GEF Annual Impact Report 2012

OCTOBER 2012

GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT FACILITY
EVALUATION OFFICE

GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT FACILITY
EVALUATION OFFICE

GEF Annual Impact Report 2012

October 2012

EVALUATION REPORT NO. 76

This report was presented to the GEF Council in November 2012.

1818 H Street, NW
Washington, DC 20433
Internet: www.gefeo.org
Email: gefevaluation@thegef.org

ISBN-10: 1-933992-50-6
ISBN-13: 978-1-933992-50-1

Credits

Director of the GEF Evaluation Office: Robert D. van den Berg
Impact Evaluation Team Leader: Aaron Zazueta, Chief Evaluation Officer, GEF Evaluation Office
Task Manager: Jeneen Reyes Garcia, Consultant, GEF Evaluation Office

Editing and design: Nita Congress
Cover photo: A boy from a fisher family looks toward the horizon of the South China Sea by Jeneen R. Garcia, GEF Evaluation Office

Evaluation Report No. 76

A FREE PUBLICATION

Contents

TABLES

Foreword

This is the sixth annual impact report produced by the Evaluation Office of the Global Environment Facility (GEF). In these reports, the Office consolidates information on completed evaluations, as well as on progress of ongoing impact evaluations, methodological developments, and other related efforts.

GEF Annual Impact Report 2012 presents progress on the following studies:

- Impact Evaluation of GEF Support in the South China Sea and Adjacent Areas
- Assessment of Quality at Entry of Arrangements to Measure Impact
- Impact Evaluation on Climate Change Mitigation
- Impact Evaluation of GEF Support to Biodiversity

The document also discusses how the Evaluation Office is mainstreaming impact evaluations across various evaluative streams and across the GEF partnership by assessing the quality of arrangements to measure impact, incorporating impact assessment considerations in terminal evaluation reviews, continuing the use of the review of outcomes to impacts (ROtI) analysis through country portfolio evaluations and terminal evaluation verifications, and the application of a theory of change framework to assess the GEF's focal area strategies.

The Office employs a range of methods that allow it to better take into account the complexities related to interventions and their social, political, economic, and environmental context. We apply theory of change–based approaches and tools inspired by complexity theory and social-ecological systems to identify likely impacts and determine progress toward their achievement. To standardize the assessment of impact across scales, a framework for the GEF's theory of change was developed this year as a result of the recently completed Impact Evaluation of GEF Support in the South China Sea and Adjacent Areas.

The Office would like to thank all those who collaborated with our impact assessment work: our staff and consultants, national focal points, project management staff, GEF Agencies, and non-GEF stakeholders. I would like to thank all those involved for their support and constructive criticism.

The Evaluation Office remains fully responsible for the contents of the report.

Rob D. van den Berg
Director, GEF Evaluation Office

Acknowledgments

The work presented in *GEF Annual Impact Report 2012* is the joint effort of a number of Global Environment Facility (GEF) Evaluation Office staff and consultants. Serving as Task Team Leader, providing supervision of the work presented in the report, was Aaron Zazueta, Chief Evaluation Officer in the GEF Evaluation Office. Jeneen Reyes Garcia, Consultant, drafted the report.

Aaron Zazueta managed the recently completed Impact Evaluation of GEF Support in the South China Sea and Adjacent Areas. Neeraj Kumar Negi, Evaluation Officer, and Jeneen Reyes Garcia, Consultant, were the team members who worked on this evaluation. Aaron Zazueta is also leading the Impact Evaluation of GEF Support to Biodiversity. Neeraj Kumar Negi is the Task Manager for the Impact Evaluation on Climate Change Mitigation and the Assessment of Quality at Entry of Arrangements to Measure Impact; the latter is being carried out in collaboration with the GEF Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel.

Abbreviations

GEF	Global Environment Facility
ICM	integrated coastal management
IIMS	Integrated Information Management System
M&E	monitoring and evaluation
OPS	overall performance study
PEMSEA	Partnerships in Environmental Management for the Seas of East Asia
SAP	strategic action plan
SCS	South China Sea
SDS-SEA	Sustainable Development Strategy for the Seas of East Asia
SGP	Small Grants Programme
SOC	state of the coast
TDA	transboundary diagnostic analysis
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme

All dollar amounts are U.S. dollars unless otherwise indicated.

1. Overview of Impact Evaluation Work in 2012

In 2012, the Evaluation Office of the Global Environment Facility (GEF) completed its two-year impact evaluation of GEF support to international waters, made progress in the impact evaluation of GEF support to climate change mitigation, and started an impact evaluation on GEF support of biodiversity. An assessment of the quality of arrangements to measure impacts integrated into project proposals at Chief Executive Officer (CEO) approval was also carried out, and has been expanded to include a follow-up assessment. A preliminary report of this assessment was presented to the June 2012 Council in the 2011 GEF Annual Performance Report. Impact-related considerations continue to be mainstreamed across other evaluation streams in the Evaluation Office to ensure the availability of information on GEF impacts in future evaluations.

This sixth annual impact report covers the period from October 1, 2011, to September 30, 2012, and is divided into two chapters following this overview. Chapter 2 consists of the findings and recommendations of the Impact Evaluation of GEF Support in the South China Sea and Adjacent Areas. Chapter 3 reports on the rest of the activities carried out by the Evaluation Office with reference to impact evaluation for the reporting period.

The South China Sea (SCS) evaluation completed this year provides three sets of recommendations. The first refers to GEF international waters support in the SCS and adjacent areas, the second to the GEF international waters focal area strategy for GEF-6 (2014–18), and the third to impact monitoring and evaluation (M&E) systems of GEF projects. The findings of this evaluation also provide a basis to further assess the impacts of GEF support to international waters at the global scale. Novel evaluation approaches that were used and developed in this evaluation to assess impacts in complex social-ecological systems will also provide inputs to other impact evaluations in the future, as well as to current evaluations. For example, a generic framework for theory of change analysis for GEF support has been developed for the Fifth Overall Performance Study (OPS5). This framework has been used in the evaluation of the GEF focal area strategies and in the progress-to-impact reviews of project terminal evaluations.

The Evaluation Office has also been very active in the development of guidelines for impact evaluations through the United Nations Evaluation Group's impact evaluation task force and in the Evaluation Cooperation Group. The Office made a presentation on the application of complex systems analysis in theory of change–based evaluations at the recent United Nations Evaluation Group's Evaluation Practice Exchange Seminar.

2. Impact Evaluation of GEF Support in the South China Sea and Adjacent Areas

2.1 Background

The Evaluation Office initiated the SCS impact evaluation to follow up on one of the recommendations of OPS4, which called for an in-depth assessment of progress toward impacts in the international waters focal area. OPS4 had focused on the likely impacts of individual projects, and had not been able to adequately capture the combined impacts of GEF projects over time and across the larger area within which interventions are taking place. The SCS impact evaluation addressed this by focusing on assessing progress toward impact of a cluster of projects contributing to the management of a large marine ecosystem.[1] The SCS, including the Gulf of Thailand, is the focus of this evaluation; the area's selection was based on level of GEF engagement, maturity of the GEF portfolio, applicability of lessons from the site to other areas, and the extent that it has not been covered yet by other major evaluations.

Encompassing roughly 3.5 million square kilometers, the SCS is the world's largest body of water after the five oceans. The region is among the richest in the world in terms of marine resources and environmental value. Rapid economic growth, however, has resulted in growing coastal habitat destruction, pollution, and overfishing. The region is also known for its history of maritime border disagreements. Thus, addressing transboundary coastal and marine concerns has been a challenge.

GEF international waters support is distinct from other focal areas in that it focuses on addressing concerns in water bodies such as large marine ecosystems, lakes, aquifers, or rivers that are shared by several countries. The presumption is that nation states need prompting and support to address these environmental concerns that cut across country borders. The GEF seeks to fill this catalyst role. During the early stages of its engagement, the GEF typically focuses on helping countries build trust and confidence among themselves and with other actors, a robust knowledge of concerns and their root causes, agreements on priority concerns and actions, national capacities to formulate and implement policies, and effective regional and national intersectoral bodies to carry out coordinated actions.

Once an enabling environment has been created, the focus shifts to the testing of implementation strategies—including technologies—approaches, and mechanisms. Where appropriate, the GEF may subsequently support activities that aim at broader adoption of the tested strategies through the mainstreaming, replication, and scaling up of lessons learned and implementation strategies that have

[1] Impact is defined as "positive and negative, primary and secondary long-term effects produced by a development intervention, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended" (OECD DAC 2002).

been shown to work. Given the scale of investment required to address transboundary concerns and the GEF's self-ascribed catalytic role, broader adoption processes are usually left to national governments and other actors. In some instances, however, the GEF may provide financing for a small proportion of funding required for such activities.

Not all GEF international waters focal area projects may not follow this sequence of activities in addressing transboundary water concerns. Projects that are not consistent with this progression are often undertaken on an opportunistic basis because they facilitate country buy-in and/or make targeted contributions to a priority transboundary concern of the countries in the region.

Since 1992, the GEF approved funding totaling $115 million to address transboundary international waters–related concerns in the SCS, with a total cofinancing commitment of $691 million. The GEF portfolio in the SCS comprises 34 projects and 150 small grants in seven countries: Cambodia, China, Indonesia, Malaysia, the Philippines, Thailand and Vietnam.[2] Of these, 20 projects and 119 small grants were supported through the international waters focal area; the remainder was supported through other focal areas.

