

Achieving enduring outcomes from GEF investment: a short literature review

Appendix

November 2019

Appendix to STAP's paper, "Achieving enduring outcomes from GEF investment": a short literature review

We sought literature on sustainability and durability in project outcomes, coupled with scaling of impact and sustainability of projects in the face of future change. About 100 sources were reviewed, including mostly peer-reviewed literature but also assessments of project portfolios by a range of development funders and foundations. This appendix summarises key findings from this literature outside the GEF family of reports from STAP and IEO. The main text draws selectively on this appendix and also links it to findings framed by the GEF publications. (The full 100+ sources are available on request if needed – not all are cited here, where they were duplicative or of more marginal relevance.)

Sustainability and durability

The longest literature on enduring project outcomes is in the health sector, where the term sustainability has been consistently used to mean what Moore et al. (2017) systematised as "(1) after a defined period of time, (2) a program, clinical intervention, and/or implementation strategies continue to be delivered and/or (3) individual behaviour change (i.e., clinician, patient) is maintained, (4) the program and individual behaviour change may evolve or adapt while (5) continuing to produce benefits for individuals/systems". The health literature also uses terms such as "benefit sustainability" or "sustained benefits" or "sustainable benefits" (Dumrak et al., 2017).

The growing use of the term in the development literature was spurred by the OECD's "DAC Principles for Evaluation of Development Assistance" (the 5 main criteria are: Relevance, Effectiveness, Efficiency, Impact, Sustainability), which have been widely adopted by development agencies, where the sustainability criterion was seen as being concerned with "measuring whether the benefits of an activity are likely to continue after donor funding has been withdrawn" (OECD, 2002; OECD DAC, 1991). However, the same definition noted that "Projects need to be environmentally as well as financially sustainable", broadening the scope to other generally-accepted meanings of 'sustainability'. These influential criteria are currently under review (see <https://dacevaluationcriteria.org/>).

These different meanings of 'sustainability' were systematised quite early by TANGO International (2009), which identified 4 aspects to consider:

- sustainability of outcomes, i.e. whether the improvements in quality of life or standard of living of project beneficiaries will endure beyond the project completion;
- sustainability of process, i.e. individuals and institutions continue providing appropriate services after the assistance and subsidies of a project end;
- sustainability of resources, i.e. activities promoted or introduced by the project will preserve/deplete the natural resource base; and
- sustainability of livelihoods, to be analysed from a perspective of (longer-term) risk management and resilience.

Most projects in the literatures mentioned so far were concerned with social outcomes, whether health or other social enterprises. As this thinking has extended in to the management of natural resources as a source of livelihoods or environmental benefits, the use of the term sustainability has become quite confused; for example, the 'sustainability' criterion of the OECD DAC has been

elaborated in their excellent approach to Sustainability Impact Analysis (OECD, 2010), but this is more concerned with triple bottom line sustainability than durability of project outcomes (Wuelser (2014) is another good source for this). Some sources fail to explain whether their primary concern was with the impacts of projects on ‘sustainability of resources’ or enduring outcomes of projects, and it can take some pages of reading before the use of the term becomes clear (e.g. Gibson, 2006).

Of course these aspects of sustainability may interact, but the use of the terms ‘durable’ and ‘enduring’ has become more common when talking primarily of project outcomes, even when not associated with environmental projects (e.g. European Court of Auditors, 2018; Hovland Consulting LLC, 2018; Lauermaun, 2016; Leviten-Reid, 2009; Maccio and Cristofoli, 2017), not least to enable the discussion of the durability of interventions to ensure sustainable practices (e.g. Sekerka and Stimel, 2011)! There is therefore a strong case to reduce confusion by applying ‘enduring’ to the long-term maintenance of *project outcomes and processes*, and restricting ‘sustainability’ to the *project’s impacts on natural resources* (including in the long-term, beyond the project lifetime, noting that these do interact at times therefore); we will adopt this usage consistently hereafter.

Whether outcomes and processes endure in the face of longer-term external changes – TANGO International (2009)’s fourth aspect of risk management and resilience above – is an issue related directly to the GEF’s concerns to allow for future impacts of climate change; this is poorly represented in the project management literature to date (though see OECD, 2010 on ‘sustainability impact assesment’), but is widely considered in the climate adaptation literature under the term ‘maladaptation’ (e.g. Gibbs, 2013; Magnan et al., 2016; Maru et al., 2014). However, there are other sources of maladaptive outcomes, explored in a new literature on unintended consequences, which would encourage a wider interpretation of maladaptation (see special issue introduced by Koch and Schulpen (2018); also Swidler and Watkins (2009); Galvin et al. (2018)). Some of these aspects are summarised in Box A in the main text.

Durability and scaling

Whatever the term used, the way in which durability is considered has also matured over the past decade, from a focus primarily on whether a project achieves its goals, to whether these are achieved durably at the level of the project itself, to whether these are scaled beyond the project level, with the latter increasingly considered at a portfolio or program level (e.g. Independent Commission for Aid Impact, 2015). This parallels the evolving priorities of GEF also, described as its intent to “contribute to system change” in the programming architecture of the 7th Replenishment, GEF-7, and its growing focus on Impact Programs. In the literature, this evolution can be seen in a shifting focus from testing hypotheses that showed that project managers should “strengthen project design and monitoring and thus improve project implementation as well as the chances for project success” (Ika et al., 2012), i.e. a focus on project *processes*, to be more concerned about project content, for example “high levels of multi-stakeholder commitment, collaboration, alignment, and adaptation are necessary for projects to succeed” (Ika and Donnelly, 2017).

