

# Terms of Reference

## Joint GEF/Sri Lanka Country Portfolio Evaluation: (1991-2012)

---

Approved by the Joint Steering Committee on 15<sup>th</sup> of January 2013

### BACKGROUND AND INTRODUCTION

1. Country Portfolio Evaluations (CPEs) are one of the main evaluation streams of work of the GEF Evaluation Office.<sup>1</sup> By capturing aggregate portfolio results and performance of GEF support at the country level they provide useful information for both the GEF Council and the countries. CPEs relevance and utility has increased in GEF-5 with the increased emphasis on country ownership and country-driven portfolio development.

2. Countries are chosen for CPEs among those which are GEF eligible, based on a selection process and a set of criteria including the size, diversity and maturity of their portfolio of projects.<sup>2</sup> Among several considerations, Sri Lanka was selected based on its diverse portfolio including several completed/closed projects with significant emphasis on biodiversity and climate change. A distinctive feature of the Joint GEF/Sri Lanka CPE is that it is jointly managed by the GEF Evaluation Office and the Sri Lankan Ministry of Finance and Planning, through a Joint Steering Committee (JSC). Independent national quality assurance support is provided by the Sri Lanka Evaluation Association, through a Peer Review Panel (PRP). A team of national consultants is assembled to support the GEF Evaluation Office in the conduct of the evaluation.

3. The Democratic Socialist Republic of Sri Lanka covers an area of 65,610 km<sup>2</sup> with a population of approximately 21.5 million people.<sup>3</sup> Sri Lanka is classified as a lower-middle-income country with a Gross National Income (GNI) per capita of approximately US\$2,580.<sup>4</sup> Sri Lanka continues to experience strong economic growth following the end of the 26-year conflict with the Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam (LTTE). The ambitious economic program of the government covers policies on foreign and domestic private investment to support growth, develop small and medium enterprises, and increase agricultural productivity. The global financial crisis and recession in 2008 and 2009 nearly caused a balance of payments crisis and slowed growth to 3.5% in 2009. In the following two years, economic activity rebounded strongly with the end of the war and an International Monetary Fund (IMF) agreement. Sri Lanka's per capita income of \$5,700 on a purchasing power parity basis is among the highest in the region.<sup>5</sup> Sri Lanka is ranked 97<sup>th</sup> out of 187 countries on the Human Development Index (HDI), placing Sri Lanka above the regional average in South Asia.<sup>6</sup>

4. Sri Lanka harbors the most diverse landscapes, rich in species and ecosystem diversity with the highest biodiversity per unit area of land among Asian countries in terms of flowering plants and all vertebrate groups, except birds. Over the last century, however, much of Sri

---

<sup>1</sup> A complete list of countries having undergone CPEs can be found on the Office's website ([www.gefeo.org](http://www.gefeo.org)).

<sup>2</sup> [http://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/documents/CPE\\_final\\_country\\_selection\\_note-0910\\_0.pdf](http://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/documents/CPE_final_country_selection_note-0910_0.pdf), Website access: 27<sup>th</sup> August, 2012.

<sup>3</sup> <https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/geos/ce.html>, Website access: 27<sup>th</sup> of August, 2012.

<sup>4</sup> <http://data.worldbank.org/country/sri-lanka>, Website access: 27<sup>th</sup> August, 2012.

<sup>5</sup> <https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/geos/ce.html>, Website access: 27<sup>th</sup> of August, 2012.

<sup>6</sup> <http://hdrstats.undp.org/en/countries/profiles/LKA.html>, Website access: 27<sup>th</sup> of August, 2012.

Lanka's forest cover has been destroyed, with less than one third of the area still under forest cover.<sup>7</sup> Sri Lanka is considered as one of the 18 biological hot spots in the world (Red List 2007) with endemic, threatened and rare species, both flora and fauna.<sup>8</sup> One important step towards the conservation of biological diversity was the adoption of the Biodiversity Conservation Action Plan (BCAP) in 1998. Further steps have been taken since 1994 to manage the natural resources and the environment, including enabling a stronger involvement of civil society and the private sector. Sri Lanka possesses some of the finest legislative enactments in the South Asian region. 26.5% of the total area of the country is protected. However, law enforcement and the respective enforcement capability of state agencies still need further improvement.<sup>9</sup> Further threats to biodiversity are the ever-increasing demand for land for human habitation and related developmental activities, poor land use planning, indiscriminate exploitation of biological resources and its vulnerability to climate change, such as sea level rise.

