

24th LDCF/SCCF Council Meeting  
June 26, 2018  
Da Nang, Viet Nam

Agenda Item 08

## **LDCF/SCCF ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT 2017**

(Prepared by the Independent Evaluation Office of the GEF)

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>Executive Summary</b> .....	<b>iii</b>
<b>Background</b> .....	<b>1</b>
<b>Assessment of Terminal Evaluations</b> .....	<b>1</b>
Outcomes and Sustainability.....	2
Quality of Project Monitoring and Evaluation .....	7
<b>Innovative Approaches</b> .....	<b>10</b>
<b>Gender Considerations</b> .....	<b>11</b>
<b>Synthesis of Lessons Learned from Completed Projects</b> .....	<b>15</b>
Project Design and Management.....	15
Climate Change Adaptation .....	16
Monitoring and Evaluation.....	17
Communication and Stakeholder Involvement .....	18
Learning.....	18
Content-technical.....	19
<b>Management Action Record</b> .....	<b>19</b>
<b>Annex A: Terminal Evaluation Report Review Guidelines</b> .....	<b>23</b>
<b>Annex B: NAPA Implementation Projects Alignment Rating</b> .....	<b>28</b>
<b>Annex C: Gender Rating</b> .....	<b>27</b>

## TABLES

Table 1: Outcome, Sustainability and M&E Ratings of Completed LDCF and SCCF Projects Part of the AER 2017 Cohort.....	3
Table 2: Gender Rating at Project Entry and Completion .....	12

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1. The LDCF/SCCF Annual Evaluation Report (AER), prepared by the Independent Evaluation Office (IEO) of the GEF, analyzes outcome, sustainability and M&E ratings. It also assesses innovative approaches, gender consideration and lessons learned. This fifth Annual Evaluation Report covers 19 completed projects, having a combined value of \$249.54 million, with the UNDP being the lead agency for most projects.
2. Seven national projects, mostly LDCF, focused on climate risks and resilience of vulnerable coastal areas, with the Bangladesh project having an afforestation emphasis. Several of these projects concentrated on capacity development (Bangladesh, Djibouti, Tuvalu, Guinea, and Haiti) and demonstrations and pilots (Mexico, Tuvalu, Guinea, Haiti and Cambodia). Three projects in Ethiopia, Mali and Morocco, two LDCF and one SCCF, focused on agriculture and farmers' adaptive capacity towards climate change. Two projects, in the Comoros and Swaziland, focused on adaptive capacities to address climate change risks in watersheds and water resources management. The projects in Vietnam and Azerbaijan tackled climate change risk in mountainous landscapes. The remaining national projects focused on a range of climate risks and resilience themes, being climate change health impacts, wildfire hazards, tourism, and extreme weather early warning systems. One global project focused on transfer of relevant adaptation technology.
3. Roughly 70 percent of completed projects had outcome ratings in the satisfactory range. These projects shared the following commonalities; they had objectives that were relevant to the GEF, achieved their overarching objective and delivered on most planned outcome areas within budget and within the projected timeframe. In the case of the LDCF projects, they were explicit actions derived from the countries' NAPAs and targeting specific climate threats or vulnerabilities as identified in the NAPAs. Two projects rated highly satisfactory were in addition highly aligned with country priorities, effective and efficient in reaching project results, applied an adaptive management approach and had a strong and inclusive project partnership structure. Six projects were rated moderately unsatisfactory. Slow recruitment, high turnover and capacity constraints of project staff, the absence or slow negotiation of memorandums of understanding and partnership agreements, and knock-on effects of delays in one activity on subsequent project activities, are commonalities of projects rated moderately unsatisfactory.
4. In terms of the sustainability of outcomes, roughly 60 percent of completed projects received ratings in the likely range. A lack of robust planning for sustainability, uncertainty regarding future funding, and the absence of support programs or formalized structures for the maintenance of infrastructure developed as part of the pilots, are all factors that might negatively impact the likelihood of sustainability. A lack of ownership, a lack of supporting policy changes, political uncertainty, and—again—a lack of funding beyond the project's timeline, are all factors linked to sustainability ratings in the unlikely range.
5. The results on outcome ratings for this year's cohort of projects are lower than the outcome ratings for projects reviewed as part of the AER 2016 and AER 2015. The ratings of the AER 2016 and AER 2015 were combined to get to a size-wise comparable grouping of 16 projects. Of these 16 projects 14 received an outcome rating in the satisfactory range. Looking

at the 2015 and 2016 cohorts' sustainability ratings, 11 projects received ratings in the likely range, four projects were rated moderately unlikely on sustainability, while one project was not rated for sustainability.

6. Over 60 percent of projects received 'M&E design at entry' ratings in the satisfactory range. Projects rated satisfactory followed established Agency and GEF procedures in line with the project size, including a M&E plan, time frame with M&E milestones, and an explicit and adequate budget for M&E tasks. Project results frameworks were included, but there was room for improvement when it comes to the indicators in these results frameworks. Projects rated in the unsatisfactory range reported a range of issues, but many of these issues related to the selection and quality of indicators.

7. Almost all projects that were rated in the satisfactory range for 'M&E design at entry' were equally rated in the satisfactory range for the 'M&E plan implementation' element. M&E systems were in place and allowed the timely tracking of results and progress toward project objectives, and most of the projects made effective use of the findings of their mid-term review and applied adaptive management approaches. Projects rated in the unsatisfactory range shared the following commonalities; difficulties in operationalizing key indicators, focus on monitoring and reporting of outputs but limited attention to monitoring and reporting of progress, and on indicators at the outcome and impact levels. Their TE's also indicated that data collection could have been more systematic.

8. The 'M&E design at entry' and 'M&E plan implementation' ratings for this year's cohort are comparable to the ratings for projects reviewed as part of the AER 2016 and AER 2015.

9. Most projects assessed contain innovative elements, for example the introduction of drought and stress-resistant crops, the use of consultative community committees, and the application of slow filtration in the community water supply schemes.

10. The focus of the gender assessment was on three gender considerations: (i) gender disaggregation of output and outcome indicator data, (ii) explicit gender considerations in the description of the project activities, and (iii) the existence of an overarching women inclusion, empowerment and/or gender mainstreaming strategy or approach. These three considerations translated into a gender rating. Seven projects had a similar gender rating at entry and upon completion, while equally six projects improved and six projects worsened their gender rating from entry to completion. None of the projects were rated gender-mainstreamed although there was a slight overall improvement with less projects being rated gender blind upon completion.

11. Most lessons learned do not relate to earlier identified innovations, but often relate to standard good practice elements in project management, communication, stakeholder involvement, M&E and knowledge management. A summary of lessons learned is provided below:

- (a) The complexity of institutional project arrangements should be informed by a project's contextual factors and financial size, and take into account in-country capacities.
- (b) Climate change adaptation efforts should be contextually informed. Finding an appropriate mix of bottom-up vs. policy-level and short-term vs long-term benefits is seen as effective.
- (c) Monitoring and evaluation should start with a thorough baseline assessment, should be well budgeted, and used as part of essential management tools.
- (d) Longer-term evaluation is advised if a project's maximum impact is expected beyond the project's time horizon.
- (e) Beneficiaries might not always be clear on a project's boundaries. Complementarities between projects should be clearly communicated.
- (f) Using participatory approaches and a large project steering committee could ensure project ownership and wider collaboration.
- (g) Larger projects would benefit from a dedicated communication specialist.
- (h) Well planned study tours and participation in forums aids capacity building.
- (i) Community water supply schemes need formalized and paid management structures if they grow to a certain size.
- (j) Reforestation efforts should be built upon a thorough analysis of deforestation factors.

12. The AER ends with a summary of the GEF Management Action Record tracking of the level of adoption of two LDCF/SCCF Council decisions: June 2016 decision on recommendations of the Program Evaluation of the LDCF; and May 2017 decision on recommendations of the Program Evaluation of the SCCF. The progress of adoption of both decisions is rated 'medium' and the IEO will continue to track the adoption of both decisions.

## **BACKGROUND**

1. **Highlight:** The LDCF/SCCF Annual Evaluation Report analyzes outcome, sustainability and M&E ratings. It also assesses innovative approaches, gender consideration and lessons learned.
2. The Least Developed Countries Fund/Special Climate Change Fund (LDCF/SCCF) Annual Evaluation Report (AER) 2017—prepared by the Independent Evaluation Office (IEO) of the GEF—presents an assessment of project outcomes and sustainability, and quality of project monitoring and evaluation and innovative approaches. The assessment is based on an analysis of the ratings and information provided in TEs that have been received in the calendar year 2017, and are first reviewed by the IEO and/or the evaluation offices of GEF Agencies. See annex A for details on the Terminal Evaluation Report review guidelines.
3. A review of innovative approaches used in the projects took place. Projects and approaches are regarded as innovative if they are deliberately applied to tackle an issue, and these approaches (a) have not been used before in the project area, and/or (b) have not been used before to tackle this specific issue. An innovative approach needs to be (c) widely replicable, and this should be possible (d) at low economic cost.
4. Gender considerations and a synthesis of lessons learned from the 2017 cohort of completed projects is also part of this year's AER. The focus of the gender assessment was on: (a) gender disaggregation of indicator data, (b) explicit gender considerations in the description of the project activities, and (c) the existence of an overarching women inclusion, empowerment and/or gender mainstreaming strategy or approach. This assessment formed the basis for project gender ratings at entry and after project completion.

## **ASSESSMENT OF TERMINAL EVALUATIONS**

5. **Highlight:** This fifth Annual Evaluation Report covers 19 completed projects, having a combined value of \$249.54 million, with the UNDP being the lead agency for most projects.
6. This is the fifth year that completed LDCF/SCCF projects are reported on in the IEO Terminal Evaluation dataset, used for the Annual Performance Reports (APRs) to the GEF Council and the LDCF/SCCF Annual Evaluation Reports (AERs) to the LDCF/SCCF Council. In the APR 2017 cohort of TEs there are 11 completed projects that received funding from the LDCF and eight completed projects that received funding from the SCCF. These projects account for \$33.81 million in LDCF funding \$30.05 million in SCCF funding and \$249.54 million and \$293.68 million in co-funding respectively. Geographically, one project is global, 11 are from the African region, five are from the Asia and Pacific region, two are from the Latin America and Caribbean region, and one project is from the Europe and Central Asia region. The United Nations Development Programme was the lead agency for 13 projects, the United Nations Environment Programme for three, the World Bank led two projects, and one project was led by the Asian Development Bank. Most of the projects (17) are full-size while two are medium-size.

