

Management Action Record (MAR) 2012

Overview

The GEF Management Action Record (MAR) tracks the level of adoption, by the GEF Secretariat and/or the GEF agencies (together here referred to as GEF Management), of GEF Council decisions that have been made on the basis of GEF EO recommendations. The MAR serves two purposes: “(1) to provide Council with a record of its decision on the follow-up of evaluation reports, the proposed management actions, and the actual status of these actions; and (2) to increase the accountability of GEF management regarding Council decisions on monitoring and evaluation issues.”¹

MAR 2012 tracks 21 separate GEF Council decisions: 10 that were part of MAR 2011, and 11 new decisions that are included for tracking in MAR 2012. In addition to the GEF Council decisions, this year the Evaluation Office has also started tracking adoption of the decisions of the Least Developed Countries Fund and Special Climate Change Fund (LDCF/SCCF) Council. One decision from the LDCF/SCCF Council’s November 2011 meeting is tracked in MAR 2012.

Rating Approach

The rating categories for the progress of adoption of Council decisions were agreed upon in the consultative process of the Evaluation Office with the GEF Secretariat and the GEF Agencies and are as follows:

- **High:** Fully adopted and fully incorporated into policy, strategy or operations.
- **Substantial:** Decision largely adopted but not fully incorporated into policy, strategy or operations as yet.
- **Medium:** Adopted in some operational and policy work, but not to a significant degree in key areas.
- **Negligible:** No evidence or plan for adoption, or plan and actions for adoption are in a very preliminary stage.
- **N/A:** Non-applicable
- **Not possible to verify yet:** verification will have to wait until more data is available or proposals have been further developed.

Documents Considered in this Analysis

MAR 2012 tracks management actions on GEF Council and LDCF/SCCF Council decisions based on 12 GEF Evaluation Office documents:

- Annual Performance Report 2006 (GEF/ME/C.31/1, May 2007)
- Joint Evaluation of the Small Grants Program – Executive Version (GEF/ME/C.32/2, October 2007)
- Annual Country Portfolio Evaluation Report 2009, (GEF/ME/C.35/1, June 2009)

¹ GEF Council, “Procedures and Format of the GEF Management Action Record.” GEF/ME/C.27/3., GEF Council November, 2005.

- Annual Report on Impact 2009, (GEF/ME/C.36/2, November 2009)
- Annual Performance Report 2009 (GEF/ME/C.38/4, June 2010)
- Evaluation of the GEF Strategic Priority for Adaptation (GEF/ME/C.39/4, October 2010)
- Annual Thematic Evaluations Report 2011 (GEF/ME/C.41/02, October 2011)
- Evaluation of the Special Climate Change Fund (GEF/LDCF.SCCF.11/ME/02, October 2011)
- Annual Performance Report 2011 (GEF/ME/C.42/01, May 2012)
- Annual Country Portfolio Evaluation Report 2012 (GEF/ME/C.42/03, May 2012)
- Annual Thematic Evaluations Report 2012 (GEF/ME/C.43/02, October 2012)
- GEF Annual Impact Report 2012 (GEF/ME/C.43/04, October 2012)

Recommendation based on Council review of GEF Annual Performance Report 2006 (GEF/ME/C.31/1).

Ref. #	Date of Council Decision	GEF EO Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2011	GEF EO Rating & Comments in MAR 2011	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2012	GEF EO Rating & Comments in MAR 2012
1	June 2007	Special attention is required to ensure continued and improved supervision in the new project cycle, through ensuring adequate funding in project fees.	The Results-based Management Framework (RBM) that is presented for Council discussion will provide the platform for the Secretariat to develop tools to monitor the portfolio, in coordination with the GEF agencies. While developing these tools, care will be taken to ensure that they do not duplicate, but rather build on, the monitoring activities undertaken by the agencies. The agencies will ensure that the appropriate level of resources received from fees are directed toward supervision of projects.(GEF/ME/C.31/2, May 2007)	Decision on Agenda Item 6: The Council, having reviewed document GEF/ME/C.31/1, GEF Annual Performance Report 2006, and document GEF/ME/C.31/2, Management Response to GEF Annual Performance Report 2006, takes notes of the recommendations and the management response and decides that: (b) special attention is required to ensure continued and improved supervision by the GEF agencies during implementation of projects and adequate funding should be provided for this supervision from the project fees.	Substantial. A proposal for the fee reform is being submitted for council decision. The Agencies are required to ensure that the appropriate level of resources received from fees is directed toward supervision of projects. World Bank response: Project fees cover the full project cycle from project formulation through supervision to closing. The efforts needed for formulation for GEF approval remain high and represent a trade-off with funds for supervision. The Bank has addressed this by revising its budget coefficients to provide more funds for supervision relative to formulation. It should be noted that GEF requests for additional information at any stage of the project cycle have implications on the use of project fees. Current Bank average fee structure, which stands below 10% fee, and the GEF fee review process underway which proposes further cuts, preclude the possibility of additional supervision requests being addressed in a meaningful manner (e.g. special cross-cutting focus issues, such as gender mainstreaming). UNDP response: UNDPs three-tiered quality assurance system continues to ensure that project supervision is provided at the country, regional and global levels. This system has consistently received high ratings from the GEF Evaluation Office. GEF SEC ad-hoc requests are increasing and are often directed by GEF SEC directly to field staff by-passing UNDP-GEF central coordination. This places an extra burden on the staff who should primarily provide supervision support to projects. This also leads to inefficiencies that could be avoided if better coordinated by GEF.	Medium. The November 2011 Council formed a working group to develop a Fees proposal for the June 2012 Council. A proposal has been agreed to by the group members and will be presented in the June 2012 Council. This proposal includes a sliding fee structure. While it is a positive step away from the current one fits all approach, it is also not clear to what extent implementation costs of MSPs were considered in the decision. The Evaluation Office will continue assessing the extent to which fees are sufficient and used for the intended purposes.	Substantial. The proposal for the fee reform was approved by Council in June 2012. The proposal was prepared with participation of GEF Agencies, GEF Secretariat staff and Council Members. The proposed fee level was decided after a careful discussion and analysis and has been agreed that it is largely commensurate with the project cycle management services activities carried out by the Agencies. A few additional streamlining measures for project cycle were subsequently approved by the Council in November 2012 to further reduce Agency burden in the project cycle activities. Information requested from Agencies are not new requirements but part of the routine project monitoring and continued improvement of the GEF database. UNDP response: Efforts to streamline the GEF project cycle commensurate with the reduction in fees progressed well in 2012. Further efforts however are needed in 2013, notably in addressing corporate services. In addition, GEF requests for ad hoc information have not declined and continue to have implications on the use of the reduced fees. Finally, the	Medium. As per the new fee changes approved by the Council in June 2012, the top rate for project fee has been reduced from 10 percent to 9.5 percent. Whereas for projects over 10 m dollars in GEF grant the project fee has reduced from 10 percent to 9 percent. The rate has remained same for project approved under programmatic approach and also for the SGP. There is little information on how stream lining of activities is translating into greater resources for supervision and monitoring activities during implementation. Especially, so because project fees have lowered.

							agreed streamlining changes to the project cycle urgently need to be integrated into the GEF project and programmatic approach cycles paper (GEF/C.39/Inf.3) in order to increase transparency and reduce confusion. IDB: Supervision of GEF projects is done by the IDB's technical staff in its country offices with support from headquarters when required. Funding from projects fees and the IDB's own resources are utilized to ensure a high standard of supervision. World Bank response: This recommendation and management response seem to have been overtaken by events (i.e. the 2013 new fee structure). The Bank had earlier addressed this recommendation by revising its budget coefficients to provide more funds for supervision relative to formulation. The current Bank average fee (below 10% fee) and the GEF fee reduction will preclude possibility of sustaining increased funds for supervision. Project fees cover the full project cycle from project formulation through supervision to closing. The efforts needed for formulation for GEF approval remain high and represent a trade-off with funds for supervision. With an overall reduction in fees, protection against cuts also for supervision cannot be guaranteed. The Bank will	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	---	--

							continue to monitor its supervision efforts and the effects of fee changes. UNEP Response: Efforts in 2012 have aimed at streamlining procedures for reducing transaction costs of project preparation steps. However, we estimate that these efforts may have only addressed 40% of UNEP's current shortfall in cost recovery (evidence cannot be given until at least a year has gone by). We urge the GEFSec to comply with the Council decision to go to a second round of streamlining, and consider stronger reforms including addressing the costs of corporate services. We support GEFSec's plans to codify unwritten policies and practices, so as to allow a transparent discussion with a view to further streamlining.	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	---	--

Recommendation based on Council review of GEF Annual Performance Report 2006 (GEF/ME/C.31/1).

