

29<sup>th</sup> LDCF/SCCF Council Meeting  
December 10, 2020  
Virtual Meeting

Agenda Item 06

**2020 PROGRAM EVALUATION OF THE  
LEAST DEVELOPED COUNTRIES FUND**

(Prepared by the Independent Evaluation Office of the GEF)

**Recommended Council Decision**

The Council, having reviewed documents GEF/LDCF.SCCF.29/E/01, *2020 Program Evaluation of the Least Developed Countries Fund* and the Management Response, endorses the following recommendations:

- (a) Build on progress made on mainstreaming gender in the LDCF portfolio and aim to decrease the knowledge gap about gender-related results.
- (b) Continue to enhance the likelihood of the sustainability of outcomes.

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1. At its 26<sup>th</sup> meeting in June 2019, the Least Developed Countries Fund/Special Climate Change Fund (LDCF/SCCF) Council approved the Four-Year Work Program of the Independent Evaluation Office (IEO) of the Global Environment Facility (GEF) (GEF 2019a). It includes an update to the 2016 program evaluation of the LDCF during fiscal year 2020. This program evaluation focuses on performance and progress toward LDCF objectives and results in the four years since the 2016 evaluation.

2. The LDCF was established as one of the climate change adaptation financing mechanisms of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), in response to guidance from the Seventh Conference of the Parties (COP) in Marrakech in 2001 (UNFCCC 2001). The LDCF is mandated by the UNFCCC to, among other responsibilities, support the climate adaptation efforts of least developed countries (LDCs)—including preparing national adaptation programs of action (NAPAs), implementing NAPA priority projects in LDCs, preparing the national adaptation plan (NAP) process in eligible developing countries, and supporting other elements of the LDC work program.

3. The GEF is an operating entity of the financial mechanism of the UNFCCC and is entrusted with the administration and financial operation of the LDCF. The LDCF is separate from the GEF Trust Fund, and—together with the SCCF—has its own council. The governance structure and operational procedures and policies that apply to the GEF Trust Fund also apply to the LDCF and SCCF. However, the LDCF/SCCF Council can modify these procedures in response to COP guidance or to help LDCF/SCCF operations achieve their objectives.

4. The LDCF works with the same agencies as the GEF. These GEF Agencies have direct access to LDCF and work closely with project proponents such as government agencies, civil society organizations, and other stakeholders to design, develop, and implement activities the fund. As of writing, 11 GEF Agencies (ADB, AFDB, CI, FAO, IFAD, IUCN, UNDP, UNEP, UNIDO, World Bank, and WWF-US) were involved in LDCF operations.

5. The main objective of this evaluation is to assess the progress the LDCF has made since the 2016 LDCF program evaluation and the extent to which the LDCF is in the process of achieving the objectives set out in the GEF Programming Strategy on Adaptation to Climate Change for LDCF/SCCF (2018–2022).

6. The evaluation developed a portfolio analysis protocol, including a quality-at-entry review, to assess the projects systematically to ensure that key project-level questions were addressed coherently. The team applied the portfolio analysis protocol to 25 full-size projects (FSPs), medium-size projects (MSPs) Council-approved projects with project identification forms (PIF) submitted in or after October 2015, 34 FSPs and MSPs for which terminal evaluations had become available since the 2016 LDCF program evaluation, and an enabling activity which had reached completion. Where appropriate, the team merged results from the 2020 portfolio review with data from the 2016 Program Evaluation for information on the LDCF portfolio as a whole.

7. In addition to the portfolio review, the team conducted two country field visits—to Rwanda and Samoa. The team selected field visit countries that had projects closed for three to five years, suitable for postcompletion evaluation, aiming to cover LDC regions. The evaluation team also conducted interviews with staff of the GEF Secretariat, the GEF Agencies, the UNFCCC Secretariat, the LDC Expert Group, civil society organizations and government officials, project implementers, beneficiaries, and other country-level stakeholders.

## Conclusions

8. **LDCF support continues to be highly relevant to COP guidance and decisions, the GEF adaptation programming strategy, and countries' broader development policies, plans and programs.** The 2016 LDCF program evaluation reported strong alignment between LDCF-financed activities and COP guidance and decisions, the GEF adaptation strategic objectives, and countries' environmental and sustainable development agendas. This evaluation has found continued strong alignment since 2016. Additionally, a large portion of the LDCF's work is inherently aligned with the Paris Agreement through its support of adaptation related NDCs/INDs. Notably, in response to recent COP guidance based on findings of the 2016 LDCF program evaluation, the LDCF has enhanced domestic institutional capacities in LDCs by supporting institutional capacity development through the involvement of national institutions in LDCF project development, approval and delivery.

9. **LDCF project design clearly contributes to the three recently revised GEF adaptation strategic objectives; contributions to the two new strategic pillars were not as strong.** The nature and extent of contributions varied from project to project, but the overall LDCF portfolio clearly contributed to reducing vulnerability and increasing resilience, mainstreaming climate change adaptation, and strengthening the enabling conditions for effective and integrated adaptation. LDCF projects invariably also helped raise general awareness of adaptation across all stakeholder groups. They commonly supported strengthening institutional capacities for adaptation-focused work. Contributions to the new GEF adaptation strategic pillars in project design were less pronounced. This is partly because the pillar revisions were only adopted in 2018, so they have yet to have a marked influence on LDCF project design.

10. **The overall gender performance of the LDCF portfolio has improved.** The use of gender analysis during project design is widespread. Revisions to the GEF's Gender Equality Policy have contributed to improved gender mainstreaming performance across the LDCF. Particularly influential has been a new requirement for all GEF-supported projects to undertake a gender analysis prior to CEO endorsement or approval. The Guidance to Advance Gender Equality in GEF Projects and Programs has also helped clarify how gender analyses can be operationalized through gender action plans or mainstreaming strategies. However, there is a knowledge gap in the gender-related results of LDCF projects: it is particularly concerning that most LDCF terminal evaluations fail to undertake any form of gender-focused assessment, even among those published after the GEF IEO guidelines made it a requirement.

11. **Substantive engagement with the private sector is limited, and LDCF projects face common challenges.** Most LDCF projects deliver activities that aim to increase private sector

involvement or deliver activities with some private sector participation. However, beyond such activity-level engagement, the private sector has very limited substantive involvement in implementing LDCF projects, for example as delivery partners or investors. Interviews with GEF Agencies identified two common challenges LDCF projects face: banking and private sectors are comparatively less developed in LDCs, and it is difficult to attract private sector interest and investment in adaptation-focused work. These two factors arguably make private sector engagement even more challenging for LDCF projects compared to other GEF funding mechanisms.

**12. The lack of resources available for new projects during GEF-6 clearly reduced the efficiency of the LDCF project approval process.** Project cycle analysis shows that during the GEF-5 period, the LDCF efficiency approval process matched other GEF-administered funds. In GEF-6, however, the LDCF approval process slowed considerably, because of a lack of resources available for new projects. Several interviewees noted improvements in efficiency during the GEF-7 period, stemming from eliminating the pipeline and operational improvements the GEF Programming Strategy for the LDCF and SCCF and Operational Improvements introduced. Despite welcome operational improvements, uncertainty over resource availability remains a concern among stakeholders.

**13. Once implementation has begun, efficiency of LDCF projects is comparable to other GEF-administered funds.** Comparisons with other GEF funds show similar project lengths, numbers of projects with extensions, and projects with extensions of longer than two years for full-size projects between funds. The most often reported causes of delays in project implementation arise from difficulties coordinating between executing partners and recruiting project personnel, changes in project executing arrangements, and staff turnover.

**14. LDCF support has resulted in catalytic efforts through production of public goods and their demonstration.** Most completed LDCF projects have produced public goods in the form of new technologies or approaches and demonstrated new technologies and approaches by disseminating information through training or at demonstration sites from a large to a very large extent. Replication and scale up are more difficult to attain, especially by project closure.

**15. LDCF support has built foundations for larger scale projects.** In the areas where stakeholders have identified catalytic effects, the strongest performance for the portfolio of completed projects was building foundations for larger scale projects—60 percent have done so from a large to a very large extent—and improving management effectiveness of adaptation-relevant national and subnational systems, which 55 percent of projects have achieved to a large or very large extent. Projects were less successful being instrumental in developing longer-term partnerships—32 percent of projects achieved this to a large or very large extent; 28 percent developed new cost-sharing approaches or leveraged new resources to a large or very large extent and built on the traditional knowledge and practices of local communities.

**16. Many factors, both in and outside a project's control, affect outcome sustainability.** Postcompletion visits to LDCF projects revealed project-supported benefits continued to varying degrees. Continued financing is an important factor in sustainability. LDCF terminal

evaluations identified common project-related factors that hindered outcome sustainability, including insufficient capacity of the project team, staff turnover and delays in recruitment, weak project design, and weak project management. The reports most frequently noted effective stakeholder engagement and effective coordination between executing partners as factors contributing to sustainability.

## **Recommendations**

17. **Build on progress made on mainstreaming gender in the LDCF portfolio and aim to decrease the knowledge gap about gender-related results.** The GEF Secretariat and GEF Agencies should continue to build on progress made since the 2016 LDCF program evaluation towards inclusion of gender considerations by ensuring that the 2017 Gender Equality Policy and related guidance is fully operationalized, including the development and implementation of robust gender action plans. To narrow the knowledge gap, GEF Agencies should fulfill evaluation requirements on gender in terminal evaluations and report on the conduct of gender analysis and monitoring and evaluation of gender equitable participation and benefits in implementation.

18. **Continue to enhance the likelihood of the sustainability of outcomes.** The GEF Secretariat and GEF Agencies should continue to carry out relevant actions in project design and implementation as highlighted in the Council document *Towards Greater Durability of GEF Investments*. This should entail giving more emphasis to the project and context factors identified by this evaluation as affecting the sustainability of outcomes during project design and implementation.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....	III
INTRODUCTION .....	1
APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY .....	4
LITERATURE REVIEW .....	8
ANALYSIS OF THE LDCF PORTFOLIO .....	9
RELEVANCE OF LDCF SUPPORT .....	14
EFFECTIVENESS OF THE LDCF.....	20
EFFICIENCY OF THE LDCF.....	34
CATALYTIC EFFECTS, SUSTAINABILITY, AND ADDITIONALITY OF THE LDCF .....	41
CONCLUSIONS .....	52
ANNEX A: UNFCCC COP GUIDANCE .....	55
ANNEX B: OVERVIEW OF COMPLETED NAPAS .....	58
ANNEX C: EVALUATION MATRIX .....	60
ANNEX D: RESULTS FRAMEWORK OF THE GEF ADAPTATION PROGRAM.....	64
ANNEX E: PORTFOLIO ANALYSIS PROTOCOL .....	65
ANNEX F: INTERVIEWEES.....	71
ANNEX G: AVERAGE TIME (MONTHS) FROM FIRST RECEIPT OF CONCEPT TO PROJECT START .....	76
ANNEX H: LDCF PROJECTS REVIEWED.....	77

## TABLES FIGURES AND BOXES

### TABLES

Table 1: GEF Agencies involved in LDCF operations .....	3
Table 2: Number of and budgetary allocation for LDCF projects by project modality.....	10
Table 3: Number of and budgetary allocation for MTF projects by GEF period .....	11
Table 4: Other focal areas to which LDCF projects potentially contribute .....	18
Table 5: Comparison of current and previous GEF adaptation strategic objectives and pillars ..	21
Table 6: Examples of innovative approaches from recently completed projects .....	23
Table 7: Gender mainstreaming rating scale .....	27
Table 8: Duration and average extensions of completed LDCF- and GEF-funded FSPs .....	37
Table 9: Delays during implementation.....	38
Table 10: Cofinancing across GEF-administered funds.....	38
Table 11: Factors that help or hinder sustainability of project outcomes .....	49

## FIGURES

Figure 1: Distribution of LDCF project types by GEF replenishment period.....	11
Figure 2: Distribution of LDCF projects and funding by GEF replenishment period .....	12
Figure 3: Distribution of LDCF financing and cofinancing leveraged by agency.....	13
Figure 4: Number and grant value of LDCF project by region .....	13
Figure 5: Distribution of LDCF projects by status .....	14
Figure 6: Design alignment with UNFCCC guidance for NAPA implementation and NAP projects .....	16
Figure 7: Linkages to intended NDCs/INDCs in projects reviewed.....	17
Figure 8: Alignment of recently approved projects with GEF adaptation strategic objectives....	22
Figure 9: Alignment of recently approved LDCF projects with GEF adaptation strategic pillars .	24
Figure 10: Selected APR performance ratings for completed LDCF projects.....	25
Figure 11: Gender mainstreaming ratings of LDCF projects completed since 2016 .....	28
Figure 12: Gender mainstreaming ratings of LDCF portfolio.....	29
Figure 13: Existence of gender action plan or mainstreaming strategy in LDCF portfolio.....	30
Figure 14: Type, extent of private sector engagement at entry and by completion .....	33
Figure 15: GEF project cycle milestones .....	35
Figure 16: LDCF funds available versus funds sought in projects awaiting approval or endorsement and projects technically cleared for approval.....	36
Figure 17: Production of a public good.....	42
Figure 18: Demonstration .....	43
Figure 19: Replication .....	44
Figure 20: Scaling up .....	44
Figure 21: Catalytic effects in the portfolio of completed projects.....	45
Figure 22: Catalytic effects stakeholders identified .....	46



Figure 23: APR sustainability ratings in the LDCF portfolio of completed projects..... 48

**BOXES**

Box 1: Intergovernmental panel on climate change definitions of key terms ..... 1

Box 2: GEF strategic objectives and pillars ..... 5

## ABBREVIATIONS

AfDB	African Development Bank
APR	annual performance report
BOAD	West African Development Bank
CAF	Development Bank of Latin America
CARLA	Climate Adaptation for Rural Livelihoods and Agriculture
CI	Conservation International
COP	conference of the parties
DBSA	Development Bank of Southern Africa
EBRD	European Bank for Reconstruction and Development
EWS	early warning system
FECO	Foreign Economic Cooperation Office, Ministry of Environmental Protection of China
FSP	full-size project
GEB	global environmental benefit
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GCF	Green Climate Fund
ICCRIFS	Integration of Climate Change Risks and Resilience into Forestry Management
IDB	Inter-American Development Bank
IEO	Independent Evaluation Office
IFAD	International Fund for Agricultural Development
INDC	intended nationally determined contribution
IPCC	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
IUCN	International Union for Conservation of Nature
LDC	least developed country

MEA	multilateral environmental agreement
MOPAN	Multilateral Organization Performance Assessment Network
MNRE	Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment (Samoa)
MSP	medium-size project
MTF	multitrust fund
MTR	midterm report
NAP	national adaptation plan
NAPA	national adaptation programs of action
NDC	nationally determined contribution
PIF	project identification forms
ODS	ozone-depleting substance
POP	persistent organic pollutant
PPG	project preparation grant
SamFris	Samoa Forest Resource Information System
SCCF	Special Climate Change Fund
SGP	Small Grants Program
STAP	Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel
UNFCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
UNIDO	United Nations Industrial Development Organization
WWF-US	World Wildlife Fund

## INTRODUCTION

1. At its 26<sup>th</sup> meeting in June 2019, the Least Developed Countries Fund/Special Climate Change Fund (LDCF/SCCF) Council approved the Four-Year Work Program of the Independent Evaluation Office (IEO) of the Global Environment Facility (GEF) (GEF 2019a). It includes an update to the 2016 program evaluation of the LDCF during fiscal year 2020. This program evaluation focuses on performance and progress toward LDCF objectives and results in the four years since the 2016 evaluation. The overall purpose is to provide the LDCF/SCCF Council with evaluative evidence of the fund's relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and additionality of LDCF support.

2. The LDCF was established as one of the climate change adaptation financing mechanisms of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), in response to guidance from the Seventh Conference of the Parties (COP) in Marrakech in 2001 (UNFCCC 2001). The LDCF is mandated by the UNFCCC to, among other responsibilities, support the climate adaptation efforts of least developed countries (LDCs)—including preparing national adaptation programs of action (NAPAs), implementing NAPA priority projects in LDCs, preparing the national adaptation plan (NAP) process in eligible developing countries, and supporting other elements of the LDC work program. Box 1 defines key terms used. Annex A is a summary of UNFCCC COP guidance and decisions for the LDCF. Recent UNFCCC COP guidance includes a request based on findings of the 2016 LDCF program evaluation “to continue to enhance capacity development in the least developed countries for the development of project proposals, with a focus on identifying potential funding sources, both national and international, and enhancing long-term domestic institutional capacities” (UNFCCC 2016).

### Box 1: Intergovernmental panel on climate change definitions of key terms

The UNFCCC COP guidance and decisions on the LDCF (annex A) and GEF strategic objectives and pillars (box 2) use several key terms defined by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC 2018):

**Adaptation:** The process of adjustment to actual or expected climate and its effects. In human systems, adaptation seeks to moderate or avoid harm or exploit beneficial opportunities. In some natural systems, human intervention may facilitate adjustment to expected climate and its effects.

**Capacity building:** The practice of enhancing the strengths and attributes of, and resources available to an individual, community, society, or organization to respond to change.

**Resilience:** The capacity of social, economic, and environmental systems to cope with a hazardous event, trend, or disturbance, responding or reorganizing in ways that maintain their essential function, identity, and structure, while also maintaining the capacity for adaptation, learning, and transformation.

**Vulnerability:** The propensity or predisposition to be adversely affected. Vulnerability encompasses a variety of concepts and elements, including sensitivity or susceptibility to harm and lack of capacity to cope and adapt.

3. The GEF is an operating entity of the financial mechanism of the UNFCCC and is entrusted with the administration and financial operation of the LDCF. The LDCF is separate from the GEF Trust Fund, and—together with the SCCF—has its own council. The governance structure and operational procedures and policies that apply to the GEF Trust Fund also apply to the LDCF and SCCF. However, the LDCF/SCCF Council can modify these procedures in response to COP guidance or to help LDCF/SCCF operations achieve their objectives.

4. Since the Paris Agreement entered into force in November 2016, the LDCF is one of the operating entities of the financial mechanism for the agreement and the UNFCCC. The LDCF is entrusted to continue to play a key role in areas such as strengthening least developed countries' adaptive capacity and resilience to climate change, with a focus on implementation. At the heart of the Paris Agreement and the achievement of long-term goals are the nationally determined contributions (NDCs) and intended NDCs (INDCs).<sup>1</sup> Each country outlines its efforts to reduce national emissions and, in some cases, to adapt to impacts of climate change. LDCF supports adaptation related NDCs/INDCs and seeks to align its programming with priorities identified in NDCs/INDCs.

5. 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 or costs at a later stage. The main content of NAPAs is a country-driven list of ranked priority adaptation activities and projects designed to facilitate development of proposals for NAPA implementation. The focus is on short-term outputs and potential long-term outcomes. As of the most recent LDCF/SCCF progress report to the Council, December 10, 2019, 51 LDCs had accessed \$12.20 million to support preparation of their NAPA (GEF 2019b). Annex B is an overview of completed NAPA country reports. Additionally, the CEO has endorsed or approved 228 projects to implement priorities identified in NAPAs, the NAP process, and elements of the LDC work program totaling \$1,401.13 million in LDCF funding (GEF 2019b).

6. NAPs provide a process for LDCs to formulate and implement activities that focus on medium- and long-term adaptation needs, building on the experience of the LDCs in addressing urgent and immediate adaptation needs through the NAPAs. As of the September 30, 2020 GEF report to the 26<sup>th</sup> session of the UNFCCC COP, LDCF support for the NAP processes totaled \$75.2 million (GEF 2020). This support has come both in the form of projects focused solely on advancing NAP processes and projects that combine support to the NAP process with adaptation investments for NAPA implementation. As of September 30, 2019, the cutoff for this evaluation, the GEF Secretariat identified 11 projects that support the NAP process.

7. Unlike the GEF Trust Fund, which is replenished every four years, the LDCF receives voluntary contributions with no regular replenishment schedule. This has created a high level of financing uncertainty. At the 24<sup>th</sup> LDCF/SCCF Council meeting in June 2018, the GEF Secretariat modified the LDCF project selection and approval process to improve pipeline management from a “first-come, first-served” basis to LDCF/SCCF Council batch approvals of projects through

---

<sup>1</sup> More information about NDCs is available from: <https://unfccc.int/process-and-meetings/the-paris-agreement/nationally-determined-contributions-ndcs#eq-5>; accessed October 2020.

work programs (GEF 2018a). Projects constituting the work program are selected based on agreed on factors for prioritization, similar to the GEF Trust Fund process. The first LDCF work program was submitted to the LDCF/SCCF Council for approval at its 25th meeting in December 2018 (GEF 2018b).

