
Terms of Reference

Joint GEF/UNDP SGP Evaluation: *Preparing for GEF-6*

*Approved by Indran Naidoo, Director, UNDP Evaluation Office, and
Rob D. van den Berg, Director, GEF Evaluation Office
on May 23, 2013*

Introduction

1. The Small Grants Programme (SGP) of the Global Environment Facility (GEF) will be evaluated jointly by the independent evaluation offices of the GEF and the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). The Joint GEF/UNDP SGP Evaluation will be conducted in two phases. The 1st Phase will be conducted from April to August of 2013. It will focus on an update of the Joint Evaluation of the SGP (GEF, UNDP, 2008)¹ and progress made to date on implementation of its recommendations. The findings of this 1st Phase will be included in the final report of the fifth GEF Overall Performance Study (OPS5).² The 2nd Phase will take place from September 2013 to March 2014 and will expand the analysis of the effectiveness of the SGP, looking at themes including the linking of poverty reduction and environment conservation at local level. The findings of the 2nd Phase will be presented to the UNDP Executive Board and the GEF Council in 2014.

2. The Joint GEF/UNDP SGP Evaluation (GEF/UNDP, 2008) was crucial in shaping the way forward for the SGP, and provided the foundation for the implementation of several important changes, some of which were essential for making the broadening of the programme to more countries possible. The Joint GEF/UNDP SGP will assess the extent to which the most important recommendations and related GEF Council decisions progress have been implemented, the factors that have affected their implementation and the extent to which recommendations and Council decisions remain pertinent in the light of current and future situations. The Joint GEF/UNDP SGP Evaluation, particularly in the first phase, will also look at trends concerning networking, management, monitoring and evaluation (M&E), focal area and capacity development, linking these to observed achievements on the ground.

3. The 1st Phase of the Joint GEF/UNDP SGP Evaluation will be considered the terminal evaluation for the current GEF SGP operational phase (Operational Phase 5 – OP5) and serve the

¹ The report of this evaluation can be downloaded from: <http://www.thegef.org/gef/Program%20Evaluation%20-%20Joint%20Evaluation%20SGP>

² OPS5 will be conducted in two phases and produce two reports: a first report at the start of the replenishment process and a final report to be presented in the final phase of the replenishment in November 2013. The TORs and budget for OPS5 can be downloaded from: <http://www.thegef.org/gef/OPS5>

purpose of informing the next SGP replenishment. The coinciding timing of the SGP replenishment and GEF replenishment in late 2013 make this arrangement possible.

The GEF Small Grants Programme

4. The SGP is a GEF corporate programme implemented by UNDP. The United Nations Office for Project Services (UNOPS) provides financial and administration support services to the SGP at country and project level. Supervision and technical support is provided by a Central Programme Management Team (CPMT) based in New York.³ Each participating country has a SGP National Coordinator (NC). The NC is often associated and supported by the UNDP country office, or hosted in a Non-Governmental Organization (NGO) that acts as a National Host Institution (NHI). National Steering Committees (NSCs) provide major substantive contributions to and oversight of their respective SGP country programme. The NSC, members of which work voluntarily, typically comprises representatives from local NGOs, government, academia, UNDP and occasionally co-funding donors, indigenous peoples' organizations, the private sector and the media; a majority of members are non-government. Grants are awarded directly to Community-Based Organizations (CBOs) and Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs). In OP5 the SGP has expanded its scope to include all Civil Society Organizations (CSOs). The use of local NGOs and/or CBOs as grantee-partners implies a built-in preference for projects requiring community involvement.

5. SGP's aim is to contribute to resolving global environment and sustainable development challenges by providing small grants to communities and CSOs for projects aligned with the strategic priorities of the GEF and within the framework of sustainable development. SGP targets community-level initiatives across the range of global environmental issues addressed by the GEF and seeks to integrate actions that lead to poverty reduction with a participatory approach.

Table 1: SGP distribution by GEF focal area⁴

Focal Area	N. of Projects	%	Total Grant	Co-financing in Cash	Co-financing in Kind
			USD millions		
Biodiversity	7,984	49.7	192.80	134.90	141.50
Climate Change and Adaptation	3,106	19.3	83.10	58.72	51.77
Land Degradation	1,923	12.0	50.70	22.90	30.30
Multifocal	1,611	10.0	35.70	16.70	18.10
International Waters	758	4.7	17.60	11.10	17.60
Persistent Organic Pollutants	341	2.1	9.29	4.80	4.60
Focal Area Not Mentioned	260	1.6	7.10	5.10	3.30
Capacity Development	81	0.5	2.35	0.81	0.71
Totals	16,064		398.64	255.03	267.88

6. To date, the SGP has provided about 16,064 small grants. A strategic preference has historically been given to biodiversity projects, which constitute the larger share of the global

³ CPMT comprises a Global Manager, a Deputy Global Manager, 4 Programme Advisors on the GEF focal areas, a Programme Specialist for knowledge management, and 2 Programme Associates. Together they provide global supervision and day-to-day programmatic and operational guidance to over 119 countries that are part of the SGP global programme. In the 9 upgraded countries CPMT is responsible for coordinating knowledge management activities as well as to matters pertaining to the SGP global Operational Guidelines.

⁴ Data is cumulative since 1992, and extracted from the SGP database, with February 5, 2013 as cut-off date.

