

Strategic Country Cluster Evaluation (SCCE): Least Developed Countries

Guidance Note for Country Case Studies

March 2019

1. Introduction and Purpose

Case studies are the main component of the Least Developed Countries (LDCs) SCCE.¹ They focus on the two overarching evaluation objectives:

- To understand the determinants of sustainability; and
- To assess GEF's relevance to and performance in tackling the main environmental challenges in LDCs.

In its latest Annual Performance Report (APR) the GEF Independent Evaluation Office (IEO) has conducted a desk review on sustainability ([GEF IEO 2018](#)). Based on 53 post completion verification reports, the review indicates that higher sustainability ratings at project completion are associated with higher levels of post project completion outcomes. For most projects, these outcomes are in turn correlated with satisfactory outcome ratings at completion. Importantly, at post completion more projects achieved environmental stress reduction and broader adoption of project outcomes than at completion. The following contributing factors were at play in those cases where past outcomes were not sustained:

- lack of financial support for the maintenance of infrastructure or follow up
- lack of sustained efforts from the executing agency
- inadequate political support including limited progress on the adoption of legal and regulatory measures
- low institutional capacities of key agencies
- low levels of stakeholder buy-in, and
- flaws in the theory of change of projects.

Building on the APR desk review findings, this evaluation aims at exploring in depth, through country case study analysis, the factors contributing and/or hindering the sustainability of project outcomes. The aim is to cross check the APR findings as well as identify any other nuances to the six factors above, or new factors that either hinder or contribute to the sustainability of project completion outcomes.

Selection of case study countries draws upon the LDC SCCE's sustainability cohort, composed of 127 national and regional projects completed between 2007 and 2014 having APR ratings for both outcomes and sustainability. Projects in the selected countries addressed the most common environmental challenges shared by the largest number of LDCs, including deforestation and land degradation, threats

¹ The Approach Paper of this evaluation is available [here](#).

to biodiversity, threats to marine resources, coastal and coral reef degradation, and inland water resources.

The purpose of this note is to detail the design of the country case study visits and provide guidance to the case study teams. The same data gathering approach should be used, so that observations and emerging findings are coherent and comparable across all countries and projects visited. In short, this note aims to maintain as much homogeneity as possible among the four studies.

2. Key evaluation questions

The LDC SCCE focuses on five key questions. As indicated in the evaluation matrix annexed to the approach paper, case studies and related country visits/data gathering pertains to the following six questions (and related indicators):

- 1) What are the key factors influencing sustainability of outcomes in the LDCs?
- 2) In what way, if any, does the environment and socio-economic development/livelihoods nexus help explain the sustainability of outcomes in LDCs?
- 3) To what extent has GEF support been relevant to the main environmental challenges LDCs face, and are there any gaps?
- 4) To what extent have gender and resilience been taken into consideration in GEF programming in LDCs?
- 5) To what extent has GEF support performed in fragile contexts in LDCs and how have the results achieved by completed GEF projects and programs been affected in situations that have become fragile?

The first three questions will be the main focus of the case study data gathering effort. They will be answered building on desk review of project documents as well as on the results from portfolio and geospatial analysis prior to the missions. Once in the countries, these three questions will be answered through central level interviews and field verifications, as detailed in the following sections. Questions 4) and 5) will be answered through central level interviews with key stakeholders in the capital. Interview guidelines with indicators for each question are presented in annex 1.

3. Case study planning, approach and methodologies

Mozambique and **Tanzania** in Africa and **Bhutan** and **Cambodia** in Asia were selected for case studies based on the largest number of national and regional projects with positive and negative APR ratings both on outcomes and sustainability. Additionally, the Sub-Saharan Africa Biomes and SIDS SCCEs have each selected four LDCs for case studies—**Guinea**, **Mali**, **Mauritania**, and **Uganda**, and the SIDS Comoros, **Guinea Bissau**, **Kiribati**, and **Vanuatu**. These SCCEs are following a similar approach and methodology. The aim is to coordinate and synergize the country level data gathering and analysis effort in a way to serve the needs of all three SCCEs. Annex 2 details the projects belonging to the LDC SCCE sustainability cohort in the selected countries.