8. The LDCF works with the same agencies as the GEF, listed in table 1. These GEF Agencies have direct access to LDCF and work closely with project proponents such as government agencies, civil society organizations, and other stakeholders to design, develop, and implement activities the fund. As of September 2019, the cutoff date for this evaluation, nine GEF Agencies were involved in LDCF operations. Since the cutoff date, two additional agencies, Conservation International and World Wildlife Fund (WWF-US,) had project concepts approved, bringing the total at this writing to 11 GEF Agencies involved in LDCF operations. Five of the seven remaining Agencies either do not cover LDCs in their areas of operations or are not accredited by GEF to work in LDCs, thus the majority of Agencies which are eligible to implement LDCF projects are involved in operations.

**Table 1: GEF Agencies involved in LDCF operations**

All GEF Agencies	GEF Agencies involved in LDCF
<b>Original GEF Agencies</b>	
United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)	UNDP
United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP)	UNEP
The World Bank Group	The World Bank Group
<b>Agencies added in two rounds of expansion</b>	
Asian Development Bank (ADB)	ADB
African Development Bank (AFDB)	AFDB
Brazilian Biodiversity Fund (FUNBIO)	
Conservation International (CI)	CI
Development Bank of Latin America (CAF)	
Development Bank of Southern Africa (DBSA)	
European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EBRD)	
Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations (FAO)	FAO
Foreign Economic Cooperation Office, Ministry of Environmental Protection of China (FECO)	
Inter-American Development Bank (IDB)	
International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD)	IFAD
International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN)	IUCN
United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO)	UNIDO
West African Development Bank (BOAD)	
World Wildlife Fund (WWF-US)	WWF-US

Sources: GEF website; [www.thegef.org/partners/gef-agencies](http://www.thegef.org/partners/gef-agencies), accessed October 2020 and GEF PMIS and portal through September 2019.

Note: Agencies in grey are not positioned to implement LDCF projects.

## APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY

9. The main objective of this evaluation is to assess the progress the LDCF has made since the 2016 LDCF program evaluation and the extent to which the LDCF is in the process of achieving the objectives set out in the GEF Programming Strategy on Adaptation to Climate Change for LDCF/SCCF (2018–2022) (box 2). The overarching goal and strategic objectives, an integral part of the GEF programming strategy on adaptation, translate into evaluation questions grouped in five core evaluation criteria. (Annex C presents the evaluation matrix.) A detailed description of the evaluation design is provided in the 2020 LDCF program evaluation approach paper (GEF IEO 2019a). The evaluation assessed the performance and progress of the LDCF using aggregated data to answer the following questions:

- (a) **Relevance.** Does LDCF support continue to be relevant to UNFCCC COP guidance and decisions, the GEF adaptation programming strategy, and countries' broader development policies, plans, and programs?
- (b) **Effectiveness.** How effective has the LDCF been at delivering on expected climate adaptation and resilience outcomes? What are the gender equality objectives achieved and gender mainstreaming principles the LDCF adheres to? To what extent has the LDCF engaged the private sector? What are lessons learned from the implementation experience?
- (c) **Efficiency.** How have resource flows and resource predictability, or lack thereof, affected the fund's programming? How efficient is the fund's project cycle as a delivery mechanism?
- (d) **Sustainability.** To what extent have LDCF project outcomes been sustainable postcompletion?
- (e) **Additionality.** What has been the additionality, both environmental and otherwise, of the LDCF?

## Box 2: GEF strategic objectives and pillars

The GEF Programming Strategy on Adaptation to Climate Change for the LDCF and SCCF (July 2018 to June 2022) has three strategic objectives (GEF 2018c):

- Reduce vulnerability and increase resilience through innovation and technology transfer for climate change adaptation.
- Mainstream climate change adaptation and resilience for systemic impact.
- Foster enabling conditions for effective and integrated climate change adaptation.

Private sector engagement will be fostered for the LDCF and SCCF through the three objectives of this strategy and implemented through the following two pillars (GEF 2018c):

- Expanding catalytic grant and nongrant investments
- Support enabling environments for the private sector to act as an agent for market transformation.

The results framework of the GEF adaptation program is provided in annex D.

### Evaluation design

10. The evaluation used a mixed-methods approach encompassing both quantitative and qualitative sources of data, information, and analytical tools. At the evaluation's onset, the team undertook a literature review of evaluations the IEO, the evaluation offices of GEF Agencies, and others conducted that reviewed the LDCF, the NAPA, and NAP process since the 2016 LDCF program evaluation. The evaluation team also reviewed GEF-specific documents on the LDCF and related interventions. It reviewed additional literature beyond GEF and LDCF/SCCF Council and project documents, GEF Secretariat policies, processes, and related documents. The document review includes non-IEO evaluation materials and academic and other literature on the fund.

11. The team developed a portfolio analysis protocol, including a quality-at-entry review, to assess the projects systematically to ensure that key project-level questions were addressed coherently (annex E). The team applied the portfolio analysis protocol to full-size projects (FSPs), medium-size projects (MSPs), and an enabling activity at various stages of implementation. The following categories determined how the team analyzed projects during the evaluation:

- (a) The assessment reviewed the 34 completed projects for which terminal evaluations had become available since the 2016 LDCF program evaluation.<sup>2</sup> These 34 projects were all approved during the GEF-4 and GEF-5 periods. All these

---

<sup>2</sup> Of these projects, 33 are NAPA implementation projects; the remaining project supported a NAP process.



projects were reviewed in 2016 for quality at entry. The 2020 review for this cohort of projects therefore focused on performance during implementation and results.

- (b) The team reviewed all 25 Council-approved projects with project identification forms (PIF) submitted in or after October 2015—the cutoff date for review as part of the 2016 Program Evaluation at entry.<sup>3</sup> The portfolio analysis protocol applied to these projects references the 2018 GEF adaptation strategy and its strategic objectives and pillars. While this strategy was put in place halfway through the period covered, it still serves as an important reference for reviewing all projects submitted and approved in the last four years, as elements of the current strategy were also present in prior strategies.
- (c) The team included the NAPA country report for South Sudan, submitted to the UNFCCC Secretariat in February 2017.<sup>4</sup>

12. Where appropriate, the team merged results from the 2020 portfolio review with data from the 2016 Program Evaluation for information on the LDCF portfolio as a whole.<sup>5</sup> For example, information for all completed NAPA implementation and NAP projects with terminal evaluations available ( $n = 45$ ) is presented together where possible. Information for all NAPA implementation and NAP projects ( $n = 229$ ) is also presented where possible. For the first time, the team included some elements of the portfolio review, such as questions on private sector involvement, contributions to NDCs and INDCs, and gender inclusion informed by the newly introduced GEF gender policy. Results for these questions can therefore only be presented for the 59 projects (25 recently approved projects plus 34 recently completed projects) reviewed in 2020.

13. The team extracted information on the portfolio of LDCF projects, including project status, financing and cofinancing, GEF Agency, executing agency or institution, country, main objectives, and key partners both from the archived GEF PMIS and the new GEF Portal, as the data was migrated from the former to the latter concurrently with the evaluation. The GEF Agencies then verified the information.

14. The evaluation team reviewed all available project documentation—including requests, PIFs, project preparation grant (PPG) requests for CEO endorsement or approval, project documents, project implementation reports, midterm reviews, terminal evaluations, and terminal evaluation reviews.

---

<sup>3</sup> In contrast to the 2016 Program Evaluation, this evaluation did not review projects pending Council approval.

<sup>4</sup> Source: UNFCCC website list of submitted NAPAs; <https://unfccc.int/topics/resilience/workstreams/national-adaptation-programmes-of-action/napas-received>, accessed October 2020.

<sup>5</sup> This evaluation also lightly reviewed projects in 2016 with Council approval but before CEO endorsement for any changes in design or additional information added at the CEO endorsement stage that might affect review responses. In some instances, the team made corrections to the 2016 database, (for example, a project reported as an MSP that was implemented as an FSP—3319 replaced by 3916.) The team removed projects cancelled or dropped since the 2016 Program Evaluation from the data set.

15. In addition to the portfolio review, the team conducted two country field visits—to Rwanda and Samoa—and interviewed key stakeholders to cross-check and validate the data collected. These included piloting a methodological approach for postcompletion verification the GEF IEO developed (GEF IEO 2019b). The team selected field visit countries that had projects closed for three to five years, suitable for postcompletion evaluation, aiming to cover LDC regions. The field visits are a critical component of the evaluation as they provide in-depth, field-verified inputs to the findings and recommendations.

16. The evaluation team conducted interviews with staff of the GEF Secretariat, the GEF Agencies, the UNFCCC Secretariat, the LDC Expert Group, civil society organizations and government officials, project implementers, beneficiaries, and other country-level stakeholders. A full list of the people consulted is in annex F.

17. The team conducted analyses and triangulation of qualitative as well as quantitative data and information collected to determine trends and formulate main findings, lessons, and conclusions. The team used the evaluation matrix (annex C), summarizing the key questions, indicators or basic data, sources of information, and methodology to guide the analysis and triangulation between sources.

18. Finally, in line with IEO practices, the team established stakeholder engagement and quality assurance measures for this evaluation. The draft approach paper and evaluation report were circulated and validated before finalization through a comprehensive stakeholder feedback process with key stakeholders. These include the GEF Secretariat, relevant GEF Agencies, the GEF Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel (STAP) and select GEF focal points. The Coordinator of the Adaptation Fund Technical Evaluation Reference Group Secretariat was an external peer reviewer, providing advice on the approach paper and evaluation report, while a Senior Evaluation Officer within the GEFIEO was an internal peer reviewer. Audit trails of comments and responses are available on the IEO website.

## **Limitations**

19. This evaluation was originally scheduled for presentation at the 28<sup>th</sup> LDCF/SCCF Council meeting held in June 2020. Its completion and presentation were delayed because of the COVID-19 pandemic. One of the evaluation's two field visits for post-completion project assessment was cut short when World Bank staff on mission were called back to their home offices in March 2020. The team had already completed the review of recently completed and approved LDCF projects with a cutoff date of September 2019 when the date to present the evaluation to council was postponed. Therefore, projects approved by the Council after September 2019 are not included in the portfolio review conducted for this evaluation. The team did, however, cover developments in the LDCF portfolio after September 2019 through stakeholder interviews. The team contacted all Agencies active in the LDCF portfolio for interview, regardless of whether they were implementing projects approved by the September 2019 cut-off date. Examples of other developments covered in this evaluation that are not part of the portfolio review include the Challenge Program on Adaptation Innovation, which was raised in stakeholder interviews and covered in discussion of private sector engagement.

20. The transition from the GEF Secretariat PMIS to a new data portal caused data gaps while the new system is being developed. This has been a limitation in presenting accurate information on project status. For project cycle analysis, gaps in data on project implementation dates were also a limitation. The evaluation has addressed this by contacting GEF Agencies for verification of project status and incorporating this information.

## LITERATURE REVIEW

21. The following summarizes the key findings and recommendations from LDCF-relevant evaluations, journal articles and think-pieces published since 2016.

22. The most substantive recent study of the LDCF, undertaken by Sovacool, Linnér, and Klein (2017) was published in a journal article. It used case studies of five LDCF-financed projects to analyze strengths and weaknesses of the fund. Through a literature review and an extensive set of interviews undertaken both before and after project implementation, the evaluation concluded that LDCF projects tended to deliver three benefits: (1) strengthened, nationally significant infrastructure, (2) enhanced institutional capacity for, and awareness of adaptation, and (3) improved community assets. However, it also identified common challenges. The most consequential challenges identified within the article were the LDCF's "insufficient and uncertain" funding envelope, and the fund's "convoluted...inefficient" management structures and processes. LDCF projects were also found to face broader contextual challenges. LDCs' limited capacities tended to limit projects' ability to deal with the complexity of adaptation and to fully manage climate-related risks.

23. The 2017-18 MOPAN (Multilateral Organization Performance Assessment Network) assessment of the GEF focused on the entire GEF institution but included some LDCF-specific findings. While most of the MOPAN assessment was positive, the efficiency of GEF's results delivery was rated "highly unsatisfactory." A key part of the supporting evidence for this conclusion was that LDCF's efficiency had been undermined "due to unstable governments, unpredictability of resources, climate extremes and natural disasters, cofunding requirements, and lengthy project approval processes." The assessment also raised concerns about a lack of consistent gender monitoring across the GEF, as the GEF-6 core gender indicators were different from those in other active results frameworks, including LDCF's. More positively, the assessment found that LDCF's support for NAPAs had helped strengthen an enabling environment for development in recipient countries.

24. A think piece policy review published by the UN Committee for Development Policy (Cortez 2019) identified some LDCF-specific concerns and observations for countries approaching graduation from the LDC category. The review provided some evidence of the value placed on the LDCF by recipient countries, noting that "losing access to the LDCF is a main concern for many graduating countries, particularly the small island developing states (SIDS), because of their considerable vulnerability to the impacts of climate change." While other adaptation funding is available to those countries, the review cautioned that graduating LDCs would be competing for these funds "from a disadvantaged position due to their relatively weaker administrative and technical capacity." The review went on to recommend that, as part

of the graduation process, countries be provided with policy guidance and capacity development that would explicitly support the necessary phasing out of LDCF as a source of adaptation funding.

25. The LDC-focused niche of the fund was explored further in a think-piece produced by the International Institute for Environment and Development (Tenzing et al. 2016). The briefing indicated that recipient countries particularly valued both the restriction of the LDCF's eligibility to LDCs and its grant-based nature. The piece viewed these two characteristics as an implicit acknowledgment that "LDCs are not in a position to 'compete' with other, more capable developing countries for climate change finance." However, the paper also suggested that more could be done to close this gap, and that LDCF could focus more on strengthening country capacities to access, absorb, and manage climate finance. In line with a core finding and recommendation of the 2016 GEF IEO evaluation of the LDCF, the paper reiterated that a prominent concern for LDCs was the inadequacy of resources available through the LDCF and the lack of funding predictability.

26. The GEF IEO's most recent evaluation of the LDCF was presented to the 20<sup>th</sup> LDCF/SCCF Council meeting in June 2016. That evaluation found LDC-supported activities to be highly relevant to COP guidance and countries' development priorities, and to show clear potential in reaching the GEF's three adaptation strategic objectives. It also found benefits beyond the climate change focal area. Furthermore, it found improvement in gender performance of the LDCF portfolio following GEF's introduction of enhanced requirements, though the share of gender-mainstreamed projects was still low, at 14 percent. Finally, it found that the unpredictability of resources, based on the lack of a formal resource mobilization process, hampered efficiency. The evaluation reached three recommendations: the GEF Secretariat should explore and develop mechanisms that ensure the predictable, adequate, and sustainable financing of the fund; the GEF Secretariat should make efforts to improve consistency in its understanding and application of the GEF gender-mainstreaming policy and the Gender Equality Action Plan to the LDCF; and the GEF Secretariat should ensure that PMIS data is up to date and accurate.

27. Finally, the GEF IEO's 2018 Sixth Comprehensive Evaluation of the GEF (OPS6) included several LDCF-specific findings, although these were mostly derived directly from the 2016 GEF IEO evaluation of the LDCF. However, the OPS6 issued one new relevant recommendation for strategic positioning—the GEF should "continue to emphasize innovative projects in its climate change mitigation, LDCF, and SCCF portfolios."

#### **ANALYSIS OF THE LDCF PORTFOLIO**

28. This chapter presents an overview of the LDCF portfolio. The portfolio has evolved since it was first introduced during the GEF-3 period, shifting from enabling activities to prepare NAPA reports to full- and medium-size projects implementing priority activities from NAPAs or supporting the NAP process.

29. GEF-5 was the most active period for the LDCF in approving new projects, with 60 percent of all approved funding and 49 percent of all approved projects introduced. The GEF-6

period saw a slowdown caused by a lack of funding compared to demand. As of the cutoff date of September 2019 for this evaluation, 15 projects focused on implementation of NAPA priorities had been approved in the GEF-7 period.

### Portfolio composition

30. An overview of LDCF support to NAPAs, NAPA implementation projects, and projects supporting the NAP process by project type is presented in table 2.<sup>6</sup> As of September 2019, 280 LDCF projects had either received Council approval or advanced beyond that stage in the project cycle. Of these projects, all 51 enabling activities had reached completion, and 45 of the full and medium-size projects had reached completion with terminal evaluations received by the GEF.

**Table 2: Number of and budgetary allocation for LDCF projects by project modality**

Project modality <sup>a</sup>	No. of projects	Budgetary allocation (million \$)		
		LDCF financing	Cofinancing	Total
Enabling activity	51	11.3	1.3	12.5
Medium-size project (MSP)	11	17.3	53.4	70.7
Full-size project (FSP)	218	1,405.0	6,223.5	7,628.5
Total MSP/FSP	229	1,422.3	6,275.9	7,699.2
<b>Grand total</b>	<b>280</b>	<b>1,433.6</b>	<b>6,277.2</b>	<b>7,711.7</b>

Sources: GEF PMIS and portal through September 2019.

a. Financial implication of dropped projects is not considered. LDCF financing numbers include PPGs as well as Agency fees.

31. **Following a dip during GEF-6, multi-trust fund proposal submissions are rising in the GEF-7 period.** This trend follows the roll-out of the GEF Programming Strategy on Adaptation to Climate Change and GEF programming directions in July 2018, in line with the GEF-7 ambition to better mainstream adaptation and climate resilience in GEF Trust Fund programming (GEF 2019c). The LDCF portfolio includes 15 multi-trust fund (MTF) projects, which combine LDCF resources with resources from SCCF or the GEF Trust Fund. MTF projects were introduced during the GEF-5 replenishment period (GEF 2018c). Table 3 includes information on MTF projects in the portfolio by GEF period.

<sup>6</sup> The GEF Secretariat provided the categorization of projects supporting the NAP process.

**Table 3: Number of and budgetary allocation for MTF projects by GEF period**


GEF period	No. of projects	Budgetary allocation (million \$)		
		LDCF/GEF/SCCF financing <sup>a</sup>	Cofinancing	Total
GEF-5	12	102.6	626.5	729.1
GEF-6	1	15.7	42.6	58.3
GEF-7	2	11.5	29.7	41.2
<b>Grand total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>129.8</b>	<b>698.8</b>	<b>828.6</b>

Sources: GEF PMIS and portal through September 2019.

a. Financial implication of dropped projects has not been considered. LDCF financing numbers include PPGs as well as Agency fees. GEF-7 programming is still underway. Two GEF-7 programs with no child projects approved are not included.

32. **The LDCF portfolio has evolved toward implementation since the GEF-3 period.** In that period, the focus was on formulating NAPA country reports through enabling activities. This shift is shown in figure 1, which presents the distribution of LDCF project types by GEF replenishment period. Aside from three enabling activities focused on preparing NAPAs approved in GEF-5, all LDCF projects and funding from GEF-5 onward have focused on implementing activities listed as priorities in countries' NAPA and NAPs. Two projects focused on supporting the NAP process were approved in GEF-5, while nine such projects were approved in GEF-6. All 15 LDCF projects approved in the GEF-7 period are NAPA implementation projects.

**Figure 1: Distribution of LDCF project types by GEF replenishment period**




Sources: GEF PMIS and portal through September 2019.

Note: Classification of NAPA Implementation and NAP projects provided by GEF Secretariat. Two GEF-7 programs with no child projects approved are not included.

33. **The largest share of LDCF projects and funding were approved in the GEF-5 period.** The 135 projects used \$860.3 million in LDCF funding. Figure 2 displays the distribution of LDCF project funding by GEF replenishment period. The relatively lower shares of LDCF funding in the

GEF-3 and GEF-4 period compared to the share of projects approved is the result of the share of enabling activities supporting preparation of NAPAs during this period, which require less funding per project. A funding shortage in the GEF-6 period slowed approvals compared with GEF-5, with 42 projects approved, representing \$302 million in LDCF funding. As GEF-7 programming is still under way, the share of funding for this period can be expected to rise.

**Figure 2: Distribution of LDCF projects and funding by GEF replenishment period**




Sources: GEF PMIS and portal through September 2019.

Note: GEF-7 programming is still under way. Two GEF-7 programs with no child projects approved are not included.

34. **Historically, UNDP has been the GEF Agency with the largest share of LDCF-funded projects and funding.** However, the pool of involved agencies is diversifying. Figure 3 presents the distribution of LDCF financing and cofinancing by agency. In the GEF-6 period, IUCN became the first of the GEF Agencies accredited in the most recent partnership expansion to have a project approved. Following the cutoff date for this evaluation, Conservation International (CI) and WWF-US also joined the list of Agencies with Council-approved LDCF projects, expanding the group of GEF Agencies involved in LDCF operations.


**Figure 3: Distribution of LDCF financing and cofinancing leveraged by agency**



Sources: GEF PMIS and GEF Portal through September 2019.

35. **National and regional LDCF projects are implemented primarily in Africa and Asia, consistent with the regional distribution of LDCs.** Figure 4 presents a breakdown of LDCF projects and funding by region. The Latin American and Caribbean region has six projects, all implemented in Haiti, amounting to \$31.4 million in LDCF funding. Five global projects have been approved, with \$14.6 million in LDCF funding.

