

60<sup>th</sup> GEF Council Meeting  
June 14–18, 2021  
Virtual Meeting

**MANAGEMENT ACTION RECORD 2021**

(Prepared by the Independent Evaluation Office of the GEF)

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction .....	3
Rating Approach.....	5
Findings .....	5
GEF Council Decisions with a High Level of Adoption.....	7
GEF Council Decisions with a Substantial Level of Adoption .....	8
Decisions with a Medium Level of Adoption .....	9
Decisions Not Rated .....	9
Graduated and Retired Decisions .....	10
Annex A: Adoption of Council Decisions.....	13
Annex B. Recommendations for Future Tracking in MAR .....	77
Annex C. Recommendations that do not require new action .....	84

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: GEF Management and IEO ratings of adoption of decisions assessed for MAR 2021 .....	6
Table 2: Level of adoption of the Council decisions by evaluation.....	8
Table 3: Council Decisions and Final GEF IEO Ratings, by MAR Year .....	12

## INTRODUCTION

1. The GEF Management Action Record (MAR) tracks the level of adoption of GEF Council and LDCF/SCCF Council decisions that are based on the recommendations of the evaluations conducted by the GEF Independent Evaluation Office (GEF IEO). The GEF Secretariat and/or the GEF Agencies, referred to as GEF Management as applicable, are responsible for adoption of the Council's decision. The MAR serves two purposes: "(1) to provide Council a record of its decisions based on the evaluation reports presented by the GEF IEO, the proposed management actions, and the actual status of these actions; and (2) to increase the accountability of GEF Management regarding Council decisions."<sup>1</sup> MAR 2021 reports on level of adoption of decisions based on GEF IEO recommendations included in 19 different evaluations:

- (a) Joint GEF-UNDP Small Grants Programme Evaluation (GEF/ME/C.48/02) reported in Semi-Annual Evaluation Report June 2015 (GEF/ME/C.48/02)
- (b) Evaluation of the GEF CSO Network (GEF/ME/C.50/02)
- (c) Review of the GEF Policy on Minimum Standards on Environmental and Social Safeguards (GEF/ME/C.52/Inf.08) reported in Semi Annual Evaluation Report of the GEF IEO May 2017 (GEF/ME/C.52/01/Rev.02)
- (d) Review of GEF Support for Transformational Change (GEF/ME/C.52/Inf.06) reported in Semi Annual Evaluation Report of the GEF IEO May 2017 (GEF/ME/C.52/01/Rev.02)
- (e) Review of GEF's Engagement with Indigenous Peoples (GEF/ME/C.53/Inf.07) reported in Semi Annual Evaluation Report of the GEF IEO November 2017 (GEF/ME/C.53/01)
- (f) Biodiversity Focal Area Study (GEF/ME/C.53/Inf.03) reported in Semi Annual Evaluation Report of the GEF IEO November 2017 (GEF/ME/C.53/01)
- (g) Program Evaluation of the Special Climate Change Fund (GEF/LDCF.SCCF.22/ME/02)
- (h) 2020 Program Evaluation of the Least Developed Countries Fund (GEF/LDCF.SCCF.29/E/01)
- (i) Chemicals and Waste Focal Area Study (GEF/ME/C.52/Inf.03) reported in Semi Annual Evaluation Report of the GEF IEO May 2017 (GEF/ME/C.52/01/Rev.02)
- (j) Evaluation of Gender Mainstreaming in the GEF (GEF/ME/C.52/Inf.09) reported in Semi Annual Evaluation Report of the GEF IEO May 2017 (GEF/ME/C.52/01/Rev.02)
- (k) Impact of GEF Support on National Environment Laws and Policies (GEF/ME/C.52/Inf.05) reported in Semi Annual Evaluation Report of the GEF IEO May 2017 (GEF/ME/C.52/01/Rev.02)

---

<sup>1</sup> GEF Council, "Procedures and Format of the GEF Management Action Record." GEF/ME/C.27/3., GEF Council November 2005.

- (l) Evaluation of Programmatic Approaches in the GEF (GEF/ME/C.52/Inf.01/Rev.01) reported in Semi Annual Evaluation Report of the GEF IEO May 2017 (GEF/ME/C.52/01/Rev.02)
- (m) Land Degradation Focal Area Study (GEF/ME/C.52/Inf.02) reported in Semi Annual Evaluation Report of the GEF IEO May 2017 (GEF/ME/C.52/01/Rev.02)
- (n) Review of Results-Based Management in the GEF (GEF/ME/C.52/Inf.07) reported in Semi Annual Evaluation Report of the GEF IEO May 2017 (GEF/ME/C.52/01/Rev.02)
- (o) Climate Change Focal Area Study (GEF/ME/C.53/Inf.02) reported in the Semi Annual Evaluation Report of the GEF IEO November 2017 (GEF/ME/C.53/01)
- (p) Evaluation of the Integrated Approach Pilots (GEF/ME/C.53/Inf.04) reported in the Semi Annual Evaluation Report of the GEF IEO November 2017 (GEF/ME/C.53/01)
- (q) Evaluation of the Multiple Benefits of GEF 's Multifocal Area (MFA) Portfolio (GEF/ME/C.53/Inf.05) reported in the Semi Annual Evaluation Report of the GEF IEO November 2017 (GEF/ME/C.53/01)
- (r) Review of Knowledge Management (KM) in the GEF (GEF/ME/C.53/Inf.08) reported in the Semi Annual Evaluation Report of the GEF IEO November 2017 (GEF/ME/C.53/01)
- (s) Review of the System for Transparent Allocation of Resources (STAR) (GEF/ME/C.53/Inf.10) reported in the Semi Annual Evaluation Report of the GEF IEO November 2017 (GEF/ME/C.53/01)

2. Of the 19 evaluations, 17 evaluations were presented to, and their recommendations endorsed by, the GEF Council. The remaining two evaluations were presented to, and their recommendations endorsed by, the LDCF/SCCF Council. These 19 evaluations contain 57 recommendations of which 52 pertain to the evaluations presented to the GEF Council and five recommendations pertain to the evaluations presented to the LDCF/SCCF Council.

3. Annex A presents details of these 57 recommendations, proposed management action, the Management's assessment of adoption, and GEF IEO's assessment. Annex B lists recommendations that will be tracked in future. Annex C lists recommendations that do not require further action but rather call for the continuation of the status quo.

4. In 2020, the GEF Council endorsed 11 recommendations that require further action by the Management, including five from the Evaluation of GEF Engagement in Fragile and Conflict-Affected Situations (GEF/E/C.59/01), three from the Evaluation of GEF Interventions in the Artisanal and Small-Scale Gold Mining Sector (GEF/E/C.59/02), one from the Evaluation of the Role of Medium Size Projects (MSP) in the GEF Partnership Knowledge Management (GEF/E/C.59/03), and two from the Evaluation of Knowledge Management in the GEF (2020) (GEF/E/C.59/04). It is too early to take stock of progress toward adopting these recommendations, therefore progress will be reported on in the future (see Annex B.2).

5. In 2019, the GEF Council endorsed five recommendations from the Strategic Country Cluster Evaluation of the Small Island Developing States (GEF/ME/C.57/02). Additionally, the GEF Council endorsed one recommendation from the Evaluation of GEF Support to Scaling Up Impact (GEF/ME/C.56/Inf.03) in 2019. Progress toward adopting these recommendations will also be reported on in the future (see Annexes B.3 and B.4).

#### RATING APPROACH

6. For each tracked GEF Council and LDCF/SCCF Council decision that is reported on, the GEF Management provides self-ratings on the level of adoption along with commentary as necessary. Ratings and commentary on tracked decisions are also provided by the GEF IEO for verification. The rating categories for the progress of adoption of Council decisions were agreed upon by the GEF IEO, the GEF Secretariat, and the GEF Agencies, through a consultative process. Categories are as follows:

- (a) **High:** Fully adopted and fully incorporated into policy, strategy or operations.
- (b) **Substantial:** Decision largely adopted but not fully incorporated into policy, strategy or operations as of yet.
- (c) **Medium:** Adopted in some operational and policy work, but not to a significant degree in key areas.
- (d) **Negligible:** No evidence or plan for adoption, or plan and actions for adoption are in a very preliminary stage.
- (e) **Not rated:** ratings or verification will have to wait until more data is available or proposals have been further developed.
- (f) **N/A:** Not-applicable (see commentary).

7. The Council decisions may be graduated or retired from the MAR because of one or more of the following reasons:

- (a) **Graduated** due to high or, where appropriate, substantial level of adoption of Council decision
- (b) **Retired** as the Council decision has become less relevant, or subsequent Council decisions have made high level of adoption of the decision difficult, or further progress on adoption of the decision is likely to be slow and long drawn. An automatic reason for retirement would be if a decision has been reported on in the MAR for five years.

#### FINDINGS

##### **Level of Agreement in Management and GEF IEO assessment of Adoption**

8. Of the 57 Council decisions tracked in MAR2021, for 53 level of adoption was rated by both the Management and the GEF IEO. Of the 53 decisions for which adoption was rated, both the Management and GEF IEO provided identical ratings for 34 decisions (64 percent). Of the 19

decisions for which there was disagreement, in vast majority (89 percent) the Management’s self-ratings were one step removed from the IEO ratings (Table 1).

9. In two cases the ratings provided by the GEF IEO and the Management were two steps removed from each other – in both these cases the IEO rated the adoption of recommendations as medium, compared to the Management’s self-assessment of high. The first of these cases pertained to the Review of Results-Based Management (RBM) in the GEF, which recommended that the GEF RBM framework be updated to reflect the evolved understanding of RBM across the GEF, including indicators for drivers of environmental degradation and long-term impacts. The IEO assessed that while the results architecture for GEF-7 was updated in 2018, it does not advance the tracking of drivers of environmental degradation and long-term impacts. Additionally, it does not cover the transformative and systemic changes at which integrated approach programs are aimed.

10. The second case where the Management and IEO’s ratings diverged by two steps pertained to the Climate Change Focal Area Study. This evaluation recommended that the GEF Secretariat take measures to ensure reporting against global environmental benefits (GEB) targets. The Management based their self-assessment rating on the introduction of core indicators related to climate change in the updated GEF-7 results architecture, as well as improvements in data collection and monitoring due to enhancements to the GEF Portal. However, the IEO noted that the recommendation specifically called for reporting on actual achievement against targets, such as at the portfolio level, which has not yet been done. Although, four recommendations related to the Biodiversity Focal Area Study were initially included in the MAR for assessment of adoption, adoption for these was not rated because the majority of Access and Benefit Sharing (ABS) projects in pipeline have not gone through the review and approval process.

Table 1: GEF Management and IEO ratings of adoption of decisions assessed for MAR 2021

Management Rating	IEO Rating					Sum of Management Ratings
	High	Substantial	Medium	Negligible	Not Rated	
High	6	6	2	0	4	18
Substantial	0	26	11	0	0	37
Medium	0	0	2	0	0	2
Negligible	0	0	0	0	0	0
Not Rated	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sum of GEF IEO Ratings	6	32	15	0	4	57

Note: Highlighted cells show agreement between GEF management and GEF IEO ratings; cells to the right of the highlighted diagonal represent higher ratings by management than by the IEO

## GEF Council Decisions with a High Level of Adoption

There are six decisions from four evaluations for which level of adoption is assessed to be high – these will graduate from MAR.

11. Review of the GEF Policy on Minimum Standards on Environmental and Social Safeguards: Adoption of Council decisions based on two recommendations was assessed to be high. The first of these recommendations called for the review of the GEF minimum standards to adequately address gaps in the GEF approach to environmental and social risks. The Environmental and Social Safeguards Policy of the GEF was updated in 2017 and the Secretariat continues to monitor and work with Agencies to ensure compliance. The second recommendation called for improvement in safeguards monitoring and reporting. The updated policy on environmental and social safeguards and associated guidelines improved reporting and monitoring in line with the evaluation recommendation. Both Management and GEF IEO agreed that the adoption of these decisions was high (Annex A.4).

12. Evaluation of Gender Mainstreaming in the GEF: Adoption of two recommendations from this evaluation was assessed to be high. The first of these recommendations called for revision of the gender mainstreaming policy to align with the best practice standards and the second recommendation called for development of an action plan to implement the revised gender policy. The Management and GEF IEO concurred that the recommendations were fully adopted – a revised gender mainstreaming policy was approved, and an action plan was developed, in close consultation with the Agencies. The Secretariat is also reporting to the Council on progress on indicators outlined in the GEF-7 Results Framework on Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment (Annex A.10).

13. Land Degradation Focal Area Study: The recommendation called for implementation of the land degradation neutrality approach with an appropriate mix of interventions. The GEF IEO confirms that there has been a change in the mix of the Land Degradation Focal Area in line with the recommendation. It acknowledges that the project mix is appropriate and consistent with the land degradation neutrality response hierarchy of ‘avoid – reduce – reverse’, and that there is increasing focus on ecosystem restoration. Both the Management and the GEF IEO agreed that adoption of this decision was high (Annex A.13).

14. Review of Results-Based Management in the GEF: The recommendation addressed the concern that too many indicators were being tracked at the corporate level, especially for the multi-focal area projects. During the GEF-7 period, the GEF has streamlined its approach to results reporting at the project level through a shift to a smaller set of core indicators with greater focus on standardized methodology, consistency, and tracking. The GEF IEO concurred with the Management’s assessment that the adoption of this decision has been high (Annex A.14).

## GEF Council Decisions with a Substantial Level of Adoption

Out of the 57 recommendations that were tracked in this MAR, GEF IEO assessed the adoption of 32 recommendations from 15 evaluations to be substantial (see Table 2). Several evaluations had multiple decisions for adoption that were rated substantial (or higher). In general, for these decisions, key elements of the recommendations had been adopted, although not to the fullest extent possible. Of these 32 decisions, 9 decisions will graduate because the GEF IEO is satisfied with the level of progress so far. Seven will retire because these have either been tracked for at least five years and/or the GEF IEO is undertaking or has already presented another evaluation that provides an update on the respective evaluations. The remaining 16 decisions will continue to be tracked.

*Table 2: Level of adoption of the Council decisions by evaluation*

<b>Evaluation subject/level of adoption</b>	<b>High</b>	<b>Substantial</b>	<b>Medium</b>	<b>Negligible</b>	<b>Not Rated</b>	<b>Total</b>
Joint GEF-Small Grant Programme	0	1	0	0	0	1
GEF CSO Network	0	4	0	0	0	4
GEF Support for Transformational Change	0	1	0	0	0	1
GEF Policy on Minimum Standards on Environmental and Social Safeguards	2	0	1	0	0	3
Biodiversity Focal Area	0	5	3	0	4	12
GEF's Engagement with Indigenous Peoples	0	5	0	0	0	5
The Special Climate Change Fund	0	3	0	0	0	3
Evaluation of the Least Developed Countries Fund	0	0	2	0	0	2
Chemicals and Waste Focal Area	0	2	0	0	0	2
Gender Mainstreaming in the GEF	2	1	0	0	0	3
Impact of GEF Support on National Environment Laws and Policies	0	1	2	0	0	3
Programmatic Approaches in the GEF	0	0	1	0	0	1
Land Degradation Focal Area	1	2	1	0	0	4
Results-Based Management in the GEF	1	1	1	0	0	3
Climate Change Focal Area Study	0	0	1	0	0	1
The Integrated Approach Pilots	0	1	2	0	0	3



Multiple Benefits of GEF's Multifocal Area (MFA) Portfolio	0	3	0	0	0	3
Knowledge Management (KM) in the GEF	0	1	1	0	0	2
System for Transparent Allocation of Resources (STAR)	0	1	0	0	0	1
Total	6	32	15	0	4	57

**Decisions with a Medium Level of Adoption**

15. GEF IEO assessed adoption of Council decisions related to 15 recommendations from 10 evaluations to be 'medium' (see Table 2). Although significant progress was made, the extent of adoption had major gaps or evidence was not yet available to confirm a higher level of adoption. For example, one of the recommendations from the Biodiversity Focal Area Study called for greater attention to regional and global programming to address illegal wildlife trade so that cross-border connections are addressed more effectively. The Management assessed the adoption of this recommendation to be substantial because it had given attention to addressing the cross-border connections through a focus on regional coordinated efforts and support for knowledge exchange among countries. The GEF IEO acknowledged the progress, but also assessed that more transboundary and regional efforts need to be supported. It also assessed that more evidence on the results of the measures undertaken by Management is needed before a more definitive conclusion on adoption is possible. Another example pertains to adoption of the Council decision on the Review of Knowledge Management. The decision called for the development of a plan to connect the knowledge management systems of the GEF Agencies, as well as generate knowledge products and organize learning activities. The GEF IEO assessed although the GEF Secretariat plans to develop the GEF Knowledge and Learning Strategy for GEF-8, it is yet to take shape. Further, during GEF-7 there was no partnership-wide knowledge management strategy or work plan. This decision will be retired from the MAR because this issue has subsequently also been addressed in the new GEF IEO evaluation on Knowledge Management, which was presented to the GEF Council in December 2020.

**Decisions Not Rated**

16. Adoption of four Council decisions related to the Biodiversity Focal Area Study was not rated. The study had 12 recommendations that were endorsed by the GEF Council. These four recommendations that were not rated addressed topics such as use and capacity for implementation, of the Access and Benefit Sharing framework for sustainability; and, use of country-specific approaches and ensuring early availability of lessons from projects and related knowledge sharing. The Management assessed adoption of these recommendations to be high. The GEF IEO acknowledged incorporation of these recommendations into the design of the recent project approvals. However, given that the number of projects that address the relevant concerns is still too small, it decided to not rate the overall level of adoption of these decisions at this stage.

## Graduated and Retired Decisions

**17.** A total of 23 recommendations and related Council decisions will graduate or retire from the MAR this year. Of these, 15 decisions will graduate due to high or substantial adoption. A summary on these decisions is provided below:

- (a) Two Council decisions based on the Review of the GEF Policy on Minimum Standards on Environmental and Social Safeguards which recommended mechanisms for reviewing the GEF Minimum Standards, as well as improving safeguards monitoring and reporting, will graduate with a high rating.
- (b) Two Council decisions based on the Biodiversity Focal Area Study which recommended scaling up GEF's work in combating the illegal wildlife trade, as well as strategically expanding the scope of its funding to other species, countries, and regions, will graduate with a substantial rating.
- (c) Four Council decisions based on the Review of GEF's Engagement with Indigenous Peoples will graduate with a substantial rating. These decisions pertain to recommendations that addressed establishing and strengthening dedicated funding opportunities for indigenous peoples' projects and organizations; updating policies and guidelines to reflect best practice standards concerning indigenous peoples; reviewing the Indigenous Peoples' Advisory Group's role for operational constraints; and monitoring the application of Minimum Standard 4 and the Indigenous Peoples' portfolio.
- (d) The Council decision based on the Program Evaluation of the Special Climate Change Fund which recommended ensuring that PMIS data is up to date and accurate will graduate with a substantial rating.
- (e) Two Council decisions based on the Evaluation of Gender Mainstreaming in the GEF recommended revising GEF's policy to better align with best practice standards and developing an action strategy for this policy will graduate with high ratings.
- (f) Two Council decisions based on the Land Degradation Focal Area Study have been graduated. The first decision, which recommended implementing LDN with an appropriate mix of interventions, will graduate with a high rating. The second decision, which recommended assessing climate risks to LDFA will graduate with a substantial rating.
- (g) The Council decision based on the Review of Results-Based Management in the GEF which recommended addressing the shortcomings of the focal area tracking tools will graduate with a high rating.
- (h) The Council decision on the Review of the System for Transparent Allocation of Resources (STAR) which recommended developing clear protocols and quality checks on calculations will graduate with a substantial rating.

18. A total of eight Council decisions that were tracked in MAR2021 will retire. Details on these decisions are provided below:

- (a) The Council decision based on the Joint GEF-UNDP Small Grant Programme Evaluation recommending that the GEF and UNDP continue upgrading, building on strengths while addressing the weakness identified, as well as revisiting the criteria for country selection, will retire with a substantial rating. A new Council decision will be made on the Third GEF-UNDP Joint Evaluation of the SGP in June 2021.
- (b) All four Council decisions based on the Evaluation of the GEF CSO Network will retire with a substantial rating. These recommendations included creating a contemporary vision for the CSO Network; developing clear rules of engagement to guide cooperation and communication within the network; continuing to strengthen itself as a mechanism for strengthening civil society participation in the GED, particularly in relation to membership development, capacity building, and value-added working relationships; and strengthening its governance structure. Progress toward adopting all four of these recommendations has been tracked for at least five years.
- (c) The two Council decisions based on the Review of Knowledge Management (KM) in the GEF will retire. The first decision, which recommended that the Secretariat place a high priority on improving the quality and availability of project-level documentation from a KM perspective, will retire with a substantial rating. The second decision, which recommended that the Secretariat and the KM Advisory Group should develop a plan to connect across GEF Agency KM systems, generate knowledge products, and organize learning activities, will retire with a medium rating. An updated evaluation on knowledge management was presented in December 2020. In future, the decisions based on the updated evaluation will be tracked.

19. A historical account of the final GEF IEO ratings for the graduated and retired council decisions tracked in MAR is provided in Table 3. The distribution shows that adoption of most of the decisions had been high or substantial (75 percent). It also shows that compared to recent years, more decisions will graduate or retire this year (2021). The main reason for this is the four-year replenishment cycle followed by the GEF, which drives updates for several evaluations and policy changes in GEF. These updates and related Council and Management decisions may lead to high or substantial adoption of some decisions. At the same time, some other Council decisions may become less relevant due to subsequent decisions taken by the Council or new evidence presented in an evaluation update.

Table 3: Council Decisions and Final GEF IEO Ratings, by MAR Year

MAR	Rating at Exit: Final Rating at Graduation or Retirement from MAR						Total
	High	Substantial	Medium	Negligible	Not Rated or Not Possible to Verify Yet	Not Applicable	
2005	5	15	7	3	0	0	30
2006	5	1	0	0	0	0	6
2007	7	8	0	0	2	0	17
2008	5	0	0	0	0	0	5
2009	5	0	0	0	0	0	5
2010	9	3	4	3	0	2	21
2011	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
2012	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2013	5	1	1	1	2	0	10
2014	4	2	6	1	1	0	14
2015	1	2	0	0	0	0	3
2016	1	3	1	0	0	0	5
2017	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
2019	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
2020	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
2021	6	16	1	0	0	0	23
<b>Total</b>	55	53	21	8	5	2	144

ANNEX A: ADOPTION OF COUNCIL DECISIONS

**A.1 Recommendation based on Council review of the Semi-Annual Evaluation Report June 2015, section on the Joint GEF-UNDP Small Grants Programme Evaluation (GEF/ME/C.48/02)**

Ref #	Date of Council Decision	GEF IEO Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2020	GEF IEO Rating & Comments in MAR 2020	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2021	GEF IEO Rating & Comments in MAR 2021
1	June 9, 2015	<b>Recommendation 1:</b> The GEF and UNDP should continue upgrading, building on strengths while addressing the weakness identified. The criteria for selection of countries for upgrading should be revisited.	UNDP and CPMT, in consultation with the GEF Secretariat, will continue to refine operationalization of the upgrading policy. The Secretariat welcomes the four suggestions listed under this recommendation and will work with the GEF Secretariat to design and execute these recommended changes in GEF-7, in particular to ensure all around	The Council, having reviewed GEF/ME/C.48/02, Semi-Annual Evaluation Report of the GEF Independent Evaluation Office: June 2015, section on the Joint GEF-UNDP Small Grants Programme Evaluation, and GEF/ME/C.48/03, Management Response to the Semi-Annual Evaluation Report of the GEF Independent Evaluation Office:	<b>Medium:</b> A Full-Sized Project for \$2.5 million for Malaysia as new Upgraded Country Programme was approved by Council as part the December 2019 Work Program.  The GEF Secretariat and UNDP are in on-going discussions about the implementation of the SGP as a whole.  A Steering Committee of the SGP meeting has	<b>Medium:</b> GEF IEO takes note of the Secretariat plans to discuss strategic issues including the upgrading criteria in the next SGP steering Committee. Indeed, the ongoing third Joint SGP Evaluation focuses on upgrading as a main area of evaluative enquiry that can inform GEF-8 Replenishment discussions.	<b>Recommendation 1: Substantial</b> The issue of upgrading was discussed during the Steering Committee of the SGP conducted in June 2020. Participants agreed on the idea of constituting a <i>task force</i> in the future (2021) to conduct an analysis and provide technical inputs that would inform a revision of the upgrading policy, including potential criteria, as well as implementation arrangements and operational modalities.  The GEF Secretariat has taken notice of the preliminary conclusions and recommendations of the	<b>Recommendation 1: Substantial</b> GEF IEO takes note of the SGP Steering Committee plans to revise the upgrading policy, including upgrading criteria, taking into account the conclusions and recommendations related to upgrading of the 3 <sup>rd</sup> Joint Evaluation of the SGP.

