

FY 2009
GEF ANNUAL MONITORING REVIEW (AMR)
GUIDELINES

GUIDELINES FOR ANNUAL MONITORING REVIEW 2009

- I. The 2009 Annual Monitoring Review (AMR) will cover all full and medium-sized GEF projects which began implementation on or before June 30, 2008, and were in implementation during FY 2009, including those projects which completed implementation during FY 2009.
- II. The timeline for the AMR 2009 process is provided in Annex 1.
- III. The AMR 2009 process will comprise of
 - a) individual project implementation reports
 - b) portfolio monitoring (tracking) tools
 - c) individual agency portfolio analyses undertaken by the GEF Agencies, and
 - d) an overall portfolio analysis, undertaken by the GEF Secretariat.
- IV. The steps, responsibilities and outputs of the AMR 2008 process are as follows:
 - 1. Project Implementation Reports (PIR):** The GEF Agencies will submit to the Results-based Management (RBM) team at the GEF Secretariat individual PIRs for all full and medium-sized GEF projects sized (but *not* pre-investment or enabling activity projects) which began implementation on or before June 30, 2008, and were in implementation during FY 2009, including those projects which completed implementation during FY 2009. Annex 2 provides an outline of the information requested in the PIRs.
 - 2. Focal Area Portfolio Monitoring (Tracking) Tools:** In an effort to develop methods to aggregate outcomes at the portfolio level, GEF focal areas have been developing portfolio monitoring tools to roll up indicators from the individual project level to the portfolio level and track overall portfolio performance in focal areas. During the AMR 2009 exercise, in addition to individual project implementation reports, the Agencies are requested to fill out and submit these tools for projects where such tools are available. Annex 5 provides guidance specific to biodiversity, climate change, and international waters focal areas. Guidance for the POPs focal area will be sent out under separate cover.
 - 3. Agency Summary Tables:** The Agencies are also requested to provide the Secretariat a summary table (in Excel) that lists all projects subject to the AMR 2009. Please see Annex 3 for the contents of the agency summary table.
 - 4. Agency Overview Reports:** Each Agency will prepare a report that includes an overview portfolio analysis, findings and lessons. Annex 4 provides an outline for Agency Overview Reports.
 - 5. Annual Monitoring Report:** The GEFSEC RBM team will prepare a draft AMR 2009 report based on PIRs, portfolio monitoring tools, and Agency Overview Reports.

- 6. Interagency Annual Monitoring Review Meeting:** An interagency meeting will be convened and led by the GEF Secretariat RBM team, in collaboration with the GEF EO. This meeting will address overall portfolio issues, findings and lessons, and will identify next steps for all GEF partners.
- 7. Council Paper:** The GEF Secretariat will finalize the AMR 2009 based on the conclusions of the Interagency AMR Meeting and will present this overview report to the Council.

V. Agency Rating Methodology

The GEF Secretariat would like to take stock of what agencies internal rating systems consist of and how they map to the development objective ratings and implementation ratings. As such, the GEF Secretariat as part of the AMR 2009 is asking each agency to submit the methodology for their own project rating system.

ANNEX 1: AMR 2009 TIMELINE

| | |
|--------------------|---|
| August 31, 2009 | Agency to submit their internal rating methodology to the GEF Secretariat |
| September 30, 2009 | Agency to submit Summary Tables, Project Implementation Reports, and Focal Area Portfolio Monitoring Tools (tracking tools) to the GEF Secretariat. |
| October 30, 2009 | Agencies to submit Agency Overview Report |
| January 15, 2010 | GEF Secretariat to complete and circulate a draft AMR Report for 2009 to the Agencies and the GEF EO. |
| Mid- February 2008 | Interagency Annual Monitoring Review Meeting to be organized by the GEF Secretariat RBM team. |
| March 2010 | GEF Secretariat RBM team to finalize the AMR 2009 report to the Council, in consultation with the Agencies and the GEF EO. |

ANNEX 2: INDIVIDUAL PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION REPORTS

Reports will be submitted on all full and medium-sized GEF projects which began implementation on or before June 30, 2009, and were under implementation during FY 2009, including those projects which completed implementation during FY 2009. Implementation Completion Reports, Performance Audit Reports and Evaluation Reports prepared during FY2009 will be submitted as part of the PIR, together with a list of these reports.

Individual Project Implementation Reports (PIRs) will include the following information:

- 1. Project general information:** Provide the following information and note any changes. Project Name, Project's GEF ID Number, Country, GEF Focal Area and Operational Program, Agency, Project Approval Date, Date of Project Effectiveness, Total Project Cost, GEF Grant Amount, GEF Project Preparation Grant Amount (if any)
- 2. Project objective:** State the global environmental objective of the project.¹
- 3. Rating project performance:** Make an overall assessment and provide ratings and narrative assessment of “likelihood of achieving project objective” and “implementation progress”. The definition of ratings is provided in Annex 7.
- 4. Contributions of the project towards focal area strategic targets:** The report will indicate the contribution which the project has made towards GEF focal area strategic priorities. (For the biodiversity focal area, please confine this section to GEF-3 projects.)
- 5. Co-financing and leveraged financing:** Only those projects which, during FY 2009, have gone through mid-term evaluations or that have been closed are required to report on co-financing and leveraged resources².
 - Co-financing are resources committed by the GEF Implementing and/or Executing Agencies or by other non-GEF source, that will be managed with the GEF allocation as part of the initial financing package for the GEF project and without which the GEF objectives cannot be met. Typically such resources are committed as part of the initial financing package; but in some cases, part of the co-financing may be mobilized subsequently. Please see Table 1 as the reporting format.
 - Leveraged Resources are defined as additional resources—beyond those committed to the project, itself by GEF and co-financiers at the time of approval—that are mobilized later as a direct result of the project. As such, leveraged resources do not form part of the committed financing plan at the outset and are not defined as “co-finance”. Leverage is nevertheless a very important indicator of the GEF's catalytic effect. Some projects establish targets for leverage.

¹ Project “goal” is the highest level objective. Project “objective” is the second highest level of objectives, these are for UNDP and UNEP the “project's objective” and for the World Bank the “global environmental objective”.