**Figure 4: Number and grant value of LDCF project by region**




Sources: PMIS and portal through September 2019.



## LDCF projects and portfolio status

36. **The LDCF portfolio has matured since the previous evaluation.** Now 45 NAPA implementation and NAP projects are completed—20 percent of the portfolio of approved projects. An overview of the LDCF portfolio by project status is presented in figure 5. Fifty-four percent of all approved NAPA implementation and NAP projects are being implemented (124 projects). Twenty-three projects, 10 percent of the portfolio, have gained CEO endorsement or approval but have not yet begun, and 37 projects (16 percent) are Council approved.<sup>7</sup> All projects focused on preparing NAPA reports have been completed, with the most recent NAPA submitted to UNFCCC in February 2017 for South Sudan.<sup>8</sup>

**Figure 5: Distribution of LDCF projects by status**



Sources: PMIS and portal through September 2019, verified by GEF Agencies.

Note: Completed NAPA Implementation and NAP projects include only those with technical evaluations available for review as of September 2019.

## RELEVANCE OF LDCF SUPPORT

37. This chapter focuses on the key question: Does LDCF support continue to be relevant to UNFCCC COP guidance and decisions, the GEF adaptation programming strategy, and countries' broader development policies, plans, and programs?

<sup>7</sup> Project status is as of September 2019. Actual status may have changed. Only projects approved by the Council or advanced beyond this stage in the project cycle are considered part of the LDCF portfolio. Cancelled projects have been excluded.


<sup>8</sup> Source: UNFCCC website list of submitted NAPAs; <https://unfccc.int/topics/resilience/workstreams/national-adaptation-programmes-of-action/napas-received>, accessed October 2020.

## **LDCF relevance to UNFCCC COP guidance**

**38. LDCF support is well aligned with and highly relevant to UNFCCC COP guidance and decisions.** The 2016 evaluation reported strong alignment in project design of LDCF-financed activities with COP guidance and decisions. For this evaluation, the team reviewed the 25 projects submitted that council approved since the 2016 evaluation at entry for this alignment. Assessment of LDCF activities since 2016 found continued strong alignment with most COP decisions, particularly in capacity development, NAPA implementation, and NAP projects. Of the 25 projects, the evaluation team found project design for 92 percent support country-driven capacity building based on and responsive to national needs. The team found 80 percent are cost-effective and complement other funding sources at entry, and 52 percent have objectives that promote integration of adaptation measures in national socioeconomic and environmental policies and actions, including development and poverty reduction from a large to a very large extent.

**39.** Figure 6 combines these results with results from the 2016 evaluation to provide information on the project design at entry of all NAPA implementation and NAP projects. Ninety-five percent of all NAPA implementation and NAP projects ( $n = 229$ ) have objectives to support country-driven capacity building based on and responsive to national needs and guided by lessons learned to a large or extremely large extent. Eighty-four percent of the portfolio of approved and ongoing LDCF projects have objectives to promote the integration of adaptation measures in national socioeconomic and environmental policies and actions, including development and poverty reduction strategies, plans, or policies to a large or very large extent. The lowest degree of alignment, 78 percent of the projects reviewed across both evaluations, related to UNFCCC guidance calling for projects to be cost-effective and complementary to other funding sources. The team found one NAPA country report completed since the 2016 evaluation to be strongly aligned with support to country-driven capacity building and integration of adaptation measures in national socioeconomic and environmental policies, but weakly aligned with the guidance on cost-effectiveness and complementarity to other funding sources.

**Figure 6: Design alignment with UNFCCC guidance for NAPA implementation and NAP projects**



Sources: LDCF project design and performance documents.


Note: Two projects were scored unable to assess for the first listed priority, while one project each was scored unable to assess for the second two.

**40. The LDCF has responded effectively to recent COP guidance on building domestic institutional capacities in LDCs.** As noted above, recent UNFCCC COP guidance includes a request based on findings of the 2016 LDCF program evaluation to enhance capacity development in the least developed countries for the development of project proposals (UNFCCC 2016). The LDCF has supported institutional capacity development, with potentially the most important contribution arising from the involvement of national institutions in LDCF project development, approval, and delivery. While there are examples of discrete activities targeted at developing capacity for proposal development, it is the ongoing involvement of national institutions in LDCF development and delivery that is most important for building and sustaining capacities. Some stakeholders interviewed noted that LDCF NAPA and NAP activities have helped some countries improve interministerial coordination. In Rwanda, the LDCF helped improve interministerial coordination and interest in climate change: the funding available from LDCF projects gives project coordinators and management units some “clout” when it comes to bringing ministries to the table. In Samoa, LDCF activities engage public service commissions to ensure that the process is broader than just one ministry, which maximizes benefits for capacity of project development.

**41. A large portion of the LDCF’s work is also inherently aligned with the Paris Agreement.** LDCF supports the adaptation-related NDCs/INDCs and seeks to align its programming with NDC/INDC-identified priorities, increasingly noted in project documents. Figure 7 shows that 80 percent of recently submitted and approved projects included reference to the country’s

respective NDCs/INDCs in project documents. Recently submitted and approved projects also included explicit references and an explanation of how the project is aligned with the country's NDCs/INDCs. Recently completed projects were all approved during the GEF-4 and GEF-5 periods, prior to adoption of the Paris Agreement, thus their design would not be expected to align with country NDCs/INDCs. However, even among these, six recently completed projects referenced NDCs/INDCs in their performance documents, of which three reported that the project had been key to further elaborate and prepare the country's NDCs/INDCs.

**Figure 7: Linkages to intended NDCs/INDCs in projects reviewed**



Sources: LDCF project design and performance documents.

42. Among recently submitted and approved projects reviewed that link to NDCs/INDCs, a World Bank project in Sudan, Sustainable Natural Resources Management Project (GEF ID 10083), fast-tracked implementation of its first NDC by pursuing Land Degradation Neutrality. A project implemented by FAO, Strengthening Resilience to Climate Change of Coastal Communities in Togo (GEF ID 10165) directly targeted three of the six priority sectors identified in its NDC: agricultural production, coastal erosion, and forestry, and supported implementation of proposed adaptation measures.

43. Among completed projects where documents confirmed a linkage with or contribution to the country's NDC/INDC, an FAO project in Mali, Integrating Climate Resilience into Agricultural Production for Food Security in Rural Areas (GEF ID 3979), influenced the development of countries' NDCs directly by supporting their formulation ahead of COP 21. A UNDP project, Increased Resilience and Adaptation to Adverse Impacts of Climate Change in Guinea's Vulnerable Coastal Zones (GEF ID 3703), influenced NDC development indirectly by working with ministries in charge of developing NDCs. Stakeholders interviewed also agree that LDCF is well aligned with the Paris Agreement, although it mainly increased the emphasis and focus on issues and approaches that the LDCF was already delivering.

44. **LDCF-funded activities support GEF focal areas outside climate change.** Most projects contribute to at least one other focal area (table 4). For recently approved projects reviewed (*n*

= 25), 15 (60 percent) include activities in their project design which would contribute to the biodiversity focal area, and 16 (64 percent) to land degradation focal areas. For the entire portfolio of NAPA implementation and NAP projects ( $n = 229$ ), 111 (48 percent) projects contribute to the biodiversity focal area, and 132 (58 percent) to land degradation. The contributions in other focal areas are much more modest. These contributions are in line with the primary priority areas for LDCF support—agriculture, climate information systems, water resource management, disaster risk management, and natural resource management. The portfolio review of recently approved projects also found the potential of LDCF support contributing to global environmental benefits (GEBs) based on the inclusion of numerical targets toward GEBs. The team noted particularly “sustainable land management in production systems, such as agriculture, rangelands, and forest landscapes”; and “promotion of collective management of transboundary water systems and implementation of the full range of policy, legal, and institutional reforms and investments contributing to sustainable use and maintenance of ecosystem services” (34 percent of projects for both).

**Table 4: Other focal areas to which LDCF projects potentially contribute**

Focal Area	Recent projects		All projects	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Biodiversity	15	60	111	48
Land Degradation	16	64	132	58
International Waters	0	0	12	5
Chemicals and Waste	0	0	1	0
Climate Change	5	20	68	30

Sources: LDCF project design and performance documents.

Note: Projects can contribute to more than one focal area. Percentages for recent projects are based on  $n = 25$ , and for all projects  $n = 229$ . The portfolio of all projects does not include enabling activities.

### **LDCF relevance to the GEF adaptation strategy**

45. **LDCF support is most relevant to the first two strategic objectives.** This evaluation uses the adaptation strategy currently in place to review projects submitted and approved since the 2016 evaluation ( $n = 25$ ). The evaluation found the project design for 88 percent of these projects to be aligned from a large to a very large extent with the objective to reduce vulnerability and increase resilience through innovation and technology transfer for climate change adaptation, and 80 percent with the objective to mainstream climate change adaptation and resilience for systemic impact. LDCF-financed support has been, to a lesser extent, generally relevant to the third objective—66 percent of projects were in alignment with the objective to foster enabling conditions for effective and integrated climate change adaptation.

46. Relevance to the two strategic pillars has been less clear, particularly when it comes to the second pillar—enabling environments for the private sector. Sixty-two percent of projects aligned to a large or very large extent with the first pillar, expanding catalytic grant and nongrant investments, but only 44 percent of projects with the second pillar, enabling

environments for the private sector to act as an agent for market transformation. Among the projects reviewed found to support the strategic pillars is a UNDP project in Ethiopia, Enhancing Adaptive Capacity of Communities by Adopting an Integrated Approach for Scaling Up (GEF ID 10174). It plans to engage the private sector in delivery of climate information technologies and in insurance schemes. An FAO project, Building Climate-Resilient Livelihoods in Vulnerable Landscapes in Bangladesh (GEF ID 10207), aims to involve a range of private sector entities, from small and medium enterprises to agroindustry noncommercial banks, by piloting financial instruments and investment models and adaptation services, including early warning systems and resilient livelihood technologies. The team found the South Sudan NAPA country report was moderately aligned with the first pillar but found no evidence it supported the second strategic pillar.

47. Stakeholders interviewed, including stakeholders at the country level, confirmed the continued relevance of LDCF support to the GEF adaptation strategy. While the most significant portfolio and project-level results interviewees cited suggest strong alignment with the spirit and specifics of the strategy, they also noted challenges in engaging the private sector in adaptation work. The report addresses these in depth in the effectiveness section.

#### **Relevance to countries' broader development policies, plans, and programs**

48. The relevance of LDCF projects to national priorities is strong, as demonstration of relevance is a central precondition for LDCF funding. The portfolio review found the project design of nearly all LDCF-financed activities highly aligned with country NAPA priorities. Most projects (81 percent of 227) address primary priority areas listed or outlined in that country's NAPA report. An additional 17 percent do not address primary priority areas as listed but do address other priorities in the country NAPA report. Only three projects touched on some priority areas but did not structurally address specific priorities outlined in the country NAPA report. Reviewers were unable to assess an additional two projects. Interviewees stressed that alignment is a precondition for funding: projects simply would not be approved—either by governments or by the LDCF—if they were not clearly aligned to national plans and priorities. For example, in Rwanda, full alignment with national priorities and plans was nonnegotiable: a “red-line” condition for any national approval of LDCF projects.

49. The evaluation also assessed the alignment of the South Sudan's NAPA country report with the country's national policies. The evaluation determined that mainstreaming NAPA priorities into the country's environmental and sustainable development agendas is clearly explained and includes a description of linkages with existing and developing policies, plans, and strategies.

50. Taking a closer look at projects approved since the 2016 evaluation ( $n = 25$ ), the evaluation detected a trend toward alignment with other priorities outlined in the NAPA country report. While the 2016 evaluation found 90 percent of projects addressed a primary priority area as listed in the report, this evaluation found only 42 percent of projects reviewed at entry did so, while the rest (58 percent) addressed priorities identified and discussed in NAPA reports, but not the primary priority areas. While NAPAs have provided a solid foundation for

adaptation work in LDCs, adaptation work and research has advanced since their formation, and countries may be responding to more recent priorities. For example, two of the 25 projects reviewed at entry in 2020 were focused at least in part on the NAP process, the UNDP project Climate-Resilient Growth and Adaptation in Democratic Republic of Congo, (GEF ID 9392) and the UNEP project Strengthening the Capacity of Government and Communities in South Sudan to Adapt to Climate Change (GEF ID 9723). As noted above, projects are also increasingly focused on alignment with priority areas identified in INDCs and NDCs. Thus, an evolution over time in the focus of LDCF projects is appropriate.

#### **EFFECTIVENESS OF THE LDCF**

51. This chapter focuses on the following key questions about LDCF effectiveness:
- (a) How effective has the LDCF been at delivering on expected outcomes?
  - (b) What are the gender equality objectives achieved and gender mainstreaming principles adhered to by the LDCF?
  - (c) To what extent has the LDCF engaged the private sector?

#### **LDCF support to GEF’s strategic adaptation objectives**

52. The evaluation’s assessment of effectiveness focused on identifying the extent to which LDCF projects supported delivery of the GEF’s three adaptation strategic objectives and two strategic pillars, and on the general performance of LDCF-supported projects. A combination of portfolio analysis, interviews, and aggregation of the GEF’s Annual Performance Report (APR) ratings supported the assessment.

#### **Alignment with GEF adaptation strategic objectives and pillars**

53. The GEF’s adaptation strategic objectives and pillars were revised in 2018, midway through the period this evaluation covers (2016–2020). While the current strategic pillars are quite different from the previous pillars, the previous and current strategic objectives are similar (table 5).


**Table 5: Comparison of current and previous GEF adaptation strategic objectives and pillars**

GEF ADAPTATION STRATEGIC OBJECTIVES	
Current (since July 2018)	Previous (prior to July 2018)
Reduce vulnerability and increase resilience through innovation and technology transfer for climate change adaptation	Reduce the vulnerability of people, livelihoods, physical assets, and natural systems to the adverse effects of climate change
Mainstream climate change adaptation and resilience for systemic impact	Strengthen institutional and technical capacities for effective climate change adaptation
Foster enabling conditions for effective and integrated climate change adaptation	Integrate climate change adaptation into relevant policies, plans, and associated processes
GEF ADAPTATION STRATEGIC PILLARS	
Current (since July 2018)	Previous (prior to July 2018)
Expanding catalytic grant and nongrant investments	Integrating climate change adaptation into relevant policies, plans, programs, and decision-making processes in a continuous, progressive, and iterative manner to identify and address short-, medium-, and long-term adaptation needs
Support enabling environments for the private sector to act as an agent for market transformation	Expanding synergies with other GEF focal areas

54. **When considering newer projects, the current LDCF portfolio is well aligned with all three strategic objectives.** Figure 8 displays results of a review of recently approved projects for alignment with the current GEF adaptation strategic objectives ( $n = 25$ ). These newer projects are particularly well-aligned with the first two objectives: 22 projects are aligned with objective 1 to a large or very large extent, and 20 are aligned with objective 2 to a large or very large extent. Alignment is still relatively strong with the third objective: 16 of the 25 projects are aligned with that objective to a large or very large extent.



**Figure 8: Alignment of recently approved projects with GEF adaptation strategic objectives**



Sources: LDCF project design and performance documents.

55. Evaluation interviews reinforced these ratings. Respondents said the LDCF portfolio shows strong alignment with—and clearly supports delivery of—the strategic objectives. Understandably, the precise nature and extent of contributions to strategic objectives varied from project-to-project. However, the interviews indicated that LDCF projects delivered some common, high-level contributions of relevance and value to all three strategic objectives.

56. First, all stakeholder groups interviewed expressed the impression that projects helped raise awareness of climate change adaptation, from communities to senior politicians and decision-makers. For some projects, this increased awareness was purposefully delivered through targeted activities (for example, direct promotional work on adaptation), but more common was a general level of awareness raised simply through each project’s basic, inherent focus on adaptation.

57. Interviewees identified a second cross-cutting contribution to objectives: direct and indirect institutional capacity development for adaptation-focused work. Many projects delivered activities expressly targeted at building capacity, but—as with awareness raising—projects often contributed indirectly to capacity development. By virtue of having to manage an adaptation-focused project, institutions were often better-placed to deal with subsequent adaptation funding processes and projects. Several interviewees said that institutional capacities also benefited because the LDCF approach—and adaptation more broadly—requires a degree of cross-sector, cross-Ministry coordination uncommon before LDCF support.

58. Perhaps the most substantial revision to the GEF adaptation strategic objectives in 2018 was the explicit identification of innovation and technology transfer as *the* means for reducing vulnerability and increasing resilience. Approaches or elements of LDCF projects are considered innovative if “they are deliberately applied to tackle an issue, and these approaches (1) have not been used before in the project area, and/or (2) have not been used before to tackle this specific issue. Other elements that make an approach innovative are that the approach needs to be (3) widely replicable, which is linked to being locally appropriate from a technological,

environmental, and socioeconomic point of view, and (iv) this should be possible at low economic cost, which links innovation to financial sustainability.” Given this increased emphasis on innovation, the portfolio analysis reviewed terminal evaluations of recently completed projects ( $n = 34$ ), with a view to identifying and characterizing how LDCF projects were already contributing to the new innovation-focused objective. Table 6 categorizes the number and proportion of projects exhibiting innovative approaches, with examples provided to illustrate each innovation category.

**Table 6: Examples of innovative approaches from recently completed projects**


Category	Number (% sample)	Illustrative example
Introduction of new technology or adaptation approach	16 (47%)	An IFAD project, Adapting Agriculture Production in Togo (ADAPT) Togo (GEF ID 4570), “tested multiple innovations in the Togolese context (drip irrigation, integrated management of fertility, water, and pests by mushrooms products (GIFERC), use of local species for reforestation, modern beekeeping, selection of improved varieties etc.)” The terminal evaluation reported some innovations were being scaled up, such as GIFERC products, agroforestry parks, and landfills in classified forest areas.
Innovative participatory techniques	3 (9%)	A UNEP project, Vulnerability Assessment and Adaptation Programme for Climate Change in the Coastal Zone of Cambodia Considering Livelihood Improvement and Ecosystems (GEF ID 3890), piloted participatory techniques, including a youth environmental debate on climate change adaptation, which was broadcast on local television.
Adaptation in a new sector	3 (9%)	Two UNDP projects, Increasing Climate Change Resilience of Maldives through Adaptation in the Tourism Sector, and Enhancing the Resilience of Tourism-reliant Communities to Climate Change Risks, implemented in Samoa, focused on adaptation and climate resilience in the tourism sector for the first time (GEF ID 4431 and 4585).
Innovative financial mechanisms	2 (6%)	A UNDP project, Promoting Autonomous Adaptation at the community level in Ethiopia (GEF ID 4222), piloted an innovative weather index-based crop insurance mechanism in 8 rural areas, based on variability of rainfall between the sowing and harvest seasons. This financial product proved highly successful. About 77 percent of farmers in the area use it.

Innovative communication techniques	1 (3%)	A World Bank project, São Tome and Príncipe Adaptation to Climate Change (GEF ID 4018), used innovative communications tools such as role play and pictograms to overcome communication barriers arising from beneficiaries' somewhat limited ability to read and understand weather reports.
-------------------------------------	-----------	---

Sources: LDCF project design and performance documents.


59. While LDCF portfolio alignment with GEF adaptation strategic objectives was strong, the extent of alignment with the two strategic pillars was less clear, as shown in figure 9. The limited alignment can be largely explained by the recentness of the pillar revisions in 2018 (table 5), and the material difference of the new pillars compared to the previous pillars. These recent, major changes have yet to 'trickle down' into project design (in contrast to the revised strategic objectives, which were substantively similar to the previous ones). As discussed in the section on LDCF Private Sector Engagement, LDCF projects also face some common challenges in engaging the private sector (the focus of the new strategic pillars).

**Figure 9: Alignment of recently approved LDCF projects with GEF adaptation strategic pillars**



60. **Most LDCF projects are well implemented and executed.** The GEF's APR gives some insight into the effectiveness of the LDCF portfolio. The APR provides an annual aggregation of terminal evaluation ratings against several criteria, including criteria directly relevant to project effectiveness. Figure 10 summarizes relevant APR ratings for all completed LDCF projects. Among completed projects with ratings available, 77 percent were rated in the satisfactory range for outcomes. For quality of GEF Agency implementation, 90 percent were rated in the satisfactory range, and for quality of performance of executing agencies, 73 percent were rated in the satisfactory range.

**Figure 10: Selected APR performance ratings for completed LDCF projects**



Sources: LDCF project design and performance documents.

61. Terminal evaluations of recently completed projects provide a wealth of technical lessons learned on climate change adaptation interventions. These shed light on past performance and can provide valuable guidance for future interventions. Fourteen of the 34 projects reviewed included technical lessons on climate change adaptation. By their nature, these lessons are specific to project interventions and therefore do not lend themselves easily to grouping. Highlights are presented below.

