

60<sup>th</sup> GEF Council Meeting  
June 14-18, 2021  
Virtual Meeting

Agenda Item 15

**WORK PROGRAM AND BUDGET OF THE  
INDEPENDENT EVALUATION OFFICE: JUNE 2021**

(Prepared by the Independent Evaluation Office of the GEF)

**Recommended Council Decision**

The Council, having reviewed the “Work Program and Budget Report of the GEF Independent Evaluation Office: May 2021,” acknowledges the progress made by the Independent Evaluation Office in the reporting period, and approves the IEO budget for FY22.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

|                                                                           |    |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| Executive Summary.....                                                    | iv |
| I. Introduction .....                                                     | 1  |
| II. Update on the Seventh Comprehensive Evaluation of the GEF (OPS7)..... | 1  |
| III. Completed Evaluations .....                                          | 1  |
| IV. Evaluation Work in Progress .....                                     | 5  |
| V. Updates on Knowledge Sharing and Communications .....                  | 8  |
| VI. Budget and Human Resources .....                                      | 9  |

## TABLES

|                                            |    |
|--------------------------------------------|----|
| Table 1: IEO Budget for FY 21.....         | 11 |
| Table 2: IEO Budget Request for FY22 ..... | 12 |
| Table 3: IEO Staff Composition FY21.....   | 12 |

## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

1. This report presents the Independent Evaluation Office (IEO) budget for FY21, and the proposed budget for FY22. It also provides an update on the Office's completed and ongoing evaluations and knowledge management activities during the reporting period of January–May 2021. The seventh comprehensive evaluation of the GEF (OPS7), "The Role and Contribution of the GEF towards a Global Greener Recovery," is under preparation and the first draft will be completed for the second replenishment meeting in September 2021. An update on OPS7 is included. The completed evaluations of the Small Grants Programme, the Country Support Program, the Integrated Approach Pilots and Impact Programs, GEF support to Innovation, GEF's engagement with Micro, Small and Medium Enterprises, GEF's policies on stakeholder engagement, gender and safeguards, the results based management system with a focus on the portal and Agency self-evaluation systems, are included as separate working documents. A status update of ongoing evaluations is included. These evaluations will be discussed with various stakeholders prior to their inclusion in OPS7. The Management Action Record (MAR) is included as an information document. The IEO continued to participate in a variety of knowledge management activities including online webinars to disseminate evaluation findings during the reporting period. The IEO website was revamped. Savings were realized in the FY21 budget mainly due to limited travel, but this was the busiest year for evaluations in the GEF-7 period.

## **I. INTRODUCTION**

1. This report provides an update on the seventh comprehensive evaluation of the GEF (OPS7), completed and ongoing evaluations, and knowledge management activities of the GEF Independent Evaluation Office since the December 2020 Council meeting until May 2021. The preparation of OPS7 is well underway and the first draft report “The Role and Contribution of the GEF to a Global Greener Recovery” will be presented at the second replenishment meeting in September 2021. The IEO completed seven evaluations during the reporting period and launched several evaluations. The completed reports for the evaluations of the Small Grants Programme, the Country Support Program, the Integrated Approach Pilots and Impact Programs, GEF support to Innovation, GEF’s engagement with micro, small and medium enterprises, GEF’s policies on stakeholder engagement, gender and safeguards, the portal and self-evaluation systems components of GEF’s results based management systems, are presented to the Council as working documents. The Management Action Record (MAR) which reports on the progress on IEO recommendations is included as an information document.

## **II. UPDATE ON THE SEVENTH COMPREHENSIVE EVALUATION OF THE GEF (OPS7)**

2. The seventh comprehensive evaluation of the GEF “The Role and Contribution of the GEF towards a Global Greener Recovery” (OPS7) is currently under preparation. All evaluations and studies underpinning OPS7 are either complete or well underway. The findings from completed and ongoing evaluations were presented in the report “Evaluation Findings Highlights: 2018-2021” to the first replenishment meeting in April 2021. The first draft report for OPS7 is being prepared for the second replenishment meeting of the GEF in September 2021. The high-level advisory panel met virtually in April 2021 to provide feedback on the evaluation findings and guidance for OPS7. The next meeting is planned for the first week of August to discuss the draft OPS7 report prior to sharing it with stakeholders and the replenishment group.

