

**TABLE OF ALL OPS-7 RECOMMENDATIONS**  
**(PREPARED BY THE GEF SECRETARIAT)**

**TABLE OF ALL OPS-7 RECOMMENDATIONS<sup>1</sup> FROM THE STUDIES DONE BY THE INDEPENDENT EVALUATION OFFICE (IEO)**

1. OPS-7 Final Report.....	1
2. 2021 Program Evaluation of the Special Climate Change Fund.....	2
3. Third Joint GEF-UNDP Evaluation of the Small Grants Programme .....	3
4. GEF Support to Innovation – Findings and Lessons .....	4
5. Evaluation of the Country Support Programme (CSP).....	5
6. Formative Evaluation of the GEF Integrated Approach to Address the Drivers of Environmental Degradation .....	6
7. Evaluation of GEF Engagement with Micro, Small, and Medium Enterprises .....	6
8. Evaluation of Institutional Policies and Engagement of the GEF.....	7
9. Results Based Management – Evaluations of the Agency Self-Evaluation Systems .....	7
10. Results Based Management – Evaluations of the GEF Portal .....	8
11. Evaluation of Knowledge Management in the GEF (2020).....	8
12. Evaluation of the Role of Medium-Sized Projects in the GEF Partnership.....	8
13. Evaluation Of GEF Interventions in the Artisanal and Small-Scale Gold Mining Sector .....	9
14. Evaluation of GEF Support in Fragile and Conflict-Affected Situations .....	10
15. 2020 Program Evaluation of the Least Developed Countries Fund.....	11
16. Strategic Country Cluster Evaluation: Sahel and Sudan-Guinea Savanna Biomes .....	11
17. Strategic Country Cluster Evaluation of the Least Developed Countries.....	11
18. Strategic Country Cluster Evaluation of The Small Island Developing States.....	12
19. Value for Money Analysis of GEF Interventions in Support of Sustainable Forest Management .....	13
20. Evaluation of GEF Support to Scaling Up Impact.....	13
21. Annual Performance Report 2019 (with a focus on Sustainable Transport).....	13
22. Evaluation of GEF's Support to Mainstreaming Biodiversity .....	14
23. Evaluation of the GEF-UNIDO Global Cleantech Innovation Programme.....	15

<sup>1</sup> While the LDCF and SCCF Evaluations are not directly related to OPS-7, their recommendations are included here for the sake of completeness. In addition, this Table does not include the following two Evaluations as they are relevant to the Independent Evaluation Office only: [Report on the Review of the GEF Terminal Evaluation Validation Process](#), and [An Evaluative Approach to Assessing GEF's Additionality](#).

COUNCIL	NAME OF STUDY	RECOMMENDATIONS	DETAILS OF RECOMMENDATIONS
61	<a href="#">OPS-7 Final Report</a>  <a href="#">GEFSEC's Management Response</a>	<i>INTEGRATED PROGRAMMING</i>	<p><b>The GEF should continue pursuing integration in programming but should clearly demonstrate the additionality of this approach in terms of environmental benefits, socioeconomic co-benefits, policy influence, and inclusion.</b> The impact programs should be maintained along current themes, but with a greater emphasis on nature-based solutions to challenges at the social-ecological nexus. Complementarities between existing and proposed projects should be more clearly sought and articulated to support a systems-oriented approach.</p> <p>Establishing clarity on roles; coordination among Agencies; and monitoring, reporting, and knowledge management responsibilities across the partnership is imperative for program success. The GEF should provide guidance and support to OFPs for the realization of cross-government, multi-ministry leadership groups on GEF projects. It should also clearly articulate in its results framework socioeconomic co-benefits and policy reforms. The path to a greener recovery will require integrated programs to ensure the inclusion of civil society and indigenous peoples as well as other diverse stakeholders, and attention to cross-cutting issues such as gender, resilience, and engagement with the private sector.</p>
		<i>SMALL GRANTS PROGRAM</i>	<p><b>The GEF should reappraise its vision for the SGP in order to expand its purpose and potential for impact.</b> The SGP has been widely appreciated as enabling civil society participation in the GEF partnership. It can play a critical role in the post-pandemic green recovery, since it provides resources that are accessible to grassroots communities, enabling them to actively participate in rebuilding a sustainable and inclusive local economy. However, different partners hold diverging and sometimes competing visions of how the SGP could further build upon its results and social capital, which has an impact on its governance and policies. The perverse incentives under the upgrading policy should be reviewed so that the SGP's nature as a community-based program is not compromised. The GEF could also consider drawing on the expertise of its expanded Agency network to deliver projects under the program.</p>
		<i>ADMINISTRATIVE PROCESSES</i>	<p><b>The GEF should review its requirements, processes and procedures to allow countries, Agencies, and the private sector to secure GEF resources and move to implementation and execution more quickly in the post-pandemic period.</b> The preparation and approval of GEF projects can take many years, given the substantial requirements, processes, and procedures. To be more dynamic and transformative, the GEF will need to adjust these processes so funds can be accessed, and projects move toward implementation, more readily— particularly in the post-pandemic period. The GEF will thus be able to support a green, blue, clean, and resilient recovery with efficiency and alacrity. For one thing, the administrative requirements for the two-step MSP process should be streamlined so it does not limit the use of the MSP, which is a useful mechanism for innovation. The approval process for the nongrant instrument should be reviewed for consistency and to reflect industry good practice standards. And the GEF partnership must address delays in implementation of enabling activities after approval.</p>
		<i>SYNERGIES AND COOPERATION AMONG AGENCIES</i>	<p><b>The GEF should establish clear ground rules for GEF Agency interactions with respect to project development and implementation, and in terms of engaging with OFPs and executing agencies.</b> Ground rules should provide guidance to the Agencies about what is—and is not—acceptable at the country level. Efforts should be made to minimize certain types of competition, favoring the selection of Agencies that have demonstrated a clear comparative advantage for certain project types and locations. Potential synergies should be cultivated between Agencies, drawing on the respective strengths of the various Agency types. GEF Agencies should be allowed to execute their own projects only on an exception basis to encourage more national organizations to undertake project execution.</p>
		<i>COUNTRY ENGAGEMENT</i>	<p><b>The GEF should develop and implement a more strategic and coherent approach to engagement at the country level to better address varying country needs and capacities.</b> To this end, the GEF should work proactively with countries to develop tailored strategies for engaging with the GEF, taking into consideration the programs of and possible synergies with other environment and climate funds. The OFPs would be essential in the preparation of such a country strategy, as they engage with a range of ministries, the convention focal points, and the focal points of other key environmental and climate finance mechanisms, and can thus ensure the development of synergies across the different funds. If well designed, the country strategy would help encourage cross-institutional collaboration and foster greater policy coherence. The GEF should leverage the Country Support Program to enable greater capacity building and strengthening of OFPs and other national institutions in line with ensuring more coherent delivery of programming.</p>
		<i>PRIORITY COUNTRY GROUPS</i>	<p><b>The GEF should increase its support to LDCs and SIDS, to have greater impact in these priority countries.</b> GEF resources allocated to LDCs and SIDS are too limited to have impact at a sufficiently large scale in addressing environmental problems. Moreover, few LDCs and SIDS have participated in the integrated approach pilots and impact programs. The GEF should continue to address capacity building in these groups through the Country Support Program or through synergies with other capacity-building programs. Across all country groups, particularly in fragile and conflict-affected situations, special attention must be paid to country context in project design and implementation.</p>
		<i>PRIVATE SECTOR ENGAGEMENT</i>	<p><b>The GEF should strengthen private sector engagement with targeted support.</b> To increase the efficiency and effectiveness of its private sector engagement, the GEF should consider (1) defining a narrower focus and specific targets for its private sector engagement; (2) clearly communicating its identity, value proposition, and processes of project design, development, and implementation to potential partners in the private sector; (3) seamlessly integrating financial and nonfinancial support to private sector partners, including micro, small, and medium enterprises; (4) ensuring that selected projects (and Agencies) have adequately researched and generated a pipeline of investment projects; and (5) supporting a comprehensive review and adjustment of its operational procedures to address constraints, including the possible development of a two-stage process for nongrant instrument approval.</p>