		<p>compliance with the SGP Operational Guidelines.</p> <p>The Secretariat agrees with the recommendation that upgrading remains voluntary for LDCs and SIDS and that changes to the process for accessing STAR funds by non-upgraded countries through the global project should be clear and agreed.</p>	<p>June 2015, section on the Joint GEF-UNDP Small Grants Programme Evaluation, requests the Secretariat and UNDP to:</p> <p>(1) Continue upgrading the SGP Country Program, building on strengths while addressing the weaknesses identified by the evaluation. The criteria for selection of countries for upgrading should be revisited.</p>	<p>been called by the Secretariat for May 2020, where strategic issues will be discussed, including the need to address the criteria for Upgrading in GEF-8.</p> <p>The GEF Secretariat expects that the IEO Joint Evaluation will provide valuable information about the upgrading criteria, that can inform the proposal to be presented to Council for consideration for GEF-8.</p>		<p>Third Joint Evaluation of the SGP related to the upgrading process and criteria. It is expected that the work of the task force and a process of consultations will inform the GEF Secretariat and UNDP's discussions regarding any changes to the Upgrading Policy to be presented to Council.</p> <p>To this regard, the GEF Secretariat included a specific action item in the Proposed <a href="#">GEF-8 Strategic Positioning and Programming Directions</a> to be presented to the Replenishment participants that reads: <i>"the GEF Secretariat will take stock of the recommendations of the Second and Third Joint Evaluations and, together with UNDP, will assess the benefits and challenges of upgrading. The objectives and criteria of any upgrading policy would be refined and presented to Council for consideration at the beginning of GEF-8."</i></p>	<p>This recommendation has been retired given that a new Council decision will be made on the Third GEF-UNDP Joint Evaluation of the SGP in June 2021.</p>
--	--	---	--	--	--	--	--

## A.2 Council decision based on the Evaluation of the GEF CSO Network (GEF/ME/C.50/02)

Ref #	Date of Council Decision	GEF IEO Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2020	GEF IEO Rating & Comments in MAR 2020	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2021	GEF IEO Rating & Comments in MAR 2021
2	June 9, 2016	<b>Recommendation 1:</b> A contemporary vision for the CSO Network be created within the new GEF architecture. The vision should inter alia a) clarify the Network's role, b) set out a shared understanding amongst all parts of the Partnership of the Network's contribution in guarding the global commons and c) identify a modality to finance	The Secretariat agrees with the recommendation that a new vision should be developed for the GEF CSO Network within the GEF Partnership. The Secretariat looks forward to collaborating with the CSO Network and other partners to develop that vision.  Regarding the recommendation to the GEFSEC and CSO Network to develop clear rules of engagement that guide	The Council, having reviewed GEF/ME/C.50/02, Evaluation of the GEF Civil Society Organization (CSO) Network, and GEF/ME/C.50/03, Management Response to the Evaluation of the GEF Civil Society Organization Network, decides to set up an ad-hoc working group of interested Council Members to develop an updated vision of the relationship between the GEF and civil society, and a plan to achieve it, in consultation with relevant stakeholders, and	<b>Substantial:</b> The GEF Secretariat has continued implementing the Updated Vision to enhance engagement with civil society.  In this context, three successful consultations with CSOs have been organized with participation of CSOs and the IPLC, as per the topics selected by Council, i.e. on Gender and the Environment; Combatting Plastic Pollution; and Combatting Illegal Wildlife Trade.  Regarding implementation of	<b>Substantial:</b> The GEF IEO notes the progress of Updated Vision to enhance engagement with civil society. Regarding implementation of the Policy on Stakeholder Engagement and monitoring of CSO engagement, the GEF Secretariat has provided the score related to the stakeholder engagement (e.g. consultation in project identification stage, and engagement and described roles	<b>Recommendations 1-4: Substantial</b> The GEF Secretariat has continued implementing the Updated Vision to enhance engagement with civil society. A progress report was submitted for information to Council at its 59 <sup>th</sup> Council meeting in December 2020 and can be found <a href="#">here</a> . The report gives a description of actions taken a, related to the implementation of the Updated Vision, i.e.: the selection process and participation of civil society and indigenous peoples in three GEF Council meetings and three GEF Consultations, as well as the engagement of civil society in activities of the Country Support Program.	<b>Recommendations 1-4: Substantial</b> The GEF-IEO acknowledges the continued implementation of the Updated Vision to enhance engagement with civil society. It observes a widening engagement with GEF affiliated CSOs and a more proactive stance on the part of the Secretariat <i>vis a vis</i> CSO representation and consultation functions. A recent IEO follow-up examination progress as per this recommendation found divided opinion on the

Ref #	Date of Council Decision	GEF IEO Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2020	GEF IEO Rating & Comments in MAR 2020	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2021	GEF IEO Rating & Comments in MAR 2021
		<p>Network activities.</p> <p><b>Recommendation 2:</b> The GEFSEC and CSO Network should develop clear rules of engagement which guides cooperation and communications. These could be adjusted as needed.</p> <p><b>Recommendation 3:</b> The CSO Network should continue to build itself as a mechanism for strengthening civil society participation in the GEF at the global, regional</p>	<p>cooperation and communications, the Secretariat is pleased to report that cooperation with the new management of the Network has been strengthened through more frequent formal communication and participation of the CSO Network representatives in various task forces and working groups, including the one on public involvement. The Secretariat will assess jointly with the CSO Network regarding</p>	<p>report back to the Council at its first meeting in 2017. The Council encourages the CSO Network to establish a working group that includes balanced representation of CSO Stakeholder views, to interact with the Council Working Group on a new, updated vision for the Network, including governance, policies, guidelines and cooperation mechanisms.</p>	<p>the Policy on Stakeholder Engagement and monitoring of CSO engagement in GEF projects, the GEF Secretariat has provided Council with information on CSO, IPLC and private sector engagement in the GEF Corporate scorecard presented at each Council meeting.</p> <p>See for example: <a href="#">GEF-7 Corporate Scorecard - June 2019</a></p> <p><a href="#">GEF-7 Corporate Scorecard - December 2019</a></p>	<p>of stakeholders in projects)</p> <p>The GEF IEO also notes that the GEF Secretariat presented the compliance with Minimum Standards in the Policies on Environmental and Social Safeguards, Gender Equality, and Stakeholder Engagement in December 2019.</p> <p>The GEF IEO continues to monitor the activities to enhance engagement with civil society. The GEF IEO is currently conducting the evaluation of the</p>	<p>The report presents an overview of the activities foreseen for the remainder of GEF-7 with emphasis on the planning of Consultations with civil society and a series of activities to enhance knowledge and learning for CSOs, in the context of the global pandemic. Since the last MAR entry, on December 4, 2020, the GEF Secretariat and the GEF Indigenous Peoples Advisory Group (IPAG) together with the GEF CSO Network and the GEF Small Grants Programme organized the GEF Consultations on Traditional Knowledge with Civil Society (CSOs) and Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities (IPLC). The Consultations took place virtually with interpretation into English, Spanish and French and gathered over</p>	<p>merits of these changes.</p> <p>On one side, the changes under the Updated Vision are thought to have led to more diverse CSO involvement in GEF governance (a better blending of Council experienced and new focal area-experienced CSOs), more focused conversations around Council and inclusion in consultation meetings including those associated with GEF 8 replenishment. The Secretariat's Partnership Team is engaging the larger field of CSOs that are mostly connected to the</p>



Ref #	Date of Council Decision	GEF IEO Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2020	GEF IEO Rating & Comments in MAR 2020	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2021	GEF IEO Rating & Comments in MAR 2021
		<p>and national levels, paying particular attention to: membership development, capacity building and value-added working relationships across the Partnership.</p> <p><b>Recommendation 4:</b> The CSO Network should strengthen its governance, with particular attention to: annual work plans, cooperation with IPAG, terms for the Network's Regional Focal Points and the</p>	<p>whether additional mechanisms are needed to further enhance cooperation.</p>			<p>institutional policies and engagement, including the Stakeholder engagement Policy.</p> <p>This decision will be retired when a new Council decision is made on the 2021 Update of the evaluation of the policies in June 2021.</p>	<p>170 participants from around the world. CSOs and IPLCs shared experiences from their projects in a consultation with GEF Council members, the GEF CEO and other stakeholders. (see Link to the <a href="#">recording</a> and link to the <a href="#">IISD report</a>.)</p> <p>Due to the Pandemic, only one Expanded Constituency Workshop took place in 2020 (Kenya). There CSOs participated together with their OFP counterparts and GEF Agencies in a 4 day training and exchange on GEF projects, programs and policies and the GEF Secretariat led a dedicated session on <a href="#">Stakeholder Engagement and Gender</a> in addition to other Knowledge and Learning activities.</p>	<p>Small Grants Program. Anecdotal feedback on the four pre-Council CSO consultations has been positive; competing calls on Council members' time on the day continues to be a challenge, however. The Covid-19 pandemic is causing the GEF to accelerate the development of online strategies to engage CSOs and other Partners at the country and regional levels through the Country Support Program (CSP).</p> <p>On the other side, the changes brought about under the Updated</p>

Ref #	Date of Council Decision	GEF IEO Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2020	GEF IEO Rating & Comments in MAR 2020	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2021	GEF IEO Rating & Comments in MAR 2021
		complaints process.					<p>Regarding direct support to the GEF CSO Network and other civil society participants, the GEF Secretariat provided Knowledge and Learning workshops and webinars as follows:</p> <p><a href="#">Art of Knowledge Exchange for CSOS</a></p> <p><a href="#">Introduction to the GEF (Introduction Seminar)</a></p> <p><a href="#">Gender and the Environment</a></p> <p>On the Implementation of the Policy on Stakeholder Engagement (SE), the GEF Secretariat continued reviewing compliance of agencies with the requirements of the Policy at entry level for both PIFs and CEO</p> <p>Endorsements/approvals submitted by Agencies. In addition, the GEF Secretariat reported to Council on engagement with CSO, IPLC and private</p>	<p>Vision are thought to be a barrier to the CSO Network's role as the voice and coordinating body for GEF-affiliated CSOs. Their role in the engagement is felt to be less certain with the introduction of the updated vision. Recommended deliberation over “modality to finance Network activities” has not been included in the visioning process and no progress has been made on Network financing since the evaluation.</p> <p>The CSO Network’s efforts to build itself up as a</p>

Ref #	Date of Council Decision	GEF IEO Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2020	GEF IEO Rating & Comments in MAR 2020	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2021	GEF IEO Rating & Comments in MAR 2021
							<p>sector for the portfolio of projects presented to Council in the GEF's Corporate scorecard for: <a href="#">June 2020</a> and <a href="#">December 2020</a>.</p> <p>The GEF Secretariat has continuously provided information at the request of the IEO and participated in multiple bilateral meetings with the IEO regarding the evaluations of the Policy on SE, civil society engagement and the CSO Network. Three representatives of the GEF Secretariat have been participating in the Reference Group set-up for these evaluations. Finally, the GEF Secretariat has provided comments to the preliminary findings of these evaluations, particularly to account for factual corrections.</p>	<p>mechanism for strengthening civil society participation in the GEF are hampered by internal tensions and financial constraints. After some initial developments, Network efforts to strengthen governance mechanisms have stalled. Today, there are signals that members are not renewing or joining. The Coordinating Committee is at half strength or less with internal tensions and vacant positions; its working groups are mostly inactive.</p>

Ref #	Date of Council Decision	GEF IEO Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2020	GEF IEO Rating & Comments in MAR 2020	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2021	GEF IEO Rating & Comments in MAR 2021
							<p>In addition to the activities listed above, the GEF Secretariat continues to engage with the CSO Network on a regular basis and has provided space for one on one meetings with the CEO, and preparatory meetings to support their participation in the upcoming GEF-8 Replenishment meetings where they will have 2 observer representatives: one from developing countries' CSOs and one from donor countries' CSOs.</p>	<p>According to the 2021 CSO survey carried out for this evaluation, the majority of CSO Network members continue to see in the CSO Network: a structure that enables effective and efficient sharing of information, all major stakeholder groups fairly represented, and election processes that are fair and transparent. At the same time perceptions of these aspects are less favorable today than was the case when surveyed in 2016.</p> <p>The evaluation found that: a) the CSO Network (400-</p>

Ref #	Date of Council Decision	GEF IEO Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2020	GEF IEO Rating & Comments in MAR 2020	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2021	GEF IEO Rating & Comments in MAR 2021
								<p>500 members strong remains broadly representative of the more than 2,000 CSOs that affiliate), b) in the larger arenas of development cooperation (including the work of climate finance institutions analogous to the GEF) CSO engagement is growing in strategic relevance under Vision 2030 (SDG 16).</p> <p>All of the recommendations have been retired.</p>

**A.3 Council decision based on Review of GEF Support for Transformational Change (GEF/ME/C.52/Inf.06) reported in Semi Annual Evaluation Report of the GEF IEO May 2017 (GEF/ME/C.52/01/Rev.02)**

Ref #	Date of Council Decision	GEF IEO Recommendation	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2020	GEF IEO Rating & Comments in MAR 2020	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2021	GEF IEO Rating & Comments in MAR 2021
3	May 25, 2017	<p><b>Recommendation 1:</b> The GEF should consider developing and applying a framework for ex-ante assessments of projects or programs that are intended to be transformational to enhance impacts. This study has presented an example of a framework that could be applied.</p>	<p><b>Substantial:</b> The GEF has embraced the framework for ex ante assessment of all programs seeking to advance transformational change. This is primarily reflected in the process established for programming resources to tackle major drivers of environmental degradation. The Program Framework Documents (PFDs) for such programs have emphasized higher levels of ambition, importance of market mechanisms and private sector engagement, and multi-stakeholder platforms as drivers of transformational change. These are framed by a robust Theory of Change with clear impact pathways and outcome targets. In addition, the GEF is also engaging with agencies on learning initiatives to assess and understand progress toward advancing transformational change, based on key principles and assumptions established for specific programs.</p>	<p><b>Substantial:</b> The GEF involved considerations for transformational change in the Programming Directions for GEF-7, including in the Impact Programs. The GEF-7 Program Framework Documents (PFDs) discuss transformational change as a level of ambition, and scale, while theories of change in PFDs consider the ways the programs will address barriers for transformational change.</p>	<p><b>Recommendation 1: High</b> Building on the progress already made, the PFDs of the IAPs and IPs in particular have been invaluable as a framework for the design phase of child projects that will serve as basis for program delivery. In addition, each program is also creating space to crowd-in key entities to scale up implementation toward achieving transformational change. Ongoing learnings in this dimension, including a synthesis of experiences and emerging lessons, are being incorporated into the GEF-8 strategy under preparation, in which a system of measurement for transformational change is under development.</p>	<p><b>Recommendation 1: Substantial</b> The GEF continues using considerations for transformational change in the IAPs and IPs.  GEF IEO acknowledges GEF Secretariat's plans to develop a results framework to measure transformational change.</p>

**A.4 Recommendations from the Review of the GEF Policy on Minimum Standards on Environmental and Social Safeguards (GEF/ME/C.52/Inf.08) reported in Semi Annual Evaluation Report of the GEF IEO May 2017 (GEF/ME/C.52/01/Rev.02)**

Ref #	Date of Council Decision	GEF IEO Recommendation	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2020	GEF IEO Rating & Comments in MAR 2020	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2021	GEF IEO Rating & Comments in MAR 2021
4	May 25, 2017	<p><b>Recommendation 1: Review the GEF Minimum Standards.</b> While the key requirements of the GEF safeguards remain relevant and aligned with international good safeguards practice, a high-level comparative review identified a range of gaps in thematic coverage in the GEF Minimum Standards that appear germane for the types of environmental and social risks present in the GEF portfolio. A review and potential update of the GEF Minimum Standards may be warranted. A phased, collaborative review process could be undertaken, with more targeted analyses of potential gap areas. A potential revision process would need to strike a proper balance between</p>	<p><b>Substantial: Review the GEF Minimum Standards:</b> As part of the approval of the updated GEF Policy on Environmental and Social Safeguards (SD/PL/03), the Council requested the Secretariat to facilitate an assessment of Agencies' compliance with the new minimum standards set forth in the Policy. The Secretariat initiated an assessment of all 18 GEF Agencies in the spring of 2019, and subsequently presented a report on the Assessment of GEF Agencies' Compliance with Minimum Standards in the Policies on Environmental and Social Safeguards, Gender Equality, and Stakeholder Engagement (GEF/C.57/05) at the 57th Council meeting in December 2019.</p> <p>The report followed an almost 6-month consultative process, which in line with the Policies was facilitated by the Secretariat and carried out by expert reviewers. In accordance with the Guidelines for GEF Agencies' Compliance with the Policies, issued in the spring of 2019 (SD/GN/03), the Secretariat, in collaboration with the expert reviewers, facilitated bilateral consultations with all Agencies on</p>	<p><b>Substantial: Review the GEF Minimum Standards:</b> Following the updated policy and associated Council requests, the GEF Secretariat initiated the Assessment of GEF Agencies' Compliance and reported on the results of assessment at the 57th Council.</p> <p>The Secretariat also developed the Guidelines on the Policy on Environmental and Social Safeguards as an information document in the 57th Council Meeting. The IEO continues to</p>	<p><b>Recommendations 1-2: High</b> Following the updated policy, the GEF Secretariat initiated the Assessment of GEF Agencies' Compliance and reported on the results of the assessment at the 57th Council. The Secretariat has continued to monitor and engage with Agencies in the implementation of the Agencies' Plans of Action and report regularly to the Council on the progress.</p> <p>Following the completion of the Guidelines on the Policy on Environmental and Social Safeguards, provided as an information document in the 57th Council Meeting, the GEF Secretariat updated its templates for PIFs, PFDs, as well as for MTRs and TEs and programmed new sections in the GEF Portal to support the effective implementation of the Policy.</p>	<p><b>Recommendation 1-2: High</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation 1:</b> The GEF Secretariat continues to monitor and work with Agencies that are in the process of implementing their Action Plans to ensure compliance with the updated GEF Policy on Environmental and Social Safeguards. Relevant project/ program templates and the GEF Portal have been revised to align with the updated Policy.</p> <p>This recommendation has been graduated.</p> <p><b>Recommendation 2:</b> The updated Policy on Environmental and Social Safeguards and associated guidelines improved reporting and monitoring in line with the IEO 2017 recommendations. Environmental and social</p>

Ref #	Date of Council Decision	GEF IEO Recommendation	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2020	GEF IEO Rating & Comments in MAR 2020	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2021	GEF IEO Rating & Comments in MAR 2021
		<p>addressing relevant policy gaps in the GEF Standards while avoiding such extensive changes that would require wholesale revisions to often newly adopted safeguard frameworks of many GEF Agencies. Avenues for minimizing costs of a review and potential update would need to be identified.</p> <p><b>Recommendation 2: Improve safeguards monitoring and reporting.</b> GEF should consider tracking social and environmental risks at the portfolio-level and ensuring a “flow-through” of monitoring information on safeguards implementation. Agencies should inform GEF of the safeguards risk categorization assigned to projects/programs and keep GEF informed of safeguards implementation issues through monitoring and reporting. Where</p>	<p>preliminary findings, offering ample opportunities for Agencies to provide clarifications and additional evidence, and to verify final findings.</p> <p>In all cases where an Agency was assessed not to have met a standard, including its sub-components, Agencies established concrete timebound actions to address the identified gaps. All these Agencies committed themselves to provide updates on the progress on their plans of action to the GEF Secretariat until they have met full compliance with each minimum standard in the three Policies.</p> <p>The Council approved, at the 57th Council meeting, the plans of action submitted by Agencies to achieve full compliance and decided that these Agencies may continue to seek GEF financing while they implement the time-bound plans of action. In line with this Council decision, the Secretariat will report to the Council on the progress on Agencies’ implementation of the plans of action at subsequent Council meetings based on the updates provided by the Agencies and, as needed, facilitate further expert assessment and consultation with the Agencies.</p> <p>The updated Policy on Environmental and Social Safeguards provides requirements for Agencies to document and report on</p>	<p>monitor the implementation of a safeguard policy.</p> <p><b>Improve safeguards monitoring and reporting:</b> The Guidelines on the Policy on Environmental and Social Safeguards that were approved in the GEF 57<sup>th</sup> Council and the agencies require reporting on risk and impact as part of MTR submission as part of MTR submission.</p> <p>The GEF IEO will continue to track, including the development of template on ESS in the portal by the GEF Secretariat.</p>	<p>The updated Policy on Environmental and Social Safeguards provides requirements for the Secretariat to report, annually, to the Council on the implementation of this Policy, including the type and level of Environmental and Social Risks and Impacts identified in GEF financed projects and programs and the management of such risks and impacts during project implementation and at project completion.</p> <p>In response to this request, GEF Secretariat provided the first annual Progress Report on the Implementation of the GEF Policy on Environmental and Social Safeguards (GEF/C.59/Inf.15) in the GEF 59<sup>th</sup> Council meeting as an information document , including the application of the Policy on the Project Identification Forms (PIFs) and Program Framework Documents (PFDs) submitted after the date of effectiveness of the Policy of July 1, 2019. In the report, the Secretariat analyzed 128 approved PIFs</p>	<p>risk classifications, types of risks, indicative management plans/actions, and potential grievance cases are to be identified and reported. The Secretariat has reported to Council on levels and types of environmental risks and impacts across the portfolio. Initial risk categorization showed that 11% of projects were rated High/Substantial Risk, 54% were rated Moderate Risk, and 28% were rated Low Risk. (GEF/C.59/Inf.15). The Secretariat has also issued, per the updated policy, its first annual report of Agency grievance cases related to GEF-financed projects/programs, covering all pending cases up to November 2020, which included 15 identified cases and 5 other cases requiring confidentiality (GEF/C.59/Inf.11). Given that the updated policy went into effect in July 2019, further implementation reporting (required at project mid-</p>



Ref #	Date of Council Decision	GEF IEO Recommendation	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2020	GEF IEO Rating & Comments in MAR 2020	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2021	GEF IEO Rating & Comments in MAR 2021
		<p>available, this should ideally build off Agency systems rather than duplicating them. GEF could issue guidance regarding safeguards-related reporting in annual reporting and project/program evaluations. Increased GEF attention of safeguards implementation reporting may support and strengthen relatively new safeguards systems among some GEF Agencies and promote greater consistency.</p> <p><b>Recommendation 3: Support capacity development, expert convening, and communications.</b> The expanded GEF Partnership encompasses Agencies with widely diverse levels of safeguards experience and institutional capacity. Expanded networking, knowledge sharing, and expert convening may be beneficial. A number of GEF Agencies would</p>	<p>environmental and social risks and potential impacts, and their management, throughout the GEF project and program cycle. In addition, the Policy sets out a role for the Secretariat in the review of projects and programs for the availability and completeness of the information requested at the various stages of the project and program cycles; and the monitoring of and reporting on safeguards implementation at the portfolio level.</p> <p>The Secretariat facilitated, in the Fall of 2019, a consultative process to develop guidelines to support the effective implementation of these requirements. The Guidelines on the Policy on Environmental and Social Safeguards (SD/GN/03) that were approved by the CEO on December 19 and included in the GEF 57<sup>th</sup> Council meeting as an information document, provide detailed guidance on how to implement the project and program level requirements set out in the Policy, including documentation and reporting throughout the GEF Project Cycle.</p> <p>The Secretariat has of yet not been able to deploy the new templates on ESS in the portal. Agencies have, however, been advised to provide information on Environmental and Social Safeguards and/or indicate the relevant project documents in the existing template on</p>	<p><b>Support capacity development, expert convening, and communications:</b> The GEF Secretariat has been taking their opportunity to explain the policy in the ECWs and Agency’s retreats. The GEF IEO continues to track.</p> <p>This decision will be retired when a new Council decision is made on the 2021 Update of the policies in June 2021.</p>	<p>and PFDs since the Policy came into effect, including risk types and risk classification of submitted projects and programs.</p> <p>Almost half of the PIFs and PFDs’ ESS risk classification was moderate (54%), and only 11 percent of PIFs and PFDs’ ESS risk were classified as high. Out of 128 PIFs and PFDs, Climate change and disaster (Minimum Standard 1) was identified as ESS risk the most, followed by Restrictions on Land Use and Involuntary Resettlement (Minimum Standard 4), Biodiversity Conservation and the Sustainable Management of Living Natural Resources (Minimum Standard 3), Community Health, Safety and Security (Minimum Standard 9), and Indigenous Peoples (Minimum Standard 5). While it is not a requirement of the Policy, some CEO Endorsements with high/substantial ESS risk mentioned that they will update implementation of their Environmental and Social Management Plans in PIRs.</p>	<p>term and completion) is not yet available.</p> <p>This recommendation has been graduated.</p> <p><b>Recommendation 3: Medium</b> The GEF Secretariat has included information sessions on the updated policy during ECWs and Agency’s retreats. However, more targeted knowledge sharing events on specific safeguard-thematic areas have not been initiated as noted in the IEO 2017 recommendations. The updated policy did not include a knowledge sharing/brokering mandate; however, a number of Agencies have expressed strong interest in such knowledge sharing/brokering in the GEF Partnership. In its Progress Report on implementation of the</p>

