



1 BASIC PROJECT INFORMATION (1/2)

* 1. Who is entering the project? Select your name.

* 2. GEF project ID

* 3. Please indicate project's GEF Agency. For multi-agency projects, select the lead GEF Agency.

* 4. Country

* 5. Select the applicable cohort(*select all that apply*)

- ☐ Africa Biomes
- ☐ Least Developed Countries
- ☐ Small Island Developing States

* 6. What is the project's name, according to the Excel overview?

* 7. Select the GEF replenishment period in which this project was approved

- ☐ Pilot Phase (1991-1994) ☐ GEF-4 (2006-2010)
- ☐ GEF -1 (1994-1998) ☐ GEF-5 (2010-2014)
- ☐ GEF-2 (1998-2002) ☐ GEF-6 (2014-2018)
- ☐ GEF-3 (2002-2006)

* 8. What project type applies?

- ☐ Full-sized project ☐ Enabling activity
- ☐ Medium-sized project

* 9. Please select the project status

* 10. Select the source(s) of project financing.
(*Select all that apply*)

- ☐ GEF Trust Fund ☐ LDCF
- ☐ NPIF ☐ CBIT
- ☐ SCCF

* 11. What kind of review will you be conducting for this project?

- ☐ Relevance
- ☐ Relevance and Sustainability (*projects closed between 2007 and 2014*)



2 BASIC PROJECT INFORMATION (2/2)

* 12. What are the documents available, to be used for review?

(Select all that apply)

- ☐ Project Preparation Grant request (PPG) / Project Identification Form (PIF)
- ☐ Project Document (PD/PAD) / Program Framework Document (PFD) / Request for CEO Endorsement
- ☐ Project Implementation Reports (PIRs)
- ☐ Mid-Term Review (MTR)
- ☐ Terminal Evaluation (TE) / Implementation Completion Report (ICR) / Terminal Evaluation Review (TER) / Implementation Completion Report Review (ICRR)
- ☐ Other (please specify)

FOR ALL ANSWERS FROM THIS POINT FORWARD, FOCUS ON THE ASPECTS OF THE PROJECT THAT ARE SUPPORTED BY GEF FUNDING, i.e. those components of the intervention that are meant to produce or (in)directly lead to Global Environmental Benefits.

* 13. **Project Objective(s)** from the latest document *-before implementation -* showing full list of objectives (e.g. PD, PAD, PFD, Request for CEO endorsement). *(Make sure to include the objective for the GEF-funded part of the project)*

* 14. **Project Components** from the latest document *-before implementation -* showing full list of components (e.g. PD, PAD, PFD, Request for CEO endorsement). *(Make sure to include the GEF-funded activities implemented under each component)*

* 15. For completed projects, does the TE / ICR (or TER / ICRR) indicate a change in objectives and/or components from the CEO approved/endorsed document?

☐ Yes

☐ No

If YES, please explain with references:

* 16. Based on the project focal area(s) designation, which focal area(s) does the project intend to provide benefits to?

(Select all that apply - if it is multi-focal and the focal areas are given, then select all focal areas given, if it is multi-focal without focal area designation, then select multi-focal)

☐ Biodiversity

☐ Mercury

☐ Climate Change (Mitigation)

☐ Ozone Depleting Substances (ODS)

☐ Climate Change Adaptation (LDCF/SCCF only)

☐ Persistent Organic Pollutants (POP)

☐ International Waters

☐ Multi-Focal (for multi-focal area projects without focal area designation)

☐ Land Degradation

For the next question:

If there are no focal areas beyond the intended focal area(s) as written in the previous question ->

Select the focal areas as they were selected in the previous question.

If the answer on the previous question was 'multi-focal project without focal area designation' ->

Select 'N/A'.

* 17. Based on project objective(s), components and activities, are there focal areas that are not officially mentioned but covered as co-benefits? Which focal areas does the project intend to provide direct benefits and co-benefits to?

(Check all that apply)

☐ Biodiversity

☐ Mercury

☐ Climate Change (Mitigation)

☐ Ozone Depleting Substances (ODS)

☐ Climate Change Adaptation (LDCF/SCCF only)

☐ Persistent Organic Pollutants (POP)

☐ International Waters

☐ N/A

☐ Land Degradation

* 18. Does the project documentation describe the GEF Agency's / Agencies' comparative advantage for being engaged in the project? *(Feel free to search all project documentation)*

☐ Yes

☐ No

If YES, do provide the text and reference. And do provide the comparative advantage for all GEF Agencies, in case of a multi-agency project:



3 RELEVANCE (1/2)

* 19. For the selected country, please indicate main environmental challenges.

(Check all that apply, based on the approach papers and country selection papers)

- | | |
|---|--|
| ☐ Climate change; Sea level rise | ☐ Threats to in-land water / freshwater fishery resources |
| ☐ Natural disasters | ☐ Threats to land-based biodiversity |
| ☐ Deforestation and Land Degradation | ☐ Waste management |
| ☐ Desertification | ☐ Air quality and air pollution |
| ☐ Coastal and coral reef degradation | ☐ Water quality and quantity |
| ☐ Threats to marine resources | ☐ Mining and other forms of resource extraction |

* 20. For the selected project, please indicate the main environmental challenges the project aims to address.

(Check all that apply, based on the PD, PAD, PFD, Request for CEO endorsement)

- | | |
|--|--|
| ☐ Climate change; Sea level rise | ☐ Threats to land-based biodiversity |
| ☐ Natural disasters | ☐ Waste management |
| ☐ Deforestation and Land Degradation | ☐ Air quality and air pollution |
| ☐ Desertification | ☐ Water quality and quantity |
| ☐ Coastal and coral reef degradation | ☐ Mining and other forms of resource extraction |
| ☐ Threats to marine resources | ☐ N/A - Other challenge not mentioned above |
| ☐ Threats to in-land water / freshwater fishery resources | |

21. In case the project addresses environmental challenges not mentioned in the previous question, please describe them below:



4 RELEVANCE (2/2)

The following questions refer specifically to the individual SCCEs; Africa Biomes - Sahel and Savannah / Least Developed Countries / Small Island Developing States. In case the project covers multiple SCCEs, answer in the text box for each.

SCCE's covered: {{ Q5 }}

* 22. Does the project description talk about specific relevance of the project to country priorities, as they are for the specific SCCE(s) covered?

(Always explain your answer)

- ☐ Yes, clearly
- ☐ Yes, to some extent
- ☐ No

Please explain your answer:

* 23. Does the contextual description talk about specific environmental challenges for the country covered? Focus on specific Sahel or Savannah, LDC or small island environmental challenges.

