

GEF/C.8/4

GEF Council
October 8 - 10, 1996
Agenda Item 6

**FRAMEWORK AND WORK PROGRAM
FOR GEF'S MONITORING, EVALUATION
AND DISSEMINATION ACTIVITIES**

RECOMMENDED DRAFT COUNCIL DECISION

The Council reviewed document GEF/C.8/4 and approves the work program and budget presented therein for the GEF monitoring, evaluation and dissemination program.

**I. GOAL, PURPOSE AND PRINCIPLES FOR THE GEF'S MONITORING,
EVALUATION AND DISSEMINATION PROGRAM (MEDP)**

1. The Global Environment Facility (GEF) is a mechanism for international cooperation for the purpose of providing new, and additional, grant and concessional funding to meet the agreed incremental costs of measures to achieve agreed global environmental benefits in the areas of biological diversity, climate change, international waters, and ozone layer depletion. Land degradation issues, primarily desertification and deforestation, as they relate to the four focal areas are also being addressed. In carrying out its mission, the GEF adheres to key operational principles based on the two Conventions, the GEF Instrument, and Council decisions. These principles are set forth in the GEF Operational Strategy.

2. The GEF's monitoring, evaluation and dissemination program is an essential overarching component of the GEF. Specifically, its purpose is to *monitor, evaluate, and disseminate* GEF project related information and lessons on:

(a) the *performance* of GEF *projects* as well as adequacy of policies and procedures;

(b) the changes in *country capacities* for addressing global environmental issues;

(c) the changes in *policies affecting* the global environment; and

(d) the global *environmental benefits* of GEF projects and programs.

3. As stated in the "Operational Strategy" document: the GEF's monitoring, evaluation, and dissemination program is particularly essential for the GEF owing to: (i) the GEF's unique mission with strategies and projects whose design, although scientifically based, are more innovative or experimental than those of regular development projects; and (ii) its pioneering in

new institutional relationships among Bretton Woods and United Nations agencies in partnership with the participant countries, international conventions, NGOs, and other organizations.

4. At its May 1995 meeting the GEF Council specified that the work program will include "operational monitoring and evaluation, scientific and technical monitoring and evaluation, and evaluation of strategic and crossprogram issues." As currently planned, the work program will enable the GEF to provide monitoring, evaluation and dissemination information:

(a) to guide decisionmaking on improvements in program management, including adjustments and amendments of policies, strategies, procedures and projects;

(b) on accountability for resource use against objectives by participating countries, Implementing Agencies, and other participating groups;

(c) documenting and disseminating lessons learned; and

(d) assessing the results and impacts of GEF activities.

5. The *primary users* of the output of the monitoring, evaluation and dissemination program will be the Council, the Conferences of Parties of the conventions, the managers and staffs of the Secretariat, Implementing Agencies and executing organizations, the participating countries and their associated governmental organizations, and nongovernmental organizations.

Guiding Principles

6. The GEF's monitoring, evaluation and dissemination program will be guided by the following principles:

(a) operational monitoring and evaluation will build on the existing systems of the Implementing Agencies with the harmonization of monitoring, evaluation and dissemination practices and outputs to meet GEF goal requirements;

(b) scientific and technical aspects of monitoring and evaluation will draw on the advice and recommendations of the Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel (STAP);

(c) evaluation practices will follow established standards for ensuring the credibility, impartiality, transparency and usefulness of evaluation products;

(d) a project framework approach will be employed to facilitate a more rigorous monitoring and tracking process;

(e) coordination by the Monitoring and Evaluation Coordinator will serve to ensure uniformity of guidelines and criteria, procedures, and reporting so that the GEFwide objective and performance can be tracked, analyzed, and assessed consistently and fairly.

7. A full discussion of the GEF's requirements^{3/4}goals, purposes, principles, and methodologies-- for a monitoring, evaluation and dissemination program are provided in the report to Council prepared for its meeting in May 1995 entitled "General Requirements for a Coordinated GEFwide Monitoring and Evaluation System" (GEF/C.4/6).