Ref. #	Date of Council Decision	GEF EO Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2011	GEF EO Rating & Comments in MAR 2011	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2012	GEF EO Rating & Comments in MAR 2012
2	June 2007	All GEF agencies will need to ensure that terminal evaluation reports include adequate information on sustainability of outcomes, quality of M&E systems and reporting on co-financing.	Evaluation reports prepared for GEF-financed projects are expected to meet the minimum requirement 3 of the GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy. In line with these requirements, agencies will ensure that terminal evaluation reports include information on sustainability of outcomes, quality of M&E systems, and assessment of co-financing realized. (GEF/ME/C.31/2, May 2007)	Decision on Agenda Item 6: The Council, having reviewed document GEF/ME/C.31/1, GEF Annual Performance Report 2006, and document GEF/ME/C.31/2, Management Response to GEF Annual Performance Report 2006, takes notes of the recommendations and the management response and decides that: (d) all GEF agencies should ensure that terminal evaluation reports include adequate information on sustainability of outcomes, quality of monitoring and evaluation systems and reporting on co-financing, in line with the minimum requirements for project evaluation in the GEF M&E Policy.	High. UNDP response: The UNDP EO has issued detailed guidance for project terminal evaluations which address these issues. World Bank response: As has been previously reported, the evaluation of GEF projects is mainstreamed into the Bank's regular supervision and evaluation systems, based on a set of standardized and harmonized (with that of the Bank's Independent Evaluation Group - IEG) evaluation criteria, and an internationally accepted ratings scale. Implementation Completion and Results Reports (ICR) [standard World Bank terminal evaluation] are completed within 6 months of project closure. The IEG so far has reviewed every ICR for GEF funded projects. UNEP response: Terms of Reference for UNEP independent Terminal Evaluations include these issues. In addition, yearly PIRs include reporting on co-financing.	Substantial. Terminal evaluations reporting on sustainability, of outcomes, quality of M&E Systems and reporting of co-financing have improved significantly. An area of concern that still remains, particularly with UNDP is the criteria used to define co-financing.	Substantial. UNDP response: The UNDP EO guidance for project terminal evaluations issued in 2012, which includes a review of co-financing, is being used at the project and country level and the quality of terminal evaluations continues to improve. UNDP is under the impression that further guidance on co-financing is to be prepared by GEFSEC and looks forward to receiving this guidance. UNEP Response: We urge the GEFSec to fast track the proposed review of co-financing policy so as to address country and agency concerns.	Substantial. The coverage of M&E issues in terminal evaluations submitted by UNDP and UNEP has shown improvement over the years. The self-appraisal by UNDP and UNEP is fairly accurate. The quality of coverage of M&E issues in terminal evaluations (for full size projects) submitted by the World Bank has remained high. For other agencies observations are too few

Recommendation based on Council review of Joint Evaluation of the Small Grants Program – Executive Version (GEF/ME/C.32/2).

Ref. #	Date of Council Decision	GEF EO Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2011	GEF EO Rating & Comments in MAR 2011	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2012	GEF EO Rating & Comments in MAR 2012
3	Nov. 2007	Country program oversight needs to be strengthened.	The management takes note of this recommendation and will consider a system to regularly audit the country programs. The GEF ombudsman will also be involved in handling complaints related to the SGP, and this would be appropriately announced on the SGP and GEF websites.	Decision on Agenda Item 9: The Council, having reviewed Document GEF/ME/C.32/2, Joint Evaluation of the Small Grants Program – Executive Version, as well as Document GEF/ME/C.32/3, Management Response to the Joint Evaluation of the Small Grants Program, takes note of the conclusions and recommendations and requests the SGP Steering Committee to implement the recommendations by: (c) Strengthening country program oversight.	Substantial. The Secretariat has attended all regional meetings in 2011-2012 and discussed operational and programmatic requirements for the program with National Coordinators of all country programs. Coordination meetings/consultations with CPMT are regularly convened. A learning mission is planned for the end of 2012 and country program audit frameworks will be developed afterwards. UNDP response: Risk monitoring of country programs is in place. Several monitoring and troubleshooting missions to SGP country programs were undertaken during the past year. As OP5 implementation gets underway a new round of risk based audits will be commenced in 2013. The SGP Public website is currently under review with a view to improve transparency and access to key information for country stakeholders, including a strengthened feedback system.	Substantial. Audits of country programs continue. Information collected through the country program audits is shared with the management chain in the Secretariat. The establishment of an Ombudsman for addressing complaints is a positive development and appears to be functioning appropriately Challenges remain with respect to the monitoring systems that are used in the program as a monitoring currently required is to taxing and often inappropriate for small grants.	Substantial: Coordination meetings/consultations with CPMT continued to be regularly convened. The programmed learning mission was conducted to India, where several projects were visited. UNDP response: Plans are underway for risk based Audits to take place in 2013. The GEF Ombudsman has served as conduit for issues or complaints raised on GEF SGP to be resolved. A process for complaints or for conflict resolution has also been posted in the GEF SGP global website. As of the present the few complaints received have been appropriately and fully resolved. SGP is reporting on an annual basis in OP5 through its Annual Monitoring Report (AMR) which draws upon annual reports for each SGP country program. In addition, selective case studies may be carried out on a portfolio of projects within a theme (e.g. CBA) or a sub-program (i.e. COMPACT	Substantial

							landscape approach). Discussions have commenced on improving and streamlining SGP's monitoring system in line with the programmatic landscape/seascape focused approach outlined by SGP as part of the design of GEF6.	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	---	--

Recommendation based on Council review of Annual Country Portfolio Evaluation Report 2009 (GEF/ME/C.35/1)

Ref. #	Date of Council Decision	GEF EO Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2011	GEF EO Rating & Comments in MAR 2011	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2012	GEF EO Rating & Comments in MAR 2012
4	June 2009	The GEF should focus attention on countries in exceptional situations concerning limited access to International Financial Institutions, like Syria.	-	Decision on Agenda Item 7: The Council, having reviewed document GEF/ME/C.35/1, Annual Country Portfolio Evaluation Report-2009, document GEF/ME/C.35/2, Management Response to the Annual Country Portfolio Evaluation Report-2009, and having taken note of the three Country Portfolio Evaluations in Cameroon, Egypt, and Syria (GEF/ME/C.34/Inf. 3 and GEF/ME/C.35/Inf. 2-3) requested the Secretariat to: (b) Conduct a survey of countries in exceptional situations concerning limited access to GEF partner International Financial Institutions, like Syria.	N/A. The secretariat continues to find this recommendation from the GEFO very much out of context and bordering on the absurd given the international political situation; and has no intention of taking any action whatsoever in response	Negligible. This issue is broader than just the country of Syria and concerns obtaining a better understanding of how many countries have limited access to GEF funds as a result of not being a member of an IFI and how to address the problem, should there be one. Council requested a survey of countries in exceptional situations be conducted. This has not yet been initiated.	N/A. Limited access to IFIs by certain countries may result from larger political considerations that are beyond the remit of the Secretariat and the GEF network.	Negligible. Council requested that a survey be done, and it has not been done.

