

BIODIVERSITY AND THE GEF

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE FOURTH OVERALL PERFORMANCE STUDY OF THE GEF



OPS4
PROGRESS TOWARD IMPACT

About the OPS4 Learning Products Series...

The Monitoring and Evaluation Policy of the Global Environment Facility (GEF) states that monitoring and evaluation should contribute to knowledge building and organizational improvement. Findings and lessons should be accessible to target audiences in a user-friendly way. Evaluation reports should be subject to a dynamic dissemination strategy tailored to the audience for that specific report. By sharing findings and lessons widely, monitoring and evaluation contributes to increased awareness of the importance of global environmental benefits, confidence in GEF work, and leveraging of support.

To achieve this, the GEF Evaluation Office has created the **OPS4 Learning Products Series**. By presenting evaluative evidence from the Fourth Overall Performance Study (OPS4) of the GEF, these learning products intend to guide and support GEF stakeholders in applying success factors to strengthen project design and implementation, improve national policies, and enhance global environmental benefits.

This booklet presents evidence from OPS4 on GEF relevance and results in the biodiversity focal area. It examines the relevance of GEF biodiversity activities to convention guidance, analyzes the GEF's catalytic role in this focal area, reviews the progress of finished projects toward impact, and reflects on what this progress means for the GEF's biodiversity strategies.

Comments and suggestions for improving the Learning Products Series are welcome. These, together with requests for further information, should be addressed to gefeo@thegef.org.

Every four years the Global Environment Facility (GEF) is replenished by its donors. Each replenishment process has been informed by independent overall performance studies of the GEF. These studies have developed into authoritative reviews of the state of the art and of available knowledge on GEF functioning and results. The Fourth Overall Performance Study of the GEF (OPS4), completed in 2009 to serve as an input to the GEF's fifth replenishment, assessed the extent to which the GEF is achieving its objectives and identified potential improvements. Previous reviews were undertaken by outside experts; OPS4 was, for the first time in the study series's history, undertaken by a GEF entity itself: the GEF Evaluation Office.

Another first for the study series is that OPS4 tackled the issue of the impact of completed GEF projects. It is clear that the GEF cannot, on its own, bring about solutions to the major global environmental problems of our time. The amount of funding is simply not enough, and these solutions have to be accomplished by the governments and local communities of recipient countries and through actions in the developed world. However, evaluative evidence shows that most of the GEF's finished projects have achieved satisfactory progress toward impact. When the follow-up is in place that ensures the up-scaling of these achievements, longer term effects and impacts can be realized.

The scope of OPS4 was defined by a number of clusters and specific key evaluation questions, ranging from the full history of the GEF to a snapshot

OPS4 INFORMATION SOURCES

OPS4 gathered evidence from

- 2,389 completed, ongoing, and approved GEF projects
- 215 terminal evaluation reports of all finished GEF projects since OPS3
- 57 countries
- 24+ evaluation reports
- 28 case studies and technical documents

of the situation at a certain moment in time, from a few representative interventions to the full GEF portfolio. Impact analysis played a fundamental role in analyzing the results. Central to the OPS4 methodological approach was the implementation of the review of outcomes to impact (ROtI) methodology at the desk and field levels for the full GEF portfolio of projects. ROtI is one of the main approaches used by the GEF Evaluation Office to evaluate impact.

OPS4 FINDINGS IN BIODIVERSITY

The GEF is undoubtedly the world's chief financial entity for biodiversity conservation projects. GEF funding has led to the creation or improved management of more than 1,600 protected areas covering 360 million hectares, and improved sustainable use and management of biodiversity in the productive landscape through mainstreaming

of biodiversity in more than 100 million hectares of productive landscapes and seascapes. Through its Small Grants Programme, the GEF has invested \$452 million in over 10,000 projects executed by indigenous and community-based organizations in more than 100 countries. The GEF has also been essential to global implementation of the Cartagena Protocol, providing support for the development of national biosafety frameworks in 123 countries and for their subsequent implementation in pilot cases.

The GEF's objectives in biological diversity derive from those of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD):

the conservation of biological diversity, the sustainable use of its components and the fair and equitable sharing of the benefits arising out of the utilization of genetic resources, including by appropriate access to genetic resources and by appropriate transfer of relevant technologies, taking into account all rights over those resources and to technologies, and by appropriate funding.