(Always explain your answer)

- ☐ Yes, clearly
- ☐ Yes, to some extent
- ☐ No

Please explain your answer:

* 24. Do the objectives, components and/or activities take into account the specific environmental challenges identified in the previous question?

(Always explain your answer)

- ☐ Yes, clearly
- ☐ Yes, to some extent
- ☐ No

Please explain

* 25. In case of SIDS, is there evidence of using an integrated island management / ridge-to-reef / blue economy approach?

(Always explain your answer)

- ☐ Yes, clearly
- ☐ Yes, to some extent
- ☐ No

Please explain

* 26. In case of SIDS, are transaction costs (the cost of doing business on the islands) mentioned in the project design?

- ☐ Yes, clearly
- ☐ Yes, to some extent
- ☐ No

Please explain



5 TYPES OF INTERVENTIONS

Project Components:

{{ Q14 }}

* 27. Based on the Project Components above, what are the areas of contribution for this GEF project?

(Select all that apply)

- | | |
|--|--|
| ☐ Knowledge and information – Knowledge generation | ☐ Institutional capacity – Governance structures and arrangements |
| ☐ Knowledge and information – Information sharing and access | ☐ Institutional capacity – Informal processes for trust building and conflict resolution |
| ☐ Knowledge and information – Awareness-raising | ☐ Implementing strategies – Technologies and approaches |
| ☐ Knowledge and information – Skills-building | ☐ Implementing strategies – Implementing mechanisms and bodies |
| ☐ Knowledge and information – Monitoring and evaluation | ☐ Implementing strategies – Financial mechanisms for implementation and sustainability |
| ☐ Institutional capacity – Policy, legal and regulatory frameworks | |

6 ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIOECONOMIC INDICATORS

* 28. Which global environmental benefits (GEBs) are identified in the project documents? *(Select all that apply)*

- ☐ GEB 1. Maintain globally significant biodiversity and the ecosystem goods and services that it provides to society.
- ☐ GEB 2. Sustainable land management in production systems (agriculture, rangelands, and forest landscapes)
- ☐ GEB 3. Promotion of collective management of trans-boundary water systems and implementation of the full range of policy, legal, and institutional reforms and investments contributing to sustainable use and maintenance of ecosystem services.
- ☐ GEB 4. Support to transformational shifts towards a low-emission and resilient development path.
- ☐ GEB 5. Increase in phase-out, disposal and reduction of releases of POPs, ODS, mercury and other chemicals of global concern.
- ☐ GEB 6. Enhance capacity of countries to implement MEAs (multilateral environmental agreements) and mainstream into national and sub-national policy, planning financial and legal frameworks.
- ☐ Other GEB mentioned, different from the above (please copy-paste in comment field)
- ☐ No GEBs identified.

Please provide information if GEB targets have been set for the project:

Environmental change (refers to improved environmental status and stress reduction): Indicators should capture the changes in environmental stress and environmental status that occurred by the end of the project. Include both quantitative and qualitative changes documented, sources of information for these changes, and how project activities contributed to or hindered these changes. Also include how contextual factors have contributed to or hindered these changes.

* 29. Looking at the indicators in the project's logical framework / monitoring tool, which environmental domains do they measure? *(Select all that apply)*

- | | |
|--|--|
| <p>☐ Climate change; sea level rise (Examples; Sea level rise measurement stations operational Increase in flooding in coastal areas Amount of land lost due to sea level rise Marine erosion due to sea level rise Development of sea level rise scenarios Intrusion of salt water into the freshwater lens due to sea level rise)</p> <p>☐ Natural disasters (Examples; Contingency plan for flood events has been developed Flood control thematic committee has been developed Disaster management and contingency planning system built into EIMAS and used)</p> <p>☐ Deforestation and land degradation, incl. SLM (Examples; % decrease in firewood collection in pilot oases Community forest reserves have been established in two-third of the targeted areas Rates of deforestation in the Albertine Rift have decreased by 50% of baseline levels Communities sign at least 10 forest management plans and start implementation 19,200 ha of degraded landscape under afforestation programs such as tree planting, agro-forestry wood lots and commercial fuel wood plantations Percentage increase in area under sustainable land management practices in the targeted watersheds Increase of vegetative cover by at least 25,000 ha by project end)</p> | <p>☐ Waste management (Examples; Environmentally friendly waste disposal in place Battery recycling system established and functioning Landfill gas potential surveyed)</p> <p>☐ Water quality and quantity (Examples; Water conservation techniques applied on 10% of farmland Increased discharge capacity of key relief canal Number of water locations assessed and supply improvements implemented Comprehensive assessment of solid waste generation established)</p> <p>☐ Mining and other forms of resource extraction (Examples; Reclaiming and rehabilitation of X abandoned mining sites Decrease in sand mining Decrease in coral mining for construction Improvements in more sustainable minerals processing Threats from production of non renewable resources - oil and gas, mining and quarrying)</p> <p>☐ Climate change mitigation, emission reduction (Examples; The annual growth of GHG emissions from fossil fuel-based activities in the country are reduced by about 2.0% RE-based energy system project implementers are reporting bi-annually the energy and GHG reduction impacts of their respective projects Cumulative CO2 reductions exceeding triple the direct impacts over an additional 10- year period Percentage increase for carbon sequestered)</p> |
|--|--|

☐ **Desertification** (Examples; Precipitation deficit | Availability of water for agricultural practices | Development of national plans to fight desertification | Development of a desertification information system | Introduction of SLM practices to control and combat desertification | Reduction of desertification in priority ecosystems)

☐ **Coastal and coral reef degradation** (Examples; Illegal practices and over-exploitation of coastal resources decreased by 50% in average in CBCAs | Local communities in and around protected areas practice diverse community-driven, sustainable use of coastal natural resources | Biennial biological survey confirms that reef condition at demonstration MPA improves beyond established baseline)

☐ **Threats to marine resources** (Examples; Improved management of marine habitats of important species | Number of communal marine and coastal biodiversity sites, including wetlands areas demarcated and protected | Technical working groups on marine biodiversity management established | 50 % of marine project supported area brought under sustainable management practices)

☐ **Threats to freshwater fishery resources** (Examples; Health and function maintained or improved within fishing reserves | Management effectiveness of three fishing reserves improved | Joint planning of short term sustainable development activities among different actors in the watershed | Area of MPA watershed managed and legally recognized)

☐ **Threats to terrestrial biodiversity** (Examples; Populations of faunal indicator species increase, indicating improved ecosystem integrity | Reduction in illegal hunting of wildlife | Biodiversity conservation considerations fully integrated into agricultural sector activities | Number of agricultural biodiversity micro-projects implemented | Removal or control of alien species)

☐ **Renewable energy and energy efficiency** (Examples; Fossil fuels (diesel and fuel-oil) displaced by renewable energy technologies – biomass and wind turbines for power generation for grid and process heat | Increase in the number of biomass fuel service providers and industrial units to support biomass gasifier plants | # solar power generators and refrigerators installed and operative)

☐ Unable to assess (Documents not available)

☐ Other, namely:

☐ No environmental aspects; focus on general capacity building.

