



Third Overall Performance Study OPS3

GEF Council

June 3, 2005

Rob D. van den Berg

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

High Level Panel comments (1)

- 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

High Level Panel comments (2)

- 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