**Table 1: GEF Support to National Projects by Focal Area and GEF Agency**

Focal Area	Agency	GEF amount (\$)	Number of projects
Biodiversity	UNDP	7,574,763	6
	UNEP	1,450,455	1
	World Bank	4,570,000	1
	World Bank/ADB	10,200,000	1
	<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>23,795,218</b>	<b>9</b>
Climate Change	UNDP	4,845,818	4
	UNDP/FAO	1,996,250	1
	UNIDO	2,355,000	1
	World Bank	13,900,000	2
	World Bank/IFC	3,600,000	1
	<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>26,697,068</b>	<b>9</b>
Multifocal Area	IFAD	6,919,915	1
	UNDP	200,000	1
	<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>7,119,915</b>	<b>2</b>
POPs	UNEP	495,000	1
	<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>495,000</b>	<b>1</b>
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>58,107,201</b>	<b>21</b>

5. Since 1991 (Table 1), the GEF has invested \$58.1 million (with about \$336.45 million in co-financing) through 21 national projects, namely 9 in biodiversity, 9 in climate change, 1 in Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs), and 2 Multifocal Area projects.<sup>10</sup> The projects are evenly spread within the GEF project cycle with 5 projects being closed and one completed; the majority of them on biodiversity and climate change. The United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), with 12 projects totaling \$12.6 million, has been the main channel for GEF support in Sri Lanka to date, followed by the World Bank (3 projects totaling \$18.47 million) and the United National Environment Programme (UNEP) (2 projects totaling \$1.94 million). In addition, Sri Lanka is also a participant country in 3 regional and 8 global projects.

<sup>7</sup> [http://sdwebx.worldbank.org/climateportalb/home.cfm?page=country\\_profile&CCode=LKA](http://sdwebx.worldbank.org/climateportalb/home.cfm?page=country_profile&CCode=LKA), Climate Change Knowledge Portal, World Bank, Website access: 28<sup>th</sup> of August, 2012.

<sup>8</sup> <http://www.cbd.int/countries/profile.shtml?country=lk#status>, Website access: 28<sup>th</sup> of August, 2012.

<sup>9</sup> [www.cbd.int/doc/world/lk/lk-nr-03-en.doc](http://www.cbd.int/doc/world/lk/lk-nr-03-en.doc), CBD Third National Report. Website access: 28<sup>th</sup> of August, 2012.

<sup>10</sup> Dropped and cancelled projects as well as PIF Rejections from the GEF Chief Executive Officer (CEO) are not considered. Two additional Multifocal Area projects are pending (GEF-5) and are not included in Table 1.

## OBJECTIVES OF THE EVALUATION

6. CPEs aim to provide the GEF Council with an assessment of results and performance of the GEF supported activities in a country, and of how the GEF supported activities fit into the national strategies and priorities as well as within the global environmental mandate of the GEF. Based on this overall purpose, the Joint GEF/Sri Lanka CPE will have the following specific objectives:

- Evaluate the **effectiveness** and **results** of completed and ongoing projects in each relevant focal area.<sup>11</sup>
- Evaluate the **relevance** and **efficiency** of GEF support in Sri Lanka from several points of view:<sup>12</sup> national environmental frameworks and decision-making processes, the GEF mandate and the achievement of global environmental benefits, and GEF policies and procedures.
- 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) Sri Lanka on its participation in the GEF, and (3) the different agencies and organizations involved in the preparation and implementation of GEF support.

7. The Joint GEF/Sri Lanka CPE will also be used to provide information and evidence to other evaluations being conducted by the Office. The evaluation will address the performance of the GEF portfolio in Sri Lanka in terms of relevance, efficiency and effectiveness as well as the contributing factors to this performance. The Joint GEF/Sri Lanka CPE will analyze the performance of individual projects as part of the overall GEF portfolio. CPEs do not aim at evaluating the performance of GEF Agencies and of national entities (agencies and/or departments, national governments or involved civil society organizations).

## KEY EVALUATION QUESTIONS

8. The Joint GEF/Sri Lanka CPE will be guided by the following key questions:

### **Effectiveness, results and sustainability**

- a) Is GEF support to Sri Lanka effective in producing results (outcomes and impacts) by focal area at the project and aggregate level?
- b) What is the likelihood that objectives will be achieved for those projects that are still under implementation in Sri Lanka?
- c) Is GEF support to Sri Lanka effective in producing results related to the dissemination of lessons learned in GEF projects and with partners?

---

<sup>11</sup> **Effectiveness:** the extent to which the GEF activity's objectives were achieved, or are expected to be achieved, taking into account their relative importance; **Results:** in GEF terms, results include direct project outputs, short- to medium-term outcomes, and progress toward longer term impact including global environmental benefits, replication effects, and other local effects; **Sustainability:** the likely ability of an intervention to continue to deliver benefits for an extended period of time after completion; projects need to be environmentally as well as financially and socially sustainable.