² The GEF Council approved the GEF policy on Co-financing (C.20/6) on September 16, 2002 and a revision (C.20/6/Rev.1) on May 16, 2003. This policy required that all projects regularly report type and source of co-financing as well as leveraged resources.

Table 1. Co-financing

(For projects which underwent a mid-term, phase or a terminal evaluation in FY 2009)

A. CO-FINANCING

| Co financing (Type/ Source) | IA own Financing (mill US\$) | | Government (mill US\$) | | Other Sources* (mill US\$) | | Total Financing (mill US\$) | | Total Disbursement (mill US\$) | |
|-----------------------------------|------------------------------------|--------|---------------------------|--------|-------------------------------|--------|-----------------------------------|--------|--------------------------------------|--------|
| | Proposed | Actual | Proposed | Actual | Proposed | Actual | Proposed | Actual | Proposed | Actual |
| Grant | | | | | | | | | | |
| Credits | | | | | | | | | | |
| Loans | | | | | | | | | | |
| Equity | | | | | | | | | | |
| In-kind | | | | | | | | | | |
| Non-grant Instruments | | | | | | | | | | |
| Other Types | | | | | | | | | | |
| TOTAL | | | | | | | | | | |

*Other refers to contributions mobilized for the project from other multilateral agencies, bilateral development cooperation agencies, NGOs, the private sector etc.

- “Proposed” co-financing refers to co-financing proposed at CEO endorsement.
- Describe “Non-grant Instruments” (such as guarantees, contingent grants, etc):

- Explain “Other Sources of Co-financing”:

ANNEX 3. AGENCY SUMMARY TABLES

The Agency summary tables should be prepared in an Excel file. A list of the requested information is listed below as well as inserted in the columns of the attached example of Excel file:

- Column 1: GEF ID
- Column 2: Focal Area
- Column 3: Region
- Column 4: Country
- Column 5: Project Title
- Column 6: Project Size
- Column 7: Project Start Date (Effectiveness) (m/d/yyyy)
- Column 8: Proposed Closing Date (m/d/yyyy)
- Column 9: Actual / Expected Closing Date
- Column 10: PPG/PDF Funding (if any) US\$ m
- Column 11: GEF Grant US \$m
- Column 13: Total GEF disbursement as of June 30, 2009 (\$m)
- Column 14: Proposed co-financing
- Column 15: Actual co-financing
- Column 16: Mid-term date (if applicable)
- Column 17: Terminal Evaluation Date
- Column 18: Overall DO rating
- Column 19: Overall IP rating
- Column 20: Overall Risk rating
- Column 21: Implementation Status (1st PIR, Cancelled, Completed, etc.)

ANNEX 4. AGENCY OVERVIEW REPORTS

Each Agency will provide an overview report based on its internal PIR process in FY 2009. The reports will be based on an aggregated analysis of the projects that were under implementation in FY 2009, including all full and medium-sized GEF projects (but not pre-investment or enabling activity projects) which began implementation on or before June 30, 2008, and were under implementation for at least some part of FY2009, as well as all GEF projects that were operationally completed during FY 2009.

Below, please find an expanded outline of the Agency Overview Report for 2009. All Agencies are requested to follow this format and keep the report length to a maximum of 20 pages, exclusive of the executive summary.

1. Summary Tables

For the 2009 AMR, each agency should provide the following data in a summary Excel file.

Portfolio Size and Value

| Portfolio Size and Value |
|--|
| Number of projects by Focal Area broken down by region, focal area objective, and project size (FSP, MSP) |
| List of new projects for the reporting year |
| Total Portfolio Disbursements |
| Total Portfolio Disbursements broken down by Region, with a list of projects with disbursements below target |

Portfolio Status

| Portfolio Status |
|---|
| List of all projects that have been CEO Endorsed/CEO Approved that have not |
| Average Time period of extension of closure date Region broken down by Full Size project and Medium Size project with list of projects that exceed target |
| Number of cancelled projects with list of projects and cancelled date |
| Number of projects rated high risk with list of projects and mitigation measures |

2. Portfolio Overview

The portfolio overview will include an analysis of portfolio growth and composition, commitments and disbursements. It will include the total amount of GEF funds that have been allocated, the total number of projects approved, the type of projects approved (i.e. full-sized, medium-sized), the total dollar amount committed to projects, and the total dollar amount disbursed as of June 30, 2009. It will also include an analysis of the GEF

portfolio's relation to the Agency's regular work program and results of Agency mainstreaming.

3. Portfolio performance

This section of the report will include trends on the following:

- i. Agency contributions towards focal area strategic priorities/programs and, where applicable, targets: Indicate how the GEF agencies' focal area portfolio has contributed towards GEF achievements per strategic priority (GEF-3 cohort) and towards achievements per strategic program (GEF-4 cohort).
- ii. Projects-at-risk:
 - a. Provide an analysis of project risk ratings for FY 2009 under the "projects-at-risk system." Particular attention will be given to projects that have been rated as substantial or high risk projects. Agencies will also include an account of actions that such projects have taken to manage risks.³
 - b. For projects that are at-risk of not achieving sustainability of project benefits, identify why they are at risk and what actions are being (or will be) taken to achieve sustainability.
 - c. For projects that are at-risk of not achieving replication, identify why they are at risk and what actions are being (or will be) taken to achieve replication.
 - d. Provide a portfolio analysis of salient issues regarding risks identified in log frames or results frameworks at project entry as well as an assessment of the most frequently encountered risks, assumptions and uncertainties during implementation. Identify factors that have emerged from project-at-risk systems that affect project performance.
- iii. Outcomes at project completion and implications for the overall portfolio: For completed projects, provide an assessment of outcomes and impacts at project completion, point out factors that have contributed to (or prevented) the attainment of targeted objectives, and derive lessons.
- iv. Elapsed time between project processing steps / slow maturing projects: Provide an assessment of trends regarding elapsed times in the overall portfolio, indicate the most prominent problems in slow maturing projects, and identify actions that will be taken to move projects along at various

³ When an Agency has rated more than 15% of its projects as high risk in its "project at risk system", an analysis of the portfolio should be conducted to clarify why this is so and what is being done to address this situation.

phases of the project cycle. For full-sized projects, provide an assessment of delays in project cycle phases within the overall portfolio. For full-sized projects include the elapsed time for projects to move:

1. from CEO Endorsement to start of implementation (effectiveness); and
2. from start of implementation to operational closure (implementation time).

v. Co-financing and Leverage: Provide an analysis of proposed and actual levels of co-financing and leveraged resources for projects that have under-gone mid-term evaluations or have been closed. In this analysis, provide explanations for projects that have not realized expected co-financing levels or have produced better than expected levels of co-financing.

