

GEF Council
June 7 - 9, 2016
Washington, D.C.

Agenda Item 11

**SEMI-ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT OF THE
INDEPENDENT EVALUATION OFFICE: JUNE 2016**

(Prepared by the Independent Evaluation Office of the GEF)

Recommended Council Decision

Regarding the Semi Annual Evaluation Report of the Independent Evaluation Office.

The Council, having reviewed the “Semi-Annual Evaluation Report of the GEF Independent Evaluation Office: June 2016,” approves the IEO Budget for FY2017.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary.....	iii
I. Introduction	1
II. Completed Evaluations	1
1. CSO Network evaluation	1
2. Tajikistan Country Portfolio Evaluation (1999-2015)	2
Effectiveness	2
Efficiency	3
3. Annual Performance Report 2015	3
4. Evaluation of the Expansion of the Partnership-Phase I	4
5. LDCF Program Evaluation.....	5
6. LDCF/SCCF Annual Evaluation Report 2015.....	6
7. Approach Paper for the Sixth Comprehensive Evaluation of the GEF.....	6
III. Evaluation Work in Progress.....	7
1. The Programmatic Approaches Evaluation	7
2. The Multiple Benefits Evaluation.....	7
3. GEF and the Private Sector	8
4. Focal Area Studies.....	8
IV. Update on Other Initiatives	9
1. Revamped IEO Website	9
2. Publications and Participation in Workshops on Environmental Evaluation	10
3. Application of modern evaluative methods	10
4. Budget for Fiscal Year 2016 and 2017	11
5. IEO Human Resources.....	12

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1. This Semi Annual Evaluation report summarizes the key conclusions from the evaluations completed between October 2015 and June 2016. These include the CSO Network Evaluation, the Tajikistan Country Portfolio Evaluation, the Annual Performance Report 2015, the first phase of the Evaluation of the Expansion of the Partnership, the LDCF Program Evaluation and the LDCF/SCCF Annual Evaluation Report 2015. The document also includes an overview of the ongoing evaluation work, focal area studies, the overall approach paper to the Sixth Comprehensive Evaluation of the GEF, knowledge initiatives, and an update on the Budget and staffing of the IEO. The full evaluation reports are respectively provided in the following Working Documents:

- (a) Evaluation of the GEF CSO Network : GEF/ME/C.50/02
- (b) Annual Performance Report 2015: GEF/ME/C.50/04
- (c) Evaluation of the Expansion of the GEF Partnership-Phase I: GEF/ME/C.50/06
- (d) Sixth Comprehensive Evaluation of the GEF (OPS6) Approach Paper:
GEF/ME/C.50/07
- (e) LDCF/SCCF Annual Evaluation Report 2015: GEF/LDCF.SCCF.20/ME/01
- (f) Program Evaluation of the Least Developed Countries Fund:
GEF/LDCF.SCCF.20/ME/02

I. INTRODUCTION

1. This is the third Semi-Annual Evaluation Report (SAER) prepared for and presented to the Council by the Independent Evaluation Office (IEO) of the GEF. The first two reports were presented to Council in June 2015 and October 2015. This reporting format includes a brief summary of evaluations and an update on ongoing evaluations and other initiatives.

2. This SAER presents a brief summary of the conclusions of the evaluations completed by the IEO during the reporting period (October 2015-June 2016). These include the CSO Network Evaluation, the Tajikistan Country Portfolio Evaluation, the Annual Performance Report 2015 (APR), the first phase of the evaluation of the expansion of the partnership, the program evaluation of the Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF) , and the LDCF/SCCF Annual Evaluation Report 2015. The proposed Council decisions pertaining to these evaluations, with the exception of the Tajikistan Country Portfolio evaluation, are included in the relevant working documents that are being presented and discussed. In this SAER, we also report on Budget, the approach paper to the Sixth Comprehensive Evaluation of the GEF, and on on-going evaluations and initiatives. The full evaluation report of the Morocco Country Portfolio Evaluation, presented at the October 2015 Council meeting, is included as an information document (GEF/ME/C.50/Inf.01). The full evaluation report of the Tajikistan Country Portfolio evaluation will be included as an information document for the October 2016 Council meeting.

