



GEF/E/C.69/01
May 2, 2025

69th GEF Council Meeting
June 02-06, 2025
Washington, D.C.

Agenda Item 08

GEF IEO ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT 2025

(Prepared by the Independent Evaluation Office)

Recommended Council Decision

The Council, having considered document, GEF/E/C.69/01, GEF IEO Annual Performance Report 2025, takes notes of the document and the recommendation and encourages the Agencies to complete and submit terminal evaluations within the timeline specified in the terminal evaluation guidelines.

Abbreviations

ADB	Asian Development Bank
AfDB	African Development Bank
AFR	Africa
APR	GEF IEO Annual Performance Report
CBIT	Capacity-Building Initiative for Transparency
EBRD	European Bank for Reconstruction and Development
ECA	Europe and Central Asia
FAO	Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GEF EO/IEO	Global Environment Facility Independent Evaluation Office
GET	GEF Trust Fund
IDB	Inter-American Development Bank
IFAD	International Fund for Agricultural Development of the United Nations
LAC	Latin America and the Caribbean
LDCF	Least Developed Countries Fund
MAR	Management Action Record
MTR	Midterm review
NPIF	Nagoya Protocol Implementation Fund
PIR	Project implementation report
SCCF	Special Climate Change Fund
SIDS	Small Island Developing States
STAP	GEF Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNEP	United Nations Environment Programme
UNIDO	United Nations Industrial Development Organization
WB	World Bank
WWF-US	World Wildlife Fund (United States/ International office)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Quick Scan	7
1. Findings Highlights	7
2. Broader Adoption	9
3. Project Cycle Efficiency	9
4. Behavior Change	10
5. Submission of Terminal Evaluation Reports.....	10
I. Introduction.....	12
II. Performance of Completed Projects.....	13
1. Methodology	14
Completed Projects	14
Performance Ratings.....	17
Realization of Cofinancing.....	18
Presentation of the findings.....	18
2. Findings	18
Outcomes	18
Likelihood of Sustainability.....	21
3. Implementation and Execution	22
4. Monitoring and Evaluation	24
5. Cofinancing.....	25
III. Broader Adoption	27
1. Methodology	27
2. Findings	27
3. Broader Adoption Outcomes	28
4. Broader adoption post completion.....	31
Philippines.....	31
Uruguay.....	32
Azerbaijan	32
5. The GEF's Catalytic Role	32
Type and extent of support	33
IV. Project Cycle Efficiency	35
1. Methodology	36

2.	Findings	38
	PIF Submission to Approval	38
	PIF Approval to CEO Endorsement.....	39
	CEO Endorsement to First Disbursement.....	40
	Time taken for Implementation Completion	42
V.	Behavior Change in GEF-Supported Interventions	43
1.	Background.....	43
2.	Methodology	43
	Areas targeted	44
	Designing for behavior change.....	44
VI.	Submission of Terminal Evaluation Reports.....	47
1.	Data and Methods	47
2.	Findings	48
3.	Recommendation.....	51
VII.	References.....	52
VIII.	Annexes	54
	Annex 1: Performance of completed projects	54
	Annex 2. Broader Adoption	60
	Annex 3: Project Cycle – Median of time taken	63
	Annex 4: Behavior Change	64
	Annex 5: List of projects with yet to be submitted terminal evaluation	67

TABLE AND FIGURES

TABLES

Table 1: Projects with validated performance ratings.....	17
Table 2: Percentage of projects that achieved broader adoption compared to their intended outcomes	29
Table 3: Types of interventions broadly adopted.....	31
Table 4: Efficiency of Project Activity Cycle – median time taken in months.....	41

FIGURES

Figure 1: Distribution of projects by replenishment period	15
Figure 2: Distribution of projects by focal area	15
Figure 3: Distribution of projects by region	16
<i>Figure 4: Distribution of project by GEF Agency</i>	<i>16</i>
Figure 5: Percentage of Completed Projects Rated in the Satisfactory Range for Outcome	19
Figure 6: Projects with Outcomes Rated in the Satisfactory Range, by Focal Area, Region, Country Groups, and Programmatic Approach	19
Figure 7: Likelihood of sustainability - percentage rated in the likely range.....	21
Figure 8: Quality of Implementation – projects rated in the satisfactory range	23
Figure 9: Quality of Execution – projects rated in the satisfactory range	23
Figure 10: Quality of M&E design and implementation – projects rated in the satisfactory range.....	24
Figure 11: Cofinancing pledges and realization in completed projects.....	26
Figure 12: Full-Sized Project Cycle	36
Figure 13: Medium-Sized Project Cycle	37
Figure 14: Time taken from PIF submission to PIF Approval – for full size standalone projects.....	39
Figure 15: Time taken from PIF Approval to CEO Endorsement – for full size projects	40
Figure 16: Timeliness of, and gaps in, terminal evaluation submission – by project categories.....	49
Figure 17: Availability and Timeliness of Submission of Terminal Evaluations by Agency	50

Box

Box 1: Scaling up through the Green Climate Fund.....	30
---	----

QUICK SCAN

The Annual Performance Report (APR) 2025 of the Global Environment Facility's (GEF) Independent Evaluation Office (IEO) assesses the performance of GEF activities and processes, the quality of monitoring and evaluation systems, and the factors influencing performance. This year's report offers an in-depth analysis of broader adoption and behavior change outcomes in completed projects, the efficiency of the project cycle, and the timeliness of terminal evaluation submissions.

The APR 2025 reports on the results and implementation of a cumulative portfolio of 2,384 completed GEF projects, which account for \$10.66 billion in GEF funding and at least \$69.41 billion in materialized cofinancing. This portfolio includes 250 projects with terminal evaluations validated after APR 2023, forming the APR 2025 cohort. The APR 2025 cohort collectively accounts for \$1.21 billion in GEF grants and at least \$9.56 billion in realized cofinancing.

The analyses of broader adoption and behavior change are based on a sample of 81 completed GEF projects approved from GEF-6 onwards. Both analyses include case studies from six completed projects in four countries, assessed through field visits at least two years post-completion. The broader adoption analysis examines the design of a random sample of 60 GEF projects CEO-endorsed between July 2023 and June 2024. Additionally, it reviews publicly available proposals of 253 Green Climate Fund (GCF) projects approved by June 2024 to assess the share of GCF projects that build on GEF activities. To assess the mainstreaming of behavior change interventions in current GEF programming, 26 CEO-endorsed or approved GEF-8 projects explicitly targeting behavior change were examined in detail.


The analysis of activity cycle efficiency assesses the time taken by GEF projects to progress from one stage of the project cycle to the next. It is based on GEF Portal data as of February 2025. Timeliness in the submission of terminal evaluations is assessed for 865 projects approved from GEF-5 onward, reported as completed in the GEF Portal by December 2023, and for which terminal evaluations are required under the GEF IEO terminal evaluation guidelines.

1. FINDINGS HIGHLIGHTS

Performance of Completed Projects


Outcomes: Eighty one percent of projects are rated in the satisfactory range for outcomes, showing slight improvement over time (Figure A). A higher percentage of projects approved from GEF-4 onwards in International Waters, Chemicals & Waste, global projects, and those in Europe, Central Asia, or Asia have outcome ratings in the satisfactory range. Conversely, a lower percentage of projects in Small Island Developing States (SIDS) and Fragile and Conflict Situations (FCS) have outcome ratings in the satisfactory range. Programmatic and standalone projects perform similarly. Within the APR2025 cohort, 82 percent of projects received a satisfactory outcome rating.

Figure A: Percentage of Completed Projects Rated in the Satisfactory Range for Outcome



Sustainability: Sixty four percent of projects are rated in the likely range for sustainability, with a positive trend over time (Figure B). For projects approved from GEF-4 onwards, a higher percentage in the Chemicals & Waste and International Waters focal areas, global projects, and those in Asia are rated in the likely range for sustainability. Conversely, a lower percentage in the Land Degradation focal area, in Africa, and in Least Developed Countries (LDCs) and Fragile and Conflict Situations (FCS) are rated in the likely range. Programmatic and standalone projects show comparable performance. In the APR2025 cohort, 75 percent of projects are rated in the likely range for sustainability.

Figure B: Likelihood of sustainability - percentage rated in the likely range



Implementation and Execution: Cumulatively, 82 percent of completed projects are rated satisfactory for both quality of implementation and execution with notable improvements in implementation since GEF-4. Implementation ratings are consistent across focal areas, whereas execution ratings show more variation, tending to be lower in Africa, FCS countries, and SIDS. Standalone projects are slightly more likely than child projects to be rated satisfactory for implementation. In the APR2025 cohort, 87 percent of projects are rated satisfactory for both implementation and execution.

M&E Design and Implementation: Cumulatively, 70 percent of completed projects are rated in the satisfactory range for M&E design, and 66 percent for M&E implementation. In the APR 2025 cohort, 83

percent of the completed projects are rated in the satisfactory range for M&E design, while 67 percent for M&E implementation.

Realization of cofinancing: Overall, 55 percent of completed projects fully realized their committed cofinancing, while 18 percent achieved less than half of the amounts committed at appraisal. Among projects approved from GEF-4 onwards, the proportion reporting full realization is lower for those implemented in Africa and by multilateral development banks. In the APR2025 cohort, 56 percent of projects reported full realization, while 19 percent realized less than 50 percent of their committed cofinancing at appraisal.

2. BROADER ADOPTION

Broader adoption refers to the uptake of GEF-supported interventions by stakeholders—through sustaining, mainstreaming, replication, and scaling up—without additional GEF funding. Recent GEF projects are increasingly achieving broader adoption at larger scales compared to older projects, with effective small-scale interventions often scaled up by other actors.

Sixty percent of completed projects approved from GEF-6 onward achieved some form of broader adoption by project completion, with mainstreaming being the most commonly observed. Among these, 86 percent reached subnational or higher levels of adoption, compared to 70 percent in the OPS7 cohort. This indicates not only a higher incidence of broader adoption but also adoption at greater scales, aligning with the GEF’s strategic focus on addressing environmental drivers and achieving impact at scale.

The analysis highlights that broader adoption is influenced by factors such as the type and extent of support, country-driven funding, partnerships with long-standing, ground-based organizations, and high-quality project staff. For example, evidence shows that country-driven GEF funding enables recipient governments to augment resources, fully mainstream, and scale up priority initiatives. Broader adoption is also more likely when activities are executed by partners with a sustained local presence. Additionally, project staff are often integrated into subsequent government and donor programs, facilitating ongoing knowledge transfer

A review of 253 approved GCF project proposals showed that 17 percent (42 projects) aim to build on GEF projects through scale-up (12 percent), replication (4 percent), sustaining (4 percent), and mainstreaming (3 percent). This indicates that several GEF projects have demonstrated effective interventions at a smaller scale, which are then scaled up by the GCF, leveraging its ability to make climate investments at scale.

3. PROJECT CYCLE EFFICIENCY

The GEF has sustained and, in some areas, improved its activity cycle efficiency in GEF-8 compared to previous replenishment periods.

PIF Submission to PIF Approval: In GEF-8, the GEF maintained the efficiency improvements achieved in GEF-7, ensuring the swift approval of PIF submissions for standalone full-size projects. This performance represents a clear improvement over GEF-5 and GEF-6.

PIF Approval to CEO Endorsement: Recent cohorts have shown improved efficiency in progressing from PIF approval to CEO endorsement compared to earlier cohorts. For example, PIF approvals from 2021-2022 had a median processing time of 19 months to obtain CEO endorsement, compared to 23 months for the 2019-2021 cohort, and 22 months for the 2015-2018 cohort. Despite this progress, nearly two-thirds of the PIFs approved during 2021-2022 still exceeded the 18-month benchmark for CEO endorsement.

CEO Endorsement to First Disbursement: Projects endorsed between 2021 and 2022 experienced slower progress toward first disbursement, with only 34 percent reaching this milestone within a year and a median time of 17 months. This contrasts with earlier cohorts where approximately two-thirds of projects achieved first disbursement within a year with median times ranging from 9 to 10 months. The slower disbursement pace in the recent cohort was partially attributed to challenges related to the COVID-19 pandemic.

Project Start to Completion: Medium size projects that began implementation between 2014-2019, were completed significantly faster than those that started implementation during the preceding four years (2010-2013). In contrast, the implementation duration for FSPs remained relatively consistent across both periods, with similar timelines observed for projects that started 2014-2017 and those from the preceding four years.

4. BEHAVIOR CHANGE

GEF's approach to targeting behavior change through its projects is evolving. While behavior change is critical to achieving environmental outcomes, it must be supported by enabling conditions such as available capital, institutional support, incentives, and lower costs of adoption, to be sustained over time.

The most common approach to behavior change has been knowledge and skill building in pro-environment practices, addressing the lack of expertise as a primary barrier. Recent projects have increasingly focused on addressing not only technical knowledge gaps but also stakeholder needs and institutional barriers. Notably, GEF-8 projects show a greater emphasis on aligning interventions with stakeholder needs (38 percent versus 14 percent in earlier projects) and on strengthening institutional capacities (43 percent versus 24 percent).


Sustaining new behaviors depended on factors such as access to capital, perceived cost-benefit advantages, and continued institutional support. In Georgia, beneficiaries of climate-resilient agricultural pilots continued to invest in these measures after project completion, whereas those without material support struggled to maintain the practices. In the Philippines, some farmers replicated sustainable practices with government support, while others reverted to conventional farming due to quicker returns and fewer skill requirements.

5. SUBMISSION OF TERMINAL EVALUATION REPORTS

Seventy percent of terminal evaluations are submitted on time, with significant variation among Agencies. CI, IADB, UNDP, IUCN, FAO, and WWF-US have near-perfect records in availability and timeliness (Figure C). In contrast, ADB, UNEP, AfDB, and IFAD show weaker performance. EBRD and CAF

have not submitted any evaluations, but their sample sizes are too small for conclusions. Terminal evaluations for nearly all UNIDO projects are available, though timeliness is an issue.

Figure C: Availability and Timeliness of Submission of Terminal Evaluations by Agency



Recommendation

GEF Agencies should strengthen efforts to ensure the timely submission of terminal evaluations and close existing submission gaps for completed projects. Agencies with significant shortfalls—such as ADB, IFAD, UNEP, and UNIDO—should enhance their internal processes and accountability mechanisms to ensure that terminal evaluations are consistently submitted to the GEF Portal on time for all completed projects. The GEF IEO will track the measures taken by the respective agencies through the Management Action Record and monitor the availability of terminal evaluations.

