

GEF Council
June 24 - 26, 2018
Da Nang, Vietnam

Agenda Item 15

**SEMI-ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT OF THE
INDEPENDENT EVALUATION OFFICE: JUNE 2018**
(Prepared by the Independent Evaluation Office of the GEF)

Recommended Council Decision

Regarding the Semi-Annual Evaluation Report of the Independent Evaluation Office.

The Council, having reviewed the “Semi-Annual Evaluation Report of the GEF Independent Evaluation Office: June 2018,” approves the IEO Budget for FY2019.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Introduction	1
II.	Completed Evaluations	1
A.	Annual Performance Report 2018: Special Focus on Sustainability	1
B.	Ecological Forecasting using Geospatial Analysis: Example from Kenya	3
III.	Evaluation Work in Progress	4
A.	Evaluation of GEF's approach to mainstreaming biodiversity	4
B.	Evaluation of the Clean Technology Program	5
C.	Evaluation of GEF support to scaling up impacts	5
D.	A framework for measuring GEF's additionality	6
E.	M&E Policy update	6
F.	Strategic Country Cluster Evaluations: LDCs, SIDS and African Biomes	6
G.	Evaluation of GEF Medium-Sized Projects	7
H.	Knowledge Management	7
IV.	Budget and Human Resources for Fiscal Year 2019	8
V.	Draft Indicative Work Program and budget for GEF-7	10
A.	Draft Proposed Work Program (FY19-22)	10
B.	Estimated Budget for GEF-7 (FY20-23)	12
VI.	The Management Action Record	13
A.	Council Decision with a Substantial Level of Adoption	14
B.	Council Decisions with a Medium Level of Adoption	15

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1. The IEO completed the Sixth Comprehensive Evaluation of the GEF (OPS6) and presented the full report at the October 2017 replenishment meeting of the GEF and at the November 2017 Council meeting. The recommendations from the evaluations underpinning OPS6 and those from the overall OPS6 report were adopted by the Council in May and November 2017. Since the presentation of OPS6 in November 2017, the IEO has completed the Annual Performance Report 2018 with a special thematic focus on sustainability, and a study which applies ecological forecasting using geospatial tools, to measure and forecast environmental impacts in Kenya. This Semi-Annual Evaluation Report (SAER) presents the findings from these two evaluations. It also includes an update on the evaluations in progress, the knowledge management activities of the office, the budget and staffing of the IEO for FY19 which is the last year for the IEO under GEF-6, a draft indicative budget and work program for the GEF-7 period, and the Management Action Record. The full evaluation reports and the Management Action Record are provided respectively in the following Information Documents:

- 1 GEF/ME/C.54/Inf 01 - Annual Performance Report 2018: Special Focus on Sustainability
- 2 GEF/ME/C.54/Inf 02 - Ecological Forecasting using Geospatial Analysis: Example from Kenya
- 3 GEF/ME/C.54/Inf 03 - Management Action Record

I. INTRODUCTION

1. This Semi-Annual Evaluation Report (SAER) presents a brief summary of the conclusions of the evaluations completed by the IEO during the reporting period (November 2017-May 2018). These include the Annual Performance Report 2018 with a special focus on project sustainability, and a methodological approach which applies ecological forecasting using geospatial tools to measure and forecast environmental impacts in Kenya. The SAER also includes an update on ongoing evaluations, the knowledge management activities in the office, and the IEO Budget for FY19, the IEO draft indicative budget and work program for GEF-7, the Management Action Record which reports on the status of implementation of IEO evaluation recommendations. The full evaluation reports of the evaluation, the ecological forecasting methodological paper, and the Management Action Record are included as information documents.

II. COMPLETED EVALUATIONS

A. Annual Performance Report 2018: Special Focus on Sustainability

2. The 2018 Annual Performance Report (APR) is primarily based on the evidence provided in the terminal evaluation reports for 1372 completed GEF projects which account for approximately \$6 billion in GEF grants. Terminal evaluations for 188 projects accounting for \$861.8 million in GEF grants were received and validated during 2017, and constitute the 2017 cohort.

Results

PERFORMANCE

3. Overall, 80 percent of all completed GEF projects with terminal evaluations have satisfactory outcomes, with some variation. Outcome ratings for the 2017 cohort of closed projects was slightly lower at 76 percent. Among the GEF regions a significantly lower percentage of projects in Africa are rated in the satisfactory range for outcomes (74 percent) relative to outcomes for other regions. In addition, a lower percentage of projects implemented in Small Island Developing States (SIDS) and Least Developed Countries (LDCs) have satisfactory outcomes as compared with the portfolio average. Medium-sized projects significantly outperform the full-sized projects on outcomes by approximately 5 percentage points.

4. Quality of project implementation has improved, quality of execution remains the same. The quality of implementation ratings for the 2017 cohort are higher, with 84 percent of projects rated in the satisfactory range compared to the portfolio average of 79 percent. Quality of execution ratings stand at 78 percent for the 2017 cohort, close to the portfolio average of 81 percent. For both, the quality of implementation and execution, the presence of an effective steering committee is positively correlated with the performance ratings. Levels of country support that match or exceed expectations is also correlated with the quality of execution ratings.