Provide source (the types of documents and their respective page numbers) where environmental indicators/ targets can be found, or explain why unable to assess:

Socioeconomic change. Describe any changes in human well-being (income, education, health, community relationships, etc.) that occurred by the end of the project. Include both quantitative and qualitative changes documented, sources of information for these changes, and how project activities contributed to or hindered these changes. Also include how contextual factors have contributed to or hindered these changes.

* 30. Looking at the indicators in the project's logical framework / monitoring tool, which socioeconomic aspects and cross cutting domains do they measure? (Select all that apply)

- | | |
|--|---|
| <p>☐ (Alternative) income generation and income diversification (Examples; Tourism income increased New income streams (jobs) and employment opportunities developed % decrease in number of rural households below the poverty line in the targeted oasis Two-fold increase in income being generated for local communities from non-timber forest resources by EOP)</p> <p>☐ Food security and access to food (Examples; Improved food security for rural households as a result of sustainable conservation of biological and agricultural diversity Increased crop yield Percentage increase in agricultural productivity (for dominant crops and livestock)</p> <p>☐ Health and access to medicine / health services (Examples; Frequency of flooding causing disruption of hospital services reduced Increase in access to health services for targeted communities)</p> <p>☐ Education and access to education (Examples; Environmental education introduced into village schools Education curriculum and demos/competitions for biodiversity conservation developed for elementary and high school Natural resource valuation curriculum integrated into course offerings of higher learning institutions)</p> <p>☐ Other communal services and access to them (Examples; Percentage of targeted communes that increase the rate of coverage of social services by more than 2% Increase in access to communal water schemes Performance-based contracts with public services satisfactorily implemented at communal level)</p> <p>☐ Market development (Examples; More retailers entering the solar PV market Reduced retail prices of Solar PV Incentive schemes and tax waivers for attracting renewable energy service providers Assessment completed of the viability of local manufacturing of RE system equipment and/or components)</p> <p>☐ Civil society engagement and development (Examples; NGO capacity is strengthened to galvanize the impact of their efforts by improved cooperation Community associations, producers' organizations and marginalized groups are enabled to actively engage in ecosystem management schemes NGOs and CSOs actively promoting sustainable land management)</p> <p>☐ Financial market development and access to finance (Examples; National micro-finance market reformed Banks willing to lend and over longer terms for the purchasing of solar PV systems RE-based projects are being considered for financing by private and government financial institutions and commercial banks)</p> | <p>☐ Gender equality and women's empowerment - cross cutting issue (Examples; Percentage of women beneficiaries Gender perspective taken into account in grant selection Women's producer organizations retain control of the money they earn Numbers of women participating in decision-making Increased participation of women in the micro-catchment management planning process)</p> <p>☐ Resilience - cross cutting issue (Examples; % change in vulnerability to climate change of men, women and children living in pilot sites Consistent use of best practice in the application of risk management and environmental assessment, consistent with relevant defined strategic aims and policies to vulnerability reduction measures)</p> <p>☐ Fragility - cross cutting issue (Examples; Disruption caused by risk events, eg. hurricanes, general elections, etc.) Number of days of delays because of risk events Increase in ecological fragility)</p> <p>☐ Private sector engagement - cross cutting issue (Examples; Replicable model of conservation of globally threatened small island biodiversity based on a collaborative model between NGOs and private sector Local NGOs and private sector have created and are operating an "investment advice facility" 50% of the trained private sector personnel engaged in RE-based project development and implementation activities)</p> <p>☐ Unable to assess (Documents not available)</p> <p>☐ No socioeconomic aspects</p> <p>☐ Other, namely:</p> |
|--|---|

Provide source (the types of documents and their respective page numbers) where socioeconomic indicators/ targets can be found, or explain why unable to assess, or explain other:

Capacity and governance changes (refers to the three GEF contribution areas: Implementing Strategies, Institutional Capacity, Knowledge and Information). Describe notable changes in capacities and governance that can lead to large-scale action (both mass and legislative) bringing about positive environmental change. “**Capacities**” include awareness, knowledge, skills, infrastructure, and environmental monitoring systems, among others. “**Governance**” refers to decision-making processes, structures and systems, including access to and use of information, and thus would include laws, administrative bodies, trust-building and conflict resolution processes, information-sharing systems, etc. Indicate how project activities contributed to/ hindered these changes, as well as how contextual factors have influenced these changes.

* 31. Looking at the indicators in the project's logical framework/ monitoring tool, which capacity, institutional and governance domains do they measure? (Select all that apply)

- | | |
|--|---|
| <p>☐ Institutional and decision-making processes, structures and systems (Examples; Capacities and institutional mechanisms for local government enhanced FBG decision and execution structures established and meeting in accordance with TORs and timetable defined in the Statutes Institutional mechanisms for local government and communities enhanced, showing concrete instances of joint decision making in all PAs by end of year 6)</p> <p>☐ Decision-makers' information and access to information (Examples; Extend of inclusion/use of traditional knowledge in environmental decision-making Adequacy of the environmental information available for decision-making Watershed management plan produced to guide decision-making with regards to management and conservation of the area Collected data is being fed into management decisions)</p> <p>☐ Development of plans, policies, codes, covenants, laws and regulations (Examples; By Year 3 associated legislative and policy reforms are in place Building code includes freshwater collection and storage as an objective SLM integrated in National Policies, Laws, Development and Investment Plans Law on Protected Areas and Law on Protection of Fauna and Flora enacted)</p> <p>☐ Trust-building and conflict resolution (Examples; Number of conflicts reduced by 10 % by the end of the first phase of the CPP 50 (of which 27 new) Conflict Resolution Frameworks effectively operational by mid-term review Land-use conflict litigation commissions are fully operational in at least 50 communes by the midterm review)</p> <p>☐ Awareness raising (Examples; Key sectors show increased awareness relative to the need and desirability of SIRM Number of awareness campaigns on biodiversity, including wetlands conservation organized for the people in the three coastal communities Various media have disseminated information on new environmental laws within six months of legislation being enacted Increase in awareness of senior decision-makers on the importance of LD)</p> <p>☐ Capacity and skills development (Examples; GSW farmers have been trained and are adopting biodiversity-friendly agricultural techniques At least 30 Natural parks managers and staff trained in PA management Continuous training and planning sessions provided to PAMO staff on an ongoing basis throughout project, based on skills gaps and needs assessment)</p> | <p>☐ Knowledge management; information-sharing and systems (Examples; Geographic information system data base on biodiversity conservation, including wetlands management for the three sites developed and in use Operational database on SLM techniques by the end of the first phase Lessons learned from pilot project are widely disseminated)</p> <p>☐ Environmental monitoring systems (Examples; Joint protection patrol and monitoring systems established and in use Land information systems have been adapted to local and national needs, and are functional 3 key endangered and threatened species data management systems designed and in place Sustainable mechanism to update the environmental information through monitoring and reporting established Biodiversity monitoring system indicating improvement in ecosystem integrity and health)</p> <p>☐ Unable to assess (Documents not available)</p> <p>☐ No capacity, institutional and governance aspects</p> <p>☐ Other, namely:</p> |
|--|---|

