

OPS4

PROGRESS TOWARD IMPACT



FOURTH OVERALL PERFORMANCE STUDY OF THE GEF

PROTOCOL FOR INTERACTION WITH GEF AGENCIES

METHODOLOGICAL PAPER #14

Fourth Overall Performance Study (OPS4) of the GEF



**Evaluation
Office**
GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT FACILITY

1818 H Street, NW
Washington, DC 20433
202-473-4054
www.gefo.org

Protocol for Interaction with GEF Agencies

October 1, 2008

This protocol describes the issues that the GEF Evaluation Office would like to raise with representatives of the GEF Agencies for the Fourth Overall Performance Study (OPS4). The list is by no means intended to be restrictive: the Office would like to invite the Agencies to raise any issue that they feel is of importance for OPS4. During meetings, interaction can take place with representatives of the GEF Evaluation Office, but we would like to invite Agencies to

- bring any documentation or reports that they feel would contribute to OPS4 or a better understanding of the issues;
- send in any further information to OPS4@thegef.org, or to the GEF Evaluation Office, 1818 H Street, NW, Washington, DC, 20433, USA, fax no. +1-202-522-1691;
- participate in the survey that will be sent out at a later date;
- interact with independent experts hired for OPS4 that will assess specific areas in the GEF where the Evaluation Office would have a conflict of interest.

The following areas and questions have been specifically drawn from the Terms of Reference of the Fourth Overall Performance Study for interaction with GEF Agencies. Many of these questions are addressed in existing documentation, such as project implementation reports; midterm reviews; terminal evaluations; cross-cutting, thematic, and country-level evaluations; and other reporting. Furthermore, on performance issues, we already have some answers through the GEF Annual Performance Report, but we would like to invite you to support us in updating these answers. The purpose of the initial meeting is to identify sources of information, limitations in the involvement of your Agency, and issues to follow up rather than to go through these questions one by one and try to answer them fully during the meeting.

Role Cluster

1. What do you perceive to be the role and added value of the GEF in tackling major global environmental and sustainable development problems?

2. What is the role of the multilateral environmental agreements?
3. How do you perceive your role as a partner in the GEF?
4. Do you see changes over time in your role as partner, and do you have recommendations on further changes that would need to be made?

If the position of your Agency on any of these issues has been set forth in reports, speeches, or statements, we would very much appreciate receiving copies or references that would enable us to download these documents.

Results Cluster

5. To what extent has your Agency achieved results and impact through GEF support?
6. To what extent have global environmental benefits been identified within these results, and to what extent have these been development related or national/local results?
7. What have been the results by focal area and for multifocal area activities?
8. What has been the distribution of these achievements according to geographical areas and groups of countries?
9. To what extent has your Agency engaged in impact studies, and, if so, to what extent have these reported on GEF-supported activities?
10. To what extent has the GEF supported the technology transfer needed to increase global environmental benefits?
11. To what extent has the GEF been catalytic in the portfolio of your Agency or in the countries that you support?
12. To what extent has GEF support enabled your Agency to expand its activities to solve global environmental problems?
13. What is the likelihood that the achievements will be sustained?
14. Which lessons can be derived for the sustainability of global environmental benefits: socially, institutionally, and financially?

Relevance Cluster

15. To what extent has your Agency looked at the relevance of GEF support to the guidance of the conventions?

16. To what extent has your Agency looked at the relevance of GEF support to national sustainable development priorities?
17. If there is a divergence between the guidance of the conventions and the particular situation in a country, to what extent has GEF support been able to address both the guidance and national priorities?
18. To what extent has the GEF promoted international cooperation in international waters?
19. To what extent do you feel that the GEF portfolio in your Agency is country driven compared to other activities in your portfolio?
20. To what extent have there been trade-offs between local development needs and global environmental benefits?
21. Most projects aim to prevent these trade-offs through win-win solutions; has this been the case in your Agency?
22. If win-win solutions could not be achieved, was a mechanism to achieve a satisfactory trade-off available and used?
23. To what extent have gender issues been integrated into your Agency's environmental portfolio, especially as regards the interaction between national and local development needs and the achievement and sustainability of global environmental benefits?

Performance Cluster

24. To what extent is the governance of the GEF transparent to you as a representative of a GEF Agency?
25. Are you aware of Council decisions and are you informed fully and in a timely manner about changes in GEF strategies, modalities, and procedures?
26. The midterm review of the Resource Allocation Framework (RAF) will be presented to the GEF Council in November 2008. Have you been able to express your view on and experiences with the RAF?
27. How does the GEF compare with other cofunding possibilities in terms of effort and costs to prepare and implement projects?
28. What is the ratio of proposals to approved projects, in your experience, in your Agency?
29. To what extent has the revised project cycle led to a shorter and better decision-making process?

30. To what extent is your Agency actively involved in achieving cofunding at the level of interventions?
31. To what extent is GEF funding incremental in your portfolio; in other words, to what extent is it enabling countries to tackle global problems that would not have been addressed otherwise?
32. What are your experiences with GEF Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel (STAP) involvement in project proposals?
33. How is monitoring and supervision organized and carried out in your Agency?
34. To what extent have GEF lessons been shared within and with your Agency, and to what extent have lessons learned in your Agency been shared with the GEF community?
35. How effective has the GEF been in handling complaints, disputes, and conflicts?