2.2 Objectives and Methodology

The main objective of this evaluation was to analyze the extent to which GEF support has contributed toward progress in addressing the transboundary environmental concerns that affect the social, economic, and environmental services of the SCS including the Gulf of Thailand. The four main evaluation questions were:

- Has support been **relevant** to SCS transboundary environmental threats and priorities?
- What are the **effects** of GEF support (positive or negative, intended or unintended) on country efforts and environmental problems?
- What are the **critical factors** that affect the likelihood that support will catalyze broader actions to reduce environmental stress and improve environmental and socioeconomic status?
- What **lessons** can be learned that apply to the SCS and elsewhere?

The evaluation design took into account three main aspects: (1) the theory of change implicit in the GEF's interventions and its implementation approach; (2) the characteristics of the complex, linked social and ecological systems that GEF interventions are trying to influence; and (3) the challenges associated with assessing the impact of GEF interventions, given the nature of these systems and of the interventions.

Among the challenges posed to the evaluation by the SCS as a complex social-ecological system were boundary disputes between countries, multiplicity of scales of linked institutions and processes, mismatches in boundaries of natural/ecological and administrative/social systems, unpredictability in system responses (e.g., time lags between intervention and change in environmental status), and the multiplicity of independent actors interacting and influencing each other's behaviors, making it difficult to establish cause and effect links. Attribution of results to GEF support was assessed when possible; in most cases, however, GEF contributions were assessed within the context of the contributions of other actors. GEF support was also assessed according to the extent to which socioeconomic dimensions were integrated with

[2] The 34 projects account for $112 million in GEF funding and $691 million in cofinancing; the 150 grants provided through the GEF's Small Grants Programme account for the remainder.

environmental objectives to reinforce environmentally sound behavior.

The evaluation adopted a mixed-methods approach: both quantitative and qualitative tools were used. Primary and secondary sources were used for gathering information, such as field visits, key informant interviews, online surveys, peer-reviewed literature, remote sensing data, global databases, and historical archives; several sources were used so as to triangulate evidence.

To assess GEF contributions within the context of a complex social-ecological system, methods and tools such as a nonlinear theory of change, discounting of rival hypotheses, social network analysis, extensive analysis of historical precedents and contexts, and counterfactual analysis were used. Conventional evaluation tools, such as portfolio analysis and case study analysis of countries and regional themes, were also used.

The approach paper for the evaluation was approved by the Director of the Evaluation Office in December 2010. Field verification was conducted from April to October 2011 of 29 sites in five countries.[3] Interviews were conducted with almost 400 representatives of GEF project staff, beneficiaries, Agencies, local and national governments, and regional organizations from all seven GEF-eligible SCS countries.

[3] In-depth case studies were done for China, the Philippines, Thailand, and Vietnam, as these four countries accounted for 86 percent of GEF funding in the SCS. Twenty-seven of a total of 36 sites in these countries were randomly sampled for field verification. Due to logistical constraints, 3 of the 27 sites were not visited but were verified through in-depth interviews of executing staff and other key informants in the relevant countries. Small Grants Programme and comparable non-GEF sites were visited when the opportunity arose. A brief visit to Cambodia was also made, with two additional demonstration sites visited.

The study was conducted by an interdisciplinary team that included GEF Evaluation Office staff and several national and international marine, legal, and evaluation experts. Stakeholder inputs were solicited through meetings of the International Waters Task Force, composed of representatives from the GEF Agencies; and a reference group composed of staff of GEF projects, implementing and executing agencies, and national governments, as well as non-GEF regional stakeholders. The reference group was convened twice to provide inputs to the evaluation approach, direct the evaluation team to credible information sources, and comment on preliminary findings.

2.3 Findings and Conclusions

CONCLUSION 1: **Although environmental pressures in the South China Sea continue to increase, the Global Environment Facility has made important contributions that are relevant to addressing regional transboundary issues.**

Except for marine capture fisheries, activities in economic sectors that are dependent on and affect the health of the SCS (which includes the Gulf of Thailand)—specifically, aquaculture, tourism, mining, agriculture, and shipping—have been steadily increasing over the last 50 years, with some accelerating in the last decade. Resource overexploitation, land-based pollution, and habitat degradation and destruction have been steadily increasing since the 1950s, resulting in an overall continuous decline in environmental conditions in the SCS. However, improvements have been seen locally, demonstrating that, given the right approaches, environmental decline can be slowed or reversed.

In complex systems such as the SCS, communication and trust are key to addressing transboundary environmental concerns. The GEF has increased opportunities for communication and collaboration by supporting networks of scientists, legal experts, and local government officials across the

region. Through these networks, new knowledge such as environmental assessment methods and ecological baselines has been produced for the region. A notable knowledge product developed with GEF support is a transboundary diagnostic analysis (TDA), which has provided a scientific basis for the priority transboundary concerns in the SCS that need to be addressed. Exchanges of knowledge, experiences, and lessons learned have been supported through websites, study tours, congresses, forums, and other learning activities. In the process, awareness and technical skills have increased at the local, national, and regional levels—in some cases resulting in more environmentally conscious behavior and laws.

GEF support has allowed the development or testing of management approaches and tools to address SCS priority environmental concerns, such as integrated coastal management (ICM); port safety, health, and environmental management; risk assessment and management; ecosystem valuation; fisheries refugia system; and joint wastewater treatment systems. Strategic action plans (SAPs) at the local, national, and regional scales have been produced incorporating these tools and approaches. Financial mechanisms to implement these approaches, such as alternative livelihoods, revolving funds, public-private partnerships, and user fee systems, were also introduced with GEF support. In several instances, supporting legislation at the municipal and provincial levels to implement these approaches has also been facilitated through GEF support. The GEF, along with other actors, has done the same at the national scale, such as through Executive Order 533 on ICM in the Philippines and the Sea Use Law in China. Many GEF project-implementing mechanisms and bodies have been incorporated into local government structures as permanent offices. These implementing strategies at the local and national scales fit within the larger framework of actions needed to address SCS transboundary concerns.

The GEF has made significant contributions in building trust by facilitating cooperative arrangements between community members and between government agencies at local and national scales. At the regional level, the GEF has facilitated five important intergovernmental arrangements in the SCS: a memorandum of agreement between two provinces in Cambodia and Vietnam for seagrass management; a joint framework for oil spill response in the Gulf of Thailand between Cambodia, Thailand, and Vietnam; the Sustainable Development Strategy for the Seas of East Asia (SDS-SEA); the Partnerships in Environmental Management for the Seas of East Asia (PEMSEA), the SDS-SEA implementing mechanism composed of 11 countries and 19 noncountry partners; and the approval of priority actions for the SCS by seven countries through a SAP.

CONCLUSION 2: **The GEF has become a critical player in the region by linking initiatives at multiple scales and providing a channel for other donors and stakeholders to support these transboundary concerns.**

Although the GEF is a relatively new player in the region, it has gained a position in the regional network of actors comparable to those of long-standing organizations—in terms of the number and types of actors it is able to reach and influence—due to its mode of working through partnerships. A social network analysis shows that all major SCS regional actors with the greatest longevity addressing environmental concerns have been partners in GEF initiatives either as an Implementing Agency, executing agency, cofinancer, or collaborator in one way or another. GEF support has also helped link actors that generally work either outside the region or at the country level. An analysis of the reach of actors in the network shows that some actors would have had their reach reduced by as much as 44 percent in the absence of GEF initiatives. While it is possible that these links could have been established through means other than those

supported by the GEF, the GEF's linking role for less central actors in the region was confirmed by a survey done as part of the present evaluation. With this broad reach, the GEF has a strategic position in mainstreaming global environmental objectives in the regional agenda.

Furthermore, an analysis of bilateral donor investments in East Asia since the 1980s shows that the GEF has become the primary funder of regional coastal and marine initiatives in the SCS in the last 20 years (table 2.1). Through its position, the GEF has provided opportunities for other donors and institutions to support regional initiatives in cases where they primarily contributed only to national or local objectives. GEF support was also found to have enabled long-standing organizations in the region to expand the nature and scale of their support in addressing transboundary environmental concerns.

TABLE 2.1 **Donor Grants Related to Regional Coastal and Marine Environmental Initiatives in the Seas of East Asia, 1988–2008**

Donor	Total grants (current million $)
GEF	~142.63[a]
Sweden	~42
Canada	>25.1
United States	>24.2
European Commission	21.3
Australia	>16.2
Netherlands	8.8
Switzerland	6.3
Italy	5.5
Germany	4.1
Japan	1.4

SOURCES: GEF Project Management Information System, AidData (www.aiddata.org) for bilateral donor investments, and project documents.

a. Of this amount, $57.5 million is incident on the SCS.

CONCLUSION 3: **In 21 of 26 cases where comparative data could be obtained, the GEF has supported initiatives that reduced environmental stress, and improved or maintained socioeconomic conditions.**

Of the 27 sites that were covered in this evaluation through field verification, 20 had completed demonstrations or were at a stage where environmental stress reduction could be expected. As each site typically addressed multiple environmental concerns, the evaluation found that at these 20 sites, a total of 40 cases of stress reduction needed to be monitored (table 2.2). For 26 of these 40 cases (65 percent), data were available to determine whether stress reduction occurred. (Stress reduction may have occurred at other sites as well, but the lack of available and relevant environmental monitoring data meant that these changes could not be assessed by the evaluation.) In all, for 21 cases, data indicated a reduction in environmental stress, with almost half of these related to habitat and biodiversity concerns. In cases where stress reduction was not systematically measured, anecdotal accounts of stress reduction were obtained for four cases of habitat and biodiversity–related initiatives, and five cases addressing fisheries. These anecdotal accounts generally pertained to the reduction of destructive fishing practices (e.g., blast fishing, trawling) and mangrove cutting among local community members.

