

# Strategic Country Cluster Evaluation (SCCE): Sahel and Sudan-Guinea Savanna biomes<sup>1</sup>

## Guidance Note for Country Case Studies

*February 2019*

### 1. Introduction and Purpose

Case studies are the main component of the Sub-Saharan Africa (SSA) Biomes SCCE. They focus on the two overarching evaluation objectives:

- (i) To understand the determinants of sustainability; and
- (ii) To assess GEF's relevance to and performance in tackling the main environmental challenges in the two biomes.

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

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

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

Selection of case study countries draws upon the SSA Biomes SCCE's sustainability cohort, composed of 68 national and regional projects completed between 2007 and 2014 having APR ratings for both outcomes and sustainability. Projects in the selected countries addressed the most common environmental challenges shared by the largest number of countries in the two biomes, i.e.

---

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

deforestation and land degradation, threats to biodiversity, and desertification. Despite marine waters related environmental challenges (especially coastal and coral reef degradation) are addressed by several projects, they are not part of the evaluation scope, which focuses on land-based environmental challenges.

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

## 2. Key evaluation questions

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

KQ1): What are the key factors influencing sustainability of outcomes in the two biomes?

KQ2): In what way, if any, does the environment and socio-economic development/livelihoods nexus (or lack thereof) help explain the sustainability of outcomes in the two biomes?

KQ3): To what extent has GEF support been relevant to the main environmental challenges the countries face in the two biomes, and are there any gaps?

KQ4): To what extent have gender and resilience been taken into consideration in GEF programming in the two biomes?

KQ5): To what extent has GEF support performed in the 13 fragile countries in the two biomes, and how have the results obtained from completed GEF projects and programs been affected in those situations that have become fragile?

Key Questions 1), 2) and 3) will be the main focus of the case study data gathering effort. They will be answered building on desk review of project documents as well as on the results from portfolio and geospatial analysis prior to the missions. Once in the countries, these three questions will be answered through central level interviews and field verifications, as detailed in the following sections. Key Questions 4) and 5) will be answered through central level interviews with key stakeholders in the capital. Interview guidelines with indicators for each question are presented in Annex 1.

## 3. Case study planning, approach and methodologies

**Guinea, Mali, Mauritania, Nigeria and Uganda** emerged as the countries having the largest number of national and regional projects with positive and negative APR ratings both on outcomes and sustainability.<sup>2</sup> Four of the five case studies (the ones in LDC countries) will also serve the Least Development Countries (LDCs) SCCE. An additional country, **Guinea Bissau**, will be covered by the Small Island Developing States (SIDS) SCCE following a similar approach and methodology. The aim is to coordinate and synergize the country level data gathering and analysis effort in a way to serve the needs

---

<sup>2</sup> SCCE: Sahel and Sudan-Guinea Savannah Biomes: Selection of Case Study Countries (IEO internal document).

of the three SCCEs. Annex 2 details the projects belonging to the SSA Biomes SCCE sustainability cohort in the selected countries.

A minimum of two weeks is foreseen for each country mission, 30-40% spent conducting interviews and data gathering in the capital (including briefing and debriefing the GEF Operational Focal Point in the country) and the rest dedicated to field verification in project sites. Teams will also conduct dyadic interviews in the countries ([Morgan et al. 2016](#)) when applicable. Dyadic interviews will be conducted with pairs of child and standalone national project managers from similar countries in the two biomes to inquire about evidence or examples of positive, negative and absent long term environmental change and the related underlying factors in each example. The focus on comparing child projects (i.e. projects designed and implemented under a program) with similar standalone projects is to test the hypothesis that implementing a 'programmatic' project gives a higher likelihood of higher outcomes and sustainability, and the underlying factors pertaining to a program that make child projects more sustainable. A separate guidance note has been prepared for dyadic interviews and will be provided to the teams.

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

1. Land productivity, land cover and soil organic carbon
2. Forest loss/gain
3. Forest fragmentation

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

Each country case study should target field verification in one site of at least three completed projects from the sustainability cohort (one with positive, one with negative, and one with neutral ratings both for outcomes and sustainability), aiming at covering the intervention typologies applied to the main environmental challenges in the two biomes. If possible, project site visits will also be identified by the case study team lead from completed projects that are not part of the sustainability cohort and projects under implementation (see Annex 3 and 4 for a full list of national projects in those two cohorts). The methods section of the case study report (a report outline is presented in Annex 5) will explain the rationale for the choice of the sites to be field verified.

