

GEF Council
June 29-July 2, 2010

Agenda Item 7

FOUR-YEAR WORK PROGRAM AND BUDGET OF THE GEF EVALUATION OFFICE

(Prepared by the GEF Evaluation Office)

Recommended Council Decision

The Council, having reviewed document GEF/ME/C.38/1, “*Four-Year Work Program and Budget of the GEF Evaluation Office*,” approves the general direction taken for the preparation of the Office’s work during GEF-5, and requests the Office, taking into account comments made during the meeting, to prepare for consideration at its June meeting in 2011 a work program budget in two parts:

- (1) An annual budget for fiscal year 2012 of fixed costs, such as salaries and general operational costs
- (2) A multi-annual budget for evaluations

The annual budgets and the four-year evaluation budget will need to be within the cap for GEF-5 to be established for the Evaluation Office, which will also be taken up in the budget proposal to be presented in June 2011.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
REVISION OF THE BUDGET OF THE OFFICE	2
WORK PROGRAM FOR FISCAL YEAR 2011	5
EVALUATION STREAMS	5
Country Portfolio Evaluations	5
Impact Evaluations	6
Performance Evaluations	6
Thematic Evaluations	8
KNOWLEDGE SHARING	9
CONSULTATION PROCESS FOR REVISION OF THE GEF M&E POLICY	10
PARTICIPATION IN GEF MEETINGS AND EVALUATION NETWORKS	10
SPECIAL INITIATIVES	11
HUMAN RESOURCES	11

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1. In the GEF-4 period the Office has gradually moved from presenting each individual evaluation report to the Council to a stream of annual reports that highlight evaluative findings in three main areas: countries, performance and impact. In addition, major evaluations were presented to the Council on an individual basis. The Fourth Overall Performance Study drew on all of these evaluations and included considerable extra evaluative work. It is proposed that the work of the Office during GEF-5 continues to be presented in four streams of evaluative work, leading up to and including the Fifth Overall Performance Study of the GEF:

- (1) Country Portfolio Evaluations
- (2) Impact Evaluations
- (3) Performance Evaluations
- (4) Thematic Evaluations

2. The experience with OPS4 and other multi-year evaluations showed that the budget of the Office needs to accommodate expenditure peaks linked to the implementation of major studies. These peaks were compensated in other budget years, in order to remain within the cap for the four years. Fixed costs, such as salaries and operational costs are annual in nature, whereas the variable costs linked to evaluations should be multi-annual. In November 2009 Council requested the Office to prepare a new four year work plan and budget which would take the experiences of the GEF-4 period into account. It is proposed that for the GEF-5 period, starting in fiscal year 2012, the Council requests a division of the Evaluation Office budget in two parts:

- (1) An annual budget of fixed costs, such as salaries and general operational costs
- (2) A multi-annual budget for evaluations

3. This proposal would be presented to the Council at its June 2011 meeting. At this stage no funding proposals are yet formulated for GEF-5, since GEF-5 is not yet active and the funding cap for the Evaluation Office during GEF-5 has not yet been set. The annual budgets and the multi-annual budget would need to remain within the funding cap to be set.

4. The work program for fiscal year 2011 will lead to the following major products:

Major Deliverables for FY11 (July 1, 2010 – June 30, 2011)

	Time frame	Comments for FY11
OPS4	Finished	Publication of the full report
Annual Report on Impact 2010	On-going	November 2010 Council
Evaluation of SPA	Jan-Sept 10	
Review of the Earth Fund	March-Sept 10	
Review of the GEF M&E policy	Apr-Sept 10	
Annual Country Portfolio Evaluation Report	On-going	June 2011 Council
Annual Performance Report	On-going	

REVISION OF THE BUDGET OF THE OFFICE

5. The work program of the Evaluation Office focuses on its role in the implementation of the GEF M&E policy. It aims to ensure that the Council receives evaluation reports and evaluative evidence according to the highest international standards, relevant to its decision-making process. Every four year work program includes an Overall Performance Study, to be delivered to the Replenishment process for the next phase of GEF.

