

Terms of Reference

GEF CLUSTER COUNTRY PORTFOLIO EVALUATION: Antigua and Barbuda, Dominica, Grenada, St. Kitts and Nevis, St. Lucia, St. Vincent and the Grenadines (1992-2010)

GEF Evaluation Office

March 2011

BACKGROUND AND INTRODUCTION

1. Country Portfolio Evaluations (CPEs) are one of the main evaluation streams of work of the GEF Evaluation Office. By capturing aggregate portfolio results and performance of the GEF at the country level they provide useful information for both the GEF Council and the countries on results and performance of the GEF supported activities, and on how these activities fit into the national strategies and priorities as well as within the global environmental mandate of the GEF. CPEs relevance and utility increases in GEF-5 with the increased emphasis on country ownership and portfolio development at the country level.

2. The first CPE cycle has covered 11 countries during GEF-4.¹ A new CPE cycle covering 15 countries during GEF-5 has started during the last quarter of 2010. Two CPEs have been launched in Nicaragua and in a selection of member countries of the Organization of the Eastern Caribbean States (OECS), consisting of Antigua and Barbuda, Dominica, Grenada, St. Kitts and Nevis, St. Lucia and St. Vincent and the Grenadines. Two Country Portfolio Studies are also being conducted this year in El Salvador and in Jamaica in collaboration with the UNDP Evaluation Office.² These terms of reference relate to the OECS Cluster CPE.

3. Countries are selected for portfolio evaluations among 160 GEF eligible countries, based on a stratified randomized selection and a set of strategic criteria, as described in the recently revised “Note on the Selection Process and Criteria for the GEF Country Portfolio Evaluations”.³ Beyond that, the decision to conduct a CPE covering six OECS member countries through a cluster approach originates from the fact that regional projects are a predominant modality of GEF support in these countries. This provides an excellent opportunity to assess the real impact of such a GEF modality at country level. Moreover, Small Islands Development States (SIDS) have been given a preferential selection criterion in the CPE work plan for GEF-5. Moreover, some GEF regional projects in biodiversity and international waters focal areas have originated from the perspective of the environmental role played by OECS in the Eastern Caribbean region.

4. The OECS countries face challenges of diseconomies of scale, especially in infrastructure, institutions, and markets. Their location also makes them vulnerable to periodic natural disasters and climate change phenomena, such as rising sea levels. While they enjoy the benefits of very open economies, they are at the same time vulnerable to external shocks such as the still ongoing impact of the recent global financial crisis. The OECS was formed in 1981 in an attempt to address some of the political and economic limitations posed by its member countries’ small size and population, building on their common features

¹ Countries having undergone CPEs during GEF-4 are: Costa Rica, Samoa, the Philippines, Benin, Cameroon, Madagascar, South Africa, Egypt, Syria, Turkey and Moldova.

² Country Portfolio Studies (CPSs) provide additional coverage of country portfolios, but have a reduced focus and scope. CPSs are undertaken where opportunities to collaborate with independent evaluation offices of GEF partners present themselves. With a relatively lower investment the GEF portfolio in a country is analyzed in collaboration with an ongoing country level evaluation.

³ http://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/documents/CPE_final_country_selection_note-0910_0.pdf

and interests. OECS' achievements to date in terms of deepening regional integration include: the Basseterre Treaty for economic and functional cooperation in foreign, defense and security policies; a common currency and central bank; an integrated legal system; and coordinated approaches to critical shared sectors such as education, health, agriculture, tourism, export development, the environment, and maritime matters. To lessen the impact of weather-related hazards and rising sea levels, OECS countries have stepped up efforts to preserve and protect their natural environment. In 2006, they ratified the St. Georges Declaration, updated in 2008, which identifies principles and guidelines for the use, conservation and management of the region's natural resources.⁴

5. The OECS member countries included in the evaluation have a population varying from as small as 50,000 people (St Kitts and Nevis) to 160,000 people (St Lucia). After a history of sugar cane plantations under the British Empire, today these countries' economies depend in large part on the tourist industry. At times, enforcement of environmental protection as well as conservation of natural resources is softened in order not to discourage foreign and national investors in tourism infrastructures and services. The six islands are also very diverse from each other in ecological and climatic terms. Countries like Antigua and Barbuda are flat and dry, with problems of desertification and scarcity of fresh water. Countries like Dominica are mountainous, with a rich rain forest endowed with abundant natural resources. Ecological concerns are likely to be different from one island to the other.

6. GEF activities in the six countries started back in 1992, mainly through a few important regional projects implemented by the World Bank. Enabling activities in biodiversity, climate change, and persistent organic pollutants to report to the environmental conventions have been implemented through UNDP and UNEP. The main GEF Agency for national projects is the UNDP both from the point of view of funding and number of projects.

7. The GEF portfolio in the six countries consists of 42 national, 16 regional, and 2 global projects. To these have to be added the 1st global biosafety project, related to the development of National Biosafety Frameworks (NBF) and the 2nd national communication to UNFCCC.⁵ Of the national projects, 32 are enabling activities, most of which have been completed. In all countries but Antigua there is a national component of the global Sustainable Land Management (SLM) project under implementation. These are listed as national Medium Size Projects (MSP) in the GEF Project Management Information System (PMIS). All countries participate in the Small Grants Programme (SGP). Antigua and Barbuda has the only national Full Size Project (FSP), multi-focal, being implemented by UNDP.