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

- i. priority to completed over under implementation projects,
- ii. priority to national over regional projects, and
- iii. projects belonging to dyads.

The SCCE Task Team Leader (TTL) Carlo Carugi will directly participate in the conduct of two case studies: (i) Guinea and (ii) Uganda, in both cases with assistance from a national consultant. The Mauritania case

study will be conducted by Sara El Choufi, SCCE team member, supported by one national consultant, and the Nigeria and Mali case studies will be conducted by a senior evaluation consultant.

#### 4. Indicative Steps

Based on the preliminary activities described above, especially on the selection of project sites for field verification, and following email introductions from the GEF IEO, the evaluators responsible for the respective case studies shall also make initial contact with the in-country project managers and other stakeholders.<sup>3</sup> A mission agenda with a timetable and list of persons to be met, including the list of project sites will be drafted and agreed to with the GEF OFP based on the selection of project sites to visit and the stakeholders to interview. Ideally, the agenda should be prepared and shared with national partners one month before the mission.

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

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

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

#	Country	MONTHS	Mar-19				Apr-19				May-19				Jun-19				Who
		WEEKS	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	
1	Guinea			X	X														Carlo, national consultant
2	Mauritania						X	X											Sara, national consultant
3.i	Mali			X	X														Senior consultant
3.ii	Nigeria					X	X												
4	Uganda									X	X								Carlo, national consultant
5	Guinea Bissau									X	X								Senior consultant (SIDS SCCE)

#### LEGEND

- Public holidays respected in the countries (Ramadan, Easter)
- Planned Office travel, not related to the SCCE

<sup>3</sup> A complete stakeholder list is being put together, with information gathered from the GEF Agencies.

## Annex 1 – Interview Guidelines

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

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

**KQ1: What are the key factors influencing sustainability of outcomes in ..... (project site/country)?**

Look for evidence and examples of positive, negative and absent change in terms of longer term sustainability of outcomes and broader adoption<sup>4</sup> in place. Identify the main underlying factors in each example. Provide detailed explanation for each factor/mechanism that either positively influenced/supported or hampered sustainability. Factors may include, but are not limited to:

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

Questioning may include the following:

- *When and why did broader adoption take place, during or after the project's implementation?*

---

<sup>4</sup> **Broader adoption** is said to have taken place when governments and other stakeholders adopt, expand, and build on the initiatives that the GEF funds, during program/project implementation or afterwards, as a result of initial successes. Broader adoption occurs through five mechanisms: sustaining, mainstreaming, replication, scaling-up, and market change, defined as:  
**Sustaining:** A GEF-supported intervention or outcome is continued to be implemented by the original beneficiaries without GEF support through clear budget allocations, implementing structures, and institutional frameworks so they can keep reaping the benefits and provide incentives for adoption by other stakeholders.

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

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

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

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

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

**KQ2:** In what way, if any, does the environment and socio-economic development/livelihoods nexus (or lack thereof) help explain the sustainability of outcomes in ..... (project site/country)?

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

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

Questioning may include the following:

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

**KQ3:** To what extent has GEF support been relevant to the main environmental challenges the countries face in ..... (project site/country), and are there any gaps?

- Existence of national operational strategies related to GEF focal areas, and alignment of GEF

support with national environmental priorities and budgets, and with other donors' support to the environmental sector in the countries

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

Questioning may include the following:

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

**KQ4:** To what extent have gender and resilience been taken into consideration in GEF programming in .....

#### KQ4.1: Gender

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

#### KQ4.2: Resilience

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

**KQ5:** To what extent has GEF support performed in the 13 fragile countries in the two biomes, and how have the results obtained from completed GEF projects and programs been affected in those situations that have become fragile?

This question applies only to Mali and Guinea Bissau.

- Main features and dynamics on environmental change caused by fragility
- Perceptions on the most important factors having influenced the variations in those fragile countries having shown the largest change in performance
- Other ..... (specify)



