



**Independent
Evaluation Office**
GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT FACILITY

LDCF/SCCF Annual Evaluation Report 2025

An Evaluation Report by the GEF IEO

2026 | April





LDCF/SCCF Annual Evaluation Report 2025

Evaluation Report No. 177
April 2026

© 2026 Global Environment Facility Independent Evaluation Office
1818 H Street, NW, Washington, DC 20433
Internet: www.gefiew.org/; email: gefevaluation@thegef.org

Reproduction permitted provided source is acknowledged. Please cite the work as follows: Global Environment Facility Independent Evaluation Office (GEF IEO), *LDCF/SCCF Annual Evaluation Report 2025*, Evaluation Report No. 177, Washington, DC: GEF IEO, 2026.

The findings, interpretations, and conclusions in this report are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the GEF Council or the governments it represents.

This report was presented to the GEF Council in June 2025.

ISBN: 978-1-64233-076-2

Task Team Leader: Anna Viggh, aviggh@thegef.org
GEF IEO Director: Geeta Batra

Cover design: AM Mascia Design + Illustration Inc.

Interior design and layout: Nita Congress

Editing: Karen Holmes

Cover photo: The Pinacanauan River near project sites of the Philippines Climate Change Adaptation Project in Aggugaddan, Penablanca Municipality, Cagayan. Photo by Anna Viggh, GEF IEO.

All dollar amounts are US dollars unless otherwise indicated.

GEF replenishment periods: **Pilot phase:** 1991–94; **GEF-1:** 1995–98; **GEF-2:** 1999–2002; **GEF-3:** 2003–06; **GEF-4:** 2006–10; **GEF-5:** 2010–14; **GEF-6:** 2014–18; **GEF-7:** 2018–22; **GEF-8:** 2022–26

Contents

Foreword	iv
Acknowledgments	vi
Abbreviations	vii
Executive summary	viii
1 Introduction	1
1.1 Background	1
1.2 Project cohort	1
2 Findings	4
2.1 Outcomes and sustainability	4
2.2 M&E design and implementation	8
2.3 Gender considerations	9
2.4 Scaling up	14
2.5 Adaptive management	18
3 Conclusions and recommendations	21
3.1 Conclusions	21
3.2 Recommendation	22
4 LDCF/SCCF MAR 2025	23
4.1 Ratings approach	23
4.2 MAR status	24
Annex: AER 2025 portfolio	29
References	32
Box	
2.1 Rating taxonomy of scaling up	15

Figures

1.1	Distribution of AER 2025 cohort projects by lead GEF Agency ..	2
1.2	Distribution of AER 2025 cohort projects by region	2
1.3	Distribution of AER 2025 cohort projects by main intervention theme	3
2.1	Distribution of outcome ratings across the AER 2025 cohort ..	5
2.2	Distribution of sustainability ratings across the AER 2025 cohort ..	5
2.3	Share of LDCF and SCCF projects rated in the likely range for sustainability over time	5
2.4	Distribution of sustainability ratings in the likely range by AER cohort	6
2.5	Distribution of M&E design and implementation ratings in the AER 2025 cohort	8
2.6	Distribution of outcome ratings for AER cohort gender components	11
2.7	Integration of and success in leveraging scaling-up funding mechanisms in the AER 2025 cohort	15
2.9	Distribution of active partnership types in project implementation in the AER 2025 cohort	15
2.9	Distribution of primary financing barriers to project scale-up in AER 2025 cohort	16
2.10	Project performance ratings at midterm and completion for the AER 2025 cohort	19

Tables

1.1	Funding by source of the AER 2025 cohort	2
2.1	Gender analysis in project design in the AER 2025 cohort ..	10
2.2	Gender action plan in project design in the AER 2025 cohort ..	10
2.3	Gender indicators in project design in the AER 2025 cohort ..	11

Foreword

The Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF) was established in 2001 under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change to support the climate adaptation efforts of least developed countries. The fund is mandated to finance the preparation of national adaptation programs of action and the implementation of priority projects under these national programs in least developed countries. The LDCF is a unique adaptation fund, as it is dedicated to least developed and low-income countries facing significant structural challenges to sustainable development, which are especially vulnerable to the impacts of climate change.

The Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF) was established in 2001 under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change to help vulnerable nations address negative impacts of climate change. The SCCF finances activities, programs, and measures related to climate change that complement those funded by resources allocated to the Global Environment Facility (GEF) climate change focal area and by bilateral and multilateral funding. The SCCF strategy for 2022–26 emphasizes the adaptation needs of small island developing states (window A) and bolsters technology transfer, innovation, and private sector engagement (window B).

The GEF Independent Evaluation Office is pleased to present the LDCF/SCCF Annual Evaluation Report (AER) 2025. This report follows the biennial schedule of the GEF Annual Evaluation Report, which assesses the

performance of completed projects using information from terminal evaluations every other year. The report provides a performance assessment of completed LDCF/SCCF projects, examines three portfolio-wide dimensions—gender considerations, scaling up, and adaptive management—and presents the Management Action Record (MAR). AER 2025 benefited from feedback from the GEF Agencies and the GEF Secretariat. The report's main objective is to assess project outcomes and sustainability and quality of project monitoring for the cohort of LDCF/SCCF projects completed since AER 2023.

Project outcomes show promising results overall, yet sustainability remains a persistent concern across the portfolio. A notable implementation gap exists between monitoring and evaluation design and actual execution caused by limited institutional capacity and resource allocation. Gender integration emerges as a meaningful driver of project success, with gender-responsive approaches consistently associated with stronger outcomes. Scaling up climate adaptation initiatives remains difficult, as projects encounter multiple barriers to broader adoption. Adaptive management proved essential for navigating implementation challenges, though many projects struggled to sustain projected performance through to completion. Drawing on these findings, the assessment identifies five interconnected drivers of climate adaptation success that offer a blueprint for future interventions.

The MAR tracks progress in implementing the GEF management’s action plan, which was endorsed by the LDCF/SCCF Council. The MAR 2025 for the LDCF/SCCF reports on two evaluations, with progress in implementation rated as high and medium.

The AER 2025 was presented to the LDCF/SCCF Council during its June 2025 meeting, and the Council subsequently endorsed the management response and agreed to the IEO’s recommendation. Through this

report, the GEF Independent Evaluation Office intends to share the findings and lessons from the assessment with a broader audience in order to inform future LDCF and SCCF programming.

Geeta Batra
Director, GEF Independent Evaluation Office

Acknowledgments

The 2025 Annual Evaluation Report for the Least Developed Countries Fund and Special Climate Change Fund was led by Anna Viggh, Senior Evaluation Officer in the Global Environment Facility Independent Evaluation Office (GEF IEO), with Rasec Niembro, IEO Evaluation Analyst, serving as a core team member. The evaluation benefited from oversight provided by Geeta Batra, Director of the IEO; quality control was provided by Fabrizio Mario Dante Felloni, Chief Evaluation Officer and Deputy Director of the IEO.

IEO Senior Operations Officer Juan Jose Portillo provided overall operational and administrative oversight. Karen Holmes edited the report, while Nita Congress

designed and laid out the publication and provided editorial quality control. We also acknowledge the support received from the GEF Secretariat and the GEF Agencies.

The GEF IEO is grateful to all these individuals and institutions for their contributions. Final responsibility for this report remains firmly with the Office.

Abbreviations

AER	annual evaluation report	IFAD	International Fund for Agricultural Development
AfDB	African Development Bank	LDCF	Least Developed Countries Fund
CIEWS	climate information and early warning systems	M&E	monitoring and evaluation
ERASIG	Enhancing Resilience of Agricultural Sector in Georgia	MAR	management action record
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations	PIR	project implementation report
GCF	Green Climate Fund	SCCF	Special Climate Change Fund
GEF	Global Environment Facility	SME	small or medium enterprise
IEO	Independent Evaluation Office	UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
		UNIDO	United Nations Industrial Development Organization

Executive summary

The 2025 annual evaluation of the Least Developed Countries Fund/Special Climate Change Fund (LDCF/SCCF) examined 33 completed climate change adaptation projects, revealing strong performance alongside structural challenges.

This assessment, prepared by the Independent Evaluation Office (IEO) of the Global Environment Facility (GEF), drew on terminal evaluations submitted between September 2022 and December 2024, covering projects implemented from May 2011 to March 2024 and approved across the GEF-4 to GEF-7 replenishment periods. The portfolio includes 20 projects funded by the LDCF, 8 funded by the SCCF, and 5 multitrust fund projects, collectively accounting for \$200.9 million in GEF financing and \$1.6 billion in cofinancing. These projects were primarily implemented by the United Nations Development Programme (9 projects); the World Bank (8); and the International Fund for Agricultural Development, the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, and the African Development Bank (4 each). Their geographic concentration is Africa (18 projects) and Asia (7 projects). Agriculture and sustainable livelihoods were the most frequently targeted themes, reflecting the funds' continued focus on resilience building in climate-vulnerable sectors.

Project outcomes show promising results, but sustainability remains a concern across the portfolio. A substantial 88 percent of projects achieved outcome ratings in the satisfactory range (moderately satisfactory, satisfactory, and highly satisfactory). While no projects received unsatisfactory ratings, neither did any achieve the highest sustainability ratings (highly likely or likely),

with 57 percent rated as only moderately likely to be sustainable. The 2025 cohort demonstrated a 9 percentage point improvement in sustainability prospects compared to the cohort examined in the 2023 Annual Evaluation Report (AER). Financial sustainability emerged as the most significant risk to the continuation of project outcomes, affecting 67 percent of completed projects. This underscores the foundational importance of robust financial mechanisms in sustaining long-term impact. Institutional risks affected 18 percent of the portfolio, followed by environmental (9 percent), social (3 percent), and other risks (3 percent). Projects that successfully embedded activities within national systems, engaged private sector partners, and secured broad stakeholder support were notably more likely to attract follow-up funding and sustain outcomes. Projects aligned with national and regional policies showed nearly twice the rate of follow-up funding compared to stand-alone initiatives, creating natural pathways for continuation beyond project completion.

A persistent implementation gap exists between monitoring and evaluation (M&E) design and execution. While 83 percent of projects received satisfactory ratings for M&E design, only 50 percent achieved satisfactory ratings for M&E implementation—a substantial 16 percentage point decline from the AER 2023 cohort. This pattern of stronger design than implementation appears consistently across previous AERs, indicating a systemic challenge, characterized by difficulties in translating well-designed M&E plans into effective, on-the-ground execution. Contributing factors include

limited institutional capacity, insufficient resource allocation, and weak mechanisms for operationalizing M&E frameworks. The evaluation found that projects with robust M&E systems demonstrated superior adaptive management capabilities and stronger outcome performance. Comprehensive monitoring frameworks directly contributed to implementation effectiveness and long-term sustainability, enabling evidence-based adjustments throughout project life cycles.

Gender integration demonstrates a strong correlation with project success, with a clear relationship between gender-responsive approaches and superior outcomes. Since the GEF Council's 2017 approval of the GEF Policy on Gender Equality, all approved LDCF and SCCF projects have included gender analysis and a specific gender action plan in their design, marking a significant policy shift toward institutionalizing gender considerations. The AER 2025 shows positive progress in gender mainstreaming, with 76 percent of projects including gender analysis in their design; however, only 39 percent implemented a specific gender action plan. Projects that systematically embedded gender considerations in their frameworks, utilizing gender-disaggregated data and gender-specific indicators, consistently outperformed others. Innovative approaches such as gender-inclusive sanitation facilities, women-led cooperatives, and prioritization of women's leadership in decision-making correlated with stronger project outcomes. This pattern was particularly pronounced in sustainable livelihood and agricultural initiatives, where women's participation proved instrumental in driving adoption of climate-resilient practices. Notably, the three projects with the lowest gender ratings also performed poorly in overall outcomes, suggesting that gender integration is not merely a compliance requirement but a fundamental effectiveness factor.

