

Terms of Reference

GEF Country Portfolio Evaluation: Moldova (1994-2009)

GEF Evaluation Office

December 2009

BACKGROUND AND INTRODUCTION

1. At the request of the Global Environment Facility (GEF) Council, the Evaluation Office conducts Country Portfolio Evaluations (CPE) every year.¹ This year, Moldova and Turkey have been selected. These Terms of Reference (TOR) relate to the Moldova CPE. CPEs aim to provide the GEF Council with an assessment of results and performance of GEF supported activities at country level, and of how GEF supported activities fit into the national strategies and priorities as well as within the global environmental mandate of the GEF.

2. Countries are selected for portfolio evaluations among 160 GEF eligible countries, based on a stratified randomized selection and a set of strategic criteria.² The evaluation findings and recommendations from the Moldova and Turkey CPEs will be synthesized in a single report, the Annual Country Portfolio Evaluation Report (ACPER) 2010, which will be presented to Council at its June 2010 meeting. Among several considerations, Moldova was selected based on its large and diverse portfolio, including projects in all GEF focal areas, its group allocations under the RAF for climate change and biodiversity, and the country's participation in both Black Sea and Danube River regional projects.

3. The Republic of Moldova is a small country of 3.63 million people with a per capita income of \$1,470 (2008)³ that became independent in August 1991 after the collapse of the former Soviet Union. As a result of constitutional changes, Moldova became a parliamentary republic in 2000. Following a decade of economic decline and fragmented institutional development, Moldova has since 2000 enjoyed relative political stability and sustained economic recovery. However, many challenges remain. Moldova has the lowest GDP amongst European nations and a vulnerable economy that relies heavily on remittances from citizens working abroad. Its agriculture-based economy is susceptible to drought and changing external market pressures. The environment suffers from the heavy use of agricultural chemicals, and poor farming methods have caused widespread soil erosion. In 2005, Moldova's CO₂ emissions were 2.1 metric tons per capita.⁴ As of 2003, only 1.4 percent of Moldova's total land area was protected.⁵

4. Moldova aspires to join the European Union over the long term. In this context, approximation with the EU environmental legislation is both a major challenge and an important priority. In 1995 Moldova signed the Partnership and Cooperation Agreement with the EU, which entered into force in 1998. The agreement sets up the framework for cooperation between the EU and neighboring countries.

5. Since 1994, the GEF has invested about \$23.91 million (with about \$24.44 million in cofinancing) through 15 national projects, namely five in biodiversity, five in climate change, two in international waters, two in POPs, and one multifocal project. Table 1 breaks down GEF support according to GEF Agency and focal area. The World Bank, with eight projects totaling \$19.87 million, has been the main channel for GEF support in Moldova followed by UNDP (five projects totaling \$2.55 million). The majority of closed national projects were implemented through the World Bank while most of the new activities are through UNDP.

¹ So far nine countries have been evaluated: Costa Rica, the Philippines, Samoa, Cameroon, Benin, Madagascar, South Africa, Egypt and Syria.

² http://www.gefeo.org/uploadedFiles/Evaluation_Office/Country_Portfolio_Evaluations/Ongoing_Evals-Country_Portfolio_Evals-Notes_on_Selection_Criteria.pdf

³ World Development Indicators database, World Bank, September 2009.

⁴ Ibid.

⁵ Earth Trends, 2003.

Table 1
GEF Support to National Projects by Focal Area and GEF Agency

Agency	Focal area	GEF amount (Million \$)	Number of projects
World Bank	Biodiversity	1.40	3
	Climate change	0.97	1
	International waters	9.51	2
	POPs	7.98	2
	Subtotal	19.87	8
UNDP	Biodiversity	0.95	1
	Climate change	1.40	3
	Multifocal	0.20	1
	Subtotal	2.55	5
UNEP	Biodiversity	0.54	1
UNIDO	Climate change	0.96	1
	Total	23.91	15

6. In biodiversity, GEF support has concentrated on conservation and management of protected areas, and efforts to meet biosafety obligations. In climate change, it has focused on renewable energy from agricultural waste and energy efficiency in buildings. The international waters projects focused on agricultural pollution control and environmental infrastructure. For POPs, the focus has been on safely managing and disposing of stockpiles of POPs contaminated pesticides and PCBs, and strengthening the regulatory and institution arrangements in Moldova. GEF support also included a series of enabling activities for all the focal areas, as requested and required by the international conventions for which the GEF serves as financial mechanism. Financing for the enabling activities supported by GEF is about \$1.5 million.

