



Draft Terms of Reference Mid-Term Review of the Resources Allocation Framework

GEF Council

November 14-16, 2007

Agenda item 11

Context

Why this mid-term review?

- Part of RAF decision and requested by the Council: independent review after two years of implementation
- Secretariat to propose changes for the implementation of the second half
- An evaluation will be carried out as part of OPS4 or in parallel

The process to develop TORs

- **Approach paper** was published on 20 July 2007 with period for comments
- **Draft TOR** on web for comments September 28
- Consultations via the internet and emails
- Comments by donors, governments, focal points, Convention secretariats, GEF agencies and 1 NGO
- Draft TOR completed as Council document: October 15

Review or evaluation?

- This is a process evaluation, formative rather than summative
- However, comments so far have urged us to stick to the exact terminology of decisions, which we will follow...

Emerging Issues so Far

- Benefits Indices: questions on balance between terrestrial and marine; vulnerability to climate change
- Performance Indices: no recognition of countries with lower capacity to perform or countries emerging from conflict?
- Exclusions: funding outside of RAF too high?
- Co-funding requirements: RAF timeframe not sufficient
- RAF in relation to guidance of the Conventions
- Implementation/Organization:
 - quality of information for implementation;
 - effect on country-level decisions and operations;
 - changes on the roles of GEF Agencies and civil society;
 - effect on transparency and predictability

Objectives of the mid-term review

*Evaluate the degree to which resources have been allocated to countries in a **transparent and cost-effective** manner based on global environmental **benefits** and country **performance***

Three Areas to Evaluate

1. Extent to which the **Design** of the RAF facilitates maximization of the impact of GEF resources
2. Extent to which early **Implementation** of the RAF is providing countries with predictability and transparency as well as enhancing country driven approaches to improve potential for delivery of global environmental benefits
3. **Compare** GEF RAF with Performance Based Systems of IFIs

Ten key questions (1)

- Design:
 - To what extent do the global environmental benefits indices reflect best available scientific data and knowledge?
 - To what extent can the performance indices be considered as ‘best practice’?
 - To what extent is the RAF designed to maximize global environmental benefits?
- Implementation:
 - Has the RAF been implemented in accordance with Council decisions?
 - To what extent has the initiation and implementation of the Resource Allocation Framework been transparent and timely?

Ten key questions (2)

- Implementation (continued):
 - How has the RAF affected the roles and operation of countries, agencies and entities under the Instrument?
 - What are the observable changes in GEF programming from GEF- 3 to GEF-4?
 - What has been the impact of the various design elements of the RAF that have raised concerns?
 - To what extent has the RAF been cost-effective?
- Context
 - What recent developments, both within the GEF and elsewhere, should the Council take into account in considering potential changes in the Resource Allocation Framework or the way it is implemented?

Design and Methodology

- Literature and desk reviews: GEF documents, other similar evaluations, GEFEO evaluations
- Delphi approach: panel of experts assessment of the indices
- Analysis of the emerging portfolio and comparison with previous GEF phases
- Surveys, interviews, stakeholder consultations
- Country level case studies and visits

Timeframe

- TOR discussed by Council in November 07
- Implementation: December 07 to July 08
- Draft report: August 08
- Submission to Council: October 08

Budget

Literature & desk reviews	\$38,500
Portfolio & data analysis	\$54,000
Semi-structured interviews	\$67,500
Country reviews	\$159,000
Delphi study	\$150,000
Consultations & surveys	\$100,000
Draft & final reports	\$39,750
Publication	\$40,000
Total	\$648,750

Comparison

IDA	80	CPIA + GNI/capita + population	US\$ 33 billion
African Development Fund	40	CPIA + GNI/capita + population	US\$ 5.8 billion
Asian Development Fund	28	CPIA + GNI/capita + population	US\$ 7 billion
GEF	161	CEPIA + CPIA-GEB Bio + CC	US\$ 2 billion