II. METHODOLOGIES, EVALUATION FRAMEWORKS AND INDICATORS

8. In order to have high quality and useful results from the GEF's monitoring and evaluation program, a number of methodological aspects of the program will be developed. These are important to ensure a degree of uniformity among the Implementing Agencies, Executing Agencies, and country organizations responsible for monitoring and evaluation tasks. The three areas of methodology are: (i) monitoring and evaluation practices, (ii) the use of program and project logical frameworks, (iii) and the development of performance and impact indicators. While these three are interrelated, it is useful to describe the requirements for each.

Monitoring and Evaluation Practices

9. The report "General Requirements for a Coordinated GEFwide Monitoring and Evaluation System" spells out the range of methodological approaches and issues (pp1015). It stated that, a number of methods will be needed to answer questions of program processes and institutional development as well as environmental impact. The monitoring and evaluation program will employ a mix of methods such as quasiexperimental design methods needed for time series analysis; implementation surveys, structured interviews, and process analyses; and qualitative approaches (participatory evaluations and beneficiary assessments). These alternative approaches to evaluation will be employed separately or together to provide differentially conclusive but complementary evidence on program and project performance and impact. The methods employed will need to be determined for each of the monitoring and evaluation requirements listed in the attached chart.

Program and Project Frameworks

10. As the Council has requested, the logical framework approach to project planning, will be introduced into GEF projects as an essential design instrument that will facilitate sound monitoring and evaluation. This approach establishes the links between goals, objectives, outputs and inputs with verifiable indicators and specifications of the assumptions that underlie these relationships. Steps will be taken to develop the framework technique appropriate for the GEF program and prepare guidance and training activities.

Scientific Contexts, Performance and Impact Indicators

11. Environmental hazards are mostly of a physical or biological nature. In the GEF context these have mostly been caused by natural, political, economic or social processes. The inter-relationships between natural and social processes have been demonstrated by many studies. STAP would be well placed to advise on indicators with which to trace the biological and geophysical relationships between environmental stress and the impact on the global environment by various types of interventions. On the other hand, the environmental agenda, as

well as GEF activities, are to a great degree directed towards national policies, institutions and human awareness raising, which may be instrumental in remedying global environmental imbalance and stress. The key steps in moving from problem identification to problem solving for such environmental hazards encompass studies of:

- (a) The stress, pressure or disturbance to the global environment caused by pollutants, or other agents influenced by human actions;
- (b) The present state of the global environment, as well as its own potential for recovery;
- (c) The interventions by international, national and civic institutions and actors to remedy environmental stress; and
- (d) The impact of the interventions on the global environmental stress.

12. GEF's Operational Strategy demonstrates its many-faceted and cross-disciplinary goals and activities in diverse focal areas. Since GEF's monitoring and evaluation will essentially address issues of whether, and at what cost the Facility's strategic and other objectives have been achieved, multi-disciplinary physical and social science approaches in evaluation would be required. This necessitates consultations routinely with a broad spectrum of the scientific community. Advice will be sought at various steps from STAP, which will play a particularly important role in the identification of indicators. Likewise, a broad relationship with the NGO community is also essential, especially based on their dissemination and advocacy role and as well as insights and competence in various areas like participatory approaches.

13. Both monitoring and evaluation methodologies and program and project frameworks are dependent on well developed sets of indicators. These indicators provide the basis for before and after analyses and describe the effects (positive and negative) of program and project interventions^{3/4}anticipated and unanticipated; intended and unintended. They fall broadly into four broad categories:

- (a) indicators of program and project implementation^{3/4}the delivery of technical services, operating funds and capital inputs with related disbursements and the resulting outputs generated (facilities created, activities and participatory processes organized, etc.);
- (b) indicators of institutional change that demonstrate capacity development, attitudinal and awareness shifts, and policy reorientations;
- (c) indicators of socioeconomic conditions that bring out the consequences of project interventions;
- (d) indicators of environmental impact in local and global terms that demonstrate the environmental accomplishments of the GEF program.