4. **Progress on projects that received sub-optimal ratings in AMR 2008:** Describe the status of projects that were at risk or were rated MU, U or HU in FY 2008, describing any management actions taken to improve progress and any changes that have occurred as a result.
5. **Mid-term Reviews and Terminal Evaluations:** Provide an account of projects that have been completed (operationally or finally closed) or have reached mid-term review stage during FY 2009. The agencies will also submit copies of mid-term reviews; evaluation reports (self evaluations or independent evaluations) and/or project completion reports that have been completed from July 1, 2008 through June 30, 2009; a list of mid-term reviews, evaluation reports and/or implementation completion reports underway as of June 30, 2007, or planned through June 2008.
6. **Best Practice:**
Highlight good practices from projects that have successfully incorporated social aspects (including gender, employment, health, and livelihood security) as part of project implementation.

ANNEX 5. FOCAL AREA TRACKING TOOLS

A. BIODIVERSITY

For the biodiversity focal area, please include tracking tools for GEF-4 projects that have begun implementation during the AMR reporting period **if you have not already submitted them when the project was presented for CEO endorsement.**

For all biodiversity projects in the GEF-3 and GEF-4 cohort that have undergone a mid-term evaluation/mid-term review or final evaluation/completion report during the AMR reporting period, please submit the tracking tools that were completed as part of these exercises.

Please remember to use the appropriate tracking tool for the GEF phase that the project is associated with given the slight changes in the tracking tools for GEF-3 and GEF-4 that reflect the changes in the GEF biodiversity strategy.

B. CLIMATE CHANGE

All projects are asked to report on two of the proposed indicators associated with the strategic priority (or objective) associated with the project. The PIR Report should include data on the project's targets for this indicator and the project's achievements in this dimension to the date of the PIR. The set of indicators has been developed such that two indicators are proposed per strategic program (SP) under GEF-4. As no GEF-4 projects are yet under implementation, we are also testing how these indicators can be used to measure results from previous GEF periods. An approach to fitting and retrofitting the GEF-4 indicators to projects prepared in accordance with GEF-3 strategic priorities is provided below. For projects dating from earlier GEF periods, the project team is asked to determine through self-assessment whether the proposed indicators can be fitted to the project under consideration. Qualitative feedback on the use of the indicators is also appreciated. Although we realize that retrofitting these indicators to older projects is a perilous task, we would encourage task managers and project team leaders to try and do so in order to give us a wider basis for portfolio reporting.

I. Energy Efficiency

A. Types of Energy Efficiency Interventions

For GEF-4, two strategic programs have been identified:

1. Promoting energy-efficient buildings and appliances (CC-SP1); and
2. Promoting industrial energy efficiency (CC-SP2).

In addition, promoting rehabilitation of large power plants was proposed in the interim GEF-4 strategy. We expect no projects to be included under this objective for AMR 2008, but we have included the information for future reference.

For GEF-3 projects, all energy efficiency projects were under OP5 and fell into one of the following two strategic priorities:

1. Market transformation for energy-efficient products and processes; and
2. Access to local sources of financing for energy efficiency/renewable energy.

B. Performance Indicators

For each strategic program, two performance indicators are proposed. In order to adopt these indicators in a meaningful way, the project must establish a clear baseline against which the indicators are to be measured and monitored. The overall objective of the energy efficiency program (SP1 and SP2 during GEF-4) is to reduce energy consumption compared to a baseline development that typically involves increasing energy consumption.

1. GEF-4 SP1: Promoting Energy-Efficient Buildings and Appliances

(NB: Also use for GEF-3 Strategic Priority 1)

Indicator 1: Drafting, Adoption and Enforcement of policies and legislative measures contributing to enabling environments

This is a qualitative indicator, to be measured as a step function. The project document should describe the type of policies, regulations, standards, etc. being supported by the GEF project, and the steps leading towards an effective policy framework with numbers from 0 to 4. The PIR should then provide an assessment of the progress toward achieving the stated outputs of the project, with 0 being no achievement toward the stated outcome and 4 being complete achievement of all steps. At the time of project preparation, the task team or project developer will have to specify the “states” of affairs with respect to the policy environment, assigning scores of 0 to 4, where “4” would represent the desirable, post-project policy environment and “0” represents the actual pre-project state of affairs.

Box 1: Hypothetical Example of Qualitative State or Step Function Indicator

The stated outcome of the project is development, enactment, and enforcement of national minimum energy efficiency standards for refrigerators. The project monitoring plan should include clear definitions of steps to be taken to achieve a final project rating of 4 once all these outcomes are achieved. This can for example take the following shape:

0= No standards for refrigerators are in place—may have been discussed;
 1= Refrigerator standards have been discussed and formally proposed;
 2= Refrigerators standards have been formally proposed, but not adopted;
 3= Refrigerator standards have been formally adopted, but have no enforcement mechanism; and
 4= Refrigerator standards are adopted, have enforcement mechanism, and sales of new, more efficient refrigerators are on the upswing.

Indicator 2: Quantity of Energy saved (toe saved or MWh saved or GJ saved)

The PIR should report the quantity of energy savings realized as a result of direct intervention of the GEF project during the previous reporting year, in terms of tons of oil

equivalent (toe) and/or megawatt hours (MWh) and/or gigajoules (GJ). (Note: 1 toe = 11.630 MWh = 41.868 GJ).