7. In addition, Moldova has participated in 17 initiatives financially supported by the GEF with a regional or global scope. Table 2 breaks down these projects. Most of the regional projects involving Moldova are international waters projects for the Danube River and Black Sea. The global projects have played a key role in developing communications to UN conventions and developing frameworks and actions plans.

Table 2
Regional and Global Projects involving Moldova by Focal area and GEF Agency

Focal area	WB	UNDP	UNEP	UNDP/UNEP	FAO	Total
Biodiversity			3	1		4
Climate change		1		1		2
International waters	3	5				8
POPs			1	1	1	3
Total	3	6	4	3	1	17

OBJECTIVES OF THE EVALUATION

8. Based on the overall CPE purpose (above) of the GEF CPEs, the evaluation for Moldova will have the following specific objectives:

- Independently evaluate the **relevance** and **efficiency** of GEF support in a country from several points of view:⁶ national environmental frameworks and decision-making processes, the GEF mandate and the achievement of global environmental benefits, and GEF policies and procedures.

⁶ **Relevance:** the extent to which the objectives of the GEF activity are consistent with beneficiaries' requirements, country needs, global priorities and partners' and donors' policies, including changes over time; **Efficiency:** The extent to which results have been delivered with the least costly resources possible (funds, expertise, time, etc.).

- Assess the **effectiveness** and **results** of completed and ongoing projects in each relevant focal area.⁷
- Provide **feedback** and **knowledge** sharing to (1) the GEF Council in its decision making process to allocate resources and to develop policies and strategies, (2) the country on its participation in the GEF, and (3) the different agencies and organizations involved in the preparation and implementation of GEF support.

9. The CPE will also be used to provide information and evidence to other evaluations being conducted by the GEF Evaluation Office. The evaluation will address the performance of the GEF portfolio in Moldova in terms of relevance, efficiency and effectiveness as well as the contributing factors to this performance. The Moldova CPE will analyze the performance of individual projects as part of the overall GEF portfolio, but without rating such projects. CPEs do not have an objective of evaluating or rating the performance of the GEF Agencies, partners, or national governments.

KEY EVALUATION QUESTIONS

10. The Moldova CPE will be guided by the following key questions:

Relevance

1. Is GEF support relevant to national development needs and challenges as established in the Economical Growth and Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper and the National Development Strategy and Action Plan?
2. Is GEF support relevant to national environmental priorities, in particular to the Moldovan Concept of Environmental Policy, and to Moldova's GEF focal area strategic documents?
3. Do the GEF and its Agencies support the establishment of priorities for sustainable development and environmental protection, and related decision-making processes within Moldova?
4. Is GEF support relevant to the objectives of the various global environmental benefits (that is, biodiversity, greenhouse gases, international waters, POPs, and land degradation)?
5. Is Moldova supporting the GEF mandate and focal area programs and strategies with its own resources and/or support from other donors?

Efficiency

1. How much time, effort and financial resources does it take to develop and implement projects, by type of GEF support modality?
2. What is the role of the various stakeholders in the implementation of GEF projects? How do they operate and how are their activities coordinated?
3. How successful is the participatory approach in project preparation and implementation?
4. What are the synergies among GEF Agencies in programming and implementation?
5. What are the synergies between national institutions for GEF support in programming and implementation?
6. What are the synergies between GEF support and other donors' support?
7. How efficient is the GEF focal point mechanism?

Effectiveness, results and sustainability⁸

1. Is GEF support effective in producing results (outcomes and impacts) at the project level?
2. Is GEF support effective in producing results (outcomes and impacts) at the aggregate level by focal area?

