

Management Action Record - 2007

Conclusion: All 41 verified Council decisions in the Management Action Record show a level of adoption of medium and higher. Of the older Council decisions, 14 out of 27 show substantial progress in the level of adoption versus last year.

This year's Management Action Record tracks the level of adoption of 46 Council decisions based on 12 GEF EO documents by presenting ratings of GEF management and the verification of these ratings by the Evaluation Office. The Evaluation Office was able to verify the adoption of 41 of these 46 Council decisions. Decisions that could not be verified yet are mainly related to project monitoring and evaluation standards, and quality of supervision. The Evaluation Office will carry out thematic assessments in the future to assess adoption on these Council decisions.

The Evaluation Office rated 18 (44 percent) out of the 41 verified decisions as having been adopted by management at high or substantial levels. This represents an improvement from last year when the percentage was 33. In addition, so far 12 Council decisions have been fully adopted (rated as high) and are graduated from the MAR. Six of them during FY 2006, all pertained to the *Evaluation of the Experience of Executing Agencies under Expanded Opportunities in the GEF* (GEF/ME/C.30/4, November 2006). The other six that were based on several evaluations were fully adopted during FY 2007.

Table 1 shows that the Evaluation Office and management agreed on the rating on progress of adoption for 51 percent of decisions (21 of 41). On the other hand, for 46 percent of the decisions (19 of 41) the Evaluation Office gave a lower rating on adoption compared to that given by the management. Many of the lower ratings given by the Evaluation Office reflect the fact that even though GEF has taken measures to address these decisions, these measures cannot be considered to demonstrate a high level of achievement yet. They also reflect the fact that some proposals to the Council are yet to be approved. If and when the Council does approve these proposals, substantial adoption may have occurred.

Table 1: Ratings of GEF Progress towards Adopting Council Decisions¹

Management ratings	GEF EO ratings					Sum of management ratings
	High	Substantial	Medium	Negligible	Not possible to verify yet	
High	5	8	8		3	24
Substantial	1	4	3		1	9
Medium			12			12
Negligible					1	1
Not possible to verify yet						0
Sum of GEF EO ratings	6	12	23	0	5	46

¹ Highlighted fields show agreement between management and GEF EO; fields to the right of the diagonal represent higher rating by the management than by GEF EO (except in the case of "not possible to verify yet"). The last column shows the sum of ratings in each category by management; the last row shows the sum of ratings by GEF EO.

Thirty Council decisions from 7 GEF EO documents were included in both last and this year's MAR. The Evaluation Office was able to follow the progress of adoption of 27 of these Council decisions (3 of them were rated as "not possible to verify yet"). Of these 27 Council decisions, 52 percent (14 out of 27) showed progress in the level of adoption.

A noticeable progress from last year is related to Council decisions requesting increased transparency in the GEF project approval process through an improved Management Information System. The recent launch of a new system, which includes a country portal to provide information related to GEF projects at a country level, is seen by the Evaluation Office as a concrete improvement on the issue of transparency and access to information.

Eight out of the 9 Council decisions for which the ratings have not shown improvement from last year are related to the Local Benefits Study and the Biosafety Evaluation. Regarding the Local Benefits Study, decisions stress the need to set up a system that ensures local benefits are addressed in a more systematic way into all stages of the GEF project cycle. However, the GEF Secretariat currently cannot verify the quality of this aspect in project design or implementation because it still has no system in place to involve specialist social development expertise in its project review processes. Regarding biosafety the Evaluation Office will rate substantial adoption once the Council approves the "Program Document for GEF Support to Biosafety during GEF-4".

SGP management has started to address the various council decisions through the GEF SGP Steering Committee. Nevertheless, the Steering Committee still does not have representation of Country Coordinators. This presents the risk that, inadvertently, new proposals won't sufficiently consider country operational issues and perspectives. The inclusion of some of the senior country coordinators in the Steering Committee would allow for the county program perspective to be part of the discussions that lead to the SGP proposals that address the GEF Council decisions.

A complete version of the MAR is available at the GEF EO website (www.gefeo.org).

Management Action Record – February 2008
Annual Performance Report 2004 (GEF/ME/C.25/1, May 2005)
Management Response (GEF/ME/C.25/2, May 2005)

Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Rating in Progress of Adoption			
			Mgmt	Comments	GEF EO	Comments
The transparency of the GEF project approvals process should be increased. The GEFSEC and IAs should make project proposal status information available to proponents through internet accessible databases and project tracking tools.	We also agree with the need for increased transparency of the approval process, including the exploration of alternatives such as internet-accessible databases, as well as an active management approach to the project approval process. Some IAs, however, have pointed that the client-oriented nature of projects preparation makes the process quite transparent already.	June 2005 – Decision on Agenda Item 5(b) - (a) The transparency of the GEF project approval process should be increased. The GEF Secretariat is requested to prepare for Council review, options for making project proposal status information available to proponents through Internet accessible databases and project tracking tools. The GEF Secretariat, Implementing Agencies and Executing Agencies are also requested to update project information on the current projects;	New rating as of Jan '08: High	Progress May '07 – January '08: The new Management Information System (PMIS) has a country portal where operational focal points can access real time information regarding the status of PIFs and project documents submitted to the GEFSEC for review.	Substantial	Progress has been made in the PMIS, but several issues need to be addressed: -An important aspect of the recommendations was to provide info on status on where (and with whom) the proposal is and how long it's been there. That is missing, There is no info on whether (and when) a proposal has been submitted to the Secretariat and is <i>awaiting</i> approval. -Not clear what is the PIMS entry when the PIF/project is not approved (rejected, deferred etc.). There are several projects in this situation but can't find any in the portal, so agencies won't know if the project has stalled or even been dropped – and we have not been able to verify whether OFPs have this information. - Not certain how accurate the info is - as usual it's focused on GEF approved - we are not sure they update the status of closed projects for example -Inconsistencies persist: For Cameroon it says for Biosafety status: "under preparation" in the table - but if you click on it you see PIF approved and approval date "not yet approved".

Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Rating in Progress of Adoption			
			Mgmt	Comments	GEF EO	Comments
<p>GEFSEC should institute an active management approach to the project approvals process, including accountability for processing time standards within the GEFSEC and IAs.</p>	<p>This is a useful and well designed one-time study that provides important and balanced findings regarding the causes for delays in GEF project preparation, even though it downplays important sources of delay, such as the time it takes to obtain endorsement letters from focal points, and the significance of the additional time required for GEF specific processes together with the innovative characteristics of many GEF projects that can require additional time for design. We agree with the recommendation for better delineation of roles, including focusing Council priorities on policy and program matters rather than project reviews. The increased technical scrutiny by Council often duplicates the technical review functions of the IA safeguard teams as well as the GEF Secretariat.</p>	<p>June 2005 – Decision on Agenda Item 5(b) - (b) GEFSEC should, in consultation with the IAs and EAs, develop: (i) an active management approach to the project approvals process, including accountability for processing time standards within the GEFSEC and IAs; (ii) a system, including criteria, for actively reviewing projects to determine which should be canceled, and (iii) report annually to the Council on progress in these areas;</p>	<p>New rating as of Jan '08: High</p>	<p>Progress May '07 – January '08: A new project cycle was approved by the Council in June 2007. By streamlining the processing time for projects to an average of 22 months, the new project cycle provides a more transparent project approval process. In addition, Council has approved a results-based management framework (RBM) in June 2007. Through the new RBM framework, the GEFSEC is monitoring processing times as part of an active management approach to the project approvals process.</p> <p>UNEP is developing time standards, which will be adapted to the new “rolling submissions” policy.</p>	<p>High</p>	<p>The new Project Cycle has been implemented; It includes project review criteria, and explicit criteria for the cancellation, suspension or termination of projects. The new RBM framework also allows for monitoring project processing times.</p>

Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Rating in Progress of Adoption			
			Mgmt	Comments	GEF EO	Comments
<p>UNDP and UNEP should set in place terminal evaluation review processes for GEF projects to improve their quality and meet the concerns of the GEF.</p>	<p>This important section develops a robust methodology to assess the quality of the terminal evaluations conducted by the Implementing Agencies, although we question the validity of applying such methodology retroactively. Such methodology is useful to track the quality of terminal evaluations over time and if it is to be used in the future, this needs to be communicated to the IAs explicitly. In addition, we note that the small sample size limits the validity of statistical analyses on these results. We agree with the EO that the observed decrease in UNDP ratings, for example, cannot necessarily be considered a trend because the sample size is based on six terminal evaluations only.</p>	<p>June 2005 – Decision on Agenda Item 5(b) - (c) UNDP and UNEP are requested to set in place terminal evaluation review processes for GEF projects to improve their quality and meet the concerns of the GEF Council about the quality and credibility of their terminal evaluations and ratings. EO is requested to review consistency of evaluations and ratings. The IAs and EAs are also requested to include in their project terminal evaluations an assessment of project monitoring and evaluation systems;</p>	<p>New rating as of Jan '08: Substantial</p>	<p>Progress May '07 – January '08: UNDP Evaluation Office has established a system for reviewing all UNDP GEF TERs as these are finalized. This assesses and rates each TER for its level of compliance with GEF 2007 EO's guidelines on TERs as well as UNDP's own evaluation policy. It includes summaries of overall strengths and weaknesses of each TER, as well as strengths and weaknesses against each review criteria. Reviews and reports are shared with GEF EO and UNDP GEF in regular reports which include analysis of key issues emerging in the TERs.</p> <p>It is too soon after the initiation of this review process for UNDP EO to report any trend in the quality of UNDP GEF TERs.</p> <p>As indicated in the previous MAR, UNEP has fully complied with the request of setting in place terminal evaluation review processes to improve their quality and address the concerns of the GEF. With regards to the need to include adequate information on sustainability of outcomes, quality of M&E systems and reporting on co-financing, UNEP confirms that all these aspects are included in both the TE and MTE TOR and TE quality review processes.</p>	<p>UNDP Substantial UNEP Substantial</p>	<p>UNDP EO has set up an evaluation review process to assess the quality of Terminal Evaluations of GEF projects. UNDP EO provides GEF EO with ratings on quality of Terminal evaluations. UNDP Terminal evaluations also increasingly address project M&E.</p> <p>UNEP EO has set up an evaluation review process to assess the quality of Terminal Evaluations of GEF projects. UNEP EO provides GEF EO with ratings on quality of Terminal evaluations, Outcomes, sustainability, Project M&E and financial reporting.</p>

Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Rating in Progress of Adoption			
			Mgmt	Comments	GEF EO	Comments
Recommendations to improve project M&E systems have been issued in the past, as well as request to include an assessment of project M&E systems in all terminal evaluation reports. While there have been advances in upgrading project M&E systems, there is still considerable room for improvement, and therefore the Office considers that these recommendations continue to be valid.	We agree that there has been a marked improvement in the number of projects with adequate M&E systems, as well as the quality of such systems. Although the report calls for further improvements, it is important to point out that many remaining weaknesses are germane to some of the focal areas and cannot be attributed to the GEF alone. For example, measuring biodiversity impacts is impossible given the current levels of scientific uncertainty; instead, it is widely accepted that certain outcomes can be used as strong proxies for impacts, such as the presence of effective managed protected areas, maintenance of habitat integrity, etc.	June 2005 – Decision on Agenda Item 5(b) – (d) □ The GEFSEC is requested to ensure that projects included in the work programs meet minimum monitoring and evaluation standards.	New rating as of Jan '08: High	Progress May '07 – January '08: In the new project cycle, all projects must meet the M&E minimum standards established by Council. Moreover, a project's results-framework (logframe) must include indicators and targets at project objective and outcome levels that show the project's contribution to achieving the expected objective and outcomes of the focal area for the GEF-4 replenishment period.	Not possible to verify yet	The new project cycle that was approved by The GEF Council requires that projects meet the GEF minimum M&E standards. The GEF EO has not yet verified that projects actually meet these standards. Next year the GEF EO will carry out a quality of M&E review of projects at entry to assess the extent to which projects meet requirements are met.

*Level of adoption may be rated in six ways: **High:** Fully adopted and fully incorporated into policy, strategy or operations; **Substantial:** Decision largely adopted but not fully incorporated into policy, strategy or operations as yet; **Medium:** Adopted in some operational and policy work, but not to a significant degree in key areas; **Negligible:** No evidence or plan for adoption, or plan and actions for adoption are in a very preliminary stage; **N/A:** Non-applicable; **Not possible to verify yet:** verification will have to wait until more data is available or proposals have been further developed.

Management Action Record – February 2008
Role of Local Benefits in Global Environmental Programs
Part One: Nature and Conclusions of the Study (GEF/ME/C.27/4, October 2005)
Management Response (GEF/ME/C.27/5, Oct 2005)

Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Rating in Progress of Adoption			
			Mgmt	Comments	GEF EO	Comments
1. Where local benefits are an essential means to achieve and sustain global benefits, the GEF portfolio should integrate them more strongly into its programming.	We agree with this recommendation. As noted above, the GEF has substantially strengthened its ability to address global-local linkages in our programming through its GEF-3 and 4 Programming Documents, and strategic priority setting.	Nov 2005 - Decision on Agenda item 7(d) 1. Where local benefits are an essential means to achieve and sustain global benefits, these should be more systematically addressed in all stages of the project cycle in GEF activities.	New rating as of Jan '08: High	Progress May '07 – January '08: The approved GEF-4 strategic document of each focal area has highlighted and recognized the linkages between global and local benefits, when relevant. The updated project review criteria guidelines (Oct 2006) clearly require analysis and relevant activities on local benefits as part of the project design, when relevant.	Medium	The GEF Sec has no social development expertise involved in the project approval process and therefore lacks the expertise to verify the quality of this aspect of project designs.

Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Rating in Progress of Adoption			
			Mgmt	Comments	GEF EO	Comments
2. Integration of local benefits should be more systematically carried forward into all stages of the project cycle	We agree with this recommendation, particularly in those instances where local benefits are essential means to achieve and sustain global benefits. For the past years, we have made initial efforts in incorporating approaches and tools within the project cycle to strengthen the global-local benefit linkages. For example, stakeholder identification and development of public participation strategies are required in appropriate stages of the project cycle. Social assessment and social experts are utilized during project preparation, implementation, and monitoring and evaluation period. We will review and strengthen these approaches through the ongoing review of the GEF project cycle and appraisal criteria, while making sure that these remain simple and do not make the project review process more complex.	Nov 2005 - Decision on Agenda item 7(d) 1. Where local benefits are an essential means to achieve and sustain global benefits, these should be more systematically addressed in all stages of the project cycle in GEF activities.	New rating as of Jan '08: High	Progress May '07 – January '08: As noted above, the updated project review criteria guidelines (Oct 2006) clearly require analysis and relevant activities on local benefits as part of the project design, when relevant.	Medium	The GEF Sec has no social development expertise involved in the project approval process and therefore lacks the expertise to verify the quality of this aspect of project designs.

Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Rating in Progress of Adoption			
			Mgmt	Comments	GEF EO	Comments
3. GEF activities should include processes for dealing with trade-offs between global and local benefits in situations where win-win results do not materialize.	We agree with the study that the assumption that projects involving the GEF would always result in “win-win” gains in both development and global environmental management, is not realistic. Some of the projects require an assessment of the potential for “win-win” gains or “trade-off” outcomes between global environmental and local livelihood benefits. The issue is discussed as part of the project design and sustainability analysis for each project at appropriate stages of the project cycle.	<p>Nov 2005 - Decision on Agenda item 7(d)</p> <p>2. GEF activities should include processes for dealing with trade-offs between global and local benefits in situations where win-win results do not materialize.</p>	<p>New rating as of Jan '08: High</p>	<p>Progress May '07 – January '08:</p> <p>Given that assessing trade-offs requires good baseline information to establish counterfactuals, and this implies considerable additional costs in multi-country/multi-site projects (which make-up the majority of UNEP projects) UNEP is addressing this aspect only when considered particularly relevant. If considered important for specific projects, trade off assessment will be part of monitoring and evaluation activities.</p> <p>STAP has completed its technical work on guidance on justification of LD as a global issue; means to integrate LD/SLM with other focal area outputs, in collaboration with the GEFSec at two workshops in 2007. Final publications are to be edited and printed.</p>	<p>Medium</p>	<p>The measures listed are encouraging, but cannot be considered to demonstrate that this process has already delivered a high level of achievement.</p>

Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Rating in Progress of Adoption			
			Mgmt	Comments	GEF EO	Comments
4. In order to strengthen generation of linkages between local and global benefits, the GEF should ensure adequate involvement of expertise on social and institutional issues at all levels of the portfolio.	As the findings of the study indicate, the involvement of expertise on social and institutional issues may have been incoherent during the early days of GEF programming. Today, it is a regular practice at every stage of the project cycle to involve appropriate expertise and tools related to social and institutional issues by all Implementing Agencies. Stakeholder consultation, participatory rural assessments, and social assessments are widely used in GEF projects by structuring multi-disciplinary project teams that include social scientists. In fact, the study's own data show that 80 percent of the most recently approved projects have involved social assessment, while it was only 39 percent in the study's overall sample. The ongoing review of the GEF project cycle and appraisal criteria will assess the relevance of having these tools and approaches as operational requirements for future projects.	Nov 2005 - Decision on Agenda item 7(d) 3. In order to strengthen generation of linkages between local and global benefits, the GEF should ensure adequate involvement of expertise on social and institutional issues at all levels of the portfolio.	New rating as of Jan '08: High	Progress May' 07 – January '08: The updated project review criteria guidelines (Oct 2006) clearly require information from socio-economic and institutional assessments as part of the project design, when relevant. As already noted in the management response, 80% of the recently approved GEF projects involve these	Medium	Whilst the increased incidence of socio-economic and institutional assessments is encouraging, it remains the case that the GEF Sec has no Social Scientist in place and therefore lacks the expertise to verify the quality of this aspect of project design or implementation.

*Level of adoption may be rated in six ways: **High:** Fully adopted and fully incorporated into policy, strategy or operations; **Substantial:** Decision largely adopted but not fully incorporated into policy, strategy or operations as yet; **Medium:** Adopted in some operational and policy work, but not to a significant degree in key areas; **Negligible:** No evidence or plan for adoption, or plan and actions for adoption are in a very preliminary stage; **N/A:** Non-applicable; **Not possible to verify yet:** verification will have to wait until more data is available or proposals have been further developed.

