Adaptation in Practice: Evaluating Innovative Approaches under the LDCF, SCCF, and SPA

Unanswered Question from the Webinar Q&A Session

February 6th, 8:30 am Washington DC

1. Julia Olivier: Hi Annie, Do you have some more interesting examples of the private sector being involved in cofinancing?

2. Ines del Real: A question: Were the projects you reviewed designed in such a way as to allow public-private partnerships...beside the Jordan example, any other remarkable private intervention? obstacles for doing so?

In addition to the Jordan project (ID 4036), Irrigation Technology Pilot project to face climate change impacts in Jordan, $1,416,000 in private sector co-financing, 4 other projects are indicating a contribution from the private sector. The first one is a global research/analysis with no on-the-ground adaptation activities:

- ID 3679 (Global), Economic Analysis of Adaptation Options in support of decision making, $3,500,000 in private sector co-financing.

Two SCCF technology transfer projects are directly involving industrial sectors with both GHG mitigation and adaptation results:

- ID 4060 (Jamaica), TT-Pilot (GEF-4): Introduction of Renewable Wave Energy Technologies for the Generation of Electric Power in Small Coastal Communities in Jamaica, $500,000 in private sector co-financing
- ID 4040 (Brazil), TT-Pilot (GEF-4): Renewable CO₂ Capture and Storage from Sugar Fermentation Industry in Sao Paulo State, $3,500,000 in private sector co-financing

And there is one SCCF Disaster Risk Reduction project in South Africa where a national supplier of integrated fire management services, the FFA Group, is involved:

- ID 3934 (South Africa), Reducing Disaster Risks from Wildfire Hazards Associated with Climate Change, $200,000 in private sector co-financing

3. Araceli: Questions to Annie: At the time is there any project pre-selection process proposal to be reviewed and who will be responsible to do this review? Does the future project pre-selection process would apply equally to each access fund modalities?

The evaluation team found that the SCCF project cycle includes an additional pre-selection step to the project cycle (based on a few lines describing the project concept) for the purpose of narrowing down the project list due to the small amount of available funding (cf Evaluation report section 6.2 Concern with
SCCF project selection). This short note is reviewed by the CEO for decision on inclusion in the portfolio. According to World Bank rules (which ultimately has the fiduciary responsibility of GEF monies) transparency is a must and selection criteria applied should be made available. This current pre-selection step is only applied to the SCCF therefore this issue is not relevant for LDCF project cycle (and SPA is closed).

4. **Rocio Diaz**: Could Annie please clarify if the good practice examples are published or is a future activity to disseminate them? And if there is a guideline to decide on good practice?

As said during the webinar, only 2 SCCF projects are completed (see SCCF Evaluation Report section 2.3 Limitations). The implementation on the ground of most other projects is currently under way, therefore almost no good practice examples are published yet. One example is the IFC SmartLessons factsheet (Jan 2012) entitled *Building a line of Defense against climate change: from reactive coping strategy to adaptive capacity in China’s irrigated agricultural development* on a project which is co-funded by SCCF (ID 3265): [http://smartlessons.ifc.org/smartlessons/lesson.html?id=1528](http://smartlessons.ifc.org/smartlessons/lesson.html?id=1528). There are no officially binding guidelines to be applied. UNFCCC Decisions translated into GEF/SCCF-LDCF Council Decisions are the guidance shaping SCCF projects.

5. **Adrian Fenton**: Open question: What efforts if any has the SCCF, LDCF, SPA (and GEF in general) made to fund autonomous adaptation, i.e adaptation by individuals and communities, as opposed to planned adaptation i.e. processes and projects by recipient governments?

In many instances the projects financed by SCCF, LDCF, and SPA are in fact geared towards autonomous adaptation, for example, in Moldova (SCCF) and Ethiopia (LDCF), training and technology is provided to individual farmers and communities, and weather risk insurance is expected to become available to individuals as a result of a regional project in South Eastern Europe. In many cases, projects are a mix of autonomous adaptation as well as non-autonomous adaptation interventions.