COUNCIL	NAME OF STUDY	RECOMMENDATIONS	DETAILS OF RECOMMENDATIONS
		<i>INNOVATION AND RISK</i>	<p><b>The GEF should continue to pursue innovative projects to advance transformational change.</b> GEF project review mechanisms should incentivize innovative projects across the partnership. The preparation process should explicitly allow for consideration of the risk associated with these projects. Moreover, the process should be streamlined; because many innovative pilots are MSPs, they should not be subject to the same processes as larger projects.</p> <p>Since innovation is associated with some level of risk, the GEF Council, together with the GEF Secretariat and the STAP, should clearly articulate the level of acceptable risk across the various instruments and approaches, for clarity across the partnership and to encourage innovation through a managed approach. The GEF could consider establishing a specific window for financing innovation with a higher risk tolerance.</p>
		<i>POLICIES AND SYSTEMS</i>	<p><b>Monitoring implementation of GEF policies needs to be continued—and done better.</b> The recent GEF policies on safeguards, gender, and stakeholder engagement will need to be monitored, with adequate data and evidence, to be able to assess their effectiveness.</p> <p><b>The GEF results-based management and knowledge management systems should adapt with the shift to integration.</b> The GEF results-based management system should be structured to enable reporting on the overall performance of each integrated approach pilot and impact program, through aggregation of results across child projects, as well as demonstrate the additionality of the integrated approach. Core indicators should be developed to capture socioeconomic and policy co-benefits. Knowledge management efforts need to be coordinated across the partnership, with a focus on promoting South-South learning.</p>
61	<p><a href="#"><u>2021 Program Evaluation of the Special Climate Change Fund</u></a></p> <p><a href="#"><u>GEFSEC's Management Response</u></a></p>	<p><i>The GEF Secretariat should acknowledge the semidormant state of the SCCF and—together with the key and emerging donors and stakeholders—develop a proactive action plan to revitalize the fund.</i></p>	<p>Removing windows SCCF-C and SCCF-D, which are evidently unattractive to donors, targeting support under window SCCF-A towards non-LDCs— particularly SIDS—and refocusing the fund toward technology transfer and innovation in adaptation in non-LDCs in window SCCF-B is the only way forward. In doing so, the Secretariat should actively articulate and communicate the SCCF’s niche and brand its focused and distinctive roles in the climate finance architecture. In the short term, and despite the preference of traditional donors to focus on few, larger funds, the existence of funds such as the SCCF could remain a proven and practical alternative for donors to diversify their funding, or an opportunity for new and emerging or smaller donor countries in climate finance.</p>

COUNCIL	NAME OF STUDY	RECOMMENDATIONS	DETAILS OF RECOMMENDATIONS
60	<p data-bbox="289 822 696 959"><a href="#">Third Joint GEF-UNDP Evaluation of the Small Grants Programme</a></p> <p data-bbox="289 1056 696 1145"><a href="#">GEFSEC's Management Response</a></p>	<p data-bbox="739 237 1439 360"><i>Recommendation 1. (to the GEF and UNDP). As recommended in the 2015 evaluation, the SGP should conduct a consultative process towards the formulation of an updated long-term vision for the SGP.</i></p>	<p data-bbox="1470 237 3033 360">This process should begin by taking stock of the past 25+ years of programming and should serve to inform future replenishment discussions. The process should be inclusive of upgraded countries, countries participating in the SGP global programme, GEF Council and UNDP, and the final vision should be adopted by the GEF Council/Assembly. The purpose would be to ensure that the vision, mission and mandate of the SGP are clear and consensual and serve as a guiding framework for policy decisions through future GEF periods.</p>
		<p data-bbox="739 368 1439 653"><i>Recommendation 2. (to the GEF). In developing the implementation arrangements for SGP, the GEF Secretariat, in collaboration with UNDP, should provide Council and the next replenishment with a detailed analysis of the impacts of a shrinking SGP funding envelope on the operations of the SGP, the pressures placed on STAR allocations, demands to add new countries to the global programme without concomitant growth in core funding, and the risk of losing the goodwill and social capital the SGP brings to the GEF as a whole.</i></p>	<p data-bbox="1470 465 3033 556">Going forward, the level of resources provided to the SGP must be considered in proportion with the requirements for expansion and 'universal access', and the upgrading policy could be designed so as to maximize benefits rather than primarily as a means for creating 'fiscal space'</p>
		<p data-bbox="739 691 1439 848"><i>Recommendation 3. (to the GEF and UNDP). The SGP should reconsider whether it needs a continued upgrading policy. If upgrading is maintained, the SGP should rethink the means for its implementation in order to reduce the risk borne by countries and CSOs.</i></p>	<p data-bbox="1470 661 3033 878">This applies to all stakeholders involved in policymaking for the SGP. This would include a revision of the upgrading criteria, as recommended in the 2015 evaluation, as well as implementation arrangements and operational modalities. The two cycles of upgrading have brought to light significant challenges that need to be taken into consideration if and when continuing to upgrade countries. The revised policy should be focused on CSO capacity and potential for global environmental benefits and should consider the effects of upgrading on transaction costs, operational considerations, risks in all fiscal contexts; and also consider the risks in having small community projects go unfunded. To conserve the high levels of efficiency when transitioning from global programme to upgraded status, assumptions about civil society capacity and the CSO-government relationship need to be examined on a case-by-case basis.</p>
		<p data-bbox="739 889 1439 1046"><i>Recommendation 4. (to the Central Programme Management Team). The ways that SGP interventions are packaged, such as strategic initiatives, focal area results, innovation programmes and Grantmakers Plus initiatives, should be simplified.</i></p>	<p data-bbox="1470 919 3033 1010">A small number of thematic frameworks (e.g., landscape/seascape approach) may be adopted to steer or shape programming, incentivize innovation or address urgent and emerging issues, but the pace of change should be slow enough to allow for local adoption and internalization by local communities.</p>
		<p data-bbox="739 1056 1439 1213"><i>Recommendation 5. (to the SGP Global Steering Committee and the Central Programme Management Team). As recommended in the 2015 joint evaluation, the SGP should review and re-energize its governance at the global and national levels.</i></p>	<p data-bbox="1470 1056 3033 1213">This will help to avoid misunderstandings and strengthen the relationship, through revised terms of reference, improved communication, agreed operational language or more frequent meetings. At the national level, the Terms of Reference of the national steering committee should be reviewed with emphasis on building synergies with the national UNDP programmes and creating spaces for new committee members that could help in increasing the broader adoption of SGP small grant projects (such as including members with expertise in building business models or inclusion of private sector representatives).</p>
		<p data-bbox="739 1223 1439 1409"><i>Recommendation 6. (to the Central Programme Management Team). The SGP should test new ways to track and aggregate the intangible results generated by countries benefiting from SGP inputs such as the benefits received from its capacity-building activities, monitoring and evaluation, communications and knowledge management.</i></p>	<p data-bbox="1470 1233 3033 1391">There should be a systematic process in which the global programme countries benefit from the experiences of the upgraded countries and vice versa. At the country level, the SGP should be able to track the evolution of the grantees they support and the broader adoption of activities that have been implemented, to maximize the space for innovation and support the evolution of its grantees. The team should continue to ensure that adequate knowledge management strategies are in place with related capacity to implement these strategies, so as to allow the maximization of broader adoption opportunities stemming from SGP initiatives.</p>
		<p data-bbox="739 1419 1439 1576"><i>Recommendation 7. (to the Central Programme Management Team, UNDP, and the GEF). The approach to and measurement of sustainability in the SGP should be improved to capture the tangible and intangible benefits of the programme.</i></p>	<p data-bbox="1470 1419 3033 1576">A first layer of sustainability could be measured at the level of small grant projects, while another could be measured at the level of grantees. A measure of sustainability in this context may be whether the organizations continue to operate in the environmental space after the SGP grant is concluded. A scale of CSO capacity could be devised that would allow for long-term tracking of SGP grantees and their progression along the development continuum, especially for those who receive repeat funding or whose activities are replicated or upscaled through new projects.</p>
		<p data-bbox="739 1594 1439 1725"><i>Recommendation 8. (to the Central Programme Management Team). The team should create operational mechanisms to improve and incentivize innovation and business-oriented approaches in country programmes.</i></p>	<p data-bbox="1470 1586 3033 1725">These mechanisms would maximize the potential for environmental benefits and social inclusion while creating opportunities for long-term viability of supported SGP small grants. The social economy model provides a useful avenue for the SGP to expand to new beneficiaries and to optimize the sustainability of its results. Enhanced and more systematic synergies between UNDP and the SGP at the country level could facilitate this process. Examples include priority selection of innovative projects, varied scales of financing for business-oriented initiatives, and the broader adoption of SGP small grant projects into UNDP programming.</p>