Management Action Record – February 2008
Annual Performance Report 2005 (GEF/ME/C.28/2/Rev.1, May 2006)
Management Response (GEF/ME/C.28/3, May 2006)

Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Rating in Progress of Adoption *			
			Mgmt	Comments	GEF EO	Comments
The GEF Secretariat should redraft project review guidelines and standards to ensure compliance with the new M&E minimum requirements. Further consideration should also be given to ways to enhance the contribution of STAP reviews during the process.	The Secretariat is redrafting project review guidelines and standards to ensure compliance with the new M&E minimum requirements, including more guidance to Secretariat program managers for reviewing M&E design in project documentation. STAP is also considering ways to enhance the contribution of STAP roster reviews during the process.	Jun.2006 - Decision on Agenda Item 4 - The GEF Secretariat should redraft project review guidelines and standards to ensure compliance with the new M&E minimum requirements. Further consideration should also be given to ways to enhance the contribution of STAP reviews during the process.	New rating as of Jan '08: High	Progress May '07 – January '08: Project review guidelines and standards have been established as part of the proposed new project cycle. All projects must meet the M&E minimum requirements established by Council (GEF M&E Policy, 2/06). STAP now screens all full size projects immediately after CEO approval, and other projects as time permits and project design requires prior to Work Program publication. STAP has declared its proposed service standards in Annex 11 of the draft GEF Operational Manual, which are consistent with Council decisions	Medium	The project review guidelines and standards regarding M&E requirements for GEF projects have been included as part of the new project cycle. Annex 11 of the available draft of the GEF Operational Manual (circulated on February 8,2008, does not mention the role of STAP in M&E.

Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Rating in Progress of Adoption *			
			Mgmt	Comments	GEF EO	Comments
The GEF Secretariat should support Focal Area Task Forces with corporate resources to continue the development of indicators and tracking tools to measure the results of the GEF operations in the various focal areas.	We agree with the conclusion that although Focal Area Task Forces have made significant progress in developing indicators and tracking tools at the portfolio level, there remain some technical difficulties to be overcome to adequately address the need to measure and aggregate results at the portfolio level. Reflecting the APR 2005 recommendation that the Secretariat should support Focal Area Task Forces with corporate resources to develop indicators and tracking tools to measure the results of the GEF operations in the various focal areas, a request is being made for a <i>Special Initiative for Results-Management</i> in the FY07 Corporate Budget. This activity would be in line with the on-going efforts to develop a GEF Results Management Framework.	Jun.2006 - Decision on Agenda Item 4 - The GEF Secretariat should support Focal Area Task Forces with corporate resources to continue the development of indicators and tracking tools to measure the results of the GEF operations in the various focal areas.	New rating as of Jan '08: Substantial	.Progress May '07 – January '08: The strategies were approved at the June 2007 Council meeting. All focal area strategies have identified focal area performance indicators and targets. These indicators feed into the work to develop a set of common quantitative indicators and tracking tools for each focal area as requested in the GEF-4 policy recommendations.	Substantial	Focal area task forces continue developing and testing indicators to measure results of the GEF4 Focal Area Strategies.

Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Rating in Progress of Adoption *			
			Mgmt	Comments	GEF EO	Comments
No recommendation	N/A	<p>Jun.2006 - Decision on Agenda Item 4 - The Implementing and Executing Agencies should share mid-term and terminal evaluations with the GEF focal points in a timely way.</p>	<p>New rating as of Jan '08: High</p>	<p>Progress May '07 – January '08: UNDP mid-term and final evaluation teams systematically conduct de-briefing meetings with all key in-country stakeholders, including the OFPs. UNDP has also instructed its Regional Advisors to copy all Evaluation reports of all projects receiving GEF support to the OFP.</p> <p>As indicated in the previous MAR, UNEP is now routinely sharing the TOR for all MTEs and TEs and the evaluation reports with GEF National Focal Points. This is reflected in the TOR of evaluations and evaluators are required to do so as part of their contracts.</p> <p>The World Bank has instructed its project teams to share mid term and terminal evaluations with OFPs</p> <p>IDB will in 2008 have the first midterm evaluation of GEF projects. IDB will make sure that both the midterm and final evaluation reports will be shared with GEF Focal Points.</p>	<p>Not possible to verify yet</p>	<p>The GEF Agencies have reported that they have instructed project and operational staff to share midterm reviews and terminal evaluations with the OFP. GEF EO has not verified directly with OFPs the extent to which evaluations have been actually shared by Agencies. GEF EO will carry out this assessment as part of the Terminal Evaluation verification process.</p>

Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Rating in Progress of Adoption *			
			Mgmt	Comments	GEF EO	Comments
No recommendation	N/A	Jun.2006 - <i>Decision on Agenda Item 4</i> - GEF partner agencies need to continue to follow-up on the recommendations made in last year's APR regarding the need to improve terminal evaluation reports.	New rating as of Jan '08: Substantial	<p>Progress May '07 – January '08: UNDP EO reviews and rates UNDP GEF TER's. Reviews, which are shared with UNDP GEF and GEF EO, explain the strengths and deficiencies of each TER.</p> <p>As indicated in the previous MAR, UNEP has fully complied with the request of setting in place terminal evaluation review processes to improve their quality and the concerns of the GEF. Concerning the need to include adequate information on sustainability of outcomes, quality of M&E systems and reporting on co-financing, UNEP confirms that all these aspects are included in both the TE and MTE TOR and TE quality review processes.</p>	<p>UNDP Substantial</p> <p>UNEP Substantial</p>	<p>UNDP EO has set up an evaluation review process to assess the quality of Terminal Evaluations of GEF projects. UNDP EO provides GEF EO with ratings on quality of Terminal evaluations. UNDP Terminal evaluations also increasingly address project M&E.</p> <p>UNEP EO has set up an evaluation review process to assess the quality of Terminal Evaluations of GEF projects. UNEP EO provides GEF EO with ratings on quality of Terminal evaluations, Outcomes, sustainability, Project M&E and financial reporting.</p>

*Level of adoption may be rated in six ways: **High**: Fully adopted and fully incorporated into policy, strategy or operations; **Substantial**: Decision largely adopted but not fully incorporated into policy, strategy or operations as yet; **Medium**: Adopted in some operational and policy work, but not to a significant degree in key areas; **Negligible**: No evidence or plan for adoption, or plan and actions for adoption are in a very preliminary stage; **N/A**: Non-applicable; **Not possible to verify yet**: verification will have to wait until more data is available or proposals have been further developed.

Management Action Record – February 2008
GEF Country Portfolio Evaluation – Costa Rica (GEF/ME/C.28/5, May 2006)
No Management Response

Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Rating in Progress of Adoption *			
			Mgmt	Comments	GEF EO	Comments
The GEF Secretariat needs to improve the information mechanisms in the GEF, most notably the GEF website, to make essential operational information available at the national level.	No Management Response	Jun. 2005 - Decision on Agenda Item 6 - The GEF Secretariat is requested to take steps to improve the information mechanisms in the GEF, most notably the GEF website, to make essential operational information available at the national level.	New rating as of Jan '08: High	Progress May '07 – January '08: The GEF website has been upgraded with a country portal to provide information related to GEF projects at the country-level.	Substantial	Country portal is now available and it is an important improvement. The country portal has some shortcomings: no status of on-going (or pipeline) projects (milestones in the project cycle; project proponents still do not know where their proposal is at within the project cycle)
Council reiterates its decision of June 2005 that “the transparency of the GEF project approval process should be increased” and requests the GEF secretariat to reinforce its efforts to improve this transparency.	No Management response	Jun. 2005 - Decision on Agenda Item 6 - Council reiterates its decision of June 2005 that “the transparency of the GEF project approval process should be increased” and requests the GEF Secretariat to reinforce its efforts to improve this transparency.	New rating as of Jan '08: High	Progress May '07 – January '08: The new GEF project cycle approved by the Council, provides for a streamlined and transparent project approval system. Together with the MIS, the GEF and the agencies should be able to provide countries with access to project-tracking and approval information.	Substantial	Information is available in the web site but practice is still not fully transparent to clients as discussed in the latest Country Portfolio Evaluations.

*Level of adoption may be rated in six ways: **High:** Fully adopted and fully incorporated into policy, strategy or operations; **Substantial:** Decision largely adopted but not fully incorporated into policy, strategy or operations as yet; **Medium:** Adopted in some operational and policy work, but not to a significant degree in key areas; **Negligible:** No evidence or plan for adoption, or plan and actions for adoption are in a very preliminary stage; **N/A:** Non-applicable; **Not possible to verify yet:** verification will have to wait until more data is available or proposals have been further developed.

Management Action Record – February 2008
Evaluation of Incremental Cost Assessment (GEF/ME/C.30/2, Nov 2006)
Management Response (GEF/ME/C.30/3, Nov.2006)

Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Rating in Progress of Adoption *			
			Mgmt	Comments	GEF EO	Comments
The current incremental cost assessment and reporting should be dropped as requirements for GEF projects;	We agree with the recommendations of the Evaluation, and would like to propose that the current way of applying the incremental cost principle, especially the assessment and reporting be scrapped and a more pragmatic and strategic approach be adopted. This new approach is rooted in incremental reasoning and the focal area strategies approved by the GEF Council for each replenishment period.	Dec. 2006 - Decision on Agenda Item 7 - The current incremental cost assessment and reporting requirements for GEF project proposals should be reformed so as to result in a simplified demonstration of the project baseline, incremental costs and co-funding;	New rating as of Jan '08: High	Progress May '07 – January '08: The new IC policy was approved by Council in June 2007 and is now fully implemented in project presentations to the GEF for funding. The new templates reflect the agreed elements and the projects are reviewed based on the IC policy. The GEF urgently needs to substitute the IC policy presented in the GEF website which still reflects the 1996 policy. Also, the GEF Communication Unit needs to find modalities that allow various stakeholders (including Countries) to have quick access to the new IC policy (e.g. as part of NDI, regional consultations, website update or a fact sheet).	High	IC policy under implementation

Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Rating in Progress of Adoption *			
			Mgmt	Comments	GEF EO	Comments
The incremental reasoning in project objectives and design should be explicitly recognized in appropriate documentation, particularly at the project concept stage, during implementation and at completion;	See above	Dec. 2006 - Decision on Agenda Item 7 – The incremental reasoning in project objectives and design should be explicitly addressed in appropriate documentation, particularly at the project concept stage, during implementation and at completion;	New rating as of Jan '08 : High	Progress May '07 – January '08: Projects submitted to the GFE using the new templates present the incremental costs based on the new IC policy. As of now, no project applying the new policy has reached completion stage. Hence, there is no track record available for closed projects. Since the IC policy was approved by Council, the policy will be fully applied including at project completion stage.	High	Project templates reflect the changes
No recommendation	N/A	Dec. 2006 - Decision on Agenda Item 7 - monitoring for progress towards achieving global environmental benefits and for achieving co-funding should be included in Project Information Reports and the Portfolio Performance Report;	New rating as of Jan '08 : Medium	Progress May '07 – January '08: Not all focal areas have developed an indicator framework which reflects on results, including impacts and outcomes related to GEB. While the FA BD and IW have developed scorecards to track project outcomes, other focal areas are still in the process setting up an appropriate tracking system. There is excellent progress as reflected in the AMR presented to Council in April 2008.	Medium	Agreed

Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Rating in Progress of Adoption *			
			Mgmt	Comments	GEF EO	Comments
No recommendation	N/A	Dec. 2006 - Decision on Agenda Item 7 - terminal evaluations should evaluate achievement of global environmental benefits and co-funding,	New rating as of Jan '08 : High	<p>Progress May '07 – January '08: Systematic review of UNDP GEF TERs by UNDP EO includes assessment of “all relevant outcomes and achievement of project objectives in the context of the focal area program indicators if applicable” with a specific indicator that assesses TER’s descriptions of “Specific contributions of the project towards GEF Focal Area program objectives and indicators”</p> <p>As indicated in the previous MAR, achievement of global environmental benefits and co-funding are fully integrated into all UNEP-GEF evaluations. Whilst evaluations always assess achievement of outcomes, given the timing of the evaluation shortly after project completion, evaluators often assess the likelihood of achieving GEB as opposed to the GEB per se.</p> <p>World Bank completion reports are based on a standard template which includes a field for rating and assessment of achievement of global environment benefits.</p>	Substantial	<p>Most terminal evaluations submitted during fiscal 2007, which were completed after issuance of the GEF EO terminal evaluation guidance, adequately cover the achievement of global environmental benefits by the respective completed project. Due design constraints (inappropriate indicators specified in project appraisal document) some terminal evaluations, however, address only project outputs. Inadequate information on cofunding remains a persistent problem in the terminal evaluations. About half of the terminal evaluation reports lack adequate analysis on financial performance of the project. Consequently, it is difficult for the Evaluation Office to assess the extent of differences in the actual cofunding mobilization and utilization vis-a-vis the expectations, the causes of variation, and the effect of variation on project performance. The problem is difficult to address. Since terminal evaluations are generally conducted immediately after a project is operationally closed, at that time not all financial transactions related to the project may have been accounted for by the financial systems of the implementing agency. While this information becomes available once a project is financially closed, generally by that time its terminal evaluation has already been completed and, consequently, financial information is often not incorporated in the terminal evaluation report.</p>

Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Rating in Progress of Adoption *			
			Mgmt	Comments	GEF EO	Comments
On-going efforts need to be strengthened to have a better identification of global environmental benefits in GEF activities, including improved dissemination and raising of awareness of the focal area strategic priorities and objectives.	The GEF will develop an outreach program on operational issues that will facilitate the dissemination and awareness-raising on agreed global environmental benefits, focal area strategic priorities and objectives. This will enable countries to fully participate in the dialogue on negotiating the agreed incremental costs of achieving/optimizing global environmental benefits in GEF-supported interventions.	Dec. 2006 - Decision on Agenda Item 7 - On-going efforts should be strengthened to have a better identification of global environmental benefits in GEF activities, including improved dissemination and raising of awareness of the focal area strategic priorities and objectives.	New rating as of Jan '08 : Substantial	Progress May '07 – January '08: Through the National Dialogue Initiative, the GEF and its partners continue to help countries understand the principle of incrementality and apply it in a pragmatic manner in developing projects that will deliver global environmental benefits. Similar information is provided to countries at sub-regional meetings as well as through bilateral dialogues.	Substantial	Website has been updated with information on new strategies. Dissemination through national dialogue workshops is still limited (few countries and selected audience). No GEF Knowledge Management strategy yet.
See above	The GEF Secretariat, together with the GEF agency partners will meet in the coming months to refine the proposed new approach to incremental costs and develop an outreach program on related operational issues. A proposal will be presented to the Council for review at its June 2007 meeting.	Dec. 2006 - Decision on Agenda Item 7 - The Council requests the GEF Secretariat to incorporate in the paper on the revised project cycle to be presented to the Council in June 2007, new operational guidelines to implement the above sub-paragraphs.	New rating as of Jan '08 : Medium	Progress May '07 – January '08: The GEFSEC is in the process of developing an operational manual which will include information on the new incremental cost policy.	Medium	Agreed