## **III. COMPLETED EVALUATIONS**

3. Seven evaluations were completed during the reporting period and are being presented to the Council as working documents. The Management Action Record is included as an information document. The evaluations were peer reviewed and due process was followed in sharing draft reports, and discussing the recommendations with relevant stakeholder groups.

### **Third Joint GEF-UNDP Evaluation of the Small Grants Programme (SGP)**

4. The SGP has been evaluated jointly by the independent evaluation offices of the GEF and UNDP. The evaluation focuses on strategic issues that have arisen since the last evaluation of SGP in 2015. The evaluation paid particular attention to the ‘upgrading policy’ in which countries allocate their GEF STAR resources to implement SGP in their countries as GEF full size projects. A few conclusions from the evaluation include: SGP continues to be highly relevant to evolving environmental priorities at all levels; the SGP has been consistent in its delivery of environmental results at local, national, and global levels and in generating economic and social benefits; as a unique mechanism that channels funds to civil society organizations, the SGP promotes new ways of working that are flexible enough to adapt to local circumstances.

However, the governance structure of the SGP is complex, the disadvantages and risks of the upgrading process outweigh its short-term financial advantages and the upgrading process has complicated the lines of accountabilities even further and the improvements in efficiency at the global program level have been weakened by challenges in upgrading countries.

### **Evaluation of the Country Support Program (CSP)**

5. The purpose of this evaluation is to provide insights and lessons regarding the relevance, efficiency, and effectiveness of the CSP and its services. The evaluation found that the CSP has been responsive to the evolution in GEF policies and programming strategies, which have helped shape the agenda and activities of the CSP, ensuring its ongoing relevance for GEF stakeholders. The CSP can be considered as a tool to help formulate and develop national priorities, especially in countries with relatively lower institutional capacities. Planned and coordinated interaction, proactive dialogue, and field visits have allowed CSP events to become more dynamic learning and knowledge building platforms. However, some areas for improvement have been identified. CSP activities should be planned as early as possible, to help countries optimize the use of GEF resources. The CSP needs to develop a clear strategy and implementation plan, strengthen the technical expertise in its team and systems to provide more localized support to countries, based on reliable and up-to-date results-based management data that tracks resources, number of activities, outcomes, and impacts.

### **Formative Evaluation of the GEF Integrated Approach to Address the Drivers of Environmental Degradation**

6. This evaluation assessed the GEF integrated approach applied through GEF-6 Integrated Approach Pilots (IAPs) and GEF-7 Impact Programs (IPs) by looking at the relevance and coherence in the design, efficiency, and early results from implementation. Overall, the evaluation found that GEF-7 IPs represent an improvement in design, over the GEF-6 IAPs. They demonstrate synergies primarily among biodiversity, climate change, and land degradation focal areas, and the interrelationships with socioeconomic considerations, focusing on urban development, rural livelihoods, and commodity value chains. The programs have been relevant in terms of geographical targeting, incentives, and the selection of Agencies and countries. A missed opportunity is that only one Small Island Developing State is participating in IAPs/IPs. The design of GEF integrated approaches places considerable responsibility on the Lead Agency to deliver programmatic results and value added. To date, IAP program-level reporting has insufficiently demonstrated the added value of the programmatic approach to integration. While program-level M&E is dealt with in recent GEF policies and guidelines, it has not yet been formally codified in project cycle practices. The evidence points to progress toward results, although it is still early to observe global environmental benefits (GEBs). At mid-term, the IAPs' knowledge platforms are supporting learning across projects, with areas for improvement.

### **Evaluation of GEF's engagement with Micro, Small and Medium Enterprises**

7. Micro, small and medium enterprises (MSMEs) constitute the larger part of the private sector in the countries that the GEF works in. As the backbone of activity in many environmentally high-impact industries, MSMEs play a critical role in the greening of supply chains. Given their highly diverse composition, working with MSMEs also provides a significant

opportunity to meet the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) targets. This evaluation aimed to assess how GEF-supported interventions engage MSMEs in the process of creating global environmental benefits, by also generating economic and social benefits for these stakeholders. Drawing on a portfolio of 158 completed projects and two in-depth case studies, the evaluation found that MSMEs vary in their capacities and constraints, which leads to different degrees of engagement and extent of environmental, social and economic benefits generated. GEF support has so far been most additional in engaging MSMEs—and has also been most successfully sustained—in the areas of capacity-building, knowledge and information dissemination, and technological innovations and improvements.

