Office of Monitoring and Evaluation

Local Benefits Study

GEF Council,

November 8, 2005

Nature of the study

- Thanks to Canada, Norway and Sweden for co-funding study
- Persistent perception that this study was only supposed to look at “best practices”
- Perception now: study is mainly concerned with pilot phase and GEF-1
- However, concern for sustainable development was always part of the GEF

Sample of projects (1)

- Only projects which intended to provide local benefits were studied
- Sample is not random but selective, to study “how and why”
- Most projects studied were GEF-2
- Total projects studied: 132

Sample of projects (2)

	Bio-diversity	Climate change	Intern. Waters	Total
Pilot phase	23	9	1	33
GEF-1	18	8	6	32
GEF-2	47	13	7	67
Total	88	30	14	132

Conclusions

- In many areas in which the GEF is active, local and global benefits are strongly interlinked
- In some GEF projects there were considerable achievements in developing local incentives to ensure environmental gains
- In many projects where local-global linkages were intended to be addressed, they were not sufficiently taken into account, resulting in less local and global benefits than anticipated.
- Win-win situations for global and local benefits proved in many cases to be unattainable.

Recommendations

- Where local benefits are an essential means to achieve and sustain global benefits, the GEF portfolio should integrate them more strongly into its programming
- Integration of local benefits should be more systematically carried forward into all stages of the project cycle
- GEF activities should include processes for dealing with trade-offs between global and local benefits in situations where win-win results do not materialize.
- In order to strengthen generation of linkages between local and global benefits, the GEF should ensure adequate involvement of expertise on social and institutional issues at all levels of the portfolio.

Incremental costs

Co-funding or "business as usual"	**GEF-funding of global benefits**
Baseline	**Incremental costs**
Local benefits	
Local or co-funding	**Gap?** **GEF-funded**