Ref #	Date of Council Decision	GEF IEO Recommendation	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2020	GEF IEO Rating & Comments in MAR 2020	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2021	GEF IEO Rating & Comments in MAR 2021
		<p>welcome increased opportunities for knowledge sharing and capacity support regarding key challenges in addressing certain safeguard issues. GEF could seek opportunities to gain from existing international safeguard networks (not ‘recreating the wheel’) and leverage the significant safeguards expertise across the GEF Partnership. GEF and GEF Agencies could convene safeguard focused workshops during Expanded Constituency Workshops or other GEF events. GEF could also consider how best to communicate GEF’s policy requirements, including the GEF Minimum Standards, with country partners to further build a shared understanding on the need for effective safeguards implementation.</p>	<p>Risks (Part II, Section 5). As per the Guidelines on the GEF Policy on Environmental and Social Safeguards, the Secretariat, in its review, are assessing the availability and completeness of information related to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) The overall project/ program risk classification;</li> <li>2) Relevant types and levels of risks and potential impacts;</li> <li>3) Measures to address identified risks and potential impacts; and</li> <li>4) Any supporting documents such as screening or Environmental and Social Risk and Impact Assessment reports.</li> </ol> <p><b>Support capacity development, expert convening, and communications:</b> Throughout the processes of (1) updating the policy on environmental and social safeguards; (2) developing the guidelines; and (3) carrying out the compliance assessment, the Secretariat has convened Agency representatives and other stakeholders to share relevant experiences and expertise, including through GEF Agency retreats as well as meetings. The Secretariat has also incorporated dedicated sessions in the ECWs to raise broader awareness.</p>		<p><b>Recommendation 3: Substantial</b> The GEF Policy on Environmental and Social Safeguards, approved by the GEF Council in 2019, did not include any specific provisions for the GEF Secretariat to support capacity development measures. Having that said, the GEF Secretariat has, as part of its efforts to engage Agencies in consultations throughout the processes of updating the Policy, developing the ESS guidelines as well as in its process facilitating the ESS compliance assessment, provided opportunities for sharing lessons learnt and knowledge exchange. In addition, the Secretariat has leveraged all possible opportunities as part of its outreach efforts such as GEF ECWs, Introduction Seminars and GEF Agency retreats to raise broader awareness and communications related to ESS.</p>	<p>updated policy (GEF/C.59/Inf.15), the Secretariat noted that it may be beneficial to exchange experiences among the GEF Agencies about environmental and social safeguard (ESS) risk identification and ratings, environmental and social assessments and management plans. The report stated that it “might also be beneficial to put in place a kind of ‘Community of Practice’ to share lessons learned across GEF Agencies’ ESS practices related to dealing with high-risk projects and grievances, and/or addressing some of the new ESS minimum standards including Gender-Based Violence; and Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) etc.”</p>

**A.5 Council decision based on Biodiversity Focal Area Study (GEF/ME/C.53/Inf.03) reported in Semi Annual Evaluation Report of the GEF IEO November 2017 (GEF/ME/C.53/01)**

Ref #	Date of Council Decision	GEF IEO Recommendation	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2020	GEF IEO Rating & Comments in MAR 2020	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2021	GEF IEO Rating & Comments in MAR 2021
5	Nov 30, 2017	<p><b>Recommendation 1: Address practical sustainability questions more directly.</b> The goal of project sustainability – nationally sustainable governmental ABS frameworks and the capacity to implement them domestically- relies on attention to the key factors directing national support. It will be essential for national government legislators to recognize the need of a budget allocation to run the processes associated with the implementation of the Nagoya Protocol. Monetary and non-monetary benefits accrued by private or public entities could be supporting activities not associated with the administrative process, including technology transfer and public awareness. Notable</p>	<p><b>Substantial: Recommendations 1-4.</b> Unable to assess progress yet as only one ABS project has been submitted and approved since the evaluation.</p> <p><b>Recommendation 5.</b> The GEF laid the groundwork and raised the profile of IWT through GWP in Phase 1 and is committed to sustain the efforts and ensure sustainability of the conservation outcomes through support in Phase II. Phase I of the Global Wildlife Program (GWP) was launched in 2015 seeking to address the escalating illegal wildlife trade (IWT) across 19 countries in Asia and Africa and supporting efforts on-the-ground with a platform for knowledge exchange and coordination implemented by the Global Child Project. The Program carries out activities in 13 African counties (Botswana, Cameroon, Ethiopia, Gabon, Kenya, Mali, Malawi, Mozambique, Republic of Congo,</p>	<p><b>Recommendations 1-4: Not rated.</b> Ratings will have to wait until more projects are approved.</p> <p><b>Recommendation 5: Substantial:</b> The GEF IEO notes that there has been an increase in the geographic coverage along with commensurate funding available through phase II of the program.</p> <p><b>Recommendation 6: Substantial.</b> GEF IEO welcomes that the program is striving to become more structured. The IEO notes that addressing</p>	<p><b>Recommendations 1-4: High</b></p> <p>(Six projects on Access and Benefit Sharing have been submitted as PIFs or as MSPs since the date of the council decision. One is under implementation and the remaining five are still in the review and approval process.)</p> <p><b>Recommendations 1:</b> All 6 projects in the cohort have specific and targeted sustainability strategies that focus on establishing and strengthening the elements of a functioning ABS framework including solidifying institutional mechanisms and arrangements that are required by the Protocol. Each of the projects also identify sustainability strategies via the identification of opportunities to generate financial resources through adding value to specific and high potential genetic resources identified in the proposals.</p> <p><b>Recommendation 2:</b> All 6 projects in the cohort support significant investment in technical capacity building and raising awareness of government and other key stakeholders about the Nagoya Protocol and its implications and opportunities for biodiversity management that also generates local benefits. This has long been a hallmark</p>	<p><b>Recommendations 1-4: Not rated</b></p> <p>The IEO acknowledges the incorporation of the recommendations in ABS project design. We will rate it when the majority of the projects complete the review and approval process.</p>

Ref #	Date of Council Decision	GEF IEO Recommendation	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2020	GEF IEO Rating & Comments in MAR 2020	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2021	GEF IEO Rating & Comments in MAR 2021
		<p>progress toward proving sustainability in this way has been achieved in some projects which are focusing on direct development of national capacities to utilize and add value to domestic Genetic Resources (GR) and ATK. This approach can be effectively scaled to each country's needs and capabilities, and to building on that country's capacities. Project designs should include plans for future sustainability.</p> <p><b>Recommendation 2: Focus on technical and professional capacity-building in addition to increasing general and generic awareness.</b> The building of "true" capacity, within the relevant governments and participating users at technical and professional levels needs to be sufficient that those parties will rarely need to seek further external assistance. In this connection, it is necessary</p>	<p>Tanzania, South Africa, Zambia, and Zimbabwe) and in 6 Asian countries (Afghanistan, India, Indonesia, Philippines, Thailand and Vietnam). In this phase, the GEF invested \$131 million and leveraged \$704 million. Phase II of the program was launched in GEF-7, aiming to continue fighting illegal wildlife trade in source, transit and demand countries while also focusing on wildlife-based economies as the basis for sustainable development. This phase will operate in 13 countries; 6 in Africa (Angola, Chad, Democratic Republic of Congo, Madagascar, Namibia and South Africa), 4 in Asia (Bhutan, Cambodia, India and Indonesia) and 3 in Latin America and the Caribbean (Belize, Ecuador and Panama). The program will also include a Global Child Project for the coordination and knowledge management that will focus on Preventing the Extinction of Known Threatened Species, and Wildlife for Sustainable Development. This global child project will not only support the 13 countries of Phase II but also the 19 countries in Phase I. The GEF is investing of \$82 million</p>	<p>demand reduction through the child projects has been a challenge due to the country driven priorities and welcomes the effort of the global project to address this gap.</p> <p>The GEF IEO also takes a note of the collaboration with SADC – TFCA and similar other planned initiatives.</p> <p>The GEF IEO notes that the current pandemic has affected efforts by GEF and the GWP. The IEO encourages engagement with the public and private sector to manage risks and plan for contingencies such as pandemics, natural disasters or other catastrophic events. This</p>	<p>of GEF support to implementation of the Nagoya Protocol and this cohort invests in these critical areas in a targeted way per stakeholder group consistent with this recommendation.</p> <p><b>Recommendation 3:</b> Each of the 6 projects in the cohort respond to the country circumstance and baseline capacity and implementation progress of the Nagoya Protocol. While many of the same elements are included given the requirements of an ABS framework (e.g., protocols and regulations for implementing arrangements using Prior Informed Consent (PIC) and Mutually Agreed Terms (MAT), establishment of a national focal point, etc.) the degree of implementation support varies depending on the country situation. In addition to government agencies and institutions, participating stakeholders vary as well and depend on the potential genetic resources that are identified in the PIFs as having potential for the future development of ABS agreements between users and providers.</p> <p><b>Recommendation 4:</b> All 6 projects in the cohort include knowledge management strategies that aim to share knowledge with national government officials and other stakeholders. Consistent with GEF policy, as these projects are under implementation the GEF agency will review implementation progress to help adapt implementation and to inform future project design and to share</p>	

Ref #	Date of Council Decision	GEF IEO Recommendation	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2020	GEF IEO Rating & Comments in MAR 2020	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2021	GEF IEO Rating & Comments in MAR 2021
		<p>to ensure that activities reach the intended audience in a form and at a level that they can absorb and use; that designated “capacity-building” activities do not ultimately become generic awareness raising; and that, where awareness raising is conducted, it is carefully targeted to address present needs with regard to project sustainability (parliamentary and minister-levels), and project activities (specific communities involved in the project) The above-mentioned trend in building national capacity to directly utilize domestic GR and ATK clearly points the way in this recommendation as well.</p> <p><b>Recommendation 3: Adopt a tailored country-specific approach in projects.</b> Interventions and the timing for their implementation should be tailored to be consistent with the national</p>	<p>and will leverage \$483 million in co-financing. Additional countries and funding will be added to the program for the Council Meeting of June and/or December 2020.</p> <p><b>Recommendation 6.</b> In preparation for the expansion of the Global Wildlife Program, the World Bank as the lead Agency, in close collaboration with the other GEF Agencies (UNDP, UNEP, ADB, WWF and CI) and the members of the Program Steering Committee, prepared a Logical Framework/ Theory of Change for the program. The objective of starting with a top-down approach was to ensure that interested countries would prepare projects with investments that were linked from the very beginning to a structured framework and would capture the lessons learned from GEF-6. Preparing this draft framework to get started with the GEF-7 program, rather than building it based on the content of the projects that were received from the interested countries, was a recommendation of the IEO that was understood by the GWP and now well implemented in</p>	<p>becomes crucial in the context of the focus on nature-based tourism and wildlife-based economies in Phase II (GEF-7) of the program.</p> <p><b>Recommendation 7. Medium.</b> The IEO welcomes the increase in geographic and species coverage.</p> <p>The IEO understands that the GEFSEC and the agencies do not have a unilateral mandate to include countries or species in the program. However, the IEO encourages the GEFSEC to continue working with the Agencies and the country partners for strategic expansion to other species,</p>	<p>technical results. The proposed GEF-8 strategy for ABS reflects lessons learned from implementation to date of the entire GEF ABS portfolio which also addresses this recommendation.</p> <p><b>Recommendation 5: Substantial</b> The second GEF-7 submission (addendum) of the GWP endorsed in June 2020 added five projects, bringing the GEF-7 investment to 17 projects, with \$108 million GEF financing and \$591.5 million in co-financing. Overall, GWP investment totals \$230 million GEF and \$1 billion co-financing, bringing together 32 countries (37 national projects) across Asia, Africa and Latin America. Combating IWT was the key focus of projects under GWP GEF-6 in recognition of the increasing threat of IWT remains strong under GEF-7 with 11 of 17 projects programming against this component. Similarly, the GEF-7 global coordination project will focus on combating IWT under sub-component 2 including work on building national capacities in financial investigation, anti-money laundering and anti-corruption, and ongoing partnership with ICCWC, to help support these national efforts. Reducing demand for illegal wildlife products and behavior change is also featured in the GEF-7 global coordination grant to ensure attention on the entire IWT supply chain.</p> <p><b>Recommendation 6: Substantial</b></p>	<p><b>Recommendation 5: Substantial</b> The GEF IEO notes that there has been an expansion of the geographic coverage from a primary focus on select countries in Asia and Africa to a program that has expanded to include countries in Latin America.</p> <p>This recommendation has been graduated.</p>

Ref #	Date of Council Decision	GEF IEO Recommendation	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2020	GEF IEO Rating & Comments in MAR 2020	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2021	GEF IEO Rating & Comments in MAR 2021
		<p>importance, relevance and capacities for ABS. The inclusion of too many interventions into a single project could undermine or minimize the long-term value of premature work done on interventions that are required at a later stage.</p> <p><b>Recommendation 4: Maximize the earliest possible availability of project lessons, experiences and outputs.</b> Evaluation planning and implementation should place greater emphasis on earlier evaluation components, such as, for example, reviewing and challenging PIRs and other internally developed reports more closely, providing clearer reporting/data standards, and calling for and executing externally conducted mid-term reviews more often. Such timely collected information made more readily available, as soon as possible, as a guide for</p>	<p>practice, proven successful for efficiency. Because participating countries in demand countries, mostly in Asia and South East Asia, did not allocate significant funding for activities on demand reduction and behavioral change, the Global Project will use some of its funds to invest in demand reduction. This integration between needs based strategic approach and country driven priorities has helped tackle not just the source and transit aspects of IWT but also address the gap in demand reduction. The GWP has built working relationships with the Southern African Development Community Trans-Frontier Conservation Areas Initiative of (SADC – TFCA <a href="https://tfcaportal.org/">https://tfcaportal.org/</a>) in an effort to secure transboundary investments among GWP participating countries. The GWP will be supporting the Annual Meeting of the SADC TFCA Network (originally scheduled for 24-26 March 2020 in Pretoria, South Africa but postponed due to the pandemic). To enhance the work on IWT across international boundaries, the GWP has organized many events to address this issue, including the</p>	<p>countries and regions that is crucial for addressing IWT.</p> <p><b>Recommendation 8: Medium:</b> The activities and knowledge products implemented by the Global Child Project are welcome, however more regional efforts and cross-border collaborations would be needed. Country projects can include components and activities for cross-border collaboration.</p> <p><b>Recommendation 9: Substantial.</b> The IEO welcomes the effort to address political will and corruption through the GEF 7 sub-components. The IEO will continue</p>	<p>Wildlife-based economy and IWT are key themes of the GEF-7 GWP and the implementation of these components of the global coordination project will provide strategic top-down focus on analysis, assessments, tools and partnerships to guide and support the GWP national projects that are working on these areas in accordance with their national priorities. The GWP coordination grant will continue to build key partnerships with donors, ICCWC, and members of the GWP Program Steering Committee in support of the implementation of the national child projects and to further leverage partnership opportunities, including through the comparative advantages of the participating GEF agencies.</p> <p>The GWP recognizes the impact of the current pandemic on GWP projects especially related to the context of nature-based tourism and wildlife-based economies. The GWP will engage public and private sector partners to explore potential application of financial and insurance mechanisms and other innovative financial instruments to channel private sector funds to the wildlife-based economy sector, including to support COVID-19 economic recovery. Engagement will focus on public-private partnerships, anti-money laundering technical assistance, and cross-sector efforts to reduce demand for wildlife and wildlife products that are illegally sourced and traded. Engagement with private sector tourism operators in Africa will not</p>	<p><b>Recommendation 6: Substantial</b> The IEO notes the improvement in the GEF 7 Program in terms of balancing both the approaches driven by country priorities. However, IEO observes that GEF 7 Program has no incentives apart from the coordination grant, and the countries might be tempted to join other programs with more financial incentives. The IEO acknowledges the proposed measures to adapt to the pandemic. The IEO will continue to track the outcomes of these measures as the Program matures.</p>



Ref #	Date of Council Decision	GEF IEO Recommendation	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2020	GEF IEO Rating & Comments in MAR 2020	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2021	GEF IEO Rating & Comments in MAR 2021
		<p>other projects and future project design. Where possible, project outputs should be accessible, to maximize the body of ABS related technical information available.</p> <p><b>Recommendation 5: The GEF has an important role to play in combating illegal wildlife trade, and the ongoing illegal wildlife trade crisis warrants scaling up of GEF’s work.</b> Given the scale of the problem, additional efforts are required to combat illegal wildlife trade. As an intergovernmental organization with an established track record in addressing a range of biodiversity-related issues, the GEF has distinct advantages. With its mandate and expertise, it brings together multilateral agencies and national governments to develop and implement effective programs on the ground. Scaling up the GEF’s work requires increased funding under</p>	<p>recent virtual event “Combating Maritime Trafficking of Wildlife” organized in partnership with UNDP and the Basil Institute on February 26, 2020 and in-person event on Cross-Border Partnerships for Conservation and Development in Zambia on November 1, 2018. In phase II, the GWP is planning regional donor coordination to work with other donors in this space and maximize effectiveness of donor funding. A component on the wildlife-based economy will also support projects in collaborating with the private sector to scale up nature-based tourism efforts and protected area financing. Because the bulk of the GEF funds are allocated to individual countries using the System of Transparent Allocation of Resources (STAR), GWP doesn’t count with significant resources (except some in the Global Project for Coordination and KM) to support to activities across international borders in transit- and demand- countries.</p> <p><b>Recommendation 7.</b> In GEF-7 the Global Wildlife Program expanded activities to cover three countries in Latin America</p>	<p>to track adoption of this decision.</p> <p><b>Recommendation 10. Substantial.</b> The IEO notes that the measures, indicators including qualitative assessments mentioned by the GEFSEC in their management response are relevant for tracking progress of the program. The IEO will continue to track adoption of this decision.</p> <p><b>Recommendation 11. Medium:</b> The IEO welcomes the planned activities to create links between other international activities. The IEO will continue to</p>	<p>only include participation in knowledge sharing, investment forum, and other similar events but also may include activities supported through a proposed finance platform (sub-component 1.2). The GWP leads the Nature-Based Tourism Community of Practice within the World Bank and in GEF-7, the program will facilitate collaboration with other organizations and partners to support knowledge exchange. Through the donor coordination platform, the GWP will find areas where technical and analytical support can be provided to GWP teams and countries. In 2020, the GWP held a targeted donor coordination call on COVID-19 impacts on donor investments and programs and ways to adapt and respond.</p> <p><b>Recommendation 7: Substantial</b> Five national child projects were endorsed under the GWP GEF-7 June 2020 submission, expanding the geographic coverage to include Malaysia, Nigeria and Pakistan (along with adding an additional project in South Africa, and additional financing for the Bhutan national project). This strengthens the GWP’s coverage of IWT by bringing in Malaysia – a country of significance in international wildlife trafficking as a Category A Party under CITES for countries most affected by the illegal trade in ivory; Nigeria – a country significantly targeted by criminal networks involved in illegal trade in CITES-listed species and currently subject to a CITES Article XIII compliance procedure; and Pakistan – a</p>	<p><b>Recommendation 7: Substantial</b> The IEO acknowledges that the GEFSEC continued to</p>

Ref #	Date of Council Decision	GEF IEO Recommendation	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2020	GEF IEO Rating & Comments in MAR 2020	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2021	GEF IEO Rating & Comments in MAR 2021
		<p>the GEF-7 replenishment cycle and a sharper focus on illegal wildlife trade.</p> <p><b>Recommendation 6: Further integration of bottom-up, country-driven approaches with top-down, strategic approaches is necessary.</b> Such integration is essential to both developing effective IWT programming and maintaining ownership and buy-in of individual countries in their projects. Adjustments to the funding mechanism for GEF IWT activities could facilitate integration of these approaches. Rather than relying solely on STAR allocation funding as under GEF-6—with the exception of funding under the global coordination grant it would be desirable to support the program with non-STAR funds to carry-out activities in transit- and demand- countries where investing GEF resources may not accrue Global Environmental</p>	<p>and the Caribbean: Belize, Ecuador and Panama. These three-projects focus on addressing the threats to Jaguars and other species in the target protected areas. It is important to remember that while the GWP is open to work with both terrestrial and marine species, and cover biodiversity more broadly, the selection of threatened species is ultimately the decision of the participating countries using their STAR allocation. Neither the GEF Secretariat nor the World Bank as the lead agency, have the mandate to include countries or species in the program.</p> <p><b>Recommendation 8.</b> Because the GEF allocates the bulk of the funds to countries via the STAR, the Global Wildlife Program does not count on the financial resources to carry out cross-border activities except for small investments with funds of the Global Child Project administered by the World Bank as the lead agency. The GWP, through its virtual events, targets participants in the United States and Europe to raise awareness about this issue and open doors</p>	<p>assess how these activities address demand reduction at a global scale.</p> <p><b>Recommendation 12:</b> Not rated. Additional data will be needed to assess the sustainability of the knowledge sharing components.</p>	<p>country targeted as a source, consumer and transit country for a range of illegally-trafficked species, including pangolins and big cats. This expansion – as per all countries participating in the GWP – has been based on country-driven priorities and interest in joining the GWP. While many projects focus on flagship or endemic species threatened by IWT (e.g. African elephant, rhinoceros, pangolin, jaguar, tiger, snow leopard and great apes; endemics such as Borneo orangutan, Nigeria-Cameroon chimpanzee, South African Abalone) their attention on strengthening legal and criminal justice frameworks, enhancing protected area management, and diversifying local livelihoods will have benefits in reducing poaching and illegal trade of a broad range of fauna and flora species.</p> <p><b>Recommendation 8: Substantial</b> The GWP continues to focus on strengthening connections between GWP participating countries and other key countries implicated in IWT. For example, at the 2020 annual knowledge exchange conference the GWP invited a speaker from the Anti-Smuggling Bureau of China Customs to participate in a panel on combating wildlife trafficking to share China’s experiences on combating IWT and law enforcement partnerships with other countries. This engagement of non-GWP countries will continue under GEF-7 as appropriate to ensure key countries in IWT supply chains are engaged, including</p>	<p>work with the Agencies and the countries and recognized their priorities and used its convening power. This allowed for the expansion of the Program to include other species, countries, and regions crucial for addressing IWT.</p> <p>This recommendation has been graduated.</p>