As the literature moves towards scaling, there is a strong implicit assumption that scaled outcomes implies greater durability. Whilst this may often be the case, it is unlikely that there is a strict causal relationship here – it is easy to imagine cases where local benefits are very enduring without scaling, and where scaled benefits are scaled successfully but turn out not to be enduring, for example where a change in policy or technology undermines the success. It is therefore important to

consider both scaling (for *more* impact) and durability (for that impact to be *long-term*) in projects and programs.

Tengberg and Valencia (2017) review literature related to transitions in their analysis of integrated approaches to natural resources management for GEF. There is a substantial literature now, both describing societal transitions from a broad multi-level perspective (e.g. Geels, 2011) and surveying the scaling of bottom-up initiatives (e.g. Moore et al., 2015; Riddell and Moore, 2015), which is converging on key aspects of scaling innovations towards transformation. STAP's paper on *Innovation and the GEF* (Toth, 2018) identified 5 forms of innovation which in principle can apply at any scale from local activities to national and even global implementation. These are: technological, financial, business model, policy, and institutional innovation (the last of which was read to encompass changes also in cultural norms). Most transformational change involves more than one of these elements of innovation.

The consistent lesson from the transitions and scaling literatures (as above) is that transformation at scale requires consideration (and alignment) of at least the following three elements:

1. There must be practical examples of success in the relevant innovation area (i.e. providing knowledge and experience that works)
2. Institutional and governance arrangements may need changing to facilitate scaling (i.e. getting the rules and institutions right)
3. Wider cultural norms and values must be aligned to enable scaling up (i.e. working to change culture and values if necessary).

It is important to analyse the possible barriers to scaling which could result from each of these elements, and which may themselves require institutional, cultural or policy innovation to overcome. There are a number of different strategies for scaling with different pathways towards transformation that correspond to which of these barriers is paramount. These are not mutually exclusive, and may often need to work in tandem (Riddell and Moore, 2015):

1. 'Scaling out' – to impact greater numbers
 - a. Deliberate replication: Replicating or spreading innovative solutions geographically and to greater numbers.
 - b. Spreading principles: Disseminate principles, with adaptation to new contexts via cogeneration of knowledge.
2. 'Scaling up' – to affect law, regulation or policy to remove barriers to adoption
 - a. Policy or legal change efforts: New policy development, partnering, advocacy to advance legal change and redirect institutional resources (including access to new forms of investment or finance).
3. 'Scaling deep' – to impact cultural roots
 - a. Changing culture: Using science-based narratives to shift norms and beliefs in support of positive innovations.
 - b. Supporting capacity: Investing in transformative learning and communities of practice.

These strategies provide further resolution to the transformational mechanisms that GEF IEO (2018a) noted in the GEF projects they reviewed – specifically, what they termed *mainstreaming*, *demonstration*, *replication* and *catalytic effects*. The lessons that GEF IEO (2018a) drew from their ex post review were the needs for (i) clear ambition in design, (ii) addressing market and system

reforms through policies, (iii) mechanisms for financial sustainability, and (iv) quality of implementation and execution. (i) and (iv) relate to processes, while (ii) and (iii) are some key parts of the scaling strategies above. GEF IEO (2018a) also note that transformations can result from projects and programs of any size.

Usefully, Lennox et al. (2018) distinguish between *retrospective* analyses of durability (which tend to focus on delivery and evidence for continuation of initiatives) compared to *prospective* approaches (that focus on setting up the intervention to achieve durability, for example, “building an initiative into an organisation, getting people on board or garnering networks that may help along the way”). Both forms of study are important and related but clearly the former is aimed at portfolio or program level learning in order to do better in the future, whereas the latter focuses on the elements needed in project and program design; the distinction is comparable to the needs of the GEF IEO for *post hoc* learning as opposed to the GEF *a priori* program development process, and prioritise different indicators, though GEF IEO (2018a) shows how the former can shed light on the latter.

Success factors

The literature mentioned above has explored success factors for achieving good and potentially enduring project outcomes in many ways, dominated by the health literature initially, but spread widely in the development and other literatures today. Here we briefly summarise some of the success factors identified in formal reviews and analyses at project, scaled project and program levels. Many of these affirm practices already adopted by the GEF or recommended more recently by STAP and the IEO. The main text emphasises those where recognition is newly emerging or which are specifically critical for the issue of durability.

Project level success – well canvassed

Bayiley and Teklu (2016) identify four quantitative critical success factors (CSFs) for projects funded by EU: intellectual capital, sound project case, key manpower competency and effective stakeholder engagement. They also note five descriptive critical success variables: clear policy of donors and recipient government, strong local ownership of project, effective consultation during planning, high motivation and interest, and compatible rules and procedures. The study underscored the importance of securing continuous support from all stakeholders and holding effective consultations of stakeholders during planning, implementation and closing phases of EU funded projects. Their analysis included ‘sustainability’.

Buntaine and Parks (2013) found that strong public sector institutions in the recipient country and proactive staff supervision foster World Bank project success. They also found that World Bank projects seeking to achieve global environmental objectives are less likely to succeed.

Martinez-Bautista et al. (2015) analysed social forestry projects in Mexico, finding that a high social capital level explained more than 43% of success probability, while low and medium social capital levels explained almost 55% of failure probability. Furthermore, they found that the type of project was a strong determinant of success or failure; continuation of a project was not necessarily related to probability of success; and the property tenure type did not determine the project success or failure.

Ika et al. (2012) assesses five CSFs: monitoring, coordination, design, training, and institutional environment. They found a statistically significant and positive relationship between each of the five CSFs and project success. Consistent with theory and practice, at that time they highlighted the most prominent CSFs for project supervisors are design and monitoring, and recommended that World Bank project supervisors and managers should strengthen project design and monitoring and thus improve project implementation as well as the chances for project success. Five years later, Ika and Donnelly (2017) reviewed four capacity building projects in Ghana, Indonesia, Sri Lanka and Vietnam, where they now drew out structural, institutional, and managerial success conditions, whether these are initial or emergent. They propose that high levels of multi-stakeholder commitment, collaboration, alignment, and adaptation are necessary for projects to succeed. That is, there has been some movement from factors around the management of projects to their content.

