

GEF Council Meeting
May 25 - 27, 2014
Cancun, Mexico

Agenda Item 17

**WORK PROGRAM AND BUDGET OF THE
GEF INDEPENDENT EVALUATION OFFICE**

(Prepared by the GEF Independent Evaluation Office)

Recommended Council Decision

The Council, having reviewed document GEF/ME/C.46/01, “*Work Program and Budget of the GEF Independent Evaluation Office*,” approves the annual budget for the Independent Evaluation Office for fiscal year 2015 for a total of US\$ 3.242 million. The multi-annual budget for the evaluation program of the GEF Independent Evaluation Office is approved for an amount of US\$ 0.67 million for evaluations carried out in fiscal year 2015, thus closing the GEF-5 period for the Office. The Office is requested to prepare an updated work plan and multi-annual budget for the GEF-6 period, including the preparations for the 6th Comprehensive Evaluation of the GEF, after the new Director has taken up the position in September 2014.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The four year work program of the Independent Evaluation Office for GEF-5 was approved by the GEF Council in May 2011. The Office operates through an annual budget for staffing and related costs and a multi-annual operational budget for its evaluation activities. This enables the Office to operate beyond the boundary of a fiscal year, which is essential for its work program of evaluations, many of which cross that boundary. At each May/June session of Council the annual budget is approved for the next fiscal year, whereas the multi-annual budget receives another tranche to ensure commitments can be made that go beyond the next fiscal year.

The cycle of work funded by the GEF-5 replenishment comes at an end in fiscal year 2015. The multi-annual budget for the GEF-5 period also ends in fiscal year 2015. Given the fact that a new Director will take office in September and that the peer review findings need to be taken into account, as well as a revision of the GEF monitoring and evaluation policy to be approved by Council, this document does not present detailed plans for the GEF-6 period. The new Director could be invited to present her or his initial views in the Progress Report to the Council at its second meeting in 2014. The Council should expect to approve a detailed multi-annual work program and budget for the Office at its first meeting in 2015 and it could request the Office to ensure it prepares proposals for this purpose.

The Fifth Overall Performance Study has provided some lessons on how the next version should be undertaken and integrated into the replenishment cycle of the GEF and the work program of the office. The first challenge is to further integrate evaluative work for the next comprehensive evaluation into the regular work of the Office. Candidates are for example gender issues as well as private sector and civil society engagements. More can be done, which could lead to further reduction of costs and a delivery of the evaluation at the start of the replenishment process.

Secondly, when the overall performance studies started, they focused on operational and performance issues. They have now turned into comprehensive evaluations that range from impact evidence to performance and organizational issues. It is proposed to continue numbering them but change the name. From the Fifth Overall Performance Study the GEF should proceed to the Sixth Comprehensive Evaluation of the GEF (CEG6).

The work program of the Office in fiscal year 2015 consists of ongoing work in the four evaluative streams of the Office – Country Portfolio Evaluations, Impact Evaluations, Performance Evaluations and Thematic Evaluations, as well as preparatory work for GEF-6.

On the annual budget, \$ 3.242 million is needed to ensure flexibility in staff hiring and meeting operational expenses. The multi-annual budget needs to be topped up with \$ 0.67 million to ensure the ongoing evaluations can be finalized and preparatory work for GEF-6 can be carried out. The overall cap of \$ 18.563 million for the GEF-5 period is maintained. Current budgeting amounts to \$ 18.555 million so remains within this cap. In line with international best practices in budgeting for evaluation, the budget line for the Office has been moved out of the administrative budget of the GEF and is now a separate line item.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

The Work Program and Budget of the Office for GEF-5	1
Country Portfolio Evaluations Stream	2
Impact Evaluations Stream	3
Performance Evaluations Stream	4
Thematic Evaluations Stream	6
Knowledge Management	8
Multi-Annual Evaluation Budget	9
Independent Evaluation Office Annual Budget	10
Human Resources	11