⁷ **Results:** the output, outcome or impact (intended or unintended, positive and/or negative) of a GEF activity; **Effectiveness:** the extent to which the GEF activity's objectives were achieved, or are expected to be achieved, taking into account their relative importance.

⁸ **Sustainability:** The likelihood that an intervention will continue to deliver benefits for an extended period of time after completion.

3. Is GEF support effective in producing results (outcomes and impacts) at the country level?
4. How successful is the dissemination of GEF project lessons and results?
5. Is GEF support effective in producing sustainable results that are maintained after project completion?

11. Each question is supported by a preliminary evaluation matrix, which is presented in annex 1. The matrix contains a tentative list of indicators or basic data, potential sources of information, and methodology components, and will be validated or further developed by the evaluation team once the evaluation phase starts. As a basis, the evaluation will use the indicators from GEF project documents as well as relevant indicators of the focal areas and the RAF. These will be complemented by appropriate and available national sustainable development and environmental indicator.

SCOPE AND LIMITATIONS

12. The Moldova CPE will cover all types of GEF supported activities in the country at all stages of the project cycle (pipeline, ongoing and completed) and implemented by all GEF Agencies in all focal areas, including applicable GEF corporate activities. The main focus of the evaluation will be national projects.

13. In addition, some of the most important regional and global projects in which Moldova participated will be reviewed. This part of the evaluation will review the overall GEF support to Moldova through these regional projects, report on results within Moldova and describe the ways in which Moldova participated in them. The review of selected regional projects will feed in the aggregate assessment of the national GEF portfolio described above.

14. The stage of the project will determine the expected focus of the analysis (see table 3).

Table 3
Focus of Evaluation According to Stage of Project

Project Status	Focus		On a exploratory basis	
	Relevance	Efficiency	Effectiveness	Results
Completed	Full	Full	Full	Full
Ongoing	Full	Partially	Likelihood	Likelihood
Pipeline	Expected	Processes	n.a.	n.a.

Note: n.a.= not applicable.

15. CPEs are challenging as the GEF does not yet operate by establishing country programs that specify expected achievements through programmatic objectives, indicators, and targets.⁹ In general, CPEs entail some degree of retrofitting of frameworks to be able to judge the relevance of the aggregated results of a diverse portfolio of projects. Accordingly, the approach the GEF Evaluation Office uses to conduct CPEs will be adapted and will be informed by other relevant national and GEF Agency strategies, country programs, and planning frameworks as a basis for assessing the aggregate results and relevance of GEF support in Moldova.

16. GEF support is provided through partnerships with many institutions operating at different levels, so it is challenging to consider GEF support separately. The CPE will not attempt to provide a direct attribution of development results to the GEF, but address the contribution of GEF support to the overall achievements, that is, to establish a credible link between what GEF supported and its implications. The evaluation will address how GEF support has contributed to overall achievements in partnership with others, by questions on roles and coordination, synergies and complementarities, and knowledge sharing.

17. The assessment of results will be focused, where possible, at the level of outcomes and impacts rather than outputs. Project-level results will be measured against the overall expected impact and

⁹ Voluntary GEF national business plans will be introduced in GEF-5.

outcomes from each project. Expected impacts at the focal area level will be assessed in the context of GEF objectives and indicators of global environmental benefits. Outcomes at the focal area level will be primarily assessed in relation to catalytic and replication effects, institutional sustainability and capacity development, and awareness.

