their approaches. For example, the Zimbabwe Project was found to have a good baseline study, but follow up data and surveys were collected in a way that was not fully comparable to the baseline. The terminal evaluation’s central concern is that monitoring should be able to measure meaningful changes in farming adaptation practices and not simply completion of activities funded by the project. Similar concerns were raised in the Ethiopia Project, in that monitoring efficacy was questioned due to a focus on reporting activities completed rather than empirical evidence of dissemination and replication. It was also noted that there was no monitoring system to track the performance of the ‘model farmers’, nor even a clear record of their names or locations.

10. In the Pagani River Basin Project difficulties in monitoring were reportedly a result of the merging of two project documents from the EU and the UNDP/GEF components. The set of indicators from the two documents were not updated during project implementation, nor refined when preparing the annual work plans. This was identified as a major setback because it could have formed the basis for monitoring and evaluation and tracked key milestones during implementation. These results suggest more focus and training may need to be provided in order to improve M&E.

LDCF: IMPLEMENTATION OF NAPAS

Background

11. As part of OPS5 the Independent Evaluation Office undertook an update of the Joint LDCF evaluation undertaken with DANIDA in 2009. Quality-at-entry reviews of the 138 projects approved to implement NAPAs were done to assess the extent to which they respond to key issues identified by NAPAs.

12. The LDCF was established as a funding mechanism for LDCs, at its seventh Conference of the Parties (COP7) to access funding to prepare and implement their NAPAs. The GEF manages the LDCF. The LDCF supports the preparation and the implementation of the NAPAs. Eligible LDCs can then access funding from the LDCF to implement the immediate adaptation needs as specified in the NAPAs. Currently, 51 LDCs have accessed \$12.2 million to support the preparation of their National Adaptation Programmes of Action (NAPA). Cape Verde and Maldives have since graduated from LDC status. In December 2012, South Sudan officially became recognized as an LDC.^{2 3}

13. NAPAs were established under article 4.9 of the UNFCCC to “provide a process for the Least Developed Countries to identify priority activities that respond to their urgent and immediate needs with regard to adaptation to climate change—those needs for which further delay could increase vulnerability or lead to increased costs at a later stage.”⁴

14. Through a country-driven and participatory approach, the NAPA process identifies adaptation needs of the country and prioritizes immediate needs for adaptation and list priority projects for funding. NAPA implementation projects therefore are expected to be closely aligned to their immediate needs as specified in the NAPA. Projects are accessing funds for adaptation needs such as agriculture and food security, disaster risk management, water resources management, natural resources management (NRM), health, climate information systems, coastal zone management, and infrastructure development.

15. The GEF Independent Evaluation Office in partnership with DANIDA conducted an evaluation of the LDCF “to analyze and document the results and lessons learned from the operations of the LDCF in financing and promoting climate change adaptation.”⁵ The joint evaluation of the Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF) was completed in 2009. The purpose of the evaluation was to assess the results and lessons learned from the operations of the LDCF (including countries, agencies, donors, and Secretariat) in financing and promoting adaptation in LDCs.

² South Sudan has not yet submitted a NAPA to the UNFCCC, but was approved to access LDCF resources for NAPA preparation in August 2013. Two of the NAPAs completed are by Cape Verde and Maldives, countries which are no longer classified as LDCs.

³ GEF/LDCF.SCCF.15/03 (10/6/2013). Progress Report on the Least Developed Countries Fund and the Special Climate Change Fund, LDCF/SCCF Council Meeting 2013.

⁴ https://unfccc.int/adaptation/workstreams/national_adaptation_programmes_of_action/items/7567.php.

⁵ GEF Evaluation Office and DANIDA. 2009. Evaluation of the operation of the Least Developed Countries Fund for Adaptation to Climate Change.

16. At that time of the joint evaluation of the LDCF, the fund was still in its first phase and grants to beneficiaries only covered the development of NAPAs. Since then the LDCF has proceeded into a new phase of funding concrete adaptation activities. Currently, of the 50 countries that had completed their NAPAs, 48 have accessed a total of \$726.3 million for country projects that address urgent and immediate adaptation needs. To date, cumulative pledges to the LDCF amount to \$878.9 million, of which \$829.5 million has been committed.⁶ In addition, a medium-size project (MSP) of \$2.2 million, aiming to support the preparation of the National Adaptation Plan (NAP) process in LDCs, was approved by the GEF CEO.⁷ This study outlines the findings of a quality-at-entry review of 138 projects approved to implement NAPAs to assess the extent to which they respond to key issues identified by NAPAs and project design quality.