II. COMPLETED EVALUATIONS

1. CSO Network evaluation

3. This evaluation responds to two key evaluation questions (1) To what extent is the CSO Network meeting its intended goals and strategic objectives and adding value to the GEF Partnership and its membership?; (2) How are Network features contributing to the effective and efficient functioning of the Network?

4. To answer these questions, the evaluation adopted a mixed-methods approach encompassing qualitative and quantitative data gathering approaches and analysis. Main areas addressed include credibility, connectivity, capacity, results, structure, membership, governance and resources.

5. The evaluation reached the following conclusions:

- (a) The GEF CSO Network continues to be relevant and is delivering results to the GEF Partnership.
- (b) The CSO Network's activities are distant from the country level where GEF projects make their mark and from where the majority of Network CSOs operate. As such, the Network's is compromised in its ability to inform Council with country perspectives and in servicing its members.

- (c) The CSO Network today is operating in an expanding GEF Partnership without a shared contemporary vision of the role that the Network can play within the changing architecture and the resources that it needs to be effective.
- (d) Within the context of an increasingly complex operating environment, the Network has strengthened itself organizationally over the evaluation period, but governance challenges remain.

2. Tajikistan Country Portfolio Evaluation (1999-2015)

6. The Tajikistan Country Portfolio Evaluation (CPE) was conducted between October 2014 and January 2016. It covers the period 1999-2015. Over this period the GEF committed US\$33.9 million in 23 national projects, with US\$119.65 million in co-financing. Tajikistan is party to sixteen regional and seven global projects, totaling US\$64.85 million, with US\$150.93 million co-financing.¹ GEF support has been broadly aligned with the international GEF mandate of achieving global environmental benefits and helped the country to meet its international commitments. GEF support is well integrated into the government systems assisted by the country's well-developed environmental legal framework. The country is party to almost all international environmental conventions, except for the Minamata convention on mercury. This would be an important consideration since mercury is among the major mineral resources extracted in Tajikistan, and where the leakage of chemicals into waters as a result of mining activities is a major cause for concern. In general, there here has been coordination and synergies between GEF Agencies, national executing agencies and other donor support at the national level, less so at the local level. The national portfolio shows a good co-financing ratio, including government in-cash as well as in-kind contributions.

Effectiveness

7. GEF support to Tajikistan has been significantly more effective in biodiversity conservation, particularly in protected areas management and biosafety legislation. There is some evidence of the broader adoption of project outcomes as stress reduction is occurring and environmental status is improving at local scales, primarily through (i) stakeholder ownership and support, (ii) effective financial mechanisms, and (iii) adequate information flows. GEF support to dealing with chemicals issues in Tajikistan was effective in the ODS sector and overall, GEF support translated in 50.7 tons of Ozone Depletion Potential (ODP) equivalent, which allowed Tajikistan to return to compliance with the Montreal Protocol in 2006. Support to Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs) was limited. Though gender is important in the country, for the most part, women's involvement in GEF projects occurred through participation in environmental education, agricultural and/or small economic activities training. Project proposals as well as implementation and evaluation reports often lack gender specific information, including gender disaggregated indicators in their project results framework.

Efficiency

8. In Tajikistan, the GEF activity cycle is perceived as too long, especially at the project formulation stage even though GEF cycle timeframes compare well with most of the other country portfolios analyzed by the IEO. Insufficient consultation between the GEF focal point mechanism and project proponents to fine-tune proposals and manage the approval process is considered a cause for delay. Delays are also associated with low in-country project design capacity and lack of specialized technical expertise. The GEF focal point mechanism has not provided sufficient strategic guidance and coordination, and has not been particularly effective in disseminating information on the GEF financing opportunities as well as rules and procedures, to national stakeholders.

9. M&E has improved in projects over time as shown by the satisfactory overall M&E ratings in the most recent project Terminal Evaluations (TEs). All the completed projects have used the midterm evaluations and reviews to take stock from the experience gained, and adapted implementation to changes in contextual conditions as and where appropriate. The GEF tracking tools have been used on a limited basis.

The full report will be presented to the Council as an Information Document in October 2016.

