Evaluation Office

GEF

Annual Country Portfolio Evaluation Report 2008

GEF Council 33

Agenda item 8

April 22, 2008

Objectives of Annual Report

- More CPEs so synthesis of findings is becoming important:
  - Benin, Madagascar, South Africa;
  - Cameroon forthcoming
- Can we say something about the GEF in Sub-Sahara Africa and in LDCs?
- Objectives of CPEs:
  1. **Relevance** to national sustainable development strategies and environmental priorities as well as to GEF mandate
  2. **Efficiency** as implemented on the ground
  3. **Results** and sustainability, particularly at the higher global environmental benefits
- Previous CPEs: Costa Rica, Samoa & The Philippines

Scope and methodology (1)

- Nationally implemented projects in all focal areas and GEF Agencies
- Selected regional projects, in particular in IW
- Conducted between Sept 07 – March 08
- Evaluation teams: GEF-EO staff plus consultants with extensive experience in each country
  - Overall coordination: Claudio Volonte
  - South Africa: Claudio Volonte, Gemma Cronin & Marlene Laros
  - Benin: Sandra Romboli (EO), Paul Onibon & Alain Lafontaine
  - Madagascar: Lee Risby (EO), Alain Randriamaherisoa, Christian Chatelain & Timothy Healy
  - Overall support: Timothy Ranja (EO)

Scope and methodology (2)

- Quantitative and qualitative methods
- Several limitations and challenges

Projects / Country	National implemented			Regional/ global implemented (No.)	Completed projects (No.)
	No.	US$ million	Enabling activities		
South Africa	26	82	6	5 out of 25	14
Madagascar	3	35	7	8 out of 13	9
Benin	13	21	9	5 out of 15	6

Key conclusions: results

1. In biodiversity, GEF has supported the countries to achieve significant environmental benefits
   - Biodiversity largest portfolio in all 3 countries
2. Mixed results in other focal areas, with land degradation and adaptation as important gaps in GEF support
   - International Waters projects reviewed have created new institutions and reduced threats to fish population
3. The GEF support has delivered some improvements in capacity, public awareness, and the enabling environment
4. Although there have been examples of catalytic effect and replication, the long term sustainability of the global benefits achieved so far is uncertain

Key conclusions: relevance

1. GEF support was relevant to national environmental and sustainable development priorities as well as to international/regional processes
2. Country ownership varies across focal areas but overall ownership needs to be enhanced
3. GEF support is relevant to the GEF mandate, particularly in biodiversity and international waters, but further integration among focal areas and across sectors could have significantly increased the total benefits

Key conclusions: efficiency

1. Focal Point mechanisms were found weak, in particularly regarding strategic guidance, promoting coordination, supervision, information sharing and learning and synergies
2. The conclusions reached in the Activity Cycle evaluation were confirmed in the 3 African countries – for GEF stakeholders the project cycle appears complex, overly lengthy and unclear
   - Recent improvements are not visible yet

GEF

Recommendation 1

1. The GEF should increase support to and strengthen the concept of integrated multi-focal areas and cross-sector approaches, going beyond the national boundaries, to ensure maximization of global benefits
   - GEF has missed opportunities to maximize benefits given the limited integration between focal areas, and with other sectors (ie, rural development, agriculture and poverty reduction)
   - Adaptation and land degradation issues were not consistently incorporated in projects reviewed
   - Positive experience of International Waters regional projects should be considered. Global environmental issues do not recognize national boundaries
   - Aligning with existing regional and sub-regional strategies will also improve sustainability
   - Improvement of national capacity through regional capacities.

Recommendation 2

2. The GEF should develop a specific and proactive engagement approach with countries in Africa, particularly LDCs that have limited capacity to access and implement GEF
   - Facilitates the creation of partnership to increase mobilization of resources
   - Facilitates the effective and strategic integration, coordination and dialogue amongst environmental actors at country level, particularly the participation of global conventions focal points
   - Recognizing differences among countries capacities and economic development (in the case of South Africa, GEF should recognize its capacity to have a more proactive and direct management of its portfolio)
   - Reduces transaction cost for the recipient countries (i.e., adoption of country based procedures)
   - The GEF should review the effectiveness of the current focal point mechanism and should consider alternative modus operandi better suitable for the African context.

Proposed Council Decisions
(taking management response into account)

1. GEF should continue to strengthen the concept of integrated multi-focal areas approaches, particularly adaptation to climate change and land degradation, to ensure maximization of global environmental benefits
2. GEF should further develop specific, proactive and more flexible engagement approaches with countries in Africa, particularly LDCs that have limited capacity to access and implement GEF

(RAF-issues are referred to Mid-term Review of RAF)