Since it was difficult to find comparable sites to measure the results with and without GEF support, larger scale trends were used for counterfactual analysis. For each of the parameters measured—coral, seagrass, and mangrove cover as indicators of habitat health; and biological oxygen demand as an indicator of coastal water quality—regional and national trends showed continuing declines in habitat and water quality. This shows that GEF-supported approaches have generally been effective at the specific sites where they have been implemented, as opposed to the rest of the respective

TABLE 2.2 **Number of Cases of Reported Environmental Stress Reduction in Field-Verified Demonstration Sites**

	Number of sites			
Environmental concern	Expected to have stress reduction	With comparative data available	With measured stress reduction	With anecdotal reports of stress reduction only
Habitat and biodiversity	17	12	10	4
Fisheries	12	6	4	5
Pollution	11	8	7	0
Total	40	26	21	9

countries and the region, where these approaches have not been widely implemented. In the four sites where specific pollution control technologies were demonstrated, improvements in water quality at points of wastewater discharge after the technologies were in operation shows the direct effect of GEF support on environmental status.

In 9 of the 20 completed demonstrations that were sampled, GEF-supported management initiatives not only reduced environmental stress, but were also reported to help foster cooperative relationships, improve livelihoods, and diversify sources of income as a direct result of improvements in environmental status. This has reinforced the implementation and promotion of environmental management initiatives within the sites and elsewhere in the respective countries. In five other sites where environmental stress reduction was reported, alternative sources of income related to ecotourism and fisheries introduced to mitigate losses in livelihood have, for the most part, encouraged environmental protection behavior among community members—or, at the very least, have reduced behavior causing environmental pressure. In most cases, reports on socioeconomic impacts were anecdotal in nature, as these were typically not measured or monitored by the demonstrations. In two sites, alternative livelihoods were supported, but no information could be obtained on their status or results.

Despite successful implementation of the demonstrations, the extent of stress reduction has been limited in several sites because of larger scale factors that the demonstrations failed to and/or could not address. These sites have generally used habitat protection as the main approach, which does not consider the larger context in which the targeted concern exists. For example, in the Vietnamese islands of Con Dao, Hon Mun, and Phu Quoc, regulations apply only within the protected area. While fishers from within the target municipalities tended to comply with the new regulations, it was more difficult to ensure compliance from large-scale commercial fishers from outside the area. A similar situation was found in the Cambodian towns of Kampot and Sihanoukville, where local fishers tended to follow regulations, but trawlers from outside the area continued to fish in shallow waters against regulations. Overexploitation therefore continues in the adjacent waters beyond these areas of jurisdiction. Experiences at these sites demonstrate that other approaches have to be introduced at the scale of these drivers for these initiatives to result in broader environmental benefits.

Coral cover was found to have increased or been maintained within GEF-supported marine protected areas in five of the visited demonstration sites over at least a five-year period. In all five sites, ecotourism- and fisheries-related alternative livelihoods reduced fishing pressure and

provided incentives to local fishers to protect the reefs. Despite this, fish abundance continues to decline in Con Dao and Phu Quoc, likely due to weak enforcement outside the marine protected areas. This decline is also due in part to environmental pressures that are not being addressed—or, as mentioned above, that the GEF-supported approaches are not designed to address at the scale at which they occur. Examples of these drivers are overfishing by commercial trawlers and land-based pollution from tourism and agriculture.

While there are insufficient long-term data to determine significant changes in seagrass cover, anecdotal information indicates an improvement in two of five sites where seagrass management took place.[4] GEF support has contributed to this by helping develop relevant legal and regulatory measures, increase public awareness of seagrass conservation issues, and improve enforcement and compliance through community participation. For example, in Kampot, Cambodia, and Bolinao, the Philippines, local community organizations reported that with GEF support they have expanded the area under management and regularly patrol for destructive fishing practices. Both sites have reported improved productivity and income from fishing. In Hepu, China, GEF support has resulted in seagrass beds being incorporated into an existing national park. However, destructive fishing practices and possibly poaching continue in most sites, especially outside the protected areas.

In four of the visited demonstration sites where mangrove protection and rehabilitation were supported, remote sensing analysis revealed that mangrove cover was increasing even before GEF support began. While the increase in mangrove cover may not be directly attributable to GEF support, the GEF has provided incremental value by sustaining the momentum of mangrove-related initiatives and, in some cases, facilitating their expansion. Increased crab productivity resulting from improved mangrove cover has strengthened mangrove protection efforts by community members in Trat, Thailand. GEF-supported ecotourism initiatives in Shankou-Weizhou, China, have similarly provided an incentive to community members to protect mangroves. Peam Krasop, Cambodia—which was not visited but was analyzed through remote sensing—was the only site that showed a continuous decline in mangrove cover over the last three decades. Here, drivers related to high migration into the area contributed to rapid deforestation at the time of GEF support.

GEF-supported demonstrations in seven of the nine visited sites addressing land-based sources of pollution have generally resulted in stress reduction and, in some cases, improved water quality. These improvements have led to an increase in property values, cleaner beaches, growth of the tourism industry in urban areas such as Xiamen, China, and Chonburi, Thailand, and better air quality and more sources of income for farmers in Guangdong, China. Organic pollution continued to increase in Manila Bay, the Philippines, despite improvements in some parameters, due to the large-scale drivers of population and economic growth which were beyond the geographical and technical scope of GEF-supported technologies and approaches.

CONCLUSION 4: **Broader adoption of GEF-supported initiatives is taking place, and is critical to fully addressing environmental pressures at the appropriate scales, but faces constraints to further progress.**

As discussed above, even though changes at the demonstration site level are linked to changes in

[4] Two of these sites (Kampot, Cambodia, and East Bintan, Indonesia) were not included in the 27 sampled sites. Kampot, however, was field-verified during a country visit.

the transboundary water body, broader adoption of promoted approaches and technologies would be required to effect changes at a larger scale. Building on previous work carried out during OPS4, the evaluation focused on three processes or mechanisms by which broader adoption may occur. The first is through **mainstreaming**, which involves elements of GEF-supported approaches being incorporated in laws, policies, regulations, programs, and other stakeholder initiatives that are usually already part of their regular program or mandate. The second is through **replication**, where the GEF-supported approach or technology is adopted in other localities at a comparable administrative or ecological scale. The third is **scaling-up**, where a similar initiative is implemented in a larger geographic area, often including new aspects or concerns of a political, administrative, or ecological nature. This last is useful in addressing issues that cannot be resolved at lower scales and in spreading the promoted interventions to contiguous areas. These three processes of broader adoption may be at work at the same time for a given demonstration, and may take place at different scales; often, one process may have to occur for another to take place.

Of the 27 verified demonstration sites, 20 were completed or were at a stage in which indications of broader adoption could be identified. While big differences in extent existed, 18 sites reported some form of broader adoption. In all, 13 cases of mainstreaming, 14 cases of replication, and 9 cases of scaling-up were reported. At the regional and national scales, broader adoption is more commonly seen in the mainstreaming of GEF-supported approaches (e.g., ICM, national SAPs) in national laws, and in mechanisms and nonbinding agreements among countries to address transboundary concerns. However, broader adoption at the local, national, and regional scales is impeded by several barriers, discussed below.

- **Conditions for broader adoption are not always present.** Broader adoption was found to be more likely to take place through mainstreaming, replication, and scaling-up when four key conditions are in place:

  - Incentives to commit based on the attributes of the introduced technology or approach
  - Institutional capacities of the adopting governments
  - Available financial resources
  - Appropriate policy frameworks.

  Mainstreaming and scaling-up were most successful in areas that had the same receptive capacity as those in the demonstration site—most notably economic and governance capacities. In addition, mainstreaming works best where administrative and geographical boundaries match those of the problem being addressed. This finding was most apparent in sites demonstrating the ICM approach supported through the United Nations Development Programme's (UNDP's) PEMSEA stream, as GEF support to this stream has been provided the longest, and the demonstrations were designed with broader adoption as a primary objective (table 2.3).

  In both Xiamen, China, and Batangas Bay, the Philippines—the first two GEF-supported ICM demonstration sites—broader adoption has taken place through replication in other cities and provinces within their respective countries; mainstreaming at the municipal, provincial, and national scales; and scaling-up to include other water bodies and watersheds adjacent to these sites. The two cases have several characteristics in common. In both countries, there is a robust decentralization policy framework that delegates management of natural resources and environment-related services to local governments. In

TABLE 2.3 **Comparison of Conditions Necessary for Broader Adoption in Scaled-Up Integrated Coastal Management Demonstration Sites**

Demonstration site/ area covered by scale-up	Incentive for adoption	Institutional capacity	Availability of financial resources	Appropriateness of policy framework
Xiamen and Jiulong River Basin	High	High	High	High
Batangas Bay and entire Batangas Province	High	High	High	High
Danang and other coastal provinces in Vietnam	High	Low	Low	Low
Sriracha and other Chonburi municipalities	Low	Low	Low	High

this sense, the ICM processes in Xiamen and Batangas Bay were aligned with country priorities—an important factor for their incorporation into national policy. The context was thus receptive to the lessons provided by ICM. Sufficient administrative capacities in the adopting local governments were also in place before they began to implement ICM. Economic growth was robust—both Xiamen City and Batangas province and their adjacent areas have been among the highest-earning in their countries. In both places, the tourism and real estate industries have been important engines of growth. The experiences demonstrated that there are significant payoffs in giving environmental concerns attention early on in the process of economic development before the consequences of pollution become irreversible or too expensive to remediate.