SGP portfolio. Climate change projects (including adaptation) come second after the biodiversity ones and are followed by land degradation projects. These three SGP project typologies constitute the large majority of the global SGP portfolio, corresponding to 81% of the total number of projects, and to 82% of the total grant budget. The SGP is required to raise co-financing at a 1:1 ratio, half in-cash and half in-kind in recognition of the nature of its grantees which are poor and vulnerable communities and local CSOs that still have to develop capacity. The cash co-financing ratio is US\$1 grant to US\$0.64. In kind co-financing almost equals co-financing in cash. The maximum SGP grant size is US\$50,000, but grants are generally in the range of US\$20,000 to 25,000. In SGP OP5, “strategic projects” of up to \$150,000 can be proposed in accordance with the updated SGP Operational Guidelines and following a special call for proposals. Grants are disbursed against agreed financial and output-based reporting milestones.

7. The SGP is a tool for the GEF to achieve global environmental benefits while addressing the livelihood needs of local populations, paying a special attention to reaching the poor. Over the years a high demand for SGP country programmes is observed, where the SGP grew to 123 countries by the end of GEF4, with 14 more countries having expressed their interest to join during GEF5. The total number of countries reached by the GEF SGP global programme (including 9 upgraded programmes) as of 30 June 2012 stands at 128.^{5,6}

8. The previous Joint Evaluation of the SGP (GEF/UNDP, 2008) highlighted that new challenges and opportunities will arise as the programme grows. That evaluation called for the SGP to reform its central management system to make it suitable for the new phase of growth and address the risks of growing programme complexities. These complexities relate to both the increased number of countries and to the SGP upgrading policy introduced in GEF5 (GEF/C.36/4), according to which mature SGP country programmes should function more independently and assume broader responsibilities. OPS4 recommended recognizing the SGP as a modality of the GEF that should be made available to all recipient countries (GEF Evaluation Office, 2009). Since the introduction of the SGP upgrading policy, mature SGP country programmes are being funded as GEF Full Size Projects (FSP) within an overall SGP programmatic framework, and are implemented continuing to follow the SGP operational guidelines. The upgrading of country programmes into a FSP modality is being conducted in GEF5 ensuring that the replenishment of country programmes funds is performance-based.⁷

9. To date, 9 countries have been upgraded and are being implemented as FSPs. The upgraded SGP country programmes are funded from the GEF5 resources allocated through the System for Transparent Allocation of Resources (STAR), as opposed to all the other SGP country programmes that continue to be funded partly through the SGP core resources as well as additional STAR funds. The SGP countries upgraded to date include Brazil, Bolivia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, India, Kenya, Mexico, Pakistan and the Philippines.⁸

⁵ This number does not include Chile, Poland and Lithuania where SGP programmes have closed.

⁶ GEF SGP Annual Monitoring Report – 1 January 2011 / 30 June 2012 (UNDP, 2012).

⁷ In addition to the upgrading of mature SGP country programs in GEF-5 and seek funding through the GEF FSP modality, the “GEF-5 Programming Document” of August 2009 (GEF/r.5.14) states that such country programs are expected to seek larger amounts of funding from a variety of sources, while still remaining part of the overall SGP for knowledge management and communications.

⁸ Chile, initially among the upgraded countries, decided to close its SGP country programme. It has developed a separate FSP with UNDP as the GEF agency and the Ministry of Environment as the national executing agency.

10. The Joint Evaluation of the SGP (2008) found that initial rules of access to GEF resources through the RAF in GEF4 were particularly complex and affected the efficiency of SGP. In light of this finding, the Joint GEF/UNDP SGP will assess the extent to which country endorsement of SGP access to STAR funds and OP5 tranching have affected implementation. The evaluation will also assess the effects of other measures such as the raising of the cap for access to SGP grant resources introduced in GEF4 allowing 5% to be used for capacity development, M&E and knowledge management.⁹ The evaluation will also look into the extent to which the criteria for accessing GEF resources are sufficiently flexible and responsive to the willingness of countries to channel their STAR resources to their SGP country programme.

11. The growth of the programme during GEF5 has required SGP to undertake several actions to strengthen programme oversight and M&E. While SGP has put into place processes to meet most of the Joint Evaluation recommendations on M&E, SGP country programmes still face challenges. Access to GEF resources through the RAF in GEF4 and now STAR in GEF5 requires SGP country strategies to articulate grants to results relevant to the GEF focal areas, to allow for a better tracking of SGP's contributions to global environmental benefits in the context of the countries' sustainable development priorities.

1st Phase – scope and key questions

12. The first phase of the evaluation will provide an update to the previous Joint GEF/UNDP Evaluation, and assess progress made to date on the implementation of its recommendations, in order to respond to key question ten of the terms of reference for the OPS5 final report:

(10) To what extent is the GEF Small Grants Programme successful in broadening its scope to more countries while continuing to ensure success on the ground?

13. The 1st Phase of the Joint GEF/UNDP SGP Evaluation will assess the extent to which the SGP continues to contribute towards conservation of the global environment while addressing the challenges inherent to its ongoing growth. In this broad framework, the following key questions will be specifically addressed:

- i. What is the effectiveness and efficiency of the SGP at local and global level?
- ii. How have the changes introduced since 2008 affected the SGP central management system and in particular its cost structure?
- iii. What are the key factors affecting SGP results?
- iv. How did the introduction of the SGP upgrading policy affect countries' access to GEF resources and the effectiveness and efficiency of ongoing country programme operations?
- v. Are the M&E systems in SGP at central as well as local level adequately and appropriately tracking SGP's contributions to global environmental benefits as well as to local groups' livelihoods?