THE GEF BIODIVERSITY PORTFOLIO

Recent figures from the GEF Secretariat indicate that, since 1991, the GEF has granted \$2.7 billion to support implementation of more than 900 biodiversity projects in over 155 countries (table 1). More than half of these funds were invested in Africa (\$726 million) and Latin America (\$932 million) (table 2).

BIODIVERSITY PORTFOLIO

- \$2,792 million
- 946 projects

In the biodiversity focal area during GEF-4 (as of June 30, 2009), the GEF Council approved 157 projects (\$455 million), 62 project identification forms (\$112.6 million), and 50 multifocal area projects (\$89.4 million). Support to **protected area systems** continued to be the largest allocation within the focal area, with about 90 percent of total funding going to protected area projects.

About 40 percent of the GEF funding was allocated to projects dealing with **mainstreaming biodiversity**, emphasizing two priorities: (1) strengthening policy and regulatory frameworks, and (2) fostering markets for biodiversity goods and services. Support

to the **Cartagena Protocol** totaled about \$28 million, while almost \$20 million has gone to **invasive species** projects and \$20 million to projects dealing with **access to benefit sharing**.

The three main Implementing Agencies for the GEF are the United Nations Development Programme, the United Nations Environment Programme, and the World Bank. According to the conventional comparative advantages of these three entities, the United Nations Environment Programme largely handles enabling activities, such as research and global and regional capacity development. These areas are farthest from the situation in which direct progress toward impacts and global environmental benefits could be demonstrated.

The United Nations Development Programme is strongly focused on the enabling and capacity

development areas, for which it is slightly easier to verify progress toward impacts and global environmental benefits, but not much. The World Bank is mainly seen as the investment arm of GEF funds, although several of its projects include elements of enabling activities and capacity development, as well as investment.

RELEVANCE OF GEF ACTIVITIES TO CONVENTION GUIDANCE

The GEF operational strategy for biodiversity sets out an approach for implementing the GEF's mandate in biodiversity in conformity with the guidance provided by the Conference of the Parties (COP) of the CBD. It provides a framework for the development and implementation of GEF-financed activities that allow recipient countries to address the complex global challenge of biodiversity conservation and sustainable use. The strategy also provides a framework for monitoring and evaluation.

Strategic priorities in GEF-4 focused primarily on protected areas and mainstreaming biodiversity. These priorities establish a flexible window to

TABLE 1 NUMBER OF BIODIVERSITY PROJECTS BY GEF PHASE

FOCAL AREA	PILOT PHASE	GEF-1	GEF-2	GEF-3	GEF-4	ALL PHASES
Biodiversity	57	206	286	240	157	946
All focal areas (inc. biodiversity)	114	378	628	793	476	2,389

Source: GEF Project Management Information System, through June 30, 2009.

TABLE 2 GEF INVESTMENT IN APPROVED BIODIVERSITY PROJECTS BY REGION

BIODIVERSITY INVESTMENT	AFRICA	ASIA	LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN	EUROPE AND CENTRAL ASIA	GLOBAL AND REGIONAL
Million \$	726	593	932	237	304
Percent of GEF total	37.8	26.7	52.0	21.4	19.7

Source: GEF Project Management Information System, through June 30, 2009.

implement convention guidance and reflect current thinking in the conservation community regarding the need to secure protected areas while making biodiversity protection a more conscious component of socioeconomic development.

The GEF has been responsive to CBD guidance, particularly on issues related to biodiversity conservation and sustainable use (see appendix B). Access to biosafety, however, has not kept up with potential demand, given the number of national biosafety frameworks completed so far (110) and based on consultations with the CBD Secretariat and GEF focal points.

More generally, OPS4 reached the following conclusions on GEF responsiveness to guidance given by the global conventions:

- The GEF continues to respond to COP guidance by incorporating it into GEF strategies, approving projects, and adapting its policies and procedures.
- COP guidance to the GEF continues to accumulate, although some conventions are moving into longer term strategies that could provide a better way for the GEF to develop future strategies.
- The GEF continues to be the primary funding source for implementation of the conventions on biodiversity, desertification, and persistent organic pollutants. Other sources have emerged, in climate change, but they are not fully operational.

