

GEF Evaluation Office

Foundations of Success

GEF IMPACT EVALUATION

GEF Biodiversity Policy Review

*Impact Evaluation Information Document No. 3
Prepared by Foundations of Success*

September 2007



This paper was commissioned by the GEF Evaluation Office (GEF EO) as an input into its program of **Impact Evaluation**.

A first annual report on this program will be presented to the GEF Council at its November 2007 meeting. The findings, interpretations, and conclusions expressed herein are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the views of GEF Evaluation Office, the GEF Council, or the Governments they represent. The authors of this document would welcome any comments or suggestions on its contents.

The papers in the Impact Evaluation information document series, as of September 2007, are:

1. Approach Paper to GEF Impact Evaluation – *Brann and Todd*
2. Final Report on Proposed Approach to GEF Impact Evaluation - *Foundations of Success*
3. GEF Biodiversity Policy Review - *Foundations of Success*
4. Methodological Challenges in Impact Evaluation: The Case of the Global Environment Facility – Todd and Vaessen
5. Priorities and indicators for Global Environment Benefits from Biodiversity: The current international architecture – *Nair*
6. Case Study Methodology – *Conservation Development Centre*
7. Case Study: Bwindi Impenetrable National Park and Mgahinga Gorilla National Park Conservation Project - *Conservation Development Centre*
8. Case Study: Lewa Wildlife Conservancy – *Conservation Development Centre*
9. Case Study: Reducing Biodiversity Loss at Cross-Border Sites in East Africa
Conservation Development Centre
10. Impacts of Creation and Implementation of National Parks and of Support to Batwa on their Livelihoods, Well-Being and Use of Forest Products – *Namara*
11. Protected Areas and Avoided Deforestation: A Statistical Evaluation – *Andam, Ferraro, Pfaff and Sanchez-Azofeifa*

Global Environment Facility

Director of the GEF Evaluation Office: Robert D. van den Berg

Impact Evaluation Team

Task Manager: David Todd, Senior Evaluation Officer

Evaluation Analyst: Divya Nair, Junior Evaluation Professional

Co-reader: Lee A. Risby, Evaluation Officer

Contents:

Purpose of This Review	1
Overview of GEF Biodiversity Policy	1
GEF Biodiversity Policy and Process.....	3
CBD Goals and Objectives, Millennium Development Goals, WSSD Target.....	4
CBD Goals	4
Millennium Development Goals	5
World Summit on Sustainable Development (WSSD) Targets.....	5
COP Guidance	6
GEF Council Decisions and Requests.....	8
GEF3 and GEF4	9
Biodiversity Strategic Priorities and Operational Programs	10
Strategic Priorities	10
Operational Programs.....	10
M&E in GEF Biodiversity Focal Area	11
History and Evolution of M&E	11
Timeline of GEF M&E History and Evolution	11
COP Guidance and Requests Related to M&E.....	13
GEF Council Decisions and Requests Related to M&E	14
How GEFSEC and GEFME Have Measured Results and Impacts.....	14
Tracking Sheets	14
Terminal Evaluations	17
Past Evaluation Findings/Recommendations on Impacts.....	18
Biodiversity Program Study 2004	18
Overall Performance Studies (OPS).....	21
Project Implementation Reviews	27
Study of GEF Project Lessons (1997).....	28
The Role of Local Benefits in Global Environmental Programs.....	28
Future Directions of M&E in GEF Biodiversity Focal Area.....	29
Appendix A: Description of GEF Policy Framework	A1
Appendix B: Timeline of COP Guidance & GEF Responses on Program Strategies and M&E .	B1
Appendix C: Timeline of Council Guidance & Responses on Program Strategies and M&E	C1

Purpose of This Review

The purpose of this review is to briefly summarize background and policy information in the GEF Biodiversity focal area in order to determine the best approach to evaluating GEF-supported initiatives. In this document we present GEF policy frameworks, the evolution of relevant COP and Council decisions, GEFSec response to these decisions, operational reviews and other evaluations, and a history of monitoring and evaluation at GEF. This document should be considered a working document whose primary audience is GEF programmatic staff who will use it to help them develop an appropriate and useful project monitoring and evaluation approach.

Overview of GEF Biodiversity Policy

The GEF operates as a mechanism for international cooperation to provide new and additional grant and concessional funding to meet the incremental costs of measures to achieve global environmental benefits in biological diversity. Global environmental benefits obtained under the CBD include reduced risks of global biodiversity loss, the enhanced protection of ecosystems and the species they contain, and increased sustainability in the use of biodiversity components.

The GEF's objectives in biological diversity derive from the objectives of the CBD: “the conservation of biological diversity, the sustainable use of its components and the fair and equitable sharing of the benefits arising out of the utilization of genetic resources, including by appropriate access to genetic resources and by appropriate transfer of relevant technologies, taking into account all rights over those resources and to technologies, and by appropriate funding.”¹

The operational strategy for biodiversity sets forth an approach for implementing the GEF's mandate in biodiversity, in full conformity with the guidance provided by the COP of the CBD. It provides a framework for the development and implementation of GEF-financed activities to allow recipient countries to address the complex global challenge of biodiversity conservation and sustainable use. It also provides a framework for monitoring and evaluation of GEF-financed activities. The following table provides detail on how the GEF Biodiversity Policy framework has evolved over time.

Evolution of GEF Biodiversity Policy Framework

1992	No framework
1994	GEF Operational Strategy
1994	GEF Operational Programs 1 – 4
2000-2001	Development of OP 13
2003	GEF 3 Replenishment agreement with biodiversity input targets
2003	Initial development of Biodiversity Strategic Priorities
2004	Finalized Strategic Priorities 1-4
2004-2005	Development of portfolio tracking tools for biodiversity SPs
2005	Revision of Biodiversity SPs, but main emphasis remains the same

Within the framework of each operational program, country-driven, site-specific activities are developed. Each operational program encompasses two types of strategies central to biodiversity: (a) long-term protection and (b) sustainable use. Other considerations that guide the development of activities in each operational program are: (c) underlying causes and policies, (d) stakeholder involvement, and (e) targeted research.

Operational programs emphasize *in situ* activities within and adjacent to conservation areas, including designated areas of biological importance. Representativeness and complementarity of ecosystems is sought. Conservation activities are comprised of direct management interventions, planning of resource use as well as promotion of sustainable development alternatives to ensure that livelihoods can be secured in and around the protected areas. Activities will seek to incorporate protected areas into larger landscapes or seascapes. Biodiversity conservation and sustainable use must also be achieved outside the designated conservation areas, including protected areas, and must be integrated into the management of the natural and modified surrounding areas.

Biodiversity loss occurs through direct and indirect causes. Issues of poverty, social development, sustainable livelihoods, and access to common property resources are closely linked to biodiversity conservation and sustainable use. Participation of affected stakeholders, including indigenous peoples, is of central importance, especially in the case of communities that reside inside protected areas and their immediate surroundings. Although the GEF will concentrate its efforts on addressing the proximate and intermediate causes of biodiversity loss, it will, through the Implementing Agencies' regular country assistance and awareness-building programs, facilitate efforts to address the ultimate causes of biodiversity loss.

The main strategic considerations guiding GEF-financed activities to secure global biodiversity benefits are:

- Integration of the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity within national and, as appropriate, subregional and regional sustainable development plans and policies;
- Helping to protect and sustainably manage ecosystems through targeted and cost-effective interventions;
- Integration of efforts to achieve global benefits in other focal areas, where feasible, and in the cross-sectoral area of land degradation, primarily desertification and deforestation;
- Development of a portfolio that encompasses representative ecosystems of global biodiversity significance; and
- That GEF activities will be targeted and designed to help recipient countries achieve agreed biodiversity objectives in strategic and cost-effective ways.

Program priorities for the biodiversity focal area include:

- Projects and programs that have national priority status and that fulfill the obligations of the Convention;

- Development of integrated national strategies, plans or programs for the conservation of biological diversity and sustainable use of its components in accordance with Article 6 of the Convention;
- Strengthening conservation, management and sustainable use of ecosystems and habitats identified by national governments in accordance with Article 7 of the Convention;
- Identification and monitoring of wild and domesticated biodiversity components, in particular those under threat, and implementation of measures of their conservation and sustainable use;
- Capacity-building, including human resource development and institutional development and/or strengthening, to facilitate the preparation and/or implementation of national strategies, plans for priority programs and activities for conservation of biological diversity and sustainable use of its components;
- In accordance with Article 16 of the Convention, and to meet the objectives of conservation of biological diversity and sustainable use of its components, projects which promote access to, transfer of and cooperation for joint development of technology;
- Projects that promote the sustainability of project benefits; that offer a potential contribution to experience in the conservation of biological diversity and sustainable use of its components which may have application elsewhere; and that encourage scientific excellence;
- Activities that provide access to other international, national and/or private sector funds and scientific and technical cooperation;
- Innovative measures, including in the field of economic incentives, aiming at conservation of biological diversity and/or sustainable use of its components, including those which assist developing countries to address situations where opportunity costs are incurred by local communities and to identify ways and means by which these can be compensated, in accordance with Article 11 of the Convention;
- Projects that strengthen the involvement of local and indigenous people in the conservation of biological diversity and sustainable use of its components;
- Projects that promote the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity of coastal and marine resources under threat. Also, projects which promote the conservation of biological diversity and sustainable use of its components in other environmentally vulnerable areas such as arid and semi-arid and mountainous areas;
- Projects that promote the conservation and/or sustainable use of endemic species;
- Projects aimed at the conservation of biological diversity and sustainable use of its components which integrate social dimensions including those related to poverty.

GEF Biodiversity Policy and Process

GEF biodiversity policy and process are meant to respond to the priorities and guidance specified in a number of conventions, councils, and similar policy documents or bodies. These priorities and guidance are described below.

CBD Goals and Objectives, Millennium Development Goals, WSSD Target

CBD Goals¹

In 1992, a set of agreements was signed at the “Earth Summit,” including two binding agreements: the Convention on Climate Change, which targets industrial and other emissions of greenhouse gases such as carbon dioxide; and the Convention on Biological Diversity, the first global agreement on the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity. This pact among most of the world’s governments sets out commitments for maintaining the world’s ecological systems and processes as we go about the business of economic development.

The Convention on Biodiversity (CBD) has three main goals:

- The conservation of biodiversity,
- Sustainable use of the components of biodiversity, and
- Sharing the benefits arising from the commercial and other utilization of genetic resources in a fair and equitable way

The CBD was the first formal recognition that the conservation of biological diversity is a common concern of humankind and is an integral part of development. The agreement covers all ecosystems, species, and genetic resources. It sets principles for the fair and equitable sharing of the benefits arising from the use of genetic resources and addresses biotechnology development and transfer, benefit-sharing and biosafety.

Some of the many issues dealt with under the Convention include:

- Measures and incentives for the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity
- Regulated access to genetic resources
- Access to and transfer of technology, including biotechnology
- Technical and scientific cooperation
- Impact assessment
- Education and public awareness
- Provision of financial resources
- National reporting on efforts to implement treaty commitments

GEF’s Biodiversity Program contributes directly to the CBD goals by setting priorities that are designed to fulfill the obligations of the Convention (see program priorities listed in the previous section) and in broad terms through its focus on the integrating conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity. It also directly targets areas the Convention supports, such as the access to, transfer of and cooperation of joint development technology;

¹ From CBD Website: <http://www.biodiv.org/doc/publications/guide.asp?id=action>

Millennium Development Goals²

The Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) form a blueprint agreed to by all the world's countries and leading development institutions to meet the needs of the poorest. They include:

- [Goal 1: Eradicate Extreme Hunger and Poverty](#)
- [Goal 2: Achieve Universal Primary Education](#)
- [Goal 3: Promote Gender Equality and Empower Women](#)
- [Goal 4: Reduce Child Mortality](#)
- [Goal 5: Improve Maternal Health](#)
- [Goal 6: Combat HIV/AIDS, Malaria and other diseases](#)
- [Goal 7: Ensure Environmental Sustainability](#)
- [Goal 8: Develop a Global Partnership for Development](#)

Of these eight goals, Goal 7 is the most relevant to GEF's biodiversity focal area. Goal 7 includes the following three targets, the first of which is the most relevant to GEF's biodiversity focal area:

- Target 9. Integrate the principles of sustainable development into country policies and programs and reverse the loss of environmental resources
- Target 10. Halve, by 2015, the proportion of people without sustainable access to safe drinking water and basic sanitation
- Target 11. Have achieved by 2020 a significant improvement in the lives of at least 100 million slum dwellers]

World Summit on Sustainable Development (WSSD) Targets

The major outcomes of the World Summit were a plan of implementation and a political declaration. The plan of implementation includes a number of new agreements as well as a reaffirmation of past commitments, many of which have still to be acted on by governments.

In addition to these formally negotiated documents, one of the aims of the Summit was to stimulate the development of partnerships between governments, the private sector and civil society. These partnerships are intended to give practical expression to the idea that the World Summit should focus on implementation, as well as providing creative mechanisms for linking the economic, social and environmental pillars of sustainable development at the local, national, regional, and global levels.

The GEF Biodiversity Program's focus on conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity at various political levels ties in directly to the WSSD targets. These targets include:

- Poverty eradication
- Changing unsustainable patterns of consumption and production.
- Protecting and managing the natural resource base of economic and social development
- Sustainable development in a globalizing world
- Health and sustainable development
- Sustainable development of small island developing States

² From MDG website

- Sustainable development for
 - Africa
 - Latin America and the Caribbean
 - Asia and the Pacific
 - West Asia
 - Europe

COP Guidance

COP1 identified a series of programme priorities for GEF. As shown in the following table, these priorities have presumably remained constant over the years, although COP3 and COP4 specified additional priorities.

COP	Programme Priorities
COP1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Projects and programmes that have national priority status and that fulfill the obligations of the Convention; (b) Development of integrated national strategies, plans or programmes for the conservation of biological diversity and sustainable use of its components in accordance with article 6 of the Convention; (c) Strengthening conservation, management and sustainable use of ecosystems and habitats identified by national Governments in accordance with article 7 of the Convention; (d) Identification and monitoring of wild and domesticated biodiversity components, in particular those under threat, and implementation of measures for their conservation and sustainable use; (e) Capacity-building, including human resources development and institutional development and/or strengthening, to facilitate the preparation and/or implementation of national strategies, plans for priority programmes and activities for conservation of biological diversity and sustainable use of its components;. (f) In accordance with Article 16 of the Convention, and to meet the objectives of conservation of biological diversity and sustainable use of its components, projects which promote access to, transfer of and cooperation for joint development of technology; (g) Projects that promote the sustainability of project benefits; that offer a potential contribution to experience in the conservation of biological diversity and sustainable use of its components which may have application elsewhere; and that encourage scientific excellence; (h) Activities that provide access to other international, national and/or private sector funds and scientific and technical cooperation; (i) Innovative measures, including in the field of economic incentives, aiming at conservation of biological diversity and/or sustainable use of its components, including those which assist developing countries to address situations where opportunity costs are incurred by local communities and to identify ways and means by which these can be compensated, in accordance with article 11 of the Convention; (j) Projects that strengthen the involvement of local and indigenous people in the

COP	Programme Priorities
	<p>conservation of biological diversity and sustainable use of its components;</p> <p>(k) Projects that promote the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity of coastal and marine resources under threat. Also, projects which promote the conservation of biological diversity and sustainable use of its components in other environmentally vulnerable areas such as arid and semi-arid and mountainous areas;</p> <p>(l) Projects that promote the conservation and/or sustainable use of endemic species;</p> <p>(m) Projects aimed at the conservation of biological diversity and sustainable use of its components which integrate social dimensions including those related to poverty.</p>
COP2	Presumably, same as COP1
COP3	<p>Presumably, same as COP1 plus following priorities:</p> <p>(a) Targeted research which contributes to conservation of biological diversity and the sustainable use of its components including research for reversing current trends of biodiversity loss and species extinction;</p> <p>(b) Promotion of the understanding of the importance of, and measures required for, the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity</p>
COP4	<p>Presumably, same previous COPs plus following priorities:</p> <p>(a) Stock-taking activities, such as, for example, assessments of current legislative, administrative, and policy measures on access to genetic resources and benefit-sharing, evaluation of the strengths and weaknesses of a country's institutional and human capacity, and promotion of consensus building among its different stakeholders; and, for those developing country Parties that have identified arrangements for benefit-sharing as a national priority;</p> <p>(b) Formulation of access and benefit sharing mechanisms at the national, subregional and regional level including monitoring and incentive measures;</p> <p>(c) Capacity-building for measures on access to genetic resources and sharing of benefits, including capacity-building for economic valuation of genetic resources;</p> <p>(d) Within biodiversity projects, other specific benefit sharing initiatives, such as support for entrepreneurial developments by local and indigenous communities, facilitation of financial sustainability of projects promoting the sustainable use of genetic resources, and appropriate targeted research components;</p>
COP5	Presumably, same previous COPs
COP6	Presumably, same previous COPs
COP7	Presumably, same previous COPs
COP8	Presumably, same previous COPs

Appendix B provides a more detailed listing of specific programmatic COP guidance over the years and how GEF has responded to this guidance and assessed results. Major themes include:³

- Access and benefit sharing (genetic resources)
- Access to and transfer of technology
- Agricultural biological diversity
- Indigenous and local communities
- Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety

³ These themes and much of the information related to COP guidance on them summarized here comes from the Biodiversity Program Study 2004, Annex 4.