⁹By agreeing to "other proposals outlined in the report" the Council implicitly agreed with paragraph 6 of the Joint Evaluation Follow-up working paper (GEF/C.33/5) which capped at 5% of the country portfolio grants for capacity building workshops, lessons learning and networking for poor communities, indigenous people, and groups in remote areas. In GEF 5, with the addition of Capacity Development as an additional "focal area" outcome in alignment with the GEF's set of strategic objectives, grant resources for capacity development, M&E, knowledge management, policy advocacy and networking increased to 10%.

- vi. Are these systems useful for learning and helping local groups to build confidence in the progress they make?

14. The changes in the SGP central management system to be looked at include the dual management structure introduced in GEF5 in which upgraded countries are coordinated through UNDP's Community Resilience and Sustainability Technical Team Cluster, a structure that functions in parallel to the CPMT in the management of the SGP.¹⁰ The SGP management and administrative cost structure at the central as well as the national level will be a specific focus of the analysis. The nature, effectiveness and efficiency of the services provided by UNOPS at central as well as national levels will also be looked at during the 1st Phase.

15. The evaluation will also review implementation of the recommendation of the previous evaluation with respect to audits.

2nd Phase – scope and key questions

16. The 2nd Phase of the Joint GEF/UNDP Evaluation will expand the analysis of the effectiveness of the SGP. The areas of inquiry and key evaluation questions for this second phase of the evaluation will be informed by and refined during the first phase of the evaluation. This phase will also involve field work in a larger illustrative sample of countries. One key theme will be the linking of poverty reduction and environment conservation at local level and the relative effectiveness of the various win-win solutions being promoted in each GEF focal area by the SGP at local level. The following key questions can be formulated at this stage:

- i. What is the effectiveness of the SGP for successfully achieving environmental conservation and sustainable management while addressing livelihoods in communities, compared with SGP components of FSPs and MSPs, as well as other similar small grant mechanisms?¹¹
- ii. To what extent have SGP results been up-scaled, replicated or mainstreamed and what are the factors favoring or hindering this?
- iii. To what extent are the SGP M&E and knowledge management systems capturing up-scaling, replication and mainstreaming of SGP results?
- iv. To what extent has SGP contributed to national level changes to address global, national and local level issues, particularly in countries with an SGP programme at least 5 years old?
- v. To what extent has SGP, through its work with NGOs and CSOs, facilitated civic engagement in the local and/or national policy arena, especially in post-conflict and fragile states?

17. The evaluation scope in the 2nd Phase will include SGP country programmes, SGP components of GEF full-size and medium-size projects (FSPs and MSPs), and other UNDP programmes with similar small grants components. These UNDP programmes would not necessarily need to be specifically focused on the environment, and their focus could be on agriculture, poverty reduction or natural resource management. Criteria for selection of such programmes would focus on the comparability with the SGP, and may include;

¹⁰ Since 2011, the SGP country programmes upgraded to FSPs are managed by this cluster within UNDP.

¹¹ This may include for example the support of national funds to support alternative livelihoods of local populations.

- a. Addressing livelihood needs;
- b. Linking poverty and the environment;
- c. Delivery mechanisms based on demands from communities;
- d. Based on demands from grass-root organizations (not individuals);
- e. Asking some form of contribution from the grantee (either cash or in kind);
- f. Having an institutional setup at national level that is similar to the SGP (i.e. with a NSC for grants approval and overseeing responsibilities);
- g. Types of services and levels of supervision provided to grantees.

18. The second phase will also assess the role of SGP as a delivery mechanism for FSP such as in the case of the projects Reverting Environmental Degradation in the South China Sea and the Nile Transboundary Environmental Action Plan.

19. The 2nd Phase will also deepen the analysis of relevance, effectiveness and efficiency, and factors affecting results, drawing on the additional evidence gathered during the field visits. The nature, effectiveness and efficiency of existing synergies and coordination mechanisms between the SGP, as a corporate GEF program and projects implemented by other GEF Agencies will be also examined.

Methods and process

20. The previous Joint Evaluation of the SGP (GEF/UNDP, 2008) was a one year-long intense effort, to which as many as 25 evaluators contributed at different levels. The evaluation encompassed country case studies in 20 countries around the globe with field work involved in nine of these, during which more than 200 grants were visited and field verified. The methods and tools developed as well as the depth and thoroughness of the evaluative analysis and evidence collected in that evaluation are assets upon which this evaluation intends to build. An evaluation matrix containing the key evaluation questions, indicators, information sources, and evaluation tools and methods – derived and adapted from the ones used in the 2007 SGP evaluation – is under development.

21. The Joint GEF/UNDP SGP Evaluation will be conducted in two main phases:

- I. **April-August 2013** Updating the quantitative and qualitative data sets assembled in 2007 in the Joint Evaluation of the SGP (through meta- analysis of evaluations, desk-literature review and portfolio review and three country visits); and
- II. **September 2013-March 2014** Collection of new evaluative evidence through interviews and surveys at global, regional and country levels, and additional country visits.