5. Expected levels of co-financing materialized in 70 percent of the projects. For completed projects, the ratio of realized co-financing to GEF dollars is 6.1 to 1; for the FY17 cohort, it is 8.4 to 1. Climate change projects tend to generate both the highest promised and realized co-financing ratios, whereas chemicals and waste projects mobilize 1.9 dollars of co-financing for every GEF dollar. Seventy (70) percent of projects realized 90 percent or more of promised co-financing; 14 percent of projects received less than 50 percent of co-financing, and this has a negative impact on outcome ratings.

6. M&E Design and Implementation Ratings have improved over time. M&E design ratings for GEF-4 completed projects are 10 percent higher than the overall average of 63 percent. Likewise, M&E implementation ratings have improved: 86 percent of completed GEF-5 projects have satisfactory ratings, compared with the overall average of 64 percent. While overall M&E implementation ratings are lowest in Africa, the Africa region outperforms other regions on the collection of disaggregated gender data. Twenty-two (22) percent of projects in Africa collected disaggregated gender data, compared to 14 percent in both Asia and ECA, 9 percent in the LAC region, and 6 percent of projects implemented globally.

7. The quality of terminal evaluations remains high although there are some gaps in coverage, particularly for medium-sized projects. Eighty-three (83) percent of all terminal evaluations were rated in the satisfactory range and this has remained fairly stable over time. For GEF-1 through GEF-3, 87 percent of all expected full-sized project terminal evaluations and 79 percent of medium-sized project terminal evaluations have been received. There is a sharp drop in the coverage of medium-sized projects from GEF-2 to GEF-3, from 91 percent to 67 percent. Much of the drop may be attributed to UNDP wherein 57 percent of terminal evaluations were submitted from GEF-3, as compared with 85 percent completion rates from other agencies for the same period.

8. Gender relevant information is being included in more terminal evaluations. A third of the projects for which project performance assessments were completed included gender relevant information in their terminal evaluation or PIRs. There is an increase in the inclusion of gender relevant information by phase: 21 percent of GEF-2 projects, 35 percent of GEF-3 projects, and 55 percent of GEF-4 projects included gender relevant information in terminal evaluations or PIRs. There is also a sharp improvement in the TEs submitted after the adoption of the GEF Gender Mainstreaming Policy in May 2011 from 18 percent in the period prior to the policy to 57 percent in TEs completed after that date.

SUSTAINABILITY

9. Sustainability of outcome ratings has improved over the GEF replenishment periods. Sixty-two (62) percent of the completed GEF projects are rated in the 'likely' range for outcome sustainability, with a ten percent increase between GEF-3 and GEF-4 and an increase of 8 percent between GEF-4 and GEF-5. Likelihood of outcome sustainability at project completion is influenced by the quality of project preparation, country context, government support, quality of implementation and execution, and materialization of co-financing. Projects in LDCs, global

projects, and the climate change and biodiversity focal areas, show a statistically significant improvement in sustainability ratings between GEF-2 and GEF-3 and onwards.

10. The percentage of GEF completed projects with a likelihood of sustainability at project completion is comparable with other multilateral organizations. Although there are differences among the multilateral organizations in terms of their mandate, geographical coverage, scale of activities, the percentage of GEF projects that are rated in the likely range for sustainability is not substantially different from other multilateral organizations. Likelihood of sustainability ratings range from 52 percent in the African Development Bank to 66 percent in Asian Development Bank. Ratings for IFAD, the Inter-American Development Bank, the World Bank and the GEF are at 60 percent, 62 percent, 65 percent and 62 percent respectively. The only outlier is UNEP where the percentage of projects with likely sustainability is 79 percent.

11. Higher sustainability ratings at project completion are associated with higher levels of post project completion outcomes, environmental stress reduction and broader adoption. Fifty-three (53) projects were evaluated in-depth for sustainability. Eighty-four (84) percent of these projects that were rated as sustainable at closure also had satisfactory post completion outcomes, as compared with 55 percent of the unsustainable projects. In addition, most projects with satisfactory outcome ratings at completion continued to have satisfactory outcome ratings post completion. Compared with the status at project completion, at post completion more projects were achieving environmental stress reduction (66 percent compared to 60 percent) and broader adoption (81 percent compared to 72 percent). Where past outcomes were not sustained, lack of financial support for maintenance of infrastructure or follow up, lack of sustained efforts from the executing agency, inadequate political support including limited progress on the adoption of legal and regulatory measures, low institutional capacities of key agencies, low stakeholder buy-in, and flaws in the theory of change of projects, were reported as contributing factors.