I. INTRODUCTION

1. The Annual Performance Report (APR) of the Global Environment Facility's (GEF) Independent Evaluation Office (IEO) presents a comprehensive assessment of the performance of GEF activities, processes, and the factors that influence performance. It also evaluates the quality of monitoring and evaluation (M&E) systems. This year's report, APR 2025, offers an in-depth analysis of broader adoption and behavior change outcomes in completed GEF projects. It examines the efficiency of the GEF project cycle, particularly the time required to reach key milestones, including project completion. Additionally, the APR evaluates the timeliness of terminal evaluation submissions.

2. APR 2025 reports on the results and implementation of a cumulative portfolio of 2,384 completed GEF projects that account for \$10.66 billion in GEF funding¹ and at least \$69.41 billion in materialized cofinancing. Agencies submitted terminal evaluations of these projects through June 2024, and these were validated by the GEF IEO through December 2024. The GEF has financed these projects through the GEF Trust Fund, the Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF), the Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF), the Capacity-Building Initiative for Transparency (CBIT), and the Nagoya Protocol Implementation Fund (NPIF).

3. The cumulative portfolio includes 250 projects with terminal evaluations validated after the closing of APR2023, the previous APR presented to the GEF Council. These 250 projects comprise the APR2025 cohort. Collectively, the APR2025 cohort accounts for \$1.21 billion in GEF grants and at least \$9.56 billion in reported realized cofinancing. Vast majority of the projects in the APR2025 cohort were approved in GEF-5 or later.

4. Chapter 2 presents an assessment of the performance of the 2,384 completed GEF projects. It presents analyses of trends in project outcomes, sustainability, implementation processes, monitoring and evaluation, and the materialization of cofinancing.

5. Chapter 3 examines the broader adoption of GEF-funded projects, focusing on their uptake, replication, or continuation by non-GEF actors. It explores the mechanisms enabling this adoption.

6. Chapter 4 analyzes factors related to project cycle efficiency. It assesses the time taken by projects to progress through key milestones starting from first submission of the project proposal to the submission of the terminal evaluation upon project completion. It aims to assess the extent to which the GEF Partnership is improving in operational efficiency.

7. Chapter 5 presents an analysis of behavior change in GEF projects, which is essential to drive transformational change.

¹ Inclusive of project preparation grants but excluding project fees of GEF Agencies.

8. Chapter 6 presents an assessment of the availability of terminal evaluation reports and the timeliness of their submission by GEF Agencies. The analysis focuses on projects approved from GEF-5 onwards, as these projects are more likely to have been completed after GEF transitioned from its Project Management Information System to the GEF Portal.

II. PERFORMANCE OF COMPLETED PROJECTS

9. This chapter discusses the performance of GEF projects across several dimensions including outcomes, sustainability, implementation process, monitoring and evaluation, and the realization of cofinancing. The analysis is primarily based on evidence reported in the terminal evaluations of completed GEF projects.

10. Although variations in project performance are observed across geographical scope, country context, GEF Agency, and focal area composition, GEF projects overall continue to demonstrate strong performance in achieving their intended results:

- (a) **Outcomes:** Cumulatively, 81 percent of projects are rated in the satisfactory range for outcomes, with a slight improvement over time. Among projects approved from GEF-4 onwards, a higher percentage of projects in the International Waters and Chemicals & Waste focal areas, global projects, and those implemented in Europe and Central Asia or Asia are rated in the satisfactory range. In contrast, a lower percentage of projects in Small Island Developing States (SIDS) and Fragile and Conflict Situations (FCS) receive satisfactory ratings. Programmatic and standalone projects show similar performance. Within the APR2025 cohort, 82 percent of projects received a satisfactory outcome rating.
- (b) **Sustainability:** Cumulatively, 64 percent of projects are rated in the likely range for sustainability, with a positive trend observed over time. For projects approved from GEF-4 onwards, a higher percentage of projects in the Chemicals & Waste and International Waters focal areas, global projects, and those implemented in Asia are rated in the likely range for sustainability. In contrast, a lower percentage of projects in the Land Degradation focal area, in Africa, and in Least Developed Countries (LDCs) and Fragile and Conflict Situations (FCS) are rated in the likely range for sustainability. Programmatic and standalone projects show comparable performance. In the APR2025 cohort, 75 percent of projects are rated in the likely range for sustainability.
- (c) **Implementation and Execution:** Cumulatively, 82 percent of completed projects are rated satisfactory for both quality of implementation and execution with notable improvements in implementation since GEF-4. Implementation ratings are consistent across focal areas, whereas execution ratings show more variation, tending to be

lower in Africa, FCS countries, and SIDS. Standalone projects are slightly more likely than child projects to be rated satisfactory for implementation. In the APR2025 cohort, 87 percent of projects are rated satisfactory for both implementation and execution.

- (d) **M&E Design and Implementation:** Cumulatively, 70 percent of completed projects are rated in the satisfactory range for M&E design, and 66 percent for M&E implementation. In the APR 2025 cohort, 83 percent of the completed projects are rated in the satisfactory range for M&E design, while 67 percent for M&E implementation. These findings align with the overall trend of substantial improvements in the quality of M&E design, contrasted with more modest progress in M&E implementation.
- (e) **Realization of cofinancing:** Overall, 55 percent of completed projects fully realized their committed cofinancing, while 18 percent achieved less than half of the amounts committed at appraisal. Among projects approved from GEF-4 onwards, the proportion reporting full realization is lower for those implemented in Africa and by multilateral development banks. In the APR2025 cohort, 56 percent of projects reported full realization, while 19 percent realized less than 50 percent of their committed cofinancing at appraisal.

1. METHODOLOGY

Completed Projects

11. Cumulatively, through June 2024, terminal evaluations for 2,384 completed projects were submitted by the GEF Agencies at the GEF Portal or submitted to the GEF IEO (Figure 1). These 2,384 completed projects account for \$10.66 billion in GEF funding and at least \$69.41 billion in reported realized cofinancing. Majority of the completed projects in the cumulative portfolio were approved in GEF-4 or earlier. The cumulative portfolio includes 250 completed projects added after the completion of APR2023. These 250 projects are collectively referred to as the APR2025 cohort. Vast majority of the projects in the APR2025 cohort were approved in GEF-5 or later. The projects in the APR2025 cohort account for \$1.21 billion in GEF grants and at least \$9.56 billion in reported realized cofinancing.

Figure 1: Distribution of projects by replenishment period




Figure 2: Distribution of projects by focal area




Figure 3: Distribution of projects by region





Figure 4: Distribution of project by GEF Agency



12. The APR2025 cohort differs from the overall cumulative portfolio of completed projects in several important ways. Compared to the cumulative portfolio, it includes a higher share of climate change and multi-focal area projects, but a lower share of biodiversity projects (Figure 2). It also has a greater representation of projects in Africa, with fewer projects in Europe and East Asia (Figure 3). Agencies including UNDP and the World Bank account for a smaller share of the APR2025 cohort compared to their share in the cumulative portfolio (Figure 4). Some of these differences—such as the increased share of multi-focal area projects and greater representation of Agencies that gained access to GEF resources through the broadening of the GEF Partnership—reflect broader trends. Others, such as the lower share of biodiversity projects in the APR2025 cohort, appear more idiosyncratic and are likely to even out over time.

Performance Ratings

13. Performance ratings reported in APR are primarily based on the evidence provided in the terminal evaluations. A project’s performance is rated on criteria such as outcome, likelihood of sustainability, quality of implementation, quality of execution, quality of M&E design and implementation, and quality of terminal evaluation report. Only validated performance ratings provided by either the GEF IEO or the evaluation units of a GEF Agency are considered for analysis and reporting. Projects are rated only when sufficient information is provided to allow an assessment of performance. Among the different performance dimensions that are rated, validated outcome ratings are available for nearly all projects (Table 1). Observations indicated as not rated or unable to assess are excluded from analysis. Of the projects covered, performance ratings for 1368 (57 percent) are provided by the evaluation units of the GEF Agencies and 1016 (43 percent) by the GEF IEO.

Table 1: Projects with validated performance ratings

Dimension	All completed projects	APR2025 Cohort
<i>Number of Completed Projects</i>	2,384	250
Rated Dimensions		
Outcome	2359 (99%)	247 (99%)
Sustainability	2163 (91%)	196 (78%)
Implementation	2115 (89%)	242 (97%)
Execution	2001 (84%)	196 (78%)
M&E Design	2178 (91%)	198 (79%)
M&E Implementation	2135 (90%)	240 (96%)

14. Project performance ratings are presented by the GEF-cycle of project approval. Historical data show that underperforming projects tend to take longer to close and, once completed, reduce the share of projects rated satisfactory for the GEF-cycle of their approval. As a result, recent cycles (e.g., GEF-6, GEF-5) with many ongoing projects may show an inflated percentage of satisfactory ratings. To address this bias, trends in performance ratings are also presented by year of project completion, using a four-year moving average to smooth annual fluctuations. These trends are presented based on data for the past 20 years.

Realization of Cofinancing

15. The analysis covers the 2,384 projects for which terminal evaluations had been received through June 2024. Though data on GEF grants and expected cofinancing are available for all projects, the data on realized cofinancing are available for 2,042 projects.

Presentation of the findings

16. The discussion on project performance focuses on projects approved from GEF-4 onwards. GEF-4 marks a shift in GEF operations, with the introduction of the Resource Allocation Framework (now called the System for Transparent Allocation of Resources), which provided countries with more predictable access to funding, and the adoption of a more programmatic approach. These features make GEF-4 a useful starting point for assessing recent performance trends. Projects from earlier cycles are presented in the aggregate.

17. Where project performance is presented by GEF-cycle, GEF-7 figures are excluded, as terminal evaluations for only six projects have been validated so far —too few to support meaningful inference. However, these projects are included in performance trends by year of completion.


2. FINDINGS

Outcomes

18. **The vast majority of GEF projects are rated in the satisfactory range for outcomes.** The outcome rating reflects the extent to which a completed project achieved its intended results by the time of completion. Cumulatively, 81 percent of validated outcome ratings for completed projects fall within the satisfactory range, and 82 percent of the projects in the APR2025 cohort are in the satisfactory range. This represents a positive trend as the four-year moving average has remained at 84 percent or higher since 2020 (Figure 5).


19. Examples from APR2025 cohort illustrate both satisfactory and unsatisfactory outcome achievements. The *Environmentally Sound Management of Municipal and Hazardous Solid Waste* project in Senegal (GEF ID 4888, Chemicals and Waste, UNIDO) was rated satisfactory due to its high relevance, coherence, and cost-effectiveness in waste management, focusing on vulnerable groups. It reduced emissions of unintentional Persistent Organic Pollutants and open waste burning, and increased awareness of waste management's health and environmental implications. Conversely, the *Mainstreaming Biodiversity Conservation through Low-Impact Ecotourism* project in Panama (GEF ID 9889, Biodiversity, IDB) was rated unsatisfactory as only two outputs were completed and intended outcomes such as improved financial sustainability and management effectiveness of protected areas were not achieved.

Figure 5: Percentage of Completed Projects Rated in the Satisfactory Range for Outcome




20. **There are variations in outcome performance across focal areas, regions, and country groups; however, both programmatic and standalone projects perform equally well.** Among completed projects from GEF-4 onward, the percentage of projects rated in the satisfactory outcome range varies moderately across focal areas, ranging from 87 percent in International Waters and Chemicals & Waste to 82 percent in Climate Change (Figure 6). Regionally, a higher percentage of projects in ECA and Asia are rated in the satisfactory range for outcomes, while Africa and LAC show the lowest percentages. Since GEF-4, the share of completed projects rated in the satisfactory range for outcomes has increased in both Asia and Africa compared to earlier periods. A high percentage of global projects are rated in the satisfactory range.


Figure 6: Projects with Outcomes Rated in the Satisfactory Range, by Focal Area, Region, Country Groups, and Programmatic Approach



c. Country groups



d. Programmatic approach



Source: GEF IEO based on the APR 2025 dataset, which includes completed projects for which terminal evaluations were submitted by June 30, 2024, and performance ratings were independently validated through December 2024.

Notes: The number of projects for which validated outcome ratings are available is shown in parentheses. BD = Biodiversity; CC-M = Climate Change Mitigation; CC-A = Climate Change Adaptation; Chem = Chemicals and Waste; IW = International Waters; LD = Land Degradation; MF = Multifocal. AFR=Africa; ECA = Europe and Central Asia; LAC = Latin America and the Caribbean; Global projects include one Inter-regional project. SIDS = Small Island Developing States ; LDCs = Least Developed Countries ; FCS = Fragile and Conflict-affected Situations, World Bank classification. 1/ FCS classification has been available since 2006, which explains the incomplete FCS data for earlier replenishment phases.

21. GEF projects face greater challenges in SIDS and FCS contexts in achieving their intended outcomes. Consequently, about a quarter of the projects in these contexts are rated in the unsatisfactory range, which is lower than the performance in other countries (Figure 6). The evaluation of *GEF Support in Fragile and Conflict-Affected Situations* (GEF IEO 2024) had highlighted the challenges that projects face in fragile and conflict-affected situations. In SIDS, capacity constraints contribute to lower outcome achievements. Similarly, the evaluation of *GEF Programs in Pacific Small Island Developing States* (GEF IEO 2024) indicates challenges such as limited institutional and technical capacity, and high staff turnover because of migration, may lead to inadequate planning, delayed implementation, and limited realization of results. While past projects in LDCs were less likely to receive satisfactory outcome ratings, their performance has improved.


22. The percentage of projects rated in the satisfactory range for outcomes is comparable between child projects and standalone projects. Preliminary data indicate that child projects implemented under integrated programs perform on par with other GEF projects. In recent phases, a slightly higher proportion of standalone projects have received satisfactory outcome ratings compared to child projects—that is, projects approved within a programmatic framework—but this difference is not statistically significant. Outcome ratings have improved over time for both child and standalone projects, with more pronounced gains among child projects reflecting their lower initial baseline (Figure 6 (d)). It is also important to note that while

the GEF formally adopted a programmatic approach in GEF-4, some projects from the Pilot Phase through GEF-3 have been retroactively classified as child projects where they were prepared under an implied programmatic logic. Among the 10 child projects under the Integrated Approach Pilot (IAP) programs in GEF-6 with validated outcome ratings, nine are rated in the satisfactory range—closely aligning with the overall GEF-6 portfolio average.