1st Phase

22. The *meta-analysis* will extract information from all relevant and available evaluations produced within the GEF M&E partnership, by both the Office – including the ongoing Mid-term Review of the STAR and the NPFE evaluations, and both ongoing and completed country level evaluations – and the independent evaluation units of the GEF Agencies. Available SGP programming and M&E reports are indicated in Annex 1.

23. The *desk and literature review* will be conducted on SGP country strategies, project documents, annual reports and country evaluations, SGP Steering Committee documents, and the GEF Council documents related to the SGP. This review will report on the consistency of SGP country strategies with GEF priorities and national priorities will assess overall results reported at the country level and factors affecting extent of progress towards results. Annex 1 presents a brief description of the available SGP programming and reporting documents.

24. The *portfolio review* will be based on the information contained in the central SGP database maintained by CPMT as well as knowledge products, case studies, and relevant publications. The review will provide an overall picture of the SGP operations and will address those effectiveness and efficiency issues that can be dealt with at the portfolio level. Specifically, the portfolio review will analyze the financial aspects of the SGP, including:

- i. country, region and focal area allocation and distributions;
- ii. average project grant size taking into account country, region and focal area differences;
- iii. levels, sources and types of co-financing per country¹²; and
- iv. administration costs and other non-grant technical costs

25. Three *country visits* are proposed to be conducted in one country in each of the three main GEF geographical regions (Africa, Asia and the Pacific, and Latin America and the Caribbean – LAC), selected among the ones that were visited for the Joint Evaluation (Table 2). Two of these will be two upgraded and one not upgraded SGP country programme. Specific TORs, interview guides and review protocols aiming at capturing evaluative evidence in response to the main areas of inquiry will be developed for these visits.

Table 2: Countries for visit during the 1st Phase

Country	Region	Grant Amount (US\$ million)	Number of Projects	SGP Year start
Egypt	Africa	6.16	285	1994
Ghana	Africa	4.37	194	1993
Kenya *	Africa	9.00	309	1993
Pakistan*	Asia	8.64	231	1994
Philippines*	Asia	9.17	292	1992
Belize	LAC	5.16	196	1993
Ecuador *	LAC	7.98	252	1995
Guatemala	LAC	4.27	366	1997
Mexico*	LAC	11.91	523	1994

* Upgraded countries

26. *Interviews* will be conducted following an interview protocol that will be developed to that purpose and used with SGP involved staff and stakeholders at central level (SGP staff from both UNDP and UNOPS, and UNDP staff involved with GEF in New York; and GEF Secretariat staff in Washington DC). The focus of interviews is at the central level because of the institutional nature of the topics under inquiry in the 1st phase. Additional interviews will be conducted at country level as part of the case studies.

¹² Including SGP's role as a delivery mechanism for other FSPs such as South China Sea, Nile Transboundary Environmental Action Project, SPA CBA, and other donor funded projects such as AusAid, NZAid, UNF, EU and Japan.

27. The 1st Phase will produce the information basis for refining the scope of the evaluation, identifying the tools and methods and developing the sampling needed to address the specific key questions that will emerge.

2nd Phase

28. *Interviews* will be conducted following an interview protocol that will be developed to that purpose, and used primarily with SGP involved staff and stakeholders at regional (mainly UNDP technical regional teams) and country level (SGP national coordinators and their programme assistants, and national steering committee members where possible). Subject to the availability, quality and reach-out potential of the SGP email addresses database, a stakeholder questionnaire will be developed and administered online through Survey Monkey or analogous web platform. The purpose will be to gather perceptions of the various stakeholders on the issues under study. Teleconferences will also be carried out as and when needed.

29. At least five *country visits* will be conducted in countries that were selected for field work during the Joint Evaluation in 2007, as these have a relatively mature SGP portfolio. Additional selection criteria include post-conflict and fragile states (see key question v., 2nd phase) as well as the possibility to gather information on existing umbrella programs that are similar to the SGP, for comparative analysis purposes. Table 3 contains a list of countries derived from the original sampling done for the Joint Evaluation in 2007, where countries were preselected for field visits based on both total GEF SGP grant and number of SGP projects, and programme maturity, expressed in terms of the first SGP project in that country having been implemented in/or before 1997. Final selection for country visits and topics of inquiry during visits will be determined on the basis of the findings of the first phase of the evaluation (see Annex 2, Table 6: Category III countries). The final selection will be done also based on the results of the 1st Phase.

Table 3: Possible countries for visits during the 2nd Phase

Country	Region	Grant Amount (US\$ million)	Number of Projects	SGP Year start
Ivory Coast	Africa	4.38	217	1993
Mali	Africa	8.85	336	1994
Senegal	Africa	8.05	242	1994
Tanzania	Africa	7.49	273	1997
Tunisia	Africa	4.69	150	1993
Zimbabwe	Africa	4.61	144	1994
India *	Asia	8.21	323	1996
Indonesia	Asia	7.91	426	1993
Jordan	Asia	6.00	184	1993
Sri Lanka	Asia	6.93	349	1994
Thailand	Asia	6.27	383	1994
Bolivia *	LAC	8.06	290	1997
Brazil *	LAC	8.07	317	1995
Chile **	LAC	7.07	260	1994
Costa Rica *	LAC	10.54	577	1993
Dominican Republic	LAC	7.9	369	1994
Kazakhstan	ECA	6.17	305	1997
Poland **	ECA	6.76	385	1994
Turkey	ECA	4.63	220	1993

* Upgraded countries

** No longer SGP

30. Additional country visits may eventually be conducted on an opportunistic basis when GEF Evaluation Office and/or UNDP Evaluation Office staff are traveling to (or from) neighboring countries for other purposes, in an effort to increase coverage. Specific data and information gathering tools will be developed for country visits that will be conducted during this 2nd Phase.

