



## **STANDARD TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR GEF COUNTRY PORTFOLIO EVALUATIONS**

**Approved by Rob D. van den Berg, Director, GEF Evaluation Office,  
on 10 December, 2012**

### **Background**

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 the GEF at the country level they provide useful information for both the GEF Council and the countries. CPEs relevance and utility increased in GEF-5 with the increased emphasis on country ownership and country driven portfolio development.
2. This document updates the 2010 standard Terms of Reference (TORs) for CPEs by incorporating the lessons learned from the recently completed meta-evaluation of the Office's country level evaluation work, which purpose was to improve its methods and processes for the GEF-5 period. While fine-tuning the terms of reference to take into account recent developments, care was taken to maintain comparability of CPEs throughout GEF-5. While following the standard terms of reference, each CPE will in addition include specific questions relevant to the country portfolio under review. This will be reflected in specific terms of reference for each CPE. CPEs are conducted fully and independently by the Office and when possible jointly and/or in partnership with other evaluation offices of GEF agencies, or independent departments in the governmental or non-governmental sector.

### **Objectives**

3. The purpose of GEF CPEs is to provide GEF Council with: an assessment of how GEF support is implemented at the country level; a report on results from GEF support; and an assessment on how this support is linked to national environmental and sustainable development agendas as well as to the GEF mandate of generating global environmental benefits within its focal areas. These evaluations have the following objectives:
  - i. evaluate the effectiveness and results of GEF support in a country, with attention to the sustainability of achievements at the project level and progress toward impact on global environmental benefits
  - ii. evaluate the relevance and efficiency of the GEF support in a country from several points of view: national environmental frameworks and decision-making processes; the GEF

---

<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)).

- mandate and the achievement of global environmental benefits; and GEF policies and procedures;
- iii. provide additional evaluative evidence to other evaluations conducted by the Office; and
  - 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.
4. Furthermore these evaluations are conducted to bring to the attention of Council different experiences and lessons on how the GEF is implemented at the national level from a wide variety of countries. CPEs do not aim at evaluating the performance of GEF agencies, national entities (agencies/departments, national governments or involved civil society organizations), or individual projects.

### Key Evaluation Questions

5. 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. These questions are:

#### ***Effectiveness, Results and Sustainability***

- a) Is GEF support effective in producing results at the project level and are these results sustainable?
- b) Is GEF support effective in producing results at the aggregate level (portfolio and program) by focal area?
- c) Is GEF support effective in producing results at the country level?
- d) Is GEF support effective in producing results related to the dissemination of lessons learned in GEF projects and with partners?
- e) Has GEF support led to progress toward impact over an extended period of time after completion?

#### ***Relevance***

- a) Is GEF support relevant to the national sustainable development agenda and environmental priorities?
- b) Is GEF support relevant to the country's development needs and challenges?
- c) Is GEF support relevant to national GEF focal area action plans?
- d) Is GEF support relevant to the objectives linked to the

### ***EVALUATION CRITERIA***

***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.

***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.

***Source:*** GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy, 2010

different global environmental benefits in biodiversity, greenhouse gases, international waters, land degradation, and chemicals focal areas?

- e) Are the GEF and its agencies supporting environmental and sustainable development prioritization, country ownership and decision-making process of the country?

### *Efficiency*

- a) How much time, effort and financial resources does it take to formulate and implement projects, by type of GEF support modality?
- b) What are the roles, types of engagement and coordination among different stakeholders in project implementation?
- c) Are there synergies among GEF agencies in GEF programming and implementation?
- d) Are there synergies between national institutions for GEF support in programming and implementation?
- e) Are there synergies between GEF support and other donors' support?
- f) What role does Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) play in project adaptive management and overall efficiency?

6. Each of these questions is complemented by indicators, potential sources of information and methods in an evaluation matrix. A standard version of the CPE evaluation matrix is annexed to this document.