Recommendation based on Council review of GEF Annual Report on Impact –2009 (GEF/ME/C.36/2).

Ref. #	Date of Council Decision	GEF EO Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2011	GEF EO Rating & Comments in MAR 2011	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2012	GEF EO Rating & Comments in MAR 2012
5	Nov. 2009	The GEF should learn from the positive private sector engagement in the reduction of Ozone Layer Depletion focal area and incorporate similar approaches into its efforts to engage the private sector in other focal areas.	We fully agree with this recommendation, although again some context is necessary. There is strong engagement with the private sector because this is where the majority of the ODS consumption/production lies; there is no parallel in any other GEF focal area to this situation. We also agree in general with most of the “lessons for consideration” that are proposed, although their actual applicability would have to be assessed in detail (GEF/ME/C.36/3, Nov 2009).	<i>Decision on Agenda Item 8:</i> The Council, having reviewed document GEF/ME/C.36/2, “GEF Annual Report on Impact –2009,” and document GEF/ME/C.36/3, “Management Response to the GEF Annual Report on Impact–2009,” took note of the Annual Report’s findings and decided that: (b) The Secretariat should incorporate lessons from the positive private sector engagement in the Ozone Layer Depletion focal area into its efforts to engage the private sector, where possible and as appropriate, in other focal areas.	Substantial. The principal feature of successful private sector engagement on phase-out of ODS was focused collaboration on the application of key technologies for replacement of ODS. In other focal areas there is a similar need to collaborate with private sector partners but without a singular focus on only one approach. The Revised Strategy for Enhanced Engagement with the Private Sector (GEF 41.09.Rev.01) as approved by Council in November 2011 has the financial tools that will allow MDBs to establish collaborative PPP and make key investments in technologies and business models for all focal areas where appropriate. WB response: The Bank and the IFC have participated to the full extent possible in a dialogue with the GEF Secretariat regarding the private sector strategy, which were not primarily driven by ODS lessons.	Substantial. The GEF strategy for engagement with the private sector was presented and approved at the November 2011 Council meeting. The EO, in future reviews, will assess the extent to which positive private sector lessons have been applied to the engagement of the private sector in GEF Ozone Layer Depletion projects.	High/Completed: As directed by Council in November 2011, the GEF worked closely with Agencies to develop operational modalities for the GEF-5 PPP. These were documented in <i>Operational Modalities for Public Private Partnership Programs</i> (GEF C.42.Inf.08). The PPP programs submitted by AfDB and IBD were approved by Council June 2012. Additional PPPs are in process. As noted earlier the strategy was not primarily driven by ODS lessons, yet the positive private sector engagement on ODS focal area projects are reflected in the private sector strategy and modalities, which focus on reducing risk to help engage private sector investment for innovative approaches in all focal areas.	Unable to assess. The management response indicates that it is developing operational modalities for the GEF-5 PPP. The Evaluation Office is presently undertaking a review to assess GEF involvement in the private sector. The review would provide more information on GEF’s engagement with the private sector and the extent management has operationally moved in engaging it.

Recommendation based on Council review of GEF Annual Performance Report 2009 (GEF/ME/C.38/4).

Ref. #	Date of Council Decision	GEF EO Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2011	GEF EO Rating & Comments in MAR 2011	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2012	GEF EO Rating & Comments in MAR 2012
6	June 2010	The GEF Evaluation Office, Secretariat and the Agencies should work together in identifying and implementing measures to improve the quality of information available through PMIS on the status of projects through the project cycle, including agency compliance with deadlines for terminal evaluations.	The Secretariat notes the low compliance of the Agencies' submission of terminal evaluations within 12 months of closure. Over the past two years, the Secretariat has collected information from Agencies on closed projects; these lists should improve the Evaluation Office's ability to track projects for which terminal evaluations have not been submitted. The Secretariat welcomes the APR's recommendation to work together with the Evaluation Office and Agencies in identifying and implementing measures to better track project status through the database.	Decision on Agenda Item 9: The GEF Council, having reviewed document GEF/ME/C.38/4, Annual Performance Report 2009, as well as GEF/ME/C.38/5, Management Response to the Annual Performance Report 2009, requested the GEF Evaluation Office, the Secretariat and the Agencies to work together in identifying and implementing measures to improve the quality of information available through PMIS on the status of projects through the project cycle, including agency compliance with deadlines for terminal evaluations. The Evaluation Office is requested to report on the progress made in the Annual Performance Report 2010.	Substantial. 1. Data gathered through the AMR process on the GEF's active portfolio has been used to update project status since 2009. 2. The Secretariat will issue an RBM guidance document by June 2012 which includes clearly defined process for submission, through the AMR process, including that TEs should be submitted to the EO not the Secretariat. 3. The Secretariat has developed a RBM dashboard within PMIS specifically aimed at identifying and flagging project status for the AMR process. The dashboard will be tested for 2012 reporting process. World Bank response: As was indicated for FY10, while some discussion has taken place, we would welcome being fully involved in design and testing of PMIS aspects. We believe the review undertaken by the Trustee as requested by the Council provides useful information to guide such efforts. Any changes should be based on the principle of avoiding duplication of data entry to avoid discrepancies. The annual AMR process has also discussed the issue and we believe this annual reporting is best vehicle for monitoring the portfolio. The Bank and EO has agreed on	Medium. GEFSEC has received a review of GEF systems from the Trustee. Based on the findings and in consultation with the Agencies, updates to the PMIS have been occurring since 2009. The EO will continue to work in coordination with the Secretariat to update information on the status of projects through the end of the project cycle.	Substantial PIR Reports were used to update the project statuses in PMIS, specially the agency approval dates. Used the analysis done by GEFEO's office on the statuses of completed projects to update the statuses in PMIS. Aforementioned RBM dashboard is currently under development which will be able to track the following reports due from Agencies to GEFSEC, PIR, Midterm Reviews, Tracking tools and Terminal Evaluation Reports, and the reports not submitted by agencies. Each year at the end of reporting period, if the agency had not submitted Terminal Evaluations which are due, GEFSEC follows up on each project with agency to get PIR, Midterm Reviews, Tracking tools and Terminal Evaluation Reports. UNDP response: UNDP has spent more time in 2012 than in previous years responding to detailed requests from the GEF EO to review and complete data extracted from PMIS. This has significant implications	Medium. The concerns related to poor quality of information on project status still remain. The Evaluation Office undertook a fairly comprehensive exercise to verify quality of information in PMIS on project status. The exercise made it obvious that for a significant proportion of the projects the status reported by PMIS was obsolete. Of the 1200 project records verified, in more than 900 instances the status reported in the PMIS did not correspond to the actual situation. The results were shared with the Secretariat. Whether corrective measures have been undertaken to address the concerns have been effective is yet to be verified by the Office. Much of the focus of the Secretariats efforts has been on reporting and following up on submission of information. Quality of information – especially for the projects from earlier periods – has not received as much attention.

					parameters for submitting TEs, for FY11 submissions are fully compliant. UNDP response: UNDP continues to provide quality-checked data from project supervision to GEFSEC on an annual basis for uploading to PMIS. UNDP understood that a review of PMIS and information systems in GEF was being undertaken but this appears to have stalled and/or has not been made public. UNEP response: UNEP has systematically forwarded all TEs generated in GEF-4 to today, to GEF SEC for uploading in PMIS. UNEP is also systematically forwarding all TEs to national focal points.		on the use of the reduced fees. UNEP Response: We urge concerted discussion between GEFSec, Agency, Trustee, GEF EO, and STAP on PMIS, and Knowledge Management in general.	
--	--	--	--	--	---	--	---	--

Recommendation based on Council review of GEF Evaluation of the Strategic Priority for Adaptation (GEF/ME/C.39/4).