THE WORK PROGRAM AND BUDGET OF THE OFFICE FOR GEF-5

1. In May 2011 Council approved the work program of the GEF Independent Evaluation Office for the GEF-5 period.¹ Furthermore, Council approved an annual budget for administrative costs of the Independent Evaluation Office and a multi-annual budget for its evaluation activities. The move towards a multi-annual budget for evaluations had become necessary, as many evaluations are implemented from one fiscal year into the next and funds to be committed for these evaluations need to be available in advance in the financial system of the World Bank. This has functioned well during the current replenishment phase.
2. The annual budget of the Office contains salaries and benefits, operational costs and other costs that can and should be planned on an annual basis. In June 2013 the Council approved a shift of funding from the multi-annual budget to the annual budget to increase flexibility in hiring of staff. This flexibility has been kept during fiscal year 2014 through hiring consultants where necessary and will make it possible for the new Director to open up positions for new staff.
3. In the framework of the Fourth Overall Performance Study a professional peer review was undertaken of the evaluation function of the GEF. In paragraph 24 of the Terms of Reference of OPS5, approved by Council in June 2012, a second peer review was foreseen for the first half of 2014, so that its conclusions can be taken up by the Council in June 2014, when the current Director would be out-going (leaving in September 2014) and a new Director would be selected. The peer review has taken place and its report is presented to the Council. Dr. Mary Chinery-Hesse, chair of the peer review panel and a member of the Committee of the Wise of the African Union, will present the report to the Council. Council's comments on the report can be taken into account in the development of the work program for the GEF-6 replenishment phase.
4. An update of the GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy should take place for the GEF-6 replenishment period. New focal area strategies and new Partner Agencies need to be taken into account, as well as a revised Results Based Management Strategy that will be presented to the Council in November, along with an evaluability assessment of the Office. New terminal evaluation guidelines will need to reflect the increased emphasis on impact. So far, no agreement has yet been reached on how terminal evaluations should include evaluative evidence on impact. The impact analysis of terminal evaluations for OPS5 has mostly been done by the Independent Evaluation Office; some GEF Agencies have moved in this direction and have started to apply theory of change and progress toward impact approaches in their terminal evaluations.
5. The following sections present the Office's work program for the four streams of evaluations – Country Portfolio, Impact, Performance, and Thematic – and the implementation of knowledge sharing activities that support the implementation of the GEF M&E Policy. This work program is detailed and fully budgeted for fiscal year 2015. Approval is sought for the additional funds that are needed in fiscal year 2015. Lastly, the report contains a section on human resources.

¹ See the Joint Summary of the Chairs, May 26, 2011, paragraph 12.

COUNTRY PORTFOLIO EVALUATIONS STREAM

6. During the GEF-5 period country level evaluations, including Country Portfolio Evaluations (CPEs) and Country Portfolio Studies (CPSs), are run consecutively. Annual reporting on findings and recommendations takes place in the Annual Country Portfolio Evaluation Report (ACPER), which is presented to Council at its May/June session. To date, three ACPERs have been completed in the main GEF geographic regions: the ACPER 2012, reporting on CPEs and CPSs conducted in the Latin America and Caribbean (LAC) region; the ACPER 2013 reporting on those conducted in the Asia and South Pacific region; and the ACPER 2014, reporting on the Sub-Saharan Africa region. The ACPER 2014 is presented as a working document at this Council session.

7. All the evaluations planned in the LAC and Asia-Pacific regions have been completed. These include the Nicaragua CPE; the Organization of Eastern Caribbean States (OECS) Cluster CPE (comprising Antigua and Barbuda, Dominica, Grenada, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia and Saint Vincent and the Grenadines); the El Salvador CPS; the Jamaica CPS; the Brazil CPE; the Cuba CPE; the Timor Leste CPS; the India CPE, the Joint GEF/Sri Lanka CPE; and the Vanuatu and SPREP Portfolio Evaluation. Three evaluations in Sub Saharan Africa are being finalized, including the Tanzania and Eritrea CPEs, and the Sierra Leone CPS. In the first half of FY14 two CPEs have been launched in Russia (ECA region) and Morocco (MENA region). These, with a last evaluation planned in the ECA region (Tajikistan) will complete the country level evaluations cycle for GEF5, for a total on 16 evaluations.