[Note that for projects approved under GEF-3 Strategic Priority 1: Market Transformation for Energy-efficient Products and Processes – the use of indicators should be directly analogous to those under GEF-4 SP1

Indicator 1: Adoption of new policies (same as above)

Indicator 2: Quantity of Energy saved (toe saved or MWh saved or GJ saved -same as above)]

2. GEF-4 SP2: Promoting Industrial Energy Efficiency

Indicator 1: Volume of investments (\$ invested)

The PIR should report the volume of investments (in terms of U.S. dollars) undertaken in the previous year related to energy efficiency measures as a result of direct intervention of the GEF project. Investments for capacity expansion as distinguishable from investments in improved process efficiency should be excluded, to the extent possible.

Indicator 2: Quantity of energy saved (toe saved or MWh saved or GJ saved) (see above Indicator 2 under SP1)

3. For projects under the GEF-4 interim strategy: Promoting Rehabilitation of Large Power Plants (NB: Applies only to projects from GEF-4 (interim period)—included here for future reference only)

Indicator 1: Electricity-generation capacity rehabilitated (MW)

The PIR should give the total amount of electricity-generation capacity rehabilitated as a result of direct intervention of the GEF project during the previous reporting year, in terms of megawatts (MW).

Indicator 2: Energy savings (toe)

The PIR should report the amount of energy savings realized as a result of direct intervention of the GEF project during the previous reporting year, in terms of tons of oil equivalent (toe).

Box 2: Hypothetical Example of Repowering Indicator

Plant X is a 200 MW thermal power plant that generates 1,300 GWh a year and consumes on average 0.28 kilograms of oil equivalent (kgoe) of fuel per kWh of electricity generated. After rehabilitation, Plant X generates 1,450 GWh a year, with average fuel use of 0.26 kgoe/kWh. Total annual fuel savings as a result of rehabilitating Plant X would be calculated as follows:

(i) Baseline: How much fuel would it require to generate 1,450 GWh of electricity at the (baseline) efficiency of 0.28 kgoe/kWh?

$$1,450 \text{ GWh} * 0.28 \text{ kgoe/kWh} = 406,000 \text{ toe}$$

(ii) Alternative: How much fuel would it require to generate 1,450 GWh of electricity at the (alternative) efficiency of 0.26 kgoe/kWh?

$$1,450 \text{ GWh} * 0.26 \text{ kgoe/kWh} = 377,000 \text{ toe}$$

(iii) Energy savings: $377,000 \text{ toe} - 406,000 \text{ toe} = 29,000 \text{ toe}$

4. For projects under GEF-3 Strategic Priority 2: Access to local sources of financing

Indicator 1: Number of financial institutions (lending for) or (expressing interest in lending for) energy efficiency or renewable energy investments beyond those doing so at the time of project initiation.

Indicator 2: Quantity of Energy saved (toe saved or MWh saved) (description see above)

II. Renewable Energy

A. Types of Renewable Energy Interventions

The Programming Document for GEF-4 proposed two Strategic Program under renewable energy:

1. On-grid renewable energy, with the objective of increasing the supply and demand of grid electricity from renewable energy sources (SP3);
2. Sustainable energy from biomass (SP4).

Because these SPs are closely related to the parallel strategic priorities on OP6 under GEF-3, they will be discussed in conjunction with them:

1. Power Sector Policy Frameworks for Renewable Energy and Energy Efficiency
2. Productive Uses of Renewable Energy.

Some OP6 projects in GEF-3 also fell under the GEF3 SP2 Access to local sources of financing. For these projects, use indicators parallel to the ones discussed above under the Energy Efficiency SPs.

B. Performance Indicators

1. GEF-4 SP3: Promoting on-grid renewables

2. GEF-4 SP4: Promoting sustainable energy from biomass

(Note: These should also cover projects under GEF-3, Strategic Priority 3)

Indicator 1: Adoption/Creation/Enactment/ of Policy for On-grid Renewables

Qualitative state for achieved steps on a scale from 0 to 4 should be used with a project-specific step function as presented above in Box 1.

Indicator 2: Electricity production in the reporting period from grid-connected renewable energy installations installed under the influence of the project (MWh / year)

Explanation above for electricity saved analogous to electricity generated. “Under the influence” means that such installations can be counted towards the indicator, for which the project can meaningfully claim some kind of causal linkage.

3. For projects under GEF-3 Strategic Priority 4: Productive uses of RE

Indicator 1: Number of businesses and households served by renewable energy beyond those receiving service at the time of project inception.

Indicator 2: Electricity production in the reporting period from rural renewable energy installations installed under the influence of the project (MWh / year)

See above explanation. “Under the influence” means that such installations can be counted towards the indicator, for which the project can meaningfully claim some kind of causal linkage.

4. For projects under GEF-3 Strategic Priority 2: Access to local sources of financing

Indicator 1: Number of financial institutions (lending for) or (expressing interest in lending for) renewable energy investments beyond those doing so at the time of project initiation.

Indicator 2: Quantity of Energy produced (MWh/year) (description see above)

III. Advanced Low GHG Emitting Energy Projects: OP 7 Projects

A. Types of OP7 Projects

The strategic objective of OP7 (during GEF-3) is to promote emerging low-GHG energy technologies. Aggregating demand for the technologies in niche applications and facilitating technological access and innovation shall lead to expanded markets for selected low-GHG emitting energy technologies in developing countries. For GEF4, the emphasis will lie on smaller investments. Old OP7 projects can be found in the area of grid-connected RE projects and fuel cells.

B. Performance Indicators

Indicator 1: Growth in interest in the selected technologies, as measured by the number of stakeholders (public or private enterprises) indicating interest in procuring or supplying the technology.

Developing this indicator will require careful design and data gathering. In the case of stationary fuel-cells, the number of expressions of interest submitted in response to a qualification round could be utilized. In the case of Empower, the number of participating companies interested in PV or CSP might be utilized. For CEPALCO, the number of companies submitting bids or the additional number of utilities expressing interest in the On-grid, small-hydro configuration could

be utilized. For fuel-cell buses, the number of responses to bid qualification or the number of municipalities or authorities expressing interest in obtain fuel-cell bus trials could be counted.