Provide source (the types of documents and their respective page numbers) where capacity, institutional and governance indicators/ targets can be found, or explain why unable to assess, or explain other:



7 TRADE-OFFS, SYNERGIES AND RISKS

Trade-off expresses the idea that “when some things are gained, others are lost”. It is the notion that it is not possible to maximize benefits in two or more sectors at the same time. Trade-offs can be between sector objectives, between environmental and socioeconomic outcomes, between geographic locations, and between global and local benefits, in addition to temporal trade-offs between short-term and long-term benefits.

Synergy refers to multiple benefits that are achieved either simultaneously through a single intervention, or through the interaction of outcomes of at least two interventions. Synergy is also used to refer to the benefits achieved by a project or program in more than one sector.

* 32. Do any of the project documents mention trade-offs and/or synergies between environmental and socioeconomic outcomes that might occur or have occurred as a result of this project?

(Keywords: trade-off, trade off, tradeoff, synergy, synergies, nexus)

☐ Yes

☐ No

Please copy-paste / type details here, including references:

* 33. Do any of the project documents mention mitigation actions / strategies towards trade-offs and/or synergies being mitigated or synergies created between environmental and socioeconomic outcomes as a result of this project?

(Keywords: trade-off, trade off, tradeoff, synergy, synergies, nexus)

☐ Yes, for all or most

☐ Yes, for some

☐ No.

Please copy-paste / type details here, including references:

* 34. Has the project indicated risks - including climatic as well as non-climatic risks - that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved?

- ☐ **Yes, sufficiently:** A sufficiently wide variety of risks, climatic as well as non-climatic, has been identified, including a description of their potential impact as well as the probability of each risk materializing within the project's lifetime.
- ☐ **Yes, but not sufficiently:** A selection of risks have been identified, but some risk factors one would expect in the country's context have not been mentioned, and risk impact and/or probability are missing in some instances.
- ☐ **Yes, but with serious omissions:** Some risks have been identified, but a number of major risk factors are missing. The risk impact is not described for all risks and the probability is missing for most.
- ☐ **No:** There is no clear risk appreciation.

Please copy-paste / type details here, including references:

* 35. Does the project provide risk mitigation strategies, or actions to be taken in the case that identified risks would materialize?

- ☐ Yes, for all or most
- ☐ Yes, for some
- ☐ No

Please copy-paste / type details here, including references:



8 CROSS CUTTING - GENDER

* 36. Did the project have a gender analysis completed at CEO Endorsement?

(Based on the PD, PAD, PFD, Request for CEO Endorsement)

☐ Yes

☐ No

☐ No, but its development is implied

Please provide further information if the answer is 'yes' or 'no, but its development is implied'.

* 37. Did the project include a gender mainstreaming strategy or plan at CEO endorsement?

(Based on the PD, PAD, PFD, Request for CEO Endorsement)

☐ Yes

☐ No

☐ No, but its development is implied

Please provide further information if the answer is 'yes' or 'no, but its development is implied'.

* 38. Did the project incorporate a gender-responsive results framework, including gender-disaggregated indicators, at CEO endorsement?

(Based on the PD, PAD, PFD, Request for CEO Endorsement)

☐ Yes

☐ No

☐ No, but its development is implied

Please provide further information if the answer is 'yes' or 'no, but its development is implied'.

* 39. If the answer was **NOT YES** on the previous three questions; is there evidence in the TE/TER (or ICR/ICRR) that a gender analysis, gender mainstreaming strategy or plan, or gender-responsive results framework, was developed or took place?

- ☐ Yes, a gender analysis was done after implementation start
- ☐ Yes, a gender mainstreaming strategy or plan was developed after implementation start
- ☐ Yes, a gender-responsive results framework was developed after implementation start
- ☐ No, no evidence on the above

Please provide further information:

* 40. Gender dis-aggregated data (as %)

Share of women involved in project design

Share of women targeted as direct beneficiaries

Share of women in lead project management roles

* 41. Is there evidence of women's inclusion and empowerment in the project TE/ICR (or TER/ICRR)?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

Please explain (copy the section below)

Gender rating

Gender-blind: Project does not demonstrate awareness of the set of roles, rights, responsibilities, and power relations associated with being male or female.

Gender-aware: Project recognizes the economic / social / political roles, rights, entitlements, responsibilities, obligations and power relations socially assigned to men and women, but might work around existing gender differences and inequalities, or does not sufficiently show how it addresses gender differences and promotes gender equality.

Gender-sensitive: Project adopts gender sensitive methodologies (a gender analysis or social analysis with gender aspects is undertaken, gender disaggregated data are collected, gender sensitive indicators are integrated in monitoring and evaluation) to address gender differences and promote gender equality.

Gender-mainstreamed: Project ensures that gender perspectives and attention to the goal of gender equality are central to most, if not all, activities. It assesses the implications for women and men of any planned action, including legislation, policies or programs, in any area and at all levels.

Gender-transformative: Project goes beyond gender-mainstreaming and facilitates a 'critical examination' of gender norms, roles, and relationships; strengthens or creates systems that support gender equity; and/or questions and changes gender norms and dynamics.

Not gender-relevant: Gender plays no role in the planned intervention. (Note that in practice it is rare for projects to not have any gender relevance. If a project touches upon the lives of people, either directly or indirectly, it has gender relevance).

* 42. What is the project's gender rating at entry?

(Based on the PD, PAD, PFD, Request for CEO Endorsement)

* 43. What is the project's gender rating at completion?

