

OPS4

PROGRESS TOWARD IMPACT



FOURTH OVERALL PERFORMANCE STUDY OF THE GEF

COUNTRY CASE STUDIES: SELECTION PROCESS

METHODOLOGICAL PAPER #12

Country Case Studies – Selection Process

Introduction

1. One of the methods used by OPS4 to collect data is country case studies. These studies include visits to a selected number of countries to interview key GEF stakeholders at the national level and to verify project accomplishments and results through visits to a few completed projects. Terms of Reference for conducting these country studies are available. In order to achieve a solid coverage of regions, groups of countries, high and low recipients, coverage of focal areas, it was decided that 11 countries will be selected for OPS4 given budget and time constraints. The Evaluation Office has visited or conducted desk reviews of large portions of the portfolio of at least 53 countries since OPS3, so the additional 11 provide a representation of different country situations (see attached table).

Steps of the Selection Process

2. All GEF eligible countries were considered and then a series of steps were taken to select the additional 11 countries. The following paragraphs present this process.

First Step: Application of Selection Criteria

3. Each country was assessed according to the criteria, indicators, and scales presented in table 1. The seven criteria include RAF allocation, historic GEF allocation, terminal evaluations availability, number of field visits, number of projects, and LDC and SIDS status. A system of indicators and scores to measure each of the criteria was developed with the highest possible score of 1 and lowest possible score of negative 1 (see table 1 for definitions and indicators). The maximum possible score per country is 6.

Table 1: Criteria, Indicators, and Scales

Criterion	Definition	Indicators	Scale
RAF allocation	Countries that have individual allocations received higher priority	A higher place in the RAF is more relevant to the GEF mandate	RAF: 1 - >\$50 .75 - \$49-\$21+ group .5 - \$20-\$1+ group .25 - groups 0 - 0
Historic GEF allocation	Countries that have received relatively large amounts of funding received higher priority	A higher amount of GEF \$ is more relevant	Historic GEF allocation: 1 - >\$100 million .75 - \$100-\$20 .5 - \$20-\$5 .25 - <\$5 0 - 0
Terminal evaluations	Terminal evaluations are a good source of information	The higher the number of terminal evaluations submitted for the country, the higher rating	Terminal evaluations: 0 - No TEs .25 - 1-3 TEs .5 - 3-7 TEs .75 - 7-10 TEs 1 - >10 TEs
Number of field visits	Countries that have been visited many times are already adequately covered and might not provide as much new information	Countries with no previous field visits received higher points	Field visits: 1 - No field visit +.5 - 1-5 visits -.5 - 5-10 visits -1 - >10 visits
Number of projects	A large portfolio ensures that an evaluation can be done in a more cost effective way	Countries with few projects received lower points	Number of projects: 1 - >20 projects .75 - 10-20 projects .5 - 5-10 projects .25 - 1-5 projects 0 - No projects
LDC status	Least developed countries	Countries with LDC status received priority	Yes = .5 No = 0
SIDS status	Small island development states	Countries with SIDS received priority	Yes = .5 No = 0

Second Step: Regional Selection

4. The Evaluation Office selected the top scoring countries per region to end up with a list of 20 countries. These countries are presented in table 2 by region. Countries were classified using the regions as defined by the World Bank. The selected countries were subjected to further analysis as described in the next steps.

Table 2: List of Top Countries Selected by Region

Region	Country
Middle East and North Africa (MENA)	Algeria Iran Syria
Africa	Burkina Faso Cameron Madagascar Mozambique Seychelles
Asia and Pacific	Bhutan China India Indonesia Malaysia
Europe and Central Asia (ECA)	Mongolia Poland Russian Federation
Latin America and the Caribbean (LAC)	Brazil Chile Colombia Peru

Third Step: Countries Visited by Previous Evaluations

5. Countries that have been visited by the Evaluation Office in previous evaluations were eliminated at this point. Countries eliminated include Syria, Madagascar, Cameron, China, Russia Federation, and Brazil.

Fourth Step: Regional Representativeness

6. To make the selection more relevant to OPS4 and to improve representativeness, a separate ranking of countries receiving group RAF allocations for both biodiversity and climate change was carried out. The top 5 ranking countries according to table 1 criteria for group-group countries were Uruguay, Tunisia, Georgia, Bhutan, and Burkina Faso. Uruguay was added to the list of selected countries. Tunisia and Georgia are in the regions covered by other ongoing evaluations as explained below in the next step.

7. To further improve representativeness the Evaluation Office considered the highest scoring countries in underrepresented sub-regions. There was no representation from Central America or the Caribbean in the list of selected countries (see table 1). From Central America the highest scoring country was Mexico (one of the biggest recipients of GEF support). In the Caribbean, Cuba had the highest score, but OPS3 conducted a case study there. The next highest scoring country was Belize. Therefore, Mexico and Belize were selected from these sub-regions.
8. There was also no representation from East Africa in the list of selected countries. In this sub-region the highest scoring countries were Ethiopia and Sudan. Given present conditions in Sudan, the Evaluation Office decided to select Ethiopia.
9. Within the sub-regions of Asia, the Evaluation Office selected Indonesia due to its large GEF portfolio over Malaysia in East Asia, and Bhutan over India, given Bhutan's land locked characteristic, in South Asia.
10. Finally, in South America, Colombia and Peru were not selected over Chile given that the Office has not done any evaluation work in this country. Furthermore neither country is a RAF group-group country.