B. Ecological Forecasting using Geospatial Analysis: Example from Kenya

12. This study presents a practical application of an ecological forecasting tool which uses geospatial analysis. The paper employs a methodology that helps quantify land cover change and aboveground carbon estimates for multiple time intervals and develops projections for the future. Further, it demonstrates the utility of ecosystem modelling tools in forecasting changes in land cover that could be applied ex-ante to set realistic targets and estimate expected returns on GEF investments.

13. The study examined twelve terrestrial protected areas (PA) in Kenya with GEF interventions. These cover a wide range of land cover types including montane forests, coastal mangrove forests, deserts, grasslands, and shrub. The largest PA is Mount Kenya NP (2,714.5 km²) and smallest is Mrima Forest Reserve (3.9 km²). The study covered two-time periods: 1995-2016 and 2020-2030.

Results

14. GEF interventions in the Kenya PAs have had continued success and demonstrate evidence of sustainability. Since GEF's support to PAs began in Kenya in the 1990s, the PAs have been successful in maintaining forest cover and preserving biomass. Of the twelve protected areas included in this study, most experienced little to no net change in above-ground carbon stocks over the 15–20-year study period. The modest changes in land cover and associated above-ground carbon are strikingly better than the changes observed in regions outside the protected areas. The factors contributing to land cover change vary between the PAs, distance to rivers and irrigated agriculture were consistently among the most influential drivers. While landscapes inside the PAs are relatively stable, the vast majority of unprotected arable land has been converted to agriculture and infrastructure.

15. There is heterogeneity in the change in vegetated land cover and the amount of above-ground carbon. For example, the Kakamega Forest Reserve, a moderately sized dense rainforest in Western Kenya and home to 380 plant species, and the Marenji Forest Reserve, a small coastal forest in southeastern Kenya, experienced an increase in vegetated land cover and above-ground carbon from 1995–2015. In comparison, the Mount Kenya Forest Reserve, the largest PA in the study, has seen a decrease in above-ground carbon around the perimeter of the PA.

16. Community engagement and infrastructure have played an important role in achieving environmental and socio-economic benefits in Mt. Kenya. Educating surrounding populations on sustainable forest management have reduced the engagement in illegal activities such as logging or poaching. The construction of electrified fencing in multiple other sites (80 km total) has led to improvements in local livelihoods. For example, a fence installed in Kirinyaga's Kangaita Forest has been instrumental in preventing disruptive wildlife from entering the surrounding communities and negatively impacting crops.

17. Ecological forecasting using geospatial tools is useful in measuring impacts and in carrying out ex-ante assessments. The tool employed in this study can help establish baselines, and measure impacts and sustainability of interventions after project completion. It can also help in ex-ante assessments of land cover change and associated carbon balance. This would help inform locations most appropriate for GEF interventions. Information generated through this approach can be useful to address questions about land use change, natural capital valuation, biophysical measures and sustainability of ecosystem services. Estimation of ecosystem services such as carbon sequestration demonstrated through this study could be extended to other ecosystem services such as water provisioning, soil retention, etc.

III. EVALUATION WORK IN PROGRESS

A. Evaluation of GEF's approach to mainstreaming biodiversity

18. Mainstreaming Biodiversity is a strategic objective of the GEF Biodiversity Strategy from GEF-4 onwards. The GEF biodiversity mainstreaming portfolio has increased substantially in

GEF-6 from previous replenishment periods and is the largest portfolio within the biodiversity focal area, comparable in size to the portfolio of Protected Areas and Protected Area systems. The objective of this evaluation is to assess the effectiveness, results, and progress towards impact of the biodiversity mainstreaming portfolio of the GEF. The scope of the evaluation includes examining the nature, extent and impacts of GEF support to mainstreaming biodiversity, the validity of the current theory of change, and the existing M&E system to monitor outcomes and capture lessons. The evaluation will include an assessment of closed projects from GEF-3 through GEF-5 and a quality at entry review of GEF-6 projects to assess the application of lessons learned from previous assessments to recent projects. The evaluation applies quantitative and qualitative approaches. In-depth case studies are being conducted in Colombia, India and South Africa along with desk review and portfolio analysis. The evaluation will be presented during the GEF Council at the fall 2018 meeting.

B. Evaluation of the Clean Technology Program

19. In 2013, the GEF partnered with UNIDO to deliver the Global Cleantech Innovation Program (GCIP) which promotes an innovation and entrepreneur ecosystem by identifying and nurturing cleantech entrepreneurs; by building capacity within national institutions and partner organizations for the sustainable implementation of the cleantech ecosystem and accelerator approach; and by supporting and working with national policy makers to strengthen the policy framework for small and medium enterprises (SMEs) and cleantech entrepreneurs. The Program operates in nine countries through individual medium-sized projects. The purpose of the evaluation is to independently assess the benefits and effect on SMEs which have been part of the program. Working with the Evaluation Office of UNIDO, the evaluation will cover the GCIP program with in-depth case studies in four partner countries: India, Pakistan, South Africa and Turkey. These four countries are approaching the end of their project duration and have a cadre of entrepreneurs that have gone through the accelerator with whom one can assess outcomes and progress to impact. The evaluation will be delivered to the GEF Council at the fall 2018 meeting.