(Based on the TE, TER, ICR, ICRR)



9 CROSS CUTTING - RESILIENCE (1/2)

* 44. Is there a mention of resilience or resilience thinking in the project documents?

(Look for resilient, resilience, vulnerability, adaptability, adaptive capacity)

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Unable to assess

10 CROSS CUTTING - RESILIENCE (2/2)

In the context of the GEF, climate resilience may be considered at three levels:

Resilience as risk management: A first level of response emerges from pure risk management considerations: sustained delivery of future GEB's is at risk from climate change; therefore, projects ought to be screened for climate risks, and suitable risk management measures should be developed and adopted in project design and implementation. This would increase the resilience of the GEF portfolio to climate change. Such a de-risking approach is now being widely adopted by most multilateral and bilateral funding organizations, starting with the development and adoption of screening tools.

Resilience as a co-benefit: GEF focal area interventions offer the opportunity of enhancing resilience of human socio-economic systems to climate change; it is therefore worth seeking resilience co-benefits of GEF focal area interventions, or in some cases, use approaches practiced in other focal areas, specifically for enhancing the climate resilience of human systems. This is the underlying logic of ecosystem-based adaptation, where ecosystem restoration serves as a means for reducing the vulnerability of human socio-economic systems.

Resilience integrated into a multiple benefits framework: It is increasingly important to develop frameworks and approaches that allow multiple objectives and multiple benefits to be achieved simultaneously across social and natural systems. In this framing, resilience is not seen as an add-on (additional risk to be managed) or a co-benefit, but rather as a system property that needs to be considered together with all of the other system properties, and thus linked to the idea of sustainable development.

Reference: *Delivering Global Environmental Benefits for Sustainable Development. STAP Report to the 5th GEF Assembly, México, May 2014.*

* 45. Is there evidence of resilience thinking in project documents as:

(Select all that apply)

- ☐ Risk management
- ☐ Co-benefit
- ☐ Integrated into multiple benefits framework
- ☐ Yes, but not in line with above three answer options

The type of resilience system thinking

Resilience from a systems or engineering perspective (absorptive): This was the original, relatively narrow focus of resilience; the ability of a system to bounce back or return to equilibrium following disturbance, referred to by Holling (1973) as 'engineering resilience'. This comes down to absorptive (coping) capacity, which Cutter et al. (2008, p.663) define as 'the ability of the community to absorb event impacts using predetermined coping responses'.

Resilience as incremental change (adaptive): adaptive resilience refers to the various adjustments (incremental changes) that people undergo in order to continue functioning without major qualitative changes in function or structural identity. These incremental adjustments and changes can take many forms (e.g. adopting new farming techniques, change in farming practices, diversifying livelihood bases, engaging in new social networks, etc). These adaptations can be individual or collective, and they can take place at multi-level (intra-household, groups of individuals/households, community, etc).

Resilience as transformational change (transformative): transformational changes often involve shifts in the nature of the system, the introduction of new state variables and possibly the loss of others, such as when a household adopts a new direction in making a living or when a region moves from an agrarian to a resource extraction economy. It can be a deliberate process, initiated by the people involved, or it can be forced on them by changing environmental or socioeconomic conditions.

What the growing body of literature that discusses transformational changes highlights is that the main challenges associated with transformation are not of a technical or technological nature only. Instead, as pointed out by O'Brien (2011), these shifts may include a combination of technological innovations, institutional reforms, behavioral shifts and cultural changes.

Reference: Béné, C., Godfrey-Wood, R., Newsham, A., and Davies, M., 2012. *Resilience: New utopia or new tyranny? Reflection about the potentials and limits of the concept of resilience in relation to vulnerability reduction programmes*. IDS working Paper 405. Brighton: Institute of Development Studies (IDS). ISBN 978 1 78118 091 4.

* 46. For the resilience thinking mentioned above, what kind of resilience thinking?

	type of resilience system thinking
Risk management	
Co-benefit	
Integrated into multiple benefits framework	

47. Feel free to add information on your scoring of the previous question.(Only a short recap if you feel it is interesting how they approached resilience, with references)

* 48. Are there clear linkages in project documents towards country priorities on resilience?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

Please explain



11 CROSS CUTTING - FRAGILITY

* 49. Is the project country currently classified as fragile?

(Note that if the fragility is only marked as 'other' for 2006 - 2008, select 'NO')

- ☐ Yes, currently classified fragile
- ☐ No, but it was classified as fragile in the last 10 years
- ☐ No, not currently fragile or fragile in the past 10 years

50. Does the contextual description in the project documents talk about the country's / countries (in case of regional projects) fragility status? *(From the PD, PAD, PFD, Request for CEO Endorsement)*

- ☐ Yes, clearly
- ☐ Yes, to some extent
- ☐ No, and it should have
- ☐ No, because the country was not fragile during the time of project implementation.
- ☐ No, because the country was not fragile when the project was designed.
- ☐ No, and it is unclear if the country was fragile at the time of design or implementation; the project was implemented before 2006 - the first year of the fragility index.

Please explain

* 51. Did GEF interventions stop or got put on hold due to fragility status?*(This can be reported in the PIR's, MTR or TE and TER (ICR and ICRR)*

- ☐ Yes, GEF activities are currently on hold or stopped
- ☐ Yes, GEF activities were on hold but have continued later
- ☐ No

Please explain

* 52. Does the TE/ICR (or TER/ICRR) discuss the impact of country / countries (in case of regional projects) fragility on project outcomes or sustainability?

☐ Yes

☐ No

Please explain

--



12 CROSS CUTTING - PRIVATE SECTOR

* 53. Is there evidence in project documents of consultation / engagement with the private sector during design or project start?

- ☐ Yes, to use private sector stakeholders' input in project design ☐ Yes, to enthruse them to fund beyond project timeframe
☐ Yes, to enthruse them during design to co-finance the project ☐ Yes, with a different aim (explained in the comment field)
☐ Yes, to inform private sector stakeholders of the project ☐ No, there is no evidence of private sector engagement
☐ Yes, to get them on board from inception

Please specify if there is a different aim for private sector engagement, and provide background information for all answers:

* 54. Is there evidence in project documents of country / countries (in case of regional projects) regulatory frameworks enabling private sector to address environmental issues?

- ☐ Yes ☐ No

If there is, please provide further information:

* 55. Is there evidence in project documents of public private partnerships for the implementation of the project?

- ☐ Yes ☐ No

If there is, please provide further information:

* 56. Is there evidence in project documents of private sector co-financing of the project?

☐ Yes

☐ No

If there is, please provide the amount and type (loan, grant, in-kind, etc.) of private sector co-financing, if that information is available.