### **GEF Support to Innovation**

8. This evaluation assessed the GEF’s efforts in supporting innovation, the factors that have influenced the success of innovation in terms of value added and transformational change and offers recommendations for the path forward. The GEF has supported innovation at various levels—at the strategic level, at the institutional level and through projects and programs. In projects, innovations may be technological, financial, business model, policy, and institutional, and are often combined to achieve value added and transformational change. At the strategic level, the IAPs and IPs are innovative in their approach to address the drivers of environmental degradation and drive transformational change at large scale involving multiple agencies based on their comparative advantage, countries based on relevance and ownership, and a broad spectrum of stakeholders. At the institutional level, GEF’s recent innovations include the use of geospatial approaches in locating projects and in monitoring and evaluation. Since most innovations inherently involve risks, the GEFSEC should continue to better monitor and assess risk and the Council, STAP and GEFSEC should determine the risk tolerance level based on such assessments. The GEFSEC should explore partnerships that may mobilize larger sources of risk capital and explicitly encourage adaptive, flexible management of innovative interventions. Monitoring, evaluation, knowledge sharing should be required in all innovative projects.

### **Evaluation of Institutional Policies and Engagement of the GEF**

9. This mixed methods evaluation assessed the coherence, operational relevance and implementation of GEF’s Policies on Stakeholder Engagement (2018), Gender Equality (2018), and on Environmental and Social Safeguards (ESS, 2019). The policies are generally well reflected in the GEF’s vision, strategic priorities and operational principles, all of which emphasize mobilizing local and global stakeholders, broadening partnerships/alliances, gender mainstreaming and women’s empowerment. Only the Policy on Gender Equality (and, in particular, the GEF Gender Implementation Strategy) aligns explicitly with the GEF-7 programming directions.

10. **Stakeholder Engagement.** Overall, the updated policy is well designed and reporting guidelines for Agencies are mostly clear, generally compatible with own practices and not onerous. Constraints in implementation are in three areas, mainly: internal experience/capacity to integrate “meaningful” stakeholder engagement into design and implementation, inadequacy of budget and time to undertake quality stakeholder engagement, and the prevailing social/political context in some countries.

11. **CSO Network.** The position of the GEF CSO Network within the GEF partnership has weakened over the past four years. The CSO Network's efforts to build itself up as a mechanism for strengthening civil society participation in the GEF—a skills building strategy, a country contact concept to help connect Regional Focal Points with the country CSOs and other GEF partners, member recruitment—are hampered by internal tensions and financial constraints.

12. **GEF Engagement with Indigenous Peoples.** Incremental gains have been made in the GEF's engagement with indigenous peoples. Strengthened safeguards provide additional protections regarding lands as well as natural and cultural resources, though country contextual factors continue to bear heavily on policy implementation. The Indigenous Peoples Advisory Group (IPAG) has gained credibility as a knowledge resource but its impact is constrained by the size of the group, its low profile, its volunteer make-up and the resources available to it.

13. **Gender.** Portfolio documents show increased attention to Gender Equality with the introduction of the updated policy—more stakeholder consultations involving individuals or groups with a gender perspective; more frequent use of a gender analysis methodology and formulation of a gender action plan; higher utilization of the combination of gender-disaggregated and gender-specific indicators; increased reporting on gender in PIRs; and greater prevalence of resource allocations to support gender training and knowledge management. Gaps in alignment with best practices are observed on the definition of the gender focal point role, on the assignment of budget resources at the corporate level to support the Policy, and on uneven patterns of gender data collection across the Agencies.