C. Evaluation of GEF support to scaling up impacts

20. The purpose of this evaluation is to understand how impacts are scaled up through GEF support. The GEF has made significant investments in piloting new technologies and approaches, some of which have transformed markets and national government systems, when scaled up. More recently, the GEF strategy supports the scale up of the impacts of its interventions through investing in projects and programs that aim to scale up rather than supporting pilot projects. This study will develop a framework for understanding the processes and factors influencing scaling up. This framework is intended for use at various stages of the project cycle: during design, implementation, at completion and beyond. The study will draw on lessons from the scientific literature, key informant interviews, portfolio and case study analysis, and field visits. Countries for the field visits will be identified following a synthesis of lessons learned from the literature and stakeholder interviews that have just been completed. The final report will be presented to the Council at the fall 2018 meeting.

D. A framework for measuring GEF's additionality

21. Since 1994 the GEF has adopted the incremental cost approach as its fundamental operational principle. The aim was to identify the financial counterfactual to an operation or program that receives GEF funding and generates Global Environmental Benefits (GEBs). The review of the Incremental Cost approach completed by the IEO in 2006 found that the assessment of incremental cost added little to the operational aspects of project preparation. Responding to the evaluation, the Secretariat developed guidelines for implementation of the incremental cost approach. However, there are still some variations in the interpretation of this approach across the agencies. The issue of addressing GEF's additionality has also been raised in recent Council meetings. The objective of this study is to develop a framework and a primer for assessing GEF's additionality, which could then be applied consistently across the partnership. This will be presented to the GEF Council at the fall 2018 meeting.

E. M&E Policy update

22. In October 2015 IEO completed an analysis of Council decisions since the last M&E Policy was published in 2010. This analysis identified a number of gaps in the current policy, pertaining to gender, the integration of environmental and social safeguards, private sector engagement and the role of public-private partnerships. These will be addressed in the revisions to the policy. IEO is currently coordinating efforts with the Secretariat on monitoring and results-based management issues as they pertain to the policy. Joint consultations are planned with GEF Agencies, STAP and the CSO Network. The updated M&E Policy will be presented at the next Council meeting in fall 2018.

F. Strategic Country Cluster Evaluations: LDCs, SIDS and African Biomes

23. The Strategic Country Cluster Evaluations (SCCEs) focus on common themes across clusters of countries and/or portfolios involving a critical mass of projects and experience with GEF programming. Three SCCEs are currently ongoing, further discussed in the following paragraphs, including (1) the African biomes SCCE, (2) the least developed countries (LDCs) SCCE, and (3) the small island developing states (SIDS) SCCE. The three SCCEs are designed around the same conceptual analysis framework to enable comparing findings across geographic regions and/or portfolios. The two overarching objectives for all three SCCEs are:

- (i) To assess the relevance of the GEF towards the target countries' main environmental challenges, from the countries' perspective, and
- (ii) To provide a deeper understanding of the outcomes and the determinants of sustainability of the outcomes of GEF support in the SCCEs' target countries.

Gender, resilience and fragility of the operational context, and engagement with the private sector will be assessed as crosscutting issues in the three SCCEs.

24. The African biomes SCCE covers 23 countries that are situated in two Sub-Saharan Africa biomes, being the Sahel and the Sudan-Guinea Savanna. Countries in Africa's Sahel and Sudan-

Guinea Savanna biomes face complex environmental challenges, the most common of which are deforestation, land degradation, desertification, and biodiversity loss. These challenges are compounded by the pressing socio-economic needs of a rapidly growing population. The main findings, conclusions and recommendations of this evaluation will be presented to the Council at the 2019 spring meeting.

25. The LDCs SCCE covers all 47 least developed countries (LDCs), located in Africa, Asia, and Latin America and the Caribbean. Selection of the LDCs for an SCCE is based on the countries' common LDC status and related economic, social and environmental challenges. LDCs are low-income countries confronting severe structural impediments to sustainable development. They are highly vulnerable to economic and environmental shocks and almost half of the LDCs are countries in fragile situations. The main findings, conclusions and recommendations will be presented to the Council at the 2019 fall meeting.

26. The SIDS SCCE covers 39 small island developing states in the AIMS (Atlantic, Indian Ocean, Mediterranean and South China Sea), Caribbean, and Pacific regions. The choice to evaluate the SIDS as a strategic cluster is based on their shared geophysical constraints, resulting in disproportionately large economic, social and environmental challenges, and is supported by Council members' requests for a more in-depth reviewing of the SIDS portfolio of projects. The evaluation's main findings, conclusions and recommendations will be presented to the Council at the 2019 fall meeting.

