



Global Environment Facility

GEF/ME/C.27/3
October 11, 2005

GEF Council
November 8-10, 2005

Agenda Item 7 (c)

PROCEDURES AND FORMAT OF THE GEF MANAGEMENT ACTION RECORD

(Prepared by the GEF Office of Monitoring and Evaluation)

Recommended Council Decision

The Council, having reviewed document GEF/ME/C.27/3, *Procedures and Format of the Management Action Record*, approves the procedures for preparing the GEF Management Action Record (MAR) as well as its format for reporting on follow-up to Council decisions concerning independent evaluation reports and their management responses. The Council requests the GEF Secretariat and the Office of Monitoring and Evaluation to prepare the GEF MAR in consultation with the appropriate GEF entities. The GEF MAR will be presented to Council by the Office of Monitoring and Evaluation for review and follow-up on an annual basis commencing June 2006.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Following Council agreement in November 2004, the GEF Office of Monitoring and Evaluation is presenting the procedures and format for the preparation of the GEF Management Action Record (MAR) for reporting on follow-up to Council decisions concerning independent evaluation reports and their management responses. The GEF MAR is an integral part of the proposed new GEF Policy on Monitoring and Evaluation regarding the satisfactory use of and follow-up to evaluation findings and recommendations.

The two purposes of the GEF MAR are (a) to provide Council with a record of its decisions on the follow-up of evaluation reports, the proposed management actions, and the actual status of these actions; and (b) to increase the accountability of GEF management regarding Council decisions on monitoring and evaluation issues.

The Office of Monitoring and Evaluation proposes to prepare a GEF MAR for each independent evaluation, study or report with a management response in consultation with the GEF Secretariat and the Implementing and Executing Agencies. The GEF MAR will be prepared for submission annually to the Council at the May/June sessions.

The GEF Office of Monitoring and Evaluation will record relevant Council decisions concerning independent evaluation reports and studies, and the management responses in a table format. The table contains the recommendations from M&E reports, the appropriate management responses, and Council decision(s). A rating system is proposed to assess the progress towards adoption of the management responses as decided upon by Council.

After recording the relevant Council decisions concerning independent evaluation reports and studies and management responses, the Office of M&E will invite GEF Management to provide a self-rating of the level of adoption of Council decisions on recommendations, and comments if necessary, two months prior to the May/June Council meeting in. Subsequently, the Office of Monitoring and Evaluation will enter its own rating of adoption with comments in time for presentation to Council.

BACKGROUND

1. Council, at its November 2004 session agreed with the proposal that the GEF Office of Monitoring and Evaluation should develop “procedures for preparing a management action record for reporting on follow-up decision of Council concerning monitoring and evaluation reports and management responses.”

2. The Office of Monitoring and Evaluation proposes to prepare an annual GEF Management Action Record (MAR) for submission to the Council at the May/June sessions. A GEF MAR will be submitted for each independent evaluation, study or report with a management response. The GEF MAR is an integral part of the proposed new GEF Policy on Monitoring and Evaluation regarding the satisfactory use of and follow-up to evaluation findings and recommendations.

PURPOSE OF THE GEF MANAGEMENT ACTION RECORD

3. The GEF Management Action Record has two purposes:

- (a) To provide Council with a record of its decisions on the follow-up of evaluation reports, the proposed management actions, and the actual status of these actions, and
- (b) To increase the accountability of GEF management regarding Council decisions on monitoring and evaluation issues.

4. The GEF MAR contains each recommendation which emerged from independent evaluations, studies and reports, the relevant management responses, the relevant Council decision(s), and documents the status of the actions that have been taken to implement the relevant Councils decision(s).

MANAGEMENT RESPONSE AND COUNCIL DECISIONS

5. During the preparation of reports from the GEF Office of Monitoring and Evaluation, the GEF Secretariat, the Implementing and Executing Agencies, STAP, and when appropriate GEF recipient countries are consulted to check on potential factual errors. Once a report is finalized, the GEF Secretariat is required to submit a management response to Council. The management response is prepared in consultation with the appropriate GEF partner(s). (Detailed procedures for Management Responses are provided in *Elements for a New GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy*, GEF/ME/C.24/1.)

6. The Council is expected to discuss and review the M&E reports and the corresponding management response, take any necessary decisions, and give guidance to GEF on policies or an appropriate plan of action within specific timeframes. The decisions are recorded in the Joint Summary of the Chairs and will be recorded in the Management Action Record.

ADOPTION RATINGS

7. The GEF Office of Monitoring and Evaluation proposes to assess the progress towards adopting the Council's decisions in the GEF MAR through a rating system, as is standard international practice. The following four ratings, which have been based on the ones in use in the World Bank's MAR, are proposed:

- (a) **High** - Fully adopted;
- (b) **Substantial** - Largely adopted but not fully incorporated into policy, strategy or operations as yet;
- (c) **Medium** - Adopted in some operational and policy work, but not to a significant degree in key areas, and
- (d) **Negligible** - No evidence or plan for adoption, or plan and actions for adoption are in a very preliminary stage.

PROPOSED PROCEDURES

8. The GEF Office of Monitoring and Evaluation will record relevant Council decisions concerning independent evaluation reports and studies and management responses in a table format. The table contains columns for first recommendations, management responses, and then Council decisions. This is followed by a section on the adoption level with columns first for GEF Management adoption self ratings and comments, and second GEF Office of Monitoring and Evaluation adoption ratings and comments.