18. Of the 15 national projects, nine have been completed, four are ongoing and the other two have been approved. Only one full-size project (Agricultural Pollution Control) and one medium-size project (Renewable Energy from Agricultural Wastes) both implemented through the World Bank have been completed. A second medium-size project (Biodiversity Conservation in the Lower Dniester Delta Ecosystem, implemented through the World Bank) was closed before completion of project activities. The remaining six completed projects are enabling activities: two on producing national reports to the CBD (through the World Bank); two on generating reports to the UNFCCC (through UNDP); one on POPs (through the World Bank); and the National Capacity Self Assessment (through UNDP). Projects under implementation include the nearly completed Environmental Infrastructure Project and the POPs Management and Destruction Project both implemented through the World Bank. Support to the Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework is implemented through UNEP, and the Improving Coverage and Management Effectiveness of the Protected Area System in Moldova implemented through UNDP started in June 2009. Reducing GHG Emissions through Improved Energy Efficiency in the Industrial Sector has been PPG approved and will be implemented through UNIDO. The remaining pipeline project, Reducing GHG Emissions through Improved Energy Efficiency in the Residential Sector implemented through UNDP has not progressed beyond the PFDA stage. In addition, there are four projects that were dropped including one proposed by EBRD on waste water treatment, two land degradation proposals from UNDP, and one World Bank biodiversity project.

19. The context in which these projects were developed, approved and are being implemented constitutes a focus of the evaluation. This includes a historical causality assessment of the national sustainable development and environmental policies, strategies and priorities, legal environment in which these policies are implemented and enforced, GEF Agency country strategies and programs and the GEF policies, principles, programs and strategies.

20. Weaknesses of M&E at the project and GEF program levels have been mentioned in past CPEs and other evaluations of the Office, and may pose challenges to the Moldova CPE as well. Not all the information which will be used for the analysis will be of a quantitative nature.

METHODOLOGY

21. The Moldova CPE will be conducted by staff of the GEF Evaluation Office and regional and local consultants, that is the evaluation team, led by a task manager from the GEF Evaluation Office. The team includes technical expertise on the national environmental and sustainable development strategies, evaluation methodologies, and the GEF. The consultants selected qualify under the GEF Evaluation Office Ethical Guidelines, and are requested to sign a declaration of interest to indicate no recent (last 3-5 years) relationship with GEF support in the country. The GEF focal point in Moldova, although not a member of the evaluation team, will be an essential partner in the evaluation.

22. The methodology includes a series of components using a combination of qualitative and quantitative methods and tools. The qualitative aspects of the evaluation include a desk review of existing documentation. The expected sources of information include:

- At the **project level**, project documents, project implementation reports, terminal evaluations, terminal evaluation reviews, reports from monitoring visits, and any other technical documents produced by projects

- At the **country level**, national sustainable development agendas, environmental priorities and strategies, GEF-wide, focal area strategies and action plans, global and national environmental indicators
- At the **Agency level**, country assistance strategies and frameworks and their evaluations and reviews
- **Evaluative evidence** at country level from GEF Evaluation Office evaluations, such as those related to the Program Study on International Waters, overall performance studies and/or other studies
- **Interviews** with GEF stakeholders, including the GEF focal point and all other relevant government ministries, bilateral and multilateral donors including the European Commission, civil society organizations and academia (including both local and international NGOs with a presence in Moldova), GEF Agencies (World Bank, UNDP, UNEP, UNIDO), and the national convention focal points;
- **Interviews** with GEF beneficiaries and supported institutions, municipal governments and associations, and local communities and authorities
- **Field visits** to select project sites
- Information from national consultation **workshops**

23. The quantitative analysis will use indicators to assess the relevance and efficiency of GEF support using projects as the unit of analysis (that is, linkages with national priorities, time and cost of preparing and implementing projects, and so forth) and to measure GEF results (that is, progress towards achieving global environmental impacts) and performance of projects (such as implementation and completion ratings). The analysis will also use available statistics and scientific sources, especially for national environmental indicators.

24. The evaluation team will use standard tools and protocols for the CPEs and adapt these to the Moldovan context. These tools include a project review protocol to conduct the desk and field reviews of GEF projects and interview guides to conduct interviews with different stakeholders.

25. A selection of project sites will be visited, including but not limited to the context of conducting the two ROTI field studies (see below). The criteria for selecting the sites will be finalized during the implementation of the evaluation, but emphasis will be placed on completed projects and those clustered within a particular geographic area, given time and financial resource limitations. The evaluation team will decide on specific sites to visit based on the initial review of documentation and balancing needs of representation as well as cost-effectiveness of conducting the field visits.