## **Scope and Limitations**

7. CPEs cover all types of GEF supported activities in the country 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 relevance to the country. However, the main focus of the evaluation consists of the projects implemented within the country boundaries, i.e. the national projects, be these full-size, medium-size or enabling activities. The review of selected regional projects feeds in the aggregate assessment of the national GEF portfolio.

8. The stage of the project determines the expected focus of analysis (see Table 1).

**Table 1. Focus of evaluation according to stage of project**

| Project Status | Focus            |                   | On a exploratory basis |                |
|----------------|------------------|-------------------|------------------------|----------------|
|                | <i>Relevance</i> | <i>Efficiency</i> | <i>Effectiveness</i>   | <i>Results</i> |
| Completed      | Full             | Full              | Full                   | Full           |
| On-going       | Full             | Partially         | Likelihood             | Likelihood     |
| Pipeline       | Expected         | Processes         | Not applicable         | Not applicable |

9. CPEs are challenging as the GEF does not explicitly establish country programs that specify expected achievements through programmatic objectives, indicators, and targets. Although voluntary National Portfolio Formulation Exercises (NPFs) have been introduced in GEF-5, there still are relatively few countries where such planning documents are prepared. Furthermore, these documents only cover for the GEF-5 period, while the CPE assesses GEF support since the start of its activities to date. CPEs that will be conducted in countries having chosen to conduct an NPFE will use it as a basis for assessing the aggregate results, efficiency and relevance of the GEF country portfolio. For the other countries, the CPE will consider the portfolio of projects and activities, their objectives, their internal coherence and how the portfolio

has evolved. The country programs of GEF Agencies, as agreed with the government and the country's national strategies and mid- and long-term goals, are also considered as a relevant framework for GEF support.

10. 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 CPE do 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. CPEs 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.

11. The assessment of results is focused, where possible, at the level of outcomes and impacts rather than outputs. Project-level results are measured against the overall expected impact and outcomes from each project. Special attention is 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) is looked at through field Reviews of Outcome to Impact (ROtI) studies. Expected impacts at the focal area level are assessed in the context of GEF objectives and indicators of global environmental benefits. Outcomes at the focal area level are primarily assessed in relation to catalytic, up-scaling and replication effects, institutional sustainability and capacity building, and awareness.

12. 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 or global policies and strategies) than national countries. However, a representative number of regional and global projects are usually included based on criteria such as the relevance of the regional project for the country, the implementation unit being located in the country, among others.

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

## **Methodology**

14. CPEs are conducted by Office staff and national and international consultants, i.e. the Evaluation Team, led by a Task Manager from the Office. Preference is given to national or country-based consultants wherever possible. The team includes technical expertise on the national environmental and sustainable development strategies, evaluation methodologies, and the GEF. The consultants selected must qualify under the 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. GEF Operational Focal Points (OFPs) in the country are asked to act as resource persons in facilitating the CPE process by identifying interviewees and source documents, organizing interviews, meetings and field visits and the initial and final consultation workshops.

15. 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 level: 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 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;
- Surveys with GEF stakeholders in the country;
- Field visits to selected project sites, using methods and tools developed by the Office such as the ROTI Handbook;
- Information from national consultation workshops.

16. The quantitative analysis uses 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, are also used.

17. The Evaluation Team uses standard tools and protocols for the CPEs and adapts these to the national 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.

18. CPEs include visits to project sites, usually at least at a level corresponding to 25% of the total evaluation effort in terms of man/days. Criteria for selecting the sites to be visited are finalized during the implementation of the evaluation, with emphasis being placed on both ongoing and completed projects. The evaluation team decides 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.

19. Quality assurance on the evaluation methods, tools and processes used is performed at key stages of the process (TORs, draft and final CPE reports) by independent peer reviewers, national whenever possible. This usually happens in parallel to the circulation of the evaluation products to stakeholders for comments.