Ref #	Date of Council Decision	GEF IEO Recommendation	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2020	GEF IEO Rating & Comments in MAR 2020	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2021	GEF IEO Rating & Comments in MAR 2021
		<p>Benefits for the participating countries. Additional non-STAR resources would benefit activities across international borders in supply countries where STAR funding may not be sufficient to cover both the domestic as well as trans-boundary activities. Private sector funding could be leveraged to address wildlife trafficking and demand issues.</p> <p><b>Recommendation 7: With respect to the scope of the GEF's illegal wildlife trade funding, there should be a strategic expansion to other species, countries, and regions.</b> Specifically, the program should expand to cover Latin America and the Caribbean, which pose particular issues with respect to the pet trade. To protect biodiversity more broadly, it would also be beneficial to expand strategically to cover other wildlife,</p>	<p>for partnerships. Through the various knowledge products such as publications and reports, the GWP also disseminates important information that countries beyond those that receive STAR can use for conservation planning and action.</p> <p><b>Recommendation 9.</b> The third component of the Global Wildlife Program in GEF-7 aims to complement existing efforts to reduce illegal wildlife trade. Specifically, this component includes four subcomponents: (i) strengthen policies and national legal frameworks and increase political recognition of wildlife crime as a Serious Crime as defined by UN Convention against Transnational Organized Crime ; (ii) generate, analyze, and share actionable information, data and intelligence on criminal networks; (iii) increase capacity to combat wildlife crime (poaching and trafficking) and fight corruption across enforcement, judiciary, and prosecution; and (iv) strengthen transboundary, regional and international capacity and cooperation. Cross-sector partnerships will be facilitated</p>		<p>coordination with relevant GEF investment in these countries. Connection with non-GWP countries is also facilitated through the networks of GWP implementing agencies and partner organizations, and through disseminating knowledge. The annual GWP qualitative reporting process invites projects to indicate if they have a knowledge or partnership need/opportunity with other GWP projects, and these are collated and used by the coordination team to inform the detailed knowledge management program.</p> <p>Under the GEF-7 coordination grant, the GWP will investigate further opportunities for regional collaboration, for example through partnering with thematic and regional programs funded by donors/partner GEF agencies and piloting regional donor coordination efforts, through engagement with regional fora such as Wildlife Enforcement Networks, Southern African Development Community and ASEAN, and through collaboration with other GEF-funded programs (i.e. ASL, Congo Basin, FOLUR, etc).</p> <p><b>Recommendation 9: Substantial</b> Combating IWT is a component of the recently endorsed GEF-7 GWP coordination project. This includes targeted activities to improve governance and ability to combat financial crimes through the provision of ICCWC anti-money laundering training and roll-out of the National Risk Assessment environmental crimes module in interested</p>	<p><b>Recommendation 8: Medium</b> The IEO recognizes the Program's focus to help coordinate and establish relationships between participating countries. Given the nature of IWT, more transboundary and regional efforts need to be supported. Also, more evidence on results are needed to evaluate the outcomes of these ongoing and proposed cross-border and regional collaborations.</p>

Ref #	Date of Council Decision	GEF IEO Recommendation	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2020	GEF IEO Rating & Comments in MAR 2020	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2021	GEF IEO Rating & Comments in MAR 2021
		<p>moving beyond elephants, rhinos, and big cats.</p> <p><b>Recommendation 8: In addition to country-led national projects, stronger regional and global programming is important.</b> Projects at both scales—country-specific projects and those at a broader scale—are important to the success of the program. Because illegal wildlife trade is ultimately an international issue, the program can be more cohesive if cross-border connections are designed as a core part of the program. This could be achieved by supporting activities across international borders with non-STAR resources. In addition, the GEF ought to consider how to engage other countries that are not yet participants in the Global Wildlife Program but are part of the larger system of illegal wildlife trade—whether they are eligible GEF recipients, like China, or non-recipients,</p>	<p>through engagement with the International Consortium to Combat Wildlife Crime (ICWC) to partner with relevant entities on enforcement, policy, regulatory, and institutional issues related to illicit financing, anti-corruption, customs, legal, and governance. For example, the GWP will help expand efforts on anti-money laundering (AML) training, which received significant support from the UK government, piloted under GWP GEF-6 in Kenya and Tanzania and these will be scaled up. There are 12 GWP countries that have already or are in the process of applying the ICCWC Toolkit and/or Indicator Framework which helps to assess and reinforce the need for stronger cooperation among all involved in combating IWT.</p> <p><b>Recommendation 10.</b> One of the indicators of the GWP is the “Number of law enforcement and judicial activities at program sites”. Under this, there are also a number of relevant sub-indicators including: i) law enforcement staff/km<sup>2</sup>; ii) Number of patrol person-days/months; iii) Number of</p>		<p>GWP countries, GWP engagement in relevant international fora including the Financial Action Task Force, and anti-corruption support activities developed in partnership with the United for Wildlife Financial Taskforce and ICCWC partners. The engagement of ICCWC in the GWP partnership supports the promotion of ICCWC tools such as the ICCWC Toolkit and ICCWC Indicator Framework, which have now been delivered or are underway in at least 15 GWP countries.</p> <p><b>Recommendation 10: Substantial</b> The coordination project has developed and deployed a monitoring system to track and aggregate progress including the GWP tracking tool for GEF-6, annual qualitative reviews, and standard project-level reporting to GEF such as PIRs and core indicator reporting. GWP’s overall progress is published yearly through the GWP Knowledge Platform/ Annual Report. Many of the GEF-6 national projects reach their mid-term throughout 2021 and will then submit their mid-term GWP tracking tools. This data will better assess progress against metrics such as seizures, arrests and prosecutions, along with other areas reported under the GWP. The experience from the GEF-6 M&amp;E framework is helping the coordination team develop a streamlined approach for GEF-7 that will aim to better use existing project-level reporting and M&amp;E mechanisms and aggregate these to show results including GEF</p>	<p><b>Recommendation 9: Substantial</b> The IEO recognizes the effort to address governance and financial crimes in GEF 7 through the provision of AML training. The IEO notes the adoption of ICCWC tools in 15 GWP countries.</p>

Ref #	Date of Council Decision	GEF IEO Recommendation	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2020	GEF IEO Rating & Comments in MAR 2020	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2021	GEF IEO Rating & Comments in MAR 2021
		<p>like the United States, Europe, or Japan. The communication initiated with major international donors and their agencies should continue.</p> <p><b>Recommendation 9: Political will and corruption should be explicitly and directly addressed in all IWT projects.</b> A robust and coordinated focus on political will and corruption will ultimately help achieve the increases in arrests, prosecutions, and convictions that the GEF-6 Biodiversity Strategy prescribes. Participating countries in future GEF funded projects on poaching and illegal wildlife trade, should be encouraged to invest some financial resources in addressing corruption issues. An alternative would be for the GEF to support third parties like the International Consortium on Combating Wildlife Crime (ICWC) to engage with countries to</p>	<p>arrests/patrol month; iv) Number of tools deployed to combat wildlife crime; v) Number of countries that have legislation that defines wildlife crime as a serious crime; vi) Number of wildlife/wildlife product seizures at program sites; vii) Number of investigations that lead to arrests of wildlife/wildlife products smugglers and viii) Number of prosecutions of wildlife/wildlife product smugglers. In only a few cases, it would be possible to capture information on the conviction and penalties as there are not enough resources and man-power to follow all the cases that reach the courts. The GWP, in addition to the tracking tools, also conducts qualitative assessments to ensure that progress made by the projects is tracked beyond numbers.</p> <p><b>Recommendation 11.</b> In GEF-7 the GWP will explore collaboration opportunities to engage with the US agencies in charge of the deployment of National Strategy for Combating Wildlife Trafficking (February 2014) and Implementation Plan (February 2015), as well as the Executive Order on Enforcing</p>		<p>core indicators. Under sub-component 3.1, the GEF-7 GWP coordination grant will continue to guide projects in M&amp;E, provide training as needed to build national capacities, establish a focused M&amp;E working group to share practices and promote consistency in data collection, and prepare program-wide progress reports.</p> <p><b>Recommendation 11: Substantial</b> To maintain the GWP focus on demand reduction across GEF-7, the GWP GEF-7 coordination grant includes a specific sub-component 2.3 on reducing demand for illegal wildlife products. This sub-component will build off existing partnerships around demand reduction and the application of behavior change principles/social and behavioral change communications to IWT. The global coordination project will support sharing of knowledge and best practices on demand reduction and behavior change among GWP projects (including child projects investing in demand reduction under GEF-6 such as Thailand, Philippines and Vietnam) and partners, capacity development, and promotion and development of behavior change tools including opportunities to apply behavior change principles across IWT supply chains and to emerging areas such as the health risks of illegal wildlife consumption and trade. There is emerging recognition among GWP national projects of the potential application of behavior change approaches. In partnership with TRAFFIC, the GWP 2020</p>	<p>The IEO will continue to track this development.</p> <p><b>Recommendation 10: Substantial</b> The IEO welcomes the effort to enhance GWP's current M&amp;E system in GEF 7, plans for providing training, and building the capacity of national projects based on the experience of GEF 6. The IEO notes the importance of having coherence between Program and project level M&amp;E. The IEO will continue to track</p>

Ref #	Date of Council Decision	GEF IEO Recommendation	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2020	GEF IEO Rating & Comments in MAR 2020	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2021	GEF IEO Rating & Comments in MAR 2021
		<p>pursue this part of the agenda as is being done in some countries.</p> <p><b>Recommendation 10: Continue to use the simplified but relevant measures for tracking overall Program performance while reflecting the uniqueness of child projects.</b> As is the GWP tracking tools are used, the GEF should continue to assess that experience to ensure that it matches the current expectations regarding its benefits. The lessons that emerge should then be integrated into the tracking tool and evaluation frameworks going forward. Monitoring and evaluation of all IWT projects should include the tracking of arrests, prosecutions, convictions, and penalties as appropriate. Collecting data for these sub-indicators for all projects would enable a more thorough assessment of the effectiveness of the</p>	<p>Federal Law with Respect to Transnational Criminal Organizations and Preventing International Trafficking was approved by President Trump in 2017. The GWP participated regularly in the USAID Reducing Opportunities for Unlawful Transport of Endangered Species (ROUTES) Partnership briefings, to stay up to date on the efforts by the international community to disrupt wildlife trafficking by reducing the use of legal transportation supply chains. The European Commission (EC) developed EU's continental strategic approaches to wildlife conservation, the external dimension of the 2016 EU Action Plan against Wildlife Trafficking, engaging with communities to enhance biodiversity conservation and sustainable development. The release of the EC's Strategic Approach to Conservation in Africa (February 2015) as well as the African Environmental Ministers Meeting (AMCEN) of March 2015 is evidence of increasing political commitment. Through the donor coordination activities, the GWP will explore collaboration opportunities related to the EU</p>		<p>knowledge exchange conference included a virtual session for Asia projects on the use of behavior change. Demand reduction continues to be an identified knowledge priority of GWP projects in Asia, and the GWP coordination and knowledge exchange platform will target activities to respond to this identified need.</p> <p>Partnerships with key donors to combating IWT continue to be built through donor coordination work under the GWP. Building off the World Bank-led reviews of international donor funding, since 2016 there has been an established donor coordination platform that meets quarterly, bringing together key donors such as UK, EU, Germany and US. This provides a platform for donors to exchange information and provide updates on the proposed focus of new donor programs helping identify synergies and avoid duplication of donor effort. During 2020, this included a Wildlife Forum meeting bringing together donors, GWP partners and ICCWC member organizations to discuss priorities to inform the next ICCWC strategic plan, and a targeted donor coordination meeting on the impacts of COVID-19 on donor-funded efforts and potential responses to adapt to these. Under GEF-7, donor coordination work will continue with additional Wildlife Forum events and collation and dissemination of information and tools between donors. Efforts will also broaden to include regional donor coordination and consultative</p>	<p>the developments in this area.</p> <p><b>Recommendation 11. Medium</b> The IEO notes that a specific sub-component on demand reduction is present in GEF 7. The IEO will continue to track the current and planned activities and how these will help support GWP's efforts towards reducing demand for</p>

Ref #	Date of Council Decision	GEF IEO Recommendation	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2020	GEF IEO Rating & Comments in MAR 2020	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2021	GEF IEO Rating & Comments in MAR 2021
		<p>projects, as well as the impact of corruption and political will on efforts to combat IWT. Doing so would contribute to realizing the priority set under Program 3 of the GEF-6 Biodiversity Strategy of increasing arrest and conviction rates for poaching of threatened species.</p> <p><b>Recommendation 11: Create links between other international activities regarding demand and GEF-supported efforts.</b> As with trafficking, it important to acknowledge a critical portion of the supply chain with respect to demand occurs in the United States and in Europe, which are not eligible GEF recipients. While this problem is, in part, outside of the scope of the GEF’s activities, it must be acknowledged in working to solve this global problem on a global scale. In addition, the GEF can foster linked between demand countries and</p>	<p>“Larger than Elephants” strategic approach to wildlife conservation in Africa, including during a joint Environment Week to be held with EC DEVCO in early 2019, and progress collaboration related to the EU “Larger than Tigers” strategic approach to wildlife conservation in Asia. The first-ever review of international donor funding for combatting illegal wildlife trade in Africa and Asia, conducted by the GWP, showed that a total of more than \$1.3 billion was committed by 24 international donors from 2010-2016 (includes GEF \$390 million funding referenced above), or approximately \$190 million per year. The Analysis of International Funding to Tackle Illegal Wildlife Trade filled a knowledge gap by demonstrating the scale of donor funding and the range of activities to tackle the crisis. A preliminary analysis of the updated data that goes through 2018 shows commitment now totals over \$2.3 billion to 1,612 projects that help combat IWT. New committed funds since 2010 fluctuated, peaking at \$464 million in 2017. Donor projects included over \$1.5 billion in</p>		<p>meetings on themes of relevance to GWP countries.</p> <p><b>Recommendation 12: Substantial</b> The knowledge sharing component is central to the delivery of the global grant and to building partnerships across the GWP. The GWP has launched several knowledge sharing products and mechanisms and is continually evolving its strategy to respond to the needs of project teams and partners. The GWP conducts regular knowledge surveys to assess knowledge needs and preferred knowledge delivery formats of project teams. In 2020, the GEF-6 global grant facilitated policy dialogue, generated new knowledge, developed tools and resources, and strengthened partnerships to expand the GWP’s reach and support national projects. Specifically, in Zambia where the WBG is the implementing agency for the GWP national project, the GWP global grant co-financed robust analytical work to make the case that investing in protected areas was a good investment strategy for the government. This methodology is now being scaled up across the GWP GEF-7 national project in Cambodia. In Kenya, the GWP financed an innovative study that compared the opportunity costs of road development and nature-based tourism, finding solutions that would help the government pursue a win-win for development and conservation. These targeted investments are additional to the general knowledge exchange and</p>	<p>illegally traded wildlife products.</p>

Ref #	Date of Council Decision	GEF IEO Recommendation	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2020	GEF IEO Rating & Comments in MAR 2020	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2021	GEF IEO Rating & Comments in MAR 2021
		<p>GEF-eligible countries, such as the partnership created between Mozambique and Vietnam regarding illegal wildlife trade.</p> <p><b>Recommendation 12: Sustainability of knowledge sharing components needs to be established.</b> The knowledge sharing components of the Global Wildlife Program will facilitate the Program’s further evolution. Fostering connections between experts and in-country staff, in addition to the relationships with the implementing agency technical staff, will enable the continual improvement of the programs at the ground level. The connections between countries fostered by these coordinating and knowledge sharing activities run by the WB with the coordination grant, can also facilitate the development of</p>	<p>investments in 69 countries, and \$0.8 billion in various regional and global projects.</p> <p><b>Recommendation 12.</b> The fifth component of GWP in GEF-7 and the third component of the GEF-7 global grant will serve as an umbrella to bring together all the other Program components and expedite action and knowledge transfer. For GEF-7 GWP, the Global Project will scale up the analytical and policy work as well as knowledge and coordination exchanges along the two priorities identified in the GEF-7 Replenishment Programming Directions: Support Wildlife-based Economy and Combat Illegal Wildlife Trade. This component not only will implement the knowledge, coordination and M&amp;E activities to help the national projects be exposed to state-of-the-art knowledge but will also build national project capacity to conduct these activities themselves. To deliver this, the program will leverage child project budgets to supplement the Global Project budget and increase the participation of project team members in</p>		<p>dissemination that takes under the GWP knowledge exchange platform.</p> <p>Since the pandemic, the GWP’s knowledge activities have been delivered virtually including the 2020 annual conference. The program has expanded its outreach through this format as more representatives are able to join these events. Aligned with both GEF-6 and GEF-7 knowledge objectives, the GWP is focusing on delivering thematic training workshops on topics that have been chosen by the project teams. For example, a conservation storytelling workshop was implemented in August 2020 for project teams in Asia. The GWP is also innovating with e-books/ online databases that collate knowledge across sources and make it easy and accessible for project teams to query information. So far, there are two e-books created – (i) investments to combat illegal wildlife trade, and (ii) nature-based tourism tools and resources. A third e-book on conservation technologies that reduce poaching, trafficking and demand is in progress. In July 2020, the GWP partnered with the GEF-funded Amazon Sustainable Landscapes program (ASL) to put together a webinar on Wildlife Insights – a technology to monitor biodiversity in the tropics.</p> <p>In GEF-7, knowledge management is its own pillar under sub-component 3.2 of the global coordination grant and is also recognized as a cross cutting theme. Where possible, the</p>	<p><b>Recommendation 12: Medium</b></p> <p>The IEO welcomes that the GWP has launched several knowledge-sharing products and has put mechanisms to improve its KM strategy. We will continue to track the outcome and impact of these current and proposed knowledge products, events, and networks.</p>

Ref #	Date of Council Decision	GEF IEO Recommendation	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2020	GEF IEO Rating & Comments in MAR 2020	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2021	GEF IEO Rating & Comments in MAR 2021
		<p>projects to combat illegal wildlife trade that reach across borders.</p>	<p>important thematic conferences and study tours by encouraging national projects to send additional people to these knowledge events. Furthermore, the GWP will train representatives from national projects to take back the lessons learned to their respective country and use national project funds to disseminate the knowledge resources to a broader in-country audience and implement national capacity building efforts. The Communities of Practice that the GWP will create on specific thematic topics will further ensure that country projects can tap into the available expertise in relevant areas.</p>		<p>GWP will align knowledge events with other GEF programs like ASL and Congo Basin Impact programs and GWP PSC members to increase outreach. It will continue building on the Communities of Practice, delivering thematic events and best practices and providing support to project teams to share knowledge with each other. The GWP is currently developing human-wildlife conflict mitigation training and mentorship opportunities (a GEF-7 feature) in partnership with the IUCN Taskforce on HWC. The GWP will look to put some of the content in the Open Learning Campus (OLC) platform hosted by the World Bank Group as a way to provide targeted training modules that can be used by GWP countries and partners beyond these targeted training events.</p>	



**A.6 Recommendations from the Review of GEF’s Engagement with Indigenous Peoples (GEF/ME/C.53/Inf.07) reported in Semi Annual Evaluation Report of the GEF IEO November 2017 (GEF/ME/C.53/01)**

Ref #	Date of Council Decision	GEF IEO Recommendations	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2020	GEF IEO Rating & Comments in MAR 2020	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2021	GEF IEO Rating & Comments in MAR 2021
6	Nov 30, 2017	<p><b>Recommendation 1: Establish and strengthen dedicated funding opportunities for indigenous peoples’ projects/organizations.</b></p> <p>Indigenous peoples remain limited as beneficiaries in the support they receive from GEF. To date, support has come primarily through the SGP which, by design, is limited in scale and scope. Dedicated funding outside STAR would address the systemic challenges and operational constraints to increased indigenous peoples’ engagement. Simultaneously, strengthening the SGP and other GEF project-oriented grant mechanisms, such as the Critical Ecosystem</p>	<p><b>Substantial:</b></p> <p><u>Establish and strengthen dedicated funding opportunities for indigenous peoples’ projects/organizations:</u></p> <p>The Inclusive Conservation Initiative project was approved at the December 2019 Council and is now in the PPG phase. The agencies selected were based on a competitive call for proposals that were reviewed by IPAG, STAP and GEF Secretariat. A call for Expressions of Interest from IPLC organizations to receive funding is currently open (broader consultations for the development of global components are on hold/moving to virtual exchanges due to COVID-19). Other projects and programs are providing significant resources, such as the Congo Basin IP where component 3</p>	<p><b>Substantial:</b></p> <p><u>Establish and strengthen dedicated funding opportunities for indigenous peoples projects/organizations:</u></p> <p>The Inclusive Conservation Initiative project, which is conducted by a partnership between the International Union for Conservation of Nature and Conservation International, was approved in 57<sup>th</sup> Council. The project is still PPG stage and the GEF IEO continues to monitor implementation of the project.</p>	<p><b>Recommendation 1: Substantial</b></p> <p>The Inclusive Conservation Initiative (ICI) will be submitted for CEO Endorsement soon. Despite the pandemic, the agencies received over 400 applications for the funding call that was issued in March 2020. The agency team speculates that they did more outreach with a broader set of organizations by focusing on virtual means, including WhatsApp and Facebook. They enlisted more than thirty experts (about half of these indigenous) to review the long-listed proposals. The Interim Steering Committee selected 9 proposals in October. The agencies have provided drafts of the CEO Endorsement documents for comment to the GEF Secretariat while they are finishing last issues and obtaining Letters of No Objection from OFPs. The Congo Basin IP and many projects continue to</p>	<p><b>Recommendation 1: Substantial</b></p> <p>Key informants to a recent IEO follow up to the 2017 Evaluation welcome the Inclusive Conservation Initiative (ICI) as a breakthrough funding initiative designed for local impact, GEF-wide learning and scale out/up. The initiative is seen as precedent setting – that is, complementary to but larger in project scale than SGP, dedicated to creating indigenous people-designed and implemented projects in biodiversity hotspots. IPAG members see in it, a “chance to test and showcase how it can work to have Indigenous Peoples at the centre of projects”. SGP, the Fellowship and engagement in MSPs and FSPs is felt to be developing at a more modest pace.</p>



Ref #	Date of Council Decision	GEF IEO Recommendations	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2020	GEF IEO Rating & Comments in MAR 2020	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2021	GEF IEO Rating & Comments in MAR 2021
		<p>Partnership Fund, or creating incentives to engage IPLCs could also help improve access.</p> <p><b>Recommendation 2: Update relevant Policies and Guidelines to reflect best practice standards concerning indigenous peoples, including a rights-based approach to engagement.</b></p> <p>Internationally, safeguard norms regarding Indigenous Peoples have changed. This manifests in a number of GEF Agency standards that have emerged since 2012. To remain at the leading edge and continue to serve the field of practice with advanced thinking about how best to safeguard the rights of indigenous peoples, a recalibration is required. Attention should be given to provisions related to the right to self-determination and to free, prior and</p>	<p>of the PFD is specifically focused on IPLCs. SGP continues to provide important support at the community level. A recent review of their portfolio identified 90 countries with indigenous peoples and, in those countries, about 40% of grants are going to indigenous peoples' organizations.</p> <p><u>Update relevant Policies and Guidelines to reflect best practice standards concerning indigenous peoples, including a rights-based approach to engagement</u></p> <p>The GEF Secretariat has informally asked agencies to track issues or concerns with the implementation of the IP provisions safeguards policy and more broadly in engaging with IPLCs. The agency members of IPAG have noted the unintended consequence of safeguards can be the exclusion of indigenous areas or peoples to avoid the "hassle" of undertaking safeguards, so the GEF Secretariat has</p>	<p><u>Update relevant Policies and Guidelines to reflect best practice standards concerning indigenous peoples, including a rights-based approach to engagement</u></p> <p>The Guidelines on the Policy on Environmental and Social Safeguard was approved in the 57<sup>th</sup> Council meeting. The Guidelines are to support the effective implementation of the project and program level documentation and reporting requirements set out in the Policy. (Indigenous peoples are dealt in Minimum Requirements 5).</p> <p>The GEF IEO will evaluate the institutional policies</p>	<p>engage with IPLCs at various levels.</p> <p>The proposed GEF-8 programming directions includes a phase 2 of ICI with an increased focus on land rights and tenure as well as an Access and Benefits Sharing business facility with goal of overcoming some of the barriers that have prevented the realization of the ideas of the Nagoya Protocol.</p> <p><b>Recommendation 2: Substantial</b></p> <p>The GEF is working with agencies to gather feedback formally and informally about the implementation of the new safeguards and application of the guidelines.</p> <p>In particular, the decision was made based on guidance from IPAG that while FPIC (free, prior and informed consent) is a requirement of projects it does not necessarily have to be obtained prior to CEO Endorsement. While this decision may appear to be a step backwards, it allows for adequate time and consultation with communities that have their own</p>	<p>This recommendation has been graduated.</p> <p><b>Recommendation 2: Substantial</b></p> <p>Indigenous peoples (IP) leaders and other stakeholders are generally favorable toward the revised ESS Policy/Guidelines (2018). The policy is considered contemporary and appropriate for the Partnership. Concerns identified in the 2017 evaluation related to FPIC coverage and implementation, expectations on Agencies regarding alignment, participation of indigenous peoples in project processes, and safeguards monitoring &amp; reporting have been addressed.</p>

