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Seventh Comprehensive Evaluation of the GEF (OPS7) – Progress to date

Independent Evaluation office
Global Environment Facility
Assess the GEF’s progress in implementation and achievement of the GEF 2020 Strategy.
**Schedule**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OPS7 approach paper**

**Summaries of all component evaluations**

**Completion of all component evaluations**

**Delivery of draft OPS7 report**

**Delivery of final OPS7 report**
## Ongoing work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fragile and conflict-affected situations</td>
<td>Institutional policies and stakeholder engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of medium sized projects</td>
<td>Results-based management and portal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terminal evaluation</td>
<td>Innovation in the GEF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEF interventions in artisanal and gold mining</td>
<td>Agency self-evaluation systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDCF evaluation</td>
<td>Third joint GEF-UNDP SGP evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge management</td>
<td>Evaluation of GEF country support program (CSP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GEF support to SFM and REDD+ projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GEF engagement with micro-, small-, medium-size enterprises</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Formative review of the GEF integrated approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Climate change resilience mainstreaming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Annual Performance Report 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LDCF/SCCF AER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SCCF evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enabling activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Governance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Adapting evaluation process during COVID-19

Mixed methods approach

Using socio-economic data, such as World Bank’s household surveys (LSMS)

Conducting remote interviews and surveys

Applying geospatial data to measure relevance, effectiveness, efficiency

Hiring local consultants for field verification (Costa Rica, Mozambique, Philippines…)

Mining IEO case studies
Evaluation lessons for COVID-19
Recently completed evaluations and knowledge products

Independent Evaluation office
Global Environment Facility
Recently completed evaluations and knowledge products

Independent Evaluation office
Global Environment Facility

Terminal evaluations
Terminal evaluations

Findings

The establishment of minimum evaluation requirements have led to improvements in evaluation quality standards.

Aligned with good practices criteria

92% evaluations rated in satisfactory range for quality (2017-2020)

Variations in the evidence presents challenges for consistency in evaluative judgments.
Terminal evaluations

Findings

- Credible evidence and few data gaps
- 6% disconnect between the GEF-IEO validations and TEs submitted
- UNIDO, FAO, and IFAD are well positioned to graduate and not require 100 percent TE validation by IEO
Terminal evaluations

Final remarks

- IEO should perform fewer validations for Agencies that meet quality standards.
- IEO should share more information on the validation process and guidelines with the Agencies.
- IEO should provide targeted guidance and capacity building to newer Agencies.
- IEO could develop a searchable qualitative database (on findings, recommendations, lessons learned).
- IEO should continue to validate TEs as part of other evaluations (country, thematic, strategic country clusters).
IEO Knowledge Products
Agenda Item 9
Evaluation of GEF Support in Fragile and Conflict-Affected Situations

Independent Evaluation office
Global Environment Facility
Conflict hotspots and location of GEF interventions
Majority of GEF projects are in fragile and conflict-affected situations

Fragility of countries and territories receiving GEF funding

Share of GEF projects in countries affected by major armed conflict

by $ value

- Conflict: 29%
- Mixed: 15%
- Non-conflict: 45%
- Not specified: 11%

by number of projects

- Conflict: 33%
- Mixed: 11%
- Non-conflict: 49%
- Not specified: 7%

Total: $4 billion
Portfolio

4,136 GEF projects

Case studies across seven conflict and fragile situations

Evaluation methods
- document analysis
- statistical analysis
- remote sensing
- interviews
Fragility

Findings

Key pathways by which conflict and fragility affect GEF projects

- Physical insecurity
- Social conflict and mistrust
- Economic drivers
- Political fragility and weak governance
- Coping strategies
**Main Findings**

**Fragility**

- **Inconsistent identification of conflict-related risks**
- **The GEF has so far not developed conflict-sensitive safeguards, policies, and guidance necessary to systematically manage these risks**
- **Half of the GEF Agencies have developed policies, strategies, and toolkits**
Fragility Impacts

The shift in priorities associated with conflict can negatively affect the relevance of projects.

Conflict impacts human rights, indigenous peoples, gender and GEF’s ability to engage with the private sector.

Increased likelihood that a project will be cancelled and dropped.

Increases the duration of a project’s delays.

Negatively affects outcomes, sustainability, implementation, execution, monitoring.
Fragility

Risk management strategies

Acknowledgement  Avoidance  Mitigation  Peacebuilding  Learning
Fragility
Case: Liberia

Liberia: SAPO National Park

Percentage of forest loss

- Liberia
- 30 km buffer
- 15 km buffer
- SAPO NP
Fragile and conflict affected situations

Recommendations

1. 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.

2. To improve conflict-sensitive programming while also providing flexibility to Agencies and projects, the GEF Secretariat could develop guidance for conflict-sensitive programming.

3. 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.

4. The current GEF Environmental and Social Safeguards could be expanded to provide more details so that GEF projects address key conflict-sensitive considerations.

