

Guidance Document: Monitoring and Evaluation in the LDCF/SCCF

October 2014

**Global Environment Facility
Independent Evaluation Office**

**Guidance Document:
Monitoring and Evaluation
in the LDCF/SCCF**

Evaluation Document
October 2014, No. 5

© 2014 Global Environment Facility Independent Evaluation Office
1818 H Street, NW
Washington, DC 20433
Internet: www.gefeo.org
Email: gefeo@thegef.org

All rights reserved.

Rights and Permissions

The material in this work is copyrighted. Copying and/or transmitting portions or all of this work without permission may be a violation of applicable law. The GEF encourages dissemination of its work and will normally grant permission promptly.

ISBN-10: 1-933992-83-2

ISBN-13: 978-1-933992-83-9

Credits

Director of the GEF Independent Evaluation Office: Juha I. Uitto

Task Manager: Anna Viggh, Senior Evaluation Officer, GEF Independent Evaluation Office

Editing and layout: Nita Congress

Evaluation Document No. 5

A FREE PUBLICATION

Contents

Preface	v
Key Terms	vii
Abbreviations	x
1. Background	1
2. Climate Change Adaptation	3
3. The Funds	5
The Least Developed Countries Fund	5
The Special Climate Change Fund	5
LDCE/SCCF Project Cycle	6
Management Framework	7
Particularized Focus on Gender	8
4. Baseline Costs, Additional Costs, and Cofinancing	11
5. Monitoring and Evaluation in the LDCE and SCCF	12
Minimum Requirements.....	14
Designing M&E Plans	14
Implementing M&E Plans	15
Evaluating Projects and Programs	15
M&E Principles.....	16
LDCE/SCCF Adaptation Monitoring and Assessment Tool.....	18
Knowledge Sharing and Dissemination.....	18
6. Results-Based Management	20
7. Roles and Responsibilities	22
M&E Partners in the LDCE/SCCF.....	22
LDCE/SCCF Council.....	22
GEF Independent Evaluation Office.....	23
GEF Secretariat.....	24

GEF Agencies 25
GEF Agency Operational Units 26
GEF Agency Evaluation Units 26
Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel 27
GEF Operational Focal Points 27
Stakeholders 28

Bibliography 29

Boxes

1: LDCF PIF Key Questions 7
2: Primary Evaluation Differences between the GEF and the Funds 9
3: Types of Evaluation 13
4: Evaluation Criteria 16
5: Key Evaluation Questions 19

Table

1: Complementary Roles of Monitoring and Evaluation 12

Preface

The Global Environment Facility (GEF) manages the Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF) and the Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF). In August 2006, the LDCF/SCCF Council decided that all GEF operational policies, procedures, and governance structures apply to these funds except when the LDCF/SCCF Council decides otherwise in response to United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) Conference of the Parties guidance. Accordingly, the LDCF and SCCF apply the 2010 GEF Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) Policy which provides norms and standards for the GEF partnership.

In contrast to the GEF Trust Fund which aims to achieve global environmental benefits, the LDCF and SCCF aim to achieve adaptation benefits. The funds focus on assisting developing countries in meeting the challenges of adaptation to climate change. The LDCF helps finance least developed countries to prepare and implement national adaptation programs of action, and the SCCF supports adaptation efforts and technology transfer in developing country parties to the UNFCCC.

In 2011, the GEF Evaluation Office assessed the M&E Policy in light of differences between the GEF Trust Fund and the LDCF and SCCF. The overall conclusion was that the 2010 GEF M&E Policy is applicable to the LDCF/SCCF with four changes related to the differences in the mandates and corresponding terminology of the GEF Trust Fund and the two funds (that is, focal areas/programming priorities, global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits, incremental cost/additional cost, and the LDCF/SCCF results-based management framework). Based on these findings, the LDCF/SCCF Council requested the Evaluation Office, in collaboration with the GEF Secretariat, develop a guidance document elaborating on the operationalization of the GEF M&E Policy for the LDCF and SCCF.

This guidance document provides LDCF/SCCF stakeholders with direction on how to monitor and evaluate results within the overarching framework of the GEF M&E Policy, modified as necessary to adapt to the LDCF/SCCF focus. The main, but not exclusive, audience is project proponents, who have varying degrees of familiarity with M&E practices. The guidance document includes an introduction to the funds and a basic climate change background within which to place LDCF/SCCF activities. It discusses the fundamentals of M&E practices within the context of the funds'

M&E policies and requirements, and provides guidance to apply the M&E Policy to LDCF/SCCF activities in accordance with GEF policies and practices.

We would like to thank everyone who contributed to the drafting of this guidance document, particularly Anna Viggh, Senior Evaluation Officer, who was the task manager of the process; Jeffrey Stern of Suazion, the lead consultant; and members of the GEF Secretariat who provided essential inputs.

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'Juha I. Uitto', with a stylized flourish at the end.

Juha I. Uitto
Director, GEF Independent Evaluation Office

Key Terms

Adaptation Monitoring and Assessment Tool (AMAT) is an easy-to-use, comprehensive set of generic indicators for adaptation projects. The AMAT provides a framework for addressing a project's overall success in light of Least Developed Countries Fund/Special Climate Change Fund (LDCF/SCCF) goals.

Additional costs, or additionality, are the extra costs necessary to respond to climate change impacts. These costs are distinct from those needed to achieve development goals that exist (or would have existed) independently of climate change (see *baseline expenditures*).

Baseline expenditures and activities are those that would have taken place in the absence of climate change.

Business-as-usual development refers to development activities that would be implemented irrespective of the presence of climate change effects.

Climate change adaptation activities are adjustments to natural or human systems in response to actual or expected climate change impacts. These activities are intended to moderate harm or exploit beneficial opportunities. Examples include building or improving sea walls, changing farming patterns, and developing alternative water sources.

Climate change mitigation activities reduce the sources of (or enhance the sinks of) greenhouse gases. Examples include directly reducing emissions at the source, changing to low-carbon energy sources, and reforestation.

Conference of the Parties (COP) is the supreme body of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change. It currently meets once a year to review the convention's progress.

Global Environment Facility (GEF) is the managing body of the LDCF and SCCF funds. GEF operational policies, procedures, and governance structures apply to the funds, unless COP guidance and the LDCF/SCCF Council decide otherwise.

GEF Agencies are the operational arms of the GEF. The GEF develops its projects through 14 Agencies: Asian Development Bank, African Development Bank, Conservation International, Development Bank of Southern Africa, European Bank for Reconstruction and Development, Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, Inter-American Development Bank, International Fund for Agricultural Development, International Union for Conservation of Nature, United Nations

Development Programme, United Nations Environment Programme, United Nations Industrial Development Organization, World Bank, and World Wildlife Fund.

GEF focal points are government officials, designated by member countries, responsible for in-country GEF activities and for ensuring that GEF projects are country driven and based on national priorities.

GEF Independent Evaluation Office provides a basis for decision making on policies, strategies, program management, procedures, and projects; promotes accountability for resource use against project objectives; and documents and provides feedback to subsequent activities and promotes knowledge management on results, performance, and lessons learned.

GEF Secretariat coordinates the overall implementation of GEF activities.

Goal is the higher order objective toward which a development intervention intends to contribute.

Impacts include an intervention's positive and negative long-term effects on population groups, including economic, sociocultural, institutional, environmental, and technological effects.

LDCF/SCCF Council, the main governing body of the funds, functions as an independent board of directors with primary responsibility for developing, adopting, and evaluating LDCF/SCCF policies and programs. It is comprised of 32 members who represent GEF member countries, 14 from donor constituencies and 18 from recipient constituencies.