Opportunities for coordination with parallel evaluations

31. The SGP has been a main avenue for GEF engagement with NGO/CBOs. As indicated in paragraph 5, NGO/CBOs are the ultimate SGP grantee partners on the ground. In this sense, the Joint GEF/UNDP SGP Evaluation presents an opportunity to gather evaluative evidence on GEF engagement with CSOs that could feed into the parallel OPS5 sub-study on GEF engagement with CSOs. Aspects that could be looked at include NGO/CBOs' capacity to provide relevant M&E information for tracking contributions to global environmental benefits.

32. Similarly, the SGP is an important avenue for GEF to engage with women and indigenous peoples. Often the NGO/CBO is a women-run entity or cooperative (e.g. tree nurseries, bee keeping, handicrafts, etc.), and often it involves income-generating schemes and support to indigenous peoples organizations. The Joint GEF/UNDP SGP Evaluation also represents a good opportunity to gather evaluative evidence for contribution to the parallel OPS5 sub-study of the GEF gender strategy and can provide evidence on the forms in which GEF engages with indigenous peoples.

33. Synergies will be explored with the UNDP Evaluation Office between this Joint GEF/UNDP SGP Evaluation and the ongoing Joint GEF/UNDP Biodiversity Impact Evaluation.

34. Finally, the UNDP Evaluation Office is conducting Assessments of Development Results (ADRs) in six countries in 2013 (Afghanistan, Algeria, Iraq, Kenya, Lebanon, and Sierra Leone),¹³ and synergies will be explored between this Joint GEF/UNDP SGP Evaluation and these ADRs. Similarly, synergies will also be explored with ongoing GEF Evaluation Office's country-level evaluations in Africa (Tanzania, Eritrea and Sierra Leone) as well as in the MENA region.

Evaluation management and timetable

35. As was the case in 2007, the Joint GEF/UNDP SGP Evaluation will be a joint effort by the GEF and the UNDP evaluation offices, as equal partners. The execution structure of the evaluation will be composed of three tiers:

- i. The Steering Committee, co-chaired by Mr. Indran Naidoo, Director of the UNDP Evaluation Office and Mr. Rob D. van den Berg, Director of the GEF Evaluation Office, and composed of Mr. Juha Uitto and Mrs. Heather Bryant from the UNDP Evaluation Office and Mr. Carlo Carugi and Mr. Aaron Zazueta from the GEF Evaluation Office. The Committee reviews and approves the Terms of Reference, the joint management arrangements, selection and hiring of consultants, and the evaluation report. It ensures that sufficient and timely resources (human and financial) are made available for the

¹³ In Sierra Leone UNDP and GEF are already coordinating in the conduct of parallel country portfolio evaluations. In Iraq there is no SGP country programme.

evaluation. The Committee will jointly chair a formal meeting with Agency representatives and stakeholders to discuss the emerging findings of the evaluation. This Committee will also function to review and resolve disputes if they arise.

- ii. The Management Team, formed by two task managers, Mrs. Heather Bryant from the UNDP Evaluation Office and Mr. Carlo Carugi from the GEF Evaluation Office, will be responsible for the over-all development and execution of the evaluation. These co-managers will be responsible for the identification, hiring and supervision of consultants in accordance to mutually agreed TORs and institutional procedures; coordination of evaluation activities carried out by both offices, quality control of products and processes; and the timely delivery of evaluation products.
- iii. The Evaluation Team, composed by one lead consultant, one national consultant per country study (total of 8), and research assistants from both UNDP and GEF evaluation offices assigned to the evaluation. Consultants will respond directly to the Management Team and conduct specific tasks as directed by the Management Team.

36. A tentative timetable for the whole evaluation period is presented here below.

Table 4: Tentative timetable

Task / Deliverables	2013									2014						Responsibility
	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	
1st Phase																
TOR	*	*														GEFEO-UNDPEO
Select and recruit consultants		*	*													GEFEO-UNDPEO
Meta-analysis, Desk, Portfolio Review	*	*	*													GEFEO
Visits in 3 countries			*	*												UNDPEO
Analysis and key findings				*	*											GEFEO-UNDPEO
Input to OPS5 final report					*	*										GEFEO
2nd Phase																
Interviews/survey							*	*	*							GEFEO-UNDPEO
Visits in 5 more countries								*	*	*						GEFEO-UNDPEO
Analysis and key findings										*	*					GEFEO-UNDPEO
Draft report											*	*				GEFEO-UNDPEO
Comments													*			-
Final report														*		GEFEO-UNDPEO
Management response															*	-

Deliverables

37. The Joint GEF/UNDP SGP Evaluation will produce a report serving as a technical document for OPS5, with annexed the meta-evaluation, the overview of the GEF SGP portfolio, and the consolidated reporting from the three country field case studies. The main deliverable of the 2nd Phase will be an evaluation report which will bring together the portfolio-wide assessment, the gathering of perceptions through interviews and online survey as applicable, and the additional five country case studies.

