

GEF Council
November 16-18, 2010
Washington, D.C.

Agenda Item 13

RESULTS-BASED MANAGEMENT AND KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT WORK PLAN FOR GEF-5

Recommended Council Decision

The Council, having reviewed document GEF/C.39/6, *GEF-5 Result-based Management and Knowledge Management Work Plan for GEF-5*, approves the proposal put forward in the document and requests the GEF Secretariat to implement the plan accordingly and to comply with the timeline detailed in Annex 1 of the document.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1. The policy recommendations for the Fifth Replenishment of the GEF Trust Fund (GEF-5) requested that the GEF Secretariat present a GEF-5 work-plan for the implementation of results-based management (RBM) and knowledge management (KM) for Council to review in November 2010.
2. In response to the policy recommendations, subsequent Council decisions, and findings from the Annual Monitoring Review (AMR) and Annual Performance Report (APR) 2009, the Secretariat has prepared a GEF-5 RBM and KM work-plan detailed in this paper.
3. The work-plan lays out the steps the GEF Secretariat, in collaboration with the GEF Agencies, the GEF Evaluation Office, and Science and Technical Advisory Panel (STAP), proposes to take to implement RBM and KM during GEF-5. Taking into account guidance from the GEF Council, findings from the AMR 2009 process, and the APR 2009, the GEF Secretariat has identified three main objectives for implementing RBM over the course of GEF-5:
 - i. Strengthen and update the tools and systems needed to capture standardized information;
 - ii. Strengthen the Secretariat's ability to collect and report on portfolio level outcome and output indicators agreed to in the GEF-5 Programming Document (GEF/R.5/31/CRP.1); and
 - iii. Strengthen the KM of the GEF at the portfolio level.
4. To achieve these goals, the Secretariat has divided the work-plan into five key components for RBM in GEF-5 these are:
 - i. Establish and implement an updated AMR process for GEF-5;
 - ii. Upgrade and integrate portfolio monitoring in the Project Management Information System (PMIS);
 - iii. Develop tools to enhance portfolio monitoring;
 - iv. Develop and implement a KM strategy; and
 - v. Provide and develop internal guidance on GEF RBM and KM
5. The paper details the proposed activities under each of these components and provides the estimated budget implications to carry out the proposed activities.

BACKGROUND

1. The policy recommendations for the Fifth Replenishment of the GEF Trust Fund (GEF-5) requested that the GEF Secretariat present a GEF-5 work-plan for the implementation of results-based management (RBM) and knowledge management (KM) for Council to review in November 2010.

2. Subsequently, at the June 2010 Council meeting, the Secretariat presented the Annual Monitoring Report (AMR) for 2009 (GEF/C.38/4). The Council welcomed the progress the GEF made in monitoring and reporting portfolio level results and requested the Secretariat to continue to strengthen its portfolio monitoring. The Council also highlighted several issues to be taken up in implementing RBM at the GEF including (*Highlights June2010*):

- *Portfolio Monitoring*: Council agreed that there was a need to strengthen the Secretariat's role in portfolio monitoring;
- *Learning*: The Secretariat should reflect risks taken by projects when analyzing learning from projects;
- *Expenditure Break-down*: The Secretariat should request a break-down by project of disbursements by output and outcome, to determine the overall percentage of funds that are delivered directly toward project goals and focal area targets;
- *Improved Measures of Performance*: The Secretariat should move towards collecting and presenting data to better inform policy choices. For example, it would be useful in GEF-5 to track the percentage of funding utilized for the focal area outcome indicators agreed to in the GEF-5 Programming Document (GEF/R.5/31/CRP.1); and
- *Sustainability of Projects*: The Secretariat should determine if there is a feasible way to report back on a yearly basis the likelihood of project sustainability.