COUNCIL	NAME OF STUDY	RECOMMENDATIONS	DETAILS OF RECOMMENDATIONS
		<p><i>Recommendation 9. (to the GEF). The GEF Secretariat should apply the explicit, accepted accounting standards that are applied to the rest of the GEF portfolio when assessing SGP management costs.</i></p>	<p>The appropriateness of the level of management expenditures should be a factor of the level of management activities that are required. Programmatic activities related to CSO capacity-building, monitoring, knowledge, technical assistance and communication should not be considered part of the management cost even if they are expenditures incurred by UNDP and UNOPS in their capacity as implementing agency and executing agency. Further discussion on this matter between the GEF and the UNDP should take place on the basis of clarification as to the future vision of the SGP. The next GEF replenishment may wish to consider setting benchmarks for programmatic costs in relation to the demands placed on and resources provided to the SGP.</p>
60	<p><a href="#"><u>GEF Support to Innovation – Findings and Lessons</u></a></p> <p><a href="#"><u>GEFSEC’s Management Response</u></a></p>	<p><i>Since many innovations involve risks, the GEF Secretariat should continuously monitor the risk across the GEF portfolio.</i></p> <p><i>The GEF should continue to explore and partner with innovation support programs that may mobilize larger sources of risk capital, and should explicitly encourage adaptive, flexible management of innovative interventions.</i></p> <p><i>The GEF must require monitoring, mid term reviews, evaluation, and knowledge sharing in all innovative projects, regardless of project size.</i></p>	<p>The GEF Council, together with the GEF Secretariat and STAP, should, based on such assessment, identify an acceptable risk tolerance level for the GEF portfolio. This risk tolerance level should be clearly communicated to the Agencies along with clarity on defining an innovative project and the criteria for selection of innovative projects.</p> <p>This could include a separate funding window for innovative projects, as well as adaptive management and flexible funding, such as a contingency component.</p> <p>Regular monitoring and mid-term reviews should be required for innovative projects of all sizes, to allow for learning and adapting as needed in time, and lessons should be captured and shared widely to understand factors underpinning success or failure, prior to scaling up or replication.</p>

COUNCIL	NAME OF STUDY	RECOMMENDATIONS	DETAILS OF RECOMMENDATIONS
60	<a href="#">Evaluation of the Country Support Programme (CSP)</a>  <a href="#">GEFSEC's Management Response</a>	<p><i>(a) Build on current efforts to collaborate with other global environmental funds.</i></p>	<p>To help countries to respond better to the commitments of countries vis-à-vis the implementation of the multilateral environmental agreements that the GEF is supporting along with other global funds, CSP management should build further on past efforts to collaborate on readiness activities with other funds. Overall, the management of the CSP should continue to monitor developments to identify where substantive opportunities for collaboration can be established beyond the current efforts.</p>
		<p><i>(b) Develop a clear CSP Strategy and an implementation plan with an appropriate budget and resource envelope.</i></p>	<p>The CSP would benefit from developing a comprehensive program strategy for every replenishment cycle, with appropriate activities designed based on country grouping needs, and with proper implementation plans to guide its actions. Such a strategic planning approach should develop a validated theory of change for the program, with clear expected results, milestones, and targets in its main spheres of influence. The CSP has a significant scope and reach and can more proactively strengthen the crucial role it plays moving forward as a key entry point in the GEF dialogue, knowledge sharing and capacity building process with GEF partners at the global, regional and country level.</p>
		<p><i>(c) Strengthen technical expertise in the CSP team and monitoring and reporting systems.</i></p>	<p>CSP management should improve the program's dedicated technical capabilities and its ability to provide more localized support, to meet the high demands placed on the CSP team across countries and regions. In light of the insufficient program data management and reporting, CSP management should also put in place results-based data management, monitoring, evaluation, and reporting systems to track the use of resources, as well as activities, outcomes, and impacts. These systems should provide the basis for more systematic and comprehensive reporting at each GEF cycle to both GEF management and the GEF Council.</p>
		<p><i>(d) Revisit the reach and timing of National Dialogues to align them better with country needs for support.</i></p>	<p>The CSP should explore ways to improve the timing of the National Dialogue or develop other up-front strategic dialogue mechanisms on the future use of GEF resources. These should be planned as early as possible and should pursue deeper multi-stakeholder engagement in the process. Finally, the CSP should examine with GEF programming staff how National Dialogues and ECWs could more directly contribute to programming objectives.</p>
		<p><i>(e) Enhance inclusiveness, so that inclusiveness at events turns into improved collaboration on the ground.</i></p>	<p>Though the CSP cannot be held responsible and accountable for how country focal points manage their GEF programs, it is in a unique position to offer best practices that ensure successful GEF programming in practice. In this context, the CSP could play an important role in ensuring that the inclusiveness they have promoted in their events continues past the CSP activity and results in active and fruitful collaboration. The CSP can be a gateway toward better integration of CSOs and other groups into GEF programming after CSP events.</p>
		<p><i>(f) Apply a customized approach to capacity building.</i></p>	<p>Because a one-size-fits-all approach to capacity building limits the number of participants that can be reached, the CSP should develop more customized approaches to capacity building with consideration for more flexibility as to the number of participants from each stakeholder group and their level of capacity. The CSP should also continue to empower OFPs by better informing them on their roles in GEF portfolio management beyond portfolio development. At the same time, it should place emphasis on their crucial facilitation role in keeping an ongoing dialogue with, and bringing on board other actors such as line ministries, the private sector, local communities, and CSOs to ensure the mainstreaming and leveraging effect of GEF resources to support national commitments to multilateral environmental agreements.</p>