6. In the GEF-4 period the Office has gradually moved from presenting each individual evaluation report to the Council to a stream of annual reports that highlight evaluative findings in three main areas: **countries, performance** and **impact**. In addition, major evaluations were presented to the Council on an individual basis, such as the Local Benefits Study, the Joint Evaluation of the GEF Activity Cycle and Modalities, the Joint Evaluation of the Small Grants Programme and the Mid-Term Review of the Resource Allocation Framework. The Fourth Overall Performance Study drew on all of these evaluations and included considerable extra evaluative work.

7. As reported in the Progress Report which was presented to Council in November 2009, the Office reviewed its experiences with inclusion of OPS4 in its work program and concludes that the peak of funding that is required by a massive exercise like OPS4 cannot be easily accommodated in an annual budget for evaluations as used by the Office during GEF-4. One underlying problem is that many evaluations and OPS4 in particular, are multi-year by nature, whereas the budget is approved on an annual basis.

8. The four year rolling work plan and budget of the Office, as approved by Council in May 2007, proposed linear incremental increases (to meet inflation) from year to year, within an overall cap of \$ 15.8 million for FY08-11, as established by the Council. However, the experience with OPS4 and other multi-year evaluations showed that the budget needs to accommodate expenditure peaks linked to the implementation of major studies rather than incremental increases. These peaks were compensated in other budget years, in order to remain within the cap for the four years. Fixed costs, such as salaries and operational costs are annual in nature, whereas the variable costs linked to evaluations should be multi-annual. In November 2009 Council requested the Office to prepare a new four year rolling work plan and budget which would take the experiences of the GEF-4 period into account.

9. In November 2009 Council approved a transfer of \$ 0.4 million from the proposed FY11 budget to the FY10 budget of the Office to meet the peak of expenses for OPS4 in that fiscal year. Consequently, the Office presented a budget of \$ 3.745 million for approval for FY11 at the May 2010 Council meeting. This budget proposal did not yet contain specific proposals for how the budget would incorporate multi-annual obligations. The decision of the Council in November 2009 and its consequences for the budget is presented in the table below.

EO budget development (in \$m)	FY08	FY09	FY10	FY11	GEF4 cap
Planned	3.461	4.239	4.024	4.145	15.869
Revision November 2009	3.461	4.644	4.019	3.745	15.869

10. The budget of the Office for fiscal year 2011, as approved by the Council in May 2010, reflects the regular work plan of the Office: continuing the country portfolio evaluations, evaluations of impact, thematic evaluations and evaluations of performance. The Office plans to start up three country portfolio evaluations in Latin America. The evaluative work on impact in the international waters focal area will continue, as well as other studies which will explore impact in other focal areas. On thematic evaluations the ongoing evaluation on the Strategic Priority for Adaptation will be finalized this fiscal year, as well as an independent review of the Earth Fund. The evaluative work for the Annual Performance Report will continue as planned. Other activities of the Office include preparing proposals for Council consideration of the review of the GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy, continued interaction with the GEF focal points at subregional meetings and knowledge management and publication activities. On staffing of the Office two vacancies will be filled during FY11 to ensure that the Office will be fully staffed to tackle all ongoing evaluations and the preparations for the work plan during GEF-5.

Evaluation Office fiscal year 2011 budget			
(USD in thousands)	FY09 expenditure	FY10 Expenditure (estimated)	FY11 Approved budget (*)
Total Fixed Costs	2,514	2,236	2,510
Staff Costs	2149	1,946	2,200
General Operations Costs	365	290	310
Total Variable Costs	2,131	1,783	1,235
Management & Advisory Support	97	45	40
Publications, Knowledge	201	148	200
Networks & GEF Meetings	35	68	90
Evaluations			
Country	176	205	405
Impact	190	190	210
Thematic	66	102	150
Performance	123	85	140
OPS4	1,243	940	0
Total	4,645	4,019	3,745

(*) FY11 budget was approved by Council at its May 2010 meeting.