Likelihood of Sustainability

23. **Based on assessment of risks conducted at project completion, nearly two-thirds of completed GEF projects are rated in the likely range for sustainability.** The sustainability rating reflects the extent to which project outcomes are expected to be durable and contribute to long-term impact. Cumulatively, 64 percent of completed projects are rated in the likely range for sustainability. Among rated projects in the APR 2025 cohort, 75 percent were rated in the likely range. Overall, the data show improving trend in sustainability ratings (Figure 7).

Figure 7: Likelihood of sustainability - percentage rated in the likely range



24. Examples from the APR2025 cohort illustrate both likely and unlikely sustainability of completed projects. The *Supporting Implementation of the Cuban National Programme to Combat Desertification and Drought* project in Cuba (GEF ID 8003, Land Degradation, UNEP) was rated in the likely range for sustainability due to strong government and stakeholder commitment, inclusion of sustainable land management (SLM) indicators in 2030 targets, and support at senior government levels. The project was also integrated into the education sector to ensure long-term development of the individual capacities in the area. Conversely, the *Integrated Protected Area System for Conservation of Biodiversity and Mitigation of Land Degradation* project in Eritrea (GEF ID 4559, Multi-focal, UNDP) was rated in the unlikely range

for sustainability. Capacity-building and baseline studies did not yield intended results, no frameworks or policies were approved, and financing for follow-up activities was unlikely.

25. Projects in the Land Degradation focal area, as well as those implemented in Africa, FCS, and LDCs face higher sustainability risks at completion compared to other completed projects.


Among projects approved from GEF-4 onwards, the likely sustainability ratings vary across focal areas—76 percent of Chemicals and Waste projects are rated in the likely range, compared to 58 percent in Land Degradation. Global and inter-regional projects are more likely to be rated in the likely range for sustainability – projects from these categories also show substantial improvement over previous GEF cycles. Although sustainability ratings for projects in Africa have also improved over time, projects in this region continue to face significant risks at completion. Similarly, a substantial share of the projects in FCS and LDCs are rated in the unlikely range for sustainability (Annex 1). There is no statistically significant difference in the percentage of child projects and standalone projects rated in the likely range for sustainability. Among the 10 child projects under the Integrated Approach Pilot (IAP) programs in GEF-6, seven have been provided sustainability ratings, of which five (71 percent) are rated in the likely range—closely aligning with the overall GEF-6 portfolio average of 77 percent.

3. IMPLEMENTATION AND EXECUTION

26. Cumulatively, 82 percent of completed projects are rated satisfactory for quality of implementation, and of the APR2025 cohort 87 percent are rated in the satisfactory range.


Ratings on quality of implementation assess the performance of GEF Agencies in designing and implementing projects, including their supervision and support of executing partners. There is an improving trend in the percentage of projects that are rated in the satisfactory range for quality of implementation both by replenishment period of approval and by year of project completion (Figure 8). For completed projects approved from GEF-4 onwards, implementation ratings are consistent across focal areas, but standalone projects are slightly more likely than child projects to be rated satisfactory for implementation, with the difference being statistically significant at the 10 percent level.

Figure 8: Quality of Implementation – projects rated in the satisfactory range



27. **Cumulatively, 82 percent of completed projects – and 87 percent of the APR2025 cohort – are rated in the satisfactory range for the quality of execution.** This rating reflects the performance of executing partners in delivering planned activities, including project management, procurement, stakeholder engagement, and monitoring. The share of projects rated satisfactory has increased over time (Figure 9). Projects in Africa, FCS countries, and SIDS continue to face greater execution challenges. Among completed projects approved from GEF-4 onward, standalone projects have a slightly higher rate of satisfactory execution than child projects under programmatic approaches.

Figure 9: Quality of Execution – projects rated in the satisfactory range




28. Projects rated satisfactory for implementation and execution are more likely to achieve satisfactory outcome ratings. A satisfactory rating for outcome is positively correlated with implementation (0.60) and with execution (0.56) (Annex 1). While correlation does not imply causation, evidence from terminal evaluations indicates that effective implementation enhances coordination and ensures timely delivery, while poor implementation often results in negligible or low output delivery. For instance, the terminal evaluation of the *Integrated Sound Management of Mercury in Artisanal and Small-scale Gold Mining* project in Indonesia (GEF ID 9707, Chemicals & Waste, UNDP) attributes the project's success to robust implementation through well-coordinated and timely execution. Conversely, the terminal evaluation of the *Scaling Up Sustainable Land Management and Agro-Biodiversity Conservation* project in Kenya (GEF ID 5272, Multi-focal, UNEP) reports that weak implementation led to low delivery of outputs, with only four of the 21 key outputs fully delivered and seven not delivered at all.

4. MONITORING AND EVALUATION

29. **Cumulatively, 70 percent of projects are rated satisfactory for M&E design and 66 percent for M&E implementation.** M&E data are critical for assessing whether project implementation is on track, achieving intended results, and aligned with the project's theory of change. It is therefore essential that M&E plans are well designed and effectively implemented. Among projects approved through GEF-3, 57 percent are rated satisfactory for M&E design. This figure increases to 79 percent for projects approved from GEF-4 onward, indicating a strong improvement. For M&E implementation, the corresponding increase is more modest— from 60 percent to 70 percent. In the APR2025 cohort, 83 percent of projects were rated satisfactory for M&E design and 67 percent were rated satisfactory for implementation. The high percentage of satisfactory ratings for design aligns with the long-term trend. However, the rating for M&E implementation is slightly lower than the cumulative portfolio average and diverges from the overall positive trend (Figure 10).

Figure 10: Quality of M&E design and implementation – projects rated in the satisfactory range



30. **The quality of M&E design has improved across nearly all focal areas for completed projects approved from GEF-4 onward, compared to those approved through GEF-3.** Among projects approved through GEF-3, the share rated satisfactory for M&E design varied widely by focal area, ranging from 39 percent in Chemicals & Waste to 76 percent in Land Degradation. For projects approved from GEF-4 onward, all focal areas except Land Degradation show substantial improvement in the share rated in the satisfactory range. Reasons for this divergence remain unclear.


31. **M&E implementation performance varies across focal areas and regions, with notable gaps in Land Degradation projects and in countries facing challenging operational contexts.** Compared to the projects approved in GEF-3 and earlier, for those approved from GEF-4 onwards from the Chemicals & Waste focal area shows the greatest improvement, whereas Land Degradation projects show a drop instead. The decline in the percentage of land degradation projects is driven by the drop in the M&E implementation ratings for Land Degradation projects in Africa –from 69 percent for projects approved in GEF-3 or earlier to 48 percent for GEF-4 onward. In other focal areas, projects in Africa show moderate improvements in M&E implementation ratings.

32. FCS countries have the lowest percentage of projects rated in the satisfactory range for both M&E design and implementation. This finding aligns with the GEF IEO's *Evaluation of Components of the GEF's Results-Based Management System (2024)*, which highlights gaps in the design and implementation of project M&E in FCS contexts. The evaluation noted that current GEF guidelines and monitoring requirements are not fully adapted to the complexities of FCS contexts. Specifically, they lack specific provisions for conflict-sensitive design, inclusive monitoring approaches, and tailored indicators. As a result, project results measurement frameworks are not well aligned with the realities on the ground, limiting their effectiveness in measuring outcomes and informing adaptive management.

5. COFINANCING

33. **GEF projects receive high cofinancing commitments at approval and, on average, exceed these pledges during implementation, although 45 percent fall short of their initial commitments (Figure 11).** Cumulatively, GEF partners pledged an average of \$6.00 in cofinancing for every dollar of GEF grant, with \$7.80 realized at completion. The median cofinancing ratio—less affected by outliers—was 2.9 at approval and 2.2 at completion. While the overall trend shows improvement in median cofinancing ratios, the dip observed in GEF-6 is largely due to the higher share of medium-sized projects among its completed portfolio so far (54 percent, compared to 34 percent in the overall portfolio). Cumulatively, 55 percent of projects fully meet or exceed their cofinancing commitments made at approval or endorsement, while 18 percent realize less than half of the pledged amount. GEF-6 projects have shown higher realization rates to date, although this may evolve as more projects from the cycle reach completion.

Figure 11: Cofinancing pledges and realization in completed projects



III. BROADER ADOPTION

34. The GEF's resources are limited, and it is only through large-scale adoption by other actors can the GEF achieve the transformational change that it envisions (GEF 2022, GEF IEO 2018). Since its Fifth Overall Performance Study (OPS 5), the IEO has tracked broader adoption in completed projects as a measure of progress toward long-term, large-scale environmental impacts. Broader adoption refers to the uptake of GEF-supported interventions by stakeholders—through sustaining, mainstreaming, replication and scaling-up—without the use of GEF funds.

35. Starting in GEF-6, the GEF made a strategic shift to tackle the drivers of environmental degradation, explicitly aiming to achieve impact at scale (GEF 2014). This evaluation assesses broader adoption in GEF-6 projects onward, identifying which interventions are most and least likely to be adopted, the enabling factors, and key influences beyond project completion. It focuses on stakeholder-funded initiatives resulting from project activities, rather than those scaled up through subsequent phases of GEF funding.

1. METHODOLOGY

36. The analysis presented in this chapter is based on desk reviews of terminal evaluations, review of prior IEO evaluations, and in-country case studies as sources of evidence. For completed GEF-6 and GEF-7 projects, a 50 percent random sample of terminal evaluation reports submitted as of June 2024 were reviewed for environmental, broader adoption and behavior change outcomes (n=81 out of 161). The 161 completed projects represent 13 percent of all CEO-endorsed or -approved GEF-6 and -7 projects in this same period. A Quality at Entry review of a random sample of 60 out of 92 projects CEO-endorsed between July 2023 and June 2024 assessed elements of broader adoption in more recent project designs. The majority of this sample (83 percent) was approved under GEF-7, when the project taxonomy for behavior change was first introduced, while 15 percent are under GEF-8.

37. Case studies on six projects in four countries (Azerbaijan, Georgia, the Philippines and Uruguay) examined broader adoption and behavior change outcomes at least two years post-completion. Additionally, IEO evaluations presented to the GEF Council between November 2022 and December 2024 were reviewed (n=13). A separate review of 253 active Green Climate Fund (GCF) projects as of June 2024 assessed the share of GCF projects that build upon GEF projects.

2. FINDINGS

38. **More than half of completed projects achieved their targeted environmental outcomes.** Sixty-four percent of completed projects with quantitative indicators reported achieving at least 70 percent of their environmental targets (table 3.1), similar to the previous OPS7 cohort of

completed projects (60 percent). No significant differences in environmental outcome achievement were found across focal areas, geographical regions or project types.

39. Most projects that met their environmental targets did so at larger scales. Most environmental outcomes were reported at subnational scale (43 percent), such as districts or provinces, while 32 percent were at national scale. . Achievements at lower scales were reported in 11 percent of projects.

3. BROADER ADOPTION OUTCOMES

40. More than half of completed projects designed to catalyze broader adoption achieved it. Sixty percent reported some form of broader adoption; a quarter had plans in place by project end, such as committed but unsecured funding sources, or policies pending government approval soon after project closure. This represents a higher rate of broader adoption than the OPS7 cohort, which consisted mainly of GEF-5 and older projects (40 percent broader adoption achieved; 55 percent with plans in place) (GEF IEO 2022).

41. At least 19 percent of projects aimed to expand on previous projects, typically to sustain or scale up outcomes, which may explain the higher achievement rate compared to older projects. This aligns with findings of past IEO evaluations that broader adoption often requires multiple projects, and that the GEF often funds a phased approach to broader adoption based on prior results. Projects that achieved some form of broader adoption were more likely to be rated as sustainable at terminal evaluation.

42. Most successful broader adoption outcomes occurred at larger scales. Eighty-six percent of projects reported broader adoption at subnational or higher levels (Annex 2), compared to 70 percent in the OPS7 cohort. Many projects connected stakeholders across geographies, such as multiple protected areas and towns within a basin, or producers and buyers across a global value chain. This wider coverage reflects the GEF's strategic shift to tackle drivers of environmental degradation and achieve impact at scale. These projects typically had activities at local, national and global levels, achieving broader adoption at multiple scales.

43. For example, a global energy efficiency project (GEF ID 9329) secured pledges from 30 cities in all global regions to each implement at least one energy efficient building project. It also established commitments from 4 international bodies, 10 private companies and 26 CSOs to form global and local partnerships to drive policy changes at subnational and city levels.

44. Mainstreaming was the most common form of broader adoption, achieved in over half of projects. Scaling-up was the least common (Table 2). While a few projects achieved a form of broader adoption they did not intend, those designed to sustain and mainstream interventions were significantly more likely to succeed in these forms.

Table 2: Percentage of projects that achieved broader adoption compared to their intended outcomes

FORMS OF BROADER ADOPTION	Intended (No. of Projects)	% of Projects (n=75)	Achieved (No. of Projects)	% of Intended
Sustaining ^a	36	48%	10	28%
Mainstreaming ^b	64	85%	36	56%
Replication ^c	28	37%	10	36%
Scaling-up ^d	20	27%	2	10%

^aContinuation of intervention and/or its positive effects after GEF support has come to an end; ^bWhen information, lessons, or specific aspects of a GEF initiative are incorporated into initiatives of governments, private or development organizations, etc.; ^cWhen a GEF intervention is reproduced at a comparable administrative or ecological scale, often in different geographical areas or regions; ^dIncrease in magnitude of benefits, and/or expansion of geographical and sectoral coverage

45. **Seventy-two percent of completed projects aimed to achieve at least two forms of broader adoption, but only 11 percent did so; almost half (48 percent) achieved one form.** Designing for the achievement of multiple forms of broader adoption reflects how the interaction of these different mechanisms typically drives transformational change. However, the great majority of projects achieved only mainstreaming. For example, a protected area (PA) management project in Timor Leste (GEF ID 9434) supported the design of natural resources management (NRM) plans intended for mainstreaming in traditional and government regulations of two pilot PAs. These pilots were expected to catalyze replication in the country’s other PAs. The project aimed to create a “strategic blueprint” for the country’s PA system, where community-driven integrated approaches could be scaled up to build the capacities of national and local stakeholders not only in terrestrial but also in marine and coastal areas. Knowledge activities to support broader adoption included documenting successful NRM implementation and spotlighting traditional conflict prevention mechanisms. By project end, NRM plans had been mainstreamed into regulations under traditional law in 4 out of 10 targeted sucos (villages). While the pilots were deemed replicable, replication had not yet occurred. Scaling-up faced risks due to uncertainty in the government’s ability to fund the necessary baseline ecological research and to leverage PA system financing. Box 3.1 highlights how broader adoption can occur through other institutions.