8. The Office's continues to pursue its efforts in joint country level evaluations. The collaboration with the UNDP Independent Evaluation Office in country level evaluation work, started in FY10 with El Salvador and Jamaica through the CPS modality, was taken forward in FY11 with Timor Leste and is continuing in FY14 with Sierra Leone. The Sri Lanka CPE has been conducted jointly with the government and was a successful experience. The Sri Lanka Ministry of Finance and Planning stated that the joint steering committee set up to co-manage the joint evaluation has proved to be a very innovative approach which maintains ownership for Government as well as donors on the evaluation findings, while the institutional architecture ensured independence which is vital in any evaluation process. The evaluation was peer reviewed by independent experts from the Sri Lanka Evaluation Association (SLEvA).

9. The overall GEF-5 country level evaluations budget, prepared based on the countries' selection procedure², is presented here below (in US\$ k). The estimated CPE cost depends on the financial size and the number of projects of the portfolio as well as the number of completed projects (portfolio maturity). The budget includes a general category "miscellanea" accounting for costs associated with Office-based research assistance and other support to the team (short term consultants; translations; participation in international conferences, other). In FY12 the actual expenditure amounted at \$0.565 million. In FY13 the actual expenditure amounted at \$0.465 million. The estimated actuals of FY14 amount at \$0.410 million, leaving a balance of \$0.580 for the last fiscal year of GEF5, FY15.

² The country's selection procedure is available on the Office website (<http://www.gefio.org/sites/default/files/ieo/ieo-documents/cpe-selection-criteria.pdf>).

Table 1 – Country level evaluations budget for GEF-5						
Region	CPE/CPS	FY12 (actuals)	FY13 (actuals)	FY14 (est. actuals)	FY15 (budget)	Totals
LAC	OECS Cluster CPE	57	0	0	0	57
	Brazil CPE	239	50	0	0	289
	Cuba CPE	148	0	0	0	148
Asia	India CPE	44	72	17	0	133
	East Timor CPS	39	0	0	0	39
	Sri Lanka CPE	38	0	36	0	146
	Vanuatu/SPREP Portfolio Evaluation	0	72	77	0	173
Africa	Tanzania CPE	0	96	97	0	197
	Eritrea CPE	0	100	40	0	73
	Sierra Leone CPS	0	0	33	0	33
ECA	Russia CPE	0	0	40	250	290
	ECA 2 CPE (Tajikistan)	0	0	0	140	140
MENA	Morocco CPE	0	0	30	120	150
Miscellanea		0	42	40	70	152
Totals		565	465	410	580	2020

IMPACT EVALUATIONS STREAM

10. Impact evaluation at the GEF Independent Evaluation Office aims at assessing impact of GEF support and to provide knowledge to the GEF partnership on ways to improve by:

- determining incidence, extent and nature of impacts;
- developing a better understanding of the processes through which impacts take place and the factors at play;
- assessing and reporting on the quality of information on impact of GEF activities

11. For FY 2015, impact work will be comprised of four sets of deliverables. These are: 1) the completion of the Joint Impact Evaluation of GEF support to Protected Areas, 2) learning and communications products, 3) the 2014 Annual Impact Report, 4) reviews of progress towards impact for all completed GEF projects, and 5) the approach paper for the next impact evaluation or mainstreaming of impact within all Office evaluation activities.

12. The **joint impact evaluation of GEF support to protected areas** (with UNDP's Independent Evaluation Office) has as its main objective to assess the impact of GEF support to biodiversity conservation through support to protected areas and protected area systems. It will evaluate the extent to which GEF strategies, programs and interventions have been able to enhance species and habitat protection and restoration and to enhance capacities for biodiversity conservation through protected areas. The evaluation will focus on interventions that are in line with GEF 5 Biodiversity Strategy Objective 1 to improve the sustainability of protected area systems.

13. The implementation of phase 2 of the evaluation will be jointly managed by the GEF IEO and UNDP IEO, with technical support provided by the IUCN WCPA-SSC Joint Task Force on Biodiversity and Protected Areas and by other experts for specific activities, and support from a Reference Group and a Technical Advisory Group (TAG) on both strategic and technical

concerns relevant to project information, conservation science and evaluation methods. It will consist of three components: 1) Identification of factors of protected area success through analysis of global databases, including counterfactual analysis; 2) Analysis of social-ecological interactions through field studies; and 3) Data synthesis through, amongst others, fuzzy-set Qualitative Comparative Analysis to triangulate the results.

