

An illustration in a soft, painterly style showing several people in a forest. In the foreground, a woman wearing a red hard hat and a white shirt holds a large clipboard. Behind her, a man in a white shirt is measuring a tree with a yellow tape measure. In the background, two other people are visible: one standing and one sitting, both in white shirts and hard hats. The forest is filled with green trees of various shapes and sizes. The overall tone is professional and focused on environmental work.

Progress Toward Impact

Overall Performance Study of the GEF

Carlo Carugi
GEF Evaluation Office
Istanbul, April 14-15, 2010

OPS4



**GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT FACILITY
EVALUATION OFFICE**

Introduction

- ❑ **OPS4** is an independent study to assess the extent to which the GEF is achieving its objectives and to identify potential improvements.
- ❑ **OPS4** is a working document of the 5th Replenishment of the GEF and will be presented to the Assembly in May 2010.
- ❑ Final report was presented to the third replenishment meeting, 13-14 October, 2009.

OPS4



Scope

- ❑ 16 key questions identified in ToR (www.gefeo.org)
- ❑ All projects and project proposals until June 30, 2009 were studied:
 - *2,389 finished, on-going and approved projects: \$ 8,772 M.*
 - *Project Terminal evaluations since OPS3: 215.*
- ❑ OPS4 built on OPS3, 24 evaluation reports of the Evaluation Office, and evidence from:
 - *57 countries, visited after OPS3*
 - *9 special country case studies*
 - *10 additional project visits*
 - *Literature and desk reviews, interviews, surveys*
- ❑ Consultations with representatives of all stakeholders

OPS4

Limitations

- ❑ All 16 key questions answered, but varying degrees of depth;
- ❑ Need more work on:
 - *The involvement of civil society and the private sector in the GEF*
 - *Resources management in the GEF*
 - *Cost-effectiveness*
 - *Impact analysis – project oriented*
- ❑ Two major evaluations of the Evaluation Office have led to on-going reform processes:
 - *The reform of the project cycle; positive indications but it is too soon for an evaluative judgments*
 - *The reform of the RAF*
- ❑ Impact evidence in the GEF is still limited to the 3 implementing agencies: World Bank, UNDP and UNEP.

OPS4

Report overview

- ❑ GEF in a Changing World
 - International Context
 - Resource Mobilization
 - Convention Guidance
 - The Catalytic Nature of the GEF
 - Programming Resources
- ❑ Progress toward Impact
 - From Hypothesis to Evidence
 - Focal Area and Multi Focal Area Progress
- ❑ Issues affecting Results
 - Performance
 - The GEF as a Learning Organization
 - Resources Management
- ❑ Governance and Partnership

The full document, annexes, methodological and technical documents related to **OPS4** can be found in www.gefeo.org

OPS4

OPS4 Main conclusions (1)

❑ Funding gap:

- International funding gap on global environmental problems
- GEF Replenishments led to less funds in real terms
- GEF now has more Focal Areas, more guidance, and more countries

❑ The GEF contributed to progress toward impact

- 70% of finished projects see progress toward global environmental benefits,
- further follow-up action from national partners is essential to achieve global environmental benefits

❑ GEF project performance is satisfactory

- the GEF projects are **effective** in producing outcomes,
- the average score over the GEF-4 period of 80% exceeding the GEF Council objective of 75%

OPS4

OPS4 Main conclusions (2)

- ❑ The **efficiency** of the GEF can and should be further improved
 - emphasis on programming,
 - less time spent on project identification,
 - enhanced fee structure,
 - more integrated learning (look at lessons from IW Learn),
 - results-based management framework that includes progress to impact measurements (logframes, tracking tools, impact)
- ❑ “Inability to deliver” is a perception linked to pre-approval phase
 - reform processes are underway and show promise
 - GEF should move from focal area programming toward programming on a national level
- ❑ The GEF partnership brings added value – its tensions need to be resolved
- ❑ Governance is adequate but could improve
 - Substantive role of Assembly / meet more often
 - Clearer delineation of governance/management roles

OPS4

OPS4 recommendations

- ❑ Interaction between the GEF and the conventions need to be improved.
- ❑ Improvements in resource management should focus on
 - developing a new system for reserving funds for project ideas
 - reforming fiduciary standards and the fee system
- ❑ The GEF Council should address tensions within the GEF partnership and provide guidance on roles and responsibilities.
- ❑ If the GEF-5 replenishment recommendations include strong proposals concerning programming, efficiency and partnership, OPS4 supports the highest level of replenishment for the GEF.

OPS4



Consultation with Focal Points: Main Conclusions

❑ ROLE:

- The GEF provides valuable support to countries to address global environmental issues

❑ RELEVANCE:

- GEF support is largely seen as relevant to global environmental issues and to conventions
- GEF operations could be more relevant to national priorities.

❑ RESULTS:

- Important contributions on capacity building and strengthening of institutions and of environmental legislative frameworks
- Short term funding of GEF operations is seen as a factor hampering sustainability and long term results

OPS4



GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT FACILITY
EVALUATION OFFICE

Consultation with Focal Points: Main Conclusions (cont.)

□ PERFORMANCE:

- Insufficient transparency in decision making across the GEF system.
- Unclear criteria and process for project identification and approval which cause confusion and delays.
- GEF co-funding requirements should be more flexible.
- Agency performance varies greatly, several general concerns need to be addressed.

Follow up:

- Need to better codify roles and responsibilities with regards to focal points
- Need to strengthen country M&E
- Need to make co-funding requirements more flexible

OPS4



GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT FACILITY
EVALUATION OFFICE

In brief

- 
- ❑ The GEF shows good progress toward impact
 - ❑ Outcome performance is satisfactory
 - ❑ “Inability to deliver” is perception linked to pre-approval phase
 - Reform processes are underway and show promise
 - Moving from focal area project support toward programming on a national level would bring GEF further in line with Paris Declaration on aid effectiveness
 - ❑ Funding of the GEF has several issues of concern:
 - International funding gap on global environmental problems
 - Funding gap on guidance from the conventions
 - Funding gap in full scale support in several groups of countries (LDCs, SIDS, Fragile states)
 - ❑ The GEF partnership brings added value – its tensions need to be resolved
 - ❑ If the GEF-5 replenishment recommendations include strong proposals concerning programming, efficiency and partnership, the Fourth Overall Performance Study supports the highest level of replenishment for the GEF

OPS4



Thank you

Carlo Carugi

ccarugi@thegef.org

OPS4



GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT FACILITY
EVALUATION OFFICE