- Clearinghouse mechanism and scientific and technical cooperation
- Components of biological diversity particularly under threat
- Dry and sub-humid lands biological diversity
- Ecosystem approach
- Education and public awareness
- Endemic species
- Forest biological diversity
- Global strategy for plant conservation
- Global taxonomy initiative
- Incentive measures
- Inland water ecosystems
- Invasive alien species
- Marine and coastal biological diversity
- Mountain ecosystems
- National reports
- Targeted research and related activities
- Millennium development goals
- Biological diversity and climate change
- Sustainable use
- Protected areas

The guidance generally instructed GEF to provide support to partner countries on the themes mentioned above. Until COP7, for the most part, the COPs did not request any formal monitoring from the GEF. Some guidance requested a general report on how funded activities in the different themes were going. GEF responded by reporting to the COPs on projects' status, including information such as a brief description of the projects, location, involved agencies, approval date, duration, total cost, GEF portion, and project approval status. For some themes, COP7 asked for specific information. For instance, for projects supporting indigenous and local communities, COP7 requested indicators on the state of retention of traditional knowledge, innovations and practices and information on legislative measures to protect traditional knowledge, innovations and practices as drawn from regional and national reports. The COPs tended to leave the technical reporting decisions up to the GEF. One of the main reporting tools GEF used to report back to the COPs is the project implementation review (see M&E section below for more information on project implementation reviews).

GEF Council Decisions and Requests

The GEF Council also provides decisions for and makes requests of the GEF related to its biodiversity policies and programs. As the table in Appendix C indicates, these decisions currently cover 7 different categories:

- Forests
- Capacity building
- WSSD biodiversity target
- Replenishment targets
- Programming for maximizing results and impacts
- OP13 – Agricultural biodiversity
- Operational strategy

As with COP guidance, GEF Council provided little guidance on how GEF should assess results or what data or indicators they should collect. There was a request for more qualitative assessments of impacts and outcomes of forestry projects. Only the replenishment targets request specific indicators – hectares of protected areas and production landscapes.

GEF3 and GEF4

In response to the *Second Program Study of the GEF Biodiversity Program*, the GEF developed strategic priorities to further sharpen the strategic focus of the operational programs. The strategic priorities for GEF-3 reflect the rich implementation experience, as well as studies and evaluations, of the decade-old portfolio. The strategic priorities internalize the guidance from the Convention and the most pertinent recommendations that have emerged from various evaluation exercises.

Strategic priorities for GEF-3 are:

- 1) Catalyzing sustainability of protected area systems;
- 2) Mainstreaming biodiversity in production landscapes and sectors;
- 3) Capacity building for the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety; and
- 4) Generation and dissemination of best practices for addressing current and emerging biodiversity issues.

The rationale for GEF-3 strategic priorities remains largely unchanged and thus, the proposed approach in GEF-4 emphasizes continuity and is consistent with the recommendations from the *Third Biodiversity Program Study*. Nevertheless, the experience gained during GEF-3 has allowed the GEF to sharpen the focus of these initial objectives. GEF-4 will focus primarily on the first two strategic priorities above. These provide a flexible window to implement the guidance of the Convention and reflect current thinking in the conservation community of the need to secure protected areas while making biodiversity protection a more conscious component of socio-economic development. These are also the main contributors towards the CBD's 2010 targets. GEF-4 will also include attention to the last two objectives, although the emphasis will remain primarily on protected areas and mainstreaming biodiversity. According to the Programming Document for GEF-4, strategic priorities are as follows:

Strategic objective 1: Catalyzing sustainability of protected area systems at national levels

This objective encompasses the achievement of ecological, institutional, social, political and financial sustainability in the context of national-level PA systems. The key goal of this objective is to conserve biodiversity in PA systems through the expansion, consolidation, and rationalization of national PA systems.

Strategic objective 2: Mainstreaming biodiversity conservation within production landscapes and sectors

The objective of mainstreaming biodiversity is to internalize the goals of biodiversity conservation and the sustainable use of biological resources into economic sectors and development models, policies and programs, and therefore into all human behavior.

Strategic objective 3: Capacity building for the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety

This strategic objective focuses on developing systemic and institutional capacity building for biosafety including training in risk assessment and management of living modified organisms

Strategic objective 4: Generation and dissemination of good practices for emerging issues in biodiversity

A key goal will be to improve the analysis, synthesis and dissemination of good practices, innovative approaches and new tools in biodiversity.

Biodiversity Strategic Priorities and Operational Programs⁴

Biodiversity conservation constitutes one of the GEF's greatest priorities. Since 1991, the GEF has invested nearly \$4.2 billion in grants and co-financing for biodiversity conservation in developing countries. As the financial mechanism for the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), the GEF helps countries fulfill their obligations under the CBD.

The GEF biodiversity portfolio supports initiatives that promote *in situ* and sustainable biodiversity conservation in protected areas and production landscapes as well as capacity building for implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety (CPB) and knowledge dissemination.

Strategic Priorities

The GEF defines its approach to biodiversity conservation through its four strategic priorities (SPs). Four major themes continue to cut across all four of these priorities:

- **Catalyzing the Sustainability of Protected Areas:** Conserving biodiversity through the expansion, consolidation, and rationalization of national protected area (PA) systems.
- **Mainstreaming Biodiversity in Production Landscapes and Sectors:** Integrating biodiversity conservation in agriculture, forestry, fisheries, tourism and other production systems and sectors to secure national and global environmental benefits.
- **Capacity Building for the Implementation of the CBD Cartagena Protocol on Biodiversity:** Building national capacity for the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol of the CBD.
- **Generation and Dissemination of Best Practices for Addressing Current and Emerging Biodiversity Issues:** Improving the analysis, synthesis, and dissemination of best practices, innovative approaches, and new tools.

Operational Programs

Six operational programs, which cover a range of ecosystems and other existing GEF policies, provide further guidance.

⁴ From GEF website

- **OP1: Arid and Semi-Arid Zone Ecosystems:** Activities focus on the conservation and sustainable use of endemic biodiversity in dryland ecosystems.
- **OP2: Coastal, Marine, and Freshwater Ecosystems:** Activities concentrate on the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity in coastal, wetland, mangrove, estuarine, marine, and freshwater ecosystems.
- **OP3: Forest Ecosystems:** Activities focus on forest ecosystems in protected areas and increasingly in landscapes as a key to the conservation, sustainable use and equitable sharing of benefits from biodiversity.
- **OP4: Mountain Ecosystems:** Activities seek to establish sustainable land use practices on mountain slopes in order to protect representative habitats and strengthen the network of conservation areas in the alpine, mountain, grassland, montane forest zones and freshwater ecosystems.
- **OP13: Conservation and Sustainable Use of Biological Diversity Important to Agriculture:** Activities promote the objectives of the Convention, in the area of agricultural biodiversity.

M&E in GEF Biodiversity Focal Area

History and Evolution of M&E⁵

The monitoring and evaluation functions of the GEF were established after the GEF restructuring in 1994, when the GEF Council was entrusted with the responsibility of developing, adopting, and evaluating the operational policies and programs for GEF activities. A framework for monitoring and evaluation was approved in May 1997 as the Framework and Work Program for GEF's Monitoring, Evaluation and Dissemination Activities (GEF/C.8/4). As a result of the Second Overall Performance Study and Replenishment of the GEF Trust Fund, the GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Unit was made independent in 2003 and now reports directly to the GEF Council. In November 2004, the GEF Council renamed the Unit as the GEF Office of Monitoring and Evaluation and requested it to proceed with developing a new policy for monitoring and evaluation in the GEF.

Timeline of GEF M&E History and Evolution

The following timeline includes a mix of major strategy shifts and design, monitoring, and evaluation decisions and events.

1991

- The GEF was established as a pilot program to provide financing to developing countries for the incremental costs of projects that produce global environmental benefits in four areas: biodiversity, climate change, international waters, and ozone depletion.

⁵ From

http://www.gefweb.org/MonitoringandEvaluation/MEPoliciesProcedures/documents/Policies_and_Guidelines-Tools_and_Guidelines-New_ME_Policy-020306.pdf

1992

- At the UN Conference on Environment and Development in 1992 (Earth Summit), the GEF was recognized as a source of funding for Agenda 21 and other outcomes of the Conference. UNCED also called for the GEF pilot program to be restructured.

1994

- Governments agreed to a restructuring of the GEF and recognized it as a mechanism for international cooperation for the purpose of providing new and additional grant and concessional funding to meet the agreed incremental costs of measures to achieve global environmental benefits in its four focal areas.
- M&E functions established after GEF restructuring in 94; GEF Council entrusted with responsibility for developing, adopting, and evaluating the operational policies and programs for GEF activities.

1995

- COP requests administrative information for monitoring and reporting purposes.

1997

- Framework for monitoring and evaluation approved in May 1997 as the Framework and Work Program for GEF's Monitoring, Evaluation and Dissemination Activities.
- First review of GEF as financial mechanism – to happen every 3 years after)
- Study of GEF Project lessons
- Project implementation reviews initiated

1998

- Study of GEF's Overall Performance to assess to what extent GEF has achieved or is making progress toward the achievement of the main objectives and guidelines laid down during restructuring in 1994
- Project Performance Report
- IW: Learn initiated – learning aimed at exchanging successful approaches among existing projects and those under preparation so that they may be adopted within the framework of adaptive management...Also help avoid problems that have been encountered by projects..."structured learning"
- COP3 instructs GEF to provide financial resources for: capacity-building, including taxonomy, to enable developing countries to develop and carry out an initial assessment for designing, implementing and monitoring programs

2001-2002

- GEF presented 2nd study of GEF's Overall Performance at GEF 2nd Assembly

2002

- Governments participating in the GEF agreed to expand the GEF focal areas to include land degradation and persistent organic pollutants in support of the UN Convention to Combat Desertification and the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants.

2003

1. May 2003 – GEF Council approves terms of reference for independent M&E unit in GEF
2. May 2003 – Review of Financial Arrangements in Biodiversity Projects presented to Council meeting
3. 2003-2004 – Biodiversity Program Study – assess main impacts of GEF supported programs on global biodiversity, highlight lessons learned
4. Certain priorities within GEF starting to report on outputs and outcomes. Biodiversity and climate change were the most advanced strategies in terms of monitoring.
5. As a result of the Second Overall Performance Study and Replenishment of the GEF Trust Fund, the GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Unit was made independent in 2003 and now reports directly to the GEF Council.

2004

- Early 2004 – expected approval of TOR for 3rd Study of GEF's Overall Performance (OPS3). Final report expected May 2004, actually completed June 2005.
- In November 2004, the GEF Council renamed the Unit as the GEF Office of Monitoring and Evaluation and requested it to proceed with developing a new policy for monitoring and evaluation in the GEF 2nd Study on GEF Biodiversity Program
- Biodiversity Program Study 2004 – completed in June, presented to GEF Council in November.

2005

- Study on the nature and role of local benefits in GEF program areas completed during FY05. This study assessed the benefits that GEF supported projects have promoted at the community level and the links between local and global environmental benefits.
- Third Overall Performance Study of the GEF (2005) – completed in June 2005.

2006

- The Evaluation Office is developing an approach to impact evaluation during 2006. The main objective is to prepare and test methods to evaluate the sustainability and replication of the results of GEF activities and to identify and disseminate lessons learned. The pilot evaluation is managed by Senior Evaluation Officer David Todd.
- GEF supported projects include a monitoring system as part of their implementation strategy. 2 projects recognized as having particularly good systems:
 - The UNDP implemented project, Demonstrating Sustainable Conservation of Biodiversity in Four Protected Areas in Russia's Kamchatka Oblast, Phase 2,
 - Korea, Conservation of Globally Significant Wetlands

COP Guidance and Requests Related to M&E

In addition to guidance on programs, the COPs have also provided GEF with guidance and requests related to monitoring and evaluation. The table in Appendix B details the main guidance offered.

Much of the early guidance focused on supporting local country capacity building for biological monitoring, creating or adding to taxonomies, and developing national plans and strategies for “the conservation of biological diversity and sustainable use of its components.”

In terms of required reporting to the COP, the COP generally requested an administrative accounting of the projects including, for example, their location, approval status, funding levels, and implementation progress. COP1 requested a review of the project activities and their outcomes, although it did not specify how outcomes should be measured. GEF reports were administrative in nature, including a summary of the projects, programme priorities addressed, amounts funded, project approval status, etc.

GEF Council Decisions and Requests Related to M&E

The GEF Council has similarly provided GEF with decisions and requests regarding monitoring and evaluation. Appendix C contains a table of key guidance in this area. In the early years (mid 1990s), Council advice was oriented toward getting GEF’s M&E office established and encouraging the Senior Monitoring and Evaluation Officer to define the goals, priorities, guidelines, and procedures of the M&E Program. The advice, however, did not specify exactly how M&E should take place. In 1998, the Council, acting on recommendations from GEF reports, called for the development of performance indicators and steps to better disseminate lessons learned.

Council decisions and discussions from May 2000 indicate a desire to shift from an “approvals culture” to focusing on program results. The Council requested that the 2nd Overall Performance Study focus on improving GEF’s performance and efficiency and identify country-level results and impacts. Although there was a request to focus on impacts, there was also recognition that it was premature to expect the achievement of medium and long-term impacts required for global environmental goals. Council also requested analysis across projects to identify impacts and lessons learned. In addition to these overarching requests, the Council also specified specific areas or themes that should be monitored (e.g., land degradation, 2015 environment target, enabling activities, policy changes, efficacy of financing, etc.).

In its May 2001 meeting, the GEF Council stressed that GEF should identify and monitor more systematically the risks to project success. The Council also underlined the importance of demonstrating and replicating the effects of GEF projects. It was also agreed that continued attention should be given to the development of indicators of project impacts and better defined baselines. In response to this last issue, the GEF M&E Unit undertook the biodiversity indicators project.

How GEFSEC and GEFME Have Measured Results and Impacts

Tracking Sheets

The biodiversity focal area has established a system to monitor portfolio performance in terms of coverage achieved and outcomes delivered. To aid in monitoring the portfolio, projects submit a “tracking tool” three times during the life of the project—by CEO endorsement or CEO approval for MSPs, at the project-midterm, and after the project final evaluation.

Information from the system is available for the first three fiscal years of GEF-3, and was included in the 2005 Portfolio Implementation Review (PIR). The system will remain in use during GEF's fourth replenishment period and will track coverage targets and outcomes as identified in the GEF-4 Programming Document.

The results show that, in GEF-3, the biodiversity focal area has already exceeded most of the coverage targets. The GEF-3 project cohort will be tracked throughout the course of individual project implementation to assess achievement of portfolio-level outcomes.