14. The monitoring and evaluation coordinator will coordinate GEF's work with the Implementing Agencies, STAP, and other staff of the Secretariat, as well as with other

competent institutions/organizations, on the identification of these sets of indicators. The work on indicators constitutes an important building block for monitoring and evaluation components in projects and the monitoring program described below.

III. PROJECT MONITORING PROGRAM

15. The development of a GEF-wide monitoring system is an essential tool for improved planning, portfolio and financial management as well as performance monitoring and evaluation. The system will conform with the GEF project cycle and the program and project logical framework approach. It will give guidance for correcting and adjusting implementation of individual projects as well as the total portfolio. It will furnish the Council, the CEO, and other parties concerned with updated overviews of the status and the prospective outcome of GEF's portfolio.

16. GEF's project monitoring will be based on existing, carefully designed systems and databases of the GEF as well as the Implementing Agencies which are similar, but not fully compatible. Care will be exercised to avoid unnecessary duplication of the reporting requirements of the Implementing Agencies.

17. On the basis of a minimum common format, each project will have built into its design a monitoring and evaluation component, funded by project resources. This will include a baseline assessment to establish the conditions existing prior to the project

implementation and a monitoring program during implementation which may include, where appropriate, participatory modes of monitoring and evaluation. The baseline and monitoring will include verifiable indicators on:

- (a) objectives, inputs delivery, processes, outputs generation;
- (b) impact on institutional development (capacities, attitudes, participation),
- (c) environmental and socioeconomic conditions, technological innovation, and
- (d) environmental impact.

18. An important outcome of the monitoring program will be the annual portfolio performance reports. Essential components will comprise rating of implementation progress, risks, and objectives achievement. A comprehensive project cycle and performance database will be required to provide current information on project operations to support annual performance reports (as well as timely financial and portfolio management decisions by other actors in the GEF family).

19. The Monitoring and Evaluation Coordinator will be responsible for:

- (a) drafting monitoring guidelines and criteria;

- (b) coordinating the implementation of the monitoring process;
- (c) maintaining a project database (in cooperation with other Secretariat staff); and
- (d) drafting the annual implementation performance report based on Implementing Agency submissions.

20. The Implementing Agencies will be responsible for:

- (a) making provision for monitoring and evaluation activities as part of the project design document;
- (b) arranging for the preparation of baseline assessments of pre-project conditions;
- (c) carrying out supervision missions, project reviews, completion reports etc.;
- (d) preparing annual monitoring reports on projects in their respective portfolio; and
- (e) participating in the drafting of monitoring and evaluation guidelines and standard.

IV. EVALUATION PROGRAM

Project Level

21. The present types of project evaluations commissioned by the Implementing Agencies comprise Mid- Term Review Reports, Performance Audit Reports (World Bank) and Evaluation Reports. The Implementing Agencies will, in the main, be responsible for the implementation of the project evaluations together with the executing agencies and the Country Focal Point.

22. A distinction will be made between internal reviews performed by the responsible operational division and evaluations carried out by persons who are independent of project operations. The latter may be staff members of the Implementing Agency or external evaluators on contract with the Implementing Agency.

23. The Monitoring and Evaluation Coordinator role for Project Evaluations will be:

- (a) developing common evaluation guidelines and criteria;
- (b) commenting on the terms of references for mid-term, phase and terminal evaluations as well as Performance Audits;
- (c) ascertaining that evaluation results are widely shared with the relevant audiences and entered into annual reports on evaluation results
- (d) arranging for separate or cluster project impact evaluations (see below).