BOX .1. Scaling up through the Green Climate Fund

The Green Climate Fund (GCF), a multilateral fund with similar streams of support as the GEF and with a much larger funding envelope, is widely seen as the means to scale up successful GEF initiatives related to climate change mitigation and adaptation. The GEF Independent Evaluation Office (IEO) conducted a review of publicly available project proposals for 253 GCF projects approved through June 2024 to assess the prevalence of projects that adapted or scaled up GEF activities. The review revealed that GEF was mentioned in the proposal documents of 165 (65 percent) of GCF projects. In several instances, GEF was mentioned in the context of showcasing project coordination or complementarity with a GEF project (23 percent) or highlighting the implementing agency's experience in executing similar projects (20 percent). The review also showed that 42 projects (17 percent) had an explicit intention to expand on GEF-supported interventions, with the most common type of broader adoption being scaling-up (12 percent). Other types such as replication (4 percent), sustaining (4 percent) and mainstreaming (3 percent) were less common.

There are several examples to illustrate broader adoption of GEF activities by GCF projects. A GCF program aims to scale up climate change adaptation projects funded through the GEF's Small Grants Programme in Micronesia, with grants up to US\$ 10 million per project. The proposal explained that such projects could not afford to be funded by the government through debt finance, and only the GCF could fund it at this scale. Another GCF project builds on a US\$ 8.74 million GEF/ SCCF project implemented by the World Bank (GEF ID 5556 and 5723) by scaling up successful solutions and technologies tested by a UNDP/ SCCF project, among others.

46. **Almost all completed and active projects indicated some intention for broader adoption.** Ninety-three percent of completed projects were explicitly designed to achieve some form of broader adoption during or after project implementation. Similarly, a review of recently approved GEF-7 and GEF-8 projects found that 80 to 97 percent of projects indicated some intention for broader adoption. A previous IEO review of early GEF-6 projects (GEF IEO 2020) found that many primarily cited knowledge dissemination and exchange as the means to catalyze broader adoption. This latest result shows that projects completed so far have been designed with more explicit and concrete activities that can be more clearly linked to broader adoption outcomes. Annex 2 provides examples of explicit mentions of broader adoption intentions in project objectives and results frameworks.

47. Most completed projects aimed to catalyze broader adoption by strengthening the legal and institutional bases, building individual and institutional capacities, and providing concrete evidence for how and why interventions should be adopted. Policy, legal & institutional development interventions were the most adopted (58 percent), mainly through mainstreaming, followed by individual & institutional capacity-building interventions (Table 3). Only 18 percent of projects reported broader adoption of interventions that directly generate environmental benefits. This trend echoes OPS5 findings. In recently approved projects, knowledge-related activities were most common, while pilot demonstrations were the least, suggesting a shift from demonstrating proof-of-concept toward disseminating knowledge to persuade stakeholders to adopt interventions.

Table 3: Types of interventions broadly adopted

Types of Interventions Broadly Adopted	No. of Projects	% of Projects (n=45)
Policy, Legal & Institutional Development <i>e.g. policies, strategies & plans, regulatory frameworks, standards, implementing bodies</i>	26	58%
Individual & Institutional Capacity-Building <i>e.g. technical training, sustainable financing mechanism, M&E systems, information systems</i>	18	40%
Multistakeholder Interactions <i>e.g. trust-building dialogues, public-private partnerships</i>	10	22%
Interventions directly generating environmental benefits <i>e.g. technologies, practices, management plans</i>	8	18%
Knowledge & Learning <i>e.g. conferences, research studies, awareness campaigns, knowledge platforms</i>	3	7%

4. BROADER ADOPTION POST COMPLETION

48. Broader adoption takes time and is often observed well past project closure. Based on field visits, we observed broader adoption post completion.

Philippines

49. A sustainable land management (SLM) project in the Philippines (GEF ID 5767) demonstrated how local and national governments can fully take on project initiatives post-completion. One year after project closure, the city government began replicating SLM practices,

supplying inputs to farmers around the pilot site using its agriculture budget. The provincial has government scaled up SLM using its disaster risk fund, recognizing its potential to prevent landslides. At the national level, SLM has been mainstreamed into agricultural programs, prompting other local governments to allocate budgets for further adoption.

Uruguay

50. A project to help Uruguay meet their obligations to the Minamata Convention (GEF ID 4998) helped pass a decree that banned imports of mercury-containing healthcare products, such as fluorescent lighting and thermometers, and mandated the proper treatment and disposal of existing stock. The project provided support for legal expertise to develop the decree and capacity-building for laboratories to analyze mercury samples from the population. Post-training, participants formed an informal network of laboratories across six Latin American countries that continues five years after project closure. In this network, they exchange information on mercury testing. One of the pilot laboratories has mainstreamed project initiatives by organizing biennial training courses for countries to strengthen their capacity on mercury analysis.

Azerbaijan

51. A project to combat desertification in Azerbaijan (GEF ID 4332) through pasture management, among other approaches, supported both policy initiatives and local pilots but saw limited outcomes post-completion. At the national level, the project updated the National Action Plan to Combat Desertification using a participatory approach and developed 30 normative legal acts promoting sustainable pasture management, but none have been approved by the government.

52. At the local level, the project piloted sustainable pasture management practices with direct support for training, equipment and alternative livelihoods. Community members in pilot areas recalled five years after project closure how the training made them pay more attention to animal grazing; no detail was provided on actual adoption of the practices. National monitoring data indicate that no further action on developing sustainable pasture management plans despite capacity-building efforts. Some alternative livelihoods were sustained, as the project helped create a national market for village products continues to be exist; however, project evaluations noted that livelihood beneficiaries were unlikely the same groups driving overgrazing, leading them to question if the livelihoods contribute to reducing environmental degradation.

5. THE GEF'S CATALYTIC ROLE

53. How the GEF provides support through projects also influences broader adoption. This section presents some features that emerged from the most recent case studies: type and extent

of support, country-driven funding, partnerships with long-term, ground-based organizations, and high-quality project staff.

Type and extent of support

54. **GEF support provides a level of funding, flexibility, duration and types of activities that governments and other partners normally do not or cannot provide.** Stakeholders indicate that activities such as pilot demonstrations, international expert advice, multistakeholder broader adoption because government budgets or loans typically do not prioritize these activities for funding. The willingness of stakeholders to adopt increases with evidence from pilots and flexibility in project implementation, which in the Philippines case allowed more time for demonstration of benefits and capacity-building.

55. **The GEF often funds multiple project phases to ensure that stakeholders have the critical follow-up support others are not yet ready to provide, such as when outcomes are known to take more than five years to be achieved.** However, interruptions in GEF support due to project cycle requirements has led to loss of momentum and political capital, as well as institutional memory through staff turnover. This was especially apparent in international waters projects where the GEF's TDA-SAP approach requires at least two phases of projects to achieve the desired high-level political outcomes, yet each subsequent phase has to go through the same processes as one-off projects (e.g. GEF IDs 1032, 5542). At best, follow-on projects need to spend additional time, funds and effort to rebuild these; at worst, outcomes are short-lived and revert to the status quo. In some cases, GEF projects have implemented pilots without a clear upfront strategy for scaling up, limiting long-term impact.

Country-drivenness

56. **The GEF's country-driven funding allows governments to augment existing resources to fully mainstream and scale up their priority initiatives.** Stakeholders in several countries have consistently responded that the GEF's STAR framework allows them to allocate funding according to their most pressing environmental concerns, as outlined in their national strategies or development plans. In the Philippines case, the small GEF grant was the government's needed boost to scale up SLM practices in the country, demonstrating how strategic investment can lead to broader adoption.

Partnership with long-term organizations

57. **Broader adoption is more likely when GEF projects partner with organizations that have a long-term presence on the ground.** In many cases, GEF is only one donor in a sequence of funders supporting initiatives that stakeholders—such as governments, civil society and international development organizations—have already been advancing for years. GEF funding plays a critical role in enabling country stakeholders to sustain their work on interventions that require long-term investment and broader adoption to achieve their intended outcomes. Often,

GEF-supported outcomes are mainstreamed and scaled up through follow-on initiatives led by GEF agencies and funded by other donors. For example, design elements and lessons from a UNDP project in Bhutan (GEF ID 4976) were mainstreamed in a \$27 million GCF-funded project that scales up multi-hazard and early warning systems in Georgia, with UNDP as executing agency.

Continuity through high-quality project staff

58. **High-quality staff recruited by GEF projects often provide continuity in support and knowledge transfer by being absorbed into subsequent government and other donor programs.** While not systematically documented in the GEF, continuous support leading to broader adoption has also occurred through GEF project staff taking on roles in government or subsequent non-GEF projects and programs. Stakeholder interviews in multiple countries have revealed that project staff are often absorbed by government agencies or subsequent initiatives, which has also resulted in the mainstreaming of knowledge and lessons from GEF projects in other interventions.

59. In the Uruguay case, the GEF project's legal expert who supported the drafting of the decree was found to be so valuable that the government decided to make the position permanent to assist with other policies to meet Convention commitments. In the Dominican Republic, the GEF project lead was later hired by the ministry that executed the project. His current position allows him to connect stakeholders in pilot sites with ministry staff to sustain capacity-building support. He also noted that local government officials involved in the project continue to provide assistance, making use of knowledge they gained from the project.

60. Dedicated staff often take the initiative to provide continued support. Three years after project closure (GEF ID 3279), community facilitators in Indonesia continued to assist pilot communities on a voluntary basis. In the Philippines case, the agricultural technician assigned to the pilot site and engaged since the project's earliest stages was later promoted to head the city's agriculture office, where he championed the mainstreaming of SLM practices in the city's budget.

IV. PROJECT CYCLE EFFICIENCY

61. Assessing the efficiency of the GEF activity cycle is crucial for understanding how effectively and promptly the GEF partnership translates replenishment resources into tangible environmental results. Delays in the project cycle can hinder the timely achievement of results and reduce the overall effectiveness of interventions. Recognizing this, the GEF Council, Secretariat, and other partners have placed increased emphasis on improving cycle efficiency. This analysis examines key stages of the GEF activity cycle including first submission of Project Information Form (PIF), PIF approval, CEO Endorsement, project start and first disbursement, mid-term review, project completion and closure, and submission of the terminal evaluation.

62. Over the past four years, notable efficiency gains have been observed in some stages of the cycle. However, several areas continue to face challenges. The key findings are:

- (a) **PIF Submission to PIF Approval:** In GEF-8, the GEF maintained the efficiency improvements achieved in GEF-7, ensuring the swift approval of PIF submissions for standalone full-size projects. This performance represents a clear improvement over GEF-5 and GEF-6. The efficiency gains observed in GEF-7 were partly influenced by the COVID-19 pandemic, which facilitated quicker processing of PIF submissions due to travel restrictions and greater reliance on online platforms. Additionally, the efficiency gains are partly due to the GEF providing a shorter window for PIF submission and review.
- (b) **PIF Approval to CEO Endorsement:** Recent cohorts have shown improved efficiency in progressing from PIF approval to CEO endorsement compared to earlier cohorts. For example, PIF approvals from 2021-2022 had a median processing time of 19 months to obtain CEO endorsement, compared to 23 months for the 2019-2021 cohort, and 22 months for the 2015-2018 cohort. Despite this progress, nearly two-thirds of the PIFs approved during 2021-2022 still exceeded the 18-month benchmark for CEO endorsement.
- (c) **CEO Endorsement to First Disbursement:** Projects endorsed between 2021 and 2022 experienced slower progress toward first disbursement, with only 34 percent reaching this milestone within a year and a median time of 17 months. This contrasts with earlier cohorts where approximately two-thirds of projects achieved first disbursement within a year with median times ranging from 9 to 10 months. The slower disbursement pace in the recent cohort was partially attributed to challenges related to the COVID-19 pandemic.
- (d) **Project Start to Completion:** Medium size projects that began implementation between 2014-2019, were completed significantly faster than those that started implementation during the preceding four years (2010-2013). In contrast, the

implementation duration for FSPs remained relatively consistent across both periods, with similar timelines observed for projects that started 2014-2017 and those from the preceding four years.

63. Programmatic and Stand-Alone Projects: Projects approved under programmatic approaches generally take slightly less time in preparation and to achieve first disbursement compared to standalone projects. However, they tend to take longer to reach implementation completion. Medium sized projects typically have shorter preparation and implementation durations than full- sized projects.

1. METHODOLOGY

64. The analysis of activity cycle efficiency assesses the time taken by GEF projects in moving from one stage of the project cycle to the next. The analysis is based on the GEF Portal data and it considers the status of GEF projects as on February 28th 2025. For analysis it considers medium-size and full-size projects, and projects under programmatic approach (child projects) and stand-alone projects separately (Figures 12 and 13).

Figure 12: Full-Sized Project Cycle



Source: GEF (2024)

Figure 13: Medium-Sized Project Cycle



Source: GEF (2024)

65. The analysis measures the time, in months, taken by projects to progress from one milestone to the next. Key stages examined include: PIF submission to PIF approval, PIF approval to CEO endorsement/approval, CEO endorsement/approval to project start / first disbursement, project start to project completion. Milestones such as CEO endorsement/approval to mid-term review and project start to mid-term review, have not been assessed because of the data gaps.

66. Each individual category (or sub-category) for which analysis is presented consists of 18 or more observations. The categories that have fewer than this number have been dropped from the analysis. Although, projects from such categories are included in the aggregate.

67. Medians are used instead of averages to represent central tendencies in this analysis. This approach is taken because nearly all project cohorts include some cases that have not yet reached the next milestone, despite significant time having passed. Calculating averages would either require waiting until all projects reach the next stage or excluding those with prolonged delays. However, excluding delayed projects introduces bias, creating an overly optimistic picture of performance that is not supported by the full data.