References

GEF-EO (Global Environment Facility Evaluation Office) 2012, 'Terms of Reference and Budget for the Fifth Overall Performance Study of the GEF-OPS 5' accessed from:
<http://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/documents/OPS5TORandbudget-forKM.pdf>

----- 2010, 'Fourth Overall Performance Study of the GEF '. Accessed from:
http://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/documents/FULL%20REPORT_OPS4%20Progress%20Toward%20Impact_0.pdf

GEF-SGP-UNDP (Global Environment Facility, Small Grants Programme and United Nations Development Programme) 2012, 'GEF SGP Annual Monitoring Report, 1 January 2011 - 30 June 2012'

GEF (Global Environment Facility) 2009, 'Small Grants Program: Execution Arrangements and Upgrading Policy for GEF-5' Working Document: GEF/C.36/4. Accessed from:
<http://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/documents/C.36.4%20Small%20Grants%20ProgrammeFINAL.pdf>

----- 2009, 'Draft GEF-5 Programming Document' Working Document: GEF/R.5/14. Accessed from:
http://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/documents/GEF.R.5.14.Draft_GEF-5.programming.document.pdf

----- 2008, 'Small Grants Program: Follow- up to the 2007 Joint Evaluation' Working Document: GEF/C.33/5. Accessed from:
<http://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/documents/C.33.5%20SGP%20Follow-up.pdf>

GEF EO – UNDP (Global Environment Facility Evaluation Office and United Nations Development Programme) 2008 'Joint Evaluation of Small Grants Programme' Evaluation Report No. 39. Accessed from:
http://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/documents/Joint_Eval_of_the_SGP.pdf

Annex 1: List of SGP documents

The SGP has a planning and M&E reporting system that goes from project to country and from country to the global level. This system is described in the following sections.

STRATEGIC / PLANNING DOCUMENTS

SGP global level planning

SGP conducts a series of regional workshops for NCs at the start of each Operational Phase to provide guidance and orientation to staff on the strategic objectives and technical issues. Since OP5, the SGP started to align with the strategic objectives and priorities of the GEF. Technical guidance notes have been prepared in each focal area describing SGP's niche in OP5 vis-à-vis each focal area. These notes are shared with all the NCs and discussed in the SGP regional workshops with them. While the SGP Resource Mobilization Strategy is still available for country staff on the SGP Intranet, more recent guidance has been provided during the 2011 OP5 regional workshops. The SGP Global Communications Strategy has been replaced by several other guidance materials, including on branding, knowledge management and communications.

Country Programme Strategies

These documents - the latest templates and links to each Country Programme Strategy (CPS) is now publically shared on the SGP's website - aim to provide the programmatic guidance for the establishment and implementation of the SGP in the different participating countries. CPSs strive to correlate, on one side, the programme global Strategic Framework and GEF Operational Strategy and Programmes with, on the other side, the national strategies linked to sustainable development and needs.

SGP Upgraded CPs.

SGP GEF FSP documentation to be reviewed will include PIFs, CEO Endorsements, PRS and other pertinent documents

M&E DOCUMENTS

The SGP Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) Framework is still available on the SGP Intranet for staff reference. More recent guidance on M&E has been provided as part of the OP5 regional workshops conducted in 2011, and is described in Section H of the SGP OP5 CEO Endorsement document for core funds and its Annex F: "SGP OP5 M&E Plan". SGP M&E reporting requirements are summarized in the table here below.

Table 1: SGP M&E reporting requirements

Scope	Report name	Prepared by	Frequency
Project	Project Progress Report	Executing NGOs/CBOs	Periodic
	Final Project Report		End of project
	Project data entered in database	NC/PA	On an ongoing basis
Country	NSC meeting minutes	NC/PA	Following each NSC meeting
	Country Annual Report	NC	Annually
	Thematic updates	NC	Periodic/ad hoc
	Financial updates	NC/PA	Regular

Global	Annual Monitoring Report	CPMT	Annually
	Project Delivery Reports	UNOPS	Quarterly
	Independent Evaluations	Independent consultants	At the end of each Operational Phase

Project Progress Reports

The National Coordinator (NC) has two basic sources of information for project monitoring: periodic progress reports and site visits. Project progress reports are prepared and presented by the NGO/CBO as part of its responsibility under the grant agreement. The NC uses these reports to follow project progress, identify any potential problems and obstacles and to do his/her own record-keeping and reporting. These reports are the prerequisite for release of next payment - grant disbursement, and site visits. During the course of Operational Program 5 (OP5) efforts have been made to simplify progress reports for grantees to really focus on project progress, and identify any implementation challenges and delays.

Final Project Reports

The recipient NGOs/CBOs are required to prepare a final report covering the life of the project, objectives reached, expected and actual results, and participant perspectives within 60 days of project conclusion. Final reports contain information on achievement of indicators and impacts. The NC reviews the final reports and asks for additional information or clarification if necessary. After approving the reports, the NC prepares a report on the project and registers the conclusion of the project on the SGP project database.

National Steering Committee meeting minutes

Prepared by NCs/PAs immediately after each NSC meeting, and signed by all the NSC members.

Country Annual Report

The NC is required to report on technical and substantive project and programme progress on an annual basis. The country annual report forms the basis of the global Annual Monitoring Report (AMR) submitted by SGP to GEF in September/October each year.