Monitoring is a continuous or periodic function that uses systematic qualitative and quantitative data collection in order to keep activities on track. It is first and foremost a management instrument.

National adaptation programs of action (NAPAs) are prepared by least developed countries to identify their urgent and immediate climate change adaptation needs.

Operational focal point is the entity designed by each country that receives GEF funding to be responsible for the operational aspects of GEF activities, including affirming that project proposals are consistent with national plans and priorities.

Outcomes are the intended or achieved short- and medium-term effects of an intervention's outputs. Outcomes represent changes in development conditions that occur between output completion and impact achievement.

Outputs are the products and services that result from the completion of activities within a development intervention.

Project partners are organizations and entities implementing projects, including governments, national institutions, international organizations, local communities, nongovernmental organizations, academic and research institutions, and private sector entities.

Results are the outputs, outcomes, or impacts that stem from a development intervention and that cause changes to a state or condition.

Results-based management is a management strategy focusing on performance and the achievement of outputs, outcomes, and impacts.

Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel (STAP) provides the GEF with independent advice on the scientific and technical aspects of programs and policies.

SMART indicators comprise a set of criteria to evaluate objectives.

- **Specific:** The system captures the essence of the desired result by clearly and directly relating to the achievement of an objective and only that objective.
- **Measurable:** The monitoring system and indicators are unambiguously specified so that all parties agree on what they cover and there are practical ways to measure them.
- **Achievable and Attributable:** The system identifies what changes are anticipated as a result of the intervention and whether the results are realistic. Attribution requires that changes in the targeted developmental issue can be linked to the intervention.
- **Relevant and Realistic:** The system establishes levels of performance that are likely to be achieved in a practical manner and that reflect the expectations of stakeholders.
- **Time-Bound, Timely, and Targeted:** The system allows progress to be tracked in a cost-effective manner at the desired frequency for a set period, with clear identification of the particular stakeholder group(s) to be affected by the project or program.

United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) is an international environmental treaty aimed at stabilizing greenhouse gas concentrations in the atmosphere at a level that would prevent dangerous anthropogenic interference with the climate system.

Abbreviations

AMAT	Adaptation Monitoring and Assessment Tool
CEO	Chief Executive Officer
COP	Conference of the Parties
GEF	Global Environment Facility
LDCF	Least Developed Countries Fund
M&E	monitoring and evaluation
NAPA	national adaptation program of action
PIF	project identification form
RBM	results-based management
SCCF	Special Climate Change Fund
STAP	Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change

1. Background

1. This guidance document provides direction and assistance in applying the Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) Policy for the Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF) and the Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF). Prepared for a broad audience (including M&E professionals, project and program management, operational focal points, and others involved in M&E activities) as a guide to integrating the funds' policies into M&E activities, it is not intended as a comprehensive treatment of M&E science. Similarly, although it introduces necessary, relevant climate change topics as they relate to the funds' purposes, it is not intended as an extensive primer on climate change concepts and terminology. While this guidance is intended to serve all LDCF and SCCF projects, it is geared more to those projects that are most likely to require it—for example, projects with approved project identification forms (PIFs) or that were endorsed/ approved by the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) during GEF-5 (2010–14).
2. The Global Environment Facility (GEF) manages the LDCF and the SCCF. In contrast to the GEF's broad mission to address global environmental issues, the two funds focus on assisting developing countries in meeting the challenges of climate change adaptation. The LDCF helps finance least developed countries to prepare and implement national adaptation programs of action (NAPAs; strategies that identify and address a country's urgent and immediate climate change adaptation needs); the SCCF supports adaptation efforts and technology transfer in developing country parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC).
3. Though subject to GEF evaluation policies ([GEF 2006](#)), the funds' nature and programming priority—climate change adaptation—entail fundamental differences in M&E approaches. LDCF/SCCF M&E activities focus on a project's or program's contributions to increasing adaptive capacities and reducing vulnerabilities to climate change impacts. Further, funding for these contributions must be in addition to funding for business-as-usual scenarios; resources secured and expended under the LDCF/SCCF must meet costs and burdens that are additional to baseline development costs and efforts. Because these baselines are not always clear or established in project or program frameworks, M&E activities must incorporate baseline determination into their analysis. Lastly, evaluations

Because baseline development costs are not always clear or established in project or program frameworks, M&E activities must incorporate baseline determination into their analysis.

should also incorporate the LDCF/SCCF results-based management (RBM) framework, which includes a set of indicators specifically developed for monitoring and evaluating adaptation projects.

4. With these differences in evaluation approaches taken into account, M&E activities for the funds should comply with all other GEF evaluation policies, practices, and overarching objectives. M&E must promote accountability and improve performance by assessing results, effectiveness, processes, and partner performance; should promote learning, feedback, and knowledge sharing based on results and lessons learned; and should form the basis for decision making on policies, strategies, and program management. Though the funds have particularized RBM indicators, M&E activities should nonetheless reflect and promote the GEF focus on using RBM to improve management effectiveness and accountability.
5. This guidance document begins with an introduction to the funds and includes the necessary basic climate change background to place LDCF/SCCF activities. It then explores the fundamentals of M&E practices within the context of the funds' M&E policies and requirements. It builds on this background to provide guidance to apply the LDCF/SCCF M&E Policy in accordance with GEF policies and practices. This discussion includes roles and responsibilities, key activities, criteria, and minimum requirements.

2. Climate Change Adaptation

6. In contrast to climate change **mitigation** activities (which focus on abating the onset and degree of climate change by reducing greenhouse gas emissions or by increasing greenhouse gas sinks), **adaptation** activities focus on coping with climate change impacts—making adjustments “in natural or human systems in response to actual or expected climatic stimuli or their effects, which moderates harm or exploits beneficial opportunities” (IPCC 2007). Adaptation is a multi-dimensional, dynamic process that encompasses a range of responses, including major investments in infrastructure, changes in behavior patterns, and innovations in risk management and disaster preparedness. Actions include climate-proofing infrastructure, communities, and capital stock against extreme weather events; and minimizing climate change impacts on human and biological systems.
7. Climate change impacts have had a measurable effect on global indicators such as average temperatures, ice coverage, and sea level, and are beginning to cause observable impacts on human and natural systems (IPCC 2014). Combined with the comparatively short time that nations have been investing in adaptation efforts and the levels of uncertainty regarding the ultimate severity and extent of climate change impacts (from variations in predictive models to unknown levels of success of mitigation efforts), there are few robust examples and little guidance on how best to plan, implement, or evaluate adaptation actions. Though there are analogues (e.g., past experience in disaster risk reduction in flood-prone areas would be relevant to locations that are newly susceptible to inundation), climate change interventions’ vast complexity and interrelations among sectors pose unique challenges.
8. Further confounding adaptation-related M&E, most adaptation measures have yet to be actually tested. Not only are adaptation actions in their relative infancy, they also are (in general) primarily intended to provide long-term benefits in the face of long-term effects and current levels of uncertainty.
9. These issues create substantial hurdles for estimating adaptation costs and the costs of baseline or “no action” scenarios. Estimates must rely on variables that will be affected by the severity of climate change (from the accuracy of predictive

Adaptation activities focus on coping with climate change impacts—making adjustments “in natural or human systems in response to actual or expected climatic stimuli or their effects, which moderates harm or exploits beneficial opportunities.”

models to the efficacy of mitigation efforts), by the effectiveness of the planned adaptation measure (as well as the effectiveness of other measures beyond the control of the immediate project), and by future geopolitical and environmental events. For example, disaster relief plans that factor in population growth must be based on a fairly accurate prediction of that growth. But such growth will depend not only on the plan's ultimate effectiveness (as designed and implemented), but also on the degree to which climate change impacts actually affect the region, other climate change-related measures that affect regional population stability and migration patterns, and general unrelated population patterns of moment.