62. The African Development Bank (AfDB) Climate Adaptation for Rural Livelihoods and Agriculture (CARLA) (GEF ID 3302) project in Malawi included various content-technical lessons related to climate change adaptation initiatives in the agriculture sector. These include the finding that treadle pump technology and motorized pumps were not suitable for smallholder farmers in the country context. The former is labor intensive; the latter is costly and environmentally unfriendly. Other lessons from this project are that beneficiary farmers prefer individual woodlots to communal woodlots, and that environmental and conservation measures in catchment areas (upstream) are key to sustained use of irrigation infrastructures developed downstream.

63. A UNEP project in Lesotho, Improvement of Early Warning System to Reduce Impacts of Climate Change and Capacity Building to Integrate Climate Change into Development Plans (GEF ID 3841), included adaptation trials conducted under difficult conditions, "targeting the most vulnerable households in the six most vulnerable villages of the three most vulnerable districts." The project's terminal evaluation includes the lesson "that when adaptation technologies are trialed in extreme conditions without control trials, it is difficult to determine what drives failure or success" (UNEP Evaluation Office 2018).

64. Terminal evaluations for two UNDP projects, Adapting Water Resource Management in Comoros to Increase Capacity to Cope with Climate Change (GEF ID 3857) and Enhancing the Resilience of Tourism-reliant Communities to Climate Change Risks (GEF ID 4585), included similar lessons on the importance of a narrow focus to climate change adaptation project designs, rather than “trying to tackle almost every angle of climate change adaptation.” The Comoros project terminal evaluation noted that this can lead to resources being spread thin with small impacts in each area. The evaluation stated, “it is therefore important to maintain a focus for the project and only include project issues outside the focus area of the project when these are absolutely necessary for success, and it is unlikely that they will be covered by other actors” (UNEP Evaluation Office 2017a).

## **Gender**

65. One of the three recommendations issued by the 2016 evaluation of the LDCF was that “the GEF Secretariat should make efforts to improve consistency regarding its understanding and application of the GEF mainstreaming policy and the Gender Equality Action Plan to the LDCF.” The current evaluation therefore assessed not just overall portfolio performance on gender, but also the extent to which the LDCF had responded to the previous evaluation’s recommendation. The assessment was based on portfolio analyses, interviews, and a review of relevant management actions undertaken since 2016.


66. As part of the portfolio analysis—and repeating an exercise undertaken during the 2016 evaluation—the team rated the extent of gender mainstreaming in LDCF projects against the scale presented in table 7.

**Table 7: Gender mainstreaming rating scale**

<b>Gender blind</b>	Project does not show awareness of the set of roles, rights, responsibilities, and power relations associated with being male or female.
<b>Gender aware</b>	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.
<b>Gender sensitive</b>	Project adopts gender-sensitive methodologies (a gender analysis is undertaken, gender-disaggregated data are collected, gender-sensitive indicators are integrated in monitoring and evaluation) to address gender differences and promote gender equality.
<b>Gender mainstreamed</b>	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.
<b>Gender transformative</b>	Project goes beyond gender mainstreaming and facilitates a critical examination of gender norms, roles, and relationships; strengthens or creates systems that support gender equity; or questions and changes gender norms and dynamics.

67. Most projects completed since 2016 are at least rated “gender aware,” however, in 38 percent of projects the extent of gender mainstreaming actually dropped over the course of project implementation. The 34 LDCF projects completed since 2016 were rated at completion. This allowed for a comparison with the same projects’ gender ratings at entry (originally assessed as part of the 2016 LDCF program evaluation) to see whether and how gender mainstreaming changes during the lifetime of a project.

**Figure 11: Gender mainstreaming ratings of LDCF projects completed since 2016**




Sources: LDCF project design and performance documents.

68. While figure 11 provides aggregate figures for the whole sample, an analysis comparing the evolution of project-by-project gender ratings at entry and completion revealed that 32 percent of recently completed projects improved their rating since their first review at entry. However, 38 percent had a *lower* gender rating at completion in comparison to their rating at entry, and 29 percent of projects showed no change in ratings during project implementation. An IFAD project, Integrating Adaptation to Climate Change into Agricultural Production and Food Security in Sierra Leone (GEF ID 3716), was rated gender mainstreamed at entry but was downgraded to gender-sensitive by completion because of limited reporting on gender disaggregated impacts. While the project achieved a gender-sensitive implementation approach through a Gender Action Learning System methodology, little is known about the impact of some activities since gender-disaggregated data was not consistently reported. Next to this, a UNDP project, Promoting Autonomous Adaptation at the Community Level in Ethiopia (GEF ID 4222), was rated gender-sensitive based on the project documentation provided at entry but was downgraded to gender-aware at completion because no gender analysis was conducted. The UNDP project Increased Resilience and Adaptation to Adverse Impacts of Climate Change in Guinea's Vulnerable Coastal Zones (GEF ID 3703) and the World Bank project in Kiribati, Increasing Resilience to Climate Variability and Hazards (GEF ID 4068), are examples of projects that were rated gender-blind at entry as they barely touched on the issue of gender, but were upgraded to gender-sensitive at completion as a gender analysis was completed and gender-disaggregated data was collected.

69. These ratings were incorporated with the ratings assigned during the 2016 evaluation, allowing for an updated assessment of gender mainstreaming across the whole LDCF portfolio. Figure 12 presents the ratings for all NAPA implementation and NAP projects, disaggregated by the GEF cycle within which each project was approved.

**Figure 12: Gender mainstreaming ratings of LDCF portfolio**



Sources: LDCF project design and performance documents.

Note: Results for two GEF-3 projects are included in totals but not displayed. GEF-7 programming is still underway. Results for all completed projects with terminal evaluations available ( $n = 45$ , of which are 30 are GEF-4 projects and 15 are GEF-5 projects) are at completion, all other results are at entry.

70. Across the whole LDCF portfolio, gender mainstreaming ratings have clearly improved over time. Figure 12 shows an improvement in gender mainstreaming ratings from the GEF-4 to the GEF-6 period. GEF-7 programming is still underway and only 15 projects were available for review during this evaluation, but none of the projects in that GEF-7 cohort were rated as gender blind; however, the proportion of gender mainstreamed projects has dropped. Across the whole LDCF portfolio, only two projects are rated as gender transformative.

71. The clear improvement in projects attaining at least a “gender sensitive” rating can be largely attributed to the GEF’s own evolving requirements. Since the 2017 update to the GEF Gender Equality Policy, it has been a requirement for any GEF-funded project to undertake “gender analysis or equivalent socioeconomic assessment” at or before CEO endorsement or approval. Undertaking a gender analysis during the design stage is sufficient for a project to attain at least a “gender sensitive” rating, so the requirements introduced through the 2017 Gender Equality Policy largely explain the high proportion of gender sensitive LDCF projects in GEF-7.


72. A UNDP project in Timor-Leste, Strengthening the Resilience of Small-Scale Rural Infrastructure and Local Government Systems to Climatic Variability and Risk (GEF ID 4693), illustrates the value of a gender analysis. Findings from the gender analysis showed weak presence of women in decision-making. For instance, government reports indicated that in 2013, women made up only 2 percent of village chiefs and 28 percent of village councilors. Over the course of the LDCF project, women were involved in 30 different local communities (*sucos*) to identify projects and priority interventions for the Climate Change Adaptation Planning for



Rural Infrastructure Development. This activity provided opportunities for women to openly share their ideas and suggestions and encouraged their involvement in the village planning process, which, ultimately, was assessed as progress toward greater empowerment of women.

73. When it comes to acting on the gender analysis, the 2018 *Guidance to Advance Gender Equality in GEF Projects and Programs* indicates that a gender action plan or equivalent can be used as “a bridge between gender analysis and implementation, and [as] a tool to help translate and make visible findings of the gender analysis in program/project implementation and evaluation.” The guidance also requires projects to develop a gender action plan by the point of CEO endorsement. This guidance is even more recent than the latest Gender Equality Policy, so its influence on the use of gender action plans across the LDCF portfolio cannot yet be ascertained. However, even prior to this guidance there was a trend in the LDCF portfolio towards inclusions of either gender action plans or gender mainstreaming strategies, or plans at design phase to develop these during implementation. Figure 13 shows results of a review of projects for gender action plans or mainstreaming strategies from the GEF-4 to the GEF-6 periods. As GEF-7 projects were both small in number and none were CEO endorsed as of the cutoff date for the evaluation, assessment for this period is not possible.

**Figure 13: Existence of gender action plan or mainstreaming strategy in LDCF portfolio**



Sources: LDCF project design and performance documents.

74. The importance of acting on the gender analysis is illustrated by a UNEP project, Implementing NAPA Priority Interventions to Build Resilience in the Most Vulnerable Coastal Zones in Djibouti (GEF ID 3408). Review at entry indicated that efforts would be made to ensure equal participation of men and women in project activities. However, the terminal evaluation noted that while women participated in certain project activities, approach to gender equity was described as ad hoc, and that a gender analysis at the time of project formulation, and a gender action plan, would have highlighted key gender-sensitive activities and constraints from

the onset, allowing for more gender inclusive designs of activities. Examples included the discovery only after implementation had begun that there were women fishers in the project area (UNEP Evaluation Office 2017b).

75. **There is a knowledge gap about the gender-related results of LDCF projects and the extent to which gender analysis and action plans influence gender-related results.** There is only limited evidence that LDCF projects are implementing gender action plans or gender mainstreaming strategies. The portfolio analysis reviewed all 45 projects with terminal evaluations available to ascertain whether gender-related results were delivered. Terminal evaluations for seven of the 45 projects (16 percent) included analysis of gender impacts and direct discussion of the delivery of the project's gender action plan, or of the impact of their omission. Thirteen evaluations (29 percent) included a discussion of the project's gender impacts but did not explicitly mention the gender action plan, and 25 (56 percent) of the evaluations did not include any discussion of gender impacts or gender action plans. These figures imply that there is a knowledge gap about the gender-related results of LDCF projects and the extent to which gender analyses and action plans influence gender-related results.

76. In April 2017, the GEF IEO issued guidelines for GEF Agencies in Conducting Terminal Evaluations for full-sized projects (GEF IEO 2017). The requirements instruct evaluators to report whether a gender analysis was conducted and to consider gender equitable participation and benefits in implementation and tracking of gender-related concerns through the project's monitoring and evaluation system (GEF IEO 2017). When considering only the LDCF projects with TE publication dates in or after April 2017 ( $n = 18$ ), only two (11 percent) included analysis of gender impacts and direct discussion of the delivery of the project's gender action plan, or the impact of their omission, while another five (28 percent) included a discussion of the project's gender impacts but did not explicitly mention the gender action plan. Thus, these figures also suggest that a majority of recent LDCF terminal evaluations are not fulfilling GEF's evaluation requirements on gender.

77. Evaluation interviewees were fully supportive of LDCF's gender policy, requirements, and guidance, but most did not see the gender framework as particularly influential in their own institutions. For GEF Agencies, the main determinant of their gender strategies and approaches tended to be their own institutional policies and processes, rather than the GEF's. Some noted that the GEF's requirements and emphasis on gender added more weight to their own efforts, confirming that addressing gender should be a fundamental principle rather than a "tick box" exercise. However, most interviewees believed that more than the LDCF or indeed any one institution, the main driver behind any improvements in addressing gender was the continuing evolution of international norms and consensus.

78. Following the gender-focused recommendation from the 2016 LDCF evaluation, the revised gender policy is being applied more consistently and has already supported improvements in the gender ratings of LDCF projects approved during GEF-7. The assessment considered the extent to which the gender-focused recommendation from the 2016 LDCF evaluation had been delivered ("the GEF Secretariat should make efforts to improve consistency regarding its understanding and application of the GEF mainstreaming policy and


the Gender Equality Action Plan to the LDCF”). Perhaps the most significant developments since 2016 have been the 2017 revisions to the *Gender Equality Policy* and the 2018 *Guidance to Advance Gender Equality in GEF Projects and Programs*. While it is too early to draw firm conclusions on the long-term influence of these developments, this portfolio analysis suggests that the revised policy is being applied more consistently and has already supported improvements in the gender ratings of LDCF projects approved during GEF-7. Specifically, improvements have come about at least in part because of the new requirement for all GEF-supported projects (including LDCF) to undertake a gender analysis prior to CEO endorsement or approval. Looking beyond gender analyses, the 2018 guidelines justify and emphasize the value of gender action plans or mainstreaming strategies to operationalize gender analyses. This does serve to improve clarity about the function of gender action plans and their role in GEF-supported projects and in doing so the guidelines help address the previous LDCF evaluation’s recommendation.

### **LDCF Private Sector Engagement**

79. Encouraging private sector involvement has always been a strategic principle for the LDCF, but the weight placed on it has increased significantly through the GEF-7 programming directions and the GEF’s Adaptation Strategy 2018–2022. Perhaps most notably, the Adaptation Strategy completely reoriented the two adaptation strategic pillars. They are now directly focused on building substantive private sector involvement in the GEF’s adaptation work including, of course, the LDCF (see table 5). More recently, the GEF has sought to further clarify and formalize its approach through a draft Private Sector Engagement Strategy, which the GEF Council took note of in mid-2020.

80. It is too early to ascertain the influence of these two strategies on the LDCF’s engagement with the private sector, but the portfolio analysis at least indicates the extent and nature of private sector engagement during recent years. The analysis reviewed all LDCF projects that have closed since 2016 ( $n = 34$ ) and recently submitted and approved LDCF projects ( $n = 25$ ), assessing whether private sector entities were involved through the types of project-level engagement outlined in figure 14. These categories do not reflect requirements for LDCF projects and programs.

**Figure 14: Type, extent of private sector engagement at entry and by completion**



Sources: LDCF project design and performance documents.

**81. In completed projects the private sector is more involved as a participant or target of LDCF projects, while engagement as an investor or executing partner has been limited.**

Examples among completed projects that engaged the private sector as participants through project activities include the Implementing NAPA Priority Interventions to Build Resilience in the most Vulnerable Coastal Zones in Djibouti project (GEF ID 3408), which held two private sector training workshops on climate change, impact assessments, coastal issues and Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR). While workshop attendees saw the private sector training events as very useful, they were unclear about the next course of action, especially as they required further guidance on environmental and social activities. A UNDP project in Timor-Leste, Strengthening the Resilience of Small Scale Rural Infrastructure and Local Government Systems to Climatic Variability and Risk (GEF ID 4696), conducted a series of workshops to develop companies’ understanding of climate-induced risks to small scale infrastructure works and adaptation and mitigation measures. As a result, there are now at least 20 local construction companies qualified to design and deploy climate-proofed rural infrastructure across all subsectors of roads, irrigation, water supply, and flood defense.

**82. Newer projects give more focus to private sector engagement.** Figure 14 indicates that the 25 projects submitted and approved since the 2016 evaluation show a marked increase in the level of private sector participation in project activities and in project designs that explicitly aim to increase private sector involvement. It is plausible that the GEF-7 programming directions and the adaptation strategy had some influence here.

**83.** The fund’s two primary focuses on LDCs and on adaptation also represent some of the main challenges to engaging the private sector. Evaluation interviews confirmed the limited extent of substantive private sector engagement in LDCF projects. However, the interviews were also instructive about the potential challenges LDCF projects have faced and are likely to experience in the future. Many interviewees noted that two of the distinguishing characteristics of the LDCF—the fund’s focus on adaptation and the fund’s focus on LDCs—are the main

challenges for generating interest among private sector entities. First, adaptation-focused work can be difficult to ‘sell’ to the private sector, particularly when compared to mitigation-focused activities. Adaptation projects and results are commonly perceived to be less tangible, require long investment timeframes, and are highly context-specific (and hence less conducive to replication in different regions or countries). Second, the private sector in LDCs tends to be less developed, more informal, and typically has tighter margins: this can reduce the appetite of both domestic and international enterprises to invest in the (perceived) risky domain of adaptation. Some interviewees said that these perceptions and challenges extend to banking sectors in LDCs. Lenders (macro and micro) tend to have limited understanding of adaptation, and consequently, are less willing to support adaptation-focused initiatives. An additional barrier noted is that LDCF can only use grant instruments, where non-grant instruments may provide more opportunity to secure substantive private sector involvement. Some interviewees believed that LDCF money was likely to be most useful and private sector engagement likely to be most fruitful in adaptation sectors and geographical areas that the private and banking sectors did not yet serve. In their view, LDCF money should be used to demonstrate, innovate, and crowd-in new investment and interest.

84. In support of the increased emphasis on private sector engagement across recent strategic documentation, in 2018 the GEF launched the *Challenge Program for Adaptation Innovation under the SCCF and LDCF*. The program looked beyond the “traditional” GEF Agencies and explicitly sought to attract applications from private sector entities. It is too early to assess the results: as of our evaluation cutoff date, none of the projects had been approved for funding. However, the Challenge Program will be reviewed in more detail in the upcoming evaluation of the SCCF.

#### **EFFICIENCY OF THE LDCF**

85. The first recommendation issued in the 2016 evaluation of the LDCF was “the GEF Secretariat should explore and develop mechanisms that ensure the predictable, adequate, and sustainable financing of the fund.” This section assesses adoption of this recommendation and addresses issues of LDCF efficiency through the following questions:


- (a) How have resource flows and resource predictability, or lack thereof, affected the fund’s programming?
- (b) How efficient is the fund’s project cycle as a delivery mechanism?

#### **Project Cycle Efficiency from first receipt of project concept to approval**

86. **Project cycle analysis shows that during the GEF-5 period, efficiency in the approval process for the LDCF was in line with other GEF-administered funds, but in GEF-6 the approval process slowed considerably.** Figure 15 is a diagram of the LDCF project cycle in place during the review (GEF 2016). The analysis includes all GEF-5 and GEF-6 full-size standalone projects for which GEF IEO had a record of dates for first receipt of concept, council approval, final project approval, and project start date funded by the LDCF trust fund ( $n = 113$ ) as well as the GEF Trust Fund ( $n = 483$ ), and SCCF trust fund ( $n = 35$ ). Annex G presents a comparison of

average time in months from first receipt of project concept to project approval to project start. This analysis shows that LDCF-funded projects are in line with projects from other funds in time needed from project approval to start on most parameters. However, in the GEF-6 period, the approval process took 18 months longer than GEF projects to obtain final approval or endorsement and 22 months longer than SCCF-funded projects. Once again, time from approval to project start was comparable, with an average of four months for LDCF- and GEF-funded projects, and five months for SCCF-funded projects. Taking the GEF-5 and GEF-6 periods together, LDCF projects took an average of 28 months from first receipt of concept to approval, compared to 23 months for the SCCF trust fund and 26 months for the GEF Trust Fund. Average time from project approval to start was very close for all three funds, with an average of five months for LDCF and six months for SCCF and GEF. These findings are supported by interviews with GEF Agencies and country stakeholders, who said that approval can be time consuming overall, but is comparable to other donors, taking into account the level of funding.

**Figure 15: GEF project cycle milestones**




Source: 2020 LDCF program evaluation.

87. **A lack of resources available to fund new projects in GEF-6 period explains efficiency decline in approval for LDCF projects.** The pipeline of projects awaiting approval grew considerably after May 2014 because there was a deficit of resources available for new funding approvals compared to resources sought in project proposals seeking CEO approval or endorsement. Figure 16 presents funding available for new decisions versus demand for funding for projects submitted for approval, based on GEF Secretariat progress reports to the Council from May 2014 to December 2019. In May and October 2014, the GEF Secretariat reported to the Council that there were no LDCF funds available for new funding decisions. While more funds became available the following year, the deficit between funding sought in projects awaiting approval and funding available continued through December 2018. The deficit in funds to meet demand reported at each Council meeting ranged from \$66 million to more

than \$300 million. A pipeline of projects either technically cleared by the GEF Secretariat or formally submitted for approval remained throughout the GEF-6 period ending April 2018. Twenty-one projects from 17 countries submitted during GEF-6 were still in the pipeline for approval when GEF-7 began and required resubmission for approval as GEF-7 projects. As of December 2019, 11 of these countries had confirmed or revised their GEF-6 pipelined projects for approval in GEF-7 (GEF 2019b).

**Figure 16: LDCF funds available versus funds sought in projects awaiting approval or endorsement and projects technically cleared for approval**



Sources: Progress reports on the LDCF and the SCCF presented to LDCF/SCCF Council May 2014 (16<sup>th</sup> Council meeting) to December 2019 (27<sup>th</sup> Council meeting).

**88. Interviewees note efficiency improvements during the GEF-7 period.** These stem from elimination of the pipeline and operational improvements introduced with the GEF Programming Strategy for the LDCF and SCCF and Operational Improvements (GEF 2018c). Project cycle analysis for the GEF-7 period was not possible because no GEF-7 full-size LDCF projects with CEO endorsement dates or start dates were available. However, figure 16 shows a correction in the pipeline beginning in December 2018.<sup>9</sup> The Secretariat’s efforts to increase predictability in funding through the operational improvements introduced during this period (outlined below) may have helped avoid a re-emergence of the pipeline, although some caution on the part of GEF Agencies in submitting project proposals may also play a role. Despite

<sup>9</sup> As of September 2020.

reports of improved efficiency, GEF Agencies reported in interviews that experience of the long pipeline during the GEF-6 period left lingering doubts about the availability of resources, which continue to effect decisions to submit project proposals.