PROCESS AND OUTPUTS

26. These country-specific TOR have been prepared based on an initial GEF Evaluation Office visit to Moldova in November 2009, undertaken with the purpose of scoping the evaluation and identifying key issues to be included in the analysis. It was also an opportunity to officially launch the evaluation, while at the same time introduce the selected local consultant to GEF national stakeholders. These TOR conclude the Moldova CPE preparatory phase, and set the scene for the evaluation phase, during which the evaluation team will complete the following tasks:

- Complete the ongoing **literature review** to extract existing reliable evaluative evidence.
- Prepare specific inputs to the evaluation:¹⁰

¹⁰ These inputs are working documents and are not expected to be published as separate documents.

- **GEF portfolio database**, which describes all GEF support activities within the country, basic information (GEF Agency, focal area, GEF modality), their implementation status, project cycle information, GEF and cofinancing financial information, major objectives and expected (or actual) results, key partners per project and so on.
 - **Country Environmental Legal Framework**, which provides the historical perspective of the context in which the GEF projects have been developed and implemented. This document will be based on information on environmental legislation, environmental policies of each government administration (plans, strategies, and similar), and the international agreements signed by the country presented and analyzed through time so to be able to connect with particular GEF support.
 - **Global Environmental Benefits Assessment**, which provides an assessment of the country's contribution to the GEF mandate and its focal areas based on appropriate indicators, such as those used in the RAF (biodiversity and climate change) and other indicators extracted from project documents and other relevant sources.
 - **Review of Outcomes to Impact (ROtI)** field studies of two national projects completed at least two years, selected in consultation with the Evaluation Office staff, to strengthen the information gathering and analysis on results.
- Conduct the **evaluation analysis and triangulation** of collected information and evidence from various sources, tools and methods. This will be done during the GEF Evaluation Office staff's second country visit to consolidate the evidence gathered so far and fill in any eventual information and analysis gaps before formulating findings, conclusions, and preliminary recommendations. During this visit, additional field work will be undertaken as needed.
 - Conduct a **national consultation workshop** with the government and national stakeholders, including project staff, donors and GEF Agencies, to present and gather stakeholders' feedback on the main CPE findings, conclusions, and preliminary recommendations to be included in a first draft CPE report. The workshop will also be an opportunity to verify eventual errors of facts or analysis in case these are supported by adequate additional evidence brought to the attention of the evaluation team.
 - Prepare a **final Moldova CPE report**, which incorporates comments received and will be presented to the GEF Council and to the Moldovan government (annex 2 presents a tentative outline). The GEF Evaluation Office will bear full responsibility for the content of the report.

27. As indicated above, the GEF focal point will be an intrinsic and essential partner in this evaluation. The Ministry of Environment (MoE) has been requested to provide support to the evaluation, such as identifying key people to be interviewed; communicating with relevant government departments; supporting organization of interviews, field visits, and meetings; and identifying main documents. The GEF Agencies will be requested to provide support to the evaluation on their specific projects or activities supported by the GEF, including identification of key project and Agency staff to be interviewed, participation in interviews, arrangement of field visits to projects, and provision of project documentation and data.

28. The evaluation will be conducted between October 2009 and May 2010. The key milestones of the evaluation are presented here below.

EVALUATION KEY MILESTONES

Milestone	Deadline
Literature review	November 30, 2009
Finalization of the GEF Moldova portfolio database	November 30, 2009
Country Environmental Legal Framework	December 31, 2009
Global Environmental Benefits Assessment	December 31, 2009
Two field ROtI studies	January 15, 2010
Data collection/interviews and project review protocols	February 15, 2010
Consolidation of evaluative evidence, eventual additional field visits	February 15, 2010
National consultation workshop	March 15, 2010
Draft CPE report circulated to stakeholders for comments	March 29, 2010
Incorporation of comments in a final CPE report	May 10, 2010
Final draft CPE report	May 26, 2010