A minimum of two weeks is foreseen for each country mission, 30-40 percent spent conducting interviews and data gathering in the capital (including briefing and debriefing the GEF Operational Focal Point in the country) and the rest dedicated to field verification in project sites. Evaluation teams will also conduct dyadic interviews in select countries, Bhutan and Tanzania ([Morgan et al. 2016](#)). Dyadic interviews will be conducted with pairs of child and standalone national project managers from the

same country to inquire about evidence or examples of positive, negative and lack of long term environmental change and the related underlying factors in each example. The focus on comparing child projects (i.e. projects designed and implemented under a program) with similar standalone projects is to test the hypothesis that implementing a 'programmatic' project gives a higher likelihood of higher outcomes and sustainability, and the underlying factors pertaining to a program that make child projects more sustainable. A separate guidance note has been prepared for dyadic interviews and will be provided to the teams.

Country visits will benefit from analyses conducted in house by the GEF IEO prior to the missions. First, results will be extracted for each country from the ongoing project documentation review and will be provided to the teams. Secondly, project sites where spatial observations can be made are being geo-located based on the location information contained in project documents prior to the visit to the countries. A preliminary geospatial analysis will be conducted at the country and project site level, aiming at identifying change and trends over time in:

- Land productivity, land cover and soil organic carbon
- Forest loss/gain
- Forest fragmentation

The results of this analysis will be field verified during country visits, with the aim of understanding the factors that contributed to the change observed through remote sensing.

Each country case study should target field verification in one site of at least three completed projects from the sustainability cohort (one with positive, one with negative, and one with neutral ratings both for outcomes and sustainability), aiming at covering the intervention typologies applied to the main environmental challenges in LDCs. Two to three additional project site visits will be identified by the case study team lead from completed projects that are not part of the sustainability cohort and projects under implementation (see annex 3 for a full list of national projects). The methods section of the case study report (a report outline is presented in annex 4) will detail the choice and representation of the sites to be field verified.

The criteria for selection of projects to cover in addition to the sustainability cohort ones are:

- Priority to completed over under implementation projects,
- Priority to national over regional projects, and
- Projects belonging to dyads.

The evaluation task manager, Anna Viggh, will directly participate in the conduct of two case studies: Bhutan and Tanzania, in both cases with assistance from a national consultant. The Cambodia and Mozambique case studies will be conducted by a national or regional senior-level consultant.

4. Indicative Steps

Based on the preliminary activities described above (including the selection of project sites for field verification), and following email introductions from the GEF IEO, the evaluators responsible for the respective case studies shall also make initial contact with the in-country project managers and other

stakeholders.² A mission agenda with a timetable and list of persons to meet, including the list of project sites will be drafted and agreed to with the GEF OFP based on the selection of project sites to visit and the stakeholders to interview. Ideally, the agenda should be prepared and shared with national partners two weeks in advance of the mission.




Given resource constraints, it will not be possible to assess a statistically representative number of project sites in each country. The intention is to visit an illustrative sample of project sites. Logistics and costs will have to be taken into consideration. The sample will be selected from sites where activities began from the year 2007 onwards (from the three cohorts). In case sites of projects under implementation need to be visited, activities at the site should have been ongoing for at least two years. For completed projects, the key stakeholders should still be available for meetings/interviews. The sampling approach will be documented in the case study report.

Country visits will consist of the following steps: (i) background reading prior to the country visits; (ii) information/data collection and interviews at the central level in the capital; (iii) project site visits; (iv) analysis; and (v) report writing. Background reading includes: LDC SCCE Approach Paper; *GEF IEO Annual Performance Report 2017* (the sustainability analysis chapter); LDC SCCE Selection of Case Study Countries note; Project Documentation (both design and progress reports (PIRs and MTRs), and terminal evaluations); this Guidance Note – including the interview protocol (in annex 1); Guidance Note for Dyadic Interviews; and Pre-mission geospatial analyses and portfolio reviews.

A tentative scheduling of the country visits is presented here below.

| # | Country | Month | Mar-19 | | | | Apr-19 | | | | Apr/ May | May-19 | | | | Jun-19 | | | | Who |
|---|------------|-------|--------|-------|-------|-------|--------|------|-------|-------|-------------|--------|-------|-------|-------|--------|-------|-------|-------|-------------------------------------|
| | | Week | 4-8 | 11-15 | 18-22 | 25-29 | 1-5 | 8-12 | 15-19 | 22-26 | 29-3 | 6-10 | 13-17 | 20-24 | 27-31 | 3-7 | 10-14 | 17-21 | 24-28 | |
| 1 | Bhutan | | | X | X | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Anna, national consultant |
| 2 | Cambodia | | | | | | | X | X | | | | | | | | | | | Senior national/regional consultant |
| 3 | Mozambique | | | | | | X | X | | | | | | | | | | | | Senior national/regional consultant |
| 4 | Tanzania | | | | | | | | | X | X | | | | | | | | | Anna, national consultant |

LEGEND:

-  Annual leave
-  UNEG Evaluation Week in Nairobi, Kenya
-  Council session

Notes: Easter - 21 April
 Ramadan - 5 May - 4 June
 Khmer New Year - 13-17 April

² A complete stakeholder list is being compiled with information gathered from the GEF Agencies.