3. Annual Performance Report 2015

10. The objective of the Annual Performance Report (APR) is to provide a detailed overview of the performance of GEF activities and processes, key factors affecting performance, and the quality of monitoring and evaluation (M&E) systems within the GEF partnership. The APR2015 covers 159 recently completed projects which account for US\$728 million in GEF funding and US\$3.3 billion in realized co-financing. In total, APR2015 reports on 1,077 completed projects for which terminal evaluation have been submitted to the IEO from calendar year 2000 to 2015. These 1,077 projects represent US\$4.8 billion in GEF funding and US\$22.4 billion in realized co-financing.

11. The key findings of APR2015 are:

- (a) Seventy-five percent of the projects and 74 percent of the funding for the APR2015 cohort is in projects with outcome ratings in the satisfactory range. These figures are lower than the average of 81 percent of projects and 79 percent of funding in the satisfactory range for the projects covered in the past APRs. A major reason for the slightly lower ratings for the FY 2015 cohort is due to the project mix which includes a greater representation of projects in Africa region that tend to have lower ratings.
- (b) Quality of implementation has remained consistent but quality of execution has declined. A lower percentage of the APR2015 cohort is rated in the satisfactory range (at 72 percent for APR 2015 cohort versus 81 percent for the cumulative total).

- (c) Compared to GEF-5, the focal tracking tools for GEF-6 are leaner and better aligned with the focal area results framework indicators. Further streamlining efforts will need to consider the use versus burden of these tracking tools.
- (d) For 5 of the 7 recommendations tracked in the MAR 2015 the level of adoption was rated to be substantial or higher. For the remaining two, the level of adoption was rated as medium. These were on recommendations related to the streamlining of multi focal project tracking tools, and on the upgrading of the SGP Country Program.

4. Evaluation of the Expansion of the Partnership-Phase I

12. The Evaluation of the Expansion of the GEF Partnership is being conducted at the request of the GEF Council.¹ The evaluation assesses the extent to which the present structure of the GEF partnership is meeting the needs of its key stakeholders and is optimal for delivery of GEF program and activities. The evaluation is being conducted in two phases. The first phase of the evaluation comprises of a preliminary analysis based on the survey of the GEF Partner Agencies, key stakeholders in recipient countries, and GEF Secretariat. The key questions of the evaluation focus on the access to new capacities as a result of the expansion, the factors that have enabled or hindered the partners in being effective, and the ability of the agencies in serving the needs in recipient countries.

13. The first phase of the evaluation started in November 2015. It employs a variety of methods and tools including desk review, interviews, online survey, and quantitative analysis of GEF Project Management Information System (PMIS) data. Perceptions of 205 individuals representing key stakeholders of GEF were covered through interviews and/or online surveys.

14. The key findings of the evaluation are:

- (a) Expansion of the GEF partnership has increased the number of Agencies and agency choices that are addressing environmental concerns related to the GEF focal areas.
- (b) The data shows that on average a GEF recipient country has access to approximately 8 Agencies. The increase is evident in SIDS and LDCs as well. However, there is substantial variability in Agency choice at the country level.
- (c) The share of the three original Agencies in the GEF project portfolio has declined from 100 percent in the Pilot Phase to 69 percent in GEF-5. The combined share of the seven agencies from the first round is now about 30 percent. Project Agencies account for about a 2 percent share in the GEF-6

¹ Joint Summary of Chairs. 49th GEF Council Meeting, Oct 2015. Decision on Agenda Item 6 – Future Directions on Accreditation.

portfolio. Their share in the GEF portfolio doubles if their share in the projects and programs that they co-implement is also taken into account.

- (d) The extent to which a Project Agency receives support in recipient countries depends on whether it is a national agency, a sub-regional or regional agency, or an International CSO. International CSOs indicated challenges in receiving country support for implementing GEF projects in several countries. Possible reasons include competition from Agencies, and relative inexperience in preparing and implementing GEF projects.
- (e) Agencies are performing satisfactorily in delivering services such as project preparation, project supervision and monitoring, support for follow up activities after project completion and assistance in GEF national portfolio formulation. However, timely communication of implementation progress is an area identified for improvement.
- (f) According to the operational focal points, the three original Agencies are best positioned to deliver the best value or are delivering the best value on all parameters tracked by the survey.
- (g) GEF Partner Agencies value the resources that GEF provides for the generation of global environmental benefits. For some Agencies the relative importance of the GEF partnership may be diminishing due to factors such as transaction costs, competition, and availability of alternative sources of funding.
- (h) Efficiency gains in some areas may be balanced or even outweighed by cost increases in others, particularly in terms of management time, as a result of the expansion.
- (i) GEF stakeholders that are part of the GEF partnership assess the GEF to be effective in delivering on its environmental mandate. Among the stakeholders, operational focal points tend to rate the overall effectiveness of the GEF higher than the Conventional Focal points or CSOs.
- (j) Most respondents suggested the need for more time to fully assess the benefits from the second round of expansion.