**Annex 3 – National completed projects included in the relevance cohort**

**(GEF 4 - GEF 6 projects that have been completed after 2014)**

GEF ID	Agency	Country	Focal Area	Title	GEF phase	Type	Trust Fund	GEF Grant (incl. PPG) (\$US million)	Co-Finance (\$US million)	Date of project start	Date of project completion
3703	UNDP	Guinea	CC	Increased Resilience and Adaptation to Adverse Impacts of Climate Change in Guinea's Vulnerable Coastal Zones	GEF - 4	FSP	LDCF	3.07	162.89	11/8/2010	
3776	UNDP	Mali	CC	Enhancing Adaptive Capacity and Resilience to Climate Change in the Agriculture Sector in Mali	GEF - 4	FSP	LDCF	2.44	8.48	6/9/2010	
3979	FAO	Mali	CC	Integrating Climate Resilience into Agricultural Production for Food Security in Rural Areas	GEF - 4	FSP	LDCF	2.18	4.50	5/31/2011	
3699	UNDP	Mali	CC	SPWA-CC: Promotion of the Use of Agrofuels from the Production and Use of Jatropha Oil in Mali	GEF - 4	MSP	GET	1.00	5.76	2/23/2012	10/30/2017
3576	UNDP	Mauritania	BD	Partnership to Mainstream Marine and Coastal Biodiversity into Oil and Gas Sector Development in Mauritania	GEF - 4	MSP	GET	1.00	4.51	12/16/2010	6/15/2016
3794	UNDP	Nigeria	CC	SPWA-CC: Promoting Energy Efficiency in Residential and Public Sector in Nigeria	GEF - 4	FSP	GET	2.73	7.10	4/11/2011	
3804	UNDP	Nigeria	CW	Less Burnt for a Clean Earth: Minimization of Dioxin Emission from Open Burning Sources	GEF - 4	FSP	GET	4.28	19.68	7/30/2010	
3827	WB	Nigeria	CC	SPWA-CC: Nigeria Urban Transport	GEF - 4	FSP	GET	4.50	325.00	5/16/2011	5/31/2017
4100	WB	Nigeria	CW	PCB Management and Disposal Project	GEF - 4	FSP	GET	6.30	12.20	2/2/2012	6/15/2016
3393	UNDP	Uganda	LD	SIP: Enabling Environment for SLM to overcome land degradation in the cattle corridor of Uganda.	GEF - 4	FSP	GET	1.88	2.60	8/12/2010	12/31/2015

**Annex 4 – National projects under implementation included in the relevance cohort**

**(GEF 4 - GEF 6 projects that have been under implementation for at least 2 years)**

GEF ID	Agency	Country	Focal Area	Title	GEF phase	Type	Trust Fund	GEF Grant (incl. PPG) (\$US million)	Co-Finance (\$US million)	Date of project start
3958	UNIDO	Guinea	CC	SPWA-CC: Promoting Development of Multi-purpose Mini-hydro Power Systems	GEF - 4	MSP	GET	0.91	0.88	5/31/2012
4692	UNDP	Guinea	CC	Strengthening Resilience of Farming Communities' Livelihoods against Climate Changes in the Guinean Prefectures of Gaoual, Koundara and Mali	GEF - 5	FSP	LDCF	3.82	29.34	11/20/2013
5041	UNDP	Guinea	MFA	Strengthening Decentralized Management of the Environment to Meet Rio Convention Objectives	GEF - 5	MSP	GET	0.55	0.63	4/29/2015
5289	UNDP	Guinea	CC	Developing a Market for Biogas Resource Development and Utilization in Guinea	GEF - 5	FSP	GET	2.71	11.00	8/25/2015
3575	UNDP	Guinea-Bissau	BD	SPWA-BD: Support for the Consolidation of a Protected Area System in Guinea-Bissau's Forest Belt	GEF - 4	MSP	GET	1.00	3.92	7/8/2010
4019	UNDP	Guinea-Bissau	CC	Strengthening Resilience and Adaptive Capacity to Climate Change in Guinea-Bissau's Agrarian and Water Sectors	GEF - 4	FSP	LDCF	4.13	19.95	4/12/2011
5331	UNIDO	Guinea-Bissau	CC	Promoting Investments in Small to Medium Scale Renewable Energy Technologies in the Electricity Sector	GEF - 5	MSP	GET	1.83	10.26	10/23/2014
3377	WB/ UNDP	Mali	LD	SIP: Fostering Agricultural Productivity in Mali	GEF - 4	FSP	GET	8.55	145.20	12/17/2010
3763	UNDP	Mali	BD	SPWA-BD: Expansion and Strengthening of Mali's PA System	GEF - 4	FSP	GET	1.83	9.25	12/23/2010
4822	FAO	Mali	CC	Strengthening Resilience to Climate Change through Integrated Agricultural and Pastoral Management in the Sahelian zone in the Framework of the Sustainable Land Management Approach	GEF - 5	FSP	LDCF	2.27	14.25	1/2/2015
5192	UNDP	Mali	CC	Strengthening the Resilience of Women Producer Group's and Vulnerable Communities in Mali	GEF - 5	FSP	LDCF	5.56	16.50	5/12/2015
5270	WB	Mali	MFA	GGW Natural Resources Management in a Changing Climate in Mali	GEF - 5	FSP	MTF	8.43	13.00	12/6/2013
3893	IFAD	Mauritania	CC	Support to the Adaptation of Vulnerable Agricultural Production Systems	GEF - 4	FSP	LDCF	3.60	10.47	4/15/2013
5190	AfDB	Mauritania	CC	Improving Climate Resilience of Water Sector Investments with Appropriate Climate Adaptive Activities for Pastoral and Forestry Resources in Southern Mauritania	GEF - 5	FSP	LDCF	6.60	14.58	
5792	WB	Mauritania	MFA	PSG-Sustainable Landscape Management Project under SAWAP	GEF - 5	FSP	GET	4.81	19.20	12/17/2015
8029	WB	Mauritania	IW	West Africa Regional Fisheries Program SOP C1	GEF - 5	FSP	GET	7.00	23.05	6/24/2015
3943	UNIDO	Nigeria	CC	SPWA-CC: Mini-grids based on Renewable Energy (small-hydro and biomass) Sources to Augment Rural Electrification	GEF - 4	FSP	GET	2.68	11.94	8/7/2012