68. Moreover, delayed projects are more prevalent in the most recent cohorts. Omitting them would make recent performance appear better than that of earlier cohorts, even if there has been no actual improvement in efficiency. In contrast, medians are unaffected by such outliers and offer a more robust and timely basis for analysis and comparison.

69. The GEF-replenishment cycle has been used to determine cohorts for assessing the performance of PIF submissions in achieving approval. For evaluating efficiency in reaching other milestones, cohorts are based on the calendar year in which a project achieved the stage from which its progress to the next stage is tracked.

70. This approach was adopted because it is still too early to assess the efficiency of GEF-8 projects in moving from PIF approval to CEO Endorsement, from CEO Endorsement to project start or first disbursement, and hardly any project from the GEF-8 period has begun implementation to allow an assessment of the time taken to project completion.


71. The observed median of time taken by projects to move from CEO endorsement/approval to project start for all categories included in the analysis is less than a year. Thus, based on this projects that were CEO endorsed/approved in 2023 could also be included in the most recent cohort. However, the analysis presented in this chapter excludes these projects because project start dates are updated based on inputs provided by the respective Agency usually through the annual project implementation reports on project progress. There may be time lag between actual start of a project and update of the project's status in the GEF Portal.

2. FINDINGS

PIF Submission to Approval

72. **Overall, PIF submissions during GEF-8 have been approved more quickly than in GEF-5 and GEF-6, and with efficiency comparable to GEF-7.** Under the GEF activity cycle, a project information form (PIF) must be submitted for each full-size standalone project for which GEF funding is sought. A key consideration here is that PIFs for full size projects are approved by the GEF Council during its biannual meetings. Which means, if a PIF is not approved the first time around, it needs to wait for another six months for approval. Thus, efficiency at this stage reflects the quality of PIFs, how timely these submissions are vis-à-vis the Council meeting at which it aims to achieve approval, and how well the aggregate requests for GEF funds through the PIFs are matched with the realized replenishment pledges available with the GEF Trustee for allocation to the approved projects. An analysis of GEF Portal data for full-size, standalone projects funded through the GEF Trust Fund, shows that PIFs submitted so far in GEF-8 have achieved approvals as quickly as submissions in GEF-7, and more quickly than the submissions in GEF-5 and GEF-6 (Figure 14). The median of the time taken for submissions in GEF-7 and GEF-8 is two months, compared to 9 months for GEF-6 and 5 months for GEF-5 submissions.

Figure 14: Time taken from PIF submission to PIF Approval – for full size standalone projects



73. APR2021 and the Evaluation of Covid by the GEF IEO found that the faster approvals during GEF-7 were largely due to the unique circumstances of the COVID-19 pandemic, wherein GEF and Agency staff devoted more time to desk based work and consequently were able to be more responsive to online submissions. In contrast, GEF-6 approvals were relatively slower, primarily due to a shortfall in replenishment funds compared to pledged amounts, which resulted from currency exchange rate volatility. Additionally, the efficiency gains are partly due to the GEF providing a short window for PIF submission and review. The data confirms that during GEF-7 and GEF-8, the majority of PIF submissions received approval within two months.

PIF Approval to CEO Endorsement


74. **Project proposals that obtained PIF approvals in 2021-2022 reached CEO endorsement more quickly than in earlier periods; however, two-thirds still exceeded the 18-month benchmark (Figure 15).** After a PIF for a full-size project is approved, GEF Agencies and recipient countries jointly develop a detailed project proposal and submit it to the GEF Secretariat for CEO endorsement/approval. Therefore, the time taken to prepare a detailed proposal reflects not only the efficiency of the GEF Secretariat and GEF Agencies but also the circumstances in the recipient countries. For full-size projects, 35 percent of PIFs approved in 2021-2022 were endorsed within 18 months, an improvement over those approved in 2019-2020 (8 percent), 2015-2018 (24 percent), and 2011-2014 (24 percent). Assessed differently, the median time taken by projects in the 2021-2022 cohort was 19 months, an improvement over the median of 23 months for the 2019-2020 cohort and 22 months for both the 2015-2018 and 2011-2014 cohorts. Despite these improvements, most full-size projects still fall short of the 18-month standard for CEO endorsement, with nearly two-thirds of the most recent cohort not meeting this benchmark.

75. The median time from PIF approval to CEO endorsement for the 2021-2022 cohort was slightly lower for full-size projects under the programmatic approach compared to standalone. Among the earlier cohorts there was little difference in time taken in preparation of these two types of projects.

76.

77. The improvement in project preparation has been driven by stricter adherence to submission deadlines and more robust enforcement of the cancellation policy. Gains over the 2019–2020 period also reflect the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic, which significantly disrupted project preparation due to on-the-ground challenges. In 2020, the GEF CEO issued several directives relaxing rules on project cancellations, extending submission and CEO Endorsement deadlines. This was reinforced by a Council decision in December 2020 that extended these relaxed measures through June 2021 (GEF 2020). The aim was to prevent automatic cancellations for delays caused by the pandemic. However, this flexibility may have inadvertently slowed the preparation of proposals that might otherwise have met the standard deadlines. While some projects in the 2021–2022 cohort also encountered disruptions, these were generally less severe than those faced by the 2019–2020 cohort.

Figure 15: Time taken from PIF Approval to CEO Endorsement – for full size projects



CEO Endorsement to First Disbursement

78. **Projects with CEO endorsement during 2021-2022 took longer to achieve first disbursement compared to those endorsed in earlier periods.** Time taken to achieve first disbursement signals start of project execution and it is often regarded as an indicator of

efficiency and challenges in project start-up. Median of time taken to reach first disbursement by projects endorsed in 2021-2022 was 17 months for full-size projects and 10 months for medium-size projects, which is substantially higher than the time taken by earlier cohorts full-size and medium size projects (table 4). The reason for slower progress for 2021-2022 projects is not yet clear. Although slow progress for the cohort may be partly explained by disruptions caused by COVID-19 these may have affected nearly 40 percent of the projects that were CEO endorsed during the 2019-2020 period.

Table 4: Efficiency of Project Activity Cycle – median time taken in months

	Medium Size Projects			Full Size Projects		
	Program	Stand Alone	All	Program	Stand Alone	All
PIF Submission to PIF Approval – by GEF cycle of Approval						
GEF-8 submissions	—	—	—	—	2	2
GEF-7 submissions	—	—	—	—	2	2
GEF-6 submissions	—	—	—	—	9	9
GEF-5 submissions					5	5
PIF Approval to CEO Endorsement/Approval – by period of PIF Approval						
Approval 2021-2022	—	12	12	17	19	19
Approval 2019-2020	—	16	16	23	24	23
Approval 2015-2018	—	14	14	22	22	22
Approval 2011-2014	—	16	16	22	22	22
CEO Endorsement/Approval to Project Start						
CEO End. 2021-2022	4	6	6	8	8.5	8
CEO End. 2019-2020	—	4	4	3	5	5
CEO End. 2015-2018	—	4	4	5	5	5
CEO End. 2011-2014	5	4	4	4	4	4
CEO Endorsement/Approval to First Disbursement						
CEO End. 2021-2022	12.5	10	10	14	19	17
CEO End. 2019-2020	—	6	7	10	9	9
CEO End. 2015-2018	—	8	8	7	10	10

CEO End. 2011-2014	7.5	6	6	9.5	9	9
Time taken from project start to completion						
Start Yr. 2014-2017	—	59	59	82	80	80
Start Yr. 2010 -2013	71	66.5	68	81	77.5	78

Source: GEF Portal 2025; for details on the number of observations for each of the cohorts and categories see Annex 3

Time taken for Implementation Completion²

79. **There has been little change in the median duration from project start to implementation completion for full-size projects, there is substantial decrease in time taken by medium-size projects (Table 4).** Overall, the median time taken by full size projects is minimal given the total duration. In contrast, medium size projects that were approved between 2014-2017 were completed nine months faster than projects approved between 2010 and 2013. In general, projects implemented under programmatic approaches took longer to complete than stand-alone projects. However, the implementation completion of integrated approach program child projects tends to be on time, with the exception of the Sustainable Cities Program child projects.

² While it would be ideal to assess the timeliness of implementation completion by comparing the actual duration of implementation with the planned duration, the GEF Portal data on planned project duration does not facilitate such a comparison due to inconsistencies in the units used for recording. For example, most of the projects approved in GEF-5 have their planned duration recorded in years, whereas for the more recent GEF cycles, it is recorded in months.

V. BEHAVIOR CHANGE IN GEF-SUPPORTED INTERVENTIONS

1. BACKGROUND

80. As most environmental degradation stems from human behaviors that can be changed, the GEF-8 Programming Directions highlight behavior change as a lever for transformational change (GEF 2022). Many of the GEF-8 Integrated Programs include behavior change as a key outcome to achieve the large-scale impact that the GEF envisions. Sustaining and expanding on environmentally impactful GEF-supported interventions first require shifts in behavior—both among stakeholders who directly interact with the environment, and among upstream stakeholders such as national and local governments who provide the enabling conditions for stakeholders on the ground to change their behavior (GEF IEO 2020).

81. Research in different fields has shown that stricter law enforcement or technological solutions alone are insufficient to catalyze lasting, large-scale change (Mills et al. 2022, Bujold et al. 2020, Michie et al. 2011). An initial IEO review found that awareness-raising and training were the most common behavior change approaches in GEF projects (GEF IEO 2024a). Outcome sustainability was most strongly linked to funding availability, appropriate laws, and logistical support. However, these efforts led to behavior change only when they addressed the needs, motivations, and barriers of multiple key stakeholder groups. Conversely, inadequate responses to these three key conditions was a common reason cited in terminal evaluations for lack of success.

82. This follow-up evaluation builds on the initial review by assessing recently completed GEF-6 and GEF-7 projects, as well as recently approved GEF-8 projects. It also looks at projects closed for at least two years to identify crucial conditions for sustaining and replicating behavior change. This update focuses on behavior change specifically referring to the adoption of technologies, services, practices or approaches that directly reduce environmental degradation, improve the state of the environment, or strengthen adaptation to climate change. It may also refer to the avoidance or modification of environmentally harmful behaviors. It excludes behavior change in upstream stakeholders whose actions do not directly result in environmental benefits.

2. METHODOLOGY

83. The evaluations on broader adoption and behavior change were conducted jointly using portfolio reviews, prior IEO evaluations, and in-country case studies as sources of evidence. For completed GEF-6 and GEF-7 projects, a 50 percent random sample of terminal evaluation reports submitted as of June 2024 were reviewed for environmental, broader adoption and behavior change outcomes (n=81 out of 161). The 161 completed projects represent 13 percent of all CEO-endorsed or CEO-approved GEF-6 and GEF-7 projects in this same period. To assess the extent the mainstreaming of behavior change interventions in current GEF programming, GEF-8 projects

CEO-endorsed or -approved as of December 2024 were filtered for “behavior change” in their project taxonomy. Project documents of all active projects that passed this filter were reviewed (n=26 out of 146).

84. Case studies on six projects in four countries (Azerbaijan, Georgia, the Philippines and Uruguay) examined broader adoption and behavior change outcomes at least two years post-completion. Additionally, IEO evaluations presented to the GEF Council between November 2022 and December 2024 were reviewed (n=13). Findings also draw from earlier evaluations, stakeholder interviews, and site visits conducted for other IEO activities.

Areas targeted

85. **The most common behavior change goal in both completed and recently approved projects was adopting a practice or technology; discouraging environmentally harmful behaviors was targeted in less than 25 percent of projects.** Completed projects mostly promoted climate change mitigation measures (41 percent) and sustainable management practices (30 percent) (Annex 4). Sustainable practices to be adopted included planting of pasture and native crops, waste segregation, and stricter fishing regulations. Climate change projects typically focused on technology adoption, such as LED bulbs and renewable energy micro-grids. Environmental protection and chemicals-related projects aimed to reduce environmentally harmful behaviors such as poaching and mercury use.

86. **Private sector stakeholders and community members were the most targeted groups for behavior change.** Most private sector entities, individual consumers and governments were expected to change behaviors for climate change mitigation. The private sector was also the main target for reducing chemical use. On the other hand, most community members and small-scale producers were expected to adopt sustainable resource use practices.

Designing for behavior change

87. **Compared to completed projects, a higher percentage of GEF-8 projects address stakeholder needs, suggesting a systems approach to addressing behavior change.** Thirty-eight percent of GEF-8 projects directly addressed needs through project activities, while only 14 percent of completed projects did so³. A comparable proportion of completed and GEF-8 projects

³ NEEDS: Basic conditions that need to be addressed—such as livelihood, land tenure rights, health, self-governance—before stakeholders can allocate psychosocial and material resources to care about environmental concerns. MOTIVATIONS: Conditions that can nudge people to change their behavior based on the benefits of changing and the costs of not changing. Examples of benefits are cash incentives, tax breaks, social recognition, peer acceptance and additional income; costs may be in the form of penalties, fines, taxes and social shame; BARRIERS: Conditions that, despite their desire to do so, prevent stakeholders from changing their behavior over the long term due to a lack of means, capacity and/or opportunity. Barriers may be related to skills, logistical support, financial costs, complexity of required actions, time demands, cultural acceptability, institutional silos, etc.

addressed motivations and barriers (76 to 78 percent). The most commonly identified stakeholder need was lack of income. Many of the targeted stakeholders lived in poverty, exacerbated by a natural resource base degraded from unsustainable extraction practices. While 29 percent of GEF-8 projects address this need through livelihood activities, only 11 percent of completed projects did so.

88. Most completed and active projects implemented skills-building activities, addressing knowledge-related barriers. In both completed and active projects, lack of knowledge and technical expertise was the most identified barrier to behavior change. Over-all, lack of most identified condition as key to catalyzing behavior change. Examples include lack of awareness of alternative management practices and lack of skills to operate more efficient technology.

89. A common reason identified for low motivation for changing behavior in both completed and active projects was weak regulatory frameworks or enforcement. Examples are ineffective anti-poaching laws or bans on production and use of plastics with persistent organic pollutants (POPs). This suggests that in many countries, the punitive costs of environmentally harmful behaviors remain much lower than the benefits of doing business as usual, while the costs of adopting pro-environment behaviors may remain high. Strengthening legal and policy frameworks to incentivize positive behaviors and disincentivize harmful ones was the second most common intervention in completed projects (49 percent).