### Efficiency during implementation

89. **Compared with GEF Trust Fund projects, full-size project lengths, rates of extensions, and extensions longer than two years are similar.** The team reviewed completed LDCF, SCCF, and GEF Trust Fund-financed full-size projects approved during GEF-4 and GEF-5 for efficiency in implementation.<sup>10</sup> The team analyzed projects for average implementation duration, rate of projects with implementation extensions, share of projects with extensions of more than two years, and expected and actual cofinancing ratios.<sup>11</sup> The three funds were largely in line on these indicators. SCCF performed better on average project extensions in months and share of projects with extensions two years or longer, although the sample was small. Table 8 presents the results.

**Table 8: Duration and average extensions of completed LDCF- and GEF-funded FSPs**

Trust Fund	Average project implementation duration in years	Average project extension in months	Share of projects with extensions 2 years or longer
GEF ( <i>n</i> = 364)	4.9	12.7	17%
LDCF ( <i>n</i> = 41)	4.6	12.7	17%
SCCF ( <i>n</i> = 20)	4.6	9.4	10%

Sources: IEO terminal evaluation database.

Note: Only projects with dates available for actual implementation start, expected date of completion at start, and actual date of completion were considered.

90. **Most frequent causes of project implementation delays were: coordinating between executing partners, recruiting project staff or consultants, changing project executing arrangements, and staff turnover.** The evaluation reviewed terminal evaluations and project implementation reports for issues reported to have delayed project implementation or led to project extension. Reasons listed more than once are summarized in table 9.

<sup>10</sup> The sample for comparison comprised full-size project GEF-4 and GEF-5 projects in the GEF IEO terminal evaluation review data set with dates available for actual implementation start, expected date of completion at start, and actual date of completion.

<sup>11</sup> Data gaps are a limitation in this analysis, particularly on project implementation dates in the GEF Secretariat project-level data available on the GEF Portal. Where possible, project dates provided by Agencies or in project implementation reports were included to fill these gaps. Projects with missing or inaccurate dates (start date before approval date) were not considered.



**Table 9: Delays during implementation**

Reported causes of delay	No. of projects
Coordination issues between executing partners	7
Recruitment issues	7
Change in executing arrangements	4
Staff turnover	4
Capacity constraints	3
Delays in disbursements	3
Design issues	4
Recommended extension at mid-term	3
Political unrest	3
Changes in government	2
Complex bureaucratic procedures	2
Delay in project approval delayed implementation	2
Procurement issues	2
Health crisis	2

Sources: LDCF project performance documents.

91. The LDCF is “primarily aimed at financing the full cost of adaptation for NAPA projects” (GEF 2011). While the GEF Policy on Cofinancing does not apply to the LDCF, and therefore the LDCF does not have cofinancing targets (unlike the GEF Trust Fund)<sup>12</sup>, LDCF projects do report on cofinancing expected at entry, which in the context of LDCF-funded projects “is defined as the cost that would be incurred for BAU (Business-as-Usual)” (GEF 2011). Failure of expected cofinancing to materialize can jeopardize performance, while cofinancing can also be an important source of stakeholder buy-in and sustainability. For these reasons, it is worth exploring cofinancing in the LDCF portfolio. Table 10 presents information on levels of materialized cofinancing across the GEF Trust Fund, the LDCF, and the SCCF.

**Table 10: Cofinancing across GEF-administered funds**

Trust Fund	Materialized cofinancing to grant-portfolio ratio	Materialized cofinancing to grant-median project ratio	% of cofinancing realized	% of projects with ≥ 90% of promised cofinancing realized	% of projects with ≥ 50% of promised cofinancing realized
GEF ( <i>n</i> = 321)	10.9	3.17	157%	65%	80%
LDCF ( <i>n</i> = 31)	2.7	0.84	52%	42%	58%
SCCF ( <i>n</i> = 18)	4.4	3.27	62%	56%	67%

Source: GEF IEO terminal evaluation review data set.

Note: Projects covered are all GEF-4 and GEF-5 projects in the GEF IEO terminal evaluation data set with information on materialized cofinancing available.

<sup>12</sup> The GEF Policy on Cofinancing, which does not apply to either the LDCF or SCCF, sets a target ratio of at least 7:1 for cofinancing to GEF dollars at the portfolio level (GEF 2018e).

92. **The LDCF portfolio does not achieve cofinancing as well as other GEF-administered funds.** The portfolio level and median project level ratio of realized cofinancing to grant financing for completed projects is lower for the LDCF than for the SCCF and the GEF. The portfolio level percentage of promised cofinancing that materializes and the share of projects with at least 90 percent and at least 50 percent of promised cofinancing realized is lower as well. Given that LDCF funds do not aim to meet a target ratio for cofinancing, the lower ratio for cofinancing for LDCF funding is logical. However, the lower number of projects in which promised cofinancing is realized may be cause for concern, as past GEF IEO analysis has found that materialization of expected cofinancing is linked to project performance, including sustainability, particularly when less than half of expected cofinancing is realized at completion (GEF IEO 2019c).

### **GEF-7 Operational Improvements**

93. To address LDCF efficiency, the GEF Secretariat introduced proposals for operational improvements in June 2018 as part of the GEF Programming Strategy on Adaptation to Climate Change for the LDCF and SCCF. One of the operational improvements was a shift in the project selection and approval process from “first-come, first-served” to LDCF/SCCF Council work program approval, with a batch of projects selected based on prioritization factors the GEF Secretariat proposed and presented for approval at Council meetings (GEF 2018c). The GEF Programming Strategy presented this move as an effort to address efficiency in light of resource constraints. It noted, “a very strict adherence to the ‘first-come, first-served’ principle of project approvals has revealed numerous limitations in the face of chronic resource constraints,” including difficulties proposing MTF or multi-lateral development bank projects that cannot be fast tracked. It also hindered mainstreaming adaptation and resilience in GEF Trust Fund projects and more ambitious or innovative proposals (GEF 2018c). There is evidence that this change is facilitating submission of MTF projects in the GEF-7 period. When the team prepared this report, 16 LDCF MTF proposals had been submitted in the GEF-7 period, compared to only one in the GEF-6 period.<sup>13</sup>

94. Other operational improvements introduced in the adaptation programming strategy include intersessional work programs, raising the LDCF funding ceiling from \$40 million to \$50 million with a cap of \$10 million per country, and capacity-building support for LDCF planning and programming. Finally, the strategy addressed the remaining pipeline of GEF-6 projects by clearing the pipeline and holding consultations with countries with projects in the pipeline on resubmitting their projects in the GEF-7 period.

95. **Multiple Agencies pointed to the operational improvements as positive developments and helpful in planning.** Interviewees also routinely commended the approachability, professionalism, and support of the GEF Secretariat’s LDCF staff. Some Agencies noted a continued lack of clarity around issues such as accessing other GEF resources through multitrust

---

<sup>13</sup> Based on data in GEF Portal as of September 2020. This includes projects submitted after the September 2019 portfolio cut-off date for this evaluation.

fund projects, and clarity on the remaining funding available per country under the GEF-7 \$10 million cap.

96. **Uncertainty over resource availability is a concern for stakeholders.** Stakeholders interviewed indicated that these operational improvements are welcome, but that uncertainty over resource availability continues to affect decisions on submissions of project proposals. The option of a replenishment cycle came up in multiple interviews. Several interviewees recommended that at least some research be undertaken on funding and contribution options.

97. Finally, stakeholders also raised issues on GEF-wide changes during the GEF-7 period which have affected their work with LDCF. One of these is a shift from the GEF Secretariat PMIS to a new platform—the GEF Portal. Several stakeholders interviewed for this evaluation noted difficulties in using the new system for LDCF projects and delays caused by the shift to the system. The transition to the portal will be assessed in a future GEF IEO evaluation of the GEF’s results-based management system (GEF IEO 2020a). Some Agencies also noted a lack of clarity around changes in the GEF-wide review process, and subsequent extra time in back and forth communications.

### **Graduation from LDC status**

98. Four countries—Cabo Verde, Equatorial Guinea, Maldives, and Samoa—have graduated from LDC status. Two additional countries, Angola and Vanuatu, are scheduled to graduate during the GEF-7 period, while three more (Bhutan, Sao Tomé and Príncipe, Solomon Islands) are scheduled to graduate in 2023 and 2024.<sup>14</sup> The GEF Secretariat’s practice has been to consider projects eligible to receive LDCF support if a country is classified as an LDC when the PIF is approved, and to continue to support projects already approved by the LDCF/SCCF Council prior to a country’s graduation through project completion (GEF 2019d.) The GEF Secretariat tried in early GEF-7 to engage Angola and Vanuatu to ensure they could receive LDCF support up to the \$10 million cap for the period before graduation (GEF 2019d.)

99. This evaluation involved a field visit to Samoa, where several stakeholders noted the UNDP’s mobilization efforts to develop a final LDCF project before graduation—the Economywide Integration of Climate Change Adaptation and Disaster Risk Management/Disaster Risk Reduction to Reduce Climate Vulnerability of Communities in Samoa project (GEF ID 5417), which UNDP implemented. This was the largest LDCF-funded NAPA implementation project in the country at \$12.3 million compared to \$1.95 to \$2.4 million for past NAPA implementation projects, demonstrating the efforts made to use resources while available. This example shows that efforts to mobilize funding before graduation can help ensure graduating LDC countries receive all the support they are eligible for.

---

<sup>14</sup> Source: UNFCCC website, timeline of country’s graduation from the LDC category; <https://www.un.org/development/desa/dpad/least-developed-country-category/ldc-graduation.html>, accessed October 2020.

## CATALYTIC EFFECTS, SUSTAINABILITY, AND ADDITIONALITY OF THE LDCF

100. The following chapter looks at the catalytic effects of LDCF support, factors that affect sustainability of outcomes, and the additionality of LDCF. The following questions are addressed:

- (a) To what extent have LDCF project outcomes been sustainable postcompletion?
- (b) What has been the additionality, both environmental and otherwise, of the LDCF?

### Catalytic effects of the LDCF


101. This section identifies whether completed LDCF projects have succeeded in generating catalytic effects. The analysis focused on the 45 completed NAPA implementation and NAP projects with performance data available as of September 2019, the cutoff date for this evaluation. The team reviewed 34—of these for this evaluation, while the remaining 11 were reviewed in the 2016 evaluation.

102. The review first looked at the extent to which LDCF support to NAPA implementation and NAP projects has been catalytic in the following ways:

- (a) **Production of a public good.** The project developed or introduced new technologies or approaches. No significant actions were taken to build on this achievement, so the catalytic effect is left to market forces.
- (b) **Demonstration.** After the production of a public good, demonstration sites, successful information dissemination, or training was implemented to catalyze the new technologies or approaches.
- (c) **Replication.** Activities, demonstrations, or techniques were repeated in or outside the project.
- (d) **Scaling up.** Approaches developed through the project were taken up on a regional or national scale, becoming widely accepted.

103. **Most completed projects produced public goods introducing new technologies or approaches.** For all completed NAPA implementation and NAP projects, roughly 70 percent developed or introduced new technologies or approaches from a large to a very large extent (figure 17). On this indicator, recently completed projects are in line with those already completed for the 2016 evaluation—68 percent of the 34 projects reviewed in 2020 were rated as delivering a public good from a large to a very large extent, versus 72 percent of the 11 projects reviewed in 2016.


**Figure 17: Production of a public good**



Sources: LDCF project performance documents.

104. **Some 70 percent of completed projects demonstrated new technologies, or approaches.** This is the share of projects rated as having achieved this catalytic effect from a large to a very large extent. Figure 18 displays results from the 2016 and 2020 review of catalytic effects from demonstration of public goods developed or introduced. About 80 percent of the projects with a high rating on “public good” also performed well on demonstration. This is evident in the UNDP project Enhancing Adaptive Capacity and Resilience to Climate Change in the Agriculture Sector in Mali (GEF ID 3776), the first LDCF project in country, which, among other activities, introduced climate-smart agricultural practices together with a training series at several scales to raise awareness on the new techniques “in the classroom and around demonstration plots” (UNDP IEO 2016a). Benefits identified include an increase in household income through the sale of surplus production and greater food security among beneficiaries. While a lower share of the 34 projects reviewed for this evaluation were rated as having achieved this indicator from a large to a very large extent compared to the 11 projects reviewed in 2016, it may not be appropriate to draw conclusions on trends given the small number of projects completed in 2016. Past GEF IEO annual performance reports have found that the first projects received pertaining to a certain GEF period tend to perform better than those received later. Performance regresses toward the average as more projects for any one GEF period become available (GEF IEO 2018a). This tendency may also explain lower ratings in the projects reviewed for this evaluation.


**Figure 18: Demonstration**



Sources: LDCF project performance documents.

105. **Sixty percent of completed projects achieved replication of approaches.** They are rated as having achieved replication of approaches from a large to a very large extent. Figure 19 displays results from the 2016 and 2020 review of catalytic effects in replicated activities or techniques in and outside the project. About 40 percent of projects showed no evidence that activities, demonstrations, or techniques were repeated in or outside the project. Broader adoption through replication is logically more difficult to achieve than production and demonstration of public goods, which projects control more directly. It is not surprising, therefore, that a lower share of projects catalyze replication. Terminal evaluations that noted replication often pointed to follow-on funding either in a new LDCF project or a project by another donor. Examples include the UNDP project in Bangladesh, Community Based Adaptation to Climate Change through Coastal Afforestation (GEF ID 3287), where additional LDCF funds had been secured by project end for a follow-on UNDP project, Integrating Community-based Adaptation into Afforestation and Reforestation Programmes in Bangladesh (GEF ID 4700). In other cases, a combination of interest from beneficiaries and identification of financing brought about replication. For example, the FAO project, Integrating Climate Resilience into Agricultural Production for Food Security in Rural Areas of Mali (GEF ID 3979), exceeded initial targets, with the help of significant in-kind contributions from government institutions and farmer organizations themselves who paid for their farmer members to attend trainings and replicated activities on their own. While observations in field visits during the 2016 LDCF evaluation suggested that extensive replication generally may not occur during project implementation, postcompletion field visits to Rwanda and Samoa showed signs of replication after project closure (GEF IEO 2018).

**Figure 19: Replication**




Sources: LDCF project performance documents.

Note: Two projects rated unable to assess are excluded from totals.

106. **Half of completed projects show no evidence of regional or national scale up.** Figure 20 displays results from the 2016 and 2020 review of catalytic effects of scaling up NAPA implementation and NAP project activities. For all completed NAPA implementation and NAP projects, more than 20 percent have developed or introduced new technologies or approaches to a large or very large extent. Like replication, scaling up approaches developed in a project is challenging, especially by project closure. The 2016 LDCF program evaluation found that for projects with lower performance to increase scaling up, additional financing would be required. This evaluation found the same for projects reviewed (GEF IEO 2018b). Roughly a quarter of the projects reviewed in 2020 achieved scaling up from a large to a very large extent, a higher share than for projects reviewed in 2016, where only two of the 11 projects reviewed were rated in this range (18 percent.)


**Figure 20: Scaling up**



Sources: LDCF project performance documents.

107. Figure 21 presents information for all completed NAPA implementation and NAP projects on these four catalytic effects. Most projects achieved production of a public good and demonstration, but performance was weaker in replication and even more so in scaling-up.

**Figure 21: Catalytic effects in the portfolio of completed projects**




Sources: LDCF project performance documents.

108. The evaluation also assessed more specific catalytic effects LDCF projects generated. The team used seven indicators of momentum and synergy identified by project stakeholders in the 2016 LDCF program evaluation to measure the LDCF support generated in development programs and institutions. Results for the portfolio of completed projects are presented in figure 22.



**Figure 22: Catalytic effects stakeholders identified**



Sources: LDCF project performance documents.

109. **Sixty percent of completed projects built foundations for larger scale projects.** This catalytic effect showed the strongest performance. More than 80 percent of projects have achieved this from a large to a very large extent. The second important contribution was improving management effectiveness, seen in 55 percent of the projects from a large to a very large extent). This is consistent with a view multiple stakeholders voiced in interviews: the LDCF supports piloting initiatives that other donors can scale up. The knowledge products created during a UNDP Maldives project, Increasing Climate Change Resilience of Maldives through Adaptation in the Tourism Sector (GEF ID 4431), such as a synthesis on the key areas of waste and water management, and energy and infrastructure of the tourism sector, contributed directly to the Waste Management Act the Ministry of Environment and Energy developed. A UNDP project, Strengthening Climate Information and Early Warning Systems in Tanzania to Support Climate Resilient Development and Adaptation to Climate Change (GEF ID 4991), established a national integrated database for climate and hydrology information that now provides a central, unified, coordinated information-sharing platform for stakeholders in the climate monitoring system. Using a centralized information access point improves climate and weather data collection and storage for the long term.

110. Fifty-two percent of projects had an impact on multiple sectors and a different level of society from a large to a very large extent; 50 percent generated significant social, economic, cultural, and human well-being co-benefits. A UNDP project in Timor-Leste, Strengthening the Resilience of Small-Scale Rural Infrastructure and Local Government Systems to Climatic Variability and Risk (GEF ID 4696), for example, generated significant social and economic benefits by implementing water supply systems, reservoirs and irrigation systems, rural access roads and bridges, and river embankments. The new water supply systems now provide water for domestic use, vegetable gardens, cash crops production, and livestock. The roads have become critical linkages for farmers to deliver and sell their produce at markets. Overall, the new infrastructure affected multiple sectors and different levels of the society, as it provided employment, income generation, and social and economic livelihoods while ultimately reducing vulnerability to the impacts of climate change.

111. **Projects had limited success developing longer-term partnerships and leveraging new resources.** Thirty-two percent of projects were found to have been instrumental in developing longer-term partnerships from a large to a very large extent. Fewer projects develop new cost-sharing approaches or leveraged new resources (28 percent) from a large to very large extent. Only 18 percent of projects were found to have built on the traditional knowledge and practices of local communities from a large to a very large extent. On this last indicator in particular, results for the 34 projects reviewed in 2020 did not perform as well as projects reviewed in 2016, where 75 percent of 11 projects had built on traditional knowledge and practices of local communities to a moderate or greater extent, versus 32 percent of the 34 projects reviewed in 2020. Portfolio review indicated that while many projects have conducted a participatory project design including communities, there is no evidence that their local or traditional knowledge was effectively integrated into design.


### **Factors affecting sustainability of outcomes**

112. Sustainability of outcomes is a challenge across all GEF-administered activities which has been examined by the GEF IEO, STAP, and the GEF Secretariat. At the 57<sup>th</sup> GEF Council meeting, the GEF Secretariat presented the document *Towards Greater Durability of GEF Investments*, with analysis on key factors influencing durability in GEF projects and programs, as well as a framework for durability design and measures towards improving durability of GEF projects and programs (GEF, 2019e). Factors noted in the document include the need for development of project theory of change, multi-stakeholder processes, stakeholder involvement, and adaptive learning. The factors affecting sustainability of outcomes in the cohort of LDCF projects reviewed reflect many findings from the existing body of work on sustainability within the GEF partnership, including those reflected in the GEF document on durability.

113. **Fifty-six percent of the LDCF portfolio of completed projects are rated likely to sustain outcomes.** The GEF IEO tracks performance ratings based on information in project terminal evaluations. Figure 23 displays sustainability ratings from the GEF IEO terminal evaluation review data set for the portfolio of completed LDCF projects. Figures are presented for all completed NAPA implementation and NAP projects. The cohort of completed projects reviewed as part of the 2016 evaluation is disaggregated from the cohort of more recently completed

projects reviewed for this evaluation.<sup>15</sup> Of these projects, sustainability of outcomes was rated likely for five, and moderately likely for 18. Seventeen projects have been rated moderately unlikely for sustainable outcomes. Only one project was rated unlikely. The share of projects reviewed in 2016 with sustainability ratings in the likely range was higher than for projects reviewed in 2020, though the sample is too small to draw conclusions on a trend. Of the sample of 11 projects, 72 percent were rated in the likely range, compared to 50 percent of the 30 projects reviewed in 2020.

**Figure 23: APR sustainability ratings in the LDCF portfolio of completed projects**



Source: GEF IEO terminal evaluation review data set.

**114. Visits to two completed LDCF projects show varying degrees of continued benefits.** Sustainability ratings are a prediction based on risks at completion. To assess actual sustainability postcompletion, the evaluation team visited two projects: Integration of Climate Change Risks and Resilience into Forestry Management in Samoa (ICCRIFS) (GEF ID 4216), implemented by UNDP, and Reducing Vulnerability to Climate Change by Establishing Early Warning and Disaster Preparedness Systems and Support for Integrated Watershed Management in Flood Prone Areas project in Rwanda (GEF ID 3838), implemented by UNEP. While these two projects cannot be considered representative of the LDCF portfolio, they provide valuable illustrative evidence on the sustainability of LDCF outcomes. Both visits revealed evidence of sustainable outcomes, particularly those related to infrastructure, capacity building, and piloted activities. The ICCRIFS project in Samoa made major lasting contributions to management techniques by integrating climate information into the Samoa

<sup>15</sup> This evaluation includes all projects with terminal evaluations received by the cutoff date, September 2019. Ratings were available for 41 projects. More terminal evaluations for other LDCF projects may have become available since then.