COUNCIL	NAME OF STUDY	RECOMMENDATIONS	DETAILS OF RECOMMENDATIONS
60	<a href="#">Formative Evaluation of the GEF Integrated Approach to Address the Drivers of Environmental Degradation</a>  <a href="#">GEFSEC's Management Response</a>	<p><i>To make the ongoing efforts in aggregate program-level reporting effective, the GEF Secretariat must clarify program-level reporting requirements for Lead Agencies.</i></p>	<p>The GEF community is eager to learn whether integrated programming delivers on its promise of the “whole being more than the sum of its parts”. The GEF IEO 2017 Programmatic Approaches evaluation has demonstrated the program value added over comparable standalone interventions. The value-added potential is there but must be measured. Current program-level reporting for the IAPs is insufficient to measure this value added. This must be improved in the GEF-7 impact programs to support the rationale for integrated programming. Program-level monitoring and reporting requirements must be better codified in project cycle practices. Global and regional coordination projects should not be required to report on GEBs in all cases. Some relevant intermediate results that are linked to the program theory of change—not just GEBs—should be aggregable across child projects. This will take substantial work on the part of the Lead Agency, as the RFS experience has demonstrated.</p>
		<p><i>The GEF Secretariat and Lead Agencies should work to further catalyze and demonstrate the value addition of a programmatic approach to integration.</i></p>	<p>Specific actions include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) The GEF Secretariat should ensure that global and regional coordination projects are designed before child projects or at least with some logical staging so that they are not designed fully in parallel. Lead Agencies’ coordination and integration role during design is intensive and may require funding beyond the normal project preparation grant. Depending on program objectives and scope, additional funds should be available.</li> <li>(b) In implementation, Lead Agencies should consider activities that support systems-based thinking—such as the midterm systems-based workshops to review drivers and barriers—and adapt accordingly. Such reflection and agility are important processes for supporting progress toward transformational change.</li> <li>(c) In design and throughout implementation, the Lead Agency, under the guidance of the GEF Secretariat, should clarify operational roles and responsibilities for working with the private sector entities involved in value chains that span from multinational to national and subnational scales. This will be critical for value chain integration across those scales and with Agencies and child projects.</li> </ul>
		<p><i>The GEF should ensure greater diversification in the set of countries included in the integrated programs.</i></p>	<p>While the programs have addressed relevant environmental issues in major countries, they should be more inclusive of smaller countries, such as SIDS.</p>
60	<a href="#">Evaluation of GEF Engagement with Micro, Small, and Medium Enterprises</a>  <a href="#">GEFSEC's Management Response</a>	<p><i>MSMEs vary in their capacities and constraints, and therefore GEF support should address their context-specific needs, barriers, and economic viability related to generating global environmental benefits.</i></p>	<p>GEF may engage MSMEs not only or necessarily through increasing their access to financing, but also by supporting low-cost, context-appropriate practices, technologies, or facilities they can easily use, and by facilitating regulatory and administrative reforms required to access resources. Increasing access to financing is appropriate where a minimum level of resources already exists, and the higher amount of investment is needed to generate a higher magnitude of global environmental benefits. Partnering with local, established organizations may provide long-term support that increases the likelihood of global environmental benefits being sustained, mainstreamed, and/or scaled up.</p>
		<p><i>In addition to tracking environmental outcomes, GEF projects should design for and monitor social and economic benefits that engage the private sector, including MSMEs.</i></p>	<p>N/A</p>



COUNCIL	NAME OF STUDY	RECOMMENDATIONS	DETAILS OF RECOMMENDATIONS
60	<a href="#">Evaluation of Institutional Policies and Engagement of the GEF</a>  <a href="#">GEFSEC's Management Response</a>	<p><i>The Secretariat should prepare an overarching narrative for the three policies under the banner of “inclusion”, make explicit the complementarities across the policies, their contribution to the GEF program, and their tie-in to the GEF project cycle. As the policies progress through implementation, the Secretariat should build capability to track inclusion at a project level in a way that allows GEF to analyze policy impact at a portfolio level.</i></p>	N/A
		<p><i>The Secretariat should develop a knowledge sharing effort that leverages expertise within the Partnership to highlight approaches for addressing safeguards implementation issues related to the updated ESS policy. Related to the IEO's evaluation on Knowledge Management, the Secretariat should incorporate- a) inclusion practice content; b) Environment and Social Safeguards implementation topics within the scope of the Secretariat's forthcoming KM strategy.</i></p>	N/A
		<p><i>The Secretariat should a) reset the GEF's relationship with the CSO Network with clarity on roles and responsibilities, and b) recalibrate the IPAG mechanism for increased strategic impact. In both instances, the Secretariat should draw upon the growing body of knowledge on civil society outreach practices, the opportunities inherent in the policies to promote inclusion, and the strategic directions indicated for GEF-8.</i></p>	N/A
60	<a href="#">Results Based Management – Evaluations of the Agency Self-Evaluation Systems</a>  <a href="#">GEFSEC's Management Response</a>	<p><i>The GEF Secretariat and Agencies should strengthen use of mid-term reviews for learning and adaptative management.</i></p>	<p>The evaluation shows that despite their potential, mid-term reviews are conducted in a limited number of instances and the guidance on mid-term reviews is inadequate. The Secretariat should provide more guidance to the Agencies on conduct of the mid-term reviews, should share good practice examples, and should track timely conduct and submission of midterm reviews. The Agencies should conduct the mid-term reviews for GEF-supported projects, as mandated by the GEF Monitoring Policy (2019).</p>
		<p><i>The GEF Secretariat, in collaboration with other partners, should strengthen learning through the systems that it manages, support for cross-Agency exchanges, and incentives for candor.</i></p>	<p>The Secretariat needs to play a greater role in facilitating learning across the GEF Partnership. Inter-Agency meetings and extended constituency workshops may be used to strengthen peer exchange on self-evaluation–related topics such as use of theory of change, and design and implementation of monitoring and evaluation plans. Similarly, enhancement of search and analysis capabilities of the Portal may be useful in strengthening learning across the Partnership. The Secretariat may also need to rope in Agencies, GEF IEO, and/or the STAP, based on the specific knowledge management challenge that needs to be addressed. For example, GEF Agencies that have experimented with incentives to enhance candor may be encouraged to share their experiences; similarly, the STAP may be drawn upon for use of theory of change, and GEF IEO on guidance on mid-term reviews.</p>