90. In active projects, institution-building was the second most common intervention, suggesting more attention to institutional barriers than solely individual-level ones. Notably, 43 percent of GEF-8 projects planned to strengthen institutional capacities, compared to just 24 percent of completed projects. Examples include developing a coordinated institutional approach at national and regional levels to address mercury trade issues and setting up a participatory and gender-responsive coastal adaptation monitoring system. These findings suggest that more recent GEF projects are addressing institutional rather than just individual-level barriers to behavior change.

91. Higher total project funding was significantly associated with achievement of behavior change outcomes. This indicates that larger investments from both the GEF and cofinancing partners are needed to ensure on-the-ground adoption of interventions that generate environmental benefits. Behavior change outcomes for this portfolio were not significantly linked to focal area, region, project type, number of years of implementation, or GEF grant and cofinancing amounts. In terms of project design, full-size projects were more significantly associated with having behavior change activities than medium-size projects, indicating a recognition of this higher funding need.

92. Most completed and active projects still do not explicitly track behavior change. Less than half of completed (38 percent) and active projects (41 percent) had explicit indicators for

behavior change. In 22 percent of completed and 10 percent of active projects, indicators measured the extent of application of an environmentally sustainable practice (e.g. hectares under active rehabilitation, number of improved cookstoves used), but did not track actual adoption by specific stakeholder groups. This is a continuing missed opportunity, first noted in the initial IEO review, to link project activities with behavior change and environmental outcomes, so that projects can better target key conditions necessary for behavior change.

93. **Most projects with behavior change indicators achieved their targets.** Sixty-nine percent achieved at least 70 percent of their behavior change goals, while 48 percent did so for environmental targets directly linked to behavior change. The lower success rate for environmental outcomes may reflect the time lag between behavioral shifts and measurable behavior and environmental targets.

94. For example, a project in Turkmenistan (GEF ID 6960) aimed to support climate resilient livelihoods in agricultural communities by promoting improved crop production systems that enhance productivity and water efficiency. One of its targets was for climate-resilient agriculture and livestock production practices to be adopted by at least 3,000 targeted farmers/households of which at least 30% are women/women-headed households, which it achieved. As a result of these farmers and households adopting the practice, the project met its environmental target of at least 20,000 ha of agricultural lands receiving reliable irrigation. In contrast, a mercury reduction project in Guyana (GEF ID 9713) tracked the number of miners adopting mercury-free practices but reported no adoption beyond the pilots; consequently, only 4 percent of its targeted mercury reduction was achieved.

95. **Sustaining behavior change beyond project completion depends on availability of continuous support, potential economic benefit for multiple stakeholder groups, availability of capital, and lower costs relative to benefits.** Continuous support may come not just through government but also through other partners, especially organizations with a local, long-term presence. In Indonesia, a project-initiated community-based waste management facility (GEF ID 3279) remains operational over five years post-project, supported by a private company through their corporate social responsibility program, and later the national government. The facility was started as an alternative source of income to encourage community members to continue forest patrols in protected area buffer zones, who still do so at present. In the same project, community facilitators hired by the project have continued to support the communities on a voluntary basis years after the project ended. In a Georgia project (GEF ID 6962), farmers adopted drip irrigation after seeing the benefits from a pilot. They accessed government loans and grants as well as other sources of income to purchase required materials. In another pilot site, no replication occurred as farmers had fewer alternative income sources and were further away from government offices.

VI. SUBMISSION OF TERMINAL EVALUATION REPORTS

96. A terminal evaluation is a comprehensive and systematic assessment of a project's performance upon its completion, encompassing its design, implementation, outcomes, and monitoring. This evaluation identifies factors influencing the project's effectiveness, sustainability, adaptive management, resource mobilization, and efficiency. It supports learning, accountability, decision-making, and knowledge sharing within the GEF partnership. Timely submission of terminal evaluations is crucial for incorporating lessons learned into future GEF activities and enabling prompt corrective actions. Similarly, high-quality reports that provide an honest account of project implementation and results, including a transparent evaluation process, are essential.

97. The GEF IEO's Evaluation of Components of the GEF's Results-Based Management System (2024) provides a detailed account of the quality of terminal evaluations submitted by the GEF Agencies assessing the quality of terminal evaluations on 14 key criteria. Therefore, this chapter examines availability and timeliness of submission of terminal evaluations.

98. The Annual Performance Report (APR) 2017 analyzed gaps in terminal evaluation submissions for GEF cycles that ended at least 12 years prior. The analysis presented in this chapter focuses on projects with available completion dates. This was made possible by the GEF Portal's functionalities, which were not available in the previous Project Management Information System (PMIS). It targets completed projects approved from GEF-5 onward, as most were completed after transitioning to the GEF Portal. This transition enabled web-based submission of terminal evaluations, allowing for more consistent and accurate tracking. The analysis is further restricted to projects reported as completed by December 31, 2023. This cutoff ensured that each project had at least 14 months for its terminal evaluation to be submitted.

99. The most recent terminal evaluation guidelines for full-size projects, issued by the GEF IEO in 2023, require Agencies to submit terminal evaluations within two months of their completion. Additionally, these evaluations must be completed within six months of project completion—effectively requiring submission within eight months. However, these guidelines only apply to projects completed on or after January 1, 2024, and do not apply retroactively. Earlier guidelines issued in 2008 and 2017 required submission within one year of project completion. Accordingly, a one-year threshold has been used in this analysis to assess timeliness of submission.

1. DATA AND METHODS

100. To assess terminal evaluation availability, data from the GEF Portal on completed or closed projects was used as a starting point. Full-size projects, medium-size projects, and enabling activities approved from GEF-5 onward and reported as completed by December 31,

2023, were identified—provided that a terminal evaluation was expected under GEF guidelines⁴. This resulted in an initial list of 865 projects.

101. For these projects, the status of terminal evaluation submission was assessed in two steps: first, by checking whether a submission date was recorded in the GEF Portal; and second, by verifying whether the terminal evaluation document was available. Since there is a risk that completion dates in the GEF Portal might have been entered before a project was truly completed, these dates were cross-checked against Project Implementation Report (PIR) submissions. Projects with PIRs submitted after the stated completion date were excluded. As a result, five projects were dropped, bringing the final number of projects included in the analysis to 860.


2. FINDINGS

102. Terminal evaluations are available for 89 percent of completed projects approved from GEF-5 onward, with availability rates of 92 percent for full-size projects (FSPs) and 84 percent for medium-size projects (MSPs). For comparison, APR 2017 reported terminal evaluation availability rates ranging from 78 percent (GEF-3) to 92 percent (GEF-2). Additionally, the recent evaluation of GEF RBM system components (GEF IEO 2024) reported mid-term review availability rates for recent annual cohorts of CEO-endorsed full-size projects ranging from 78 percent to 95 percent.

103. The timeliness and gaps in terminal evaluation submissions vary across different project categories. Figure 16 shows the percentage of projects for which terminal evaluations are submitted on time, submitted with delay, or have not been submitted yet. Terminal evaluation availability is higher for full-size projects, national projects, and projects implemented in Latin America and the Caribbean (LAC). Conversely, submission gaps are substantial for global and regional projects, medium-size projects, and projects in Small Island Developing States (SIDS). Submissions are more likely to be timely for projects in Asia and LAC, as well as for national projects.


⁴ Terminal evaluations are not required for enabling activities that were approved under expedited procedures. However, enabling activities that were approved as full size projects are required to prepare terminal evaluations.

Figure 16: Timeliness of, and gaps in, terminal evaluation submission – by project categories



104. **Agency performance in ensuring the availability and timely submission of terminal evaluations varies.** Figure 17 shows the percentage of completed projects for which terminal evaluations were submitted, as well as the proportion submitted on time (within one year) by Agencies. CI, IADB, UNDP, IUCN, FAO, and WWF-US have near-perfect records in terms of availability and timeliness. In contrast, ADB, UNEP, AfDB, and IFAD have substantially lower availability rates. EBRD and CAF have not submitted any terminal evaluations, but their sample size is too small to draw general conclusions. ADB, UNEP, IFAD, AfDB, and UNIDO submitted terminal evaluations for less than half of their completed projects on time.

Figure 17: Availability and Timeliness of Submission of Terminal Evaluations by Agency



105. UNEP presents a unique case among Agencies with identified gaps, as it accounts for a significant share of the total shortfall in terminal evaluation submissions—despite a history of strong performance. Historically, UNEP's terminal evaluations have been highly rated for quality in the past evaluations conducted by the GEF IEO (2024⁵, 2023⁶). The APR2017 found UNEP's submission rate for projects approved through GEF-3 to be 88 percent, substantially higher compared to the current assessment's rate of 60 percent. The transition to the GEF Portal requires greater responsibility on Agencies to ensure timely submission of terminal evaluations, increasing the risk of submission gaps. Previously, the GEF IEO and GEF Agencies conducted a joint annual follow up process to track terminal evaluation submissions for completed projects, resulting in most Agencies submitting evaluations annually. Now, under the current system with the GEF Portal, Agencies are expected to submit reports independently and on a rolling basis, which may pose challenges for those not yet fully aligned or adapted to the new submission requirements. This issue requires attention and resolution. The list of completed projects lacking terminal evaluations is provided in Annex 5.

⁵ <https://www.gefio.org/sites/default/files/documents/council-documents/c-68-e-03.pdf>

⁶ <https://www.gefio.org/sites/default/files/documents/evaluations/rbm-2023.pdf>

3. RECOMMENDATION

106. This report has one recommendation for GEF Agencies:

- GEF Agencies should strengthen efforts to ensure the timely submission of terminal evaluations and close existing submission gaps for completed projects. Agencies with significant shortfalls—such as ADB, IFAD, UNEP, and UNIDO—should enhance their internal processes and accountability mechanisms to ensure that terminal evaluations are consistently submitted to the GEF Portal on time for all completed projects. The GEF IEO will track the measures taken by the respective agencies through the Management Action Record and monitor the availability of terminal evaluations.

VII. REFERENCES

Bujold, P.M., K. Williamson, and E. Thulin. 2020. The Science of Changing Behavior for Environmental Outcomes: A Literature Review. Rare Center for Behavior & the Environment and the Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel to the Global Environment Facility.

GEF. 2014. GEF-6 Programming Directions. Available at:
<https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/documents/GEF-6%20Programming%20Directions.pdf>

GEF. 2020. The Impact of COVID-19 on GEF Project Preparation and Implementation: Overview of Responses from Across the GEF Partnership. GEF/C.59/11. Available at:
https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/council-meeting-documents/EN_GEF.C59_11_Impact%20of%20COVID19%20on%20Project%20Preparation%20and%20Implementation_0.pdf

GEF. 2022. GEF-8 Programming Directions. GEF/R.08/29/Rev.01. Available at:
https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/documents/2022-04/GEF_R.08_29_Rev.01_GEF8_Programming_Directions.pdf

GEF. 2024. GEF Introduction Seminar 2024. Available at:
https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/documents/2024-09/Day%20Intro%20Seminar%20Slides_v2.pdf

GEF IEO. 2014. OPS 5. Fifth Overall Performance Study of the GEF. Final Report: At the Crossroads for Higher Impact. Available at:
<https://www.gefio.org/sites/default/files/documents/evaluations/ops5-final-report-eng.pdf>

GEF IEO. 2018. Evaluation of GEF Support for Transformational Change. Evaluation Report No. 122. Available at:
<https://www.gefio.org/sites/default/files/documents/evaluations/transformational-change.pdf>

GEF IEO. 2019. GEF Annual Performance Report 2017. Evaluation Report No. 136. Available at:
<https://www.gefio.org/sites/default/files/documents/evaluations/apr-2017.pdf>

GEF IEO. 2020. GEF Support to Scaling Up Impact. Evaluation Report No. 138. Available at:
<https://www.gefio.org/sites/default/files/documents/evaluations/scaling-up.pdf>

GEF IEO.2022. Seventh Comprehensive Evaluation of the GEF: Working Toward a Greener Global Recovery. Available at:
<https://www.gefio.org/sites/default/files/documents/evaluations/ops7.pdf>

GEF IEO. 2023a. GEF Results-Based Management: Agency Self-Evaluation and the GEF Portal. Evaluation Report No. 158. Available at:

<https://www.gefio.org/sites/default/files/documents/evaluations/rbm-2023.pdf>

GEF IEO. 2023b. Guidelines for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of Full-Size Projects. Available at: <https://www.gefio.org/sites/default/files/documents/evaluations/terminal-evaluations-2023.pdf>

GEF IEO. 2024a. GEF Annual Performance Report 2023. Evaluation Report No. 162. Available at: <https://www.gefio.org/sites/default/files/documents/evaluations/apr-2023-behavioral-change.pdf>

GEF IEO. 2024b. Evaluation of Components of the GEF's Results-Based Management System. GEF/E/C.68/03. Available at: <https://www.gefio.org/sites/default/files/documents/council-documents/c-68-e-03.pdf>

GEF IEO. 2024c. Evaluation of GEF Programs in Pacific Small Island Developing States. GEF/E/C.68/02. Available at: https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/documents/2024-11/EN_GEF.C68_E_02_Pacific_SIDS_Evaluation_Report_16Nov24_Final.pdf

GEF IEO 2024d. Evaluation of GEF Support in Fragile and Conflict-Affected Situations. Available at: <https://www.gefio.org/sites/default/files/documents/evaluations/fragility-2020.pdf>

Michie, S., Van Stralen, M.M. and West, R. 2011. "The behaviour change wheel: a new method for characterising and designing behaviour change interventions". *Implementation Science*. 6. pp.1-12. Available at:

<https://implementationscience.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/1748-5908-6-42>

VIII. ANNEXES

ANNEX 1: PERFORMANCE OF COMPLETED PROJECTS


Annex 1.1: Correlations between Performance Ratings

Performance ratings	Outcome	Sustainability	Quality of M&E design	Quality of M&E implementation	Quality of implementation	Quality of execution
Outcome (n=2,353)	1					
Sustainability (n=2,157)	0.3823*	1				
Quality of M&E design (n=2,172)	0.1992*	0.1626*	1			
Quality of M&E implementation (n=2,129)	0.3718*	0.2794*	0.4432*	1		
Quality of implementation (n=2,109)	0.5955*	0.2957*	0.2925*	0.4513*	1	
Quality of execution (n=1,995)	0.5611*	0.3264*	0.1670*	0.3818*	0.5822*	1

Source: GEF IEO based on the APR 2025 dataset, which includes completed projects for which terminal evaluations were submitted by June 30, 2024, and performance ratings were independently validated through December 2024.

