

**STANDARD TERMS OF REFERENCE  
FOR  
GEF COUNTRY PORTFOLIO STUDIES**

**Approved by Rob D. van den Berg, Director, GEF Evaluation Office,  
on 13 December 2012**

**Background**

1. Country Portfolio Studies (CPSs) are an addition to Country Portfolio Evaluations (CPEs) which is 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, these evaluations provide useful information for both the GEF Council and the countries. The relevance and utility of the Office's country level evaluations increased in GEF-5 with the increased emphasis on country ownership and country driven portfolio development.
2. CPSs provide the Office with additional coverage of country portfolios, but have a reduced focus and scope. They are conducted wherever opportunities to collaborate with independent evaluation offices of GEF Agencies exist. Benefits of such collaborations include more informed and complete evaluations, reduced evaluation burden to countries, and cost-savings for both offices. Compared to CPEs, CPSs involve fewer number of stakeholders to be interviewed (basically the key actors participating in the GEF in the country) and limited visits to projects.
3. This document updates the 2010 standard Terms of Reference (TORs) for CPSs 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 TORs to take into account recent developments, care was taken to maintain comparability of CPSs throughout GEF-5. CPSs are conducted fully and independently by the Office in collaboration with GEF agency evaluation offices.
4. These standard TORs are used to guide CPSs without having to prepare country specific TORs as is done for CPEs. In addition, specific agreements will be developed between the GEF Evaluation Office and the relevant GEF agency evaluation office to govern the collaboration between offices. Such agreements will highlight the reciprocal benefits and synergies of the collaboration from the point of view of the two offices and the concerned country.

**Objectives**

5. The purpose of CPSs is the same of CPEs. CPSs aim at providing the GEF Council with: an assessment of how GEF 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

---

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

sustainable development agendas as well as to the GEF mandate of generating global environmental benefits within its focal areas. These studies 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 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.
6. CPSs do not have an objective of rating the performance of GEF agencies, partners or national governments. CPSs analyze the performance of individual projects as part of the overall GEF portfolio, but without rating such projects.

### Key Evaluation Questions

7. CPSs are guided by the same set of key questions for CPEs. Each study will report only on those that are appropriate and for which sufficient quantitative and qualitative information can be gathered:

#### *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

### **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*

an extended period of time after completion?

### ***Relevance***

- f) Is GEF support relevant to the national sustainable development agenda and environmental priorities?
- a) Is GEF support relevant to the country's development needs and challenges?
- b) Is GEF support relevant to national GEF focal area action plans?
- c) Is GEF support relevant to the objectives linked to the different global environmental benefits in biodiversity, greenhouse gases, international waters, land degradation, and chemicals focal areas?
- d) 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?

8. Each of these questions is complemented by indicators, potential sources of information and methods in an evaluation matrix. A standard version of the CPS evaluation matrix is annexed to this document. This matrix can be used to determine which questions are appropriate and for which sufficient information can be gathered.

## **Scope and Limitations**

9. CPSs cover GEF supported activities in the country at different stages of the project cycle (ongoing and completed) and implemented by all GEF agencies in all focal areas, including applicable GEF corporate activities such as the Small Grants Programme (SGP). The main focus of the study consists of the nationally implemented projects. In addition, national components of regional and global projects could be taken into consideration to present the overall support and participation in the GEF, but without attempting to fully assess their aggregate relevance, results and performance. The review of selected regional projects feeds into the aggregate assessment of the national GEF portfolio described above.

10. The main focus of CPSs is on completed projects and partly on ongoing projects. The stage of the project determines the expected focus (see table 1).

**Table 1. Focus of Evaluation According to Stage of Project**

Project Status	Focus		On an Exploratory Basis	
	Relevance	Efficiency	Effectiveness	Results
Completed	Full	Full	Full	Full
Ongoing	Full	Partially	Likelihood	Likelihood

11. Country level evaluations 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 (NPFES) 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 CPS assesses GEF support since the start of its activities to date. CPSs 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 CPS 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.

12. GEF support is provided through partnerships with many institutions, so it is challenging to consider GEF support separate from the contribution of partners. The CPS does not attempt to provide a direct attribution of development results to the GEF, but tries to address the contribution of the GEF support to the overall achievements.

13. 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 one mature enough project (i.e. completed for at least two years) is assessed through a field Review of Outcome to Impact (ROtI) study, where applicable. 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 and replication effects, institutional sustainability and capacity building, and awareness.

14. The context in which these projects were developed, approved and are being implemented constitutes another possible focus of the CPS. To the extent feasible, the study will include a brief historical presentation of the national sustainable development and environmental policies, strategies and priorities, and the legal environment in which these policies are implemented and enforced.

## **Methodology**

15. CPSs 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 consultant(s) selected must qualify under the Office's 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. The GEF Operational Focal Point (OFP) in the country, although not a member of the study team, is asked to act as resource persons in facilitating the CPS process by identifying interviewees and source documents, organizing interviews, meetings and field visits.