11. The fixed costs are annual by nature and will be presented to Council annually for approval at its June meeting. Of the variable costs, all evaluative work is potentially multi-annual, although from time to time there would be short studies or reviews that would remain within one fiscal year. The budget for publications and knowledge products is also multi-annual in nature, as it is already known well in advance which products are to be expected in the coming years.

12. Country Portfolio Evaluations (CPEs) were originally planned to take place within the fiscal year cycle. The first CPEs did take place within one fiscal year, but the system ran into problems later on. First of all, the Cameroon CPE turned out to need more work than expected

and as a result went on into the next fiscal year. Second, for countries in the Southern Hemisphere the fiscal year cycle is interrupted by their summer holidays, which has caused some timing problems and delays. Third, to run a larger number of CPEs in parallel has proven to be a strain on the staff of the Office. For GEF-5 the CPEs will be run consecutively. This means that in FY11 one CPE could start in September, one in December or January, and the third in April, to be followed by more CPEs in FY12. Multi-annual planning of CPEs will be supported by a multi-annual budget.

13. All the major evaluations of impact of the Office have taken longer than one fiscal year. Furthermore, some of the smaller studies have also led to expenditure in more than one fiscal year, because the Annual Report on Impact is presented to the November Council meeting, which means that work has usually started in May or June and been completed in September or October. The upcoming evaluation of impact of GEF support to the South China Sea will also take more than one fiscal year and needs to be supported by a multi-annual budget.

14. The thematic evaluations of the Office have in many cases been spread out over two or more fiscal years. This usually has not been a problem, because several of them were funded as “special initiatives”, which by definition are not limited to one fiscal year. In May 2007 it was decided to integrate the special initiatives in the regular work program of the Office, to ensure transparency in the Office budget. The on-going evaluation of the Strategic Priority for Adaptation also is multi-annual in nature and a multi-annual budget would support evaluations of this kind. It is envisaged that another thematic evaluation would start in FY11 and finish in FY12, and preliminary work on another evaluation would start in FY11 and would be implemented in FY12 and finish in FY13.

15. The Annual Performance Report has seen a lot of work related to a fiscal year, and is less multi-annual in nature than the other streams of evaluative work. However, some of the work that was undertaken for OPS4, such as the quality of supervision and agency fees, has been multi-year and the scope for such work should increase. Furthermore, the Evaluation Office will become more responsive to requests from Council and the CEO for independent reviews like the one currently taking place on the Earth Fund, which will also often spread over two fiscal years. A multi-annual budget will support these reviews.

16. The multi-annual budget of the Evaluation Office would thus be limited to the evaluation related costs of the Office, including knowledge management and printing. Since GEF-5 has not yet become active, no budget approval is sought at this moment in time. Furthermore, the corporate budget for GEF-5 has not yet been discussed, so no cap has yet been set for the four-year budget of the Office in GEF-5. Nevertheless, the present document proposes a set of activities for GEF5, requesting inputs and comments from GEF Council.

17. It is proposed that the Council requests the GEF Evaluation Office to divide its budget for GEF-5 in two: an annual budget to cover the fixed costs (salaries, benefits and operational costs) and a multi-year budget, to cover the variable costs of evaluation activities and knowledge management.

WORK PROGRAM FOR FISCAL YEAR 2011

18. The work program for fiscal year 2011 is detailed below in the sections on the four evaluation streams of the Office, and its products in FY11 are summarized in the following table on major deliverables:

Major Deliverables for FY11 (July 1, 2010 – June 30, 2011)

	Time frame	Comments for FY11
OPS4	Finished	Publication of the full report
Annual Report on Impact 2010	On-going	November 2010 Council
Evaluation of SPA	Jan-Sept 10	
Review of the Earth Fund	March-Sept 10	
Review of the GEF M&E policy	Apr-Sept 10	
Annual Country Portfolio Evaluation Report	On-going	June 2011 Council
Annual Performance Report	On-going	