## Outcomes and Sustainability

7. The highlights of this section are:
  - (a) Projects focus on climate risks and resilience of vulnerable coastal areas, watershed areas, mountainous landscapes, and agriculture and farmers' adaptive capacity.
  - (b) About 70 percent of projects had outcome ratings in the satisfactory range, and the remaining six projects were all rated moderately unsatisfactory.
  - (c) All LDCF projects were aligned with their NAPA report's country priorities.
  - (d) Roughly 60 percent of completed projects received sustainability ratings in the likely range.
8. Table 1 provides summary information and ratings for the AER 2017 cohort of 19 completed LDCF/SCCF projects. Given the small number of completed projects to date, these projects are not representative of the full range of objectives and approaches of the two funds.
9. Almost half of the 18 national projects focused on climate risks and resilience of vulnerable coastal areas. These projects include Adaptation to Climate Change Impacts on the Coastal Wetlands in Mexico (GEF ID 3159), Community-Based Adaptation to Climate Change through Coastal Afforestation in Bangladesh (GEF ID 3287), Implementing NAPA (National Adaptation Programme of Action Priority Interventions to Build Resilience in the most Vulnerable Coastal Zones in Djibouti (GEF ID 3408), Increasing Resilience of Coastal Areas and Community Settlements to Climate Change in Tuvalu (GEF ID 3694), Increased Resilience and Adaptation to Adverse Impacts of Climate Change in Guinea's Vulnerable Coastal Zones in Guinea (GEF ID 3703), Strengthening Adaptive Capacities to Address Climate Change Threats on Sustainable Development Strategies for Coastal Communities in Haiti (GEF ID 3733), and Vulnerability Assessment and Adaptation Programme for Climate Change in the Coastal Zone of Cambodia Considering Livelihood Improvement and Ecosystems (GEF ID 3890). Several of these projects concentrated on capacity development (Bangladesh, Djibouti, Tuvalu, Guinea, and Haiti) and demonstrations and pilots (Mexico, Tuvalu, Guinea, Haiti and Cambodia).
10. Three projects focused on agriculture and farmers' adaptive capacity towards climate change. The objective of the project in Mali, Enhancing Adaptive Capacity and Resilience to Climate Change in the Agriculture Sector (GEF ID 3776) was to enhance adaptive capacities of vulnerable rural populations to the additional risks posed by climate change on agricultural production and food security. Integrating Climate Change in the Implementation of the Plan Maroc Vert Project in Morocco (GEF ID 3967) aimed to strengthen the capacity of public and private institutions and of farmers for integrating climate change adaptations in projects directed to small farmers. The project Promoting Autonomous Adaptation at the community level in Ethiopia (GEF ID 4222) focused on supporting local communities and administrations at the lowest level of government to design and implement adaptation actions aimed at reducing vulnerability and building resilience, especially in those communities that are particularly vulnerable.

**Table 1: Outcome, Sustainability and M&E Ratings of Completed LDCF and SCCF Projects Part of the AER 2017 Cohort**

GEF ID	Fund	Agency	Project title	Country	LDCF/SCCF Grant (M\$) <sup>1</sup>	Outcome rating <sup>2</sup>	Sustainability rating <sup>3</sup>	M&E design at entry rating <sup>2</sup>	M&E plan implementation rating <sup>2</sup>
3103	SCCF	ADB/ UNDP	Climate-resilient Infrastructure in Northern Mountain Province of Vietnam	Vietnam	3.40	MU	ML	MU	MU
3159	SCCF	World Bank	Adaptation to Climate Change Impacts on the Coastal Wetlands	Mexico	4.50	MS	ML	MU	MU
3218	SCCF	UNDP	Integrating Climate Change into the Management of Priority Health Risks	Ghana	1.72	MU	ML	U	MU
3287	LDCF	UNDP	Community-Based Adaptation to Climate Change through Coastal Afforestation	Bangladesh	3.30	HS	L	S	HS
3408	LDCF	UNEP	Implementing NAPA Priority Interventions to Build Resilience in the most Vulnerable Coastal Zones in Djibouti	Djibouti	2.07	MU	U	MS	MS
3694	LDCF	UNDP	Increasing Resilience of Coastal Areas and Community Settlements to Climate Change	Tuvalu	3.30	MU	MU	MU	MU
3703	LDCF	UNDP	Increased Resilience and Adaptation to Adverse Impacts of Climate Change in Guinea's Vulnerable Coastal Zones	Guinea	2.97	MU	MU	MU	MU
3733	LDCF	UNDP	Strengthening Adaptive Capacities to Address Climate Change Threats on Sustainable	Haiti	3.50	S	MU	S	MS

<sup>1</sup> Amount excludes PPG grant and agency fees.

<sup>2</sup> GEF/EF Agency six-point rating scale: Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S), Moderately Satisfactory (MS), Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U), and Highly Unsatisfactory (HU).

<sup>3</sup> GEF/GEF Agency four-point scale: Likely (L), Moderately Likely (ML), Moderately Unlikely (MU), and Unlikely (U). Alternatively, the rating might be Not Rated (NR).

GEF ID	Fund	Agency	Project title	Country	LDCF/SCCF Grant (M\$) <sup>1</sup>	Outcome rating <sup>2</sup>	Sustainability rating <sup>3</sup>	M&E design at entry rating <sup>2</sup>	M&E plan implementation rating <sup>2</sup>
			Development Strategies for Coastal Communities in Haiti						
3776	LDCF	UNDP	Enhancing Adaptive Capacity and Resilience to Climate Change in the Agriculture Sector in Mali	Mali	2.34	S	ML	MS	MS
3857	LDCF	UNDP/ UNEP	Adapting Water Resource Management in Comoros to Increase Capacity to Cope with Climate Change	Comoros	3.74	MS	ML	U	U
3890	LDCF	UNEP	Vulnerability Assessment and Adaptation Programme for Climate Change in the Coastal Zone of Cambodia Considering Livelihood Improvement and Ecosystems	Cambodia	1.64	S	MU	S	S
3907	SCCF	UNEP	Technology Needs Assessments	Global	8.18	S	L	S	S
3934	SCCF	UNDP	Reducing Disaster Risks from Wildfire Hazards Associated with Climate Change	South Africa	3.54	MS	ML	S	MS
3967	SCCF	World Bank	Integrating Climate Change in the Implementation of the Plan Maroc Vert Project	Morocco	4.35	MS	MU	MU	MU
4222	LDCF	UNDP	Promoting Autonomous Adaptation at the community level in Ethiopia	Ethiopia	5.31	HS	ML	S	S
4255	SCCF	UNDP	Adapting National and Transboundary Water Resources Management to Manage the Expected Climate Change	Swaziland	1.67	S	ML	S	S
4261	SCCF	UNDP	Integrating climate change risks into water and flood management by vulnerable	Azerbaijan	2.70	MU	MU	MS	MS

GEF ID	Fund	Agency	Project title	Country	LDCF/SCCF Grant (M\$) <sup>1</sup>	Outcome rating <sup>2</sup>	Sustainability rating <sup>3</sup>	M&E design at entry rating <sup>2</sup>	M&E plan implementation rating <sup>2</sup>
			mountainous communities in the Greater Caucasus region of Azerbaijan						
4431	LDCF	UNDP	Increasing Climate Change Resilience of Maldives through Adaptation in the Tourism Sector	Maldives	1.65	MS	MU	S	MU
5002	LDCF	UNDP	Strengthening Climate Information and Early Warning Systems in Western and Central Africa for Climate Resilient Development and Adaptation to Climate Change	Benin	4.00	MS	ML	S	S

11. Two projects focused on adaptive capacities to address climate change risks in watershed and water resources management: Adapting Water Resource Management in Comoros to Increase Capacity to Cope with Climate Change in Comoros (GEF ID 3857) and Adapting National and Transboundary Water Resources Management to Manage the Expected Climate Change in Swaziland (GEF ID 4255). The Comoros project aimed to reduce the risk of climate change on lives and livelihoods from impacts on water resources, while the project in Swaziland concentrated on integrating climate change risks into national policies, national programs and transboundary water negotiations.

12. The projects in Vietnam and Azerbaijan tackled climate change risk in mountainous landscapes. In Vietnam the Climate-resilient Infrastructure in Northern Mountain Province project (GEF ID 3103) focused on increasing the resilience and reducing vulnerability of local, critical economic infrastructure to the adverse impacts of climate change. The Integrating Climate Change Risks into Water and Flood Management by Vulnerable Mountainous Communities in the Greater Caucasus Region of Azerbaijan project (GEF ID 4261) aimed to strengthen technical capacities and demonstrations in water and flood management practices.

13. The remaining national projects focused on a range of climate risks and resilience themes. The objective of the project in Ghana, Integrating Climate Change into the Management of Priority Health Risks project (GEF ID 3218), was to identify, implement, monitor, and evaluate adaptations to reduce current and likely future burdens of malaria, diarrheal diseases, and meningococcal meningitis. The Reducing Disaster Risks from Wildfire Hazards Associated with Climate Change project in South Africa (GEF ID 3934) aimed to develop and implement integrated disaster risk management strategies to address climate change-induced fire hazards and risks. The project Increasing Climate Change Resilience of Maldives through Adaptation in the Tourism Sector (GEF ID 4431) focused on increasing adaptive capacity of the tourism sector to respond to the impacts of climate change and invest in appropriate, no regrets adaptation measures. The project Strengthening Climate Information and Early Warning Systems in Western and Central Africa for Climate Resilient Development and Adaptation to Climate Change in Benin (GEF ID 5002) aimed to strengthen the weather, climate and hydrological monitoring capabilities, early warning systems and available information for responding to extreme weather and planning adaptation to climate change.