Ref. #	Date of Council Decision	GEF EO Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2011	GEF EO Rating & Comments in MAR 2011	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2012	GEF EO Rating & Comments in MAR 2012
7	Nov. 2010	The GEF should continue providing explicit incentives to carry on the mainstreaming of resilience and adaptation into the GEF focal areas, as a means of reducing risks to the GEF portfolio.	We support the recommendation that the GEF should continue to provide incentives to carry on the mainstreaming of resilience and adaptation into the GEF focal areas, and note that some of the proposals for achieving this may include the application of screening tools and safeguards, as well as the mobilization of further financial incentives. The Secretariat has started to address some of the factors that still prevent the integration and mainstreaming of climate change adaptation across the GEF focal areas, including: The GEF Secretariat taking the first steps to create a screening tool for adaptation as outlined in GEF/C.35/inf.7 – “Incorporating Climate Change Adaptation into GEF Projects”; (b) The STAP is preparing a (currently in draft) study clarifying the scientific rationale of reducing climate change risks and enhancing resilience of the GEF focal areas and; (c) The GEF Secretariat is exploring possibility of providing financial incentives, both through strategic priorities in each	Decision on Agenda Item 9: The Council, having reviewed documents, Evaluation of the GEF Strategic Priority for Adaptation (GEF/ME/C.39/4) and Management Response to the Evaluation of the GEF Strategic Priority for Adaptation (GEF/ME/C.39/5), requested the Secretariat to develop and implement screening tools. These tools will serve as a first step to ensure the mainstreaming and targeting of adaptation and resilience, to reduce the risks from climate change in GEF focal areas and its activities. The Council further requested the Secretariat to report to its November 2012 meeting on steps taken and progress made, including indicators for RBM and M&E.	Substantial. Progress April 11– Apr 2012: The STAP has successfully completed the review of tools and methods to increase climate resilience of GEF projects and programs, and has brought together related GEF agencies in a workshop to share the agency specific knowledge on the matter. It has designed a “Climate risk screening tool and resilience enhancement measures for GEF - PIFs and PFDs” to be implemented during the STAP project review process. The Secretariat, with its members from adaptation, natural resources and business strategy, is working to build on the screening tool and devise a methodology mainstream resilience into all the GEF focal areas. World Bank response: The new option of multi-TF projects with GEF, LDCF, SCCF is welcome and adds such incentives for such projects. No other incentives are currently noted; rather additional requirements/screening represents barriers and in the project cycle beyond Bank’s risk assessment in the Operational Risk Assessment Framework in PAD. Possible fee reductions would further dis-incentivize additional requirements.	Substantial. The "Climate Risk Screening Tool" devised by STAP in consultation with GEFSEC, GEF EO, the GEF Agencies as well as external experts can make a significant contribution to mainstream climate risk considerations into GEF projects across focal areas. Findings from the SPA evaluation informed the design process of the screening tool. The recently adopted and launched Adaptation Monitoring and Assessment Tool (AMAT), while only applied to climate change adaptation projects under the LDCF/SCCF, can serve as a source of information and experience to further improve mainstreaming of resilience and adaptation into the GEF focal areas. Especially the new option to combine funds from GEF with LDCF/SCCF in multi-trust fund projects will open opportunities for synergy.	Substantial. Progress Apr 2012– Apr 2013: In November 2012, the Secretariat updated the Council on efforts to enhance climate resilience in GEF projects through Council Document GEF/C.43/Inf.06, Enhancing Climate Change Resilience in GEF Projects: Update on GEF Secretariat Efforts. The GEF has made considerable progress in harnessing the synergies between climate change adaptation and its other focal areas. As at April 2013, the GEF has invested \$61.1 million of LDCF/SCCF resources in 12 projects and programs accessing resources from multiple trust funds, including the BD, CCM, IW and LD focal areas of the GEF Trust Fund. AMAT is applied consistently across all projects and programs accessing resources from the LDCF and the SCCF. The GEF will work to further harness these synergies in GEF-6. UNDP response: UNDP has begun to use the AMAT and initial feedback is that the AMAT is onerous and its value-	Substantial: The progress made so far is welcome. The Evaluation Office encourages the Secretariat to complete the next steps outlined in Council Document GEF/C.43/Info.06: finalize the draft document that outlines climate resilience considerations across all focal areas, and improve GEF-6 focal area strategies and RBM indicators to better incorporate resilience.

			GEF focal area and through the use of resources from the Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF) and the Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF) during GEF-5. (GEF/ME/C.39/5 October 2010)				added contribution is unclear to the country and the Agency. Before the AMAT structure is considered for further expanded used, UNDP suggests that GEFSEC undertake a comprehensive lessons learned exercise almost immediately with a view to streamlining and improving the value of the tracking tool in programming in GEF-6. The review should consider, given the purpose of the AMAT tool, whether the mechanics of the tool is the most appropriate in comparison to other alternative, more simplified, designs of the tool. UNEP's Response: We support UNDP and Executive Office comments but urge that STAP be involved, given the new Adaptation STAP member embedded in the GEF STAP team.	
--	--	--	---	--	--	--	--	--

Recommendation based on Council review of GEF Evaluation of the Strategic Priority for Adaptation (GEF/ME/C.39/4).

Ref. #	Date of Council Decision	GEF EO Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2011	GEF EO Rating & Comments in MAR 2011	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2012	GEF EO Rating & Comments in MAR 2012
8	Nov. 2010	Given that adaptation measures in SPA projects are still under implementation, further evaluations could provide opportunities to learn from outcomes and progress toward impact.	The Secretariat will work with the Evaluation Office to develop guidelines for mid-term and final evaluations for adaptation projects; this is included in the FY 2011 LDCF/SCCF RBM work-plan. In addition, the Secretariat is in the process of developing a comprehensive knowledge management strategy in collaboration with the Agencies, STAP, and the EO, for the GEF partnership. One of the main purposes of such a strategy is to develop a systematic process for reporting on and utilizing lessons learned. Finally, the Secretariat has developed a comprehensive Monitoring and Evaluation Framework for adaptation including the newly developed 'Adaptation Monitoring and Assessment Tool (AMAT)', a tracking tool that will systematically track the progress of certain adaptation indicators on a portfolio level.	Decision on Agenda Item 9: The Council, having reviewed documents, Evaluation of the GEF Strategic Priority for Adaptation (GEF/ME/C.39/4) and Management Response to the Evaluation of the GEF Strategic Priority for Adaptation (GEF/ME/C.39/5)...r requested the Secretariat to continue monitoring the implementation of the SPA to ensure lessons can be learned from the portfolio. It requested the Evaluation Office, STAP and the Adaptation Task Force to provide guidelines in 2012 for evaluations of SPA projects to learn from the outcomes and impacts of the projects.	Substantial. The Secretariat monitors the implementation of the SPA portfolio through the GEF Trust Fund AMR; A section on SPA projects is included annually in the AMR both for part I and part II. The Adaptation Task Force is working on providing guidelines to the evaluations of SPA projects for further analysis of future impacts. World Bank response: As indicated in FY11, the SPA has been completed and evaluated. The introduction of additional evaluation objectives cannot be credibly applied retroactively to specific projects. The Bank is of the opinion that the adoption of the new Adaptation Monitoring and Assessment Tool (AMAT), which also applies to the needs of the SPA, and agreement reached with respect to timing of in-depth assessment of results (at MTR and TER) within the context of the reform of the AMR process, negates the need to have separate guidelines for mid-term and terminal evaluation of	Substantial. Guidelines for evaluations of SPA projects are being developed simultaneously with an update for guidelines for terminal evaluations of GEF projects. Building on the experiences from monitoring LDCF/SCCF projects (AMAT tool) for the further monitoring of the implementation of SPA projects as outlined in the management response is a welcome course of action. For continued efforts to evaluate and draw lessons learned on climate change resilience from SPA project, findings from the GEF EO's wider work on climate change adaptation, especially the LDCF and SCCF evaluations, also need to be taken into account.	Substantial. Progress Apr 2012– Apr 2013: The Secretariat continues to monitor the SPA portfolio as part of the AMR process. UNDP response: UNDP is not aware of any evaluation guidelines for SPA projects, and understands that the updated guidelines for terminal evaluations have not been finalized. See UNDP response to items 7 regarding the AMAT. UNEP Response: We welcome guidelines on evaluation of SPA projects in consultation, to be carried out with Agencies and STAP.	Substantial. Revised guidelines for terminal evaluations which apply to SPA projects are nearly finalized.