Brooks (2017) used a comparative database of 136 community-based conservation (CBC) to explore joint success across ecological, economic, and social goals, finding that capacity building, local participation, environmental education, and project age contribute to win-win outcomes. These results hold across various national and local contexts and resource domains, suggesting that general project design features can contribute to joint success in CBC projects.

de Vente et al. (2016) reviewed participatory processes in projects to distinguish effects of local context from generalizable factors associated with process design. The latter were generally more important and included: the legitimate representation of stakeholders; professional facilitation including structured methods for aggregating information and balancing power dynamics among participants; and provision of information and decision-making power to all participants. They found that, although processes initiated or facilitated by government bodies led to significantly less trust, information gain and learning, decisions in these processes were more likely to be accepted and implemented.

Enduring project success i.e. beyond 2-5 years:

In a fairly early analysis of factors encouraging durable development in a major IFAD project in India, TANGO International (2009) found that their most significant strategies for achieving durability were (paraphrased):

- slow, patient group formation and sensitization to gain trust and community participation
- emphasis on community priorities and significant local contributions of labour, materials, and sometimes cash
- incremental increase in loan amounts to community-based organisations to build self-confidence and viability
- diversifying income sources and building human and social capital to increase the resilience of poor households and their livelihoods in hard times
- attitudinal and behavioural change towards protecting the environment was enabled by linking with cultural traditions and by ensuring tangible benefits (e.g. protecting sources of potable water)
- local ownership and government awareness were established by integrating government stakeholders into the District Societies (essentially project field offices)
- project managers and IFAD supervisors were flexible in their approach, allowing design modifications and an extension period to help assure durability.

Sastre-Merino et al. (2013) describe the 'Working with People' model for encouraging durable rural development projects in Peru, exploring its holistic approach through three lenses – ethical-social, technical-entrepreneurial and political-contextual. The projects emphasize "promoting leadership and capacity building in technical, behavioural and contextual project management skills".

Mahonge (2013) looked at the durability of various environmental projects in Tanzania, up to a decade after project completion. They distinguished beneficiary-based and project-based factors, and highlighted the importance of various factors in enhancing ownership above all else. These included spending time in the field with the beneficiaries as the matter of principle, active participation from the outset, valuing local knowledge in local development, early identification and use of the local unique or 'focal' features as the framework for converging societal and community interests, and an emphasis on learning (especially through doing) processes, and on process monitoring and evaluation. Other factors included self-inspiration, capacity building, willingness to change, social cohesiveness, and a well-structured institutional framework. Self-initiated livelihood diversification in response to conservation of some previously-exploited resources is also apparent in the description.

Oldewage-Theron et al. (2018) tested the US OAH (Office of Organizational Health) criteria for 'sustainability': creating an action strategy, assessing the environment, being adaptable, securing community support, integrating programme services into community infrastructures, building leadership team in the community, creating strategic partnerships and securing diverse financial opportunities. Their findings suggested all 8 criteria were needed for project sustainability.

Moore and Boldero (2017) discuss durability under the term 'maintenance' of adopted environmental behaviours, noting that such behaviours may be *one off*, such as buying more energy efficient appliances or bus fleets, in which case this may be achieved within a project's lifetime; *continuous*, where an activity such as recycling must be maintained over time, so the processes to ensure this need to be put in place as part of a project's outcomes; or *dynamic*, such as revegetation, where different behaviours are needed over time. Recognising these different forms of behaviour can help ensure durability. They also mention 'moral norms' as an element guiding the durability of these behaviours.

Looking at renewable energy projects, Terrapon-Pfaff et al. (2014) find consistent success factors across contexts – leaving aside technical aspects, these are trust and reliability, sense of ownership among beneficiaries, external influences, and low motivation or capacity of potential users/producers. These also point to barriers to success. In further work on energy provision projects, Terrapon-Pfaff et al. (2018) note that an assumed positive outcome is the productive use of energy, which is expected to create value - for example in the form of increased local availability of goods or higher incomes - thereby having a positive impact on local livelihoods. However, their results show that access to sustainable energy does not automatically result in productive activities and that energy is only one of the input factors required to foster socio-economic development. Furthermore, the results demonstrate that activities, materials and information to support the productive use of energy - such as training, equipment or market research - need to be an integrated part of the energy project itself to allow for productive activities to develop on a wider scale.

Ceptureanu et al. (2018) reviewed an extensive literature and carried out 188 interviews to identify a list of the durability factors for (mostly health-related) community-based programs. The significant

factors were ranked as follows: Program champions, Community participation, Staff involvement and integration, Program funding, Program effectiveness, Coordinator competence, Responsivity, Community capacity, Organizational stability, Understanding the community, Program integration with the host organization, Program flexibility, Specific sustainability actions and processes, Community support, Organizational system, Program theory, Leadership, Political legitimation, Partnering, Transparency, Community context and Program evaluation, in this order. They note these fall in 3 categories: related to program itself, related to host (implementing) organisation and related to the community where the program is operationalized. One finding (p.9) is that sustainability of a community-based program relies more on the quality of the program and less on the quality of the host organization or the community, with 9 out of 12 factors related to the program, 2 to community and 1 to the host organization. This provides great opportunities for good program design to influence outcomes.