Scaling up climate adaptation initiatives remains challenging, with projects facing multiple barriers to broader adoption. The evaluation found that 67 percent of assessed projects included scaling mechanisms in their initial design,

with 60 percent of these demonstrating some success in implementation. Partnership engagement proved crucial, with national government agencies (89 percent) and local communities (64 percent) being the most commonly involved stakeholders. However, four categories of barriers consistently impeded scaling efforts: administrative challenges (39 percent), funding sustainability gaps (30 percent), external disruptions such as political instability (21 percent), and market-related barriers (10 percent). Distinct regional patterns in scaling challenges emerged: Eastern Europe and Central Asia face predominantly administrative hurdles (60 percent), Asia struggles primarily with external disruptions (63 percent), Africa shows a more balanced distribution of challenges, and global projects contend mainly with external disruptions (67 percent). Despite demonstrated potential in select initiatives, systemic challenges persist in attributing LDCF/SCCF contributions to catalyzing private climate finance, limiting knowledge transfer and replication of successful models.

Adaptive management proved essential for navigating implementation challenges, even though many projects struggled to maintain projected performance through completion. Of the 31 projects with available documentation, 55 percent received lower final ratings at completion compared to midterm reviews, while only 16 percent improved their ratings. This pattern suggests that midterm reviews tended to be overly optimistic, with projections not materializing in final outcomes since target achievement is often backloaded in the final implementation phase. The Africa region showed a lower application of adaptive management, accounting for 70 percent of projects with declining performance while making up 55 percent of the overall portfolio. Projects with built-in flexibility mechanisms—such as contingency planning, adjustable implementation schedules, and mechanisms for reallocating resources or redesigning components in response to new risks—demonstrated greater resilience against contextual shifts ranging from political transitions to extreme weather events.

The evaluation identified five interconnected drivers of climate adaptation success that provide a blueprint for future interventions:

- Projects with deep community involvement fostered greater ownership and resilience, with local stakeholders continuing adaptation practices beyond the project life cycle.
- Flexible implementation frameworks, such as those allowing for activity reprioritization, adaptive budget reallocation, revision of outputs based on real-time feedback, conflict sensitivity tools and decision-making authority at local levels, enabled projects to navigate unforeseen challenges more effectively than rigid approaches, particularly in climate-vulnerable environments.
- Alignment with national and regional policies created institutional pathways for continuation, with policy-aligned projects securing follow-up funding at nearly twice the rate of stand-alone initiatives.
- Gender-responsive approaches consistently correlated with superior project outcomes, particularly in sustainable livelihood and agricultural initiatives.
- Comprehensive monitoring frameworks directly contributed to implementation effectiveness and long-term sustainability, enabling evidence-based adjustments throughout project implementation.

These interconnected drivers suggest that successful climate adaptation requires integrated approaches that combine local ownership, strategic flexibility, institutional integration, social inclusion, and robust learning mechanisms.

Scaling up and sustainability are deeply intertwined with how well implementation is carried out. Projects demonstrating strong implementation performance consistently achieved higher sustainability ratings and greater scaling impact. The assessment found that embedding projects within government systems, fostering diverse stakeholder partnerships, and establishing local revenue mechanisms significantly enhanced

institutional capacity and financial sustainability. Similarly, projects that aligned with national and regional policies created natural pathways for continuation, securing follow-up funding at nearly twice the rate of stand-alone initiatives.

Based on the findings and conclusions, the AER 2025 makes one recommendation:

Recommendation 1: To achieve sustained and transformative impact from climate change adaptation interventions, the GEF partnership—including the Secretariat, Agencies, and participating countries—must place greater emphasis on identifying and addressing implementation-related barriers to scaling up adaptation efforts under the LDCF and the SCCF through coordinated action. While strong project design is critical, scaling and sustainability ultimately depend on effective implementation and execution. This requires strengthening implementation support systems, such as technical backstopping and access to knowledge resources; tailoring strategies to regional contexts; and streamlining procedures to minimize delays. By working collaboratively within their respective roles, the GEF Secretariat, GEF Agencies, and countries can significantly improve delivery and maximize adaptation outcomes.

The LDCF/SCCF Management Action Record (MAR) 2025 tracked progress in implementing management responses to four recommendations. These comprised one recommendation from the 2020 LDCF Program Evaluation and three recommendations from the Evaluation of GEF Support to Climate Information and Early Warning Systems (CIEWS). For the LDCF program evaluation, management agreed to continue strengthening the sustainability of outcomes by reinforcing durability considerations in project design and implementation, consistent with the Council document “Towards Greater Durability of GEF Investments.” The GEF Secretariat reported high progress, citing systematic integration of durability principles under the GEF-8 adaptation strategy, enhanced stakeholder consultations, promotion of community ownership, and context-specific theories

of change. Examples from the active GEF-8 portfolio, including projects in Bhutan and Nepal, demonstrate integration of capacity building and local institutional engagement. The GEF IEO validated this progress as high and graduated the recommendation.

For CIEWS, the MAR 2025 assessed progress on three partially agreed recommendations. These recommendations focused on (1) shifting from early warning information to early action; (2) strengthening indicators and monitoring practices; and (3) enhancing the financial sustainability of CIEWS components, including private sector engagement. The Secretariat reported substantial progress in promoting early action and addressing last-mile challenges through new projects emphasizing community engagement and tailored communication,

validated by the IEO as substantial. Progress on aligning and updating CIEWS indicators was assessed by the Secretariat as substantial, reflecting technical consultations in preparation for the 2026–30 programming strategy. However, the IEO validated progress as medium and will continue to track developments. Efforts to improve financial sustainability—including piloting private sector-led solutions, challenge programs, and blended finance vehicles—show moderate progress, with the IEO noting positive steps but highlighting limitations in scale and the need for continued monitoring.



Introduction

1.1 Background

The 2025 Annual Evaluation Report (AER) of the Least Developed Countries Fund/Special Climate Change Fund (LDCF/SCCF), prepared by the Independent Evaluation Office (IEO) of the Global Environment Facility (GEF), presents an assessment of project outcomes and their sustainability, and quality of project monitoring and evaluation (M&E). This evaluation draws on 33 terminal evaluations submitted since the AER 2023, aligning with the shift to biennial reporting for the GEF annual performance report and the GEF management action record (MAR). The terminal evaluations were reviewed by the GEF IEO, GEF Agency evaluation offices, or both, in line with the review guidelines presented in GEF IEO (2023). The AER 2025 covers projects implemented from May 2011 to March 2024, and approved across the GEF-4 to GEF-7 replenishment periods. The LDCF/SCCF MAR (covered in [chapter 4](#)) tracks progress in implementing management action plans endorsed by the LDCF/SCCF Council.

The AER 2025 evaluates three strategic dimensions across the portfolio: gender considerations, scaling up, and adaptive management. In assessing gender, the evaluation reviews the integration of gender analysis, the implementation of gender action plans, the quality of gender-related reporting, and the tangible results achieved through these efforts. For scaling up, the analysis examines plans and opportunities for expansion while identifying four key barriers: administrative challenges, sustainability gaps, external disruptions, and market-related obstacles. Finally, the review of adaptive management focuses on how projects have adjusted their strategies and implementation in response to changing conditions, ensuring continued relevance and effectiveness.

1.2 Project cohort

The AER 2025 cohort comprises 33 projects—20 funded exclusively by the LDCF, 8 by the SCCF, and 5 multitrust fund projects ([table 1.1](#)). Collectively, these projects represent a

Table 1.1 Funding by source of the AER 2025 cohort

Fund source	Number of projects	Funding (million \$)	Cofinancing (million \$)
Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	20	110.2	665.3
Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	8	37.8	260.7
Multitrust fund ^a	5	52.9	681.9
Total	33	200.9	1,607.9

Source: GEF IEO terminal evaluation review data set.

a. Of the five multitrust fund projects, three were developed with support from the LDCF and the GEF Trust Fund, one received support from the SCCF and the GEF Trust Fund, and one was funded by both the LDCF and the SCCF.


total investment of \$200.9 million, complemented by \$1.6 billion in cofinancing.¹ By replenishment period, 26 projects were approved during GEF-5, 5 during GEF-6, 1 during GEF-4, and 1 during GEF-7. A complete list of projects is available in the [annex](#).

Of the 33 projects, 9 were implemented by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and 8 by the World Bank. The African Development Bank (AfDB), the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), and the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD) each implemented four projects. The Asian Development Bank, Conservation International, the United Nations Environment Programme, and the United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO) implemented one project each ([figure 1.1](#)).


Of the 33 projects, 27 were implemented at the national level, with 18 in the African region, 7 in Asia, and 2 in Europe and Central Asia. Of the remaining six, two were global, and four were regional—two in Europe and Central Asia and two in Africa ([figure 1.2](#)).

The projects addressed climate change adaptation and resilience through a variety of interventions and in multiple sectors ([figure 1.3](#)).


¹Throughout this report, grant funding includes the LDCF/SCCF/GEF amounts approved at the Chief Executive Officer endorsement stage along with any project preparation grants. Agency fees are excluded.

Figure 1.1 Distribution of AER 2025 cohort projects by lead GEF Agency

Source: GEF IEO terminal evaluation review data set; $n = 33$.

Figure 1.2 Distribution of AER 2025 cohort projects by region

Source: GEF IEO terminal evaluation review data set; $n = 33$.

Figure 1.3 Distribution of AER 2025 cohort projects by main intervention theme

Source: GEF IEO terminal evaluation review data set; $n = 33$.

- The most represented theme in the AER 2025 cohort is **agriculture**, with eight projects. All of these were implemented nationally—five in Africa, two in Europe and Central Asia, and one in Asia.
- Seven projects focused on **sustainable livelihoods**, four of which were implemented at the national level in Africa, and two in Asia. One project was implemented globally.
- Four projects focused their interventions on **coastal zone management**; three of them were regionally implemented (two in Africa and one in Europe and Central Asia) and one at the national level in Vanuatu.
- Three projects focused on **disaster risk management**: one project in Niger, one in Afghanistan, and one regional in Asia.
- Three projects addressed **early warning systems and climate information** at the country level: one in the Democratic Republic of Congo, one in Lao People's Democratic Republic, and one in Guinea.
- Three projects focused on **land and forest management** at the country level: one in Nigeria, one in Rwanda, and one in Sudan.

- Two projects addressed **water** issues: one in Uganda and one in Sierra Leone.

The AER 2025 cohort includes three projects focused on other themes: a project in Kiribati on **food security**, a project in Senegal focused on addressing capacity gaps for adjusting the **national adaptation plan**, and one implemented globally focused on the **incubation and acceleration of small and medium enterprises (SMEs)**.

As in the AER 2023 cohort, agriculture remains the most represented theme (GEF IEO 204). Sustainable livelihoods projects have increased, especially in Africa, highlighting a strengthened focus on community resilience. These shifts suggest a growing emphasis on integrated resilience-building efforts rather than sector-specific interventions.



2

Findings

2.1 Outcomes and sustainability

Distribution of outcome and sustainability ratings


Project performance analysis revealed that 88 percent of projects (29 of 33) were rated in the satisfactory range for outcomes on their terminal evaluation. On a six-point scale from highly satisfactory to highly unsatisfactory, 2 projects (6 percent) were rated highly satisfactory, 6 (18 percent) as satisfactory, 21 (64 percent) as moderately satisfactory, and 4 (12 percent) as moderately unsatisfactory ([figure 2.1](#)). Significantly, no projects received unsatisfactory or highly unsatisfactory ratings. While AER 2025 demonstrates robust overall performance with 88 percent of projects rated in the satisfactory range for outcomes, the concentration in the moderately satisfactory category (64 percent) indicates potential areas for improvement.