			While this framework and tool was developed specifically for the Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF) and Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF), both would also apply to the needs of the SPA. Please refer to documents: GEF/LDCF.SCCF.9/inf.4 and GEF/LDCF.SCCF.9/inf.5 (GEF/ME/C.39/5 October 2010)		adaptation projects.			
--	--	--	--	--	----------------------	--	--	--

Recommendation based on Council review of GEF Annual Thematic Evaluations Report 2011 (GEF/ME/C.41/02).

Ref. #	Date of Council Decision	GEF EO Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2011	GEF EO Comments in MAR 2011	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2012	GEF EO Rating & Comments in MAR 2012
9	Nov. 2011	As GEF-5 strategies were approved and are now under implementation, NCSA experiences and lessons learned should be incorporated in a new GEF strategic framework for capacity development for GEF-6.	The Secretariat takes note of the evaluation's first recommendation "As GEF-5 strategies were approved and are now under implementation NCSA experiences and lessons learned should be incorporated in a new GEF strategic framework for capacity development for GEF-6." The Secretariat believes that capacity development is better achieved if situated within projects and programs that are directed towards GEF focal area objectives and therefore would take into consideration the findings of the review while developing the overall programming approach for GEF-6.	Decision on Agenda Item 8: The Council, having considered document GEF/ME/C.41/02, Annual Thematic Evaluations Report 2011 and document GEF/ME/C.41/03, Management Response to the Annual Thematic Evaluations Report 2011, requested the Secretariat to incorporate NCSA experiences and lessons learned in the programming approach for GEF-6.	Medium. A coordination meeting with agencies and convention secretariats is planned to discuss how better to integrate NCSA results in capacity development approach of the GEF and to better respond to convention guidance on capacity development especially in preparation of GEF6 replenishment.	Not possible to verify yet. The decision was taken in November 2011 and programming for GEF-6 has not started yet.	Medium. The programming directions for GEF-6 are under discussion. The new way of doing business will provide an opportunity to incorporate ideas arising from the NCSAs into those strategies as they evolve throughout the replenishment process. UNEP Response: We welcome efforts to refine and expand the limited mandate given to CCCD in GEF 5, particularly in moving to more comprehensive cross cutting CD approaches reflecting key drivers of change that can help move GEF investment to stronger transformational change.	Medium: Programming for GEF-6 is ongoing and the Secretariat should continue to incorporate NCSA experiences and lessons learned in the programming approach for GEF-6.

Recommendation based on Council review of GEF Annual Thematic Evaluations Report 2011 (GEF/ME/C.41/02).

Ref. #	Date of Council Decision	GEF EO Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2011	GEF EO Rating & Comments in MAR 2011	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2012	GEF EO Rating & Comments in MAR 2012
10	Nov. 2011	Knowledge products of NCSAs, including toolkits on how to conduct them, should be made available to agencies and GEF workshops such as Multi-Stakeholder Dialogues.	The Secretariat welcomes the finding that the Global Support Program (GSP) improved the implementation of NCSAs. The Secretariat will work through the Country Support Program (CSP) to ensure that the evaluation's second recommendation that "Knowledge products of NCSAs, including toolkits on how to do them, should be made available to agencies and GEF workshops such as Multi-stakeholder dialogues, " is implemented. Relevant materials and toolkits will be updated and distributed through the Expanded Constituency Workshops (ECWs) and Multi-stakeholder dialogues.	Decision on Agenda Item 8: The Council, having considered document GEF/ME/C.41/02, Annual Thematic Evaluations Report 2011 and document GEF/ME/C.41/03, Management Response to the Annual Thematic Evaluations Report 2011, requested the Secretariat to make available knowledge products of NCSAs, including toolkits on how to conduct them, to agencies and GEF workshops such as Multi-Stakeholder Dialogues as well as to GEF focal points.	Medium. The Secretariat will prepare a targeted publication on capacity development to enhance dissemination of results achieved through NCSAs. The Secretariat will make an effort to disseminate the publication during ECW's, Multi-stakeholder seminars and Familiarization seminars that are attended by OFP's and PFP's.	Not possible to verify yet. The decision was taken in November 2011 and there has not been enough time to develop NCSA knowledge products.	High: The Secretariat produced a publication on NCSAs and the results and lessons learned from the process. In addition, the ECWs for 2013 contain a session dedicated to NCSAs and the possibilities to address the needs identified therein. UNEP Response: We suggest that the recommendation should be revised because the dissemination of NCSA products may now be outdated given that GEF 5 moved on to CCCD projects. We agree to conducting joint Knowledge Management exercises among the GEFSec and Agencies implementing the CCCD portfolio.	Substantial. The ECW sessions dedicated to NCSAs is a welcome exercise. The publication the Secretariat produced predates the evaluation; therefore the Evaluation Office encourages the Secretariat to make available other knowledge products of NCSAs. Regarding UNEP's comment, Council decisions cannot be revised.

Recommendation based on Council review of GEF Annual Performance Report 2011 (GEF/ME/C.42/01).