The current review of the OECD's 'DAC' principles (see https://ieg.worldbankgroup.org/sites/default/files/Data/DAC-Criteria/ConsultationReport_EvaluationCriteria.pdf) includes commentary on durability, noting (p.6) weaknesses in the existing criteria. These weaknesses include a limited emphasis on systems thinking or SDG links, inadequate recognition of on-going change, and that they do not emphasise transformative change or on-going learning. Durability (called 'sustainability') and impact were the criteria that had poorest implementation scores, with 'sustainability' still tending to be narrowly seen as 'funding continuity'. Recommendations for changes to the criteria (p.11) include being explicit about whether a project intends to be transformative, and consideration of scaling and replicability, as well as (p.17) more recognition of complexity and systems thinking, all echoing trends in GEF.

Within GEF, Zazueta (2017) identified 7 principles for successful integrated transformation from a review of GEF climate change and chemicals projects, showing that projects embodying more of these principles performed better and achieved wider adoption (see p.22-26, *ibid.*). The principles (precis'd), many of which overlapped with the findings of Tengberg and Valencia (2017), were:

1. Identify the root causes of the problem
2. Design projects to foster the desired behavioural change
3. Demonstrate the comparative advantage of the project's innovation to target adopters
4. Ensure the buy-in of stakeholders
5. Ensure durability by building on-going processes, capacities and benefits
6. Plan for first adoption after project closure
7. Enable learning and adaptive management during implementation

Scaled outcomes seeking wider system transformation: Project level...

Boshoven et al. (2018) applies a consistent (if somewhat simplistic) theory of change across various conservation enterprise projects to help to identify consistent outcomes. Findings from applying this theory of change (ToC) include: (a) the role of implementing partners evolved and expanded over time, from helping to establish individual enterprises to building alliances and business partnerships between communities and the private sector; (b) it takes longer than the typical three- to five-year donor funding cycle to put in place the multiple enabling conditions that are needed for the sustainability of enterprises and conservation outcomes; (c) typically only a small percentage of community members receive direct cash benefits, however community organizations can distribute

enterprise benefits in the form of community services; (d) different stakeholders are motivated by different benefits, and, therefore, incentivizing changes in attitudes and behaviour towards conservation is not straightforward; and (e) in multiple sites, partners had verified improved biodiversity conservation results in part due to their conservation enterprises.

Bao et al. (2015) review an extensive literature in health on transitions to local enduring financing. Their conceptual framework models transition as a process spanning pre-transition and transition itself and extending into sustained services and outcomes. They identify key transition domains, including leadership, financing, programming, and service delivery, and identify relevant activities that drive the transition in these domains forward to include: sustaining a supportive policy environment; creating financial sustainability; developing local stakeholder capacity; communicating to all stakeholders; and aligning programs. They discuss the transition (scaling?) process, saying “Ideally transition monitoring would begin prior to transition processes being implemented and continue for some time after transition has been completed.” They note that the monitoring and evaluation of transition faces new and unique challenges, requiring the measurement of constructs to which evaluators may not be accustomed – many domains hinge on measuring “intangibles” such as the management of relationships, and monitoring these constructs may require a compromise between rigorous data collection and the involvement of key stakeholders. As no set of indicators will be applicable across all types of health program transitions, they instead propose guiding questions and illustrative quantitative and qualitative indicators to be considered and adapted according to the priority transition domains in the particular health program. Bennett et al. (2015) and Ozawa et al. (2016) provide related examples.

Barnes and van Laerhoven (2015) examine how non-government organisation partners vary between viewing institutional change as largely determined by structure or agency, as well as whether they see themselves or the institution as being the agent of change. This highlights the importance of understanding the perspective of partner institutions, and ensuring that adaptive processes are built into the local structures so that they can adjust their perspective as needed after the project intervention is complete, especially if those processes are intended to scale.

Reviewing UK social projects, Yee and White (2016) find that “community building is valued above leadership and capacity as the most important condition for design to have the greatest impact in innovation and transformation projects.”

Hovland Consulting LLC (2018) review conservation projects in western North America and find 5 key approaches for success (each has some sub-steps): A. Take a holistic approach; B. Build strong coalitions and trusted relationships; C. Expand grantee capacity and tactics; D. Prioritise communications and story telling; E. Pursue local conservation outcomes.

Rogers and Coates (2015) report a study of [shortish term] durability of food for peace projects, highlighting resource, capacity, motivation, and cross-scale links as crucial to durability. They also note the importance of considering the diversity of circumstances, the need for gradual withdrawal pre-planned, developing a good ToC, and having awareness of longer term shocks, including from climate-related risks. They provide recommendations for project design requirements, including the above as well as indicators for impact and ‘sustainability’ of change.

The European Court of Auditors (2018) reviewed 41 EU regional development projects. Of these, 20% were not enduring, and nearly 50% had inadequate indicators, data collection or archiving. They provide a definition of durable project results, as well as highlighting direct and indirect project results (p.4-5). A few failures were external, but others were due to weak projects. They argue for better monitoring (but they are auditors so have highlighted this more than specific project design aspects!).

...And program scaling

The Independent Commission for Aid Impact (2015) discusses the program scale of review; they highlight the need for explicit risk assessment, especially in the context of conflict and fragile states, and clearly set expectations as regards risk appetite across a program. They emphasise flexibility and regular review of the ToC to enable learning (to “tighten feedback and learning loops”); and deep engagement with project beneficiaries. They also highlight the need for coherence across an organisation’s own programs and with other investors. They also note that the issue of durability must be taken seriously, as too often “Business cases are written primarily to secure internal approval for expenditure, rather than to identify the necessary building blocks for sustainable impact.”

Rogers and Coates (2015) argue for program evaluation beyond 5 years, noting the need for good archiving of project records and indicators, as these are often hard to find a few years later when durability really needs to be revisited (note the comments of European Court of Auditors (2018) above, also).

