

## Comments on APR Approach Paper

Comment by	Comments	GEF EO Response
<b>RATINGS</b>		
<p>1. World Bank Group (WBG)</p>	<p>The message on the ratings assessment of IEG Vs EO is not clear to us. Both section (para 10-15) on TE process and 'Adoption of Agency EO ratings" (para 16-19) cover the issue, which may lead to perception of overlap / inconsistencies. For example, Para 10 says that 'The Office intends to prepare reviews for about 20 to 30 terminal evaluations. For the terminal evaluation that would <i>not</i> be reviewed, the GEF EO would adopt the ratings provided by the independent evaluation offices of the implementing agencies." Para 16 states that " where there is sufficient track record to indicate convergence in the ratings provided by the independent evaluation office of an agency and the GEF EO, the GEF EO accepts the ratings provided by the evaluation office of such agencies." Footnote also says that 'the GEF EO adopts the ratings provided by the independent evaluation offices of the agencies on other parameters only when these have been provided using an approach that is congruent with the GEF EO approach. " What is the case for the WB? On what basis will the selection of Review be made? It would be desirable that this is transparent.</p>	<p>In case of World Bank, barring exceptions the outcome ratings provided by the IEG are adopted. They are not adopted in instances where given a project was a joint project and the ratings provided by the evaluation offices of the agencies, including IEG, are not consolidated and, therefore, reflect performance of only those components that were implemented by the respective agency.</p> <p>We would continue to sample a portion of World Bank terminal evaluations (ICRs) and provide outcome ratings for these. The selection of terminal evaluations - that are otherwise eligible for adoption of rating - is done on a random selection basis. In instances where we do conduct a terminal evaluation review, the ratings that GEF EO are the ratings that are reported to the Council. For other projects adopted ratings are reported.</p>
<p>2. WBG</p>	<p>Clarification of Table 2: How can the total number of 'GEF EO rating or adopted IA evaluation office rating" in a cohort be <u>higher</u> than the number of 'IA evaluation office rating'? Unless the EO has also adopted the TEs <i>without</i> IA rating, but if the column title is not correct? In some cohorts, the 'GEF EO</p>	<p>GEF EO (including adopted ratings) provides outcome ratings for a greater number of projects than EOs of IAs because of a simple reason: EOs of IA have not been providing ratings in all the</p>

	rating or adopted IA evaluation office rating" exceeds both IA-rated TEs and non-rated TEs together, how is this possible?	instances. As long as the number of projects for which EO has provided or adopted ratings is lower than or equal to the total number of projects included in that year's APR cohort - we are still operating within the zone of possibility.
3. WBG	Table 3: The comparison with rating disconnect between GEF EO and IA rating is relevant. However, the link between GEFEO rating to back to TE and even PIR is too long, and not easily comparative.	Terminal evaluations, its reviews by the evaluation office of the agencies, and by the GEF EO, look at the evidence on project performance at project end. Thus, they are comparable. The ratings in the last PIR and TERs compare a slightly different phenomenon. Nonetheless, the PIR is the best approximation we have for 'at project end' information on outcomes that comes through regular communication channels on project monitoring. Their comparison provides a good sense of the extent ratings contained in the last PIRs (or PIRs in general) are reliable.
4. WBG	The basis for calculation of ratings in annex 2 is not always clear, especially the various formula. Page 14; "the overall outcome achievement rating may not be higher than "unsatisfactory" (will make performance plummet...?)	Yes, using relevance rating as a critical parameter will make 'outcome' performance rating plummet if the relevance is rated unsatisfactory. If the project was not relevant to GEF concerns and did not target global environmental benefits, then the overall GEF EO outcome rating will not be above "unsatisfactory" regardless of how effective it was in delivering outcomes.
5. WBG	The assessment of quality of project M&E systems should be consistent with the M&E policy. We	Point noted and addressed in the revised APR approach paper.

	<p>would appreciate further discussion with EO and GEFSEC on common understanding of the M&amp;E design and implementation, which differ depending on different agency systems. (it says for example (bottom page 15) that 'An M&amp;E system should be in place with proper training for parties responsible for M&amp;E activities to ensure that data will continue to be collected and used after project closure.' and that the EO will assess (and rate?) " Did the project provide proper training for parties responsible for M&amp;E activities to ensure data will continue to be collected and used after project closure?'. We do not think it appropriate that GEF or EO should insist on specific training activities in each project as this seems to imply.</p>	
<b>APR COHORT</b>		
6. WBG	<p>A main concern is the cohort of WB projects (annex 1). We thought we had addressed together the reconciliation of the TEs last year, but are surprised to see only 16 WB projects 'for which TEs were submitted' - which are not the ones we submitted TEs/ICRs for just before Christmas (at least 26), but they are not even the ones submitted last year (8 are among the ICRs we submitted last year for FY11, but another 10 are not in this list?)? In this case the discrepancy cannot be explained by waiting for IEG reviews, as per para 7-9? Need to discuss the WB universe and process.</p>	<p>For World Bank the APR cohort takes into account only those ICR submissions for full size projects, where the independent reviews by the IEG are also available. Since there is a time lag involved in ICRs becoming available and ICR reviews being completed, the list of ICRs submitted to the GEF EO and the completed projects included in the cohort may not be identical. We will make the text more consistent with the actual situation.</p>
<b>OTHER COMMENTS</b>		
7. WBG	<p>We appreciate the focus on the other agencies for the supervision review, and have no further comments on that part.</p>	<p>No action required</p>
8. AfDB	<p>The African development Bank has not specific comments on this paper. Since we have not terminated project we will be glad to participate on the quality of supervision section exercise that will</p>	<p>No action required.</p>

	be partially integrated in the APR-2012.	
9. UNEP	UNEP welcomes the approach and has no comments on the Approach Paper.	No action required