Ref. #	Date of Council Decision	GEF EO Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2012	GEF EO Rating & Comments in MAR 2012
11	June 2012	There is early evidence of inclusion of Operational Focal Points in monitoring and evaluation plans at project entry, as required in the new GEF M&E policy. GEF Agencies should continue in this direction and enhance their efforts to specify how OFPs will be engaged, when feasible and relevant, in project or program monitoring and evaluation.	The Secretariat is encouraged by the finding that GEF Projects are beginning to specify how Operational Focal Points (OFPs) will be informed and where feasible, involved in M&E activities. The engagement of OFPs is a new requirement in the M&E policy and intended to reflect the efforts of countries to establish or improve national monitoring and evaluation, and include an emphasis on increased country ownership. The Secretariat and Evaluation Office have collaborated to introduce this new monitoring and evaluation minimum requirement and explain its implications through the Expanded Constituency Workshops (ECWs). The Secretariat supports the recommendation of the APR that GEF Agencies should enhance their efforts to specify how OFPs will be engaged, when feasible and relevant, in project or program monitoring and evaluation.	Decision on Agenda Item 7: The Council, having reviewed document GEF/ME/C.42/01, "Annual Performance Report 2011," and document GEF/ME/C.42/02, "Management Response to the Annual Performance Report 2011," noted that evidence emerges that the GEF Agencies are starting to involve GEF Operational Focal Points in a more systematic manner in monitoring and evaluation. The Council requested the GEF Agencies to continue to enhance their efforts to specify how Operational Focal Points will be engaged, when feasible and relevant, in project or program monitoring and evaluation.	Medium: The ECWs have incorporated session conducted by the EO on the role of OFPs in Monitoring and Evaluation. UNDP response: The UNDP EO guidance for project terminal evaluations issued in 2012, which outlines the role of OFPs, is being used at the project and country level and the quality of terminal evaluations continues to improve. In addition, OFPs increasingly provide substantive input to the PIR for UNDP supported projects. UNEP Response: UNEP systematically shares PIRs, MTE and TEs with OFPs. In addition, OFPs are involved in TORs of MTE and TEs. UNEP has also invited OFPs to consider providing upstream views on PIRs and is awaiting their responses. One issue encountered is the wish by some countries to question the independence of MTE and TEs, and it would be useful for this issue, which is already in GEF Policy, to be reiterated by GEF EO Director at forthcoming council meetings.	Not possible to verify yet. Some of the actions – as per the responses from UNDP and UNEP – are starting to take place. World Bank has not yet provided a response. Overall, the progress made on this issue is difficult to verify at this moment. The Office will track this issue in future.

Recommendation based on Council review of Annual Country Portfolio Evaluation Report 2012 (GEF/ME/C.42/03).

Ref. #	Date of Council Decision	GEF EO Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2012	GEF EO Rating & Comments in MAR 2012
12	June 2012	Project approval and implementation in Small Island Developing States should be more flexible and context-specific.	The Secretariat takes note of the remaining conclusions in the 2012 ACPER, including the unique challenges faced by Small Island Developing States (SIDS) in developing and implementing projects. With respect to recommendation one "Project approval and implementation in Small Island Developing States should be more flexible and context specific," caution should be exercised in order not to give the impression that each country's unique needs can be met in every case. The specific example of Cuba outlined in paragraph 84 provides an appropriate example where such generalization would be impractical/infeasible. Nevertheless, the GEF Secretariat supports the recommendation that calls for increased flexibility to SIDS whenever it is indeed feasible.	Decision on Agenda Item 8: The Council, having reviewed document GEF/ME/C.42/03, "Annual Country Portfolio Evaluation Report 2012," document GEF/ME/C.42/04, "Management Response to the Annual Country Portfolio Evaluation Report 2012," and having taken note of the two Country Portfolio Evaluations in Nicaragua and OECS (GEF/ME/C.42/Inf.02) requested the Secretariat: 1) To consider ways to make project approval and implementation in Small Island Developing States more flexible and context-specific.	[No rating provided] UNEP Response: The streamlining reform may have helped so far (evidence still outstanding) but there was no streamlining specific to SIDs and LDCs. We recommend a special attention to this in the second round of streamlining reforms.	Negligible. GEF EO finds no evidence of SIDS/LDCs-specific streamlining so far.

Recommendation based on Council review of Annual Country Portfolio Evaluation Report 2012 (GEF/ME/C.42/03).

Ref. #	Date of Council Decision	GEF EO Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2012	GEF EO Rating & Comments in MAR 2012
13	June 2012	The burden of monitoring requirements of multifocal area projects should be reduced to a level comparable to that of single focal area projects.	The Secretariat has had many discussions with Agencies related to recommendation two "The burden of monitoring requirements of multifocal area projects should be reduced to a level comparable to that of single focal area projects." It should also be noted that using tracking tools for multifocal area projects was only introduced in GEF-5, so it may be premature to draw this conclusion at this time. Furthermore, one should remember that these new tools are required only three times during the life of the project, a very reasonable requirement: at CEO endorsement, mid-term, and project completion. Additionally, for multifocal area projects, the Secretariat does not require the full set of tracking tools be applied. Rather, as the language in paragraph 86 suggests, the tools should only be completed for the "essential focal area indicators that need to be monitored throughout multifocal area projects." There are currently no multifocal area projects under implementation that require tracking tools from more than one focal area.	Decision on Agenda Item 8: The Council, having reviewed document GEF/ME/C.42/03, "Annual Country Portfolio Evaluation Report 2012," document GEF/ME/C.42/04, "Management Response to the Annual Country Portfolio Evaluation Report 2012," and having taken note of the two Country Portfolio Evaluations in Nicaragua and OECS (GEF/ME/C.42/Inf.02) requested the Secretariat: 2) To reduce the burden of monitoring requirements of multifocal area projects to a level comparable to that of single focal area projects.	Substantial. The current approach to tracking tools for multifocal areas is that the tools should only be completed for the "essential focal area indicators that need to be monitored throughout multifocal area projects." UNDP response: UNDP has at least one MFA project under implementation that has completed both the BD and CCM tracking tools. This increase in the monitoring and reporting requirements has significant implications on the use of the reduced fees. UNEP Response: Such streamlining has not yet been done and we urge fast tracking discussion between GEFSec and Agencies to arrive at recommendations to Council.	Negligible. GEF EO finds no evidence that tracking tools burdens for MFAs have been reduced.

Recommendation based on Council review of Annual Country Portfolio Evaluation Report 2012 (GEF/ME/C.42/03).

Ref. #	Date of Council Decision	GEF EO Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2012	GEF EO Rating & Comments in MAR 2012
14	June 2012	South-South cooperation should be enabled as components of national, regional and global projects where opportunities for exchange of technology, capacity development and/or sharing of best practices exist.	The Secretariat takes note of recommendation three that "South-South cooperation should be enabled as components of national, regional and global projects where opportunities for exchange of technology, capacity development and/or sharing best practices exist." The Secretariat agrees as is stated in paragraph 89 that enabling South-South cooperation should not be in the form of funding from GEF project financial resources to those Southern countries providing South-South support.	Decision on Agenda Item 8: The Council, having reviewed document GEF/ME/C.42/03, "Annual Country Portfolio Evaluation Report 2012," document GEF/ME/C.42/04, "Management Response to the Annual Country Portfolio Evaluation Report 2012," and having taken note of the two Country Portfolio Evaluations in Nicaragua and OECS (GEF/ME/C.42/Inf.02) requested the Secretariat: 3) To enable South-South cooperation activities as components of national, regional and/or global projects where opportunities for exchange of technology, capacity development and/or sharing of best practices exist.	Medium. The Secretariat looks for opportunities in collaboration with agencies to support South-South collaboration. See following response from UNEP. UNEP Response: We welcome the recent approval of the SCCF project 'Enhancing Capacity Knowledge and Technology to Build Climate Resilience of Vulnerable Developing Countries' that is based on South-South Cooperation . It is too early to see results but we propose more attention to this issue in the GEF portfolio, including finding ways and means to facilitate them through a targeted CCCD assessment project in GEF 6.	Not possible to verify yet. Too few projects to date.

Recommendation based on Council review of Annual Thematic Evaluations Report 2012 (GEF/ME/C.43/02).