14. One of the 19 projects in the AER 2017 cohort is a global project, Technology Needs Assessments (GFE ID 3907), that focused on transfer of relevant adaptation technology. It concentrated on assisting countries to go beyond narrowly identifying technology needs and to develop national technology action plans for prioritized technologies that reduce greenhouse gas emissions, support adaptation to climate change, and are consistent with national development objectives.

#### Outcome ratings

15. Thirteen of the completed projects had outcome ratings in the satisfactory range. Two projects, the Coastal Forestation project in Bangladesh (GEF ID 3287) and the Ethiopian Autonomous Adaptation project in (GEF ID 4222), were rated highly satisfactory. Both projects were highly in line with country priorities, effective and efficient in reaching project results,

applied an adaptive management approach, and had a strong and inclusive project partnership structure. Five projects had satisfactory outcomes including the global project, Technology Needs Assessments (GEF ID 3907), and national projects Development Strategies for Coastal Communities in Haiti (GEF ID 3733), Resilience in the Agriculture Sector in Mali (GEF ID 3776), Vulnerability Assessment in the Coastal Zone of Cambodia (GEF ID 3890), and Water Resources Management in Swaziland (GEF ID 4255).

16. The remaining six projects in the satisfactory range were rated moderately satisfactory for outcomes including Coastal Wetlands in Mexico (GEF ID 3159), Adapting Water Resource Management in Comoros (GEF ID 3857), Disaster Risks from Wildfire Hazards in South Africa (GEF ID 3934), the Moroccan Implementation of the Plan Maroc Vert in (GEF ID 3967), Tourism Sector project in Maldives (GEF ID 4431), and Early Warning Systems in Benin (GEF ID 5002). Projects rated in the satisfactory range shared the following commonalities; they had objectives that were relevant to the GEF, achieved their overarching objective and delivered on the majority of planned outcome areas within budget and within the projected timeframe. In the case of the LDCF projects, they were explicit actions derived from the countries' NAPAs and targeting specific climate threats or vulnerabilities as identified in the NAPAs.

17. Six projects had outcome ratings in the unsatisfactory range, all rated moderately unsatisfactory. Climate Resilient Infrastructure in Vietnam (GEF ID 3103), Health Risks in Ghana (GEF ID 3218), Vulnerable Coastal Zones in Djibouti (GEF ID 3408), Resilience of Coastal Areas and Community Settlements in Tuvalu (GEF ID 3694), Resilience and Adaptation of Vulnerable Coastal Zones in Guinea (GEF ID 3703), and Water and Flood Management in Azerbaijan (GEF ID 4261). In the case of the Vietnam project (GEF ID 3103), the rating was due to significant delays that led to added cost, and the dual management system for the separate UNDP and ADB components imposed some inefficiencies. Similarly, the Ghana project (GEF ID 3218) coped with significant delays in project execution, due to difficulties in developing a functioning governance structure and a lack of clear roles and responsibilities hampering operational cooperation between project partners. Slow recruitment, high turnover and capacity constraints of staff, the absence or slow negotiation of memorandums of understanding and partnership agreements, and knock-on effects of delays in one activity on subsequent project activities, are commonalities of projects rated in the unsatisfactory range.

18. For the LDCF Program Evaluation 2016, the evaluation team assessed the alignment of NAPA implementation projects with their NAPA country priorities.<sup>4</sup> Ten of the 11 national LDCF projects that are part of the AER 2017 cohort all received an alignment rating of very high, which means that the implementation projects' outcome areas all address primary priority areas that are listed or outlined in their respective NAPA country reports. Primary priority areas addressed are agriculture, climate information systems, disaster risk management, coastal zone management, natural resource management and fragile ecosystems, infrastructural development, human health, climate education. The Maldives Tourism project (GEF ID 4431) received a high rating, meaning that the project does not address primary priority areas as listed or outlined in the country NAPA report, but it addresses other priorities that are outlined

---

<sup>4</sup> For details on the procedure for the NAPA implementation projects alignment rating, please see annex B.

in the country NAPA report. None of the projects were rated in the low range for NAPA alignment.

### Sustainability ratings

19. In terms of the sustainability of outcomes, 11 of the 19 completed projects received ratings in the likely range. Only two projects, Coastal Forestation in Bangladesh (GEF ID 3287) and the global Technology Needs Assessments (GEF ID 3907), were rated likely to be sustainable. For the Bangladesh project, sustainability is likely in most project sites and the acquired know-how and individual capacities, together with the enabling policy framework contributes to the sustainability of project benefits. The main risk to short term sustainability would be the occurrence of severe cyclones and associated floods within the next five years. According to the TE for the global project, the sustainability of its outcomes depends on processes beyond the scope of the project's influence, such as new international agreements and financing that are helping to move forward the agenda of mitigation of and adaptation to climate change.

20. Nine projects were moderately likely to be sustainable: Climate Resilient Infrastructure in Vietnam (GEF ID 3103), Coastal Wetlands in Mexico (GEF ID 3159), Health Risks in Ghana (GEF ID 3218), Resilience in the Agriculture Sector in Mali (GEF ID 3776), Water Resource Management in Comoros (GEF ID 3857), Wildfire Hazards in South Africa (GEF ID 3934), Ethiopian Autonomous Adaptation project (GEF ID 4222), Water Resources Management in Swaziland (GEF ID 4255), and Early Warning Systems in Benin (GEF ID 5002). The Ethiopia and Mexico projects saw strong community participation, which is expected to contribute to the projects' sustainability. In the case of the Comoros and Ghana projects it is unclear whether there is the willingness and capacity of the government to build on project achievements, and in the case of Mali there is a risk of socio-political instability. A lack of robust planning for sustainability, uncertainty regarding future funding, and the absence of support programmes or formalized structures for the maintenance of infrastructure developed in the pilots, are all factors that might negatively impact the likelihood of sustainability.

21. For the remaining projects, eight received ratings for sustainability of outcomes in the unlikely range. Seven were moderately unlikely to be sustainable, including Resilience of Coastal Areas in Tuvalu (GEF ID 3694), Vulnerable Coastal Zones in Guinea (GEF ID 3703), Coastal Communities in Haiti (GEF ID 3733), Vulnerability Assessment in the Coastal Zone of Cambodia (GEF ID 3890), Implementation of the Plan Maroc Vert in Morocco (GEF ID 3967), Water and Flood Management in Azerbaijan (GEF ID 4261), and the Tourism Sector project in Maldives (GEF ID 4431). In the case of the Guinea project, the biggest risk to sustainability is a lack of ownership, which the TE links to an 'assistantship-based mentality' that, even in the case of successful and profitable activities, prevents people from claiming ownership. The project in Morocco saw a reluctance among farmers to switch from their current crop to almonds and olives, the biggest obstacles being the upfront technology cost and the lengthy time for young trees to produce fruit. The Maldives project was rated moderately unsustainable due to a lack of clear institutional and governance changes—mainly policy changes—that would indicate the probability of governance sustainability. Similarly, political and governance uncertainty resulted in a moderately unsustainable rating for the Haiti project. For the Azerbaijan project there are

no secure budgets or financial mechanisms to carry the outputs into the future. Equally the Cambodia project faces difficulties with respect to financial sustainability; especially at the provincial level there will not be the budget to guarantee the continued financial support needed for maintaining and replicating the interventions.

22. The results on outcome ratings for completed LDCF and SCCF projects are lower than the outcome ratings for the projects reviewed as part of the AER 2016 and AER 2015.<sup>5</sup> The ratings of the AER 2016 and AER 2015 were combined to get to a size-wise comparable grouping of 16 projects. Of these 16 projects, 14 received an outcome rating in the satisfactory range, and two were rated moderately unsatisfactory. Looking at the 2015 and 2016 cohorts' sustainability ratings, 11 projects received ratings in the likely range, four projects received a moderately unlikely rating on sustainability, while one project was not rated for sustainability. Given the small number of completed projects to date, a comparison between sets of AER cohorts is not representative of the full range of objectives and approaches of the two funds.

### **Quality of Project Monitoring and Evaluation**

23. The highlights of this section are:

- (a) Over 60 percent of projects received 'M&E design at entry' ratings in the satisfactory range.
- (b) Almost all projects that were rated in the satisfactory range for 'M&E design at entry' were equally rated in the satisfactory range for the 'M&E plan implementation' element.

24. The quality of monitoring and evaluation in LDCF/SCCF projects is reviewed by rating the M&E design and planning at project start, as well as the implementation of the M&E plan. The latter also looks at adjustments made to the logical results framework during the project's life cycle, and follow-up and management response to mid-term review recommendations. The scoring of both M&E elements is done by means of a six-point rating scale, ranging from highly satisfactory to highly unsatisfactory.

#### **M&E design at entry ratings**

25. Twelve of the 19 projects received 'M&E design at entry' ratings in the satisfactory range. Projects rated satisfactory include the Coastal Forestation project in Bangladesh (GEF ID 3287), Coastal Communities in Haiti (GEF ID 3733), Vulnerability Assessment in the Coastal Zone of Cambodia (GEF ID 3890), Technology Needs Assessments (GEF ID 3907), Wildfire Hazards in South Africa (GEF ID 3934), Ethiopian Autonomous Adaptation project (GEF ID 4222), Water Resources Management in Swaziland (GEF ID 4255), Tourism Sector project in Maldives (GEF ID 4431), and Early Warning Systems in Benin (GEF ID 5002). The remaining three received a moderately satisfactory rating of: Vulnerable Coastal Zones in Djibouti (GEF ID 3408), Agriculture Sector in Mali (GEF ID 3776), and Water and Flood Management in Azerbaijan (GEF

---

<sup>5</sup> IEO, [LDCF/SCCF Annual Evaluation Report 2016](#), May 2017. Council document GEF/LDCF.SCCF.22/ME/01 and IEO, [LDCF/SCCF Annual Evaluation Report 2015](#), May 2016. Council document GEF/LDCF.SCCF.20/ME/01.