Indicator 2: Annual electricity production from grid-connected renewable energies that were installed under the influence of the project (MWh / year)

Cf. OP6

IV. Sustainable Transport

A. Types of Sustainable Transport Projects

The GEF Sustainable Transport portfolio has two main categories; (a) Non-Technology Options (Modal Shift) and (b) Technology-Oriented Options (Low emission vehicle). Within these two general categories, the terms of transport projects specify that support can be provided to the following:

1. Non-Technology Options (Modal Shift)

- Public Rapid Transit (PRT)
- Traffic Demand Management (TDM)
- Non-Motorized Transport (NMT)
- Land-Use Planning (LUP)

2. Technology Oriented Options (Low emission vehicles)

- Fuel cell buses
- Electric/hybrid vehicles

For these projects, please use OP7 indicators as described above.

B. Performance Indicators

1. GEF-4 SP5: Promoting Sustainable Transport

Indicator 1: Adoption/Creation/Enactment/ of Sustainable Transport Policy

For this case, five-step qualitative state or step function approach explained introduced in first box above should be developed and used.

Indicator 2: Number of Annual Person-trips taken on Sustainable Transport Options Promoted Under Project. This measure should be calculated or estimated on an annual basis by all transport sector (OP11) projects focusing largely on modal shift or improved public transit. By using the absolute number of trips as opposed to the modal share (as a fraction or percentage), the measure will focus on increases or decreases, and to provide an indication of success, it will have to be measured against a baseline scenario or scenario projection which should be contained in the project document, and/or the PIR. It is proposed as “person-trips” as opposed to “vehicle trips” or “passenger trips” as it leaves the measure open to better measure pedestrian trips, which might be excluded in counts taken on bicycle paths or walkways. It focuses on “trips” or “journeys” without specifying the average length of a journey or the number of kilometers traveled. The averages should be available for each city, but are not included for the sake of additivity or the ability to “roll-up” the indicator.

C. INTERNATIONAL WATERS

General GEF-3:

The simplified GEF 3 International Waters Tracking Tool (TT) was designed for results based management reporting at a programme level for targets associated with the GEF 3 Replenishment. It was developed and adopted by the GEF International Waters Task Force. The TT allows Agencies and GEFSEC to aggregate individual project results on yearly basis in a quantitative manner to characterize program results.

The simplified TT will not replace the existing PIR/AMR project performance reviews, which agencies conduct annually with their own review forms but will provide an additional, global quantitative picture for results in the GEF 3 IW portfolio.

The simplified TT includes indicators based primarily on targets outlined in the GEF 3 Replenishment. They are marked as core in the TT. In addition, several new indicators are used to capture the progress in important fields of GEF interventions, e.g. inter-ministry coordination and examples of catalytic results where agencies report them. These are all process or stress reduction indicators as described in the GEF International Waters M & E Indicator guidance.

There are similar indicators used for Strategic Priority (SP) 1 and SP 2 projects but they have different benchmarks. SP1 projects represent more mature interventions to support implementation of already adopted Strategic Action Programmes (SAP) and/or regional legal agreements, while the SP 2 foundational projects are aimed at enabling or fostering transboundary cooperation. These two types of projects are expected to provide different quantitative and qualitative results within the same indicator..

The TT template is based on process and partly on stress reduction indicators since a change in environmental/water resources status, the third category of GEF IW M & E indicators, is not envisaged in the lifespan of most projects. If the project by default is not expected to provide results described by certain indicator, then the term N.A. should be used.

Special, customized results frameworks are developed and used for Investment Funds Programmes; individual projects should report within this TT, while separate reporting is expected at the level of Investment Fund.

Rating is subject to self-assessment; zero mark means no results achieved, while mark three represents 100% achievement of projected results. Ratings will be averaged within each GEF 3 IW indicator to provide a portfolio view, not a projectspecific view. This roll-up will allow additional analysis of program and portfolio level results.

Indicators and ratings:

- *Regional Legal Agreement:* Convention or other legal instrument being prepared/adopted in line with international law practice;

- *Transboundary Water Institution*: Either secretariat or other body agreed/established/funded by the countries sharing the transboundary water body;
- *National/Local Reforms Enacted/Implemented*: Within this indicator, using multiple term national/local reform, what was accomplished at appropriate national or local level should be reported, according to project design and expected outcome.
- *On-the-Ground Stress Reduction Results*: Concrete tangible stress reduction (demonstration of or investment in technology or best practice) results should be reported;
- *Functional National Inter-Ministry Committees*: Progress in establishment/functioning of inter-ministry coordination body at national level should be reported;
- *Agreement on Transboundary Priorities and Root Causes (Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis Development and Completion)*: The ratings represent different level of identification and scientific justification of transboundary issues as well as the agreement on those at regional level;
- *Regional Management Organisation Capacitated*: The regional legal agreement might be in affected regions still under development or adoption processes, therefore the level of operability and sustainability of the organisation agreed/established/funded by the countries sharing the transboundary water body should be reported;
- *SAP Approved*: The text for individual ratings is self explanatory;
- *Catalytic results*: Although such an indicator for catalytic results that were not originally planned was not part of the GEF 3 Replenishment document, agencies are encouraged to list such results that they deem to be catalytic.
- *Other*: This additional indicator should provide specific indicator chosen by the agency, which in best way document the progress of the project and its contribution to the GEF 3 results.

General GEF-4:

The GEF 4 International Waters (IW) Tracking Tool (TT) is designed to support GEF's new approach to Results-based Management. The TT provides reporting of outcomes at the level of strategic programmes (SP 1 - SP 4) and the IW portfolio level as well as for targets associated with the GEF 4 Replenishment. The TT allows GEF Agencies and the Secretariat to monitor and aggregate individual project results on yearly basis in order to characterize program results quantitatively.

Projects should be able to report annual results on a special GEF 4 IW TT reporting form nested in the GEF PMIS database. The TT form should be filled in by the required project identifiers and by using the scroll down menus providing options to choose appropriate indicators, ratings, and additional text field to justify the rating chosen and to provide information on the results achieved, in a maximum of 250 characters. If the project by default is not expected to provide results described by certain indicator, then the term N.A. should be used. These instructions are accompanied with two annexes, which describe in full the rating scales for each of the types of GEF IW indicators.

The GEF 4 IW TT does not replace the existing annual PIR/AMR project performance reviews, which agencies conduct with their own review forms but provides an additional, global quantitative picture for results achieved by the GEF 4 IW portfolio.

