

Terms of Reference

Turkey Country Portfolio Evaluation (1992-2009)

GEF Evaluation Office

November 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, Turkey and Moldova have been selected. These Terms of Reference (TOR) relate to the Turkey CPE. CPEs aim to provide the GEF Council with an assessment of results and performance of the GEF supported activities at country level, and of how the 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 criteria². The evaluations findings and recommendations from the Turkey and Moldova 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, Turkey was selected based on its large portfolio with significant emphasis on biodiversity and climate change, its uniqueness as a key partner country for major GEF regional projects in international waters, and the influence of the European Union (EU) accession process is having on the redesigning of Turkish national environment and sustainable development agenda.

3. In recent years Turkey, a middle-income country with a population of about 74 million inhabitants and a per capita income of \$8,000 (2008 est.),³ has experienced significant social, political and economic transformations. Turkey's economic growth averaged at 6% per year in the period 2002-2007, one of the highest sustained rates in the world. The rapid economic growth, industrialization and population increase are placing increasing stress on the vulnerable ecosystems of the country, and issues related to unsustainable exploitation of natural resources, extensive air, water and land pollution, and inadequate waste management systems remain challenges. Despite Turkey's rich biodiversity benefited in recent years from national forestation efforts and an extension of protected areas, now accounting for more than 5% of the country's total land area,⁴ deforestation and soil erosion are still a problem. Wetlands, protected areas and biodiversity are under pressure from urbanization, tourism and rapid economic development.

4. The EU accession process is having an influence in shaping the country's sustainable development and environment agenda. Turkey has recently ratified both the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants (POP) and the Kyoto Protocol, although the latter without an indication of emission reduction targets. According to a recent OECD report, Turkey compares well with other OECD countries in terms of biodiversity and its relatively low level of greenhouse gas emissions per head of population,⁵ but it faces significant future environmental challenges due to unsustainable patterns of

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 Bank ED Stats, 2008.

⁴ Environmental Performance Review: Turkey. OECD, Paris, c2008.

⁵ Ibid.

production and consumption. The Turkish Government recognizes that while environmental protection can be seen as a cost item in the short run, it enhances and makes competitiveness sustainable in the long run.⁶

5. Since 1991, the GEF has invested about US\$36.76 million (with about US\$81.25 million in co-financing) through 13 national projects, namely 6 in biodiversity, 4 in climate change, 1 in international waters, 1 multi-focal and 1 in POPs, plus the Small Grants Program (SGP). Started in 1993, the SGP has financed 172 projects to date in all GEF focal areas, with a total GEF contribution of US\$3,275,401. Following the introduction of the Resource Allocation Framework (RAF) in 2006, the SGP only finances grants in biodiversity and climate change.

Table 1: GEF support to national projects by focal area and GEF Agencies (US\$ million)

Agency	Focal Area	Total/Focal Area	Totals
World Bank	Biodiversity	13.30	
	International Waters	7.30	20.60
UNDP	Biodiversity	3.30	
	Climate Change	5.73	9.03
UNEP	Biodiversity	0.56	
	Multifocal	0.20	0.76
UNIDO	POPs	0.47	0.47
UNDP/UNIDO	Biodiversity	5.90	5.90
Total			36.76