- The GEF's reporting requirements to the conventions have generally been met, but certain aspects require improvement.
- Important steps have been taken to improve the relationship between the GEF and the conventions and their secretariats, most notably the climate change convention.

THE CATALYTIC ROLE OF THE GEF

The GEF's catalytic role is embodied in its approach of moving from **foundational activities** focusing on creating an enabling environment; to **demonstration activities**, which are innovative and show how new approaches and market changes can work; to **investment activities** that scale these previous endeavors up to a national level to achieve sustainable global environmental benefits. Demonstration, innovation, and market barrier removal do not work if there is no follow-up through investment or scaling up of financial means. Replication and up-scaling can be considered either an impact driver or desired intermediate state, depending on the time frame in which it is anticipated the replication or scaling up will take place.

The GEF's current funding level is sufficient to play a catalytic role in a limited number of countries; there is insufficient funding to bring demonstration and investment to fragile states, small island developing states, and least developed countries. Proposals to focus more exclusively on demonstration to the detriment of foundation and investment will reduce the GEF's catalytic effect and the sustainability of global environmental effects achieved.

Although there are elements of demonstration in foundational projects, and of foundation and investment in demonstration projects, overall — with the exception of GEF-1 — the GEF funding pattern over the three categories has been remarkably consistent. The share of foundation activities has gone down gradually over time, from 20 percent in the GEF pilot phase to 6 percent in GEF-4. The share of demonstration activities has been higher than 45 percent and rose to more than 65 percent in GEF-4. The share of investment has been more or less stable at between 15 and 23 percent; it had reached 43 percent in GEF-1.

There are significant differences among the focal areas in terms of distribution of funding by project category. In the biodiversity area, most projects have been in the demonstration category (table 3).

TABLE 3 DISTRIBUTION OF GEF FUNDING FOR BIODIVERSITY BY CATEGORY

FOUNDATION	DEMONSTRATION	INVESTMENT	UNABLE TO ASSESS	TOTAL
12	57	27	4	100

Source: GEF Project Management Information System, through June 30, 2009.

PROGRESS TOWARD BIODIVERSITY IMPACTS

Of the whole cohort of completed biodiversity projects analyzed with the ROTI methodology at the desk and field levels, 40 percent have made strong progress toward global environmental benefits, and 30 percent have made little or no progress. The remaining projects are between these two clear positions, having made some progress, but without establishing the means to continue this after project completion.

FACTORS THAT FOSTER PROJECT SUCCESS

ROTI desk reviews were conducted for the OPS4 cohort of 100 biodiversity projects. Within this cohort, 22 percent of the projects had documented impacts within the lifetime of the project. This means the terminal evaluation included evidence of a change in biodiversity status.

A review of key met and unmet impact drivers and assumptions for each category of project achievement was undertaken. Biodiversity projects that are highly likely to contribute to global environmental benefits have at least three main impact drivers that have been successfully met: stakeholder ownership and support, effective financial mechanisms, and adequate information flows. In addition, these projects have appropriately addressed issues of scale.

Stakeholder ownership and support are among the most commonly identified impact drivers met by successful projects, as well as being unmet by less successful projects. To carry forward project results after completion, stakeholders must have ownership of the process — they must in fact be transformed from “stakeholders” to “results owners.” In many cases, relevant national institutions must continue to provide political and/or financial support for global environmental benefits to be achieved; examples include passing and implementing policies and plans and mainstreaming biodiversity concerns into policies. The support and ownership of local communities is also critical for many projects, particularly to the effective management of protected areas. In projects related to production landscapes, private sector support can be an important factor. At the local level, ownership can develop when community socioeconomic welfare increases as a result of a particular intervention. The good and weak practices in these areas were extensively analyzed in the Evaluation Office study of the Role of Local Benefits in Global Environmental Programs.

Effective financial mechanisms in GEF biodiversity projects include a range of approaches, such as trust funds, markets for sustainable livelihoods, small grants programs, and incentives from and markets for certified products. Ultimately, stakeholders need financial means to support conservation and sustainable use activities. As with stakeholder ownership, financial factors can play a role at many different levels, from alternative income-generating activities for local communities

to national government budgeting for competing development priorities.