EVALUATION STREAMS

Country Portfolio Evaluations

19. The number of country portfolio evaluations conducted by the Office has steadily increased since their introduction in 2006. With the last two evaluations conducted this year in Turkey and Moldova, a total of eleven country portfolio evaluations have taken place thus far.¹ Starting in 2008, the Office has introduced the practice of synthesizing conclusions and recommendations of the country portfolio evaluations conducted that particular year in an Annual Country Portfolio Evaluation Report. Henceforth, country portfolio evaluations have become a consolidated evaluation stream of work of the Office. By capturing aggregate portfolio results and performance of the GEF at the country level they provide useful information for both the GEF Council and the countries. It is expected that their relevance and utility will increase in GEF-5 with the increased emphasis on country ownership and portfolio development at the country level.

20. The Office plans to conduct a total of 12 country portfolio evaluations during GEF-5. In order to achieve an adequate and illustrative coverage, which is representative of how the GEF performs in the more than 150 countries that receive grants, three countries will be selected in each geographic region (as defined by the World Bank). These will include one country receiving a high, one a medium and one a low STAR allocation in each region. The selection methodology developed by the Office in 2006 will be updated to include additional considerations, including evaluability assessments. Furthermore, it is hoped to increase the coverage through joint country level evaluation work between the Office and the independent

¹ Countries having undergone country portfolio evaluations during GEF-4 are: Costa Rica, Samoa, the Philippines, Benin, Cameroon, Madagascar, South Africa, Egypt, Syria, Turkey and Moldova.

evaluation offices of GEF agencies where feasible, for example by including a GEF component in a country level evaluation of one or more of the GEF agencies.

21. As the GEF-4 country portfolio evaluation cycle has come to an end, a unique opportunity exists for drawing lessons from this experience for the new cycle in GEF-5, in terms of methods, processes and budgets. This meta-evaluation analysis of the conclusions and recommendations of the eleven country portfolio evaluations conducted in GEF-4 will be conducted in the near future to ensure that its lessons can be integrated in the country portfolio evaluation during GEF-5.

Impact Evaluations

22. During GEF 5 the Office will have three strands of work in impact evaluation that will build on the accomplishments of the office during GEF-4. Firstly, the Office will continue to carry out portfolio level assessments of progress toward impact of GEF projects by incorporating elements of the ROtI methodology in the Terminal Evaluations of projects. The office in consultation with evaluation offices of the GEF agencies will develop guidelines to incorporate this analysis into the Terminal Evaluations of GEF projects.

23. Secondly, an impact evaluation of GEF operations at the ecosystem level will be started up in fiscal year 2011, focusing on the GEF's support in the South China Sea within the International Waters focal area. All relevant GEF projects will be assessed on their role and contribution to the generation of global environmental benefits in the context of efforts carried out by other actors. Using a theory of change approach this impact evaluation will present further light on the progress toward impact and on additional actions required to continue this progress toward global environmental benefits.

24. Thirdly, the Office will continue to undertake impact evaluations on specific topics or initiatives in one or more countries. The Office will continue to build on theory of change based evaluations carried out in the past and will use the methodological approaches appropriate to address pertinent evaluative questions in each case, including qualitative and quantitative evaluation methods. In the Annual Report to be presented in November, the Office will report on an impact evaluation in Peru on the GEF's support to protected areas. An impact evaluation of a risk assessment approach to natural disasters for local communities, developed by the SGP in Mexico, is currently being set up.

Performance Evaluations

25. The Annual Performance Report (APR) presents a detailed account of the performance of the GEF portfolio in terms of project results, processes that may affect project results, and monitoring and evaluation (M&E) arrangements in completed projects. In addition, it presents a summary of management action records (MAR) that track adoption of the Council decisions within the GEF partnership, and a performance matrix that summarizes the performance of GEF Agencies and the GEF Secretariat on various parameters tracked by the Office. During GEF-5 it will also report on performance and process evaluations undertaken by the Office.