ID 4261). Projects rated satisfactory followed established Agency and GEF procedures in line with the project size, including a M&E plan, time frame with M&E milestones, and an explicit and adequate budget for M&E tasks. Project results frameworks were included, but there was room for improvement when it comes to the indicators in these results frameworks. In the case of the Vulnerable Coastal Zones project in Djibouti (GEF ID 3408), the indicators of the project results framework included impact and outcome indicators that would be more suitable as indicators at the output level. The M&E plan could have been more detailed, focusing mainly on general responsibilities and key milestones, which was also a shortcoming of the Mali project's M&E plan. The project results framework of the Mali project was significantly revised, but the revised framework was only applied during the final year of implementation.

26. Seven of the 19 projects were found to have an 'M&E design at entry' in the unsatisfactory range. Five projects were rated moderately unsatisfactory: Climate Resilient Infrastructure in Vietnam (GEF ID 3103), Coastal Wetlands in Mexico (GEF ID 3159), Resilience of Coastal Areas and Community Settlements in Tuvalu (GEF ID 3694), Vulnerable Coastal Zones in Guinea (GEF ID 3703), and Implementation of the Plan Maroc Vert in Morocco (GEF ID 3967). Health Risks in Ghana (GEF ID 3218) and Water Resource Management in Comoros (GEF ID 3857) were rated unsatisfactory. Projects rated unsatisfactory reported a range of issues, many of these issues related to the selection and quality of indicators. The moderately unsatisfactory rating for the Climate Resilient Infrastructure in Vietnam (GEF ID 3103) was due to insufficient clarity in the outcome statements and key assumptions. Although there was an extensive M&E design, the quality of indicators was relatively poor; some of the indicators were not operational or not meaningful. In the case of the Coastal Wetlands project in Mexico (GEF ID 3159) the project's objectives were clearly specified, however, the selected indicators had several weaknesses. Some indicators were overly complex and ambitious, while others tried to measure several things at the same time. For some indicators it was not clear how their outcomes would contribute to the project's objectives. It was also the indicators that deserved improvement in the Implementation of the Plan Maroc Vert project (GEF ID 3967) in Morocco; indicators were mostly at the activity output level, with only two outcome indicators and no impact indicators on the ultimate goals of climate change adaptation.

27. The M&E plan for the Health Risks project in Ghana (GEF ID 3218) was reasonably conceived and budgeted for, but the logical framework presented numerous weaknesses earning it an unsatisfactory rating. The TE notes that among other things, the links between outcomes and outputs and the overall objective are not sufficiently clear, and many of the proposed indicators are not SMART. Also rated unsatisfactory is the Water Resource Management project (GEF ID 3857) in Comoros that had carried out a decent baseline study during inception. However, several of the outcome indicators defined were hard to measure and were dropped. Furthermore, no output indicators were defined.

#### M&E plan implementation ratings

28. Eleven of the 12 projects that were rated in the satisfactory range for 'M&E design at entry' were equally rated in the satisfactory range for the 'M&E plan implementation' element. M&E systems were in place and allowed the timely tracking of results and progress toward project objectives, and most of the projects made effective use of the findings of their mid-term

review and applied adaptive management approaches. The Tourism Sector project in Maldives (GEF ID 4431) was the exception where the design of the M&E plan was satisfactory but the implementation of the plan was moderately unsatisfactory. As the M&E plan was not implemented as designed its function was not fully accomplished. For example, PIRs were not prepared regularly and the mid-term review took place two years later than planned which left little space for adaptive management or redirecting implementation based on the review.

29. The seven projects rated in the unsatisfactory range for 'M&E design at entry' were equally rated in the unsatisfactory range for the 'M&E plan implementation' element. All were rated moderately unsatisfactory except for Water Resource Management in Comoros (GEF ID 3857) that was rated unsatisfactory. The Comoros project's mid-term review demanded M&E strengthening, but this did not happen; an M&E expert was planned as part of the technical team, but this post was eliminated after the first M&E expert resigned shortly after being hired. Moderately unsatisfactory rated projects shared the following commonalities: difficulties in operationalizing key indicators, focus on monitoring and reporting of outputs but limited attention to monitoring and reporting of progress, and on indicators at the outcome and impact levels, and TE's indicated that data collection could have been more systematic. The Vietnam Climate Resilient Infrastructure project (GEF ID 3103) found it difficult to operationalize the M&E system due to the ineffectiveness of certain key indicators, neglect of key assumptions about government acceptance of technical advice, and the unreliability of the capacity development rating scheme being used. In Morocco (GEF ID 3967), there was limited focus on the impact level, and the TE advised to focus more on whole farm systems rather than single activities. The TE of the Health Risks in Ghana project (GEF ID 3218) indicated that there was no evidence of M&E being used as a management tool, and a formal monitoring and reporting system was lacking.

30. The M&E design at entry ratings for completed LDCF and SCCF projects are comparable to the ratings for the project reviewed as part of the AER 2016 and AER 2015.<sup>6</sup> The ratings of the AER 2016 and AER 2015 were combined to get to a size-wise comparable grouping of 16 projects. Of these 16 projects nine received an M&E design at entry rating in the satisfactory range, and seven were rated moderately unsatisfactory. Looking at the 2015 and 2016 cohorts' M&E plan implementation ratings, nine projects received ratings in the satisfactory range, six projects were rated in the unsatisfactory range, and one project was not rated for M&E plan implementation. Given the small number of completed projects to date, a comparison between sets of AER cohorts is not representative of the full range of objectives and approaches of the two funds.

---

<sup>6</sup> IEO, [LDCF/SCCF Annual Evaluation Report 2016](#), May 2017. Council document GEF/LDCF.SCCF.22/ME/01 and IEO, [LDCF/SCCF Annual Evaluation Report 2015](#), May 2016. Council document GEF/LDCF.SCCF.20/ME/01.

## INNOVATIVE APPROACHES

31. Highlight: Most projects assessed contain innovative elements, for example the introduction of drought and stress-resistant crops, the use of consultative community committees, and the application of slow filtration in the community water supply schemes.

32. As stated in the AER 2014, there is no overarching description or definition of what is to be regarded as 'innovation' or 'innovative'.<sup>7</sup> One common denominator in LDCF/SCCF projects is that projects and approaches are regarded as innovative if they are deliberately applied to tackle an issue, and these approaches (i) have not been used before in the project area, and/or (ii) have not been used before to tackle this specific issue. Other elements that make an approach innovative is that the approach needs to be (iii) widely replicable, which is linked to being locally appropriate from a technological, environmental as well as a socio-economic point of view, and this should be possible (iv) at low economic cost, which links innovation to financial sustainability.

33. All 19 completed projects of the AER 2017 cohort were reviewed for innovative approaches. Most projects have innovative elements, for example, the TE of the Maldives Tourism project (GEF ID 4431) saw the project as innovative given that it was a first intervention for the country embarking upon dealing with climate change adaptation of its most important productive sector. The TE of the Moroccan Implementation of the Plan Maroc Vert project (GEF ID 3967) identified the cultivation of drought and stress-resistant triticale—a hybrid of wheat and rye—as a replacement for the more water demanding maize as a welcome innovation for livestock farmers. Other strong innovations are further discussed below.

34. The main innovation of the Resilience in the Agriculture project in Mali (GEF ID 3967) is the establishment of 'consultative community committees', made up of communal councils and technical services representatives, to identify and prioritize needs, and to choose the sites and actors directly involved in all activities, not only for the project's duration but also after project closure. This approach has developed a high sense of ownership and empowerment of the beneficiary populations. The committees also took the lead in measuring the results of the activities. The TE of the Swaziland Water Resources Management project (GEF ID 4255) also concludes that the involvement of community groups in the project design and implementation resulted in a high level of ownership, which had a positive impact on the project's longer-term sustainability.

35. An engagement-related innovation could be seen in the Cambodia Vulnerability Assessment in the Coastal Zone project (GEF ID 3890), where a 'youth environmental debate' on climate change adaptation was broadcast on local television. Debate competitions were developed between four universities on the topics of adaptation mainstreaming, strengthening climate change policy and science based adaptation, and improving coastal communities' livelihoods through agricultural intensification.

---

<sup>7</sup> IEO, [LDCF/SCCF Annual Evaluation Report 2014](#), May 2015. Council document GEF/LDCF.SCCF.18/ME/02.

36. The introduction of slow filtration in the community water supply schemes of the Comoros Water Resource Management project (GEF ID 3857) is an interesting innovation to improve water quality, often ignored in community projects, and deserves further monitoring. Another water-related innovation was identified in the Swaziland Water Resources Management project (GEF ID 4255) where sand dams provided river water through most of the dry season, and also filtered the water for livestock consumption.

37. The Climate Resilient Infrastructure project in Vietnam (GEF ID 3103) introduced practical technical innovations in rural infrastructure. Bioengineering methods involving riverbank protection and roadside slope stabilization and drainage control were demonstrated at four sites and provide practical examples of cost-effective alternatives to addressing slope instability and soil erosion could be considered innovative. The TE noted however that the project has not identified any strong change agents in government or financing partners that are willing to lead the necessary reforms for climate resilient infrastructure investment, which diminishes the prospect for sustainability.

38. The low number of projects analyzed makes the identification of innovation trends and generalization of such trends difficult. Innovations often cannot be detached from the more 'conventional' project elements, and solutions introduced combine a suite of innovative and conventional approaches. Combined with innovation being context-dependent—what is seen as innovative in one project country could be regarded as conventional in another project country—it is not possible to come to an overarching conclusion, or a consistent understanding, of the effectiveness of innovative approaches.

## **GENDER CONSIDERATIONS**

39. The highlights of this section are:

- (a) Seven projects had a similar gender rating at entry and upon completion, while equally six projects improved and six projects worsened their gender rating from entry to completion.
- (b) None of the projects were rated gender-mainstreamed although there was a slight overall improvement with less projects being rated gender blind upon completion.

