Enhancing global environmental benefits through excellence in evaluation
Update on the Sixth Comprehensive Evaluation of the GEF (OPS6)
OPS6 Update

1 Context
2 Performance and Impact
3 Policies and Institutional Issues
4 Financing, Governance and Partnership
SECTION 1
Context
Focal Area Studies
- International waters
- Chemicals and waste

Mainstreaming / Cross cutting
- Joint GEF-UNDP Evaluation of the Small Grants Programme
- The GEF Non-grant Instrument
- GEF Engagement with the Private Sector
- Evaluation of the Gender Mainstreaming Policy
- Review of the GEF Agency Minimum Standards on Environmental and Social Safeguards
- Review of the Indigenous Peoples Policy
- Review of the Resource Allocation System STAR
Performance and Impacts

- Trends in Performance (replacing APR 2017)
- A Value for Money Analysis of GEF Interventions in Land Degradation and Biodiversity
- Measuring Environmental Outcomes Using Remote Sensing and Geospatial Methods
- Program Evaluation of the Least Developed Countries Fund
- Impact Evaluation of GEF Support to Protected Areas and Protected Area Systems
- Impact of GEF Support on National Environmental Laws and Policies in Selected Countries
- Transformational Engagements
- Program Evaluation of the Special Climate Change Fund
- Evaluation of Programmatic Approaches in the GEF
- Project-Level Accomplishments/ Progress toward Impact
- Evaluation of Integrated Approach Pilots
- Evaluation of the Illegal Wildlife Trade Program Study
- Evaluation of the Multiple Benefits of GEF Support through Its Multifocal Area Portfolio
Institutional Issues

Evaluation of the Expansion of the GEF Partnership

Evaluation of the GEF CSO Network

OPS6

- Early findings

- Review of the GEF Approach to Results-Based Management
- GEF6 Strategy, Global Relevance
- Evaluation of the Knowledge Management System
- Review of the Comparative Advantage, Financing, and Governance of the GEF Partnership

Completed (17/29) March April May June July August September

- Full OPS6 report
Terminal evaluations for all GEF countries
Site visits to 41 countries
GEF relevance

- Evolution of the focal areas strategies
- Commitment to the mandate alongside innovation
- Spread across countries and sectors
- Responsiveness to convention secretariats
SURVEY RESULTS

Comparative advantages of the GEF

- Broad coverage of environmental issues: 95%
- Alignment with MEAs and conventions: 91%
## SURVEY RESULTS

### Comparative advantages of the GEF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advantage</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Broad coverage of environmental issues</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alignment with MEAs/conventions</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to help countries meet commitments to MEAs/conventions</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to support innovative programming/projects cutting across focal areas</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to quickly respond to convention requests</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility in addressing new and emerging environmental issues</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity of agencies</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to work with civil society</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pursuit of innovative approaches to environmental finance</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to engage the private sector</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
STRATEGIC DIRECTIONS

Toward an integrated approach

Multifocal projects
Programmatic approach

Addressing the drivers of environmental degradation

... while meeting Convention requirements
SECTION 2
Performance and Impact
Continued good performance of the 581 completed projects have satisfactory outcome and implementation ratings. 79% of the projects have moderate sustainability ratings of moderately likely or above.
FOCAL AREA STUDIES

International waters

Highly relevant

Challenging transboundary conditions require cooperation

A catalyst for integration

74% satisfactory outcomes

Limited funding

Portfolio imbalance

Challenge in engaging the private sector

Missed opportunities in linking regional priorities with STAR
FOCAL AREA STUDIES
Chemicals and waste

Highly relevant
An improved partnership
Good private sector engagement

78% satisfactory outcomes

Scaling up results need improvement
Challenges in sector-wide approaches and regulatory reform focus
Need for better results tracking
FOCAL AREA STUDIES

Land degradation

Highly relevant
Effective in producing global environmental benefits
Greater scope leads to greater benefits

78% satisfactory outcomes

Inadequate attention to socioeconomic drivers
Need to integrate land degradation neutrality
M&E tools could be strengthened
FOCAL AREA STUDIES
Climate change

- Integrated approaches
- Multifocal area approaches
- Strengthening the enabling environment
- Private sector engagement

77% satisfactory outcomes

- Identification of synergies with other funds
Multifocal area

77% satisfactory outcomes

Designed to produce multiple benefits

Emphasis on integration

BD+LD+CC

Most common combination

Challenges from complexity
Achieved positive environmental outcomes consistent with the combination of focal areas (86%)

Achieved positive socioeconomic outcomes (primarily increased income or access to capital) (88%)

Reported some form of broader adoption (mainly through mainstreaming and sustaining) (86%)
Programmatic approaches