COUNCIL	NAME OF STUDY	RECOMMENDATIONS	DETAILS OF RECOMMENDATIONS
60	<a href="#">Results Based Management – Evaluations of the GEF Portal</a>  <a href="#">GEFSEC’s Management Response</a>	<p><i>The GEF Secretariat should strengthen its process to address user feedback on the Portal.</i></p>	<p>The evaluation found that the Portal team has been readily available to address user needs. But the present process for addressing user feedback needs to be strengthened so that it fully meets user needs. The strengthened process should enable direct feedback through the Portal along with the options that are presently available. It should also record user feedback/complaints, require a response within a committed time frame, and track progress towards resolution.</p>
		<p><i>GEF Management should develop and implement a time bound plan to speed up the development of the Portal.</i></p>	<p>The users of the GEF Portal perceive that despite significant progress, the development of Portal has continued for long. For some, especially Agencies, this perceived delay in completion of the development phase is a source of frustration and it may be causing some inefficiencies across the GEF Partnership. Several gaps need to be addressed and it may be more cost effective to address them sooner rather than later. The GEF Management should assess how best it may speed up the process and implement its plan.</p>
59	<a href="#">Evaluation of Knowledge Management in the GEF (2020)</a>  <a href="#">GEFSEC’s Management Response</a>	<p><i>The GEF partnership should develop a clear KM strategy.</i></p>	<p>Within the planning toward GEF-8, a group dedicated to KM, or the KM Advisory group, should advise the GEF Secretariat on developing a partnership-wide KM strategy with clear priorities and focus. The strategy would need to be supported by the necessary resources and endorsement of the GEF Council. The strategy should set out the KM priorities and define the roles and responsibilities across the GEF partnership including the role of the KM Advisory group. Supported by an action plan, the strategy should set out principles and standards for the KM steps: knowledge capture, development, sharing, dissemination, and application articulated in reinforced project-level guidelines, requirements, and common KM metrics.</p>
		<p><i>The GEF partnership should invest in a technical solution that strengthens the KM system.</i></p>	<p>At the operational level, a common approach is needed to guide the KM steps supported by a technical solution which can support KM needs: the ability to capture KM data, lessons, and good practices and to present them in a usable and accessible format for both GEF stakeholders and externally. This would require either enhancing the KM capabilities of the new Portal or building a GEF Knowledge Exchange Hub as previously proposed by the GEF Secretariat. Processes need to put into application the principles and standards set out in the strategy for each KM step: capture and storage knowledge in a uniform and accessible form; exchange of knowledge between the GEF Secretariat and agencies; collation and curation of knowledge in comparable and usable formats to increase accessibility and avoid fragmentation.</p>
59	<a href="#">Evaluation of the Role of Medium-Sized Projects in the GEF Partnership</a>  <a href="#">GEFSEC’s Management Response</a>	<p><i>The MSP should continue to be primarily used for developing innovative projects. Midterm and final evaluations should be conducted on MSPs designed as innovative or transformative, to provide lessons for scaling up or replication.</i></p>	<p>MSPs have a very specific role to play in the constellation of donor environment financing. MSPs appear to be most effective when they: (1) are applied to risky projects that can trial new approaches, and leverage more traditional forms of capital, (2) are integrated into a larger intervention, or (3) are supporting targeted research of global or regional importance, such as the Arctic, finance governance, SME nature-based entrepreneurship, and health and the environment. Stakeholders consulted during this evaluation view the \$2 million limit as appropriate and did not deem an increase necessary. The conclusions suggest that the instrument is relevant and effective and fulfils its intended role in the GEF suite of instruments.</p>

COUNCIL	NAME OF STUDY	RECOMMENDATIONS	DETAILS OF RECOMMENDATIONS
59	<a href="#">Evaluation Of GEF Interventions in the Artisanal and Small-Scale Gold Mining Sector</a>  <a href="#">GEFSEC's Management Response</a>	<p><i>GEF and the Minamata Convention should continue to encourage high mercury use countries to become more involved in the Convention.</i></p>	<p>An increasing number of countries continue to take meaningful steps towards involvement in the Convention and thus towards eliminating mercury use. As countries with ASGM present ratify the Convention, this will unlock GEF ASGM financing, increasing the global impact of GEF and the Convention.</p>
		<p><i>The GEF should increase project focus on policy interventions that help governments put into place the necessary framework to formalize ASG miners and monitor the sector.</i></p>	<p>As GEF moves into countries where ASGM formalization isn't as advanced, it will have to address this first step in the theory of change to a larger extent than in the GOLD program. Formalization policy interventions will have to assist governments in developing a framework that not only puts formalization into laws but also creates cost-effective monitoring and institutional and engagement structures to apply the policy throughout disperse ASGM areas.</p>
		<p><i>The GEF should seek opportunities for multi-focal area ASGM interventions and measure co-benefits beyond the Chemicals and Waste focal area.</i></p>	<p>The GEF has already moved in a direction of multi-focal area, holistic solutions to environmental problems with the creation of the impact programs and integrated approaches. ASGM has links to several focal areas, depending on the characteristics of each mining area, and is therefore a sector which could combine funding from several focal areas or at least include activities related to International Waters, Biodiversity, Climate Change, and Land Degradation within a Chemicals and Waste-funded project. Additionally, as environmental health takes on a higher priority in the age of the COVID-19 pandemic, ASGM interventions should consider stronger links with government health agencies to build improved environmental health monitoring and education. These efforts could work in tandem with, rather than in competition with, funding linked to the Minamata Convention to reduce mercury use.</p>
		<p><i>The planetGOLD global platform should make available results and lessons learned from completed ASGM projects and provide more detailed information on NAP and GOLD child projects.</i></p>	<p>The focus on global knowledge management and sharing in the GOLD program is valuable and should be continued. In addition to the information already available, additional information and lessons learned on completed GEF (and non-GEF) ASGM projects, especially the GEF 5 MSPs that were designed as pilot projects, should be included. Results, documents, and lessons from the Terminal Evaluations would be useful for a broad range of stakeholders and perhaps would improve stakeholder retention of the projects' outcomes. Additionally, more frequent updates on project status (both GOLD and NAP projects) on the website would help stakeholders follow progress. The hub project should seek to ensure that the results and negative aspects of lessons learned from the GOLD program are disseminated along with positive lessons, to ensure maximum adaptive learning for the future.</p>