9. The Office of Monitoring and Evaluation will invite GEF Management to provide a self-rating of the level of adoption of Council decisions on recommendations, and comments if necessary, two months prior to the May/June Council meeting in which the GEF MAR will be discussed. Subsequently, the Office of M&E will enter its own rating of adoption with comments in time for presentation to Council.

10. The Management Action Record will be updated annually for submission to the May/June Council session. After an item has been reported as fully adopted or no longer relevant, it will be deleted from the GEF MAR and after all items have been adopted, the MAR will be archived. In cases where the Office of Monitoring and Evaluation carries out subsequent evaluations or studies on the same topic, the new recommendations and Council decisions will replace the previous ones in the MAR.

11. The Director of the GEF Office of Monitoring and Evaluation will report to the Council on the Office's overall assessment of the follow-up of Council decisions as noted in the Management Action Report. This assessment will be included as a chapter of the Annual Performance Review that is also submitted annually to the May/June Council meeting.

12. An example of the proposed Management Action Record format partially filled in for the *Review of the GEF Operational Program 12: Integrated Ecosystem Management* (GEF/ME/C.25.5) and the *GEF Management Response to the M&E Program Study on OP12 Integrated Ecosystem Management* (GEF/ME/C.25/6) is attached for the Council's consideration.

Management Action Record
Review of the GEF Operational Program 12:
Integrated Ecosystem Management
 (GEF/ME/C.25/5, May 2005)

Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Rating in Progress of Adoption*			
			Mgmt	Comments	GEFME	Comments
N/A	N/A	June 2005 - Decision on Agenda items 5(e) - The Council, having reviewed the document, GEF/ME/C.25/5, requests the OPS3 team to take the evaluation into consideration when preparing their final report.	N/A	N/A	High	The OPS3 team took the evaluation into consideration when preparing their final report.
<u>Quality at Entry.</u> The study noted that projects did not score well on technical factors that are important to potential success, such as sound initial diagnoses of problems and assessment of potential solutions, accurate establishment of baselines, appropriate scientific and technical approaches to solution of problems, monitoring of change or impact, and mechanisms to learn from experiences and adapt accordingly.	Management has taken important steps to ensure that projects will provide a more robust presentation of the technical factors in proposals at work program inclusion. This includes the presentation of a sound problem analysis, a root-causes-impact chain, the identification of barriers for integrated ecosystem management and the related identification of project interventions. Discussions of options to the technical approaches that are proposed will also be encouraged. The GEFSEC will extract best practices and lessons learned in project design and level of detail of technical	June 2005 - Decision on Agenda items 5(e) - The Council requests the GEF Office of Monitoring and Evaluation to report on follow-up actions taken to implement the management response in June 2006, taking into account the decision of the Council on the management response.				

Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Rating in Progress of Adoption*			
			Mgmt	Comments	GEFME	Comments
	<p>approaches for future reference and replication. The GEFSEC will draw on good practice examples to explore further the feasibility of developing indicators that demonstrate synergistic benefits. Closer collaboration will be sought with focal area specialists to strengthen indicators to measure global environmental benefits.</p>					
<p>Integration. The study found that a multi-focal approach does not necessarily imply that the projects have exploited the synergies between the focal areas or developed an integrated approach. The study points to a lack of strategic guidance in the operational program and unclear guidelines for preparing integrated ecosystem management projects.</p>	<p>The GEFSEC will pay increased attention to the issue of synergies in the context of the internal discussion process on thematic and institutional integration. While there were inconsistencies in the early days of OP12, the GEF has proactively addressed the lack of strategic priorities in OP12 by setting up an institutional mechanism to ensure transparency, cross-focal area peer reviews and performance standards. Today, reviews for projects entering the OP12 portfolio are peer-reviewed by at least two thematic professionals in the GEFSEC and some of the agencies before the project enters the next stage in the GEF project cycle.</p>	<p>June 2005 - Decision (See above)</p>				

Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Rating in Progress of Adoption*			
			Mgmt	Comments	GEFME	Comments
<u>Assessments.</u> “Win-wins” versus “trade-offs” must be considered during project preparation in terms of working to achieve: (i) development and/or poverty alleviation while maintaining or increasing global environmental goods and services, and (ii) synergies between or among focal areas	The GEFSEC will pursue this recommendation with the GEF interagency task forces.	June 2005 - Decision (See above)				
<u>Synergies.</u> During project preparation more attention to multifocality among global environmental goods is required. In some projects, synergies may be questionable to the point that the risk of “double jeopardy” arises in having to establish baselines and achieve and measure separate but synergistic impacts. That is, it may be that holding projects responsible for multifocal outcomes could be beyond project capabilities and budgets.	Technical backstopping missions by the IAs and EAs will pay special attention to mitigating the risk of “double jeopardy.” Clear incentives therefore have to be developed to encourage proponents to contemplate a synergistic (or integrated) project. The GEF interagency task force will consider these issues.	June 2005 - Decision (See above)				

*Level of adoption may be rated in four ways: **High:** Fully adopted, **Substantial:** Largely adopted but not fully incorporated into policy, strategy or operations as yet, **Medium:** Adopted in some operational and policy work, but not to a significant degree in key areas, and **Negligible:** No evidence or plan for adoption, or plan and actions for adoption are in a very preliminary stage.