3. As part of the AMR 2009, the Secretariat also outlined several steps to strengthen RBM and portfolio monitoring at the GEF, these include:

- Tracking the cohort of projects at risk in any given fiscal year and trends across years;
- Updating tools and systems to capture standardized information;
- Undertaking reviews to track monitoring and learning questions;
- Utilizing core indicators and targets in all project log frames, all focal area tracking tools, and the annual Project Implementation Report (PIR); and
- Establishing the IT infrastructure that will allow for analysis of data collected through the tracking tools.

4. The Council also reviewed the Annual Performance Report (APR) 2009 (ME/C.38/4), and requested the GEF Evaluation Office, the Secretariat and the Agencies to work together in identifying and implementing measures to improve the quality of information available through Project Management Information System (PMIS) on the status of projects with respect to the project cycle, including Agency compliance with deadlines for terminal evaluations.

5. In response to the above requests and findings from the AMR 2009, the Secretariat has prepared a GEF-5 RBM and KM work-plan detailed in this paper.

INTRODUCTION

6. The following work-plan lays out the steps the GEF Secretariat, in collaboration with the GEF Agencies, the GEF Evaluation Office, and Science and Technical Advisory Panel (STAP), proposes to take to implement RBM and KM during GEF-5. Taking into account guidance from the GEF Council, findings from the AMR 2009 process, and the APR 2009, the GEF Secretariat has identified three main objectives for implementing RBM over the course of GEF-5:

- i. Strengthen and update the tools and systems needed to capture standardized information;
- ii. Strengthen the Secretariat's ability to collect and report on portfolio level outcome and output indicators agreed to in the GEF-5 Programming Document (GEF/R.5/31/CRP.1); and
- iii. Strengthen the KM of the GEF at the portfolio level.

7. To achieve these goals, the Secretariat has divided the work-plan into five key components for RBM in GEF-5 these are:

- i. Establish and implement an updated AMR process for GEF-5;
- ii. Upgrade and integrate portfolio monitoring in the PMIS;
- iii. Develop tools to enhance portfolio monitoring;
- iv. Develop and implement a KM strategy; and
- v. Provide and develop internal guidance on GEF RBM and KM.

COMPONENT 1: ANNUAL MONITORING REVIEW PROCESS GEF-5

8. As outlined in the GEF RBM Framework (GEF/C.31/11), the AMR is designed to provide performance information regarding the overall health of GEF's portfolio of active projects. The report provides an overview on the GEF's active portfolio of projects, an assessment of portfolio achievements, and progress towards results targets. In addition, the Council has requested a break-down by project of disbursements by output and outcome, in order to ascertain the overall percentage of funds that are delivered directly toward project goals and focal area targets (Highlights, June 2010). The GEF Secretariat in collaboration with the Agencies will conduct a feasibility and cost assessment of tracking disbursements by output and outcome and will report back through to Council through the AMR 2010.

9. *Activities:* In order to comply with Council requests to provide information on the GEF portfolio in a more timely manner and to capture progress toward results targets agreed to in the GEF-5 Programming Document (GEF/R.5/31/CRP.1), the Secretariat will work with the Agencies to revise and standardize reporting requirements at the start of GEF-5. Three main reporting elements will be discussed, agreed to, and finalized by the spring of 2011 to ensure that

data collection and reporting during GEF-5 meets the needs of the Secretariat, Evaluation Office, Agencies, Council and other stakeholders.

10. The first is to discuss how to achieve timelier reporting to Council on the overall GEF portfolio. Currently, the AMR is presented to Council in the spring, almost a full year after the reporting period. The Secretariat is proposing a streamlined two-phased approach to monitoring of the GEF portfolio. The initial report will cover the overall health of the portfolio and will come out in the fall. It will be a scoping tool that can identify potential problems, good practices, and areas that need further investigation. The following phase will be to conduct more in-depth data gathering and analysis on the issues identified by the GEF Secretariat as potentially problematic, areas requiring greater attention, or areas that can provide learning opportunities about the portfolio.