G. Evaluation of GEF Medium-Sized Projects

27. The GEF Medium-Sized Project (MSP) modality has provided an expedited mechanism allowing a broader representation of stakeholders to directly access GEF funds, including government agencies, international NGOs, national NGOs, academic and research institutions, and private sector companies. The objective of the MSP modality is to promote rapid and efficient execution of smaller projects by simplifying processing steps together with review and approval procedures, and shortening the project cycle relative to GEF full-sized projects. This evaluation will provide evidence on the past GEF experience in designing and implementing MSPs as well as the effectiveness and results of MSP projects. It will contribute to the further development of MSPs in the context of GEF's strategic move to increase its investments in integrated programming as a strategy to tackle the main drivers of environmental degradation and achieve impact at scale. The evaluation will be presented to Council at the 2019 fall meeting.

H. Knowledge Management

28. The IEO has been sharing the findings of the Sixth Comprehensive Evaluation of the GEF (OPS6) with members of the GEF partnership. The Office has prepared an [infographic](#) on key conclusions of OPS6, and executive summaries of OPS6 in [English](#), [French](#), and [Spanish](#). The IEO website is updated on a regular basis with the completed evaluation reports, four-page briefs, and other documents on the OPS6 component evaluations. An interactive website [section](#) displays data on performance and data from other evaluations. The IEO is also presenting the

findings of OPS6 at the Constituency meetings taking place in connection with the GEF Assembly in Da Nang, Vietnam. The presentations discuss the OPS6 and component evaluation findings as they relate to the constituencies.

29. During the reporting period, IEO staff have contributed to publications on evaluations on sustainable development¹. IEO staff have also hosted webinars and discussions, and made presentations at conferences focused on environmental and evaluation issues, including an IEO session on Measuring Environmental Impacts with Geospatial Data (December 2017), the ReLAC, REDLACME and IDEAS Conference on Evaluation of the Sustainable Development Goals (December 2017), the Second Global Adaptation Network Forum (March 2018), the American Association of Geographers Annual Meeting (April 2018), the World Bank's Results Measurement and Evidence Stream Annual Meeting (May 2018), and the UN Evaluation Group's Evaluation Week (May 2018).

30. The Office maintains strategic partnerships for knowledge exchange on methods and findings with the United Nations Evaluation Group, the Evaluation Cooperation Group of the multilateral development banks, and the Transformational Change Learning Partnership of the Climate Investment Funds.

31. To build and strengthen knowledge within the Office, training sessions have been held on the use and application of geospatial methods, and on writing effective evaluations for influence.

IV. BUDGET AND HUMAN RESOURCES FOR FISCAL YEAR 2019

32. The GEF Council approved the IEO budget for FY18 in the amount of \$5.246 million (Table 1). The allocation of the budget was divided as follows: \$4.296 million for operations and \$950,000 for evaluation work. The operations budget for FY18 was reduced by \$50,000 at the Council's request, and the remaining resources were disbursed as approved.

33. The operations budget includes both fixed and variable costs. The fixed costs pertain to staffing costs and the variable costs include operational expenses (Table 1). In the case of the evaluation budget, FY18 represented the peak year in the multiyear evaluation budget, with the focus on the completion of OPS6. The evaluations were conducted as planned and OPS6 was delivered on schedule. The IEO has managed and monitored the operations and evaluation budgets strictly following all World Bank rules and regulations. The World Bank routinely performs quality assurance reviews to make sure that the funds are being used as intended.

¹ Juha I. Uitto, Jeremy Kohlitz, and David Todd. *Evaluating Sustainable Development in SIDS - Lessons from the Pacific and the Caribbean* in Rob D. van den Berg, Indran Naidoo, and Susan D. Tamondong, eds. (2017). [Evaluation for Agenda 2030: Providing Evidence on Progress and Sustainability](#). Exeter, UK: IDEAS.; NORAD Evaluation Department. (2018). [Seminar Report. International Sustainable Forest Initiatives: Seminar on evaluation and learning.](#)

34. FY19 represents the last year of the GEF-6 cycle. The IEO is requesting a budget of \$4.381 million to cover fixed costs and operational activities, representing an increase of 2 percent over FY18, and \$190,000 for evaluation work, for a total of \$4.571 million (Table 1). The evaluation budget outlays are significantly lower with the release of the OPS6 final report. Since the evaluation budget is a multi-annual budget, \$200,000 will be carried over from FY18 to FY19 to enable the office to implement the FY19 work program.

35. The IEO budget request for FY19 is based on the four-year IEO program budget approved in 2014. However, this budget did not consider the World Bank increase in staff overhead costs from 50 percent to 70 percent. For FY18, the estimated amount of extra funds required to cover those costs was \$601,000 and was approved by the Council. For FY19, this increase in overhead costs has been calculated at \$618,000. This amount takes into consideration the reduction in the annual salary rate increase for staff, from 4.5 percent to 2.9 percent, reflecting the recently announced efficiency measures associated with the World Bank general capital increase. Taken together, the fixed and variable cost increase is well within the World Bank limits.