3. The Funds

10. The LDCF provides financing for least developed countries' efforts to prepare and implement NAPAs; the SCCF finances adaptation activities and technology transfer in developing countries. Both funds focus on increasing adaptive capacities and reducing climate change vulnerabilities.

The Least Developed Countries Fund

11. The LDCF focuses on the urgent and immediate adaptation needs of the least developed country parties to the UNFCCC that are particularly vulnerable to climate change impacts. It primarily supports countries' efforts to prepare and implement NAPAs (a process through which countries identify their urgent and immediate needs to adapt to climate change). Therefore, LDCF projects and programs follow a country-driven approach, are designed in accordance with country priorities, promote cost-effectiveness, exhibit transparency in operations, and strive for complementarity with other funding sources ([UNFCCC COP 2003](#), paragraph 3). LDCF-supported NAPA implementation projects should involve national stakeholders, engage vulnerable communities' active participation in design and execution, encourage the use of national and regional experts, and promote national leadership and ownership ([UNFCCC COP 2002](#)).
12. The LDCF programmatic approach's overall objective is to secure large-scale, sustained adaptation activities as described within a country's NAPA through medium- to long-term strategies. Consistent with NAPA purposes, the LDCF focuses on reducing the vulnerability of those sectors and resources that are central to development and livelihoods (e.g., water, agriculture and food security, health, disaster risk management and prevention, infrastructure, coastal zone management, natural resource management, and fragile ecosystems) ([GEF 2010](#)).

The Special Climate Change Fund

13. The SCCF was established to support developing country parties to the UNFCCC finance projects related to adaptation, technology transfer, support to a specific subset of sectors, and economic diversification. In contrast to the

The LDCF focuses on the urgent and immediate adaptation needs of the 49 least developed country parties to the UNFCCC that are particularly vulnerable to climate change impacts.

The SCCF was established to support developing country parties to the UNFCCC finance projects related to adaptation, technology transfer, support to a specific subset of sectors, and economic diversification.

LDCF, which is available only to least developed countries, financing under the SCCF is open to all UNFCCC non-Annex I parties.

To ensure country ownership, SCCF-funded projects must reflect national communications, NAPAs (in the case of least developed countries), and other context-specific studies, and must be endorsed by the relevant GEF operational focal point.

14. In establishing the SCCF, the Conference of the Parties (COP, the supreme body of the UNFCCC) placed the greatest emphasis on financing adaptation-focused projects, followed by technology transfer. Because only the adaptation and technology transfer financing windows are currently open, the SCCF has yet to begin providing sector-specific or economic diversification financing. These guidelines are therefore limited to adaptation and technology transfer.
15. The SCCF supports both long- and short-term adaptation activities in water resource management, land management, agriculture, health, infrastructure development, fragile ecosystems (including mountainous ecosystems), and integrated coastal zone management. The SCCF also supports disaster risk management activities, such as developing national or regional information communications networks that utilize an array of technologies.
16. These activities should be country driven, cost-effective, and integrated into national sustainable development and poverty reduction strategies. To ensure country ownership, SCCF-funded projects must reflect national communications, NAPAs, and other context-specific studies; and must be endorsed by the relevant GEF operational focal point.
17. Technology transfer focuses on transferring environmentally sustainable technologies (including mitigation technologies), devising and conducting technology needs assessments, implementing projects linked to the needs assessments, and disseminating experiences and lessons learned from successfully demonstrated environmentally sustainable technologies. In contrast to the LDCF and other funding aspects of the SCCF, the technology transfer funding window's inclusion of mitigation technologies is expected to produce global benefits.

LDCF/SCCF Project Cycle

18. The LDCF/SCCF project cycle generally begins with a project proponent developing a concept, approaching a GEF Agency, and then securing the endorsement of the relevant GEF operational focal point (designated by the country, the operational focal point is responsible for the operational aspects of GEF activities, including affirming that project proposals are consistent with national plans and priorities). For full-size projects (those seeking over \$2 million in funding), the project proponent submits a PIF (see [box 1](#)), followed by a CEO endorsement form.¹ The GEF Secretariat reviews the PIF and either approves it, returns it for revision, or rejects it. After GEF Secretariat approval, the PIF is submitted

Box 1: LDCF PIF Key Questions

PIF review questions fall into four categories:

■ **Basic project idea (adaptation benefits and additional cost argument)**

- What is the likely business-as-usual development for the targeted sector in the absence of climate change?
- What are the climate change vulnerabilities?
- With the LDCF investment, what are the specific adaptation activities to be implemented to increase the climate resilience of the baseline or business-as-usual development activity?

■ **Fit with NAPA priorities**

- Does the project respond to the highest priority(ies) identified in the NAPA (and if not, why not)?
- Does an SCCF technology transfer project comport with the technology needs assessment?

■ **Implementation setup**

- Who will implement the project and why (including comparative advantage of the GEF Agency(ies)?
- Is the project being coordinated with related projects and programs to avoid duplication of activities?

■ **Indicative budget and cofinancing**

- How will the project components be weighted in terms of budget and why?
- What levels and sources of cofinancing is the project expecting?

Source: [GEF 2011a](#).

to the LDCF/SCCF Council, which reviews and approves projects on a rolling basis with a “no objection” paradigm—projects are only submitted for discussion in a full Council meeting if four or more Council members object. After the GEF CEO endorses a project, funds are released to the GEF Agency. Medium-size projects (those under \$2 million) begin with the CEO endorsement form; funding is released to the GEF Agency upon GEF CEO endorsement.

Management Framework

19. At the Seventh UNFCCC COP in 2001, the UNFCCC established the LDCF and the SCCF as the first multilateral adaptation finance instruments. Both funds are partnership based and provide grant and concessional funding only for those

The LDCF and SCCF are required to adhere to GEF's policies and rules in all aspects of their operations, including M&E practices. This requires that LDCF/SCCF projects and programs conduct regular M&E activities and maintain flexibility to respond to changing circumstances and experience gained from M&E activities.

costs that are additional to a development baseline and that are directed toward adaptation efforts. The funds share a number of similarities, including origin, operational structure, and governance in accord with the GEF.

20. The GEF Secretariat conducts many activities to assist in accessing fund resources (e.g., the GEF Secretariat is collaborating with the UNFCCC Secretariat to finance workshops to build local capacities to access adaptation financing under the funds). The GEF, as manager of the funds, is also working to further clarify project baselines and application processes, support the development of a programmatic approach to NAPA implementation, and streamline project cycles (particularly during the project preparation stages).
21. The LDCF/SCCF Council, the main governing body for the funds, provides strategic and policy direction for the funds' programming priorities. Functioning as an independent board of directors, the Council's primary responsibility is to develop, adopt, and evaluate LDCF/SCCF policies and programs. Any GEF Council member is eligible to observe or participate in the LDCF/SCCF Council.
22. The funds are required to adhere to GEF policies and rules in all aspects of their operations, including M&E practices (but see [box 2](#)), except for when the LDCF/SCCF Council decides otherwise in response to COP guidance. This requires that LDCF/SCCF projects and programs conduct regular M&E activities and maintain sufficient flexibility to respond to changing circumstances and experience gained from M&E activities.