Forest Resource Information System (SamFris) and tailoring Samoa’s Climate Early Warning System (CLEWS) to provide forestry information, as well as training government staff. The wide-scale training on agroforestry techniques conducted in 26 villages across three demonstration sites—two national parks and their adjacent villages, and one of customary lands—also showed signs of continued uptake, although interviewees said uptake varied. The project in Rwanda also delivered significant results that continued, including establishing institutional capacity and infrastructure for forecasting and early warning systems (EWS), and farmland rehabilitation through terracing and agroforestry.

115. In both projects, there was less evidence of results from activities to mainstream climate change in policy and development plans and, consequently, sustainability. In Samoa, while the project successfully completed a new forestry policy integrating climate risks and resilience, the policy ultimately did not pass. In Rwanda, project participants had largely forgotten work to mainstream climate in district development plans and the national Land Use Master Plan five years after the project was completed. It was essentially lost in the broader effort to develop district and national plans.

116. **Many factors affect outcome sustainability.** The team reviewed recently completed projects with terminal evaluations available for discussion of context-related factors outside project management control and project-related factors that helped or hindered sustainability. The team coded factors by theme, presented in table 11.

**Table 11: Factors that help or hinder sustainability of project outcomes**

Positive factors contributing to sustainability	Negative factors hindering sustainability
Number of projects	Number of projects
<b>Context-related factors</b>	
Strong presence of other donors (1)	Natural disaster (13) <sup>a</sup>
Stable government (1)	Financial shock (2)
	Political unrest (2)
	Change in national government (1)
	Poor infrastructure (1)
<b>Project-related factors</b>	
Effective stakeholder engagement (9)	Insufficient capacity on project team (8) Absence of technical advice (2)
Effective coordination between executing partners (7)	Staff turnover or delays in recruitment (7)
Strong project design (4)	Weak project design (7)
Recruitment of technical experts (3)	Weak management (7)
Implementation of midterm recommendations (3)	Weak monitoring and evaluation (6)
Effective use of learning exchanges (2)	Lack of country ownership (3) At local level (2) At national level (1)
Strong monitoring and evaluation (2)	Expected cofinancing did not materialize (3)
Good policy base in country (1)	Delays in procurement (2)
Incorporation of lessons learned from past projects (1)	Weak preparation and readiness (2)
	Project blended with other initiative (1)
	Delays in funds disbursements (1)

Sources: LDCF project performance documents.

a. Natural disasters included cyclone or hurricane, drought, health disaster, flood, shoreline erosion, and unpredictable weather.

117. Project terminal evaluations were much more likely to list context-related factors that hindered likelihood of project sustainability than factors that contributed to it. Thirteen of the 34 projects reviewed noted some form of natural disaster during project implementation which hindered likely sustainability of benefits. Other context-related factors hindering sustainability included financial shocks, political unrest, or changes in government during implementation, as well as poor infrastructure in the country. Context factors noted as helping achieve sustainability were the strong presence of other donors in country, and a stable government.

118. Insufficient capacity of the project team, staff turnover, delays in recruitment, weak project design, and weak project management were the most frequently noted project-related factors hindering likely sustainability of project outcomes. Alternatively, effective stakeholder engagement and effective coordination between executing partners were the most frequently noted factors contributing to achieve likely sustainability of project outcomes.

## Lessons Learned

119. **Stakeholder involvement is key for sustainability.** The terminal evaluation of a UNDP project in Tuvalu, Increasing Resilience of Coastal Areas and Community Settlements to Climate Change (GEF ID 3694), noted, “The problem of climate change adaptation is essentially transdisciplinary and multisectoral. It requires federating the efforts of various stakeholders and harmonizing their position within a coordinated framework” (UNDP IEO 2016b). This may explain the prevalence of lessons learned on communications and stakeholder involvement. Twenty-nine of the 34 projects reviewed included lessons learned on the importance of communications and stakeholder involvement to project sustainability. Ensuring proper stakeholder involvement in adaptation projects is key both to ensuring that interventions are relevant and appropriate in the specific project context, and for creating stakeholder buy-in and lasting investment. For example, the terminal evaluation for a UNDP project, Enhancing Adaptive Capacity and Resilience to Climate Change in the Agriculture Sector in Mali (GEF ID 3776), reported that communities and civil society were not involved in planning the trials of the adaptation technologies, which hindered their success. The lesson learned was, “community involvement in all aspects of planning adaptation technologies is critical for achievement of results and sustainability” (UNDP IEO 2016a). At the national level, the terminal evaluation for the AfDB- implemented CARLA project in Malawi (GEF ID 3302) suggested that fostering collaborative interministerial relationships and arrangements should be included as a distinct output where possible. Finally, the postcompletion visit to Rwanda for the Reducing Vulnerability to Climate Change by Establishing Early Warning and Disaster Preparedness Systems and Support for Integrated Watershed Management in Flood Prone Areas project (GEF ID 3838) identified the strength of national ownership and leadership and deep involvement of the Rwandan authorities in project design, oversight, and implementation as key factors both in the project’s success and in ensuring that learning from the project was retained and institutionalized in Rwanda.

120. Lessons learned emphasized the importance of community-level buy-in, along with recommendations on how best to achieve this in 10 of the 34 recently reviewed terminal evaluations. For example, the terminal evaluation for the UNDP project, Increased Resilience and Adaptation to Adverse Impacts of Climate Change in Guinea's Vulnerable Coastal Zones (GEF ID 3703), said, “project interventions targeted at working with population in communities, such as EWS projects, tend to deliver better results in more effective and efficient ways when implemented by experienced NGOs rather than government and its staff that has its regular daily working obligations” (UNDP IEO 2016c).

121. **Continued financing is important to sustainability.** In both projects visited by the evaluation for postcompletion assessment, it was found that activities integrated into ongoing government work and budget, such as infrastructure and government capacity building for EWS, have proven more sustainable. In Samoa, piecemeal funding for follow-up work with project villages on a local-level pilot intervention led to varying levels of continued work and benefits from the project. Interviewees in the Samoan Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment (MNRE) Forestry Division reported they have only been able to follow up with a few of the villages involved and found that postcompletion, some communities did not have the money to implement community management plans developed during the project, or were unable to finance all project activities. The continued impact of work with communities has varied, depending on follow-up support from government and other funding sources. The MNRE water division has worked with some of the villages involved in ICCRIFS postcompletion as part of its regular programming. It has used the environmental management plans developed as part of the project to identify priorities for implementation. Interviewees noted that in some cases, villages have used plans developed through the ICCRIFS project to develop proposals for funding from other sources, including the GEF Small Grants Programme (SGP).

### **Additionality of the LDCF**

122. GEF additionality is the additional outcomes (environmental and other) that can be directly connected with the GEF-supported project or program (GEF IEO 2020b).<sup>16</sup> The IEO classifies additionality in six areas: specific environmental additionality, legal and regulatory additionality, institutional and governance additionality, financial additionality, socioeconomic additionality, and innovation additionality (GEF IEO 2020b).

---

<sup>16</sup> The GEF IEO approach to additionality ([GEF IEO 2020b](#)) includes a more detailed discussion of definitions of additionality across agencies, as well as the explanation of the definition the GEF IEO adopted :

- (a) Changes in the attainment of direct project outcomes at project completion that can be attributed to GEF interventions; these can be reflected in an acceleration of the adoption of reforms, the enhancement of outcomes, or the reduction of risks and greater viability of project interventions.
- (b) Spill-over effects beyond project outcomes that may result from systemic reforms, capacity development, and socioeconomic changes.
- (c) Clearly articulated pathways to achieve broadening of impact beyond project completion that can be associated with GEF interventions.

123. **LDCF’s most distinctive facet is its sole dedication to LDCs.** The majority of stakeholders interviewed appreciated LDCF’s ringfencing resources for LDCs and that LDCs need not “compete” with higher-capacity countries. Furthermore, the comparative age of the LDCF means applicants are familiar with processes and proposal development. Approval and implementation are comparatively smooth as they are based on well-established procedures that countries and Agencies are now well-practiced in, compared to more recently established funds such as the Green Climate Fund (GCF). Several interviewees also identified the LDCF as more open to taking risks in LDCs and investing in innovation compared to other funds.

124. **LDCF has contributed innovation and institutional strengthening additionalities beyond adaptation benefits.** Innovation is strongly emphasized in the LDCF and recently completed projects have contributed to innovation additionalities (See table 5). LDCF activities have also contributed to institutional capacity development for adaptation-focused work through implicit project components and indirectly through the process of developing and implementing LDCF projects. Results have been achieved to varying degrees in other areas of additionality, including environmental and socioeconomic, with the weakest area being financial additionalities in securing nondonor financing. The two postcompletion evaluations in Rwanda and Samoa found that innovation and institutional additionalities achieved continued years after project closure.

## CONCLUSIONS

### Relevance of LDCF support

125. **LDCF support continues to be highly relevant to COP guidance and decisions, the GEF adaptation programming strategy, and countries’ broader development policies, plans and programs.** The 2016 LDCF program evaluation reported strong alignment between LDCF-financed activities and COP guidance and decisions, the GEF adaptation strategic objectives, and countries’ environmental and sustainable development agendas. This evaluation has found continued strong alignment since 2016. Additionally, a large portion of the LDCF’s work is inherently aligned with the Paris Agreement through its support of adaptation related NDCs/INDs. Notably, in response to recent COP guidance based on findings of the 2016 LDCF program evaluation, the LDCF has enhanced domestic institutional capacities in LDCs by supporting institutional capacity development through the involvement of national institutions in LDCF project development, approval and delivery.

### Effectiveness of the LDCF

126. **LDCF project design clearly contributes to the three recently revised GEF adaptation strategic objectives; contributions to the two new strategic pillars were not as strong.** The nature and extent of contributions varied from project to project, but the overall LDCF portfolio clearly contributed to reducing vulnerability and increasing resilience, mainstreaming climate change adaptation, and strengthening the enabling conditions for effective and integrated adaptation. LDCF projects invariably also helped raise general awareness of adaptation across all stakeholder groups. They commonly supported strengthening institutional capacities for adaptation-focused work. Contributions to the new GEF adaptation strategic pillars in project

design were less pronounced. This is partly because the pillar revisions were only adopted in 2018, so they have yet to have a marked influence on LDCF project design.

127. **The overall gender performance of the LDCF portfolio has improved.** The use of gender analysis during project design is widespread. Revisions to the GEF's Gender Equality Policy have contributed to improved gender mainstreaming performance across the LDCF. Particularly influential has been a new requirement for all GEF-supported projects to undertake a gender analysis prior to CEO endorsement or approval. The Guidance to Advance Gender Equality in GEF Projects and Programs has also helped clarify how gender analyses can be operationalized through gender action plans or mainstreaming strategies. However, there is a knowledge gap in the gender-related results of LDCF projects: it is particularly concerning that most LDCF terminal evaluations fail to undertake any form of gender-focused assessment, even among those published after the GEF IEO guidelines made it a requirement.

128. **Substantive engagement with the private sector is limited, and LDCF projects face common challenges.** Most LDCF projects deliver activities that aim to increase private sector involvement or deliver activities with some private sector participation. However, beyond such activity-level engagement, the private sector has very limited substantive involvement in implementing LDCF projects, for example as delivery partners or investors. Interviews with GEF Agencies identified two common challenges LDCF projects face: banking and private sectors are comparatively less developed in LDCs, and it is difficult to attract private sector interest and investment in adaptation-focused work. These two factors arguably make private sector engagement even more challenging for LDCF projects compared to other GEF funding mechanisms.

### **Efficiency of the LDCF**

129. **The lack of resources available for new projects during GEF-6 clearly reduced the efficiency of the LDCF project approval process.** Project cycle analysis shows that during the GEF-5 period, the LDCF efficiency approval process matched other GEF-administered funds. In GEF-6, however, the LDCF approval process slowed considerably, because of a lack of resources available for new projects. Several interviewees noted improvements in efficiency during the GEF-7 period, stemming from eliminating the pipeline and operational improvements the GEF Programming Strategy for the LDCF and SCCF and Operational Improvements introduced. Despite welcome operational improvements, uncertainty over resource availability remains a concern among stakeholders.

130. **Once implementation has begun, efficiency of LDCF projects is comparable to other GEF-administered funds.** Comparisons with other GEF funds show similar project lengths, numbers of projects with extensions, and projects with extensions of longer than two years for full-size projects between funds. The most often reported causes of delays in project implementation arise from difficulties coordinating between executing partners and recruiting project personnel, changes in project executing arrangements, and staff turnover.



## Catalytic Effects, Sustainability, and Additionality of the LDCF

131. **LDCF support has resulted in catalytic efforts through production of public goods and their demonstration.** Most completed LDCF projects have produced public goods in the form of new technologies or approaches and demonstrated new technologies and approaches by disseminating information through training or at demonstration sites from a large to a very large extent. Replication and scale up are more difficult to attain, especially by project closure.

132. **LDCF support has built foundations for larger scale projects.** In the areas where stakeholders have identified catalytic effects, the strongest performance for the portfolio of completed projects was building foundations for larger scale projects—60 percent have done so from a large to a very large extent—and improving management effectiveness of adaptation-relevant national and subnational systems, which 55 percent of projects have achieved to a large or very large extent. Projects were less successful being instrumental in developing longer-term partnerships—32 percent of projects achieved this to a large or very large extent; 28 percent developed new cost-sharing approaches or leveraged new resources to a large or very large extent and built on the traditional knowledge and practices of local communities.

133. **Many factors, both in and outside a project's control, affect outcome sustainability.** Postcompletion visits to LDCF projects revealed project-supported benefits continued to varying degrees. Continued financing is an important factor in sustainability. LDCF terminal evaluations identified common project-related factors that hindered outcome sustainability, including insufficient capacity of the project team, staff turnover and delays in recruitment, weak project design, and weak project management. The reports most frequently noted effective stakeholder engagement and effective coordination between executing partners as factors contributing to sustainability.

## Recommendations

134. **Recommendation 1: Build on progress made on mainstreaming gender in the LDCF portfolio and aim to decrease the knowledge gap about gender-related results.** The GEF Secretariat and GEF Agencies should continue to build on progress made since the 2016 LDCF program evaluation towards inclusion of gender considerations by ensuring that the 2017 Gender Equality Policy and related guidance is fully operationalized, including the development and implementation of robust gender action plans. To narrow the knowledge gap, GEF Agencies should fulfill evaluation requirements on gender in terminal evaluations and report on the conduct of gender analysis and monitoring and evaluation of gender equitable participation and benefits in implementation.

135. **Recommendation 2: Continue to enhance the likelihood of the sustainability of outcomes.** The GEF Secretariat and GEF Agencies should continue to carry out relevant actions in project design and implementation as highlighted in the Council document *Towards Greater Durability of GEF Investments*. This should entail giving more emphasis to the project and context factors identified by this evaluation as affecting the sustainability of outcomes during project design and implementation.

## ANNEX A: UNFCCC COP GUIDANCE

The LDCF was established in 2001 as an adaptation funding mechanism. Its mandate, objectives, and priorities in supporting LDCs has developed over time. Below is a concise overview of UNFCCC COP Guidance and Decisions for the LDCF (GEF 2018f):<sup>17</sup>

- FCCC/CP/2001/13/Add. 1, Decision 2/CP.7, Annex B, par. 9, and Annex D, par. 22: Support country-driven capacity-building activities in developing countries as part of the LDC (non-Annex 1) work program with a focus on those countries most vulnerable to the adverse effects of climate change.
- FCCC/CP/2001/13/Add.1, Decision 5/CP.7 and Decision 7/CP.7, par.6: Support the work program for the LDCs, including NAPA preparation.
- FCCC/CP/2003/6/Add.1, Decision 4/CP.9, par.1a: Support preparation of National Communications to the Convention.
- FCCC/CP/2003/6/Add.1, Decision 6/CP.9, pars. 2 and 3: Support implementation of NAPAs (the support of NAPA implementation projects) as soon as possible after the NAPA completion.
- FCCC/CP/2003/6/Add.1, Decision 6/CP.9, par. 3 and FCCC/CP/2005/5/Add.1, Decision 3/CP.11, par.1a: NAPAs should be country driven, in line with national priorities to ensure cost-effectiveness and complementarity with other funding sources. The focus should be on urgency and immediacy of adapting to the adverse effects of climate change, with a prioritization of activities.
- FCCC/CP/2005/5/Add.1, Decision 3/CP.11, par. 1 b-c: (b) Supporting the implementation of activities identified in NAPAs to promote integration of adaptation measures in national development and poverty reduction strategies, plans, or policies, with a view to increasing resilience to the adverse effects of climate change, and (c) Supporting a learning-by-doing approach.
- FCCC/CP/2010/7/Add.1, Decision 1/CP.16, par. 15: Establish a process to formulate and implement NAPs to identify medium- and long-term adaptation needs and developing and implementing strategies and programs to address those needs.
- FCCC/CP/2012/8/Add.2, Decision 12/CP.18, par. 1: To provide funding from the LDCF for activities that support preparation of the NAP.
- FCCC/CP/2014/10/Add.2 Decision 10/CP.20 par. 8 & par.10: To share lessons learned and progress made in pilot accreditation of GEF national project agencies, to enhance

---

<sup>17</sup>Additional source: UNFCCC Decisions: <https://unfccc.int/decisions>, accessed September 2019.

communication with implementing agencies, and to encourage implementing agencies to improve their communication with countries to facilitate timely implementation of NAPAs.

- FCCC/CP/2015/10/Add.1 Decision 1/CP.21 In Decision 1/CP.21, par. 58, The COP decided that the GCF and the GEF, the entities entrusted with operating the Financial Mechanism of the Convention, as well as the LDCF and the SCCF, administered by the GEF, shall serve the Paris Agreement.
- FCCC/CP/2015/10/Add.2 Decision 8/CP.21 par.6 & 8: Notes that the GEF IEO is carrying out a review of the LDCF, and requests the GEF carry out a technical review of the program priorities of the LDCF, taking into account the GEF IEO review and focusing on pilot climate-change activities relevant to the least developed countries to enhance longer-term institutional capacity to design and execute these capacities.
- FCCC/CP/2016/10/Add.1 Decision 11/CP.22 par. 14 & 15: Welcomes the conclusions of the “Program Evaluation of the Least Developed Countries Fund” and requests the GEF to continue to enhance capacity development in the least developed countries to create project proposals with a focus on identifying potential funding sources, both national and international, and enhancing long-term domestic institutional capacities.
- FCCC/CP/2017/11/Add.1/Decision 10/CP.23 par.11 Encourages the Global Environment Facility to further enhance engagement with the private sector, including its technology projects. 19.
- FCCC/CP/2018/10/Add.2 Decision 16/CP.24 par. 3 & 4: That support to the Least Developed Countries Work Program should come from the LDCF, as well as other bilateral and multilateral sources, and that the Least Developed Countries Work Program be updated to reflect the needs of the least developed countries, including through:
  - Establishing or strengthening national climate change secretariats or focal points to enable effective implementation of the Convention, the Kyoto Protocol, and the Paris Agreement in the least developed country parties
  - Providing training to strengthen capacity of negotiators for Least Developed Countries to participate in the climate change process
  - Supporting a process to formulate and implement NAPs and related adaptation strategies, including NAPAs
  - Supporting preparation and implementation of NDCs/INDCs

- Continuing to promote public awareness programs, strengthening cooperative action on adaptation technology development and transfer, strengthening capacity of meteorological and hydrological services for weather and climate information to support implementation of adaptation actions, and continuing to support capacity-building initiatives to enable effective engagement in reporting and review activities under the Convention and the Paris Agreement, as needed.
- FCCC/PA/CMA/2018/3/Add.1: Section II. par. 7 & 9: That the LDCF shall serve the Paris Agreement.