11. The second of the three reporting elements is to finalize the data requested by the GEF Secretariat for the PIR, in collaboration with the Agencies. Preliminary discussions with the Agencies have already taken place on the information needed. The Secretariat will also finalize a template for those Agencies preferring to utilize a standardized form.

12. The third element is to finalize all focal area tracking tools. The Secretariat's technical teams have been working closely with their respective task forces (which include members from STAP and Agencies) to finalize the tracking tools. Most of the focal area tracking tools have either been completed or are in the last stages of development. The Secretariat expects that all tracking tools will be complete by the beginning of December 2010. Most of the data critical to the needs of the GEF's portfolio monitoring is captured through the tracking tools.

13. *Outcomes:* Establish and maintain an annual GEF-5 monitoring review process for timely and effective reporting. Issue a detailed guidance document on GEF-5 portfolio monitoring. The guidelines will include information on the two-phased annual monitoring review process, an agreed PIR template, and guidance on filling out focal area tracking tools.

14. *Timeframe:* By December 2010, the GEF Secretariat will develop a more detailed proposal of a two-phased AMR and distribute the latest PIR template/data requested as a basis for discussion with the Agencies. An inter-agency meeting will be held in January 2011 to discuss feasibility of the GEF proposal and alternative possibilities proposed by the Agencies. The final agreement will be part of the GEF-5 Monitoring Guidelines, which will be finalized in consultation with the Agencies by April 2011.

15. *Cost Implications:* Staff time. If data is better captured through the PMIS (see component 2), the GEF Secretariat staff time required to produce reports should decrease and efforts will be made to ensure time spent by government project staff and Agencies' staff will not increase.

COMPONENT 2: INTEGRATION INTO PMIS

16. One of the major challenges to implementing RBM at the GEF is that the data requirements and reporting needs have not been fully integrated in the GEF's IT infrastructure. Updating and capturing data on the status of projects through the project cycle, as well as information collected through the annual monitoring exercise is critical to the implementation of RBM. Identifying the IT needs for RBM and KM will strengthen the Secretariat's ability to capture and analyze standardized information in a timely manner and will allow the Secretariat to report on portfolio level outcome and output indicators agreed to in the GEF-5 Programming Document (GEF/R.5/31/CRP.1).

17. *Activities:* In order to have a fully functioning system in place at the start of GEF-5, the Secretariat will prioritize the needs of capturing data for the purposes of RBM over the next year. The four main areas that will need to be automated are:

- i. Capturing through the project identification form (PIF) the funding utilized for the focal area outcome indicators agreed to in the GEF-5 programming document;
- ii. Programming tracking tools into PMIS and enabling tracking tool data collection and analysis through PMIS;
- iii. Programming and updating data currently being collected through PIRs, including status of projects, projects-at-risk, disbursements etc; and
- iv. Programming of overview reports and focal area level reports to provide periodic updates at the portfolio level and ensure more timely service delivery.¹

18. The Secretariat is proposing to open up the database to Agencies to enable direct data input for PIRs and tracking tools. A short proposal on how this will be operationalized will be developed in the coming months and shared for feedback with the Agencies. The Secretariat will work to come to an agreement with Agencies how to implement the direct data input plan.

19. *Outcomes:* Track and report on portfolio level results more consistently and accurately. Data on focal area results indicators, status of projects, and other portfolio monitoring indicators captured and updated through PMIS.

20. *Timeframe:* The Secretariat has redesigned the PIF template taking into consideration the Council's request to track the percentage of funds utilized for the focal area outcome indicators. The Secretariat will report on the initial figures through the AMR 2010. All focal area tracking tools will be finalized by early December 2010. The proposal for directly inputting data into the PMIS will be circulated to Agencies in December 2010. Programming of the tracking tools will begin in January 2011. The finalization of the GEF-5 PIR template/data requested is scheduled for February 2011. Once the GEF-5 PIR template/data requested and tracking tools are finalized they will be programmed into the system to test direct input into the database by May 2011.