Particularized Focus on Gender

23. The impacts of global climate change will be felt most acutely by those least able to adapt. In general, poor women and men in the developing world lack the resources and opportunities to cope with the often devastating results of climate change. While all members of society will be affected by climate change, women are likely to be disproportionately affected because of their historic disadvantages and high involvement in and dependence on sectors that are expected to experience the most intense climate change impacts (e.g., water and agriculture).
24. As the processes and procedures for the LDCF and SCCF become more advanced, greater attention is being paid to gender and vulnerability analysis. Increasing attention is being given to the differences between men and women within at-risk populations. Implementing Agencies will be encouraged to conduct gender analysis, incorporate gender-sensitive budgeting methodologies, and include women's perspectives throughout planning and implementation. This will ensure projects and programs develop an understanding of and account

Box 2: Primary Evaluation Differences between the GEF and the Funds

Though the funds are subject to the GEF M&E Policy, there are four fundamental differences:

1. Adaptation activities under the funds follow “programming priorities”; GEF activities are broader in nature and address “focal areas.”
2. The funds’ M&E Policy requires analysis of a project’s or program’s adaptation benefits; the GEF M&E Policy emphasizes a project’s or program’s global environmental benefits.
3. The funds’ M&E Policy considers additional costs; the GEF M&E Policy considers a project’s or program’s incremental costs.
4. The funds’ RBM framework focuses on adaptation activities and includes a targeted set of indicators; the GEF RBM framework is broader in scope.

	GEF Trust Fund	LDCF	SCCF
Project must generate global environmental benefits	Yes	No	No*
Projects must generate adaptation benefits	No	Yes	Yes*
Funding allocated according to RAF or STAR	Yes	No	No
Projects financed according to incremental cost principle	Yes	No	No*
Project proposals approved on a rolling basis	No	Yes	No
Funding of projects according to “balanced access”	No	Yes	No

Source: Compiled from [GEF 2011a](#) and [2011b](#).

Note: RAF = Resource Allocation Framework; STAR = System for Transparent Allocation of Resources; * = technology transfer for mitigation projects is excepted.

for women’s and men’s different activities, responsibilities, and relative access to resources and decision making. For example, analysis that focuses on women’s and men’s relative strengths and skills in agriculture and animal husbandry may yield different approaches to increasing overall adaptive capacity; differences in literacy rates may suggest different disaster preparedness outreach strategies.

25. Seven of the 14 LDCF and SCCF project results frameworks include gender-disaggregated indicators, particularly regarding outputs and outcomes related to adaptation assets created to support individual or community livelihood strategies. Gender will be integrated as appropriate in all results frameworks and in updated operational guidance. The LDCF and SCCF will also benefit from the

GEF Secretariat's work to develop specific operational guidance for strengthening socioeconomic and gender analysis and for identifying appropriate indicators. The results of this work will become part of project design requirements and project review criteria.

Note

- 1 Templates and guidelines are available at http://www.thegef.org/gef/guidelines_templates.

4. Baseline Costs, Additional Costs, and Cofinancing

26. Development activities that would have taken place in the absence of climate change comprise a project's *baseline costs* (the business-as-usual scenario). New activities (or changes to planned activities) that are necessary to adapt to climate change comprise a project's *additional costs*. For example, upgrading port facilities in order to increase trade will entail a set of baseline development costs. Modifying the port's design and adding new structures (e.g., heightening sea walls) to account for impending climate change–induced storm surges will entail a set of additional adaptation costs. Both funds aim to provide financing to fully meet these additional costs. Some stand-alone adaptation activities would not take place at all absent climate change impacts (thus definitionally meeting the additionality requirement). Both funds will fully fund these activities, provided they are exclusively adaptation interventions and not linked to business-as-usual development.
27. Because the funds provide financing only for additional costs, the operational guidelines emphasize securing cofinancing for project and program baseline costs. By fully meeting the additional costs, fund financing will catalyze climate change adaptation efforts and leverage additional resources within the context of broader development agendas. This will mainstream adaptation into larger development projects, result in greater impacts, capitalize on potential synergies, and maximize the benefits of economies of scale.
28. Establishing baselines is critical to implementing the funds' RBM framework. Therefore, project designs should prepare a baseline description that includes the status of the national climate, development, vulnerabilities, and adaptive capacities. There should be specific information regarding the climate change scenarios being addressed, the targets pursued, the project elements that contribute to the baseline, and other sources of financing.
29. The PIF or program framework document should provide an overview of a project's business-as-usual scenario and a prediction of what would most likely happen without fund financing. Because some adaptation activities provide net benefits, it is important to account for benefits forgone in the absence of fund financing. This may entail a careful monetization of abstract benefits (e.g., a sea wall built to prevent storm surge flooding may enhance local fishing and recreation activities).

New activities (or changes to planned activities) that are necessary to adapt to climate change comprise a project's additional costs; both funds aim to provide financing to fully meet these additional costs.

5. Monitoring and Evaluation in the LDCF and SCCF

Monitoring analyzes whether a program or project is on track to achieve its objectives; evaluation analyzes whether the program or project is on the right track.

- 30. M&E activities in the LDCF and SCCF have two overarching objectives: promoting accountability and promoting learning, feedback, and knowledge sharing. M&E should promote accountability for the achievement of fund objectives through the assessment of results, effectiveness, processes, and performance of the partners involved in fund activities; results should be monitored and evaluated for their contribution to achieving adaptation benefits within LDCF/SCCF programming priorities. M&E should also promote learning, feedback, and knowledge sharing on results and lessons learned. This will improve performance and decision making and enable adaptive management throughout project implementation.
- 31. Monitoring and evaluation are distinct and complementary tools (see [table 1](#)). Whereas monitoring analyzes whether a program or project is *on* track to achieve its objectives, evaluation analyzes whether the program or project is on the *right* track. Descriptive by nature, monitoring provides information on a program or project’s current state relative to its targets and outcomes, tracks progress toward benchmarks, and measures progress toward outcomes.
- 32. Evaluation provides evidence and analysis of why targets and outcomes have or have not been achieved and addresses causal connections between a project and

Table 1: Complementary Roles of Monitoring and Evaluation

Monitoring	Evaluation
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Links activities and their resources to outputs and outcomes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Analyzes why intended results were or were not achieved
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Translates objectives into performance indicators and sets targets 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Assesses specific causal contributions of activities to results
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Routinely collects data on indicators and compares actual results with targets 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Examines the implementation process ■ Explores unintended results
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Reports progress to management and alerts it to problems 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Provides lessons, highlights significant accomplishments or program potential, and offers recommendations for improvement

Source: [Kuzek and Rist 2004](#).

its outcomes (see [box 3](#)). Evaluation validates results and analyzes why and the extent to which intended and unintended results were achieved (e.g., increased resilience, cost-effectiveness). Evaluation also provides evidence on how changes are taking place, and the strengths and weaknesses of the design of the projects, programs, or corporate strategies embedded in the RBM framework. Evaluation uses include improving the design and performance of a planned or ongoing

Box 3: Types of Evaluation

The evaluation approach and method must be adapted to the nature of the project or program. The main types of evaluation include the following:

- **Project evaluations** of projects under implementation, at the end of the intervention (terminal evaluation), and after the project ends (ex post evaluation) or before the project starts (ex ante—quality at entry)
- **Program evaluations** of a set of interventions focused on attaining a set of global, regional, country, or sector objectives; these include evaluations or studies of LDCF/SCCF programming priorities, programmatic approaches, and corporate programs
- **Country-level evaluations** of a portfolio of projects and activities and the assistance strategies behind them, including country portfolio evaluations that assess how the country interacts with the funds and how fund support fits into the country's priorities
- **Impact evaluations** of an intervention's intended, unintended, direct, and indirect long-term adaptation impacts; these may be assessed at the project, program, portfolio, country, or regional level
- **Cross-cutting and thematic evaluations** of a selection of interventions that address a particular adaptation challenge in one or more countries, regions, or sectors; these include evaluations that assess LDCF/SCCF principles, such as the funds' catalytic roles, participation, or programming priorities
- **Process and performance evaluations** of the internal dynamics of participating organizations, instruments, mechanisms, and management practices; these include evaluation of institutional and procedural issues across LDCF/SCCF programming priorities and assessments of fund policies, criteria, and procedures
- **Ad hoc reviews** of programs and processes that do not require a full evaluation but do need independent assessment; these reviews are conducted by the GEF Independent Evaluation Office based on specific requests from the LDCF/SCCF Council or LDCF/SCCF management
- **Overall performance studies** of the LDCF/SCCF address overriding issues such as adaptation impacts and benefits, institutional arrangements, policies, strategies, programs, and priorities; these studies typically build on the results of other evaluations

Source: [GEF EO 2010](#).

program (a formative evaluation); forming overall judgments about the effectiveness of a completed program, often to ensure accountability (a summative evaluation); and generating knowledge about good practices.