8. Under the System for Transparent Allocation of Resources (STAR) for GEF-5, each country has been allocated between \$4.000 and \$4.730 million. Under the new STAR procedures, countries can use those resources flexibly. None has been utilized yet.

Table 1: GEF-5 STAR allocations by focal area and country (US\$ million)

Country	BD	CC	LD	Total
Antigua and Barbuda	1,500,000	2,000,000	940,000	4,440,000
Dominica	1,500,000	2,000,000	500,000	4,000,000
Grenada	1,500,000	2,000,000	1,160,000	4,660,000
St Kitts and Nevis	1,500,000	2,000,000	980,000	4,480,000
St Lucia	1,870,000	2,000,000	860,000	4,730,000
St Vincent and the Grenadines	1,500,000	2,000,000	710,000	4,210,000

9. Since 1991, the GEF has invested about US\$12.31 million (with about US\$10.13 million in co-financing) through 42 national projects, namely 15 in biodiversity, 12 in climate change, 5 in land

⁴ St. Georges Declaration of Principles for Environmental Sustainability in the OECS, 2006.

⁵ A decision will be taken during the evaluation phase on whether to add these two projects in the national, regional or global portfolio.

degradation, 3 in POPs and 7 multi-focal area projects, plus the SGP. Out of the 42 national projects, 36 have been completed and 6 are ongoing.

Table 2: GEF support to national projects by focal area and GEF Agencies (US\$ million)

Agency	Focal Area	Total/Focal Area	Totals
World Bank	Biodiversity	0.72	1.17
	Climate Change	0.45	
UNDP	Biodiversity	1.61	9.07
	Climate Change	1.34	
	Land Degradation	2.50	
	Multi-focal	3.62	
UNEP	Biodiversity	0.45	2.07
	POPs	1.06	
	Multi-focal	0.57	
		Total	12.31

10. As previously noted, regional projects have been and still are a major modality of GEF support in the six countries. As such, they will constitute a major focus of the OECS Cluster CPE. All the countries participated in 8 out of 15 regional projects included in the OECS Cluster CPE portfolio. All in all, the regional portfolio comprises 3 projects in biodiversity, 4 projects in climate change adaptation and 2 in climate change mitigation, 4 projects in international waters and 2 multi-focal area projects.

Table 3: Regional and global projects involving the six OECS countries by focal area and GEF Agency

Focal Area	WB	UNDP	UNEP	IADB	Total
Biodiversity	2		8 ⁶		10
Climate Change	3	3	2		8
International Waters	1	2	1	1	5
Multi Focal		1	1		2
Total	6	6	11	1	25

OBJECTIVES OF THE EVALUATION

11. The purpose of the OECS Cluster CPEs is to provide GEF Council with an assessment of how GEF is implemented at the country level, a report on results from projects and assess how these projects are linked to national environmental and sustainable development agendas as well as to the GEF mandate of generating global environmental benefits within its focal areas. The evaluation will have the following objectives:

- i. independently evaluate the **relevance** and **efficiency**⁷ of the GEF support in a country from several points of view: national environmental frameworks and decision-making processes; the GEF mandate and the achievement of global environmental benefits; and GEF policies and procedures;
- ii. assess the **effectiveness** and **results**⁸ of completed projects aggregated by focal area;
- iii. provide additional evaluative evidence to other evaluations conducted or sponsored by the Office; and

⁶ Seven of these are global and regional projects in biosafety.

⁷ **Relevance:** the extent to which the objectives of the GEF activity are consistent with beneficiaries' requirements, country needs, global priorities and partners' and donors' policies; **Efficiency:** a measure of how economically resources/inputs (funds, expertise, time, etc.) are converted to results.

⁸ **Results:** the output, outcome or impact (intended or unintended, positive and/or negative) of a GEF activity; **Effectiveness:** the extent to which the GEF activity's objectives were achieved, or are expected to be achieved, taking into account their relative importance.

- iv. provide **feedback** and **knowledge** sharing to (1) the GEF Council in its decision making process to allocate resources and to develop policies and strategies; (2) the Country on its participation in, or collaboration with the GEF; and (3) the different agencies and organizations involved in the preparation and implementation of GEF funded projects and activities.

12. The performance of the GEF portfolios in the six countries will be assessed in terms of relevance, efficiency and effectiveness, and of the contributing factors to this performance. The OECS Cluster CPE will analyze the performance of individual projects as part of the overall GEF portfolio, but without rating such projects. CPEs do not aim at evaluating or rating the performance of the GEF Agencies, partners or national governments.

KEY EVALUATION QUESTIONS

13. CPEs are guided by a set of key questions that should be answered based on the quantitative and qualitative analysis of the evaluative information and perceptions collected during the evaluation exercise. The OECS Cluster CPE will be guided by the following key questions:

Effectiveness, results and sustainability⁹

- a) What are the results (outcomes and impacts) of GEF support at the project level?
- b) What are the results of GEF support at the aggregate level (portfolio and program) by focal area?
- c) What are the results of GEF support at the regional level?
- d) Is GEF support effective in producing results that build on previous lessons learned and good practices from GEF projects and partners?
- e) Is GEF support effective in producing results that are sustained after project completion?
- f) Is GEF support progressing in scale and scope in OECS countries and the region to achieve increasingly more substantial results?
- g) Is GEF support effective at developing capacity within the OECS region?