The broader adoption process in Xiamen and Batangas Bay can be contrasted with experiences in Vietnam and Thailand. Danang, a Vietnamese port city, also experienced an economic boom with particularly strong growth in the tourism and real estate industries. Similarly, ICM has helped in planning growth and addressing environmental concerns early on. It has also been identified as an area for development by the Vietnam government. As part of a national law to implement ICM in 14 coastal provinces of the country, ICM was replicated in 3 provinces. However, the cities to which ICM is being expanded do not have the dynamism of Danang, nor access to as much fiscal resources. Decentralization policies in Vietnam, while delegating to responsibility for natural resource management to local provinces, have not fully transferred the necessary financial resources to put this into action. Further, plans for the establishment of a national ICM training center in Danang have been slowed by a lack of expected funding from the central government. Existing capacities at the provincial level are another limiting factor.

In Thailand, the ICM demonstration that began in the municipality of Sriracha in the province of Chonburi started shortly after a new decentralization policy was passed that granted the local governments more responsibility in managing their natural resources. ICM activities initially focused on five municipal local government units in the vicinity of the Sriracha port. These units were selected primarily because of their history of collaboration, financial resources, and relatively strong institutions. Scaling-up allowed the local government units to share wastewater treatment facilities and therefore collectively cut costs. Beginning in 2009, the ICM approach was extended to all coastal local government units, and eventually to all upland local government units, covering all 99 municipalities of the Chonburi Prov-

ince. However, there are significant differences between coastal and upland municipalities. Sriracha and its surrounding local government units have been able to develop their human and institutional resources on the strength of a growing port economy. Upland local government units, however, lack the fiscal resources generated by the economic spillover of the Sriracha port, the oil refineries, and the tourism industry. The incentives for upland adoption of ICM are also not as compelling as for inland local government units. In the case of coastal local government units, the rapid growth of tourism and real estate values are important incentives for protecting the beaches. Scaling-up in Chonburi faces the classic upstream/downstream dilemma, whereby upland local government units will have to invest in activities that will largely benefit coastal local government units.

The differences between the Xiamen and Chonburi experiences are that scaling-up in Xiamen has taken place gradually over almost two decades, and has so far involved only comparatively progressive cities that can support the costs of implementing the approach and coordinating with the other cities. Scaling up the unit of management has been relatively easier in Batangas as well, given that the additional bays are all within the jurisdiction of the same high-income province, albeit composed of additional municipalities. Because the GEF-supported demonstration was initially done with the province as the primary administrative unit, it had an inherent authority to convene other municipalities in order to scale up ICM to include all other water bodies in the province beyond Batangas Bay. In Chonburi, on the other hand, the provincial government has not had as much of an implementing role. Sriracha has had to take on the leadership role of getting other municipalities in the province to adopt and scale up ICM, requiring the creation of new implementing structures both at the level of the additional municipalities and at the level of clusters of municipalities. In Chonburi, the costs of coordinating regulations and activities across municipalities of very different economic and institutional capacities may be too high, requiring significant political and financial support from the national government that is currently not present.

- **Systems for managing trade-offs and risks are not always in place.** Change in land or sea use as part of coastal area zoning often requires the displacement of stakeholders from their livelihoods and/or homes. In the process of achieving global environmental objectives, 15 of the 27 sampled demonstration sites have required trade-offs and posed risks to human welfare. In 11 sites, while executing agencies have clearly taken measures to address these concerns, the appropriate systems to identify and mitigate socioeconomic risks were reported to not always be in place; as a result, not all measures taken were adequate in preventing negative unintended impacts.

  Ten of the 15 demonstration sites involved a reduction in access to coastal resources, and therefore had alternative livelihoods as a measure to mitigate socioeconomic losses. As noted above, five of these sites were successful in providing supplemental income and reducing environmental pressure, but two were not successful because market needs and appropriate environmental conditions were not considered in designing livelihoods. More detailed information was not available for the three other sites.

  In 5 of the 15 sites, relocation of homes and livelihoods was necessary to make way for new uses of coastal areas. Such relocation has typically—but not always—been dealt with by

providing financial compensation and resettlement sites to displaced communities. In two of these sites, both implemented by the World Bank, appropriate safeguard policies set in motion processes to mitigate risks to ensure that stakeholder concerns were addressed in a fair and timely manner. In the other three sites, the measures taken may not have met international standards. For example, UNDP's PEMSEA funding stream, which promotes the ICM approach, typically follows the respective country's policies in dealing with relocation and resettlement issues that arise in the course of coastal zoning and ICM program implementation. While some countries' practices might meet international standards, those of others do not. The evaluation could only ascertain the risks to, but not the actual impact on, the affected population of such resettlement practices. Resettlement issues that are not properly addressed may also pose a risk to the GEF's reputation.

A similar reputational risk is seen in one site where insufficient stakeholder engagement was undertaken in forging public-private partnerships in Puerto Galera (the Philippines). While this has greater implications for limiting the broader adoption of demonstrated approaches, it may also create distrust and disaffection among stakeholders and toward GEF-supported initiatives.

- **Reluctance of countries to support initiatives addressing regional transboundary environmental concerns and global environmental benefits.** East Asia is one of the few regions in the world that does not have a legally binding convention for the management of its regional seas. The multilateral environmental instruments in the region are mostly nonbinding, and take the form of declarations, strategies, and action plans, most of which are not financed by the countries themselves. Disagreements among littoral countries over maritime domains and resources have greatly limited the area and terms on which most states are willing to engage in cooperation on marine environmental governance in the SCS. When these domains and transboundary resources are at stake, countries have preferred to work through legally binding instruments that are primarily economic in intent and bilateral in nature. It is difficult to get participating countries to agree to conduct environmental research and monitoring activities in the high seas and in the contested islands. Even though there is very strong evidence that fish stocks are declining and that all countries would gain from more productive fisheries, participating countries have been wary of entering into multilateral regional arrangements or in supporting activities related to the management of transboundary fish stocks. This reluctance is resulting in a tragedy of the commons at a regional scale, as seen in the continuing decline of the environmental health of the SCS.

GEF support has mostly been able to move the transboundary environmental agenda forward where there is alignment with country priorities—and more specifically, where countries derive direct benefits. The GEF approach to the constraints posed by disagreements in maritime borders, as manifested in its strategic programming and in the design of its projects, has been to facilitate consensus among the participating countries and support regional cooperation wherever possible. Most of the regional support provided by the GEF has been in the form of foundational activities (e.g., transboundary diagnosis, priority setting, knowledge generation). Actual environmental responses that have been supported by the GEF have taken place mostly at the country level and on issues that do not require coordinated intergovernmental responses. Notable exceptions are the cooperation between Cambodia and Vietnam

in the management of seagrass beds; the joint framework on oil spill response in the Gulf of Thailand adopted by Cambodia, Thailand, and Vietnam; and the SCS SAP.

- **Differences in the extent of country support for environmental multilateral mechanisms, and a current heavy dependence on donor funding—including GEF support—by regional environmental mechanisms.** As part of the GEF international waters approach, broader adoption by countries of a viable regional mechanism that provides specific core coordinating services is necessary in achieving global environmental benefits over the long run. This assumption is based on experiences elsewhere in the world and on countries' capacity needs to address transboundary environmental concerns in the region. But some countries have noted that they are not convinced of the need to create more regional organizations. Countries in the SCS have been engaged since the 1970s in a complex network of intergovernmental institutions, through which they have adopted an array of instruments pertaining to the region's critical environmental concerns. However, regional environmental initiatives of intergovernmental organizations have historically been mostly financed by donors. In contrast to their reluctance to commit financially to regional environmental initiatives, littoral countries have contributed consistently to intergovernmental organizations that primarily address economic issues.

  Since 1993, the GEF has provided a stream of financial support to PEMSEA, which has since functioned with an outreach broader than the SCS to include other seas of East Asia. While most countries acknowledge and appreciate the support provided by PEMSEA, not all have recognized PEMSEA as an international organization operating in the region. In 2009, eight countries signed an agreement recognizing PEMSEA as an international legal entity; to date, three of the seven GEF-eligible countries bordering the SCS have yet to sign this agreement. While four countries (China, Japan, the Republic of Korea, and the Philippines) have pledged voluntary contributions toward PEMSEA's annual operating costs, none of the signing countries plans to commit to regular financial contributions or be financially liable for PEMSEA; instead, their approach is that each country should make voluntary contributions according to its means.[5]

  Consequently, after 20 years of support, PEMSEA remains heavily dependent on GEF funding for continuation of its services. According to PEMSEA's 2010 budget, the GEF funded 86.5 percent of total operations and implementation costs, which involved a broad range of activities under the Implementation of SDS-SEA project (GEF ID 2700). PEMSEA is aware of the risks of dependence on a single major donor, and has developed a Financial Sustainability Framework Plan for strengthening PEMSEA through voluntary contributions and other financial mechanisms.

  The GEF has adopted a phased approach in its support to PEMSEA. As of this writing, a project proposal was expected to be presented for approval in the November 2012 Council for the last phase of GEF support. The GEF Evaluation Office was informed that one of the main objectives of this project will be to support a five-year transition to PEMSEA's full financial sustainability. Also, based on PEMSEA's Resource Facility Reengineering Plan and SDS-SEA Regional Implementation Plan, it is apparent that PEM-

[5] The Philippines has signed a 10-year agreement providing PEMSEA with the use of a headquarters building and associated amenities. Timor-Leste has contributed $100,000 per year to PEMSEA; this is earmarked for activities undertaken on a cost-sharing basis by the PEMSEA Resource Facility and Timor-Leste.

SEA intends to expand its services by strengthening the PEMSEA Resource Facility. With GEF support over the next five years, PEMSEA plans to implement its Financial Sustainability Framework Plan to create various funding sources and sustainable streams of income, with the view of being financially sustainable by 2016.