¹ These reports refer to internal reports generated through the PMIS. No additional data is being requested from Agencies to generate such reports. These will be designed with program managers and the management team for their specific needs.

21. *Cost Implications:* Staff time, specifically significant time will be needed directly from the GEF's Database Manager. In addition, resources may be needed to train Agencies on how to directly input data (approximately 50,000 USD)

COMPONENT 3: TOOLS TO ENHANCE PORTFOLIO MONITORING

22. While the Secretariat has a number of effective tools in place – PIRs, AMR, focal area tracking tools – the Council has requested that the Secretariat continue to strengthen its role in portfolio monitoring and to enhance the tools it employs.

23. *Activities:* The Secretariat has identified several tools it will develop over the course of GEF-5 to strengthen its role in portfolio monitoring; these include:

- Portfolio monitoring missions;
- Quality-at-entry of project design;
- Portfolio level risk assessment;
- Socio-economic and gender analysis guidance; and
- Geographic information systems (GIS) to support monitoring and evaluation (M&E).

24. The Secretariat will work with Agencies to build on systems already in place.

25. *Outcome:* Strengthened portfolio monitoring performed by the Secretariat to inter-alia identify systemic issues, improve targeted learning, and inform future strategic directions.

PORTFOLIO MONITORING MISSIONS

26. At the end of GEF-4, the Secretariat developed an initial process for portfolio learning missions. As part of this pilot phase the Secretariat is undertaking four learning missions that will be completed by December 2010. The pilot phase utilized the learning objectives that were developed as embedded elements of the RBM framework in the GEF-5 replenishment strategy.

27. Before scaling up the portfolio monitoring missions, a review will be carried out to determine the effectiveness of the process and the value added of the Secretariat and invited experts, such as STAP members, carrying out these missions. The review will include input, feedback and suggestions from Agencies.

28. *Timeframe:* A strategy and associated budget for how to move forward with portfolio monitoring missions will be developed in coordination with the GEF Agencies and presented to Council at its spring 2011 meeting.

29. *Cost Implications:* A budget for the pilot phase of the portfolio monitoring missions was approved in FY 2009 (158,000 USD).

QUALITY-AT-ENTRY

30. The World Bank, as part of its portfolio monitoring through its Quality Assurance Group (QAG), undertakes quality-at-entry assessments on a sample of their portfolio. The Secretariat is proposing to develop a methodology for assessing quality-at-entry of projects in order to:

- Maintain accountability for quality by providing real-time information to program managers and project proponents on the overall quality of project/programs at-entry;
- Identify systemic issues as a basis for improving project reviews and project design; and
- Improve targeted learning in selected key areas and disseminate findings.

31. The methodology would also identify the capacity needed within the Secretariat for conducting quality-at-entry assessments every other year (as is done for the Quality of Supervision assessment managed by the Evaluation Office) and delineate any cost implications.

32. *Timeframe:* The methodology will be completed by fall 2011 and will be reported on through the AMR every other year.

33. *Cost Implication:* One consultant to develop methodology and associated cost implications for undertaking assessments. (30 days and approximately 15,000 USD)

PORTFOLIO RISK ASSESSMENT

34. The Secretariat currently receives individual project risk ratings from Agencies through the PIRs. The Secretariat does not, however, conduct an overall portfolio risk assessment. The Secretariat could conduct such an analysis using the following parameters:

- Implementation performance;
- Likelihood of achieving global objectives;
- Project effectiveness delays;
- Disbursement delays; and
- Country performance issues.

35. Including such an assessment through the AMR would allow the Secretariat to track risk at the portfolio level. The Secretariat is interested in developing a methodology for portfolio risk assessment, which cannot be done by aggregating project risk ratings provided by Agencies through the PIR process.

36. *Timeframe:* The Secretariat will develop a methodology for conducting a portfolio risk assessment and any associated costs for carrying out this exercise by fall of 2011.