Table 1: Estimated IEO Budget for Fiscal Year 2019

<i>Expense Category</i>	<i>FY18 Approved Budget</i>	<i>FY18 Estimated Expenses</i>	<i>FY19 Budget Request</i>	<i>Difference FY18 - FY19</i>	
<i>Fixed Cost</i>					
IEO Salaries and Benefits Cost	3.005	3.005	3.092	0.087	2.9%
Non- Salary Staff-cost	0.601	0.601	0.618	0.017	2.9%
General Operations Cost	0.490	0.490	0.500	0.010	2.0%
<i>Total (A)</i>	4.096	4.096	4.211	0.115	2.8%
<i>Variable Cost</i>					
Professional Development	0.060	0.060	0.050	(0.010)	-16.7%
Participations in Networks	0.040	0.040	0.030	(0.010)	-25.0%
IEO Management Operations	0.060	0.060	0.060	0.000	0.0%
Knowledge Management	0.040	0.040	0.030	(0.010)	-25.0%
<i>Total (B)</i>	0.200	0.200	0.170	(0.030)	-15.0%
<i>Total Annual Budget (A+B)</i>	4.296	4.296	4.381	0.085	2.0%
<i>Evaluations</i>					
Focal Areas	0.100	0.100	0.030	(0.070)	-70.0%
Mainstreaming/Cross Cutting	0.250	0.250	0.000	(0.250)	-100.0%
Performance and Impact	0.100	0.075	0.120	0.045	60.0%
Institutional Issues	0.150	0.025	0.040	0.015	60.0%
OPS6	0.350	0.300	0.000	(0.300)	-100.0%
<i>Total Evaluations (C)</i>	0.950	0.750	0.190	(0.560)	-74.7%
<i>Total IEO Budget (A+B+C)</i>	5.246	5.046	4.571	(0.475)	-9.4%

36. During FY18, IEO continued to operate with 19 staff and there was no change in staff composition over the year. The current staff composition of the IEO is shown in the Table 2 below. The IEO proposes to continue with the same staff complement for FY19.

Table 2: IEO Staff

	IEO Staff
1	Director
1	Chief Evaluation Officer
5	Senior Evaluation Officer
1	Senior Operations Officer
3	Evaluation Officer
1	Knowledge Management Officer
3	Evaluation Analyst
1	Information Analyst
1	Research Assistant
1	Senior Program Assistant
1	Program Assistant

Note: One senior evaluator is funded through the Donor Funded Staffing Program

V. DRAFT INDICATIVE WORK PROGRAM AND BUDGET FOR GEF-7

37. This section presents the indicative draft work program and the estimated IEO budget for GEF-7. The work program and budget will be formally submitted for Council approval in the fall 2018 Council meeting. The FY19 evaluations have been addressed in the section on ongoing evaluations, and are also included in Table 3.

38. IEO's strategic directions for FY19–22 are defined to maximize alignment with the key strategic priorities of the GEF and the main environmental challenges expected to affect client countries over the period. The IEO's work program is designed to help the GEF enhance its impacts and better address the most relevant environmental and related development challenges faced by its clients.

A. Draft Proposed Work Program (FY19-22)

39. The work program for FY23 will be determined after the GEF replenishment meeting in 2022.

40. Evaluations. The draft proposed program of evaluations for the last year of GEF-6 and three years of the GEF-7 period (FY19–22) responds to some of the biggest strategic priorities of relevance to GEF recipient countries and donors. In total, IEO plans to maintain its yearly delivery of four to five evaluations and the Annual Performance Report (APR). IEO will maintain the coverage rate of validation of approximately 600 terminal evaluations over the GEF-7 period. Each APR will continue to include a thematic chapter on a process, policy or a focal area. The special themes include transportation, a review of the agency evaluation systems and a review of the revised PMIS. IEO will resume its program of country-level evaluations, referred to as Strategic Country Cluster Evaluations, which will be clustered around country groups facing common environmental challenges, such as LDCs, MICs, and SIDS.