* 57. Is there evidence in the TE/ICR (or TER/ICRR) of private sector financing beyond the project's timeframe?

☐ Yes

☐ No

If there is, please provide the amount and type (loan, grant, in-kind, etc.) of anticipated private sector financing beyond the project's timeframe, if that information is available.



13 SUSTAINABILITY COHORT - PROJECT OUTCOMES

* 58. Please provide the APR project outcome rating

* 59. Is there a section in the TE/TER or ICR/ICRR or APR Review on project outcomes?

☐ Yes

☐ No

☐ Unable to assess / documents missing

60. If yes, copy explanation on ratings from one of the following sources of information: 1) APR Review Document, 2) TER or ICRR, 3) TE or ICR.

(Provide the reference for each explanation)



14 SUSTAINABILITY COHORT - PROJECT SUSTAINABILITY

* 61. Please provide project sustainability ratings

	Overall	Financial	Political	Institutional	Environmental
Sustainability Rating					

* 62. Is there is section in the TE/TER or ICR/ICRR or APR Review on project sustainability?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Unable to assess

63. If yes, copy explanation on ratings from one of the following sources of information: 1) APR Review Document, 2) TER or ICRR, 3) TE or ICR.

(Provide the reference for each explanation)

15 SUSTAINABILITY COHORT - BROADER ADOPTION

Broader adoption is said to have taken place when governments and other stakeholders adopt, expand, and build on the initiatives that the GEF funds, during program/project implementation or afterwards, as a result of initial successes.

Broader adoption occurs through five mechanisms: sustaining, mainstreaming, replication, scaling-up, and market change.

Sustaining. A GEF-supported intervention or outcome is continued to be implemented by the original beneficiaries without GEF support through clear budget allocations, implementing structures, and institutional frameworks so they can keep reaping the benefits and provide incentives for adoption by other stakeholders.

Mainstreaming. Information, lessons, or specific aspects of a GEF initiative become part of a stakeholder's own initiatives, such as laws, policies, regulations, and programs. Mainstreaming may occur through governments and/or development organizations and other sectors.

Replication. A GEF-supported intervention is reproduced at a similar administrative or ecological scale, often in other geographical areas or regions.

Higher level mechanisms:

Scaling-up. GEF-supported initiatives are implemented at a larger geographical scale, often expanded to include more political, administrative, economic, or ecological components. Scale-up allows concerns that cannot be resolved at lower scales to be addressed, and promotes the spread of GEF contributions to areas contiguous to the original intervention site.

Market change. A GEF-supported intervention influences economic demand for and supply shifts to more environment-friendly products and services. Market change may encompass technological changes, policy and regulatory reforms, and financial instruments.

* 64. Based on documents (i.e. TE, TER, ICR, ICRR, APR rating document), did ANY broader adoption take place, **during the project's implementation**?

(Fill out for each mechanism, only one answer per row)

	Yes (implemented and/ or showing results)	Some concrete action taken but not (yet) fully implemented	Planned / discussed in detail but not (yet) implemented	Mentioned / intended but no detailed plans or discussions (yet)	Nothing has taken place
Sustaining	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Mainstreaming	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Replication	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Scaling-up	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Market change	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Copy-paste/ type any details reported on broader adoption of outcomes, including extent of adoption , scales and locations at which adoption took place, and how it took place.

* 65. Based on documents (i.e. TE, TER, ICR, ICRR, APR rating document), is there ANY evidence of likely broader adoption **after the project's implementation**?

(Fill out for each mechanism, only one answer per row)

	Yes, follow-on interventions designed	Yes, governance structures in place	Yes, financing in place	No, but detailed discussion / planning taking place	Only mentions and intentions, but no detailed discussions or plans	Nothing planned or taking place
Sustaining	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Mainstreaming	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Replication	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Scaling-up	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Market change	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Copy-paste/ type any details reported on broader adoption of outcomes, including extent of adoption , scales and locations at which adoption took place, and how it took place.

As a reminder for the next question, GEF's areas of contribution are:

Knowledge and information: Knowledge generation, information sharing and access, awareness-raising, skills-building and monitoring and evaluation.

Institutional capacity: Policy, legal and regulatory frameworks, governance structures and arrangements, informal processes for trust building and conflict resolution.

Implementing strategies: Technologies and approaches, implementing mechanisms and bodies, financial mechanisms for implementation and sustainability.

And.. **Production of a public service or good:** The project developed or introduced new knowledge, policies, financial or institutional arrangements, technologies and/or approaches, but no significant actions were taken to build on this achievement.

Piloting and demonstration: The project developed or introduced new knowledge, policies, financial or institutional arrangements, technologies and/or approaches, but no significant actions were taken to build on this achievement.

You previously selected the following areas of contribution for this project:

{{ Q27 }}

* 66. Based on documents (i.e. TE, TER, ICR, ICRR, APR rating document), what are the areas of contribution for initiated, implemented and planned broader adoption, or activities in support of broader adoption?

(Fill out for each mechanism, multiple options possible)

	Knowledge and information	Institutional capacity	Implementing strategies	None
Production of a public good or service	☐	☐	☐	☐
Piloting and demonstration	☐	☐	☐	☐
Sustaining	☐	☐	☐	☐
Mainstreaming	☐	☐	☐	☐
Replication	☐	☐	☐	☐
Scaling-up	☐	☐	☐	☐
Market change	☐	☐	☐	☐

Copy-paste/ type any details reported on broader adoption of outcomes, including extent of adoption , scales and locations at which adoption took place, and how it took place.



16 SUSTAINABILITY COHORT - ENVIRONMENTAL OUTCOMES (1/2)

* 67. Does the project TE/ICR (or TER/ICRR) report any POSITIVE environmental outcomes / changes / trends?

☐ Yes

☐ No

Copy-paste/ type the details of any reported positive environmental outcomes.

As much as possible, provide quantitative before-after measures, and the scale/ locations at which these occurred.

* 68. Does the project's TE/ICR (or TER/ICRR) report any NEGATIVE environmental outcomes, lack of achievement of environmental outcomes, or are environmental outcomes at risk of being reversed?

☐ Yes

☐ No

Copy-paste/ type the details of any reported negative environmental outcomes.

As much as possible, provide quantitative before-after measures, and the scale/ locations at which these occurred.



17 SUSTAINABILITY COHORT - ENVIRONMENTAL OUTCOMES (2/2)

Positive changes / trends:

{{Q67}}

* 69. For which environmental aspects are the above positive changes / trends reported in the TE/ICR (or TER/ICRR)?