The importance of **adequate information flows** is often overlooked as a factor in successful projects. These information flows can include research, monitoring and evaluation, and public communications programs. High-quality data in sufficient quantities facilitate efficient resource allocation and lead to improved decision making. Effective information sharing also contributes to building awareness and disseminating experiences.

A wide range of key assumptions holds true for successful projects—albeit not without some complications, and the ROTI desk analysis identified some assumptions with which even many successful projects struggle. These assumptions are most often related to genuinely exogenous factors, such as sociopolitical stability within a country; and macroeconomic factors, such as the relative return

IMPACT DRIVERS PREDICTING SUCCESS

Biodiversity projects highly likely of contributing to global environmental benefits have met three main impact drivers:

- Stakeholders become results owners
- Effective financial mechanisms are in place
- Adequate information flows to build awareness and disseminate experiences is in place

on investment of different land use types, exchange rate fluctuations, and economically driven population flows.

FACTORS THAT PREVENT PROJECT SUCCESS

What makes biodiversity conservation so difficult is the ever-changing nature of any given set of environmental, sociopolitical, and economic circumstances in a geographic area. New threats can and sometimes do appear during the course of project implementation. Such threats include infrastructure development and changes in global commodity prices, which put pressure on resources such as timber or precious metals or drive agricultural expansion.

Among the potentially most significant emerging threats to biodiversity at a global scale is climate change — which could, for example, shift biome boundaries and disrupt the ecological rationale for the current delineations of protected area systems supported by the GEF. For this reason, the sustainability of project results must be considered a dynamic state.

Projects shown to be unlikely to contribute to global environmental benefits face multiple barriers to achieving impact drivers and meeting their original assumptions which keep them from demonstrating the progress necessary to trigger a higher rating. Commonly unmet impact drivers include insufficient

COMMONLY UNMET IMPACT DRIVERS IN BIODIVERSITY

- Insufficient technical and institutional capacity
- Ineffective or inappropriate policy frameworks
- Lack of mechanisms for replication/scaling up
- Insufficient financial sustainability
- Insufficient stakeholder ownership
- Insufficient information/data to assess whether intended progress is actually being achieved

technical and institutional capacity; ineffective or inappropriate policy frameworks — for example, related to land tenure issues; lack of mechanisms for replication/scaling up, such as dissemination strategies; insufficient financial sustainability, including reliance on markets that are not adequately developed or dependence on government funding, but with a low priority to receive such funds; insufficient stakeholder ownership (ownership can be affected by any one of many potentially relevant stakeholder groups); and insufficient information/data to assess whether intended progress is actually being achieved.

GEF projects often achieve outcomes such as building protected area management capacity or assisting in the establishment of institutional frameworks. However, in many cases, a protected area must be effectively managed (and monitored) for an extended period of time before it can be determined that the targeted globally significant biodiversity has been effectively conserved.

Projects in the middle category (about 50 percent) often fall victim to various unmet assumptions. Among these are the linkage of community benefits to conservation results, which does not hold; the lack of existence (and maintenance) of adequate individual technical capacity; the inadequacy of intervention (in breadth or scale) to address threats; the lack of materialization or maintenance of political support or ownership; the unavailability of financial options, either for community benefits or general sustainability of results.

Fourteen percent of the projects in the ROTI desk review cohort simply failed to deliver their outcomes. Specific issues faced by nonperforming projects include the following:

- Achieved few or no essential impact drivers during implementation
- Failed to generate the necessary support from local communities, national institutions, or the private sector

- Mechanisms for replication and/or scaling up are absent
- Failed to address threats relevant to the attainment of objectives
- Failed to assess risks to assumptions adequately in project design or during implementation
- Lack of understanding or failure to integrate the risk of political instability in some countries
- Sociopolitical issues were not adequately addressed, or were left to other actors

RESULTS-BASED MANAGEMENT AND TRACKING TOOLS

Biodiversity tracking tools were introduced in GEF-3 to measure progress in achieving the outputs and outcomes established at the portfolio level under the biodiversity focal area for the strategic objectives of catalyzing sustainability of protected area systems and mainstreaming biodiversity in production landscapes/seascapes and sectors. However, a tracking tool for building capacity in access to benefit sharing has yet to be developed. Outputs and outcomes derived from the tracking tools from the GEF-3 and GEF-4 project cohorts, respectively, were aggregated for analysis of directional trends and patterns at a portfolio level to both inform the GEF's future strategic directions and to report to the

GEF Council on portfolio-level performance in the biodiversity focal area on an annual basis.