6. **dsalmon**: As a question to the facilitators, were all the projects reviewed carried out only by the GEF appointed implementing and/or executive agencies?

Different components of the projects reviewed are carried out by a variety of stakeholders involved with project implementation: these ranges from national, regional, and local governments and the GEF Agency to NGOs and Local communities. The GEF Implementing Agency in some cases keeps an oversight role more than carrying out the actual project components. One of the key SCCF principles is country ownership. Our evaluation found that generally, country ownership in projects is high.

- **ID2832: Mainstreaming Climate Change in Integrated Water resources Management in Pangani River Basin.** The UNDP was the implementing agency, but kept an oversight role. The executing partners were the local Pangani River Water Management Office and the IUCN. The water ministry played a small role in the early stages of the project, and the University of Dar es Salam assisted with the generation of waterflow models. Smaller local NGOs assisted with capacity development and communication with local communities. Local communities took part in project implementation through the creation of Water User Associations (WUAs) and village councils established to focus on the implementation of project components.
7. Naima: I am wondering whether you can cite some guidance on some success stories that consolidate the adaptation/field work between governments and communities?

As mentioned, during the time of the evaluation many projects were still not under implementation, and several were still in the early stages of implementation. Only two projects had been closed. As a result actual impacts and success stories were difficult to gauge. We recommend that you look at sites such as the Adaptation Learning Mechanism (ALM) - [http://www.adaptationlearning.net/](http://www.adaptationlearning.net/) - where you may be able to find some examples, or look at some of the project highlights on the SCCF website: [http://www.thegef.org/gef/project_highlights/SCCF](http://www.thegef.org/gef/project_highlights/SCCF)

8. dsalmon: Are there any plans in the future to broaden the accredited implementing agencies?

The GEF is currently in the process of expanding its partnership with agencies that can meet the necessary conditions, and has in fact received applications from a number of interested agencies from around the world, which the GEF is at the moment reviewing in a 3-Stage process.

The results of the reviews of the first set of applicants are expected to be presented to the next GEF Council, i.e. in June 2012. As GEF rules and procedures apply to LDCF and SCCF, with minor exceptions, the broadened GEF partnership would apply to these funds as well.

9. Sarah Standley: How do recipients report on how they are allocating adaptation finance at country level. What makes funding effective at country level

Monitoring of the use of funds for SCCF project activities (as for LDCF or GEF Trust Fund projects) is primarily the responsibility of the GEF Agency implementing the respective project. The GEF Agencies follow the monitoring and evaluation requirements as laid out in the SCCF/LDCF M&E policy, including regular reporting to the GEF Secretariat, use of tracking tools, Mid-term Evaluations and Terminal Evaluations. Terminal Evaluations are reviewed by the GEF Evaluation Office. To monitor effectiveness at the project level, the LDCF/SCCF Results Based Management framework provides the objectives, expected outcomes and outputs as well as targets to be achieved. The LDCF/SCCF tracking tool that is currently being piloted measures progress towards these targets ([http://www.thegef.org/gef/tracking_tool_LDCF_SCCF](http://www.thegef.org/gef/tracking_tool_LDCF_SCCF)).

10. Konny Rassmann: A question to evaluators: did you consider monitoring / evaluation methods that focus on behavioural change (e.g. Outcome Mapping)?

The early stage of most SCCF projects, with only few projects under implementation for a significant period of time, prevents a systematic evaluation of behavioral change at this point. The projects at a more advanced stage of implementation, especially the four projects subject to evaluation field visits, were evaluated in terms of behavioral change and the evidence is presented in the SCCF evaluation report. In terms of monitoring, the mentioned LDCF/SCCF tracking tool includes indicators suitable for measuring behavioral change ([http://www.thegef.org/gef/tracking_tool_LDCF_SCCF](http://www.thegef.org/gef/tracking_tool_LDCF_SCCF)).