6. GEF projects in Turkey are implemented mainly by the World Bank and UNDP. The World Bank involvement as a GEF agency in Turkey started earlier in biodiversity and protected area management, and is now limited to a sizeable investment, the Anatolia Watershed Management Project, which classified under international waters as it is part of the regional WB-GEF Strategic Partnership for Nutrient Reduction in the Danube River and Black Sea. UNDP earlier involvement was mainly on regional projects in the international waters focal area. UNDP provided implementing role also to the Enabling Activity for the preparation of Turkey's First National Communication to UNFCCC which was completed in 2007. UNDP also completed Turkey's First and Second GEF National Dialogues in 2005 and 2009 respectively. Today, UNDP has somehow taken over from the World Bank the work in biodiversity, and just started implementation of two projects, one on marine and coastal protected areas on the Mediterranean coast, and the other on forest protected areas in the Kure Mountains. UNDP also provides technical assistance to prepare full scale projects in the field of Energy Efficiency for Appliances and Building. UNEP has been involved in two enabling activities, one on the development of the National Biodiversity Strategic Action Plan (NBSAP) completed in 2007, and the other multi-focal, the National Capacity Self Assessment (NCSA) for global environmental management, which is about to be completed. UNIDO is involved with UNDP in one of the three full size projects on climate change on improving energy efficiency in industry, and has completed an enabling activity on POPs. The large majority of regional and global projects involving Turkey in international waters deal with the Black Sea and the Mediterranean Sea. Turkey has been allocated a substantial amount of resources for GEF4 through the RAF, namely \$6.55 for biodiversity and \$19.4 for climate change.

Table 2: Regional and global projects involving Turkey by focal area and GEF Agency

Focal Area	WB	UNDP	UNEP	UNEP/UNIDO	Total
Biodiversity			2		2
Climate Change	1				1
International Waters	5	7	1		13
Multi Focal	1	1		1	3
Land Degradation			1		1
Total	7	8	4	1	20

⁶ Ninth Development Plan, 2007-2013. T.R. Prime Ministry, State Planning Organization.
(<http://ekutup.dpt.gov.tr/plan/ix/9developmentplan.pdf>)

OBJECTIVES OF THE EVALUATION

7. Based on the overall CPE purpose specified above, the evaluation for Turkey will aim at:
 - a. independently evaluating the **relevance** and **efficiency**⁷ of the GEF support in a country from the points of view of national environmental frameworks and decision-making processes, the GEF mandate and the achievement of global environmental benefits, and GEF policies and procedures;
 - b. assessing the **effectiveness** and **results**⁸ of completed and on-going projects in each relevant focal area; and
 - c. providing **feedback** and **knowledge** sharing to the GEF Council in its decision making process to allocate resources and to develop policies and strategies, to the Turkish Government on its participation in the GEF, and to the different agencies and organizations involved in the preparation and implementation of GEF support.
8. The Turkey CPE will also be used to provide information and evidence to other evaluations being conducted by the GEF Evaluation Office, among which the impact study on international waters and the Annual Performance Report (APR) 2009. The performance of the GEF portfolio in Turkey will be assessed in terms of relevance, efficiency and effectiveness, and of the contributing factors to this performance. The Turkey CPE will analyze the performance of individual projects as part of the overall GEF portfolio, but without rating such projects. CPEs do not aim at evaluating or rating the performance of the GEF Agencies, partners or national governments.

KEY EVALUATION QUESTIONS

9. The Turkey CPE will be guided by the following key questions:

Relevance

- a) Is GEF support relevant to Turkey's sustainable development agenda and environmental priorities that are currently being developed?
- b) How is the Turkish EU accession programme influencing the relevance of GEF support to Turkey?
- c) Is GEF support relevant to Turkey's development needs and challenges?
- d) Is GEF support relevant to Turkey's GEF focal area action plans?
- e) Is GEF support relevant to Global Environmental Benefits (i.e. biodiversity, GHG, international waters, POPs, land degradation, etc.)?
- f) Is GEF support relevant to addressing all focal areas which are important for Turkey?
- g) Is GEF support relevant to GEF mandate and focal area programs and strategies?

Efficiency

- a) How much time, money and effort does it take to develop and implement a project, by type of GEF support modality?

⁷ **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.).

⁸ **Effectiveness:** the extent to which the GEF activity's objectives were achieved, or are expected to be achieved, taking into account their relative importance. **Results:** the output, outcome or impact (intended or unintended, positive and/or negative) of a GEF activity.