**ANNEX B: OVERVIEW OF COMPLETED NAPAS**

<b>Country</b>	<b>GEF Agency</b>	<b>GEF ID</b>	<b>Date of Submission to UNFCCC</b>
Afghanistan	UNEP	2530	September 2009
Angola	UNEP	3409	December 2011
Bangladesh	UNDP	2026	November 2005, updated June 2009
Benin	UNDP	2461	January 2008
Bhutan	UNDP	2352	May 2006
Burkina Faso	UNDP	2156	December 2007
Burundi	UNDP	2466	February 2007
Cabo Verde	UNDP	2351	December 2007
Cambodia	UNDP	1869	March 2007
Central African Republic	UNEP	2425	June 2008
Chad	UNDP	2480	February 2010
Comoros	UNEP	2049	November 2006
Democratic Republic of Congo	UNDP	2409	September 2006
Djibouti	UNEP	2191	October 2006
Equatorial Guinea	UNDP	5191	November 2013
Eritrea	UNDP	1959	May 2007
Ethiopia	UNDP	1960	June 2008
Gambia	UNEP	2050	January 2008
Guinea	UNDP	2362	July 2007
Guinea-Bissau	UNDP	2524	February 2008
Haiti	UNEP	1948	December 2006
Kiribati	UNDP	2388	January 2007
Lao People's Democratic Republic	UNDP	2148	May 2009
Lesotho	UNEP	2013	June 2007
Liberia	UNEP	2414	July 2007
Madagascar	World Bank	2521	December 2006
Malawi	UNDP	2027	March 2006
Maldives	UNDP	2353	March 2008

Mali	UNDP	2410	December 2007
Mauritania	UNEP	1956	November 2004
Mozambique	UNDP	2029	July 2008
Myanmar	UNEP	3702	May 2013
Nepal	UNDP	3412	November 2010
Niger	UNDP	2481	July 2006
Rwanda	UNEP	2484	May 2007
Samoa	UNDP	1868	December 2005
São Tomé and Príncipe	World Bank	2464	November 2007
Senegal	UNEP	2085	November 2006
Sierra Leone	UNDP	2482	June 2008
Solomon Islands	UNDP	2814	December 2008
Somalia	UNDP	5007	April 2013
South Sudan	UNDP	5564	February 2017
Sudan	UNDP	2031	June 2007
Tanzania	UNEP	1996	September 2007
Timor-Leste	UNDP	3464	September 2011
Togo	UNDP	2465	September 2009
Tuvalu	UNDP	1969	May 2007
Uganda	UNEP	2168	December 2007
Vanuatu	UNDP	1970	December 2007
Yemen	UNDP	1990	April 2009
Zambia	UNDP	2413	October 2007

## ANNEX C: EVALUATION MATRIX

Key question	Indicators/measures	Source of information	Methodology
<b>1. Relevance:</b> Does LDCF support continue to be relevant to UNFCCC COP guidance and decisions, the GEF adaptation programming strategy, and countries' broader development policies, plans and programs?			
<b>1a.</b> How relevant has LDCF support been to UNFCCC COP guidance and decisions, including the Paris Agreement?	Extent of alignment between LDCF-related guidance/decisions and COP guidance/decisions	GEF/LDCF guidance (including council decisions), COP guidance (including Paris Agreement), project documentation, GEF Secretariat staff, GEF IEO and external evaluations	Portfolio analysis, interviews, country visits, literature review, meta-evaluation review
	Extent of alignment between LDCF projects and COP guidance/decisions		
<b>1b.</b> How relevant has LDCF support been to the GEF's adaptation programming strategy?	Extent of alignment between LDCF projects and GEF adaptation programming strategy, including the three strategic objectives and two strategic pillars	GEF and LDCF guidance (including council decisions), GEF adaptation strategy, project documentation, GEF Secretariat staff, GEF IEO and external evaluations	Portfolio analysis, interviews, country visits, meta-evaluation review, literature review
<b>1c.</b> How relevant has LDCF support been to country-level environmental and sustainable development policies, plans, and programs?	Extent of alignment between LDCF projects and national policies, plans, and programs, including NAPAs and NDCs	Country stakeholders (government, GEF Agencies, project partners), NAPAs, NDCs, project documentation, GEF IEO and external evaluations	Portfolio analysis (alignment between implementation projects and NAPA), interviews, country visits, literature review, meta-evaluation review
<b>1d.</b> To what extent have LDCF project outcomes been sustainable postcompletion?	Type and extent of LDCF project contributions to domestic institutional capacity development	Country stakeholders (government, including GEF focal points, GEF Agencies, project	Portfolio analysis, interviews, country visits, meta-evaluation

Key question	Indicators/measures	Source of information	Methodology
		partners), project documentation, GEF IEO and external evaluations	review, literature review
<b>2. Effectiveness: How effective has the LDCF been at delivering on expected outcomes?</b>			
<b>2a.</b> How effective has the LDCF been in supporting the GEF's strategic adaptation objectives?	Outcome ratings of LDCF projects		
	Type and extent of LDCF project contributions to GEF strategic objectives Type and extent of LDCF project contributions to GEF strategic pillars	Project documentation, external evaluations, country stakeholders (government, GEF Agencies, project partners, beneficiaries), GEF Secretariat staff	Portfolio analysis, interviews, country visits, meta-evaluation review
<b>2c.</b> What are the gender equality objectives achieved and gender mainstreaming principles adhered to by the LDCF?	Gender ratings of LDCF projects		
	Type and extent of gender analyses, actions, and results delivered through LDCF projects	GEF and LDCF guidance (including council decisions), project documentation, external evaluations, country stakeholders (government, GEF Agencies, project partners, beneficiaries), GEF Secretariat staff	Portfolio analysis, interviews, country visits, meta-evaluation review
<b>2d.</b> To what extent has the LDCF engaged the private sector?	Type and extent of private sector engagement with LDCF projects		
	Level of private sector cofinancing in LDCF projects	Project documentation, external evaluations, country stakeholders (government, GEF Agencies, project partners, beneficiaries), GEF Secretariat staff	Portfolio analysis, interviews, country visits, meta-evaluation review
<b>2e.</b> What are lessons learned from implementation experience?	Compilation of type and substance of lessons learned through LDCF projects	Project documentation, external evaluations, country stakeholders (government, GEF Agencies,	Portfolio analysis, interviews, country visits, meta-evaluation review



Key question	Indicators/measures	Source of information	Methodology
		project partners, beneficiaries), GEF Secretariat staff	
<b>3. Efficiency: How efficient has LDCF support been?</b>			
	Funding profile (funding types, sources, volumes) of LDCF projects and overall LDCF portfolio		
<b>3a.</b> How have resource flows and resource predictability, or lack thereof, affected the funds' programming?	Availability of resources for LDCF pipeline  Comparison of time elapsed between project cycle milestones for LDCF projects with similar funds such as GEF, SCCF, AF  Type and length of project delays	Project documentation, GEF Agency staff, GEF Secretariat staff, country stakeholders	Interviews, country visits, meta-evaluation review, project cycle analysis
	Efficiency ratings of LDCF projects		
<b>3b.</b> How efficient is the fund's project cycle as a delivery mechanism?	Expected and actual cofinancing ratios for LDCF projects, performance  Time between project cycle milestones  Type and length of project delays	Project documentation, GEF Agency staff, GEF Secretariat staff, country stakeholders	Portfolio analysis, interviews, country visits
<b>4. Sustainability: To what extent have the outcomes achieved in LDCF projects been sustainable post-completion?</b>			
<b>4a.</b> What are the main factors affecting the sustainability of LDCF-supported outcomes?	Sustainability ratings of LDCF projects	Project documentation, external evaluations, country stakeholders (government, GEF Agencies,	Portfolio analysis, interviews, country visits, meta-evaluation review

Key question	Indicators/measures	Source of information	Methodology
		project partners, beneficiaries), GEF Secretariat staff	
<b>5. Additionality: What has been the additionality, both environmental and otherwise, of the LDCF?</b>			
<b>5a. What is the value added of LDCF?</b>	Type of interventions covered in the LDCF Portfolio of NAPA Implementation Projects		
	Type and extent of LDCF project contributions to GEF focal areas	Project documentation, external evaluations, country stakeholders (government, GEF Agencies, project partners, beneficiaries), GEF Secretariat staff	Portfolio analysis, interviews, country visits, meta-evaluation review
	Type and extent of catalytic effects delivered through LDCF projects		
	Type and extent of global environmental benefits delivered through LDCF projects		

## ANNEX D: RESULTS FRAMEWORK OF THE GEF ADAPTATION PROGRAM

The revised results framework of the GEF Adaptation Program is structured around three strategic objectives with associated outcomes and indicators. As of July 1, 2018, project and program proponents that seek funds from the LDCF or the SCCF for climate change adaptation will be asked to align their proposals with one or more of these strategic objectives.

<b>Goal</b>	To strengthen resilience and reduce vulnerability to the adverse impacts of climate change in developing countries, and support country efforts to enhance adaptive capacity
<b>Objective 1</b>	Reduce vulnerability and increase resilience through innovation and technology transfer for climate change adaptation
<i>Outcome 1.1</i>	Technologies and innovative solutions piloted or deployed to reduce climate-related risks and/or enhance resilience
<i>Outcome 1.2</i>	Innovative financial instruments and investment models enabled or introduced to enhance climate resilience
<b>Objective 2</b>	Mainstream climate change adaptation and resilience for systemic impact
<i>Outcome 2.1</i>	Strengthened cross-sectoral mechanisms to mainstream climate adaptation and resilience
<i>Outcome 2.2</i>	Increased ability of country to access climate finance or other relevant, large-scale, programmatic investment
<b>Objective 3</b>	Foster enabling conditions for effective and integrated climate change adaptation
<i>Outcome 3.1</i>	Climate-resilient planning enabled by stronger climate information decision support services, and other relevant analysis
<i>Outcome 3.2</i>	Institutional and human capacities strengthened to identify and implement adaptation measures

## **ANNEX E: PORTFOLIO ANALYSIS PROTOCOL**

### **Information on reviewer and data source**

1. Who is entering the data for this project?
2. Which documents will be used for this review? *(Select all that apply)*

### **Basic project information**

3. GEF ID
4. Project name
5. Lead implementing agency
6. Main focal area
7. Type of primary in-country executing partner
8. Name(s) of in-country executing partner(s)
9. Is the project's scope national, regional, or global?
10. Please list the country or countries in which the project was implemented.
11. Is project implementation closed?

*(for completed projects, skip to Catalytic Effects)*

### **Objectives and Components**

12. What is the project's overarching objective?
13. Please write down the project components.
14. Are the adaptation benefits clear, relevant, and measurable?
15. What is the probability that the project will deliver tangible adaptation benefits in line with set objectives?
16. Did the project design include plans for private sector engagement in any of the following ways?
  - Cofinancing from private sector partner is promised in the project documents.
  - Project included a private sector executing partner.

- Private sector was engaged through project activities.
- Project design includes activities designed to mobilize the private sector.

Please provide a brief description for any private sector engagement indicated above.

17. Do any project documents, including project appraisal documents, Request for CEO Endorsement, Correspondence between agency and GEF Secretariat, PIRs, midterm report (MTR), or other project implementation reports note any delays in the following stages? Please check all that apply.

- Delays in achieving final project approval or endorsement
- Delays after approval or endorsement but before formal project start
- Delays during project implementation

18. Do PIRs, MTR, or other project implementation reports note that the project end date has been extended?

19. If the answer is yes for either of the two previous questions, please provide the explanation given in the documents for why delays were experienced or for the need for project extension.

20. Does project either build on a past project (funded by GEF/LDCF or others), or is it blended with another project?

#### **Relevance to Conventions and GEF Adaptation Strategies**

21. Choose primary NAPA priorities the implementation project addresses.

***(Select all that apply)***

- 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 land management)
- Coastal zone management (other than mangrove ecosystems/reconstruction)
- 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 natural resource management)
- Other (please specify)

22. Alignment of NAPA implementation project with UNFCCC guidance and decisions
1. Supports country-driven capacity building based on and responsive to national needs and guided by lessons learned.
  2. Is cost-effective and complementary to other funding sources.
  3. Promotes integration of adaptation measures in national socioeconomic and environmental policies and actions, including development and poverty reduction strategies, plans or policies.

23. Alignment of NAPA implementation project with GEF adaptation strategic pillars.
1. Expanding catalytic grant and nongrant investments.
  2. Supporting enabling environments for the private sector to act as an agent for market transformation.

24. Alignment of NAPA implementation project with GEF adaptation strategic objectives
- Reduce vulnerability and increase resilience through innovation and technology transfer for climate change adaptation
  - Mainstream climate change adaptation and resilience for systemic impact
  - Foster enabling conditions for effective and integrated climate change adaptation.

25. Do the project documents explicitly confirm a linkage with or contribution to the country's INDCs/NDCs?

#### **Contribution to Other Focal Areas**

26. Select focal areas other than the main focal area of climate change to which the implementation project (potentially) contributes (*Select all that apply*)

- Biodiversity
- Land Degradation
- International Waters
- Mercury
- Ozone Depleting Substances (ODS)
- Persistent Organic Pollutants (POP)
- No focal areas besides climate change apply

27. Overall assessment of NAPA implementation project's alignment with NAPA priorities (*Compare outcome areas of the implementation project with priority activities in the country NAPA report—the enabling activity.*)

28. Contribution of NAPA Implementation Project to GEF GEBs

Maintain globally significant biodiversity and provide ecosystem goods and services to society.

- Use sustainable land management in production systems—agriculture, rangelands, and forest landscapes.

- Promote collective management of transboundary water systems and implementation of the full range of policy, legal, and institutional reforms and investments contributing to sustainable use and maintenance of ecosystem services.
- Support transformational shifts toward a low-emission and resilient development path.
- Increase phase-out, disposal, and reduce release of POPs, ODS, mercury, and other chemicals of global concern.
- Enhance capacity of countries to implement MEAs (multilateral environmental agreements) and mainstream MEAs in national and subnational policy, planning, financial, and legal frameworks.

29. Has the implementation project indicated risks, including climatic and nonclimatic risks, that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved?

30. Does the implementation project provide risk mitigation strategies or actions to be taken if identified risks materialize?

31. Does the implementation project include activities to support replication or scale up of the project intervention postcompletion? If so, please provide a description of activities in the comment field.

32. Does the implementation project include activities designed to support continued financing for the intervention post-completion? If so, please provide a description of activities in the comment field.

### **Gender**

33. Does the project include a gender analysis or equivalent socioeconomic assessment?

34. Does the project include a gender action plan?

35. Does the results framework include gender disaggregated or gender specific indicators?

36. Overall assessment of implementation project's inclusion of the gender component.

37. Would you consider this project an example of best practice in any area? If so, please describe why in a sentence or two.

38. Do you have anything else to add about this project that stood out while reviewing it, or any information about it that would be useful to track?

### **Closed Projects: Catalytic Effects**

39. Identify the implementation project's alignment with the following catalytic effects:

- **Public good:** The project developed or introduced new technologies and/or approaches

- **Demonstration:** Demonstration sites and/or training was given to further catalyze the new technologies/approaches
- **Replication:** Activities, demonstrations, and/or techniques are repeated in or outside the project
- **Scaling up:** Approaches developed through the project are taken up on a regional or national scale, becoming widely accepted

#### 40. Catalytic effects, Part 2

- The project generated significant social, economic, cultural, and human well-being co-benefits.
- The project built on the traditional knowledge and practices of local communities.
- The project had an impact on multiple sectors and at different levels of society.
- Project built foundations for larger scale project(s) through analytic work, assessments and capacity building activities.
- The project was instrumental in developing longer-term partnerships.
- The project was successful in developing new cost sharing approaches / leveraging new resources.
- The project improved management effectiveness of adaptation-relevant sub-national or national systems. (Is the government better equipped to deal with climate change adaptation because of the project?)

### Sustainability

41. Please provide a description of any **project-related factors** that contributed to project sustainability of outcomes?

42. Please provide a description of any **project-related factors** that hindered project sustainability of outcomes?

43. Please provide a description of any **context-related factors** that contributed to project sustainability of outcomes?

44. Please provide a description of any **context-related factors** that hindered project sustainability of outcomes?

45. Do any project documents, including PAD, Request for CEO Endorsement, Correspondence between Agency and GEF SEC, PIRs, MTR, terminal evaluation or other project implementation reports note any delays in the following stages? Please check all options that apply.

- Delays in achieving final project approval or endorsement
- Delays after approval and endorsement but before formal project start
- Delays during project implementation



46. Do PIRs, MTR, terminal evaluation, or other project implementation reports note that the project end date was extended?

47. If the answer is yes for either of the two previous questions, please provide the explanation given in PIRs, MTR, terminal evaluation, or other implementation reports for why delays were experienced, or the project needed to be extended.

48. Does the terminal evaluation include an assessment of the project's gender mainstreaming strategy or gender action plan (or the impact of its omission if one was not included)?

49. Was a gender analysis or equivalent socioeconomic assessment conducted?

50. Does the terminal evaluation, MTR, PIRs, or other implementation documents report on gender disaggregated or gender specific indicators?

51. What is the overall assessment of the implementation project's inclusion of the gender component at closure?

52. Did the project include private sector engagement? Please provide a brief description.

53. Do the terminal evaluation, MTR, PIRs, or other project implementation documents confirm an explicit linkage with or contribution to the country's INDCs/NDCs?

#### **Innovation in Closed Projects**

54. Provide a synopsis of innovations identified in the implementation project's terminal evaluation:

#### **Lessons Learned for Closed Projects**

55. What were the lessons learned in communications and stakeholder involvement?

56. What were the lessons learned in monitoring and evaluation?

57. What were the content-technical lessons learned about climate change adaptation?

58. Add any other lessons learned not covered in the answers to the above three questions.

59. Would you consider this project an example of best practice in any area? If so, please describe why with a sentence or two.

60. Do you have anything else to add about this project that stood out while reviewing it, or any information about it that would be useful to track?

## **ANNEX F: INTERVIEWEES**

### **GEF Secretariat**

Aoki, Chizuru, GEF Secretariat, Lead Environmental Specialist

Iqbal, Fareeha, GEF Secretariat, Senior Climate Change Specialist

Spensley, Jason Garth, GEF Secretariat, Senior Climate Change Specialist

Kuang-Idba, Katya GEF Secretariat, Climate Change Specialist

Barnwal, Alope, GEF Secretariat, Senior Climate Change Specialist

Shiga, Yuki, GEF Secretariat, Environmental Specialist

### **UNFCCC**

Desanker, Paul, UNFCCC Secretariat, Manager National Adaptation Plans and Policy Subprogram, Adaptation Program

Maletjane, Motsomi, UNFCCC Secretariat, Team Leader, LDC Unit

Mohamed, Hana Hamadalla, UNFCCC Secretariat Least Developed Countries Expert Group (LEG), Current LEG Chair

Wangdi, Sonam UNFCCC Least Developed Countries (LDC) Chair, Bhutan National Environment Commission, Secretary

Dorji, Tshewang, Bhutan National Environment Commission, Deputy Chief Environment Officer

Zam, Kinley, Bhutan National Environment Commission, Project Support Officer

### **STAP**

Carr, Edward, STAP Panel, Adviser on Climate Change Adaptation

Duron, Guadalupe, STAP, Temporary Secretariat Lead for Climate Change Adaptation

### **GEF Agencies**

Dunn, Bruce, ADB, Senior Environmental Specialist

Narciso, Rosario Catalina (Nina), ADB, ADB/GEF Portfolio Management Officer

Abraham, Arunkumar, ADB, Senior Environment Specialist

Fay, David, ADB, Transport Specialist

Blaik, Stephen, ADB, Water Supply and Sanitation Specialist

Ribeiro, Tiago, ADB, Urban Development Specialist

Tawisook, Witton, ADB, Transport Specialist

Aden, Ayanleh Daher, AfDB, Senior Environment & Climate Finance Officer, Coordinator, Global Environment Facility (GEF) & Adaptation Fund (AF) Unit

Ndiaye, Guirane, AfDB, Economist Environment & Climate Finance Division

Nyagwambo, Nyasha Lawrence, AfDB, Environment & Climate Finance Division

Miguel Morales, CI, Vice President at Conservation International, CI-GEF/GCF Agencies

Samaroo, Orissa, CI GEF Agency, Senior Director, GEF Policy & Project Management

Griffin, Jeffrey, FAO, Senior Coordinator, GEF Coordination Unit

Wieben, Emilie, FAO, Climate Change Specialist, GEF Coordination Unit

Karki, Sameer, FAO, Technical Officer, GEF Coordination Unit

Gordes, Alashiya, IFAD, Technical Specialist, Environment Climate, Gender and Social Inclusion Division

Trembley, Nicolas, IFAD, Regional Climate and Environmental Specialist, Near East, North Africa and Europe

Sene, Pathé, IFAD, Regional Climate and Environmental Specialist, West and Central Africa

Colmant, Renaud, IFAD, Environment and Climate Officer

Chileshe, Paxina, IFAD, Regional Climate and Environmental Specialist, Eastern and Southern Africa

Delahaye, Sébastien, IUCN, Portfolio Manager GEF & GCF Coordination Unit

Chachibaia, Ketii, UNDP, Senior Technical Advisor for Climate Change Adaptation

Juergen, Hierold, UNIDO, GEF Coordinator and Division Chief, Partnerships Coordination Division

Gordiievska, Olga, UNIDO, Associate GEF Coordination Expert

Kabege, Juliet, UNIDO, Industrial Development Officer

Mhlanga, Alois, UNIDO, Chief, Climate Technology and Innovations Divisions

Sutton, Dinara Besekei, World Bank, Thematic Specialist on programming side LDCF, SCCF, AF