Fifth Step: Integration with GEF Evaluation Office Ongoing Evaluations

11. The synergy criterion measures the relevance of the particular country to ongoing evaluations proposed by the GEF Evaluation Office. Two regions were considered adequately covered by ongoing evaluations this year: MENA (Country Portfolio Evaluations in Egypt and Syria), and ECA (impact evaluations for Ozone Depleting Substances in Russia, Ukraine, Kazakhstan, and Uzbekistan).
12. China was reintroduced into the list to take advantage of recently completed and ongoing evaluations by GEF Agencies (such as case studies for UNDP and the World Bank environment sector evaluations) and an extensive database of project terminal evaluations. In addition, the country has one of the largest and most diverse GEF portfolios.

Final List of Countries for OPS4 Country Case Studies

13. The final countries selected for OPS4 country case studies are:
 - Latin America and Caribbean: Belize, Chile, Mexico, and Uruguay
 - Africa: Mozambique, Ethiopia, and Seychelles*
 - Asia and the Pacific: Bhutan, China, and Indonesia*
 - Middle East and North Africa: Iran

Visits by Other Evaluations in FY09

14. In addition to these eleven countries selected, two will be visited for Country Portfolio Evaluations and four will be visited for the Impact Evaluation. In total, 17 country case studies are expected to be conducted in FY09. Table 3 presents the list of countries selected for OPS4 country case studies.

Table 3: OPS4 Country Case Studies

Region	Country	Type of evaluation	RAF Group		RAF individual		LDC	SIDS	Land locked
			Bio	CC	Bio	CC			
MENA	Egypt	CPE			X	X			
MENA	Iran	Case			X	X			
MENA	Syria	CPE				X			
ECA	Russia	Impact			X	X			
ECA	Kazakhstan	Impact			X	X			X
ECA	Uzbekistan	Impact	X			X			X
ECA	Ukraine	Impact	X			X			X
LAC	Chile	Case			X	X			
LAC	Mexico	Case			X	X			
LAC	Uruguay	Case	X	X					
LAC	Belize	Case	X	X				X	
Africa	Mozambique	Case		X	X		X		
Africa	Seychelles	Case			X			X	
Africa	Ethiopia	Case			X	X	X		X
Asia	Indonesia	Case			X	X			
Asia	China	Catalytic			X	X			
Asia	Bhutan	Case	X	X			X		X

Note: *Indonesia and Mozambique were dropped as country case studies in April 2008 due to time constraints. Visits will take place in both countries but to conduct project reviews following the ROTI (Review of Outcomes to Impacts) methodology.

Countries Covered by Evaluation Work of the GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Team (FY06-FY09)

Country	Bio-safety 2006	Local Benefits Study 2006	CPEs 2006– 09	Annual Impact 2007– 09	SGP 2007	Project Cycle Eval- uation 2007	Verifi- cation 2007–08	Case Studies (Catalytic & CD) 2009	Total in OPS4	No. of coun- tries
Argentina		1							1	1
Bahamas	1								1	2
Bangladesh						1			1	3
Belize		1			1				2	4
Benin			1						1	5
Bolivia		1							1	6
Burkina Faso	1								1	7
Cameroon			1						1	8
Chile							1		1	9
China	1					1		1	3	10
Costa Rica			1	1		1			3	11
Cuba					1				1	12
Croatia	1								1	13
Ecuador					1	1			2	14
Egypt			1		1	1	1		4	15
Ethiopia	1								1	16
Ghana		1			1	1			3	17
Guatemala	1								1	18
India	1	1							2	19
Indonesia		1					1		2	20
Kazakhstan				1					1	21
Kenya		1		1	1	1	1		5	22
Lao (P.D.R.)						1			1	23
Madagascar			1			1			2	24
Mexico	1				1	1			3	25
Morocco	1								1	26
Nepal		1							1	27
Niger							1		1	28
Pakistan		1			1				2	29
Papua New Guinea							1		1	30
Philippines		1	1		1	1	1	1	6	31
Poland					1				1	32
Romania		1					1		2	33
Russian Federation				1					1	34
Samoa			1						1	35
Senegal		1				1			2	36
Slovak Republic						1			1	37
Slovenia								1	1	38
South Africa			1			1	1		3	39

Country	Bio-safety 2006	Local Benefits Study 2006	CPEs 2006– 09	Annual Impact 2007– 09	SGP 2007	Project Cycle Eval- uation 2007	Verifi- cation 2007–08	Case Studies (Catalytic & CD) 2009	Total in OPS4	No. of coun- tries
Sri Lanka						1			1	40
Suriname							1		1	41
Syria			1				1		2	42
Tajikistan	1								1	43
Tanzania		1		1					2	44
Thailand							1		1	45
Macedonia, FYR						1			1	46
Tunisia						1	1		2	47
Turkey					1	1			2	48
Uganda	1			1					2	49
Ukraine				1					1	50
Uzbekistan				1					1	51
Vietnam							1	1	2	52
Yemen		1							1	53
Totals	11	14	9	8	11	18	14	4	89	