41. A second phase of the evaluation of the Integrated Approach Pilots will be carried out as the implementation of these programs will be well underway in GEF-7. Focal area studies that were completed in OPS6, will be updated with an emphasis on special themes such as biosafety, fisheries, and the CBIT. Topics and initiatives that have not been addressed in previous OPSs, such as the Country Support Program, MSPs and Enabling Activities, will be evaluated during this period. IEO will also implement impact evaluations in the areas of Sustainable Forest Management and Fisheries. The focus on the private sector will be maintained in IEO evaluations in GEF-7 through a multi country evaluation of the CleanTech program, and an evaluation of GEF's interventions to assist small and medium enterprises. An update to the NGI evaluation will be carried out in the context of the MICs evaluation.
42. Closer to OPS7, the IEO will assess the implementation of the gender, safeguards and indigenous peoples' policies, as well as the systems for STAR, knowledge and results based management, currently being revised by GEFSEC. The effects of the expansion of the partnership will also be assessed as there would have been enough time for project implementation by newer agencies.
43. All evaluations implemented between FY19-21 will feed into the Seventh Comprehensive Evaluation of the GEF (OPS7) which will be delivered in time for the replenishment meetings in the fall of 2021. (See Table 3 for Planned Evaluations for FY19-FY22)). The work program for FY23 will be determined after the GEF replenishment meeting in 2022.
44. Expansion of Pilot Evaluation Products. Supporting the GEF's learning from evidence will remain a key priority of IEO. The IEO meso-study on Transformational Engagements under OPS6 was a pilot study and there has been an increased demand for learning products of this nature by the agencies. These meso-studies draw on existing evidence with limited fieldwork. IEO will extend this pilot to other similar meso-studies such as the study focusing on lessons from scaling up and replication.
45. In response to the Council's expressed interest in focused, real-time evaluations from IEO to contribute to the search for effective solutions to specific environmental and program implementation challenges, IEO will continue to provide more real-time evaluation evidence. The impact programs designed in GEF-7 would be evaluated using this approach and will have a strong focus on learning and process components.
46. New Methodologies. IEO continues to push the frontier on developing and testing new methods for environmental evaluation. During GEF-6 value for money approaches were developed to assess efficiency of GEF projects in land degradation and biodiversity in terms of carbon sequestration benefits. Geospatial analysis is now an integral part of most evaluations, as are case studies. Cost effective Rapid Impact Evaluation methods are being applied. IEO is currently working on methodologies to assess GEF additionality, and to measure socio-economic co-benefits. IEO continues to partner with STAP, relevant government agencies and academic and research institutions to maintain its leadership in this area.

Table 3: Proposed Evaluations-FY19-22

FY19 (Last year of GEF-6)	FY20	FY21	FY22 (by October '22)
Strategic Country Cluster Evaluation SIDS	Strategic Country Cluster Evaluation Africa	Evaluation of the IAPs/Impact Programs	Seventh Comprehensive Evaluation of the GEF (OPS-7).
Strategic Country Cluster Evaluation LDCs	Evaluation of MSPs	Evaluation of the Implementation of GEF's policies on: Gender, Safeguards, Indigenous Peoples	
Evaluation of GEF's interventions in Biodiversity Mainstreaming	Sustainable Forest Management Focal Area Study (with impact evaluation)	Evaluation of GEF's Interventions with Small and Medium Enterprises (with impact evaluation)	
Evaluation of the Clean Tech Program	Evaluation of the Country Support Program	Strategic Country Cluster Evaluation MICs	
ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT			
Annual Performance Report (special focus on transportation)	Annual Performance Report (special focus on review of the agency evaluation systems)	Annual Performance Report (special focus on review of the re-designed PMIS)	
LDCF/SCCF AER	LDCF/SCCF AER	LDCF/SCCF AER	LDCF/SCCF AER
MESO EVALUATIONS			
Evidence from GEF's Experience with Scale-Up and Replication	Evaluation of Enabling Activities GEF in Fragile and Post Conflict Environments	Follow up studies to the Evaluation of STAR, RBM, KM Updates to focal area studies (special themes such as-CBIT, Fisheries, Biosafety) NGI Governance of the GEF	
POLICIES			
M&E Policy Update	Understanding Additionality in the GEF	OPS7 approach paper	

B. Estimated Budget for GEF-7 (FY20-23)

47. IEO has requested for \$24.5 million as part of the GEF-7 replenishment package. IEO is committed to implement the efficiency measures consistent with the general capital increase of the World Bank. This would translate into an estimated savings of \$383,000 in staffing costs and approximately \$170,000 in evaluation cost savings through reductions in travel and consultant

hiring. This would result in an overall estimated savings of \$553,000 over the 4-year period, or 2.25 percent of the requested budget for GEF-7. IEO continues to implement several efficiency measures to keep evaluation costs down. These measures include 1) no expansion in staff since GEF-6 and maintaining a balanced staffing structure; 2) IEO staff leading and conducting evaluations; 3) strengthened external consultant recruitment processes and internal processes related to travel costs; 4) cost efficiencies resulting from a continuous move toward more e-reports and web-based dissemination; and 5) the increased use of national and regional consultants in evaluations.

Table 4: Estimated IEO Budget for GEF-7 (FY20-23)