Of the 23 projects evaluated with sustainability ratings available, 57 percent were rated moderately likely to be sustainable. No projects achieved the higher ratings of highly likely or likely. The remaining projects were distributed toward the lower end of the sustainability spectrum, with the sustainability of 26 percent (6 projects) rated as moderately unlikely and 17 percent (4 projects) rated as unlikely ([figure 2.2](#)). No projects received the lowest rating of highly unlikely. This distribution suggests that while most rated projects show moderate potential for sustainability, there remains substantial room for improvement, as no projects achieved the top two sustainability tiers.

Trends in sustainability ratings


Analyzing trends in outcome sustainability for the 23 LDCF and SCCF projects for which sustainability ratings were available, the AER 2025 cohort of LDCF projects showed a 5 percentage point increase in likely sustainable ratings compared to the AER 2023 cohort average ([figure 2.3](#)). The higher sustainability ratings for the SCCF projects in the AER 2025 cohort resulted from their emphasis on local ownership, institutional collaboration, and context-specific

Figure 2.1 Distribution of outcome ratings across the AER 2025 cohort




Source: GEF IEO terminal evaluation review data set; $n = 33$.

Figure 2.2 Distribution of sustainability ratings across the AER 2025 cohort



Source: GEF IEO terminal evaluation review data set; $n = 23$.

Figure 2.3 Share of LDCF and SCCF projects rated in the likely range for sustainability over time



Source: GEF IEO terminal evaluation review data set.


Note: Figures inside bars are the number of projects rated. One project received funding from both the LDCF and the SCCF and is therefore represented in both fund categories in this graph.

solutions. Note however, that ratings were available for only six projects, making the sample size quite small. By partnering closely with national governments and embedding climate resilience into national policies, the Climate Resilience Through Conservation Agriculture (GEF ID 4366, IFAD) and Increasing Productivity and Adaptive Capacity in Mountain Areas of Morocco (GEF ID 5685, IFAD) projects ensured alignment with long-term development priorities. Community empowerment through targeted training and participatory approaches enabled farmers and local stakeholders to adopt and sustain climate-smart practices, while substantial cofinancing (e.g., \$28 million in Morocco) reduced dependency on external funding. Additionally, the Adaptation SME Accelerator Project (GEF 10296, Conservation International) effectively leveraged private sector innovation and scalable business models, blending public and private resources to drive market-based solutions. Factors such as strong governance, financial resilience, adaptive local engagement, and scalable innovation were identified in projects that collectively fostered environments where climate resilience could thrive beyond project timelines. Historically, SCCF projects have tended to achieve higher sustainability ratings than LDCF projects, largely due to the greater risks and constraints associated with LDCF interventions.

Sustainability ratings for AER cohorts had been declining since 2019, but the 2025 cohort reversed this trend (figure 2.4).

There is a 9 percentage point increase in the number of projects rated in the likely range between AER 2023 and AER 2025. To explore potential drivers of this improvement, the IEO analyzed the regional distribution of LDCF/SCCF interventions across previous AER cohorts, but the examination found no statistically significant patterns. The predominant thematic focus areas in AER 2025—agriculture, sustainable livelihoods, and coastal zone management—are consistent with those of previous AERs. However, their implementation has evolved, with a growing emphasis on

Figure 2.4 Distribution of sustainability ratings in the likely range by AER cohort



Source: GEF IEO terminal evaluation review data set.

Note: Figures inside bars are the number of projects rated.

integrated resilience-building efforts rather than isolated sector-specific interventions.

Projects within the AER 2025 cohort closely align with those in the AER 2023 cohort, reflecting similar implementation contexts, funding cycles, and design frameworks. The AER 2025 and AER 2023 cohorts are comparable across several key attributes. Both cohorts primarily consist of projects approved from GEF-5 to the early GEF-7 cycle, reflecting similar programming priorities and operational guidance. The distribution of GEF Agencies is also consistent. The average LDCF/SCCF grant amount per project is within a comparable range, and both cohorts feature similar thematic concentrations. The primary distinction between the two cohorts lies in the timing of terminal evaluation validations, with the 2025 cohort undergoing validation later than the 2023 cohort. This temporal discrepancy introduces uncertainty in interpreting sustainability trends, as observed differences in outcomes may reflect procedural variations in evaluation scheduling rather than substantive shifts in project performance. For instance, shorter post-implementation observation periods for the 2025 cohort could limit the visibility of long-term impacts, while delayed terminal evaluation validations might artificially affect results. To mitigate this ambiguity, sustained monitoring across subsequent AER cycles

is critical. Over time, longitudinal data will help disentangle genuine improvements in sustainability from administrative aspects, ensuring trends are grounded in sustainable outcomes rather than temporal procedural factors.

Further examination of projects rated in the likely range for sustainability reveals a strong correlation between sustainability ratings and overall project performance. All projects assessed as likely sustainable at closure also achieved overall outcome ratings in the satisfactory range. By contrast, among projects with outcomes rated in the unsatisfactory range, only 30 percent demonstrated similar sustainability potential. This pattern highlights the interconnected nature of project execution quality and long-term sustainability, reinforcing the evident principle that without delivering strong immediate outcomes, there is little to sustain.

Factors influencing project sustainability

Multiple critical factors influence the sustainability of project outcomes after completion, as consistently demonstrated through multiple GEF IEO evaluation findings. These determinants include quality of project preparation, country-specific contextual factors, strength of government support, standards of implementation and execution, and successful mobilization of cofinancing. Examining outcome sustainability specifically in the 2025 cohort illustrates a disparity commonly observed in LDCs (GEF IEO 2022a): while 62 percent of projects achieved sustainability ratings in the likely range, the overall GEF portfolio demonstrated substantially stronger performance with 75 percent achieving such ratings.

Financial sustainability is the predominant risk factor in the 2025 AER cohort of terminal evaluations, affecting 67 percent of completed projects. This is followed by institutional risks (18 percent), environmental risks (9 percent), and social risks (3 percent). The COVID-19 pandemic was

identified as a relevant long-term sustainability risk in only one project.

Financial mechanisms serve as fundamental pillars for ensuring sustained project outcomes. This importance is exemplified by the project Strengthening Hydro-Meteorological and Climate Services (GEF ID 5451, World Bank), which highlights the development of a business plan aimed at improving revenue generation and the establishment of collaborative frameworks through memorandums of understanding and the National Framework for Climate Services. These mechanisms ensure coordination among stakeholders and secure government budgetary commitments, directly aligning with the 2025 cohort's findings on the need for localized revenue systems and institutional collaboration for long-term sustainability. Community ownership models with contributory mechanisms are illustrated by the Building Resilience to Climate Change in the Water and Sanitation Sector (GEF ID 5204, AfDB) project in Uganda, which emphasizes community engagement through water user committees. The project established capital contributions from communities such as financial or labor inputs for infrastructure construction, and trained local artisans in operations and maintenance. These mechanisms empower communities to directly finance and manage infrastructure such as multipurpose valley tanks. The implementation of water user fees and community-led maintenance plans under water user committees has sustained the functionality of irrigation systems and climate-resilient infrastructure well beyond project completion.

Strategic approaches that embed projects within existing government systems and foster private sector partnerships significantly enhance institutional capacity and resource continuity, simultaneously addressing two primary dimensions of sustainability risk. For instance, the Increasing Productivity and Adaptive Capacity in Mountain Areas of Morocco project exemplifies how multiple critical factors can align to enhance outcome sustainability. As documented in the terminal evaluation, the project

demonstrated remarkable resilience despite initial implementation delays and external challenges such as the COVID-19 pandemic. Key sustainability determinants included strong government ownership, effective mobilization of cofinancing from multiple sources, and high-quality implementation that achieved 101 percent of targets with 96 percent financial execution. The project's attention to building the capacity of producer organizations and local institutions was particularly noteworthy, with 13,542 beneficiaries receiving training in sustainable agricultural practices and resource management. These factors contributed to tangible impacts, including an 18 percent reduction in poverty and a 24 percent increase in beneficiary household incomes, as well as innovations like safflower cultivation being scaled up by regional authorities—illustrating how proper implementation can establish the foundation for sustainable outcomes beyond project completion.

Projects that aligned climate adaptation efforts with national and regional policies had a higher likelihood of achieving long-term impact and institutionalization. Evidence across the AER 2025 cohort demonstrates that interventions designed in harmony with existing policy frameworks achieved more substantial outcomes and better sustainability ratings. This integration created natural pathways for continuation after project completion, as activities were absorbed into ongoing government programs and budgetary processes. These findings emerged consistently across diverse geographical and political contexts. The Senegal River Basin Climate Change Resilience Development Project (GEF ID 5133, World Bank) effectively coordinated transboundary water resource management among multiple countries. The West Balkans Drina River Basin Management Project (GEF ID 5723, World Bank) strategically elevated climate adaptation considerations into a comprehensive transboundary strategic action plan, establishing an innovative governance framework that systematically integrated flood and drought mitigation measures across multiple jurisdictions, and creating an institutional architecture that continues to drive

coordinated climate action well beyond the project's formal conclusion.


A lesson across multiple projects is that deep community engagement enhances long-term sustainability. Projects that actively involved local communities in both planning and implementation fostered greater ownership and resilience. The analysis of completed projects revealed that community-driven approaches resulted in more sustainable outcomes, with local stakeholders continuing adaptation practices beyond the project life cycle. This pattern emerged consistently across geographical regions and intervention types, suggesting that meaningful participation serves as a fundamental sustainability driver rather than merely a procedural requirement. The Climate Change Adaptation Project, Phase I (GEF ID 3243, World Bank) in the Philippines demonstrated how participatory climate adaptation efforts increase local commitment and knowledge retention. The Strengthening Agro-climatic Monitoring and Information Systems in Lao PDR (GEF ID 5462, FAO) project strategically deployed community radio broadcasts as a high-impact communication channel, dramatically expanding access to critical agro-climatic information across remote regions while systematically overcoming digital divides that had previously isolated vulnerable farming communities from essential early warning systems and agricultural advisories.

2.2 M&E design and implementation

Overall, the available terminal evaluation ratings indicate that M&E performance declined compared to the AER 2023 cohort.

Among the 23 projects with available terminal evaluation M&E design ratings, 19 (83 percent) were rated in the satisfactory range (figure 2.5)—a 5 percentage point decrease from the AER 2023 cohort. On M&E implementation, of the 30 projects with available ratings, 15 (50 percent) were rated in the satisfactory range,

Figure 2.5 Distribution of M&E design and implementation ratings in the AER 2025 cohort



Source: GEF IEO terminal evaluation review data set.

marking a substantial decline of 16 percentage points compared to the AER 2023 cohort.

A persistent pattern emerges of M&E implementation ratings consistently falling below M&E design ratings, suggesting a systemic gap between design ambitions and implementation realities. This pattern was also observed in previous AERs. The Southeast Europe Catastrophe Risk Insurance Facility (GEF ID 4515, World Bank) project, which aimed to increase access to catastrophe insurance in Eastern Europe, exemplifies this pattern. While the project's design included appropriate elements for establishing a regional reinsurance facility, the M&E framework suffered from a fundamental misalignment: measuring insurance penetration rates rather than access to insurance products. This misalignment created unrealistic expectations, since the project lacked authority to mandate the government actions necessary to drive insurance adoption. This case illustrates how even technically sound projects can face implementation challenges when M&E frameworks fail to align with the project's actual objectives and capabilities. Similarly, the Enhancing Resilience of the Agricultural Sector in Georgia (ERASIG; GEF ID 5147, IFAD) project highlighted the importance of clearly

distinguishing specific indicators from baseline project indicators when LDCF/SCCF funding is integrated into existing programs. While blending with existing programs can improve efficiency and financial sustainability, the lack of differentiated M&E frameworks makes it difficult to assess the specific contributions of various GEF funds.