33. The GEF Secretariat developed an RBM framework to measure project progress and results. The relevant GEF Agency is responsible for preparing RBM reports, including annual project implementation reports and terminal evaluations. The GEF devised the LDCF/SCCF Adaptation Monitoring and Assessment Tool (AMAT) in order to assist in tracking project-specific outcome and output indicators for these reports. Within 12 months of project completion, the GEF Agency is required to submit a terminal evaluation to the GEF Independent Evaluation Office (full-size projects also require a detailed midterm review).¹

Minimum Requirements

34. Agencies should conduct and finance evaluations according to their internal practices. All M&E activities should provide a sound basis for decision making and should draw robust conclusions for project improvement and future learning. M&E activities should accurately capture a project's outputs, delineate progress toward outcomes, and identify key implementation issues (and propose actions to solve them).
35. Evaluation reports should be in line with LDCF/SCCF M&E requirements and be credible, unbiased, consistent, and well documented. Where possible (particularly with periodic M&E activities), reports should incorporate continuity in order to facilitate tracking of results and progress. Monitoring should be based on periodic observation visits, capture stakeholder views, and explain all methodological and physical limitations.
36. In light of medium-size projects' smaller budgets and relatively limited M&E capacities, the GEF Independent Evaluation Office is developing specific guidance to ensure evaluation credibility and cost-effectiveness.

Designing M&E Plans

37. All projects and programs must include a concrete and fully budgeted M&E plan; project logical frameworks should align to the funds' programming priorities. These plans are dynamic tools and should be revised as project or program scope changes. M&E plans should include the following (at a minimum):
 - SMART and other relevant indicators for results and implementation that are linked to the LDCF/SCCF RBM framework and AMAT²

- Baseline information that describes the problem to be addressed and includes indicator data; if major baseline indicators were not identified in program or project design, the M&E plan should include an alternative method to address this
- Identification of the reviews and evaluations to be conducted (including midterm reviews and terminal evaluations)
- Organizational setup and M&E budgets
- Arrangements to keep the relevant GEF operational focal points informed and involved (while respecting the independent nature of evaluation)

Implementing M&E Plans

38. Project and program monitoring and supervision should include M&E plan implementation, comprising (at a minimum):

- Active implementation of SMART and other indicators
- Active measurements of SMART indicators
- Reasonable explanations for SMART indicators not measured or included
- Updated baseline data
- Compiled data to facilitate review of progress
- Confirmation that the organizational setup and M&E budget have been put into practice in accordance with the M&E plan

Evaluating Projects and Programs

39. Full-size projects and all programs should be evaluated at the end of implementation. The evaluations should be conducted independently from project management and apply all applicable norms and standards of the GEF Agency(ies). Evaluation reports should be submitted to the GEF Independent Evaluation Office immediately when ready or within 12 months of project or program completion.

40. The GEF Agency should inform the operational focal points of midterm reviews and terminal evaluations. Where applicable and feasible, focal points should be briefed and debriefed at the start and end of evaluation missions. The GEF Agency should provide operational focal points with a draft evaluation report for comment, invite their contributions to the management response (where

applicable), and provide them with the final evaluation report within 12 months of project or program completion.

41. Evaluations should include (at a minimum) (see [box 4](#)):
- Assessment of output and outcome achievement, with ratings for targeted objectives and outcomes
 - Projection and rating of each outcome’s sustainability as of project or program termination
 - Analysis and rating of the M&E plan design and its application
 - An evaluation report that details when and where the evaluation took place, who was involved, key questions addressed, methodology, project or program data (including actual expenditures), broader lessons learned, and the evaluation terms of reference

M&E Principles

42. Principles common to both GEF and the funds guide M&E activities (see [box 5](#)). These principles are based on internationally recognized professional standards that should be applied to all fund-related M&E activities. Evaluation should provide evidence-based information that demonstrates independence, credibility, utility, impartiality, transparency, disclosure, ethical, participation, and competencies and capacities.

Box 4: Evaluation Criteria

Relevance: the extent to which an activity is suited to the local and national environmental priorities and policies and to the funds’ focus on adaptation benefits; relevance analysis should include an assessment of change over time

Effectiveness: the extent to which an objective has been achieved (or how likely it is to be achieved)

Efficiency: the extent to which results have been delivered with the least costly resources possible

Results: include direct project outputs, short- to medium-term outcomes, progress toward longer term impacts, replication, and local effects

Sustainability: the likelihood that an intervention will continue to deliver benefits after completion; evaluations should include analysis of environmental, financial, and social sustainability

43. **Independence.** Evaluation teams should be independent from policy-making processes, service delivery, and project or program management. Evaluation team members should not have been personally engaged in or responsible for the evaluated activity's design, implementation, or supervision.
44. **Credibility.** Evaluations should be credible and based on reliable data or observations. Reports should reflect consistency and dependability in areas such as data, findings, judgments, and lessons learned; and should thoroughly describe the quality of the instruments, procedures, and analysis used to collect and interpret information. Where possible, evaluations should incorporate dynamic and pragmatic methodologies and indicators to measure results and progress.
45. **Utility.** M&E activities must serve intended users' information needs. To meet this principle, partners, evaluators, and units commissioning evaluations should ensure that the work is well informed, relevant, and timely and that it is clearly and concisely presented. Evaluation reports should present evidence, findings, issues, conclusions, and recommendations in a complete and balanced way.
46. **Impartiality.** Evaluations must give a comprehensive and balanced presentation of the strengths and weaknesses of the evaluation subject. Evaluation processes should reflect impartiality at all stages and take into account all stakeholders' views. Units commissioning evaluations should ensure that the evaluators selected are impartial and unbiased. It is particularly important to strictly adhere to the impartiality principle in self-evaluations, self-assessments, internal reviews and reports, and monitoring actions.
47. **Transparency.** Transparency and open consultation with stakeholders are essential to evaluation processes. This involves clear communication concerning decisions for the evaluation plan, scope, purpose, criteria applied, and the intended use of evaluation findings. Evaluation reports should provide transparent information on sources, methodologies, and approaches.
48. **Disclosure.** Evaluation lessons should be disseminated in accordance with widely accepted international standards. This includes establishing effective feedback loops with policy makers, operational staff, beneficiaries, stakeholders, and the public. A dissemination plan can help promote transparency by utilizing a broad range of vehicles, including websites, knowledge products, and events.
49. **Ethical.** Evaluations should give due regard for the welfare, beliefs, and customs of those involved or affected. Evaluation team members should take appropriate measures to avoid conflicts of interest. Evaluators must respect the right of institutions and individuals to provide information in confidence. Team members or managers should discreetly report any evidence of wrongdoing to the GEF

Independent Evaluation Office Director, who will take appropriate actions. Ethical evaluation requires that management and/or commissioners of evaluations remain open to the findings and do not allow vested interests to interfere with the evaluation.

