

Summary of Document GEF/ME/C.42/03

Annual Country Portfolio Evaluation Report 2012

Recommended Council Decision

The Council, having reviewed document GEF/ME/C.42/03, “*Annual Country Portfolio Evaluation Report 2012*,” document GEF/ME/C.42/04, “*Management Response to the Annual Country Portfolio Evaluation Report 2012*,” and having taken note of the two Country Portfolio Evaluations in Nicaragua and OECS (GEF/ME/C.42/Inf.02) requests the Secretariat:

- (1) To consider ways to make project approval and implementation in Small Island Developing States more flexible and context-specific.
- (2) To reduce the burden of monitoring requirements of multifocal area projects to a level comparable to that of single focal area projects.
- (3) To enable South-South cooperation activities as components of national, regional and/or global projects where opportunities for exchange of technology, capacity development and/or sharing of best practices exist.

Executive Summary

1. This fifth *Annual Country Portfolio Evaluation Report* (ACPER) provides a synthesis of the main conclusions and recommendations coming from country portfolio evaluations (CPEs) and Country Portfolio Studies (CPSs) conducted in the Latin America and Caribbean (LAC) region. These include two CPSs finalized in fiscal year 11 in El Salvador and Jamaica, two completed CPEs completed in fiscal year 12 in Nicaragua and OECS (comprising of Antigua and Barbuda, Dominica, Grenada, Saint Lucia, Saint Kitts and Nevis, and Saint Vincent and the Grenadines) and two ongoing CPEs that are presently in their finalization stage in Brazil and Cuba. Key findings and recommendations were presented and discussed and comments were received from GEF stakeholders at consultation workshops in each country. Chapters 1 of the two completed CPE reports (Nicaragua and OECS) include the main conclusions and recommendations and are provided as Council information documents. The full reports are provided on the GEF Evaluation Office website. The responses provided to the evaluation by the respective government are annexed to these two reports.

2. Support from the Global Environment Facility (GEF) to those countries started in 1992 in OECS, Brazil and Cuba, in 1994 in El Salvador and Jamaica, and in 1996 in Nicaragua.

Country	Type of evaluation	Number of projects included in the evaluation				National completed projects
		National FSPs & MSPs	SGP	Enabling activities	Regional/ global projects	
Nicaragua	CPE	10	Yes	6	24	9
OECS	Cluster CPE	7	Yes	35	25	36
Brazil	CPE	41	Yes	4	36	20
Cuba	CPE	14	Yes	5	15	10
El Salvador	CPS	5	Yes	6	20	6
Jamaica	CPS	6	Yes	6	15	7

3. This ACPER 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) Most projects achieved moderately satisfactory or higher outcome ratings in their focal areas. Global environmental benefits are still modest, though progress toward impact is happening.
- (2) Climate change adaptation in the Central America and Caribbean region is becoming increasingly important in the GEF portfolios analyzed. In some countries this is fully evident, while in other countries adaptation is still in its initial stages.
- (3) Capacity development at both individual and institutional level was overall good, with a few exceptions at the local level.
- (4) Many countries in the Latin America and Caribbean region follow an ecosystem approach to environmental conservation and sustainable use, which increases the demand for multifocal area projects.
- (5) Scaling-up, replication and sustainability remain a challenge in the portfolios analyzed, with some notable exceptions.
- (6) Opportunities for South-South cooperation through national, regional, and global projects and/or project components exist, but are not fully taken up.

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

- (7) Overall, GEF support has been relevant to both national environmental conservation and sustainable development policies, and to the GEF international mandate of achieving global environmental benefits.
- (8) Mixed ownership is observed in the portfolios analyzed, strong in middle income economies and less so in Small Island Developing States, with the exception of Cuba.

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

- (9) Small Island Developing States face challenges in project approval processes and in implementation due to the specific circumstances in which they operate and to their specific needs. This hampers the achievement of greater global environmental benefits.
- (10) Monitoring and evaluation for adaptive management as well as environmental monitoring are challenging.

Recommendations

- (1) Project approval and implementation in Small Island Developing States should be more flexible and context-specific.
- (2) The burden of monitoring requirements of multifocal area projects should be reduced to a level comparable to that of single focal area projects.
- (3) South-South cooperation should be enabled as components of national, regional and/or global projects where opportunities for exchange of technology, capacity development and/or sharing of best practices exist.