17. The analysis used a total of 138 projects, representing 50 countries, approved to implement NAPAs, under the LDCF trust fund modality and is comprised of 130 full-size projects (FSPs) and 8 medium-size projects (MSPs).⁸ NAPAs were assessed to determine key adaptation priorities as well as ranking of priorities. The primary adaptation priority/sector of each LDCF project was determined based on information from project documents as well as LDCF primary sector listings. The degree of alignment to NAPA priorities was based on the degree to which the project responded to the highest ranked priorities. The highest degree of alignment being that of addressing the highest ranked priority identified in the NAPA.

18. The evaluation also reviewed the overall relevance of the projects at design stage within the broader context of the NAPAs and LDCF criteria and priorities. This included alignment with other national priorities, as well as the degree of partnerships with key stakeholders, risk assessments (presence of risk assessment and mitigation strategy), and degree of gender based inclusion in adaptation activities at project design.

Conclusions

19. **Conclusion 1: A large majority of the projects is aligned with their NAPA.** Fifty-eight percent of projects in the portfolio show very high alignment with the NAPA, i.e. that they address the highest priority identified in the relevant NAPA. None of the projects in the portfolio show little or no alignment with the relevant NAPA. Alignment to the NAPA was measured by the degree with which NAPA implementation projects responded to the priority adaptation needs listed in the NAPA. All projects are aligned to their respective NAPA with 58 percent showing a very high degree of alignment and 42 percent a high alignment, i.e. more than half of projects are aligned with their respective country's highest priority.

20. **Conclusion2: Agriculture is the key adaptation issue in NAPAs.** Agriculture emerged as the key priority in the NAPAs submitted to the UNFCCC. Agriculture is listed as a key adaptation need in 96 percent of the NAPAs analyzed, followed by water resource management

⁶ Council Document GEF/LDCF.SCCF.15/03. October 6, 2013. Progress Report on the Least Developed Countries Fund and the Special Climate Change Fund.

⁷ <http://www.thegef.org/gef/LDCF> and Council Document GEF/LDCF.SCCF.15/03. October 6, 2013. Progress Report on the Least Developed Countries Fund and the Special Climate Change Fund.

⁸ The first phase of the review used a cohort of 51 projects having a 90 percent probability of being within a 10 percentage point of the results that the study found in the sample.

at 87 percent and NRM 78 percent each respectively. Thirty-two percent of NAPA implementation projects list Agriculture and food security as a primary priority. Only two projects list infrastructure development as a primary priority. Human health is not listed as a primary priority in any of the projects. At the regional level, 70 percent of projects from the Africa region indicated agriculture as their highest priority and 28 percent from Asia and 2 percent from the Latin American and Caribbean Region.

21. **Conclusion 3: All Projects are found to be consistent with LDCF strategies, eligibility criteria, and priorities.** The NAPA implementation projects are also well aligned with other national development priorities, such as, National Adaptation Priorities (NAPs), National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans (NBSAPs), national communications to the UNFCCC, Technology Needs Assessments (TNAs), National Implementation Plans (NIPs), Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSPs), and national Planning Frameworks (NPF).

22. **Conclusion 4: NAPA projects are mainstreaming gender into adaptation initiatives.** Overall a high percentage of projects (82 percent) have a gender strategy. NAPA implementation projects are now increasingly using gender disaggregated indicators to measure progress, following the introduction of a results based management tracking tool that mandated the use of gender disaggregated indicators to measure progress on mainstreaming gender into adaptation measures in by the LDCF in 2010.

23. **Conclusion 5: A large majority of NAPA implementation projects included wide stakeholder involvement and are assessing risks.** Ninety-six percent of NAPA implementation projects included stakeholder involvement at project design, particularly with community based organizations (80 percent of the projects were planning at design to work with CBOs). Projects are assessing risks and 95 percent of the projects included a mitigation strategy.