24. A *midterm review* or *evaluation* component will normally be included where project duration exceeds three years and will be carried out by evaluators independent from project operations. Projects which contain two or more phases, or which are extended will normally be evaluated. At times, a cluster evaluation - covering more than one project - may be more appropriate than a single project evaluation. The midterm evaluation will focus on project performance in relation to project objectives, identify progress toward objectives, impediments to the achievement of objectives, intended and unintended effects and any requirements for project design modification. Responses by project management to the evaluation recommendations will be required. *Lead responsibility*: Implementing Agencies with executing agencies and Country Focal Point.

25. A **project completion report** or *implementation completion report* will be prepared at the time that project activities and disbursements are concluded. The project completion report will cover the achievement of objectives, critical factors (positive and negative) affecting implementation and impact, followup requirements, and lessons learned. A proportion of World Bank GEF projects will be followed up through performance audits by the Operations Evaluation Department. *Lead responsibility*: Implementing Agency and Country Focal Point.

26. An independent *project impact evaluation* will be carried out for single projects or a cluster of projects by Operational Program about 15 years after project completion. These evaluations will concentrate on issues like the global environment benefits of the project(s), the socioeconomic effects, the institutional development achievements, and technological innovation. Lessons learned will be an important feature of these evaluations, which will be conducted by the GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Coordinator in cooperation with the central evaluation offices of the Implementing Agencies and the Country Focal Point.

Program and Strategy Level

Program Level

27. The performance of the *ten Operational Programs* will be monitored and evaluated in relation to their objectives as specified in each individual program document (currently in draft). Among other factors, monitoring and evaluation activity will take into account the guidance of the Conference of the Parties of the conventions, the seven strategic considerations of GEF that cut across all programs, the several strategic considerations specific to each program, the GEF's ten operational principles for its Work Programs, project selection criteria, and the application of criteria for "shortterm responses."

Cross-Cutting Evaluations, Country Reviews and Global Results

28. Crosscutting *evaluations* provide the opportunity to assess topics of concern to all the Operational Programs. The range of topics would include, for example, aspects of institutional development (participation, capacity building, policy formulation, technology comparisons), funding arrangements (incremental costs, cofinancing, technical and financial assistance, country contributions, financial sustainability), management and operations responsibilities, best practice in monitoring arrangements, lessons from the pilot phase, and the use of lessons learned. It also

provides an opportunity for the GEF Council, the CEO and Program Managers to request special assessments of topics of particular interest to them from time to time.

Country Reviews

29. When requested by countries, country reviews could be carried out. The reviews would cover a country's progress on policies, practices, and capacities, as well as the potential or actual environmental impact of the GEF operations in the country. It would, thus, include the performance of GEF projects and the project cycle process relevant to the country, including enabling activities, on the changes in country professional and institutional capacities addressing global environmental issues, changes in awareness, policies and practices affecting the global environment, and the global environmental results and impacts of GEF projects and programs. These reviews provide an opportunity for developing further a national consensus on global environmental issues. Each review would identify the critical actions required and the arrangements for their implementation.

30. The primary responsibility for the leadership of the country reviews will be the Country Focal Point and related stakeholders and will be carried out by local institutions alone or in cooperation with relevant Implementing Agencies and/or other international organizations involved in environmental matters in the country. The Country Reviews would contribute to national (or regional) capacity building and should also be considered in the context of other GEF-related or donor interventions. The Monitoring and Evaluation Coordinator will provide guidelines and other support services for the reviews, after extensive consultation with relevant Country Focal Points and Implementing Agencies.

Assessments of GEF's Global Results and Impact

31. This evaluation or study, when requested by Council, would address the overriding issues of global (or regional) impact and benefits of GEF programs, as well as the appropriateness of GEF programs and priorities in view of the GEF policies and convention guidance. It would further examine the relevance and effectiveness of the GEF's Operational Strategy and Programs and identify requirements for their modification. It would include the review of changes in attitudes, policies and practices affecting the global environment, the global environmental results and impacts of GEF projects and programs, and what has been learned about strategies and technologies. It would be managed by the Monitoring and Evaluation Coordinator in close consultations with other staff of the Secretariat, the Implementing Agencies, STAP, the Convention Secretariats and other relevant partners including NGOs, and will partly build on lessons learned from all types of evaluations and studies in the four local areas.