## **Process and Outputs**

20. The CPE process formally starts once the country is selected and has agreed to the CPE. In countries with a relatively strong evaluation capacity, as for example demonstrated in a vibrant professional evaluation community or association, and a national evaluation culture, as for example demonstrated in national M&E or RBM policies, the Office conducts a pre-evaluation mission soon after having received the agreement to conduct a CPE. The purpose of this mission is to explore the interest and modalities to conduct the evaluation jointly with the country and/or with a very strong input from national evaluators. Otherwise, in general the CPE process includes the following steps:

- Initial Office visit to:
  - (1) Scope the evaluation, i.e. define precisely what the evaluation should cover, and identify through consultations with national stakeholders what key issues should be included in the analysis;
  - (2) Secure government support, in particular from GEF OFPs. The OFP is requested to provide support to the evaluation such as: identification of key people to be interviewed, support to organize interviews, field visits and meetings, and identification of main documents;
  - (3) Conduct a first stakeholder consultation workshop to present evaluation and receive comments to develop country-specific TORs;
  - (4) Conduct individual meetings as a follow up of the consultation workshop, to fine tune the information gathered during the initial stakeholder consultation workshop.
- Prepare country-specific TORs with annexed evaluation matrix, and submit it to peer reviewers for quality control, before finalization and disclosure;
- Launch the evaluative phase, collect information and review literature to extract existing reliable evaluative evidence;
- Prepare specific inputs to the CPE, including:
  - the *GEF 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.
  - the *Country Environmental Legal Framework* which provides an historical perspective of the context in which the GEF projects have been developed and implemented. This document is based on information on environmental legislation, environmental policies of each government administration (plans, strategies and similar), and the international agreements signed by the country presented and analyzed through time so to be able to connect with particular GEF support.
  - the *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.
- Conduct field studies (case studies, field verifications, ROTIs, other) of completed national projects, selected in consultation with the Office staff, which contributes to strengthen the information gathering and analysis on results.
- Conduct the analysis and triangulation of collected information and evidence from various sources, tools and methods. This is preferably done during a second mission in the country by the Office staff to consolidate the evidence gathered so far and fill in any eventual information and analysis gaps before getting to findings, conclusions, lessons, and preliminary recommendations. During this mission, additional analysis, meetings, document reviews and/or field work might be undertaken as needed;
- Conduct a national stakeholder consultation workshop for the Government and national stakeholders, including project staff, donors and GEF Agencies, to present and gather stakeholders' feedback on the preliminary CPE findings, conclusions, lessons, and potential recommendations to be included in an *Aid-Mémoire*. The workshop is also 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 and circulate to stakeholders and peer reviewers a draft 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 CPE report.

21. The Office bears full responsibility for the content of the final CPE report.

### Key Milestones

22. The evaluation is conducted between [month/year] and [month/year]. The key milestones of the evaluation are presented here below:

| Milestone   | Deadline |
|---|----------|
| Preparatory work, preliminary data gathering  |          |
| Scoping mission   |          |
| Drafting country-specific TORs/evaluation matrix  |          |
| Quality control/peer review, finalization and disclosure of TORs                        |          |
| Launching evaluation phase, literature review, data gathering                           |          |
| Finalization of the GEF country portfolio database                                      |          |
| Country Environmental Legal Framework   |          |
| Global Environmental Benefits Assessment  |          |
| Field studies   |          |
| Data collection/interviews and project review protocols                                 |          |
| Consolidation and triangulation of evaluative evidence, additional analysis/gap-filling |          |
| Presentation of key preliminary findings in a national consultation workshop            |          |
| Draft CPE report sent out to stakeholders and independent peer reviewers for comments   |          |
| Incorporation of comments received in a final CPE report                                |          |
| Country response to the CPE   |          |

### CPE Audience

23. The main CPE audiences are the GEF Council and the government of the country for which its GEF portfolio is under evaluation. Given the potential future implications of findings and recommendations emanating from this type of evaluation, national audiences, and in particular the GEF focal points and project executors and proponents, are considered key audiences of these studies. Governments may specifically define their targeted audiences during the conduct of the CPEs. This may include relevant government agencies, institutions and organizations that working directly with GEF, and focal points to conventions, as well as representatives from the civil society, academia and private sector, and representatives from GEF agencies with offices in the country. The GEF Council main constituency includes participant GEF member states, GEF Secretariat, STAP, GEF agencies and national executing agencies, the secretariats of the environment conventions for which the GEF is the financing mechanism.