37. *Cost Implications:* One consultant to develop methodology and associated cost implications for undertaking assessments. (20 days and approximately 12,500 USD)

SOCIOECONOMIC STUDY

38. As part of OPS-4, the 2009 report on “Gender Mainstreaming in the GEF” found that only 14% of recent project documents made reference to a socioeconomic analysis. It is often difficult to judge whether or not socioeconomic benefits have been appropriately considered in project design without an underlying socioeconomic analysis. As a follow-up to the OPS-4 report, the Secretariat has hired a consultant to help develop results indicators for inclusion in focal area and project results frameworks.

39. A guidance document will be developed to encourage the inclusion of local socioeconomic benefits in project design and facilitate the measurement of such local benefits and their contribution to the achievement of global environmental benefits.

40. *Timeframe:* The guidance document is expected to be completed by the spring of 2011.

41. *Cost Implications:* One consultant for 40 days (approximately 12,000 USD).

GEOGRAPHIC INFORMATION SYSTEMS (GIS)

42. The Secretariat, with support from STAP, organized an expert consultation in January 2010 to explore whether GIS tools would be a cost effective way to improve portfolio monitoring and KM. Independent experts and selected GEF program managers concluded that there were advantages to a well-targeted GIS application, in particular as a cost-effective means for improving results measurement effectiveness and visibility. They also agreed that GIS is an important tool that can support the M&E of the GEF portfolio.

43. The Secretariat is proposing to work with STAP and focal area task forces to develop GIS standards and tools. GIS consultants would be hired to develop standards and guidance for the biodiversity (BD) and land degradation (LD) focal areas. Based on the standards and guidance developed for BD and LD, the Secretariat would assess the feasibility of expanding the use of GIS and remote sensing tools to other focal areas and the need for a corporate approach. The following steps would be carried out:

- Identify portfolio monitoring questions that can be answered with geo-spatial information;
- Identify the data layers available (in the public domain and those that may need to be generated) for both contextual and monitoring baselines;
- Develop technical standards to use GIS and remote sensing to map actions and results. A focal area specific approach would be developed, with common standards across focal area as appropriate, keeping in mind the need for consistency and coherence across focal areas; and
- Examine compatibility for storage in the PMIS and capacity building requirements.

44. *Timeframe:* Work on GIS would not begin until the data needs of the current portfolio monitoring tools are established. Consultants would therefore be hired at the end of 2011.

45. *Cost Implications:* One consultant per focal area 50 days (approximately 20,000 USD per focal area)

COMPONENT 4: KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT STRATEGY

46. The GEF Secretariat will develop in coordination with the Evaluation Office, STAP, and the Agencies a KM strategy that focuses on the development of the following:

- A process for generating, reporting on, and utilizing lessons learned;
- A KM set of products and activities;
- A supporting infrastructure; and
- Systematic coordination with Agency KM mechanisms.

47. The strategy will seek to clarify how the GEF partnership will work toward developing a strong corporate level KM system. Other areas that the strategy will examine are ways in which the Secretariat can:

- Strengthen internal KM processes and generate GEF knowledge products for dissemination to GEF staff and stakeholders, based on learning objectives aligned with the GEF-5 replenishment strategy;
- Promote a knowledge sharing and learning culture within the GEF and to wider stakeholder groups, with tailored and well targeted products and activities;
- Optimize resources, identifying products and activities that can be used both as communication and knowledge sharing opportunities; and
- Take an active role to facilitate coordination of information, including the creation, use and sharing of relevant information on good practice in global environmental management.