Given that the current global economic recovery is likely to be slow and prolonged, it is uncertain at present how the resource-intensive core coordination and technical support functions of the PEMSEA Resource Facility as currently defined can be supported over the long term. If the GEF continues to channel funds toward increasing PEMSEA services over the next five years, it faces the risk that this expanded regional mechanism will face an abrupt financial shortfall and difficult adjustment once GEF financial support is phased out, if the required funding is beyond what the member countries themselves or other donors are willing to support with their own resources.

- **Low coordination and insufficient management of internal risks within the GEF partnership.** A programmatic approach has been an important aspect of GEF international waters support since development of the operational programs in 1996. This approach is key when seeking to contribute to transboundary environmental benefits by tackling the multiple dimensions that need to be addressed. These dimensions include a better understanding of the interactions of diverse natural systems within a broad geographical area, the engagement of multiple countries and stakeholders, and—stemming from these—the long and unpredictable timelines and directions within which results take place.

  The GEF has supported multiple complementary initiatives in the SCS that have proposed novel approaches to addressing coastal and marine environmental concerns previously identified in the region. These initiatives have contributed to increased communication among the various regional organizations and to cooperative engagement between countries. However, except for the GEF Small Grants Programme (SGP), these initiatives, while linked, were not integrated with existing regional organizations. They thus worked mostly in isolation from one another, were rarely coordinated, and on occasion have competed with one another.

  While the lack of integration of GEF-supported initiatives to existing regional organizations has allowed for the development of novel approaches that might have not been possible otherwise, the evaluation identified several risks related to how these approaches developed. The lack of coordination among the GEF'S otherwise complementary main financing streams has resulted in higher transaction costs for the countries, requiring governments to spread their qualified staff thin. In effect, the way GEF support has been delivered in the SCS has resulted in a higher number of regional initiatives that require financial and political support from countries—further contributing to competition and duplication among regional organizations. Low coordination and cooperation among the different GEF funding streams has also undercut the potential for the GEF to offer comprehensive solutions to address the region's challenging transboundary concerns. In addition, while the GEF's promotion of "champions" has been key to outstanding achievements of GEF support in the SCS and to major gains in broader adoption, the lack of management of the risks of relying on champions has resulted in approaches not being integrated, a lack of introspection, and losses in the momentum and synergy of GEF-supported initiatives.

Structural factors within the GEF partnership have played an important role. With equal standing in the GEF partnership, none of the GEF Agencies have the authority or incentive to convene others for collaboration on similar initiatives. In the past, the International Waters Task Force convened by the GEF Secretariat allowed for some coordination in the partnership. With the loss of prominence of focal area task forces since GEF-4, the modest coordinating functions of the International Waters Task Force have been further reduced. In recent years, the GEF has been experimenting with programmatic approaches such as the Coral Triangle Initiative, which seeks to tap into the competencies of several agencies. The GEF has tried to ensure coordination by assigning a lead agency to coordinate joint implementation of projects, but these entities report that they find it difficult to engage with other agencies as cycles, reporting requirements, and priorities differ.

The GEF has also sought to address regional programmatic issues through stocktaking meetings that convene all the GEF projects in a given region to discuss coordination and collaboration issues. The East Asian Seas Stocktaking Meeting in October 2010 suggested recommended actions such as joint planning in project preparation and implementation, and strengthening of national interagency coordination mechanisms. However, it still failed to address the key structural issues related to the need for an incentive structure for GEF Agencies and funding streams to collaborate, and the absence of an entity that can make agencies accountable for coordination and collaboration.

CONCLUSION 5: **GEF projects in the SCS and adjacent areas have major deficiencies in the accessibility, use for management, and reporting of environmental monitoring data.**

Environmental monitoring data are being collected in 32 of 40 cases, but only in 19 cases were data available, due to information management systems either not being in place or not suited to country conditions.

Each of the 27 sampled sites aimed to improve environmental status in relation to habitat and biodiversity, fisheries, land-based pollution, or a combination of these concerns. Tallying the multiple concerns at each site, there were a total of 40 cases where environmental monitoring was to be conducted (table 2.4). Sixteen of 17 cases that were expected to be monitoring habitat and biodiversity parameters were found to be doing so. However, data were only available through publications or made accessible during field visits in nine of these cases. Of the 12 cases expected to monitor improvements in fisheries, 8 were found to be collecting data, and only in 6 were the data available. Of the 11 cases of sites expected to monitor coastal pollution from land-based sources, 8 were collecting data, but only 4 had the data available.

TABLE 2.4 **Sites Addressing and Monitoring Specific Environmental Concerns**

Environmental concern	Sites where monitoring was to be conducted	Sites with periodic data collection	Sites with monitoring data available
Habitat and biodiversity	17	16	9
Fisheries	12	8	6
Land-based pollution	11	8	4
Total cases	40	32	19

In 9 out of 20 sites that had completed demonstrations, no evidence was found of data being used and reported for management and public accountability.

In six of the sites, GEF support was key to initiating habitat and pollution monitoring activities. While information management and reporting systems have also been supported to store monitoring data and make them accessible for analysis, management, and reporting, these sophisticated systems were found in most cases to have been used only when a high level of financial and technical support was provided by the GEF. Even then, the technology and standardized tools introduced—particularly the Integrated Information Management System (IIMS), a web-based geographic information system (GIS), and the State of the Coast (SOC) reporting system—saw limited adoption, partly because they were not well suited to local capacities. Lack of budget among local and national government agencies and frequent staff turnover has been a common obstacle in continuing M&E activities, even in the few sites where human resources are readily available. Low adoption was also found in past non-GEF projects in the region that supported similar systems.

Notable examples where monitoring data have been used for management and/or public accountability were found in Batangas, Bolinao, Manila Bay, and Masinloc, the Philippines; Con Dao, Hon Mun, and Phu Quoc, Vietnam; Xiamen, China; and Sihanoukville, Cambodia. In these cases, the technologies and systems used typically already existed in the countries. For example, since 2007, Xiamen has been sending out text messages to fishers to disseminate monitoring data and prevent disasters. In Manila Bay, monitoring data showed that water quality criteria were not being met, and the reports produced through the IIMS were used by the Supreme Court of the Philippines to compel the responsible national agencies to fulfill their mandates in improving water quality in the bay to avoid administrative sanctions.

2.4 Recommendations

The GEF Evaluation Office has formulated three sets of recommendations from this evaluation. The first set refers specifically to the future of GEF support in the SCS and adjacent areas. The second set addresses M&E issues within the international waters focal area. The third set of recommendations is proposed to be incorporated when developing the international waters focal area strategy for GEF-6 (2014–18). The Evaluation Office did not have access to the proposals that are being prepared for the SCS and East Asian seas, so it was not possible to assess if these adequately address issues raised in this evaluation. Thus, the Office also recommends that the GEF Council take into account the findings of this evaluation when considering further proposals for the SCS and adjacent areas and, where appropriate, that these findings be addressed by GEF Chief Executive Officer endorsement.

RECOMMENDATIONS RELATED TO THE SOUTH CHINA SEA AND ADJACENT AREAS

RECOMMENDATION 1: **GEF support should more fully draw on the GEF partnership to mainstream transboundary concerns within countries and existing regional organizations.**

The evaluation has identified important cases in which lessons of GEF support are being mainstreamed and are affecting aspects of the broader policy context. These have been important accomplishments that, by and large, have been achieved through the same sectoral ministries or administrative structures receiving the specific stream of GEF support. The engagement of the relevant sectoral ministers has been a key aspect of the GEF approach to international waters since the operational programs were developed in 1996.

The GEF Evaluation Office *Program Study on International Waters 2005* also points out the importance of further engaging a broad range of relevant sectoral ministries in GEF projects (GEF EO 2005).

The GEF has already taken steps in this direction in the region—e.g., through the Yellow Sea SAP, which has brought countries to agreement on reducing fish catch by 40 percent. As indicated in this evaluation, several projects in the region have worked with different sectoral ministries in demonstrating approaches and technologies locally and in seeking their broader adoption. While the GEF should continue its bottom-up support through local demonstrations, it should strategically strengthen its work from the top down, seeking opportunities for transformational changes that can create more favorable conditions for broader adoption.

More specifically, the GEF could provide support to its well-positioned partners to look more actively for opportunities to mainstream transboundary environmental concerns to the broader policy framework of such ministries as the economy, finance, agriculture, public works, fisheries, and other sectors that affect drivers related to the management of transboundary environmental goods and services. This support need not be done through large investments, but rather by providing modest resources to agencies that already have access to these ministries.

Similarly, while continuing to support approaches such as the SDS-SEA and the SCS SAP, GEF support should draw on its prominent position in the region to mainstream transboundary concerns related to regional environmental goods and services in intergovernmental regional economic forums.

RECOMMENDATION 2: **The GEF should give more attention to supporting countries to work together to address concerns related to regional environmental goods and services.**

The GEF should further ensure that its international waters funding is structured in such a way as to provide it with the flexibility to present countries with incentives to work together to address the "tragedy of the commons." It should also support collaborative endeavors among countries to improve the management of regional environmental goods, as exemplified by the fisheries refugia initiative developed by the SCS TDA-SAP project (Reversing Environmental Degradation Trends in the South China Sea and Gulf of Thailand, GEF ID 885).

RECOMMENDATION 3: **The GEF should more clearly define the role and linkages of regional mechanisms in the context of its broader regional strategy, and ensure country and donor commitments to increasing levels of cofinancing to cover the full costs of regional services by the end of the next phase of support.**

The two previous international waters program studies recommended that the GEF give more attention to the sustainability of regional mechanisms (Bewers and Uitto 2002; GEF EO 2005). While it is clear that GEF support to PEMSEA should continue, the GEF should also—to be consistent with Recommendation 5—clarify how its support to PEMSEA fits in with and is linked to other major GEF-supported initiatives and the GEF's broader programmatic strategy in the region to support countries in working together to address transboundary environmental concerns.