Relevance

- a) Is GEF support relevant to the OECS and its member countries' national environmental priorities and national GEF focal area strategies and action plans?
- b) Is GEF support relevant to the OECS and its member countries' sustainable development needs and priorities?
- c) Is GEF support relevant to global environmental benefits in OECS and its member countries (i.e. biodiversity, GHG, international waters, POPs, land degradation, etc.)?
- d) Is GEF support relevant to the GEF mandate, operational principles, and global focal area strategies?
- e) Is GEF support relevant to emerging or evolving issues in the OECS region?
- f) Is GEF support relevant to the varying levels of capacity and differing needs and priorities among OECS countries?
- g) Are regional approaches relevant to the needs of participating OECS countries?

⁹ **Sustainability:** The likelihood that an intervention will continue to deliver benefits for an extended period of time after completion.

Efficiency

- a) How much time, money and effort is expended to develop and implement a project in the OECS region? (by type of GEF support modality, including SGP)
- b) What are the roles, and level of coordination and communication, among stakeholders in project development and implementation?
- c) Are GEF modalities and processes adequate for efficiently addressing the needs and priorities of SIDS in the Caribbean region?
- d) What are the synergies for GEF programming and implementation (including among GEF focal areas) among: GEF Agencies; national and regional institutions; GEF projects; and other donor-supported projects and activities in the OECS region?
- e) Has the GEF support mobilized resources from other sources for the environment?
- f) Is monitoring and evaluation contributing to efficiency and effectiveness of GEF support in the region?

14. Each of these questions is complemented by an evaluation matrix, which is presented in Annex 1. The matrix contains a tentative list of indicators or basic data, potential sources of information, and methodology components, and will be validated and/or further developed by the evaluation team once the evaluation phase starts. As a basis, the evaluation will use the indicators in the GEF project documents as well as indicators of each of the focal areas and STAR as well as any appropriate and available national sustainable development and environmental indicator.

SCOPE AND LIMITATIONS

15. The OECS Cluster CPE will cover all types of GEF supported activities in the country at all stages of the project cycle (pipeline, on-going and completed) and implemented by all GEF Agencies in all focal areas, including applicable GEF corporate activities such as the SGP and a selection of regional and global programs that are of special relevance to the six countries.

16. While the evaluation will look at the projects implemented within the boundaries of the six countries, i.e. the national projects, be them full size, medium size or enabling activities, a major focus will be a selection of the most important regional projects in which all the six countries participate, clustered by focal area or theme (i.e. biosafety, climate change adaptation, international waters, among others). This will be the case for those projects which are interlinked in a phased programmatic approach. This part of the evaluation will review the overall GEF support to the six countries through these regional projects, report on results within the countries themselves and describe the ways the six countries contribute to and/or participate in them. The review of selected regional projects will feed in the aggregate assessment of the national GEF portfolio described above.

17. The stage of the project will determine the expected focus of the analysis:

Table 4: Focus of evaluation according to the stage of the project

Project Status	Focus		On a exploratory basis	
	Relevance	Efficiency	Effectiveness	Results
Completed	Full	Full	Full	Full
On-going	Full	Partially	Likelihood	Likelihood
Pipeline	Expected	Processes	n.a.	n.a.

18. CPEs are challenging as the GEF does not establish country programs that specify expected achievements through programmatic objectives, indicators, and targets.¹⁰ In general, CPEs entail some

¹⁰ Voluntary National Portfolio Formulation Exercises (NPFES) are being introduced in GEF-5. CPEs that will be conducted in countries having chosen to do an NPFE will use it as a basis for assessing the aggregate results, efficiency and relevance of the GEF country portfolio.

degree of retrofitting of frameworks to be able to judge the relevance of the aggregated results of a diverse portfolio of projects. Accordingly, the standard CPE evaluation framework described here will be adapted along with the other relevant national and GEF Agencies' strategies, country programs and/or planning frameworks as a basis for assessing the aggregate results, efficiency and relevance of the GEF country portfolio.

19. GEF support is provided through partnerships with many institutions operating at many levels, from local to national, regional and international level. It is therefore challenging to consider GEF support separately. The OECS Cluster CPE will not attempt to provide a direct attribution of development results to the GEF, but address the contribution of the GEF support to the overall achievements, i.e. to establish a credible link between what GEF supported activities and its implications. The evaluation will address how GEF support has contributed to overall achievements in partnership with others, by questions on roles and coordination, synergies and complementarities and knowledge sharing.

20. The assessment of results will be focused, where possible, at the level of outcomes and impacts rather than outputs. Project-level results will be measured against the overall expected impact and outcomes from each project. Progress towards impact of a representative sample of mature enough projects (i.e. completed at least since 2 years) will be looked at through field Reviews of Outcome to Impact (ROtI) studies. Expected impacts at the focal area level will be assessed in the context of GEF objectives and indicators of global environmental benefits. Outcomes at the focal area level will be primarily assessed in relation to catalytic and replication effects, institutional sustainability and capacity building, and awareness.

21. The context in which these projects were developed, approved and are being implemented constitutes a focus of the evaluation. This includes a historical causality assessment of the national sustainable development and environmental policies, strategies and priorities, legal environment in which these policies are implemented and enforced, GEF Agency country strategies and programs and the GEF policies, principles, programs and strategies.

22. Weaknesses of M&E at the project and GEF program levels have been mentioned in past CPEs and other evaluations of the Office, and have been highlighted by many stakeholders consulted during the scoping mission. These weaknesses may pose challenges to the OECS Cluster CPE as well. Not all the information which will be used for the analysis will be of a quantitative nature.