COUNCIL	NAME OF STUDY	RECOMMENDATIONS	DETAILS OF RECOMMENDATIONS
59	<a href="#">Evaluation of GEF Support in Fragile and Conflict-Affected Situations</a>  <a href="#">GEFSEC's Management Response</a>	<p><i>The GEF Secretariat should use the project review process to provide feedback to Agencies to identify conflict- and fragility-related risks to a proposed project and develop measures to mitigate those risks.</i></p>	<p>The GEF should use the project review process to integrate consideration of fragile and conflict-affected contexts. Project reviews provide an opportunity for the GEF to identify risks that could affect project success and for proposing measures to mitigate those risks. This would help ensure that recognizing and addressing such risks is more consistent.</p>
		<p><i>To improve conflict-sensitive programming while also providing flexibility to Agencies and projects, the GEF Secretariat could develop guidance for conflict-sensitive programming.</i></p>	<p>This guidance could address measures across the programming lifecycle, from design to implementation and closure. GEF guidance on conflict-sensitive programming could draw upon both the commonalities and innovations of the guidance that has been developed by 10 Agencies.</p>
		<p><i>To improve conflict-sensitive design, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation of GEF projects, the GEF Secretariat together with the Agencies should leverage existing platforms for learning, exchange, and technical assistance.</i></p>	<p>These platforms are designed to effectively foster learning and exchange, build capacity, and provide specialized assistance. Since conflict sensitivity is a cross-cutting issue, lessons learned should be exchanged on existing knowledge platforms supported through programs such as the Integrated Approach Pilots, Impact Programs, Global Wildlife Program, and planetGOLD, among others, as well as on the online GEF Portal.</p>
		<p><i>The current GEF Environmental and Social Safeguards could be expanded to provide more details so that GEF projects address key conflict-sensitive considerations.</i></p>	<p>At least 11 GEF Agencies have incorporated consideration of conflict and fragility into their respective safeguards. The GEF has adopted Environmental and Social Safeguards that seek to minimize potentially adverse environmental and social impacts from projects. However, these safeguards mention conflict only once and lack a holistic recognition of the way that conflicts might be linked to the environment and natural resources. As it has done when updating safeguards regarding gender, the GEF could consider the more detailed provisions incorporated by Agencies as it considers whether and how to expand its safeguards to more effectively address conflict sensitivity.</p>
		<p><i>The GEF Secretariat could consider revising its policies and procedures so that GEF-supported projects can better adapt to rapid and substantial changes common in fragile and conflict-affected situations.</i></p>	<p>The circumstances on the ground in these situations can change rapidly. Yet, GEF policies and procedures can make it difficult to adjust projects to adapt in a timely manner. Incorporating adaptive management into GEF policies and procedures could provide a more flexible and adaptive environment, enabling projects to adapt more quickly and more efficiently to changes resulting from conflict or fragility, as well as other difficult situations.</p>

COUNCIL	NAME OF STUDY	RECOMMENDATIONS	DETAILS OF RECOMMENDATIONS
59	<a href="#">2020 Program Evaluation of the Least Developed Countries Fund</a>  <a href="#">GEFSEC's Management Response</a>	<i>Build on progress made on mainstreaming gender in the LDCF portfolio and aim to decrease the knowledge gap about gender-related results</i>	The GEF Secretariat and GEF Agencies should continue to build on progress made since the 2016 LDCF program evaluation towards inclusion of gender considerations by ensuring that the 2017 Gender Equality Policy and related guidance is fully operationalized, including the development and implementation of robust gender action plans. To narrow the knowledge gap, GEF Agencies should fulfill evaluation requirements on gender in terminal evaluations and report on the conduct of gender analysis and monitoring and evaluation of gender equitable participation and benefits in implementation.
		<i>Continue to enhance the likelihood of the sustainability of outcomes</i>	The GEF Secretariat and GEF Agencies should continue to carry out relevant actions in project design and implementation as highlighted in the Council document <i>Towards Greater Durability of GEF Investments</i> . This should entail giving more emphasis to the project and context factors identified by this evaluation as affecting the sustainability of outcomes during project design and implementation.
58	<a href="#">Strategic Country Cluster Evaluation: Sahel and Sudan-Guinea Savanna Biomes</a>  <a href="#">GEFSEC's Management Response</a>	<i>Project and program design in the biomes must include a discussion on how sustainability, including financial sustainability, is going to be addressed and managed.</i>	A well-designed intervention should include measures and activities that will support the continued delivery of outcomes beyond the life of the project. Sustainability factors identified at the design stage should be tracked by GEF Agencies during implementation and terminal evaluations should report on these. Financial sustainability must be given priority in the design and implementation of GEF support in the biomes and in Africa overall. The GEF Secretariat and GEF Agencies should elaborate financial arrangements at the project-design stage, that can continue after project completion to deliver benefits over time. Support to institutions should be designed considering measures to enable those institutions to operate post-completion on a sufficient and stable financial foot.
		<i>A clear discussion on how to foster synergies between environment and development must be included in design and managed through implementation.</i>	When designing and appraising proposals in the two biomes attention should be paid to the influence synergies between socioeconomic and environmental objectives have on the prospects for sustainability. Not much consideration has been given at project design stage to the influence that synergies between socioeconomic and environmental objectives have on the prospects for sustainability in the biomes. Several examples observed in the five countries visited provided compelling evidence indicating that when these considerations have been taken into account in design and implementation the prospects for sustainability postcompletion greatly improved. Fostering synergies between the environmental and development objectives should be more systematically pursued as the GEF already increasingly considers socioeconomic cobenefits in its recent portfolio.
58	<a href="#">Strategic Country Cluster Evaluation of the Least Developed Countries</a>  <a href="#">GEFSEC's Management Response</a>	<i>Continue to strengthen project design to improve sustainability of outcomes.</i>	Though performance of projects completed more recently has improved, the GEF Secretariat and GEF Agencies should take into due consideration a country's socioeconomic and political context in developing projects and programs for LDCs. While demonstrating sustainability takes time, a well-designed project should include measures and activities that will support—in terms of both financial and institutional standpoints—continued delivery of outcomes beyond the life of the project. Particular emphasis should be on elaborating financial arrangements at the project-design stage, that can continue after project completion to deliver benefits over time. Special attention on financial sustainability should be given to projects and programs in African LDCs.
		<i>Derive greater benefits from the expanded GEF partnership for LDCs that are also SIDS.</i>	In line with the SIDS SCCE recommendation, GEF Agencies of the first and second expansion should strengthen dialogue with governments and key stakeholders in LDCs that are SIDS based on their thematic and regional competencies.
		<i>Strengthen climate resilience considerations in all projects.</i>	While resilience is addressed in climate change adaptation projects, the GEF Secretariat and GEF Agencies should strengthen climate resilience considerations in other focal area interventions. Addressing climate resilience in project design will increase the likelihood of the sustainability of the GEF portfolio.