### CPE Report Outline

24. The CPE report is 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

- Effectiveness and results
- Relevance

- Efficiency

Lessons

Recommendations

## CHAPTER 2. Evaluation framework

Background

Objectives and scope

Methodology

Limitations

Audience

## CHAPTER 3. Context

[country]: general description

Environmental resources in key GEF support areas

The environmental legal framework in [country]

The environmental policy framework in [country]

The Global Environmental Facility: general description

## CHAPTER 4. The GEF portfolio in [country]

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 and results of GEF support to [country]

Global environmental benefits

Catalytic, up-scaling and replication effects: progress toward impact

Institutional sustainability and capacity building

Results by focal area

## CHAPTER 6. Relevance of the GEF support in [country]

Relevance of GEF support to the country's sustainable development agenda and environmental priorities

Relevance of GEF support to country's development needs and challenges

Relevance of GEF support to the achievement of global environmental benefits

## CHAPTER 7. Efficiency of GEF supported activities in [country]

Time, effort, and financial resources required for project formulation and implementation

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 country

Learning

## ANNEXES

A. Country response

B. Quality assurance statement

B. Country-specific TORs

C. Evaluation matrix

D. Interviewees

E. Sites visited

F. Workshop participants

G. GEF portfolio in [country]

H. Bibliography



## ANNEX 1

### Standard CPE evaluation matrix

| Key question  | Indicators/basic data  | Sources of information  | Methodology   |
|---|--|---|---|
| <b>Is GEF support effective ...</b>   |  |   |   |
| ... in producing results at the project level and are these results sustainable?                            | Project outcomes and impacts   | Project staffs and beneficiaries, national and local government representatives<br>ROtI studies   | Focus groups and individual interviews<br>ROtI methodology  |
|   | Existing ratings for project outcomes (i.e., self-ratings and independent ratings)                                     | Project-related reviews (implementation reports, terminal evaluations, TE reviews, etc.)  | Desk review, 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 analysis of evaluation reports  |
| ... in producing results at the aggregate level (portfolio and program) by focal area?                      | Aggregated outcomes and direct impact  | Project staffs and beneficiaries, national and local government representatives   | Focus groups and individual interviews  |
|   |  | ROtI studies  | ROtI methodology  |
|   |  | Project-related reviews (implementation reports, terminal evaluations, TE reviews, etc.)  | GEF Portfolio aggregate analysis  |
|   | Catalytic, up-scaling and replication effects: progress toward impact  | Data from overall projects and other donors   | Desk review   |
|   |  | ROtI studies  | ROtI methodology  |
|   | Contribution by the GEF  | Project staffs and beneficiaries, national and local government representatives   | Focus groups and individual interviews  |
| Data from overall projects and other donors   |  | Desk review   |   |
| ... in producing results at the country level?  | Project outcomes and direct and long-term impact   | Project-related documentation (project documents and logframes, implementation reports, terminal evaluations, TE reviews, etc.)   | GEF portfolio aggregate analysis, desk review   |
|   | Aggregated outcomes and direct and long-term impact  | Project staffs and beneficiaries, national and local government representatives   | Field visits, focus groups and individual interviews  |
|   | Catalytic, up-scaling and replication effects: progress toward impact  | Data from projects financed by other donors and or by the government. ROtI studies  | Desk review, ROtI methodology   |
| ... 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 GEF | Project-related reviews (implementation reports, terminal evaluations, TE reviews, etc.), ROtI studies, project staffs and beneficiaries, national and local government representatives             | Desk review, ROtI methodology, GEF portfolio and pipeline analysis  |
|   |  | NGO staffs, project staff and beneficiaries, national and local government representatives  | Focus groups and individual interviews  |
| Has GEF support led to progress toward impact over an extended period of time after completion?             | Availability of financial and economic resources   | Project-related reviews (implementation reports, terminal evaluations, TE reviews, etc.), NGO staffs, Project staffs and beneficiaries, national and local government representatives, ROtI studies | Desk review, focus groups and individual interviews, project review protocols, ROtI methodology, GEF portfolio analysis |
|   | Stakeholders' ownership, social factors  |   |   |
|   | Existence of a technical know how  |   |   |
|   | Environmental risks  |   |   |
|   | Existence of an institutional and legal framework  | Country environmental legal framework   | Literature review, timelines, historical causality, etc.  |