METHODOLOGY

23. The OECS Cluster CPE will be conducted by staff of GEF Evaluation Office and a team of national, regional and international consultants, i.e. the Evaluation Team, led by a Task Manager from the GEF Evaluation Office. The team includes technical expertise on the national and regional environmental and sustainable development strategies, evaluation methodologies, and GEF.

24. The selected consultants qualify under the GEF Evaluation Office Ethical Guidelines, and are requested to sign a declaration of interest to indicate no recent (last 3-5 years) relationship with GEF support in the country. In line with Office practice when selecting consultants for evaluations, the Office gives preference to national or regional experts. Consultants with expertise in both environment and evaluation within the six countries in this particular CPE is limited. Some of the selected national and regional consultants to conduct this evaluation have participated in the design and/or implementation of some of the projects included in the CPE. In such cases, the Office will make sure that those consultants will not be assigned to the assessment, review or evaluation of the projects in which they have been involved in the past.

25. The GEF Focal Point mechanisms in the six OECS countries, although not members of the evaluation team, will be essential partners in the evaluation.

26. The methodology includes a series of components using a combination of qualitative and quantitative methods and tools. The qualitative aspects of the evaluation include a desk review of existing documentation. The expected sources of information include:

- Project level: project documents, project implementation reports, mid-term reviews, terminal evaluations, terminal evaluation reviews, reports from monitoring visits, and any other technical documents produced by projects;
- Country level: national sustainable development agendas, environmental priorities and strategies, GEF-wide, focal area strategies and action plans, global and national environmental indicators;
- Agency levels: country assistance strategies and frameworks and their evaluations and reviews;
- Evaluative evidence at country level from other evaluations implemented either by the Office, by the independent evaluation offices of GEF Agencies, or by other national or international evaluation departments;
- Interviews with GEF stakeholders, including the GEF focal point and all other relevant government departments, regional organizations (including CARICOM, CCCCC, OECS, CEHI and others), bilateral and multilateral donors, civil society organizations and academia (including local NGOs), GEF agencies (World Bank, UNDP, UNEP), SGP and the national UN Conventions' focal points;
- Interviews with GEF beneficiaries and supported institutions, municipal governments and associations, and local communities and authorities;
- Field visits to selected project sites;
- Information from national consultation workshops.

27. The quantitative analysis will use indicators to assess the relevance and efficiency of GEF support using projects as the unit of analysis (that is, linkages with national priorities, time and cost of preparing and implementing projects, etc.) and to measure GEF results (that is, progress towards achieving global environmental impacts) and performance of projects (such as implementation and completion ratings). Available statistics and scientific sources, especially for national environmental indicators, will also be used.

28. The Evaluation Team will use standard tools and protocols for the CPEs and adapt these to the OECS context. These tools include a project review protocol to conduct the desk and field reviews of GEF projects and interview guides to conduct interviews with different stakeholders.

29. A selection of project sites will be visited, including but not only in the context of the conduct of the two foreseen ROTI field studies (see further below). The criteria for selecting the sites will be finalized during the implementation of the evaluation, with emphasis placed on both ongoing and completed projects.

30. The evaluation team will decide on specific sites to visit based on the initial review of documentation and balancing needs of representation as well as cost-effectiveness of conducting the field visits. Quality assurance on evaluation methods, tools and processes used will be performed at key stages of the process by two external experts renowned in the international evaluation community and academia. To this end, memorandums of understanding have been prepared and signed by the Evaluation Office and appropriate institutions to which the experts belong.

PROCESS AND OUTPUTS

31. These country-specific TOR have been prepared based on an initial GEF Evaluation Office visit to the six OECS countries in January 2011, conducted with the purpose of scoping the evaluation and identifying key issues to be included in the analysis. The mission was also an opportunity to officially launch the evaluation, while at the same time introduce the selected consultants to GEF national stakeholders. These TOR conclude the OECS Cluster CPE preparatory phase, and set the scene for the evaluation phase, during which the Evaluation Team will complete the following tasks:

- Complete the ongoing **literature review** to extract existing reliable evaluative evidence;

- Prepare specific inputs to the evaluation:¹¹
 - **GEF portfolio database**, which describes all GEF support activities within the country, basic information (GEF Agency, focal area, GEF modality), their implementation status, project cycle information, GEF and co-financing financial information, major objectives and expected (or actual) results, key partners per project, etc.
 - **Regional Environmental Legal Overview**, which provides an historical perspective of the context in which the GEF projects have been developed and implemented in the OECS region. This document will be based on information on regional environmental legislation and national environmental policies of government administrations in the six countries (plans, strategies and similar), and the international agreements signed by the six countries presented and analyzed through time so to be able to connect with particular GEF support.
 - **Global Environmental Benefits Assessment**, which provides an assessment of the country's contribution to the GEF mandate and its focal areas based on appropriate indicators, such as those used in the System for the Transparent Allocation of Resources (STAR) (biodiversity, climate change and land degradation) and others used in projects documents;
 - **Review of Outcomes to Impact (ROtI)** field studies of one regional and one national project completed since at least two years, selected in consultation with the Evaluation Office staff, which will contribute to strengthen the information gathering and analysis on results.
- Conduct **field visits** of ongoing and completed national projects, selected in consultation with the Office staff, which will contribute to strengthen the information gathering and analysis on both efficiency and results.
- Conduct the **evaluation analysis** and **triangulation** of collected information and evidence from various sources, tools and methods. This will be done internally by the Evaluation Team at the end of the evaluation data gathering and analysis phase in May 2011. The aim will be to consolidate the evidence gathered so far and fill in any eventual information and analysis gaps before getting to findings, conclusions and preliminary recommendations.
- Conduct a **Final Consultation Workshop**¹² with participation of representatives from the six countries, to present and gather stakeholders' feedback on the key preliminary findings emerged from the analysis, conclusions and preliminary recommendations to be included in an Aide-Mémoire. The workshop will also be an opportunity to verify eventual errors of facts or analysis in case these are supported by adequate additional evidence brought to the attention of the Evaluation Team;
- Prepare a **draft OECS Cluster CPE report**, which incorporates comments received at the final consultation workshop. The draft report will be sent out to the external peer reviewers before circulation to stakeholders;
- Consider the eventual incorporation of comments received to the draft report and prepare the **final OECS Cluster CPE report**.¹³