5. LDCF Program Evaluation

15. The program evaluation focuses on performance and progress towards LDCF objectives and emerging results. The program was evaluated on relevance, effectiveness and efficiency and results and sustainability.

16. The findings show that LDCF supported activities, for the most part, have been highly relevant to COP guidance, and countries' development priorities and the interventions show clear potential in reaching the GEF's three adaptation strategic objectives. Eighty-eight percent of NAPA country reports (EAs), and 90 percent of implementation projects (MSP/FSP) to a large extent aligned with the GEF adaptation strategic objectives and 98 percent of NAPA implementation projects had a high probability of delivering on the objectives. It is not within the Fund's mandate to explicitly target focal areas beyond climate change, but there is clear potential for beneficial synergies with the biodiversity and land degradation focal areas in particular. LDCF support to NAPA implementation projects has resulted in catalytic effects in completed projects, through the generation of significant social, economic, cultural and human well-being co-benefits, impacts on multiple sectors and at different levels of society, and the development of foundations for larger scale projects through analytic work, assessments and capacity building. Only 15 percent of completed projects performed well on upscaling.

17. The efficiency of the LDCF has been negatively impacted by the unpredictability of available resources. Despite employing measures to expedite the project cycle the LDCF's efficiency has experienced negative effects from the unpredictable nature of available resources. There is no formal resource mobilization process and the Fund has to rely on voluntary contributions.

18. The main recommendations pointed to the need for exploring avenues for more stable funding, application of the gender guidelines more consistently and a need for the PMIS system to provide more updated project information.

6. LDCF/SCCF Annual Evaluation Report 2015

19. The third LDCF/SCCF Annual Evaluation Report (AER) (GEF/LDCF.SCCF.20/ME/01) presents an assessment of eleven completed LDCF/SCCF projects for which the terminal evaluations (TEs) were submitted during the fiscal year 2015. These eleven projects account for US\$14.6 million in LDCF funding and US\$33.91 million in SCCF funding. The AER looks at performance, innovation, gender considerations and presents a synthesis of lessons learned from the FY 2015 cohort of completed LDCF/SCCF projects. Ten of the eleven completed projects had outcome ratings in the satisfactory range, while only the completed Sudan project was rated moderately unsatisfactory. Projects rated in the satisfactory range had objectives that were relevant to the GEF climate change focal area and to the country's priorities. Only four of the eleven projects received M&E ratings in the satisfactory range. A new gender rating assessed seven projects as gender aware, and four projects as gender sensitive. None of the completed projects part of the FY 2015 cohort were rated as gender mainstreamed. Given the small number of completed projects to date, a comparison of one year to the next is not representative of the full range of objectives and approaches of the two funds. A retrospective review of all completed projects, currently 24 in total, is planned for next year's report.

7. Approach Paper for the Sixth Comprehensive Evaluation of the GEF

20. The approach paper for the Sixth Comprehensive Review of the GEF has been developed, with inputs from stakeholders across the partnership. The theme for the Approach

Paper is : GEF in a changing landscape for environmental finance. The report will follow up on the recommendations of OPS5 and assess the extent to which those have been implemented. It will focus on institutional and governance issues, the health of the partnership, financing, and performance and impact issues of programmatic approaches, focal area, and multi focal area projects. The report will provide early insights into recent programmatic developments in GEF6 through a real time evaluation of the Integrated Approaches Program. An external review panel of 5 high-level experts has been appointed to provide guidance throughout the evaluation process as well as quality assurance. Once approved by Council, all studies to address the issues included in the paper will be launched. A draft of the report will be presented to the Council in June 2017, and the final report will be completed by October 2017.