Annex 1: Evaluation Matrix

Key question	Indicators/basic data	Sources of information	Methodology
Is GEF support relevant?			
Is GEF support relevant to national development needs and challenges as established in the Economical Growth and Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper and the National Development Strategy and Action Plan?	GEF supports development needs (i.e., income generating, capacity building) and reduces challenges	Relevant country level sustainable development and environment policies, strategies and action plans	Desk review, GEF portfolio analysis by focal area, Agency, modality and project status (national)
	The GEF's various types of modalities, projects and instruments are in coherence with country's needs and challenges	Project-related documentation (project document and logframe, implementation reports, terminal evaluations, TE reviews, etc.), PMIS, Agencies' project databases	
		Government officials, agencies' staff, donors and civil society representatives	
		Country Legal Environmental Framework	
Is GEF support relevant to national environmental priorities, in particular to the Moldovan Concept of Environmental Policy, and to Moldova's GEF focal area strategic documents?	GEF support is within Moldova's environmental priorities	Relevant country level sustainable development and environment policies, strategies and action plans, in particular the Moldovan Concept of Environmental Policy	Desk review, GEF portfolio analysis by focal area, Agency, modality and project status (national)
		Project-related documentation (project document and logframe, implementation reports, terminal evaluations, TE reviews, etc.), PMIS, Agencies' project databases	
	Level of GEF funding compared to other ODA in the environmental sector	Available databases (international as WB, OECD, etc., and national, i.e. dept. of statistics, other)	Stakeholder consultation (focus groups, individual interviews)
	GEF support linked to the national environmental action plan (NEAP); national communications to UNFCCC; national POPs; National Capacity Self-Assessment (NCSA); etc.	GEF-supported enabling activities and products (NCSA, NEAP, national communications to UN Conventions, etc.)	
	GEF support has country ownership and is country based (i.e., project origin, design and implementation)	Government officials, agencies' staff, donors and civil society representatives	
		Country Legal Environmental Framework	
Do the GEF and its Agencies support the establishment of priorities for sustainable development and environmental protection, and related decision-making processes within Moldova?	Relevant national policies and strategic documents include set of priorities, which reflect the results and outcomes of relevant GEF support	Project-related documentation (project document and logframe, implementation reports, terminal evaluations, TE reviews, etc.), PMIS, Agencies' project databases	Desk review
	GEF activities facilitate and contribute to decision-making process leading the the definition of sustainable development and environmental protection priorities	Government officials, agencies' staff, donors and civil society representatives	Stakeholder consultation (focus groups, individual interviews)
		Country Legal Environmental Framework	Literature review, timelines, historical causality, etc.

Key question	Indicators/basic data	Sources of information	Methodology
Is GEF support relevant? (continued)			
Is GEF support relevant to the objectives of the various global environmental benefits (that is biodiversity, greenhouse gases, international waters, POPs, land degradation, etc.)?	Project outcomes and impacts are related to the RAF Global Benefit Index (for biodiversity and climate	National Convention action plans, RAF, BD scorecard, etc.	Desk review, project field visits, project review protocols
		Country Legal Environmental Framework	Literature review, timelines, historical causality, etc.
	GEF support linked to national commitments to Conventions	Project-related documentation (project document and logframe, implementation reports, terminal evaluations, TE reviews, etc.), PMIS, Agencies' project databases	GEF portfolio analysis by focal area, Agency, modality and project status (national)
		Government officials, agencies' staff, donors and civil society representatives	Stakeholder consultation (focus groups, individual interviews)
Is Moldova supporting the GEF mandate and focal area programs and strategies with its own resources and/or support from other donors?	GEF activities, country commitment and project counterparts support GEF mandate and focal area programs and strategies (i.e., catalytic and replication, etc.)	Global Environmental Benefits Assessment	Literature review
		GEF Instrument, Council decisions, focal area strategies, GEF4 programming strategy.	Desk review, GEF portfolio analysis by focal area, Agency, modality and project status (national)
		Project-related documentation (project document and logframe, implementation reports, terminal evaluations, TE reviews, etc.), PMIS, Agencies' project databases	
		GEF Secretariat staff and technical staff from GEF Agencies	Interviews
		Global Environmental Benefits Assessment	Literature review
		Country Legal Environmental Framework	Literature review, timelines, historical causality, etc.