32. As was the case during the scoping mission, the national GEF Focal Point mechanisms in the six countries will assist the Evaluation Team and consultants with the identification of key people to be interviewed, communication with relevant government departments, support to organize interviews, field visits and meetings, and identification of main documents. The GEF Agencies will be requested to assist the Evaluation Team and the selected consultants regarding their specific GEF-supported projects and activities, including identification of key project and agency staff to be interviewed and provision of project documentation and data.

¹¹ These inputs are first of all working documents. A decision on whether to publish them as technical annexes to the CPE report will be taken later in the evaluation process. In any case, they are not expected to be published as separate documents.

¹² It was agreed with the six countries during the scoping mission to hold the workshop in St Lucia.

¹³ The GEF Evaluation Office will bear full responsibility for the content of the report.

EVALUATION KEY MILESTONES

33. The evaluation analysis phase is conducted between end of March 2011 and August 2011. The key milestones of the evaluation are presented here below:

Table 5: Evaluation milestones

Milestone	Deadline
Literature review	March 31, 2011
Finalization of the GEF OECS portfolio database	March 31, 2011
Regional Environmental Legal Framework	March 31, 2011
Global Environmental Benefits Assessment	March 31, 2011
Two field ROI studies	April 30, 2011
Data collection/interviews and filling project review protocols	May 15, 2011
Consolidation of evaluative evidence, eventual additional field visits	May 15, 2011
National consultation workshop	May 31, 2011
Draft OECS Cluster CPE report sent out for external peer review	June 20, 2011
Draft OECS Cluster CPE report sent out to stakeholders for comments	June 30, 2011
Incorporation of comments received in a final OECS Cluster CPE report	July 20, 2011
Final OECS Cluster CPE report	August 30, 2011

CPE REPORT OUTLINE

34. The CPE report should be a concise, stand-alone document organized along the following general table of contents:

CHAPTER 1. Main Conclusions and Recommendations

Background

Objectives, Scope and Methodology

Conclusions

- Relevance
- Efficiency
- Results and effectiveness

Recommendations

CHAPTER 2. Evaluation Framework

Background

Objectives and Scope

Methodology

Limitations

CHAPTER 3. Context

The OECS region and the six countries under analysis: General description

Environmental resources in key GEF support areas

Overview of the environmental legal framework in the OECS region

Overview of the environmental policy framework in the OECS region

The Global Environmental Facility: General description

CHAPTER 4. The GEF portfolio in the six OECS member countries under analysis

Defining the GEF Portfolio

Activities in the GEF Portfolio

Evolution of GEF Support by Focal Area and by GEF Agency

Corporate, Regional and Global Programs

- CHAPTER 5. Effectiveness, results and sustainability of GEF support to the six OECS countries under analysis
Regional and Global Environmental Impacts
Catalytic and Replication Effects
Institutional Sustainability and Capacity Building
Results by Focal Area
- CHAPTER 6. Relevance of the GEF support to the six OECS countries under analysis (at national and regional level)
Relevance of GEF Support to the six OECS countries' Sustainable Development Agenda and Environmental Priorities (at national and regional level)
Relevance of GEF Support to the six countries' Development Priorities and Challenges (at national and regional level)
Relevance of GEF Support to National and Regional Action Plans within GEF Focal Areas
Relevance of GEF Support to the achievement of Global Environmental Benefits
Relevance of the GEF Portfolio to Other Global, Regional and National Institutions
- CHAPTER 7. Efficiency of GEF support to the six OECS countries under analysis
Time, Effort, and Financial Resources Required for Project formulation
Coordination and Synergies
Monitoring and Evaluation for Project Adaptive Management
Roles and Responsibilities among Different Stakeholders in Project Implementation
The GEF Focal Point Mechanism in the six OECS countries under analysis
Learning
- ANNEXES
- A. Countries' Responses
 - B. OECS cluster CPE - specific Terms of Reference
 - C. Evaluation Matrix
 - D. Interviewees
 - E. Sites Visited
 - F. Workshop Participants
 - G. GEF Portfolio in the six OECS countries under analysis
 - H. Bibliography