- b) What role does Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) play in increasing project efficiency?
- c) What are the roles, engagement and coordination among various stakeholders in project implementation?
- d) Was the efficiency of the project ever measured or value for money approach used in project design and implementation?
- e) How is synergy and leverage with other projects in the region sought?
- f) Are there synergies among GEF Agencies in GEF programming and implementation?
- g) Are there synergies between national institutions for GEF support in programming and implementation?
- h) Are there synergies between GEF support and other donors' support?

Effectiveness, results and sustainability⁹

- a) Is GEF support effective in producing results at the project level?
- b) Is GEF support effective in producing results at the aggregate level (portfolio and program) by focal area?
- c) Is there enough good quality capacity development and awareness-raising about environment issues due to GEF?
- d) Is GEF support effective in producing results at the country level?
- e) Is GEF support effective in producing results related to the dissemination of lessons learned in GEF projects and with partners?
- f) How were GEF projects able to promote effective community-based NRM in Turkey's national parks?
- g) Is GEF support effective in producing results which last in time and continue after project completion?

10. 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 and/or further developed by the evaluation team once the evaluation phase starts. As a basis, the evaluation will use the indicators in the GEF project documents as well as indicators of each of the focal areas and RAF as well as any appropriate and available national sustainable development and environmental indicator.

SCOPE AND LIMITATIONS

11. The Turkey CPE will cover all types of GEF supported activities in the country at all stages of the project cycle (pipeline, on-going and completed) and implemented by all GEF Agencies in all focal areas, including applicable GEF corporate activities such as the SGP and the National Dialogues Initiative (NDI). The main focus of the evaluation will be the projects implemented within the boundaries of Turkey, i.e. the national projects, be them full size, medium size or enabling activities.

12. In addition, some of the most important regional and global projects in which Turkey participates will be reviewed, namely those related to the Black Sea cluster and the Mediterranean Sea cluster. Apparently, these projects are interlinked in a phased programmatic approach, which started before 2001

⁹ **Sustainability:** The likelihood that an intervention will continue to deliver benefits for an extended period of time after completion.

with the development of Strategic Action Plans (SAP) followed by the setup of a Strategic Partnership Investment Funds, currently delivered in subsequent funding tranches. This part of the evaluation will review the overall GEF support to Turkey through these regional projects, report on results within Turkey and describe the ways Turkey contributes to and/or participates in them. The review of selected regional projects will feed in the aggregate assessment of the national GEF portfolio described above.

13. 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
On-going	Full	Partially	Likelihood	Likelihood
Pipeline	Expected	Processes	n.a.	n.a.
SGP	Expected	Processes	Likelihood	Likelihood

14. CPEs are challenging as the GEF does not yet operate by establishing country programs that specify expected achievements through programmatic objectives, indicators, and targets.¹⁰ 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 standard CPE evaluation framework will be adapted along with the other relevant national and GEF Agencies' strategies, country programs and/or planning frameworks as a basis for assessing the aggregate results and relevance of the GEF Turkey portfolio.

15. GEF support is provided through partnerships with many institutions operating at many levels, from local to national and international level. It is therefore 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 the GEF support to the overall achievements, i.e. to establish a credible link between what GEF supported activities 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.

16. 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 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 building, and awareness.

17. Out of the 13 national projects, 6 have been completed, 4 are on-going and the other 3 are in pipeline. One full size project has been completed nine years ago (In-situ Conservation of Genetic Diversity, implemented by the World Bank) and another one in January 2009 (Biodiversity and Natural Resource Management Project, also implemented by the World Bank). The Anatolia Watershed Management Project is still under implementation by the World Bank, while the two UNDP biodiversity projects, one full size (Kure Mountains Protected Area Project) and the other medium size (Marine and Coastal Ecosystems Protected Areas Project) started implementation earlier this year. UNDP also has 3 full size project in climate change which have about to be launched, namely the Energy Efficiency in Buildings, the Market Transformation of Energy Efficiency Appliances, and the Improving Energy Efficiency in Industry (this project is being jointly implemented with UNIDO). The Turkish GEF portfolio further comprises 4 completed enabling activities, namely one on POPs by UNIDO, 2 on generating reports to the UNCBD (Clearing House Mechanism and National Biodiversity Strategic Action Plan) and on Biosafety by UNEP (National Biosafety Framework), and 1 on the 1st national communication on climate change to be submitted to UNFCCC. The last is a multi-focal area enabling activity (National

¹⁰ Voluntary GEF national business plans will be introduced in GEF-5.

