Enhancing global environmental benefits through excellence in evaluation
Semi-Annual Evaluation Report
November 2017
Outline

1 OPS6

- Objective, Quality Assurance, Methodology, Limitations
- GEF Portfolio
- Strategic Relevance
- Performance and Impact
- Focal Areas and Multifocal Investments
- Programmatic Approaches and Integrated Approach Pilots
- Institutional Framework
- Conclusions and Recommendations

2 IEO Update on Knowledge Management

3 Recommended Council Decision
SECTION 1
Overview
Objective
To provide solid evaluative evidence to inform the replenishment negotiations for GEF-7

Methodology
29 evaluations and studies
Mix of qualitative and quantitative approaches including geospatial analysis
Formative approaches to evaluate ongoing programs

Limitations
Limitations imposed by data and timing
OPS6 Overview

Quality assurance panel

Dr. Hans Bruyninckx
Dr. Holly Dublin
Prof. Osvaldo Feinstein
Dr. Sunita Narain
Dr. Kazuhiko Takemoto

Statement on quality of OPS6 included in annex A
GEF-6 Overview

Portfolio (as of June 30, 2017)

Focal areas
- Multifocal
- Climate change
- Chemicals and waste
- Biodiversity
- International waters
- Land degradation

Modalities
- Full-size projects
- Programmatic approaches
- Small Grants Program
- Medium-sized projects
- Enabling activities

 Agencies
- UNDP
- World Bank
- Others
- UNEP
- UNIDO
- FAO

Regions
- Africa
- Asia
- Latin America & Caribbean
- Regional and global
- Europe & Central Asia

444 projects
$2.4 billion
OPS6 Overview

Strategic relevance

Conventions. Main funding mechanism for:

Countries

Support for middle income countries remains important

More than 140 recipient countries

Support to LDCs and SIDS has increased

Also relevant to the

Sustainable Development Goals
SECTION 2
Performance and Impact
Performance and Impact

- Satisfactory outcomes: 81%
- Sustainability of Outcomes is a challenge
- Project cycle efficiency gains are slow

Cofinancing commitments for GEF-6 exceed the target 8.8:1 (6:1 target)
PERFORMANCE AND IMPACT

Broader adoption and transformational change

61% of projects achieved broader adoption
59% of projects achieved environmental stress reduction

Mechanisms for broader adoption:
- Mainstreaming and replication
- Scaling-up and market change

Success factors for transformational change:
- Clear ambition in designs
- Addressing market reforms through policies
- Mechanisms for financial sustainability
- Quality of implementation and execution
- May be achieved by projects of different size
PERFORMANCE AND IMPACT

Examples: transformational change

**Uruguay**
Wind power
2008: 0%
2016: 33%

**Africa**
1.3 mln – quality solar lanterns; Private market transformed

**Amazon**
13.2 mln ha – strict protection
10.8 mln ha – sustainable use

**China**
Wind power
2005: 1.3 GW
2015: 129.3 GW

**Namibia**
98% PAs improved;
Doubled number of wild dogs, leopards, cheetahs, lions (2004–12)
SECTION 3
Focal Areas
Performance and Impact
FOCAL AREA STUDIES

Common findings

Relevant to conventions

Strong performance ratings on outcomes with limited variation

Sustainability of outcomes (Land degradation & Biodiversity)

M&E Design (International Waters and Chemicals)

M&E Implementation (International Waters, Chemicals and Multifocal)

Variation in private sector engagement

Transformational change
FOCAL AREA STUDIES

Climate change

Highly relevant to UNFCCC

Important role in strengthening enabling environment

GHG emission reductions
(a) Significant contributions from other focal areas
(b) Inadequate measurement
FOCAL AREA STUDIES

Climate change: Added value and complementarity

Significant and flexible grant financing
Innovative risk-sharing approaches

Upstream focus on the enabling environment
Piloting and demonstrating technologies
Private sector engagement

Integrated projects

Catalytic effects in closed projects
~70% | mainstreaming
~30% | replication, scaling up, market changes
FOCAL AREA STUDIES

Climate change changing landscape

Niche areas

- Upstream approaches including policy reform to accelerate market development and create an enabling environment for investment
- Risk sharing approaches
- Piloting innovative technologies
- Collaborating with other climate funds and MDBs to scale up investments
FOCAL AREA STUDIES

Biodiversity: Addresses specific drivers and pressures of biodiversity loss

Increase in the biodiversity mainstreaming portfolio with focus on reforms, and improved outcomes

Percent of forest loss in GEF supported protected areas was half that of protected areas not supported
FOCAL AREA STUDIES

Biodiversity: Access and Benefits Sharing and the Nagoya Protocol

- Significant support to 100+ countries in ratifying
- Support pilots with the private sector

- Project designs “overpacked”
- Complexity and individual uniqueness of each situation not adequately recognized
Relevant to GEF-6 BD Strategy
The coordination grant is accomplishing more than expected
Appropriate theory of change
Simple M&E

Funding mechanism creates structural limitations
Supply side focus
Gaps in species and geographic coverage; single country projects
Political will and corruption not explicitly addressed
FOCAL AREA STUDIES