16. The methodology includes a series of components using a combination of qualitative and quantitative evaluation methods and tools. The CPS will to a large extent depend on existing documents that provide overviews of issues, aggregate results or independent analysis of legal frameworks, strategies and trends in sustainable development and the environment. The expected sources of information could include documents and articles on:

- Country level: national sustainable development agendas, environmental priorities and strategies, GEF-wide, focal area strategies and action plans, global and national environmental indicators
  - GEF agency level: country assistance strategies and frameworks and their evaluations and reviews
17. Besides, the following are primary documents to be reviewed during the CPS:
- Project level: project documents, project implementation reports, terminal evaluations, terminal evaluation reviews, reports from monitoring visits, and any other technical documents produced by projects
  - Evaluative evidence at country level from other evaluations implemented either by the Office, by independent evaluation units of GEF agencies, or by other national or international evaluation departments
18. Moreover, evaluative information will be sought in the country through:
- Interviews with selected GEF stakeholders, including the GEF OFP and other relevant government departments, civil society organizations, and academia (including both local and international NGOs with a presence in the country), selected GEF agencies, SGP and the national UN conventions' focal points
  - Interviews with selected GEF beneficiaries and supported institutions, municipal governments and associations, and local communities and authorities
  - Field visits to selected project sites, using methods and tools developed by the Office such as the ROtI Handbook, depending on the maturity of the portfolio
  - National consultation workshops conducted by or in collaboration with the relevant GEF Agency evaluation unit
19. Where feasible, indicators will be used 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. Where sufficient data and findings are available, triangulation will be applied in the analysis to verify and validate findings.
20. The evaluation team uses standard tools and protocols developed by the Office for country level evaluations and adapt 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.
21. The CPSs include visits to selected project sites. The criteria for selecting the sites is finalized during the implementation of the study, with emphasis placed on ongoing and/or completed projects and those clustered within a particular geographic area given time and financial resources limitations. The Task Manager 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.

## **Process and Outputs**

22. Once the Office selects the country for a CPS based on opportunities for collaboration with a GEF agency evaluation unit, two main steps follow: a) communication to the relevant

ministries in the country by the Office (to the Ministry of Environment) and the GEF agency evaluation unit (to its Ministry of reference), to inform about the parallel evaluations; b) selection of consultant(s) who will support both evaluations. These two steps happen in a coordinated manner. The specifics of the collaboration with the GEF agency evaluation unit are discussed before these two main steps are agreed upon and undertaken. After that, the study team completes the following tasks, with support from the Office:

- Collect information and review literature to extract existing reliable evaluative evidence.
- Prepare specific inputs to the CPS, 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 cofinancing financial information, major objectives and expected (or actual) results, key partners per project, etc.
  - the *Country Environmental Legal Framework*, which provides a brief historical perspective of the context in which the GEF projects have been developed and implemented. This historical perspective will be accompanied by a timeline diagram that shows how GEF support relates over time to the development of the national environmental legislation and policies, as well as to the international environmental agreements signed by the country.
  - a description of the country's contribution to the GEF mandate of achieving global environmental benefits in its focal areas. This description will be based on the most readily available indicators, such main species and percentage of land under protected status for biodiversity, greenhouse gas emissions for climate change, and others used in projects documents.
- Conduct at least one field study (ROI, or field verification of terminal evaluation) of a completed national project, selected in consultation with the Office staff, which will contribute to strengthen the information gathering and analysis on results, as appropriate.
- Conduct the evaluation analysis and triangulation of collected information and evidence from various sources, tools and methods.
- Prepare draft report and presentation for consultation/workshop jointly with the relevant GEF agency evaluation unit. Workshop participants include government and other national stakeholders, project staff, donors, GEF agencies and civil society. Stakeholders' feedback will be sought on the main CPS findings, conclusions and lessons. 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 final CPS report, which incorporates comments received through consultations with national stakeholder.

23. The Office bears full responsibility for the content of the final CPS report.

### Key Milestones

24. The study is conducted between [month/year] and [month/year]. The key milestones of the CPS are presented below:

Milestone	Deadline
Preparatory work, preliminary data gathering	

Literature review, data gathering	
Finalization of the GEF country portfolio database	
Country Environmental Legal Framework	
Global Environmental Benefits description	
Field studies	
Data collection/interviews and project review protocols, portfolio overview	
Consolidation and triangulation of evaluative evidence	
Presentation of key findings through joint consultations/workshop with stakeholders	
Draft CPS report sent out to stakeholders	
Incorporation of comments received in a final CPS report	
Final CPS report	
Country response to the CPS	

### CPS Audience

25. The main CPS audience includes 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 evaluations. Governments may specifically define their targeted audiences during the conduct of the CPS. 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, the secretariats of the environment conventions for which the GEF is the financing mechanism.