Annex 1 OECS Cluster CPE - Evaluation Matrix

Key Question	Indicators / Data	Sources of Information	Methodology
Effectiveness, Results and Sustainability			
1. What are the results (outcomes and impacts) of GEF support at the project level?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Project outcome and impacts - Existing ratings for project outcomes (i.e., self-ratings and independent ratings) of expected vs actual results - Effectiveness of different GEF modalities - Effectiveness of regional approaches vs national projects (may need comparison outside the region?) - Changes in global benefits indexes and other global environmental indicators 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Projects' staff, local stakeholders, local and national government officials - Project related reviews, (implementation reports, mid-term reviews, terminal evaluations, TE reviews, etc.) - Evaluative evidence from projects and donors 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Stakeholder consultation: Individual interviews, focus groups - ROTI studies - Project field visits - Desk review: Project review protocols - Desk review: Meta-analysis of evaluation reports - Literature review - Global Environmental Benefits Assessment
2. What are the results of GEF support at the aggregate level (portfolio and program) by focal area?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Aggregated project outcomes and impacts - Catalytic effect (i.e. replication and up-scaling) - Contribution by the GEF 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Projects' staff, local stakeholders, national and local government representatives - Project related reviews, (implementation reports, mid-term reviews, terminal evaluations, TE reviews, etc.) - Data from overall projects and other donors 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Desk review: Project review protocols - Desk review: Meta-analysis of evaluation reports - Stakeholder consultation: Individual interviews, focus groups - Project field visits - ROTI studies - Global Environmental Benefits Assessment
3. What are the results of GEF support at the regional level?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Aggregated outcomes and impact, including analysis of results from regional vs. national modalities - Overall outcomes and impact of GEF support - Outcomes and impacts generated from regional synergy - Catalytic effect (i.e. replication and up-scaling) - Adequate accounting in project design for risks specific to OECS countries and the region as a whole - Integration and mainstreaming of measures addressing environmental issues with the national and regional 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Project related documentation (project document and logframe, implementation reports, mid-term reviews, terminal evaluations, TE reviews, etc.), PMIS, GEF agencies' project databases - Projects' staff, local stakeholders, local and national government officials - Regional organizations staff - Data from projects financed by other donors and or by the government 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Desk review: Project review protocols - Desk review: Meta-analysis of evaluation reports - Project field visits - Stakeholder consultation: Individual interviews, focus groups - ROTI studies - Global Environmental Benefits Assessment

Key Question	Indicators / Data	Sources of Information	Methodology
	development agenda and policy frameworks		
4. What are the results of GEF support that build on previous lessons learned and good practices from GEF projects and partners?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Project design, preparation and implementation have incorporated lessons from previous projects within and outside the GEF - Quality and application of M&E and knowledge management systems and tools - Existence and effectiveness of information and data sharing processes/mechanisms, corresponding to adequacy of information flows 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Project related reviews, (implementation reports, mid-term reviews, terminal evaluations, TE reviews, etc.) - GEF Secretariat - GEF agency staff - NGO staff, projects' staff, local stakeholders, local and national government officials - Regional organizations staff - Available national statistics and environmental databases 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Desk review: Project review protocols - Desk review: Meta-analysis of evaluation reports - ROTI studies - Stakeholder consultation: Individual interviews, focus groups
5. What are the results of GEF support that are sustained after project completion?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Availability of financial resources - Availability of technical capacity - Stakeholders' ownership - Environmental risks - Existence of an adequate institutional and legal framework 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Project related reviews, (implementation reports, mid-term reviews, terminal evaluations, TE reviews, etc.) - GEF agency staff - Executing agency staff - Projects' staff, local stakeholders, local and national government officials 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Desk review: Project review protocols - Desk review: Meta-analysis of evaluation reports - Project field visits - Stakeholder consultation: Individual interviews, focus groups - ROTI studies
6. Is GEF support progressing in scale and scope in OECS countries and the region to achieve increasingly more substantial results?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Type and size of GEF investment in the region over time - Existence of strategies and frameworks for implementation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Project related documentation (project document and logframe, implementation reports, mid-term reviews, terminal evaluations, TE reviews, etc.), PMIS, GEF agencies' project databases - GEF agency staff - Executing agency staff - Projects' staff, local stakeholders, local and national government officials - Regional organizations staff 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Desk review: GEF portfolio analysis - Desk review: Project review protocols - Desk review: Meta-analysis of evaluation reports - Project field visits - Stakeholder consultation: Individual interviews, focus groups
7. Is GEF support effective at developing capacity within the OECS region?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Increasing ability of institutions and organizations to originate and drive project development process - Increasing ability of government to respond to and effectively manage environmental issues - Increasing ability of government to implement international environmental conventions - Increasing use of local or regional technical capacity, as appropriate 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Project related documentation (project document and logframe, implementation reports, mid-term reviews, terminal evaluations, TE reviews, etc.), PMIS, GEF agencies' project databases - GEF agency staff - Executing agency staff - Projects' staff, local stakeholders, local and 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Desk review: Project review protocols - Desk review: Meta-analysis of evaluation reports - Project field visits - Stakeholder consultation: Individual interviews, focus groups - Regional Legal Environmental