<sup>12</sup> **Relevance:** the extent to which the activity is suited to local and national environmental priorities and policies and to global environmental benefits to which the GEF is dedicated; **Efficiency:** the extent to which results have been delivered with the least costly resources possible.

- d) Is GEF support to Sri Lanka effective in producing results which last in time and continue after project completion?
- e) Is GEF support to Sri Lanka effective in moving from foundational activities and production of information and databases to demonstration and investment activities with concrete tangible results?
- f) Is the GEF support to Sri Lanka effective in linking environmental conservation measures with compatible sustainable livelihood and development activities?
- g) Is GEF support to Sri Lanka effective in replicating/up-scaling the successful results it has demonstrated in its projects?

### **Relevance**

- a) Is the GEF support relevant to Sri Lanka national environmental priorities and sustainable development needs and challenges?
- b) Are GEF and its Agencies supporting the environmental and sustainable development prioritization, country ownership and decision-making processes of Sri Lanka?
- c) Is the GEF support to Sri Lanka relevant to the objectives linked to the different Global Environmental Benefits in biodiversity, greenhouse gases, international waters, land degradation, and chemicals focal areas?
- d) Is Sri Lanka supporting the GEF mandate and focal areas programs and strategies with its own resources and/or with the support from other donors?
- e) Is the relevance of the GEF support to Sri Lanka's national priorities coinciding or clashing with the relevance to the GEF international mandate of achieving Global Environmental Benefits?

### **Efficiency**

- a) How much time, effort and financial resources does it take to formulate and implement projects, by type of GEF support modality in Sri Lanka?
- b) What role does Monitoring and Evaluation play in increasing project adaptive management and overall efficiency in Sri Lanka?
- c) What are the roles, types of engagement and coordination among different stakeholders in project implementation in Sri Lanka?
- d) What are the synergies for GEF project programming and implementation among: GEF Agencies; national institutions; GEF projects; and other donor-supported projects and activities in Sri Lanka?
- e) How do the national budget procedures in Sri Lanka affect GEF project proposals preparation and funding?

9. Each of these questions is complemented by indicators, potential sources of information and methods in 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.

### **SCOPE AND LIMITATIONS**

10. The Joint GEF/Sri Lanka CPE will cover all types of GEF supported activities in Sri Lanka at different 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 Small Grants Programme (SGP) and a selection of regional and global programs that are of special importance to the country. However, the main focus of the evaluation

will be the projects implemented in Sri Lanka (within boundaries), i.e. the national projects, be these full-size, medium-size or enabling activities.<sup>13</sup>

11. The stage of the project will determine the expected focus of the analysis (see Table 3).

**Table 3: Focus of Evaluation According to Stage of Project**

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

Note: n.a. = not applicable.

12. The GEF does not establish country programs that specify expected achievements through programmatic objectives, indicators, and targets. However, since 2010 the GEF has started supporting countries in undertaking national portfolio formulation exercises on a voluntary basis. These exercises serve as a priority setting tool for countries and as a guide for GEF Agencies as they assist recipient countries. These country programming efforts are rather recent, which limits their usefulness in country portfolio evaluations that look back up to the start of GEF operations, i.e. sometimes 20 years back. This is why generally CPEs entail some degree of retrofitting of frameworks to be able to judge the relevance of the aggregated results of a diverse portfolio of projects. Accordingly, the 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 portfolio in Sri Lanka.

13. GEF support is provided through partnerships with many institutions operating at many levels, from local to national and international level. It is therefore challenging to consider GEF support separately. The Joint GEF/Sri Lanka CPE will not attempt to provide a direct attribution of development results to the GEF, but address the role and contribution of GEF support to Sri Lanka overall efforts in achieving global environmental benefits. 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.

14. The assessment of results will be focused, where possible, at the level of outcomes and impacts rather than outputs. Project-level outputs will be measured against the overall expected impact and outcomes from each project. Special attention will be paid to the identification of factors affecting the level of outcome achievements and progress to impact, as well as to the risks that may prevent further progress to long term impacts. Progress towards impact of a 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.<sup>14</sup> Expected and unexpected 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. The analysis on the context in which outcomes and impacts have been unfolding, including the identification of the main external impact drivers and assumptions, will be an essential part of the analysis, especially, but not exclusively, in the ROtI studies that will be conducted.