### **Operational Focal Points**

Gnapelet, Lambert, Central African Republic, Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development, Meteorological Engineer and Environment Manager

Thein, Hla Maung Myanmar, Environmental Conservation Department, Ministry of Environmental Conservation and Forestry, Director General

Win, San, Myanmar Environmental Conservation Department, Ministry of Environmental Conservation and Forestry, Deputy Director, Climate Change Division

Moise, Jean-Pierre, Haiti, Ministry of Environment,

### **GEF CSO (Civil Society Organization) Network**

Akhteruzzaman, Sano, Chair of the GEF CSO Network

### **Challenge Program Proponents**

Ruetz, Charlotte, Switzerland, Nespresso, Coffee Sustainability Project Mana

### **Samoa Country Interviews**

Sorensen, Jorn, UNDP, Resident Representative

Linneweber, Verena, UNDP, Deputy Resident Representative

Kerslake, Yvette, UNDP, Assistant Resident Representative

Faafetai, Ephna, UNDP, Finance Associate

Crawley, Ulu Bismarck, Samoa Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment, Chief Executive Officer, GEF Operational Focal Point

Rasmussen, Anne, Samoa Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment, Assistant Chief Executive Officer for GEF and Climate Change

Pouli, Moafanua Tolusina, Samoa Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment, Forestry Division, Assistant Chief Executive Officer -Forestry Division

Amerika, Taala Paulo, Samoa Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment, Communications Officer

Siolo, Susau, Samoa Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment, Forestry Division, Principal Policy Officer

Iakopo, Malaki Asuao, Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment, Assistant Chief Executive Officer, Water Resources Division

Simi, Peseta Noumea, Samoa Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade, Chief Executive Officer

Strickland, Francella, Samoa Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade, Assistant Chief Executive Officer

Mulitalo, Afamasaga Faaiuga, Ministry of Women and Community Development – Internal Affairs Division, Chief Executive Officer

Strickland, Danita, CI, Program Coordinator

Jungblut, Vainuupo, Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP), Protected Areas Officer

Aiono, Luaiufi, Samoa Farmers Association

ICCRIFS beneficiaries interviewed in the following project sites (names not available): Agro-forestry plot at Lotofaga, Project nursery at Saoluafata, Community nursery and agroforestry plot at Sapapalii

### **Rwanda Country Interviews**

Basigeho, Jean de la Paix, COTEMBI Farmers' Cooperative, President

Gahigi, Aimable, Meteo Rwanda, Director General

Harerimana, Theoneste, Nyabihu Beekeepers Cooperative Union, President

Kalisa, John, World Bank, Urban Economy Consultant

Karangwa, Timothée, Nyahibu District, Karago Sector Agronomist

Kayigema, Vicent, FONERWA (Rwanda Green Fund), Project Manager

Kayonga, Leonard, Rwanda Land Management and Use Authority, Director of Land Management and Spatial Planning

Marima, Pauline, UNEP, Evaluation Officer

Mifinsi, Samuel, COPEPAFOGI Farmers' Cooperative, President

Mugabo, Fabrice, Rwanda Environment Management Authority, Climate Change and Adaptation Specialist

Mugwaneza, Jean Bosco, Rwanda Environment Management Authority, M&E Specialist

Munyazikwiye, Faustin, Rwanda Environment Management Authority, Deputy Director General

Mutabazi, Alphonse, Independent, Consultant

Ngizwenayo, Dieudonne, AfDB, Consultant

Nshimiyimana, Eric, Nyirabashoni Cooperative of Farming Chickens, Vice President

Nyiratuza, Madeleine, UNDP, Head of Sustainable Growth Unit

Rodrigues, Stephan, UNDP, Resident Representative

Ruhamyia, Coletha, Rwanda Environment Management Authority, Director General

Rutagengwa, Alexis, Rwanda Land Management and Use Authority, Head of Land Use Planning, Surveying & Mapping Department

Umugwaneza, Janet, Rwanda Environment Management Authority, Single Project Implementation Unit Coordinator

Uwoyeyantite, Aimé Patrice, Rutsiro District Veterinary Pharmacy, Pharmacy Manager

Uzayisabn, Bernardin, UNDP, Programme Analyst, Environment and Sustainable Growth

**ANNEX G: AVERAGE TIME (MONTHS) FROM FIRST RECEIPT OF CONCEPT TO PROJECT START**

Trust fund	Average time in months				
	First receipt to Council approval	Council approval to final CEO endorsement	First receipt to project endorsement	Project endorsement to start	First receipt to project start
<b>GEF-5 period</b>					
LDCF ( <i>n</i> = 100)	4	21	26	5	32
GEF ( <i>n</i> = 379)	4	24	28	6	35
SCCF ( <i>n</i> = 29)	1	22	23	6	30
<b>GEF-6 period</b>					
LDCF ( <i>n</i> = 13)	18	22	40	4	45
GEF ( <i>n</i> = 104)	4	17	22	4	26
SCCF ( <i>n</i> = 6)	0	17	18	5	23
<b>Total</b>					
LDCF ( <i>n</i> = 113)	6	21	28	5	33
GEF ( <i>n</i> = 483)	4	22	26	6	33
SCCF ( <i>n</i> = 35)	1	21	23	6	28

Sources: GEF Secretariat records with updates from Agencies where available, and Adaptation Fund Secretariat records.

Note: Includes only full-size standalone projects for which GEF IEO had a record of dates for first receipt of concept, council approval, final project approval, and project start date.

## ANNEX H: LDCF PROJECTS REVIEWED

### COMPLETED PROJECTS

GEF ID	TITLE	LEAD AGENCY	REGION	COUNTRY	GEF REPLENISHMENT PERIOD
3287	Community-based adaptation to climate change through coastal afforestation	UNDP	Asia	Bangladesh	GEF-4
3302	Climate adaptation for rural livelihoods and agriculture (CARLA)	AfDB	AFR	Malawi	GEF-4
3408	Implementing NAPA priority interventions to build resilience in the most vulnerable coastal zones in Djibouti	UNEP	AFR	Djibouti	GEF-4
3694	Increasing resilience of coastal areas and community settlements to climate change	UNDP	Asia	Tuvalu	GEF-4
3703	Increased resilience and adaptation to adverse impacts of climate change in Guinea's vulnerable coastal zones	UNDP	AFR	Guinea	GEF-4
3704	Integrated adaptation program to combat the effects of climate change on agricultural production and food security	UNDP	AFR	Benin	GEF-4
3716	Integrating adaptation to climate change into agricultural production and food security in Sierra Leone	IFAD	AFR	Sierra Leone	GEF-4
3733	Strengthening adaptive capacities to address climate change threats on sustainable development strategies for coastal communities in Haiti	UNDP	LAC	Haiti	GEF-4
3776	Enhancing adaptive capacity and resilience to climate change in the agriculture sector in Mali	UNDP	AFR	Mali	GEF-4
3841	Improving early warning system to reduce impact of climate change and build capacity to integrate climate change into development plans	UNEP	AFR	Lesotho	GEF-4
3847	Integrating climate change risks into resilient island planning	UNDP	Asia	Maldives	GEF-4
3857	Adapting water resource management in Comoros to increase capacity to cope with climate change	UNDP	AFR	Comoros	GEF-4
3890	Vulnerability assessment and adaptation program for climate change in the coastal zone of Cambodia considering livelihood improvement and ecosystems	UNEP	Asia	Cambodia	GEF-4
3979	Integrating climate resilience into agricultural production for food security in rural areas	FAO	AFR	Mali	GEF-4
4018	São Tome and Príncipe adaptation to climate change	World Bank	AFR	São Tome and Príncipe	GEF-4



4034	Improving the resilience of the agriculture sector in Lao PDR to climate change impacts	UNDP	Asia	Lao PDR	GEF-4
4068	Increasing resilience to climate variability and hazards	World Bank	Asia	Kiribati	GEF-4
4216	Integration of climate change risk and resilience into forestry management (ICCRIFS)	UNDP	Asia	Samoa	GEF-4
4222	Promoting autonomous adaptation at the community level in Ethiopia	UNDP	AFR	Ethiopia	GEF-4
4234	Climate change adaptation project in watershed management and water retention	IFAD	AFR	Senegal	GEF-5
4276	Adaptation in the coastal zones of Mozambique	UNDP	AFR	Mozambique	GEF-5
4431	Increasing climate change resilience of Maldives through adaptation in the tourism sector	UNDP	Asia	Maldives	GEF-5
4447	Strengthening climate resilience and reducing disaster risk in agriculture to improve food security in Haiti post-earthquake	FAO	LAC	Haiti	GEF-5
4554	Effective governance for small-scale rural infrastructure and disaster preparedness in a changing climate	UNDP	Asia	Lao PDR	GEF-5
4570	Adapting agriculture production in Togo (ADAPT)	IFAD	AFR	Togo	GEF-5
4585	Enhancing the resilience of tourism-reliant communities to climate change risks	UNDP	Asia	Samoa	GEF-5
4692	Strengthening resilience of farming communities' livelihoods against climate changes in the Guinean prefectures of Gaoual, Koundara, and Mali	UNDP	AFR	Guinea	GEF-5
4696	Strengthening resilience of small-scale rural infrastructure and local government systems to climatic variability and risk	UNDP	Asia	Timor-Leste	GEF-5
4991	Strengthening climate information and early warning systems in Tanzania to support climate-resilient development and adaptation to climate change	UNDP	AFR	Tanzania	GEF-5
4992	Strengthening climate information and early warning systems to support climate resilient development and adaptation to climate change	UNDP	AFR	Ethiopia	GEF-5
4993	Strengthening climate information and early warning systems in Africa to support climate-resilient development and adaptation to climate change	UNDP	AFR	Uganda	GEF-5
4994	Strengthening climate information and early warning systems in Malawi to support climate-resilient development and adaptation to climate change	UNDP	AFR	Malawi	GEF-5
5002	Strengthening climate information and early warning systems in Western and Central Africa for climate-resilient development and adaptation to climate change	UNDP	AFR	Benin	GEF-5
5320	Assisting LDCs with country-driven processes to advance NAPs	UNEP	CEX	Global	GEF-5

**APPROVED PROJECTS**

GEF ID	TITLE	LEAD AGENCY	REGION	COUNTRY	GEF REPLENISHMENT PERIOD
9199	Enhancing sustainability and climate resilience of forest and agricultural landscape and community livelihoods	UNDP	Asia	Bhutan	GEF-6
9303	Climate change adaptation in the lowland ecosystems of Ethiopia	UNDP	AFR	Ethiopia	GEF-6
9318	Climate resilience in the Nakambe Basin	UNDP	AFR	Burkina Faso	GEF-6
9364	São Tomé and Príncipe additional financing for West Africa coastal area resilience investment project	World Bank	AFR	Sao Tome and Principe	GEF-6
9392	Climate resilient growth and adaptation in Democratic Republic of Congo	UNDP	AFR	Congo DR	GEF-6
9488	Rural livelihoods' adaptation to climate change in the Horn of Africa - phase II (RLACC II)	AfDB	AFR	Somalia	GEF-5
9501	Rural livelihoods' adaptation to climate change in the Horn of Africa phase II (RLACC II)	AfDB	AFR	Sudan	GEF-5
9512	Climate resilience in the outer islands of Tuvalu	ADB	Asia	Tuvalu	GEF-5
9723	Strengthening the capacity of government and communities in South Sudan to adapt to climate change	UNEP	AFR	South Sudan	GEF-6
9750	Resilient productive landscapes in Haiti	World Bank	LAC	Haiti	GEF-6
10083	Sustainable natural resources management project, Adaptation Fund	World Bank	AFR	Sudan	GEF-7
10089	Strengthening rural and urban resilience to climate change and variability by the provision of water supply and sanitation in Chad	AfDB	AFR	Chad	GEF-7
10096	Ecosystems and landscape approach to climate proof the rural settlement program of Rwanda	UNDP	AFR	Rwanda	GEF-7
10100	Scaling up local adaptation and climate-risk informed planning for resilient livelihoods	UNDP	AFR	Mozambique	GEF-7
10103	Climate change adaptation and livelihoods in three arid regions of Mauritania	UNEP	AFR	Mauritania	GEF-7
10105	Strengthening climate information and early warning systems for climate resilient development and adaptation to climate change in Guinea-Bissau	UNDP	AFR	Guinea-Bissau	GEF-7
10165	Strengthening resilience to climate change of coastal communities in Togo	FAO	AFR	Togo	GEF-7
10174	Enhancing adaptive capacity of communities by scaling up best practices and adopting an integrated approach in Ethiopia	UNDP	AFR	Ethiopia	GEF-7

10177	Promoting climate-resilient livelihoods in rice-based communities in the Tonle Sap region	FAO	Asia	Cambodia	GEF-7
10181	IKAN Adapt: strengthening the adaptive capacity, resilience, and biodiversity conservation ability of fisheries and aquaculture-dependent livelihoods in Timor-Leste	FAO	Asia	Timor-Leste	GEF-7
10186	Climate change adaptation in forest and agricultural mosaic landscapes	FAO	AFR	Zambia	GEF-7
10187	Climate-smart agriculture alternatives for upland production systems in Lao PDR	FAO	Asia	Lao PDR	GEF-7
10199	Improving water availability in the Gambia's rural and peri-urban communities for domestic and agricultural use	AfDB	AFR	Gambia	GEF-7
10203	Strengthening the adaptive capacity and resilience of communities in Uganda's watersheds	AfDB	AFR	Uganda	GEF-7
10207	Building climate resilient livelihoods in vulnerable landscapes in Bangladesh (BCRL)	FAO	Asia	Bangladesh	GEF-7

## REFERENCES

All URLs were checked before publication or as of the access date noted.

Cortez, Ana. 2019. [Improved assistance measures for graduated and graduating least developed countries for the achievement of agenda 2030](#). CDP Policy Review No. 9. New York: UN Committee for Development Policy.

GEF (Global Environment Facility). 2011. [Accessing Resources under the Least Developed Countries Fund](#). Washington, DC: GEF.

\_\_\_\_\_. 2014–2019. Progress Reports on the Least Developed Countries Fund and the Special Climate Change Fund presented to LDCF Council from May 2014 (Council meeting 16) to December 2019 (Council meeting 27) GEF, Washington DC.

\_\_\_\_\_. 2016. [GEF Secretariat Analysis of First Disbursement](#)." GEF/C.50/Inf.05. GEF, Washington, DC.

\_\_\_\_\_. 2017. [Policy on Gender Equality](#)." GEF/C.53/04. GEF, Washington, DC.

\_\_\_\_\_. 2018a. [GEF Joint Summary of the Chairs](#)." 24<sup>th</sup> LDCF/SCCF Meeting, Decision on Agenda Item 5. GEF, Washington, DC.

\_\_\_\_\_. 2018b. [Work Program for Least Developed Countries Fund](#)." GEF/ LDCF.SCCF.25/04. GEF, Washington, DC.

\_\_\_\_\_. 2018c. [GEF Programming Strategy on Adaptation to Climate Change for the Least Developed Countries Fund and the Special Climate Change Fund and Operational Improvements July 2018 to June 2022](#)." GEF/LDCF.SCCF.24/03. GEF, Washington, DC.

\_\_\_\_\_. 2018d. [Guidance to Advance Gender Equality in GEF Projects and Programs](#). Washington, DC: GEF.

\_\_\_\_\_. 2018e. [Policy on Co-Financing](#)." FI/OL/01. GEF, Washington DC.

\_\_\_\_\_. 2018f. [United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change Guidance from the Conference of the Parties and Responses by the Global Environment Facility, COP1-COP23](#). Washington, DC: GEF.

\_\_\_\_\_. 2019a. [LDCF/SCCF Annual Evaluation Report: June 2019](#)." GEF/LDCF.SCCF.26/ME/01/Rev.01. GEF, Washington, DC.

\_\_\_\_\_. 2019b. [Progress Report on the Least Developed Countries Fund and the Special Climate Change Fund, Executive Summary](#)." GEF/LDCF.SCCF.27/03. GEF, Washington, DC.

\_\_\_\_\_. 2019c. [Progress Report on the Least Developed Countries Fund and the Special Climate Change Fund, Executive Summary](#)." GEF/LDCF.SCCF.26/03. GEF, Washington, DC.

\_\_\_\_\_. 2019d. [“Updated Information Note on Least Developed Countries Fund Support for Graduating Least Developed Countries.”](#) GEF/LDCF.SCCF.27/Inf.05. GEF, Washington, DC.

\_\_\_\_\_. 2019e. [“Towards Greater Durability of GEF Investments.”](#) GEF/C.57/08. GEF, Washington, DC.

\_\_\_\_\_. 2020. [“Report of the Global Environment Facility to the Twenty-Sixth Session of the Conference of the Parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change.”](#) GEF/C.59/Inf.05. GEF, Washington, DC.

Global Environment Facility Independent Evaluation Office. (GEF IEO) 2018a. [GEF Project Performance and Progress to Impact](#). Evaluation Report No. 121. Washington DC: GEF IEO.

\_\_\_\_\_. 2018b. [Program Evaluation of the Least Developed Countries Fund](#). Evaluation Report No. 106. Washington DC: GEF IEO.

\_\_\_\_\_. 2018c. [OPS6: Sixth Comprehensive Evaluation of the GEF](#). Evaluation Report No. 110. Washington DC: GEF IEO.

\_\_\_\_\_. 2019a. [“2020 Update: Program Evaluation of the Least Developed Countries Fund.”](#) Washington DC: GEF IEO.

\_\_\_\_\_. 2019b. [“Methodological Approach for Post-Completion Verification.”](#) GEF/ME/C.57/03. GEF, Washington, DC.

\_\_\_\_\_. 2019c. [GEF Annual Performance Report 2017](#). Evaluation Report No. 136. Washington DC: GEF IEO.

\_\_\_\_\_. 2019d. [“The GEF Evaluation Policy.”](#) GEF/ME/C.56/02/Rev.01. GEF, Washington, DC.

\_\_\_\_\_. 2020a. [“Seventh Comprehensive Evaluation of the GEF \(OPS7\): Results Based Management Draft Concept Note.”](#) GEF IEO, Washington, DC.

\_\_\_\_\_. 2020b. [An Evaluative Approach to Assessing GEF’s Additionality](#). Evaluation Report No. 139. Washington DC: GEF IEO.

Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC). 2018. [“Climate Change 2014: Impacts, Adaptation, and Vulnerability, IPCC Working Group II Contribution to AR5, Glossary.”](#) IPCC, Geneva.

MOPAN (Multilateral Organization Performance Assessment Network). 2019. [MOPAN 2017-18 Assessments: Global Environment Facility](#). Paris: MOPAN.

United Nations Development Program (UNDP). 2016a. [“Terminal Evaluation: Enhancing adaptive capacity and resilience to climate change in the agricultural sector in Mali.”](#) GEF ID 3776. UNDP, New York, NY.

\_\_\_\_\_.2016b. [“Terminal Evaluation of the Tuvalu National Adaptation Programme of Action \(NAPA\) NAPA-I and NAPA-I+ Projects.”](#) GEF ID 3694. UNDP, New York, NY.

\_\_\_\_\_.2016c. [“Terminal Evaluation Report RACZ Project, Strengthening resilience and adaption to negative impacts of climate change in Guinea’s vulnerable coastal zones.”](#) GEF ID 3703. UNDP, New York, NY.

United Nations Environment Program (UNEP) Evaluation Office. 2017a. [“Terminal Evaluation of the UNEP-UNDP Project: Adapting water resource management in the Comoros to expected Climate Change.”](#) GEF ID 3857. UNEP, Nairobi.

\_\_\_\_\_.2017b. [“Terminal Evaluation of the GEF funded UN Environment Project Implementing NAPA priority interventions to build resilience in the most vulnerable coastal zones in Djibouti.”](#) GEF ID 3408. UNEP, Nairobi.

\_\_\_\_\_.2018. [“Terminal Evaluation of the Lesotho NAPA Project Improvement of Early Warning System to Reduce Impacts of Climate Change and Capacity Building to Integrate Climate Change into Development Plans.”](#) GEF ID 3841. UNEP, Nairobi.

United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change. (UNFCCC) 2001. [“Decision 7/CP.7 Funding Under the Convention.”](#) UNFCCC, Bonn.

\_\_\_\_\_. 2016. [“Report of the Conference of the Parties on its twenty-second session, held in Marrakech from 7 to 18 November 2016.”](#) UNFCCC, Bonn.

Sovacool, Benjamin, Björn-Ola Linnér, and Richard Klein. 2017. [“Climate change adaptation and the Least Developed Countries Fund \(LDCF\): Qualitative insights from policy implementation in the Asia-Pacific.”](#) *Climate Change*. 140: 209–226.

Tenzing, J., Andrei, S., Gaspar-Martins, G., Pateh Jallow, B. and Njewa, E. 2016. [\*A vision for the Least Developed Countries Fund in a post-Paris climate regime.\*](#) London: IIED.