Part of the biodiversity tracking tool for protected areas makes use of the Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool (METT), developed to provide a quick overview of progress in improving management effectiveness in individual protected areas. The METT has been widely adopted globally and is one of the indicators that track global progress to the CBD 2010 biodiversity target. At the level of individual protected areas, the tool provides data that could be useful as background information for impacts. Notably, there is a section that analyzes threats in detail and assesses how strong each is. However, the tool's documentation notes that it is too limited to allow a detailed evaluation of outcomes and is really aimed at providing a quick overview of the steps in the management framework up to and including outputs.

Certain questions in the tracking tool are more explicitly linked to favorable conservation outcomes than others, and a high total score on the METT

may mask underlying weaknesses in management activities that are thought to more strongly correlate with positive conservation outcomes. Going forward, the GEF should carefully analyze these relationships and augment findings gleaned from the METTs with an analysis that assesses the correlation between METT scores and conservation outcomes and impact.

Another section of the GEF tracking tool for protected areas is the Financial Sustainability Scorecard for National Protected Area Systems. This section is detailed and would provide very relevant information for assessing progress in maintaining the achievement of project results with regard to reducing the financing gap at the protected area system level.

All the data derived from the tracking tools for GEF's strategic objectives would require a very substantial effort to collate, provide quality assurance to, and analyze; this would require specific resources in the GEF Secretariat if it is to be done properly. If these resources are not forthcoming,

THE MANAGEMENT EFFECTIVENESS TRACKING TOOL

- Records scores to questions that measure the progress of protected areas in achieving management effectiveness as defined by the World Commission on Protected Areas protected area framework
- Operates with the assumption that an effectively managed protected area is achieving its conservation management objectives and is on track to produce positive conservation outcomes
- Provides data potentially useful as background information for impacts

the tools will not be useful at all. The challenge is to ensure sufficient resources during GEF-5 and to integrate indicators that derive from the progress from outcome to impact review into the tracking tools. The GEF Secretariat should be encouraged to put this type of activity high on its priority list for actual resources, and it should ask the Council to approve what could be a substantial exercise: to reinforce the tracking tools by including indicators for progress toward impact, and integrating these systems into the overall results-based management system of GEF-5.

OPS4 RECOMMENDATIONS

■ **Relevance to COP guidance.** Communications between the GEF and the COP secretariats should continue and should focus on improving the quality of guidance, meaning the relationship between the GEF Council and the COPs. The future allocation system in the GEF should exclude funding for communications to the conventions, since they are mandatory and are supposed to be paid in full by the GEF. Prioritization for implementation of guidance from the conventions should be at the national level. Within this prioritization process, issues eligible for GEF support can be identified. The GEF should be responsive to new guidance from the COPs between replenishments, either by including an unallocated amount in the replenishment or by accepting additional funds between

replenishments to enable implementation of new guidance. Reporting from the GEF to the conventions should include a critical assessment of GEF experience with implementation of projects, as well as its experience in incorporating COP guidance into its strategies and program priorities. Convention focal points need further involvement in the GEF at the national level (that is, GEF committees should require the participation of convention focal points) and at the global level.

■ **Catalytic role of the GEF.** Funding levels in the GEF should increase substantially to enable the GEF to play its full catalytic role in all recipient countries to ensure that global environmental benefits are achieved. At the project level, guidance on design, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation of the project's catalytic role should be encouraged to ensure better tracking and measurement of the GEF's catalytic effect. The Evaluation Office will encourage this through making its methodological framework, data, and findings available for further discussion and elaboration in the GEF partnership.

■ **Results.** To reach the full potential contribution that GEF projects can make toward global environmental benefits, projects need to be designed and implemented as much as possible to ensure local ownership, continued government support, and ongoing availability of funding after project closure to support

the biodiversity strategy's focus on sustainable biodiversity conservation. However, the support of such actors cannot be guaranteed by any project. This suggests the value of a portfolio approach at the national level, which currently exists only in the larger GEF recipient countries. Such an approach would include national GEF programming and follow-up, including continuing institutional support, monitoring, supervision, and evaluation, and would help recipient countries maximize progress toward global environmental benefits.