For Strategic Priority 1 (Catalyzing sustainability of protected area systems) the tracking tool was developed based on the World Commission on Protected Areas' (WCPA) framework. The framework holds that that good protected area management follows a process that has six distinct stages, or elements:

- 1) Understanding the context of existing values and threats
- 2) Planning
- 3) Allocation of resources (inputs)
- 4) Management actions (processes)
- 5) Products and services produced (outputs)
- 6) Resultant impacts or outcomes

Accordingly, the tracking tool contains a series of questions related to these six stages. The tracking tool itself is 10 pages long. An excerpt is included below, for illustrative purposes:

Issue	Criteria	Score ⁶	Comments	Next steps
1. Legal status Does the protected area have legal status? <i>Context</i>	The protected area is not gazetted	0	<i>Note:</i> see fourth option for private reserves	
	The government has agreed that the protected area should be gazetted but the process has not yet begun	1		
	The protected area is in the process of being gazetted but the process is still incomplete	2		
	The protected area has been legally gazetted (or in the case of private reserves is owned by a trust or similar)	3		
2. Protected area regulations Are inappropriate land uses and activities (e.g. poaching) controlled? <i>Context</i>	There are no mechanisms for controlling inappropriate land use and activities in the protected area	0		
	Mechanisms for controlling inappropriate land use and activities in the protected area exist but there are major problems in implementing them effectively	1		
	Mechanisms for controlling inappropriate land use and activities in the protected area exist but there are some problems in effectively implementing them	2		

⁶ Scale ranges from 0 (poor) to 3 (excellent).

Issue	Criteria	Score ⁶	Comments	Next steps
	Mechanisms for controlling inappropriate land use and activities in the protected area exist and are being effectively implemented	3		
3. Law enforcement	The staff have no effective capacity/resources to enforce protected area legislation and regulations	0	<i>Possible issue for comment:</i> What happens if people are arrested?	
Can staff enforce protected area rules well enough?	There are major deficiencies in staff capacity/resources to enforce protected area legislation and regulations (e.g. lack of skills, no patrol budget)	1		
Context	The staff have acceptable capacity/resources to enforce protected area legislation and regulations but some deficiencies remain	2		
	The staff have excellent capacity/resources to enforce protected area legislation and Regulations	3		

GEF has a separate tracking tool it uses for Strategic Priority 2 (Mainstreaming biodiversity in production landscapes and sectors). This tool contains nine separate categories:

1. Project general information
2. Project Landscape/Seascape Coverage
3. Management Practices Applied
4. Market Transformation and Mainstreaming Biodiversity
5. Improved Livelihoods
6. Project Replication Strategy
7. Enabling Environment
8. Mainstreaming biodiversity into the GEF Implementing Agencies' Programs
9. Other Impacts

An excerpt of this tool is found below:

III. Management Practices Applied

10.a. Within the scope and objectives of the project, please identify in the table below the management practices employed by project beneficiaries that integrate biodiversity considerations and the area of coverage of these management practices? Note: this could range from farmers applying organic agricultural practices, forest management agencies managing forests per Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) guidelines or other forest certification schemes, artisanal fisherfolk practicing sustainable fisheries management, or industries satisfying other similar agreed international standards, etc. An example is provided in the table below.

Targets and Timeframe	Area of coverage foreseen at start of project	Achievement at Mid-term Evaluation of Project	Achievement at Final Evaluation of Project
Specific management practices that integrate BD			
1. E.g., Shade-grown coffee production (agroforestry)	120,000 hectares	89,000 hectares	130,000 hectares
2.			
3...			

10. b. Is the project promoting the conservation and sustainable use of wild species or landraces?

Yes No

If yes, please list the wild species (WS) or landraces (L):

Species (<i>Genus sp.</i> , and common name)	Wild Species (please check if this is a wild species)	Landrace (please check if this is a landrace)
1.		
2.		
3.		
4...		

Terminal Evaluations

UNDP/GEF M&E policies and procedures require that all GEF-supported regular and medium-sized projects should undergo a final evaluation upon completion of implementation. A final evaluation of a GEF-funded project is also required before a concept proposal for additional funding (or subsequent phases of the same project) can be considered for inclusion in a GEF work program.

Terminal evaluations are intended to assess the relevance, performance, and success of a project. They identify early signs of potential impact and sustainability of results, including the contribution to capacity development and the achievement of global environmental goals. They

also identify and document lessons learned and make recommendations that might improve design and implementation of other GEF-funded projects.

Terminal evaluations do not currently follow a standard format or procedure. They are conducted by external consultants who respond to terms of reference provided by the Implementing Agencies. Although the World Bank appears to have a standard format for its terminal evaluation reports, there is not a standard format or procedure for the other IAs. They, however, all share the general objective of assessing the results achieved by the projects during their implementation. Methods used for terminal evaluations typically include a mix of document review, interviews with key informants (project staff, stakeholders, partners, and government agencies), and site visits.

Past Evaluation Findings/Recommendations on Impacts

Biodiversity Program Study 2004

Of the evaluations and studies we reviewed for this policy document, the Biodiversity Program Study 2004 was the most comprehensive and thorough. This document offers a lot of critical reflection and practical advice for improving how the Biodiversity Program operates.

The study took place between September 2003 and June 2004 by a team comprised of independent consultants and staff from GEF’s Office of Monitoring and Evaluation. Like other GEF focal area programs, the Biodiversity Program is evaluated every three to four years. These evaluations constitute a major input to the Overall Performance Studies, the GEF replenishment process, and the GEF Assembly. The evaluation report is very comprehensive and includes a series of findings and recommendations. In the following table, we summarize some of the key findings and recommendations, especially as they relate to planning, monitoring, and evaluation.

Table 1. Key findings and Recommendations from the Biodiversity Program Study 2004

MAIN FINDINGS	RECOMMENDATIONS ⁷
Strategic Planning, Monitoring, and Evaluation	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no strategic framework at the Biodiversity Program level, making it difficult to roll up results from the project level to the program level 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Good strategic planning and monitoring and evaluation to pull the thread all the way through from the projects to the program and beyond to the level of the CBD Clear process for implementing M&E findings
Standardizing Project Level M&E	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Absence of a clearly defined role for the GEF Secretariat Biodiversity Team in project-level monitoring 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Standardizing and overseeing the evaluation aspects belongs within the purview of the GEFM&E Unit
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At both the project and program levels, there seems to be difficulty distinguishing between the evaluation of efficiency (i.e., how well something is 	<ul style="list-style-type: none">

⁷ In some cases, specific recommendations were not offered, although some of the findings could be addressed through recommendations not directly linked to them.

MAIN FINDINGS	RECOMMENDATIONS ⁷
<p>done) versus effectiveness (i.e., what has been achieved)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • While M&E must take place at all levels along the project continuum (activities to outputs to outcomes and impacts), some projects refer to M&E primarily in terms of activities and outputs • Many terminal evaluations focus on the completion of activities rather than outcomes (achievements/reduction of pressures) or, more importantly, higher level objectives (impact/change in biodiversity status). 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No standard criteria for reporting and evaluation process, leading to considerable variability among the IAs in how assessments, reviews, and evaluations are conducted, 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The GEFM&E Unit should continue to improve the minimum standards for evaluation and criteria that all IAs must meet and the process through which findings and recommendations will feed back into periodic reviews of the GEF Biodiversity Program
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No universal language or practice of M&E across projects in the portfolio 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (IAs) As a standard procedure, the IAs should redouble efforts to ensure their growing rigor in establishing and financing clear M&E plans from the outset, including the articulation of targets at all levels, the selection of both biological and socioeconomic indicators to measure progress along the way, and the establishment of baselines. These plans must be further strengthened to include simple, practical, and sustainable systems for measuring and tracking these indicators on meaningful time scales through periodic assessment. • Monitoring should be a more integral and inherent part of the entire process of project implementation and beyond.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Absence of clear M&E plans 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack or inappropriate selection of biodiversity and socioeconomic targets and goals as well as indicators with which to measure progress towards targets 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Non-existent, inadequate, or mistimed collection of baseline data on both biological and socioeconomic indicators 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Failure to monitor assumptions throughout the life of the project 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inconsistent linkages between selected indicators and targeted outcomes and impacts. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (IAs)The cost of developing these monitoring plans, including the selection of indicators, should be written into the PDF-B for FSPs or into the project budget for MSPs.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inadequate finances to cover the costs of necessary M&E and no foresight in building these costs into project budgets from the onset 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focus should be on simple, practical, and sustainable monitoring systems
<p>Demystifying the Practice of Adaptive Management</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strict adherence to rigid planning structures 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Greater flexibility and room for innovation to allow adaptation with changes in external factors, operational circumstances, or violations of assumptions • Logframe planning could include multiple scenarios or be reviewed regularly and allow more flexibility for changes to planned project outputs and activities. Logical frameworks as well as targets and indicators at the performance, achievement, and impact levels should be actively used as management tools.
<p>Improving Program Level M&E</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of clear logical frameworks at program level, 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (GEFM&E): Clear standards and guidelines should

MAIN FINDINGS	RECOMMENDATIONS ⁷
<p>leading to problems in aggregate M&E of performance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Retrospective logical framework built by GEF Biodiversity Task Force for the outcome level; did not make connection between how changes in human behavior (outcomes) will improve biodiversity status (impacts) Current logframe falls short of articulating a goal for the Biodiversity Program and formulating measurable targets to measure progress towards its achievement. 	<p>be developed for M&E at the project level and a system of M&E that will roll up to the Biodiversity Program level to allow true evaluation of the performance of the entire portfolio in efficiently and effectively attaining its objectives</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Various topical studies, reviews, evaluations, SMPRs, PPRs, TERs, final evaluations, etc. have been carried out but their cumulative value in providing an overall assessment is not clear 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To meet donor needs, considerably greater intellectual and financial investments in M&E are needed
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Paucity of relevant data make it challenging if not impossible to assess the overall impact of the Biodiversity Program’s interventions to date 	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Projects do not include financing or planned activities that would accommodate post-project completion evaluations. Without prior integration of this approach into the GEF’s M&E planning, it will always be forgotten, thus crippling the GEF’s ability to truly assess the sustainability of the outputs, outcomes, and impacts 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (GEFM&E and IAs): Mechanisms should be established at the project or program level to conduct post-completion evaluations in order to assess sustainability beyond the life of the project

While the Biodiversity Program Study 2004 had a number of findings regarding the shortcoming of M&E systems within the GEF, it did also note some progress that the GEF and the IAs were making to remedy the situation. For example, all IAs have been working to address the lack of standardized M&E practices at the project level:

“UNEP has instituted standardized M&E plans, rigorous internal review processes to enhance project designs, and annual review meetings to review lessons learned; has promoted the use of a logframe tracking tool; and is exploring the possible production of a standardized project procedures manual. UNDP has begun retrofitting indicators as and where necessary, has developed a web-accessible Resource Kit for Measuring and Demonstrating Impact, and has developed standardized TORs for evaluations aimed at strengthening M&E in project. The World Bank has conducted an extensive review of M&E in project design and implementation, which provides important insights and lessons. In fact, for the past 2 years, the GEF Council has insisted that projects, when presented for their approval, have an appropriate M&E system, including a clear plan and budget. And, indeed, on paper, newer projects increasingly show improved M&E planning over earlier ones (see Chapter 8), especially in the establishment of logical frameworks, biological indicators, baselines, and systematic monitoring.”

In terms of practicing adaptive management, the report also found that some project teams had successfully restructured projects following mid-term evaluations (e.g., the World Bank Mexico Protected Areas project, UNDP’s Bhutan Jigme Dorji project, and the jointly implemented UNDP/World Bank Madagascar Environment Program II). In addition, the World Bank’s risk

management strategies (already in practice) and those of UNEP and UNDP that are under development provide important examples of the practice of adaptive management in action at the project level.

The Biodiversity Program Study 2004 offered some concluding and overarching advice for moving forward and strategically designing, guiding and managing the Biodiversity Program:

After over a decade of project design, approval, implementation, and evaluation, the GEF Biodiversity Program has accrued many experiences of both achievements and shortcomings. Further studies are not necessary to underscore the need for a meaningful streamlining of the project preparation process to reduce the lengthy and unacceptably high transaction costs for proponents (now averaging about 5 years), increased consistency in the application of strategic planning through the use of the logical framework approach at both the project and program levels, the strengthening of project implementation both technically and operationally, and the adoption of industry standards for M&E. While it is recognized that streamlining the project preparation process and some of the steps recommended for more rigorous strategic planning, implementation and evaluation may appear antithetical, it is possible to achieve both in shorter time frames if all steps in the process are made more efficient. Perhaps the most challenging time commitment, and one that may be difficult to redress, but necessary nonetheless, is the time required to conduct the required level of stakeholder consultations in large, complex biodiversity projects. The GEF Biodiversity Team and the greater GEF family should now think more critically about their exact roles in supporting catalytic activities to bolster the efforts of others, particularly national level capacity, in delivering global environmental benefits. It is time to move beyond an era of supporting and administering a loosely associated portfolio of projects, designed at different levels by different players to deliver different outcomes and impacts. A more strategic, higher level vision is urgently needed that will enable the contributions of the GEF Biodiversity Program to build on its unique identity and the experiences of more than a decade of operations, and provide guidance and assistance to countries in making measurable contributions to the goals, objectives, and targets of the CBD.

Rec (GEF Secretariat): The time has come for the GEF Biodiversity Team to move from simply administering the portfolio of projects to actively and strategically providing greater vision and better cohesion to, and stronger delivery of, the GEF Biodiversity Program.

Overall Performance Studies (OPS)

The overall performance studies provide an overview of GEF-funded results in addressing global environmental problems and examine how the GEF functions as a network and partnership of institutions and organizations. To date, three Overall Performance Studies have been conducted. Each is described briefly.

OPS1

The First Overall Performance Study, submitted in 1997, was undertaken to assess to what extent the GEF achieved its main objectives and guidelines laid down during the 1994 restructuring. For the biodiversity focal area, OPS1 assessed GEF's contribution to country-level processes that

prepare countries to implement the Convention. This included assistance to countries for fulfilling their reporting requirements and taking related measures in compliance with the Convention. The study examined the degree to which the identification and implementation of projects was country-driven. It also examined the information sharing and coordination between the Convention Secretariat and the GEF Secretariat was, as well as between the Parties to the Convention and the GEF Council Members.

Priority recommendations highlighted in the report are as follows:⁸

- (a) **Leveraging of Resources from the Private Sector:** The GEF Secretariat and Implementing Agencies should engage business and banking associations and mobilize financing from individual private financial sector companies, such as banks, insurance companies and pension funds. To interest the financial sector in GEF projects, the GEF should use the “incremental risk” of a potential private sector GEF project as a way of determining the size of the GEF grant. GEF should identify and apply techniques for reducing the risk of the private investors of participating in GEF projects, such as using GEF funds to provide loan guarantees.
- (b) **The Focal Point System:** In order to enable Operational Focal Points to be more effective advocates for GEF issues in their country, the GEF Secretariat and Implementing Agencies should broaden the existing Project Development Workshop format by involving the Operational Focal Points as much as possible in planning and execution and by focusing more on the coordination and information dissemination functions of the Operational Focal Points. The GEF should provide resources for translation of basic GEF documents into the local language of those countries requiring such translated documents.
- (c) **Communications and Outreach:** The GEF Council should authorize and adequately fund the development of a GEF outreach and communications strategy that targets GEF’s multiple constituencies, including the Focal Points and relevant government agencies, NGOs and civil society, the media and the private sector. The strategy should rely on simple, user-friendly materials about the GEF and its operations, and should include provision of basic GEF documents in local languages. This strategy should be coordinated with the broadening of the Project Development Workshops.
- (d) **Mainstreaming by the Implementing Agencies:**
 - The World Bank should adopt public, measurable goals for the integration of global environmental objectives into its regular operations, including goals related to: 1) staff incentives, 2) funding level and/or number of GEF associated projects, 3) funding level and/or number of projects for the global environment in its regular lending portfolio, and 4) integration into its sector work and the Country Assistance Strategy (CAS) process. It should report regularly to GEF and to the public on its progress in achieving these objectives.
 - The World Bank should begin a transition from its role in financing conventional power loans to a new role in financing sustainable energy technologies.
 - The World Bank should allocate increased financial resources to the Global Overlays program in order to ensure adequate staffing for a substantially higher level of integration of global environment into sector work and the CAS process.