PROGRESS OF THE SCCF

24. The Evaluation of the SCCF, completed in 2011, was also updated in the framework of OPS5. The SCCF was formally established at COP 7, assigning it a broad mandate to finance activities, programs, and measures for climate change within four funding windows: adaptation (SCCF-A); transfer of technologies (SCCF-B); energy, transport, industry, agriculture, forestry, and waste management (SCCF-C); and support to economic diversification of fossil fuel-dependent countries (SCCF-D).

25. The Evaluation of SCCF covered 35 projects and aimed to collect evaluative evidence on the progress toward SCCF objectives as well as main achievements and lessons learned during a decade of SCCF implementation. The evaluation assessed the relevance of the SCCF programming and project portfolio to the guidance of the UNFCCC, the GEF, and recipient countries' sustainable development agendas. It also reviewed the effectiveness and efficiency of the SCCF programming and portfolio in achieving objectives and expected outcomes.

26. One significant conclusion on effectiveness was that SCCF projects employ innovative approaches to overcome the lack of data on many emerging adaptation issues. For example, the SCCF portfolio features innovative ways to cope with the limitations of climate data and modeling and making use of existing scientific knowledge to provide a basis for locally

implemented adaptation activities. The majority of SCCF projects include comprehensive strategies for generating a scientific baseline to adaptation activities by interpreting existing data regarding their significance for the project's geographic, social, and political context. Also, several SCCF projects make extensive use of participatory vulnerability assessment methods incorporating experiences from local communities into the adaptation activity design. These approaches will have to prove their ultimate effectiveness over time, but show promising intermediate achievements toward project objectives.

Methodology

27. Progress of the SCCF since the 2011 evaluation was reviewed in terms of new approvals and reporting on results and implementation of the innovative approaches identified by the SCCF evaluation. The database including information on project status, financing, implementation institutions, themes, countries, and regions was updated. The team conducted a desk review of available project monitoring and evaluation documents including project implementation reports (PIRs), mid-term reviews (MTRs), and terminal evaluations to assess the progress in achieving results of the projects using innovative approaches.

Portfolio Composition and Evolution

28. The SCCF portfolio of 35 approved projects has grown considerably since the 2011 SCCF evaluation. The updated SCCF portfolio⁹ consists of a broad variety of activities and comprises 59 approved projects, of which 42 are national, 13 are regional, and 4 are global. The majority of the projects (51) are funded under the SCCF-A (adaptation) window, of which 44 are FSPs and 7 are MSPs. The remaining 8 projects are funded under the SCCF-B (technology transfer) window and they are all FSPs. The SCCF-C and SCCF-D windows remain unfunded.

29. The overall project portfolio amounts to \$247.3 million; overall cofinancing¹⁰ is \$1,761.6 million for the 59 projects. At the time of the 2011 SCCF evaluation the overall portfolio amounted to \$142.6 million with a cofinancing amount of \$843.5 million for 35 projects. The 2011 evaluation found that most of the cofinancing was coming from other GEF-administered funding sources and national governments: 36 percent and 44 percent, respectively. CSOs and the private sector were responsible for the least amount of cofinancing, each contributing only 1 percent of total. This evaluation did not look into the amounts of cofinancing.

Innovative Approaches

30. When examining effectiveness and results, the evaluation focused on the innovative approaches to address a lack of baseline data that had been identified in the project design by the 2011 SCCF evaluation. Projects for which PIRs, MTRs and terminal evaluations were available were assessed for progress in achieving results using innovative approaches. Twenty three projects had PIRs available, while only two projects (GEF ID 2931 and 2902) had a MTR

⁹ The portfolio included in this analysis includes projects approved as of February 28, 2014. See Council Document GEF/LDCF.SCCF.15/03.

¹⁰ Cofinancing amounts at PIF stage were used if cofinancing information at the endorsement stage was not available.

available and four projects (GEF ID 2832, 3154, 3156, and 3679) had a terminal evaluation available. All 23 projects were funded under the SCCF-A window.