Annex 1 – Interview Guidelines

This Annex guides the interviews to be conducted in the country visits under this evaluation. This applies mostly to interviews held with national level stakeholders - the Government (GEF Operational Focal Point, other staff involved with the project), GEF Agencies and executing agencies. It may also be used during project site visits with beneficiaries, depending on whether they are sufficiently familiar with the project to be able to reply to the questions in an informed manner.

The list below is not exhaustive and can be used as an initial reference, to be adjusted, modified and adapted to the program, topic and country covered in the case study. A separate list is provided for dyadic interviews to national project directors in the guidance document for dyadic interviews.

a) What are the key factors influencing sustainability of outcomes in (project site/country)?

Look for evidence and examples of positive, negative and absent change in terms of longer term sustainability of outcomes and broader adoption³ in place. Identify the main underlying factors in each example. Provide detailed explanation for each factor/mechanism that either positively influenced/supported or hampered sustainability. Factors may include, but are not limited to:

- Financial support for the maintenance of infrastructure or follow up
- Sustained efforts from the national executing agency
- Existence of institutions and/or governance structures functioning after completion
- Political support, including legal and regulatory measures
- Institutional capacities of key national agencies
- Stakeholders involved at design
- Other (specify)

Questioning may include the following:

- *When and why did broader adoption take place, during or after the project's implementation?*
- *What were the project-related contributing factors positively affecting the sustainability of outcomes? What were the project-related factors hindering the sustainability of outcomes? Which were the*

³ **Broader adoption** is said to have taken place when governments and other stakeholders adopt, expand, and build on the initiatives that the GEF funds, during program/project implementation or afterwards, as a result of initial successes. Broader adoption occurs through five mechanisms: sustaining, mainstreaming, replication, scaling-up, and market change, defined as:
Sustaining: A GEF-supported intervention or outcome is continued to be implemented by the original beneficiaries without GEF support through clear budget allocations, implementing structures, and institutional frameworks so they can keep reaping the benefits and provide incentives for adoption by other stakeholders.

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

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

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

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

underlying mechanisms at play?

- *What were the context-related contributing factors positively affecting the sustainability of outcomes? What were the context-related hindering factors negatively affecting the sustainability of outcomes? What were the underlying mechanisms at play?*
- *Were there specific risks – climatic as well as non-climatic risks – that threatened or prevented project objectives from being achieved, and threatened longer term sustainability?*
- *In relation to longer term sustainability and broader adoption, which were the most critical contributing and hindering factors, and were these mostly project- or context-related?*

b) In what way, if any, does the environment and socio-economic development/livelihoods nexus (or lack thereof) help explain the sustainability of outcomes in (project site/country)?

Focus on the nexus or trade-off between environmental development and various aspects of socioeconomic development as a potential explanation factor that either positively influenced/supported or hampered longer term sustainability. Nexus and/or trade-offs may be explained by the following:

- Existence (or lack) of in country regulatory framework enabling private sector to address environmental issues, with examples of compliance and/or adoption by private entities
- Evidence (or lack) of access to private sector funding after project completion, and what that means with respect to the environment/development trade-offs
- Perceptions of the existence of a nexus or a trade-off between environment and socioeconomic development (food security, income generation, other), with concrete examples of both nexus and trade-offs
- Examples of specific mitigation actions to tackle trade-offs or take advantage of synergies
- Other (specify)

Questioning may include the following:

- *Which positive or negative environmental changes or trends are visible after project completion, resulting from the project? What are the factors that contributed to or hindered such changes?*
- *What positive or negative socioeconomic changes or trends are visible after project completion, resulting from the project? What are the factors that contributed to or hindered such changes?*
- *What positive or negative changes or trends in individual and institutional capacity, and governance are visible after project completion, resulting from the project? What are the factors that contributed to or hindered such changes?*

c) To what extent has GEF support been relevant to the main environmental challenges the countries face in (project site/country), and are there any gaps?