Follow-up of Evaluations

32. Senior management responses to conclusions and recommendations for actions to be taken are required for all evaluations. The Implementing Agencies management will have responsibility for responses to project evaluations (midterm, extensions, and completion). The GEF CEO and Council will be requested to respond to evaluations of project impact, operational programs and crosscutting topics. Responses from the Implementing Agencies, Country Focal

Points and relevant stakeholders will also be requested. The Monitoring and Evaluation Coordinator will monitor and report on the responses to the follow-up of evaluations.

V. DISSEMINATION PRODUCTS AND USERS

33. An essential and integral part of monitoring and evaluation is the dissemination of the analyses, findings, recommendations and lessons learned. This work calls for clearly identified tasks, resources for their implementation, designated dissemination responsibilities, and identification of the needs of the end users. The dissemination task is more than just report distribution. It requires the use of techniques that promote and facilitate the integration of findings and lessons into the GEF's Operational Programs and projects and, more broadly, in the advancement of an awareness of global environmental issues and opportunities for achieving global benefits.

34. The *main components* of the dissemination task are:

- (a) transparency in the availability of information from monitoring and evaluation activities;
- (b) ease of access to relevant monitoring and evaluation information as required by decisionmakers and other users;
- (c) special initiatives to engage policy and operations decisionmakers and program stakeholders in internalizing the lessons from experience and best practices;
- (d) requirements for the use of lessons and best practices in the development of new policies and projects;
- (e) systematic action on the findings and recommendations that flow from the monitoring and evaluation program;
- (f) specific dissemination programs for each Implementing Agency and Country Focal Point.

35. Some of the main *dissemination techniques* will include: report preparation, summaries and abstracts, electronic information systems, management and staff review sessions, evaluator participation in project review processes, special analyses of experience in project documents, country and regional seminars and workshops, and reference services.

36. The primary end users of monitoring and evaluation products are: Council, COPs, CEO and Secretariat, STAP, Implementing Agencies, other international organizations, NGOs, participating country representatives, and related stakeholders and interested public. Each dissemination product will identify the intended primary and secondary recipients.

378. The Monitoring and Evaluation Coordinator will have the lead responsibility for guidelines, monitoring actions, and direct dissemination actions for those evaluations it manages in close cooperation with the Senior External Relations Coordinator of the GEF Secretariat. The

Implementing Agencies will be responsible for drafting a dissemination program for their own monitoring and evaluation activities.

38. Responsibility Designations and Timeframes. The accompanying chart provides overview of the monitoring, evaluation and dissemination program. It specifies the monitoring, evaluation and dissemination program requirements and activities, and the Monitoring and Evaluation Coordinator's responsibilities. As indicated these responsibilities may, in some instances, be joint, as appropriate, and each task have a lead organization designated. The coordinator will have various roles depending on the activity. For some, he will provide guidelines, coordination and oversight (shown with an asterisk); for others he will be responsible for directing evaluation work and dissemination in cooperation with the Senior External Affairs Officer.

VI. PRIORITIES OF THE MONITORING, EVALUATION AND DISSEMINATION PROGRAM FOR FY97

39. Assuming that the framework laid out in this report is acceptable to the Council, the main next steps for implementing the work program for FY97, building on what has already been established include:

40. Development of a Monitoring System. The development of an improved monitoring system, including a joint database, has the highest priority in the monitoring and evaluation work program in FY97. The system will largely be based on existing formats and software in the Implementing Agencies and only the incremental costs of adapting this to GEF needs are provided in the attached budget.