Key question	Indicators/basic data	Sources of information	Methodology
Is GEF support efficient?			
How much time, money and effort does it take to develop and implement a project, by type of GEF support modality?	Process indicators: processing timing (according to project cycle steps), preparation and implementation cost by type of modalities, etc.	Project-related documentation (project documents and logframes, implementation reports, terminal evaluations, TE reviews, etc.), PMS, Agencies project databases, RAF pipeline	Desk review, GEF portfolio analysis, timelines
	Process of identifying and approving projects, including cooperation with focal point		
	Projects dropped after PDF and cancelled projects	GEF Secretariat and Agencies' staff and government officials, GEF Focal Point	Interviews, field visits, project review protocols
	GEF vs. cofinancing	National and local government officials, donors, NGOs, beneficiaries	
What is the role of various stakeholders in the implementation of GEF projects? How do they operate and how are their activities coordinated?	Level of participation	Project-related reviews (implementation reports, terminal evaluations, TE reviews, etc.)	Desk review and meta analysis of evaluation reports
	Roles and responsibilities of GEF actors	Project staff, government officials	
	Coordination between GEF projects	GEF Secretariat staff and technical staff from GEF Agencies	Interviews, field visits, institutional analysis
	Existence of a national coordination mechanism for GEF support		
How successful is the participatory approach in project preparation and implementation?	Extend of participatory approach in project preparation and implementation	Project-related reviews (implementation reports, terminal evaluations, TE reviews, etc.)	Desk review and meta analysis of evaluation reports
	Awareness of and support to the project	Project staff, government officials, NGOs, beneficiaries	
	Project preparation and implementation integrate various stakeholders' views	GEF Secretariat staff and technical staff from GEF Agencies	Interviews, field visits
What are the synergies among GEF Agencies in programming and implementation?	Acknowledgement between GEF Agencies of each other's projects	Project-related reviews (implementation reports, terminal evaluations, TE reviews, etc.)	Desk review and meta analysis of evaluation reports, interviews and field visits
	Effective communication and technical support between GEF project agencies and organizations	GEF Agency staff, national executing agencies (NGOs, other)	
What are the synergies between national institutions for GEF support in programming and implementation?	Acknowledgement between institutions of each other's projects	Project-related reviews (implementation reports, terminal evaluations, TE reviews, etc.)	Desk review and meta analysis of evaluation reports, interviews and field visits
	Effective communication and technical support between national institutions	Project staff, national and local government officials	
What are the synergies between GEF support and other donors' support?	Acknowledgement between institutions of each other's projects	Project-related reviews (implementation reports, terminal evaluations, TE reviews, etc.)	Desk review, focus groups and individual interviews, and field visits
	Effective communication and technical support between institutions	NGO staffs and donors' representatives	
	Complementarity of GEF support	Evaluations of other donors' funded projects	Meta analysis of evaluation reports
How efficient is the GEF focal point mechanism?	Transparency and efficiency of project preparation and approval process	Project staff, national and local government officials, beneficiaries	Individual interviews, field visits, institutional analysis
	Efficient coordination of different stakeholders in project preparation and implementation	GEF Secretariat staff and technical staff from GEF Agencies	
	Effective communication with other stakeholders, including feedback on project implementation		