⁸ Much of this section comes directly from the First Study of GEF’s Overall Performance.

- The IFC should maintain a database of its projects with global environmental benefits, so that its mainstreaming of global environment can be assessed in the future.
 - UNDP should establish a system of tracking projects and components that are relevant to the GEF focal areas and set public, measurable targets related to: 1) funding levels and/or number of core-funded projects for biodiversity conservation, alternative energy and international waters, 2) funding level and/or number of GEF-associated projects, and 3) the Country Cooperation Frameworks (CCFs). It should report regularly to GEF and to the public on its progress in achieving those targets. It should also consider making linkages between potential GEF projects and potential core budget projects an explicit objective of the process of preparing the Country Cooperation Frameworks.
 - UNEP should devise a system of staff incentives, involving at least a revision of staff evaluation criteria, to give adequate consideration to GEF work.
 - The GEF Secretariat and UNEP should devote more staff time and resources to upstream consultation not only in Washington but in Nairobi to ensure that all relevant UNEP program staff have adequate guidance in formulating GEF proposals.
- (e) **Implementing Agency Monopoly:** The GEF Council should undertake a study of the advantages and disadvantages of various approaches to permitting additional organizations to propose GEF projects directly to the Secretariat and assume direct responsibility for GEF projects.
- (f) **Incremental Costs:** A working group representing the GEF Secretariat and the Implementing Agencies should, in consultation with the convention secretariats, develop simpler, more straightforward guidance and communication for recipient country officials on the calculation of incremental costs and a strategy for increasing their involvement in the process of estimating those costs.
- (g) **GEF Council Review:** The GEF Council should seriously consider delegating the second review of project proposals to the GEF Secretariat.

OPS2

Completed in 2001, the Second Overall Performance Study (OPS2) was designed to assess the extent to which GEF had achieved, or was making progress toward achieving, its main objectives specified during the restructuring in 1994, and the policies adopted by the GEF Council in subsequent years. The OPS2 involved a desk study, as well as site visits to 11 countries.

Recommendations highlighted in the report follow:

- (a) **GEF Results and Impacts:** The GEF should review and rationalize the number and objectives of operational programs in light of the lessons learned to ensure consistency and a unified focus on delivering global environmental benefits. Furthermore, to ensure quality outcomes that focus on global environmental benefits, OPS2 recommends that GEF make a special effort to use scientific analysis as a constant foundation for the planning and implementation of new projects in all focal areas. The science-based Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis (TDA) should continue to be the basis for facilitating regional agreements on actions to address threats to international waters and for developing strategic action programs (SAPs). OPS2 further recommends the extension of a similar approach to land degradation, as it is now becoming a new focal area.
- (b) **GEF Relations with Conventions and Countries:**
- The GEF should adopt a cautious approach to funding any new rounds of enabling activities to the same convention. All such activities must be assessed for their effectiveness in responding to the convention guidance and to country needs. It is

important to assess the use of national reports, national communications, and national action programs within the strategic frameworks for a country's national sustainable development program and GEF's programming and project preparation activities. In this context, OPS2 also recommends that the GEF Council explore the feasibility of each country reporting directly to the appropriate convention on the effectiveness and results of GEF's country-relevant support for both enabling activities and projects.

- In its dialogue with each convention that it supports, the GEF should regularly seek to update and clarify existing priorities and commitments in light of each new round of guidance it receives.
- The GEF should continue ongoing efforts to support capacity development of operational focal points, the national GEF coordinating structures, and the country dialogue workshops. Furthermore, OPS2 recommends that the GEF Secretariat help empower operational focal points by providing better information services on the status of projects in the pipeline and under implementation. To that end, the GEF Council should allocate special funding, administered by the GEF Secretariat, to support the organization of regular in-country GEF portfolio review workshops, carried out by the national operational focal points with participation by the related convention focal points, implementing agencies, and executing agencies.

(c) GEF Policies and Programs:

- An interagency task force should be organized by the GEF Secretariat for the purpose of developing an effective and systematic way to document information on stakeholder consultations and participation, including the involvement of indigenous communities, in GEF-funded projects.
- To improve the understanding of agreed incremental costs and global benefits by countries, IA staff, and new EAs, OPS2 recommends that the 1996 Council paper on incremental costs (GEFF/C.7/Inf.5) be used as a starting point for an interagency task force. This group would seek to link global environmental benefits and incremental costs in a negotiating framework that partner countries and the GEF would use to reach agreement on incremental costs. This should be tested in a few countries, and revised based on the experience gained, before it is widely communicated as a practical guideline for operational focal points, IAs, and GEF Secretariat staff.
- In response to the concerns raised when the GEF was established regarding cost efficiency, accountability for services provided, and monitoring of overhead costs, OPS2 recommends two measures: (i) establishing a standard set of tasks to be performed by the IAs with fee resources and (ii) adopting a simple output-based fee payment system for IAs using two or three payments that are phased through the life of a project and linked to specific project milestones.
- Each IA and new executing agency should be held responsible for generating significant additional resources to leverage GEF resources. A clear definition of co-financing and a set of strict co-financing criteria should be developed for different GEF project categories and country circumstances. The emphasis should be on the *total* amount of additional co-financing considered to constitute a significant and effective cost-sharing arrangement for each project, rather than on the quantity of co-financing forthcoming from an agency's operating programs and government contributions. Co-financing levels should be monitored and assessed annually through the interagency PIR process, as well as

evaluated in the final project reports. The monitoring of replication of successful project activities should be established as a separate exercise in GEF.

- The GEF must place greater emphasis on sustainability and the potential for replication in project design and implementation. In particular, OPS2 recommends that the GEF should engage the private sector more effectively in all phases of the project cycle, including securing adequate GEF Secretariat expertise in this field. It should seek to create an enabling environment in which more specific, market-oriented strategies and expanded GEF operational modalities enable timely interaction with the private sector, thereby forming the basis for long-term sustainability of GEF activities.

(d) GEF Institutional Arrangement and Relationships:

- The GEF should manage delivery of global environmental benefits by initiating a institution-wide shift from an approval culture to one that emphasizes quality and results. This should be achieved through a partnership approach that expands the use of interagency task forces to address program and policy issues and adopts broader teamwork practices to support project implementation and evaluation.
- The GEF Council should commit to strengthening the professional resources and management capacities of the GEF Secretariat in the following key areas:
 - Establishing a separate unit (Country Support Team) that possesses adequate regional knowledge, language capacity, and the competence to provide the national operational focal points, in close collaboration with the IAs and the EAs, with effective, prompt policy and procedural guidance
 - Strengthening its capacity to develop and communicate operational modalities that can effectively engage the private sector, including the recruitment of relevant private sector expertise and arrangement of secondments from the IAs/IFC or the external private sector
 - Requesting a special human resources planning exercise, including work programming and budget implications, of the proposed and expanding functions of the GEF Secretariat to give the GEF Council more precise recommendations regarding staffing needs
 - Contracting an external management review of current management systems and future management needs in the GEF Secretariat.

With due respect for the IAs' overall responsibility for project implementation and evaluation, the GEF Council should strengthen and expand the monitoring and evaluation functions of the GEF monitoring and evaluation unit so that it can play a supporting partnership role in mid-term reviews and project evaluations, particularly by providing advice on TORs for mid-term reviews and final project evaluations, contributing to the review of each of these reports, reviewing and compiling the results reported from project evaluations, and arranging adequate feedback to all GEF partners.

To strengthen the GEF system for providing science and technology inputs, OPS2 recommends appointing STAP members for staggered terms, exploring with STAP members mechanisms for improving the use of in-country scientific and technical expertise within the GEF, and seeking STAP recommendations for appropriate changes to improve the project review system and enhance the utility of the roster of experts.

To support GEF's evolution to a quality- and results-oriented institutional culture and to ensure that new demands on the GEF are effectively addressed, OPS2 recommends that the institutional structure of the GEF be strengthened and that, towards this end, the GEF Council consider a review of options to strengthen GEF's institutional structure, including providing it with a separate legal status.

OPS3

The team for the Third Overall Performance Study of the GEF (OPS3), which took place between September 2004 and June 2005, was charged with evaluating the 1) results of GEF activities, 2) sustainability of results at the country level, 3) GEF as a catalytic institution, 4) GEF policies, institutional structure and partnerships, and 5) GEF implementation processes. The major findings and recommendations include:

- (a) **Focal Areas Results.** The GEF has achieved significant results, particularly at the outcome level, in the focal areas of Biodiversity, Climate Change, International Waters, and Ozone Depletion, and is well placed to deliver important results in the newer focal areas of Land Degradation and Persistent Organic Pollutants. The report includes a presentation of the major achievements in each of them;
- (b) **Strategic Programming for Results - Focal Area Level.** While OPS3 observed good steps in GEF's attempt to shift from an approval focus to a results and quality orientation, and significant results have been achieved much remains to be done to focus on and manage results. This could be done by clarifying and improving the coherence of strategic direction in each of the focal areas to improve effective programming and to be able to meaningfully track indicators for results;
- (c) **Strategic Programming for Results - Country Level.** GEF projects are often developed in a more ad hoc and sometimes opportunistic manner, rather than systematically developed to contribute to an overall country strategy. As a result, because coherent portfolios are not always developed for countries, results may not always be maximized or achieved in the most cost effective manner. OPS3 recommends that the GEF needs a programmatic approach that (1) targets cross-focal area synergies; (2) prioritizes country projects; (3) explicitly considers global environmental benefits; and (4) sharpens the focus on sustainability and catalytic effects;
- (d) **Responsiveness to Conventions.** OPS3 finds that the GEF has been responsive to guidance from the conventions it serves. OPS3 recommends that there is a strengthening of communications between the GEF Secretariat and the secretariats of the Conventions it serves;
- (e) **Information Management within the GEF Network.** The GEF systems for information management, which encompass knowledge management, management information systems and infrastructure are inadequate and should be improved; and
- (f) **Network Responsibilities and Administration.** The GEF, based on its organization, structure, and division of roles and responsibilities, is a network organization with independent or at least semi-autonomous entities working together to achieve a common result. This structure is an appropriate institutional form to enable the GEF to meet its mandate and operations. OPS3 recommends that (i) the GEF Secretariat's role as the network administrative office be strengthened; (ii) there be more clarity in the roles and responsibilities for all GEF partners, especially IAs, EAs and STAP; (iii) the GEF foster M&E at all levels; and, (iv) launch a private sector initiative.
- (g) **Small Grants Program.** The SGP is well-received by recipient countries and increases the visibility of the GEF. The flexibility of the SGP has allowed for innovative thinking and

design of activities to meet country needs and capacities in SIDS and LDCs. OPS3 recommends that there should be an increase in this program's funding allocation.

Project Implementation Reviews

Under the monitoring and evaluation program, project implementation reviews are carried out annually by the GEF Implementing Agencies and the Secretariat. The reviews have two purposes: 1) to examine the status of GEF projects, and 2) to identify lessons learned from GEF experience and share them broadly within the GEF family and with other interested parties. The project review process is designed to complement and strengthen internal portfolio management procedures used by the Implementing Agencies.

For the 1997 project implementation review, each agency was asked to prepare a financial analysis of its GEF portfolio, a summary overview emphasizing key trends in this portfolio and lessons learned to date, and individual reports for all projects that had been in implementation for at least a year as of June 30, 1997. Each project report rated implementation progress and the likelihood that its global environmental objectives would be achieved. In addition, agencies were asked to address two crosscutting issues in their overviews and project reports: 1) experience in obtaining stakeholder involvement and assuring that projects are country-driven and reflect recipient commitment, and 2) the extent of private sector (NGO and for-profit) involvement in the project and any factors that may limit such involvement.

The 1997 review provides a summary of the portfolio of projects in implementation in each of the GEF's four focal areas. About half of the projects reviewed were in the biodiversity focal area. The review highlights the areas of significant progress identified during the FY97, experiences gained in implementing projects over the past year, and the principal challenges facing projects in the area of biological diversity. Copies of the 1997 review will be available to the Parties at their fourth meeting.

The 1998 Project Performance Report presents the results of the Project Implementation Review 1998 (PIR). In addition, the report goes beyond the implementation review and draws on additional information and insights about the performance of GEF's programs for evaluations and other studies. This broader focus complements the Program Status Review prepared for each Operational Program, and provides an assessment of important cross-cutting issues and lessons identified from implementation experience. Some of the main findings were:

- The active and full engagement of communities in all stages of projects design, implementation and monitoring is a key determinant of project success. It leads to greater "ownership" of project activities
- Biodiversity projects need to combine conservation efforts with activities that address more immediate socio-economic needs and are sensitive to political processes.
- GEF biodiversity projects are generally overly ambitious, have too many objectives, and have implementation periods that are too short.
- The long term financing and sustainability of biodiversity conservation and sustainable use projects remain major questions.

- It is important to understand the root causes of the threats to biodiversity loss. This often implies giving attention to the policy and socio-economic environment within which biodiversity projects are carried out, in addition to technical or site-specific factors.
- Support is needed from the full range of government actors (including local and regional agencies) and private sector stakeholders (including timber and mining companies, wildlife traders and large landowners).

Study of GEF Project Lessons (1997)

The 1997 Study of GEF Project Lessons assessed the experience to date of projects approved during the Pilot Phase to identify factors that account for GEF project success or problems. It entailed a general review of 30 projects, with field visits to five sites and more detailed analysis of another six of these projects. The study focused particular attention on three topics identified as high priority by project managers and staff and reflect the fact that stakeholder participation is a key feature of the GEF: (1) building partnerships and understanding among project implementers and communities, (2) integration of project activities with national policies and priorities, and (3) approaches to ensure effective private sector involvement in GEF projects. The study was to provide the basis for a series of “Project Lessons Notes” planned by the GEF Monitoring and Evaluation team beginning in 1998.

The Role of Local Benefits in Global Environmental Programs

This study analyzes the inter-relationship between local benefits and global environment benefits in the GEF strategy and projects. In several GEF focal areas, local benefits, or recompense for costs incurred locally to protect the environment, are an essential means of generating and sustaining intended global benefits.

The study had a series of conclusions, some of which were directly related to planning, monitoring, evaluation, and learning. While these conclusions were written in the context of the local benefits study, they most likely apply across other projects. The main findings in this area were:

- Inadequate assessment of feasibility of activities upon which attainment of project objectives depended was a pervasive challenge.
- There were limitations in the supervision, monitoring, and evaluation of projects
- The systems of reporting to GEF do not provide sufficient information [on stakeholder involvement or local livelihood benefits and impacts.]
- Evaluations do not analyze why project components were not implemented
- Knowledge sharing and learning from experience did not emerge as major themes
- Challenges to effective processes of learning were found.

Key weaknesses in project monitoring mentioned include:

- Lack of meaningful indicators
- Weak monitoring systems
- Focus primarily on outputs and not outcomes.
- Over attribution of achievements

- Lack of incentives for M&E

Future Directions of M&E in GEF Biodiversity Focal Area

The Programming Document for GEF-4 presents a proposal for programming resources for the fourth replenishment period, which covers July 2006 through June 2010. In GEF-3 and GEF-4, monitoring and evaluation and the generation of lessons learned have taken on greater importance. This can be seen in the strategic priorities for GEF-4, in particular the fourth priority:

- 1) Catalyzing sustainability of protected area systems;
- 2) Mainstreaming biodiversity in production landscapes and sectors;
- 3) Capacity building for the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety; and
- 4) Generation and dissemination of best practices for addressing current and emerging biodiversity issues

One of the major elements of the management agenda for GEF-4 is the development of a system for improved knowledge management. The GEF, with its broad array of projects across the world, is in a unique position to learn from its experience. Learning is particularly important given the vast nature of the problems the GEF is trying to address and the finite resources it has to address them. At present, each Implementing Agency has put in place its own knowledge management system, but the GEF as a whole does not have a system. Over the course of GEF-4, it will be a goal to establish an integrated GEF knowledge management system that takes into account the systems and valuable experience of the Implementing Agencies. This management system will identify, disseminate, and incorporate into future project design and implementation lessons learned from both project successes and failures.