15. The inclusion of regional and global projects increases the complexity of this type of evaluations since these projects are developed and approved under different context (i.e. regional

<sup>13</sup> The review of selected regional projects will feed in the aggregate assessment of the national GEF portfolio described above.

<sup>14</sup> The field ROtI method will be applied to 3 out of the 6 closed/completed national projects.

or global policies and strategies) than national countries. However, a representative number of regional and global projects in which Sri Lanka participated/s will be included based on criteria such as the relevance of the regional project for Sri Lanka, or the location of the project management unit when it is based in Sri Lanka, among others.

16. Out of the 21 national projects, 5 projects have been closed, 1 has been completed, 3 are being implemented, 2 have been approved by the GEF Council, 3 have been endorsed and 3 have been approved by the GEF Chief Executive Officer (CEO), and 4 have been approved by the GEF Agency. 13 Full Size Projects (FSPs) include 3 projects implemented by the World Bank, 5 by UNDP, 1 by UNEP, 1 by the International Fund for Agriculture Development (IFAD) and 1 by the United National Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO). 1 FSP is jointly implemented by the World Bank and the Asian Development Bank (ADB) and 1 by the World Bank and the International Finance Corporation (IFC). The 2 Medium Size Projects (MSPs) are implemented by UNDP. 6 Enabling Activities (EAs) include 5 projects implemented by UNDP, 1 by UNEP.

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

18. Weaknesses of M&E at the project and GEF program levels have been mentioned in past CPEs and other evaluations of the Office. These weaknesses may pose challenges to the Sri Lanka CPE as well. Not all the information which will be used for the analysis will be of a quantitative nature.

## **METHODOLOGY**

19. The Joint GEF/Sri Lanka CPE will be conducted by staff of the Office and a team of national experts provided by a national institution, *The Center for Poverty Analysis (CEPA)*, i.e. the Evaluation Team, led by a Task Manager from the GEF Evaluation Office. The team includes technical expertise on environment and sustainable development in Sri Lanka, evaluation methodologies, and the GEF. The consultants selected qualify under the Office's Ethical Guidelines, and have signed a declaration of interest to indicate no recent (last 3-5 years) relationship with GEF support in Sri Lanka. The Operational Focal Point (OFP) in Sri Lanka acts as resource person in facilitating the Sri Lanka CPE process by identifying interviewees and source documents, organizing interviews, meetings and field visits.

20. The methodology includes a series of components using a combination of qualitative and quantitative evaluation methods and tools. The expected sources of information include:

- Project level: project documents, project implementation reports, 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, 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 OFP and all other relevant Government departments, bilateral and multilateral donors, civil society organizations and academia (including both local and international NGOs with a presence in the country), GEF Agencies, 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.

21. 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.

22. The Evaluation Team will use standard tools and protocols for the CPEs and adapt these to the specific context in Sri Lanka. These tools include a project review protocol to conduct the desk and field reviews of GEF projects and interview guides.

23. The Joint GEF/Sri Lanka CPE will include visits to project sites. The criteria for selecting the sites will be finalized during the conduct of the evaluation, with emphasis placed on both ongoing and completed projects. 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.

24. Quality assurance will be performed at key stages of the process by a Peer Review Panel composed by three independent experts from the *Sri Lanka Evaluation Association (SLEvA)*. The expertise provided covers the relevant scientific and technical aspects of the peer review function related to the GEF focal areas as well as to evaluation.

## **PROCESS**

25. A number of steps have already been undertaken for the Joint GEF/Sri Lanka CPE. In February 2012 a pre-evaluation mission took place to explore possibilities for joining forces with institutions in Sri Lanka in the management and conduct of the CPE. As a result of this mission it was agreed with the Sri Lankan Ministry of Finance and Planning to jointly manage the evaluation. The JSC has been established soon after that mission. Parallel to that, an agreement was reached with SLEvA to set up a national Peer Review Panel to support the evaluation. Furthermore, an agreement was reached within JSC for selecting a qualified national firms and/or institutions to assist the Office with the conduct of the evaluation.