26. The APR 2010 will be the seventh such report prepared by the GEF Evaluation Office. During FY11 one of the major activities will be to review tools, methods and approaches used in

preparing the APR. This will involve engaging the Agencies and the Secretariat in a consultative process, and gain from their perspective. The Office will also work with them on ways to increase the reliability of the PMIS database on information available on status of under implementation and completed projects.

27. It is expected that, like in the past, Council, GEF Secretariat and other key GEF stakeholders may request the Evaluation Office to conduct specific performance evaluations and reviews of different aspects of the GEF. The Policy Recommendations for the GEF5 replenishment ask for an evaluation of the structure and operation of the **Earth Fund**, following which the Council will consider the proposal to further capitalize the Earth Fund with an infusion of additional resources during GEF-5. After interviews with key stakeholders in the GEF Secretariat and GEF Agencies, the Office concluded to conduct an independent review, focusing on process and performance, since no results can be evaluated yet. A note has been prepared describing how an independent review of the Earth Fund will be conducted.

28. The review will focus on four areas:

- Extent to which the design, development and implementation of the Fund has responded to Council decisions
- Analysis of the activities funded by the Earth Fund from platforms to projects.
- Presentation of the different types of engagement with the private sector such as membership in the Board, providing capital to the fund or leverage in platforms and projects.
- Efficiency of the Fund: (1) Fund's "project cycle" and (2) the roles and responsibilities of different stakeholders.

29. The review will consist mainly of a series of interviews with key stakeholders and a desk review of relevant documentation. A report is expected to be presented at the GEF Council meeting in November 2010.

Thematic Evaluations

30. Thematic evaluations are expected to cover topics across the GEF such as evaluations of programs, strategies and focal areas. Currently, the Evaluation Office has three of these evaluations on its agenda: the Strategic Priority for Adaptation (SPA), the National Capacity Self Assessment Program, and the support to the Biosafety Clearinghouse Mechanism (CHM). Other issues for evaluations will be identified during GEF-5 and included in the work plan for future Council consideration.

31. The evaluation of the **Strategic Priority for Adaptation (SPA)** is underway and expected to deliver a report to the November 2010 Council meeting. At its November 2008 Meeting, the GEF Council requested the GEF Evaluation Office "to conduct an independent evaluation of the \$50 million pilot" (Joint Summary of the Chairs, Decision on Agenda Item 13 report on the Completion of the SPA). It is expected that an evaluation of a program such as SPA will provide valuable lessons and experiences to the GEF and its support to adaptation, and in fact to others outside the GEF partnership. An approach paper has been prepared for the evaluation and it is available on the GEF EO website.

32. The overall purpose of the evaluation is to provide the GEF Council with evaluative evidence to take further decisions on adaptation in the GEF based on lessons learned from the SPA. Given the early stage of the implementation of the SPA projects the evaluation will focus on an assessment of the strategy itself and on the design/implementation approaches of the projects, including adaptation measures. The evaluation will concentrate on the relevance and effectiveness of these areas. The overarching evaluative question is: what can we learn from this pilot program on adaptation in terms of climate change adaptation within the GEF focal areas, the resilience of these projects, and the effectiveness of the adaptation measures that have been applied so far?

33. The evaluation has established links with work conducted by STAP and the community of practice on evaluation and climate change managed by the Office. In FY11, the evaluation team will complete the reviews of all projects, including the field visits, conduct the analysis and prepare the first draft, and organize a consultation workshop with key stakeholders in late September.

34. Evaluations of the GEF support to **National Capacity Self-Assessments (NCSAs)** and the **Clearing House Mechanism (CHM) for Biosafety** will be explored during fiscal year 2011. NCSAs and CHM have been two mechanisms with which the GEF has supported the capacity building of GEF recipient countries and has responded to the conventions guidance on capacity building. Although the Evaluation Office has conducted an assessment of results of the capacity building activities in projects and both NCSAs and CHM have been assessed in the Country Portfolio Evaluations there has not been a systematic and global evaluation of these two activities.