■ **Tracking tools.** Based on emerging evidence on impact drivers essential for progress toward global environmental benefits, the GEF Secretariat should ensure that its tracking tools fully encompass this longer term perspective. The GEF Council should approve and finance what could be a substantial exercise: developing and monitoring indicators for progress toward impact, integrated into the results-based management system of GEF-5. This would be particularly useful in the context of the more systemic approaches, which have emerged in later GEF biodiversity strategies, the results of which will only begin to emerge in the OPS5 cohort of projects. Harmonization between the tracking tools and the ROTI approach could provide a powerful system of indicators, enabling more effective management of portfolio-wide progress toward impacts.

APPENDIX A. OPS4 MAIN CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

NO.	CONCLUSION	RECOMMENDATION
THE GEF IN A CHANGING WORLD		
1	Global environmental trends continue to spiral downward.	Funding levels for global environmental issues need to rise substantially in order to tackle increasingly urgent problems.
2	The GEF has been underfunded since GEF-2, given the scope of its agenda, the guidance of the conventions, and its mode of operation.	The GEF-5 replenishment needs to offer a substantial increase over GEF-4, or the GEF will need to reduce support dramatically to focal areas, groups of countries, or modalities.
3	The GEF's link to international environmental agreements as a financial mechanism is an added value in tackling global environmental problems.	The GEF and the conventions need to interact to improve and focus guidance. Guidance should be prioritized at the national level.
4	The GEF's mode of operation through three levels of action — foundation, demonstration, and investment — brings an added value to its catalytic role.	The catalytic role of the GEF can be strengthened by increasing its funding level and by incorporating catalytic lessons in improved guidance and monitoring.
5	GEF support is relevant to national environmental and sustainable development priorities as well as to international and regional processes.	The GEF should further develop programming at the national level by supporting the creation of GEF national committees and GEF national business plans.
PROGRESS TOWARD IMPACT		
6	Seventy percent of finished projects show moderate to solid progress toward impact.	Progress toward impact in GEF-supported outcomes shows the value of a portfolio approach at the national level, which enables recipient countries to fully support and maximize progress toward global environmental benefits.
ISSUES AFFECTING RESULTS		
7	GEF projects achieve 80 percent moderately satisfactory and higher outcomes as compared to the benchmark norm of 75 percent, yet inefficiencies continue in the preapproval phase.	GEF project performance should be further strengthened through improved guidelines, a better fee structure, and strengthening of social and gender issues.
8	The Small Grants Programme continues to be an effective tool for the GEF in achieving global environmental benefits while addressing the livelihood needs of local populations, with special attention to reaching the poor.	The Small Grants Programme should be recognized as a GEF modality that should be available to all recipient countries.
9	Learning in the GEF is still not structurally and systematically encouraged.	Learning in the GEF should focus on cross-agency and cross-country learning and be consolidated in a corporate strategy.
10	Monitoring, tracking tools, and impact indicators are not yet fully integrated into a results-based management framework for the GEF.	The GEF should integrate impact indicators and measurements in a results-based framework for GEF-5.
11	Resources are managed relatively well in the GEF, but improvements are possible.	Improvements in resource management should focus on developing a new system for reserving funds for project ideas and reforming fiduciary standards and the fee system.
12	The governance model of the GEF compares well to that of other international organizations.	Governance can be further improved by ensuring a more substantive role for the Assembly, by addressing constituency problems, and by implementing a longer term process to achieve a better division between governance and management in the Council.
13	Tensions in the GEF partnership arise from programming and project identification issues; these in turn mostly stem from a lack of communication but are also due in part to fundamental questions on the appropriate roles of the GEF partners.	The Council should address tensions within the GEF partnership and provide guidance on roles and responsibilities.