Ref #	Date of Council Decision	GEF IEO Recommendations	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2020	GEF IEO Rating & Comments in MAR 2020	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2021	GEF IEO Rating & Comments in MAR 2021
		<p>informed consent (FPIC) as they pertain to consultations with indigenous peoples concerning GEF projects.</p> <p><b>Recommendation 3: Review the Indigenous Peoples’ Advisory Group’s role for operational constraints.</b> IPAG is unequivocally viewed as an important and advantageous body to guide GEF’s decision making and engagement with indigenous people. To increase its effectiveness, GEF should undertake several steps including a review of succession planning and “on-boarding” for IPAG members to preserve knowledge of outgoing members and to orient new ones, and a review of the existing scope/limitations of the IPAG’s mandate and its relationship with the Indigenous Peoples Focal Points (IPFP) embedded within the</p>	<p>asked GEF Agencies to look out for this occurring. In addition, the GEF’s safeguards language on peoples in voluntary isolation is new to many agencies and, therefore, is an important potential learning opportunity.</p> <p>As noted in the responses on the safeguards policy - the Guidelines on the Policy on Environmental and Social Safeguards (SD/GN/03) that were approved by the CEO on December 19 and included in the GEF 57<sup>th</sup> Council meeting as an information document, provide detailed guidance on how to implement the project and program level requirements set out in the Policy, including documentation and reporting throughout the GEF Project Cycle.</p> <p><u>Review the Indigenous Peoples’ Advisory Group’s role for operational constraints.</u> These are ongoing discussions as IPAG also</p>	<p>and stakeholder engagement, including the engagement with Indigenous peoples in the GEF Projects.</p> <p><u>Review the Indigenous Peoples’ Advisory Group’s role for operational constraints</u> The GEF IEO continues to monitor IPAG and Inclusive Conservation Initiative activities to understand the IPAG.</p> <p><u>Monitor application of Minimum Standard 4 and Indigenous Peoples’ Portfolio:</u> GEF IEO will continue to assess the Secretariat’s review of</p>	<p>timelines and decision processes that may not align with the GEF and may be remote and difficult to access (e.g. a community that can only be reached during the dry season). While technology can and does help and the pandemic has encouraged creativity, it is important to respect the orality of many IPLC cultures and the importance of face-to-face conversations that make it difficult to substitute other methods.</p> <p>Requiring FPIC at CEO Endorsement would also give the impression that FPIC is something that is completed and then it is done rather than an ongoing process. Projects, for instance, that are working to develop community management approaches for protected areas or OECMs may be about undertaking meaningful consultation processes.</p> <p><b>Recommendation 3: Substantial</b> This was quite a year for operational constraints. The IPAG has been starting discussions about options or strategies to address these issues. However, it is difficult to have real</p>	<p>The accompanying guidelines are described as “general” and in need of elaboration with case examples. With its portfolio spread across key convention areas and its reach through multiple agency delivery channels, the GEF is considered uniquely suited to “mainstream” engagement and safeguard policies.</p> <p>This recommendation has been graduated.</p> <p><b>Recommendation 3: Substantial</b> The IPAG is operationally stable and strong – that is, strategically focused, with a dedicated and connected membership. Its members and affiliates see it as well supported by the Secretariat administratively and with high-level</p>

Ref #	Date of Council Decision	GEF IEO Recommendations	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2020	GEF IEO Rating & Comments in MAR 2020	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2021	GEF IEO Rating & Comments in MAR 2021
		<p>CSO Network. GEF should clarify IPAG's communication/engagement role for more formal contacts with regional and global networks of indigenous peoples; consider an increase in the staff time and resources allocated by the GEFSEC IP focal point to IPAG activities; translation requirements for relevant documents such that IPAG is able to engage in English, French, Spanish</p> <p><b>Recommendation 4: Facilitate dialogue between indigenous peoples and local communities and GEF Government Focal Points.</b> One of the major hurdles for greater engagement of indigenous peoples in GEF projects is acceptance by national governments in some of the countries that GEF operates. The GEF through its relationships with national</p>	<p>considers its role now that the Inclusive Conservation Initiative has been funded and has its own Interim Steering Committee. IPAG will also need to have some significant member turn over which will provide an opportunity to consider improving operations. Some issues remain outside of the Secretariat's ability to control, such as the lack of a CSO Network Steering Committee indigenous representative due to ongoing turn over in membership.</p> <p><u>Monitor application of Minimum Standard 4 and Indigenous Peoples' portfolio:</u> The GEF Portal project taxonomy includes a key word marker for indigenous peoples. This will allow us the GEF to monitor projects that engage with indigenous peoples.</p> <p>As noted in the management response on safeguards more generally - the</p>	<p>Agency performance in implementation of Minimum Standard 5 in updated safeguard policy, as well as effectiveness of the new GEF portal in identifying projects with IPLC involvement as beneficiaries or implementors through the keyword taxonomy system.</p> <p>The GEF IEO is currently evaluating the institutional policies and engagement, including how engagement with civil society including indigenous peoples has been reflected in GEF projects. This decision will be retired when a new Council decision is made on the 2021 Update of the evaluation of the policies in June 2021.</p>	<p>discussions with members scattered across time zones and dealing with the impacts of COVID on indigenous communities. IPAG members participated in multiple TAG groups for GEF-8 and met with the new CEO. Some members put in significant time as part of the ICI Interim Steering Committee. The virtual format of Council meetings meant that IPAG was given the opportunity to speak during Council being recognized as indigenous peoples specifically, which was a positive change. Without being able to meet face-to-face, bringing on new members is difficult. Certain IPAG members have also faced multiple hurricanes, threats to safety, and the loss of many community members during the past year – all of which required urgent attention.</p> <p>To put it mildly, this year has been exceptionally challenging and in-depth discussion of changes has been delayed as a result.</p>	<p>advocacy. The IPAG has earned credibility among those who know it; though its value proposition is not widely known within or beyond the Partnership.</p> <p>The volunteer ethos of the IPAG is valued but insufficiently addressed in: a) the role delineation on the IPAG between the advisors and the indigenous peoples members, b) the reckoning of the time and cost burden on those who are not supported by any institution to participate.</p> <p>With requests on the IPAG increasing, the current membership has ideas on how the impact of the IPAG could be enhanced in the service of supporting implementation of the ESS and Stakeholder Engagement policies.</p> <p>This recommendation has been graduated.</p> <p><b>Recommendation 4: Substantial</b></p>

Ref #	Date of Council Decision	GEF IEO Recommendations	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2020	GEF IEO Rating & Comments in MAR 2020	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2021	GEF IEO Rating & Comments in MAR 2021
		<p>governments can help to increase prominence of indigenous peoples' activities and encourage mainstreaming of IP issues into environmental programming. In this regard, GEF should seek opportunities for a higher profile of indigenous peoples in GEF projects and a higher profile at GEF events such as Extended Constituency Workshops and Council meetings.</p> <p><b>Recommendation 5: Monitor application of Minimum Standard 4 and Indigenous Peoples' portfolio.</b> A greater flow of information should come from tracking the environmental and social risks of the GEF portfolio. Currently there is no requirement that Agencies report on compliance with safeguards, leaving the GEF portfolio vulnerable. Agencies should inform GEF of the safeguard risk</p>	<p>Secretariat initiated an assessment of all 18 GEF Agencies in the spring of 2019, and subsequently presented a report on the Assessment of GEF Agencies' Compliance with Minimum Standards in the Policies on Environmental and Social Safeguards, Gender Equality, and Stakeholder Engagement (GEF/C.57/05) at the 57th Council meeting in December 2019.</p> <p>In all cases where an Agency was assessed not to have met a standard, including its sub-components, Agencies established concrete timebound actions to address the identified gaps.</p> <p>All these Agencies committed themselves to provide updates on the progress on their plans of action to the GEF Secretariat until they have met full compliance with each minimum standard in the three Policies.</p> <p>The Guidelines on the Policy on Environmental and Social</p>		<p><b>Recommendation 5: Substantial</b> The GEF Portal project taxonomy includes a key word marker for indigenous peoples. This will allow us the GEF to monitor projects that engage with indigenous peoples.</p> <p>By October 2020, there are ten Agencies out of 18 that have complied with the GEF Policy on Environmental and Social Safeguards (ESS) (SD/PL/03), while eight Agencies are still in</p>	<p>Agencies are seen as important drivers/intermediaries in the bid to ensure that country governments recognize and engage indigenous peoples. Observations on performance in this regard are mixed but trending positively particularly with Agency readiness to take up FPIC and other provisions under the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP). Key indicators of improvement are Agencies involving indigenous peoples both in program and project design and governance, and in institutional level consultations and meetings.</p> <p>The most frequently mentioned constraints on good implementation are: Agency capacity and/or pre-disposition, national government recognition of indigenous peoples, and the availability of time and budget to engage properly.</p>

Ref #	Date of Council Decision	GEF IEO Recommendations	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2020	GEF IEO Rating & Comments in MAR 2020	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2021	GEF IEO Rating & Comments in MAR 2021
		<p>categorization assigned to projects involving indigenous peoples and keep GEF informed of safeguards implementation issues through monitoring and reporting. Similarly, projects need to be tagged to allow for systematic retrieval. As part of the tagging, further definition within the GEF of what is considered indigenous peoples' engagement should ensue. Finally, GEF could encourage Agencies to use mid-term and terminal evaluation templates that capture indigenous peoples' engagement and results.</p>	<p>Safeguards (SD/GN/03) that were approved by the CEO on December 19 and included in the GEF 57<sup>th</sup> Council meeting as an information document, provide detailed guidance on how to implement the project and program level requirements set out in the Policy, including documentation and reporting throughout the GEF Project Cycle.</p>		<p>progress. The agencies that need to have been working on updating their safeguards. Compliance has been reviewed as part of the larger processes of safeguard compliance review.</p> <p>Following the Guidelines on the Policy on Environmental and Social Safeguards (SD/GN/03), GEF Agencies started providing the GEF Secretariat overall preliminary risk rating for project or program, types of risks and early screening report or preliminary environmental impact assessment summary, disclosing relevant documents, and informing/consulting Stakeholders on information related to environmental and social risk screening or assessment. The GEF Secretariat also started reviewing these submissions as a part of PIFs, PFDs, and CEO Endorsements assessing the availability and completeness of the indicative information regarding ESS risks including application of Minimum Standard 4 and Indigenous People's Portfolio.</p> <p>Based on the review, the GEF Secretariat provided the first</p>	<p><b>Recommendation 5: Substantial</b></p> <p>The IEO acknowledges that Agency reporting on safeguards is now a requirement and the tagging of indigenous peoples related projects has improved. GEF-7, projects are identifiable at PIF and CEO Endorsement Stage with the inclusion of an "indigenous peoples" identifier on a taxonomy sheet that supports the project templates.</p> <p>The reliability of this identifier remains to be established, however. Earlier templates are being used in some GEF-7 project submissions and there are indications that proponents are overlooking the identifier altogether in their submissions. GEF-6 projects that engage indigenous peoples can be identified by the answers to questions about stakeholder engagement in the project templates, but they are not searchable on the GEF Portal data base.</p>

Ref #	Date of Council Decision	GEF IEO Recommendations	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2020	GEF IEO Rating & Comments in MAR 2020	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2021	GEF IEO Rating & Comments in MAR 2021
					<p>annual Progress Report on the Implementation of the GEF Policy on Environmental and Social Safeguards (GEF/C.59/Inf.15) in the GEF 59<sup>th</sup> Council meeting as an information document. In the report, the Secretariat analyzed 128 approved PIFs and PFDs since the Policy on ESS came into effect, including risk types and risk classification of submitted projects and programs. Out of 128 PIFs and PFDs, 40 PIFs and PFDs identified risk related to the Minimum Standard 4, Restrictions on Land Use and Involuntary Resettlement, and 34 PIFs and PFDs identified risk related to Indigenous Peoples. While it is not a requirement of the Policy on ESS, some CEO Endorsements with high/substantial ESS risk mentioned that they will update implementation of their Environmental and Social Management Plans in PIRs. Thus, monitoring of application of Minimum Standard 4 and Indigenous People’s Portfolio is making substantial progress.</p>	<p>IP informants perceive that it is too soon to see a systemic improvement the monitoring of the indigenous peoples portfolio. Regarding Minimum Standard 5, they perceive the processes for collecting, analyzing and aggregating data on the engagement of indigenous peoples as not yet sufficiently in place to meet policy requirements.</p> <p>This recommendation has been graduated.</p>

**A.7 Council decision based on the Program Evaluation of the Special Climate Change Fund (GEF/LDCF.SCCF.22/ME/02)**

Ref #	Date of Council Decision	GEF IEO Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2020	GEF IEO Rating & Comments in MAR 2020	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2021	GEF IEO Rating & Comments in MAR 2021
7	May 25, 2017	<b>Recommendation 1:</b> Reaffirming and strengthening a recommendation from the previous SCCF Program Evaluation in 2011, the GEF Secretariat should prioritize the development of mechanisms that ensure predictable, adequate and sustainable financing for the Fund, given its support for, and focus on innovation	The Secretariat appreciates the findings of the report and notes the recommendation for the SCCF to focus on innovation. Based on the deliberations by the LDCF/SCCF Council and the endorsement of that finding, the GEF Secretariat will continue to articulate and publicly communicate the role of the SCCF externally. The Secretariat agrees with the GEF IEO that enhancing financial predictability	The Council, having reviewed document GEF/LDCF.SCCF.22/ME/02, Program Evaluation of the Special Climate Change Fund and GEF/LDCF.SCCF.22/ME/03, Management Response to the Program Evaluation of the Special Climate Change Fund, takes note of the conclusions of the evaluation and endorses the recommendations taking into account the Management	<b>Substantial: Recommendation 1:</b> As stated in the previous MARs, predictability of financing for the SCCF falls within the purview of the donors to the Fund as well as the LDCF/SCCF Council. The Secretariat systematically provides information on the resource constraints and requests donor support at Council meetings and at donor consultations.  <b>Recommendation 2:</b> SCCF's uniqueness in the climate finance landscape has	<b>Substantial: Recommendation 1:</b> <b>Medium:</b> The Secretariat's efforts to systematically provide information on the resource constraints and requests donor support at Council meetings and at donor consultations are welcome. The IEO encourages the Secretariat to develop a more systematic mechanism.  <b>Recommendation 2:</b>	<b>Recommendation 1: Substantial</b> As stated in the previous MARs, predictability of financing for the SCCF falls within the purview of the donors to the Fund as well as the LDCF/SCCF Council. The Secretariat systematically provides information on the resource constraints and requests donor support at Council meetings and at donor consultations. The Secretariat has also continued to proactively externally communicate innovation and entrepreneurship being advanced by SCCF projects, as well as SCCF complementarity with the GCF. This communication has been carried out by profiling exemplary SCCF projects in articles with leading media outlets, case studies in publications, and arranging SCCF partners to speak in several events about innovation and private sector investment being achieved. Communication on specific SCCF project has been	<b>Recommendation 1: Substantial</b> The Secretariat's efforts to systematically provide information on the resource constraints and requests donor support at Council meetings and at donor consultations and promoting SCCF complementarity with the GCF are welcome. The IEO encourages

Ref #	Date of Council Decision	GEF IEO Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2020	GEF IEO Rating & Comments in MAR 2020	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2021	GEF IEO Rating & Comments in MAR 2021
		<p><b>Recommendation 2:</b> The GEF Secretariat should articulate and publicly communicate the SCCF's niche within the global adaptation finance landscape, to include an explicit statement regarding the SCCF's relation with – and complementarity to – the Green Climate Fund.</p> <p><b>Recommendation 3:</b> The GEF Secretariat</p>	can improve the effectiveness of the SCCF. The Secretariat notes that the means to address this need falls within the purview of the donors of the fund. As part of the overall upgrade of the GEF project management information systems, the Secretariat will also endeavor to correct, verify and update the relevant SCCF project data.		been on supporting innovation and promoting entrepreneurship-based solutions for adaptation as reflected in the new adaptation programming strategy, and complementarity with the GCF is also clarified in the strategy. All the projects that the SCCF has supported in the reporting period focus on areas where the SCCF unique advantages are established: innovation, particularly with private sector engagement; regional/global in nature to support the most vulnerable, such as	<p><b>Substantial:</b> The IEO will track the implementation of the GEF adaptation strategy.</p> <p><b>Recommendation 3: Medium:</b> While the transition to the portal is still underway, the systems in place to ensure that portal data-including project status,</p>	<p>complemented by profiling updated SCCF information on the GEF website, and GEF senior representatives speaking about the impact and innovation being gained through the SCCF in numerous public events organized by and with partners.</p> <p><b>Recommendation 2: High</b> The SCCF has continued to focus its project support in the reporting period on areas where SCCF unique advantages are established: innovation, particularly with private sector engagement; regional and global support, including for SIDS; as well as testing new models for system scale transformation. During this reporting period, several SCCF projects have continued to be supported through the Challenge Programme for Adaptation Innovation, with the objective of testing and modelling innovation and private sector engagement for climate change adaptation. The 29<sup>th</sup> meeting of the LDCCF/SCCF Council</p>	<p>the Secretariat to develop a more systematic mechanism.</p> <p><b>Recommendation 2: Substantial</b> The IEO is assessing the implementation of the GEF adaptation strategy by the SCCF in the ongoing 2021 SCCF</p>



Ref #	Date of Council Decision	GEF IEO Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2020	GEF IEO Rating & Comments in MAR 2020	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2021	GEF IEO Rating & Comments in MAR 2021
		should ensure that PMIS data is up to date and accurate.			<p>SIDS, and for the Challenge Program for Adaptation Innovation.</p> <p><b>Recommendation 3:</b> The GEF project management information system (PMIS) is no longer being updated, as the GEF has transitioned to the Portal. The staff responsible for data management (see comment from MAR 2019) have gone through all the project files on the Portal and the PMIS with a consultant to identify data discrepancies. The information has been shared with ITS World Bank, responsible for the Portal maintenance, so</p>	<p>key dates and financial figures, is continually updated and kept accurate moving forward is not clear.</p> <p>The IEO will continue to track adoption of this decision.</p>	<p>recommended further maximizing the impact potential of the Challenge Program for Adaptation Innovation by opening a second Call for Proposals prior to the end of GEF-7, subject to resource availability.</p> <p><b>Recommendation 3: High</b> The transition of all SCCF project information to the Portal has steadily progressed throughout the reporting period, as is also the case for LDCF and GEF Trust Fund projects. With the introduction of the GEF Portal as a project and program management tool, which is accessed by agencies and GEF Secretariat, as well as OFPs and Council Members, the data collection and analysis has improved significantly. The reporting features have also significantly advanced. For example, the Portal Advanced General Reporting feature enables the automated generation of for tailored reports of information on the full SCCF</p>	<p>program evaluation.</p> <p><b>Recommendation 3: Substantial</b> The transition to the portal has led to improvements in accuracy, though the GEF IEO has found that data accuracy issues</p>

Ref #	Date of Council Decision	GEF IEO Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2020	GEF IEO Rating & Comments in MAR 2020	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2021	GEF IEO Rating & Comments in MAR 2021
					<p>that they can be addressed as the Portal continues to undergo further development. All SCCF project submissions are done on the Portal, similar to the GEF Trust Fund, following same access and updating procedures by the Agencies and the Secretariat. As such, there should not be any new data updating and accuracy issues that would be specific to the SCCF.</p>		<p>project portfolio, which are produced by selecting drop down menus of filters and fields. This feature is built on the Tableau platform and therefore has ability to visually display the information generated in a range of pie charts and graphs. The reporting feature generates reports with all the information of reports produced in PMIS, but with several additional features and functionalities, as well as the ability of all staff being able to directly generate the reports on an as need basis. Examples of additional features and information on SCCF projects captured in the Portal includes entry fields for the updated Safeguards Policy, dates of milestones met through the project review process, and a new budget table.</p>	<p>remain both in historical data migrated to the portal, and in the new data and reports generated automatically based on inputs by Agencies.</p> <p>This recommendation has been graduated.</p>

## A.8 Council decision based on the 2020 Program Evaluation of the Least Developed Countries Fund (GEF/LDCF.SCCF.29/E/01)

Ref #	Date of Council Decision	GEF IEO Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2021	GEF IEO Rating & Comments in MAR 2021
8	December 11, 2020	<p><b>Recommendation 1:</b>  <b>Build on progress made on mainstreaming gender in the LDCF portfolio and aim to decrease the knowledge gap about gender-related results.</b>                      The GEF Secretariat and GEF Agencies should continue to build on progress made since the 2016 LDCF program evaluation towards inclusion of gender considerations by ensuring that the 2017 Gender Equality Policy and related guidance is fully operationalized, including the development and implementation of robust gender action plans. To narrow the knowledge gap, GEF Agencies should fulfill evaluation requirements on gender in terminal evaluations and report on the conduct of gender analysis and monitoring and evaluation of gender equitable participation and benefits in implementation.</p> <p><b>Recommendation 2:</b></p>	<p>The Secretariat welcomes the report's finding that "across the whole LDCF portfolio, gender mainstreaming ratings have clearly improved" and that "the revised gender policy is being applied more consistently and has already supported improvements in the gender ratings of LDCF projects approved during GEF-7". Moving forward in GEF-7, the Secretariat will, as recommended by the IEO, endeavor to continue to build on progress in gender mainstreaming and aim to reduce the knowledge gap on gender-related results.</p> <p>The Secretariat acknowledges IEO's recommendation to continue to enhance the likelihood of sustainability of</p>	<p>The Council, having reviewed documents GEF/LDCF.SCCF.29/E/01, 2020 Program Evaluation of the Least Developed Countries Fund and the Management Response, endorses the following recommendations:</p> <p>(1) Build on progress made on mainstreaming gender in the LDCF portfolio and aim to decrease the knowledge gap about gender-related results.</p> <p>(2) Continue to enhance the likelihood of the sustainability of outcomes.</p>	<p><b>Recommendation 1: Substantial</b>                      All projects approved and endorsed throughout the reporting period have benefited from a robust gender action plan. These projects are also informed by an analysis of key gender issues related to the project context and components, including for example, relevant laws, cultural norms and traditions shaping behaviors and disaggregated information on target beneficiaries. Moreover, GEF Agencies are increasingly fulfilling evaluation requirements and reporting on the conduct of gender analysis and monitoring and evaluation of gender equitable participation and benefits in implementation.</p> <p><b>Recommendation 2: Substantial</b>                      The likelihood of the sustainability of outcomes of LDCF project has continued to be advanced through a set of actions. All LDCF projects continue to be reviewed with a focus on ensuring sustainability of design, with emphasis on the project's unique contextual factors effective sustainability. Additionally, the Secretariat is advancing dialogue with GEF Agencies on good practice</p>	<p><b>Recommendation 1: Medium</b>                      The Secretariat's efforts to mainstream gender in project design and Agencies' increased reporting on gender in terminal evaluations is noted. The IEO will continue to track the implementation of gender mainstreaming and related reporting.</p> <p><b>Recommendation 2: Medium</b>                      The IEO welcomes the actions to advance the likelihood of the sustainability of outcomes of LDCF projects and encourages a</p>

Ref #	Date of Council Decision	GEF IEO Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2021	GEF IEO Rating & Comments in MAR 2021
		<p><b>Continue to enhance the likelihood of the sustainability of outcomes.</b>  The GEF Secretariat and GEF Agencies should continue to carry out relevant actions in project design and implementation as highlighted in the Council document Towards Greater Durability of GEF Investments. This should entail giving more emphasis to the project and context factors identified by this evaluation as affecting the sustainability of outcomes during project design and implementation</p>	<p>outcomes. In this regard, the Secretariat will continue to carry out relevant actions in project design and implementation as highlighted in the Council document Towards Greater Durability of GEF Investments, as recommended by the IEO, and will continue to urge Agencies to emphasize contextual factors affecting sustainability outcomes.</p>		<p>for climate adaptation project design to maximize impact and ensure sustainability of outcomes. This dialogue is benefitting from a set of good practice materials drafted in collaboration with STAP. The Secretariat is also placing increased emphasis is also being placed in the review and approval of projects on policy considerations unique to each country that will affect sustainability of project outcomes.</p>	<p>stronger focus on financial arrangements for post completion. The IEO will continue to track adoption of this decision.</p>

**A.9 Recommendations from the Chemicals and Waste Focal Area Study (GEF/ME/C.52/Inf.03) reported in the Semi Annual Evaluation Report of the GEF IEO May 2017 (GEF/ME/C.52/01/Rev.02)**