14. **Safeguards.** The updated ESS Policy improved safeguards reporting and monitoring requiring Agencies to provide information at project mid-term and project completion. However, the ESS Policy does not require safeguards reporting in PIRs. The Policy also increased portfolio-level reporting on safeguard risks and grievance cases, in line with the 2017 IEO recommendations. GEF has not made significant progress in supporting capacity development, expert convening and communications on safeguards in the GEF Partnership. Potential areas where the GEF ESS could be further strengthened include fragility and conflict issues, more explicit alignment with human rights frameworks. The highlighting of safeguard-related risks and impacts across the portfolio, as well as heightened attention to grievance cases, may help drive greater attention to safeguard issues during project implementation.

#### **Results Based Management System: Evaluations of Agency Self-Evaluation Systems and the GEF Portal**

15. This report on results based management brings together evidence from two evaluations: i) The Evaluation of the Agency Self-Evaluation Systems; and, ii) The Evaluation of the GEF Portal.

16. **Agency Self-Evaluation Systems.** Rating approaches of GEF Agencies are well aligned with the GEF IEO's approach in terms of what they aim to capture, and scales applied, but there are minor differences that affect comparability across Agencies. The quality of terminal evaluation reports is improving and GEF Agencies generally comply with the GEF IEO's terminal evaluation guidelines for full size projects. Agency self-evaluation systems provide support to learning on doing things right. Policies, guidance, and mechanisms are in place to ensure credible, quality, and timely information. Feedback loops are in place at the project and

organization level, and red flags in project implementation reports trigger corrective actions. The focus is mainly on activities and outputs. Self-evaluation systems place less emphasis on learning about doing the right things. Few agencies incentivize candor in self-evaluation but this is slowly improving.

17. **The GEF Portal.** The Portal has enhanced the online project proposal submission and review capabilities. The Portal has contributed to the acquisition of more and better data, and access to data is more regulated than before. Overall, the Portal has contributed to improvement in data quality—especially of the more recent projects—through increased automation and arrangements to ensure data entry discipline, with a few errors in data outputs noted. The Portal is easy to navigate, visually appealing, and accessible, and it compares well with its peers on these criteria. At the same time, its performance is mixed in terms of taxonomy and tagging, search and analytical abilities, and real-time availability of data to external stakeholders and the public. Other gaps in performance include lack of ability to download batches of documents, lack of a comprehensive system of alerts on project cycle milestones.

#### **IV. EVALUATION WORK IN PROGRESS**

18. Evaluation work is in full swing to meet the timelines of the OPS7, to deliver the first report in September 2021. Due to the current pandemic, field missions to conduct post-completion verifications or additional case studies have not been possible since March 2020. The IEO is using other quantitative and qualitative approaches, such as text analytics, satellite data analysis and existing survey data collected by other organizations (including the World Bank). The evaluations presented below are currently under way and will all feed into OPS7. The approach papers/concept notes are available on the [IEO website](#).

##### **The GEF Global Wildlife Program: An Evaluation Update**

19. GEF has made a concerted effort to address illegal wildlife trade in an integrated and impactful manner through the Global Wildlife Program (GWP). This update is a follow up to the IEO's formative evaluation conducted in 2017 to examine how the recommendations of the evaluation have been addressed in the second phase of the GWP. This evaluation also formatively looks at Phase II of GWP, which has now expanded to 37 projects in 32 countries of Asia, Africa, Latin America, and the Caribbean. Since several of these projects are located in fragile and conflict-affected situations, the evaluation will also assess how the GWP has managed the associated risks. This study also examines the impact of COVID-19 on the implementation of the program. The findings will inform the OPS7 and will be presented to the GEF Council in December 2021.

##### **Evaluation of GEF Support to Sustainable Forest Management (SFM)**

20. Since the pilot phase, the GEF has provided support to partner countries for Sustainable Forest Management (SFM). However, there hasn't been a systematic assessment of GEF supported SFM portfolio. The objective of this evaluation is to assess the performance and impact of GEF interventions in SFM and provide insights and lessons for future forest-related interventions. The study will employ a mixed-methods approach. It will complement the value-

for-money analysis of GEF support to SFM interventions that was presented to the 56th Council. The evaluation portfolio includes both projects under specific SFM programs since GEF-4 and the projects that address many of the United Nations Forum on Forests' thematic SFM elements. The evaluation assesses the relevance and coherence of SFM initiatives, including the formative assessment of the newer GEF forest-relevant IAPs and IPs. Cross-cutting issues such as gender considerations, safeguards, private sector engagement, adaptation to climate change, governance issues, and tenure security, and the participation of local communities and indigenous peoples are also being assessed. This ongoing work will further identify challenges, lessons learned, and good practices in SFM. The findings will feed into the OPS7 and will be presented to the GEF Council in December 2021.