41. Identification of Indicators. The monitoring and evaluation performance and impact data will be based on indicators, as described in paragraph 11, and linked to the ten operational programs. The work will be undertaken in cooperation with Implementing Agencies, STAP and other competent institutions/organizations, i.e. at a number of seminars.

42. Project Reviews, Evaluations and Completion Reports. A large number of project reviews and evaluations will be carried out by the Implementing Agencies in accordance with agency procedures and GEF policies. It is envisaged that the scope of the assessments will reflect the indicators identified for the Operational Programs and the Monitoring and Evaluation guidelines. The project reviews/evaluations will constitute essential building blocks for evaluations of the program level.

43. Monitoring and Evaluation Components in Projects. Monitoring and evaluation components are to be inserted into all projects of a minimum size and duration. The component will be based on the GEF project cycle, Operational Program indicators as well as the Logical Framework System. The drafting of guidelines for Monitoring and Evaluation components will be done in cooperation with the Implementing Agencies and other relevant actors. Old projects, which exceed a minimum size or have other specific characteristics, will also be retrofitted with Monitoring and Evaluation components and baseline data. The use of the Logical Framework System for project cycle management will be encouraged, i.e., through seminars and case material.

44. Annual Portfolio Performance Report. In order to provide a GEF-wide and consistent reporting a joint common reporting format will be prepared in cooperation with the Implementing Agencies for FY97. The two existing databases will be extended to include performance data. Suitable software will be developed to allow for interagency on-line access. Some costs for software adaptations and training of task managers is budgeted for in FY97.

45. Program Evaluation of Biodiversity. A concerted project and program evaluations of biodiversity projects have been planned for FY97-98. In the preparatory phase, the Monitoring and Evaluation Coordinator, the GEF Secretariat, Implementing Agencies and the Convention Secretariat will, in consultation with STAP and other competent organizations, identify issues which should be studied at the project and program levels. In this way, project reviews and evaluations undertaken in FY97 would feed into the subsequent program evaluation.

46. Cross-cutting Evaluations. The plan for FY97 is to initiate two cross-cutting evaluations:

(a) The Adequacy of Project Preparation and Design

47. This work will be initiated in FY97 and will comprise assessments of procedures and the management of the initial steps of the project cycle, i.e.

(i) role of beneficiary groups and government in project identification and

(ii) preparation;

(iii) adherence to GEF policy in project design, the degree of objective-

(iv) oriented planning, clarity of expected outcomes, existence of baseline data, etc.

(v) usefulness of various administrative steps and levels in project preparation and approval, the lead time for project preparation, etc.;

(b) Characteristic Features of Good and Less Good Projects

48. It is GEF's policy to explore different strategies and project concepts by encouraging experimentation and innovation. A specific study to be completed at end of FY97 will seek to document and draw systematic lessons on what approaches, project types and forms of cooperation have proved, or seem to be the most promising, as well as the most unpromising. A combined desk and field study will seek to identify and document characteristic features of promising and unpromising interventions within various focal areas and different levels of intervention (policy, program and project).

49. Dissemination. Further guidance and procedures for GEF's Monitoring and Evaluation dissemination work will be drafted in cooperation with the Senior External Relations Coordinator. This would include a detailing of the disclosure policy, a closer identification of audiences, designs of documents, choice of electronic media, etc.

GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Program Budget for FY97

50. The proposed budget for FY97 is US\$ 718,000 as shown in the table below. This includes the interim budget of US\$ 398,000 approved by Council at the April 1996 meeting. In addition, the GEF administrative budget for FY97 includes an additional US\$ 699,000 for Implementing Agencies mid-term reviews, project evaluations and completion assessments.

Staffing

51. The budget is based on the salary and benefits for the Senior Monitoring and Evaluation Coordinator for 12 months and a support staff position for 9 months. In addition, provisions have been made for the recruitment of a Long-term Consultant(9 months) and a short term consultant (3 months).