Multifocal

Share of portfolio is growing

Pilot  GEF-1  GEF-2  GEF-3  GEF-4  GEF-5  GEF-6

STAR focal areas

- Climate change
- Biodiversity
- Land degradation
- Chemicals & waste
- International waters

Graphic: A bar chart showing the share of portfolio in different areas, with a Venn diagram illustrating the focal areas of climate change, biodiversity, land degradation, chemicals & waste, and international waters.
FOCAL AREA STUDIES

Multifocal

- Majority of projects generated multiple benefits
- Potential to enhance synergies and mitigate trade-offs
- Institutional arrangements for sectoral integration
FOCAL AREA STUDIES

Multifocal

Enhancing synergies

Mitigating trade-offs through value addition

Senegal

Brazil

China
SECTION 3

Programmatic and Integrated Approach Pilots
PROGRAMMATIC APPROACHES

Findings

- Program child projects perform slightly better than standalone projects
- Outcome performance, cost effectiveness, and efficiency decline with increased complexity
- Coherence in project-program objectives has improved, but results focused on projects rather than programs
INTEGRATED APPROACH PILOTS

Designed to build on linkages and connections across focal areas
Formative evaluation based on 30 child projects approved

Sustainable cities
Challenges to rapid urbanization in 28 cities

Commodities
Tropical Deforestation caused by soy, beef and palm oil in 4 producing countries

Food Security
Smallholder agriculture and food value chains in 12 African countries
INTEGRATED APPROACH PILOTS

Relevance

93% of in-country stakeholders agree on potential to address conventions

IAPs are equally or better aligned with country priorities
INTEGRATED APPROACH PILOTS

Design

- Coherence in objectives between program and child projects
- Emphasis on knowledge exchange

- Limited demonstration of program additionality
INTEGRATED APPROACH PILOTS

Process

- Relevant selection of countries, cities and agencies but process varied
- Set-aside funds provided incentives for countries

Selection process not always transparent
It takes time to design and launch a complex integrated program
SECTION 4

Institutional Framework
INSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORK

Private sector

- Not an area of comparative advantage
- Operational restrictions constrain engagement
- Climate change investments feature heavily

Needs to be seen as a partner, not only a source of funding

460 projects
$2,5 million in GEF investments
System for Transparent Allocation of Resources (STAR)

Enhanced resource allocation transparency and predictability

Complex

GEF-6 STAR increases in allocation to least developed countries

Country allocations

19%

Allocation for non-SIDS, non-LDCs

33%
INSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORK

Gender

Modest improvements

Gender analysis = higher gender ratings

Policy does not provide a clear framework

Gender Partnership is evolving into a platform to build a constituency
INSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORK

Indigenous peoples and local communities

- Important stakeholder
- Advisory Group provides relevant advice
- Agencies in alignment with Minimum Standard 4
- SGP is primarily modality for engagement

ISSUES TO ADDRESS

- Portfolio monitoring
- Move to “Free, Prior, Informed Consent”
INSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORK

Health of expanded partnership

Increase in access to new capacities
New agencies are catching up quickly
STAP provides high quality knowledge

Inter agency competition counterproductive
Efficiency trade offs with expansion
STAP can play a stronger unifying role
INSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORK

Governance

- GEF is effectively governed
- CSO network is relevant
- Council has good regional balance and is transparent

Transparency in management
Col risks of executing/implementing agencies
Limited delegation from Council to committees
Independent Chair
INSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORK

PMIS, RBM: Progress observed

Project Management Information System
Data quality needs to keep up with partnership needs

Results-Based Management
Promotes accountability, limited learning
INSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORK

Knowledge management

Substantial progress during GEF-6
Influenced national policies and practices
Knowledge provider

Systemic issues

Availability and accessibility of project information
Limited guidance to Agencies
Limited connection with Agencies’ KM systems and platforms
Comparative advantage

**RELEVANCE**
1. Serves multiple conventions and broad range of environmental issues
2. Strong Support to LDCs and SIDS

**PERFORMANCE**
3. Long history of good performance
4. Ability to address linkages and synergies between focal areas

**TRANSFORMATIONAL**
5. Ability to Create an enabling environment in countries through legal and regulatory reforms
6. Delivers innovative financial models and risk-sharing approaches
# Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic</th>
<th>Financial</th>
<th>Policies</th>
<th>Institutional</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Transformational change</td>
<td>5. Private sector management</td>
<td>7. Safeguards and indigenous people</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Integration based on additionality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9. Systems for data, monitoring and knowledge</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
UPDATE

IEO knowledge management

Events

Expanded Constituency Workshops (7)

Partnerships

Website

Earth-Eval

These pages display the daily and interactive maps for completed and ongoing evaluations of the Independent Evaluation Office of the GEF. Please explore the information portfolio using one of the criteria.
Recommended Council Decision

The Council, having reviewed the “Semi-Annual Evaluation Report of the GEF Independent Evaluation Office: November 2017,” endorses the recommendations of the individual evaluations included. The Council takes note of the OPS6 recommendations and advises the GEF Secretariat to address them in programming for GEF-7.
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