26. In August 2012 a second mission took place with the main objective of scoping the evaluation, i.e. define precisely what the evaluation should cover, and identify through consultations with GEF national stakeholders what key questions should be answered by the evaluation. The mission was also an opportunity to officially launch the evaluation, while at the same time introduce the selected national consultant firm to GEF national stakeholders. Unfortunately, the selected firm could not honor its commitment due to internal problems

emerged between the proposed team of experts and the firm itself, which ultimately led the firm to withdraw from the assignment. Further consultations within the JSC led to the recruitment of CEPA, the 2<sup>nd</sup> ranked firm, in October 2012, which was briefed and introduced to national GEF stakeholders, to the JSC and the PRP during a third mission that took place in early November 2012. These TOR conclude the Joint GEF/Sri Lanka CPE preparatory phase, and set the scene for the upcoming 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:
  - **GEF Sri Lanka Portfolio Database** which describes all GEF support activities within the country, basic information (GEF Agency, focal area, implementation status), project cycle information, GEF and co-financing financial information, major objectives and expected (or actual) results, key partners per project, etc.
  - **Country Environmental Legal Framework** which provides an historical perspective of the context in which the GEF projects have been developed and implemented in Sri Lanka. This document will be based on information on national environmental legislation and policies of each government administration (plans, strategies and similar), and the international agreements signed by Sri Lanka presented and analyzed through time so to be able to connect with specific GEF support.
  - **Global Environmental Benefits Assessment**, which provides an assessment of Sri Lanka'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 (ROI)** field studies of 3 national projects completed since at least two years, selected in a way to represent results in as many diverse GEF focal areas and GEF Agencies as possible, and strengthen as such the information gathering and analysis on results.
- Conduct the **evaluation analysis and triangulation** of collected information and evidence from various sources, tools and methods. This will be done during a fourth mission in Sri Lanka by the Task Manager to consolidate with the CEPA team the evidence gathered and fill in any eventual information and analysis gaps before getting to key preliminary findings. These will be summarized in a concise **Aide Mémoire**, which will be distributed to stakeholders one week prior to the final consultation workshop.<sup>15</sup> During this mission, additional analysis, meetings, document reviews and/or field work might be undertaken as needed;
- Conduct a national **Stakeholder Consultation Workshop** with participation of the Government representatives and other national stakeholders, including project staff, donors and GEF Agencies, to present and gather stakeholders' feedback on the main Joint GEF/Sri Lanka CPE preliminary findings contained in the Aide Mémoire, and proceed to the formulation of conclusions and preliminary recommendations to be included in a draft Joint GEF/Sri Lanka CPE report. 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;

---

<sup>15</sup> The Aide Mémoire will be circulated by the JSC, who will also send it out to GEF stakeholders with the invitation to the final consultation workshop.

- Prepare and circulate to stakeholders and to the JSC and PRP a **Draft Joint GEF/Sri Lanka CPE Report**, which incorporates comments received at the national stakeholder consultation workshop;
- Consider the eventual incorporation of comments received to the draft report and prepare the **Final Joint GEF/Sri Lanka CPE Report**. The GEF Evaluation Office will bear full responsibility for the content of the report.

27. The dissemination of the final GEF Sri Lanka CPE report will be a shared responsibility of the Ministry of Finance and Planning, who will distribute the report to GEF national stakeholders in the country, and of the GEF Evaluation office, who will take care of distribution outside Sri Lanka.

### KEY MILESTONES

28. The evaluation is being conducted between December 2011 and June 2013. The following activities have been completed:

Preparation	Status
Preparatory work, preliminary data gathering	Completed in December 2011
Pre-evaluation mission	Completed in February 2012
Drafting country-specific TOR and evaluation matrix	Completed in November 2012
Quality control/peer review, finalization and disclosure of TOR	Completed in January 2013

29. The key milestones of the upcoming evaluation phase are presented here below:

Milestone	Deadline
Launching evaluation phase, literature review, data gathering	January 1, 2013
Global Environmental Benefits Assessment	January 15, 2013
Country Environmental Legal Framework	February 10, 2013
Finalization of the GEF country portfolio database	February 28, 2013
Data collection/interviews and project review protocols	February 28, 2013
Field studies (including the 3 ROtI studies)	March 31, 2013
Consolidation and triangulation of evaluative evidence, additional analysis/gap-filling	April 10, 2013
Presentation of key preliminary findings in a national consultation workshop	April 29, 2013
Draft CPE report sent out to PRP and to GEF stakeholders	June 15, 2013
Incorporating comments received from PRP and GEF stakeholders in the final report	July 31, 2013

### REPORT OUTLINE

30. The Joint GEF/Sri Lanka CPE report will be a concise, stand-alone document organized along the following general table of contents:

*VOLUME 1*  
*Main Report*

CHAPTER 1. Main Conclusions and Recommendations

Background

Objectives, scope and methodology

Conclusions

- Effectiveness and results
- Relevance

- Efficiency

Lessons

Recommendations

## CHAPTER 2. Evaluation framework

Background

Objectives and scope

Methodology

Limitations

## CHAPTER 3. Context

General description

Environmental resources in key GEF support areas

The environmental legal and policy framework in Sri Lanka

The Global Environmental Facility: general description

## CHAPTER 4. The GEF portfolio in Sri Lanka

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. Results of GEF Support to Sri Lanka