- | | |
|--|--|
| ☐ Climate change; sea level rise | ☐ Threats to terrestrial biodiversity |
| ☐ Natural disasters | ☐ Waste management |
| ☐ Deforestation and land degradation, incl. SLM | ☐ Water quality and quantity |
| ☐ Desertification | ☐ Mining and other forms of resource extraction |
| ☐ Coastal and coral reef degradation | ☐ Climate change mitigation, emission reduction |
| ☐ Threats to marine resources | ☐ Renewable energy and energy efficiency |
| ☐ Threats to freshwater fishery resources | ☐ Unable to assess (Documents not available) |
| ☐ Other, namely: | |

Negative changes / trends:

{{Q68}}

* 70. For which environmental aspects are the above negative changes / trends reported in the TE/ICR (or TER/ICRR)?

- | | |
|--|--|
| ☐ Climate change; sea level rise | ☐ Threats to terrestrial biodiversity |
| ☐ Natural disasters | ☐ Waste management |
| ☐ Deforestation and land degradation, incl. SLM | ☐ Water quality and quantity |
| ☐ Desertification | ☐ Mining and other forms of resource extraction |
| ☐ Coastal and coral reef degradation | ☐ Climate change mitigation, emission reduction |
| ☐ Threats to marine resources | ☐ Renewable energy and energy efficiency |
| ☐ Threats to freshwater fishery resources | ☐ Unable to assess (Documents not available) |
| ☐ Other, namely: | |



18 SUSTAINABILITY COHORT - SOCIOECONOMIC OUTCOMES (1/2)

* 71. Does the project TE/ICR (or TER/ICRR) report any POSITIVE socioeconomic outcomes / changes / trends?

☐ Yes

☐ No

Copy-paste/ type the details of any reported positive socioeconomic outcomes.

As much as possible, provide quantitative before-after measures, and the scale/ locations at which these occurred.

* 72. Does the project's TE/ICR (or TER/ICRR) report any NEGATIVE socioeconomic outcomes, lack of achievement of socioeconomic outcomes, or are socioeconomic outcomes at risk of being reversed?

☐ Yes

☐ No

Copy-paste/ type the details of any reported negative socioeconomic outcomes.

As much as possible, provide quantitative before-after measures, and the scale/ locations at which these occurred.

19 SUSTAINABILITY COHORT - SOCIOECONOMIC OUTCOMES (2/2)

Positive changes / trends:

{{Q71}}

* 73. For which socioeconomic aspects are the above positive changes / trends reported in the TE/ICR (or TER/ICRR)?

- | | |
|---|--|
| ☐ (Alternative) income generation and income diversification | ☐ Financial market development and access to finance |
| ☐ Food security and access to food | ☐ Gender equality and women's empowerment - cross cutting issue |
| ☐ Health and access to medicine / health services | ☐ Resilience - cross cutting issue |
| ☐ Education and access to education | ☐ Fragility - cross cutting issue |
| ☐ Other communal services and access to them | ☐ Private sector engagement - cross cutting issue |
| ☐ Market development | ☐ Unable to assess (Documents not available) |
| ☐ Civil society engagement and development | ☐ No socioeconomic aspects |
| ☐ Other, namely: | |

Negative changes / trends:

{{Q72}}

* 74. For which socioeconomic aspects are the above negative changes / trends reported in the TE/ICR (or TER/ICRR)?

- | | |
|---|--|
| ☐ (Alternative) income generation and income diversification | ☐ Financial market development and access to finance |
| ☐ Food security and access to food | ☐ Gender equality and women's empowerment - cross cutting issue |
| ☐ Health and access to medicine / health services | ☐ Resilience - cross cutting issue |
| ☐ Education and access to education | ☐ Fragility - cross cutting issue |
| ☐ Other communal services and access to them | ☐ Private sector engagement - cross cutting issue |
| ☐ Market development | ☐ Unable to assess (Documents not available) |
| ☐ Civil society engagement and development | ☐ No socioeconomic aspects |
| ☐ Other, namely: | |



20 SUSTAINABILITY COHORT - CAPACITY, INSTITUTIONAL AND GOVERNANCE
OUTCOMES (1/2)

* 75. Does the project TE/ICR (or TER/ICRR) report any POSITIVE capacity, institutional and governance outcomes / changes / trends?

☐ Yes

☐ No

Copy-paste/ type the details of any reported positive capacity, institutional and governance outcomes.

As much as possible, provide quantitative before-after measures, and the scale/ locations at which these occurred.

* 76. Does the project's TE/ICR (or TER/ICRR) report any NEGATIVE outcomes, lack of achievement of outcomes, or are outcomes at risk of being reversed in relation to capacity, institutional and governance development?

☐ Yes

☐ No

Copy-paste/ type the details of any reported negative capacity, institutional and governance outcomes.

As much as possible, provide quantitative before-after measures, and the scale/ locations at which these occurred.

21 SUSTAINABILITY COHORT - CAPACITY, INSTITUTIONAL AND GOVERNANCE OUTCOMES (2/2)

Positive changes / trends:

{{Q75}}

* 77. For which capacity, institutional and governance aspects are the above positive changes / trends reported in the TE/ICR (or TER/ICRR)?

- | | |
|---|--|
| ☐ Institutional and decision-making processes, structures and systems | ☐ Capacity and skills development |
| ☐ Decision-makers' information and access to information | ☐ Knowledge management; information-sharing and systems |
| ☐ Development of plans, policies, codes, covenants, laws and regulations | ☐ Environmental monitoring systems |
| ☐ Trust-building and conflict resolution | ☐ Unable to assess (Documents not available) |
| ☐ Awareness raising | ☐ No capacity, institutional and governance aspects. |
| ☐ Other, namely: | |

Negative changes / trends:

{{Q76}}

* 78. For which capacity, institutional and governance aspects are the above negative changes / trends reported in the TE/ICR (or TER/ICRR)?

- | | |
|---|--|
| ☐ Institutional and decision-making processes, structures and systems | ☐ Capacity and skills development |
| ☐ Decision-makers' information and access to information | ☐ Knowledge management; information-sharing and systems |
| ☐ Development of plans, policies, codes, covenants, laws and regulations | ☐ Environmental monitoring systems |
| ☐ Trust-building and conflict resolution | ☐ Unable to assess (Documents not available) |
| ☐ Awareness raising | ☐ No capacity, institutional and governance aspects. |
| ☐ Other, namely: | |



22 SUSTAINABILITY COHORT - FACTORS AFFECTING SUSTAINABILITY OF OUTCOMES (1/3)

Summary of Factors

Contributing factors = Positively influenced, facilitated or led to sustainability, and/or broader adoption and/or environmental, socioeconomic or capacity, institutional and governance outcomes

Hindering factors = Negatively influenced, slowed down, prevented or reversed sustainability, and/or the effects of broader adoption, and/or environmental, socioeconomic or capacity, institutional and governance outcomes

* 79. Does the TE/ICR (or TER/ICRR) make mention of contributing or hindering factors affecting sustainability of outcomes?