Ref. #	Date of Council Decision	GEF EO Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2012	GEF EO Rating & Comments in MAR 2012
15	Nov. 2012	An explicit discussion of envisaged causal linkages and chains of causality in line with current scientific knowledge should form the basis for the formulation of GEF-6 Strategies.	The Secretariat will consider the specific causal linkages and pathways presented in this report for each focal area when developing the GEF-6 strategies. As stated in the evaluation and as was undertaken in GEF-5, the scientific community represented by the STAP panel, together with experts that may be engaged through Technical Advisory Panels, will play a central role to ensure the latest scientific knowledge is fully taken into account in strategy development.	Decision on Agenda Item 10: The Council, having considered document GEF/ME/C.43/02, Annual Thematic Evaluations Report 2012 and document GEF/ME/C.43/03, Management Response to the Annual Thematic Evaluations Report 2012, requested the Secretariat to ensure that: a) An explicit discussion of envisaged causal linkages and chains of causality in line with current scientific knowledge forms the basis for the formulation of GEF-6 Strategies.	Medium. The Secretariat, is currently working with the TAGs to develop programming strategies for GEF-6. The TAGs are examining underlying drivers and causal linkages in developing such strategies.	Medium: The explicit discussion needs to continue throughout the development of GEF-6 programming strategies.

Recommendation based on Council review of Annual Thematic Evaluations Report 2012 (GEF/ME/C.43/02).

Ref. #	Date of Council Decision	GEF EO Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2012	GEF EO Rating & Comments in MAR 2012
16	Nov. 2012	GEF-6 Strategies should enable a more flexible and strategic approach to developing Multi-Focal Area projects which would be able to adopt elements from several focal areas in a consistent manner.	The Secretariat fully agrees with Recommendation 2 that GEF-6 strategies should “enable a more flexible and strategic approach to developing Multi-Focal Area projects, which would be able to adopt elements from several focal areas in a consistent manner.” The Secretariat and the Agencies have initiated discussions in regards to the streamlining measures, and will continue to work with our partners to develop a more coherent strategy for Multi-Focal Area projects in GEF-6.	Decision on Agenda Item 10: The Council, having considered document GEF/ME/C.43/02, Annual Thematic Evaluations Report 2012 and document GEF/ME/C.43/03, Management Response to the Annual Thematic Evaluations Report 2012, requested the Secretariat to ensure that: b) GEF-6 Strategies enable a more flexible and strategic approach to Multi-Focal Area projects, which would be able to adopt elements from several focal areas in a consistent manner.	Medium. The TAGs, in developing focal area strategies for GEF-6 are considering key integrated programs or “signature programs” towards developing multi-focal strategic interventions that address underlying drivers of degradation of global environmental commons. UNEP Response: Please see comments to point 13.	Medium: The discussion needs to continue throughout the development of GEF-6 strategies.

Recommendation based on Council review of Annual Thematic Evaluations Report 2012 (GEF/ME/C.43/02).

Ref. #	Date of Council Decision	GEF EO Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2012	GEF EO Rating & Comments in MAR 2012
17	Nov. 2012	GEF-6 Strategies should be based on systematic considerations of potential pathways from GEF activities to the broader adoption of GEF results to further define and strengthen the GEF's catalytic role.	The Secretariat and the Agencies are committed to considering potential ways GEF and LDCF/SCCF activities can lead to transformational impacts. As part of the GEF-6 strategy development process, the Secretariat will take Recommendation 3 into account and consider "potential pathways from GEF activities to the broader adoption of GEF results to further define and strengthen the GEF's catalytic role."	Decision on Agenda Item 10: The Council, having considered document GEF/ME/C.43/02, Annual Thematic Evaluations Report 2012 and document GEF/ME/C.43/03, Management Response to the Annual Thematic Evaluations Report 2012, requested the Secretariat to ensure that: c) GEF-6 Strategies include a strengthened articulation of potential pathways from activities to the broader adoption of results to maximize the GEF's catalytic role.	Medium. GEF-6 programming approaches, under development, articulate broader adoption approaches. UNEP Response: We suggest a brainstorming to develop innovative means to achieve this important goal. For example, how can Agencies collaborate better in reviewing each other's projects to build in lessons and results of complementary projects? Could the STAP develop a new line of Advisory Products called "Lessons learnt"?	Not possible to verify yet: GEF-6 Strategies have not been completed yet.

Recommendation based on Council review of Annual Thematic Evaluations Report 2012 (GEF/ME/C.43/02).

Ref. #	Date of Council Decision	GEF EO Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2012	GFE EO Rating & Comments in MAR 2012
18	Nov. 2012	GEF-6 Strategies should revisit the GEF's overall approach to capacity development in response to concerns voiced by the conventions.	The Secretariat agrees with Recommendation 5 and will revisit the GEF's overall approach to capacity development as part of the GEF-6 strategy discussion. While the Secretariat agrees that capacity development is included as part of activities within focal areas, flexibility for standalone capacity development is useful and necessary.	Decision on Agenda Item 10: The Council, having considered document GEF/ME/C.43/02, Annual Thematic Evaluations Report 2012 and document GEF/ME/C.43/03, Management Response to the Annual Thematic Evaluations Report 2012, requested the Secretariat to ensure that: d) GEF-6 Strategies revisit the GEF's overall approach to capacity development in response to concerns voiced by the conventions.	Medium. The GEF-6 programming strategies, undertaken through the TAGs are also reviewing GEF's approach to capacity development. UNEP Response: The TAG for CCCD has taken this into consideration and we are hopeful that Council will see value of these new directions including more funding to CCCD.	Medium: The review of GEF's approach to capacity development should continue throughout the development GEF-6 Strategies.

Recommendation based on Council review of GEF Annual Impact Report 2012 (GEF/ME/C.43/04).

Ref. #	Date of Council Decision	GEF EO Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2012	GEF EO Rating & Comments in MAR 2012
19	Nov. 2012	[This Council Recommendation comes from a complete reading of the report (GEF Annual Impact Report 2012), and is not linked to any individual GEF EO recommendation]	[No direct response given to this Council decision, as it was not linked to a specific GEF EO recommendation].	Decision on Agenda Item 11: The Council, having reviewed document GEF/ME/C.43/04, "GEF Annual Impact Report 2012", and document GEF/ME/C.43/05, "Management Response to the GEF Annual Impact Report 2012", took note of the considerable achievements of GEF support to the South China Sea and adjacent areas including, amongst others, that in 21 of 26 cases where comparative data could be obtained, GEF has supported initiatives that reduced environmental stress and improved or maintained socioeconomic conditions. Given the important contributions that GEF support has made to addressing regional transboundary concerns, and the role of the GEF as a critical player in the region, as noted by the report, the Council requested the Secretariat to: 1) Take into account the findings and recommendations of this evaluation when screening future proposals submitted for GEF funding in the South China Sea and adjacent areas, most notably: • when choosing areas for expansion, that the conditions conducive to broader adoption are present in those areas; • that the distinctive competencies within the GEF partnership are more fully drawn on to mainstream transboundary environmental concerns among sectorial ministries • that systems for managing risks and trade-offs are specified; • that more attention is given to the support of actions that address regional environmental goods and services; • that cash and in-kind cofinancing for regional services provided by GEF projects reach sustainable levels by project end; • that adequate coordination and management of risks within the GEF partnership be given attention.	[No rating provided] UNEP Response: The June Council submissions have incorporated these recommendations and build upon agencies comparative advantages to best support countries (PEMSEA, Fish Refugia). We note, however, that the transaction costs of regional projects are still high, both for countries and agencies. Recently proposals were sent to GEF Sec and Agencies by UNEP, FAO and AfDB for consideration on streamlining regional projects which we hope can be immediately acted upon.	Not possible to verify yet: There is currently insufficient information for Evaluation Office to assess the adoption of Council's recommendation. This issue will be covered in ongoing work for OPS5, which will offer a chance for review.

Recommendation based on Council review of GEF Annual Impact Report 2012 (GEF/ME/C.43/04).