GEF ID	Agency	Country	Focal Area	Title	GEF phase	Type	Trust Fund	GEF Grant (incl. PPG) (\$US million)	Co-Finance (\$US million)	Date of project start
4090	UNDP	Nigeria	BD	SPWA-BD: Niger Delta Biodiversity Project	GEF - 4	FSP	GET	3.76	10.65	9/26/2012
4907	WB	Nigeria	MFA	GGW: Nigeria Erosion and Watershed Management Project (NEWMAP)	GEF - 5	FSP	MTF	8.59	500.00	9/16/2013
5375	UNIDO	Nigeria	CC	Scaling up Small Hydro Power (SHP) in Nigeria	GEF - 5	FSP	GET	2.74	17.20	3/24/2015
3392	WB	Uganda	LD	SIP: Sustainable Land Management Country Program	GEF - 4	FSP	GET	7.20	117.90	12/20/2011
4456	UNDP	Uganda	BD	Conservation and Sustainable Use of the Threatened Savanna Woodland in the Kidepo Critical Landscape in North Eastern Uganda	GEF - 5	FSP	GET	3.18	10.68	7/24/2013
4644	UNDP	Uganda	MFA	Addressing Barriers to the Adoption of Improved Charcoal Production Technologies and Sustainable Land Management Practices through an Integrated Approach	GEF - 5	FSP	GET	3.58	14.66	5/20/2014
4993	UNDP	Uganda	CC	Strengthening Climate Information and Early Warning Systems in Africa to Support Climate Resilient Development and Adaptation to Climate Change	GEF - 5	FSP	LDCF	4.10	26.27	1/23/2014
5204	AfDB	Uganda	CC	Building Resilience to Climate Change in the Water and Sanitation Sector	GEF - 5	FSP	LDCF	8.62	38.00	4/30/2015
5603	UNIDO	Uganda	CC	Reducing Vulnerability of Banana Producing Communities to Climate Change Through Banana Value Added Activities - Enhancing Food Security and Employment Generation	GEF - 5	FSP	LDCF	2.92	7.07	12/4/2015

## **Annex 5 – Case study reporting**

The reporting should be done for each country separately and should not take more than 15 pages main report, and follow the indicative outline below:

### Report Outline

1. Introduction, Context and Methodology (2 pages)
2. Findings (10 pages)
  - 2.1 KQ1: Key factors driving the observed sustainability of outcomes
  - 2.2 KQ2: Observed sustainability and the environmental / socio-economic nexus
  - 2.3 KQ3: Relevance of GEF support to the environmental challenges faced by the country
  - 2.4 KQ4.1: Gender
  - 2.5 KQ4.2: Resilience
  - 2.6 KQ5: Fragility (if applicable)
3. Summary of emerging findings and preliminary conclusions (3 pages)

The main report should be complemented by the following two annexes:

Annex 1: List of interviewees

Annex 2: List of sites visited (with maps if available)

Additional technical annexes for presenting the data collected and related analyses should be added as needed, in support to the main findings presented in the report.