- Existence of national operational strategies related to GEF focal areas, and alignment of GEF support with national environmental priorities and budgets, and with other donors' support to

the environmental sector in the countries

- Perceptions of projects' relevance towards the country's priorities and specific environmental challenges, with concrete examples of relevance or the lack thereof
- Perceptions of the most appropriate type of support the GEF could give to the country in support of tackling its main environmental challenges
- Perceptions of whether [the expansion of the GEF partnership](#) resulted in the country being able to collaborate with more Agencies
- Variety of the services available to countries from the xx GEF Agencies working in the country, and actual and planned use of the services available to countries from these Agencies
- Perceptions of incentives and disincentives to embark in GEF integrated programs and/or multifocal projects

Questioning may include the following:

- *How does the support offered by the GEF compare with the national environmental priorities?*
- *What is the most appropriate type of support the GEF could give to the country for in support of tackling their main environmental challenges?*
- *Does the country prefer national projects over regional projects, medium-size over full-size projects, single focal area over multi-focal area projects? And why?*
- *Did the expansion of the GEF partnership result in the country being able to collaborate with more Agencies?*
- *Are the accessible GEF Agencies qualified to support the country's main environmental challenges?*
- *Are there any plans to use GEF Agencies that have not been used in the past?*

d) To what extent have gender and resilience been taken into consideration in GEF programming in?

Gender

- Existence of country gender plans, policies, strategies, specific gender-focused ministries or departments, and linkages between these and the environmental focus of GEF projects. With concrete examples, if these exist
- Linkages between country gender plans, policies and strategies and those at project level
- Evidence of women's inclusion and women's empowerment at the project level
- Perceptions of the role of women in environmental stewardship in the country
- Evidence of women's inclusion and women's empowerment

Resilience

- Existence of resilience-focused country plans, policies, strategies, and specific resilience-focused departments or task forces, and linkages between these and the environmental focus of GEF projects. With concrete examples if these exist.
- Is there evidence of resilience thinking or resilience considerations in GEF projects? Do these considerations link towards country priorities on resilience? Give concrete examples.

Annex 3 - Relevance: Completed and Under Implementation (at least 2 years) Projects

Bhutan

| GEF ID | Agency | Focal Area | Title | GEF phase | Type | Status | Trust Fund | GEF Grant (incl. PPG) (\$US million) | Co-Finance (\$US million) | Date of project start | Date of project completion |
|--------|------------|------------|---|-----------|------|----------------------|------------|--------------------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------|
| 3844 | UNDP | CC | Sustainable Rural Biomass Energy | GEF-4 | FP | Completed | GET | 1.78 | 2.53 | 8/29/2012 | |
| 4824 | GEFSEC | LD | NAP Alignment and Report Preparation | GEF-5 | EA | Completed | GET | 0.15 | 0.05 | 2/1/2012 | |
| 4579 | World Bank | MFA | Sustainable Financing for Biodiversity Conservation and Natural Resources Management | GEF-5 | FP | Under Implementation | GET | 4.21 | 12.33 | 11/4/2013 | |
| 4976 | UNDP | CCA | Addressing the Risk of Climate-induced Disasters through Enhanced National and Local Capacity for Effective Actions | GEF-5 | FP | Under Implementation | LDCF | 11.59 | 54.54 | 4/18/2014 | |
| 5448 | UNDP | BD | Implementing the Nagoya Protocol on Access to Genetic Resources and Benefit Sharing | GEF-5 | MSP | Under Implementation | NPIF | 1.05 | 3.00 | 9/24/2014 | |