Ref. #	Date of Council Decision	GEF EO Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2012	GEF EO Rating & Comments in MAR 2012
20	Nov. 2012	Recommendation 5 from the GEF Annual Impact Report 2012: A more robust programmatic approach should be developed for GEF IW support to the SCS and adjacent area...GEF engagements with the magnitude of support given in the SCS and adjacent areas require more robust tracking and reporting of multiagency commitments to communication, coordination and introspection among IW projects, and a common focus on global benefits. GEF has introduced the stocktaking meetings for this purpose, but as indicated above, they have only skirted around critical GEF partnership issues. Given the structural nature of the interactions among agencies (being equals), the responsibility for more robust tracking and reporting with regards to multi-agency collaboration and cooperation should be placed on the GEF Secretariat. This new function should be approached as an instrument for adaptive management. It should also allow for inputs from the various GEF stakeholders, including country representatives, and seek to identify and tackle critical issues affecting the functioning of the partnership and the execution of the broader GEF strategy in the region.	The Secretariat and Agencies appreciate Recommendation 5 that "A more robust programmatic approach should be developed for GEF IW support to the SCS and adjacent areas." Subsequent to the implementation of the projects in the SCS, the GEF has recognized the importance of a programmatic approach in the region and has made several changes in how programming is undertaken. This includes a medium-sized project (MSP) for the recently approved World Bank programmatic approach in the SCS with the mandate to coordinate the program.1In addition to measures taken within specific programmatic approaches and projects, we are supporting robust dialogues through the Inter-Agency Focal Area Task Forces which are chaired by the GEF Secretariat as a forum for further collaboration and cooperation. It should also be noted, that in the case of the SCS regional project, there was no attempt prior to the approval of these projects to think of strategic partnerships, programmatic approaches or similar constructs.	The Council, having reviewed document GEF/ME/C.43/04, "GEF Annual Impact Report 2012", and document GEF/ME/C.43/05, "Management Response to the GEF Annual Impact Report 2012", took note of the considerable achievements of GEF support to the South China Sea and adjacent areas including, amongst others, that in 21 of 26 cases where comparative data could be obtained, GEF has supported initiatives that reduced environmental stress and improved or maintained socioeconomic conditions. Given the important contributions that GEF support has made to addressing regional transboundary concerns, and the role of the GEF as a critical player in the region, as noted by the report, the Council requested the Secretariat to: 2) Adopt a more robust tracking and reporting approach to ensure Agency accountability for collaboration and cooperation in the South China Sea and the East Asian Seas.	Medium. The Secretariat and the agencies, through the Interagency task force are examining different modalities to develop a robust tracking and reporting approach. UNEP Response: Agencies and GEFSec have reviewed and discussed these recommendations with countries concerned. The IW portfolio has different modalities for programmatic coherence. The Inter-Agency IW Task Force will provide a robust tracking tool. In addition, other mechanisms can be developed, such as cross communication between Steering Committees of the different projects; and sharing of PIRs before finalization.	Not possible to verify yet: There is currently insufficient information for Evaluation Office to assess the adoption of Council's recommendation. This issue will be covered in ongoing work for OPS5, which will offer a chance for review.

Recommendation based on Council review of GEF Annual Impact Report 2012 (GEF/ME/C.43/04).

Ref. #	Date of Council Decision	GEF EO Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2012	GEF EO Rating & Comments in MAR 2012
21	Nov. 2012	The findings of this (GEF Annual Impact Report 2012) evaluation should be considered when developing the GEF 6 International Waters Focal Area and, when applicable, the strategies of other focal areas.	The Secretariat as stated in Recommendation 8 will consider the findings from the SCS evaluation when developing the GEF-6 IW strategies.	Decision on Agenda Item 11: The Council, having reviewed document GEF/ME/C.43/04, "GEF Annual Impact Report 2012", and document GEF/ME/C.43/05, "Management Response to the GEF Annual Impact Report 2012", took note of the considerable achievements of GEF support to the South China Sea and adjacent areas including, amongst others, that in 21 of 26 cases where comparative data could be obtained, GEF has supported initiatives that reduced environmental stress and improved or maintained socioeconomic conditions. Given the important contributions that GEF support has made to addressing regional transboundary concerns, and the role of the GEF as a critical player in the region, as noted by the report, the Council requested the Secretariat to: 3) Take in to account the findings and recommendations of this evaluation when developing the GEF 6 International Waters Strategies	Medium. Under consideration as GEF-6 programming strategies are being developed. UNEP Response: UNEP as a member of TAG for IW will continue to work with GEFSec and Agencies to address these findings.	Not possible to verify yet: There is currently insufficient information for Evaluation Office to assess the adoption of Council's recommendation. This issue will be covered in ongoing work for OPS5, which will offer a chance for review.

Recommendation based on LDCF/SCCF Council review of Evaluation of the Special Climate Change Fund (GEF/LDCF.SCCF.11/ME/02).

Ref. #	Date of LDCF/SCCF Council Decision	GEF EO Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2012	GEF EO Rating & Comments in MAR 2012
-	Nov. 2011	Recommendation 2: The LDCF/SCCF Council should ask the Secretariat to prepare proposals to ensure: a) transparency of the project pre-selection process; b) dissemination of good practices through existing channels; c) visibility of the fund by requiring projects to identify their funding source.	The Secretariat is pleased to fully endorse the recommendations put forth in the Evaluation... The Secretariat intends to take action in order to implement the second recommendation.	Decision on Agenda Item 6, Evaluation of the Special Climate Change Fund: The LDCF/SCCF Council, having reviewed the document GEF/LDCF.SCCF.11/ME/02, Evaluation of the Special Climate Change Fund, and document GEF/LDCF.SCCF.11/ME/03, Management response to the Evaluation of the SCCF, notes the conclusion of the impact of funding levels and the need for continued support. The LDCF/SCCF Council requests the Secretariat to prepare proposals to ensure: a) transparency of the project pre-selection process; b) dissemination of good practices through existing channels; c) visibility of the fund by requiring projects to identify their funding source.	<u>Overall rating: Substantial</u> a) High. In response to Recommendation 2-(a), the Secretariat developed a pre-selection criteria information document to be circulated during the 12th LDCF/SCCF Council meeting. The pre-selection process and criteria were included in the <i>Updated Operational Guidelines for the SCCF</i> , approved by the LDCF/SCCF Council in November 2012. The contents of this document were also posted on the GEF website, for transparency purposes, during the corresponding Work Program. (please see http://www.thegef.org/gef/https%3A/%252Fwww.thegef.org/gef/sccf/criteria) Furthermore, the Adaptation Task Force has received a written report on the pre-selection process for June 2013 SCCF Work Program. b) Substantive. The dissemination of good practices continues through the Annual Monitoring Report, GEFs newsletter (Greenline), and starting with the Climate COP in 2012, through the Adaptation Practitioners Days, a two day event that gathers LDCF/SCCF practitioners. The Adaptation Learning Mechanism	<u>Overall rating: Substantial</u> a) High. The EO is in agreement with the rating provided by management. The EO encourages the Secretariat to periodically assess the application of the pre-selection process and criteria. b) Substantive. Efforts made by the Secretariat to disseminate lessons are welcome. Continued efforts should include the preparation of a plan to systematically disseminate good practices through existing channels at the fund level. c) Negligible. While reference to the communication and visibility policy and requests through the Adaptation Task Force may be helpful, the Council decision calls for the Secretariat to prepare a proposal to ensure visibility of the fund, which is in addition to the GEF communication and visibility policy. SCCF visibility requires clear identification of the funding source in outreach documents, project leaflets, press releases, and websites. The Secretariat may consider adopting a logo.

					continues to serve as a key platform for disseminating lessons and good practice on adaptation. c) Medium. The GEF has a communication and visibility policy, which, by default, applies. Secretariat has requested, through the Adaptation Task Force, that projects identify their funding source.	
--	--	--	--	--	---	--