Warner et al. (2019) review four case studies of projects and look at what brought about transformation. They comment that, although transformational adaptation is often perceived as a major large-scale intervention, their case studies show that transformational adaptation is more likely to involve a bundle of adaptation interventions that are aimed at flexibly adjusting to change rather than reinforcing the status quo in ways of doing things (this resonates with the idea of ‘bundling’ in the widespread flexible adaptation pathways literature, e.g. Bosomworth et al. (2015); CSIRO (2018); Haasnoot et al. (2013); Stafford Smith et al. (2011); Wise et al. (2014) among others). This is a reminder that transformation is diverse (see above).

A related issue for transformation is the time lag to achieving major, scaled impacts. Midmore (2017) reviews econometric effort that has been devoted to analysis of investment in agricultural research and its effects on farm productivity, which has produced a consensus that returns are high, but they are achieved only after long lags. This has tended to result in program evaluation approaches that focus on research that can be shown to have impact, rather than research impact itself, tending to prioritise efficiency and transparency. He argues that methodological pluralism, with greater integration and triangulation between different evaluation approaches, is a promising means of resolving these problems that may be causing the real factors driving uptake and impact to be missed. Thornton et al. (2017) address some of these issues in agricultural research for development by describing the application of a monitoring, evaluation and learning system based on theory of change, combining indicators of progress in research with indicators of change aimed at understanding the factors that enable or inhibit the behavioural changes that can bring about development impacts. Theory of change represents our best understanding of how engagement and learning can enable change as well as how progress towards outcomes might be measured. They

argue that a theory of change approach has potential to bridge the gap between knowledge generation and development outcomes.

The importance of theory of change has been reflected in various GEF publications including the STAP's development of RAPTA (O'Connell et al., 2016). Maru et al. (2018a) analyse how theory of change is applied at present, finding it is yet to be appropriately mainstreamed into development by donors, researchers and practitioners for various reasons including different interpretations of what it is. They make five recommendations to assist the mainstreaming of ToC: (i) select a type of ToC suited to the relative complexity of the problem and focal system of interest; (ii) state a theory or hypotheses to be tested as the intervention progresses; (iii) articulate the relationship between the ToC and parallel approaches (e.g. log frame); (iv) accept that a ToC is a process, and (v) allow time and resources for implementers and researchers to develop ToC thinking within projects. They also recommend that communities of practice should be established among AR4D (effective agricultural research for development) and donor organisations to test, evaluate and improve the contribution that ToCs can make to sustainable food security and agricultural development. Of course, this could also be done at the scale of a GEF Impact Program. Although having a ToC at the time of project design is important, absent that, developing one during the project's life can still help flexible amendment of project processes, for example by identifying additional critical stakeholders to engage.

Table A.1 consolidates many of the key insights from this review in the framework of logic outlined in the main text.

STAP Appendix Table A.1: Summary of indicators of successful project durability (left column), principles for GEF funded activities that will promote durability (middle column), and actions in project and program design that will meet these principles (right column). Summary headings link to logic chain in Figure 3 and green items show additional considerations when scaling.

Emergent indicators	Principles for durability and durable scaling	Design actions, and for scaling
<p>Stakeholder trust and motivation (salience, legitimacy & credibility?)</p>	<p>Engage key stakeholders</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legitimate engagement, on-going partnerships, with and among appropriate stakeholders, <i>reviewing and evolving who is needed</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have processes to manage diverse values and motivations <i>especially across scales</i> • Co-design, co-production, with pre-planned, phased withdrawal <i>with careful timing relative to scaling and long-term financing</i> <p>Incentivise core actors</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Value local knowledge and institutions • Link to local culture and story telling • Build human and social capital, community capacity, <i>and build beyond the initial core actors</i> • Develop leadership and champions • Deliver local benefits, whatever else is achieved • <i>Identify cultural barriers and enablers of transformation</i> <p>Emphasise diversity and adaptability</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure diverse inputs – people, livelihoods, financing • Be flexible and adaptable in project implementation <i>with structured flexibility as barriers and enablers change</i> • Build adaptive processes into community/local structures <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Consider the policy and institutional context</i> • <i>Explicitly set goals for transformation/scaling early</i> <p>Apply systems thinking and learning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Take an integrated, holistic systems view <p>• Emphasise on-going monitoring, reflection and learning cycles <i>allowing for added complexity in scaling/transformation</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plan for long-term change and shocks (Box A) • Challenge with the need for transformation • Allow time for scaling to deliver impact </p>	<p>Multi-stakeholder processes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do (and regularly update) stakeholder mapping and institutional analyses to inform engagement <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify and equitably engage all key stakeholders, explicitly allowing that these will evolve over time • <i>Identify/engage cross-scale/domain actors important for scaling</i> <p>Support stakeholder involvement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Connect with local culture, knowledge and institutions <p>• Plan to demonstrate benefits to core actors <i>and to wider audience</i></p> <p>• Design appropriate individual/community/institutional capacity building, encompassing leadership, diversity, local institutions, local knowledge, local culture <i>including for scaling</i></p> <p>Theories of change</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Co-design a theory of change for the project level including co-identification of drivers, desired outcomes, barriers and enablers, phased withdrawal, and a necessary and sufficient set of responses • <i>Elaborate (or add a) ToC to address scaling, intended mechanisms and innovations, barriers and enablers</i> <p>• Identify and plan for winners and losers of distributional outcomes in ToC, <i>also across scale</i></p> <p>• Identify relevant long-term changes that affect project outcomes, <i>including when scaled (e.g. in other locations)</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regularly review ToC in light of learning to allow structured flexibility in implementation </p> <p>Adaptive learning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establish effective MEL (including for durability) and KM systems with process (e.g. local committee) to continue after project and extend across scales, including measures of durability of scaling
<p>Enduring capacity and financing</p>		
<p>Resilience (adaptability and transformability)</p>		