50. **Participation.** Fund evaluations should include a broad cross-section of stakeholder participation, including operational focal points, project managers, nongovernmental and civil society organizations, and people involved in project implementation. Securing this participation will enable extensive learning exchanges among the funds, stakeholders, beneficiaries, and partner organizations.
51. **Competencies and capacities.** LDCF/SCCF evaluations typically require a broad spectrum of expertise such as technical, environmental, within a social science, or evaluative. Units commissioning evaluations should select independent-minded, experienced evaluators with the capacity to employ a rigorous methodology for assessing results and performance. Wherever possible, evaluations should utilize local technical and evaluative expertise.

LDCF/SCCF Adaptation Monitoring and Assessment Tool

52. The Secretariat and the Adaptation Task Force collaborated to develop the AMAT to monitor LDCF/SCCF adaptation activities. The tool provides 14 useful generic indicators for adaptation projects (regardless of sector), provides a framework for addressing the overall success of the project in light of LDCF/SCCF goals, and strikes a balance between comprehensiveness and ease of use.
53. The tracking tool facilitates the collection, aggregation, and communication of progress and outcomes across a large number of projects and programs. Because the tool is focused on quantitative data and designed to ensure consistency among indicators and units of measurement, it represents a limited picture of the expected and actual results of a project or program. Therefore, the tool should not be used in place of more specific or comprehensive M&E frameworks designed for individual projects. Moreover, because the tool is submitted only at CEO endorsement/approval, midterm, and project completion, it does not capture outcomes that emerge after project completion.

Knowledge Sharing and Dissemination

54. For improved effectiveness, lessons from M&E activities should be made available to country-level stakeholders directly involved in project and program formulation and implementation. To achieve this, LDCF/SCCF partners should

Box 5: Key Evaluation Questions

Does the LDCF/SCCF program or project

- address immediate adaptation needs?
- utilize funds that are in addition to established baselines?
- provide benefits that would not have accrued under other development plans?
- support the preparation of a NAPA or implementation of activities in support of an adopted NAPA?
- align with country-devised priorities?
- promote cost-effectiveness?
- exhibit transparency?
- leverage partner funding?
- involve the active participation of vulnerable communities?
- incorporate national and regional expertise?
- promote national leadership and ownership?

seek out dynamic and interactive ways of disseminating M&E outputs to a wide audience, including environmental entities, academia, research institutions, civil society, and the general public. By broadly sharing analysis, findings, and lessons, M&E builds confidence in LDCF/SCCF work, leverages support, and increases awareness of the importance of meeting the additional costs to achieve adaptation benefits.

Notes

- 1 The current RBM framework and associated tools are available in [GEF \(2014b\)](#).
- 2 See [Key Terms](#) for a definition of SMART indicators.

6. Results-Based Management

Focusing on two main result areas (reducing vulnerability to climate change impacts and increasing adaptive capacities to cope with and address the climate change impacts), the LDCF/SCCF RBM approach supports monitoring and reporting at both the program and the priority intervention levels.

55. RBM and monitoring are functions to continuously plan, measure, monitor, assess, review, and report on progress toward desired results. They provide the LDCF/SCCF Council, the GEF, and the COP with the information necessary to assess how interventions are contributing to achieving adaptation goals. These functions should be performed by those responsible for managing LDCF and SCCF policies, programs, projects, operations, or organizational units. Because of their commonalities, both funds are subject to the same overarching RBM framework.
56. A strong RBM system is essential to building confidence among partner organizations, stakeholders, and beneficiaries in the reliability of information on development effectiveness. The framework's definitions and methodologies enable more comprehensive portfolio-level monitoring and reporting on progress and outcomes; introduce qualitative tools and methodologies that allow portfolio-level monitoring and reporting to go beyond quantitative outputs; use indicators and methodologies that are in line with evolving COP guidance; and are consistent with the tools and methodologies used by other funds, programs, and agencies.
57. As adaptation programming is relatively new, the LDCF/SCCF RBM framework provides opportunities to field test new methodologies and adaptation metrics. The approach taken includes process-based metrics (monitoring the progress of adaptation measure implementation) and outcome-based indicators that help measure the effectiveness of LDCF/SCCF-supported adaptation policies, strategies, and activities. The monitoring framework includes process-based indicators, outcome-based indicators, and indicators that are relevant and measurable at different spatial and temporal scales.
58. The LDCF/SCCF RBM approach supports monitoring and reporting at both the program and priority intervention levels. Result areas include measures of changing vulnerability; measures of adaptive capacity or resilience; measures of changing exposure; and measures of awareness, knowledge, and participation. Other RBM principles include focusing on reducing vulnerability to climate change impacts and increasing adaptive capacities to cope with and address

climate change impacts; capturing the additional adaptation benefits rather than focusing on developmental outcomes; prioritizing process- and outcome-based indicators; and integrating climate change adaptation into relevant policies, plans, and associated processes. For monitoring, RBM promotes a focus on progress rather than effectiveness, which is more appropriately captured through evaluations.

59. All project designs should include a logical framework approach/results framework with specific output and outcome indicators that align with funding area objectives. During implementation, process, output, and immediate outcome indicators help assess whether a project is on track to achieve its stated outcomes. Incorporated into monitoring activities, core outputs and outcomes at the project and sector levels can be used as a proxy to track and benchmark a project to determine if it is progressing toward achieving reduced vulnerability or increased adaptive capacities. An evaluation presents the opportunity to use the indicators to conduct a more accurate in-depth assessment, analyzing causes and effects of LDCF/SCCF interventions.

7. Roles and Responsibilities

M&E Partners in the LDCF/SCCF

60. Monitoring and evaluation are a shared responsibility in the LDCF/SCCF. The LDCF/SCCF Council provides the overall framework, starting with agreement on objectives and corporate programming area results frameworks. The LDCF/SCCF Secretariat proposes to the Council how these objectives and results should be monitored, and the GEF Independent Evaluation Office proposes to the Council how these should be evaluated. Emerging environmental and development trends (and LDCF/SCCF results and performance within the context of these trends) are reported on in the overall performance study prepared by the Independent Evaluation Office as one of the key documents of the replenishment process. The LDCF/SCCF Council uses this information to make strategic and policy-level decisions.
61. GEF Agencies and their partners execute project, program, and portfolio M&E activities. The GEF Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel (STAP) provides advice on indicators, targets, and evaluation approaches. The GEF Independent Evaluation Office collaborates with the independent evaluation units of the GEF Agencies to enhance collective capacities to fulfill evaluation needs effectively and efficiently.

LDCF/SCCF Council

62. The LDCF/SCCF Council ensures accountability and oversight of fund performance and results. The Council develops, adopts, and evaluates the operational policies and programs for LDCF/SCCF-financed activities; reviews LDCF/SCCF operations with respect to purpose, scope, and objectives; and ensures that LDCF/SCCF policies, work programs, strategies, programs, and projects are monitored and regularly evaluated. On behalf of the Council, the LDCF/SCCF Trustee ensures the maintenance of appropriate records and accounts of the funds and provides for their audit.
63. The LDCF/SCCF Council ensures that adequate resources are allocated to enable M&E functions to operate effectively and with due independence. The Council also ensures that evaluators have the freedom to conduct their work

without personal or professional repercussions. The Council promotes transparency, participation, and disclosure in M&E findings, and dedicates sufficient time to discuss M&E issues at Council meetings.

64. The LDCE/SCCF Council, the GEF CEO, and the GEF Director of Evaluation are jointly responsible for ensuring that M&E findings, conclusions, and recommendations are actively used in decision making and for maintaining repositories of lessons learned.