35. A preliminary search in the GEF project database calculates that the GEF has provided support to 124 national NCSA projects and one global support project for about \$26 million. It is unclear how many of them have been completed although many of the NCSAs are available through different websites (for example, the GEF Country Support Program and many of the national GEF web sites). The GEF Secretariat has requested the Evaluation Office to conduct an evaluation of these projects. An approach paper will be prepared in January 2011 to implement the evaluation resulting in a report to be presented to the November 2012 Council.

36. The GEF has provided support to the Biosafety CHM process for several years, through national and global projects, in particular, through a global project implemented by UNEP for \$14 million approved in 2004 and recently completed² and a second phase recently approved by Council. An approach paper will be prepared early in 2011 to implement the evaluation. An evaluation report is expected to be presented at the November 2012 Council meeting.

KNOWLEDGE SHARING

37. Over the past year a major effort was invested in the restructuring of the entire website, which included the development of a new look and structure, new menus, new pages for the whole EO site as well as new functions and features. The new features on the website include a

² An evaluation was completed in July 2009: Terminal Evaluation of project GF/6010-04-02 (4771): Building Capacity for Participation in the Biosafety Clearing-House (BCH)” – Phase I.

database of evaluation reports (ASK ME), a knowledge sharing page, an international collaborations page, as well as sign-up functions and an Evaluation Office Help Desk.

38. The OPS4 report was finalized and an executive version was printed and translated into 6 languages (English, French, Spanish, Chinese, Russian and Arabic) together with a CD-ROM containing the full report. These were disseminated at the GEF Assembly in May 2010. The full report will be printed and disseminated in FY11 and a number of learning products stemming from the report are being developed as "spin-off" products such as learning products on biodiversity, climate change, national communications, country ownership, national implementation mechanisms, etc. are under development.

39. A large number of evaluation reports will be printed in the coming year, taking into account the back-log from FY10 and the regular printing needs for FY11, (these include ACPER 2010, CPE Moldova, CPE Turkey, APR 2010, new M&E Policy, ACPER 2009, CPE Egypt, CPE Syria, APR 2009, ODS and AIR 2009). These will also have 2-page summaries that will be available in three languages. Moreover, a program will be developed for how learning and knowledge sharing can systematically be drawn from evaluations. Specific products may be identified and vary depending on the nature of the evaluations.

CONSULTATION PROCESS FOR REVISION OF THE GEF M&E POLICY

40. The consultation process for the revision of the GEF M&E Policy is ongoing with the appropriate partners involved in monitoring and evaluation at various levels in the GEF partnership. Consultations are being done together with the GEF Secretariat on monitoring and the revision of the Results Based Management framework.

41. The Evaluation Office has consulted with GEF focal points and Agencies at the sub-regional meetings in Port Moresby, Hanoi, and Istanbul. The M&E Policy was discussed at the STAP meeting in Rome, and with Agencies individually and at an interagency meeting in Washington. The Evaluation Office plans further individual discussions with Agencies in the coming months. The Office launched an electronic survey about the needs and opportunities for updating the Policy. The survey is intended to identify trends and issue for further discussion. To date the general consensus is that the needed changes to the M&E Policy are minimal. In July the Office will consolidate the issues raised by all partners and stakeholders concerning the revision of the Policy. Any relevant replenishment decisions or Council decisions will also be taken into account. The draft revised GEF M&E Policy will be shared for review by the GEF M&E partners in early September and presented to the next GEF Council for review and approval.