The GEF should carefully assess the sustainability risks of providing its support toward the expansion of services provided by the PEMSEA Resource Facility and the implied higher costs that will have to be borne by the countries once

GEF support phases out in five years. The GEF should assess the likelihood of this approach being able to draw the required levels of financial support from countries and donors, given midterm forecasts of the global economy and the reluctance that most countries have thus far shown in committing funds.

One option is to ensure country and donor commitments to increasing levels of cofinancing so as to achieve, by project end, payment for the full costs of the regional services put in place by GEF support. This might mean focusing GEF support on only the most critical functions, while requiring that expansion of the PEMSEA program and services be financed by sources other than the GEF. The GEF should draw on its prominent position in the region to engage the countries and other donors in a dialogue on the PEMSEA services they are willing to support. The GEF should also use its position to help PEMSEA attain robust cofinancing ratios on the costs of running PEMSEA and the technical services it provides, so as to demonstrate the financial viability of the approach proposed.

RECOMMENDATION 4: **UNDP needs to ensure that the social risks of the projects it finances in the SCS are identified and addressed.**

UNDP needs to ensure that PEMSEA and other executors of GEF support in the region properly identify the social risks of GEF-supported activities, and that plans to prevent realization of risks or risk mitigation are in place, followed, and monitored. UNDP should ensure that PEMSEA and other executors of future GEF projects in the SCS and adjacent areas meet GEF policy PL/SD/01, Agency Minimum Standards on Environmental and Social Safeguards.

RECOMMENDATION 5: **A more robust programmatic approach should be developed for GEF international waters support to the SCS and adjacent areas.**

Issues that have emerged in this evaluation and in OPS2, OPS3, and the previous two international waters program studies regarding the current approach in the SCS and adjacent areas include the lack of an explicit indication of how different projects fit into a broader programmatic strategy, insufficient collaboration, and a failure to realize the full benefits of the complementarity intended among the various projects and distinctive competencies of the GEF Implementing Agencies. The GEF has attempted some solutions—such as joint Agency implementation of projects and, in the international waters focal area, the introduction of stocktaking meetings (first introduced in the Danube Black Sea and more recently in the seas of East Asia)—but these have not done much to overcome the hurdles. The GEF needs to strengthen its current programmatic approach in the SCS and adjacent areas by addressing the following gaps.

Accountability Gap

While multiple GEF projects in a transboundary water body typically have an implicit programmatic strategy,[6] such strategies have not been formally articulated or adopted by the GEF in such a way as to fully identify how different projects fit into an overall GEF strategy for the region. Nor is it clear how the different projects or agencies are accountable in relation to the broader strategy of GEF support to the countries in the region. While project documents clearly define the expected outcomes for which each project is accountable, less clear or left implicit are the interagency roles, operational links, and areas and extent of coordi-

[6] The key elements of such a strategy, including for the SCS and the seas of East Asia, were presented in a technical document written for OPS2, "Geographically Based Programmatic Approaches" (Duda 2001).

nation and collaboration that are expected in the context of the GEF's broader regional strategy. The project-based approach, combined with the funding stream/Agency dynamics of GEF support in the SCS and adjacent areas, has contributed to the development of robust initiatives with strong identities that during implementation have high risks of becoming disjointed. In the case of the SCS and adjacent areas, funding streams other than the SGP have little incentive to coordinate and join efforts during implementation. This undercuts the extent to which the benefits of the combined competencies of the various GEF partners can be realized. A comprehensive approach is needed to encompass the links and interactions of the full range of GEF funding in the region. A challenge will be to strike the right balance between clear accountability and overly prescriptive directives.

Tracking and Reporting Gap

GEF engagements with the magnitude of support given in the SCS and adjacent areas require more robust tracking and reporting of multi-agency commitments to communication, coordination, and introspection among international waters projects, and a common focus on global benefits. The GEF has introduced stocktaking meetings for this purpose, but—as indicated above—they have only skirted critical GEF partnership issues. Given the structural nature of the interactions among Agencies as equals, responsibility for more robust tracking and reporting with regard to multi-Agency collaboration and cooperation should be placed on the GEF Secretariat. This new function should be approached as an instrument for adaptive management. It should also allow for inputs from the various GEF stakeholders, including country representatives, and seek to identify and tackle critical issues affecting the functioning of the partnership and the execution of the broader GEF strategy in the region.

Funding Gap

The GEF has not fully acknowledged that coordination and collaboration carries a cost. While costs of stocktaking meetings have been channeled through projects, project budgets have not always allocated additional funds to lead agencies that coordinate the activities of other entities. Funds and staff time of the GEF Secretariat to play a oversight role, including attendance at regional meetings, have also been uncertain. Relatively small additional funds can make a big difference in ensuring that large amounts of GEF support move in the right track. The GEF should carefully identify, cost out, and finance the key functions needed to ensure proper oversight of coordination, introspection, and inter-Agency communication in major regional engagements such as the SCS and the seas of East Asia.

Distinctive Competency Gap

As indicated through this evaluation, entrenchment among Agencies and streams of funding has hampered the synergy of drawing on the distinctive competencies of Agencies within the GEF partnership. The GEF should ensure that, during project preparation, the most qualified Agency or GEF instrument is drawn upon to implement a given project or project component. For example, activities related to private sector investments and interactions with ministries related to finance and infrastructure are areas that the World Bank is already engaged in through its regular business. It is therefore the Agency best equipped in implementing these components in GEF projects or programs—even if the project or program is implemented through a different Agency. Similarly, the UNDP SGP has extensive experience in managing community-based demonstrations, and is therefore most suited to implement components of GEF projects that take place at this scale.

RECOMMENDATIONS RELATED TO MONITORING AND THE USE OF MONITORING DATA

Monitoring and evaluation concerns have been among the most prominent raised by previous OPSs and international waters program studies. While significant progress has been made in terms of monitoring indicators, GEF-supported projects in the SCS and adjacent areas continue to have major gaps with regard to M&E systems that would allow for a fuller assessment of the impact of GEF support in the region.

RECOMMENDATION 6: **Impact monitoring and related reporting systems supported by the GEF should be consistent with local capacities and priorities. They should also be sufficiently flexible to accommodate the more user-friendly and affordable technologies that are rapidly emerging.**

The evaluation found many instances in which the GEF supported the introduction of information and communication technology for data storage and retrieval. In most instances, the use of such technology required specialized user skills and significant training. Thus, the IIMS, for example, has been used mostly for compiling data rather than exploiting its more sophisticated functions of modeling and generating reports. Consequently, less technically complicated solutions may be the most appropriate until local human and, especially, financial capacities are increased. Similarly, while the SOC reporting system is a useful tool that promotes the interaction of different government agencies and information sharing, slow adoption may be a result of too many indicators needing to be populated, which adds to the workload of government staff, and a lack of available data. A reporting tool that requires fewer indicators but presented more frequently may be more useful in sites with low technical capacity, complemented by a more comprehensive but less frequent SOC report produced as the site builds greater capacity. Greater capacity can only be built when governments make monitoring and reporting systems a fiscal priority; this in turn will be realized only when such systems are used as a decision-making and accountability tool rather than just for collecting and compiling data. Given the human resource constraints faced in several countries, it is unlikely that local governments will be able to attract and retain the required qualified staff or needed financial resources in the near term (Heeks 2002; Yeo 2002).

Also, the rapid pace of technological change is increasingly moving toward much more user-friendly and affordable technologies, such as smartphones, tablets, rapid provisioning of services, cloud computing, and georeferenced digital photography and data. These and other current technologies could be applied to data collection, storage, and retrieval; and have the advantage of more intuitive user interfaces. Such technologies are now within reach of the GEF but were not often found in the sites visited.

RECOMMENDATION 7: **Impact monitoring and evaluation data and information should be made available to the GEF Evaluation Office in a timely and transparent manner.**

The evaluation team encountered numerous problems in access to timely and complete data, reports, and general information needed to carry out the evaluation. Some of the problems were caused by inefficient information storage and retrieval systems. The evaluation found instances in which upon project closure, Agencies stopped supporting websites, or staff turnover resulted in a loss of institutional memory regarding the existence or location of information. In other cases, access to information was not given priority, and project executor and stakeholder responses were slow. In still other instances, requests resulted only in partial information or were ignored altogether. Also, researchers were sometimes reluctant to provide

information they had not yet used in their own publications.

The GEF Agencies should take contractual and practical measures to ensure that M&E data and information for GEF projects is made available to the GEF Evaluation Office in a timely and complete manner. Agencies must also ensure that monitoring data and information include georeferenced boundaries and locations of demonstrations. These geospatial data should be provided at the GEF Chief Executive Officer endorsement, midterm review, and terminal evaluation of each project.

RECOMMENDATION TO THE GEF-6 INTERNATIONAL WATERS FOCAL AREA STRATEGY

RECOMMENDATION 8: **The findings of this evaluation should be considered in developing the international waters focal area in GEF-6 and, when applicable, the strategies of other focal areas.**

The evaluation presents findings that highlight many valuable experiences as well as factors that negatively affect progress to impact of GEF support. The findings and recommendations of this evaluation should thus be taken into careful consideration when developing the GEF-6 international waters strategy.