Ref #	Date of Council Decision	GEF IEO Recommendation	Management Response	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2021	GEF IEO Rating & Comments in MAR 2021
9	May 25, 2017	<p><b>Recommendation 1: Strategies for scaling up.</b> More attention needs to be paid during project design and implementation to considering strategies for scaling up and particularly financial mechanisms to support private sector engagement and sustainability. The GEF cannot finance the collection and destruction of every ton of legacy POPs, nor cannot it fund the conversion of every industrial facility to cleaner production processes. A more robust theory of change is needed for how the GEF's demonstration activities will catalyze broader action and impact in the CW focal area. This may involve the development of innovative private sector partnerships, economic instruments, and financial models, as envisioned in the GEF-6 CW Focal Area Strategy under Program 1; such efforts deserve continued support in GEF-7. In particular, as the GEF CW portfolio evolves and focus changes, attention should be paid to ensure that remaining</p>	<p>The Secretariat agrees with IEO's recommendation that projects and programs in the chemicals and waste focal area should be designed with clear strategies for scaling up, including – where relevant – enhanced private sector engagement and regulatory reforms. The Secretariat takes note of the need to enhance communication across the GEF Partnership.</p>	<p><b>Recommendation 1: High</b> The GEF 7 programming directions for chemicals and waste is framed within the major sectors in which chemicals and waste relevant to the GEF are used, produced, and emitted. This structure allows for better alignment with the private sector which is key to having long lasting impact regarding the elimination of existing chemicals and waste and preventing future build up. The design of projects and programs are required at a minimum to incorporate a pathway to ensure sustainability of activities through interventions aimed at changing the behavior of the public and private sector. One example of this in programming is the GEF Implementing Sustainable And Non-chemical Development in SIDS (ISLANDS) program, which is a program covering 30 SIDS. The intervention is designed to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Strengthen the enabling environment to manage chemicals waste by taking best practices from the SIDS and designing regionally harmonized approaches so that trade, management and overall management of chemicals and waste can be implemented. The regulatory and policy frameworks are also strengthened to be able to future proof introduction of other harmful chemicals.</li> <li>2) Eliminate existing waste and stockpiles of chemicals as well as put in place systems, including engagement with the private sector,</li> </ol>	<p><b>Recommendations 1 and 2: Substantial</b> The GEF-7 programming directions highlights the alignment with the private sector. The artisanal gold mining program for example demonstrates alignment with the private sector through the entire value chain, as well as explores innovative financing models in design. Implementation activities and mid-term reviews will shed light on the success of these strategies and activities.</p>

Ref #	Date of Council Decision	GEF IEO Recommendation	Management Response	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2021	GEF IEO Rating & Comments in MAR 2021
		<p>legacy POPs are not orphaned, especially given that cost, ownership, and other barriers are diminishing the efficacy of the demonstration effect for these projects. Different solutions will likely be required for LDCs and SIDS versus middle income countries.</p> <p><b>Recommendation 2: Communications among the GEF partnership organizations is an area for continued attention.</b> Given an evolving and expanding landscape of opportunities, it is important that all aspects of communication are transparent and collaborative and that country perspectives drive the process. To facilitate the process, a more structured set of partnership planning meetings that fosters ongoing dialogue on resource availability over the replenishment period, focus or priority among strategic objectives and program areas, and transparency of the project pipeline process would be helpful in reducing pockets of confusion.</p>		<p>through development of SMEs in the chemicals and waste management sector to over time eliminate all harmful chemicals contained within the territories of SIDS.</p> <p>3) Put in place systems to reverse the supply chains of products that would need to enter such as electronics so that these products can be used and at end of life be returned for recycling, recapture of materials and disposal of harmful components.</p> <p>Another example in programming is the Global Opportunities for the Long-term Development + (GOLD+) program which designs in interventions to support formalization, access to finance and markets and to technology and global best practice in the sector.</p> <p>Overall the portfolio is responding to this recommendation.</p> <p><b>Recommendation 2 – Substantial.</b> The chemicals and waste team meet regularly and routinely with the chemicals and waste task force as well as provide upstream comments on projects and programs to ensure alignment with the expectations of the Conventions and the programming directions. Some agencies have been more nimble at adapting to the GEF 7 programming directions and work is ongoing to have all agencies working at the highest level.</p>	

**A.10 Recommendations from the Evaluation of Gender Mainstreaming in the GEF (GEF/ME/C.52/Inf.09) reported in Semi Annual Evaluation Report of the GEF IEO May 2017 (GEF/ME/C.52/01/Rev.02)**

Ref #	Date of Council Decision	GEF IEO Recommendation	Management Response	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2021	GEF IEO Rating & Comments in MAR 2021
10	May 25, 2017	<p><b>Recommendation 1:</b>  <b>The GEF Secretariat should consider a revision of its policy to better align with best practice standards.</b> As a financial mechanism for five major international environmental conventions and a partnership of 18 agencies, this should include anchoring the policy in the gender-related decisions of the conventions and best practice standards from the GEF Agencies. In the revisions of the policy, the GEF Secretariat should take into account that policies rooted in rights-based frameworks result in more effective gender mainstreaming. Given the effectiveness of the GEF Gender Partnership, the GEF Secretariat should consider the partnership as the vehicle for stakeholder engagement in the updating of its policy. Lastly, the policy should provide greater guidance on gender analysis, and on the responsibilities of the GEF Agencies vis-à-vis the GEF Secretariat.</p> <p><b>Recommendation 2:</b>  <b>The GEF Secretariat with its partners should develop an action plan for implementation of the gender policy in</b></p>	<p>The Secretariat agrees broadly with IEO's conclusions and recommendations. It has recently initiated a process to review and revise its current Policy by the end of 2017, and it welcomes IEO's input into this process. In Particular, it agrees that an updated Policy on gender should introduce clearer requirements, particularly with respect to gender analysis, and should clarify the expected roles and responsibilities of the Agencies and the Secretariat.</p>	<p><b>Recommendation 1: High</b>  The Policy on Gender Equality, developed in close consultation with GEF Agencies and the GEF Gender Partnership, placed the GEF approach to gender mainstreaming on par with international best practices and provided concrete policy requirements to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Shift GEF's approach from a gender-aware, "do no harm" approach to a gender-responsive, "do good" approach by requiring improved standards in the design, implementation and evaluation of GEF activities, and introducing measures to allow GEF, over time, to better leverage strategic opportunities to address gender gaps critical to the achievement of global environmental benefits.</li> <li>▪ Improve reporting on results by requiring project- and program-level monitoring and reporting on gender by Agencies, and portfolio-level monitoring and reporting on performance and results by the GEF Secretariat.</li> </ul> <p><b>Recommendation 2: High</b>  The Gender Implementation Strategy, developed in close consultation with GEF Agencies and the GEF Gender Partnership, provided strategic entry points to address gender in GEF-7 and a plan of action to guide GEF's efforts to support the effective implementation of the Policy. In addition, the GEF Secretariat, also in close collaboration with the GEF Agencies and the GEF Gender Partnership, developed guidelines, organized around the GEF project cycle, that provide details on key steps and practical actions to help</p>	<p><b>Recommendation 1: High</b>  The Secretariat has developed a revised policy on gender that aligns with best practices.</p> <p>This recommendation has been graduated.</p> <p><b>Recommendation 2: High</b>  The Secretariat has developed an action plan with its partners for implementation of the gender policy in GEF-7.</p> <p>This recommendation has been graduated.</p>

Ref #	Date of Council Decision	GEF IEO Recommendation	Management Response	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2021	GEF IEO Rating & Comments in MAR 2021
		<p><b>GEF-7.</b> An appropriate gender action plan should support the implementation of the potentially revised policy on Gender Mainstreaming, and should include continued focus on developing and finalizing comprehensive guidelines, tools and methods. This should be done in collaboration with the GEF Gender Partnership, drawing on the knowledge and best practice standards of GEF Agencies, other climate funds, the secretariats of relevant conventions and other partners. Upstream analytical work on the associated links between gender equality and project performance across GEF programmatic areas would support mainstreaming.</p> <p><b>Recommendation 3:</b>  <b>To achieve the objectives of institutional strengthening and gender mainstreaming the GEF Secretariat should ensure that adequate resources are made available.</b> During GEF-7 institutional capacity within the Secretariat and its staff on gender mainstreaming will need strengthening, and resources within the agencies which have strong institutional gender focus and expertise should be leveraged.</p>		<p>Agencies and partners meeting the principles and requirements set out in the Policy. In collaboration with the GEF Gender Partnership, the guidance document continues to be actively promoted, among others, during Agencies Retreats, Secretariat meetings, GEF Introduction Seminars, and Extended Constituency Workshops (ECWs). Moreover, advancements have been made to improve project review process, including GEF Project templates, supporting the Secretariat ability to assess whether projects responds to the principles and requirements set out in the Policy as well as prompting early and meaningful considerations of gender in GEF projects and programs by all Agencies. In addition, the Secretariat has been providing annual updates to the Council on the progress on the indicators outlined in the GEF-7 Results Framework on Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment (GEWE), as well as activities described in the Implementation Strategy.</p> <p><b>Recommendation 3: Substantial</b>  GEF hired a Senior Gender Specialist and established a dedicated workstream to lead GEF’s work on gender and social issues, led by the specialist with support from other GEF staff. Apart from the development of the new Policy, Implementation Strategy and Guidelines, internal capacity building events, as well as tools and checklists for GEF Agencies and GEF staff and countries have been developed and disseminated. The Secretariat developed in collaboration with the GEF SGP and the GEF Gender Partnership an Open Online Course on Gender and Environment that is supporting capacity development across the GEF partnership and beyond.</p>	<p><b>Recommendation 3: Substantial</b>  The Secretariat should continue building institutional capacity on gender mainstreaming and ensure that adequate resources are made available.</p> <p>This decision will be retired as a new Council decision will be made on the Evaluation of Institutional Policies and Engagement at the GEF in December 2021.</p>



**A.11 Recommendations from the Impact of GEF Support on National Environment Laws and Policies (GEF/ME/C.52/Inf.05) reported in Semi Annual Evaluation Report of the GEF IEO May 2017 (GEF/ME/C.52/01/Rev.02)**

Ref #	Date of Council Decision	GEF IEO Recommendation	Management Response	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2021	GEF IEO Rating & Comments in MAR 2021
11	May 25, 2017	<p><b>Recommendation 1: Strengthen plans for legal and policy reforms presented in project documents.</b> GEF plays a very important role in the environmental policy and regulatory reform agenda in client countries. When reforms are contemplated, GEF should ensure that project documents clearly differentiate among policies, statutes, regulations, and administrative directives. If a specific environmental law is identified, the document should describe how it fits into the government’s legislative/regulatory agenda with specific details on the extent of support from key stakeholders, including government officials, parties directly affected, and the general population.</p> <p><b>Recommendation 2: Develop and implement projects or specific program</b></p>	<p>With respect to the recommendation that the GEF should “develop and implement projects or specific program components that focus solely on legal and/or policy reforms [rather] than embedding work on legal reforms in a component of a project”, experience suggests that approaches and delivery mechanisms should be carefully tailored to each context. Whereas targeted investments in legal and/ or policy reforms may be effective in certain circumstances, the Secretariat sees policy, legal and regulatory reforms as part of a broader toolkit of</p>	<p><b>Recommendation 1: Substantial</b></p> <p>The GEF project portfolio continues to make progress in this area with most of the projects reviewed identifying the types of reforms to be undertaken- i.e. policies or legislation or regulations. In most cases these are also named, such as ID 9551- Protected Areas in South Sudan where Output 1.1.2 refers to Legislation, regulations and policies on wildlife and protected areas are developed, reviewed, updated, endorsed and enforced (e.g., Wildlife Act, Wildlife Policy, Tourism Policy, etc.); ID 10724- LDN in Argentina where Output 1.1.1 Proposed Bill on Minimum LDN standards drafted from a landscape perspective; ID 9451 Caribbean Oceanscape where Component 1 refers to the development of national ocean policies; and ID 10402- Scaling up investment in energy efficiency in buildings where Component 1 refers to amendments to the draft National Energy Efficiency Action Plan and Secondary legislation of the Law on Efficient Use of Energy Resources. For some of the CW projects, such as ID 9263- Sound management of POPs in Cote d'Ivoire, the differentiation within the regulatory framework is to be further clarified as part of the early project activities.</p> <p>The GEF continues to request that project documents indicate alignment of projects with national priorities. All of the projects reviewed indicated alignment with the existing national policy and regulatory frameworks related to the areas of intervention.</p> <p>Under the Stakeholder Engagement Policy and Guidelines, projects documents are required to include the stakeholders to be engaged and their role in project implementation. The stakeholders including their categories and their roles in relation to project implementation</p>	<p><b>Recommendation 1: Substantial</b></p> <p>There has been good progress on this front, but will need greater consistency across projects to better assess lessons from experience as well as GEF’s strengths and challenges in this area.</p>

Ref #	Date of Council Decision	GEF IEO Recommendation	Management Response	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2021	GEF IEO Rating & Comments in MAR 2021
		<p><b>components that focus solely on legal and/or policy reforms.</b> Rather than embedding work on legal reforms in a component of a project, GEF should consider structuring some entire projects around advancing a specific set of legal reforms, particularly in countries with limited institutional capacity. This should focus on putting laws in place that are needed to meet goals defined in international conventions for which GEF serves as the designated financing mechanism. As GEF seeks to achieve more transformational change through its programmatic approaches, and mainstream private sector engagement, the role of policy reform will become even more important.</p> <p><b>Recommendation 3: Improve M&amp;E and learning from the reform process.</b> GEF should consider modifying the PMIS to enable projects components that deal with legal reforms to be identified and tracked</p>	<p>intervention models that are often best applied in combination rather than in isolation of each other.</p>	<p>and the legal/policy components have been well described in the projects reviewed.</p> <p><b>Recommendation 2: Medium</b> For most focal areas (LD, BD, IW, CW), none of the projects reviewed focused solely on policy or legal reform, but rather included these reforms as a Component. This confirms the practice across the GEF portfolio, that the country context in most cases requires additional and complementary activities. The IEO Report from May 2017 also states that 'legal reforms are often necessary, particularly in transforming markets, but not always sufficient to achieve aims, and require complementary efforts in institutional strengthening and enforcement' (see Conclusion 3).</p> <p>Within the CCM focal area, a couple of the reviewed projects focused solely on policy/legal aspects, such as ID 9652- Costa Rica's Integrated Reporting and Transparency System and ID 9966- Integrated Reporting and Transparency System in Bosnia-Herzegovina. These projects are designed to develop the countries' capacities to meet the requirements of the transparency framework under the Paris Agreement, rather than proposing new environmental laws.</p> <p>A CW project that has been highlighted by STAP (during CM59) as a particularly good example to promote circular economy is ID 10683 - Promotion of circular economy in the textile and garment sector in Ethiopia, which includes under Component 1 a review of the relevant existing laws and regulations to propose a revised legal framework. This legal reform is applied in combination with other approaches, such as financing mechanisms and business models for circular economy, and investments for implementation of specific options in two facilities in the country.</p> <p>Of note with one of the IW projects reviewed (ID 10193- Ma and Neun/Ca Transboundary River Basins-Viet Nam, Lao PDR), is the</p>	<p><b>Recommendation 2: Medium</b> Given the GEF's comparative advantage in policy and regulatory reform, coupled with the need to encourage greater private sector investment, will require additional focus in this area. Upstream work in policies will pave the way for higher more investments and private sector participation as well as support policy coherence efforts.</p>

Ref #	Date of Council Decision	GEF IEO Recommendation	Management Response	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2021	GEF IEO Rating & Comments in MAR 2021
		<p>in the system. Evaluations should be more rigorous, including an assessment of project activities undertaken to advance legal reforms, resulting changes in the content and wording of laws, and the extent to which laws achieved stated aims. Thus, follow up on implementation should be carried out two to three years after project closure to assess the impacts and document lessons learned.</p>		<p>focus of the interventions to lay the groundwork that may be required for legal reform through subsequent projects. This project applied the Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis – Strategic Action Program (TDA-SAP) methodology which is applied to many projects in the IW portfolio. This point can also be applied across the portfolio where there may be projects that are engaging in baseline activities to then inform policy/legal reform in follow up projects.</p> <p>The GEF continues to require all project submissions to indicate alignment with country commitments under all related Conventions. For the projects reviewed, all responded to the country's commitments under the relevant international conventions.</p> <p><b>Recommendation 3: Substantial</b>  Progress has been made in this area. Specifically, 2 of 5 focal areas have dedicated Core Indicators (IW-7.2;7.3, CW-9.4;10.1) that speak directly to policy/legal reform and 1 focal area (BD) with indicators (1.1, 1.2) which do so indirectly, as they cover interventions that typically require legal reform. The portal allows projects reporting on this indicator to be identified and for progress against these indicators to be tracked at PIR, MTR and TE stages. Additionally, the LDFA has a GEF-7 Programming Objective (2-5-Create enabling environments to support scaling up and mainstreaming of SLM and LDN) which also allows for policy/legal reform and consequently for projects to be identified and tracked.</p> <p>For most of the projects reviewed (GEF 6 &amp; GEF-7), it is too early to report on the robustness of the evaluations. However three examples of projects reviewed did report on progress against legal and policy reform in their PIRs with varying levels of detail - ID 9664-ASL in Brazil; ID 9556- TRI-Kenya; ID 9263- Sound management of POPs in Cote d'Ivoire; and one reported in their MTR -ID 9451- Caribbean Regional Oceanscape Project.</p>	<p><b>Recommendation 3: Medium</b>  Within the framework of the GEF core indicators. The sub indicators (IW-7.2;7.3, CW-9.4;10.1). It is too early to assess progress in implementation and rigorous evaluation of contributions in this area. The IEO will continue to track progress.</p>

Ref #	Date of Council Decision	GEF IEO Recommendation	Management Response	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2021	GEF IEO Rating & Comments in MAR 2021
				<p>The Implementation module of the portal now has a KM section that enables agencies to upload lessons learned, good practice and provide access to knowledge products that emerge during project implementation. Additionally, some projects contain components that could facilitate future follow on implementation. As an example, the difficulty to find the data needed to assess the effectiveness of legislation or regulations was emphasized in the IEO report from May 2017 (see Conclusion 7). Projects contributing to improved frameworks, monitoring and knowledge management could help in overcoming such issues.</p>	

**A.12 Recommendations from the Evaluation of Programmatic Approaches in the GEF (GEF/ME/C.52/Inf.01/Rev.01) reported in Semi Annual Evaluation Report of the GEF IEO May 2017 (GEF/ME/C.52/01/Rev.02)**

Ref #	Date of Council Decision	GEF IEO Recommendation	Management Response	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2021	GEF IEO Rating & Comments in MAR 2021
12	May 25, 2017	<p><b>Recommendation 1: M&amp;E should be implemented at the program levels, with a clear demonstration of the additionality of the program over projects.</b></p> <p>Program additionality over a set of projects needs to be demonstrated through a well-developed program theory of change, as well as through better information sharing on programs to enhance program monitoring, midterm reviews and terminal evaluations, which are currently largely absent. Importantly, the four M&amp;E Minimum Requirements in the current GEF M&amp;E Policy (2010) already apply to both projects and programs. As programs become even more prominent in the future, the GEF Secretariat should endeavor to strengthen RBM and monitoring to better capture program results over and above the aggregation of project level results.</p>	<p>The evaluation finds that child projects under programmatic approaches outperformed stand-alone projects that are not part of programs, leading to the recommendation that the GEF should continue with appropriate programmatic interventions. The Secretariat agrees with the conclusion and recommendation. Programmatic approaches represent a growing share of GEF financing, and – looking forward – programs could serve as a major delivery mechanism in GEF-7.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the relative effectiveness of programs, IEO cautions that the multidimensional nature of programs has generated a greater need for coordination and management, with implications for efficiency, results and performance, and recommends that these issues be carefully addressed in the design and implementation of future programs. The Secretariat finds IEO’s recommendation very timely. It sees an urgent need for the GEF to focus its resources on investments that address the drivers of environmental degradation and harness multi-stakeholder partnerships, and agrees that such efforts should be informed by lessons from past, multi-dimensional programs. Indeed, as recognized in the evaluation, recent programs – including the GEF-6 IAPs – have seen greater investment in coordination, communication and knowledge management through dedicated global and regional platforms.</p>	<p><b>Recommendation 1: Substantial</b></p> <p>The GEF recognizes the crucial need to strengthen coordination, communication, knowledge, monitoring and learning as key functions for delivering programs. Building on progress made with IAP programs and emerging lessons from the design and implementation phases, these functions have been reinforced for the GEF-7 Impact Programs. As a result, there is now greater emphasis on a governance mechanism that facilitates engagement between global and country “child projects,” which includes all agencies and executing entities. Such mechanism also facilitates multi-stakeholder dialogues, which has been a subject of recent analytical work by STAP, including a technical workshop to assess state of knowledge and best practices. Eventually, we envision that use of common standards and frameworks across programs will ensure coherence and consistency in monitoring and reporting. Furthermore, the global child project will add value by also creating links to initiatives and entities that are external to the program, crowding in knowledge, expertise, and innovations to support countries. These efforts will ultimately ensure that the “whole” of the program is greater than “sum of the parts.”</p>	<p><b>Recommendation 1: Medium</b></p> <p>GEF IEO acknowledges the good progress made thus far and the plans to adopt common monitoring and reporting standards across programs. While sharing of knowledge through the hub project is a step in the right direction towards demonstrating program additionality, more needs to be done in terms of strengthening RBM and monitoring to better capture program results over and above the simple aggregation of project level results.</p>

**A.13 Recommendations from the Land Degradation Focal Area Study (GEF/ME/C.52/Inf.02) reported in Semi Annual Evaluation Report of the GEF IEO May 2017 (GEF/ME/C.52/01/Rev.02)**

Ref #	Date of Council Decision	GEF IEO Recommendation	Management Response	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2021	GEF IEO Rating & Comments in MAR 2021
13	May 25, 2017	<p><b>Recommendation 1:</b> <b>Implementing LDN with an appropriate mix of interventions.</b> While being cognizant of cost-effectiveness, context, and country priorities, LDFA should also consider restoration activities along with SLM. SLM practices are intended to help avoid and reduce land degradation while ecosystem restoration will help reverse the process. Newer projects in GEF-6 increasingly focus on achieving LDN targets and therefore would benefit from distinguishing between the two complementary pathways—SLM, and ecosystem restoration, to be able to measure progress toward the LDN targets.</p> <p><b>Recommendation 2:</b> <b>Give due consideration to complex contextual factors within an integrated approach framework.</b> While LDFA’s strategic focus has appropriately moved toward integrated approaches, complex contextual factors including drought, food insecurity and migration should be given due consideration during project design. The LDFA is highly relevant to areas with land degradation, including Africa, particularly with its distressed</p>	<p>The Secretariat agrees with IEO’s recommendations, many of which reflect recent trends in GEF-6 as well as proposed programming directions for GEF-7. The study underscores the growing need to consider complex contextual factors, such as drought, food insecurity and migration, and the importance of identifying and addressing climate-related risks. The recommendation is clearly relevant beyond the land degradation focal area alone. Indeed, the Secretariat’s strategy for GEF-7 proposes additional measures to address the linkages between security and the environment, and</p>	<p><b>Recommendation 1: High</b> The LDFA portfolio consists of an appropriate mix of interventions along the LDN response hierarchy: avoid – reduce – reverse. Specifically, restoration interventions have been increasingly incorporated in project design and implementation in GEF-7 projects, with restoration targets in GEF-7 exceeding 100% as per GEF core indicator 3. Further responding to the IEO recommendation, the GEF-8 LDFA strategy will remain fully aligned with the LDN concept and include dedicated focal area objectives on both SLM and restoration of agro-ecosystems.</p> <p><b>Recommendation 2: Substantial</b> The LDFA strategy has more recently moved towards considering and addressing complex contextual factors, within its mandate to generate global environmental benefits. Within the framework of the Sustainable Dryland Landscapes Impact Program, which has been designed by FAO as the lead agency and with UNCCD as a major stakeholder and partner, complex thematic issues such as drought, land tenure, and gender are being addressed. Factors of food insecurity and migration also play a role in the implementation of the GEF-6 IAP on</p>	<p><b>Recommendation 1: High</b> The IEO acknowledges the change in the LDFA portfolio with an appropriate mix of interventions along the LDN response hierarchy. The increasing focus on restoration is also acknowledged.</p> <p>This recommendation has been graduated.</p> <p><b>Recommendation 2: Substantial</b> The inclusion of contextual factors such as land tenure, migration and gender in the GEF 7 strategy and at the project level is duly acknowledged. The IEO will track the outcome as the portfolio matures.</p>