14. **Learning and communication** has now become more prominent than in previous years. The transition from GEF-5 to GEF-6 is seen as an opportunity to reflect on the work carried out so far, draw lessons for other GEF stakeholders and future evaluations, and widely disseminate these lessons in professional meetings and publications.

15. **The portfolio analysis** on progress towards impact done for OPS5 will be expanded to include all available Terminal Evaluations before OPS4 and after OPS5.

16. An **approach paper for the next impact evaluation** will be prepared after the new Director is in place. The Office will seek early input of GEF stakeholders in this process. There are three options that could be considered and presented to stakeholders for discussion:

- Continue expanding the existing evaluative evidence on the older focal areas (Biodiversity, Climate Change and International Waters);
- Focus on one of the newer focal areas such as Land Degradation;
- Identify a topic of intersection between different focal areas and assess the accumulated impact and interactions.

17. Concurrently, the impact team will also focus on **mainstreaming impact evaluation** into other evaluation streams in the Office. The search for higher utility would require the identification of approaches used in the office that are promising but also the search of new approaches and methods that would build on the current credibility of the work of the Office.

Table 2 – Impact evaluations budget for GEF-5					
In \$k	FY12 (actuals)	FY13 (actuals)	FY14 (est.)	FY15	Totals
International Waters Impact Evaluation	261	44	0	0	305
Climate Change Impact Evaluation	0	131	26	0	157
Biodiversity Impact Evaluation	0	40	345	60	445
Reviews on impact measuring arrangements	70	0	0	0	70
Progress to impact of completed projects	0	111	32	15	158
Learning, communication and preparation of new impact evaluation	0	0	35	80	115
	331	326	438	155	1,250

PERFORMANCE EVALUATIONS STREAM

18. Performance evaluations undertaken by the GEF Independent Evaluation Office assess the internal dynamics of participating organizations, instruments, mechanisms, and management practices. They include evaluations of institutional and procedural issues across GEF focal areas, and assessment of experience with GEF strategies and policies, criteria and procedures. They

also include periodic or special-purpose evaluations of a program's progress and plans, as well as assessments on research, knowledge/ market benefits and cost effectiveness over a span of years.

19. The **Annual Performance Report (APR)** is a feature product of the performance evaluation stream of work. Based on the information received on completed projects, it presents a detailed account of the performance of the GEF portfolio in terms of project results, processes that may affect project results and monitoring and evaluation (M&E) arrangements. The GEF Agencies are required to prepare a terminal evaluation report at the operational completion for all GEF full sized and medium sized projects and programs. The GEF M&E policy requires independent terminal evaluations, or, alternatively, an independent review of the terminal evaluation. Several GEF Agencies have an established process in place whereby their independent evaluation office reviews and validates terminal evaluations and assesses the quality of terminal evaluation reports. Where a GEF Agency lacks an independent review process, the GEF Independent Evaluation Office will review the terminal evaluation reports.

20. APR 2014 will report on a high number of completed projects. It is expected that the Office will need to review a considerable number of terminal evaluations, as not in all cases the independent review processes in GEF Agencies are fully established yet. The budget for APR 2014 therefore must be maintained at its current level. A sub-study will also be undertaken on a specific performance issue; this will be decided at the time of consultation on the approach paper for APR 2014.

21. With the increase in the number of observations in the terminal evaluation review dataset, stakeholders have expressed the need to report on the basis of the GEF replenishment periods. However, since outcomes of projects that were completed before 2002 have not yet been reported on in APR and APR2004³ did not report on outcomes, the reporting on outcomes of completed projects from the pilot phase and GEF-1 period is limited. To address this gap the projects whose outcomes the projects completed before 2002 also need to be reviewed and reported on. For a significant proportion of the projects from that period that have not yet been reported on terminal evaluations are now available with the GEF IEO.

