



GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT FACILITY
EVALUATION OFFICE

OPS4

PROGRESS TOWARD IMPACT



FOURTH OVERALL PERFORMANCE STUDY OF THE GEF

PROTOCOL FOR INTERACTION WITH GEF FOCAL POINTS

METHODOLOGICAL PAPER #15

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 Focal Points

September 24, 2008

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

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?

Results Cluster

2. To what extent has GEF support enabled your country to meet its obligations under the multilateral environmental agreements?
3. To what extent has the GEF supported national and local capacity building to tackle global environmental problems?

4. To what extent has the GEF supported technology transfer needed to increase global environmental benefits?
5. To what extent has the GEF been catalytic in your country?
6. What is the likelihood that the achievements in your country will be sustained?
7. Which lessons can be derived for the sustainability of global environmental benefits: socially, institutionally, and financially?

Relevance Cluster

8. To what extent has GEF support in your country matched the guidance of the conventions, as relevant to your country?
9. If there is a divergence between the guidance of the conventions and the particular situation in your country, to what extent has GEF support been able to address both the guidance and national priorities?
10. To what extent has the GEF promoted international cooperation in international waters in your country?
11. To what extent has GEF support contributed to your country's sustainable development agenda and environmental priorities?
12. To what extent do you feel that the portfolio in your country is country driven?
13. To what extent have there been trade-offs between local development needs and global environmental benefits?
14. Most projects aim to prevent these trade-offs through win-win solutions; has this been the case in your country?
15. If win-win solutions could not be achieved, was a mechanism to achieve a satisfactory trade-off available and used?
16. Has this been reported on, and, if so, where?

Performance Cluster

17. To what extent is the governance of the GEF transparent to you as a GEF focal point?
18. Are you aware of Council decisions and are you informed fully and in a timely manner about changes in GEF strategies, modalities, and procedures?

19. 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, and, if not, can we contact you separately?
20. How does the GEF compare with other donors in terms of effort and costs to prepare and implement projects?
21. What is the ratio of proposals to approved projects, in your experience, in your country?
22. To what extent has the revised project cycle led to a shorter and better decision-making process?
23. To what extent has your country achieved cofunding at the level of interventions?
24. To what extent is GEF funding incremental in your country: in other words, to what extent is it enabling your country to tackle global problems that would not have been addressed otherwise in your country?
25. What has been the role, division of labor, and comparative advantage of the GEF Agencies in your country?
26. To what extent are you or have you been involved in the monitoring and evaluation of GEF-supported projects?
27. To what extent have GEF lessons been shared with your country, and to what extent have lessons learned in your country been shared with the GEF community?
28. How effective has the GEF been in handling complaints, disputes, and conflicts?
29. To what extent has the GEF supported you in your role as GEF focal point?
30. What has been the division of labor between the operational and the political focal points?
31. Did your country engage in a national dialogue supported by the Country Support Programme, and what have been the lessons learned from this experience?

