

LDCF/SCCF Annual Evaluation Report 2024

Audit Trail

Comments on Draft Report – May 2024

Paragraph Number	Reference text	GEF SEC comments	GEF IEO comments
Executive Summary Paras 2 to 3 (Paras 1 and 4 are currently blank)	General comment	It is not explicitly clear what the dates are that this review covers. But perhaps this clarity will be improved with new text in paras 1 and 4?	Added (page iv, para. 1, and page 1, para. 2) the following sentence: “These GEF TF evaluations, which also include LDCF/SCCF projects, cover projects spanning the GEF-3 to GEF-7 replenishment periods.”
Entire document	General comment	This document is a compilation of snippets of guidance excerpted from various evaluations on different topics (the list is provided in Table 1 of the document). Most of the insights could apply to any GEF project and appear not to be specific to the LDCF and SCCF. Although the insights in the Main Takeaways section (para 62 onwards) are quite useful, “LDCF/SCCF Annual Evaluation Report” seems to be a misnomer.	From page iv, para. 3 and page 1, para. 3: “The synthesis of evidence aligns with the themes and levers of transformation as formulated in the GEF Programming Strategy on Adaptation to Climate Change for the LDCF and the SCCF for the GEF-8 Period of July 1, 2022, to June 30, 2026.” Hence it is aimed to apply specifically to the adaptation portfolio. The analysis shows that the 22 GEF TF projects reviewed do provide insights along the adaptation themes and levers of transformation, due to the cobenefits provided by these GEF TF projects.
Entire document	General comment	This document is the annual evaluation of the LDCF and SCCF, yet the project examples are overwhelmingly from the GEF Trust Fund. The rationale for including these non-adaptation projects for an evaluation of two adaptation funds should be presented clearly in the	Note that there are 22 GEF TF examples, and 22 LDCF, SCCF, and MTF examples (of which 11 are LDCF, 6 SCCF and 5 MTF). There was a careful consideration in making the examples balanced, although the evaluations’ project portfolio is

Paragraph Number	Reference text	GEF SEC comments	GEF IEO comments
		introductory matter. Please see below a list of GEF Trust Fund project examples included in the evaluation (which greatly outnumber the list of LDCF/SCCF projects) : GEF Trust Fund example – Bolivia ID 3831 (para 14) GEF Trust Fund example – Guinea ID 1877 (para 15) GEF Trust Fund example – Malawi ID 3376 (para 15) GEF Trust Fund example – Niger ID 3381 (para 16) GEF Trust Fund example – Ethiopia ID 2794 (para 18) GEF Trust Fund example – Kenya ID 9139 (para 18) GEF Trust Fund example – Gambia ID 3368 (para 20) GEF Trust Fund example – Malawi ID 9138 (para 21) GEF Trust Fund example – Ecuador ID 4774 (para 22) GEF Trust Fund example – Kazakhstan ID 5699 (para 25) GEF Trust Fund example – Mediterranean regional ID 9685 (para 28) GEF Trust Fund example – Uzbekistan ID 4600 (para 34) GEF Trust Fund example – Uzbekistan ID 10367 (para 34) GEF Trust Fund example – Azerbaijan ID 4332 (para 35) GEF Trust Fund example – Niger ID 3382 (para 40) GEF Trust Fund example – Senegal ID 5449 (para 50) GEF Trust Fund example – Jordan ID 2631 (para 52) GEF Trust Fund example – Kenya 3370 (para 54) GEF Trust Fund example – Azerbaijan ID 10708 (para 58) GEF Trust Fund example – Nile River Basin ID 3321	overall skewed towards GEF TF, due to its comparatively large financial size. Added on page iv, para. 4 and page 1, para. 4: “The synthesis of evidence focuses on LDCF, SCCF, multitrust fund projects, and GEF TF projects, drawing examples from 22 GEF TF projects and 22 LDCF, SCCF, and multitrust fund projects.”
7	<i>From GEF-3 to GEF-7, the LDCF and SCCF have financially supported a total of 426 projects.</i>	Given this review is titled as for 2024, it would seem logical that GEF8 be included in the scope.	The five evaluations reviewed to create the synthesis did not include any GEF-8 projects, therefore GEF-8 cannot be included in the AER 2024.