48. The strategy will also need to address the infrastructure needs for developing a robust KM mechanism within and across the GEF, potential activities could include:

- Expanding the GEF Portal to include the knowledge products that will be developed:
 - a. Creation of a KM Section on the web;
 - b. Enabling GEF staff and partners to use shared virtual workspaces;
- Developing an easy-to-use, comprehensive Global Environmental Management Practices and Lessons Database:
 - a. The Database will represent a repository for GEF knowledge products, including lessons learned, best practices, STAP advisory products and toolkits and other project related publications and audio-visual material, generated from the Secretariat as well as GEF Agencies, STAP and the Evaluation Office;

- b. The Database could also at a later stage incorporate lessons and communication material of GEF projects, which are currently developed and stored in other databases, to become a one-stop-shop point of reference for practitioners, Agencies, academia and users interested in environmental practices and lessons.

49. A comprehensive KM strategy paper will be presented to Council at the spring 2011 Council meeting. The Secretariat will convene a task force with representatives from the Evaluation Office, STAP, and the GEF Agencies to formulate an agreed strategy.

50. *Cost Implications:* will be presented as part of the KM strategy at the spring 2011 Council meeting.

COMPONENT 5: DEVELOP INTERNAL GUIDANCE ON GEF RBM AND KM

51. RBM should be seen as an organization wide tool to foster results, enquiries, and learning to better inform decision making. In order for RBM to be successful, the Secretariat must not only engage all of the GEF partners, but also devote resources to encourage an understanding and engagement in RBM within the Secretariat.

52. Moreover, the revised GEF M&E policy presented to the November 2010 Council, updates the roles and responsibilities of main stakeholders in M&E. Specifically, it more clearly lays out the responsibilities of the GEF Secretariat in portfolio monitoring. A necessary follow-up action is the development of guidelines for internal purposes within the Secretariat to assist program managers in developing a standard approach for tracking of portfolio level results, as well as guidance for reviewing M&E design.

53. The Secretariat is proposing to hire a facilitator to run several workshops on RBM and KM for the entire Secretariat staff. The workshops will give an overview of what RBM aims to achieve for the GEF and will focus on each individual's roles within the system. Particular attention will be devoted to program managers, who have a critical role in portfolio monitoring. The workshops will also allow for feedback from staff on how the system can better support their needs as a tool to improve processes, increase effectiveness and efficiency, better inform management decisions, and increase accountability.

54. Based on these workshops and consultation with staff, the Secretariat will develop an internal guidance document on RBM and KM. The Secretariat will utilize Agency documentation to inform such guidance, as applicable.

55. *Timeframe:* Planning for the workshops will begin in the spring of 2011 and will take place after the spring 2011 Council meeting. The guidance document will be completed by the end of 2011.

56. *Cost Implications:* One facilitator to run the workshops. (5 days and approximately 5,000 USD); One consultant to develop guidance document. (30 days and approximately 12,000 USD).

SUMMARY

57. The current work plan proposed for GEF-5 contains five major components. In addition, a report on progress of RBM and KM implementation will be presented to council in the fall of 2011. The table below presents a summary of the main components, budget implications, and deadlines. (A more detailed time line and budget is attached as Annex 1).

Budget summary:

1. Annual Monitoring Review Process GEF-5	None	Spring 2011
2. Integration into PMIS (piloting Agencies' direct input into database)	50,000	End of 2011
3. Tools to Enhance Portfolio Monitoring		
a. Portfolio Monitoring Missions	<i>Pilot Phase:</i> 158,000	Proposal Spring 2011
b. Quality at Entry	15,000	Fall 2011
c. Portfolio Risk Assessment	12,500	Fall 2011
d. Socioeconomic study	12,000	Spring 2011
e. GIS to Support M&E	20,000	Spring 2012
Total	217,500	
4. Knowledge Management Strategy		Spring 2011
5. Internal Guidance on RBM/KM	17,000	Fall 2011
6. Progress report on RBM/KM Implementation	None	Fall 2011
TOTAL	284,500	
<i>Amount Previously Approved</i>	<i>291,000¹</i>	
<i>Contingency</i>	<i>6,500</i>	

¹ Total approvals for RBM: 408,000 USD. In FY 2007, 200,000 USD was approved as an RBM special initiative; in FY 2009, 208,000 USD was approved as a special initiative. As of September 13, 2010, 117,000 USD has been utilized or committed. The remaining amount from the RBM budget totals 291,000.