### **Evaluation of GEF Enabling Activities**

21. The evaluation assesses the role of enabling activities in helping countries meet their Convention obligations, their role in developing national policies as well as preparing national plans and strategies, and the efficiency of the enabling activity project cycle as well as the direct access mechanism. The evaluation additionally looks at the relevance and strategic importance of enabling activities in the GEF suite of modalities and to the GEF partnership, and opportunities where the GEF may be able to streamline enabling activities. The portfolio is composed of 544 MSPs with \$262.21 million in GEF grants and \$187.97 million in planned cofinancing. The evaluation additionally looked the global and umbrella arrangements<sup>2</sup> utilized in the GEF to assist countries in meeting their obligations to the conventions, which, between GEF-4 and GEF-7, amount to 119 projects/programs and an additional \$348.28 million in GEF grants. The evaluation will be completed by July 2021 and presented to the GEF's 61st Council in December 2021.

### **A Study on Climate Resilience in the GEF Trust Fund**

22. Although the GEF Trust Fund focuses on achieving GEBs and not improving climate resilience in local communities, it has become increasingly clear that the two are interlinked in many cases. The study on climate resilience in the GEF Trust Fund is the first time that the GEF IEO will assess GEF's inclusion of climate resilience in its Trust Fund projects and programs. The study seeks to review GEF's strategy towards climate resilience over time, highlight the different ways in which climate resilience is integrated into GEF Trust Fund programming and understand the Trust Fund's comparative advantage on the subject and how its approach compares to best practices among the international environmental development community. To do so, GEF programming directions, Council and guidance documents will be reviewed and interviews with stakeholders with knowledge of GEF's strategy towards climate resilience completed. Additionally, a project review of 34 GEF-5 and GEF-6 projects identified as having integrated climate resilience into their design will be done along with interviews of project designers and managers for three case study projects. The study's main findings will be

---

<sup>1</sup> Grant amount including project preparation grant but excluding associated agency fees.

<sup>2</sup> Umbrella arrangements are a method of bundling multiple enabling activities aimed at helping a group of countries in meeting their obligation for one convention into one project proposal in order to gain efficiencies in processing the request for funding.

incorporated into OPS7 in June 2021 and will be presented to the GEF Council in December 2021.

### **Evaluation of the International Waters Program: Focus on Fisheries and Freshwater**

23. In addition to a review of the overall GEF strategy in International Waters, two studies are being carried out to fill the gaps in the previous focal area study on international waters conducted by the IEO in 2016. These studies, primarily desk based, will mainly focus on the fisheries and freshwater portfolios of the GEF.

**Fisheries.** As noted in the 2016 international waters focal area study, marine fisheries are the dominant theme for interventions in this focal area. However, the relevance and effectiveness of GEF investments in fisheries management have yet to be reviewed. This study aims to present a synthesis of the GEF's continuous support for global fisheries based on a review of the terminal evaluations of completed fishery projects. This review will identify contributing and hindering factors that affect the magnitude and quality of project outcomes to inform better design and implementation of future interventions. This will primarily be a desk-based study and will be presented to the Council in December 2021.

**Freshwater.** Freshwater plays a significant role in sustaining life on earth, and the findings from OPS6 indicated a slight imbalance between marine/ocean and freshwater projects in the GEF international waters portfolio. This study will provide evidence on the effectiveness and impacts of the GEF freshwater portfolio based on a desk review. It will be presented to the Council in December 2021.

### **Evaluation of GEF's Results Based Management System**

24. The GEF's approach to results based management (RBM) has evolved. Emphasis has shifted from tracking a wide range of indicators through tracking tools during the GEF-4 to GEF-6 periods to the present approach of focusing on a smaller set of core indicators. The evaluation, an input to OPS7, seeks to answer following questions: To what extent have OPS6 recommendations related to the GEF RBM system been implemented? To what extent have the changes in the results architecture been effective? To what extent does the RBM system contribute to good knowledge management? The evaluation will be completed in July 2021.