The process to measure the results of the biodiversity portfolio represents a continuation of the approach that was established during GEF-3. During GEF-3, portfolio-level monitoring tools (see earlier discussion on tracking tools) have been developed and will be applied to measure progress in achieving coverage and impact targets for Strategic Objectives 1 and 2. These tracking tools help aggregate project level outputs and outcomes to the program level and provides a means for verifying the achievement of the program level targets.

According to the Programming Document, GEF-4 programming is directly influenced by previous experience and studies. GEF evaluations have shown that lessons and good practices need to be better understood and more widely disseminated both internally and externally to produce further improvements in project design, implementation, and results. The proposed strategic priorities incorporate both implementation experience and improved understanding of technical issues and respond to the most relevant aspects of the GEF Biodiversity Program Study 2004. The document also states that portfolio monitoring to assess progress in achieving outcomes has been improved.

A key goal of the knowledge management system will be to improve the analysis, synthesis and dissemination of good practices, innovative approaches and new tools in biodiversity. This priority will be cross-cutting and will place a distinct emphasis on strategic objectives 1 and 2 above. The planned knowledge management system is an important step in the right direction for the GEF. It offers the opportunity to improve not only the way GEF does biodiversity

conservation and sustainable development, but also the way the rest of the world approaches these important issues.

Appendix A: Description of GEF Policy Framework⁹

GEF's mission is to serve as a mechanism for international cooperation for the purpose of providing new, and additional, grant and concessional funding to meet the agreed incremental costs of measures to achieve agreed global environmental benefits in the focal areas of biological diversity, climate change, international waters, and ozone layer depletion. Land degradation issues, primarily desertification and deforestation, as they relate to the four focal areas are also addressed.

The operational strategy was developed to guide the GEF in the preparation of country-driven initiatives in its emphasis areas mentioned above. This strategy guides the GEF Secretariat and the three Implementing Agencies (the United Nations Development Program, the United Nations Environment Program, and the World Bank) in developing work programs, business plans, and budgets. It also guides the GEF Council in approving these activities.

According to the strategy, monitoring and evaluation play an especially important role in the GEF for a number of reasons:

1. GEF's unique mission in the global environment requires it to develop strategies and projects whose designs, although scientifically based, may be more innovative or experimental than those of regular development projects.
2. GEF is pioneering new institutional relationships among the Bretton Woods and United Nations agencies in partnership with the participant countries, international conventions, NGOs, and other organizations.
3. The emphasis in the early part of the GEF project cycle on "casting the net widely" and the dynamic process of developing operational programs place a premium on continuous learning and improvement. As a consequence, the GEF will emphasize the quality of monitoring and evaluation systems and ensure that their findings are disseminated widely.

GEF operations are programmed in three broad, interrelated categories: operational programs, enabling activities, and short-term response measures.

Operational programs

Operational program is a conceptual and planning framework for the design, implementation, and coordination of a set of projects to achieve a global environmental objective in a particular focal area. In the focal areas of biological diversity and climate change, operational programs are developed in accordance with the program priorities approved by the Conference of the Parties to the Conventions. The objectives of operational programs are met through the development and implementation of projects in recipient countries, based on country-driven project opportunities and priorities.

On the basis of guidance from the Conventions, extensive consultations, and technical and scientific review, 10 initial operational programs have been proposed and adopted:

1. Biodiversity: Arid and semi-arid ecosystems

⁹ From GEFweb **Operational Strategy of the Global Environment Facility**

2. Biodiversity: Coastal, marine, and freshwater ecosystems (including wetlands)
3. Biodiversity: Forest ecosystems
4. Biodiversity: Mountain ecosystems
5. Climate change: Removing barriers to energy conservation and energy efficiency
6. Climate change: Promoting the adoption of renewable energy by removing barriers and reducing implementation costs
7. Climate change: Reducing the long-term costs of low greenhouse gas-emitting energy technologies
8. International waters: Waterbody-based program
9. International waters: Integrated land and water Multiple Focal Area
10. International waters: Contaminant-based program

Enabling activities

Enabling activities, including inventories, compilation of information, policy analysis, and strategies and action plans, represent a basic building block of GEF assistance to countries. Their functions include: fulfilling essential communication requirements to a Convention; providing a basic level of information to enable policy and strategic decision making; and/or assisting planning to identify country priority activities. Countries thus enabled will have the ability to formulate and direct sectoral and economy-wide programs to address global environmental problems through a cost-effective approach.

Short-term response measures

Although the large majority of GEF activities contribute directly to operational programs or enabling activities, some projects that are unrelated to either of these two categories are of sufficiently high priority that they may be considered for financing. Such projects are expected to yield significant strategic or programmatic benefits, but they should yield short-term benefits at a low cost. For example, climate change projects aimed *solely* at reducing the net emissions of greenhouse gases or urgent measures to conserve an extremely endangered species may be considered under this category.

Appendix B: Timeline of COP Guidance and GEF Responses on Program Strategies and M&E¹⁰

Year	What should the GEF do (COP guidance to GEF)	What data should be collected?	What was the GEF response to the guidance?	How did the GEF assess results?
STRATEGIES				
ACCESS AND BENEFIT-SHARING - GENETIC RESOURCES				
1996	COP3: "...support human and institutional capacity-building programmes for Governments, non-governmental organizations and local and indigenous communities, as appropriate, to promote the successful development and implementation of legislative, administrative and policy measures and guidances on access to genetic resources, including scientific, technical, business, legal and management skills and capacities" Decision III/5, para. 4	None specified	The Second CBD Review noted that the GEF had indicated a commitment to supporting specific "benefit sharing initiatives" such as policy, regulatory, and institutional frameworks for mechanisms that will facilitate access to genetic resources and benefit sharing. The revised GEF Guidelines for Additional Funding of Biodiversity Enabling Activities (expedited procedures) incorporated assessment of capacity building for access to genetic resources, benefit sharing, and formulation of mechanisms for these purposes. (See Chapter 6 of the 2004 Biodiversity Program Study for further assessment)	Reported to COP 04/15 on project status (countries, approval date, total cost, GEF portion, and project approval status); Noted 1st OPS to come out in 1998 - will assess progress toward achieving main objectives and guidelines from 1994 restructuring. Provided COP with 1997 Project Implementation Review - Summarizes portfolio of projects for GEF's 4 focal areas. Highlights areas of significant progress during 1997, experiences gained and principal challenges.
1998	COP4: "... provide support for: (i) Stock-taking activities, such as, for example, assessments of current legislative, administrative and policy measures on access to genetic resources and benefit-sharing, evaluation of the strengths and weaknesses of a country's institutional and human capacity, and promotion of consensus-building among its different stakeholders; (ii) Formulation of access and benefit-sharing mechanisms at the national, subregional and regional levels, including monitoring, assessment, and incentive measures; (iii) Capacity-building on measures on access to genetic resources and sharing of benefits, including capacity building on economic valuation of genetic resources; (iv) Within biodiversity projects, other specific benefit sharing initiatives such as support for entrepreneurial developments by local and indigenous communities, facilitation of financial sustainability of projects promoting the sustainable use of genetic resources, and appropriate targeted research components" Decision IV/13, para. 8	None specified		Reported to COP 05/07 on project status (countries, approval date, total cost, GEF portion, and project approval status); Also gave textual description of alien species, taxonomy, inland waters, forest issues, clearinghouse mechanism, incentive measures, access & benefit sharing. Presented summary results from Project Performance Report 1998 (based on project implementation review 1998).
2000	COP5: "...provide support ... [f]or projects that will address the issue of access and benefit-sharing, in accordance with decision V/26" Decision V/13, paragraph 2(g)	None specified		

¹⁰ The majority of this information comes directly from the GEF Biodiversity Program Study 2004, Annex 4.

Year	What should the GEF do (COP guidance to GEF)	What data should be collected?	What was the GEF response to the guidance?	How did the GEF assess results?
2002	COP6: "...provide financial resources ... [F]or projects that assist with the implementation of the Action Plan on Capacity-building for Access and Benefit-sharing in support of the implementation of the Bonn Guidelines on Access to Genetic Resources and Fair and Equitable Sharing of the Benefit Arising out of their Utilization" Decision VI/17, para. 10(m)	None specified		
2004	COP7: "...provide financial resources for country-driven projects based on national priorities that assist with the implementation of the Action Plan in support of the implementation of the Bonn Guidelines on Access to Genetic Resources and Fair and Equitable Sharing of Benefits Arising out of their Utilization, and...to support capacity-building regarding the transfer of technologies which enables providers to fully appreciate and actively participate in benefit-sharing arrangements at the stage of granting access permits. Decision VII/20, para. 19	None specified		
ACCESS TO AND TRANSFER OF TECHNOLOGY				
1994	COP1: "The programme priorities are ...projects which promote access to, transfer of and cooperation for joint development of technology" Decision I/2, annex I, para. 4 (f)	Text, lists - nothing specific but general report required	The Action Plan to Respond to Recommendations for Improving GEF's Performance includes actions that respond directly to CBD guidance concerning transfer of technology through the development of a strategy to better engage the private sector.	Reported to COP 02/08 on project status (description, involved agencies, approval date, duration, total cost, GEF portion, and project approval status)
2004	COP7: "...provide adequate and timely financial support for the implementation of the programme of work on technology transfer and technological and scientific cooperation...in particular for: (a) Building policy, legal, judicial and administrative capacity; (b) Facilitating access to relevant proprietary technologies; (c) Providing other financial and non-financial incentives for the diffusion of relevant technologies; (d) Building capacities of, and empowering, indigenous and local communities and all relevant stakeholders with respect to access to and use of relevant technologies; (e) Improving the capacity of national research institutions in developing countries and countries with economies in transition for the development of technologies, as well as for adaptation, diffusion and the further development of imported technologies consistent with their transfer agreement and international law including through fellowships and international exchange programmes; (f) Supporting the development and operation of regional or international initiatives to assist technology transfer and cooperation as well as scientific and technical cooperation, including those initiatives designed to facilitate South-South cooperation and South-South joint development of new technologies; Decision VII/20, para. 12	None specified		

Year	What should the GEF do (COP guidance to GEF)	What data should be collected?	What was the GEF response to the guidance?	How did the GEF assess results?
AGRICULTURAL BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY				
1996	COP3: "...[support] efforts for the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity important to agriculture, in accordance with decision III/11" Decision III/5, para. 2 (c)	None specified	The new OP on agribiodiversity was a direct response to this area of guidance. Following COP6, 10 new projects were approved in this area. By the end of 2003, the GEF had approved \$19.7 million. Examples of projects dealing with pollinators in agriculture: Community-Based Management of On-Farm Plant Genetic Resources in Arid and Semi-Arid Areas of Sub-Saharan Africa; Conservation and Management of Pollinators for Sustainable Agriculture through an Ecosystem Approach (pipeline).	Reported to COP 04/15 on project status (countries, approval date, total cost, GEF portion, and project approval status); Noted 1st OPS to come out in 1998 - will assess progress toward achieving main objectives and guidelines from 1994 restructuring. Provided COP with 1997 Project Implementation Review - Summarizes portfolio of projects for GEF's 4 focal areas. Highlights areas of significant progress during 1997, experiences gained and principal challenges.
2000	COP5: "...[support] projects which: (i) Implement the Convention's programme of work on agricultural biodiversity...through the timely finalization and implementation of its operational programme on agricultural biodiversity, and through the development and implementation of other relevant operational programmes ... For projects which assist with the development and implementation of the International Initiative for the Conservation and Sustainable Use of Pollinators in Agriculture..."; Decision V/13, paragraphs 2(b.i) and 2(c)	None specified		
2002	COP6: "...[support] projects that assist with the implementation of the Plan of Action for the International Initiative for the Conservation and Sustainable Use of Pollinators by developing country Parties ... To build capacity of developing country Parties ...to participate effectively in the preparatory process for the first Report on the State of World's Animal Genetic Resources" Decision VI/17, paragraphs 10(g) and 10(h)	None specified		
INDIGENOUS & LOCAL COMMUNITIES				
1994	COP1: "...[support] projects that strengthen the involvement of local and indigenous people in the conservation of biological diversity and sustainable use of its components" Decision I/2, annex I, para. 4 (j)	Text, lists - nothing specific but general report required	The GEF has supported a substantive portfolio of projects with components addressing indigenous community priorities. SGP has funded over 100 projects with indigenous peoples; the new GEF CEO has demonstrated strong commitment in this area.	Reported to COP 02/08 on project status (description, involved agencies, approval date, duration, total cost, GEF portion, and project approval status)
1996	COP3: "...Examine the support of capacity-building projects for indigenous and local communities embodying traditional lifestyles related to the preservation and maintenance of their knowledge, innovations and practices relevant to the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity with their prior informed consent and their participation" Decision III/5, para. 5	None specified		Reported to COP 04/15 on project status (countries, approval date, total cost, GEF portion, and project approval status); Noted 1st OPS to come out in 1998 - will assess progress toward achieving main objectives and guidelines from 1994 restructuring. Provided COP with 1997 Project Implementation Review

Year	What should the GEF do (COP guidance to GEF)	What data should be collected?	What was the GEF response to the guidance?	How did the GEF assess results?
				- Summarizes portfolio of projects for GEF's 4 focal areas. Highlights areas of significant progress during 1997, experiences gained and principal challenges.
2000	COP5: "...provide support ... [f]or the implementation of the priority activities identified in the programme of work on Article 8(j) and related provisions..." Decision V/13, paragraph 2(i)	None specified		
2002	COP6: "...provide financial resources ... [f]or the enhancement of national capacities for the establishment and maintenance of mechanisms to protect traditional knowledge at national and subnational levels, and for building the capacity of indigenous and local communities to develop strategies and systems for the protection of traditional knowledge" Decision VI/17, para. 10(n)	COP7: Indicators on the state of retention of traditional knowledge, innovations and practices should be established with the active involvement of indigenous and local communities, in consultation with relevant organizations, in connection with the ongoing work on indicators under the Convention; Indicators to assess the success or failure of measures to promote or preserve traditional knowledge, innovations and practices should be established, with the active involvement of indigenous and local communities, in connection with the ongoing work on indicators under the Convention; Information on legislative measures to protect traditional knowledge, innovations and practices as drawn from regional and national reports, should be kept up to date. (Source: Decision VII/16; http://www.biodiv.org/decisions/default.aspx?m=COP-07&id=7753&lg=0)		

Year	What should the GEF do (COP guidance to GEF)	What data should be collected?	What was the GEF response to the guidance?	How did the GEF assess results?
CARTAGENA PROTOCOL ON BIOSAFETY				
1996	COP3: "...provide financial resources ... [f]or capacity-building in biosafety, including for the implementation...of the UNEP International Technical Guidelines on Safety in Biotechnology" Decision III/5, para. 2 (a)	None specified	In November 2000, the Council approved the GEF's Initial Strategy for Assisting Countries to Prepare for the Entry into Force of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety. This strategy included the Council approval of a global GEF/UNEP project, the Development of National Biosafety Frameworks. The project is designed to assist 100 participating countries to set up their national frameworks for the management of living modified organisms (LMOs), allowing them to meet the requirements of the Cartagena Protocol. The project has been extended to another 20 eligible countries. In addition, the strategy included the implementation of 12 demonstration projects to support countries in the implementation of their national biosafety frameworks. One of the GEF3 strategic priorities is specific on biosafety and allocates about \$200 million.	Reported to COP 04/15 on project status (countries, approval date, total cost, GEF portion, and project approval status); Noted 1st OPS to come out in 1998 - will assess progress toward achieving main objectives and guidelines from 1994 restructuring. Provided COP with 1997 Project Implementation Review - Summarizes portfolio of projects for GEF's 4 focal areas. Highlights areas of significant progress during 1997, experiences gained and principal challenges.
2002	COP6: "...provide financial resources ... [F]or national capacity-building in biosafety, in particular for enabling effective participation in the Biosafety Clearing-House and in the implementation of the Action Plan for Building Capacities for the Effective Implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety...and for other needs identified in the recommendations of the Intergovernmental	None specified		
CLEARING-HOUSE MECHANISM AND SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL CO-OPERATION				
1994	COP1: "...[support] activities that provide access to other international, national and/or private sector funds and scientific and technical cooperation" Decision I/2, annex I, para. 4 (h)	Text, lists - nothing specific but general report required	GEF's revised operational criteria for enabling activities made provisions for capacity building in support of the CHM; a CHM Unit has developed web pages on biosafety and for various biodiversity keywords. In 2004 GEF approved a project supporting the development of the Inter-American Biodiversity Information Network (IABIN), a	Reported to COP 02/08 on project status (description, involved agencies, approval date, duration, total cost, GEF portion, and project approval status)
1995	COP2: "...Explore the modalities of providing support through...for capacity-building in relation to the operation of the clearinghouse mechanism" Decision II/3, para. 9, and Decision II/6, para. 11	Text, lists - nothing specific but general report required		Reported to COP 03/05 on project status (countries, description, involved agencies, approval date, duration, total cost, GEF portion, and project approval status)