40. All 19 completed projects of the AER 2017 cohort were reviewed for three gender considerations; (i) gender disaggregation of output and outcome indicator data, (ii) explicit gender considerations in the description of the project activities, and (iii) the existence of an overarching women inclusion, empowerment and/or gender mainstreaming strategy or approach. These three considerations translated into a gender rating—further detailed in annex C, which was piloted in the Program Evaluation of the LDCF<sup>8</sup> and further applied in multiple recent evaluations. Most TEs provide some assessment of—or information about—gender considerations, but the discussion below highlights the more explicit cases.

---

<sup>8</sup> IEO, [Program Evaluation of the Least Developed Countries Fund](#), 2017.

41. The AER evaluation team re-evaluated project gender ratings now that the projects have been completed, to assess whether projects improved their quality-at-entry gender rating. Table 2 shows gender ratings at project entry and completion. At entry, seven projects were rated gender-sensitive, seven gender-aware, and five gender-blind. Upon completion four were rated gender-sensitive, 12 gender-aware, and three gender-blind.

**Table 2: Gender Rating at Project Entry and Completion**

GEF ID	Location	Gender rating	
		Quality-at-entry	Upon completion
3103	Vietnam	Gender-aware	Gender-sensitive
3159	Mexico	Gender-blind	Gender-aware
3218	Ghana	Gender-sensitive	Gender-aware
3287	Bangladesh	Gender-blind	Gender-aware
3408	Djibouti	Gender-sensitive	Gender-aware
3694	Tuvalu	Gender-aware	Gender-blind
3703	Guinea	Gender-blind	Gender-aware
3733	Haiti	Gender-sensitive	Gender-sensitive
3776	Mali	Gender-aware	Gender-aware
3857	Comoros	Gender-sensitive	Gender-aware
3890	Cambodia	Gender-aware	Gender-aware
3907	Global	Gender-aware	Gender-aware
3934	South Africa	Gender-blind	Gender-aware
3967	Morocco	Gender-blind	Gender-blind
4222	Ethiopia	Gender-aware	Gender-sensitive
4255	Swaziland	Gender-sensitive	Gender-aware
4261	Azerbaijan	Gender-sensitive	Gender-sensitive
4431	Maldives	Gender-aware	Gender-aware
5002	Benin	Gender-sensitive	Gender-blind

42. The Strategies for Coastal Communities project in Haiti (GEF ID 3733) was rated gender-sensitive at entry, and the TE of the project also concludes that the extensive inclusion of gender aspects in project activities and monitoring has been a success with a strong participation of women in the pilot projects and the development of a gender strategy. Women's participation in project activities varied between 30 and 40 percent, depending on the activity, financial support was given to women's groups and various resource management committees now consist of 30 percent of women.

43. In Djibouti, the Vulnerable Coastal Zones project (GEF ID 3408) aimed to develop a gender-sensitive stakeholder engagement plan, and efforts to promote gender equity were planned to be integrated in all aspects of the project's activities and management. The TE notes

that a stakeholder engagement plan was never developed, but women were participating in a number of project activities that traditionally see women's engagement, for example gardening and shore fishing. There was limited women's engagement in livestock focused activities. The evaluator's conclusion is that the project did over time make some explicit efforts to promote gender equality, include women in project activities and management, and integrate women's groups in community-based activities. However, a more integrated gender perspective throughout the project cycle requires a more explicit effort, including a gender analysis and action plan covering the entire implementation period.

44. The Vulnerable Coastal Zones project in Guinea (GEF ID 3703) also saw women engage - with participation rates of 70 to 80 percent - in activities that are traditionally seen as female activities, for example gardening and fish smoking. The difference here is that also in the more male dominated activity of rice cultivation, the women participation rate was still close to 40 percent. The project was rated gender blind at entry, but the evaluator describes the project as 'moderately satisfactory' when it comes to promoting gender equality.

45. The Comoros Water Resource Management project (GEF ID 3857) was rated gender-sensitive at entry. The project document said the project would aim to promote gender equity, and integrate it in all aspects of the project's activities and management. The TE found that the project had few considerations regarding gender, which the evaluator found surprising as it is well known that a right approach to gender is essential for community water supply projects. The evaluation found no evidence of a gender analysis or strategy, and none of the gender specific outcome areas were achieved. Given how little information is available on gender, it is not possible to say to what degree this lack of gender analysis and strategy has affected overall project performance.

46. In Ghana the Health Risks project (GEF ID 3218) was rated gender-sensitive at entry, given a number of gender specific project outputs. One of the outputs, a study titled 'Incorporating Gender-Sensitive Actions in the 2014-2017 Health Sector Medium Term Development Strategy', was developed but it is unclear whether and how relevant ministries have used this report. No gender specific activities were implemented linked to the report. As another output, a tool was developed for climate risk screening in the health sector and a document titled 'Guidelines for the Use of a Gender Sensitive Climate Resilience Screening Tool for the Health Sector' was produced. Upon project completion the tool and related document had not yet been disseminated to relevant stakeholders and the evaluator feared that the tool's need for a significant level of effort to implement might not fit the available resources in the relevant government agencies. The evaluation concluded that some level of gender awareness raising took place through the project's trainings.

47. The LDCF Resilience in the Agriculture Sector project in Mali (GEF ID 3776) was rated gender-aware at entry. The TE found that the gender aspect was well defined and permeated through the interventions implemented on the ground. The challenges of rural women were given due consideration and the project has resulted in women spending less time on agricultural activities, and they therefore have more time to dedicate to alternative income-generating activities. Market gardening activities were also very successful, and included the training of women, tools and equipment as well as agricultural input. In addition, women's

groups and associations are targeted as beneficiaries for income-generating activities. Women consulted by the evaluator demonstrated a good understanding of climate change and the impacts on their lives and livelihoods, and demonstrated a high-level of ownership of the LDCF-financed project.

48. The Maldives Tourism Sector project with GEF ID 4431 was rated gender-aware at entry. The TE also concludes that the project did not mainstream gender equality and women's empowerment considerations. There were some efforts in the small grant pilots to harness gender, but gender issues were not duly taken into account in project design and implementation, nor has the project contributed to greater consideration of gender aspects. The Coastal Areas and Community Settlements project in Tuvalu (GEF ID 3694) was also rated gender-aware at entry. The TE concludes that that gender inequalities were evident in the project's decision-making structure, and the specific needs of woman were not well considered.

49. The South African SCCF project Disaster Risks from Wildfire Hazards (GEF ID 3934) was rated gender-blind at entry. A gender or social inclusion analysis was not prepared at the project preparation phase or after implementation had started. The management response on the mid-term review comments on gender noted that at the time of project development, a gender analysis and action plan were not required. The fire management sector is largely male-dominated, but the project was quite successful in achieving relatively substantive involvement by women, and the majority of people in the project management unit were women.

50. The Coastal Forestation project in Bangladesh (GEF ID 3287) was rated gender-blind at entry; given there was limited to no discussion on gender in the project documents. The project did not conduct a gender analysis, but the TE concludes that efforts were made to empower women by trying to include them in trainings and other project activities. However, a gender analysis would have helped, and the traditional gender roles—excluding women's participation in public affairs, and associated inequity—would need a combined effort of multiple government and non-government initiatives and longer timeframes than this one project to result in true change and women's empowerment.

51. None of the projects part of the 2017 cohort were rated gender-mainstreamed although there was a slight overall improvement with less project being rated gender blind upon completion. Note that all completed projects reviewed were designed before the 2011 GEF policy on gender mainstreaming<sup>9</sup> and the 2014 gender equality action plan (GEAP)<sup>10</sup> were Council approved and came into effect. Also, individual GEF Agencies often apply their internal gender policies, strategies and action plans, but do not report on these efforts because this type of reporting was not a requirement in the past.

---

<sup>9</sup> GEF, [Policy on Gender Mainstreaming](#), May 2012. Policy Document GEF/SD/PL/02.

<sup>10</sup> GEF, [Gender Equality Action Plan \(GEAP\)](#), October 2014. Council Document GEF/C.47/09/Rev.01.

## **SYNTHESIS OF LESSONS LEARNED FROM COMPLETED PROJECTS**

52. Highlight: Lessons learned often relate to standard good practice elements in project management, communication, stakeholder involvement, M&E and knowledge management.
53. The synthesis of lessons learned has been drawn from the specific TE report sections on lessons learned, as well as other sections of the TEs that held valuable lessons.
54. Most of the lessons learned do not relate to earlier identified innovations. They relate to standard good practice elements in project management, communication and stakeholder involvement, and M&E and knowledge management. The lessons learned groupings in order of occurrence (from most to least occurring) are; (a) project design and management, (b) climate change adaptation (c) monitoring and evaluation, (d) communications and stakeholder involvement, (e) learning, and (f) content-technical. These groupings are used below to further discuss individual lessons learned topics.

### **Project Design and Management**

55. Highlight: The complexity of institutional project arrangements should be informed by a project's contextual factors and financial size, and take into account in-country capacities.
56. The TE of the Coastal Areas and Community Settlements project in Tuvalu (GEF ID 3694) concludes that the decentralized implementation of a project that covers a wide geographic area within a complex environmental, political, institutional and social matrix presents significant institutional and operational challenges, and the project delivery model should be cognizant of this complexity. The TE of the Mexico Coastal Wetlands project (GEF ID 3159) on the other hand identifies tradeoffs between the level of complexity and the financial project size. A lesson learned here is that complex institutional arrangements involving multiple agencies should be avoided if the amount of resources is small and, thus, the activities involved may not receive high priority within any of the agencies involved. The Comoros Water Resource Management project's TE (GEF ID 3857) equally indicates that there is a risk of investments being spread out too thinly if you want to do many adaptation activities with a limited amount of funding. It will be difficult to manage all activities and that the impact in each area will be small. Only include issues outside the focus area of the project, when these are absolutely necessary for success, and if it is unlikely that they will be covered by other actors.
57. Another lesson learned from the Ghana Health Risks project (GEF ID 3218) is that project management procedures and financial rules are complicated. It is not easy for local institutions and recruited project managers, to understand them, and use them properly. The lesson is that proper training, clarification, and provision of guidelines and templates during project inception is necessary, with regular updates during project implementation. This lesson learned also applies to the use of the logical framework and implementation of the M&E plan during the project.
58. The TE of the Climate Resilient Infrastructure project in Vietnam (GEF ID 3103) concludes that a joint project between two or more GEF Agencies demands an integrated

approach to its activities and theory of change. This project was in effect two separate sub-projects with generally good channels of communication, but with few direct project-content linkages and with very different identities and management systems. The efficiency of combining these two projects without properly developing the synergies is questionable.