31. In the 2011 evaluation, one significant conclusion on effectiveness (conclusion 7) was that SCCF projects employ innovative approaches to overcome the lack of data on many emerging adaptation issues. Those innovative approaches have been identified at the project design phase. The 2011 evaluation found that “The limited availability of local climatic data, as well as the inadequate ability to analyze these data, represents a significant barrier when designing adaptation activities.” The data at project level cannot be precisely provided by the down-scaling of climate modeling data, which reduces the ability to design and implement location-specific adaptation projects. Therefore, the evaluation found that to overcome this difficulty, the SCCF portfolio featured innovative approaches making use of the existing scientific knowledge. Some of the instruments used by SCCF projects are “meta-analyses of existing materials and available climate change and variability data, supplemented by sector-specific data related to the project as well as by the use of down-scaled climate modeling data when available.” Projects in the Andean region (GEF ID 2902) and Mexico (GEF ID 3159) were identified as using these types of innovative approaches. Other SCCF projects, especially ones in China (GEF ID 3265) and Tanzania (GEF ID 2832), designed adaptation activities on the basis of available knowledge from participatory vulnerability assessment methods incorporating experiences from local communities to streamline climate change adaptation into water management.

32. The evaluation team reviewed all available PIRs, MTRs and terminal evaluations for all 23 projects. Given the limited amount of detail provided in the monitoring reports (PIRs, and MTRs) it is not possible to derive a consistent understanding of the effectiveness of the innovative approaches for all the projects. In the PIRs, the innovative approaches at project design are identifiable; however, it is difficult to see the actual effectiveness of these approaches over time. The PIRs and MTRs describe intermediate achievements but do not necessarily say whether the achievements are due to the innovative approaches or to another component of the project. On the other hand, the four terminal evaluations available are useful in identifying the effectiveness of a few innovative approaches. The innovative approaches identified by the SCCF evaluation all had the objective of overcoming the lack of climate change data available at the project level, or the inability to analyze the data available. In the terminal submitted to the IEO, several types of innovative approaches are described. Four of those projects seem to have had a positive result from the innovative approaches while the effectiveness of the project Economic Analysis Project (GEF ID 3679) resulted in an unsatisfactory rating for the innovative approach introduced.

33. In the Economic Analysis Project, the objective was “to develop a framework and information base to support increased and innovative means of financing adaptation to climate change.” This objective was to be realized by supporting decision making processes in the public and private sector with economic and environmental assessments of the costs, benefits and options for effective adaptation. The project was expected to also deliver a fundamental contribution towards the assessment of the global financing needs for adaptation by delivering credible bottom-up estimates that can be integrated in parallel efforts to estimate the macro-economics of adaptation. The project was developed at a time when there was little global advice on the economic analysis of adaptation, and was innovative in that it was one of the first

exercises to systematically test a single method – cost-benefit analysis – on a global scale. In addition, the mobilization of funding (PIF, p.4) was identified of an innovative approach however, this finance component was dropped. It does stand out as unusual for the GEF and SCCF in that it came through the direct imitative of McKinsey & Company who put together a package of funding and led the analysis. The effectiveness, however, was rated as unsatisfactory by the TE, as the report has very few lasting impacts, did not trigger a substantive and enduring debate about economic decision making, nor have a substantial or sustained impact in the peer reviewed literature or agency decision making.

34. In the Ethiopia Project, several innovative approaches were introduced. A local rainfall monitoring was introduced to address a lack of data available to assist weather forecasts and improve the advices given to farmers on the timing of land preparation and planting. According to the terminal evaluation,” the project has tested an important set of multi-dimensional agronomic, livestock and watershed measures that serve as a framework for advancing drought mitigation in conjunction with government programs.” The project also utilized an innovative revolving distribution system for drought resistant seeds and livestock whereby the original beneficiaries/recipients are required to pass seed and/or offspring to a 2nd group, which was predetermined by the local management council. This unique system helped to reach more beneficiaries and to develop a greater sense of local ownership of the activities. In addition, an Integrated Pest Management technique adapted from an indigenous method of pest control produced positive externalities in the form of increased crop yields and the decreased use of chemical pesticides. In this project, the innovative approaches were successful, even though further development and validation might be needed.