References

- Bao J, Rodriguez DC, Paina L, Ozawa S, Bennett S. (2015) Monitoring and Evaluating the Transition of Large-Scale Programs in Global Health. *Global Health-Science and Practice* 3(4):591-605. DOI 10.9745/ghsp-d-15-00221
- Barnes C, van Laerhoven F. (2015) Making it last? Analysing the role of NGO interventions in the development of institutions for durable collective action in Indian community forestry. *Environ Sci Policy* 53:192-205. DOI 10.1016/j.envsci.2014.06.008
- Bayiley YT, Teklu GK. (2016) Success factors and criteria in the management of international development projects Evidence from projects funded by the European Union in Ethiopia. *International Journal of Managing Projects in Business* 9(3):562-582. DOI 10.1108/ijmpb-06-2015-0046
- Bennett S, Ozawa S, Rodriguez D, Paul A, Singh K, Singh S. (2015) Monitoring and evaluating transition and sustainability of donor-funded programs: Reflections on the Avahan experience. *Evaluation and Program Planning* 52:148-158. DOI 10.1016/j.evalprogplan.2015.05.003
- Berkes F, Folke, C (Eds.) (1998) *Linking Social and Ecological Systems: Management Practices and Social Mechanisms for Building Resilience*. Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, UK.
- Bierbaum R, Cowie A. (2018) *Integration: to solve complex environmental problems*. Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel to the Global Environment Facility, Washington DC. 20 p.
- Boshoven J, Hill M, Koontz A. (2018) *The Nature of Conservation Enterprises: A 20-year retrospective evaluation of the theory of change behind this widely used approach to biodiversity conservation*. USAID, Washington. 84 p.
- Bosomworth K, Harwood A, Leith P, Wallis P. (2015) *Adaptation Pathways: a playbook for developing options for climate change adaptation in Natural Resource Management*. Southern Slopes Climate Change Adaptation Research Partnership (SCARP): RMIT University, University of Tasmania, and Monash University. 26 p.
- Brooks JS. (2017) Design Features and Project Age Contribute to Joint Success in Social, Ecological, and Economic Outcomes of Community-Based Conservation Projects. *Conservation Letters* 10(1):23-32. DOI 10.1111/conl.12231
- Brundtland Commission (1987) *Report of the World Commission on Environment and Development: Our Common Future*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Buntaine MT, Parks BC. (2013) When Do Environmentally Focused Assistance Projects Achieve their Objectives? Evidence from World Bank Post-Project Evaluations. *Global Environmental Politics* 13(2):65-+. DOI 10.1162/GLEP_a_00167
- Byers E, Gidden M, Leclère D, Balkovic J, Burek P, Ebi K, Greve P, Grey D, Havlik P, Hillers A and others. (2018) Global exposure and vulnerability to multi-sector development and climate change hotspots. *Environmental Research Letters* 13(5):055012. DOI 10.1088/1748-9326/aabf45
- Ceptureanu S, Ceptureanu E, Luchian C, Luchian I. (2018) *Community Based Programs Sustainability. A Multidimensional Analysis of Sustainability Factors*. *Sustainability* 10(3):870. DOI 10.3390/su10030870
- CSIRO. (2018) *Climate Compass: A climate risk management framework for Commonwealth agencies*. CSIRO, Australia.
- de Vente J, Reed MS, Stringer LC, Valente S, Newig J. (2016) How does the context and design of participatory decision making processes affect their outcomes? Evidence from sustainable land management in global drylands. *Ecol Soc* 21(2). DOI 10.5751/es-08053-210224
- Dumrak J, Baroudi B, Hadjinicolaou N. 2017. Exploring the Association between Project Management Knowledge Areas and Sustainable Outcomes. In: Halicka K, Nazarko L (ed). *7th International Conference on Engineering, Project, and Production Management*. p 157-164.