Cambodia

| GEF ID | Agency | Focal Area | Title | GEF phase | Type | Status | Trust Fund | GEF Grant (incl. PPG) (\$US million) | Co-Finance (\$US million) | Date of project start | Date of project completion |
|--------|--------|------------|---|-----------|------|----------------------|------------|--------------------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------|
| 3635 | UNDP | MFA | SFM Strengthening Sustainable Forest Management and the Development of Bio-energy Markets to Promote Environmental Sustainability and to Reduce Green House Gas Emissions in Cambodia | GEF-4 | FP | Completed | GET | 2.36 | 7.60 | 3/18/2011 | 12/12/2015 |
| 3890 | UNEP | CCA | Vulnerability Assessment and Adaptation Programme for Climate Change in the Coastal Zone of Cambodia Considering Livelihood Improvement and Ecosystems | GEF-4 | MSP | Completed | LDCF | 1.69 | 4.20 | 1/1/2012 | |
| 3976 | UNIDO | CC | Reducing Greenhouse Gas Emissions through Improved Energy Efficiency in the Industrial Sector | GEF-4 | FP | Completed | GET | 1.30 | 3.31 | 4/19/2011 | 11/30/2015 |
| 4428 | GEFSEC | MFA | GEF National Portfolio Formulation Document | GEF-5 | EA | Completed | GET | 0.03 | - | 12/17/2010 | 7/27/2012 |
| 4042 | UNIDO | CC | TT-Pilot (GEF-4): Climate Change Related Technology Transfer for Cambodia: Using Agricultural Residue Biomass for Sustainable Energy Solutions | GEF-4 | FP | Under Implementation | GET | 1.77 | 4.57 | 11/19/2012 | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|------|-------|-----|--|-------|-----|----------------------|------|------|-------|------------|--|
| 4434 | FAO | CCA | Strengthening the Adaptive Capacity and Resilience of Rural Communities Using Micro Watershed Approaches to Climate Change and Variability to Attain Sustainable Food Security | GEF-5 | FP | Under Implementation | LDCF | 5.17 | 25.73 | 6/9/2014 | |
| 5265 | UNEP | CW | Review and Update of the National Implementation Plan for the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs) in the Kingdom of Cambodia | GEF-5 | EA | Under Implementation | GET | 0.17 | 0.29 | 5/20/2013 | |
| 5295 | UNDP | MFA | Generating, Accessing and Using Information and Knowledge Related to the Three Rio Conventions | GEF-5 | MSP | Under Implementation | GET | 1.02 | 1.30 | 1/14/2015 | |
| 5318 | UNDP | CCA | Strengthening Climate Information and Early Warning Systems in Cambodia to Support Climate Resilient Development and Adaptation to Climate Change | GEF-5 | FP | Under Implementation | LDCF | 4.91 | 21.88 | 11/28/2014 | |
| 5421 | UNIDO | CC | Reduction of GHG Emission through Promotion of Commercial Biogas Plants | GEF-5 | MSP | Under Implementation | GET | 1.55 | 12.50 | 5/22/2015 | |

Mozambique

| GEF ID | Agency | Focal Area | Title | GEF phase | Type | Status | Trust Fund | GEF Grant (incl. PPG) (\$US million) | Co-Finance (\$US million) | Date of project start | Date of project completion |
|--------|------------|------------|--|-----------|------|----------------------|------------|--------------------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------|
| 3753 | UNDP | BD | Sustainable Financing of the Protected Area System in Mozambique | GEF-4 | FP | Completed | GET | 5.00 | 13.87 | 12/2/2011 | |
| 3768 | UNEP | BD | Development of the National Clearing House Mechanism- and Capacity Assessment for ABS and Taxonomy (previously titled " Updating of the NBSAP, Development of the NCHM") | GEF-4 | EA | Completed | GET | 0.18 | 0.02 | 9/30/2010 | 12/30/2011 |
| 4542 | GEFSEC | MFA | GEF National Portfolio Formulation Document | GEF-5 | EA | Completed | GET | - | - | 5/27/2011 | 9/10/2013 |
| 3986 | FAO | CW | Disposal of POPs Wastes and Obsolete Pesticides | GEF-4 | FP | Under Implementation | GET | 2.00 | 4.25 | 7/1/2011 | |
| 4276 | UNDP | CCA | Adaptation in the Coastal Zones of Mozambique | GEF-5 | FP | Under Implementation | LDCF | 4.52 | 9.68 | 2/20/2012 | |
| 5161 | UNIDO | CW | Enabling Activities to Review and Update the National Implementation Plan for the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs) in Mozambique | GEF-5 | EA | Under Implementation | GET | 0.18 | 0.20 | 8/21/2013 | |
| 5225 | World Bank | MFA | Mozambique Conservation Areas for Biodiversity and Development Project | GEF-5 | FP | Under Implementation | GET | 6.32 | 61.50 | 5/1/2015 | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|------|-------|-----|--|---------|----|----------------------|------|------|-------|-----------|--|
| 5433 | FAO | CCA | Strengthening Capacities of Agricultural Producers to Cope with Climate Change for Increased Food Security through the Farmers Field School Approach | GEF-5 | FP | Under Implementation | LDCF | 9.20 | 27.34 | 7/1/2015 | |
| 6985 | UNIDO | CW | National Action Plan on Mercury in the Mozambican Artisanal and Small-Scale Gold Mining sector | GEF - 6 | EA | Under Implementation | GET | 0.50 | 0.08 | 6/15/2015 | |