Paragraph Number	Reference text	GEF SEC comments	GEF IEO comments
8	<i>The regional distribution of these projects, as shown in Figure 1, highlights a concentrated focus on supporting adaptation efforts in Africa and Asia and the Pacific. This reflects the LDCF's focus on least developed countries, which are mainly situated in Africa (33 countries) and Asia and the Pacific (11 countries),² as well as the heightened vulnerabilities and pressing needs in these regions.</i>	However, the SCCF is mandated to support all GEF eligible countries, including non LDCs and non-SIDS, including in Latin America and the Caribbean. We suggest to note this mandate is largely unfunded due to the SCCF being largely cash starved.	Noted, the text above the figure on the regional distribution has been adjusted to reflect this comment.
9	<i>The LDCF/SCCF cofinancing represents 20.1 percent of the total project portfolio funding based on expected contributions at project approval.</i>	Table 4 indicates 3,003.2 in LDCF and SCCF finance and 18,905.2 in co-finance. Therefore, the 20.1% figure of LDCF/SCCF finance to co-finance seems incorrect. Also, I believe LDCF/SCCF finance is typically referred to in Council documents as "finance", rather than "co-finance", so referring to it here as "cofinancing" could create confusion.	Changed para. 11 on page 5 to: "Also in the evaluations' project portfolio, MTF projects leveraged most cofinancing, with \$7.50 of cofinancing in expected contributions at project approval for every dollar funded by the LDCF, SCCF and GEF TF. LDCF and SCCF projects on average leveraged \$4.55 and \$5.57 in expected cofinancing contributions for every dollar invested."
9	<i>It is important to note that this figure may not reflect the final, realized</i>	There is a Figure 1 right after this para, so it may be more clear to refer to the percent as a "percent" or "number".	The word "figure" has been taken out of the sentence. It referred to the amount mentioned earlier and not to the figure on the next page.

Paragraph Number	Reference text	GEF SEC comments	GEF IEO comments
	<i>cofinancing at project completion.</i>		The sentence has also been moved up to not give the idea of it linking to the figure below it.
ES para 3	<i>Regarding GEF TF projects, the emphasis lies not on their contributions to global environmental benefits, but rather on adaptation co-benefits and extracting valuable insights in alignment with adaptation themes, transformational levers, and cross-cutting considerations and priorities that provide lessons for LDCF and SCCF projects.</i>	The lack of consistency in these statements can lead to confusion. We suggest to make these statements more consistent.	The para. 10 text has been deleted, given it is confusing to state this (as part of the evaluations' project portfolio discussion) and then later include GEF TF projects in the examples.
6			The other two paragraphs give a clear reasoning for including GEF TF projects and the focus, and have as such been kept.
10	<i>the report draws on specific examples from GEF TF-financed projects, highlighting their relevance in adaptation co-benefits</i>		
	<i>In the remainder of this section, the GEF TF is only taken into account as part of MTF projects.</i>		

Paragraph Number	Reference text	GEF SEC comments	GEF IEO comments
11	<i>The concentration of projects in specific regions and the distribution of GEF Agencies can be attributed to the significant weight of the LDCF in the LDCF/SCCF/MTF portfolio.</i>	We suggest to note the under representation of non LDCs and imbalance of Africa and Asia has been due to the SCCF being largely cash starved, particularly in GEF7, as well as in GEF-8 to be able to support countries beyond LDCs and SIDS. Referring to the portfolio of LDCF and SCCF projects as LDCF/SCCF/ portfolio is misleading. While some LDCF and SCCF projects are MTFs, this is the LDCF/SCCF portfolio of which some projects are MTFs between these two GEF TFs and/or other GEF Trust Funds. Suggest to clarify.	Adjusted in para. 9, page 4: “Furthermore, it’s important to note that although the SCCF is mandated to support all GEF-eligible countries, including non-least developed countries (LDCs) and non-small island developing states (SIDS), this mandate has been largely unfulfilled due to the fund’s chronic underfunding. The SCCF has faced significant resource constraints, limiting its ability to provide comprehensive support across its intended global scope.” And para. 12, pages 5-6: “The regional concentration of projects can be primarily attributed to the substantial influence of the LDCF within the overall portfolio. The SCCF’s limited financial resources have constrained its ability to support countries effectively, resulting in geographical distribution patterns for the LDCF/SCCF project portfolio where the LDCF country focus predominates due to its larger share in resources.”
17	<i>Similarly, the Community-based Land Management project in Guinea (1877)</i>	Is 1877 referring to a GEF ID for a LDCF or SCCF project, or otherwise?	From the Water Security Evaluation, page 61, para. 109. It is a GEF TF project. Added “GEF TF” to the sentence upon first use.
35	<i>However, the project falls short of providing tangible support for early actions during disasters. While it successfully strengthens the capacity to issue timely warnings, the</i>	As discussed in para 5 of the ‘GEF Management Response to the Evaluation of GEF Support to Climate Information and Early Warning Systems’ (GEF/C.66/17), the GEF “does not directly support disaster risk management; therefore, activities that fall purely in the area of disaster risk management, such evacuation and	Added as footnote 4 on page 15.