Projects with robust M&E systems demonstrated superior adaptive management capabilities and stronger outcome performance. Examination of completed projects in the AER 2025 cohort reveals that comprehensive M&E frameworks directly contributed to implementation effectiveness and long-term sustainability. The data show a substantial performance gap, with projects implementing strong M&E practices scoring higher on sustainability ratings compared to those with inadequate monitoring mechanisms. This pattern was consistent across regions and intervention types, indicating that systematic data collection and analysis serves as a foundational element for successful climate adaptation interventions. The correlation between M&E quality and project outcomes underscores that measurement systems function not merely as reporting tools but as essential management instruments that enable evidence-based adjustments and strategic refinements throughout implementation. The Lao PDR agro-climatic project illustrates how initial M&E challenges—particularly delayed baseline data collection—can compromise timely adaptation. After midterm adjustments to its monitoring approach, the project successfully implemented a farmer feedback mechanism that significantly improved local ownership of climate information services. The CCA [Climate Change Adaptation] Growth: Implementing Climate Resilient and Green Economy Plans in Highland Areas in Ethiopia (GEF ID 6967, UNDP) project exemplifies excellence in M&E implementation. The project established a multi-tiered monitoring system that combined quantitative metrics with qualitative assessments from community stakeholders. This approach enabled systematic documentation of climate adaptation practices and created

feedback loops between implementation and planning. By integrating community-level monitoring with district and national reporting systems, the project facilitated vertical knowledge exchange and built local capacity for climate data collection. The comprehensive M&E framework not only tracked immediate outputs but also assessed longer-term adaptation outcomes, creating an evidence base that directly informed the scaling of successful interventions across eight additional districts beyond the initial target.

2.3 Gender considerations

All 33 projects in the AER 2025 cohort were reviewed to identify the inclusion and quality of gender components at design and during implementation. Gender analyses in projects continue to provide valuable information on gender differences in needs, roles, responsibilities, and opportunities for equal participation and leadership of women and men.¹

Inclusion of gender components at project design and implementation

All terminal evaluations included some discussion of gender outcomes or inclusion, although contributions to gender equity during implementation were often not fully captured in project design documents. The evaluation found that 76 percent of projects incorporated a gender analysis in their design, with 39 percent also featuring a specific gender action plan. However, 24 percent of projects did not include a gender analysis ([table 2.1](#)). One successful example is

¹A gender analysis is a “critical examination of how differences in gender norms, roles, power structures, activities, needs, opportunities and rights affect men, women, girls and boys in a certain situation or context. It includes collection and analysis of sex-disaggregated data and gender information to understand gender differences and gaps, determine gender differentiated impacts and risks, to identify measures to avoid adverse gender impacts, and to uncover and act on opportunities to address gender gaps and inequalities relevant to the activity” (GEF 2017, 7).

Table 2.1 Gender analysis in project design in the AER 2025 cohort

Gender analysis status	Projects	
	No.	%
A gender analysis was conducted and is shared in the available documents	12	36
Documents indicate a gender analysis was conducted, but results are not shared	13	39
No gender analysis is mentioned in the available documents	8	24

Source: GEF IEO terminal evaluation review data set; $n = 33$.

the Strengthening the Resilience of Rural Livelihoods and Sub-national Government Systems to Climate Risks and Variability in Benin (GEF ID 5904, UNDP) project, where a participatory gender action plan gave rise to women-led income-generating activities. This initiative significantly increased women's incomes by 30 percent and enhanced their inclusion in management and leadership roles within the community. Conversely, missed opportunities were identified. For example, the ERASIG project lacked a gender analysis, resulting in limited benefits for women, particularly in climate adaptation efforts. The absence of gender considerations in agricultural activities reinforced existing inequities rather than addressing them.

The assessment of terminal evaluations revealed that 39 percent of projects (13) implemented a gender action plan, while 91 percent (30 projects) included at least gender-disaggregated indicators. Although a high percentage of projects incorporated gender analysis, public documentation of gender action plans was available for only 24 percent of projects, highlighting opportunities to enhance documentation practices in future project cycles (table 2.2). A positive example is the Enhancing the Adaptation Capacities and Resilience to Climate Change in Rural Communities in Analamanga, Atsinanana, Androy, Anosy, and Atsimo Andrefana (GEF ID 5632, UNDP) project, which established women's multifunctional centers featuring solar-powered

Table 2.2 Gender action plan in project design in the AER 2025 cohort

Gender action plan	Projects	
	No.	%
A gender action plan was conducted and is shared in the available documents	8	24
The documents indicate that a gender action plan was conducted, but results are not shared	5	15
No gender action plan is mentioned in the available documents	20	61

Source: GEF IEO terminal evaluation review data set; $n = 33$.

mills and literacy programs. These centers addressed both climate resilience and gender-specific barriers to education and income generation. Additional interventions included multifunctional platforms with solar fields benefiting women's groups, market gardening perimeters with solar pumps for women's groups, rice cultivation activities around micro-dams involving women, and small livestock activities targeting female beneficiaries. These represent innovative, climate-resilient income-generating activities specifically designed to empower women. However, some interventions fell short of their intended outcomes. For instance, in the Protecting Urban Areas Against the Impacts of Climate Change in Vanuatu (GEF ID 9197, Asian Development Bank) project, implementation of gender-responsive infrastructure—such as footpaths and improved washing areas—was undermined by low female participation (accounting for 27 percent of project beneficiaries). While the project incorporated universal access features and gender equality awareness training for workers and communities, participation constraints—including the absence of female facilitators—limited its overall impact and responsiveness in the benefited areas.

Gender-related actions

Clear progress emerges when examining gender components across GEF replenishment periods. In the AER 2025 cohort,

91 percent of projects include gender indicators in some capacity, with a majority (55 percent) now incorporating both gender-disaggregated and gender-specific metrics (table 2.3). This upward trend aligns with the GEF Council's 2017 approval of the GEF Policy on Gender Equality, after which all approved LDCF and SCCF projects included gender analysis and a specific gender action plan at design.

Table 2.3 Gender indicators in project design in the AER 2025 cohort

Indicator status	Projects	
	No.	%
Both gender-disaggregated and gender-specific indicators are included	18	55
Gender-disaggregated indicators are included	12	36
Neither gender-disaggregated nor gender-specific indicators are included	3	9

Source: GEF IEO terminal evaluation review data set; $n = 33$.


These findings should be interpreted cautiously, due to the small sample sizes in later replenishment periods—only five projects from GEF-6 and one from GEF-7 were analyzed. This limited representation prevents drawing definitive conclusions about broader trends. Despite apparent progress in newer projects, the need to deepen gender perspectives throughout GEF project design and implementation remains essential.

Gender component ratings and outcomes

Among the AER 2025 cohort, 78 percent of the projects were rated in the satisfactory range for their gender components or activities. Only three projects (9 percent) were rated as highly satisfactory for their gender results (figure 2.6).

Gender integration drives superior project performance and measurably amplifies impact across interventions. A detailed examination suggests that gender-responsive projects systematically embedded gender considerations into

Figure 2.6 Distribution of outcome ratings for AER cohort gender components



Source: GEF IEO terminal evaluation review data set; $n = 33$.

their frameworks, utilizing gender-disaggregated data and gender-specific indicators to monitor women's participation and benefits. Exemplary projects such as Enhancing Sustainability and Climate Resilience of Forest and Agricultural Landscape and Community Livelihoods (GEF ID 9199, UNDP) in Bhutan and the global SME Accelerator Project conducted gender analyses and developed gender action plans, providing structured approaches to addressing gender disparities. The SME Accelerator Project surpassed its target for women-led SMEs, ensuring women occupied leadership roles in economic innovation, while the Bhutan project leveraged gender analysis to design targeted women's interventions. Despite lacking a formal gender action plan, the Adapting Afghan Communities to Climate-Induced Disaster Risks (GEF ID 6914, UNDP) project demonstrated the efficacy of gender-disaggregated data by achieving over 70 percent female participation in a complex context. In contrast, the three projects with the lowest gender ratings were also rated unsatisfactory for outcomes.² None

² These projects were Southeastern Europe and Caucasus Catastrophe Risk Insurance Facility, Strengthening Hydro-Meteorological and Climate Services, and Reducing Vulnerability of Banana Producing Communities to Climate Change (GEF ID 5603, UNIDO).

had an available gender analysis or gender action plan; all were approved in GEF-5.

Projects with gender-responsive approaches consistently achieve higher outcome ratings and broader societal benefits. Analysis of the AER 2025 cohort reveals a clear correlation between gender integration and superior project outcomes. Projects incorporating comprehensive gender analyses and action plans consistently outperformed those lacking these elements, with gender-integrated projects demonstrating higher outcome ratings than gender-blind interventions. This performance differential was particularly pronounced in sustainable livelihood and agricultural initiatives, where women’s participation drove adoption of climate-resilient practices. The Livestock and Rangeland Resilience Program (GEF ID 5651, IFAD) in Sudan successfully combined gender empowerment with climate adaptation, increasing women’s leadership in climate-smart agriculture. This inclusive structure created culturally appropriate pathways for women’s engagement in decision-making regarding climate adaptation; it extended to governance structures, systematically integrating women into community disaster management committees and providing them with meaningful roles in resilience planning.

Good practices and innovation in gender interventions

The assessment of gender components in projects included an analysis of good practices and innovative approaches, highlighting how gender-responsive interventions enhance project effectiveness and promote inclusive development. Findings indicate that integrating gender perspectives through targeted strategies—such as gender-inclusive sanitation facilities, women-led cooperatives, and livelihood programs—significantly strengthens project outcomes. Prioritizing women’s leadership and decision-making roles, including representation in committees and the promotion of women-led SMEs, further amplifies these benefits.

Conversely, the absence of a gender strategy or failure to address structural barriers can undermine the project’s impact and hinder achievement of its objectives.

Innovative gender-inclusive approaches have been successfully implemented across various projects, leading to notable achievements in female participation. For instance, Uganda’s Building Resilience to Climate Change in the Water and Sanitation Sector project introduced gender-inclusive sanitation facilities with menstrual hygiene management, which significantly improved school enrollment and retention rates for girls. Additionally, women were trained in masonry and rainwater harvesting, which fostered economic empowerment and sustainability. In Zambia, the Climate Resilient Livestock Management Project (GEF ID 5394, AfDB) implemented a pass-on gift scheme, structured to encourage farmers to pass on the offspring of animals to other women, thereby expanding the reach of the project. Similarly, Sudan’s Livestock and Rangeland Resilience Program integrated gender action learning systems and technology adoption, such as liquefied petroleum gas cookstoves to replace traditional biomass fuels and reduce women’s workload. This resulted in strong gender outcomes, including over 12,000 jobs for women and significant leadership representation.

Some projects encountered challenges in effectively integrating gender perspectives, leading to implementation obstacles.

The Africa region project Enhancing Climate Change Resilience in the Benguela Current Fisheries System (GEF ID 5113, FAO) lacked a gender analysis at the design stage, as it was not a requirement at the time. This gap affected the project’s ability to enhance female participation, despite some improvements after the midterm evaluation. Similarly, the ERASIG project in Georgia did not include a gender approach, limiting benefits for women and failing to address gender-specific climate adaptation needs. Additionally, Strengthening Hydro-Meteorological and Climate Services in the Democratic Republic of Congo and Reducing Vulnerability of Banana Producing Communities to Climate Change

Through Banana Value Added Activities (GEF ID 5603, UNIDO) in Uganda struggled with gender mainstreaming, as women were underrepresented in technical teams and productive activities.