Tanzania

| GEF ID | Agency | Focal Area | Title | GEF phase | Type | Status | Trust Fund | GEF Grant (incl. PPG) (\$US million) | Co-Finance (\$US million) | Date of project start | Date of Project completion |
|--------|------------|------------|--|-----------|------|----------------------|------------|--------------------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------|
| 3391 | UNDP | LD | SIP: Reducing Land Degradation on the Highlands of Kilimanjaro | GEF-4 | FP | Completed | GET | 2.76 | 21.65 | 3/3/2010 | 12/1/2015 |
| 4473 | GEFSEC | MFA | GEF National Portfolio Formulation Document | GEF-5 | EA | Completed | GET | 0.03 | - | 3/25/2011 | 11/17/2011 |
| 5093 | UNIDO | CW | Enabling Activities to Review and Update the National Implementation Plan for the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs) | GEF-5 | EA | Completed | GET | 0.21 | 0.21 | 12/17/2012 | 6/2/2017 |
| 5185 | UNDP | LD | Support to Alignment of Tanzania's National Action Plan with the UNCCD's 10 Year Strategic Framework and Support National Reporting | GEF-5 | EA | Completed | GET | 0.14 | 0.45 | 12:00:00 AM | 1/29/2016 |
| 3000 | UNDP | MFA | SFM: Sustainable Management of the Miombo Woodland Resources of Western Tanzania | GEF-4 | FP | Under Implementation | GET | 2.95 | 13.77 | 5/25/2012 | |
| 3965 | UNDP | BD | Strengthening the Protected Area Network in Southern Tanzania: Improving the Effectiveness of National Parks in Addressing Threats to Biodiversity | GEF-4 | FP | Under Implementation | GET | 5.45 | 12.06 | 7/15/2011 | |
| 4004 | UNIDO | CC | Mini-Grids Based on Small Hydropower Sources to Augment Rural Electrification | GEF-4 | FP | Under Implementation | GET | 3.41 | 9.78 | 3/11/2012 | |
| 4141 | UNEP | CCA | Developing Core Capacity to Address Adaptation to Climate Change in Productive Coastal Zones | GEF-4 | FP | Under Implementation | LDCF | 3.46 | 67.83 | 5/21/2012 | |
| 4855 | World Bank | BD | Kihansi Catchment Conservation and Management | GEF-5 | FP | Under Implementation | GET | 5.98 | 18.30 | 12/2/2013 | |
| 4873 | UNIDO | CC | Promotion of Waste-to-Energy Applications in Agro-Industries | GEF-5 | FP | Under Implementation | GET | 5.33 | 26.75 | 2/9/2015 | |
| 4991 | UNDP | CCA | Strengthening Climate Information and Early Warning Systems in Tanzania to Support | GEF-5 | FP | Under Implementation | LDCF | 4.10 | 23.17 | 12/16/2013 | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|------|------|----|--|-------|----|----------------------|-----|------|-------|-----------|--|
| | | | Climate Resilient Development and Adaptation to Climate Change | | | | | | | | |
| 5034 | UNDP | BD | Enhancing the Forest Nature Reserves Network for Biodiversity Conservation in Tanzania | GEF-5 | FP | Under Implementation | GET | 4.23 | 19.60 | 6/29/2015 | |

Annex 4 – Case Study Report Outline

The case study report should be about 15 pages with two to four pages in annexes. The following is an indicative outline:

1. Introduction, context and methodology
2. Key factors driving sustainability of outcomes
3. Observed sustainability, context and nexus
 - 3.1 Observed sustainability and the environmental/socio-economic context
 - 3.2 Observed sustainability and the water-energy-food nexus
4. Relevance
 - 4.1 Relevance in relations to national priorities and strategies
 - 4.2 Relevance in relation to the GEF focal areas
5. Cross cutting issues
 - 5.1 Gender and gender issues
 - 5.2 Resilience
 - 5.3 Private sector engagement and financing
6. Summary of emerging findings and preliminary conclusions

Annex 1: List of interviewees

| Salutation (Mr, Mrs, Dr, etc.) | First name | Last name | Organization | Job title | Email |
|-----------------------------------|------------|-----------|--------------|-----------|-------|
| | | | | | |

Annex 2: Identified differences in ratings for projects part of sustainability cohort

| Project ID | Gender rating at completion | Observed gender rating | Sustainability rating | Observed sustainability rating | Short explanation of change |
|------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| | | | | | |

Annex 3: Identified gaps in relevance (if any)