Thematic and Financial Updates / Project Delivery Reports

Thematic reporting is done periodically based on information needs of CPMT. Financial reporting is done via Atlas, updates on commitment are provided to UNOPS by NCs.

Annual Monitoring Reports/Project Delivery Reports

The CPMT is required to report annually to the GEF Council on the achievement of a series of benchmarks and deliverables and to participate in the GEF Programme Implementation Review (PIR) exercise. This is a consolidated report based on country programmes reporting. In OP5 a thorough review of the project PIR format and process was conducted and it was found not entirely relevant or appropriate for SGP structure and operations. Drawing upon PIR and past SGP annual reports format, an online Country Annual Report format is now provided to country programmes based on which a synthesized AMR is produced by SGP/CPMT once a year, and submitted to the GEFSEC. A global level Project Delivery Report on expenditures is provided by UNOPS to UNDP on a quarterly basis.

Global Independent Evaluations

Independent Evaluations goal is to review the performance of the programme, including both an evaluation of progress in programme implementation, measured against the planned outputs set forth in the Project Document, and, in the case of the most recent evaluations, an assessment of features related to the impact of the programme.

Annex 2: Countries with Small Grant Programmes

All the countries where SGP programmes have been implemented are listed in the tables below. Country programmes are divided into three main categories based on the criteria's mentioned in the GEF Council working paper GEF/C.36/4 - *Small Grants Programme: Execution Arrangements and Upgrading Policy for GEF-5*. The main criterion for categorization is the age of the country programme, which highlights the extent of benefits a country programme has received from the GEF; additional criteria include operational experience, institutionalization and growth. Category I is sub-divided into two sub-categories: Category Ia includes all SIDS and LDC country programmes (53 countries), and Category Ib incorporates country programmes operational for less than 5 years (9 countries). Category II includes all country programmes operational between 5 and 15 years. This category is further subdivided into 3 sub-categories: Category IIa comprises country programmes operational between 5 to 9 years (12 countries), Category IIb country programmes operational between 9 and 12 years (8 countries) and Category IIc country programmes operational between 12 and 5 years and received cumulative grants of less than \$ 6 million (12 countries). Category III covers country programmes that are more than 15 years old and have received cumulative grants of more than \$ 6 million (16 countries). Table 7 lists 3 closed SGP countries programmes and finally Table 8 lists those countries where SGP is active under SGP sub-regional programme arrangements.

Table 1: CATEGORY Ia: LDCs and SIDSs

#	Country	Region	Grant Amount (US\$ million)	Number of Projects	SGP start year*
1	Belize	LAC	5.16	196	1993
2	Dominican Republic	LAC	7.9	369	1994
3	Mali	Africa	8.85	336	1994
4	Senegal	Africa	8.05	242	1994
5	Papua New Guinea	Asia	2.24	161	1994
6	Burkina Faso	Africa	4.92	149	1994
7	Barbados	LAC	2.29	112	1994
8	Trinidad and Tobago	LAC	1.89	89	1995
9	Dominica	LAC	1.67	74	1995
10	Mauritius	Africa	4.08	136	1996
11	United Republic of Tanzania	Africa	7.49	273	1997
12	Suriname	LAC	2.29	93	1997
13	Nepal	Asia	5.56	167	1998
14	Bhutan	Asia	2.79	110	1999
15	Mauritania	Africa	4.46	183	2002
16	Niger	Africa	4.28	147	2004
17	Cambodia	Asia	3.04	148	2005
18	Samoa	Asia	2.11	133	2005
19	Mozambique	Africa	2.29	116	2005
20	Fiji	Asia	3.57	106	2005
21	Jamaica	LAC	2.86	96	2005
22	Cuba	LAC	2.64	69	2005
23	Micronesia	Asia	1.92	69	2005
24	Ethiopia	Africa	4.38	160	2006
25	Rwanda	Africa	2.37	53	2006
26	Yemen	Africa	1.45	52	2006
27	Cook Island	Africa	0.41	12	2006

28	Benin	Africa	1.74	54	2007
29	Chad	Africa	1.39	53	2007
30	Comoros	Asia	1.6	51	2007
31	Niue	Asia	0.04	4	2007
32	Madagascar	Africa	3.47	176	2008
33	Lesotho	Africa	1.38	42	2008
34	Zambia	Africa	1.4	36	2008
35	Vanuatu	Asia	1.07	33	2008
36	Haiti	LAC	1.15	30	2008
37	Lao People's Democratic Republic	Asia	2.57	71	2009
38	Malawi	Africa	1.32	40	2009
39	Liberia	Africa	0.85	35	2009
40	Solomon Islands	Asia	0.53	25	2009
41	Eritrea	Africa	0.63	16	2009
42	Cape Verde	Africa	1.27	64	2010
43	Democratic Republic of the Congo	Africa	1.74	57	2010
44	Ukraine	Asia	2.24	49	2010
45	Togo	Africa	1.23	48	2010
46	Guinea	Africa	1.15	39	2010
47	Central African Republic	Africa	0.99	35	2010
48	Maldives	Asia	0.8	27	2010
49	Burundi	Africa	1.19	26	2010
50	Seychelles	Africa	1.17	24	2010
51	Bahamas	LAC	0.16	14	2011
52	Guinea-Bissau	Africa	0.34	13	2011
53	Afghanistan ¹⁴	Asia	n/a	n/a	2012
54	St. Kitts and Nevis	Barbados and OECS	0.05	1	1997
55	St. Lucia	Barbados and OECS	0.10	3	2000
56	St. Vincent and the Grenadines	Barbados and OECS	0.13	8	1997
57	Grenada	Barbados and OECS	0.11	12	1995
58	Marshall Islands	Micronesia	0.09	2	2006
59	Palau	Micronesia	0.23	8	2005