Many projects successfully integrated gender-responsive mechanisms, yielding positive experiences and exceeding gender targets. In the Climate Change Adaptation Project, Phase I in the Philippines, women-led fisher organizations reinvested increased income from modern fish pots into microloans for members, creating a sustainable cycle of financial support within the community. The Climate Resilience Through Conservation Agriculture in Moldova project exceeded gender targets by supporting women's inclusion in farmer field schools—achieving an impressive 419 percent increase in female participation. In Kiribati, the Enhancing National Food Security in the Context of Global Climate Change (GEF ID 5414, UNDP) project integrated women into non-traditional economic activities such as tourism and fisheries management, achieving a remarkable 4:1 ratio of women to men in training participation. Similarly, the Adapting Afghan Communities project ensured that each village had both male and female lead farmers, enhancing women's access to capacity-building and livelihood interventions.

Several projects actively promoted women's leadership and decision-making roles, further strengthening gender outcomes. Uganda's Building Resilience to Climate Change in the Water and Sanitation Sector project mandated that at least one-third of water user committee members be women and provided leadership training for women in the construction and maintenance of rainwater harvesting systems. The Livestock and Rangeland Resilience Program in Sudan achieved 76 percent female representation in leadership positions within village development committees, demonstrating robust gender integration in decision-making. Similarly, the Increasing Productivity and Adaptive Capacity in Mountain Areas of Morocco project surpassed targets for women's leadership positions, supporting their

involvement in new economic sectors such as bee-keeping and saffron farming. The Adapting Afghan Communities project promoted balanced committee composition to enhance women's representation in governance structures. Additionally, the SME Accelerator Project supported SMEs that had a woman founder, at least 51 percent ownership by women, or women in executive management or board positions.

Projects that proactively addressed gender disparities and social inclusion achieved higher outcome ratings and broader societal benefits. Analysis of the AER 2025 cohort reveals a clear correlation between gender-responsive approaches and superior project outcomes. Projects incorporating comprehensive gender analyses and action plans consistently outperformed those lacking these elements, with gender-integrated projects demonstrating higher outcome ratings compared to gender-blind interventions. This performance differential was particularly pronounced in sustainable livelihood and agricultural initiatives, where women's participation proved instrumental in driving adoption of climate-resilient practices. The evidence suggests that gender integration represents not merely a compliance requirement but a fundamental effectiveness factor that enhances project impact across multiple dimensions. The Livestock and Rangeland Resilience Program in Sudan successfully combined gender empowerment with climate adaptation, increasing women's leadership in climate-smart agriculture.

Overall, these findings highlight the importance of structured gender strategies and innovative interventions in fostering women's empowerment, improving project sustainability, and ensuring inclusive development. The integration of gender-responsive approaches across various sectors has proven to be a key driver of enhanced participation, economic empowerment, and leadership opportunities for women, reinforcing the long-term impact of GEF-funded initiatives.

2.4 Scaling up

Scaling up development projects involves systematic expansion, replication, and institutionalization of successful interventions to enhance their reach, impact, and sustainability. This process includes building on proven approaches, integrating lessons learned, and fostering partnerships to extend benefits to a broader population or geographic area. Key mechanisms for scaling up include strengthening institutional capacities to sustain and mainstream interventions, fostering policy reforms to create enabling regulatory environments, mobilizing technical and human resources, and leveraging innovation to enhance efficiency and adaptability. By embedding projects within long-term development strategies and securing multistakeholder engagement, scaling-up ensures that successful initiatives move beyond pilot stages to achieve transformative and lasting change.

Projects in the AER 2025 cohort were reviewed to assess the extent to which interventions incorporated mechanisms for scaling up, expanded their reach, and established effective partnerships for long-term sustainability. Review of project documentation at the design and implementation stages made it possible to identify whether projects included explicit strategies for replication, institutional integration, or policy alignment to extend their impact beyond the initial intervention. Such approaches could include knowledge dissemination, capacity-building efforts, policy reforms, technological innovations, multistakeholder collaborations, and the integration of successful models into national development plans. Given the climate adaptation focus of the AER 2025 portfolio, the assessment prioritized evaluating the scalability of climate adaptation interventions—including resilience-building measures, adaptation technologies, and climate finance mechanisms. [Box 2.1](#)

presents the three dimensions of assessment in reviewing scaling-up of climate finance components.³

The evaluation identified scaling mechanisms embedded in the initial design of 67 percent (22) of the assessed projects (figure 2.7). At project completion, 60 percent (13 projects) of this subset demonstrated some kind of success in implementing these mechanisms, indicating that deliberate scaling approaches incorporated during project formulation substantially increase the likelihood of broader adoption and impact amplification.

Successful scaling requires a coordinated effort addressing multiple factors. These include leveraging the complementary strengths, networks, and resources of various stakeholders (from government agencies providing policy frameworks and cofinancing, to local communities ensuring contextual relevance, to private sector entities offering innovative financing mechanisms) to create the collaborative context necessary for both expanding financial flows and enhancing their impact across different scales of climate action. [Figure 2.8](#) shows a clear pattern in active partnership engagement (i.e., partners demonstrating substantive engagement rather than those listed as stakeholders without documented evidence of contributions to project outcomes) across the portfolio. National government agencies are most frequently engaged as active partners (89 percent of projects), reflecting the essential role of government ownership in project implementation. Local communities follow at 64 percent, highlighting the importance of grassroots engagement for sustainable outcomes. Nongovernmental organizations and civil society organizations are involved in 52 percent of projects, serving


³ This assessment aligns with recent literature on climate finance effectiveness. As noted by Stoll et al. (2021, 45), “In order to mobilize more private sector engagement and to have more impact, climate finance providers should thus move beyond the binary classification of private versus public projects and aim to mobilize co-finance. Instead, they should work with their relevant public and private partners in developing countries to mobilize private sector engagement in a tailor-made way.”

Box 2.1 Rating taxonomy of scaling up

The assessment of scaling up climate finance components included three dimensions:

- Integration of scaling strategies in project design.** Based on a review of project documents, a rating was assigned to projects on a five-point scale ranging from “to a very small extent” to “to a very large extent.” Projects rated as “to a very large extent” provide detailed information on their scaling framework, including replication strategies, institutional integration, policy linkages, and mechanisms for expanding interventions beyond the initial scope. These projects clearly articulate pathways for sustaining and broadening impact.
- Measurable framework for scaling results.** Based on a review of the results framework and terminal evaluations, a rating was assigned to projects on a five-point scale, ranging from “to a very small extent” to “to a very large extent.” Projects rated as “to a very large extent” include robust monitoring and evaluation systems with specific indicators that ensure the evaluability of scaling efforts. Indicators track not only expansion in geographic coverage and beneficiaries reached, but also institutional adoption and policy integration that sustain project outcomes.
- Scaling effectiveness ratings.** Based on a review of terminal evaluations, a rating was assigned to projects on a six-point scale ranging from highly satisfactory to highly unsatisfactory. Components rated as highly satisfactory demonstrate successful replication, strong institutional buy-in, effective stakeholder engagement, and integration into broader development policies or programs. These projects also provide evidence of sustained impact beyond project duration, based on both qualitative and quantitative findings from terminal evaluations.

Figure 2.7 Integration of and success in leveraging scaling-up funding mechanisms in the AER 2025 cohort



Source: GEF IEO terminal evaluation review data set; $n = 33$.

Figure 2.8 Distribution of active partnership types in project implementation in the AER 2025 cohort



Source: GEF IEO terminal evaluation review data set; $n = 33$.

Note: NGO = nongovernmental organization. Active partnerships refer to collaborative relationships where, according to terminal evaluations, partners demonstrated substantive engagement in at least one outcome-level intervention of a project. This excludes nominal or passive partnerships where entities were merely listed as stakeholders without documented contribution to project outcomes.

as crucial intermediaries. International organizations (34 percent) and private sector entities (27 percent) are represented less frequently but provided potentially valuable partnership types, with private sector engagement showing room for growth in future project designs.

Strategic scaling of climate adaptation initiatives requires coordinated approaches, government ownership, and diverse stakeholder collaboration. The Strengthening

Agro-climatic Monitoring and Information Systems in Lao PDR demonstrated successful scaling. This initial effort was expanded through a new project—Scaling up Local and National Level Decision Making for Climate Resilience in the Agricultural Sector of Lao PDR—financed by the Green Climate Fund (GCF). This project built on its predecessor’s achievements by institutionalizing climate-responsive planning and decision-making tools within national frameworks. The Lao PDR government’s investments beyond GCF funding demonstrated strong government ownership as a key factor in scaling success. Notably, this case also exemplifies effective coherence and complementarity between multilateral climate funds, in line with the GEF-GCF Long-Term Vision for enhanced coordination (GEF and GCF 2021). Through strengthened institutional capacity and expanded financial mechanisms, the project revealed how strategic partnerships—particularly with national agencies and local communities—enhanced both impact and long-term sustainability.

In reviewing barriers to scaling up project activities, several clear trends emerge from the LDCF/SCCF portfolio’s project documents. The most prevalent barriers can be categorized into four main groups, as follows:

- **Administrative and procedural barriers.** These encompass institutional inefficiencies, bureaucratic processes, delayed disbursements, procurement complications, and coordination challenges that impede timely financial flows and effective utilization.
- **Funding sustainability gaps.** These refer to discontinuities between initial project capitalization and long-term financial needs, including insufficient recurrent funding for operations and maintenance, limited government budget allocations for continuation, and dependency on external funding beyond the project life cycle.
- **External disruptions.** These barriers comprise unpredictable events and contextual factors outside


direct project control, including political instability, economic volatility (inflation, currency devaluation), security challenges, and global disruptions like pandemics that affect financial planning and implementation.

- **Market and demand-related barriers.** These involve challenges in creating financially self-sustaining mechanisms, including limited market demand for project services, insufficient private sector engagement, low willingness-to-pay among beneficiaries, and underdeveloped financial ecosystems for adaptation solutions.

Administrative challenges and funding gaps are particularly dominant ([figure 2.9](#)).

Administrative barriers represent the most significant obstacle to scaling up. Approximately 39 percent of projects reported challenges related to administrative and institutional complexity, delayed disbursements, and bureaucratic inefficiencies. For instance, according to their respective terminal evaluations, the Southeastern Europe and Caucasus Catastrophe Risk Insurance Facility project encountered, “administrative heaviness and cumbersome procedures” and “rigid criteria for grant allocation hampering budget consumption,” while Benguela Current fisheries system project faced “seriously slow disbursement procedures.” These administrative constraints significantly impeded timely implementation and reduced the efficiency of available funding. While such barriers are often linked to processes within the GEF and its Agencies, in many cases

Figure 2.9 Distribution of primary financing barriers to project scale-up in AER 2025 cohort



Source: GEF IEO terminal evaluation review data set; $n = 33$.

they also reflect country-level bureaucratic hurdles that lie beyond the GEF's direct influence.

Limited financing for expansion represents the second major barrier category, with roughly 30 percent of projects citing difficulties in securing adequate resources for systematic replication and institutional mainstreaming. The terminal evaluation for the Climate Change Adaptation Project, Phase I specifically mentioned a “lack of long-term commitment from financing institutions” to support project replication across additional regions, while the Climate Adaptation in Wetlands Areas (GEF ID 5489, FAO) project encountered challenges in “mobilizing sufficient capital for geographic expansion” and “securing resource pathways for scaling successful interventions.” This pattern reveals a critical gap between pilot project implementation and the substantial investments needed to achieve transformative scale. Conversely, the Livestock and Rangeland Resilience Program in Sudan offers a positive example of effective scaling through resource mobilization. It successfully implemented a co-management approach that enabled expansion by leveraging 8 percent of funding contributed directly by communities. Despite facing significant challenges—including currency devaluation, high inflation, and account freezing for eight months in 2019—the project established mechanisms for broader replication through water-paid services and community contributions,⁴ demonstrating how strategic partnerships and diversified funding can facilitate scaling beyond pilot sites even in fragile contexts.