22. OPS5 has found that the current RBM framework of the GEF is too burdensome and has proposed to undertake an evaluability assessment for the corporate results and RBM framework proposed for GEF-6. The aim of this assessment is to provide timely feedback to the GEF on the appropriateness of the proposed approach, indicators and targets. The performance team – in collaboration with the thematic team – is undertaking this assessment. The assessment will lead to a Council document that would accompany the new GEF-6 RBM framework document to be approved by the Council at its second meeting in 2014.

23. In its May 2011 meeting, the GEF Council decided to broaden the GEF partnership under the provisions of paragraph 28 of the GEF Instrument by approving a pilot on accrediting new institutions for the implementation of GEF projects. The Council also instructed the Independent Evaluation Office to initiate an evaluation on the pilot at the earlier of the two milestones: (a) two years after the first five agencies have been accredited or (b) January 2015. In its November 2013 meeting the Council gave its approval to two agencies moving from stage II to stage III of accreditation. Given the slow progress it is the second trigger that will be relevant for this evaluation. In January 2015 consultations will be started on the evaluation to be undertaken.

³ APR2004 reported primarily on the quality of terminal evaluation reports. Project outcomes were reported on for the first time in APR2005.

24. **Development of methodology and guidance** for the GEF partnership will continue. The terminal evaluation guidelines need to be updated for GEF-6. An important service that the performance team is providing to the Independent Evaluation Office is support for **portfolio analysis and database management**. Given the ongoing needs of portfolio analysis and to develop cleaner and more reliable datasets for OPS5, an additional amount needs to be budgeted for this service in fiscal year 2014.

Table 3 – Performance evaluations budget for GEF-5					
In \$k	FY12 <i>(actuals)</i>	FY13 <i>(actuals)</i>	FY14	FY15	Totals
Annual Performance Report	144	234	197	195	770
STAR mid-term evaluation	0	32	71	0	103
NPFE mid-term evaluation	0	34	47	0	81
Article 28 evaluation	0	0	0	10	10
Evaluability Assessment	0	0	20	20	40
Database support and methodology development	20	20	65	20	125
	164	320	400	245	1,129

THEMATIC EVALUATIONS STREAM

25. Thematic evaluations conducted by the GEF Independent Evaluation Office assess topics of concern to all GEF activities and provide a basis for decision making and lesson learning on specific themes. These evaluations are organized in four levels: program, process, focal area and cross-sectoral evaluations. Topics range from strategies and policies to cross-cutting programs.

26. Through the **Annual Thematic Evaluation Report** (ATER) the Office presents information on the progress of ongoing thematic evaluations, methodological developments and other related efforts. In addition, whenever an evaluation or an assessment is completed during a reporting period, a summary of its findings and conclusions are also included in the report. The Office also reports to the LDCF/SCCF Council on adaptation to climate change work through the LDCF/SCCF Annual Evaluation Report.

27. In FY14 the ongoing **Evaluation of GEF Enabling Activities** is in its second phase and has informed OPS5. The evaluation aims to provide lessons learned from implementing Enabling Activities and evaluative evidence of the role of Enabling Activities in the overall catalytic effect of the GEF, as indicated through previous evaluations conducted by Office. The thematic evaluation stream commissioned a study on the state of the art of capacity development and the current paradigm termed “capacity development 2” (CD2). In FY15 the evaluation will work on developing a CD2 framework and will explore capacity development and the efficiency and effectiveness of the Enabling Activities modality through five in-depth case studies. Another ongoing evaluation that is complementing the Enabling Activities Evaluation is the assessment of the follow up to NAPAs which were financed through the enabling activities modality. Two of the Enabling Activities in-depth case studies will also focus on NAPA implementation projects.

28. During FY14 further analysis of focal area strategies focused on the alignment of Results Based Management tracking tools to **GEF Focal Area Strategies**, to gain an understanding of how the tracking tools reflect each focal area strategy results framework and to highlight gaps. A comparative assessment of the results frameworks approved for GEF-4 and GEF-5 was done to count indicator elements. Findings of the assessment were an input to OPS5. Together with the

performance evaluation stream an evaluability assessment of the GEF-6 corporate level results framework has been initiated that will be continued in FY15.