Capacity Self Assessment), still under implementation by UNEP. As indicated above, the SGP is active in Turkey since 1993, its implementation resulting in a remarkable portfolio of 172 projects.

18. 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.

19. Weaknesses of M&E at the project and GEF program levels have been mentioned in past CPEs and other evaluations of the Office, and have been highlighted by many stakeholders consulted during the scoping mission (§25). These weaknesses may pose challenges to the Turkish CPE as well. Not all the information which will be used for the analysis will be of a quantitative nature.

METHODOLOGY

20. The Turkey CPE will be conducted by staff of GEF Evaluation Office and consultants based in Turkey, i.e. 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 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 mechanism in Turkey, although not a member of the evaluation team, will be an essential partner in the evaluation.

21. 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:

- Project level: project documents, project implementation reports, terminal evaluations, terminal evaluation reviews, reports from monitoring visits, and any other technical documents produced by projects;
- Country level: national sustainable development agendas, environmental priorities and strategies, GEF-wide, focal area strategies and action plans, global and national environmental indicators;
- Agency levels: 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, the Joint UNDP/GEF SGP Evaluation, overall performance studies and/or other studies;
- Interviews with GEF stakeholders, including the GEF focal point and all other relevant government departments, bilateral and multilateral donors including the European Commission, civil society organizations and academia (including both local and international NGOs with a presence in Turkey), GEF agencies (World Bank, UNDP, UNEP, UNIDO), SGP and the national Conventions focal points;
- Interviews with GEF beneficiaries and supported institutions, municipal governments and associations, and local communities and authorities;
- Electronic survey with GEF stakeholders in Turkey;¹¹
- Field visits to selected project sites;

¹¹ A contact list has been provided to the Evaluation Team by UNDP and World Bank country offices. The GEF Coordination Unit in the Ministry of Environment and Forestry also sent a list of contacts. The three lists will be consolidated into one by the Evaluation Team.

- Information from national consultation workshops.

22. 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, etc.) and to measure GEF results (that is, progress towards achieving global environmental impacts) and performance of projects (such as implementation and completion ratings). Available statistics and scientific sources, especially for national environmental indicators, will also be used.

23. The Evaluation Team will use standard tools and protocols for the CPEs and adapt these to the Turkey 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.

24. A selection of project sites will be visited, including but not only in the context of the conduct of the two foreseen ROtI field studies (see further below). The criteria for selecting the sites will be finalized during the implementation of the evaluation, with emphasis placed on both ongoing and completed projects. 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

25. These country-specific TOR have been prepared based on an initial GEF Evaluation Office visit to Turkey in October/November 2009, undertaken with the purpose of scoping the evaluation and identify key issues to be included in the analysis. It was also an opportunity to officially launch the evaluation, while at the same introduce the selected local consultants to GEF national stakeholders. These TOR conclude the Turkey 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:¹²
 - **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 co-financing financial information, major objectives and expected (or actual) results, key partners per project, etc.
 - **Country Environmental Legal Framework**, which provides an 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/or other relevant sources;
 - **Review of Outcomes to Impact (ROtI)** field studies of two national projects completed since at least two years, selected in consultation with the Evaluation Office staff, which will contribute to strengthen the information gathering and analysis on results.

¹² These inputs are working documents and are not expected to be published as separate documents.