External disruptions also emerged as a significant barrier, affecting about 21 percent of projects. Such disruptions included political instability. For example, the terminal evaluation for the regional Senegal River Basin Climate

⁴Water-paid services are those financed through user fees or tariffs, such as municipal or rural water supply systems where users pay for access, irrigation systems maintained through fees from farmer cooperatives, or public-private partnerships where payment for services schemes are used to ensure sustainability.

Change Resilience Development Project cited “coups in Mali and Guinea” and economic volatility, and Sudan’s Livestock and Rangeland Resilience Program faced “currency devaluation and high inflation.” The terminal evaluation for the Benguela Current fisheries system project noted the COVID-19 “pandemic’s impact on tourism revenue and shifting of resources to health/social protection sectors.” Such disruptions create unpredictable implementation environments that complicate financial planning and sustainability.

Market and demand-related barriers were identified in approximately 10 percent of the projects. The terminal evaluation for the Nigeria Erosion and Watershed Management Project (GEF ID 4907, World Bank) highlighted a “lack of demand for catastrophe insurance products” and “low willingness of consumers to pay for optional insurance products.” These barriers point to challenges in developing financially sustainable climate adaptation solutions that can attract consistent funding beyond the initial grant period.

The GEF IEO analysis found distinct regional patterns in scaling-up challenges. The Eastern Europe and Central Asia region faces predominantly administrative barriers (60 percent), while Asia struggles primarily with external disruptions (63 percent). Africa shows a more balanced distribution of challenges, with administrative barriers slightly higher (35 percent) but nearly equal representation across other categories, reflecting the highly challenging context on the continent. Global projects contend mainly with external disruptions (67 percent) and administrative challenges (33 percent). These regional variations point to the need for context-specific approaches to address the predominant finance barriers to scaling up in each area. While these patterns provide useful directional insights, they are drawn from a relatively small sample in Asia (7 projects) and in Eastern Europe and Central Asia (2 projects) and should be interpreted with caution. These regional variations nonetheless highlight the importance of

context-specific approaches to address the predominant barriers to scaling up climate finance.

The evaluation identified systemic challenges in attributing LDCF/SCCF contributions to catalyzing private climate finance, despite demonstrated potential in select initiatives.

The Nigeria Erosion and Watershed Management Project exemplified this gap: while it facilitated Nigeria's inaugural green bond and attracted private capital, its terminal evaluation lacked clear metrics to isolate the SCCF's role. This ambiguity of attribution obscures the funds' impact on de-risking investments and limits replication of blended finance models. Notably, the project underutilized SCCF resources to structure or guarantee the bond, missing an opportunity to establish a scalable template for leveraging public funds to unlock private capital in adaptation sectors. Such gaps hinder donor recognition of the funds' full value proposition and constrain knowledge transfer to other contexts.

Analysis of the LDCF/SCCF portfolio indicates limited integration of strategic financing instruments aimed at mobilizing private capital and institutional investment. The use of financial de-risking tools—such as concessional lending, first-loss capital, or performance-based grants—remains largely undocumented, making it difficult to assess their effectiveness within the adaptation finance space. Similarly, while technical assistance is frequently provided, its connection to the development of investable climate finance products, such as sovereign green bonds or adaptation-linked loans, is often implicit rather than intentional. In the absence of deliberate design features, opportunities to scale private sector engagement—especially in countries with shallow capital markets and high perceived risks—appear underutilized.

2.5 Adaptive management

The GEF defines adaptive management as a structured, iterative process of decision-making that emphasizes learning and adaptation in the face of uncertainty (GEF Secretariat


2024; GEF STAP 2025). This approach involves setting clear management objectives, implementing actions, monitoring outcomes, and adjusting strategies based on new information and changing conditions. By continuously integrating feedback and learning from experiences, adaptive management aims to enhance the effectiveness and sustainability of environmental projects (GEF Secretariat 2024).

To analyze adaptive management in LDCF/SCCF projects, the evaluation team reviewed the outcome ratings assigned in midterm reviews, project implementation reports (PIRs), and terminal evaluations. The evolution of these ratings throughout the project life cycle was assessed to identify trends, improvements, or setbacks in implementation and performance. This approach allowed for an examination of how adaptive management has influenced final outcomes.

Of the 31 projects with available documentation, 55 percent (17 projects) received a lower final rating at completion compared to their PIR and midterm review ratings. Among the remaining projects, 16 percent (five projects) improved their ratings, while 29 percent (nine projects) stayed the same ([figure 2.10](#)). This downward trend suggests patterns in adaptive management implementation. The decline in project ratings may stem from implementation challenges, fundamental design flaws, or operational and administrative delays. Additionally, the timing of the midterm reviews may have contributed to the downturn. In some cases, reviews conducted relatively late in the project cycle could have limited opportunities for course correction, resulting in insufficient time to implement significant improvements before project completion.

A key pattern emerged from the analysis: since target achievement is often backloaded in the final implementation phase, midterm reviews and PIRs tended to be overly optimistic, with projections not materializing in final outcomes. This finding highlights the need for rigorous adaptive management by implementing and executing partners throughout the project life cycle—even when interim evaluations

Figure 2.10 Project performance ratings at midterm and completion for the AER 2025 cohort



Source: GEF IEO terminal evaluation review data set; $n = 31$.

indicate satisfactory progress. The Climate Resilient Livestock Management Project exemplifies this trend. Its 2020 midterm review revised targets downward, reducing rangeland restoration from 4,500 hectares to 2,500 hectares due to budget constraints, yet final outcomes still fell short. Key indicators, such as reduced greenhouse gas emissions from infrastructure, saw 0 percent progress against a 100 percent target, despite midterm optimism about measures like biogas digesters. The final assessment cited unresolved challenges, including delayed infrastructure utilization and incomplete greenhouse gas impact assessments—risks that the midterm review had underestimated. This project illustrates how midterm reviews may overlook systemic risks (e.g., slow adoption of new technologies, contractor delays), leading to overstated progress. Conversely, Bhutan’s Enhancing Sustainability and Climate Resilience of Forest and Agriculture Landscape project demonstrates how effective midterm interventions can drive improvement. The project team successfully implemented midterm review recommendations by strengthening the mainstreaming reference group, enhancing stakeholder collaboration, and improving knowledge management. These timely adjustments helped overcome challenges in operationalizing the integrated landscape management approach and

institutional coordination, ultimately leading to a final rating of highly satisfactory.

This analysis revealed a lower application of adaptive management in the Africa region. Of the 17 projects with declining final ratings compared to their implementation reports, 12 were implemented in Africa, accounting for 70 percent of projects with deteriorating performance. While Africa represented the largest share of the portfolio (55 percent), the disproportionately high concentration of underperforming projects underscores persistent institutional and capacity challenges in the region.

Given the dynamic nature of climate adaptation projects, implementation frameworks that incorporate flexibility have proven more effective in responding to unforeseen challenges and shocks. Projects that incorporated flexibility into their design were better positioned to navigate shocks and changing conditions. The AER 2025 cohort provides multiple examples where adaptive management approaches enabled projects to overcome implementation barriers and external disruptions. Projects with built-in flexibility mechanisms demonstrated resilience against contextual shifts, from political transitions to extreme weather events, maintaining progress toward objectives despite changing circumstances. The evidence indicates that adaptive capacity is a critical success factor in climate-vulnerable environments. The Enabling Climate Resilience in the Agriculture Sector in the Southwest Region of Madagascar (GEF ID 5233, AfDB) project successfully applied phased implementation and flexible financing mechanisms to adjust to climate-induced changes. Senegal’s Promoting Innovative Finance and Community Based Adaptation in Communes Surrounding Community Natural Reserves (GEF ID 5867, UNDP) project demonstrated effective adaptive management in action. When its planned climate development fund faced barriers, the team pivoted to partner directly with microfinance institutions supporting women’s groups. This resulted in 76 percent of communities reporting increased income—well above the 45 percent midterm projection. By implementing all

11 midterm review recommendations, implementation delays decreased by 40 percent in the final phase. The project's success highlights how incorporating contingency mechanisms (15 percent of budget reserved for adaptive responses) and regular scenario planning enables climate resilience projects to navigate uncertainties and achieve better outcomes despite changing circumstances.

The analysis of final ratings compared to midterm reviews highlights the critical role of supervision reports in project performance. In some cases, PIRs and midterm reviews identified issues early, enabling strategic adjustments that improved final outcomes. In others, they confirmed that well-performing projects were on track, providing valuable insights to sustain good practices. A strong example of this case is the Promoting Innovative Finance and Community-Based Adaptation project, which, as noted above, successfully implemented all 11 midterm review recommendations. Key actions included organizing a joint mission with key stakeholders to strengthen coordination and securing an agreement with Cauris Microfinance to enhance funding. Additionally, improvements to quality control mechanisms ensured that project documents met financial requirements before approval. These adaptive measures contributed to the project's successful completion.

Adaptive management in LDCF/SCCF projects faces various challenges and limitations that can affect its effectiveness. Limited financial and human resources, along with technical capacity constraints, restrict the in-depth analysis of PIR and midterm review data and the

implementation of necessary adjustments. Additionally, institutional resistance to change can delay or obstruct key modifications, particularly when they challenge existing plans or require shifts in stakeholder priorities.

Although PIRs and midterm reviews provide valuable insights into project performance, they do not capture all factors influencing final outcomes. External dynamics, such as political and economic shifts or unforeseen environmental events, can significantly affect performance. Furthermore, long-term sustainability depends not only on adaptive measures during implementation but also on postproject institutional commitment and additional funding. Therefore, adaptive management should extend beyond these reports, incorporating a broader and more flexible approach that considers both internal and external factors to enhance effectiveness and sustainability.

Supervision reports alone are insufficient to drive significant performance improvements. The decline in final project ratings suggests that, while these reports offer valuable recommendations, their impact is often inadequate to resolve structural or implementation issues. Strengthening monitoring mechanisms and ensuring the effective integration of report recommendations into project management is crucial to enhancing outcomes.



3

Conclusions and recommendations

3.1 Conclusions

The LDCF/SCCF portfolio demonstrates strong scaling-up intentions at design, yet faces implementation barriers that limit transformative impact. The evaluation found that the majority of projects (67 percent) include elements for scaling up in their initial design, showing clear intention to expand successful interventions beyond pilot stages. However, shortcomings emerge during implementation, with administrative challenges (39 percent), funding sustainability gaps (30 percent), external disruptions (21 percent), and market-related barriers (10 percent) consistently impeding broader adoption. While some factors lie outside the GEF's direct control, many administrative and institutional barriers fall within the sphere of influence of the GEF and its Agencies. These implementation challenges not only affect immediate project outcomes but fundamentally constrain long-term sustainability and scaling potential.

Scaling up and sustainability are deeply intertwined with how well implementation is carried out. Projects demonstrating strong implementation performance consistently achieved higher sustainability ratings and greater scaling impact. The assessment found that embedding projects within government systems, fostering diverse stakeholder partnerships, and establishing local revenue mechanisms significantly enhanced institutional capacity and financial sustainability. Similarly, projects that aligned with national and regional policies created natural pathways for continuation, securing follow-up funding at nearly twice the rate of stand-alone initiatives.

Regional variations in barriers to scaling up suggest the need for context-specific implementation approaches. With Eastern Europe and Central Asia facing predominantly administrative barriers, Asia struggling primarily with external disruptions, and Africa showing a balanced distribution of challenges, a one-size-fits-all implementation approach proves insufficient. The evaluation revealed that projects tailored to regional administrative contexts and equipped with flexible management frameworks consistently

demonstrated greater resilience and effectiveness in overcoming implementation barriers; this suggests that implementation strategies must be adapted to specific regional constraints.