Ref #	Date of Council Decision	GEF IEO Recommendation	Management Response	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2021	GEF IEO Rating & Comments in MAR 2021
		<p>emigration hotspots. While neither land degradation nor drought are the primary drivers, they increase food insecurity and vulnerability and therefore may exacerbate the risk of conflict or migration.</p> <p><b>Recommendation 3:</b> <b>Assess climate risks to LDFA initiatives and design adaptive management responses to such risks.</b> Unsustainable land management practices which the GEF LDFA strategies aim to ameliorate, have a direct and clear linkage to climate change. The effects of climate change are likely to affect many land-based activities including ecosystem functions and services. Broader application of the RAPTA framework is encouraged.</p> <p><b>Recommendation 4:</b> <b>Strengthen M&amp;E tools, and methods of knowledge dissemination.</b> The development and continued improvement of the tracking tool is a step in the right direction but will be inadequate to assess project impacts in the long run. The tracking tools should include additional biophysical indicators, increasingly available through geospatial data, to set baselines and measure progress of land productivity to track both GEB's and LDN targets. Precise geospatial</p>	<p>to systematically identify and mitigate climate and disaster risks across all GEF-financed projects and programs.</p>	<p>Food Security and the Great Green Wall Initiative, which are programs that are closely related to the LDFA agenda. Within the context of UNCCD Enabling activities, GEF-7 is supporting the planning and implementation of National Drought Plans (NDPs).</p> <p><b>Recommendation 3: Substantial</b> A climate change risk screening including mitigation measures is increasingly incorporated in all PIF submissions across focal areas and has also become a best practice approach for all relevant LDFA projects. While some elements of the RAPTA framework are included in the climate change risk screening, the approach has been simplified in line with recent STAP guidance on climate change risk screening.</p> <p><b>Recommendation 4: Substantial</b> LDFA tracking tools as the main M&amp;E tool were fully incorporated in the GEF-7 core indicator architecture. The core indicators track progress towards results in an integrated way across focal areas for main GEBs in a more stringent but simplified way. UNCCD LDN framework indicators are incorporated as relevant for measuring GEBs. By measuring the same core indicators over several replenishment periods, SLM and restoration indicators can be tracked over longer time frames. Precise geospatial information has become a requirement for all project submission and is recorded and</p>	<p><b>Recommendation 3: Substantial</b> The IEO notes the effort to systematically mainstream climate risk assessment in all the relevant GEF projects. It also acknowledges the increasing focus on this topic based on STAP's updated guidance.</p> <p>This recommendation has been graduated.</p> <p><b>Recommendation 4: Medium</b> The IEO acknowledges the improvement in M&amp;E in the GEF 7 result architecture, but the core indicators and their sub-indicators seem inadequate to capture multiple dimensions of land degradation issues. Also, the indicators need to match their definitions. For instance, the core indicator "area restored" doesn't align with its definition, clearly stating that it is land under restoration. The evaluation pointed out that ecosystem restoration</p>

Ref #	Date of Council Decision	GEF IEO Recommendation	Management Response	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2021	GEF IEO Rating & Comments in MAR 2021
		<p>information on project locations is imperative for carrying out accurate M&amp;E of LD projects. The LDFA should consider integrating the indicators proposed by the UNCCD's Land Degradation Neutrality (LDN) framework. The benefits and impacts of sustained SLM practices and restoration measures are not fully accounted for in the current M&amp;E system. Recognition therefore should be given to the fact that it might be necessary to set a sufficiently longer time frame in monitoring projects striving to achieve LDN.</p>		<p>documented in the portal in a structured manner. Improved methods for knowledge dissemination are being increasingly applied and progress has been made in the context of developing of Trends.Earth (formerly the Land Degradation Monitoring Toolbox), which is a GEF-supported platform developed by Conservation International for monitoring land change using earth observations in an innovative desktop and cloud-based system.</p>	<p>takes time, so the wording can be clarified moving forward.</p> <p>The IEO also supports the development of digital tools such as Trends.Earth together with great leaps in collection of geospatial data. However, ambiguity remains regarding the collection of location information.</p>



**A.14 Recommendations from the Review of Results-Based Management in the GEF (GEF/ME/C.52/Inf.07) reported in Semi Annual Evaluation Report of the GEF IEO May 2017 (GEF/ME/C.52/01/Rev.02)**

Ref #	Date of Council Decision	GEF IEO Recommendation	Management Response	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2021	GEF IEO Rating & Comments in MAR 2021
14	May 25, 2017	<p><b>Recommendation 1: Update the GEF RBM Framework.</b> The GEF RBM framework of 2007 needs to be updated to reflect the evolved understanding of RBM across the GEF Partnership. During GEF-6, the focus has been on inputs, outputs and in some cases outcomes of GEF activities. The updated framework needs to address the indicators for drivers of environmental degradation and long term impacts of GEF activities so that these are also tracked systematically. GEF should also incorporate the relevant SDG indicators in its results framework for GEF-7 (and beyond).</p> <p><b>Recommendation 2: Upgrade the PMIS to facilitate reporting on achievement of targets.</b> Reporting on results also needs to give adequate attention to past results. Given that GEF-4 and GEF-5 Programming Directions</p>	<p>The Secretariat appreciates IEO’s review of results-based management (RBM), which comes at an important time for the GEF Partnership. As recognized in the review, RBM has been a key area for internal reform in GEF-6, and further work is required to put in place an effective, fit-for-purpose results architecture for GEF-7. Accordingly, the Secretariat agrees broadly with IEO’s recommendations and is in the process of addressing many of these.</p> <p>With respect to the recommendation to “incorporate the relevant SDG</p>	<p><b>Recommendation 1: High</b> The GEF updated its results architecture at the close of the GEF-7 Replenishment in alignment with the adopted programming directions which adopt a sharper focus on the drivers of environmental degradation and promote integration. It consists of eleven core indicators and associated sub-indicators that span all five focal areas. The core indicators have been developed by the Secretariat in close consultation and collaboration with Agencies and other stakeholders, and incorporating input from Participants and Observers in the GEF-7 process. This streamlined results framework reduces the monitoring and reporting burden at the project and program levels, starting for projects approved in GEF-6. In particular, the core indicators have been designed with the following objectives in mind: Greater focus on the most relevant outcomes; Stronger incentives, reduced transaction costs to capture, monitor and report multiple benefits; Clarity of definitions and methodologies, Appropriate disaggregation to support analytical needs and accountability to multi-lateral environmental agreements. Separately, the GEF reports to the OECD on the share of its funding supporting SDGs. Related documents include: GEF/C.54/11/Rev.02, ME/GN/02, GEF/C.59/03/Rev.01.</p> <p><b>Recommendation 2: High</b> The GEF Portal includes a results management information system, improving the way the GEF tracks</p>	<p><b>Recommendation 1: Medium</b> The GEF updated its results architecture for GEF-7 in June 2018. The indicators that the Agencies are required to track are fewer as most tracking tools have been dropped and corporate indicators – now referred to as core indicators – have been strengthened with inclusion of sub-core indicators. However, the updated framework does not advance tracking of drivers of environmental degradation and long-term impacts. These also do not cover the transformative and systemic changes that the integrated approach programs are aimed at.</p> <p><b>Recommendation 2: Substantial</b></p>

Ref #	Date of Council Decision	GEF IEO Recommendation	Management Response	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2021	GEF IEO Rating & Comments in MAR 2021
		<p>documents had specified targets for those replenishment periods, there is a case for reporting on the actual achievement of these targets. It may be the case that past gaps in the submission of tracking tools, availability of tracking tool data, and data quality, is a constraint. Therefore, it is imperative that measures are put in place to ensure that these bottlenecks</p> <p><b>Recommendation 3: Address the shortcomings of the focal area tracking tools.</b> GEF needs to rethink the approach to tracking tools for the biodiversity and multiple focal area projects. Although streamlining of the biodiversity tracking tools may be challenging, GEF may consider alternatives such as tracking changes in the protected areas through GIS and remote sensing based tools, coupled with targeted learning missions. Streamlining of the approach to tracking results of the multifocal projects was recommended by OPS-5 and by the GEF-6 Policy Recommendations. However,</p>	<p>indicators in its results framework for GEF-7”, the Secretariat agrees that a future results framework should make explicit any linkages to relevant goals, targets and indicators under Agenda 2030. At the same time, the SDG indicators are often designed to be tracked at the national level and may therefore not be directly applicable to GEF projects and programs.</p>	<p>its contribution to delivering global environment benefits. This integrated IT platform allows the GEF to track results from project approval to project completion. This is a significant departure from the past. Up until the Portal, the GEF had operated without a central repository on project results. Project results were captured across multiples documents, stored on staff laptops and custom spreadsheets. This made it much more difficult to track the impact of single projects. It also made it more difficult to establish a comprehensive assessment of the GEF impact. This has all changed with the Portal roll out and full implementation. It provides Agencies with a simple and user-friendly environment in which they can report on project implementation and results. It also offers a central and easily accessible repository of project information, from project inception to project completion. This puts the GEF in a position to report consolidated results not only on completed projects but also on its on-going ones, overall improving the quality and integrity of data. In alignment with the GEF-7 Results Architecture, GEF-7 and GEF-6 projects enter results data directly in Portal fields, whereas projects from earlier phases continue to follow previous results requirements and submit results data as attachments.</p> <p><b>Recommendation 3: High</b> Starting in GEF-7 the GEF has streamlined its results reporting at the project and portfolio level through a set of 11 Core Indicators that are designed to capture outcome and output level results across focal areas in an integrated manner. Each of the key GEF programming priorities include at least one indicator.</p>	<p>GEF moved to a new Portal in July 2018. The Portal facilitates entry of data on project results in a timely and consistent manner. Reporting on actual target achievement for past periods – GEF-4, and GEF-5 – is possible now. However, this has not been undertaken yet as it would have required additional work to capture data from terminal evaluations and tracking tools. The Portal will facilitate reporting on actual results for projects approved from GEF-6 onwards.</p> <p><b>Recommendation 3: High</b> The GEF has streamlined its approach to results reporting at the project level. It has reduced the number of indicators that are tracked at the corporate level substantially. It had also strengthened its guidance on the</p>

Ref #	Date of Council Decision	GEF IEO Recommendation	Management Response	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2021	GEF IEO Rating & Comments in MAR 2021
		no direct progress has been made on this front. Given that multifocal projects have emerged as an important modality, the burden for tracking of the results needs to be rationalized.		Tracking tools are no longer used except for GEF-5 and earlier projects reporting their achieved results in mid-term reviews and terminal evaluations. The Protected Area Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool (METT) is used to demonstrate progress under sub-indicators 1.2. and 2.2. Each new project provides the WDPA ID of the protected areas it plans on covering. This allows to track over time where GEF-financed project sites are located. This comes as a complement to the opportunity provided to Agencies to provide the geonames, geographic coordinates and maps as part of the project submission.	<p>indicators that are tracked, and improved quality of data through automated validation of data entry through the Portal. The Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool of the biodiversity area is still in use but for good reasons: to cover protected areas and to contribute to the global datasets on this issue. Indeed the streamlining of the GEF approach to results reporting has reduced the burden on Agencies and is contributing to improved data on results.</p> <p>This recommendation has been graduated.</p>

**A.15 Recommendations from the Climate Change Focal Area Study (GEF/ME/C.53/Inf.02) reported in the Semi Annual Evaluation Report of the GEF IEO November 2017 (GEF/ME/C.53/01)**

Ref #	Date of Council Decision	GEF IEO Recommendation	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2021	GEF IEO Rating & Comments in MAR 2021
15	Nov 30, 2017	<p><b>Recommendation 1:</b>  <b>The GEF Secretariat should take measures to ensure reporting against GEB targets.</b>            To understand what past results have been achieved, the GEF Secretariat and the Agencies should ensure post-completion reporting against GEB targets, specifically GHG emissions mitigated.</p>	<p><b>Recommendation 1: High</b>            The updated GEF-7 results architecture represents a continuous improvement of the GEF's results practice. The improvements introduced in GEF-7 include the adoption of a set of 11 core indicators. Indicator 6 tracks "greenhouse gas emissions mitigated", expressed in metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent. With the introduction of the GEF Portal as a project and program management tool, which is accessed by agencies and GEF Secretariat, as well as OFPs and Council Members, the data collection and analysis has improved significantly with regards to the tracking of the climate mitigation results against the GEF corporate targets.</p> <p>More specifically, Agencies have to include an estimation of the emission reduction potential of the proposed project/program when they first submit a proposal as PIF /PFD to the GEF Portal. The GEFSEC climate change focal area team assesses that the estimate is reasonable and follows GEF methodologies for the estimation of GHG emission reductions and/or generally recognized carbon accounting standards. Such initial estimate is either confirmed or revised by the Agency at the time of the submission of the CER Endorsement/Approval request. Finally, Agencies are requested to report on the emission reductions that are actually generated during project implementation through the Mid-Term Report (MTR) and the terminal evaluation (TE).</p> <p>Data on GHG emission reductions project performance as entered by the GEF Agency in the GEF Portal and now allows a post-completion comparison between emission reductions <i>expected</i> at project design stage and emissions reductions <i>realized</i> during project implementation. As for post-implementation results, which may continue to be accrued by the project over a timespan of up to 20 years, initial estimation will be confirmed or revised at the time of the preparation of the TE.</p>	<p><b>Recommendation 1: Medium</b>            The recommendation specifically called for reporting on actual achievement against the targets. This could have been done at the portfolio level for at least the GEF-5 projects because many GEF-5 projects have been completed. This has so far not been done. However, the indicators to track climate change related results at the corporate level have been strengthened. With shift to the GEF Portal, which has integrated core indicators in its data entry fields, GEF is better placed to report actual results against the targets. This said the reporting on actual achievements against the targets is yet to happen.</p>

**A.16 Recommendations from the Evaluation of the Integrated Approach Pilots (GEF/ME/C.53/Inf.04) reported in the Semi Annual Evaluation Report of the GEF IEO November 2017 (GEF/ME/C.53/01)**

Ref #	Date of Council Decision	GEF IEO Recommendation	Management Response	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2021	GEF IEO Rating & Comments in MAR 2021
16	Nov 30, 2017	<p><b>Recommendation 1:</b>  <b>Assess the value addition of the knowledge platforms in a mid-term review to ensure they generate the necessary traction and provide overall support to program implementation.</b> For many interviewed stakeholders, the most important innovative feature in the IAPs is the hub project-supported knowledge platforms. The platforms are viewed as a forum for learning about innovations, exchange ideas and to showcase child projects. The knowledge platforms will require a strong commitment and support by all participating entities to provide the services and benefits they have been designed for. Their contribution towards overall program objectives should be assessed, to ensure they generate the envisioned additionality and support to program implementation.</p> <p><b>Recommendation 2:</b>  <b>Standardize the indicators, tracking tools and metrics across the IAPs to demonstrate program additionality through M&amp;E.</b> Indicators, tracking tools and metrics should be made uniform to enable aggregation within each IAP and for the three IAPs altogether. This should be done to clearly demonstrate the additionality brought by these pilot initiatives.</p> <p><b>Recommendation 3:</b></p>	<p>The IAP evaluation recommends that a mid-term review of the IAP knowledge platforms be carried out to assess their added value. The Secretariat welcomes this recommendation, as such mid-term reviews would provide additional, timely input towards the design of similar programs in GEF-7.</p>	<p><b>Recommendation 1: Substantial</b>            Although the programs have yet to reach mid-term, a formative evaluation for OPS7 suggests that the global platforms are in fact playing a very critical and supportive role for the IAP programs. The evaluation reinforces a synthesis of emerging lessons and experiences conducted by Lead Agencies and GEFSEC, which included details of tools, practices and approaches being used across the programs. Furthermore, STAP considers knowledge platforms as crucial for multi-stakeholder dialogues, which facilitates sharing and learning across program portfolios.</p> <p><b>Recommendation 2: Substantial</b>            Each of the IAP programs now have a common framework for monitoring and tracking progress toward outcomes. However, because the GEF project cycle still requires M &amp; E for individual child projects, the framework is intended for program-level achievements based on results framework in the PFD. Furthermore, the fact that child projects are on different implementation timelines makes it difficult to aggregate indicators. Such aggregation is done based on project implementation reports submitted to the GEF Secretariat and included in the Annual Monitoring Report presented to Council. The</p>	<p><b>Recommendation 1: Substantial</b>            GEF IEO acknowledges the effectiveness of IAPs knowledge platforms based on its own mid-term assessment conducted as part of the 2020 Formative Evaluation of the GEF integrated approach.</p> <p><b>Recommendation 2: Medium</b>            GEF IEO acknowledges the progress made in developing program results frameworks. But problems of inconsistency between program and child projects M&amp;E reporting have persisted through implementation.</p>

Ref #	Date of Council Decision	GEF IEO Recommendation	Management Response	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2021	GEF IEO Rating & Comments in MAR 2021
		<p><b>Assess the role of global environmental benefit (GEB) targets, clarifying whether they are meant as aspirational goals, or as hard targets, and they will be measured at the program level.</b> A mid-term review of the IAPs should take place to assess issues of additionality, effectiveness and efficiency at the mid-term stage of the IAP programs. Given a lack of clarity as to whether GEB targets are aspirational or hard targets, the review should clarify the role of GEB targets, and explain how the GEF aims to assess GEB goals at the program level.</p>		<p>first such synthesis for the IAP programs was included in the Monitoring Report presented to Council in December 2020.</p> <p><b>Recommendation 3: Medium</b> The aspirational targets for core indicators established in the PFD under each program was used as basis for hard targets presented in the CEO endorsements for individual child projects. The latter will serve as a basis for tracking and reporting program level achievements at MTR and TER stages.</p>	<p><b>Recommendation 3: Medium</b> GEF IEO takes note of GEF Secretariat plans to address the need for more clarity as to whether GEB targets are aspirational or hard targets.</p>

**A.17 Recommendations from the Evaluation of the Multiple Benefits of GEF 's Multifocal Area (MFA) Portfolio (GEF/ME/C.53/Inf.05) reported in the Semi Annual Evaluation Report of the GEF IEO November 2017 (GEF/ME/C.53/01)**

Ref #	Date of Council Decision	GEF IEO Recommendation	Management Response	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2021	GEF IEO Rating & Comments in MAR 2021
17	Nov 30, 2017	<p><b>Recommendation 1:</b>  <b>Identify conditions appropriate for the implementation of MFA projects at the project design and review stage.</b> MFA projects are not required to be integrated, or to seek synergies and mitigate trade-offs. However, projects successful at enhancing synergies and mitigating trade-offs have common conditions and characteristics that have enabled them to maximize the benefits of having multiple focal area objectives. GEF agencies must ensure that the environmental issues and management approaches targeted by MFA projects allow for such synergies while managing the higher transaction costs. Existing capacities and institutional arrangements for sectoral integration at the corporate and country levels should be assessed as part of the MFA project design and approval process. Opportunities for good stakeholder engagement, partnerships to leverage resources from multiple sectors, and integration in project interventions, should be considered in this assessment.</p> <p><b>Recommendation 2:</b>  <b>Streamline and enhance monitoring and reporting of MFA projects, including their synergies and trade-offs.</b> Although attempts</p>	<p>The Secretariat is in broad agreement with the conclusions and recommendations of the evaluation. With respect to the recommendation to “develop shared guidance on the conditions for designing, reviewing and implementing MFA projects”, the Secretariat has begun working on such guidance in close collaboration with Agencies and the Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel</p>	<p><b>Recommendation 1: Substantial</b>            GEF Secretariat conducted an analysis of the MFA portfolio at the end of GEF-6 in response to the recommendation. The analysis of the MFA portfolio resulted in internal draft “Guidelines for Design and Review of GEF Multifocal Area Projects, which were applied by GEF Program Managers during the review process. In addition to multifocal area projects, with the start of GEF’s Impact Programs in GEF-7, issues of integration, synergies, how to mitigate trade-offs, and foster cross-sectoral cooperation were specifically emphasized in the design stage of these programs, among other things through the requirement to align with integrated programmatic objectives. It is however noted, that integration is a complex and continuously evolving topic in GEF programming, which needs to be further pursued and enhanced not only by further developing guidance for design and review of projects and programs but also by necessary changes in GEF’s delivery model (e.g. increasing flexibility of STAR, further enhancing the programmatic approach, etc.).</p> <p><b>Recommendation 2: Substantial</b>            With the introduction of the new RBM architecture and the core indicators in GEF-7 a break-through was achieved in terms of</p>	<p><b>Recommendation 1: Substantial</b>            The GEF’s increasing move towards integration is significant for maximizing synergies and mitigating trade-offs within specific sectors and systems in which the IAPs work. Anticipated changes in the GEF’s delivery model will also likely contribute to this end. The IEO looks forward to the guidance for the design and review of MFA projects being finalized and published to ensure that synergies are maximized and trade-offs mitigated in projects that are not part of the IAPs. This guidance would include minimum criteria for MFA projects, such as an assessment of existing and planned arrangements in the project area that will facilitate coordination of resources and activities across focal areas/ sectors.</p>

Ref #	Date of Council Decision	GEF IEO Recommendation	Management Response	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2021	GEF IEO Rating & Comments in MAR 2021
		<p>have been made at the program level to remove repetitive and irrelevant indicators from the tracking tools, streamlining of monitoring and reporting tools in MFA projects is needed at the institutional level. Project monitoring tools should also measure and report the synergies generated and trade-offs mitigated.</p> <p><b>Recommendation 3:</b>  <b>Develop shared guidance on the conditions for designing, reviewing, and implementing MFA projects across the GEF partnership.</b>  While strategic priorities have been developed for each focal area, none specify how and which focal area synergies might best contribute to the GEF’s vision. As a starting point, members of the GEF partnership need to continue developing a common understanding of key concepts, such as “multiple benefits,” “synergies,” “trade-offs,” and “integration” with the involvement of STAP. Building on the findings of this evaluation, the GEF should develop guidance on the conditions under which MFA projects should be designed and implemented, to enhance synergies across focal areas. Minimum criteria or standards for MFA project design and monitoring would ensure that the benefits of focal area integration are maximized, while transaction costs at the corporate and country levels are managed.</p>	<p>(STAP). This work draws in part on STAP’s work on the science of integration in natural resource management<sup>69</sup>. The Secretariat expects to be able to share the results of this work at the onset of GEF-7.</p>	<p>streamlining monitoring and reporting of all projects, including MFA projects, through a system of integrated core-indicators. Core indicators are not linked to focal areas anymore, but all types of projects, regardless of the funding sources may contribute to generate GEBs in different area. For examples, carbon benefits can be generated by all types of projects. Reporting on synergies and trade-offs mitigated will still need to be improved in the further development of the core indicator monitoring system.</p> <p><b>Recommendation 3: Substantial</b>  GEF Secretariat collaborated with STAP to enhance integration in design of MFA projects. The results of this collaboration are reflected in the STAP advisory “Integration: to solve complex environmental problems” (<a href="https://www.stagef.org/resources/advisory-documents/integration-solve-complex-environmental-problems">https://www.stagef.org/resources/advisory-documents/integration-solve-complex-environmental-problems</a>). The document helped to define key concepts and to create a common understanding in the GEF partnership. The key recommendations of the advisory document were mainstreamed into the project design and review process, such as (i) systems thinking, (ii) theory of change, (iii) resilience thinking, and (iv) effective stakeholder engagement. Specifically with regard to resilience thinking, STAP produced the RAPTA guidelines: <a href="https://www.stagef.org/resources/advisory-documents/rapta-guidelines">https://www.stagef.org/resources/advisory-documents/rapta-guidelines</a> as a tool to help project designers and planners build the ideas of resilience, adaptation and transformation into their projects from the start, to ensure outcomes that are practicable, valuable and sustainable through time and change.</p>	<p><b>Recommendation 2: Substantial</b>  The use of core indicators streamlines reporting of GEBs for all GEF projects, not just for MFA projects. The IEO looks forward to the next development in the GEF’s reporting system that can capture both synergies and trade-offs--particularly in MFA and IAP child projects--by documenting actual and potential synergies and trade-offs at project design stage.</p> <p><b>Recommendation 3: Substantial</b>  The STAP guidance lays out clear principles on how to enhance integration within projects. The IEO looks forward to seeing how these principles have been operationalized in a published guidance for the design and review of MFA projects.</p>



**A.18 Recommendations from the Review of Knowledge Management (KM) in the GEF (GEF/ME/C.53/Inf.08) reported in the Semi Annual Evaluation Report of the GEF IEO November 2017 (GEF/ME/C.53/01)**