| Key question   | Indicators/basic data  | Sources of information  | Methodology   |
|--|--|---|---|
| <b>Is GEF support relevant to...</b>   |  |   |   |
| <p>... the country's sustainable development agenda and environmental priorities?</p>  | <p>GEF support is within the country's sustainable development agenda and environmental priorities</p> <p>Level of GEF funding compared to other ODA in the environmental sector</p> <p>GEF support has country ownership and is country based (i.e., project origin, design and implementation)</p> | <p>Relevant country level sustainable development and environment policies, strategies and action plans</p> <p>Project-related documentation (project document and logframe, implementation reports, terminal evaluations, TE reviews, etc.), PMIS, Agencies' project databases</p> <p>Available databases (international as WB, OECD, etc., and national, i.e. dept. of statistics, other)</p> <p>Government officials, agencies' staff, donors and civil society representatives</p> <p>Country environmental legal framework</p> | <p>Desk review, GEF portfolio analysis by focal area, Agency, modality and project status (national)</p> <p>Stakeholder consultation (focus groups, individual interviews)</p> <p>Literature review, timelines, historical causality, etc.</p>  |
| <p>... the country's development needs and challenges?</p>   | <p>GEF supports development needs (i.e., income generating, capacity building) and reduces challenges</p> <p>The GEF's various types of modalities, projects and instruments are in coherence with country's needs and challenges</p>  | <p>Relevant country level sustainable development and environment policies, strategies and action plans</p> <p>Project-related documentation (project document and logframe, implementation reports, terminal evaluations, TE reviews, etc.), PMIS, Agencies' project databases</p> <p>Government officials, agencies' staff, donors and civil society representatives</p> <p>Country environmental legal framework</p>   | <p>Desk review, GEF portfolio analysis by focal area, Agency, modality and project status (national)</p> <p>Stakeholder consultation (focus groups, individual interviews)</p> <p>Literature review, timelines, historical causality, etc.</p>  |
| <p>... national GEF focal area action plans?</p>   | <p>GEF support linked to the national environmental action plan (NEAP); national communications to UNFCCC; national POPs; National Capacity Self-Assessment (NCSA); adaptation to climate change (NAPA), etc.</p>  | <p>GEF-supported enabling activities and products (NCSA, NEAP, NAPA, national communications to UN Conventions, etc.)</p>   | <p>Desk review</p> <p>Stakeholder consultation (focus groups, individual interviews)</p>  |
| <p>... the objectives linked to the different global environmental benefits (i.e. biodiversity, GHG, international waters, POPs, land degradation, etc.)?</p>          | <p>Project outcomes and impacts are related to the RAF and STAR Global Benefit Index (for biodiversity and climate change and land degradation) and to other global indicators for POPs and international waters</p> <p>GEF support is linked to national commitments to Conventions</p>             | <p>National Conventions action plans, RAF, STAR, BD scorecard, etc.</p> <p>Project-related documentation (project document and logframe, implementation reports, terminal evaluations, TE reviews, etc.), PMIS, Agencies' project databases</p> <p>Government officials, agencies' staff, donors and civil society representatives</p> <p>Global Environmental Benefits Assessment</p>  | <p>Desk review, project field visits, project review protocols</p> <p>Literature review, timelines, historical causality, etc.</p> <p>GEF portfolio analysis by focal area, Agency, modality and project status (national)</p> <p>Stakeholder consultation (focus groups, individual interviews)</p> <p>Literature review</p> |
| <p>Are the GEF and its Agencies supporting environmental and sustainable development prioritization, country ownership and decision-making process of the country?</p> | <p>GEF Agencies' support to national environment and sustainable development prioritization, country ownership and country decision-making process</p>   | <p>GEF Secretariat staff and technical staff from GEF Agencies</p> <p>Government officials, agencies' staff, donors and civil society representatives</p> <p>GEF Instrument, Council decisions, focal area strategies, GEF4 programming strategy, GEF Agencies' country strategies and plans</p> <p>Project-related documentation (project document and logframe, implementation reports, terminal evaluations, TE reviews, etc.), PMIS, Agencies' project databases</p>  | <p>Stakeholder consultation (focus groups, individual interviews)</p> <p>Desk review, GEF portfolio analysis by focal area, Agency, modality and project status (national)</p>  |