Global environmental impacts

Catalytic, up-scaling and replication effects

Institutional sustainability and capacity building

Results by GEF focal area

## CHAPTER 6. Relevance of GEF support to Sri Lanka

Relevance of GEF support to the Sri Lankan environmental priorities and sustainable development needs and challenges

Relevance of GEF support to national action plans within GEF focal areas

Relevance of GEF support to the achievement of global environmental benefits

## CHAPTER 7. Efficiency of GEF support to Sri Lanka

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 Sri Lanka

Learning

## ANNEXES

A. Country Response

B. Peer Review Panel statement

B. Country-specific Terms of Reference

C. Evaluation matrix

D. Interviewees

E. Sites visited

F. Workshop participants

- G. GEF portfolio in Sri Lanka
- H. Bibliography

*VOLUME 2*  
*Technical documents*

- A. Country Environmental Legal Framework
- B. Global Environmental Benefits Assessment
- C. Review of Outcomes to Impact study 1
- D. Review of Outcomes to Impact study 2
- E. Review of Outcomes to Impact study 3

## ANNEX 1: EVALUATION MATRIX

Questions	Indicators	Sources of information	Method
<b><i>Effectiveness, results and sustainability</i></b>			
a) Is GEF support to Sri Lanka effective in producing results (outcomes and impacts) by focal area at the project and aggregate level?	Overall project and aggregate outcomes and impacts of GEF support	Project staff and beneficiaries, national and local government representatives ROtI studies, terminal evaluations	Focus groups and individual interviews ROtI methodology, meta-evaluation
	Existing ratings for project outcomes (self-ratings and independent ratings)	Project-related reviews (implementation reports, terminal evaluations, terminal evaluation reviews)	Desk review, meta-analysis of evaluation reports, project review protocols
	Changes in global benefit indexes and other global environmental indicators	Evaluative evidence from projects and donors, global environmental benefits assessment	Literature review, meta-evaluation
b) What is the likelihood that objectives will be achieved for those projects that are still under implementation in Sri Lanka?	Existing ratings for project outcomes (self-ratings and independent ratings)	Project-related reviews such as implementation reports, PMIS, agencies' project databases, GEF agency staff, project staff	project review protocols, portfolio analysis, desk review, interviews, and field visits
c) Is GEF support to Sri Lanka effective in producing results related to the dissemination of lessons learned in GEF projects and with partners?	Project design, preparation, and implementation have incorporated lessons from previous projects within and outside the GEF	Project-related reviews (implementation reports, terminal evaluations, terminal evaluation reviews, and so on), ROtI studies, project staff and beneficiaries, national and local government representatives	project review protocols, desk review, ROtI methodology, GEF portfolio and pipeline analysis
	Dissemination of positive impacts of GEF projects and best practices into national development plans and other channels (i.e. other environmental, coastal, tourism, industrial plans) to mainstream lessons from GEF projects.	project staff and beneficiaries, national and local government representatives civil society staffs (NGOs and academia)	Focus groups and individual interviews
	Lessons learned are shared nationally and regionally (locally) and models/interventions can be found in use in at least 10 instances (including GEF/SGP)	Project-related reviews (implementation reports, terminal evaluations, terminal evaluation reviews, and so on), ROtI studies, project staffs and beneficiaries, national and local government representatives	Desk review, ROtI methodology, GEF portfolio and pipeline analysis
d) Is GEF support to Sri Lanka effective in producing results which last in time and continue after project completion?	Observed ability of delivering global environmental benefits beyond completion of GEF support for over 1 year	Evaluation reports, ROtI studies, project staffs and beneficiaries, national and local government representatives	Desk review, meta-evaluation, project review protocols, ROtI methodology, GEF portfolio, stakeholder consultations
	Availability of financial and technical resources (from government and other sources) to carry out the interventions beyond GEF funding	Project reviews, project staffs and beneficiaries, national and local government representatives	Desk review, ROtI methodology, stakeholder consultations
	Ownership of projects by local institutions or by beneficiary groups continuing to engage	Project reviews, project staffs and beneficiaries, national and local government representatives	Desk review, ROtI methodology, stakeholder consultations