59. The Djibouti Vulnerable Coastal Zones project's TE (GEF ID 3408) formulates a specific lesson learned on sustainability; Include the development of a sustainability mechanism as a distinct activity under each project output, for example post-project maintenance arrangements. A sustainability mechanism for each output should be developed during the project implementation phase. Relevant sustainability mechanisms could include detailing the post-project maintenance arrangements, arrangements for the dissemination of report findings or finding an institutional home for a particular output.

### **Climate Change Adaptation**

60. Highlight: Climate change adaptation efforts should be contextually informed. Finding an appropriate mix of bottom-up vs. policy-level and short-term vs long-term benefits is seen as effective.

61. The TE of the Guinea Vulnerable Coastal Zones project (GEF ID 3703) concludes that adaptation to climate change will be more effective when it departs from a bottom-up approach. Such approach demands good coordination between the various project levels (local - prefectural - national, in this case). Similarly, the TE of the Mexico Coastal Wetlands project (GEF ID 3159) identifies community participation essential for the successful implementation of local adaptation measures.

62. The Swaziland Water Resources Management project's TE (GEF ID 4255) further concludes that climate change adaptation needs to be mainstreamed into development planning initiatives at various governmental planning levels for the results from the initiatives to be sustainable over the long term. The integration of climate change adaptation initiatives into county development initiatives will guarantee the institutionalization of responses to climate change into national development planning.

63. The TE of the Coastal Wetlands in Mexico project (GEF ID 3159) indicates that it is important to find a mix of adaptation measures that produce both short-term and long-term benefits. Some of the adaptation measures should provide the communities with environmental, economic, social, health benefits in the short term, since the benefits which are longer term are difficult to assimilate by communities who see the future as uncertain and distant. The Azerbaijan Water and Flood Management (GEF ID 4261) project's TE provides a similar lesson learned, adding that a balance between adaptation measures with both short and long-term benefits should be equally visible in a balanced budget between activities with short term returns and those with longer term returns.

## Monitoring and Evaluation

64. The highlights of this section are:

- (a) Monitoring and evaluation should start with a thorough baseline assessment, should be well budgeted, and used as part of essential management tools.
- (b) Longer-term evaluation is advised if a project's maximum impact is expected beyond the project's time horizon.

65. The TE of the Coastal Areas and Community Settlements project in Tuvalu (GEF ID 3694) states that a complex project such this NAPA implementation project requires regular and proactive monitoring and evaluation. The development and implementation of schedules and templates are an essential management tool for ensuring transparency, supporting adaptive management and for strengthening a sense of collective project ownership and its outcomes. Conversely, neglecting monitoring protocols creates uncertainty, confusion and frustration.

66. The TE of the Malian Agricultural Sector project (GEF ID 3776) further identifies the importance of a thorough baseline assessment at the onset of every full-size project. Without an understanding of the prevailing socio-economic conditions prior to the implementation of a project, it is challenging to determine the real impacts achieved. The evaluation of the project becomes based on anecdotes, rather than hard data. Sufficient funds need to be allocated at PPG stage to undertake a rigorous baseline assessment, which should not be solely based on secondary data, but should include a mix of primary and secondary data.

67. The Mexico Coastal Wetlands project's (GEF ID 3159) TE states that monitoring and evaluation of climate change adaptation measures should be viewed as longer-term activities and should likewise continue after the initial project concludes. Undertaking a cost-benefit analysis of project investments to strengthen local adaptation to climate change as part of project evaluation activities represents a good practice that should be replicated elsewhere.

68. A lesson learned from the South African Wildfire Hazards project (GEF ID 3934) also relates to evaluation of success over a longer period of time; The evaluation concludes that performance indicators and targets are perhaps not achievable within the project's timeframe. With a project primarily focused on strengthening adaptive capacities it takes time before capacity building efforts translate into measurable change as a result of improved management practices on wildfire risk reduction. The project's time horizon is too short for achieving and monitoring changes in the extent and number of damaging and non-damaging wildfires.

## **Communication and Stakeholder Involvement**

69. The highlights of this section are:

- (a) Beneficiaries might not always be clear on a project's boundaries. Complementarities between projects should be clearly communicated.
- (b) Using participatory approaches and a large project steering committee could ensure project ownership and wider collaboration.

70. The Cambodia Vulnerability Assessment in the Coastal Zone project's TE (GEF ID 3890) found that there was a degree of confusion amongst local stakeholders when there was communication with locals on the various ongoing parallel or recently concluded projects, due to a lack of clarity over which project was contributing to what outcome and how these projects linked. In future projects, it is important to try to reduce these uncertainties by conveying clearly any differences and complementarities between projects and communicate this clearly with local beneficiaries, following the stakeholder engagement plan.

71. A lesson learned of the implementation of the Health Risk project activities in Ghana (GEF ID 3218) is that the implementation is often concentrated in the hands of few people. A possible way to ensure ownership and collaboration from a wider variety of stakeholders is to establish a rather large Project Steering Committee, meeting twice a year, and including different sectors from the government, development partners and relevant NGOs. Such Steering Committee has a role of overall guidance of the project and validation of major strategic decisions or changes to project objectives/outcomes. It must however be seconded by a smaller, more executive and technical working group, with an advisory and validation role on project implementation matters.

72. The TE of the Resilience in the Agriculture Sector in Mali project (GEF ID 3776) concludes that a high level of ownership can be achieved through the use of participatory approaches, to let beneficiaries recognize and analyze the future impacts of climate change on their own lives and livelihoods, and let them identify adaptation interventions to increase their own resilience.

## **Learning**

73. The highlights of this section are:

- (a) Larger projects would benefit from a dedicated communication specialist.
- (b) Well planned study tours and participation in forums aids capacity building.

74. A lesson learned from the Mali Agriculture Sector project (GEF ID 3776) is that it is crucial to have a communication specialist appointed for full-size projects, especially pilot projects. The dissemination of information is a crucial element of pilot projects. The quality of the information, the frequency and type of communication to stakeholders, will have a direct bearing on project success and the adoption and scaling out of information and lessons that emerge from the project.

75. The TE of the project in Tuvalu, Coastal Areas and Community Settlements (GEF ID 3694) concludes that the power of learning exchanges, field visits and networking amongst peers in building capacity was possibly underestimated. Provided they are well planned and managed, study tours, and participation at regional and international forums should be an integral feature of projects that have capacity building as a primary objective.

### **Content-technical**

76. The highlights of this section are:

- (a) Community water supply schemes need formalized and paid management structures if they grow to a certain size.
- (b) Reforestation efforts should be built upon a thorough analysis of deforestation factors.

77. A lesson learned from the Comoros Water Resource Management project (GEF ID 3857) is that there is a limit to the size of a community water supply scheme, for it to still be able to be effectively managed by informal water management committees. The water supply schemes in the Comoros are rather big, and the task of operating the schemes clearly surpasses what can be expected from an informal water management committee, so the infrastructure is not properly operated and maintained. At a certain size, water supply schemes need to be operated and managed through a formalized and paid for community or private operator.

78. Another lesson learned from the Comoros project (GEF ID 3857) is that reforestation on communal lands demands a thorough analysis of the key factors causing the deforestation. If factors causing the deforestation are not addressed, reforestation is likely to be unsuccessful.

### **MANAGEMENT ACTION RECORD**

79. The GEF Management Action Record (MAR)<sup>11</sup> tracks the level of adoption by the GEF Secretariat and/or the GEF Agencies (together here referred to as GEF Management) of GEF Council and LDCF/SCCF Council decisions that have been made on the basis of GEF IEO recommendations. The MAR serves two purposes: “(i) to provide Council with a record of its decision on the follow-up of evaluation reports, the proposed management actions, and the actual status of these actions; and (ii) to increase the accountability of GEF Management regarding Council decisions on monitoring and evaluation issues.”<sup>12</sup>

80. The MAR for the LDCF/SCCF tracks two LDCF/SCCF Council decisions: June 2016 decision on recommendations of the Program Evaluation of the LDCF; and May 2017 decision on

---

<sup>11</sup> IEO, Management Action Record, June 2017.

<sup>12</sup> GEF, [Procedures and Format of the GEF Management Action Record](#), November 2005. Council Document GEF/ME/C.27/3.

recommendations of the Program Evaluation of the SCCF.<sup>13 14</sup> In the MAR the IEO completes the columns pertaining to recommendations, management response, and Council decisions. Management is invited to provide a self-rating of the level of adoption of Council decisions on recommendations and to add comments as necessary. After management's self-rating, the Office verifies actual adoption and provides its own ratings and comments. The rating categories for the progress of adoption of Council decisions were agreed upon through a consultative process of the IEO, the GEF Secretariat, and GEF Agencies. Categories are as follows:

- (a) **High:** Fully adopted and fully incorporated into policy, strategy or operations.
- (b) **Substantial:** Decision largely adopted but not fully incorporated into policy, strategy or operations as yet.
- (c) **Medium:** Adopted in some operational and policy work, but not to a significant degree in key areas.
- (d) **Negligible:** No evidence or plan for adoption, or plan and actions for adoption are in a very preliminary stage.
- (e) **Not rated or possible to verify yet:** ratings or verification will have to wait until more data is available or proposals have been further developed.
- (f) **N/A:** Not-applicable.

81. For the LDCF evaluation the LDCF/SCCF Council decision stated that “the LDCF/SCCF Council, having reviewed document GEF/LDCF.SCCF.20/ME/02, Program Evaluation of the Least Developed Countries Fund,<sup>15</sup> and GEF/LDCF.SCCF/20/ME/03, Management Response to the Program Evaluation of the Least Developed Countries Fund,<sup>16</sup> took note of the conclusions of the evaluation and endorsed the recommendations taking into account the Management Response.”<sup>17</sup> The evaluation’s recommendations are as follows:

- (1) **Recommendation 1:** The GEF Secretariat should explore and develop mechanisms that ensure the predictable, adequate and sustainable financing of the Fund.