The GEF 4 IW TT includes all indicators in the GEF 4 IW Focal Area Strategy. These indicators represent the normal three types of IW indicators used in this focal area: process, stress reduction, and environmental/water resources & socioeconomic status indicators. The process indicators are the same for all Strategic Programmes (except for one additional one for private sector involvement in SP 4). The stress reduction indicators are divided into two larger groups (national/local reforms and demonstrations/investments). Each group provides a menu of specific indicators for each SP, as listed in the GEF 4 IW Focal Area Strategy. Although the Strategy requires use of environmental/water resources & socioeconomic status indicators only for SP 1 projects, GEF agencies may wish to report on project progress or results in environmental/water resources and socioeconomic status in the other programs if available. More information on GEF IW Indicator is located on the GEF IW knowledge management website www.iwlearn.net.

For programmatic approaches in the IW focal area, special results frameworks are developed and used for Investment Funds Programmes. Results for individual projects should be reported within this TT, while separate reporting is also expected at the level of Investment Fund each year.

When a project is being implemented by more than one GEF agency, only one agency should report within GEF 4 IW TT. The agency with larger portion of GEF grant should report on behalf of the entire project, and cooperating GEF agencies are requested to provide the reporting agency with relevant input.

If a project is being implemented within two GEF 4 IW SPs, reporting for both SPs should be undertaken on relevant indicators and an asterisk “*” should be add to the end of the project title in both reporting forms in order to avoid double counting.

Project ratings are subject to self-assessment; a zero mark means no results achieved, while mark three represents 100% achievement of projected results. Ratings will be averaged within each GEF 4 IW indicator to provide a program level and portfolio level view, not a project specific view. This roll-up will allow additional analysis and qualitative description of program and portfolio level results for reporting to the GEF Council and to Replenishment discussions.

Indicators and ratings:

SP 1 Restoring and Sustaining Marine Fish Stocks:

IW PROCESS INDICATORS:

- *Functional National Inter-Ministry Committees:* Progress in establishment/functioning of inter-ministry coordination body at national level should be reported;
- *Agreement on Transboundary Priorities and Root Causes (TDA):* The ratings represent different level of identification and scientific justification of transboundary issues within the process of development and completion of the TDA as well as the agreement on those at regional level. Root Causes Analysis, which is a preliminary

one and comprises only qualitative but not quantitative analysis should be assessed as inadequate.

- *National commitments to policy, legal & institutional reforms (Ministerial level adoption of SAP, ICM or IWRM Plans, etc.)* The rating represents different scope of commitment to reforms either at regional level (participating countries) or at national level (national planning framework);
- *Regional Legal Agreement:* Convention or other legal instrument being prepared/adopted in line with international law practice.
- *Functional and Sustainable Regional Transboundary Water Institution:* Either secretariat or other body agreed/established/funded by the countries sharing the transboundary water body;
- *Mechanisms in Place to Monitor Stress Reduction & Environmental/Water Resources and Socioeconomic Status of the Waterbody:* The rating represents both existence or quality of baseline data (information) on stress reduction, environmental/water resources and socioeconomic status and mechanisms to monitor change in those.
- *Project website established and maintained in line with the GEF IW:Learn template/guidelines:* Projects are suppose to establish and maintain a webpage in line with IW:Learn template and assure regular update of its content.
- *Knowledge Production/ Tools:* Projects are expected to produce various knowledge products and tools for capturing the results and best practices of the GEF intervention and shared them with the IW projects portfolio;
- *Experience Sharing & Learning:* Projects are expected to actively participate in various, regular IW portfolio learning and knowledge exchange activities, communities of practice and to host a staff exchange form other projects or transboundary institution;
- *Co-financing/Resource Mobilization target met (realised vs expected):* The rating represents the achieved level of committed co-financing against the planned one over time;
- *Catalytic results:* Catalytic results could be achieved when a GEF Agency pursues strategies and approaches that have a greater effect than the project intervention itself. The catalytic results could be local, national, regional or global. **Catalytic results** are results achieved through processes external to the project, but still facilitated by the project's activities, mechanisms and strategies, e.g.:
 - removal of barriers to up-scaling or replication,
 - new donor activities outside the scope of agreed co-financing,
 - market, policy and institutional changes outside the original scope of the project intervention, and
 - innovation and introduction of new approaches, practices and techniques;
- *Other:* This additional column provides a space for other specific indicator chosen by the agency for documenting the progress of the project and its contribution to the GEF 4 IW results.

IW STRESS REDUCTION INDICATORS:

- *Through implementation of national reforms providing tangible/measurable results:* One (minimum) or more indicators, relevant for this SP should be reported. Based on the rating table in the annex project should fill in rating(s) for reported indicators. Results of stress reduction achieved are to be reported in the text field, including values and units, if applicable.
- *Through demonstrations and investment (in technology or application of best practice):* One (minimum) or more indicators, relevant for this SP should be reported. This indicator describes what stage of implementation of stress reduction measures on the ground was achieved. Based on the rating table in the annex project should fill in rating(s) for reported indicators. The level of achievement of quantitative results should be reported including values and units.

IW ENVIRONMENTAL, WATER RESOURCES AND SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS INDICATORS:

- One (minimum) or more indicators, relevant for this SP should be reported. More specific information on the results, including technical details (values, units, etc.) should be provided in the text field.

SP 2 Reducing Nutrient Overenrichment and Oxygen Depletion in LMEs:

IW PROCESS INDICATORS:

- *Functional National Inter-Ministry Committees:* Progress in establishment/functioning of inter-ministry coordination body at national level should be reported;
- *Agreement on Transboundary Priorities and Root Causes (TDA):* The ratings represent different level of identification and scientific justification of transboundary issues within the process of development and completion of the TDA as well as the agreement on those at regional level. Root Causes Analysis, which is a preliminary one and comprises only qualitative but not quantitative analysis should be assessed as inadequate.
- *National commitments to policy, legal & institutional reforms (Ministerial level adoption of SAP, ICM or IWRM Plans, etc.)* The rating represents different scope of commitment to reforms either at regional level (participating countries) or at national level (national planning framework);
- *Regional Legal Agreement:* Convention or other legal instrument being prepared/adopted in line with international law practice.
- *Functional and Sustainable Regional Transboundary Water Institution:* Either secretariat or other body agreed/established/funded by the countries sharing the transboundary water body;
- *Mechanisms in Place to Monitor Stress Reduction & Environmental/Water Resources and Socioeconomic Status of the Waterbody:* The rating represents both existence or quality of baseline data (information) on stress reduction, environmental/water resources and socioeconomic status and mechanisms to monitor change in those.