Paragraph Number	Reference text	GEF SEC comments	GEF IEO comments
	<i>implementation lacks crucial elements like community drills, pre-positioning of emergency supplies, or establishing safe evacuation routes. As a result, despite the improved warning systems, the affected communities face challenges in effectively responding to disasters due to a lack of practical support for early actions.</i>	reconstruction, are outside the mandate for support provided by the GEF, LDCF and SCCF.” However, LDCF and SCCF projects are increasingly including elements such as community drills and (climate-related) disaster planning, to better prepare people to cope with natural hazards.	
45	<i>The Climate Information and EWS Evaluation, found that utilization of innovative approaches in the project portfolio reviewed was limited, with only 22 percent mentioning such approaches during design and a mere five percent successfully implementing them by project completion.</i>	Please specify which of the family of GEF Trust Funds this evaluation is referring to. Was this really an evaluation of LDCF and SCCF GEF trust fund projects, or also of GEF Trust Fund projects? Please also indicate the years that this evaluation covered. Also, this sentence should have a footnote to the evaluation. It is useful to remember that “innovation” is context-specific; What could be perceived as non-innovative in one country could be innovative in another.	A sentence was added to the first paragraph of Theme 4, para. 28, page 13: “Seventy-eight percent of projects part of the CIEWS Evaluation portfolio were LDCF funded.” For further deep-diving in what is covered by a specific evaluation, the relevant evaluation is always referenced in the text.
47	<i>Within the evaluation portfolio of the Water Security Evaluation, only a small percentage of</i>	Please indicate which of the family of GEF trust funds this evaluation covered. Was this an evaluation of LDCF and SCCF GEF trust fund projects, or of GEF Trust Fund projects, or	A reference to the Water Security Evaluation has been added. The evaluation describes in detail the portfolio it covers.

Paragraph Number	Reference text	GEF SEC comments	GEF IEO comments
	<i>completed projects (18 percent) involved the private sector in implementing water security activities.</i>	something else? Please also indicate the years that this evaluation covered. Also, this sentence should have a footnote to the evaluation. Please specify which portfolio is being referred to. Is this for the GEF Trust Fund, or the LDCF and SCCF trust funds?	
48	<i>Equally, the LDCF-financed project SMARTFARM—A Data and Digital Technology Driven and Farm Management Solution for Climate Resilience in Ethiopia/Rwanda (GEF ID 10965)</i>	Please note this was supported through the Challenge Program for Adaptation Innovation. This is relevant because this program has been a major catalyst for innovation and private sector engagement with the use of LDCF and SCCF finance.	Adjusted in para. 49, page 20, by adding: “supported through the Challenge Program for Adaptation Innovation”
53	<i>Youth engagement and empowerment remains limited, with in the project portfolio analyzed for the Water Security Evaluation finding only 11 percent of completed projects involving youth or youth groups.</i>	Please specify which portfolio is being referred to. Is this for the GEF Trust Fund or the LDCF and SCCF trust funds?	A reference to the Drylands Evaluation has been added. The evaluation describes in detail the portfolio it covers.
54	<i>By implementing climate-resilient agricultural practices, introducing drought-tolerant crops, and...</i>	It is surprising that in a section focused on climate resilience, all the examples provided are from the GEF Trust Fund. The LDCF and SCCF portfolios have been supporting climate-resilient agricultural practices for a long time. Are there no examples to provide from those funds (for this evaluation report on the LDCF and SCCF)?	A summary of SCCF project GEF ID 6960 from the Water Security Evaluation portfolio was added in para. 55, page 22.

Paragraph Number	Reference text	GEF SEC comments	GEF IEO comments
55	<i>Projects adopt integrated approaches that combine climate-resilient practices, disaster risk management measures, and income-generating activities.</i>	This is the essence of what the LDCF and SCCF have been supporting. Why not provide examples from the LDCF/SCCF portfolio? The examples are from the GEF Trust Fund.	A summary of LDCF project GEF ID 10159 from the CBA Evaluation portfolio was added in para. 56, page 5.
59	<i>Sustaining multistakeholder governance platforms, post-project closure remains a challenge.</i>	This sentence randomly appears without context. Was it taken from the evaluation of the IAPs? Please provide relevance/context for its inclusion in this LDCF/SCCF evaluation report.	The sentence comes from the Drylands Evaluation, page 44, para. 119. The sentence has been referenced as from Stafford-Smith and Metternicht (2021), given the evaluation itself does not link it directly to project examples in the text, but does link it to this academic reference.
67	<i>Private sector engagement in water security projects is limited due to the perception of water as a public good. However, opportunities exist for involvement in resilience-building and multi-stakeholder initiatives. Challenges in CIEWS projects include funding reliance and competition. Private sector engagement in drylands projects is increasing, yet challenges remain due</i>	An analysis of private sector engagement in projects over time would show that there has been a significant increase in recent years, particularly in GEF-7 and GEF-8. Suggest including a reference to movement and progress in the focus of projects on private sector engagement in water security and other themes in more recent years.	Three specific positive examples on what the private sector could do in water security were added in para. 68, pages 25-26.

Paragraph Number	Reference text	GEF SEC comments	GEF IEO comments
	<i>to market connectivity issues and lack of investment incentives.</i>		
68	<i>Despite challenges such as cultural norms and childcare barriers, women are increasingly involved in decision-making processes and project activities.</i>	Given the barriers to women's involvement in decision making processes and project activities extend well beyond childcare, we suggest to either avoid zeroing in on just this barrier by either removing this specific reference or listing other barriers as well.	The text has been adjusted accordingly in para. 69, page 26.