III. EVALUATION WORK IN PROGRESS

1. The Programmatic Approaches Evaluation

21. The IEO has begun work on the programmatic approaches evaluation, which was included in the IEO work program and budget (GEF/ME/C.48/01) approved by the Council in its June 2015 meeting. The main purpose of the programmatic approaches evaluation is to assess whether and how GEF programs have delivered the expected results in terms of broader scale and longer term global environmental benefits while addressing the main drivers of global environmental degradation. The evaluation also aims at providing evidence on the performance of the GEF in delivering programs as a support modality. It will explore efficiency issues, including program design, governance and management arrangements, coordination and M&E. Cross-cutting issues such as gender and private sector involvement will be covered where opportunities for specific data gathering arise. The evaluation is being conducted between October 2015 and June 2017. The full report will be presented to the Council in June 2017.

2. The Multiple Benefits Evaluation

22. Given the interconnected nature of environmental issues, interventions intended to benefit one convention may also produce multiple benefits aligned with the targets of other conventions. Multiple benefits generated through GEF support consist of two types: the global environmental benefits (GEBs) that contribute towards achieving the strategic priorities of multiple focal areas,¹ and the local environmental and socioeconomic benefits that indirectly generate and sustain the GEBs. One way that GEF has sought to create multiple benefits in a more integrated manner is through multi-focal area (MFA) projects. These projects are funded through allocations from different global environmental conventions and/or trust funds, and track indicators specific to each focal area.

23. With each succeeding GEF phase, the proportion of grant amounts allocated for Multi Focal Area projects has approximately doubled; actual MFA grant amounts have almost tripled from US\$ 357 million in GEF-4 to US\$998 million in GEF-5, making it GEF's fastest-growing portfolio.¹ Yet no comprehensive evaluation has so far been done on this emerging portfolio. This evaluation aims to fill this gap. Using a mixed methods approach, the IEO seeks to assess the extent to which GEF support has contributed to the generation of multiple benefits,

including any associated synergies and trade-offs, by addressing environmental issues through a multi-focal approach. The evaluation will be presented to Council in June 2017.

3. GEF and the Private Sector

24. The GEF aims to expand private sector investment and commitment to environmental solutions across GEF's focal areas and initiatives. So far, GEF strategies to engage the private sector and encourage investment focused on transforming regulatory environments, convening multi-stakeholder alliances, strengthening institutional capacity and demonstrating innovative approaches. While GEF-4 and GEF-5 were mostly geared towards removing barriers for private sector engagement through ear-marked funding and non-grant funding, GEF-6 has planned a more holistic approach by mainstreaming private sector engagement in GEF focal areas and supporting integrated approach pilots of public-private partnerships. For GEF-6, the GEF also launched a \$110m Non-grant pilot program to combat global environmental degradation. With GEF-6 being underway for two years now, IEO will evaluate the results of private sector engagements under the current program and explore opportunities for GEF-7. The aim of the study is to answer questions around the offer, demand and solutions of private sector engagement within and outside the GEF, and to provide evidence on models of private/ public sector partnerships and instruments that have worked elsewhere. The draft report and findings, will be presented at the October 2016 GEF Council meeting.

4. Focal Area Studies

25. In response to the findings of the IEO's Knowledge Management Needs Assessment (GEF/ME/C.49/Inf.01), IEO is undertaking focal area studies that summarize evaluative evidence and distill emerging lessons for GEF-7, and contribute to the Sixth Comprehensive Evaluation of the GEF. Three focal area studies are underway: International Waters, Chemicals and Waste and Land Degradation.

A. International Waters Focal Area Study

26. The purpose of the IW Focal Area study is to synthesize existing evaluative evidence in relation to the relevance, performance, results, progress to impact, and lessons learned of GEF support to International Waters. The study has five-fold objectives: 1) assess the relevance of the GEF IW Focal Area strategy to the global environmental problems and key transboundary issues; 2) present a synthesis of IW results and impacts; 3) assess the approaches and mechanisms through which results have been achieved; 4) assess whether recently approved projects are consistent with the strategy and, to the extent possible, are likely to achieve outcomes; 5) identify lessons for GEF-7. The study will be completed and presented to the Council at the October 2016 meeting.