5. 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.
Agenda Item 10
IEO Evaluation of GEF Interventions in the Artisanal and Small-Scale Gold Mining Sector

Independent Evaluation office
Global Environment Facility
Artisan and small-scale gold mining

Findings: post-completion evaluations

GEF-5 pilot MSPs achieved sustained mercury use reductions in some cases

Formalization gained momentum after Project closure
Artisan and small-scale gold mining

Example

“Sin Mercurio” project in Ecuador and Peru

Material ready for cyanidation process in processing plant in Ecuador.
Artisan and small-scale gold mining

Lessons learned from past projects

Miners need **access to finance** to transition to non-mercury technologies. Access to finance is GOLD program’s largest component.

- **Formalize** miners through improved policy and streamlined bureaucratic process.
- With formalization, miners will have more access to financial products and markets to invest in non-mercury technologies.
- With access to finance, miners will shift away from mercury towards other, cleaner technologies.
- **Disseminate lessons learned to other areas** and miners not involved in GOLD to further reduce mercury use.
Artisan and small-scale gold mining

Findings: project design in ongoing projects

GOLD program aligned to Minamata Convention and covers many top mercury use countries
Artisan and small-scale gold mining

Findings: ongoing project design

- Targets for mercury reductions will be difficult to monitor and verify, partially due to a scarcity of high-quality baseline data.
- Shift to working with downstream supply chain stakeholders, including private sector.
- Global project promotes strong program collaboration and learning.
- Addresses policies and safeguards through the planetGOLD Criteria and gender through project level gender analyses.
- Programs very focused on mercury reductions and few projects include interventions to address associated environmental issues.
- Majority of mercury reductions expected through broader adoption and replication.
Recommendations

1. Encourage more large mercury users to become involved in *Minamata Convention*

2. Promote interventions that assist governments in implementing ASGM *policies*

3. Seek *opportunities* for multi-focal area ASGM co-benefits and interventions.

4. Further the use of the *planetGOLD website* to disseminate lessons learned from previous projects and communicate status of projects.
Agenda Item 11
Evaluation of the Role of Medium-Sized Projects (MSP) in the GEF Partnership

Independent Evaluation office
Global Environment Facility
Medium-sized projects

Evaluation scope: GEF-4 and onwards

819 (80%) of the 1,024 MSPs

$958 million (77%) of the $1.24 billion in MSP grants

$5.1 billion (86%) of the $5.9 billion in MSP planned cofinancing

Data as of September 15, 2020
### Medium-sized projects

#### Portfolio

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number of Projects</th>
<th>GEF Grant + PPG ($US million)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Biodiversity</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate Change Mitigation</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi Focal Area</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Degradation</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemicals and Waste</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Waters</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate Change Adaptation</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Medium-sized projects

Findings

A broad representation of CSO executing agencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MSP</th>
<th>FSP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MSPs remain **relevant** to the GEF partnership

An entry point into the GEF

Used for capacity building and developing knowledge products

Address funding gaps

Perform on par with or slightly higher than FSPs

A catalyst for financing innovation and scaling up

Approval process is efficient

The $2 million limit seems appropriate for smaller agencies and countries

Use of modality affected by the STAR allocation system
Medium-sized project

Example

Payments for Environmental Services and Sustainable Financing Schemes in the Danube Basin
The medium-sized projects 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.
Agenda Item 12
Evaluation of Knowledge Management in the GEF (2020)

Independent Evaluation office
Global Environment Facility
Knowledge management at the GEF

Progress in each step, several new products

Knowledge capture
Knowledge development
Knowledge sharing
Knowledge application

- Portal & PMIS
  - Very useful
  - Moderately
  - A little
  - Not aware
- Good practice) briefs
- E-learning
- Kaleo

0% 20% 40% 60% 80% 100%
Knowledge management at the GEF

Challenges remain

**Capturing data and information from GEF projects and programs**

- Limited ability of GEF Portal to aggregate and extract lessons
- Need for detailed KM project-level guidance and examples

**KM Strategy and partnership members’ roles**

- Absence of KM strategy and clear role of KM Advisory Group and other members of partnership
- Capacity to connect with GEF Agency systems and platforms
Knowledge management at the GEF

Programmatic approaches incorporate knowledge and learning

Program-level approaches to KM facilitate knowledge sharing across projects, countries, and agencies.

Systematic KM approaches and consistent set of KM indicators absent in some programs.

Central knowledge and learning platforms are not limited to programs:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focal areas:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IW:LEARN</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cross-cutting themes:
- GEF Gender Partnership

GEF-6 and GEF-7 examples:
- Integrated Approach Pilots
- Impact Programs
- GOLD Program
- Coastal Fisheries Initiative
Knowledge management at the GEF

Recommendations

1. The GEF partnership should develop a clear KM strategy.

2. The GEF partnership should invest in a technical solution that strengthens the KM system.
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