Questions	Indicators	Sources of information	Method
	with the interventions – a minimum 1 year after GEF funding has ended.		
e) Is GEF support to Sri Lanka effective in moving from foundational activities and production of information and databases to demonstration and investment activities with concrete tangible results?	Evidence of projects that have transitioned from foundational activities to pilot/demonstration and to investment	Project reviews, project staffs and beneficiaries, national and local government representatives	Project review protocols, stakeholder consultations
f) Is the GEF support to Sri Lanka effective in linking environmental conservation measures with compatible sustainable livelihood and development activities?	Incorporation of livelihood needs into project design.	SGP documents, Project reviews, project staffs and beneficiaries, national and local government representatives	Project review protocols, stakeholder consultations
	Evidence of livelihood improvements (increase in the number of income generating options, income, savings and assets) among communities who are dependent on natural resources	Project-related reviews, ROtI studies, project staff and beneficiaries, national and local government representatives, and civil society representatives	Project review protocols, meta-evaluation, ROtI methodology, GEF portfolio and pipeline analysis
	% allocated for livelihood support from the total support	Project-related evaluations and reviews, ROtI studies	ROtI methodology, desk review, project review protocols
g) Is GEF support to Sri Lanka effective in replicating/up-scaling the successful results it has demonstrated in its projects?	Institutions continue the projects or use lessons to provide services and interventions Other organisations/stakeholders lend their support to these initiatives Evidence of an increase in the use of similar interventions in the same areas or through projects that have been developed based on these findings	SGP documents, portfolio data, NGO staffs, project staff and beneficiaries, national and local government representatives	Project review protocols, meta-evaluation, ROtI methodology, GEF portfolio and pipeline analysis Focus groups and individual interviews – including GEF SGP
<b>Relevance</b>			
a) Is the GEF support relevant to Sri Lanka national environmental priorities and sustainable development needs and challenges?	GEF support is within the Sri Lankan environmental priorities and sustainable development agenda (over time with different agendas – i.e. path to sustainable development, Mahinda Chintanaya) Alignment/support of activities prioritized in key national policies and strategies (over time with NEAP, Haritha Lanka) GEF support contributes to build environmental processes/systems that assist the country to achieve its priority sustainable	Sri Lankan environmental and sustainable development policies, strategies and action plans. The environmental legal framework in Sri Lanka	Desk review, GEF portfolio analysis by focal area, agency, modality, and project status (national), selected key person interviews
		Project-related documentation (project document and log frame, implementation reports, terminal evaluations, terminal evaluation reviews), PMIS, agencies' project databases	
		Country environmental legal framework	

Questions	Indicators	Sources of information	Method
	development objectives (i.e. BAP, CC adaptation strategy)		
b) Are GEF and its Agencies supporting the environmental and sustainable development prioritization, country ownership and decision-making processes of Sri Lanka?	Percentage of GEF funding compared to other official development assistance in the environmental sector Co-financing rate (from Government, private sector and/or civil society).	Available databases (global such as World Bank, ADB, other international agencies; and national, such as Ministry of Finance and planning, Department of Census and Statistics, Central Bank, Environment Ministry)	Desk reviews and meta-analysis of evaluation of financing information of government, donors, private and civil society documents
	GEF support has Sri Lankan ownership and is country based (i.e. project design and implementation by in-country national institutions)	Project design and implementation documents, Government officials, agencies' staff, donors, and civil society representatives.	Desk review, stakeholder consultation (focus group discussions, individual interviews)
	Relevant national policies and strategic documents include set of priorities that reflect the results and outcomes of relevant GEF support over time (as strategies and action plans have changed over time)	STAR/RAF documents, project-related documentation Country environmental legal framework	Literature review, timelines, historical causality, etc.
c) Is the GEF support to Sri Lanka relevant to the objectives linked to the different Global Environmental Benefits in biodiversity, greenhouse gases, international waters, land degradation, and chemicals focal areas?	GEF outcomes and impacts are in line with the Global Benefit Index (for biodiversity and climate change) and to other global indicators for greenhouse gases, POPs, land degradation, and international waters	National action plans to respond to Conventions and reference/links in the RAF, STAR documents.	Desk review, project field visits, project review protocols
		Global environmental benefits assessment	Literature review
	GEF support linked to meeting national commitments to the international environmental conventions UNFCCC, CBD, POPs in the time frames expected in the commitments	Project-related documentation (project document and logframe, implementation reports, terminal evaluations, terminal evaluation reviews, and so on), PMIS, agencies' databases	GEF portfolio analysis by focal area, agency, modality, and project status
		Global environmental benefits assessment Government officials, agencies' staff, donors and civil society representatives	Literature review Stakeholder consultation (focus groups, individual interviews)
d) Is Sri Lanka supporting the GEF mandate and focal areas programs and strategies with its own resources and/or with the support from other donors?	GEF activities, country commitment and project counterparts support the GEF mandate and focal area programs and strategies (catalytic, up-scaling and replication in at least 2 instances per focal area)	GEF Instrument, Council decisions, focal area strategies, GEF-5 programming strategy	Desk review; GEF portfolio analysis by focal area, agency, modality, and project status
		Project-related documentation (project document and logframe, implementation reports, terminal evaluations, terminal evaluation reviews), PMIS, agencies' databases	
		GEF Secretariat and GEF agencies' technical staff	Individual interviews
		Global environmental benefits assessment Country environmental legal framework	Literature review Literature review, timelines, historical causality, etc.