Year	What should the GEF do (COP guidance to GEF)	What data should be collected?	What was the GEF response to the guidance?	How did the GEF assess results?
1996	<p>COP3: "...[support] the following activities as critical components in the implementation of the clearing house mechanism...: (i) Capacity-building...including training in information systems technologies that will allow developing countries to take advantage of the recent developments in electronic communication, including the Internet; (ii) Country-driven pilot projects, focused on priority areas... which would enable developing countries to begin to implement the main features of the pilot-phase of the clearing-house mechanism" Decision III/5, para. 2 (d)</p>	None specified	regional clearinghouse. However, there is no clear indication whether the mechanism is becoming more effective and sustainable.	Reported to COP 04/15 on project status (countries, approval date, total cost, GEF portion, and project approval status); Noted 1st OPS to come out in 1998 - will assess progress toward achieving main objectives and guidelines from 1994 restructuring. Provided COP with 1997 Project Implementation Review - Summarizes portfolio of projects for GEF's 4 focal areas. Highlights areas of significant progress during 1997, experiences gained and principal challenges.
1998	<p>COP4: "...(i) Support capacity building activities and country-driven pilot projects focused on priority areas, as critical components in the implementation of the clearing-house mechanism at the national, subregional, biogeographic, and regional levels...; (ii) Provide...increased support...to promote the objectives of the Convention, to establish and strengthen biodiversity information systems such as, inter alia, training, technology and processes related to the collection, organization, maintenance and updating of data and information and its communication to users through the clearing-house mechanism; (iii) Evaluate at the end of the clearing-house mechanism pilot phase the experience of the Global Environment Facility's support for developing countries' activities, to consider additional efforts to meet the increasing interest in taking part in and having access to the clearing-house mechanism...and to report to the Conference of the Parties prior to the next meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice" Decision IV/13, para. 5</p>	None specified		Noted GEF Secretariat preparing a separate report of GEF's support for developing country activities to participate in the learning-house mechanism.; Reported to COP 05/07 on project status (countries, approval date, total cost, GEF portion, and project approval status); Also gave textual description of alien species, taxonomy, inland waters, forest issues, clearinghouse mechanism, incentive measures, access & benefit sharing. Presented summary results from Project Performance Report 1998 (based on project implementation review 1998).
2000	<p>COP5: "...[support] participation in the clearing-house mechanism of the Convention..." Decision V/13, paragraph 2(f)</p>	None specified		
COMPONENTS OF BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY PARTICULARLY UNDER THREAT				
1995	<p>COP2: "...implement the relevant provisions of the following decisions: II/8 on preliminary consideration of components of biological diversity particularly under threat and action which could be taken under the Convention" Decision II/6, paragraph 11</p>	Text, lists - nothing specific but general report required	UNEP/CBD/COP/2/8: In 1995, funded 3 projects (Guatemala, India, and Indonesia) for a total of \$37.5 million that addressed this programme priority.	Reported to COP 03/05 on project status (countries, description, involved agencies, approval date, duration, total cost, GEF portion, and project approval status)
DRY AND SUB-HUMID LANDS BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY				

Year	What should the GEF do (COP guidance to GEF)	What data should be collected?	What was the GEF response to the guidance?	How did the GEF assess results?
1994	COP1: “The programme priorities are ... [p]rojects which promote the conservation of biological diversity and sustainable use of its components in other environmentally vulnerable areas such as arid and semi-arid and mountainous areas” Decision I/2, annex I, para. 4 (k)	Text, lists - nothing specific but general report required	Funding in the Arid and Semi-Arid Ecosystems OP increased more than four times, from about \$29 million during the pilot phase to \$110 million by 98-99. By the end of 2003, the GEF had approved an additional \$180 million. As desertification was an increasingly relevant and prevalent global issue and threat, this area of GEF biodiversity activity also increased in importance and emphasis.	Reported to COP 02/08 on project status (description, involved agencies, approval date, duration, total cost, GEF portion, and project approval status)
2000	COP5: “...[support] as a priority...projects which: (ii) Implement the Convention’s programme of work on biodiversity of dry and sub-humid lands...through the development, review and implementation of its operational programmes, in particular, the operational programme on arid and semi-arid ecosystems” Decision V/13, paragraph 2(b.ii)	None specified		
ECOSYSTEM APPROACH				
2000	COP5: “...provide support ... [f]or projects utilizing the ecosystem approach, without prejudice to differing national needs and priorities which may require the application of approaches such as single-species conservation programmes...” Decision V/13, paragraph 2(a)	None specified	The GEF has launched a new OP on Integrated Ecosystem Management (OP12). By the end of 2003, the GEF had approved 23 projects in this OP for a total cumulative value of about \$77 million.	
2004	COP7: ...support for the implementation of the ecosystem approach...; Decision VII/20, para. 5	None specified		
EDUCATION AND PUBLIC AWARENESS				
1996	COP3: “...in preparing projects..., to include in such projects... project components addressing ... [p]romotion of the understanding of the importance of, and measures required for, the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity” Decision III/5, para. 6 (b)	None specified	Almost all GEF projects have education and public awareness as essential components. SGP country programs also devote considerable resources to community and NGO activities that enhance public education and awareness. Since 1996, UNDP, on behalf of the GEF family and in close consultation with the Secretariat and other IAs, has coordinated the organization of many national and regional or subregional Country Dialogue Workshops (CDWs) to promote country ownership and awareness building by means of country-level dialogue. CDWs have helped inform broad-based national audiences about the GEF and can be considered very successful in addressing issues related to communication,	Reported to COP 04/15 on project status (countries, approval date, total cost, GEF portion, and project approval status); Noted 1st OPS to come out in 1998 - will assess progress toward achieving main objectives and guidelines from 1994 restructuring. Provided COP with 1997 Project Implementation Review - Summarizes portfolio of projects for GEF's 4 focal areas. Highlights areas of significant progress during 1997, experiences gained and principal challenges.
2000	COP5: “...provide support ... [f]or capacity development for education, public awareness and communication in biological diversity at the national and regional levels...” Decision V/13, para. 2(l)	None specified		
2002	COP6: “...provide financial resources ... [F]or capacity development and country-driven projects prioritized in the Global Initiative on Communication, Education and Public Awareness” Decision VI/17, para. 10(o)	None specified		

Year	What should the GEF do (COP guidance to GEF)	What data should be collected?	What was the GEF response to the guidance?	How did the GEF assess results?
2004	COP7: ...provide funding to developing countries...and countries with economies in transition for the implementation of their national CEPA programmes and activities; Decision VII/20, para. 18	None specified	awareness, and education. The GEF is supporting a second phase of CDW in 2004.	
ENDEMIC SPECIES				
1994	COP1: “The programme priorities are ... [p]rojects that promote the conservation and/or sustainable use of endemic species” Decision I/2, annex I, para. 4 (l)	Text, lists - nothing specific but general report required	Report to COP 03/05 - lists projects in Lebanon, Jordan, Peru, and Sierra Leone that address endemic species	Reported to COP 02/08 on project status (description, involved agencies, approval date, duration, total cost, GEF portion, and project approval status)
FOREST BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY				
1998	COP4: “...provide adequate and timely financial support...for projects and capacity-building activities for implementing the programme of work of forest biological diversity...and the use of the clearing-house mechanism to include activities that contribute to halting and addressing deforestation, basic assessments and monitoring of forest biological diversity, including taxonomic studies and inventories, focusing on forest species, other important components of forest biological diversity and ecosystems under threat” Decision IV/13, para. 4	None specified	As of 2000, some 60% of the 320 protected areas supported by GEF projects were in forested ecosystems. By the end of 2003, the GEF had approved 116 projects through the forest OP for almost \$600 million. The second strategic priority in GEF3 includes mainstreaming of biodiversity into production landscapes and sectors, including forestry.	Reported to COP 05/07 on project status (countries, approval date, total cost, GEF portion, and project approval status); Also gave textual description of alien species, taxonomy, inland waters, forest issues, clearinghouse mechanism, incentive measures, access & benefit sharing. Presented summary results from Project Performance Report 1998 (based on project implementation review 1998).
2000	COP5: “...provide support ...for projects which: (iii) Assist in the implementation of the programme of work on forest biodiversity at the national, subregional and regional levels, and consider the operational objectives of the aforementioned programme of work as guidance for funding...” Decision V/13, para. 2(b.iii)	None specified		
2002	COP6: “...provide financial resources ... [F]or country-driven projects focusing on the identified national priorities, as well as regional and international actions that assist the implementation of the expanded work programme considering conservation of biological diversity, sustainable use of its components and fair and equitable sharing of the benefits from genetic resources in a balanced way, underscoring the importance of ensuring long-term conservation, sustainable use, and benefit-sharing of native forests” Decision VI/17, para. 10(c)	None specified		
GLOBAL STRATEGY FOR PLANT CONSERVATION				
2002	COP6: “...provide financial resources ... [f]or country-driven capacity-building activities...for the implementation of the Global Strategy for Plant Conservation” Decision VI/17, para. 10(d)	None specified	No action or strategy has been identified through available documentation.	
GLOBAL TAXONOMY INITIATIVE				

Year	What should the GEF do (COP guidance to GEF)	What data should be collected?	What was the GEF response to the guidance?	How did the GEF assess results?
1998	COP4: "... provide financial resources for country-driven activities within the context of its operation programmes to participate in the Global Taxonomy Initiative which take into account as appropriate, elements of the Suggestions for Action contained in the annex to decision IV/1 D" Decision IV/13, para. 2	None specified	A number of projects have supported the collection of information and biological specimens for incorporation in taxonomic collections and for taxonomy identification (see Chapter 6 of the 2004 Biodiversity Program Study)	Reported to COP 05/07 on project status (countries, approval date, total cost, GEF portion, and project approval status); Also gave textual description of alien species, taxonomy, inland waters, forest issues, clearinghouse mechanism, incentive measures, access & benefit sharing. Presented summary results from Project Performance Report 1998 (based on project implementation review 1998).
2000	COP5: "...provide support ... [t]o continue promoting awareness of the Global Taxonomy Initiative in the relevant activities of the Global Environment Facility, such as the Country Dialogue Workshops, and to facilitate capacity-building in taxonomy, including in its Capacity Development Initiative" Decision V/13, paragraph 2(k)	None specified		
2002	COP6: "...provide financial resources ... [f]or national and regional taxonomic capacity-building, as a basis for implementing the programme of work for the Global Taxonomy Initiative, with particular attention to funding country-driven pilot projects identified under the Global Taxonomy Initiative..." Decision VI/17, para. 10(f)	None specified		
2004	COP7: "...take full account of the importance of taxonomic capacities in achieving the goals of the Convention, to support taxonomic activities to attain the 2010 target, and to provide all necessary support to national, and where appropriate regional , taxonomic centres of research and expertise; and urges the...[provision of] adequate and timely support to developing countries to assist in the implementation of the Global Taxonomy Initiative, and for integrating taxonomic capacity-building activities into thematic and cross-cutting programmes, including supporting activities and projects, such as, where appropriate, stand-alone capacity-building projects; Decision VII/20, para. 7	None specified		
INCENTIVE MEASURES				
1994	COPI: "The programme priorities are ... [i]nnovative measures, including in the field of economic incentives, aiming at conservation of biological diversity and/or sustainable use of its components, including those which assist developing countries to address situations where opportunity costs are incurred by local communities and to identify ways and means by which these can be compensated..." Decision I/2, para. 4 (i)	Text, lists - nothing specific but general report required	The Second CBD Review noted that IAs, like the World Bank, have "made many efforts to overcome the dilemma of benefits of environmental abuse vs. benefits from environmental	Reported to COP 02/08 on project status (description, involved agencies, approval date, duration, total cost, GEF portion, and project approval status)

Year	What should the GEF do (COP guidance to GEF)	What data should be collected?	What was the GEF response to the guidance?	How did the GEF assess results?
1996	COP3: "... [r]econfirms the importance of the Global Environment Facility's support for incentive measures... Decision III/5, para. 3	None specified	conservation/sustainability with more promotion of win-win policies, more quantitative measurement of economic benefits from improving the environment, more emphasis on better resource management, and helping countries improve M&E and enforcement of environmental regulations" (World Bank, 2000). Several projects approved following COP6 have incentives measures components. However, it is not clear whether these measures will be more effective or easier to implement than before the evaluations.	Reported to COP 04/15 on project status (countries, approval date, total cost, GEF portion, and project approval status); Noted 1st OPS to come out in 1998 - will assess progress toward achieving main objectives and guidelines from 1994 restructuring. Provided COP with 1997 Project Implementation Review - Summarizes portfolio of projects for GEF's 4 focal areas. Highlights areas of significant progress during 1997, experiences gained and principal challenges.
1998	COP4: "...provide adequate and timely support for the design and approaches relevant to the implementation of incentive measures, including, where necessary, assessment of biological diversity of the relevant ecosystems, capacity building necessary for the design and implementation of incentive measures and the development of appropriate legal and policy frameworks, and projects with components that provide for these incentives..." Decision IV/13, para. 7	None specified		Reported to COP 05/07 on project status (countries, approval date, total cost, GEF portion, and project approval status); Also gave textual description of alien species, taxonomy, inland waters, forest issues, clearinghouse mechanism, incentive measures, access & benefit sharing. Presented summary results from Project Performance Report 1998 (based on project implementation review 1998).
2000	COP5: "...provide support ... [f]or projects that incorporate incentive measures that promote the development and implementation of social, economic and legal incentive measures for the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity..." Decision V/13, paragraph 2(h)	None specified		
2002	COP6: "...provide financial resources ... for projects that assist with the implementation of the programme of work on incentive measures..." Decision VI/17, Para. 10(j)	None specified		
INLAND WATER ECOSYSTEMS				

Year	What should the GEF do (COP guidance to GEF)	What data should be collected?	What was the GEF response to the guidance?	How did the GEF assess results?
1998	COP4: "... within the context of implementing national biological diversity strategies and action plans, provide adequate and timely support to eligible projects which help Parties to develop and implement national, sectoral and cross-sectoral plans for the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity of inland water ecosystems..." Decision IV/13, para. 3	None specified	As of 2002, 40% of projects in OP2 (coastal, marine, and freshwater) and almost 50% in OP12 addressed watershed management issues.	Reported to COP 05/07 on project status (countries, approval date, total cost, GEF portion, and project approval status); Also gave textual description of alien species, taxonomy, inland waters, forest issues, clearinghouse mechanism, incentive measures, access & benefit sharing. Presented summary results from Project Performance Report 1998 (based on project implementation review 1998).
2000	COP5: "...provide support. ... for the implementation of capacity-building measures for developing and implementing national and sectoral plans for the conservation and sustainable use of inland water ecosystems, including comprehensive assessments of the biological diversity of inland waters, and capacity-building programmes for monitoring the implementation of the programme of work and the trends in inland water biological diversity and for information gathering and dissemination among riparian communities" Decision V/13, paragraph 2(n)	None specified		
2002	COP6: "...provide financial resources ... for projects that assist with the implementation of the programme of work on biological diversity of inland water ecosystems" Decision VI/17, para. 10(i)	None specified		
INVASIVE ALIEN SPECIES				
1998	COP4: "... provide adequate and timely support for country-driven projects at national, regional and subregional levels addressing the issue of alien species..." Decision IV/13, para. 1	None specified	The Second CBD Review noted that the GEF had allocated \$34.5 million in direct funding to seven projects by 1999, as well as \$35.5 million in co-financing for the control and eradication of invasive alien species. See Chapter 6 of the 2004 Biodiversity Program Study.	Reported to COP 05/07 on project status (countries, approval date, total cost, GEF portion, and project approval status); Also gave textual description of alien species, taxonomy, inland waters, forest issues, clearinghouse mechanism, incentive measures, access & benefit sharing. Presented summary results from Project Performance Report 1998 (based on project implementation review 1998).
2000	COP5: "...provide support... for activities to implement the Global Invasive Species Programme..." Decision V/13, paragraph 2(m)	None specified		