29. The thematic evaluation stream conducted a study on the GEF's Policy on Gender Mainstreaming that was approved in May 2011. The conclusions and recommendations fed into OPS5 and provide an understanding of the baseline of the gender policy, i.e. the issues it needs to address. The Office also completed studies on Civil Society Organizations and private sector engagement in the GEF as part of OPS5. In FY15 the thematic evaluation team will continue working on these ongoing **cross-cutting issues**. The work will focus on methodological development to include these cross-cutting issues in IEO evaluations.

30. The **Small Grants Programme (SGP)** of the GEF is being evaluated jointly by the independent evaluation offices of the GEF (GEF IEO) and UNDP as equal partners. The Joint GEF/UNDP SGP Evaluation is being conducted in two phases. The 1st Phase started in April and was concluded in February 2014. The focus was on providing an update of the previous Joint Evaluation of the SGP (GEF, UNDP, 2008) and an assessment of the progress made to date on implementation of its recommendations. The findings of this 1st Phase have been included in the final OPS5 report. The 2nd Phase started in March 2014 and is expected to be completed in November 2014. The scope is to expand the analysis of the effectiveness of the SGP, looking at themes as cumulative effectiveness, gender mainstreaming and poverty, among others. The 2nd Phase will be presented to the UNDP Executive Board and the GEF Council in 2015.

31. The overall budget for this evaluation, initially approved by the Joint Steering Committee of the evaluation on 23 March, 2013, amounted to \$200,000.⁴ The GEF IEO share, amounting at \$75,000, originates from the 5th Overall Performance Study (OPS5) budget, as the first phase was designed to inform that evaluation on SGP performance and results during GEF-5. The 2nd Phase is presently ongoing and the total estimated expenditures at the end of FY14 amount to \$51,000. An additional \$46,300 is foreseen in FY15. The 2nd Phase is also funded from the \$46,614 unspent balance of the previously Council approved budget of the 2007 Joint GEF/UNDP Evaluation of the SGP.

32. The **Final Report of the Fifth Overall Performance Study: At Crossroads for Higher Impact** was submitted to the third replenishment meeting in December 2013. The Final and First Reports of OPS5 as well as 20 technical documents and supporting documents are available on the Office's website. Work continues on the publication of OPS5 for submission to the Assembly in May 2014. OPS5 had a budget of \$1.099 million and is estimated to be underspent by \$236 thousand by the end of FY14. The first report of OPS5 was budgeted at \$145k, whereas it actually cost \$136k. The final report of OPS5 and the sub-studies were budgeted at \$863k, and expenditure is estimated to be \$700. Relatively substantial cost-savings were achieved that have led to an overall reduction of the thematic evaluations budget.

33. The budget for GEF-5 for the thematic evaluation stream is presented in table 4. The thematic team also provides support to LDCF/SCCF. For the first time an annual evaluation report has been presented to the LDCF/SCCF Council; the work program and budget for the evaluative work for LDCF/SCCF are presented to that Council. The team also provided support to the Adaptation Fund, preparing amongst others the evaluation framework of the Adaptation Fund. As from 2011 the Office was recognized as the evaluation function of the Adaptation Fund

⁴ The GEF and UNDP Independent Evaluation Offices contribute 37.5% each, while the remaining 25% comes from the SGP, through the budget allocated for the terminal evaluation of its 5th Operational Programme (OP5).

on an interim-basis for three years. However, further proposals from the Office as evaluation function have not met with appreciation in the Adaptation Fund Board and the Office has therefore decided to withdraw as evaluation function.

Table 4 – Thematic evaluations budget for GEF-5					
In \$k	FY12 <i>(actuals)</i>	FY13 <i>(actuals)</i>	FY14 <i>(est.</i> <i>actuals)</i>	FY15	Totals
Evaluation NCSA	90	0	0	0	90
Evaluation Enabling Activities	20	40	58	80	198
Evaluation FA Strategies	86	76	34	20	216
Evaluation of the SGP	0	0	15	46	61
OPS5 including preparatory work	29	167	744	0	940
Annual Thematic Evaluation Report	0	0	0	46	46
Totals	225	283	851	192	1,551

KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT

34. During fiscal year 2015, the Independent Evaluation Office will continue focusing on the **dissemination of findings and learning emerging from OPS5**. To accomplish this task, in addition to produce the OPS5 final report, the office will be introducing new multi-media products that will provide stakeholders and interested parties, with a convenient and interactive way to access not only OPS5 first and final reports but also all the other studies, documents and reports linked to this evaluation. Also, these new products will be developed to collect and disseminate information based on performance, impact, country portfolio and thematic evaluations.