☐ Yes

☐ Unable to assess

☐ No

80. If YES, provide an overview below of contributing factors mentioned:
(add page reference)

81. If YES, provide an overview below of hindering factors mentioned:
(add page reference)

23 SUSTAINABILITY COHORT - CONTRIBUTING FACTORS (2/3)

Contributing factors

{{ Q80 }}

* 82. Which PROJECT-RELATED FACTORS contributed to project sustainability of outcomes?

(Select all that apply)

- | | |
|--|---|
| ☐ Highly relevant technology / approach (e.g. micro-credit facility that benefits local beneficiaries) | ☐ Good project design (other factors than those mentioned above) |
| ☐ Broader adoption processes initiated using project resources | ☐ Timely adaptation of project to changing contexts / Evidence-based adaptive management |
| ☐ Good engagement of key stakeholders / Stakeholders involved at design and decision-making | ☐ Extended implementation period (e.g. mid-term review led to project extension) |
| ☐ Strong buy-in and a strong sense of project ownership among key stakeholders | ☐ Institutions Strategic partnerships functioning at project completion |
| ☐ Good coordination with / continuity of previous or current initiatives (e.g. lessons learned used) | ☐ Project builds on previous GEF support (add GEF ID in comments if available) |
| ☐ Good project management or co-management (e.g. strong project team with an engaged steering committee) | ☐ Follow-up initiatives planned / implemented using GEF resources (e.g. enabling activity led to full sized project) |
| ☐ Clear understanding of project management and financial rules and regulations | ☐ No project related contributing factors mentioned |
| ☐ Well-developed timing of different activities (e.g. taking into account that the development of legislations, and government policies and plans will take longer than other activities) | |
| ☐ Other - please explain: | |

* 83. Please explain your answer on project-related contributing factors:

* 84. Which CONTEXTUAL FACTORS contributed to project sustainability of outcomes.

(Select all that apply)

- | | |
|---|---|
| ☐ Links to previous / current related initiatives (by government, donors, global events, etc.) | ☐ Other stakeholder support (e.g. donors, CSOs) |
| ☐ "Champions" (individuals who pushed strongly for outcomes to be achieved) | ☐ Other favorable political conditions/events (e.g. election of supportive politicians) |
| ☐ National government support (e.g. budget allocated, supporting policies adopted) | ☐ Favorable economic conditions/drivers/events (e.g. shift in consumer preferences due to income increase) |
| ☐ Strong institutional capacities to implement activities | ☐ Favorable social conditions/drivers/events (e.g. change in lifestyles, change in education system) |
| ☐ Private sector involvement and support | ☐ Favorable environmental conditions/drivers/events (e.g. good climate, lack of natural disasters) |
| ☐ Regulatory framework for Private Sector involvement in environmental projects | ☐ No contextual contributing factors mentioned |
| ☐ Other - please explain/ Comments | |

* 85. Please explain your answer on contextual contributing factors:

* 86. Which factors were MOST CRITICAL to achieving sustainability of outcomes.

- | | |
|---------------------------------------|--|
| ☐ Project-related | ☐ Neither |
| ☐ Contextual | ☐ Unable to Assess |
| ☐ Both | |

Notes / Comments



24 SUSTAINABILITY COHORT - HINDERING FACTORS (3/3)

Hindering factors

{{ Q81 }}

* 87. Which PROJECT-RELATED FACTORS hindered project sustainability of outcomes?

(Select all that apply)

- | | |
|--|--|
| ☐ Inappropriate / insufficient technology / approach (e.g. local users did not have the expertise to use the new equipment provided) | ☐ Poor project design (other factors than those mentioned above) |
| ☐ No sign of broader adoption processes being initiated | ☐ Inability to adapt project to changing context / Poor adaptive management |
| ☐ Lack of engagement with key stakeholders / Limited to no involvement of key stakeholders at design and decision-making | ☐ Insufficient time for implementation (e.g. project had unrealistic objectives for timeframe) |
| ☐ Poor buy-in and a limited sense of project ownership among key stakeholders | ☐ Planned institutional development / strategic partnerships not achieved at project's end |
| ☐ Poor coordination with / continuity of previous or current initiatives (e.g. limited use of lessons learned) | ☐ Project was a stand-alone initiative and did not build on previous or other current GEF support |
| ☐ Poor project (co-)management (e.g. a project manager did not have expertise, poor engagement of steering committee, different project partners poorly communicate management decisions) | ☐ No activities to sustain momentum (e.g. No follow-on funding from government) |
| ☐ Poor understanding of project management and financial rules and regulations | ☐ No project related hindering factors mentioned |
| ☐ Poor timing of the various project activities | |
| ☐ Other - please explain: | |

* 88. Please explain your answer on project-related hindering factors:

* 89. Which CONTEXTUAL FACTORS hindered the realization of project sustainability of outcomes.

(Select all that apply)

- | | |
|---|---|
| ☐ Does not link to previous / current related initiatives (by government, donors, global events, etc.) | ☐ Lack of other stakeholder support (e.g. donors, CSOs) |
| ☐ Lack of "Champions" (no individuals pushing strongly for outcomes to be achieved) | ☐ Unfavorable political conditions/events (e.g. change in leadership, civil war) |
| ☐ Lack of national government support (e.g. no budget allocated, critical policies not adopted) | ☐ Unfavorable economic conditions/drivers/events (e.g. recession, change in market prices) |
| ☐ Low institutional capacities to implement activities | ☐ Unfavorable social conditions/drivers/events (e.g. change in lifestyles, change in education system) |
| ☐ Lack of private sector involvement and support | ☐ Unfavorable environmental conditions/drivers/events (e.g. storms, droughts, etc.) |
| ☐ No regulatory framework for Private Sector involvement in environmental projects | ☐ No contextual hindering factors mentioned |
| ☐ Other - please explain/ Comments | |

* 90. Please explain your answer on contextual hindering factors:

* 91. Which factors were MOST CRITICAL to hindering the achievement of sustainability of outcomes.

- | | |
|---------------------------------------|--|
| ☐ Project-related | ☐ Neither |
| ☐ Contextual | ☐ Unable to Assess |
| ☐ Both | |

Notes / Comments



25 Thank You!

92. Any other comments on this project? This is also your LAST CHANCE to go back and review/ change your answers.

Good job! :D Now on to the next!