- Conduct the **evaluation analysis** and **triangulation** of collected information and evidence from various sources, tools and methods. This will be done during a visit by GEF Evaluation Office staff in late January 2010 to consolidate the evidence gathered so far and fill in any eventual information and analysis gaps before getting to findings, conclusions and preliminary recommendations. During this visit, additional field work will be undertaken as needed;
- Conduct a **National Consultation Workshop** for 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 Turkey CPE report**, which incorporates comments received and will be presented to Council and to the Turkish government (Annex 2 presents a tentative outline). The GEF Evaluation Office will bear full responsibility for the content of the report.

26. As was the case during the scoping mission (§25), the national GEF Focal Point mechanism, through the GEF Coordination Unit in the Ministry of Environment and Forestry, will assist the Evaluation Team and local consultants with the identification of key people to be interviewed, communication with relevant government departments, support to organize interviews, field visits and meetings, and identification of main documents. The GEF Agencies will be requested to assist the Evaluation Team and local consultants regarding their specific GEF-supported projects and activities, including identification of key project and agency staff to be interviewed and provision of project documentation and data.

EVALUATION KEY MILESTONES

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

Milestone	Deadline
Literature review	November 30, 2009
Finalization of the GEF Turkish 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 1, 2010
National consultation workshop	March 8, 2010
Draft CPE report sent out to stakeholders for comments	March 22, 2010
Incorporation of comments received in a final CPE report	May 3, 2010
Final 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 Turkey's sustainable development agenda and environmental priorities that are currently being developed?	GEF support is within the country's sustainable development agenda and environmental priorities	Relevant country level sustainable development and environment policies, strategies and action plans Project-related documentation (project document and logframe, implementation reports, terminal evaluations, TE reviews, etc.), PMIS, Agencies' project databases	Desk review, GEF portfolio analysis by focal area, Agency, modality and project status (national)
	GEF support is within the local priorities	Available databases (international as WB, OECD, etc., and national, i.e. dept. of statistics, other)	
	Level of GEF funding compared to other ODA in the environmental sector		
	GEF funding is contributing to the national environment agenda and process	Relevant work programmes. Stakeholders	Desk review, e-survey
	GEF projects and activities are fully embedded into the work programmes of existing institutions - national and local, governmental or non-governmental		
	GEF support innovation, pilot demonstration projects	Government officials, agencies' staff, donors and civil society representatives	Stakeholder consultation (focus groups, individual interviews), e-survey
	GEF support has country ownership and is country based (i.e., project origin, design and implementation)	Country Legal Environmental Framework	Literature review, timelines, historical causality, etc.
How is the Turkish EU accession programme influencing the relevance of GEF support to Turkey?	GEF interventions clearly support/complement the EU Approximation process	EU Turkey website, EU approximation documentation	Desk review
Is GEF support relevant to Turkey's development needs and challenges?	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. Stakeholders. Project-related documentation (project document and logframe, implementation reports, terminal evaluations, TE reviews, etc.), PMIS, Agencies' project databases. Stakeholders	Desk review, GEF portfolio analysis by focal area, Agency, modality and project status (national), e-survey
	The GEF's various types of modalities, projects and instruments are in coherence with country's needs and challenges, including supporting gender development	Government officials, agencies' staff, donors and civil society representatives	Stakeholder consultation (focus groups, individual interviews), e-survey
		Country Legal Environmental Framework	Literature review, timelines, historical causality, etc.
Is GEF support relevant to Turkey's GEF focal area action plans?	GEF support linked to the National Environmental Action Plan (NEAP); National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (NBSAP), national communications to UNFCCC; national communications on POPs; draft National Capacity Self-Assessment (NCSA); adaptation to climate change (NAPA), draft National Biosafety Framework (NBF), other.	GEF-supported enabling activities and products (NCSA, NEAP, NAPA, national communications to UN Conventions, etc.) Small Grant Programme country strategy	Desk review
	The role of government planning agencies (SPO, MoEF) in the project identification, selection, development, monitoring and appraisal	Government officials, agencies' staff, donors and civil society representatives	Stakeholder consultation (focus groups, individual interviews), e-survey