35. The focus on OPS5 does not limit the work of the knowledge management team. It takes place against the background of two important developments. The first is the rapid and extended use of new communications platforms, especially, those based on social media. The second is the increased recognition of the importance of learning from experiences in the GEF, as for example, is seen in the GEF 2020 Strategy, in recommendations of the Fifth Overall Performance Study (OPS5), and emerging learning initiatives led by the GEF Secretariat.

36. Initiatives that will be taken in fiscal year 2015 include a **stakeholder survey** to gain insights from users of evaluation information and products. IEO will conduct a baseline survey to determine current level of use of IEO products, collect information on the most appropriate formats, and identify priorities for future learning products. In addition, a desk review of current practices in knowledge, communications, and learning applied by evaluation units of GEF Agencies and other international organizations will be undertaken. Based on the stakeholder survey, desk review, and stakeholder consultations, the IEO Knowledge, Learning, and Communication Strategy for GEF-6 will be developed.

37. The Office will increasingly include knowledge and communication strategies at the start of each evaluation. During FY15 at least two evaluations will have an established plan for communication that will address communication, stakeholder engagement before, during, and

after evaluation. The plans will also include knowledge products that will be developed in parallel with evaluations and released together with the final evaluation report. The KM team will support evaluators in implementation of communication plans.

38. Other work of the team will focus on developing specific products for social media, such as blogs and webinars. The websites of the Office will be maintained and updated where possible to enable better interaction. Regarding publications the office will continue the practice of making reports available electronically as first and foremost distribution channel and printing reports “on demand” on a specific needs basis only.

39. The Second phase of the community of practice **Climate-Eval** is under way and the main focus for FY15 is the organization of the 2nd International Conference on Evaluating Climate Change and Development. A steering committee has been created and it currently working on the final details. The event is planned to take place in Washington, D.C. in September 2014. Two meta-evaluations will be conducted by the community to further develop global knowledge on evaluation of climate change and natural resource management programs.

Table 5 – Knowledge management budget for GEF-5					
In \$k	FY12 <i>(actuals)</i>	FY13 <i>(actuals)</i>	FY14 <i>(est.)</i>	FY15	Totals
Communication and knowledge sharing	83	51	38	24	224
Communities of practice	44	40	3	32	94
Records management & web tools	69	85	48	103	302
Totals	196	176	89	159	620

MULTI-ANNUAL EVALUATION BUDGET

40. The multi-annual budget, as presented in table 6, currently has available \$ 5 million for evaluations from fiscal year 2012 continuing on into fiscal year 2014. Sufficient funding needs to be made available to ensure that the regular work program of the Office can be carried out, as well as OPS5 and the mid-term evaluations that are envisaged. An additional amount of \$ 0.9 million will allow the Office to do this. Table 7 contains the overview of additional funding needed for fiscal years 2014 and 2015. The requested amount of \$ 0.9 million is based on expectations of commitments that need to be entered into during fiscal year 2014. The request is substantially lower than the request of \$ 3 million in fiscal year 2013, which included the extra expenditure related to OPS5 and the two mid-term evaluations (STAR and NPFE). Furthermore, it includes a budget reduction of approximately \$ 0.3 million that allows for an increase in the annual budget of the office.

41. Overall the multi-annual evaluation budget of the Office was calculated at \$ 7.1 million for the period FY12-15. The revised budget, which shifts funding from extended term consultants and temporaries to regular staff of the Office, leads to a total of \$ 6.4 million. Savings in evaluation budgeting have been achieved for a total of \$ 0.7 million over the period FY12-15.