Notes: The phi coefficient measures the degree of association between dichotomous variables. Its interpretation is similar to a Pearson correlation coefficient. In 2 x 2 contingency tables, the phi coefficient and Pearson correlation coefficient are the same. * Statistically significant at the 1% level. The number of projects for which validated M&E desing and implementation ratings are available is shown in parentheses.


Annex 1.2: Projects with Sustainability of Outcomes Rated in the Likely Range, by Focal Area (a), Region (b), Country Groups (c), and Programmatic Approach (d).



Source: GEF IEO based on the APR 2025 dataset, which includes completed projects for which terminal evaluations were submitted by June 30, 2024, and performance ratings were independently validated through December 2024.

Notes: The number of projects for which validated sustainability ratings are available is shown in parentheses. BD = Biodiversity; CC-M = Climate Change Mitigation; CC-A = Climate Change Adaptation; Chem = Chemicals and Waste; IW = International Waters; LD = Land Degradation; MF = Multifocal. AFR=Africa; ECA = Europe and Central Asia; LAC = Latin America and the Caribbean; Global projects include one Inter-regional project. SIDS = Small Island Developing States ; LDCs = Least Developed Countries ; FCS = Fragile and Conflict-affected Situations, World Bank classification. 1/ FCS classification has been available since 2006, which explains the incomplete FCS data for earlier replenishment phases.

Annex 1.3: Projects with Implementation Quality Rated in the Satisfactory Range, by Focal Area, Region, Country Groups, and Programmatic Approach.




Source: GEF IEO based on the APR 2025 dataset, which includes completed projects for which terminal evaluations were submitted by June 30, 2024, and performance ratings were independently validated through December 2024.


Notes: The number of projects for which validated implementation ratings are available is shown in parentheses. BD = Biodiversity; CC-M = Climate Change Mitigation; CC-A = Climate Change Adaptation; Chem = Chemicals and Waste; IW = International Waters; LD = Land Degradation; MF = Multifocal. AFR=Africa; ECA = Europe and Central Asia; LAC = Latin America and the Caribbean; Global projects include one Inter-regional project. SIDS = Small Island Developing States ; LDCs = Least Developed Countries ; FCS = Fragile and Conflict-affected Situations, World Bank classification. ^{1/} FCS classification has been available since 2006, which explains the incomplete FCS data for earlier replenishment phases. * Statistically significant at the 10% level.

Annex 1.4: Projects with Execution Quality Rated in the Satisfactory Range, by Focal Area, Region, Country Groups, and Programmatic Approach.


a. Focal area




b. Region



c. Country groups



d. Programmatic approach




Source: GEF IEO based on the APR 2025 dataset, which includes completed projects for which terminal evaluations were submitted by June 30, 2024, and performance ratings were independently validated through December 2024.


Notes: The number of projects for which validated execution ratings are available is shown in parentheses. BD = Biodiversity; CC-M = Climate Change Mitigation; CC-A = Climate Change Adaptation; Chem = Chemicals and Waste; IW = International Waters; LD = Land Degradation; MF = Multifocal. AFR=Africa; ECA = Europe and Central Asia; LAC = Latin America and the Caribbean; Global projects include one Inter-regional project. SIDS = Small Island Developing States ; LDCs = Least Developed Countries ; FCS = Fragile and Conflict-affected Situations, World Bank classification. ^{1/} FCS classification has been available since 2006, which explains the incomplete FCS data for earlier replenishment phases.

Annex 1.5: Projects with M&E Design Rated in the Satisfactory Range, by Focal Area, Region, Country Groups, and Programmatic Approach.


a. Focal area




b. Region



c. Country groups



d. Programmatic approach




Source: GEF IEO based on the APR 2025 dataset, which includes completed projects for which terminal evaluations were submitted by June 30, 2024, and performance ratings were independently validated through December 2024.


Notes: The number of projects for which validated M&E design ratings are available is shown in parentheses. BD = Biodiversity; CC-M = Climate Change Mitigation; CC-A = Climate Change Adaptation; Chem = Chemicals and Waste; IW = International Waters; LD = Land Degradation; MF = Multifocal. AFR=Africa; ECA = Europe and Central Asia; LAC = Latin America and the Caribbean; Global projects include one Inter-regional project. SIDS = Small Island Developing States ; LDCs = Least Developed Countries ; FCS = Fragile and Conflict-affected Situations, World Bank classification. ^{1/} FCS classification has been available since 2006, which explains the incomplete FCS data for earlier replenishment phases.

Annex 1.6: Projects with M&E Implementation Rated in the Satisfactory Range, by Focal Area, Region, Country Groups, and Programmatic Approach.


a. Focal area




b. Region



c. Country groups



d. Programmatic approach



Source: GEF IEO based on the APR 2025 dataset, which includes completed projects for which terminal evaluations were submitted by June 30, 2024, and performance ratings were independently validated through December 2024.

Notes: The number of projects for which validated M&E implementation ratings are available is shown in parentheses. BD = Biodiversity; CC-M = Climate Change Mitigation; CC-A = Climate Change Adaptation; Chem = Chemicals and Waste; IW = International Waters; LD = Land Degradation; MF = Multifocal. AFR=Africa; ECA = Europe and Central Asia; LAC = Latin America and the Caribbean; Global projects include one Inter-regional project. SIDS = Small Island Developing States ; LDCs = Least Developed Countries ; FCS = Fragile and Conflict-affected Situations, World Bank classification. 1/ FCS classification has been available since 2006, which explains the incomplete FCS data for earlier replenishment phases.

ANNEX 2. BROADER ADOPTION

Broader Adoption


Table 2.1. Examples of explicit intentions to achieve broader adoption as outlined in project documents

Type of Broader Adoption	Examples of Objectives, Components, Activities, Outputs and Outcome Indicators for Broader Adoption
Sustaining	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ “to strengthen the long-term conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity” ▪ “financial sustainability at each of the 5 PAs will be improved” ▪ “number of multi-stakeholder coordination mechanism ... for the long-term adoption of mercury-free gold mining technologies established”
Mainstreaming	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ “implementation of sustainable government-supported coordination mechanisms between water sectors” ▪ “four (4) national guidelines based on BAT/BEP published” ▪ “development and institutionalization of a...verification mechanism for gold” ▪ “development of a National CSLM strategy...to mainstream CSLM into national and local development plans”
Replication	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ “the Project will target the introduction of a number of adaptation measures that will have a demonstrative effect and enhance replication potential” ▪ “to strengthen the capacity for rolling out and replicating the CSLM technologies” ▪ “to enable PNG to achieve and replicate “honest,” low-cost, technically sound community RE systems”
Scaling-up	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ “engagement scaled up in 10 additional countries..., producing high-level plans for these 10 additional countries” ▪ “shift in the development of a mercury-free ASGM supply chain and downstream El Dorado brand jewelry” ▪ “number of regions...where mercury-free technology has replaced the use of mercury”

Annex 2.2: Highest scales at which some form of broader adoption was achieved in projects

Highest Scale of Broader Adoption Achieved	No. of Projects	% of Projects (n=45)
National	24	53%
City/ municipal	7	16%
Global	6	13%
Sub-national	5	11%
Regional (multi-country)	4	9%
Site	4	9%

Annex 2.3: Intended broader adoption of GEF-supported initiatives in GCF projects (n=253)



Annex 2.4: Types of activities supporting broader adoption in GEF projects

Types of Activities Supporting Broader Adoption	No. of Projects	% of Projects (n=75)
Policy, Legal & Institutional Development <i>to establish/ strengthen the legal basis and institutional means for broader adoption of the intervention</i>	52	69%
Individual & Institutional Capacity-Building <i>to establish or strengthen the knowledge, resources and infrastructure that will allow broader adoption of the intervention</i>	47	63%
Piloting of Intervention <i>to demonstrate how and why the intervention should be broadly adopted</i>	43	57%
Knowledge Exchange & Learning <i>to create and spread information about the intervention for stakeholders beyond the pilot area</i>	28	37%
Multistakeholder Interactions <i>to create/ maintain stakeholder relationships that enable broader adoption of the intervention</i>	26	35%

ANNEX 3: PROJECT CYCLE – MEDIAN OF TIME TAKEN

Time taken by projects to reach the next stage in the activity cycle (number of observations in parentheses)⁷

	Medium Size Projects			Full Size Projects		
	Program	Stand Alone	All	Program	Stand Alone	All
PIF Submission to PIF Approval – by GEF cycle of Approval						
GEF-8 submissions	—	—	—	—	2 (n=100)	2 (n=100)
GEF-7 submissions	—	—	—	—	2 (n=333)	2 (n=333)
GEF-6 submissions	—	—	—	—	9 (n=270)	9 (n=270)
GEF-5 submissions					5 (n=449)	5 (n=449)
PIF Approval to CEO Endorsement/Approval – by period of PIF Approval						
Approval 2021-2022	—	12 (n=76)	12 (n=76)	17 (n=18)	19 (n=74)	19 (n=92)
Approval 2019-2020	—	16 (n=42)	16 (n=42)	23 (n=97)	24 (n=188)	23 (n=285)
Approval 2015-2018	—	14 (n=86)	14 (n=86)	22 (n=93)	22 (n=271)	22 (n=361)
Approval 2011-2014	—	16 (n=149)	16 (n=149)	22 (n=64)	22 (n=426)	22 (n=490)
CEO Endorsement/Approval to Project Start						
CEO End. 2021-2022	4 (n=37)	6 (n=92)	6 (n=129)	8 (n=102)	8.5 (n=196)	8 (n=298)
CEO End. 2019-2020	2 (n=4)	4 (n=39)	4 (n=43)	3 (n=28)	5 (n=89)	5 (n=117)
CEO End. 2015-2018	12 (n=6)	4 (n=219)	4 (n=225)	5 (n=103)	5 (n=321)	5 (n=424)
CEO End. 2011-2014	5 (n=37)	4 (n=130)	4 (n=167)	4 (n=127)	4 (n=301)	4 (n=214)
CEO Endorsement/Approval to First Disbursement						
CEO End. 2021-2022	12.5 (n=38)	10 (n=92)	10 (n=130)	14 (n=102)	19 (n=199)	17 (n=301)
CEO End. 2019-2020	7.5 (n=4)	6 (n=39)	7 (n=43)	10 (n=28)	9 (n=90)	9 (n=118)
CEO End. 2015-2018	13 (n=6)	8 (n=219)	8 (n=225)	7 (n=107)	10 (n=324)	10 (n=431)
CEO End. 2011-2014	7.5 (n=38)	6 (n=133)	6 (n=171)	9.5 (n=126)	9 (n=303)	9 (n=429)
Time taken from project start to completion						

⁷ Categories with fewer than 10 observations were not analyzed.

Start Yr. 2014-2017	80 (n= 5)	59 (n=232)	59 (n 237)	82 (n=91)	80 (n=378)	80 (n=469)
Start Yr. 2010 -2014	71 (n=66)	66.5 (n=102)	68 (n=168)	81 (n=165)	77.5 (n=238)	78 (n=403)

ANNEX 4: BEHAVIOR CHANGE

Annex 4.1: Projects that Target Behavior Change

Forty-six percent of completed projects were found to target behavior change that would directly lead to environmental outcomes; full-size projects (66 percent) were more likely to have such targets than medium-size projects. In GEF-8 projects that had “behavior change” in their project taxonomy, 85 percent targeted this type of behavior change. Focal area and regional differences were not statistically significant in either set of projects.

Examples of behaviors that these projects targeted are the adoption of sustainable approaches to environmental protection and resource use, measures to reduce energy consumption and enhance efficiency, and reducing the use of harmful chemicals in agriculture, industry and other sectors.

Projects that only indirectly generated environmental benefits focused on enhancing institutional capacities, such as improving institutional structures and decision-making, strengthening monitoring and information systems, and establishing financial mechanisms.

Completed projects targeting behavior change mostly promoted climate change mitigation measures (41 percent) and sustainable management practices (30 percent). On the other hand, half of the GEF-8 projects promoted environmental protection measures and 32 percent also promoted sustainable management practices; only 9 percent of active projects targeted behavior change related to climate change mitigation.

The most common climate change mitigation practices across various projects included energy efficiency improvements in buildings, industries, and public sector operations, as well as the adoption of renewable energy, particularly in Small Island Developing States (SIDS). Other measures included low-carbon transportation solutions such as electric vehicles (EVs), investment in green businesses and sustainable industries, and practices to reduce emissions from livestock and degraded land restoration. Sustainable management practices mainly involved grazing and pasture management, regulation of forest use, and biodiversity-friendly fishing practices. Examples of environmental protection and restoration behaviors included tree-planting, mulching to restore soil quality, agroforestry and managing invasive species.

Annex 4.2: Areas of targeted behavior change in completed GEF-6 and -7 projects and active GEF-8 projects

AREA WHERE BEHAVIOR CHANGE WAS TARGETED	% OF COMPLETED PROJECTS (n=37)	% OF ACTIVE GEF-8 PROJECTS (n=22)
Climate change mitigation measures (e.g. use of energy-efficient technology, use of renewable energy)	41%	10%
Sustainable natural resource use and management (e.g. fishing, farming, forest production)	30%	33%
Environmental protection/ restoration (e.g. reforestation, avoidance of resource extraction)	19%	48%
Climate change adaptation measures (e.g. optimized water use, use of early warning systems, use of insurance)	11%	10%
Reduction of chemical use (e.g. mercury, DDT)	11%	29%
Waste management (e.g. organic, inorganic, chemical)	5%	14%

Annex 4.3. Proportion of projects with successful and unsuccessful behavior change and environmental outcomes

% OF PROJECTS with indicators (n=21)*	≥70% environmental outcomes achieved	≤70% environmental outcomes achieved
≥70% behavior change outcomes achieved	14%	3%
≤70% behavior change outcomes achieved	0%	3%

Annex 4.4: Key conditions addressed by completed and active projects to facilitate behavior change

Conditions Addressed by Projects ⁸	COMPLETED GEF-6 AND -7 PROJECTS (n=37)	ACTIVE GEF-8 PROJECTS (n=21)
Needs	14%	38%
Motivations	76%	76%
Barriers	78%	76%

Annex 4.5: Key conditions and common interventions implemented by completed and active projects to address them

Key Conditions and Common Activities to Address Them	COMPLETED GEF-6 AND -7 PROJECTS (n=37)	ACTIVE GEF-8 PROJECTS (n=21)
Needs		
Sustainable livelihoods	11%	29%
Motivations		
Policy and regulatory frameworks	49%	38%
Awareness-raising	35%	36%
Barriers		
Skills-building	54%	62%
Institutional capacity-building	24%	43%
Financial mechanisms	32%	29%
Knowledge-sharing	24%	38%
Technical assistance	27%	38%

⁸ **NEEDS:** Basic conditions that need to be addressed—such as livelihood, land tenure rights, health, self-governance—before stakeholders can allocate psychosocial and material resources to care about environmental concerns. **MOTIVATIONS:** Conditions that can nudge people to change their behavior based on the benefits of changing and the costs of not changing. Examples of benefits are cash incentives, tax breaks, social recognition, peer acceptance and additional income; costs may be in the form of penalties, fines, taxes and social shame; **BARRIERS:** Conditions that, despite their desire to do so, prevent stakeholders from changing their behavior over the long term due to a lack of means, capacity and/or opportunity. Barriers may be related to skills, logistical support, financial costs, complexity of required actions, time demands, cultural acceptability, institutional silos, etc.