COUNCIL	NAME OF STUDY	RECOMMENDATIONS	DETAILS OF RECOMMENDATIONS
57	<a href="#">Strategic Country Cluster Evaluation of The Small Island Developing States</a>  <a href="#">GEFSEC's Management Response</a>	<i>Derive greater benefits from the expanded GEF partnership.</i>	GEF Agencies should focus their efforts in SIDS based on their thematic and geographic competence and establish a permanent presence to strengthen dialogue with the respective government and key stakeholders.
		<i>Increase the number of integrated interventions.</i>	GEF Agencies should respond to the SIDS demand by designing more integrated projects, in line with the ridge to reef, whole island, and blue economy approaches. When justified, multiphase projects should be a prioritized model for GEF projects to improve outcome sustainability.
		<i>Promote innovation and knowledge exchange.</i>	The GEF project portfolio in SIDS should include a combination of innovative (e.g., income-generating products from invasive alien species) and scaling-up approaches that have shown to be effective. Innovation should be supported even if it has a higher risk. Regional programs should encourage a transfer of knowledge to the poorest SIDS through a South-South capacity-building approach.
		<i>Strengthening institutional capacity.</i>	GEF Agencies and projects should continue to build institutional capacity in the SIDS and assist in improving project design with due consideration to sustainability (exit strategy, stakeholder engagement, national and local capacity building to ensure continuation, M&E) and in the use of financial resources.
		<i>Within the context of the climate change mitigation projects, build on the GEF's comparative advantage.</i>	When considering interventions in the climate change mitigation area, the GEF should strategically explore the opportunity to address two of the main challenges facing SIDS—deficient waste management and the lack of sustainable energy. GEF financing should continue to explore the various alternatives for renewable energy in SIDS possibly including wind, tidal and ocean wave power, and geothermal energy resources.

COUNCIL	NAME OF STUDY	RECOMMENDATIONS	DETAILS OF RECOMMENDATIONS
56	<a href="#">Value for Money Analysis of GEF Interventions in Support of Sustainable Forest Management</a>  <a href="#">GEFSEC's Management Response</a>	<p><i>Improve geographic precision in recording and reporting project locations.</i></p>	<p>This will allow for robust monitoring and evaluation of progress and results which are directly attributable to the GEF intervention. It will help gather additional information on ecological and socioeconomic changes within the aerial coverage of the GEF intervention. The requirement to collect geolocation in the GEF-7 results architecture is a step in the right direction. However, the geolocation data being collected is not precise. The GEF and partner agencies should ensure that location information is accurately captured for the site of the intervention. Collection of precise intervention boundaries is optional in the GEF-7 results architecture, but it should be highly encouraged.</p>
		<p><i>Capture socioeconomic co-benefits of interventions using a spatial approach.</i></p>	<p>GEF projects generate global environmental benefits (GEBs) as well as have the ability to produce socioeconomic co-benefits. Since GEF is capturing this co-benefit through the key indicator – the number of beneficiaries - using socioeconomic indicators which are available will shed more light than focusing on the number of beneficiaries. Project specific indicators that capture the socioeconomic conditions at the baseline and project end should be encouraged to assess both direct and induced co-benefits over time, as well as possible trade-offs. This is specifically relevant for SFM interventions that are now targeted in unique geographies such as the Amazon, the Congo Basin and drylands areas with valuable forests in poor socioeconomic situations.</p>
		<p><i>Select projects or programs to improve the evidence base for GEF interventions.</i></p>	<p>In general, there is limited evidence on the effectiveness, efficiency, and impact of various approaches and instruments such as the landscape approaches, certification schemes, and PES including in SFM interventions. Therefore, it is important to gather empirical evidence. The GEF partnership should continue to encourage the adoption of innovative experimental or quasi-experimental design elements in SFM interventions to generate data and improve the evidence base using quasi-experimental designs or randomized control designs, such as that applied in Uganda, so that impacts can be more conclusively linked to GEF SFM interventions.</p>
56	<a href="#">Evaluation of GEF Support to Scaling Up Impact</a>  <a href="#">GEFSEC's Management Response</a>	<p><i>The GEF partnership needs to ensure that factors influencing scaling up are identified and taken into account, as appropriate, in project design and implementation, and their impact assessed at midterm and terminal evaluations.</i></p>	<p>A program or project should identify its contributions to the scaling up process, such as through its support for the appropriate enabling conditions, particularly systematic learning mechanisms, and addressing contextual factors that affect scaling up. While this evaluation found successful cases of scaling up in the absence of these guidelines, guidance may systematically increase the likelihood of outcomes being scaled up during and beyond project or program implementation, in line with the GEF's vision. The expectation is not for all GEF projects to achieve impact at scale, but to clearly articulate how each project contributes to the long-term vision for achieving results at larger scale.</p> <p>Projects and programs implemented in parallel or in sequence that are explicitly linked by design must have common environmental indicators that use the same units of measurement to allow outcomes to be aggregated, and progress to be tracked. The GEF's current results framework provides common indicators which makes this possible at the portfolio level; but linked projects and programs must use common units of measurement and indicators for specific outcomes that are not tracked by the GEF's core indicators and sub-indicators.</p>
56	<a href="#">Annual Performance Report 2019 (with a focus on Sustainable Transport)</a>  <a href="#">GEFSEC's Management Response</a>	<p><i>M&amp;E design used for monitoring results of sustainable transport projects should be consistent with the project's theory of change.</i></p>	<p>GEF projects should specify clear assumptions on how a project would achieve its longterm intended results, and a clear methodology should be applied across projects to assess GHG emissions abatement. GEF projects currently clearly specify the total GHG reduction from the GEF supported project and include activities supported through co-financing. GEF should also track the incremental benefits achieved from GEF funding so that a clear metric is available to assess GEF's efficiency in delivering a unit of GHG emissions abatement. For projects where the primary focus of GEF funding is on capacity development, knowledge management and changes in legal, policy and regulatory measures, the GEF should also monitor progress based on process and behavioral change/policy reform indicators. This approach will be particularly helpful in monitoring results for the Sustainable Cities Impact Program with its focus on urban land use and transport planning, capacity building and knowledge exchange.</p>
		<p><i>GEF should continue to prioritize funding for capacity development, urban and transport planning, and policy and regulatory framework development activities. The GEF should restrict support for civil works to pilot and/or demonstration of sustainable transport approaches.</i></p>	<p>GEF financing is generally used to provide funding for transport planning, capacity development, policy and regulatory reform, and information dissemination. This focus is relevant and appropriate because it facilitates speedier adoption of sustainable transport approaches and could lead to the optimal design and management of transit infrastructure. However, in some instances GEF funding has also been used to partly finance civil works such as the construction and repair of bike lanes and roads. This funding should be limited to pilots or demonstration.</p>