3.2 Recommendation

Based on the findings and conclusions, the AER 2025 makes one recommendation:

Recommendation 1: To achieve sustained and transformative impact from climate change adaptation interventions, the GEF partnership—including the Secretariat, Agencies, and participating countries—must place greater emphasis on identifying and addressing implementation-related barriers to scaling up adaptation efforts under the LDCF and the SCCF through

coordinated action. While strong project design is critical, scaling and sustainability ultimately depend on effective implementation and execution. This requires strengthening implementation support systems, such as technical backstopping and access to knowledge resources; tailoring strategies to regional contexts; and streamlining procedures to minimize delays. By working collaboratively within their respective roles, the GEF Secretariat, GEF Agencies, and countries can significantly improve delivery and maximize adaptation outcomes.



4

LDCF/SCCF MAR 2025

The MAR has been presented annually to the GEF Council since June 2006. It is the main accountability mechanism to monitor and report on progress in the implementation of recommendations from evaluations prepared by the GEF IEO. Prior to 2021, the Council endorsed the recommendations, and the GEF IEO tracked their implementation. The GEF Secretariat provided a management response to the IEO evaluations and recommendations, but the specific actions included in the management response were not endorsed by the Council.

As a follow-up to the professional peer review of the GEF's independent evaluation function (PRP 2019), the GEF approach to the MAR was revised. GEF management now responds to each GEF IEO evaluation recommendation with an action plan, and the Council comments on and endorses this plan. The GEF IEO then tracks progress in its implementation. The GEF Council began to endorse management action plans in June 2021.

The management response to a GEF IEO recommendation indicates whether it agrees with the recommendation. Where management agrees with a recommendation—including instances where it partially agrees—it is expected to identify specific actions, along with a time frame, where appropriate, to address it. In instances where management disagrees with a recommendation, it is not expected to provide an action plan to address the recommendation.

4.1 Ratings approach

For each of the recommendations for which implementation of the management's action plan is tracked, GEF management is invited to provide self-ratings on progress in implementation along with commentary as necessary. Ratings and commentary on tracked recommendations are also provided by the GEF IEO for validation. The scale for assessing the level of implementation of the management action plan is analogous to that used in earlier MARs. However, the description of the ratings has been

updated to reflect the revised MAR process. The implementation progress ratings are as follows:

- **High.** The management action plan for the relevant recommendation has been fully implemented.
- **Substantial.** The management action plan for the relevant recommendation has largely been implemented or most actions have been implemented, but some aspects/actions have not been fully implemented.
- **Medium.** Some of the actions listed in the management action plan have been implemented, but not to a significant degree. While some of the specified actions have been implemented, there is only limited progress in implementation of the key specified actions.
- **Negligible.** Specified actions have not yet been implemented, or the progress made so far is negligible.
- **Not rated.** Sufficient information on implementation is not available to allow an assessment of progress.
- **Not applicable.** Not applicable may be used when subsequent decisions taken by the GEF Council supersede the management action plan.

The evaluation recommendations and the related management action plans may be graduated or retired from the MAR for one or more of the following reasons:

- **Graduated** due to high or, where appropriate, substantial level of progress in implementation of management's action plan.
- **Retired** because the evaluation recommendation and related action plan are not relevant anymore, or further progress on implementation of the action plan is unlikely. An automatic reason for retirement is if a recommendation and related action plan have been covered in the MAR for five years.

4.2 MAR status

MAR 2025 for the LDCF/SCCF tracks progress in implementation of management's action plans for one GEF

IEO recommendation for the 2020 LDCF program evaluation (GEF IEO 2022b) and three recommendations for the Evaluation of GEF Support to Climate Information and Early Warning Systems (CIEWS; GEF IEO 2025).

2020 LDCF program evaluation

GEF IEO recommendation: Continue to enhance the likelihood of the sustainability of outcomes. The GEF Secretariat and the GEF Agencies should continue to carry out relevant actions in project design and implementation as highlighted in the GEF Council document "Towards Greater Durability of GEF Investments" (GEF 2019). This should entail giving more emphasis to the project and context factors identified by this evaluation as affecting the sustainability of outcomes during project design and implementation.

Level of GEF management agreement and its response including specified actions: Agreed. The Secretariat acknowledges the GEF IEO's recommendation to continue to enhance the likelihood of sustainability of outcomes. In this regard, the Secretariat will continue to carry out relevant actions in project design and implementation as highlighted in the Council document "Towards Greater Durability of GEF Investments," as recommended by the IEO and will continue to urge Agencies to emphasize contextual factors affecting sustainability outcomes (GEF 2020). No time frame was indicated.

GEF Secretariat assessment of progress in implementation of its action plan: High. The LDCF continues to implement all elements of the GEF-8 climate change adaptation strategy that directly speak to durability of design and implementation. Complementary to the successful regional workshops in the previous fiscal year that enhanced country ownership and capacity building, the GEF Secretariat is continuing to enhance stakeholder consultations in line with current GEF policies and guidelines and promoting local community involvement to improve project ownership and accountability. This is to foster partnership for inclusion and operationalize

the whole-of-society approach, a key principle outlined in the GEF-8 strategy. It advocates for robust theories of change within the country context for durable adaptation.

The current active GEF-8 portfolio demonstrates progress in integrating durability principles into project design and implementation. For example, the GEF-8 LDCF project in Bhutan (Enhancing the Climate Resilience of Urban Landscapes and Communities in Thimphu-Paro region of Bhutan; GEF ID 11109) emphasizes capacity building through local universities to ensure long-term sustainability and fully aligns with new urban development policy. Similarly, the GEF-8 LDCF project in Nepal (Climate Resilient Transformation of Rice-based Farming and Food Systems in Central Nepal; GEF ID 11401) includes local government representatives in project steering committees. These approaches highlight the integration of durability into the GEF-8 LDCF/SCCF portfolio.

GEF IEO validation of reported implementation progress: High.

The IEO recognizes the Secretariat's continued efforts under GEF-8 to enhance the likelihood of the sustainability of outcomes through actions in project design and implementation as highlighted in GEF (2020). This recommendation will be graduated.

Support to CIEWS

Recommendation 1

GEF IEO recommendation: GEF projects should shift their focus from solely providing early warning information to fostering early actions during disaster events. GEF projects ought to prioritize data usability and ensure that both national and local plans are in place. This involves establishing effective communication systems and providing the necessary knowledge of how to respond once a warning is issued. To overcome the "last mile" challenge, GEF projects must prioritize community engagement, capacity building, and the development

of tailored communication strategies to address the specific needs and challenges of remote and vulnerable communities.

Level of GEF management agreement and its response including specified actions: Partially agreed.

The GEF Secretariat and the GEF Agencies should continue to explore strategies to enhance the financial sustainability of CIEWS components. The significant costs associated with the operation and maintenance of CIEWS initiatives require a tailored approach to secure long-term financing to enable their continued success beyond the project's completion. Recognizing the complexities of engaging the private sector and acknowledging their potential role, particularly in least developed countries, GEF projects are encouraged to support efforts to create an enabling environment for the private sector in developing innovative adaptation solutions derived from CIEWS. This is especially important considering the multiple applications and increasing advantages that CIEWS offer to several sectors, including transportation, agriculture, tourism, finance, and insurance.

GEF Secretariat assessment of progress in implementation of its action plan: Substantial.

In alignment with LDCF and SCCF mandates, the GEF Secretariat has continued to engage with operational focal points, Agencies, and global and regional partners to support early warning action in the face of climate variability and extremes, in conjunction with support for CIEWS. This has included approval and development of new projects that foster early action to reduce climate vulnerabilities and risks; as well as overcoming last mile challenges, including by prioritizing community engagement and the development of tailored communication strategies to address the specific needs and challenges of remote vulnerable communities.

GEF IEO validation of reported implementation progress: Substantial.

The IEO notes the progress made by the GEF Secretariat in approving and developing new projects that foster early action and address last mile

challenges. The IEO will monitor the portfolio to assess continued efforts.

Recommendation 2

GEF IEO recommendation: The GEF Secretariat, the GEF Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel, and the GEF Agencies should continue aligning indicators with established good practices.

GEF projects should adopt the most fitting indicators in line with World Meteorological Office guidelines and informed by international good practices and lessons learned from past experiences. These indicators would effectively measure the success of CIEWS interventions, serve as a roadmap for future interventions, and provide information to global results frameworks. Furthermore, for effective monitoring, GEF projects should set minimum standards for measuring and tracking CIEWS components at the project level. In alignment with ongoing efforts to streamline and simplify the GEF results framework, this approach emphasizes repurposing existing indicators at the project level rather than introducing new ones. The overarching goal is to enhance the quality of measurement and tracking of the application of CIEWS components, ensuring that interventions are well-informed and impactful.

Level of GEF management agreement and its response including specified actions: *Partially agreed*. While indicators for CIEWS do not align with the focal areas of the GEF Trust Fund, as part of its ongoing efforts to improve capture of socioeconomic well-being and adaptation benefits, it will explore integrating best practices related to CIEWS indicators in the GEF Trust Fund. However, the results frameworks of the LDCF and the SCCF do include indicators for CIEWS. The Secretariat updates its LDCF/SCCF indicators every four years, as it launches the next adaptation programming strategy. The indicators are revised in accordance with best adaptation practice and in alignment—where possible—with the indicators of other climate funds, while adhering to the principle of streamlining the results framework in order to prevent overburdening GEF Agencies and countries. The GEF Secretariat will revisit, and may update, the LDCF/

SCCF indicators that will accompany the adaptation programming strategy for the 2026–30 period, including indicators for CIEWS.

GEF Secretariat assessment of progress in implementation of its action plan: *Substantial*. In preparation for development of the new LDCF/SCCF programming strategy for the 2026–30 period, the Secretariat has prepared and convened in-depth Technical Advisory Group meetings. These meetings included substantial discussion on CIEWS, as well as implications for impact monitoring and indicators. These meetings benefited from the insights of key actors in CIEWS and climate adaptation impact monitoring. Consultations have also been held with the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change authors and other stakeholders.

GEF IEO validation of reported implementation progress: *Medium*. The IEO notes the GEF Secretariat’s preparation for new programming strategy and will continue tracking the development of indicators for CIEWS.

Recommendation 3

GEF IEO recommendation: The GEF Secretariat and the GEF Agencies should continue to explore strategies to enhance the financial sustainability of CIEWS components. The significant costs associated with the operation and maintenance of CIEWS initiatives require a tailored approach to secure long-term financing to enable their continued success beyond the project’s completion. Recognizing the complexities of engaging the private sector and acknowledging their potential role, particularly in least developed countries, GEF projects are encouraged to support efforts to create an enabling environment for the private sector in developing innovative adaptation solutions derived from CIEWS. This is especially important considering the multiple applications and increasing advantages that CIEWS offer to several sectors, including transportation, agriculture, tourism, finance, and insurance.

Level of GEF management agreement and its response including specified actions: *Partially agreed*. The LDCF and SCCF projects that support CIEWS include strengthening the institutional capacity of meteorological agencies and mainstreaming their services with sectors such as agriculture. This has often led to robust government institutions, which have continued to monitor and provide climate and weather data after project completion. Regarding the private sector, engagement has been primarily in the application and use of climate data in sectors where private sector actors are active. The GEF Secretariat is supporting countries in piloting innovative CIEWS-based and private sector-led adaptation solutions and creating enabling policy environments, including in the agriculture advisory and climate risk insurance sectors. It will continue to identify more such opportunities for private sector engagement in CIEWS, including through the Challenge Program for Adaptation Innovation. As such, the GEF Secretariat welcomes highlighting the importance of continuing to ensure that GEF support for CIEWS includes purposeful financial sustainability strategies to enable the medium- and long-term functioning and use of the systems.