Annex I: RBM Work-plan

Activities	2010	2011				2012				2013				2010 Costs		2011 Costs	
	Oct-Dec	Jan-Mar	Apr-Jun	Jul-Sept	Oct-Dec	Jan-Mar	Apr-Jun	Jul-Sept	Oct-Dec	Jan-Mar	Apr-Jun	Jul-Sept	Oct-Dec	Cost	Funding Source	Cost	Funding Source
Component 1: Annual Monitoring Review: Process for GEF-5																	
Outcome 1: Establish and maintain an annual monitoring review process throughout GEF-5 for timely and effective reporting.																	
1. Introduce two-step process for timely reporting to Council (with Agencies)			X														
a. Design two-step process as a proposal	X																
b. Consultation and Agreement with Agencies		X															
2. Develop a guidance document on annual monitoring in the GEF																	
a. PIR and tracking tool process			X														
b. GEF-5 AMR guidance			X														
3. Implementation of the new design																	
a. Snapshot of Portfolio					X				X				X				
b. Detailed portfolio report						X					X						
Component 2: Integration into PMIS																	
Outcome 2: Track portfolio results more consistently																	
1. Align PIF to capture FA outcome indicators	X																
2. Agree on PIR template for GEF-5 (including programming into PMIS)		X															
3. Program/update data collected through PIRs			X											50,000	FY07 Budget*		
4. Tracking Tool data integrated into PMIS			X														
5. Develop standardized reports for focal area results					X												
Component 3: Tools to Enhance Portfolio Monitoring																	
Outcome 3: Strengthen the Secretariat's portfolio monitoring																	
1. Portfolio Monitoring Missions																	
a. Pilot missions completed	X													158,000	FY09 Budget**		
b. Asses pilot phase		X															
c. Develop strategy for missions			X														Budget to be included
2. Quality at entry																	in strategy
a. Develop methodology					X									15,000	FY09*		
b. Report to Council through AMR every other year									X								Budget identified
3. GEF portfolio risk assessment																	through methodology design
a. Develop methodology					X									12,500	FY09*		
b. Report to Council through AMR									X				X				Budget identified
4. Socioeconomic Study																	through methodology design
a. Preparation of specific guidance on conducting socio-economic assessments	X													12,000	FY07 Budget**		
b. Publication			X														
c. Assessment of the integration & implementation in GEF-5 projects									X					12,000	FY07**		
5. GIS to support M&E																	
a. Develop GIS standards and tools					X									15,000	FY09**		
b. Assessment of cost implications							X							5,000	FY09**		
c. Report to Council									X								

Component 4: Knowledge Management Strategy															
Outcome 4: Strengthen the knowledge management function of the GEF at the portfolio level															
1. Development of KM Strategy															
a. Convene task force	X														
b. Process for reporting and utilizing lessons learned					X										
c. Plan for KM infrastructure					X										
d. Document to Council					X										
2. Knowledge-sharing infrastructure															
a. Strengthen systems to facilitate (web and PMIS)							X								
b. Systematic coordination with Agency KM mechanisms								X				X			
Component 5: RBM Training															
Outcome 5: Allow Program Managers to truly understand RBM, its benefits, and importance in integrating it in their work.															
1. Internal Secretariat Workshops			X										5,000	FY09**	
2. Develop guidance document for Program Managers					X										12,000 FY09
Component 6: RBM and KM Implementation															
Outcome 6: Ensure satisfactory implementation of RBM and KM, and present benefits of strategies developed															
Report on Progress RBM and KM Implementation to Council					X										

*FY 2007: RBM framework approved in FY 2007

**FY 2009: RBM special initiative Budget approved FY 2009