Ref #	Date of Council Decision	GEF IEO Recommendation	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2021	GEF IEO Rating & Comments in MAR 2021
18	November 30, 2017	<p><b>Recommendation 1:</b>  <b>The GEF Secretariat should place a high priority on improving the quality and the availability of project-level documentation from a KM perspective, including lessons learned during design and implementation.</b> To ensure minimum standards of consistency in KM across GEF agencies and projects, clear guidance should be provided to Agencies on, for example, the typology of knowledge products to be generated during and after project implementation, and the capture and storage of such information. As the PMIS is currently under revision, efforts should be made to ensure that it becomes the key platform for storing and sharing project-level documentation throughout the project lifecycle. The revisions to this platform should be</p>	<p><b>Recommendation 1: Substantial</b>  Under the Guidelines on the Project and Program Cycle Policy (2020 Update)(GEF/C.59/Inf.03), a KM Approach is required of all GEF projects/programs at both PIF/PFD and CEO Endorsement stages including “plans to learn from relevant projects, initiatives, evaluations and best practice during project/program preparation as well as proposed knowledge and learning outputs/deliverables, and to explain how the KM Approach will contribute to the project/program’s overall impact. The proposed KM Approach will include processes to capture, assess and document and share, in a user-friendly manner, information, lessons, best practices, and expertise generated during implementation; plans for strategic communications; and an overview of existing lessons and best practice that inform the project concept (Annex 16: Knowledge Management, in the Guideline (GEF/C.59/Inf.03)”. At the CEO Endorsement stage, it is required to include a budget, timeline and specific knowledge and learning outputs/deliverables of KM Approach (Annex 16: Knowledge Management, in the Guideline (GEF/C.59/Inf.03).</p> <p>GEF agencies as well as GEFSEC PMs have received training and guidance on what a KM Approach is expected to contain at each stage. Each GEF project/program is required to implement its KM Approach throughout the project/program cycle and periodically report on progress made. The Guideline also states that the Agencies provide progress in narrative context on the challenges encountered during implementation, as well as an account of progress made in implementing knowledge management activities for PIR, MTR and TE.</p>	<p><b>Recommendation 1: Substantial</b>  The GEF IEO acknowledges the progress made with the introduction of guidance on KM activities as an important step to support the use of knowledge in projects and programs. According to the Evaluation of Knowledge Management in the GEF (2020; GEF/E/C.59/04), the GEF Agencies perceive as helpful the addition of the KM Guidance to the Guidelines on the Project and Program Cycle Policy (2020 Update) (GEF/C.59/Inf.03), although they seek more details and practical examples.</p> <p>The introduction of the GEF Portal as a replacement of the PMIS is a positive change as it improves data collection and transparency. However, as noted by the Evaluation of Knowledge Management in the GEF (2020; GEF/E/C.59/04), the Portal is not yet a KM tool, as it does not provide a functionality to</p>

Ref #	Date of Council Decision	GEF IEO Recommendation	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2021	GEF IEO Rating & Comments in MAR 2021
		<p>made in consultation with the GEF Agencies and other parts of the partnership to ensure access for GEF Agencies, project and program staff and countries. The platform should facilitate easy uploading, downloading, and analysis of project and program documents from design through supervision and finally completion.</p> <p><b>Recommendation 2: The GEF Secretariat and the KM Advisory Group, should develop a plan to connect across GEF Agency KM systems, generate knowledge products and organize learning activities across focal areas, agencies and cross cutting themes.</b> The partnership would benefit from a clear work plan on learning activities and knowledge products to be generated within and across focal areas in collaboration with GEF agencies, along with a proposed resource envelope and enhanced internal capacity. Ideally these products would draw on lessons from across the partnership, including from agencies, STAP,</p>	<p>The GEF Portal, an on-line platform that facilitates easy uploading, downloading and analysis of project and program documents from design to completion, has replaced PMIS. It contains KM tool tips to guide agencies when uploading project/program KM Approaches. GEF Portal’s “implementation module” also has a KM section that enables agencies to upload lessons learned, good practice and links to knowledge products that emerge during project implementation. They also report on progress made in implementing the KM Approach of each project. Agencies can upload this info as it becomes available (together with PIRs) and at mid-terms and project completion.</p> <p>The only missing element is that the GEF still has no formal GEF KM policy or published KM guidelines. These issues will be addressed in the GEF Knowledge and Learning Strategy that is going to be developed for GEF -8.</p> <p><b>Recommendation 2: Substantial</b></p> <p>Based on a KM Road Map, the GEF Secretariat, in collaboration with GEF agencies, has put in place several initiatives that have culminated in knowledge products and learning activities across focal areas, agencies and cross cutting themes. These include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- GEF Kaleo Online Knowledgebase</li> <li>- GEF Knowledge Days and Fairs, including site visits with learning stations during the Expanded Constituency Workshops (ECWs)</li> <li>- GEF Academy, including two e-courses in three languages (Introduction to the Global Environment Facility, and Gender and Environment in English, French and Spanish)</li> <li>- GEF Art of Knowledge Guidebook and Workshops (e.g. Art of Knowledge Exchange workshop for CSOs in November 2020)</li> <li>- GEF South-South Exchanges between OFPs (e.g. As a part of Knowledge day during ECWs, GEF Introduction seminar (2020), GEF CSP Stakeholder Empowerment Series - Gender and Environment webinar in October 2020)</li> <li>- GEF IAP: Knowledge Management Platforms, IAP knowledge workshop, Program website and newsletters, Experience and Emerging Lessons from IAPs including synthesis on knowledge management</li> </ul>	<p>aggregate and extract lessons and good practices across projects on specific themes, focal areas, or geographic regions that would allow partners to learn from each other and adapt good practices.</p> <p>This recommendation has been retired.</p> <p><b>Recommendation 2: Medium</b></p> <p>According to the Evaluation of Knowledge Management in the GEF (2020; GEF/E/C.59/04), the GEF partnership has made progress at each step of the KM process, however a common approach to and strategy for KM is lacking.</p> <p>The GEF currently has no partnership-wide KM strategy or work plan with priorities and a resource envelope; instead, KM is broadly guided by the approach paper approved by the GEF Council in 2015.</p> <p>GEF IEO acknowledges GEF Secretariat’s plans to develop the</p>

Ref #	Date of Council Decision	GEF IEO Recommendation	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2021	GEF IEO Rating & Comments in MAR 2021
		<p>Conventions and countries, and would support strategic decision making and planning at the portfolio and corporate levels. Mechanisms to disseminate and share such knowledge products should also be clearly articulated in the plan.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- KM Products/Deliverables emerging from the implementation of GEF-6 and GEF-7 projects/programs</li> </ul> <p>However, there is still no plan to connect across GEF Agency KM systems. Also, there is no corporate resource envelope dedicated to KM and the GEF Secretariat's internal capacity to coordinate/facilitate KM efforts across the Partnership remains low. These issues will be addressed in the GEF Knowledge and Learning Strategy that is going to be developed for GEF -8.</p>	<p>GEF Knowledge and Learning Strategy for GEF-8.</p> <p>This recommendation has been retired.</p>

**A.19 Recommendations from the Review of the System for Transparent Allocation of Resources (STAR) (GEF/ME/C.53/Inf.10) reported in the Semi-Annual Evaluation Report of the GEF IEO November 2017 (GEF/ME/C.53/01)**

Ref #	Date of Council Decision	GEF IEO Recommendation	Management Response	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2021	GEF IEO Rating & Comments in MAR 2021
19	November 30, 2017	<p><b>Recommendation 1: GEF Secretariat should develop clear protocols and quality checks on calculations.</b> In line with the GEF-5 Mid-Term Review of STAR, the GEF Secretariat has made efforts to minimize errors in the STAR calculations. As STAR databases and equations continue to become increasingly complex, the GEF Secretariat should ensure that quality-control protocols are developed and risks to mistakes in calculations are minimized.</p>	<p>The review concludes that “[in general], calculations of STAR allocations were carried out correctly”, but that “there is room for improvement in minimizing calculation errors”. The review then goes on to recommend that the Secretariat “develop clear protocols and quality checks on calculations”. While the Secretariat agrees that there is the need to continuously improve on STAR, it also notes as in the full review, while some errors were observed in some of the calculations of GEF-6 STAR allocations, “[t]he overall effect of the errors was not substantial.”</p>	<p><b>Recommendation 1: High</b>            The GEF Secretariat has continued improving the data quality and calculation accuracy in the STAR models, as per the recommendation of the Evaluation. For GEF-7, a clear data management protocol was developed and fully implemented, and will continue for the GEF-8 calculations. These have ensured (and will continue to ensure) the rigor of STAR calculations, and contributed to an improvement in the STAR database management.</p> <p>In particular, the following actions were undertaken:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The STAR team has been expanded, as more staff members across the Secretariat are dedicating time to aspects of the STAR model and its calculations</li> <li>• Quality control protocols have been assured by the independent construction and reconciliation of (i) data entry, (ii) index calculation and (iii) allocation simulations, at multiple levels across team members</li> <li>• Protocols for missing data have been further developed and refined; these have also been fully articulated in the STAR policy</li> <li>• STAR simulations are independently automated through the GEF’s IT platform for a final quality cross-check</li> </ul> <p>As the STAR model becomes increasingly complex, the GEF Secretariat will continue to act within the framework outlined above, as well as further develop any needed protocols to maintain rigorous quality control as per changing needs and requirements. Relatedly, the Secretariat will also continue to explore the potential of additional software platforms for programming and simulations. Internal process documentation will also be continually updated so as to ensure the maintenance of these protocols as needed across the coming GEF phases.</p>	<p><b>Recommendation 1: Substantial</b>            The thrust of the recommendation was to ensure that risk of mistakes in STAR related calculations is minimized. Arrangements for independent construction of datasets and calculations is likely to minimize the risks. As noted in the Secretariat’s response, the protocols for quality control will need to evolve with changing needs and requirements.</p> <p>This recommendation and related decision have been graduated.</p>

ANNEX B. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE TRACKING IN MAR

**B.1 Recommendations for future tracking in MAR (from Semi Annual Evaluation Report of the GEF IEO May 2017)**

Ref #	Evaluation Title	Semi Annual Evaluation Report of the GEF IEO May 2017
1	Chemicals and Waste Focal Area Study (GEF/ME/C.52/Inf.03)	<b>Support for reforms.</b> The GEF may also want to consider providing more support for broad-based regulatory reform and sector-wide approaches, to address chemicals and waste issues more holistically.
2	Chemicals and Waste Focal Area Study (GEF/ME/C.52/Inf.03)	<b>The GEF should also not forget its ozone depletion program,</b> which may have new relevance with the recent adoption of the Kigali Amendments to the Montreal Protocol. In the coming years, some CEITs may need support to meet these new obligations, and opportunities are likely to arise for MFA collaborations with the climate change focal area, especially on energy efficiency.
3	Chemicals and Waste Focal Area Study (GEF/ME/C.52/Inf.03)	<b>Better monitoring practices.</b> Given the challenges this study faced in tallying the verified results of the GEF CW focal area, the GEF’s monitoring procedures deserve more scrutiny. Tracking tools should be consistently submitted and clearly identified as annual or terminal submissions, and terminal results reported by indicator should match values in the terminal evaluation. Project proposals should consistently incorporate resources designated for monitoring and evaluation (M&E).

## B.2 Recommendations for future tracking in MAR (from the December 2020 Joint Summary of the Chairs Report)

Ref #	Evaluation Title	GEF IEO Recommendations Endorsed by the Council (December 2020)
1	Evaluation of GEF Engagement in Fragile and Conflict-Affected Situations (GEF/E/C.59/01)	<p><b>The GEF Secretariat should use the project review process to provide feedback to Agencies to identify conflict and fragility-related risks to a proposed project and develop measures to mitigate those risks.</b></p> <p>The GEF should use the project review process to integrate consideration of fragile and conflict-affected contexts. Project reviews provide an opportunity for the GEF to identify risks that could affect project success and for proposing measures to mitigate those risks. This would help ensure that recognizing and addressing such risks is more consistent</p>
2	Evaluation of GEF Engagement in Fragile and Conflict-Affected Situations (GEF/E/C.59/01)	<p><b>To improve conflict-sensitive programming while also providing flexibility to Agencies and projects, the GEF Secretariat could develop guidance for conflict-sensitive programming.</b></p> <p>This guidance could address measures across the programming lifecycle, from design to implementation and closure. GEF guidance on conflict-sensitive programming could draw upon both the commonalities and innovations of the guidance that has been developed by 10 Agencies.</p>
3	Evaluation of GEF Engagement in Fragile and Conflict-Affected Situations (GEF/E/C.59/01)	<p><b>To improve conflict-sensitive design, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation of GEF projects, the GEF Secretariat together with the Agencies should leverage existing platforms for learning, exchange, and technical assistance.</b></p> <p>These platforms are designed to effectively foster learning and exchange, build capacity, and provide specialized assistance. Since conflict sensitivity is a cross-cutting issue, lessons learned should be exchanged on existing knowledge platforms supported through programs such as the Integrated Approach Pilots, Impact Programs, Global Wildlife Program, and planetGOLD, among others, as well as on the online GEF Portal.</p>
4	Evaluation of GEF Engagement in Fragile and Conflict-Affected Situations (GEF/E/C.59/01)	<p><b>The current GEF Environmental and Social Safeguards could be expanded to provide more details so that GEF projects address key conflict-sensitive considerations.</b></p> <p>At least 11 GEF Agencies have incorporated consideration of conflict and fragility into their respective safeguards. The GEF has adopted Environmental and Social Safeguards that seek to minimize potentially adverse environmental and social impacts from projects. However, these safeguards mention conflict only once and lack a holistic recognition of the way that conflicts might be linked to the environment</p>

Ref #	Evaluation Title	GEF IEO Recommendations Endorsed by the Council (December 2020)
		and natural resources. As it has done when updating safeguards regarding gender, the GEF could consider the more detailed provisions incorporated by Agencies as it considers whether and how to expand its safeguards to more effectively address conflict sensitivity.
5	Evaluation of GEF Engagement in Fragile and Conflict-Affected Situations  (GEF/E/C.59/01)	<p><b>The GEF Secretariat could consider revising its policies and procedures so that GEF-supported projects can better adapt to rapid and substantial changes common in fragile and conflict-affected situations</b></p> <p>The circumstances on the ground in these situations can change rapidly. Yet, GEF policies and procedures can make it difficult to adjust projects to adapt in a timely manner. Incorporating adaptive management into GEF policies and procedures could provide a more flexible and adaptive environment, enabling projects to adapt more quickly and more efficiently to changes resulting from conflict or fragility, as well as other difficult situations.</p>
6	Evaluation of GEF Interventions in the Artisanal and Small-Scale Gold Mining Sector  (GEF/E/C.59/02)	<p><b>The GEF partnership should increase project focus on policy interventions that help governments put into place the necessary framework to formalize artisanal and small-scale gold miners and monitor the sector.</b></p> <p>As GEF moves into countries where ASGM formalization isn't as advanced, it will have to address this first step in the theory of change to a larger extent than in the GOLD program. Formalization policy interventions will have to assist governments in developing a framework that not only puts formalization into laws but also creates cost-effective monitoring and institutional and engagement structures to apply the policy throughout disperse ASGM areas.</p>
7	Evaluation of GEF Interventions in the Artisanal and Small-Scale Gold Mining Sector  (GEF/E/C.59/02)	<p><b>The GEF partnership should seek opportunities for multi-focal area ASGM interventions and measure co-benefits beyond the Chemicals and Waste focal area.</b></p> <p>The GEF has already moved in a direction of multi-focal area, holistic solutions to environmental problems with the creation of the impact programs and integrated approaches. ASGM has links to several focal areas, depending on the characteristics of each mining area, and is therefore a sector which could combine funding from several focal areas or at least include activities related to International Waters, Biodiversity, Climate Change, and Land Degradation within a Chemicals and Waste– funded project. Additionally, as environmental health takes on a higher priority in the age of the COVID-19 pandemic, ASGM interventions should consider stronger links with government health agencies to build improved environmental health monitoring and education. These efforts could work in tandem with, rather than in competition with, funding linked to the Minamata Convention to reduce mercury use.</p>

Ref #	Evaluation Title	GEF IEO Recommendations Endorsed by the Council (December 2020)
8	Evaluation of GEF Interventions in the Artisanal and Small-Scale Gold Mining Sector (GEF/E/C.59/02)	<p><b>The planetGOLD global platform should make available results and lessons learned from completed ASGM projects and provide more detailed information on NAP and GOLD program child projects.</b></p> <p>The focus on global knowledge management and sharing in the GOLD program is valuable and should be continued. In addition to the information already available, additional information and lessons learned on completed GEF (and non-GEF) ASGM projects, especially the GEF 5 MSPs that were designed as pilot projects, should be included. Results, documents, and lessons from the Terminal Evaluations would be useful for a broad range of stakeholders and perhaps would improve stakeholder retention of the projects' outcomes. Additionally, more frequent updates on project status (both GOLD and NAP projects) on the website would help stakeholders follow progress. The hub project should seek to ensure that the results and negative aspects of lessons learned from the GOLD program are disseminated along with positive lessons, to ensure maximum adaptive learning for the future.</p>
9	Evaluation of the Role of Medium Size Projects (MSP) in the GEF Partnership Knowledge Management (GEF/E/C.59/03)	<p><b>Midterm and final evaluations should be conducted on MSPs designed as innovative or transformative, to provide lessons for scaling up or replication.</b></p>
10	Evaluation of Knowledge Management in the GEF (2020) (GEF/E/C.59/04)	<p><b>The GEF partnership should develop a clear KM strategy.</b></p> <p>Within the planning toward GEF-8, a group dedicated to KM, or the KM Advisory group, should advise the GEF Secretariat on developing a partnership-wide KM strategy with clear priorities and focus. The strategy would need to be supported by the necessary resources and endorsement of the GEF Council. The strategy should set out the KM priorities and define the roles and responsibilities across the GEF partnership including the role of the KM Advisory group. Supported by an action plan, the strategy should set out principles and standards for the KM steps: knowledge capture, development, sharing, dissemination, and application articulated in reinforced project-level guidelines, requirements, and common KM metrics</p>
11	Evaluation of Knowledge Management in the GEF (2020) (GEF/E/C.59/04)	<p><b>The GEF partnership should invest in a technical solution that strengthens the KM system.</b></p> <p>At the operational level, a common approach is needed to guide the KM steps supported by a technical solution which can support KM needs: the ability to capture KM data, lessons, and good practices and to present them in a usable and accessible format for both GEF stakeholders and externally. This would require either enhancing the KM capabilities of the new Portal or building a GEF Knowledge Exchange Hub as previously proposed by the GEF Secretariat. Processes need to put into application the principles and standards set out</p>



Ref #	Evaluation Title	GEF IEO Recommendations Endorsed by the Council (December 2020)
		<p>in the strategy for each KM step: capture and storage knowledge in a uniform and accessible form; exchange of knowledge between the GEF Secretariat and agencies; viii collation and curation of knowledge in comparable and usable formats to increase accessibility and avoid fragmentation.</p>

### B.3. Recommendations for future tracking in MAR (from the December 2019 Joint Summary of the Chairs Report)

Ref #	Evaluation Title	GEF IEO Recommendations Endorsed by the Council (December 2019)
1	Strategic Country Cluster Evaluation of the Small Island Developing States  (GEF/ME/C.57/02)	<b>Derive greater benefits from the expanded GEF partnership.</b> GEF Agencies should focus their efforts in SIDS based on their thematic and geographic competence and establish a permanent presence to strengthen dialogue with the respective government and key stakeholders.
2	Strategic Country Cluster Evaluation of the Small Island Developing States  (GEF/ME/C.57/02)	<b>Increase the number of integrated interventions.</b> GEF Agencies should respond to the SIDS demand by designing more integrated projects, in line with the ridge to reef, whole island, and blue economy approaches. When justified, multiphase projects should be a prioritized model for GEF projects to improve outcome sustainability.
3	Strategic Country Cluster Evaluation of the Small Island Developing States  (GEF/ME/C.57/02)	<b>Promote innovation and knowledge exchange.</b> The GEF project portfolio in SIDS should include a combination of innovative (e.g., income-generating products from invasive alien species) and scaling-up approaches that have shown to be effective. Innovation should be supported even if it has a higher risk. Regional programs should encourage a transfer of knowledge to the poorest SIDS through a South-South capacity-building approach.
4	Strategic Country Cluster Evaluation of the Small Island Developing States  (GEF/ME/C.57/02)	<b>Strengthening institutional capacity.</b> GEF Agencies and projects should continue to build institutional capacity in the SIDS and assist in improving project design with due consideration to sustainability (exit strategy, stakeholder engagement, national and local capacity building to ensure continuation, M&E) and in the use of financial resources.
5	Strategic Country Cluster Evaluation of the Small Island Developing States  (GEF/ME/C.57/02)	<b>Within the context of the climate change mitigation projects, build on the GEF's comparative advantage.</b> When considering interventions in the climate change mitigation area, the GEF should strategically explore the opportunity to address two of the main challenges facing SIDS—deficient waste management and the lack of sustainable energy. GEF financing should continue to explore the various alternatives for renewable energy in SIDS possibly including wind, tidal and ocean wave power, and geothermal energy resources.

#### B.4 Recommendations for future tracking in MAR (from the June 2019 Joint Summary of the Chairs Report)

Ref #	Evaluation Title	GEF IEO Recommendations Endorsed by the Council (June 2019)
1	Evaluation of GEF Support to Scaling Up Impact (GEF/ME/C.56/Inf.03)	<p><b>The GEF partnership needs to ensure that factors influencing scaling up are identified and taken into account, as appropriate, in project design and implementation, and their impact assessed at midterm and terminal evaluations.</b> The expectation is not for all GEF projects to achieve impact at scale, but to clearly articulate how each project contributes to the long-term vision for achieving results at larger scale. Projects and programs implemented in parallel or in sequence that are explicitly linked by design must have common environmental indicators that use the same units of measurement to allow outcomes to be aggregated, and progress to be tracked. The GEF’s current results framework provides common indicators which makes this possible at the portfolio level; but linked projects and programs must use common units of measurement and indicators for specific outcomes that are not tracked by the GEF’s core indicators and sub-indicators.</p>

## ANNEX C. RECOMMENDATIONS THAT DO NOT REQUIRE NEW ACTION

### C.1 Recommendations that do not require new action

Ref #	Evaluation Title	Recommendation
1	Evaluation of Programmatic Approaches in the GEF (GEF/ME/C.52/Inf.01/Rev.01)	<p><b>The GEF should continue with appropriate programmatic interventions, addressing issues that are likely to impede outcomes and performance, efficiency, and management, as they become multidimensional</b></p> <p>The GEF should emphasize programmatic approaches by deploying its resources catalytically to mobilize larger flows of funding that achieve impact at scale. However, the GEF is promoting increasingly complex programs, while simpler programs have shown better results. Furthermore, complex programs require much larger resources to coordinate and manage. Importantly, the GEF shows an increasing preference for multi-agency programs, although the evidence shows that these are the most difficult to implement and evaluate. Since this aspect reduces both efficiency and cost-effectiveness, program complexity will need to be better managed to ensure good results.</p>
2	Evaluation of Programmatic Approaches in the GEF (GEF/ME/C.52/Inf.01/Rev.01)	<p><b>The GEF should continue ensuring that programs are relevant to the national environmental priorities of the participating countries while meeting the requirements of the Conventions.</b></p> <p>The GEF should continue to ensure that finance is being channeled to support nationally determined priorities (inclusive of broad stakeholder engagement) in line with the requirements of the multilateral environmental conventions, and strengthen national capacities to plan, coordinate, implement, and monitor environmental change actions. The GEF should continue to promote multi-partner platforms in-country, provide incentives for longer term investments, strengthen national capacities and involve country partners early in the programming process, to ensure that it can respond effectively to country priorities. It should do so in all its programs, be these global, regional or national in their geographic scope.</p>
3	Climate Change Focal Area Study (GEF/ME/C.53/Inf.02)	<p><b>The GEF should place continued emphasis on its work on the enabling environment, and innovative projects in climate change mitigation to support market transformation.</b> The GEF should continue to focus on piloting and demonstrating technologies and financial approaches that could be scaled up by other actors. The GEF should explore its potential to be an incubator for countries to test and refine their approaches prior to seeking large-scale finance through other partners. These are areas where the GEF has shown strong results and a comparative advantage. The GEF should also continue to emphasize innovative and cutting-edge projects in its LDCF, and SCCF portfolios, to advance climate change adaptation knowledge and practice.</p>

Ref #	Evaluation Title	Recommendation
4	Evaluation of GEF Interventions in the Artisanal and Small-Scale Gold Mining Sector (GEF/E/C.59/02)	<p><b>The GEF partnership and the Minamata Convention should continue to encourage high mercury use countries to become more involved in the Convention.</b></p> <p>An increasing number of countries continue to take meaningful steps towards involvement in the Convention and thus towards eliminating mercury use. As countries with ASGM present ratify the Convention, this will unlock GEF ASGM financing, increasing the global impact of GEF and the Convention.</p>
5	Evaluation of the Role of Medium Size Projects (MSP) in the GEF Partnership Knowledge Management (GEF/E/C.59/03)	<p><b>The MSP should continue to be primarily used for developing innovative projects.</b></p>