3. Progress on Other Impact-Related Work

3.1 GEF Support to Climate Change Mitigation

The GEF serves as the financial mechanism for implementing guidance from the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change on an interim basis. Since the GEF's inception, it has provided funding support through its Trust Fund for climate change adaptation—primarily for climate change mitigation.[1] As of August 2011, the GEF had provided funding of $9.12 billion for the generation of global environmental benefits, of which $3.04 billion was for climate change mitigation–related activities.[2]

The Impact Evaluation of GEF Support to Climate Change Mitigation is being undertaken as an input to OPS5. While past evaluations on climate change mitigation have addressed the overall GEF portfolio, major emerging economies have not been a focus. These economies are especially important in terms of their climate change mitigation potential because, given the size of the markets and an increasing trend in energy demand, any improvement over the baseline is likely to lead to greater absolute greenhouse gas emissions reductions.

The impact evaluation seeks to conduct a comparative assessment of the extent and ways in which the GEF is transforming climate change mitigation–relevant markets in major emerging economies.[3] More specifically, the impact evaluation aims to

- assess contributions of GEF-supported activities to greenhouse gas emissions reduction and avoidance,
- assess progress made by GEF-supported activities toward transforming markets for climate change mitigation, and
- ascertain the impact pathways and factors affecting further progress toward market transformation.

The approach paper for the evaluation was approved in June 2012. Field verification in four major emerging economies—China, India, Mexico,

[1] The GEF has supported adaptation activities through the various trust funds it manages, including the GEF Trust Fund, the Special Climate Change Fund, the Least Developed Countries Fund, and the Adaptation Fund. The present impact evaluation focuses on climate change mitigation activities supported through resources from the GEF Trust Fund.

[2] These amounts exclude fees provided to the Agencies to meet their implementation costs.

[3] Geller and Nadel (1994) have defined market transformation as lasting changes in the structure and/or function of markets, used within the context of energy efficiency–relevant markets. This term could be extended to cover other climate change mitigation–relevant markets.

and Russia—was to be performed from October to November 2012, with India and Mexico having more detailed country case studies. As of this writing, evaluators for each country have already been contracted for this work. The final evaluation report is scheduled to be completed in early 2013 and incorporated into the first OPS5 report.

3.2 GEF Support to Biodiversity

The GEF serves as the financial mechanism for implementing guidance from the United Nations Convention on Biological Diversity. In this capacity, it has funded more than 900 projects in over 150 countries since 1991. The GEF Evaluation Office and the UNDP Evaluation Office have agreed to undertake a joint impact evaluation of GEF support to biodiversity, assessing impact from an environmental as well as socioeconomic perspective. The intent is to help the GEF and UNDP assess the extent to which existing strategies, programs, and interventions have been able to enhance species and habitat protection and restoration while securing livelihoods, good health, and resilience for the poor. Given the structure and maturity of the GEF biodiversity portfolio, the evaluation will focus on the contribution of GEF support to the protection of biodiversity through protected areas; it will also examine how GEF support to protected areas has been mainstreamed into landscape management frameworks. The biodiversity impact evaluation was scheduled to take place from November 2012 to September 2013.

The evaluation has two phases: drafting of the approach paper, and conduct of the evaluation. A consultant was hired in September 2012 to draft the approach paper, which was to be finalized in April 2013. While the approach paper is under final approval, the team to carry out the evaluation will be identified. The evaluation approach will be developed based on the following:

- To what extent has GEF support been relevant to country priorities in the protection of biodiversity (through protected areas and landscape management) as well as to country priorities for sustainable development?

- What have been the effects of support (positive or negative, intended or unintended) on country efforts and achievements in sustaining biodiversity protection in ways that also meet the social and economic needs of countries and local populations?

- What are the critical factors affecting the extent to which GEF and partner support has led to actions or is likely to lead to further actions (by countries and other stakeholders) resulting in sound management of biodiversity while generating social and economic benefits to local populations?

Special attention will be given to identifying the main factors enabling "win-win" scenarios, whereby successful habitat protection and sustainable livelihoods are mutually reinforcing. Conditions in which trade-offs take place will also be examined, including the role of the private sector where relevant. The evaluation design will seek to move the discussion beyond anecdotal evidence of success, providing more rigorous, verifiable documentation of positive environmental and socioeconomic impact. Among the expected methods to be used are analyses of global databases, quasi-experimental design, remote sensing analysis, and field verification.

The long duration of GEF support and large number of initiatives increase the likelihood of impact having taken place through this focal area. From the GEF perspective, this impact evaluation fits within an ongoing set of evaluations covering each of its focal areas, which will provide an important

set of findings for the second report of OPS5. For UNDP, this evaluation constitutes the first in a set of impact evaluations of UNDP programming, and builds on the findings and conclusions of a recent thematic evaluation focused on the nexus of issues linking UNDP poverty and environmental protection support to countries. The bulk of UNDP's biodiversity portfolio has been implemented through GEF support.

3.3 Assessment of Quality at Entry of Arrangements to Measure Impact

The last three GEF overall performance studies (OPS2, OPS3, and OPS4) since 2005 reported considerable gaps in the evidence base on impact due to weaknesses in environmental M&E systems in GEF-supported projects. The constraints faced by the SCS impact evaluation team in obtaining environmental monitoring data confirmed these concerns. The quality of information available to assess the impact of GEF support on stress reduction and environmental status depends to a large extent on the quality of M&E arrangements integrated into project design, and the extent to which these are implemented and remain functional after GEF support ends.

Previous reviews of the quality of M&E arrangements at entry in 2005 and 2009 have provided real-time feedback to members of the GEF partnership, and have resulted in the revision of project appraisal criteria, stricter implementation of M&E requirements, and improved compliance with the minimum M&E requirements. The focus of this current evaluation is on M&E for impact, and it is more concerned with the quality of arrangements rather than compliance. As this requires expert knowledge of environmental impact indicators, the Evaluation Office has collaborated with the GEF's Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel to carry out the evaluation. The effort has focused on assessing the quality of impact measurement arrangements that are incorporated in the design of GEF projects and programs, and on providing feedback on the effectiveness of the project and program proposal appraisal process in ensuring the quality of these arrangements. Specifically, the assessment asks the following:

- To what extent is the appraisal process for project and program proposals effective in ensuring the quality of arrangements to measure impact?
- To what extent is the approach proposed in the project or program proposals to measure impact scientifically sound and likely to generate reliable information on the achievement of impacts?
- To what extent are the proposed approaches realistic, practical, and in line with existing capacities in the recipient countries?
- Are the resources allocated for implementing arrangements to measure impact sufficient and appropriate?

In 2012, a representative sample of 55 projects and programs that were endorsed by the GEF Chief Executive Officer in fiscal year 2011 were reviewed by a panel of two subject area experts per project. A standardized tool was used to assess the reliability, feasibility, and practicality of the arrangements and the sufficiency of resources allocated for impact monitoring–related activities.

A preliminary report of the evaluation was presented in the 2011 GEF Annual Performance Report to the June 2012 Council. The final report, including an analysis of factors explaining the results of the review, was originally scheduled for the November 2012 Council. However, at the suggestion of the Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel, the evaluation will include an additional light review in the middle of 2013 to track if any changes have been made on the projects that were

reviewed for this evaluation. This review will also identify which factors are most and least effective in ensuring that M&E arrangements for impact are in place and are being implemented. The evaluation report will be integrated with the final OPS5 report.

3.4 Mainstreaming Impact Evaluation across Different Evaluation Streams

The Evaluation Office continues to mainstream impact-related considerations across its other evaluation streams (i.e., country portfolio evaluation, performance evaluation, and thematic evaluation). In the country portfolio evaluation stream, impact-related aspects are being addressed through documentation of the catalytic effects and long-term achievements of GEF activities, and through review of outcomes to impacts (ROtI) analysis for completed projects where applicable. In the performance evaluation stream, impact evaluation is being mainstreamed through the inclusion of impact-based criteria into the terminal evaluations and terminal evaluation reviews of GEF projects. A desk review of these terminal evaluations, terminal evaluation reviews, and ROtIs is currently being conducted to assess the progress to impact made by all completed projects of the GEF-4 (2006–10) and GEF-5 (2010–14) cohorts. The results of this assessment will be integrated with the first OPS5 report in early 2013.

In 2012, mainstreaming of impact evaluation largely took place through the thematic evaluation stream. This stream provided a framework for evaluating the GEF focal area strategies through a theory of change that identifies elements indicating progress toward impact. The framework was developed earlier this year as an offshoot of the SCS impact evaluation and builds on previous impact work conducted by the Office.

Annex: Management Response

The Secretariat and Agencies welcome the sixth *GEF Annual Report on Impact 2012* prepared by the GEF's Evaluation Office. The report provides the conclusions and recommendations of the Impact Evaluation of GEF Support in the South China Sea and Adjacent Waters as well as an update on activities being carried out by the Evaluation Office related to impact evaluations. The management response focuses on the main conclusions and recommendations stemming from the South China Sea evaluation.

The Secretariat and Agencies appreciate having had the opportunity to attend the workshop that the Evaluation Office organized to discuss the preliminary findings from the South China Sea Evaluation (SCS Evaluation). Naturally, there are some nuances in the full evaluation that cannot be fully captured in the summary included in the *Annual Report on Impact.* Nevertheless, there are many important lessons that have been drawn from the SCS Evaluation that the Secretariat and Agencies will integrate into future programming and implementation in the region.

The Secretariat and Agencies welcome Conclusions 1, 2, and 3, which indicate the considerable achievement of GEF support to the South China Sea and adjacent areas. In the majority of the cases where comparative data could be obtained, the GEF has supported initiatives that reduced environmental stress and improved or maintained socioeconomic conditions. The Secretariat is pleased with the conclusions that GEF support has made important contributions to addressing regional transboundary issues in the SCS.