52. To facilitate more lengthy planning and further institutional strengthening, Council's authorization is sought for the recruitment of a second fixed term Monitoring and Evaluation Officer. since it is uncertain how long the recruitment would take, no allocations have been made for this position in the FY97 budget.

Coordination expenses

53. Staff salaries and benefits refer to Secretariat positions. Under "Travel" and "Meetings/Seminars" some amounts have been budgeted to cover expenses for specified tasks by Implementing Agencies, NGOs, research institutions, etc. Most of the other items are budgeted according to standard costing in the Secretariat.

BUDGET FOR GEF MONITORING AND EVALUATION PROGRAM - FY97

Secretariat's M&E Function:

Staff Resources (number of positions)

Number of Professional Level	1.0
Number of Long-term/Short-term Consultants	1.5
Total Support Level Positions	1.0

Coordination Expenses:

Staff Salaries and Benefits	180
Consultants (LT - 3/4 yrs; ST - 1/2 yr)	80
Travel *	20
Meetings/ Seminars *	30

Communications	5
Reports and Dissemination	5
Management Information System	1
Representation	2
Office occupancy and operation, fixed costs	55
TOTAL ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS	378
Operational Expenses:	
Special M&E Studies and Assignments **	340
TOTAL OPERATIONAL EXPENSES	340
GRAND TOTAL	718

Operational Expenses

The proposed operational expenses are for these activities:

Design of monitoring system and database	200,000
Focal Area: Biodiversity, preparatory phase	30,000
Cross-cutting Characteristic of good and less good projects	80,000
Cross-cutting: Project preparation and planning	30,000
TOTAL	340,000

**CHART: MONITORING, EVALUATION AND DISSEMINATION PROGRAM:
COMPONENTS, TIMEFRAMES, AND RESPONSIBILITIES (SEE FOOTNOTES)**

Activity	Monitoring/Evaluation
Follow-up	
Requirements/Responsibilities	Requirements/Responsibilities
1. Projects	
1.1 Design of M&E M&EC/GEFSEC and Implementing components in projects projects Agencies	M&EC for design Implementing Agencies for insertion in
1.2. Project implementation Implementing Agencies and performance monitoring report M&EC. Secretariat	Annual reporting by Implementing Agencies , Country Focal Point, Executing Agencies and * M&EC to complete final report.
1.3 Project mid-term, Implementing Agencies and phased or extended projects Secretariat evaluation	Mid-term for projects exceeding three years duration Implementing Agencies, Executing Agencies, Country Focal Point, M&EC*
1.4 Implementation/project Implementing Agencies and completion and (World Bank) Secretariat performance audits	Following completion of activities and disbursements Implementing Agencies, Executing Agencies, Country Focal Point, M&EC*
1.5 Project impact (by Secretariat project or project cluster)	Impact assessed 1-5 years after completion Implementing Agencies, Executing Agencies, Country Focal Point, M&EC*
2. Operational Strategy	
2.1 Operational strategy fourth Secretariat and Implementing performance - ten operational Agencies programs	Evaluation of each program during third or year of operations M&EC/STAP
2.2 Cross-cutting in 1997 Follow-up after initial evaluations and country reviews evaluation	Two evaluations scheduled to be initiated M&EC
Secretariat and M&EC	
2.3 Country reviews of Follow-up after each country GEF's role and results Point review	To be explored in selected countries M&EC, Implementing Agencies, Country Focal

Country Focal Point,

Implementing Agencies,

Secretariat

2.4	Assessments of GEF's	End of fifth year in-depth review of
	results and Secretariat	
	global results and impacts	impact
		M&EC, STAP

-
1. The unit in bold has the lead responsibility.
 2. Country Focal Point refers to GEF country representative and other country stakeholders.
 3. *Monitoring and Evaluation Coordinator (M&EC): responsibility for providing M&E guidelines, harmonizing standards and practices, coordinating M&E activity, and monitoring M&E processes.