---

<sup>13</sup> IEO, [Program Evaluation of the Least Developed Countries Fund](#), June 2016. LDCF/SCCF Council Document GEF/LDCF.SCCF.20/ME/02.

<sup>14</sup> IEO, [Program Evaluation of the Special Climate Change Evaluation](#), May 2017. LDCF/SCCF Council Document GEF/LDCF.SCCF.22/ME/02.

<sup>15</sup> IEO, [Program Evaluation of the Least Developed Countries Fund](#), June 2016. LDCF/SCCF Council Document GEF/LDCF.SCCF.20/ME/02.

<sup>16</sup> GEF, [Management Response to the Program Evaluation of the Least Developed Countries Fund](#), June 2016. LDCF/SCCF Council Document GEF/LDCF.SCCF.20/ME/03.

<sup>17</sup> GEF, [Joint Summary of the Chairs 20th LDCF/SCCF Meeting](#), June 2016.

- (2) **Recommendation 2:** The GEF Secretariat should make efforts to improve consistency regarding their understanding and application of the GEF gender mainstreaming policy and the Gender Equality Action Plan (GEAP) to the LDCF.
- (3) **Recommendation 3:** The GEF Secretariat should ensure that the data in the Project Management Information System is up to date and accurate.

82. The GEF Secretariat continues to make efforts to update recipient countries on the resource availability at negotiations, LDC briefings, and other meetings. The Secretariat is also supporting projects from the pipeline as resources become available. As was done last year the IEO encourages the Secretariat to develop a more systematic mechanism to promote the predictable, adequate and sustainable financing of the LDCF. The IEO has rated Recommendation 1 as medium.

83. The Secretariat continues to work with countries and agencies to ensure the GEAP is referenced as a minimum criterion prior to technical clearance. It is also encouraging that projects submitted to the LDCF/SCCF Council for approval are expected to carry out a Gender Gap Analysis during project preparation prior to CEO Endorsement/Approval and gender mainstreaming is being discussed with countries within the context of the GEF Programming Strategy on Adaptation for the LDCF/SCCF for 2018 to 2022. The Secretariat should monitor compliance with the completion of a Gender Gap Analysis during project preparation. The IEO has rated Recommendation 2 as medium.

84. While work is progressing on the upgrade of the GEF project management information system it has not resulted in a clear picture of progress towards improving the quality of information. The IEO has rated Recommendation 3 as negligible.

85. With an overall rating of medium, GEF Management has made modest progress in the level of adoption of the LDCF/SCCF Council decision regarding the LDCF program evaluation. The IEO will continue to track the adoption of this decision.

86. For the SCCF evaluation the LDCF/SCCF Council decision stated that “the Council, having reviewed document GEF/LDCF.SCCF.22/ME/02, Program Evaluation of the Special Climate Change Fund<sup>18</sup> and GEF/LDCF.SCCF.22/ME/03, Management Response to the Program Evaluation of the Special Climate Change Fund,<sup>19</sup> takes note of the conclusions of the evaluation and endorses the recommendations taking into account the Management Response.”<sup>20</sup> The evaluation’s recommendations are as follows:

- (1) **Recommendation 1:** Reaffirming and strengthening a recommendation from the previous SCCF Program Evaluation in 2011, the GEF Secretariat should prioritize the

---

<sup>18</sup> IEO, [Program Evaluation of the Special Climate Change Evaluation](#), May 2017. LDCF/SCCF Council Document GEF/LDCF.SCCF.22/ME/02.

<sup>19</sup> GEF, [Management Response to the Program Evaluation of the Special Climate Change Fund](#), May 2017. LDCF/SCCF Council Document GEF/LDCF.SCCF.22/ME/03.

<sup>20</sup> GEF, [Joint Summary of the Chairs 22<sup>nd</sup> LDCF/SCCF Meeting](#), May 2017.

development of mechanisms that ensure predictable, adequate and sustainable financing for the Fund, given its support for, and focus on innovation.

- (2) **Recommendation 2:** The GEF Secretariat should articulate and publicly communicate the SCCF's niche within the global adaptation finance landscape, to include an explicit statement regarding the SCCF's relation with—and complementarity to—the Green Climate Fund.
- (3) **Recommendation 3:** The GEF Secretariat should ensure that PMIS data is up to date and accurate.

87. That elements of sustainable financing of the SCCF is being discussed with countries in the context of the Secretariat's negotiation of the GEF Programming Strategy on Adaptation for the LDCF/SCCF for 2018 to 2022 is welcome. The IEO encourages the Secretariat to develop a more systematic mechanism to promote the predictable, adequate and sustainable financing of the SCCF. The IEO has rated Recommendation 1 as medium.

88. The IEO acknowledges that elements of the SCCF's niche within the global adaptation finance landscape is being discussed with countries within the context of the GEF Programming Strategy on Adaptation for the LDCF/SCCF for 2018 to 2022. The IEO encourages the Secretariat to articulate and publicly communicate the SCCF's niche within the global adaptation finance landscape. The IEO has rated Recommendation 2 as medium.

89. While work is progressing on the upgrade of the GEF project management information system it has not resulted in a clear picture of progress towards improving the quality of information. The IEO has rated Recommendation 3 as negligible.

90. The overall rating of adoption of the LDCF/SCCF Council decision regarding the SCCF program evaluation is medium. The IEO will continue to track the adoption of this decision.

## ANNEX A: TERMINAL EVALUATION REPORT REVIEW GUIDELINES

The assessments in the terminal evaluation reviews is based largely on the information presented in the terminal evaluation report. If insufficient information is presented in a terminal evaluation report to assess a specific issue such as, for example, quality of the project's monitoring and evaluation system or a specific aspect of sustainability, then the preparer of the terminal evaluation reviews briefly indicates so in that section and elaborate more if appropriate in the section of the review that addresses quality of report. If the review's preparer possesses other first-hand information such as, for example, from a field visit to the project, and this information is relevant to the terminal evaluation reviews, then it should be included in the reviews only under the heading "Additional independent information available to the reviewer." The preparer of the terminal evaluation review has taken into account all the independent relevant information when verifying ratings.

### A.1 Criteria for Outcome Ratings

Based on the information provided in the terminal evaluation report, the terminal evaluation review makes an assessment of the extent to which the project's major relevant objectives were achieved or are expected to be achieved<sup>21</sup>, relevance of the project results, and the project's cost-effectiveness. The ratings on the outcomes of the project is based on performance on the following criteria:<sup>22</sup>

- a) **Relevance.** Were project outcomes consistent with the focal area/operational program strategies and country priorities? Explain.
- b) **Effectiveness.** Are project outcomes commensurate with the expected outcomes (as described in the project document) and the problems the project was intended to address (that is, the original or modified project objectives)?
- c) **Efficiency.** Include an assessment of outcomes and impacts in relation to inputs, costs, and implementation times based on the following questions: Was the project cost-effective? How does the project's cost/time versus outcomes equation compare to that of similar projects? Was the project implementation delayed due to any bureaucratic, administrative, or political problems and did that affect cost-effectiveness?

An overall rating is provided according to the achievement and shortcomings in the three criteria ranging from highly satisfactory, satisfactory, moderately satisfactory, moderately unsatisfactory, unsatisfactory, highly unsatisfactory, and unable to assess.

The reviewer of the terminal evaluation provides a rating under each of the three criteria (relevance, effectiveness, and efficiency). Relevance of outcomes is rated on a binary

---

<sup>21</sup> *Objectives* are the intended physical, financial, institutional, social, environmental, or other development results to which a project or program is expected to contribute (OECD DAC 2010).

<sup>22</sup> *Outcomes* are the likely or achieved short-term and medium-term effects of an intervention's outputs. Outputs are the products, capital goods, and services that result from a development intervention; these may also include changes resulting from the intervention that are relevant to the achievement of outcomes (OECD DAC 2010). For the GEF, environmental outcomes are the main focus.

scale: a 'satisfactory' or an 'unsatisfactory' rating is provided. If an 'unsatisfactory' rating has been provided on this criterion, the overall outcome achievement rating may not be higher than 'unsatisfactory'. Effectiveness and Efficiency is rated as follows:

- **Highly satisfactory.** The project had no shortcomings.
- **Satisfactory.** The project had minor shortcomings.
- **Moderately satisfactory.** The project had moderate shortcomings.
- **Moderately unsatisfactory.** The project had noticeable shortcomings.
- **Unsatisfactory.** The project had major shortcomings.
- **Highly unsatisfactory.** The project had severe shortcomings.
- **Unable to assess.** The reviewer was unable to assess outcomes on this dimension.

The calculation of the overall outcomes score of projects considers all three criteria, of which relevance criterion will be applied first - the overall outcome achievement rating may not be higher than 'unsatisfactory'. The second constraint that is applied is that the overall outcome achievement rating may not be higher than the 'effectiveness' rating. The third constraint that is applied is that the overall rating may not be higher than the average score of effectiveness and efficiency criteria calculated using the following formula:

$$\text{Outcomes} = (b + c) \div 2$$

In case the average score is lower than the score obtained after application of the first two constraints, then the average score will become the overall score. The score is converted into an overall rating with mid values being rounded up upwards.

## A.2 Impacts

Has the project achieved impacts, or is it likely that outcomes will lead to the expected impacts? Impacts will be understood to include positive and negative, primary and secondary long-term effects produced by a development intervention. They could be produced directly or indirectly and could be intended or unintended. The terminal evaluation review's preparer takes note of any mention of impacts, especially global environmental benefits, in the terminal evaluation report including the likelihood that the project outcomes will contribute to their achievement. Negative impacts mentioned in the terminal evaluation report should be noted and recorded in section 2 of the terminal evaluation reviews template in the subsection on "Issues that require follow-up." Although project impacts are to be described, they will not be rated.