The Secretariat and Agencies agree with Conclusion 4 that in the SCS "Broader adoption of GEF-supported initiatives is taking place, and is critical to fully addressing environmental pressures at the appropriate scales, but faces constraints to further progress." The Secretariat and Agencies are aware of the constraints and are taking on board lessons learned from the GEF support given to date. This is reflected in the current design of projects going forward for approval.

The Secretariat and Agencies take note of Conclusion 5 that "GEF projects in the SCS and adjacent areas have major deficiencies in the accessibility, use for management, and reporting of environmental monitoring data." The Secretariat would like to note that according to the SCS Evaluation a large majority of projects have collected data as planned. The Secretariat regrets that not all the data was made available to the evaluation team in a timely manner, and will work with Agencies to take a closer look at this issue for international waters projects in the SCS and adjacent areas.

The Secretariat and Agencies agree with Recommendation 1 that GEF support in the SCS should draw more fully on the GEF partnership "to main-

stream transboundary concerns within countries and existing regional organizations."

The Secretariat and Agencies agree with Recommendation 2 to give more attention to supporting countries to work together to address concerns related to regional environmental goods and services.

The Secretariat and Agencies are also aware of the issues highlighted by Recommendation 3 to "more clearly define the role and linkages of regional mechanisms in the context of its broader regional strategy, and ensure country and donor commitments to increasing levels of cofinancing to cover the full costs of regional services by the end of the next phase of support." One of the purposes of the program Reducing Pollution and Rebuilding Degraded Marine Resources in the East Asian Seas through Implementation of Intergovernmental Agreements and Catalyzed Investments (UNDP) that is proposed for the current work program (November 2012) is to establish the GEF's exit strategy from supporting the Partnerships in Environmental Management for the Seas of East Asia. The program will strengthen PEMSEA's ability to put in place innovative financing mechanisms "for sustaining the operation of intergovernmental and multi-sector partnership arrangement at the regional, subregional/LME [large marine ecosystem] levels." The planned cofinancing ratio for the costs of regional services is substantial at 1:15 (grant to cofinance). In terms of the sustainability of PEMSEA, PEMSEA has provided the following response: "Since 2008, national governments, local governments and non-country partners have contributed USD69.7 million in-kind and in-cash co-financing for the operation of PEMSEA and the implementation of the SDS-SEA."

The Secretariat agrees with Recommendation 4 that UNDP needs to ensure that the social risks of the projects it finances in the SCS are identified and addressed. UNDP has provided the following in relation to this recommendation: "we would like to inform you that we have in place an Environmental and Social Screening Procedure for UNDP Projects. As part of the annual Project Implementation Reviews (PIRs), social and environmental issues are monitored and mitigation and alleviation measures are reported to the GEF."

The Secretariat and Agencies appreciate Recommendation 5 that "A more robust programmatic approach should be developed for GEF international waters support to the SCS and adjacent areas." Subsequent to the implementation of the projects in the SCS, the GEF has recognized the importance of a programmatic approach in the region and has made several changes in how programming is undertaken. This includes a medium-size project for the recently approved World Bank programmatic approach in the SCS with the mandate to coordinate the program.[1] In addition to measures taken within specific programmatic approaches and projects, we are supporting robust dialogues through the Inter-Agency Focal Area Task Forces which are chaired by the GEF Secretariat as a forum for further collaboration and cooperation. It should also be noted that in the case of the SCS regional project, there was no attempt prior to the approval of these projects to think of strategic partnerships, programmatic approaches, or similar constructs.

The Secretariat and Agencies take note of Recommendation 6 that "Impact monitoring and related reporting systems supported by the GEF should be consistent with local capacities and priorities. They should also be sufficiently flexible to accommodate the more user-friendly and affordable technologies that are rapidly emerging."

[1] Scaling up Partnership Investment's for Sustainable Development of the LME of East Asia and Their Coasts (approved November 2011).

The Secretariat and Agencies also take note of Recommendation 7 that "Impact monitoring and evaluation data and information should be made available to the GEF Evaluation Office in a timely and transparent manner." The Secretariat and Agencies agree to the importance of making data and information available in a timely and transparent manner. It should be recognized, though, that there may be challenges in accessing data and information from projects that are already completed. While executing entities in many cases do continue the M&E functions, there is no guarantee that the type of data collected after project closure is able to disaggregate impact from previous GEF investments versus other resources that may have come in afterwards.

The Secretariat as stated in Recommendation 8 will consider the findings from the SCS Evaluation when developing the GEF-6 international waters strategies.

References

GEF publications are available at this link: www.thegef.org/gef/gef_Documents_Publications. Publications cited for the GEF Evaluation Office are available at www.thegef.org/ under Evaluations & Studies and in the online documents database ASK ME. All web links cited here were accessed October 2012, unless otherwise indicated.

Bewers, J. Michael, and Juha I. Uitto. 2002. "International Waters Program Study: Final Report." Washington, DC: Global Environment Facility Monitoring and Evaluation. http://thegef.org/gef/Focal%20Areas%20Evaluation%20-%20Program%20Study%20on%20International%20Waters%202002.

Duda, A. M. 2001. "Geographically Based Programmatic Approaches." International Waters Program Study: Background Document 9.

GEF EO (Global Environment Facility Evaluation Office, then known as the GEF Monitoring & Evaluation Unit). 2005. *Program Study on International Waters 2005.* http://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/documents/International_Waters_Program_Study-2005.pdf.

Geller, H., and S. Nadel. 1994. "Market Transformation Strategies to Promote End-Use Efficiency." *Annual Review of Energy and the Environment* 19: 301–46.

Heeks, R. 2002. "Information Systems and Developing Countries: Failure, Success, and Local Improvisations." *Information Society* 18: 101–12.

OECD DAC (Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development Development Assistance Committee). 2002. "Glossary of Key Terms in Evaluation and Results Based Management." http://www.oecd.org/dac/2754804.pdf.

Yeo, K. 2002. "Critical Failure Factors in Information System Projects." *International Journal of Project Management* 20: 241–46.

Recent GEF Evaluation Office Publications

Evaluation Reports

75	The GEF in the South China Sea and Adjacent Areas	
74	GEF Annual Country Portfolio Evaluation Report 2012	2012
73	Evaluation of the Special Climate Change Fund	2012
72	GEF Beneficiary Countries of the OECS (1992–2011) (Antigua and Barbuda, Dominica, Grenada, St. Kitts and Nevis, St. Lucia, St. Vincent and the Grenadines), Volumes 1 and 2	2012
71	Evaluación de la cartera de proyectos del FMAM en Nicaragua (1996–2010), Volumens 1 y 2	2012
70	Evaluation of GEF National Capacity Self-Assessments	2012
69	Annual Thematic Evaluation Report 2011	2012
68	GEF Annual Impact Report 2011	2012
67	Estudio de la cartera de proyectos del FMAM en El Salvador (1994–2010), Volumens 1 y 2	2012
66	GEF Country Portfolio Study: Jamaica (1994–2010), Volumes 1 and 2	2012
65	GEF Annual Performance Report 2010	2011
64	GEF Annual Country Portfolio Evaluation Report 2011	2011
63	GEF Annual Impact Report 2010	2011
62	Review of the Global Environment Facility Earth Fund	2011
61	Evaluation of the GEF Strategic Priority for Adaptation	2011
60	GEF Country Portfolio Evaluation: Turkey (1992–2009)	2011
59	GEF Country Portfolio Evaluation: Moldova (1994–2009)	2011
58	GEF Annual Country Portfolio Evaluation Report 2010	2010
57	GEF Annual Performance Report 2009	2010
56	GEF Impact Evaluation of the Phaseout of Ozone-Depleting Substances in Countries with Economies in Transition, Volumes 1 and 2	2010
55	GEF Annual Impact Report 2009	2010
54	OPS4: Progress Toward Impact—Fourth Overall Performance Study of the GEF, Full Report	2010
53	OPS4: Progress Toward Impact—Fourth Overall Performance Study of the GEF, Executive Version	2010
52	GEF Country Portfolio Evaluation: Syria (1994–2008)	2009
51	GEF Country Portfolio Evaluation: Egypt (1991–2008)	2009
50	GEF Annual Country Portfolio Evaluation Report 2009	2009
49	GEF Annual Performance Report 2008	2009
48	GEF Annual Impact Report 2008	2009
47	Midterm Review of the Resource Allocation Framework	2009
46	GEF Annual Report on Impact 2007	2009
45	GEF Country Portfolio Evaluation: Cameroon (1992–2007)	2009
44	GEF Annual Country Portfolio Evaluation Report 2008	2008
43	GEF Country Portfolio Evaluation: South Africa (1994–2007)	2008
42	GEF Country Portfolio Evaluation: Madagascar (1994–2007)	2008
41	GEF Country Portfolio Evaluation: Benin (1991–2007)	2008
40	GEF Annual Performance Report 2007	2008
39	Joint Evaluation of the GEF Small Grants Programme	2008
38	GEF Annual Performance Report 2006	2008
37	GEF Country Portfolio Evaluation: Samoa (1992–2007)	2008
36	GEF Country Portfolio Evaluation: The Philippines (1992–2007)	2008

Evaluation Documents

ED-4	The GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy 2010	2010
ED-3	Guidelines for GEF Agencies in Conducting Terminal Evaluations	2008
ED-2	GEF Evaluation Office Ethical Guidelines	2008

Learning Products

LP-3	The Journey to Rio+20: Gathering Evidence on Expectations for the GEF	2012
LP-2	Climate Change and the GEF	2010
LP-1	Biodiversity and the GEF	2010

To see all GEF Evaluation Office publications, please visit our webpage: www.thegef.org/gef/EO%20Publications.

Global Environment Facility
Evaluation Office
1818 H Street, NW
Washington, DC 20433
USA

www.gefeo.org