COUNCIL	NAME OF STUDY	RECOMMENDATIONS	DETAILS OF RECOMMENDATIONS
55	<a href="#">Evaluation of GEF's Support to Mainstreaming Biodiversity</a>  <a href="#">GEFSEC's Management Response</a>	<i>Design mainstreaming interventions with a longer-term perspective and a resource envelope to ensure sustainability.</i>	Sustainability of biodiversity mainstreaming depends on programming for multiple phases and accompanied financing as standard project durations are often insufficient to enable ecological change, build baseline capacity, influence institutional mind sets, and change behavior. Mainstreaming interventions, including the most straightforward activities such as spatial and land-use planning, depend on the presence of suitable pre-conditions, and involve iterative processes. While GEF's ToC and the GEF 7- strategy reflects this understanding, agencies should design projects with a longer-term perspective and systematically apply the ToC. Countries should explore sources of innovative financing including private and public sector contributions to support long-term transformation processes that biodiversity mainstreaming interventions require.
		<i>Improve and Strengthen M&amp;E design and implementation.</i>	Indicators at the project and portfolio level should capture environmental, socio-economic, financial and policy and regulatory outcomes to assess performance and for assessing benefits and trade-offs, and for adaptive management. Quantitative measurements of bio-physical and socio-economic impacts are required to complement existing qualitative assessments. Measuring changes in biophysical attributes requires knowledge of the spatially explicit delineated boundaries. IT based solutions can be used to accomplish this based on GEF experience supporting similar initiatives. Biodiversity mainstreaming projects are time intensive and assessing their outcomes and contributions in terms of incremental transformations presents a major challenge during project lifetime. To some extent, this can be overcome by in-depth assessments at post completion for groups of projects that address common issues and apply comparable approaches, or in countries that have a series of mainstreaming interventions over time.
		<i>The GEF should continue to leverage its convening power to improve policy design and process and strengthen inter-ministerial and inter-sectoral collaboration.</i>	In the context of countries allocating more resources to biodiversity mainstreaming and their evolving priorities, GEF should continue to leverage its convening power to bring together different actors within governments, council members, funders, policy leaders and partners to strengthen the policy process and build capacity. The GEF should work with countries and implementing partners to actively strengthen collaboration across relevant ministries and sectors. While such collaborations enable engagement with a broad range of stakeholders, these partnerships also help address externalities such as market shocks, land tenure insecurity, political discontinuity, conflict, natural disasters and climate change risks.
		<i>Include a systematic analysis of associated benefits and trade-offs in project design.</i>	Project designs should include provisions for systematic analysis of benefits and trade-offs of socio- economic and ecological outcomes, both ex-ante and ex-post, associated with biodiversity mainstreaming interventions. Due consideration should be given to transitional costs and short term socioeconomic trade-offs that may precede benefits.



COUNCIL	NAME OF STUDY	RECOMMENDATIONS	DETAILS OF RECOMMENDATIONS
55	<a href="#">Evaluation of the GEF-UNIDO Global Cleantech Innovation Programme</a>  <a href="#">GEFSEC's Management Response</a>	<p><i>Any future "GCIP" or similar program should be structured using a more globally coordinated approach with appropriate choice of interventions based on strategic country selection.</i></p>	<p>A globally coordinated approach would allow for the establishment of a 'platform' to support more effective coordination, learning and exchange across national projects. Provided that the right metrics are in place for systemic monitoring and evaluation, this would usefully inform decision-making and support the measurement of impact. Country ownership of such a platform would facilitate measurement of impact after project completion.</p> <p>Countries should be selected strategically based not only on their willingness to use STAR allocation but also factors concerning their current state and readiness to support cleantech innovation, particularly the mandate and capacities of the host institution and the way in which cleantech innovation is a part of national environmental and development strategy. This could be assessed during a project preparation phase.</p>
		<p><i>The GCIP should actively support national-level coordination to dynamize the cleantech entrepreneurship ecosystem.</i></p>	<p>GCIP should focus on catalyzing the national host's mandate to coordinate, convene and communicate with actors already working in-country to support clean technology innovation. This includes using a more explicit system to categorize the significant volume of entrants who xix apply, but are not selected, and channelling them to more suitable ecosystem actors according to their stage of development (of enterprise maturity and technology phase). This would require adequate resourcing and understanding of the national coordination role.</p>
		<p><i>Allow sufficient time to customize and sharpen the focus on policy strengthening and regulatory frameworks to foster cleantech innovation and its adoption.</i></p>	<p>A conducive policy environment is needed to support the growth of the cleantech SMEs. The GCIP policy strengthening component needs to be adequately scoped, sufficiently resourced, embarked on at an early stage, with appropriate steering and according to local conditions. Allocating government co-financing commitments to this outcome would be a suitable dedication of national resources for creating inputs to ongoing processes, even post-project completion. Entities tasked with this outcome should have policy engagement as core to their own institutional mandate.</p>
		<p><i>Expand the network of private sector partners to address GCIP participants' needs for business expertise and early stage technology validation.</i></p>	<p>GCIP should be more strategic in its approaches to access the desired external expertise of the private sector and integrate the private sector-specific technology challenges in its competition-based Accelerator for more beneficial collaborations. GCIP should tap into broader established private sector networks, e.g., technology associations, business school alumni, business owners' clubs, SME associations, trade associations, communities of practice, women's business associations, etc. Ideally, forming collaborations with such networks would be mutually beneficial as often such communities are looking for ways to provide services and opportunities to their own members. Processes that are involved in regularly renewing private sector should be streamlined.</p>
		<p><i>Measure direct and indirect impacts of the GCIP by establishing adequate monitoring and evaluation systems and ensure that they are implemented using standardized and relevant indicators.</i></p>	<p>GCIP results frameworks should systematically gather information on outcomes and higher-level impacts/results. A common methodology and terminology is required for data collection and comparison. This could potentially include a requirement that beneficiary startups periodically provide relevant data to the local host organization (or platform) for a period into the future, when impacts are primarily felt and can be reliably quantified and verified.</p> <p>GCIP attracts applications from startups that are developing technologies with environmental and social co-benefits beyond climate change. GCIP should also capture and report on these co-benefits. Startups should be able to present standardized GEB benefits to a large and growing impact investment community that is looking specifically for the creation of GEBs as part of the return on investment. The requirements of these investors should be carefully considered in the development of GEB targets, clarifying how aspirational GEB goals will be measured at the project- and global-level.</p>
		<p><i>Deepen country engagement during the project period, including a plan and resourcing, to sustain activities and expand outcomes after project closure.</i></p>	<p>GCIP projects should dedicate greater effort to developing national- and regional-level initiatives. This would deepen country engagement and connect startups with investors and other business partners. GCIP should consider procuring trainers and materials through more open competition for service providers, with preference given to qualified vendors based locally and regionally.</p>