## A.3 Criteria for Sustainability Ratings

Sustainability will be understood as the likelihood of continuation of project benefits after completion of project implementation (GEF 2000). To assess sustainability, the terminal evaluation reviewer identifies and assesses key risks that could undermine continuation of benefits at the time of the evaluation. Some of these risks might include the absence of or

inadequate financial resources, an enabling legal framework, commitment from key stakeholders, and enabling economy. The following four types of risk factors are assessed by the terminal evaluation reviewer to rate the likelihood of sustainability of project outcomes: financial, sociopolitical, institutional frameworks and governance, and environmental.

The following questions provide guidance to assess if the factors are met:

- **Financial resources.** What is the likelihood that financial resources will be available to continue the activities that result in the continuation of benefits (income-generating activities, and trends that may indicate that it is likely that in future there will be adequate financial resources for sustaining project outcomes)?
- **Sociopolitical.** Are there any social or political risks that can undermine the longevity of project outcomes? What is the risk that the level of stakeholder ownership is insufficient to allow for project outcomes/benefits to be sustained? Do the various key stakeholders see in their interest that the project benefits continue to flow? Is there sufficient public/stakeholder awareness in support of the long-term objectives of the project?
- **Institutional framework and governance.** Do the legal frameworks, policies, and governance structures and processes pose any threat to the continuation of project benefits? While assessing this parameter, consider if the required systems for accountability and transparency, and the required technical know-how, are in place.
- **Environmental.** Are there any environmental risks that can undermine the future flow of project environmental benefits? The terminal evaluation should assess whether certain activities in the project area will pose a threat to the sustainability of project outcomes. For example, construction of dam in a protected area could inundate a sizable area and thereby neutralize the biodiversity-related gains made by the project.

The reviewer provides a rating under each of the four criteria (financial resources, sociopolitical, institutional, and environmental) as follows:

- **Likely.** There are no risks affecting that criterion of sustainability.
- **Moderately likely.** There are moderate risks that affect that criterion of sustainability.
- **Moderately unlikely.** There are significant risks that affect that criterion of sustainability.
- **Unlikely.** There are severe risks affecting that criterion of sustainability.
- **Unable to assess.** Unable to assess risk on this dimension.
- **Not applicable.** This dimension is not applicable to the project.

#### A.4 Criteria for Assessment of Quality of Project M&E Systems

GEF projects are required to develop M&E plans by the time of work program inclusion, to appropriately budget M&E plans, and to fully carry out the M&E plan during implementation. Project managers are also expected to use the information generated by the M&E system during project implementation to improve and adapt the project to changing situations. Given

the long-term nature of many GEF projects, projects are also encouraged to include long-term monitoring plans that measure results (such as environmental results) after project completion. Terminal evaluation reviews will include an assessment of the achievement and shortcomings of M&E systems.

- a) **M&E design.** Project should have a sound M&E plan to monitor results and track progress in achieving project objectives. An M&E plan should include a baseline (including data, methodology, and so on), SMART (specific, measurable, achievable, realistic, and timely) indicators and data analysis systems, and evaluation studies at specific times to assess results. The time frame for various M&E activities and standards for outputs should have been specified. Questions to guide this assessment include: In retrospect, was the M&E plan at entry practicable and sufficient (sufficient and practical indicators identified; timely baseline; targets created; effective use of data collection; analysis systems including studies and reports; practical organization and logistics in terms of what, who, and when for M&E activities)?
- b) **M&E plan implementation.** The M&E system was in place and allowed the timely tracking of results and progress toward project objectives throughout the project. Annual project reports were complete, accurate, and with well-justified ratings. The information provided by the M&E system was used to improve and adapt project performance. An M&E system should be in place with proper training for parties responsible for M&E activities to ensure that data will continue to be collected and used after project closure. Question to guide this assessment include: Did the project M&E system operate throughout the project? How was M&E information used during the project? Did it allow for tracking of progress toward project objectives? Did the project provide proper training for parties responsible for M&E activities to ensure data will continue to be collected and used after project closure?
- c) **Other questions.** This includes questions on funding and whether the M&E system was a good practice.
  - Was sufficient funding provided for M&E—in the budget included in the project document?
  - Was sufficient and timely funding provided—for M&E during project implementation?
  - Can the project M&E system be considered—a good practice?

A number rating 1–6 is to be provided for each criterion according to the achievement and shortcomings with highly satisfactory = 6, satisfactory = 5, moderately satisfactory = 4, moderately unsatisfactory = 3, unsatisfactory = 2, highly unsatisfactory = 1, and unable to assess = no rating. The reviewer of the terminal evaluation provides a rating under each of the three criteria (M&E design, M&E plan implementation, and M&E properly budgeted and funded) as follows:

- **Highly satisfactory.** There were no shortcomings in that criterion of the project M&E system.

- **Satisfactory.** There were minor shortcomings in that criterion of the project M&E system.
- **Moderately satisfactory.** There were moderate shortcomings in that criterion of the project M&E system.
- **Moderately unsatisfactory.** There were significant shortcomings in that criterion of the project M&E system.
- **Unsatisfactory.** There were major shortcomings in that criterion of the project M&E system.
- **Highly unsatisfactory.** There was no project M&E system.

The rating for M&E during implementation will be the overall rating of the M&E system:

**Rating on the Quality of the Project Monitoring and Evaluation System = b**

## ANNEX B: NAPA IMPLEMENTATION PROJECTS ALIGNMENT RATING

The LDCF was established in response to guidance received from the Seventh Conference of Parties (COP) to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) meeting in Marrakech in 2001, as one of its climate change adaptation (CCA) financing mechanisms. The LDCF is mandated by parties to the UNFCCC to, among others, provide support to the least developed countries' (LDCs) climate adaptation efforts, including the preparation of National Adaptation Programmes of Action (NAPAs), the implementation of NAPA priority projects in LDCs, as well as support for the preparation of the NAP process in eligible developing countries.

NAPAs provide a process for LDCs to identify priority activities that respond to their urgent and immediate needs to adapt to climate change—those for which further delay would increase vulnerability and/or costs at a later stage. The main content of NAPA Country Reports is a country-driven list of ranked priority adaptation activities and projects, designed to facilitate the development of proposals NAPA Implementation Projects.

For the LDCF Program Evaluation 2016 NAPA Country Reports as well as NAPA Implementation Projects have been reviewed and country priorities for adaptation activities have been identified for each. These priority adaptation activities fitted the following groupings:

- Agriculture (*including animal husbandry and fishery*)
- Climate information systems
- Disaster risk management
- Natural resource management & fragile ecosystems (*including mountain ecosystems, mangroves, forestry, wildlife, land degradation and management*)
- Water resource management
- Human health
- Infrastructural development
- Renewable energy/energy efficiency/energy security
- Climate education
- Tourism
- Climate smart urban areas
- Sustainable rural livelihoods (*other than agriculture and NRM*).

Most NAPA Country Reports provided a list of prioritized adaptation activities. For those that did not, sectoral prioritization was used by the reviewer to identify areas of priority adaptation activities. For those that did not prioritize activities nor provide an overview of priority sectors, the key environmental stresses and climatic vulnerabilities as identified in the NAPA Country Report were used by the reviewer to identify key areas of priority adaptation activities.

For each country, the scoring of NAPA Implementation Projects' key priority adaptation activities was compared against its NAPA Country Report scoring on the same. This comparison resulted in an alignment rating for each NAPA Implementation Project with the key priority areas as identified in the NAPA Country Report.

The reviewer rated NAPA Implementation Projects' alignment with key priority areas in the NAPA Country Reports as follows:

- **Very High:** The NAPA Implementation Project's outcome areas address primary priority areas as listed/outlined in the NAPA Country Report.
- **High:** The NAPA Implementation Project's outcome areas do not address primary priority areas as listed/outlined in the NAPA Country Report, but address other priorities that are outlined in the NAPA Country Report.
- **Low:** The NAPA Implementation Project might touch upon some priority areas (primary or other), but does not address specific priorities as outlined in the NAPA Country Report in a structural manner.
- **No Alignment:** Project does not address ANY of the priorities (primary or other) outline in the country NAPA report.
- **Unable to Assess.** The reviewer was unable to assess outcomes on this dimension.

## ANNEX C: GENDER RATING

The gender mainstreaming description as part of the Gender Equality Action Plan (GEAP) glossary states that “Mainstreaming involves ensuring that gender perspectives and attention to the goal of gender equality are central to all activities.” And “It [gender mainstreaming] is a strategy for making the concerns and experiences of women as well as of men an integral part of the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of policies and programs in all political, economic and societal spheres, so that women and men benefit equally, and inequality is not perpetuated.”<sup>23</sup>

The ultimate goal of mainstreaming is to achieve gender equality, and the goal of projects taking into account gender is to mainstream gender according to the above description. It was decided to ‘relax’ the gender mainstreaming description a little in the gender rating and not aim for gender perspectives and gender equality being central to ‘all activities’, but to ‘most, if not all, activities’.

The gender rating applied makes use of the following five scales:

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

Gender is not mentioned in project documents beyond an isolated mention in the context description, gender is not tracked by the tracking tools and M&E instruments, no gender analysis took place, no gender action plan or gender strategy was developed for the project.

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

Gender is mentioned in the project document, but it is unclear how gender equality is being promoted. There might be one or two gender disaggregated indicators, but it is unclear whether and how that data informs project management. Gender might be mentioned in a social assessment, but it is unclear what is done with that information. No gender action plan or gender strategy was developed for the project.

**Gender-sensitive:** Project adopts gender sensitive methodologies to address gender differences and promote gender equality.

A gender analysis or social analysis with gender aspects is undertaken, gender disaggregated data are collected, gender sensitive indicators are integrated in

---

<sup>23</sup> GEF, [Gender Equality Action Plan \(GEAP\)](#), October 2014. Council Document GEF/C.47/09/Rev.01.

monitoring and evaluation, and the data collected informs project management. But the gender focus is only apparent in a limited number of project activities.

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

Like gender-sensitive, but there are gender relevant components in most, if not all, activities.

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

Like gender-mainstreamed, but the way gender is addressed might result in behavioral changes towards gender norms and dynamics in the systems targeted by the project.

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