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My assessment

- Two draft reports for discussion: executive version and full report
- Office’s role accomplished: oversight of process, technical backstopping and administrative support, ensure consistency and high quality of field visits, written comments on drafts, and support through High Level Advisory Panel
- Frequent, open and responsive interaction between the Office, OPS3 team and the Panel, each keeping their independence
- Time frame was very short but large OPS3 team was able to finish on time although there were some problems with the sequencing of events
My assessment (cont.)

- Field visits were logistically difficult to arrange although regional consultation workshops were well attended
- Budget may need to be revised given additional requests
- OPS3 team managed the process in a truly exemplary manner
- Questions in TOR have been addressed
- Advice from High Level Panel has been taken on board
- Interactions with Council have helped focus OPS3
- The draft report is consistent with the methodology presented in Inception and Interim Reports: data gathering and analysis based on literature review, evaluative evidence in the GEF (mainly from M&E Office studies) and extensive stakeholder consultations and country visits.
Results

- Results and the strategic tradeoffs as well as shortcomings concerning these results are presented
- Sustainability and catalytic role are addressed
- Many recommendations and suggestions for increasing the results orientation of the GEF
- Solid basis for discussion and for decisions on GEF-4
Next steps: Council decisions

• Proposal: Council forwards OPS3 reports to replenishment meetings and asks M&E Office and OPS3 team to present it
• GEF management response to be part of replenishment process (GEF-4 programming)
• Program studies incorporated and fully endorsed by OPS3, GEF management response already prepared so no longer need for separate discussion
Next Steps: process

- Written comments by June 15 on:
  - Factual errors, errors of analysis
  - No additional work can be done
- Final report ready by June 30
- Final report posted on M&E Office website
- Translation and publication over the summer
- Distribution and dissemination strategy
Report has been delivered within limitations of time and methodology
ICF to be congratulated for the progress made under tremendous time pressure
Results in each focal area have been succinctly presented
Panel agrees that mixed record emerges on strategic directions in the GEF
Panel agrees to OPS3 recommendations on stronger programming through a country focus

GEF as global network: an innovative idea

OPS3 contains elements that will help strengthen the results focus in the GEF

Main shortcomings of OPS3: lack of new empirical evidence and lack of critical analysis
High Level Panel comments (3)

- Process for OPS3 was flawed
  - Time for actual study was too short
  - Consequently, no new empirical evidence was gathered on focal area results
  - Robustness of results depends on quality of M & E evaluations

- The High Level Panel strongly recommends changes in process for OPS4