Key question	Indicators/basic data	Sources of information	Methodology
Is GEF support effective in producing results which are sustainable?			
Is GEF support effective in producing results (outcomes and impacts) at the project level?	Project outcomes and impacts	Project staffs and beneficiaries, national and local government representatives ROtI studies	Focus groups and individual interviews ROtI methodology
	Existing ratings for project outcomes (i.e., self-ratings and independent ratings)	Project-related reviews (implementation reports, terminal evaluations, TE reviews, etc.)	Desk review, project review protocols
	Changes in global benefit indexes and other global environmental indicators	Evaluative evidence from projects and donors, Global Environmental Benefits Assessment	Literature review, meta analysis of evaluation reports
Is GEF support effective in producing results (outcomes and impacts) at the aggregate level by focal area?	Aggregated outcomes and impact from above	Project staffs and beneficiaries, national and local government representatives	Focus groups and individual interviews
		ROtI studies	ROtI methodology
		Project-related reviews (implementation reports, terminal evaluations, TE reviews, etc.)	GEF Portfolio aggregate analysis
	Catalytic and replication effect	Data from overall projects and other donors	Desk review
		ROtI studies	ROtI methodology
		Project staffs and beneficiaries, national and local government representatives	Focus groups and individual interviews
	Contribution by the GEF	Data from overall projects and other donors	Desk review
		ROtI studies	ROtI methodology
Is GEF support effective in producing results (outcomes and impacts) at the country level?	Aggregated outcomes and impact from above	Project-related documentation (project documents and logframes, implementation reports, terminal evaluations, TE reviews, etc.)	GEF portfolio aggregate analysis, desk review
	Overall outcomes and impacts of GEF support	Project staffs and beneficiaries, national and local government representatives	Field visits, focus groups and individual interviews
	Catalytic and replication effect	Data from projects financed by other donors and or by the government. ROtI studies	Desk review, ROtI methodology
How successful is the dissemination of GEF project lessons and results?	Project design, preparation and implementation have incorporated lessons from previous projects within and outside GEF	Project-related reviews (implementation reports, terminal evaluations, TE reviews, etc.), ROtI studies, project staffs and beneficiaries, national and local government representatives	Desk review, ROtI methodology, GEF portfolio and pipeline analysis
	Effective communication of project lessons and results, development of specific tools for dissemination		
	Use of project results by other projects and reciprocally	NGO staffs, Project staff and beneficiaries, national and local government representatives	Focus groups and individual interviews
Is GEF support effective in producing sustainable results that are maintained after project completion?	Availability of financial and economic resources	Project-related reviews (implementation reports, terminal evaluations, TE reviews, etc.), NGO staffs, Project staffs and beneficiaries, national and local government representatives, ROtI studies	Desk review, focus groups and individual interviews, project review protocols, ROtI methodology, GEF portfolio analysis
	Stakeholders' ownership, social factors		
	Existence of a technical know how		
	Environmental risks		
	Existence of an institutional and legal framework	Country legal environmental framework	Literature review, timelines, historical causality, etc.

Annex 2: CPE Report Outline

CHAPTER 1. Main Conclusions and Recommendations

Background

Scope and Methodology

Conclusions on the portfolio

- Relevance
- Efficiency
- Results and effectiveness

Recommendations

CHAPTER 2. Evaluation Framework

Background

Objectives of the Evaluation

Key Questions for the Evaluation

Methodology

CHAPTER 3. Context of the Evaluation

Moldova: General description

Brief description of environmental resources in key GEF support areas

The environmental legal framework in Moldova

The environmental policy framework in Moldova

The Global Environmental Facility: General description

CHAPTER 4. Activities funded by the GEF in Moldova

Introduction

Activities considered in the Evaluation

Activities over time

Evolution of the GEF funding to the country

CHAPTER 5. Relevance of GEF support in Moldova

Relevance of GEF Support to the Country's Sustainable Development Agenda and Environmental Priorities

Relevance of GEF Support to Country's Decisions and Processes

Relevance of GEF Support to National Action Plans within GEF Focal Areas

Relevance of GEF Support to the achievement of Global Environmental Benefits

Relevance of the GEF Portfolio to Other Global and National Organizations

CHAPTER 6. Efficiency of GEF supported activities in Moldova

Time, effort and money to develop and implement projects, by type of GEF support modality

Roles and Responsibilities among Different Stakeholders in Project Implementation

The GEF Focal Point Mechanism in the Country

Lessons Learned between GEF Projects

Synergies between GEF Stakeholders and Projects

CHAPTER 6. Results of GEF support to Moldova

Global Environmental Impacts

Catalytic and replication effects

Institutional sustainability and capacity building

Details of project results