	GEF-7				
	<i>FY20</i>	<i>FY21</i>	<i>FY22</i>	<i>FY23</i>	<i>Total</i>
<i>Fixed Cost</i>					
<i>Salaries</i>	2.409	2.527	2.651	2.781	10.368
<i>Benefits</i>	1.686	1.769	1.856	1.947	7.257
<i>Sub-total (A)</i>	4.095	4.296	4.506	4.727	17.625
<i>Operations (B)</i>	0.522	0.529	0.534	0.532	2.117
<i>Total (A + B)</i>	4.617	4.825	5.040	5.259	19.742
<i>Variable Cost</i>					
<i>Prof. Dev.</i>	0.020	0.020	0.020	0.020	0.080
<i>Networks</i>	0.020	0.020	0.020	0.020	0.080
<i>Management</i>	0.065	0.065	0.065	0.065	0.260
<i>Total (C)</i>	0.105	0.105	0.105	0.105	0.420
<i>Total (A+B+C) = D</i>	4.722	4.930	5.145	5.364	20.162
<i>Evaluations (E)</i>	1.500	2.000	0.600	0.238	4.338
<i>Total (D + E)</i>	6.222	6.930	5.745	5.602	24.500
<i>Estimated Savings</i>	FY20	FY21	FY22	FY23	Total
<i>Salaries & Benefits</i>	0.035	0.073	0.115	0.160	0.383
<i>Evaluations</i>	0.040	0.095	0.025	0.010	0.170
<i>Total</i>	0.075	0.168	0.140	0.170	0.553

VI. THE MANAGEMENT ACTION RECORD

48. The GEF Management Action Record (MAR) tracks the level of adoption of GEF Council decisions which are based on the IEO's evaluation recommendations. These recommendations are implemented by the GEF Secretariat and/or the GEF Partner Agencies (together referred to as GEF Management). The MAR serves two purposes: (1) to provide Council a record of its decisions based on the evaluation reports presented by the GEF IEO, the proposed management actions, and the actual status of these actions; and (2) to increase the

accountability of GEF Management regarding Council decisions on monitoring and evaluation issues.”²

49. MAR 2017 reports on the level of adoption of 4 decisions from the following evaluations.

- (a) Annual Country Portfolio Evaluation Report 2012 (GEF/ME/C.42/03)
- (b) Semi-Annual Evaluation Report June 2015, section on the Joint GEF-UNDP Small Grants Program Evaluation (GEF/ME/C.48/02)
- (c) Evaluation of the GEF CSO Network (GEF/ME/C.50/02)
- (d) Annual Performance Report 2015 (GEF/ME/C.50/04)

50. In 2017 the GEF Council endorsed all 58 GEF IEO recommendations presented in the May and November 2017 Semi-Annual Evaluation Reports. These recommendations have not been included for tracking in MAR 2017, to allow for implementation. They are listed in Annex A of MAR 2017 along with a timeline for their future tracking.

51. The November 2017 Council decision regarding the Semi-Annual Evaluation Report also took note of the OPS6 recommendations and advised the GEF Secretariat to address them in the programming for GEF-7. These recommendations will not be tracked in the MAR because they have been reflected in the GEF-7 policy agenda and programming directions.

A. Council Decision with a Substantial Level of Adoption

52. The adoption of the decision on the evaluation of the GEF CSO Network, was rated to be substantial by both the IEO and GEF management. The decision led to the establishment of an ad-hoc working group of Council members to develop an updated vision of the relationship between the GEF and civil society in consultation with relevant stakeholders, and encouraged the CSO Network to establish a working group to interact with the Council Working Group on an updated vision for the Network. The Ad-Hoc Working Group on Civil Society presented an Updated Vision to Enhance Civil Society Engagement with the GEF to at the GEF Council’s 53rd meeting. At the same Council meeting the Secretariat presented an updated Policy on Stakeholder Engagement with the GEF. The Council has requested GEF Secretariat to present a progress report on the implementation of the Updated Vision for information to the 55th Council in the fall of 2018.

² GEF Council, “Procedures and Format of the GEF Management Action Record.” GEF/ME/C.27/3., GEF Council November, 2005.

B. Council Decisions with a Medium Level of Adoption

The level of adoption of three decisions was rated as medium by the IEO.

53. The first decision was based on the Annual Country Portfolio Evaluation Report of 2012, and recommended that the Secretariat reduce the burden of monitoring requirements of multifocal area projects. The GEF is moving its results-based management system towards tracking 11 core indicators and 25 sub-indicators from GEF-7 onwards, which should reduce the burden of tracking for all project types. As the decision is no longer relevant, it is retired from the MAR.

54. The second decision relates to the burden of monitoring requirements reported in the 2015 Annual Performance Report. The decision endorsed the recommendation that GEF needs to reassess its approach to tracking tools for GEF-7, and should also assess the burden and utility of its biodiversity tracking tools and other alternatives. Management rated the level of adoption as substantial, however, as a revised results-based management approach is still under development by the Secretariat, the level of adoption is rated as medium by the IEO. An alternative to the tracking tools is still under development.

55. The third decision relates to the review of the Joint GEF-UNDP Small Grants Program Evaluation, with a recommendation for the Secretariat and UNDP to continue upgrading the SGP Country Program, and to revisit the criteria for selection of countries for upgrading. The level of adoption is rated as medium by both management and IEO. Management reported that UNDP and the Central Program Management Team, in consultation with the GEF Secretariat and relevant stakeholders, will revisit the upgrading criteria in GEF 7. The program will focus on consolidating and scaling up successful on-the-ground actions in the existing 15 Upgraded Country Programs for community based landscape planning and management, in GEF-7.