Questions	Indicators	Sources of information	Method
	Level of funding from Sri Lankan Government for GEF projects	National allocations for related projects (Government, Ministry of Environment records)	Government documents and interviews with government officials
e) Is the relevance of the GEF support to Sri Lanka's national priorities coinciding or clashing with the relevance to the GEF international mandate of achieving Global Environmental Benefits?	Alignment of GEBs to national sustainable development priorities (i.e. encouraging economic development and poverty alleviation in a sustainable manner)	Comparison of country context/national development strategies and GEB (through country context and GEB assessment)	Desk review
		Government officials, agencies' staff, donors and civil society representatives	Stakeholder consultation (focus groups, individual interviews, national workshop)
	Contribution of GEF projects to support or integrate environment objectives into the larger development agendas (such as regaining Sri Lanka and Mahinda Chintanaya).	Project-related documentation, STAR/RAF strategy documents	GEF portfolio analysis
		Government officials, agencies' staff, donors and civil society representatives	Stakeholder consultation (focus groups, individual interviews, national workshop)
		Country environmental legal framework	Literature review, timelines, historical causality, etc.
	Alignment of externally funded projects to meeting local/regional sustainable development priorities and needs	Government officials, agencies' staff, donors and civil society representatives	Stakeholder consultation (focus groups, individual interviews, national workshop)
<b>Efficiency</b>			
a) How much time, effort and financial resources does it take to formulate and implement projects, by type of GEF support modality in Sri Lanka?	Process indicators: processing timing (according to project cycle steps), preparation and implementation cost by type of modalities etc.	Project-related documentation (project document and logframe, implementation reports, terminal evaluations, terminal evaluation reviews), PMIS, agencies' databases	Desk review, GEF portfolio analysis, timelines
	Project dropouts and cancellations	GEF Secretariat and agencies' staff and government officials, GEF focal point	Individual interviews, field visits, project review protocols
	GEF vs. co-financing	National and local government officials, donors, NGOs, beneficiaries	
b) What role does Monitoring and Evaluation play in increasing project adaptive management and overall efficiency in Sri Lanka?	Evidence of use of M&E information to steer the project towards achieving results	Project-related documentation – especially progress reports and learning	Desk reviews GEF portfolio analysis, interviews with GEF agencies, focal point
	Project learning provides information for decisions for future projects, programmes, policies and portfolios	Project termination reports, policy makers/government officials, GEF Secretariat and agencies staff, project reports	Desk review, interviews with GEF agencies, focal point
c) What are the roles, types of engagement and coordination among different stakeholders in project implementation in Sri Lanka?	Types of actors involved and levels of participation	Stakeholder map, project-related reviews (implementation reports, terminal evaluations, terminal evaluation reviews)	Desk review and portfolio analysis, stakeholder analysis
	Roles and responsibilities of GEF actors are well defined.	Project documentation (implementation/progress reports), project staff, government officials, beneficiaries	
	Coordination between GEF projects		
	Existence of a national coordination	GEF Secretariat staff and technical staff from GEF	Interviews, field visits, institutional

Questions	Indicators	Sources of information	Method
	mechanism for GEF support	agencies, and GEF OFP staff	analysis
d) What are the synergies for GEF project programming and implementation among: GEF agencies; national institutions; GEF projects; and other donor-supported projects and activities in Sri Lanka?	Acknowledgments among GEF agencies and institutions of each other's projects	Project-related reviews (implementation reports, terminal evaluations, terminal evaluation reviews)	Desk review and meta-analysis of evaluation reports, interviews, and field visits
	Effective communication and technical support between GEF agencies and between national institutions	GEF agency staff, national executing agencies (NGOs, other), project staff, national and local government officials	
e) How do the national budget procedures in Sri Lanka affect GEF project proposals preparation and funding?	Timing of Project cycles (national budget, and GEF project cycles)	Government documents, Government officials, Project proponents	Document review, interviews
	Budget allocations and alignment of GEF projects to carry out these activities	Government documents and data and information from officials.	Document review, interviews