B. Land Degradation Focal Area Study including a Value for Money Analysis

27. The Land Degradation Focal Area will use evidence from existing evaluations specifically, to review the quality at entry, study the progress towards impact, and present a synthesis on

evolution of GEF strategies to combat land degradation through sustainable land management. This study would allow the GEF to improve and adapt its support to improve GEF Land Degradation priority action and operations. The analysis will include (i) the study on Progress toward impact and, (ii) present a synthesis on the evolution of GEF Land Degradation strategy. The report will also include a Value for Money study. The purpose of this part of the analysis is to examine the VFM of GEF LD projects, in addition to the VFM of environmental benefits they provide across other GEF focal areas such as Biodiversity and Climate Change. The analysis will help understand if GEF investments and technical support have been optimally utilized to achieve the intended global environmental benefits across focal areas. The report, decision support tools and knowledge management products will be presented at the October 2016 GEF Council meeting.

C. Chemicals and Waste Focal Area Study

28. The long-term goal of the CW focal area strategy as formulated in GEF-6 Programming Directions is to prevent the exposure of humans and the environment to harmful chemicals and waste of global importance, including POPs, mercury, and ODS, through a significant reduction in the production, use, consumption, and emissions/releases of those chemicals and waste. The GEF serves as the financial mechanism to the Stockholm Convention on POPs, on an interim basis, and the Minamata Convention on Mercury and indirectly supports the Basel and Rotterdam Conventions. The purpose of the CW Focal Area study is to assess the relevance of the GEF investments to the guidance and decisions of the conventions; to understand the impacts of CW investments on the production, use, consumption, and emissions/releases of chemicals and waste, impacts on other GEF focal areas such as food security, water, SCP, sustainable cities, and on LDCs and SIDS. The study will also assess the co-benefits from CW investments on climate change mitigation and adaptation, land degradation, international waters, and biodiversity and address issues of efficiency and provide lessons for GEF7. The findings will be presented to the Council in October 2017.

IV. UPDATE ON OTHER INITIATIVES

1. Revamped IEO Website

29. Approved by the GEF Council at its 48th meeting in June 2015, the Knowledge Management Approach Paper (GEF/C.48/07/Rev.01) included a new and updated website for the GEF and GEF IEO. Aligned with its mandate, the IEO found that it is in their best interest separate from the GEF with an independent website that will be developed in two phases. The first phase, which took place from December 2015 until May 2016, was focused on the standardizing and collecting data for all evaluations, and incorporating new design aspects to the website. Some new features include enhanced search function capabilities on the evaluations, council documents, and main pages. This will ensure relative information is displayed in a user-friendly way for stakeholders to better understand and use results for appropriate decision-making on GEF projects and programs. In addition, a new section on data and maps will feature the performance ratings in each country as noted in the recently conducted APR 2015.

30. The second phase of the project will aim to develop dynamic tools into the country map such as incorporating MAR findings, clickable charts and graphs that provide overviews of all evaluation-related content among other emerging requests by GEF stakeholders. Additionally, a collaborative space to seek best practices in terms of evaluation findings and results are desired for evaluation units of GEF partner agencies, and from evaluation networks such as the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) and the Evaluation Cooperation Group (ECG). An online training module on terminal evaluation guidelines will be made available to stakeholders.

2. Publications and Participation in Workshops on Environmental Evaluation

31. The IEO staff have contributed to a variety of publications in reputed journals and other international publications.² In addition, the office has presented in a variety of conferences focused on environmental and evaluation issues including the 4th International Conference on National Evaluation Capacities (October 2015), the American Evaluation Association annual conference (October 2015), the International Development Evaluation Conference (November 2015), the United Nations Evaluation Group annual meetings (April 2016), the Evaluation Cooperation Group of the IFIs meeting (January 2016), the DAC Evaluation Network meeting (April 2016), the Adaptation Futures Conference (May 2016), and the Convention on Biodiversity first meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Implementation (May 2016). In addition, the IEO participated in important GEF-wide events that pertain to the current evaluation work program, including the first meeting of the Global Platform for Sustainable Cities (March 2016) and the 8th GEF International Waters Conference (May 2016).

3. Application of modern evaluative methods

32. The IEO continues to refine its methodologies and techniques to stay at the forefront of environmental evaluation approaches internationally. Country level impact analysis has been strengthened by the use of geospatial and remote sensing analysis, and the system level theory of change on broader adoption mechanisms for progress to impact have been applied in Tajikistan. New evaluation approaches such as rapid impact evaluation are being used in the Programmatic Approaches evaluation, and real time (formative) evaluations will be applied in the focal area studies, the Multiple Benefits and the Integrated Approaches evaluations.