APPENDIX B. ASSESSMENT OF GEF RESPONSE TO COP GUIDANCE

GUIDANCE TO THE GEF BY THE COP	GEF RESPONSE	EVALUATION OFFICE ASSESSMENT OF RESPONSE
BIOSAFETY		
Support implementation of the protocol (COP8)	GEF Council approved the Strategy for Financing Biosafety, which prioritizes protocol implementation, in particular the Updated Action Plan for Building Capacities for the Effective Implementation of the Cartagena Protocol	GEF strategy (SP6) was approved as a response to the meeting of the parties request
Assess impact of the Resource Allocation Framework in implementation of the protocol (COP9)	Issue has been put forward to GEF Chief Executive Officer for consideration	GEF responsiveness during GEF-4 has been limited to the approval of 26 project identification forms (potential value of \$25.6 million) for national biosafety framework implementation, but none of these have been approved by the Council
National reports (COP9)	Under consideration for GEF-5	None seem to have been approved in GEF-4
Support to Biosafety Clearing-House Mechanism project (COP9)	Support under consideration	Support is under consideration; a PIF was approved (September 2009) to support 50 countries' participation in the Clearing-House Mechanism.
Support to universities and relevant institutions (COP9)	Not eligible for GEF	Not eligible for GEF
Support to capacities in the areas of sampling and detection of living modified organisms (COP9)	Eligible within GEF-4	Eligible within GEF-4
Support to the following issues during GEF-5: implementation of legal and administrative systems, risk assessment and risk management, enforcement measures, liability and redress measures (COP9)	Biosafety strategy approved by Council in 2006 and it is proposed that this continue to be implemented in GEF-5	Agree
Global Biodiversity Outlook support (COP9)	GEF to provide information but not funding	Agree
ACCESS TO AND TRANSFER OF TECHNOLOGY		
Preparation of national assessments; improve access; capacity building under enabling activities; support to technologies and governance and regulatory frameworks (COP9)	Under consideration for GEF-5	Agree
Clearing-House Mechanism	Eligible in GEF-4; 14 projects approved so far in GEF-4 that support country participation in the mechanism	Agree

GUIDANCE TO THE GEF BY THE COP	GEF RESPONSE	EVALUATION OFFICE ASSESSMENT OF RESPONSE
Biodiversity strategies (revision and implementation)	Eligible in GEF-4 both to revise and to support implementation	Agree, implementation of biodiversity strategies has taken place through basically all projects, since these projects are approved under national biodiversity strategy and action plans
ECOSYSTEM APPROACH		
Support to apply ecosystem approach	Eligible in GEF-4; most GEF-3 and GEF-4 programming utilized ecosystem approach principles	Not possible to estimate; OPS4 did not do a project-level review
Support to national or subglobal assessments making use of the conceptual framework and methodologies of the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment	Several projects were supported in GEF-4 that use the conceptual framework and methodologies at the subnational level including the ProEcoServ project with site interventions in Chile, Vietnam, Trinidad and Tobago, South Africa, Lesotho, Mexico; subnational projects that apply the conceptual framework can operationalize and apply it in a more practical way, while assessments at the national or subglobal level may tend to be academic exercises	Agree
Private sector (engaging the business community in convention implementation)	Eligible in GEF-4; the GEF has seen an increase in engagement	Not reviewed in OPS4
Global invasive species (financial support)	GEF-4 has a strategic program (SP7); very few countries have requested support on this issue	Agree, very few projects have been put forward by Agencies and countries: four national projects and two regional (Latin America and the Caribbean and the Pacific Islands)
PROTECTED AREAS		
Full implementation of program of work	Eligible in GEF-4 (three of the seven strategic programs are on protected areas)	At least 147 projects deal with Strategic Objective 1 (protected areas) for about \$487 million
Specific issues: support to UNDP-GEF project (Supporting Country Action on CBD Protected Area); climate change links; protected areas remain a priority	UNDP-GEF project has just completed its midterm evaluation; any future support of this type will reflect the lessons learned and codified in the project's final evaluation; this is consistent with GEF policy on phased or follow-on projects. Supporting project interventions that address building climate resilience of protected area systems was eligible in GEF-4 and will continue to be eligible in GEF-5.	Not reviewed in OPS4