- Perform better than standalone projects, except in complex programs
- Addresses environmental drivers
- Improved program coherence
- Efficiency declines with increased complexity
ISSUES

Programmatic approaches

Managing complexity

Managing coordination effectively

Measuring program performance

Program design
Small grants program

- Success in securing Global Environmental Benefits
- Attention to community level benefits, poverty and livelihoods
- More successful at mainstreaming gender than other GEF projects
- Differing views on the extent to which SGP should address socio-economic priorities
- The upgrading policy brought challenges
- M&E remains too complex
4 NECESSARY CONDITIONS
for successful transformational change

Ambitious objectives
High-quality implementation
Self-sustaining mechanism
Financially sustainable
STRONG POINTS

Legal and regulatory reform

- GEF has contributed to enactment of environmental laws
- Many factors influence reform
- Often overly optimistic about the likelihood and pace of legal reform
ISSUES

Legal and regulatory reform

- Capacity building and enabling activities
- Institutional capacity and political will
- Stability of government
- Technical capacity
- Ownership
DEMONSTRATING IMPACT

Land Degradation (multifocal): Madhya Pradesh, India
DEMONSTRATING IMPACT
Biodiversity

GEF Supported PAs
Count: 1292
Area: 2785350 Sq KM
DEMONSTRATING IMPACT

Biodiversity: Global

Forest cover loss (2000-2012)

- Protected areas:
  - GEF: 0.9%
  - Non-GEF: 2.3%

- Buffer zones:
  - GEF: 3.4%
  - Non-GEF: 4.5%
DEMONSTRATING IMPACT

Biodiversity (multifocal): Jordan
DEMONSTRATING IMPACT

International waters: Lake Victoria

[Graph and images showing changes over years with GEF IDs and NDVI values]
Globally positive impacts on forest cover

Lag time of 4.5-5.5 years for larger impact

Access to electricity associated with larger impact

Larger impact observed in areas with poor initial conditions
**VALUE FOR MONEY**

**Biodiversity**

Positive impact on forest cover and vegetation productivity

- Noticeable impact after 1st year
- Access to electricity linked to larger impact
- Performance improved as projects increased in size

*$1:1.04$
STRONG POINTS

Private sector programs

- High co-financing ratio of 8:1
- GEF is a valued partner
- Technical knowledge
- Helps mitigate risk
- Flexible financing instruments
- 80% satisfactory outcomes
CHALLENGES
Private sector programs

- Need to find comparative advantage
- Raise awareness of the GEF
- Improve processes and mechanisms

80% satisfactory outcomes
## Nongrant instruments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instrument</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Loans</strong></td>
<td>Most popular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Equity</strong></td>
<td>More prevalent recently</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Guarantees</strong></td>
<td>Mixed evidence on effectiveness</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Issues
- Diversification beyond climate change
- Monitoring complexity in financial structures
- Setting realistic targets for reflows
- Defining a niche for the GEF

78% satisfactory outcomes
SECTION 3
Policies and Institutional Issues
New policies have positive impact

- Consolidation of the project cycle
- Cancellation policy
- Harmonization pilot with the World Bank
Results-based management system

- Streamlining the results framework
- Improved corporate reporting
- Remains complex
- Focus on shorter-term results
- PMIS database needs upgrading
Knowledge management is getting attention

Only 1 in 3 respondents happy with mechanisms in place

BUT

Recognition of shortcomings and efforts under way

Positive contribution of STAP
Safeguard policies

Catalyst among many GEF Agencies to strengthen existing safeguard policies

Gaps in the GEF
Minimum Standards

Need for enhanced monitoring and reporting
SECTION 4
Financing, Governance, and Health of the Partnership
Financing

- Modest funding to meet global needs
- Co-financing consistent with policy (6:1)
- STAR encourages country ownership but leads to fragmentation of resources

62% of completed projects
Financing: STAR

STAR is a key component of GEF’s ability to support environmental activities in a wide range of countries

STAR is a key component of GEF’s ability to meet country objectives

STAR ensures an equitable resource allocation overall

STAR is being implemented efficiently

STAR enables the delivery of regional projects

STAR enables partnerships between the public and private sectors

72.4%
66.6%
57.4%
48.7%
29.8%
24.7%
Partnership

From 10 to 18 agencies

Increase in access to new capacities and networks

More competition and higher transaction costs
Civil Society Organizations Network

**Strong points**
- Continues to be relevant
- Good credibility
- Influence on GEF policy agenda

**Issues**
- Lack of a shared vision
- Governance
- Lack of connectivity to the country level
Good governance

Overall, the GEF is effectively governed
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