### **Program Evaluation of the SCCF**

25. The IEO is conducting a program evaluation of the SCCF. The main objective of this evaluation is to assess the progress made by the SCCF since the 2016 program evaluation and the extent to which the SCCF is achieving the objectives set out in the GEF Programming Strategy on Adaptation to Climate Change for LDCF/SCCF (2018-2022). The evaluation will also follow up on conclusions and recommendations of the 2016 evaluation and will provide the LDCF/SCCF Council with evaluative evidence of the fund's relevance and emerging results. Evaluative evidence will be based on a portfolio review of project and program documentation, interviews with key stakeholders, and field visits to two countries including two post-completion evaluations. The approach paper for the SCCF program evaluation is available on the GEF IEO website. The evaluation will be presented to the LDCF/SCCF Council in December 2021.

## **Additional Evaluation Work Planned for FY22**

26. In addition to completing the ongoing evaluations that all feed into OPS7, the IEO proposes to start a few new country and regional evaluations and simultaneously invest in some methodology work on assessing socioeconomic benefits, in FY22. The IEO proposes testing a new approach to conducting country and regional evaluations—a mixed-methods deep-dive into salient topics in the GEF portfolio in selected countries or regions. In terms of data collection methods, this approach mostly focuses on extensive face-to-face interviews with every relevant stakeholder, documentary photography, GIS and mapping, and literature reviews (including quantitative secondary data). Selected themes will provide an opportunity for comprehensive situational analysis, allowing us to uncover the complexity of environmental initiatives in a systemic fashion, including the social, political, cultural and economic conditions under which such initiatives have a chance to succeed. Whether done as single- or multi-country studies, this approach will yield great potential for idea generation and conceptual creativity which might enrich future studies.

27. The first multi country evaluation proposed would be based on ‘Reducing Pollution and Preserving Environmental Flows in the East Asian Seas through the Implementation of Integrated River Basin Management’ (ID# 9654) and ‘Enhancing Sustainability of the Transboundary Cambodia-Mekong River Delta Aquifer’ (ID# 10520). This would be a multi-country regional study including Cambodia, Lao PDR and Viet Nam that would provide opportunities for socioeconomic triangulation. This will be accompanied by testing evaluation methods that could be best utilized to evaluate socioeconomic cobenefits associated with environmental interventions. The evaluation will also examine the evolution of GEF’s interventions through a review of ongoing GEF interventions as well. A second country/regional study for the Latin America region will be identified. These will be delivered to the December 2022 Council.

## **V. UPDATES ON KNOWLEDGE SHARING AND COMMUNICATIONS**

28. The [2nd Edition of Evaluating Environment in International Development](#), edited by the Director, was published in March 2021. The second edition brings together contributions from 22 evaluation thinkers and practitioners who reflect their experiences from major international organizations, civil society, private sector and academia. Another volume of papers and presentations from the 2019 Third International Conference on Evaluating Environment and Development has been accepted for publication by Springer and will be published by December 2021,

29. The IEO Director has served in advisory capacity on panels and evaluations during the reporting period.

- (a) International Program on Development Evaluation Training (IPDET) Advisory Board
- (b) Footprint Evaluation Thought Partners Panel, Global Evaluation Initiative (World Bank IEG and UNDP IEO)
- (c) GCF Independent Evaluation Unit, ‘Assessing the likelihood of transformational change at the Green Climate Fund’, IEU Learning Paper
- (d) Global Partnership on Education, GPE Results Framework Review Panel

- (e) International Evaluation Academy Board
- (f) Monitoring and Evaluating Environmental Peacebuilding Initiatives, Environmental Law Institute (ELI) and United States Institute of Peace (USIP)

30. **Participation in events** has largely been affected by travel restrictions due to the COVID-19 pandemic. However, virtually the IEO has stayed engaged during the reporting period and has presented in several events:

31. In December 2020, the IEO participated in a webinar organized by the European Evaluation Society on [Evaluation for the Good Anthropocene](#), which looked at changing our relation to natural and human systems to preserve life and biodiversity while also creating inclusive, resilient communities.