- *Project website established and maintained in line with the GEF IW:Learn template/guidelines:* Projects are supposed to establish and maintain a webpage in line with IW:Learn template and assure regular update of its content.
- *Knowledge Production/ Tools:* Projects are expected to produce various knowledge products and tools for capturing the results and best practices of the GEF intervention and shared them with the IW projects portfolio;
- *Experience Sharing & Learning:* Projects are expected to actively participate in various, regular IW portfolio learning and knowledge exchange activities, communities of practice and to host a staff exchange from other projects or transboundary institution;
- *Co-financing/Resource Mobilization target met (realised vs expected):* The rating represents the achieved level of committed co-financing against the planned one over time:
- *Catalytic results:* Catalytic results could be achieved when a GEF Agency pursues strategies and approaches that have a greater effect than the project intervention itself. The catalytic results could be local, national, regional or global. **Catalytic results** are results achieved through processes external to the project, but still facilitated by the project's activities, mechanisms and strategies, e.g.:
 - removal of barriers to up-scaling or replication,
 - new donor activities outside the scope of agreed co-financing,
 - market, policy and institutional changes outside the original scope of the project intervention, and
 - innovation and introduction of new approaches, practices and techniques;
- *Other:* This additional column provides a space for other specific indicator chosen by the agency for documenting the progress of the project and its contribution to the GEF 4 IW results.

IW STRESS REDUCTION INDICATORS:

- *Through implementation of national reforms providing tangible/measurable results:* One (minimum) or more indicators, relevant for this SP should be reported. One (minimum) or more indicators, relevant for this SP should be reported. Based on the rating table in the annex project should fill in rating(s) for reported indicators. Results of stress reduction achieved are to be reported in the text field, including values and units, if applicable.
- *Through demonstrations and investment (in technology or application of best practice):* One (minimum) or more indicators, relevant for this SP should be reported. This indicator describes what stage of implementation of stress reduction measures on the ground was achieved. Based on the rating table in the annex project should fill in rating(s) for reported indicators. The level of achievement of quantitative results should be reported including values and units.

IW ENVIRONMENTAL, WATER RESOURCES AND SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS INDICATORS:

- SP 2 projects may report on these indicators, if applicable. If a different environmental, water resources or socioeconomic indicator is applicable, other than offered by the scroll down menu, the project should specify it the text field.

SP 3 Balancing Over-Use and Conflicting Uses of Transboundary Waters:

IW PROCESS INDICATORS:

- *Functional National Inter-Ministry Committees:* Progress in establishment/functioning of inter-ministry coordination body at national level should be reported;
- *Agreement on Transboundary Priorities and Root Causes (TDA):* The ratings represent different level of identification and scientific justification of transboundary issues within the process of development and completion of the TDA as well as the agreement on those at regional level. Root Causes Analysis, which is a preliminary one and comprises only qualitative but not quantitative analysis should be assessed as inadequate.
- *National commitments to policy, legal & institutional reforms (Ministerial level adoption of SAP, ICM or IWRM Plans, etc.)* The rating represents different scope of commitment to reforms either at regional level (participating countries) or at national level (national planning framework);
- *Regional Legal Agreement:* Convention or other legal instrument being prepared/adopted in line with international law practice.
- *Functional and Sustainable Regional Transboundary Water Institution:* Either secretariat or other body agreed/established/funded by the countries sharing the transboundary water body;
- *Mechanisms in Place to Monitor Stress Reduction & Environmental/Water Resources and Socioeconomic Status of the Waterbody:* The rating represents both existence or quality of baseline data (information) on stress reduction, environmental/water resources and socioeconomic status and mechanisms to monitor change in those.
- *Project website established and maintained in line with the GEF IW:Learn template/guidelines:* Projects are suppose to establish and maintain a webpage in line with IW:Learn template and assure regular update of its content.
- *Knowledge Production/ Tools:* Projects are expected to produce various knowledge products and tools for capturing the results and best practices of the GEF intervention and shared them with the IW projects portfolio;
- *Experience Sharing & Learning:* Projects are expected to actively participate in various, regular IW portfolio learning and knowledge exchange activities, communities of practice and to host a staff exchange form other projects or transboundary institution;

- *Co-financing/Resource Mobilization target met (realised vs expected):* The rating represents the achieved level of committed co-financing against the planned one over time:
- *Catalytic results:* Catalytic results could be achieved when a GEF Agency pursues strategies and approaches that have a greater effect than the project intervention itself. The catalytic results could be local, national, regional or global. ***Catalytic results*** are results achieved through processes external to the project, but still facilitated by the project's activities, mechanisms and strategies, e.g.:
 - removal of barriers to up-scaling or replication,
 - new donor activities outside the scope of agreed co-financing,
 - market, policy and institutional changes outside the original scope of the project intervention, and
 - innovation and introduction of new approaches, practices and techniques;
- *Other:* This additional column provides a space for other specific indicator chosen by the agency for documenting the progress of the project and its contribution to the GEF 4 IW results.

IW STRESS REDUCTION INDICATORS:

- *Through implementation of national reforms providing tangible/measurable results:* One (minimum) or more indicators, relevant for this SP should be reported. Based on the rating table in the annex project should fill in rating(s) for reported indicators. Results of stress reduction achieved are to be reported in the text field, including values and units, if applicable.
- *Through demonstrations and investment (in technology or application of best practice):* One (minimum) or more indicators, relevant for this SP should be reported. This indicator describes what stage of implementation of stress reduction measures on the ground was achieved. Based on the rating table in the annex project should fill in rating(s) for reported indicators. The level of achievement of quantitative results should be reported including values and units.