GEF Secretariat assessment of progress in implementation of its action plan: *Substantial*. The GEF Secretariat has continued to identify opportunities for private sector engagement in CIEWS. This has included launching a third round of the Challenge Program for Adaptation Innovation, with a focus on fostering innovation and enabling private sector engagement in developing adaptation solutions across sectors. This also includes the development of blended finance vehicles with the potential to invest in enterprises that provide and use CIEWS.

GEF IEO validation of reported implementation progress: *Medium*. The IEO acknowledges the GEF Secretariat's efforts to engage the private sector in CIEWS through the Challenge Program and the development of blended finance vehicles. While these may help address financial sustainability, it may be limited in scope. The IEO will continue to monitor the progress of these efforts.

AER 2025 portfolio

GEF ID	Project title	GEF period	Fund	GEF Agency	Country	Grant (mil. \$)	Rating			
							Out-come	Sustain-ability	M&E design	M&E imple-mentation
3243	Climate Change Adaptation Project, Phase I	GEF-4	SCCF	WB	Philippines	5.2	MS	MU	S	MU
4366	Climate Resilience Through Conservation Agriculture	GEF-5	SCCF	IFAD	Moldova	2.9	S	MU	MS	MS
4515	Southeastern Europe and Caucasus Catastrophe Risk Insurance Facility (SEEC CRIF)	GEF-5	SCCF	WB	Regional	4.2	S	L	S	MS
4907	GGW: Nigeria Erosion and Watershed Management Project (NEWMAP)	GEF-5	MTF	WB	Nigeria	5.7	S	ML	S	S
4934	Enhancing Capacity, Knowledge and Technology Support to Build Climate Resilience of Vulnerable Developing Countries	GEF-5	SCCF	UNEP	Global	3.8	MS	ML	S	MU
4952	Landscape Approach to Forest Restoration and Conservation (LAFREC)	GEF-5	MTF	WB	Rwanda	4.2	S	ML	MS	S
5113	Enhancing Climate Change Resilience in the Benguela Current Fisheries System	GEF-5	MTF	FAO	Regional	3.9	HS	MU	HS	HS
5133	Senegal River Basin Climate Change Resilience Development Project	GEF-5	MTF	WB	Regional	5.3	S	ML	S	S
5147	Enhancing Resilience of Agricultural Sector in Georgia (ERASIG)	GEF-5	SCCF	IFAD	Georgia	10.9	S	ML	MU	MS
5204	Building Resilience to Climate Change in the Water and Sanitation Sector	GEF-5	SCCF	AfDB	Uganda	8.0	MS	NR	NR	U
5209	Building Resilience to Climate Change in the Water and Sanitation Sector	GEF-5	LDCF	AfDB	Sierra Leone	5.7	S	MU	MS	MU

GEF ID	Project title	GEF period	Fund	GEF Agency	Country	Grant (mil. \$)	Rating			
							Out-come	Sustain-ability	M&E design	M&E imple-mentation
5233	Enabling Climate Resilience in the Agriculture Sector in the Southwest Region of Madagascar	GEF-5	LDCF	AfDB	Madagascar	7.0	MS	MU	S	S
5394	Climate Resilient Livestock Management Project	GEF-5	LDCF	AfDB	Zambia	8.7	MS	MU	MS	MS
5414	Enhancing National Food Security in the Context of Global Climate Change	GEF-5	LDCF	UNDP	Kiribati	4.0	MS	U	MS	MU
5436	Disaster Risk Management and Urban Development Project	GEF-5	LDCF	WB	Niger	3.8	S	L	S	S
5451	Strengthening Hydro-Meteorological and Climate Services	GEF-5	LDCF	WB	Congo DR	4.5	HS	ML	S	S
5462	Strengthening Agro-climatic Monitoring and Information Systems to Improve Adaptation to Climate Change and Food Security in Lao PDR	GEF-5	LDCF	FAO	Lao PDR	8.0	MS	MU	S	MS
5489	Climate Adaptation in Wetlands Areas (CAWA)	GEF-5	LDCF	FAO	Lao PDR	8.4	MS	MU	S	MS
5603	Reducing Vulnerability of Banana Producing Communities to Climate Change Through Banana Value Added Activities - Enhancing Food Security and Employment Generation	GEF-5	SCCF	UNIDO	Uganda	5.5	MS	MU	S	MS
5632	Enhancing the Adaptation Capacities and Resilience to Climate Change in Rural Communities in Analamanga, Atsinanana, Androy, Anosy, and Atsimo Andrefana	GEF-5	LDCF	UNDP	Madagascar	5.7	S	ML	S	S
5651	Livestock and Rangeland Resilience Program	GEF-5	LDCF	IFAD	Sudan	3.8	MS	ML	S	MU
5685	Increasing Productivity and Adaptive Capacity in Mountain Areas of Morocco (IPAC-MAM)	GEF-5	SCCF	IFAD	Morocco	4.2	S	ML	MS	S
5723	West Balkans Drina River Basin Management Project	GEF-5	SCCF	WB	Regional	3.9	HS	MU	HS	HS
5782	Adapting Agriculture to Climate Change in the Gambia	GEF-5	LDCF	FAO	Gambia	5.3	S	ML	S	S

GEF ID	Project title	GEF period	Fund	GEF Agency	Country	Grant (mil. \$)	Rating			
							Out-come	Sustain-ability	M&E design	M&E imple-mentation
5867	Promoting Innovative Finance and Community Based Adaptation in Communes Surrounding Community Natural Reserves (Ferlo, Niokolo Koba, Senegal River Bas Delta & Saloum Delta), Senegal	GEF-5	LDCF	UNDP	Senegal	10.9	S	ML	MU	MS
5904	Strengthening the Resilience of Rural Livelihoods and Sub-national Government System to Climate Risks and Variability in Benin	GEF-5	LDCF	UNDP	Benin	8.0	MS	MU	S	MS
6914	Adapting Afghan Communities to Climate-Induced Disaster Risks	GEF-6	LDCF	UNDP	Afghanistan	8.4	MS	MU	S	MS
6967	CCA Growth: Implementing Climate Resilient and Green Economy plans in highland areas in Ethiopia	GEF-6	LDCF	UNDP	Ethiopia	5.5	MS	MU	S	MS
6991	Senegal National Adaptation Plan	GEF-6	LDCF	UNDP	Senegal	5.7	S	ML	S	S
8023	Strengthening Climate Information and Early Warning Systems for Climate Resilient Development and Adaptation to Climate Change in Guinea	GEF-6	LDCF	UNDP	Guinea	3.8	MS	ML	S	MU
9197	Protecting Urban Areas Against the Impacts of Climate Change in Vanuatu	GEF-5	LDCF	ADB	Vanuatu	4.2	S	ML	MS	S
9199	Enhancing Sustainability and Climate Resilience of Forest and Agricultural Landscape and Community Livelihoods	GEF-6	MTF	UNDP	Bhutan	3.9	HS	MU	HS	HS
10296	Adaptation SME Accelerator Project (ASAP)	GEF-7	SCCF	CI	Global	5.3	S	ML	S	S

Source: GEF IEO terminal evaluation review data set.

Note: Grant amounts are LDCF/SCCF/GEF funding approved at Chief Executive Officer endorsement, including any project preparation grant; Agency fees are excluded. *Funds:* LDCF = Least Developed Countries Fund; SCCF = Special Climate Change Fund. *GEF Agencies:* ADB = Asian Development Bank; AfDB = African Development Bank; CI = Conservation International; FAO = Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations; IFAD = International Fund for Agricultural Development; UNDP = United Nations Development Programme; UNEP = United Nations Environmental Programme; UNIDO = United Nations Industrial Development Organization; WB = World Bank. *Ratings:* HS = highly satisfactory; S = satisfactory; MS = moderately satisfactory; MU = moderately unsatisfactory; U = unsatisfactory; HU = highly unsatisfactory; L = likely; ML = moderately likely; MU = moderately unlikely; U = unlikely; NR = not rated.

References

All URLs were checked before publication.

- GEF (Global Environment Facility). 2017. "[Policy on Gender Equality](#)." GEF/C.53/04. GEF, Washington, DC.
- GEF (Global Environment Facility). 2019. "[Towards Greater Durability of GEF Investments](#)." GEF/C.57/08. GEF, Washington, DC.
- GEF (Global Environment Facility). 2020. "[Management Response to: 2020 Program Evaluation of the Least Developed Countries Fund](#)." GEF/E/LDCF.SCCF.29/E/02. GEF, Washington, DC.
- GEF and GCF (Global Environment Facility and Green Climate Fund). 2021. "[Towards a Long-Term Vision on Complementarity GEF and GCF Collaboration](#)."
- GEF IEO (Global Environment Facility Independent Evaluation Office). 2022a. "[Strategic Country Cluster Evaluation of the Least Developed Countries](#)." Evaluation Report No. 142. Washington, DC: GEF IEO.
- GEF IEO (Global Environment Facility Independent Evaluation Office). 2022b. "[Least Developed Countries Fund: 2020 Program Evaluation](#)." Evaluation Report No. 147. Washington, DC: GEF IEO.
- GEF IEO (Global Environment Facility Independent Evaluation Office). 2023. "[Guidelines for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of Full-Size Projects](#)." GEF IEO, Washington, DC.
- GEF IEO (Global Environment Facility Independent Evaluation Office). 2024. "[LDCF/SCCF Annual Evaluation Report 2023](#)." Evaluation Report No. 161. Washington, DC: GEF IEO.
- GEF IEO (Global Environment Facility Independent Evaluation Office). 2025. "[GEF Support to Climate Information and Early Warning Systems](#)." Evaluation Report No. 169. Washington, DC: GEF IEO.
- GEF Secretariat (Global Environment Facility Secretariat). 2024. "[Global Environment Facility Strategy for Knowledge Management and Learning](#)." GEF, Washington, DC.
- GEF STAP (Global Environment Facility Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel). 2025. "[Real-Time Monitoring, Evaluation, and Learning \(MEL\) in GEF-9: A Joint Information Note from STAP and the IEO Based on Four Case Studies](#)." GEF/STAP/C.69/Inf.02. GEF, Washington, DC.
- PRP (Peer Review Panel). 2019. "[Third Professional Peer Review of the Independent Evaluation Function of the Global Environment Facility and IEO Action Plan](#)." GEF/ME/C.56/inf. 04. Global Environment Facility Independent Evaluation Office, Washington, DC.
- Stoll, P.P., W.P. Pauw, F. Tohme, and C. Grüning. 2021. "[Mobilizing private adaptation finance: lessons learned from the Green Climate Fund](#)." *Climatic Change* 167 (45).



The Independent Evaluation Office (IEO) of the Global Environment Facility (GEF) was established by the GEF Council in July 2003. The Office is independent from GEF policy making and its delivery and management of assistance.

The Office undertakes independent evaluations at the strategic level. These evaluations typically focus on cross-cutting themes, such as focal area-wide topics or integrated approaches to delivering global environmental benefits. The IEO presents a GEF-wide annual performance report and also undertakes institutional evaluations, such as assessing GEF governance, policies, and strategies. The Office's work culminates in a quadrennial comprehensive evaluation of the GEF.

The Office cooperates with professional evaluation networks on developing evaluation approaches, setting standards, and delivering training—particularly with regard to environmental evaluation and evaluation at the interface of environment and socioeconomic development. We also collaborate with the broader global environmental community to ensure that we stay on the cutting edge of emerging and innovative methodologies.

To date, the Office has produced over 160 evaluation reports; explore these on our website: www.gefio.org/evaluations.

Independent Evaluation Office, Global Environment Facility
1818 H Street, NW • Washington, DC 20433, USA
www.gefio.org

 @gefio  @gefio