32. In January 2021, a seminar on the Application of Remote Sensing for Ex-ante Decision Support and Evaluating Impact was held with the Asian Development Bank.

33. In April 2021, the IEO presented its evaluation of GEF interventions in ASGM during the event on [PlanetGOLD in Review: Making a World of Difference in Small-scale Gold Mining](#).

34. In May 2021, a webinar was organized between by the Environment, fragility, and a conflict community of practice of the World Bank on the IEO evaluation on [Learning from GEF Support in Fragile and Conflict-Affected Situations](#). This event was largely attended by practitioners involved in GEF-WB projects.

35. In May 2021, the IEO presented at the Canadian Evaluation Society (CES) Annual Conference on “Is Evaluation Ready for Sustainability?” The IEO also sponsored 10 participants from the Latin America, Asia and Africa to attend the CES meetings. The IEO had a virtual booth for attendees to ask questions to staff members on evaluative work.

36. **IEO Website.** In March of this year the IEO website was revamped to include up-to-date technology and a brand-new visual design following the latest trends in website development. The new website includes information on evaluations, events, methods, and other products. A total of 173 evaluations are currently available for users to download or share across social media channels and various platforms. IEO events have contributed to new users accessing supporting documents such as videos and presentations on the website. As of April 30th, we had a total of 76,070 views for the Fiscal Year 21, with web traffic significantly increasing with the first replenishment meeting.

## **VI. BUDGET AND HUMAN RESOURCES**

### **IEO Budget FY21**

37. The GEF Council approved a four-year budget for the GEF IEO in the amount of \$24.5 million for the GEF-7 cycle. This amount covers fiscal years FY20-FY 23.

38. For FY21, the GEF Council approved the annual operations budget of \$4.930 million and the multi-annual evaluation budget of \$1.700 million, for a total amount of \$6.630 million to execute the approved IEO work program.

39. The annual operations budget for FY21 was approved in the amount of \$4.825 million; this includes benefits, salaries, and fixed costs, plus some other operating costs. The projected amount of fixed cost to be disbursed is \$4.607 million, approximately 5% below budget. The savings is due to staff turnover. Two staff members, a senior evaluation officer in September 2020 and an evaluation analyst in May 2021, have moved to other positions.

40. The budgeted variable costs were \$105,000 and include the following items: 1) professional development, 2) participation in networks, and 3) IEO management. The projected amount of variable costs to be disbursed is \$92,000. The savings reflect the reduced costs related to travel for participation in evaluation network activities and training.

41. The multi-annual budget for evaluations for FY21 was approved in the amount of \$1.7 million. This amount has allowed the office to conduct evaluations, approved by the GEF Council, to complete the 7<sup>th</sup> Comprehensive Evaluation of the GEF (OPS7).<sup>3</sup> The projected amount to be disbursed by the end of FY21 is close to \$1.5 million or approximately 82% of the approved budget. The savings are mainly from zero travel expenses due to the pandemic.

42. During FY21, the office continued to draw on consultant expertise in conducting the evaluations. The office adheres to World Bank Human Resources policies in selection and hiring of consultants.

43. Based on the multi-annual nature of the evaluation budget, any undisbursed funds from the FY21 evaluation budget will be rolled over into FY22 budget, to continue and complete the evaluations currently under way and start the work program for FY 22 (Table 1).

---

<sup>3</sup> [Four Year Work Program and Budget of the Independent Evaluation Office – GEF-7. GEF/ME/C.56/03/Rev.01.](#)  
June 04, 2019