² Uitto, J., 2016. "Evaluation and the Global Environment: Challenges and Opportunities," Evaluation Connections, April; Carugi, C., 2016. "Experiences with Systematic Triangulation at the Global Environment Facility," Evaluation and Program Planning, Volume 55, April; Batra, G., York N., 2016. "When the stars align: how evaluations get used in practice," Evaluation Connections, February; Batra, G., Uitto J., and Cando-Noordhuizen L. 2015. "From MDGs to SDGs: Evaluating Global Environmental Benefits," Evaluation Matters, Third Quarter (Vol. 1); Uitto, J., 2016. "Evaluating the Environment as a Global Public Good," Evaluation, Vol. 22 (I), 108-115

Remote Sensing and GIS data will be used more broadly in all program evaluations. A Value for Money Analysis is being carried out in land degradation projects as a pilot.

4. Budget for Fiscal Year 2016 and 2017

33. The IEO approved budget for FY16 has been executed as planned. The annual operations budget has made some small adjustments in its staff costs due to staff turnover and in its operations mainly because of the move to a new office space. The office has managed to operate within the budget approved by the GEF Council.

34. The multi-annual evaluation budget has not seen major changes and all the evaluation work covered under this account is currently completed or under way. The multi-annual nature of the evaluation budget allows the necessary flexibility to work on evaluations that go beyond this fiscal year.

35. The total IEO proposed budget for FY17 is US\$5,657 million of which US\$3,432 million is to cover operations and US\$2,225 million is for evaluations. This budget has been calculated taking into account the office work plan, and the work program designed to complete the necessary inputs into the Sixth Overall Comprehensive Evaluation (OPS6). As done in the past, all the evaluations produced by the office in the next two years, have been designed and planned to feed into OPS6.

Independent Evaluation Office FY16 Budget (thousand \$)			
USD in thousands	FY16 Budget	FY16 Expenditure (Estimated)	FY17 Proposed Budget
Fixed Costs		<i>(As of May 10, 2016)</i>	
<i>Staff Cost</i>	\$2,604	\$2,522	\$2,777
<i>General Operations Costs</i>	\$450	\$450	\$470
Total Fixed Costs (A)	\$3,054	\$2,972	\$3,247
Variable Costs			
<i>Professional Development</i>	\$60	\$20	\$60
<i>Participations in Networks</i>	\$40	\$66	\$40
<i>IEO Management Operations</i>	\$50	\$101	\$55
<i>Knowledge Management</i>	\$30	\$63	\$30
Total Variable Costs (B)	\$180	\$250	\$185
Total Annual Budget (A+B)	\$3,234	\$3,222	\$3,432
Evaluations			
<i>Focal Area Studies</i>	\$100	\$140	\$200
<i>Civil Society Organizations Network</i>	\$200	\$207	\$0
<i>Multiple Benefits</i>	\$325	\$100	\$325
<i>Programmatic Approaches</i>	\$250	\$100	\$250
<i>Integrated Programs</i>	\$250	\$0	\$250
<i>Strategic Country Level and Cluster Evaluations</i>	\$200	\$75	\$500
<i>Sixth Comprehensive Evaluation of the GEF</i>		\$238	\$700
<i>Annual Performance Report</i>	\$150	\$222	\$0
Total Evaluations Costs (C)	\$1,475	\$1,082	\$2,225
Total (A+B+C)	\$4,709	\$4,304	\$5,657

5. IEO Human Resources

36. During FY16, IEO has experienced challenges in the process of hiring long-term consultants as a result of the World Bank eliminating this contract modality. Long-term and extended term consultants were a critical element of our evaluation work which is planned on a multi-year basis. In light of this change, and the need to have evaluation professionals on a more permanent basis, especially at the research analyst and evaluation officer level, the IEO has hired, on a fixed term basis for one and two years, six new staff assigned to do evaluation work. The current staff composition of the IEO, for the GEF6 period, is shown in the table below.

	IEO Staff

1	Director
1	Chief Evaluation Officer
4	Senior Evaluation Officers
1	Senior Operations Officer
3	Evaluation Officer
1	Knowledge Management Officer
3	Evaluation Analyst
1	Information Analyst
1	Research Assistant
1	Senior Program Assistant
1	Program Assistant