* The start year is the year of disbursement of the 1st small grant

Table 2: CATEGORY Ib: Non-LDC and non-SIDS - less than 5 years old

#	Country	Region	Grant Amount (US\$ million)	Number of Projects	SGP start year
1	Nigeria	Africa	1.89	68	2009
2	Gambia	Africa	0.99	40	2009
3	Armenia	ECA	1	27	2009
4	Slovak Republic	ECA	1.9	74	2010
5	Venezuela	LAC	2.12	54	2010
6	Tajikistan	Asia	0.92	39	2010
7	People's Republic Of China	Asia	1.65	37	2010
8	Paraguay	LAC	0.17	6	2011
9	Algeria	Africa	0.23	6	2012

Table 3: CATEGORY IIa: 5-9 years old

#	Country	Region	Grant Amount	Number	SGP start year
---	---------	--------	--------------	--------	----------------

¹⁴ Afghanistan has recently been included. The allocation has not been disbursed as yet and the projects have not started.

			(US\$ million)	of Projects	
1	Nicaragua	LAC	2.76	146	2004
2	Romania	ECA	3.14	95	2005
3	Syrian Arab Republic	Africa	1.84	44	2005
4	Bulgaria	ECA	3.96	121	2006
5	Argentina	LAC	2.3	113	2006
6	Uruguay	LAC	1.85	97	2006
7	Belarus	ECA	3.04	85	2006
8	Macedonia	ECA	1.57	78	2006
9	Lebanon	Africa	1.74	53	2006
10	Panama	LAC	2.03	96	2007
11	Cameroon	Africa	1.84	62	2007
12	Uzbekistan	Asia	1.55	60	2008

Table 4: CATEGORY IIb: 9-12 years old

#	Country	Region	Grant Amount (US\$ million)	Number of Projects	SGP start year
1	Iran	Asia	4.86	220	2001
2	Malaysia	Asia	4.65	128	2001
3	Kyrgyzstan	Asia	3.27	241	2002
4	Honduras	LAC	4.35	166	2002
5	Mongolia	Asia	2.43	327	2003
6	El Salvador	LAC	3.44	142	2003
7	Namibia	Africa	3.39	119	2003
8	South Africa	Africa	3.22	75	2003

Table 5: CATEGORY IIc: 12-15 years old & received cumulative grants of less than \$6 million

#	Country	Region	Grant Amount (US\$ million)	Number of Projects	SGP start year
1	Turkey	ECA	4.63	220	1993
2	Ivory Cost	Africa	4.38	217	1993
3	Ghana	Africa	4.37	194	1993
4	Botswana	Africa	4.2	158	1993
5	Tunisia	MENA	4.69	150	1993
6	Zimbabwe	Africa	4.61	144	1994
7	Guatemala	LAC	4.27	366	1997
8	Uganda	Africa	4.81	166	1998
9	Peru	LAC	8.87	256	1999
10	Albania	ECA	2.38	209	1999
11	Vietnam	Asia	5.08	176	1999
12	Morocco	MENA	4.12	153	2000

Table 6: CATEGORY III: more than 15 years old & received cumulative grants of more than \$6 million

#	Country	Region	Grant Amount (US\$ million)	Number of Projects	SGP start year
1	Philippines**	Asia	9.17	292	1992
2	Costa Rica**	LAC	10.54	577	1993
3	Kenya**	Africa	9	309	1993
4	Indonesia	Asia	7.91	426	1993
5	Jordan	MENA	6	184	1993
6	Mexico**	LAC	11.91	523	1994
7	Pakistan**	Asia	8.64	231	1994
8	Thailand	Asia	6.27	383	1994

9	Sri Lanka	Asia	6.93	349	1994
10	Egypt	MENA	6.16	285	1994
11	Brazil**	LAC	8.07	317	1995
12	Ecuador**	LAC	7.98	252	1995
13	India**	Asia	8.21	323	1996
14	Bolivia**	LAC	8.06	290	1997
15	Kazakhstan	Asia	6.17	305	1997

** Upgraded countries. Chile closed its SGP country programme and continues with an FSP with UNDP as GEF Agency and the Ministry of Environment as executing agency

Table 7: Countries where SGP is closed

#	Country	Region	Grant Amount (US\$ million)	Number of Projects	SGP start year
1	Poland	ECA	6.76	385	1994
2	Lithuania	ECA	2.61	104	2001
3	Chile**	LAC	7.07	260	1994

Table 8: Countries under various Sub-regions

#	Country	Sub-Region	Grant Amount	Number of Projects	SGP start year	Categ ory
1	Palestinian Authority	Egypt	3.92	126	1999	III
2	Tokelau	Samoa	0.04	2	2007	I
3	Kiribati	Fiji	0.06	2	2008	I
4	Nauru	Fiji	0.05	1	2009	I
5	Tuvalu	Fiji	0.25	5	2008	I
6	Tonga	Fiji	0.09	2	2009	I