Year	What should the GEF do (COP guidance to GEF)	What data should be collected?	What was the GEF response to the guidance?	How did the GEF assess results?
2002	COP6: "...provide financial resources ... [a]s a priority, for projects that assist with the development and implementation, at national and regional levels, of the invasive alien species strategies and action plans...in particular those strategies and actions related to geographically and evolutionarily isolated ecosystems, paying particular attention to the needs of least developed countries and small island developing States, including needs related to capacity-building" Decision VI/17, para. 10(k)	None specified		
2004	COP7: "...provide financial support to developing countries...and countries with economies in transition, to assist in the improved prevention, rapid response and management measures to address threats of alien invasive species; Decision VII/20, para. 9	None specified		
MARINE AND COASTAL BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY				
1994	COP1: "The programme priorities are ...projects that promote the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity of coastal and marine resources under threat" Decision I/2, annex I, para. 4 (k)	Text, lists - nothing specific but general report required	By 2002, the GEF had funded 32 projects to address conservation and sustainable use in key coral reef areas. In 2003, an approach providing some operational guidance to the IAs to stimulate development of projects that provide multiple benefits to coral conservation and management and also address biodiversity was developed. In November 2003, the GEF approved the project Coral Reef Targeted Research and Capacity Building (\$11.7 million).	Reported to COP 02/08 on project status (description, involved agencies, approval date, duration, total cost, GEF portion, and project approval status)
2000	COP5: "...provide support ... for capacity-building at the national, subregional and regional level to address the issue of coral bleaching within the context of implementation of the programme of work on marine and coastal biological diversity..." Decision V/13, para. 2(d)	None specified		
2002	COP6: "...provide financial resources ... for country-driven activities aimed at enhancing capabilities to address the impacts of mortality related to coral bleaching and physical degradation and destruction of coral reefs, including developing rapid response capabilities to implement measures to address coral-reef degradation, mortality and subsequent recovery" Decision VI/17, para. 10(e)	None specified		
2004	COP7: "...provide financial support for the implementation of the elaborated programme of work on marine and coastal biodiversity; Decision VII/20, para. 3	None specified		
MOUNTAIN ECOSYSTEMS				
1994	COP1: "The programme priorities are ... [p]rojects which promote the conservation of biological diversity and sustainable use of its components in other environmentally vulnerable areas such as arid and semi-arid and mountainous areas" Decision I/2, annex I, para. 4 (k)	Text, lists - nothing specific but general report required	By the end of 2003, the GEF had approved 27 projects through the mountain program (OP4) for a total cumulative value of \$134 million.	Reported to COP 02/08 on project status (description, involved agencies, approval date, duration, total cost, GEF portion, and project approval status)
NATIONAL REPORTS				
1995	COP2: "...make available financial resources to developing country Parties to assist in the preparation of their national reports" Decision II/6, para. 11	Text, lists - nothing specific but general report required	OPS2 concluded that the GEF had been responsive to requests from the conventions to support countries in meeting their requirements. Following guidance from COP5, the	Reported to COP 03/05 on project status (countries, description, involved agencies, approval date, duration, total cost, GEF portion, and project approval status)

Year	What should the GEF do (COP guidance to GEF)	What data should be collected?	What was the GEF response to the guidance?	How did the GEF assess results?
1998	COP4: "...continue to provide financial assistance for the preparation of national reports, having regard to the constraints and needs identified by Parties in their first national reports..." Decision IV/13, para. 6	None specified	GEF revised the Guidelines for Additional Funding of Biodiversity Enabling Activities (expedited procedures) to include GEF support for the consultative process to assist countries with the preparation of second national reports. Between 75 and 80 countries received GEF support for a consultative process in view of preparing second national reports.	Reported to COP 05/07 on project status (countries, approval date, total cost, GEF portion, and project approval status); Also gave textual description of alien species, taxonomy, inland waters, forest issues, clearinghouse mechanism, incentive measures, access & benefit sharing. Presented summary results from Project Performance Report 1998 (based on project implementation review 1998).
2000	COP5: "...provide support ... [for] assisting with the preparation of second national reports, taking into account the fact that the Conference of the Parties may develop guidelines for subsequent national reports" Decision V/13, paragraph 2(e)	None specified		
2002	COP6: "...provide financial resources ... in a timely manner, to eligible Parties for the preparation of national reports" Decision VI/17, para. (l)	None specified		
2004	COP7: ...collaborate to strengthen the various capacities of Parties, particularly developing country Parties and countries with economies in transition, to prepare their future national and thematic reports; 15. ...analyse the progress of Parties, particularly developing country Parties and countries with economies in transition, in implementing the Convention, in relation to those areas identified as a priority by those countries, in order to inter alia assist them in the preparation of their future national reports; 16. ...explore ways to expedite and simplify its procedures for allocating funds to the eligible countries to prepare their national reports to fulfill their reporting obligations under the Convention; 17. ...provide the necessary financial support to facilitate the preparation of the third national reports by the Parties; Decision VII/20, paras. 14, 15, 16 and 17	None specified		
TARGETED RESEARCH AND RELATED ACTIVITIES				
1994	COP1: "The programme priorities are ... [p]rojects that promote the sustainability of project benefits; that offer a potential contribution to experience in the conservation of biological diversity and sustainable use of its components which may have application elsewhere; and that encourage scientific excellence" Decision I/2, annex I, para. 4 (g)	Text, lists - nothing specific but general report required	Several GEF projects have incorporated research components to find solutions to problems of biodiversity conservation and sustainable use, which have	Reported to COP 02/08 on project status (description, involved agencies, approval date, duration, total cost, GEF portion, and project approval status)

Year	What should the GEF do (COP guidance to GEF)	What data should be collected?	What was the GEF response to the guidance?	How did the GEF assess results?
1996	<p>COP3: "...in preparing projects..., to include in such projects... project components addressing: [t]argeted research which contributes to conservation of biological diversity and the sustainable use of its components including research for reversing current trends of biodiversity loss and species extinction" Decision III/5, para. 6 (a)</p>	None specified	generated valuable information for making sound conservation management decisions.	Reported to COP 04/15 on project status (countries, approval date, total cost, GEF portion, and project approval status); Noted 1st OPS to come out in 1998 - will assess progress toward achieving main objectives and guidelines from 1994 restructuring. Provided COP with 1997 Project Implementation Review - Summarizes portfolio of projects for GEF's 4 focal areas. Highlights areas of significant progress during 1997, experiences gained and principal challenges.
MILLENNIUM DEVELOPMENT GOALS				
2004	<p>COP7: ...as a contribution towards the Millennium Development Goals, to implement development activities in ways that are consistent with, and do not compromise, the achievement of the objectives of the Convention on Biological Diversity and the 2010 target, including by improving environmental policies in relevant development agencies and sectors such as through integrating concerns relating to biodiversity and the Millennium Development Goals more directly into environmental impact assessments, strategic environmental assessments and other such tools, including at the national level through the national strategies for sustainable development and the poverty reduction strategies and programmes, and invites the GEF to support capacity-building activities in developing countries for this purpose; Decision VII/20, para. 13</p>	None specified	No action or strategy has been identified through available documentation.	
BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY AND CLIMATE CHANGE				
2004	<p>COP7: ...provide financial support to developing country Parties...and countries with economies in transition, where appropriate, for: (a) Country-driven activities, including pilot projects, aimed at projects related to ecosystem conservation, restoration of degraded lands and marine environments and overall ecosystem integrity that take into account impacts of climate change; (b) Assistance in capacity-building with the aim of increasing the effectiveness in addressing environmental issues through their commitments under the Convention on Biological Diversity, the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, and the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification, inter alia, by applying the ecosystem approach; (c) Assistance in developing synergy-oriented programmes to conserve and sustainably manage all ecosystems, such as forests, wetlands and marine environments, that also contribute to poverty eradication; Decision VII/20, para. 6</p>	None specified	Guidance was just given at COP7	

Year	What should the GEF do (COP guidance to GEF)	What data should be collected?	What was the GEF response to the guidance?	How did the GEF assess results?
SUSTAINABLE USE				
1994	COP1: “The programme priorities are ... [p]rojects aimed at the conservation of biological diversity and sustainable use of its components which integrate social dimensions including those related to poverty” Decision I/2, annex I, para. 4 (m)	Text, lists - nothing specific but general report required	See Chapter 6 of the 2004 Biodiversity Program Study.	Reported to COP 02/08 on project status (description, involved agencies, approval date, duration, total cost, GEF portion, and project approval status)
2004	COP7: ...develop and transfer technologies and provide financial support to assist in the implementation of the Addis Ababa Principles and Guidelines at the national level to ensure that the use of biological diversity is sustainable; Decision VII/20, para. 8	None specified		
PROTECTED AREAS				
2004	COP7: ...support the implementation of the programme of work, and in particular to: (a) In collaboration with other donors, encourage increased support to address the long-term financial sustainability of protected areas...to help achieve the target of securing, by 2008, sufficient resources to meet the costs to effectively implement and manage national and regional systems of protected areas; (b) Further develop its portfolio on protected areas towards comprehensive, representative and effectively managed protected area systems addressing system wide needs; and (c) Support country driven early action by continuing to streamline its procedures and the provision of fast disbursing resources through expedited means; Decision VII/20, para. 10	None specified	See Chapter 6 of the 2004 Biodiversity Program Study.	
DESIGN, M&E GUIDANCE				
IDENTIFICATION, MONITORING AND ASSESSMENT, AND INDICATORS				
1994	COP1: “The programme priorities are ...Identification and monitoring of wild and domesticated biodiversity components, in particular those under threat, and implementation of measures for their conservation and sustainable use” Decision I/2, annex I, para. 4 (d)	Text, lists - nothing specific but general report required	According to the GEF report to COP6, most projects in the Biodiversity Program include environmental monitoring components in support of Article 7 and Annex I of the Convention. UNDP has recently prepared technical notes on project-level monitoring and indicators. The World Bank recently conducted training to its staff on the use of logframes in GEF projects. New project proposals are becoming more consistent on the use of logframes, baselines, and indicators. At the portfolio level, the GEFM&E Unit recently published a working paper on program-level indicators, which was used to develop targets and	Reported to COP 02/08 on project status (description, involved agencies, approval date, duration, total cost, GEF portion, and project approval status)
1996	COP3: “...provide financial resources... for capacity-building, including taxonomy, to enable developing countries to develop and carry out an initial assessment for designing, implementing and monitoring programmes...” Decision III/5, para. 2 (b)	None specified		Reported to COP 04/15 on project status (countries, approval date, total cost, GEF portion, and project approval status); Noted 1st OPS to come out in 1998 - will assess progress toward achieving main objectives and guidelines from 1994 restructuring. Provided COP with 1997 Project Implementation Review - Summarizes portfolio of projects for GEF's 4 focal areas. Highlights areas of significant progress during 1997, experiences gained and principal challenges.

Year	What should the GEF do (COP guidance to GEF)	What data should be collected?	What was the GEF response to the guidance?	How did the GEF assess results?
2000	COP5: "...provide support ... to strengthen capabilities to develop monitoring programmes and suitable indicators for biological diversity, in accordance with decision V/7" Decision V/13, paragraph 2(j)	None specified	indicators for the GEF3 biodiversity strategies. The GEF Biodiversity Task Force is presently working on further developing measurement of these targets and indicators (see Chapter 8 of the 2004 Biodiversity Program Study).	
2004	COP7: Recognizes that the development and use of indicators, particularly in the development phase, requires a financial and technical commitment from Parties, and therefore requests the financial mechanism and encourages bilateral and multilateral funding agencies to assist developing countries...and countries with economies in transition through the provision of financial assistance and training, as required and as appropriate, to develop and implement effective biodiversity indicators; Decision VII/20, para. 4 I	None specified		
NATIONAL PLANNING AND IMPLEMENTATION				
1994	COP1: "The programme priorities are ... (a) projects and programmes that have national priority status and that fulfill the obligations of the Convention; (b) development of integrated national strategies, plans or programmes for the conservation of biological diversity and sustainable use of its components...; (e) capacity-building, including human resources development and institutional development and/or strengthening, to facilitate the preparation and/or implementation of national strategies, plans for priority programmes and activities for conservation of biological diversity and sustainable use of its components; (i) strengthening conservation, management and sustainable use of ecosystems and habitats identified by national Governments..." Decision I/2, annex I, para. 4(a), (b), (e) and (i);	Text, lists - nothing specific but general report required	As the Second CBD Review noted, the GEF has supported the development of strategies through its enabling activities mechanism. According to OPS2, the GEF had followed convention guidance in implementing support for enabling activities that assisted countries to develop their communications to the convention, including the NBSAPs. Between COP6 and COP7, only five projects in support to NBSAPs were approved by the GEF. There have been substantial delays in the preparation of these reports (see Chapter 6 of the 2004 Biodiversity Program Study for an analysis of NBSAPs).	Reported to COP 02/08 on project status (description, involved agencies, approval date, duration, total cost, GEF portion, and project approval status)
1995	COP2: "...facilitate urgent implementation of Article 6 of the Convention by availing to developing country Parties financial resources for projects in a flexible and expeditious manner; to implement the relevant provisions of the following decisions: II/7 on consideration of Articles 6 and 8 of the Convention, II/8 on preliminary consideration of components of biological diversity particularly under threat and action which could be taken under the Convention ..." Decision II/6, paragraphs 5 and 11	Text, lists - nothing specific but general report required		Reported to COP 03/05 on project status (countries, description, involved agencies, approval date, duration, total cost, GEF portion, and project approval status)
2002	COP6: "...provide financial resources ...as a priority, for the elaboration, development, and revision as necessary, of national biodiversity strategies and action plans, and for activities which assist their implementation..." Decision VI/17, para. 10(a)	None specified		
2004	COP7: I...provide adequate and timely support to developing country Parties...and Parties with economies in transition, as appropriate for the implementation of activities to achieve and monitor progress towards the goals and targets identified in the framework for evaluation of progress towards implementation of the Strategic Plan of the Convention, in accordance with decision VII/30; Decision VII/20, para. 11	None specified		

Year	What should the GEF do (COP guidance to GEF)	What data should be collected?	What was the GEF response to the guidance?	How did the GEF assess results?
REPORTING TO COP				
1994	COP1: A synthesis of the different projects under implementation; List of project proposals submitted by eligible Parties, for funding, reporting on their approval status; A review of the project activities approved by the restructured GEF and their outcomes, including information on funding and progress in implementation.	List of projects, review of activities, their status	In reports to the COP, GEF provided a summary of all projects, programme priorities addressed, amount funded, and status of the projects.	Reported to COP 02/08 on project status (description, involved agencies, approval date, duration, total cost, GEF portion, and project approval status)
1995	COP2: Detailed information should be provided on the conformity of work programmes with COP guidance; A list of projects submitted by eligible country Parties and information on their status should be included	Description of conformity, list of projects		Reported to COP 03/05 on project status (countries, description, involved agencies, approval date, duration, total cost, GEF portion, and project approval status)

Appendix C: Timeline of GEF Council Guidance and GEF Responses on Program Strategies and M&E