GUIDANCE TO THE GEF BY THE COP	GEF RESPONSE	EVALUATION OFFICE ASSESSMENT OF RESPONSE
Island biodiversity (support for implementation of work program and simplify GEF processes for small island developing states [SIDS])	Eligible in GEF-4, programmatic approach for Pacific SIDS under implementation. The GEF Secretariat offered to facilitate the development of a programmatic approach for the Caribbean, but this was not pursued by the countries. In GEF-4, SIDS received support for 31 projects totaling \$82 million and benefiting 34 SIDS; 16 Caribbean SIDS received grants totaling \$42 million, covering 17 projects; 18 SIDS have also received grants under the UNDP-GEF Global Early Action project to support implementation of the CBD Programme of Work on Protected Areas; a total of \$3,074,858 has been allocated for SIDS under this project, which is approximately 42% of the total project budget; 18 of the 47 countries funded by the project are SIDS (38%).	Agree on eligibility and on support for implementation of work program; no changes in project procedures for SIDS other than the approval of a programmatic approach for the Pacific
2010 biodiversity targets	Eligible in GEF-4	All projects in the GEF are related to the targets
Fund Fourth National Report	Eligible in GEF-4	Agree: six projects approved to support third report
Taxonomy initiatives (support of work program; support to taxonomy focal points)	Eligible in GEF-4	Not reviewed in OPS4
OTHER		
CBD four-year framework of program priorities to be included in GEF-5	GEF will take into account when developing GEF-5 strategies	This is a good step forward from the CBD to facilitate the GEF in incorporating CBD guidance and priorities
Resource mobilization	The GEF has worked closely with the CBD on development of a Resource Mobilization Strategy; COP9 has adopted a strategy that calls for the GEF to consider how it will support it; the CBD Secretariat is elaborating on this request	Agree
Information on the Resource Allocation Framework	Included in GEF report to the COP	Agree
Simplify, streamline project cycle	GEF project cycle revised	Agree

APPENDIX C. GLOSSARY

Activities: The practical, time-bound actions that a project carries out to deliver the desired project outputs.

Assumptions: The significant factors that, if present, are expected to contribute to the ultimate realization of project impacts, but that are largely beyond the power of the project to influence or address.

Global environmental benefits: Lasting improvements in the status of an aspect of the global environment that safeguards environmental functioning and integrity as well as benefits human society.

Impact: A fundamental and durable change in the condition of people and their environment brought about by the project.

Impact drivers: The significant factors that, if present, are expected to contribute to the ultimate realization of project impacts and that are within the ability of the project to influence.

Intermediate states: The transitional conditions between the project's outcomes and impacts that must be achieved in order to deliver the intended impacts.

Outcomes-impacts pathways: The means-ends relationships between project outcomes and the intended impacts that describe the specific conditions or factors that are required in order to achieve impacts. Developing a clear understanding of the outcomes-impacts pathways is at the core of the ROTI methodology.

Outputs: The goods and services that the project must deliver in order to achieve the project outcomes. Outputs are within the direct control of the project to deliver.

Outcomes: The short- to medium-term behavioral or systemic effects toward which the project makes a contribution, and that are designed to help achieve the project's impacts.

Review of outcomes to impact (ROTI): One of the main approaches to impact evaluation used by the GEF Evaluation Office.

Theory of change: A theory-based evaluation tool that maps out the logical sequence of means-ends linkages underlying a project and thereby makes explicit both the expected results of the project and the actions or strategies that will lead to achievement of results.

© 2010 Global Environment Facility Evaluation Office
1818 H Street, NW
Washington, DC 20433
Internet; www.gefeo.org
Email: gefeo@thegef.org

The findings, interpretations, and conclusions expressed here are those of the Global Environment Facility Evaluation Office and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Global Environment Facility, its Council, or the governments they represent.

Rights and Permissions

The material in this publication is copyrighted. Copying and/or transmitting portions or all of this work without permission may be a violation of applicable law. The Global Environment Facility Evaluation Office encourages dissemination of its work and will normally grant permission promptly. For permission to photocopy or reprint any part of this work, please send a request with complete information to gefeo@thegef.org.

Credits

Authors: Carlo Carugi, Senior Evaluation Officer, and Maria Soledad MacKinnon, Consultant, GEF Evaluation Office

Editing and layout: Nita Congress

Cover art: Garry Nichols/Images.com/Corbis (illustration); GEF/Joel Forte (photo)