| Key question  | Indicators/basic data   | Sources of information  | Methodology  |
|---|---|---|--|
| <b>Is GEF support efficient?</b>  |   |   |  |
| How much time, effort and financial resources does it take to develop and implement a project, by type of GEF support modality? | Process indicators: processing timing (according to project cycle steps), preparation and implementation cost by type of modalities, etc. | Project-related documentation (project documents and logframes, implementation reports, terminal evaluations, TE reviews, etc.), PMIS, Agencies project databases, RAF pipeline | Desk review, GEF portfolio analysis, timelines                                   |
|   | Projects drop-outs and cancellations  | GEF Secretariat and Agencies' staff and government officials  | Interviews, field visits, project review protocols                               |
|   | GEF vs. cofinancing   | National and local government officials, donors, NGOs, beneficiaries  |  |
| What are the roles, types of engagement and coordination among various stakeholders in project implementation?                  | Level of participation  | Project-related reviews ( implementation reports, terminal evaluations, TE reviews, etc.)   | Desk review and meta analysis of evaluation reports, interviews and field visits |
|   | Roles and responsibilities of GEF actors  | Project staff, government officials   |  |
|   | Coordination between GEF projects   |   | GEF Secretariat staff and technical staff from GEF Agencies                      |
|   | Existence of a national coordination mechanism for GEF support  | Interviews, field visits, institutional analysis  |  |
| Are there synergies among GEF Agencies in GEF programming and implementation?   | Acknowledgement between GEF Agencies of each other's projects   | Project-related reviews ( implementation reports, terminal evaluations, TE reviews, etc.)   | Desk review and meta analysis of evaluation reports, interviews and field visits |
|   | Effective communication and technical support between GEF project agencies and organizations  | GEF Agency staff, national executing agencies (NGOs, other)   |  |
| Are there synergies between national institutions for GEF support in programming and implementation?                            | Acknowledgement between institutions of each other's projects   | Project-related reviews (implementation reports, terminal evaluations, TE reviews, etc.)  | Desk review and meta analysis of evaluation reports, interviews and field visits |
|   | Effective communication and technical support between national institutions   | Project staff, national and local government officials  |  |
| Are there synergies between GEF support and other donors' support?  | Acknowledgement between institutions of each other's projects   | Project-related reviews ( implementation reports, terminal evaluations, TE reviews, etc.)   | Desk review, focus groups and individual interviews, and field visits            |
|   | Effective communication and technical support between institutions  | NGO staffs and donors' representatives  |  |
|   | Complementarity of GEF support  | Evaluations of other donors' funded projects  | Meta analysis fo evaluation reports  |
| What role does Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) play in project adaptive management and overall efficiency?                      | Quality of M&E inputs   | Project-related reviews ( implementation reports, mid-term evaluations, terminal evaluations, TE reviews, etc.)   | Desk review  |
|   | Quality and level of adaptive management applied to projects and programs   | GEF Secretariat and Agencies' staff and government officials  | Stakeholder consultations (focus groups and individual interviews)               |
|   | Level of independence, quality and timeliness of external evaluations   | National and local government officials, donors, NGOs, beneficiaries  | Field visits   |
|   | Projects and programs compliance woth GEF and GEF Agency M&E policies   | Evaluations of other donors' funded projects  | Meta analysis fo evaluation reports  |