Is GEF support relevant to global environmental benefits (i.e. biodiversity, GHG, international waters, POPs, land degradation, etc.)?	Project outcomes and impacts are related to the RAF Global Benefit Index (for biodiversity and climate change) and to other global indicators for POPs, land degradation and international waters	National Conventions action plans, RAF, BD scorecard, etc. Country Legal Environmental Framework	Desk review, project field visits, project review protocols Literature review, timelines, historical causality, etc.
	GEF support linked to national commitments to UN and other Conventions	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	GEF portfolio analysis by focal area, Agency, modality and project status (national) Stakeholder consultation (focus groups, individual interviews), e-survey
		Global Environmental Benefits Assessment	Literature review
Is GEF support relevant to addressing all focal areas which are important for Turkey?	GEF support in Climate Change and Biodiversity also had secondary benefits for Land Degradation	Stakeholders, Government official documents	Desk review, stakeholder consultation, e-survey
Is GEF support relevant to GEF mandate and focal area programs and strategies?	GEF activities, country commitment and project counterparts support GEF mandate and focal area programs and strategies (i.e., catalytic and replication, etc.)	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. Including efficient allocation of all RAF funds	Project-related documentation (project documents and logframes, implementation reports, terminal evaluations, TE reviews, etc.), PMIS, Agencies project databases, RAF pipeline. Stakeholders	Desk review, GEF portfolio analysis, timelines, e-survey
	The GEF funding mechanism is easy to access by end-users	GEF Secretariat and Agencies' staff and government officials	
	Projects drop-outs from PDF and cancellations		National and local government officials, donors, NGOs, beneficiaries
	GEF project identification and selection process is participatory and efficient		
	GEF funds are considered to have a large impact in relation to the level of funding		
	GEF vs. cofinancing		
What role does Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) play in increasing project efficiency?	Project/portfolio monitoring feeds into project planning and implementation decision-making (i.e. adaptive management)	Project-related documentation (project documents and logframes, implementation reports, terminal evaluations, TE reviews, etc.), PMIS, Agencies project databases, RAF pipeline	Desk review, GEF portfolio analysis, timelines, e-survey
	Government and/or GEF agencies and/or other implementing partners act on information provided in GEF M&E reports	GEF Secretariat and Agencies' staff and government officials, and reports	Interviews, field visits, project review protocols
	Government's own approach to M&E is revised/improved based on lessons learnt with GEF	Government reports.	
	What are the roles, engagement and coordination among various stakeholders in project implementation?	Level of participation, also of the private sector and civil society organisations	Project-related reviews (implementation reports, terminal evaluations, TE reviews, etc.)
Roles and responsibilities of GEF actors are defined/assumed		Project staff, government officials	
Coordination between GEF projects is working well		Agency report, government reports, planning meeting reports, etc	Interviews, field visits, institutional analysis, e-survey
GEF resources are strategically focussed, institutionally or geographically, to optimise impact			
Existence of a national coordination mechanism for GEF support			
Was the efficiency of the project ever measured or value for money approach used in project design and implementation?			
How is synergy and leverage with other projects in the region sought?	GEF projects are fully complementary to other projects active in their location	Stakeholders, Project-related reviews (implementation reports, terminal evaluations, TE reviews, etc.)	Desk review, stakeholder consultation, e-survey
Are there synergies among GEF Agencies in GEF 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, e-survey
	GEF has helped national partners in working together	Agency report, government reports, planning meeting reports, etc	
	Synergies across projects and other GEF activities (eg SGP) (eg shared inputs, activities or outputs)	GEF Agency staff, national executing agencies (NGOs, other)	
Are there synergies between national institutions for GEF support in programming and implementation?	Effective communication and technical support and information sharing between GEF project agencies and organizations		Desk review and meta analysis of evaluation reports, interviews and field visits, e-survey
	Acknowledgement between institutions of each other's projects	Project-related reviews (implementation reports, terminal evaluations, TE reviews, etc.)	
	There is enough communication/consultation with local people	Project staff, beneficiaries, national and local government officials	
Are there synergies between GEF support and other donors' support?	Effective communication and technical support between national institutions	Project-related reviews (implementation reports, terminal evaluations, TE reviews, etc.)	Desk review, focus groups and individual interviews, and field visits, e-survey
	Acknowledgement between institutions of each other's projects	NGO staffs and donors' representatives	Meta analysis fo evaluation reports, e-survey
	Complementarity of GEF support	Evaluations of other donors' funded projects	