35. The Zimbabwe Project is intended to demonstrate and promote the adoption of a range of gender sensitive approaches for adaptation to climate change among rural communities currently engaged in agriculture in vulnerable areas of Chiredzi District as a national model for climate change adaptation. Outcome 3 of this project aims at enhancing the use of early warning systems in agricultural and pastoral systems in the selected pilot sites systems. Farmers in drought-prone areas of Chiredzi District have a high demand for enhanced forecasts as the current national weather forecasts have not provided effective support for farming decisions, most notably the timing of planting. This project has highlighted the lack of confidence in the current national forecasting process for farming decisions, and the potential for improvements through relatively simple supply of basic rainfall/temperature information, and utilized innovative approaches through extension agents in assisting farmer-oriented local forecasts. According to the TE, the local forecasting system was appreciated by the farmers interviewed, and this method is a notable contribution toward more functional and reliable forecasting methods in Zimbabwe and Africa. However, the project placed an emphasis on the adaptation technologies rather than the institutional processes for adaptation, and there was no explicit strategy for replication other than through pilot demonstrations. It is reported to be effective in that 40 percent of farmers have on adopted a diversified crop mix including drought tolerant varieties and the adoption of moisture management practices. Therefore, this innovative approach to filling a known lack of data was successful but the scope and duration of success is limited by a lack of clarity in the plan for project sustainability.

36. The Pangani River Basin Project has a primary objective to empower water users and managers in Pangani Basin to manage and allocate water resources with consideration for

Climate Change, and a growing and already overexploited demand, through a decentralized and participatory Integrated Water Resources Management Plan. According to the TE, this situation has led to different types of conflicts, namely between (i) hydropower and irrigation, (ii) pastoralists and irrigators, (iii) agriculture and environment, (iv) hydropower and the environment, and (v) between farmers themselves. In order to mitigate these conflicts, and ensure sustainable management and utilization of the water resources in the basin, innovative approaches were required for involving water users and other stakeholders in managing and developing the water resources through participatory forums. In order to fill an information deficit about the water resources available in the Basin, a detailed climate change modeling study for the management of the water basin, with 5 different water flow scenarios that are quite different from each other plus three scenarios involving climate change was commissioned. This has helped the Government and other stakeholders to understand what the future could be like, and to discuss and negotiate the desired future scenario. However, according to the TE, the different scenarios were based on a limited database due to lack of consistent data collection in the periods with economic difficulties in Tanzania in the 1970s-1980s. To partially overcome this, remote sensing was employed to judge land use change from 1987-2005. GIS data was also acquired from multiple sources and compiled. Despite these advances in information, the terminal evaluation recommends that the Pangani Basin Water Board continue to improve the quality of data and information on the quality and quantity of water in the basin in order to have better flow scenarios.

MANAGEMENT ACTION RECORD

37. The Management Action Record (MAR) reporting on the follow-up on the implementation of LDCF/SCCF Council decisions on recommendations of the SCCF Evaluation is annexed to this report. In the MAR the Independent Evaluation Office completes the columns pertaining to recommendations, management response, and Council decisions. Management is invited to provide a self-rating of the level of adoption of Council decisions on recommendations and to add comments as necessary. After management's self-rating, the Office verifies actual adoption and provides its own ratings and comments. The MAR for the SCCF Evaluation shows the progress made by the Secretariat in ensuring a) transparency of the project pre-selection process; b) dissemination of good practices through existing channels; and, c) visibility of the fund by requiring projects to identify their funding source.

38. The level of adoption of LDCF/SCCF Council decisions is being tracked for the first time. The single decision being tracked in this report is from the Council's November 2011 meeting, based on the Evaluation of the Special Climate Change Fund. The Council decision comprises three sub-components, requesting the Secretariat to: (1) prepare proposals to ensure transparency of the project pre-selection process; (2) disseminate good practices through existing channels; and (3) enhance visibility of the fund by requiring projects to identify their funding source. Sub-components 1-2 have been assessed by LDCF/SCCF Management and verified by the IEO as fully adopted (high rating). Actions taken include issuance of a report for GEF Partner Agencies for each pre-selection process, including details of the evaluation committee, and outcome and reasoning concerning the projects in the pre-selection pool; and production of a book on lessons learned from the GEF's adaptation portfolio to date, along with a knowledge management event at the 2013 UNFCCC COP. Regarding the third sub-component of the Council decision on increasing visibility of the fund, the GEF IEO notes that Secretariat's

outreach efforts have intensified. At the same time, the GEF IEO encourages the Secretariat to prepare a proposal to ensure visibility of the fund in a systematic way. The third sub-component of the 2011 Council decision will be tracked in MAR 2014, while the first two components will no longer be tracked.