Table 6 - Multi-annual budget FY13-FY15 (in \$k)					
	FY12 <i>(actuals)</i>	FY13 <i>(actuals)</i>	FY14 <i>(est.)</i>	FY15 <i>(budget)</i>	Totals
Country Portfolio Evaluations	565	465	410	580	2,020
Impact Evaluations	331	326	438	155	1,250
Performance Evaluations	164	320	400	245	1,129
Thematic Evaluations	225	285	808	233	1,551
Knowledge sharing/management	196	176	89	159	620
Totals	1,481	1,572	2,145	1,372	6,570

Table 7 - Multi-annual budget request FY14-FY15 (in \$k)	
Multi-annual budget for GEF-5	6,570
Council approval for FY12 and FY13 (June 2011)	2,000
Council approval for FY13 and FY14 (June 2012)	3,000
Council approval for FY14 and FY15 (June 2013)	900
Total Council approved	5,900
Requested Council approval in May 2014	670
Balance	0

INDEPENDENT EVALUATION OFFICE ANNUAL BUDGET

42. The Independent Evaluation Office's annual budget over the GEF-5 replenishment period is shown in table 8. In June 2013 the Council approved a shift of funding from the multi-annual budget to the annual budget to provide more flexible funding for staff of the Office. This shift was neutral as regards the total amount of funding for the Office during GEF-5. The staffing of the Office is presented in the next section. The shift to the annual budget has enabled the Office to fund the second professional peer review of the GEF evaluation function, as well as to ensure its attendance at replenishment meetings as well as the Assembly and Council meeting in Mexico. For fiscal year 2015 a budget is proposed that has zero growth.

Table 8 - Annual Budgets for GEF-5 (in \$k)				
	FY12 (Actuals)	FY13 (Actuals)	FY14 (Estimates)	FY15 Budget
Fixed Costs				
Staff Cost	2,166	2,200	2,595	2,655
General Operations Costs	363	410	430	440
Total Fixed Costs (A)	2,529	2,610	3,025	3,095
Variable Costs				
Management & Advisory Support	62	29	113	40
Publications	56	45	27	25
Networks & GEF Meetings	86	49	77	82
Total variable costs (B)	204	123	217	147
Totals	2,733	2,733	3,242	3,242

43. The overall cap of \$ 18.563 million for the GEF Independent Evaluation Office for the period FY12-FY15, as calculated in the work program and budget of the Office for the GEF-5 period approved by Council in May 2011, will be maintained, as shown in table 10.

Table 9 – Overall budget of GEF IEO for the GEF-5 period (FY12-FY15) in \$million	
Annual costs over the GEF-5 period	11,950
Multi-annual costs over the GEF-5 period	6,570
Total for GEF-5	18,520
Council approved Work Program and Budget for GEF-5 period of 2011:	18,563

HUMAN RESOURCES

44. In June 2013 the Council approved an increase of the annual budget of the Office to allow for a shift in staffing from term consultants to regular staff. This has provided flexibility to the Office to hire additional staff on a temporary basis. The purpose of the increase was to ensure financial space to hire three additional regular staff. This has not happened due to developments during fiscal year 2014. The first was that the replenishment proposals did not yet provide sufficient clarity in 2013 to identify where shifts in programming would take place during GEF-6. The second development took place in OPS5, where interesting findings and new possibilities for mainstreaming of evaluative issues, such as gender, private sector and civil society organizations, as well as further mainstreaming of impact work, led to reconsiderations of which positions in which teams should be opened up. The third development was that in 2014 the preparations for evaluation programming during GEF-6 started up and should leave sufficient flexibility for a new Director, to start in September 2014, the peer review as well as the delayed finalization of the replenishment. These developments all pointed in the direction of ensuring continued flexibility in hiring and keeping the additional three regular positions open for the time being, until the work program for GEF-6 of the Independent Evaluation Office is becoming clear.

45. The current composition of the Office is:

FY14 positions		FY14 actual
1	Director	1
1	Chief Evaluation Officer	1
4	Senior Evaluation Officers	4
1	Senior Evaluation Operations Officer	1
5	Evaluation Officers	2
1	Knowledge Management Officer	1
1	Junior Professionals	1
1	Research Analyst	1
1	Senior Program Assistant	1
1	Program Assistant	1
17	Total regular staff	14
0	Extended Term Consultants	2
17	Regular staff plus consultants	16