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 at the project level?	Project outcomes and impacts	Project staffs and beneficiaries, national and local government representatives ROtI studies	Focus groups and individual interviews, e-survey ROtI methodology
	Existing institutions are addressing threats to global environment more effectively	Institutional or capacity assessments	Focus groups and individual interviews
	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 at the aggregate level (portfolio and program) by focal area?	Aggregated outcomes and impact from above (eg changes in attitudes, practices or behaviour of resource users or stakeholder groups)	Project staffs and beneficiaries, national and local government representatives ROtI studies	Focus groups and individual interviews ROtI methodology
		Project-related reviews (implementation reports, terminal evaluations, TE reviews, etc.)	GEF Portfolio aggregate analysis
	GEF Projects are clearly seen to raise the profile of global environmental issues on the national (environmental) agenda	Government policies, newspapers	Desk review
		Project reports	Desk review
	GEF projects are demonstrating/piloting technologies and practices that are then replicated	Data from overall projects and other donors	Desk review
		ROtI studies	ROtI methodology
	Overall outcomes and impacts of GEF support by focal area	Project staffs and beneficiaries, national and local government representatives	Focus groups and individual interviews, e-survey
		Data from overall projects and other donors	Desk review
Is there enough good quality capacity development and awareness raising about environment issues due to GEF?	NGOs/academics, government officials and civil society is increasingly involved/participating at all stages of project cycle, and in diverse roles (co-financer, service provider, stakeholder, etc)	ROtI studies	ROtI methodology
Is GEF support effective in producing results at the country level?	Aggregated outcomes and impact from above - and no evidence of 'missing the elephant in the room' (ie GEF projects doing everything expected, but missing critical or fundamental issues).	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, e-survey
	Catalytic and replication effects	Data from projects financed by other donors and or by the government. ROtI studies	Desk review, ROtI methodology
Is GEF support effective in producing results related to the dissemination of lessons learned in GEF projects and with partners?	Lessons learned are shared regionally	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
	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
		NGO staffs, Project staff and beneficiaries, national and local government representatives	Focus groups and individual interviews, e-survey
How were GEF projects able to promote effective community-based NRM in Turkey's national parks?	Protected Areas NR Management Plans have been legally recognised, financed and are being implemented There is enough communication/consultation with local people	Project-related reviews (implementation reports, terminal evaluations, TE reviews, etc.), stakeholders, beneficiaries	Desk review and stakeholder consultation, e-survey
Is GEF support effective in producing results which last in time and continue after project completion?	Availability of financial and economic resources to replicate or follow-up, through Turkish Government or other external donors' funded projects and programmes	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, e-survey
	Stakeholders' ownership, social factors		
	Existence of a technical know how		
	GEF interventions lead directly to follow-up interventions 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

[country]: General description

Brief description of environmental resources in key GEF support areas

The environmental legal framework in [country]

The environmental policy framework in [country]

The Global Environmental Facility: General description

CHAPTER 4. Activities funded by the GEF in [country]

Introduction

Activities considered in the Evaluation

Activities over time

Evolution of the GEF funding to the country

CHAPTER 5. Relevance of the GEF support in [country]

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 [country]

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 the GEF support to [country]

Global Environmental Impacts

Catalytic and replication effects

Institutional sustainability and capacity building

Details of project results