Year	Council stated objective	What should the GEF do (Council decision for GEF)	What data should be collected?	What was the GEF response to the objective?	How did the GE assess results?
STRATEGIES					
FORESTS					
Nov-05	Decision	Decision on Agenda Item 15 GEF Activities Related to Forests 40. The Council, having reviewed document GEF/C.27/14, GEF Activities Related to Forests, welcomes the paper as a description of GEF support for sustainable forest management to date and notes that the paper provides a good basis for future work on this issue. The GEF Secretariat and Implementing and Executing Agencies are requested to undertake further analysis of potential benefits of further GEF support for sustainable forest management and to set out cost options for further action where indicated. This work should take into account any RAF implications and should contribute to the on-going work to clarify the focal area strategies and operational programs.	N/S	N/A	N/A
Nov-05	Discussion	Some Council Members called for a more effective and coordinated approach to addressing GEF forest-related issues and suggested activities such as reduced impact logging, combating illegal logging and capacity building for sustainable forest management. One Council Member acknowledged GEF’s contribution to forest-related matters, but clarified that this contribution is still relatively small in comparison to the magnitude of the problem. Several Council Members highlighted the need to support more opportunities in the Congo Basin since it is home to the second largest tropical forest in the world, and also noted that the Central African region is home to one of the largest carbon sinks worldwide. Several Council Members called upon the GEF to increase support to forest systems outside protected areas and involve local communities in its management. In this context, Council Members emphasized the potential for local benefits from GEF-supported interventions.	Addressing issues such as reduced impact logging, illegal logging and capacity building for SFM.	N/A	N/A
Nov-05	Discussion	Several Council Members requested more qualitative assessment of impacts and outcomes of forestry projects.	"Qualitative assessment"	N/A	N/A
Nov-05	Discussion	A few Council Members requested that in preparing options of the costs and benefits for further expanding GEF support to sustainable forest management for Council consideration, the Secretariat and agencies should develop a range of options, from the status quo to a new operational program.	N/S	N/A	N/A

Year	Council stated objective	What should the GEF do (Council decision for GEF)	What data should be collected?	What was the GEF response to the objective?	How did the GE assess results?
PRIVATE SECTOR					
Nov-04	Decision	<p>Decision on Agenda Item (b) (ii) Management Response to the Review of GEF’s Engagement with the Private Sector</p> <p>11. The Council takes note of document GEF/ME/C.24/6, Management Response to the Review of GEF’s Engagement with the Private Sector, and requests the Secretariat to articulate a private sector strategy, with the collaboration of the Implementing and Executing Agencies, and in consultation with private sector stakeholders. The strategy should be based on a analysis of the barriers to private sector participation in the GEF and means to overcome those barriers. The strategy should consider:</p> <p>(a) expectations of various partners in a project/program context to ensure that appropriate risk-sharing arrangements are established amongst the various partners;</p> <p>(b) roles of the Implementing and Executing Agencies with a view to defining the types of projects that are most appropriate to the capabilities and comparative advantages of each agency;</p> <p>(c) norms for identification and selection of private sector partners on a competitive and transparent basis, and criteria for rewarding performance.</p> <p>12. The strategy should also include clear operational guidelines on the scope of collaboration with the private sector. In this regard, the Secretariat is also requested to work with the Trustee to develop clear guidelines on the use of guarantees and loans in GEF projects.</p> <p>13. The GEF Secretariat is requested to prepare the strategy for consideration by the Council at its meeting in December 2005.</p>	N/S	Developed Private Sector Strategy in November 2005	N/S
		<p>9. The Council requests the Monitoring and Evaluation Unit to work with the GEF Secretariat and the Implementing Agencies to prepare an action plan, including proposed actions, timetables and where appropriate, costs, for responding to the reports’ recommendations, taking into account the comments made at the Council meeting, for review and approval by the Council at its meeting in November 2004. In particular, the Council underscores that the work should address as a priority methodologies and options for measuring and integrating sustainability and replication in GEF projects, and simplification of project objectives.</p>			
CAPACITY BUILDING					

Year	Council stated objective	What should the GEF do (Council decision for GEF)	What data should be collected?	What was the GEF response to the objective?	How did the GE assess results?
Nov-03	Decision	<p>17. The Council, having reviewed document GEF/C.22/8, Strategic Approach to Enhancing Capacity Building, approves the strategic approach and requests the GEF Secretariat, in collaboration with the Implementing Agencies and the monitoring and evaluation unit, to undertake further work to operationalize it. This will include the development of:</p> <p>(a) targets and indicators for measuring results and impacts of capacity building activities;</p> <p>(b) operational modalities and project criteria for the implementation of the strategic approach, including for the enhancement of capacity building components within GEF projects and for country capacity building programs for LDCs and SIDS; and</p> <p>(c) proposals for Council consideration for a technical support program.</p> <p>18. The GEF Secretariat is requested to report to the Council at its meeting in May 2004, and regularly thereafter, on the development and implementation of the strategic approach.</p>	N/S	?	GEF Evaluation Office to carry out capacity building evaluation
Nov-03	Discussion	<p>61. The Council agreed that whenever possible capacity building should be integrated with other GEF project activities.</p> <p>62. The Council stressed the need for the development of indicators to measure results and impacts, including the sustainability of the capacity built.</p> <p>63. The Council underlined the importance of capacity building across focal areas as a means of promoting synergies among the conventions. It was also noted that capacity building should be provided to strengthen policy planning and project cycle management.</p> <p>64. It was agreed that the level of support for capacity building should not be preset or anticipated in the strategy but rather should be determined on the basis of country needs and the evolving approach to country-based allocations.</p>	N/S	?	GEF Evaluation Office to carry out capacity building evaluation
May-01	Discussion	<p>Agenda Item 7 Results of the Capacity Development Initiative</p> <p>35. The Council emphasized the importance of promoting cross convention synergies in capacity building activities in order to promote efficiency and quality. In this respect, the Secretariat was requested to clarify how the proposed framework for GEF action could lead to better coordination amongst the enabling activities for the conventions as well as the link between the proposals for capacity building and the evolving work on a programmatic approach.</p> <p>36. The proposed elements of strategic collaboration and the framework for GEF action for capacity building for the global environment should more explicitly take into account the integration of GEF capacity building activities into broader sustainable development strategies.</p> <p>37. Flexibility was encouraged with regard to the design of decentralized programs at the country level to allow for regional approaches where countries agree that such an approach would be beneficial.</p> <p>38. The Council requested the GEF Secretariat to initiate implementation of the actions called for in its decision as early as possible, using the resources in the Secretariat corporate budget. It was agreed that the Secretariat would submit to the Council at its December meeting a request for the resources required to carry out the Council's decision.</p>	N/S	?	GEF Evaluation Office to carry out capacity building evaluation
WSSD BIODIVERSITY TARGET					

Year	Council stated objective	What should the GEF do (Council decision for GEF)	What data should be collected?	What was the GEF response to the objective?	How did the GE assess results?
Nov-03	Discussion	<p>35. A Council Member highlighted the importance of the target set by WSSD and the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity for a significant reduction in the current rate of loss of biological diversity.</p> <p>36. Another Council member highlighted the importance of national systems of protected areas and the sustainable use of biological resources within the context of reducing poverty and increasing conservation of biodiversity.</p>	N/A	N/A	Biodiversity Program Study 2004
REPLENISHMENT TARGETS					
May-04		Biodiversity: Projects projected to place at least 17 million hectares of land under improved management for conservation or protection will be approved. In addition, projects will be approved to place under conservation no less than 7 million additional hectares of "productive landscapes", including land around protected areas that are under productive use, but support habitats and ecosystems.	Hectares of PAs and production landscapes.	Develop tracking tools to measure targets.	Report on targets to council in November 2004.
PROGRAMMING FOR MAXIMIZING RESULTS AND IMPACTS					
Dec-01	Decision	<p>Decision on Agenda Item 10 Overall structure, processes and procedures of the GEF</p> <p>23. The Council reviewed document GEF/C.18/8, Overall Structure, Processes and Procedures of the GEF, and requests the Secretariat, in consultation with the Implementing Agencies, Executing Agencies and Trustee, to revise the note and the concepts, proposals and strategic directions contained in it for consideration by the Council at its meeting in May 2002, taking into account the comments made by the Council and with a view to facilitating discussion and agreement by the Council as it prepares for the Assembly in October 2002.</p> <p>24. The Council agreed that Part I of the paper on strategic programming for maximizing results and impacts would be addressed in the Corporate Business Plan for FY03-05 that will be prepared for Council's consideration at the meeting in May.</p>	N/S		
OP13 - AGRICULTURAL BIODIVERSITY					
May-00	Decision	<p>Decision on Agenda Item 11 Elements of a GEF Operational Program on Conservation and Sustainable Use of Biological Diversity important to Agriculture</p> <p>16. The Council reviewed document GEF/C.15/7, Elements of a GEF Operational Program on Conservation and Sustainable Use of Biological Diversity Important to Agriculture, and approves the elements as a basis for preparing an operational program, subject to the comments made during the Council meeting. The Council requests the Secretariat to develop the operational program, in consultation with concerned partners and stakeholders, including the Implementing Agencies, STAP and the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity, and to circulate the draft program to Council Members for comment before finalizing it.</p>	N/S	Developed the Agricultural Biodiversity Operational Program	?
May-00	Discussion	<p>Agenda Item 11 Elements of an operational program on agrobiodiversity</p> <p>53. The Council requested that the operational program to be developed on the basis of the elements take fully into account:</p> <p>(a) the three objectives of the Convention on Biological Diversity as well as relevant guidance of the Conference</p>	N/S	Developed the Agricultural Biodiversity Operational Program	?

Year	Council stated objective	What should the GEF do (Council decision for GEF)	What data should be collected?	What was the GEF response to the objective?	How did the GE assess results?
		of the Parties; (b) the importance of the rights and needs of local and indigenous communities to agrobiodiversity; (c) the Global Plan of Action for Plant and Genetic Resources approved in Leipzig in 1996; (d) the International Undertaking for Plant Genetic Resources being developed under the auspices of FAO; (e) the importance of collaboration with FAO and other institutions working in the field of agriculture; (f) the need for capacity building to assist countries to prepare projects eligible for financing under the operational program; (g) synergies and conflicts between traditional agricultural practices and global commerce; (h) the value of genetic resources and the equitable sharing of benefits; (i) issues of biosafety and genetically modified organisms; (j) ex situ as well as in situ activities; (k) links to other focal areas, such as climate change; and (l) role of research institutions in developing countries. 54. The Council requested the Secretariat to review the structure of the operational programs as a whole, their relationship to each other, and to share with the Council its views as to the future evolution of the operational programs.			
OPERATIONAL STRATEGY					
Oct-95	Decision	During discussions of the Operational Strategy, STAP was requested to examine further the following issues emerging from the strategy: (a) in the context of biodiversity: (i) STAP is requested to analyze sustainability in the context of ecosystems and present and analyze successful examples. (ii) STAP is requested to extend the analysis of ecosystems as an organizing framework for operational programs. A STAP assessment paper should be prepared.	N/S	?	N/A
M&E GUIDANCE					
May-01	Decision	Decision on Agenda Item 9 Monitoring and Evaluation ¹⁸ . The GEF Council reviewed the 2000 Project Performance Report (GEF/C.17/8) and supports the conclusions of the review, subject to the comments made at the meeting. The Council stressed in particular that the GEF should identify and monitor more systematically the risks to project success as well as the creation of framework conditions for project implementation. The Council also underlined the importance of promoting demonstration and replication effect of GEF projects.	risks to project success, conditions for implementation, demonstration, replication	?	?
May-01	Discussion	It was agreed that continued attention should be given to the development of indicators of project impacts and more well defined baselines.	N/S	M&E Unit undertook biodiversity indicators project	N/A

Year	Council stated objective	What should the GEF do (Council decision for GEF)	What data should be collected?	What was the GEF response to the objective?	How did the GE assess results?
May-00	Decision	Decision on Agenda Item 13 1999 Project Performance Report 22. The Council reviewed the 1999 Project Performance Report (GEF/C.15/10) and concurs with the conclusions of the review, and in particular, supports the recommendation that the GEF move away from an "approvals culture" towards greater attention to the results of its programs. The Council requests the GEF Secretariat and the Implementing Agencies to take these conclusions fully into account in their development and management of GEF activities, and requests the Senior Monitoring and Evaluation Coordinator to report back to the Council as to how the conclusions have been taken into account.	Results	?	???

Year	Council stated objective	What should the GEF do (Council decision for GEF)	What data should be collected?	What was the GEF response to the objective?	How did the GE assess results?
May-00	Discussion	<p>Agenda Item 14 Proposal for second Study of GEF Overall Performance 63. In discussing the proposed approach to the second Overall Performance Study, the Council requested the Secretariat to take into account in the preparation of the terms of reference the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) the study should adopt an open and constructively critical approach, aimed at improving the performance and efficiency of the GEF; (b) the study should include review of impacts in the area of land degradation and in multifocal areas; (c) issues relating to local- global benefits and environment in relation to the larger perspective of sustainable development deserve serious attention; (d) the study should be forward looking and consider new policy issues that have arisen and not just focus on the past activities of the GEF; (e) the study should stress results and impacts at the country level, and in this regard, should provide for an adequate number of country reports and visits to ensure consultation at the country level with all interested stakeholders; (f) the study should consider the impact of the GEF in the context of the international development target on the environment which calls for "current trends in the loss of environmental resources to be effectively reversed at both global and national levels by 2015;" (g) the team of experts that will prepare the study should be recruited according to criteria approved by the Council and in consultation with the CEO/Chairman; (h) the criteria for the study team should include gender aspects (among others); (i) in focusing on impacts, the study should recognize that it is premature to expect realization of medium and long-term impacts that are required for global environment benefits; (j) the study should examine what policy changes have taken place since the first Overall Performance Study and what progress has been made in implementing these policies; (k) the study should examine the efficacy of financing to developing countries that has been achieved through the incremental costs criteria and how the Conventions' provisions on full agreed incremental costs have been implemented; (l) the study should focus on an analysis of groups of projects and their impacts and lessons learned, particularly in the climate change area; (m) the study team should include expertise in the private sector; (n) the study should consider the assessments of enabling activities; (o) the study should examine the country focal point system and whether it is achieving the desired results; (p) the study should consider the effectiveness of public participation and consultation; (q) public consultations should seek to include civil society and interested stakeholders in developing countries. The use of information technology could assist in reaching a wider audience for consultations; (r) the NGO network could usefully assist in ensuring an effective consultative process. 	2015 environment target	Conducted OPS2	See findings in OPS2

Year	Council stated objective	What should the GEF do (Council decision for GEF)	What data should be collected?	What was the GEF response to the objective?	How did the GE assess results?
Mar-98	Discussion	<p>Agenda Item 6: Review of evaluation reports and follow-up actions</p> <p>18. The Council congratulated the evaluation team that prepared the Study of GEF's Overall Performance as well as the Senior Monitoring and Evaluation Coordinator and his colleagues in the Secretariat and Implementing Agencies for the high quality reports that had been prepared. While calling upon the Secretariat, in consultation with the Implementing Agencies, to prepare an action plan on the proposed follow-up to the evaluation reports for consideration at its next meeting, the Council requested that actions identified in other recommendations endorsed by the Council not be delayed. In particular, the Council requested the Secretariat to proceed with the development of performance indicators and steps to strengthen the dissemination of lessons learned.</p>	N/S	?	?
Apr-96	Decision	<p>DECISION ON AGENDA ITEM 6 Monitoring and Evaluation 14. The Council reviewed document GEF/C.7/5, Monitoring and Evaluation: work program and budget. There was general consensus about the important role monitoring and evaluation should play in the GEF. The Council, while fully recognizing the minimum amount of time available for the newly-appointed Senior Monitoring and Evaluation Officer to prepare the paper, requests that the paper be revised to present a more detailed work program. This paper should take a GEF-wide approach to monitoring and evaluation, as recommended in the independent evaluation of the GEF pilot phase and endorsed in the restructuring of the GEF. It should define goals, priorities, guidelines and procedures of the Monitoring and Evaluation Program, and the specific components and outputs. The Monitoring and Evaluation Program should build upon the monitoring and evaluation policies of the Implementing Agencies. The Council requests that the revised paper be circulated to Members for review and comment no later than July.</p>	N/S	Established M&E work program	N/A