IW ENVIRONMENTAL, WATER RESOURCES AND SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS INDICATORS:

- SP 3 projects may report on these indicators, if applicable. If a different environmental, water resources or socioeconomic indicator is applicable, other than offered by the scroll down menu, the project should specify it the text field.

SP 4 Reducing Persistent Toxic Substances and Management of Waters with

Melting Ice:

IW PROCESS INDICATORS:

- *Functional National Inter-Ministry Committees:* Progress in establishment/functioning of inter-ministry coordination body at national level should be reported;
- *Agreement on Transboundary Priorities and Root Causes (TDA):* The ratings represent different level of identification and scientific justification of transboundary issues within the process of development and completion of the TDA as well as the agreement on those at regional level. Root Causes Analysis, which is a preliminary one and comprises only qualitative but not quantitative analysis should be assessed as inadequate.
- *National commitments to policy, legal & institutional reforms (Ministerial level adoption of SAP, ICM or IWRM Plans, etc.)* The rating represents different scope of commitment to reforms either at regional level (participating countries) or at national level (national planning framework);
- *Regional Legal Agreement:* Convention or other legal instrument being prepared/adopted in line with international law practice.
- *Functional and Sustainable Regional Transboundary Water Institution:* Either secretariat or other body agreed/established/funded by the countries sharing the transboundary water body;
- *Mechanisms in Place to Monitor Stress Reduction & Environmental/Water Resources and Socioeconomic Status of the Waterbody:* The rating represents both existence or quality of baseline data (information) on stress reduction, environmental/water resources and socioeconomic status and mechanisms to monitor change in those.
- *Project website established and maintained in line with the GEF IW:Learn template/guidelines:* Projects are suppose to establish and maintain a webpage in line with IW:Learn template and assure regular update of its content.
- *Knowledge Production/ Tools:* Projects are expected to produce various knowledge products and tools for capturing the results and best practices of the GEF intervention and shared them with the IW projects portfolio;
- *Experience Sharing & Learning:* Projects are expected to actively participate in various, regular IW portfolio learning and knowledge exchange activities, communities of practice and to host a staff exchange form other projects or transboundary institution;
- *Co-financing/Resource Mobilization target met (realised vs expected):* The rating represents the achieved level of committed co-financing against the planned one over time;
- *Catalytic results:* Catalytic results could be achieved when a GEF Agency pursues strategies and approaches that have a greater effect than the project intervention itself. The catalytic results could be local, national, regional or global. **Catalytic results** are results achieved through processes external to the project, but still facilitated by the project's activities, mechanisms and strategies, e.g.:
 - removal of barriers to up-scaling or replication,
 - new donor activities outside the scope of agreed co-financing,
 - market, policy and institutional changes outside the original scope of the project intervention, and

- innovation and introduction of new approaches, practices and techniques;
- *Other*: This additional column provides a space for other specific indicator chosen by the agency for documenting the progress of the project and its contribution to the GEF 4 IW results.

IW STRESS REDUCTION INDICATORS:

- *Through implementation of national reforms providing tangible/measurable results*: One (minimum) or more indicators, relevant for this SP should be reported. Based on the rating table in the annex project should fill in rating(s) for reported indicators. Results of stress reduction achieved are to be reported in the text field, including values and units, if applicable.
- *Through demonstrations and investment (in technology or application of best practice)*: One (minimum) or more indicators, relevant for this SP should be reported. This indicator describes what stage of implementation of stress reduction measures on the ground was achieved. Based on the rating table in the annex project should fill in rating(s) for reported indicators. The level of achievement of quantitative results should be reported including values and units.

IW ENVIRONMENTAL, WATER RESOURCES AND SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS INDICATORS:

- SP 4 projects may report on these indicators, if applicable. If a different environmental, water resources or socioeconomic indicator is applicable, other than offered by the scroll down menu, the project should specify it the text field.

ANNEX 6. DEFINITION OF RATINGS

IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS RATINGS

1. **Highly Satisfactory (HS):** Implementation of **all** components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised implementation plan for the project. The project can be presented as “good practice”.
2. **Satisfactory (S):** Implementation of **most** components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan except for only a few that are subject to remedial action.
3. **Marginally Satisfactory (MS):** Implementation of **some** components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan with **some** components requiring remedial action.
4. **Marginally Unsatisfactory (MU):** Implementation of **some** components is not in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan with **most** components requiring remedial action..
5. **Unsatisfactory (U):** Implementation of **most** components is not in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan.
6. **Highly Unsatisfactory (HU):** Implementation of **none** of the components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan.

GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT OBJECTIVE/DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVE RATINGS

7. **Highly Satisfactory (HS):** Project is expected to achieve or exceed **all** its major global environmental objectives, and yield substantial global environmental benefits, without major shortcomings. The project can be presented as “good practice”.
8. **Satisfactory (S):** Project is expected to achieve **most** of its major global environmental objectives, and yield satisfactory global environmental benefits, with only minor shortcomings.
9. **Marginally Satisfactory (MS):** Project is expected to achieve **most** of its major relevant objectives but with either significant shortcomings or modest overall relevance. Project is expected not to achieve **some** of its major global environmental objectives or yield some of the expected global environment benefits.
10. **Marginally Unsatisfactory (MU):** Project is expected to achieve of its major global environmental objectives with major shortcomings or is expected to achieve only **some** of its major global environmental objectives.

11. **Unsatisfactory (U):** Project is expected **not** to achieve **most** of its major global environment objectives or to yield any satisfactory global environmental benefits.

12. **Highly Unsatisfactory (HU):** The project has failed to achieve, and is not expected to achieve, **any** of its major global environment objectives with no worthwhile benefits.

RISK RATINGS

13. Risk ratings will assess the overall risk of factors internal or external to the project which may affect implementation or prospects for achieving project objectives. Risks of projects should be rated on the following scale:

14. **High Risk (H):** There is a probability of greater than 75% that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face high risks.

15. **Substantial Risk (S):** There is a probability of between 51% and 75% that assumptions may fail to hold and/or the project may face substantial risks.

16. **Modest Risk (M):** There is a probability of between 26% and 50% that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize, and/ or the project may face only modest risks.

17. **Low Risk (L):** There is a probability of up to 25% that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize, and/ or the project may face only modest risks.