Key Question	Indicators / Data	Sources of Information	Methodology
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Share of investment focused on local / regional capacity development (individual or institutional) - Level of public awareness and engagement on globally significant environmental issues 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - national government officials - Regional organizations staff 	<p>Framework</p>
Relevance			
<p>8. Is GEF support relevant to the OECS and its member countries' national environmental priorities and national GEF focal area strategies and action plans?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Coherence of GEF support with countries' environmental priorities - Linkage of GEF support to national environmental action plans (NEAP); National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (NBSAP); national communications to UNFCCC; POPs National Implementation Plans (NIPs); National Capacity Self Assessment (NCSA); adaptation to climate change (NAPA); as well as relevant regional strategies and action plans, etc. - Coherence of GEF support with regional environmental priorities - Level of GEF funding compared to other ODA in the environment sector - Level of country and/or regional stakeholders ownership in GEF-supported project concept origin, design and implementation - Existence of mechanisms/processes within countries and within the region to coordinate GEF support and ensure relevance 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Relevant country level sustainable development and environment policies, strategies and action plans - GEF-supported enabling activities and products (NCSA, NEAP, NAPA, national communications to UN conventions, etc.) - Small Grants Programme country and regional strategies - Local and national government officials, GEF agencies' staff, donors and civil society representatives - Project related documentation (project document and logframe, implementation reports, mid-term reviews, terminal evaluations, TE reviews, etc.), PMIS, GEF agencies' project databases - Available databases (international as WB, OECD, etc., and national, i.e. dept of statistics, other) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Desk review: GEF portfolio analysis - Stakeholder consultation: Individual interviews, focus groups - Regional Legal Environmental Framework
<p>9. Is GEF support relevant to the OECS and its member countries' sustainable development needs and priorities?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Coherence of GEF support with sustainable development needs (i.e., income generation, food security, education, gender equity, health, clean water) - Ability of the GEF modalities, projects and instruments to address countries' and regional sustainable development needs and challenges 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Relevant country level sustainable development policies, strategies and action plans - Project related documentation (project document and logframe, implementation reports, mid-term reviews, terminal evaluations, TE reviews, etc.), PMIS, GEF agencies' project databases - Local and national government officials, GEF agencies' staff, donors and civil society representatives 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Desk review: GEF portfolio analysis - Stakeholder consultation: Individual interviews, focus groups - Regional Legal Environmental Framework
<p>10. Is GEF support relevant</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Relation of project outcomes and impacts to RAF / 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - National convention action plans, RAF, BD 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Desk review: GEF portfolio analysis

Key Question	Indicators / Data	Sources of Information	Methodology
to global environmental benefits in OECS and its member countries (i.e. biodiversity, GHG, international waters, POPs, land degradation, etc.)?	<p>STAR Global Environmental Benefit index (for biodiversity, climate change, and land degradation) and to other global indicators for POPs, land degradation and international waters</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Relation of project outcome and impacts to threats identified by non-GEF sources to globally significant environmental resources - Linkage of GEF support to national implementation of conventions 	<p>scorecard, etc.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Project related documentation (project document and logframe, implementation reports, mid-term reviews, terminal evaluations, TE reviews, etc.), PMIS, GEF agencies' project databases - Local and national government officials, GEF agencies' staff, donors and civil society representatives 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Project field visits - Desk review: Project review protocols - Regional Legal Environmental Framework - Stakeholder consultation: Individual interviews, focus groups - Global Environmental Benefits Assessment
11. Is GEF support relevant to the GEF mandate, operational principles, and global focal area strategies?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Coherence of GEF supported activities with GEF mandate and operational principles (i.e. catalytic role, flexibility, transparency, incremental cost, country-drivenness, etc.) - GEF-supported activities contribute to implementation of global environmental conventions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - GEF instrument, council decisions, focal area strategies, GEF-5 programming strategy - Project related documentation (project document and logframe, implementation reports, mid-term reviews, terminal evaluations, TE reviews, etc.), PMIS, GEF agencies' project databases - GEF Secretariat staff - GEF agencies' staff 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Desk review: GEF portfolio analysis - Stakeholder consultation: Individual interviews, focus groups - Global Environmental Benefits Assessment - Regional Legal Environmental Framework
12. Is GEF support relevant to emerging or evolving issues in the OECS region?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - GEF activities alignment with issues currently deemed most urgent vs. alignment with past obsolete or less presently relevant priorities - Existence, currency, and accessibility of environmental data produced with GEF support, to identify and track emerging and evolving issues 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Project related documentation (project document and logframe, implementation reports, terminal evaluations, TE reviews, etc.), PMIS, GEF agencies' project databases - Available national statistics and environmental databases - Available international statistics and databases (WB, OECD, etc.) - Local and national government officials, GEF agencies' staff, donors and civil society representatives 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Desk review: Project review protocols - Desk review: Meta-analysis of evaluation reports - Literature review - Stakeholder consultation: Individual interviews, focus groups - Project field visits
13. Is GEF support relevant to the varying levels of capacity and differing needs and priorities among OECS countries?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Level of tailoring or customization of approach within regionally focused activities - Ability of GEF support to meet individual country needs and priorities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Project related documentation (project document and logframe, implementation reports, mid-term reviews, terminal evaluations, TE reviews, etc.), PMIS, Agencies' project databases - GEF Secretariat staff - GEF agencies' staff - Local and national government officials, 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Desk review: Project review protocols - Desk review: Meta-analysis of evaluation reports - Stakeholder consultation: Individual interviews, focus groups - Project field visits