PARTICIPATION IN GEF MEETINGS AND EVALUATION NETWORKS

42. **Support to GEF Focal Points:** for several years the Office has participated in the subregional workshops organized by the GEF Country Support Programme conducting training and consultations on several topics. Consistently, the GEF Focal Points have requested more capacity on how to monitor and evaluate their GEF national portfolios. Focal Points are after all the only mechanism to conduct M&E at the country portfolio level, across GEF Agencies and focal areas. The office proposes to prepare material coming from our work focusing on the needs of the GEF focal points to be provided at future workshops and also through the Office website. This will be done in collaboration with the GEF Country Support Programme. Some examples

include experiences across regions on GEF Focal Points mechanisms, and on how to track national portfolios.

43. The Office will continue to interact with the **global evaluation community**. The Evaluation Office participates in the UN Evaluation Group and the Evaluation Cooperation Group of the International Financial Institutions. This allows the Office to continue to apply best international standards and practices in its evaluation work. Furthermore, participation in international evaluation conferences will allow the Office to test out new and innovative approaches in the professional community of evaluators. Where possible, attendance to such conferences will also be promoted from a perspective of professional development of staff of the Office. Lastly, the Office will continue to interact with independent universities and research institutes on specific methodological or analytical work, for the benefit of its evaluations.

SPECIAL INITIATIVES³

Community of Practice on Evaluating Climate Change and Development

44. The activities following the International Conference held in Alexandria, in May 2008 have led to a concrete and fully funded initiative, namely the Community of Practice on Evaluation Climate Change and Development. The Community of Practice is a two year initiative (2009-2011) focused on evaluation in the context of climate change and development. The Community of Practice is global in nature, but tailored to attract practitioners from developing and transition countries in particular. It creates, validates and disseminates evaluation information and knowledge. The added value of this initiative is to capture and validate innovate, established and best evaluation practices related to climate change.

45. During FY10 funding was secured in the Council approved special trust fund for voluntary contributions to initiatives of the Evaluation Office from Sweden (Swedish International Development Agency-Sida) and Switzerland (Federal Office of the Environment) and a full time Coordinator was recruited working in the Knowledge Management Team of the GEF Evaluation Office. A large number of activities have taken place since. A book launch event of the publication “Evaluating Climate Change and Development” presenting a compilation of the International Conference papers was organized, a virtual platform for topic discussions was completed, a dedicated website Climate-Eval www.climate-eval.org was created as a home for the community of practice, an electronic library consisting of more than 450 documents on climate change and development evaluation is currently being designed and will be completed in FY11. Five studies are planned on Evaluation and Adaptation/Mitigation, of which two have started and will be completed in FY11. The Community of Practice will also be presented and promoted in various evaluations setting in the coming year, such as ReLAC International Congress of Evaluation in July 2010, the International Program for Development Evaluation Training (IPDET) and the Conference on Development and implementation of Monitoring and Evaluation Systems in Kyrgyz Republic in September 2010. The initiative already has more than 100 members from 37 countries.

³ Special initiatives of the Office are financed through voluntary funding outside the budget approved by Council and managed by staff financed by that funding. The special initiatives trust fund of the Office has been set up with the approval of the Council in 2006.

HUMAN RESOURCES

46. The Office's staff is comprised of the following permanent positions:

1	Director
1	Chief Evaluation Officer
3	Senior Evaluation Officers
4	Evaluation Officers
1	Operations Evaluation Officer
2	Program Assistants

47. Two positions, one senior and one evaluation officer, were vacant during most of FY10. The senior evaluation officer is currently being recruited. The second vacancy is also currently being recruited but the TORs have been modified to include a major emphasis on knowledge sharing. Up to now, one of the evaluation officers was also in charge of knowledge products in the office for 50% of her time. Given the increasing emphasis on knowledge sharing and the increasing workload of the evaluation officers it is proposed that one of the evaluation officers' positions is changed to a Knowledge Management Officer. This change will have no budget implications. Therefore, the composition of the staff complement for FY11 will be as follows:

1	Director
1	Chief Evaluation Officer
3	Senior Evaluation Officers
3	Evaluation Officers
1	Operations Evaluation Officer
1	Knowledge Management Officer
2	Program Assistants