ANNEX 5: LIST OF PROJECTS WITH YET TO BE SUBMITTED TERMINAL EVALUATION

Projects without a Terminal Evaluation submitted to the GEF Portal

Lead Implementing Agency	GEF ID	Project Title	GEF Phase	Project Type
ADB	4536	Climate Resilient Coastal Protection and Management	GEF - 5	FSP
	4621	Hebei Energy Efficiency Improvement and Emission Reduction Project	GEF - 5	FSP
	4633	Shaanxi Weinan Luyang Integrated Saline and Alkaline Land Management	GEF - 5	FSP
	4652	GMS Forest and Biodiversity Program (GMS-FBP) - Creating Transboundary Links Through a Regional Support	GEF - 5	MSP
	5005	Integrating Biodiversity Conservation, Climate Resilience and Sustainable Forest Management in Trung Truong Son Landscapes	GEF - 5	FSP
	5171	CTI: Coral Reef Rehabilitation and Management Program-Coral Triangle Initiative, Phase III (COREMAP-CTI III)	GEF - 5	FSP
	5582	ASTUD: Jiangxi Ji'an Sustainable Urban Transport Project	GEF - 5	FSP
	9067	Renewable Energy Sector Project	GEF - 6	FSP
	9355	Outer Island Renewable Energy Project	GEF - 6	FSP
	9512	Climate Resilience in the Outer Islands of Tuvalu	GEF - 5	MSP
AfDB	4904	Pilot African Climate Technology Finance Center and Network	GEF - 5	FSP
	5504	Reducing Rural and Urban Vulnerability to Climate Change by the Provision of Water Supply	GEF - 5	FSP
	6974	Improving Mobility in Parakou	GEF - 6	MSP
	9116	Promoting Access to Renewable Energy and Development of IT Tools for Rural Communities of Cameroon	GEF - 6	MSP
	9130	Cities-IAP: Abidjan Integrated Sustainable Urban Planning and Management	GEF - 6	FSP
CAF	10035	Preparing the Ground for the Implementation of the La Plata Basin Strategic Action Program	GEF - 6	MSP
EBRD	4422	Increasing Climate Resilience through Drinking Water Rehabilitation in North Tajikistan	GEF - 5	FSP
	5833	Global Energy Efficiency Facility (GE2F2) - Design of Strategies and Deployment Mechanisms	GEF - 5	MSP
	6942	Finance and Technology Transfer Centre for Climate Change (FINTECC)	GEF - 6	FSP
FAO	4641	Disposal of POPs and Obsolete Pesticides and Strengthening Sound Pesticide Management	GEF - 5	FSP
	9928	Sustainable Management of Kharga Oasis Agro-Ecosystems in the Egyptian Western Desert	GEF - 6	MSP

Lead Implementing Agency	GEF ID	Project Title	GEF Phase	Project Type
IFAD	4453	Adaptation of Small-scale Agriculture (LASAP)	GEF - 5	FSP
	4657	Competitiveness and Sustainable Rural Development Project in the South Western Border Corridor (PROLENCA-GEF)	GEF - 5	FSP
	5376	Enhancing the Resilience of the Agricultural Ecosystems	GEF - 5	FSP
	5764	Sustainable Management of Peatland Ecosystems in Indonesia (SMPEI)	GEF - 5	FSP
	9103	Building Adaptive Capacity through the Scaling-up of Renewable Energy Technologies in Rural Cambodia (S-RET)	GEF - 6	FSP
	9139	Food-IAP: Establishment of the Upper Tana Nairobi Water Fund (UTNWF)	GEF - 6	FSP
	9141	GEF-IAP: Participatory Natural Resource Management and Rural Development Project in the North, Centre-North and East Regions (Near Tamba project)	GEF - 6	FSP
UNDP	4974	Enhancing Adaptive Capacity and Resilience to Climate Change in the Agriculture Sector in Comoros	GEF - 5	FSP
	5615	Building Capacity for LDCs to Participate Effectively in Intergovernmental Climate Change Processes	GEF - 5	FSP
	5701	Reducing Environmental and Health Risks to Vulnerable Communities from Lead Contamination from Lead Paint and Recycling of Used Lead Acid Batteries	GEF - 5	MSP
UNEP	4452	Standardized Methodologies for Carbon Accounting and Ecosystem Services Valuation of Blue Forests	GEF - 5	FSP
	4523	Support to Preparation of the Second National Biosafety Reports to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety-Africa	GEF - 5	MSP
	4524	Support to Preparation of the Second National Biosafety Reports to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety-North Africa (NA), Asia (A), Central and Eastern Europe (CEE)	GEF - 5	MSP
	4525	Support to Preparation of the Second National Biosafety Reports to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety: Latin America, Caribbean and Pacific Regions	GEF - 5	MSP
	4829	Support to GEF Eligible Parties for Alignment of National Action Programs and Reporting Process under UNCCD	GEF - 5	FSP
	4881	Continuing Regional Support for the POPs Global Monitoring Plan under the Stockholm Convention in the Latin American and Caribbean Region	GEF - 5	FSP
	5136	Support to 20 GEF Eligible Parties for Alignment of National Action Programs and Reporting Process under UNCCD (Add-on Umbrella 2)	GEF - 5	MSP
	5287	Solar Water Heater Market Development and Energy Efficiency Project	GEF - 5	MSP

Lead Implementing Agency	GEF ID	Project Title	GEF Phase	Project Type
	5299	Delivering the Transition to Energy Efficient Lighting	GEF - 5	FSP
	5356	Global Forest Watch 2.0 FW 2.0	GEF - 5	FSP
	5367	PCB Reduction in Cameroon Through The Use Of Local Expertise And The Development Of National Capacities	GEF - 5	FSP
	5390	Sustainable Pathways - Protected Areas and Renewable Energy	GEF - 5	FSP
	5400	Targeted Research for Improving Understanding of the Global Nitrogen Cycle towards the Establishment of an International Nutrient Management System INMS	GEF - 5	FSP
	5403	Conservation and Sustainable Use of Agricultural Biodiversity to Improve Regulating and Supporting Ecosystem Services in Agriculture Production	GEF - 5	MSP
	5483	Enhancing Livelihoods in Rural Communities through Mainstreaming and Strengthening Agricultural Biodiversity Conservation and Utilization	GEF - 5	MSP
	5523	Building climate Resilience through Innovative Financing Mechanisms for Climate Change Adaptation	GEF - 5	FSP
	5541	Global Support Programme: Increasing the Quantity and Improving the Quality of Information for the Review of Implementation of the UNCCD Implementation	GEF - 5	MSP
	5634	Ratification and Implementation of the Nagoya Protocol in the Countries of the Pacific Region	GEF - 5	MSP
	5639	Stocktaking and Update of National Biosafety Framework of Mauritania	GEF - 5	MSP
	5681	Building Climate Resilience of Urban Systems through Ecosystem-based Adaptation (EbA) in Latin America and the Caribbean.	GEF - 5	FSP
	5691	Sustainable Land Management of Lake Nyasa Catchment in Tanzania	GEF - 5	MSP
	5694	Building Climate Resilience through Rehabilitated Watersheds, Forests and Adaptive Livelihoods	GEF - 5	FSP
	5703	Enhancing the Resilience of Communities Living in Climate Change Vulnerable Areas of Sudan Using Ecosystem Based Approaches to Adaptation (EbA)	GEF - 5	FSP
	5730	Mainstreaming Biodiversity Information into the Heart of Government Decision Making	GEF - 5	FSP
	5744	Strengthening Access and Benefit Sharing (ABS)	GEF - 5	MSP
	5775	Building the Foundation for Forest Landscape Restoration at Scale	GEF - 5	MSP
	5799	Delivering the Transition to Energy Efficient Lighting in Residential, Commercial, Industrial, and Outdoor Sectors	GEF - 5	MSP

Lead Implementing Agency	GEF ID	Project Title	GEF Phase	Project Type
	5806	Creation of Loungo Bay Marine Protected Area to Support Turtles Conservation in Congo	GEF - 5	MSP
	5811	Closing the Gaps in Great Green Wall: Linking Sectors and Stakeholders for Increased Synergy and Scaling-up	GEF - 5	MSP
	5821	Engaging Policy Makers and the Judiciary to Address Poaching and Illegal Wildlife Trade in Africa	GEF - 5	MSP
	5825	Applying Landscape and Sustainable Land Management (L-SLM) for Mitigating Land Degradation and Contributing to Poverty Reduction in Rural Areas	GEF - 5	MSP
	5898	Support to 16 GEF Eligible Parties for Alignment of National Action Programs and Reporting Process under UNCCD	GEF - 5	MSP
	6990	Achieving Biodiversity Conservation through Creation, Effective Management and Spatial Designation of Protected Areas and Capacity Building	GEF - 6	MSP
	8004	Preparation of Intended Nationally Determined Contribution (INDC) to the 2015 Agreement under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC)	GEF - 6	MSP
	8024	Preparation of Intended Nationally Determined Contribution (INDC) to the 2015 Agreement under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC)	GEF - 6	MSP
	9087	Preparation of Intended Nationally Determined Contribution (INDC) to the 2015 Agreement under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC)	GEF - 6	MSP
	9118	Support to Preparation of the Third National Biosafety Reports to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety - AFRICA REGION	GEF - 6	MSP
	9119	Support to Preparation of the Third National Biosafety Reports to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety - GRULAC and CEE REGIONS	GEF - 6	MSP
	9120	Support to Preparation of the Third National Biosafety Reports to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety - Asia Pacific Region	GEF - 6	MSP
	9337	Global Project to Leapfrog Markets to Energy Efficient Lighting, Appliances and Equipment	GEF - 6	FSP
	9681	Addressing Marine Plastics - A Systemic Approach	GEF - 6	MSP
	9719	Piloting Innovative Investments for Sustainable Landscapes	GEF - 6	MSP
	9730	Generating Economic and Environmental Benefits from Sustainable Land Management for Vulnerable Rural Communities of Georgia	GEF - 6	MSP
	9738	GLOBE Legislators Advancing REDD+ and Natural Capital Governance Towards the Delivery of the 2030 Agenda	GEF - 6	MSP

Lead Implementing Agency	GEF ID	Project Title	GEF Phase	Project Type
	9762	Promoting Protected Areas Management through Integrated Marine and Coastal Ecosystems Protection in Coastal Area of Montenegro	GEF - 6	MSP
	9822	Support to Eligible Parties to Produce the Sixth National Report to the CBD (Europe, CIS and Mongolia)	GEF - 6	MSP
	9823	Support to Eligible Parties to Produce the Sixth National Report to the CBD (Pacific)	GEF - 6	MSP
	9824	Support to Eligible Parties to Produce the Sixth National Report to the CBD (Africa-2)	GEF - 6	MSP
	9832	Support to Eligible Parties to Produce the Sixth National Report to the CBD – (Global: Africa-3, Maldives, Nicaragua, Pakistan and Solomon Islands)	GEF - 6	MSP
	9866	Support to Preparation of the Interim National Report on the Implementation of the Nagoya Protocol	GEF - 6	MSP
	9882	Enhancing Legislative, Policy, and Criminal Justice Frameworks for Combating Poaching and Illegal Wildlife Trade in Africa	GEF - 6	MSP
	10050	Upscaling of Global Forest Watch in Caucasus Region	GEF - 6	MSP
UNIDO	5421	Reduction of GHG Emission through Promotion of Commercial Biogas Plants	GEF - 5	MSP
	5795	Promoting Energy Efficient Cook Stoves in Micro and Small-scale Food Processing Industries	GEF - 5	MSP
	9056	Promotion of Small Hydro Power (SHP) for Productive Use and Energy Services	GEF - 6	MSP
	9373	Guidance Development and Case Study Documentation of Green Chemistry and Technologies	GEF - 6	MSP
	9485	Programme for Cleantech Innovation and Green Jobs in Morocco	GEF - 6	MSP
World Bank	4579	Sustainable Financing for Biodiversity Conservation and Natural Resources Management	GEF - 5	FSP
	4626	Geothermal Power Generation Program	GEF - 5	FSP
	4630	Agriculture Competitiveness	GEF - 5	FSP
	4709	GGW: Integrated Disaster and Land Management (IDLMP) Project	GEF - 5	FSP
	5452	Guangdong Agricultural Pollution Control	GEF - 5	FSP
	5619	GGW Sudan Sustainable Natural Resources Management Project SSNRMP	GEF - 5	FSP
	5650	Promotion of Clean and Green Cities in China Through International Cooperation	GEF - 5	MSP
	9211	Coordinate Action and Learning to Combat Wildlife Crime	GEF - 6	FSP

Lead Implementing Agency	GEF ID	Project Title	GEF Phase	Project Type
	9575	Sudan Sustainable Natural Resources Management Project- Additional Financing	GEF - 6	FSP
	9666	Urban Networking to Complement and Extend the Reach of the Sustainable Cities IAP	GEF - 6	MSP

Source: GEF IEO based on GEF-5 and GEF-6 closed projects as of December 31, 2023.