

## Summary of Document GEF/ME/C.38/2

### Annual Country Portfolio Evaluation Report - 2010

#### Recommended Council Decision

The Council, having reviewed document GEF/ME/C.38/2, “*Annual Country Portfolio Evaluation Report – 2010*,” document GEF/ME/C.38/3, “*Management Response to the Annual Country Portfolio Evaluation – 2010*,” and having taken note of the two Country Portfolio Evaluations in Turkey and Moldova (GEF/ME/C.38/Inf. 1 and GEF/ME/C.38/Inf. 2) requests:

- (1) The GEF Agencies to systematically involve operational focal points in M&E activities by sharing M&E information with them in a timely manner;
- (2) The Secretariat to consider provision of specific M&E training to the national focal point mechanism through the Country Support Programme;
- (3) The Evaluation Office to strengthen, in collaboration with the Secretariat on monitoring issues, the role of Operational Focal Points in monitoring and evaluation in the proposals for revision of the M&E policy.

The Council also encourages the GEF Agencies to give stronger support to environment issues outside their GEF supported projects, and promote up-scaling with partner governments.

#### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1. This third *Annual Country Portfolio Evaluation Report* provides a synthesis of the main conclusions and recommendations coming from two country portfolio evaluations finalized in fiscal year 2010:<sup>1</sup> Turkey and Moldova. Both country portfolio evaluations were conducted between September 2009 and April 2010. Drafts of the two reports were presented and discussed and comments were received from GEF stakeholders at consultation workshops in each country. Chapters 1 of both reports include the main conclusions and recommendations and are provided as Council information documents. The full reports are provided on the Evaluation Office website and will be published at a later date. The responses provided to the evaluation by the respective government are annexed to these two reports.

2. GEF support to these two countries started during the pilot phase of the GEF for Turkey and after the GEF restructuring (1994) for Moldova.

**Table 1.1 Project Coverage of each Country Portfolio Evaluation**

Country	GEF funding (US mil.)	Number of projects included in the evaluation				
		National FSPs and MSPs	SGP	Enabling activities	Regional/ global projects	National completed projects
Turkey	36.33	8	Yes	5	11 of 20	6
Moldova	21.72	8	No	6	14 of 16	9

<sup>1</sup> July 2009 to June 2010.

3. This synthesis report focuses on: the relevance of the GEF support to the GEF and to the countries; the efficiency of GEF support; the role and responsibilities of GEF stakeholders and the result and sustainability of GEF support, particularly at the global environmental benefits level.

### **Conclusions**

4. The following conclusions were reached on the results of the GEF support:

- 1) GEF support in biodiversity has built robust foundations for the achievement of significant results in Turkey and Moldova. Further progress toward impact is limited by unresolved institutional barriers and socio-economic factors.
- 2) GEF support in climate change has produced limited but promising results in Turkey and Moldova.
- 3) International waters initiatives strengthened the countries' commitments to regional cooperation for reducing nutrient discharge and fish overexploitation. It is still too early for observable improvements in the water bodies to materialize.
- 4) GEF support to Persistent Organic Pollutants has been of strategic importance in both countries and facilitated up-scaling in Moldova.
- 5) Land degradation did not receive the attention and support that countries were expecting, including through multifocal area projects.

5. On relevance of GEF support the following conclusions should be noted:

- 6) GEF support in Turkey and Moldova has been relevant to national sustainable development and environmental priorities, to international conventions, and regional processes as well as to the GEF mandate. Other national priorities such as land degradation have not been addressed.
- 7) National ownership of the GEF portfolio is limited, but improving in both countries.

6. The efficiency of the GEF support was assessed as follows:

- 8) Duration of project processing and implementation compares well to average figures for GEF projects. However, mixed perceptions on complexity and length of the GEF Activity Cycle remain in both countries.
- 9) The GEF focal point mechanism has not been fully effective in its coordination and strategic guidance roles, including sharing of information and M&E.

### **Recommendations**

- 1) Operational Focal Points involvement in M&E activities should be increased by sharing M&E information, supporting country portfolio level M&E and providing M&E training.
- 2) GEF Agencies should be encouraged to give stronger support to environment issues outside their GEF supported projects, and promote up-scaling with partner governments.