GEF Independent Evaluation Office

65. The GEF Independent Evaluation Office, the main M&E unit for the LDCE/SCCF, operates independently from GEF Secretariat and GEF Agency management. The Office is central to ensuring the independence of evaluation within the LDCE/SCCF, setting minimum M&E requirements, ensuring oversight of the quality of M&E systems, and sharing evaluative evidence within the LDCE/SCCF.
66. The Independent Evaluation Office improves accountability and learning through evaluative, normative, and oversight functions. The Office's primary focus is to independently evaluate the effectiveness of LDCE/SCCF programs and resource allocations on the project, program, country, portfolio, and institutional levels. To fulfill its normative function, the Independent Evaluation Office ensures improved and consistent measurement of LDCE/SCCF results by setting minimum M&E standards within the LDCE/SCCF. To meet its oversight function, the Office provides quality control of the minimum requirements of LDCE/SCCF M&E practices.
67. The Independent Evaluation Office is also responsible for conducting institutional evaluations and evaluations that involve a set of projects from more than one GEF Agency. These evaluations are typically on a strategic level, on programming priority areas, or on cross-cutting themes. Within the LDCE/SCCF, the Independent Evaluation Office facilitates cooperation with and among the GEF partners on M&E issues.
68. The Independent Evaluation Office uses the Management Action Record System to promote knowledge sharing and follow-up of evaluation recommendations. The system provides the Council with a record of its decisions on evaluation report follow-up, proposed management actions, and action status. The system increases GEF management accountability regarding Council decisions by assessing progress made toward adopting these decisions.

69. The Independent Evaluation Office works with the GEF Secretariat and GEF Agencies to establish systems to disseminate M&E lessons learned and best practices and to provide independent evaluative evidence to the GEF knowledge base. The Office specifically supports knowledge sharing by ensuring the highest standards in accessibility and presentation for its published reports, providing additional learning products based on evaluations, using a range of channels to reach target audiences, participating in knowledge management activities, and facilitating inter-Agency sharing of experiences.
70. The Independent Evaluation Office maintains clear conflict of interest rules. For example, any staff member who has been involved in the design, implementation, or supervision of an activity cannot conduct its evaluation. Further, the Office does not engage consultants to evaluate or report on an activity if they have previously worked on its design or implementation.

GEF Secretariat

71. The GEF Secretariat supports evaluation by responding promptly and fully to Independent Evaluation Office information requests, coordinating the GEF system management responses to corporate evaluations, providing administrative support for the Independent Evaluation Office, and consulting with the Office when conducting reviews of monitoring and learning issues.
72. The Secretariat is responsible for monitoring in accordance with the LDCF/SCCF RBM framework. This may entail aggregating findings across the portfolio by focal area, type, theme, or issue. Applying internationally recognized best practices, the GEF Secretariat supports follow-up of findings and analysis of trends and systemic issues in order to inform decision making, strategy development, and the LDCF/SCCF knowledge base. The Secretariat prepares an annual monitoring report for the LDCF/SCCF Council. The report presents an overview of progress toward results, including outcomes, implementation issues, and portfolio-wide trends. This annual report is based on project or program implementation reports and focal area tracking tools submitted by the GEF Agencies.
73. In line with its commitment to RBM, the Secretariat takes the lead in identifying corporate- and portfolio-level indicators to track progress against stated objectives and replenishment targets. Working with Implementing Agencies and the Independent Evaluation Office, the Secretariat also takes the lead in establishing monitoring requirements at the project, program, and portfolio levels. The Secretariat reviews all projects and programs prior to their approval to ensure that they meet LDCF/SCCF M&E requirements, including the use of indicators and targets that align with programming priority objectives and indicators.

74. The Secretariat takes the lead in using monitoring information to develop a GEF knowledge management system. The Secretariat coordinates the overall knowledge management strategy of the GEF, and promotes mechanisms to disseminate portfolio lessons learned and best practices emanating from GEF monitoring activities. The Secretariat may visit projects to review portfolio monitoring and learning issues.
75. The Secretariat ensures that findings and recommendations stemming from M&E activities are followed up with regard to LDCF/SCCF policies, programs, and procedures, and that related Council decisions are implemented. The Secretariat ensures that results and lessons identified through M&E activities are adequately reflected in public information about the LDCF/SCCF. This includes activities to gather and disseminate best practices to improve portfolio quality and foster replication, to provide information required by the Independent Evaluation Office, and to prepare joint management responses to evaluations.

GEF Agencies

76. Each GEF Agency has its own independent system of governance and rules and regulations regarding project planning, implementation, and M&E. GEF Agency evaluation units should ensure continuous and robust monitoring of the LDCF/SCCF portfolio. The units should also report on the Agencies' project and program progress, results, learning, and lessons; ensure effective project and program monitoring; adaptively manage project and program implementation; systematically involve national partners; and routinely and broadly share M&E information.
77. All GEF Agency partners should actively and transparently contribute to knowledge and learning. Partners should base knowledge management and lessons learned dissemination strategies on user needs and priorities and should adopt the latest technologies and approaches. GEF Agency development of and participation in knowledge management systems and communities of practice will increase access to knowledge and enhance knowledge sharing, collaboration, and innovation.
78. In fulfilling their management functions, GEF Agency operational units and the GEF Secretariat should ensure the monitoring of and reporting on progress and results at the project, program, and consolidated portfolio levels. They should also ensure that learning and lessons feed back into and improve planning and implementation of strategies and project and program designs. In line with GEF instruments, M&E processes should fully draw on the capacities and knowledge of scientific advisers, governments, stakeholders, and beneficiaries.

GEF Agency Operational Units

79. GEF Agency operational units are responsible for developing M&E plans and performance and results indicators; and for monitoring project and program activities, production of outputs, and progress toward outcomes. When possible, project logical frameworks should align with LDCF and SCCF programming priorities in order to ensure that Agencies can consistently analyze results.
80. Agencies should work with the GEF Secretariat to develop program indicators for programming priorities.
81. To support the Secretariat's learning role and its portfolio monitoring function (which mandates that it visit, review, and request information for projects financed by the funds), Agencies should respond to information requests and facilitate reviews and missions. Through their internal monitoring systems, the relevant Agency operational units should periodically assess trends and issues on project and program implementation and performance within their GEF Agency portfolio, and periodically report (at least annually) to the GEF Secretariat on project and program implementation and performance.
82. Agencies should undertake midterm reviews for full-size projects under implementation. Midterm reviews are also encouraged for medium-size projects and enabling activities, where appropriate and feasible. These reports are submitted to the GEF Secretariat as part of annual reporting functions. The Agencies should also submit a focal area tracking tool for projects and programs (where applicable) and overview reports, providing an overall assessment of their GEF portfolio under implementation.
83. To avoid duplicating evaluation efforts, ensure cost-effectiveness, and maximize synergies in jointly implemented activities, partner M&E responsibilities should be determined during project preparation. This could take the form of a joint evaluation, with one Agency assuming the lead or parallel evaluative work leading to a single program-level report. These M&E agreements should be included in the CEO endorsement.

GEF Agency Evaluation Units

84. GEF Agencies have agreed to exchange evaluation agendas and work plans with the GEF Independent Evaluation Office in order to identify areas of common interest and cooperation and potential collaborations in joint evaluations. This cooperation encourages optimal coverage of adaptation-related issues in evaluation plans.

85. For relevant evaluations related to fund programming priorities, the evaluation units provide the GEF Independent Evaluation Office with opportunities to contribute in terms of reference, approach, and scope. The GEF Agency evaluation units are also expected to cooperate on norms, standards, and evaluation quality. Agencies are expected to provide adequate financial support to evaluation units without detracting from the independent nature of evaluation.

Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel

86. The STAP provides timely and relevant advice on scientific and technical matters and on the science and technology components of the Independent Evaluation Office work program. It may also suggest subjects to evaluate and provide opinions on whether the evaluation of scientific aspects and related methodologies for measuring adaptation benefits is possible at this time. STAP members may also be called upon to directly support an evaluation (while respecting the independence of both the STAP and the Independent Evaluation Office).

87. Upon request, the STAP supports the GEF Secretariat and Agencies in monitoring the scientific and technical aspects of GEF portfolios and programs. The STAP also supports knowledge management and information sharing related to scientific and technical aspects of the portfolio. It supports the GEF Secretariat in developing and using scientific indicators to measure results at the national and portfolio levels.

88. The STAP Chair takes part in relevant GEF M&E meetings and consultations.

GEF Operational Focal Points

89. A number of entities in participating countries are involved in M&E. Many countries establish or improve their national monitoring, evaluation, and assessment systems of adaptation benefits. This may include improving census and other data sets, determining national and project baselines, and fostering a participatory environment.

90. Aligned with LDCF/SCCF operational principles and emphasis on country ownership, LDCF/SCCF M&E activities provide for a broad range of consultation and participation. GEF Agencies and the GEF Independent Evaluation Office should consult with operational focal points and keep them informed about the planning, conduct, and results of M&E activities performed in the country. This inclusion should not, however, diminish the independence of M&E activities.

In order to maximize country ownership, LDCF/SCCF M&E activities should fully engage GEF operational focal points regarding the planning, conduct, and results of any evaluation activity performed in the country.

91. Upon specific request, the GEF Secretariat and the GEF Independent Evaluation Office will provide support to operational focal points on M&E activities through the GEF Country Support Programme. Support includes database creation, milestone tracking, tool kits, and informational presentations.
92. To maximize country ownership, LDCF/SCCF M&E activities should fully engage GEF operational focal points regarding the planning, conduct, and results of any evaluation activity performed in the country (though care must be taken to maintain evaluation independence). Staff members of the cooperating governments or institutions will be expected to support evaluations by responding promptly and fully to Independent Evaluation Office requests for information relating to GEF projects, portfolios, or policies and for sharing relevant experiences.
93. GEF operational focal points are particularly responsible for the use of, follow-up to, and action on evaluation recommendations. Operational focal points also play a key role in keeping national stakeholders (particularly civil society organizations involved in fund activities) fully consulted with, informed on, and involved in the plans, implementation, and results of relevant M&E activities.

Stakeholders

94. LDCF/SCCF M&E activities involve the participation of locally and internationally based stakeholders that have a direct, indirect, or potential interest in the outcome of an LDCF/SCCF-financed project or program. Stakeholders include executing agencies, groups contracted to conduct project or program activities, civil society groups, and individuals living in the project or programming area or who depend on the area's natural resources. Stakeholder involvement in M&E depends on the nature of and stakeholders' relation to the project or program. For example, academic institutions or private sector companies may support M&E activities directly and provide outside perspectives and expertise. Nongovernmental civil society organizations may play important roles in monitoring project or program activities or by providing feedback as beneficiaries or representatives of community groups.
95. Stakeholder use of M&E processes includes assessing progress, raising issues, and confirming the achievement of results. Therefore, it is particularly important to actively engage with stakeholders to elicit their views and perspectives. Monitoring system design and evaluation terms of reference should incorporate stakeholder identification, interaction, and participation.

Bibliography

Adaptation Fund. 2012. *Guidelines for Project/Programme Final Evaluations*.

GEF (Global Environment Facility). 2006. “Governance of the Climate Change Funds.” GEF/C.29.5.

———. 2010. “Updated Results-based Management Framework for the Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF) and the Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF) and Adaptation Monitoring and Assessment Tool.” GEF/LDCF.SCCF.9/Inf.4.

———. 2011a. *Accessing Resources under the Least Developed Countries Fund*.

———. 2011b. *Accessing Resources under the Special Climate Change Fund*.

———. 2011c. “Monitoring and Evaluation Policy for Least Developed Countries Fund and Special Climate Change Fund.” GEF/LDCF.SCCF.11/ME/01.

———. 2011d. *Strategy on Adaptation to Climate Change for the Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF) and the Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)*.

———. 2012a. “Updated Operational Guidelines for the Least Developed Countries Fund.” GEF/LDCF.SCCF.13/04.

———. 2012b. “Updated Operational Guidelines for the Special Climate Change Fund for Adaptation and Technology Transfer.” GEF/LDCF.SCCF.13/05.

———. 2013. “Draft GEF Programming Strategy on Adaptation to Climate Change for the Least Developed Countries Fund and the Special Climate Change Fund.” GEF/LDCF.SCCF.15/Inf.02.

———. 2014a. “GEF Programming Strategy on Adaptation to Climate Change for the Least Developed Countries Fund and the Special Climate Change Fund.” GEF/LDCF.SCCF.16/03/Rev.01.

———. 2014b. “Updated Results-based Management Framework for Adaptation to Climate Change under the Least Developed Countries Fund and the Special Climate Change Fund.” GEF/LDCF.SCCF.17/05.

GEF EO (Global Environment Facility Evaluation Office; formerly the GEF Office of Monitoring and Evaluation). 2005. “Procedures and Format of the GEF Management Action Record.” GEF/ME/C.27/3.

———. 2008. *Guidelines for GEF Agencies in Conducting Terminal Evaluation*. Evaluation Document No. 3.

- . 2010. *GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy 2010*. Evaluation Document No. 4.
- Global Gender and Climate Alliance. 2011. “The Least Developed Countries Fund and the Special Climate Change Fund: Exploring the Gender Dimensions of Climate Finance Mechanisms.” United Nations Development Programme.
- IPCC (Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change). 2007. “Glossary.” *IPCC Fourth Assessment Report. Climate Change 2007: Impacts, Adaptation, and Vulnerability*.
- . 2013. *Climate Change 2013: The Physical Science Basis—Summary for Policymakers. Working Group I Contribution to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change.*
- . 2014. *Climate Change 2014: Impacts, Adaptation, and Vulnerability. Summary for Policymakers.*
- Kuzek, Jody Zall, and Ray C. Rist. 2004. *Ten Steps to a Results-based Monitoring and Evaluation System*. World Bank.
- Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Denmark. 2009. *Joint External Evaluation: Operation of the Least Developed Countries Fund for Adaptation to Climate Change.*
- Ministry of Housing, Spatial Planning and Environment. 2004. *Manual for Monitoring and Evaluating Climate Change Policy Instruments*. The Netherlands.
- Operations Evaluation Department. 2009. *Evaluation Policy and Guidelines for Evaluations*. Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Netherlands.
- UNFCCC COP (United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change Conference of the Parties). 2002. *Decision 27/CP.7*.
- . 2003. *Decision 6/CP.9*.
- United Nations Development Programme, *Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results*, 2009.
- United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (ESCAP). 2010. *ESCAP M&E System: Monitoring and Evaluation System Overview and Evaluation Guidelines*. Bangkok.
- United Nations Evaluation Group. 2005a. “Norms for Evaluation in the UN System.”
- . 2005b. “Standards for Evaluation in the UN System.”
- . 2013. *UNEG Handbook for Conducting Evaluations of Normative Work in the UN System.*
- Wörten, C. 2013. *Guidelines to Climate Mitigation Evaluations*. Climate-Eval, Climate Change Evaluation Community of Practice.



Global Environment Facility
Independent Evaluation Office
1818 H Street, NW
Washington, DC 20433
USA

www.gefeo.org