**Table 1: IEO Budget for FY 21**

| <i>Expense Category</i>                 | <i>FY21<br/>Approved<br/>Budget</i> | <i>FY21<br/>Estimated<br/>Expenses</i> |
|-----------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|----------------------------------------|
| <b><i>Fixed Cost</i></b>                |                                     |                                        |
| IEO Salaries and Benefits Cost          | 4,296                               | 4,115                                  |
| General Operations Cost                 | 529                                 | 492                                    |
| <b><i>Total (A)</i></b>                 | <b>4,825</b>                        | <b>4,607</b>                           |
| <b><i>Variable Cost</i></b>             |                                     |                                        |
| Professional Development                | 20                                  | 16                                     |
| Participations in Networks              | 20                                  | 20                                     |
| Knowledge Management                    | 65                                  | 56                                     |
| <b><i>Total (B)</i></b>                 | <b>105</b>                          | <b>92</b>                              |
| <b><i>Total Annual Budget (A+B)</i></b> | <b>4,930</b>                        | <b>4,699</b>                           |
| <b><i>Evaluations</i></b>               |                                     |                                        |
| Performance                             | 390                                 | 310                                    |
| Corporate Issues                        | 390                                 | 198                                    |
| Impact                                  | 390                                 | 270                                    |
| OPS7                                    | 530                                 | 690                                    |
| <b><i>Total Evaluations (C)</i></b>     | <b>1,700</b>                        | <b>1,468</b>                           |
| <b><i>Total IEO Budget (A+B+C)</i></b>  | <b>6,630</b>                        | <b>6,167</b>                           |

**Proposed IEO Budget FY22**

44. For FY22, the office is requesting a total amount of \$6.046 million within the approved envelope for the GEF-7 period. This includes an operations budget of \$5.146 million to cover salaries and benefits, fixed and variable costs (Table 2). The increase of approximately 4.1% in salaries and benefits is in accordance with the World Bank Salary Rate Increase for FY22.

45. The estimated evaluation budget for FY22 has been calculated at \$900,000. This amount will support the delivery of the work program, in particular the completion of OPS7 in time for the 8<sup>th</sup> replenishment meetings of the GEF.

46. The IEO is preparing a full dissemination plan for the OPS7. In addition to making the full report and all the evaluations underpinning OPS7 available on the IEO website, a variety of multimedia tools and channels will be used. Webinars, conferences and dissemination events will be held to share the rich findings from OPS7 and all component evaluations. All these activities will be especially designed to reach stakeholders at regional and country level.

**Table 2: IEO Budget Request for FY22**

| <i>Expense Category</i>          | <i>FY22<br/>Budget<br/>Request</i> |
|----------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| <i>Fixed Cost</i>                |                                    |
| IEO Salaries and Benefits Cost   | 4,472                              |
| General Operations Cost          | 545                                |
| <i>Total (A)</i>                 | <b>5,017</b>                       |
| <i>Variable Cost</i>             |                                    |
| Professional Development         | 20                                 |
| Participations in Networks       | 34                                 |
| Knowledge Management             | 75                                 |
| <i>Total (B)</i>                 | <b>129</b>                         |
| <i>Total Annual Budget (A+B)</i> | <b>5,146</b>                       |
| <i>Evaluations</i>               |                                    |
| Performance                      | 225                                |
| Corporate Issues                 | 200                                |
| Impact                           | 225                                |
| OPS7                             | 250                                |
| <i>Total Evaluations (C )</i>    | <b>900</b>                         |
| <i>Total IEO Budget (A+B+C)</i>  | <b>6,046</b>                       |

## Human Resources

47. During FY21, the IEO continued to operate with 19 staff but will close FY21 with 17 staff and two vacancies (table 3). The senior evaluation officer who was hired under the Donor Funded Staffing Program has returned to Japan on completion of the 4-year assignment, and an evaluation analyst will be moving to the World Bank before the end of this fiscal year. In response to the recommendations of the peer review, the IEO, together with the human resources team of the World Bank, will review and adjust the current organization and staffing structure in FY 2022, prior to filling the current vacancies.

**Table 3: IEO Staff Composition FY21**

|          | <b>IEO Staff</b>             |
|----------|------------------------------|
| <b>1</b> | Director                     |
| <b>1</b> | Chief Evaluation Officer     |
| <b>3</b> | Senior Evaluation Officer    |
| <b>1</b> | Senior Operations Officer    |
| <b>4</b> | Evaluation Officer           |
| <b>1</b> | Knowledge Management Officer |
| <b>2</b> | Evaluation Analyst           |
| <b>1</b> | Information Analyst          |
| <b>1</b> | Research Assistant           |
| <b>1</b> | Senior Executive Assistant   |
| <b>1</b> | Program Assistant            |