### CPS Report Outline

26. The main output of the CPS is a report consisting of a systematic treatment of all the key questions that could be answered (see paragraph 6), including data, analysis, and evaluative judgments. The CPS report is organized along the following general table of contents:

#### CHAPTER 1. Main conclusions and lessons

- Background and objectives
- Scope and methodology
- Conclusions (effectiveness and results, relevance, efficiency)
- Lessons

#### CHAPTER 2. Study framework and context

- Methodology and limitations
- Key questions
- Global environment benefits description
- Country environmental legal framework
- The GEF portfolio

#### CHAPTER 3. Effectiveness and results of GEF support

- Global environmental benefits
- Catalytic, up-scaling and replication effects: progress toward impact
- Institutional sustainability and capacity building
- Results by focal area

#### CHAPTER 4. Relevance of GEF support

- 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 5. Efficiency of GEF support

- Time, effort, and financial resources required for project formulation and implementation
- Roles and responsibilities, and the GEF focal point mechanism
- Coordination and synergies
- Monitoring and evaluation for project adaptive management

#### ANNEXES:

- A. Terms of Reference
- B. Evaluation Matrix
- C. Interviewees
- D. Sites Visited
- E. GEF Portfolio in [country]
- F. Bibliography



## ANNEX 1

### Standard CPS 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 ROtI studies	Focus groups and individual interviews 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 ROtI studies	Focus groups and individual interviews 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 ROtI studies	Desk review ROtI methodology
		Project staffs and beneficiaries, national and local government representatives	Focus groups and individual interviews
	Contribution by the GEF	Data from overall projects and other donors ROtI studies Project staffs and beneficiaries, national and local government representatives	Desk review ROtI methodology Focus groups and individual interviews
... 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>			
... the country's sustainable development agenda and environmental priorities?	GEF support is within the country's sustainable development agenda and environmental priorities	Relevant country level sustainable development and environment policies, strategies and action plans Project-related documentation (project document and logframe, implementation reports, terminal evaluations, TE reviews, etc.), PMIS, Agencies' project databases	Desk review, GEF portfolio analysis by focal area, Agency, modality and project status (national)
	Level of GEF funding compared to other ODA in the environmental sector	Available databases (international as WB, OECD, etc., and national, i.e. dept. of statistics, other)	
	GEF support has country ownership and is country based (i.e., project origin, design and implementation)	Government officials, agencies' staff, donors and civil society representatives Country environmental legal framework	Stakeholder consultation (focus groups, individual interviews) Literature review, timelines, historical causality, etc.
... the country's development needs and challenges?	GEF supports development needs (i.e., income generating, capacity building) and reduces challenges	Relevant country level sustainable development and environment policies, strategies and action plans Project-related documentation (project document and logframe, implementation reports, terminal evaluations, TE reviews, etc.), PMIS, Agencies' project databases	Desk review, GEF portfolio analysis by focal area, Agency, modality and project status (national)
	The GEF's various types of modalities, projects and instruments are in coherence with country's needs and challenges	Government officials, agencies' staff, donors and civil society representatives Country environmental legal framework	Stakeholder consultation (focus groups, individual interviews) Literature review, timelines, historical causality, etc.
... national GEF focal area action plans?	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.	GEF-supported enabling activities and products (NCSA, NEAP, NAPA, national communications to UN Conventions, etc.)	Desk review Stakeholder consultation (focus groups, individual interviews)
... the objectives linked to the different global environmental benefits (i.e. biodiversity, GHG, international waters, POPs, land degradation, etc.)?	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	National Conventions action plans, RAF, STAR, BD scorecard, etc.	Desk review, project field visits, project review protocols Literature review, timelines, historical causality, etc.
	GEF support is linked to national commitments to Conventions	Project-related documentation (project document and logframe, implementation reports, terminal evaluations, TE reviews, etc.), PMIS, Agencies' project databases Government officials, agencies' staff, donors and civil society representatives Global Environmental Benefits Assessment	GEF portfolio analysis by focal area, Agency, modality and project status (national) Stakeholder consultation (focus groups, individual interviews) Literature review
Are the GEF and its Agencies supporting environmental and sustainable development prioritization, country ownership and decision-making process of the country?	GEF Agencies' support to national environment and sustainable development prioritization, country ownership and country decision-making process	GEF Secretariat staff and technical staff from GEF Agencies Government officials, agencies' staff, donors and civil society representatives GEF Instrument, Council decisions, focal area strategies, GEF4 programming strategy, GEF Agencies' country strategies and plans Project-related documentation (project document and logframe, implementation reports, terminal evaluations, TE reviews, etc.), PMIS, Agencies' project databases	Stakeholder consultation (focus groups, individual interviews) Desk review, GEF portfolio analysis by focal area, Agency, modality and project status (national)

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 with GEF and GEF Agency M&E policies	Evaluations of other donors' funded projects	Meta analysis fo evaluation reports