- European Court of Auditors. (2018) EU support for productive investments in businesses - greater focus on durability needed. European Union, Luxembourg. 69 p.
- Galvin KA, Beeton TA, Luizza MW. (2018) African community-based conservation: a systematic review of social and ecological outcomes. *Ecol Soc* 23(3). DOI 10.5751/es-10217-230339
- Geels FW. (2011) The multi-level perspective on sustainability transitions: Responses to seven criticisms. *Environmental Innovation and Societal Transitions* 1(1):24-40. DOI <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eist.2011.02.002>
- GEF IEO. (2010) The GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy. Global Environment Facility Independent Evaluation Office, Washington, DC.
- GEF IEO. (2018a) Evaluation of GEF Support for Transformational Change, Evaluation Report No. 122. Global Environment Facility Independent Evaluation Office, Washington, DC.
- GEF IEO. (2018b) GEF Project Performance and Progress to Impact (Evaluation Report No. 121). Global Environment Facility, Independent Evaluation Office, Washington DC. 56 p.
- Gibbs MT. (2013) Asset anchoring as a constraint to sea level rise adaptation. *Ocean & Coastal Management* 85:119-123. DOI 10.1016/j.ocecoaman.2013.09.001
- Gibson RB. (2006) Sustainability assessment: basic components of a practical approach. *Impact Assessment and Project Appraisal* 24(3):170-182. DOI 10.3152/147154606781765147
- Gorddard R, Colloff MJ, Wise RM, Ware D, Dunlop M. (2016) Values, rules and knowledge: Adaptation as change in the decision context. *Environ Sci Policy* 57:60-69. DOI <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.envsci.2015.12.004>
- Haasnoot M, Kwakkel JH, Walker WE, ter Maat J. (2013) Dynamic adaptive policy pathways: A method for crafting robust decisions for a deeply uncertain world. *Global Environmental Change* 23(2):485–498. DOI <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2012.12.006>
- Hovland Consulting LLC. (2018) Best Practices for Enduring Conservation with a summary of a Five-Year Retrospective (2013-2018) of the Hewlett Foundation's Western Conservation Grantmaking Strategy. Hovland, Boulder CO. 11 p.
- Ika LA, Diallo A, Thuillier D. (2012) Critical success factors for World Bank projects: An empirical investigation. *International Journal of Project Management* 30(1):105-116. DOI 10.1016/j.ijproman.2011.03.005
- Ika LA, Donnelly J. (2017) Success conditions for international development capacity building projects. *International Journal of Project Management* 35(1):44-63. DOI 10.1016/j.ijproman.2016.10.005
- Independent Commission for Aid Impact. (2015) DFID's approach to delivering impact. ICAI, London.
- Koch DJ, Schulpen L. (2018) Introduction to the special issue 'unintended effects of international cooperation'. *Evaluation and Program Planning* 68:202-209. DOI 10.1016/j.evalprogplan.2017.10.006
- Lauermann J. (2016) Temporary projects, durable outcomes: Urban development through failed Olympic bids? *Urban Stud* 53(9):1885-1901. DOI 10.1177/0042098015585460
- Lennox L, Maher L, Reed J. (2018) Navigating the sustainability landscape: a systematic review of sustainability approaches in healthcare. *Implement Sci* 13(1):27. DOI 10.1186/s13012-017-0707-4
- Leviten-Reid E. (2009) Comprehensive Strategies for Deep and Durable Outcomes. The Caledon Institute of Social Policy, Ottawa, Canada. 20 p.
- Maccio L, Cristofoli D. (2017) How to support the endurance of long-term networks: The pivotal role of the network manager. *Public Administration* 95(4):1060-1076. DOI 10.1111/padm.12349
- Magnan AK, Schipper ELF, Burkett M, Bharwani S, Burton I, Eriksen S, Gemenne F, Schaar J, Ziervogel G. (2016) Addressing the risk of maladaptation to climate change. *WIREs Clim Change* doi: 10.1002/wcc.409:20pp. DOI 10.1002/wcc.409

- Mahonge C. (2013) Factors behind sustainability of activities in the post-project period in Matengo highlands in Tanzania. *Journal of Environmental Sustainability* 3(3):91-102. DOI
- Martinez-Bautista H, Sanchez FJZ, Alvarado-Segura AA, Maldonado HR, Salinas MF. (2015) Determinants of success or failure on community forestry projects with government funding in Mexico. *Bosque* 36(3):363-374. DOI 10.4067/s0717-92002015000300004
- Maru Y, Sparrow A, Storzaker R, Davies J. (2018a) Integrated agricultural research for development (IAR4D) from a theory of change perspective. *Agric Sys* 165:310-320. DOI <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agsy.2016.09.012>
- Maru YT, Sparrow A, Butler JRA, Banerjee O, Ison R, Hall A, Carberry P. (2018b) Towards appropriate mainstreaming of "Theory of Change" approaches into agricultural research for development: Challenges and opportunities. *Agric Sys* 165:344-353. DOI 10.1016/j.agsy.2018.04.010
- Maru YT, Stafford Smith M, Sparrow A, Pinho PF, Dube OP. (2014) A linked vulnerability and resilience framework for adaptation pathways in remote disadvantaged communities. *Global Environmental Change* 28:337-350. DOI <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2013.12.007>
- Midmore P. (2017) The Science of Impact and the Impact of Agricultural Science. *Journal of Agricultural Economics* 68(3):611-631. DOI 10.1111/1477-9552.12242
- Moore HE, Boldero J. (2017) Designing Interventions that Last: A Classification of Environmental Behaviors in Relation to the Activities, Costs, and Effort Involved for Adoption and Maintenance. *Front Psychol* 8:1874. DOI 10.3389/fpsyg.2017.01874
- Moore JE, Mascarenhas A, Bain J, Straus SE. (2017) Developing a comprehensive definition of sustainability. *Implement Sci* 12(1):110. DOI 10.1186/s13012-017-0637-1
- Moore M-L, Riddell D, Vocisano D. (2015) Scaling Out, Scaling Up, Scaling Deep: Strategies of Non-profits in Advancing Systemic Social Innovation. *Journal of Corporate Citizenship* 2015(58):67-84. DOI 10.9774/GLEAF.4700.2015.ju.00009
- O'Connell D, Abel N, Grigg N, Maru Y, Butler J, Cowie A, Stone-Jovicich S, Walker B, Wise R, Ruhweza A and others. (2016) Designing projects in a rapidly changing world: Guidelines for embedding resilience, adaptation and transformation into sustainable development projects. (Version 1.0). Global Environment Facility, Washington, D.C. 112 p.
- OECD. (2002) Glossary of Evaluation and Results Based Management (RBM) Terms. OECD, Paris. 38 p. DOI 10.1787/9789264034921-en-fr
- OECD. (2010) Guidance on Sustainability Impact Assessment. OECD, Paris. 35 p.
- OECD. (2018) The Oslo Manual 2018, 4th Ed. OECD, Paris. DOI 10.1787/9789264304604-15-en
- OECD DAC. (1991) Principles for evaluation of development assistance. OECD Development Assistance Committee, Paris. 12 p.
- Oldewage-Theron WH, Duvenage SS, Egal AA, Lyford C. (2018) Comparative analysis of the factors contributing to sustainability of a food and nutrition intervention programme: Two case studies from South Africa. *Evaluation and Program Planning* 71:51-57. DOI 10.1016/j.evalprogplan.2018.08.003
- Ozawa S, Singh S, Singh K, Chhabra V, Bennett S. (2016) The Avahan Transition: Effects of Transition Readiness on Program Institutionalization and Sustained Outcomes. *Plos One* 11(7). DOI 10.1371/journal.pone.0158659
- Park SE, Marshall NA, Jakku E, Dowd AM, Howden SM, Mendham E, Fleming A. (2012) Informing adaptation responses to climate change through theories of transformation. *Global Environmental Change* 22(1):115-126. DOI 10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2011.10.003
- Riddell D, Moore M-L. (2015) Scaling Out, Scaling Up, Scaling Deep: Advancing Systemic Social Innovation and the Learning Processes to Support it (report prepared for the J.W. McConnell Family Foundation and Tamarack Institute). J.W. McConnell Family Foundation and Tamarack Institute, Canada. 36 p.