Key Question	Indicators / Data	Sources of Information	Methodology
<p>14. Are regional approaches relevant to the needs of participating OECS countries?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Coherence of regional projects with national priorities - Activities of regional projects implemented in participation countries - National level inputs to regional project management and governance structures - Institutional mechanisms in place for ensuring relevance 	<p>donors, NGOs, local stakeholders</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Relevant country level sustainable development policies, strategies and action plans - Project related documentation (project document and logframe, implementation reports, mid-term reviews, terminal evaluations, TE reviews, etc.), PMIS, Agencies' project databases - GEF Secretariat staff - GEF agencies' staff - Local and national government officials, donors, NGOs, local stakeholders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Desk review: Project review protocols - Desk review: Meta-analysis of evaluation reports - Stakeholder consultation: Individual interviews, focus groups - Project field visits
Efficiency			
<p>15. How much time, money and effort is expended to develop and implement a project in the OECS region? (by type of GEF support modality, including SGP)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Process indicators: processing timing (according to project cycle steps) (also linked with timeliness of relevance), preparation and implementation cost by type of modalities, etc. - Adequacy of budgets for management, implementation, and follow-up - Level of project oversight from GEF agencies - Adequacy of communication of GEF policies and procedures (and of changes as they occur) - Timeliness of disbursements - Projects drop-outs from PDF and cancellations - GEF vs. co-financing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Project related documentation (project document and logframe, implementation reports, mid-term reviews, terminal evaluations, TE reviews, etc.), PMIS, agencies' project databases - GEF Secretariat - GEF agencies' staff - Executing agency staff - Regional organizations staff - Local and national government officials, donors, NGOs, local stakeholders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Desk review: GEF portfolio analysis - Desk review: Project review protocols - Desk review: Meta-analysis of evaluation reports - Stakeholder consultation: Individual interviews, focus groups - Project field visits
<p>16. What are the roles, and level of coordination and communication, among stakeholders in project development and implementation?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Balance between national and regional components and activities of regional projects - Extensiveness of engagement in different steps of the process - Balance of use of external vs. national / regional technical capacity - Roles and responsibilities of GEF actors - Level of participation of relevant stakeholders throughout project cycle - Level of communication between GEF focal points and 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Project related reviews, (implementation reports, mid-term reviews, terminal evaluations, TE reviews, etc.) - Project staff, government officials - GEF Secretariat - GEF agencies' staff - Executing agency staff - Regional organizations staff 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Desk review: Project review protocols - Desk review: Meta-analysis of evaluation reports - Stakeholder consultation: Individual interviews, focus groups - Project field visits

Key Question	Indicators / Data	Sources of Information	Methodology
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - other national stakeholders - Coordination between GEF projects, including between national and regional projects - Existence and efficiency of a national (/regional) coordination mechanism for GEF support - Balance of competing regional interests - Examples of adaptive management / flexibility 		
<p>17. Are GEF modalities and processes adequate for efficiently addressing the needs and priorities of SIDS in the Caribbean region?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Capacity to apply GEF modalities in OECS countries at national and regional scales - Identified gaps or needs that are not addressed through GEF modalities - Level of understanding of processes for applying GEF modalities - Methods and structures of GEF engagement at the national level (FPs, agencies, etc.) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Project related reviews, (implementation reports, mid-term reviews, terminal evaluations, TE reviews, etc.) - Project staff, government officials - Executing agency staff - GEF Secretariat staff - GEF agency staff - Regional organizations staff 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Desk review: Project review protocols - Desk review: Meta-analysis of evaluation reports - Stakeholder consultation: Individual interviews, focus groups - Project field visits
<p>18. What are the synergies for GEF programming and implementation (including among GEF focal areas) among: GEF Agencies; national and regional institutions; GEF projects; and other donor-supported projects and activities in the OECS region?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Coordination and complementarity between projects implemented by different GEF agencies - Effective communication and technical support by GEF agencies - Existence and effectiveness of information and data sharing processes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Project related reviews, (implementation reports, mid-term reviews, terminal evaluations, TE reviews, etc.) - Regional, national and local government officials - GEF Secretariat - GEF agency staff - Executing agency staff - Regional organizations staff - NGO staffs and donors' representatives - Evaluations of other donors' funded projects - Available national statistics 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Desk review: Project review protocols - Desk review: Meta-analysis of evaluation reports - Stakeholder consultation: Individual interviews, focus groups - Project field visits
<p>19. Has the GEF support mobilized resources from other sources for the environment?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Co-financing ratios - Leveraged funding - Assessment of potential co-financing opportunities in SIDS - Sources of co-financing - Processes through which co-financing is secured 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Project related reviews, (implementation reports, mid-term reviews, terminal evaluations, TE reviews, etc.) - Local and national government - GEF Secretariat - GEF agency staff - Executing agency staff - Partners and other donors - Regional organizations staff 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Desk review: Project review protocols - Desk review: Meta-analysis of evaluation reports - Stakeholder consultation: Individual interviews, focus groups - Project field visits
<p>20. Is monitoring and</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Quality of M&E outputs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Project related reviews, (implementation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Desk review: Project review

Key Question	Indicators / Data	Sources of Information	Methodology
evaluation contributing to efficiency and effectiveness of GEF support in the region	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Quality and level of adaptive management applied to projects and programs - Project compliance with GEF and GEF agency M&E policies - Existence of needs or gaps in M&E coverage for regional approaches - Level of independence, quality and timeliness of external evaluations 	reports, mid-term reviews, terminal evaluations, TE reviews, etc.) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Local and national government - GEF Secretariat staff - GEF agency staff - Executing agency staff - Regional organization staff 	protocols <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Desk review: Meta-analysis of evaluation reports - Stakeholder consultation: Individual interviews, focus groups - Project field visits