- Rogers BL, Coates J. (2015) Sustaining Development: A Synthesis of Results from a Four-Country Study of Sustainability and Exit Strategies among Development Food Assistance Projects. FHI 360/Food and Nutrition Technical Assistance III Project (FANTA), Washington, DC. 68 p.
- Sastre-Merino S, Negrillo X, Hernández-Castellano D. (2013) Sustainability of Rural Development Projects within the Working With People Model: Application to Aymara Women Communities in the Puno Region, Peru. *Cuadernos de Desarrollo Rural* 10(70):219-243. DOI
- Sekerka LE, Stimel D. (2011) How durable is sustainable enterprise? Ecological sustainability meets the reality of tough economic times. *Business Horizons* 54(2):115-124. DOI 10.1016/j.bushor.2010.09.006
- Stafford Smith M, Horrocks L, Harvey A, Hamilton C. (2011) Rethinking adaptation for a 4C World. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A* 369:196-216. DOI doi:10.1098/rsta.2010.0277
- Stirling AC, Scoones I. (2009) From risk assessment to knowledge mapping: Science, precaution and participation in disease ecology. *Ecol Soc* 14(2):Art 14 (on-line). DOI
- Stocking M, et al. (2018) Managing knowledge for a sustainable global future. Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel to the Global Environment Facility, Washington, DC. 16 p.
- Swidler A, Watkins SC. (2009) 'Teach a Man to Fish': The Doctrine of Sustainability and Its Effects on Three Strata of Malawian Society. *World Dev* 37(7):1182-1196. DOI 10.1016/j.worlddev.2008.11.002
- TANGO International. (2009) Sustainability of rural development projects: Best practices and lessons learned by IFAD in Asia - INDIA CASE STUDY. IFAD, Rome.
- Tengberg A, Valencia S. (2017) Science of Integrated Approaches to Natural Resources Management: a STAP Information Document. Global Environment Facility, Washington, DC.
- Terrapon-Pfaff J, Dienst C, König J, Ortiz W. (2014) A cross-sectional review: Impacts and sustainability of small-scale renewable energy projects in developing countries. *Renewable & Sustainable Energy Reviews* 40:1-10. DOI 10.1016/j.rser.2014.07.161
- Terrapon-Pfaff J, Grone MC, Dienst C, Ortiz W. (2018) Productive use of energy - Pathway to development? Reviewing the outcomes and impacts of small-scale energy projects in the global south. *Renewable & Sustainable Energy Reviews* 96:198-209. DOI 10.1016/j.rser.2018.07.016
- Thornton PK, Schuetz T, Forch W, Cramer L, Abreu D, Vermeulen S, Campbell BM. (2017) Responding to global change: A theory of change approach to making agricultural research for development outcome-based. *Agric Sys* 152:145-153. DOI 10.1016/j.agsy.2017.01.005
- Toth F. (2018) Innovation and the GEF: STAP Information Paper. Global Environment Facility, Washington, DC.
- van Vuuren DP, Riahi K, Calvin K, Dellink R, Emmerling J, Fujimori S, Samir KC, Kriegler E, O'Neill B. (2017) The Shared Socio-economic Pathways: Trajectories for human development and global environmental change. *Glob Environ Change-Human Policy Dimens* 42:148-152. DOI 10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2016.10.009
- Walker W, Marchau V, Bloemen P, Lawrence J, Lempert R, Kwakkel J. (2018) Comment on "From data to decisions: Processing information, biases, and beliefs for improved management of natural resources and environments" by Glynn et al. *Earth's Future* 6:757-761. DOI 10.1002/2017EF000750
- Warner K, Zommers Z, Wreford A, Hurlbert M, Viner D, Scantlan J, Halsey K, Halsey K, Tamang C. (2019) Characteristics of Transformational Adaptation in Climate-Land-Society Interactions. *Sustainability* 11(2):356. DOI
- White House Office of Science and Technology Policy. (2015) A Strategy for American Innovation.
- Wilkinson A, Eidinow E. (2008) Evolving practices in environmental scenarios: a new scenario typology. *Environmental Research Letters* 3(4):45017 (45011pp). DOI <http://dx.doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/3/4/045017>

- Wise RM, Fazey I, Stafford Smith M, Park SE, Eakin HC, Archer Van Garderen ERM, Campbell B. (2014) Reconceptualising adaptation to climate change as part of pathways of change and response. *Global Environmental Change* 28:325-336. DOI <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2013.12.002>
- Wuelser G. (2014) Towards adequately framing sustainability goals in research projects: the case of land use studies. *Sustainability Science* 9(3):263-276. DOI 10.1007/s11625-013-0236-2
- Yee JSR, White H. (2016) The Goldilocks Conundrum: The 'Just Right' Conditions for Design to Achieve Impact in Public and Third Sector Projects. *International Journal of Design* 10(1):7-19. DOI
- Zazueta A. (2017) Principles for the Development of Integrated Climate Change and Chemicals and Waste: A STAP Information Document. Global Environment Facility, Washington, DC.