*Level of adoption may be rated in six ways: **High:** Fully adopted and fully incorporated into policy, strategy or operations; **Substantial:** Decision largely adopted but not fully incorporated into policy, strategy or operations as yet; **Medium:** Adopted in some operational and policy work, but not to a significant degree in key areas; **Negligible:** No evidence or plan for adoption, or plan and actions for adoption are in a very preliminary stage; **N/A:** Non-applicable; **Not possible to verify yet:** verification will have to wait until more data is available or proposals have been further developed.

Management Action Record – February 2008
Evaluation of the GEF Activity Cycle and Modalities (GEF/ME/C.30/6, Nov 2006)
Management Response (GEF/ME/C.30/7, Nov 2006)

Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Rating in Progress of Adoption *			
			Mgmt	Comments	GEF EO	Comments
No easy fix will improve the activity cycle – what is needed is a radical re -drawing of the cycle, maintaining the quality and attributes for GEF funding	We agree with the overall conclusion emerging from the four major findings of the evaluation that the current GEF project cycle is not effective, not efficient, not cost-effective, and not made full use of trends in its Agencies. We, therefore, agree with the recommendation of the evaluation, and would like to propose that the current project cycle be scrapped and a completely new project cycle be designed for a GEF of the current decade.	Dec. 2006 - Decision on Agenda Item 9 - The Council agrees with the management response that no gains would be achieved by streamlining the current project cycle at the margins. Therefore the Council requests the Secretariat, in consultation with all the GEF entities, to present for Council review in June 2007 options for a new project cycle, with the objective of processing a proposal from identification to start of implementation in less than 22 months without compromising project quality or undermining financial accountability.	New rating as of Jan '08: Substantial	Progress May '07 – January '08: The new project cycle follows the guidance of the Council decision by streamlining the processing time for projects to an average of 22 months while at the same time ensuring transparency in decision making and quality control in the process.	High	The new cycle has been implemented. While it is too soon to say if the 22 months will be reached, it is noted that the agencies report in the Annual Monitoring Report that elapsed time has gone down.

Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Rating in Progress of Adoption *			
			Mgmt	Comments	GEF EO	Comments
The identification phase should be kept to a minimum of establishing project eligibility, whether resources are in principle available and whether the concept is endorsed by recipient countries	The recent introduction of a Project Identification Form (PIF) by the GEF Secretariat aims to focus project eligibility upstream to weed out ineligible project ideas without resorting to unnecessary GEF financing. The GEF Secretariat will continue reviewing the optimal timing and implementation procedures for a PIF and explore how best it fits into the current as well as future streamlined project cycle.	Dec. 2006 - Decision on Agenda Item 9 – a) Focus the project identification phase on establishing project eligibility, resource availability, country endorsement and agreed agency comparative advantage;	New rating as of Jan '08: Substantial	Progress May '07 – January '08: PIF has already been under implementation. Depending on the final project cycle proposal approved by the Council, the timing of submission of PIF will be revisited to ensure its fit to the new project cycle.	Medium	The PIF represents a reduction in requirements compared to previous cycle. There have been a number of revisions (with added elements) since the original design reflecting the minimum requirements. There is room for further simplification and continued vigilance to keep the criteria for the early design stage easy and unambiguous.
The Work Program as presented to Council should move towards the strategic level	We agree with the recommendation that the work program presentation to the Council should be in a strategic context, whereby the Council can review the work program as it applies to GEF strategic directions, country priorities, innovative thrust of the portfolio, etc. The GEF Secretariat and the Agencies will take up this challenge in the coming months as we develop options(s) for a revised project cycle.	Dec. 2006 - Decision on Agenda Item 9 – b) Move the work program from being project-based to being program-based in line with GEF strategies and policies;	New rating as of Jan '08: Substantial	Progress May '07 – January '08: The proposed new project cycle incorporated the processing of program based modality where Council's decision will focus on the assessment of the program framework with respect to GEF strategies and focal area priorities.	Substantial	The work programs contain more strategic programs (with underlying project PIFs). In line with the evaluation findings, care should be taken to maintain simplicity and transparency for countries in managing project development under programmatic approaches.

Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Rating in Progress of Adoption *			
			Mgmt	Comments	GEF EO	Comments
Fully documented project proposals should be endorsed by the CEO on a rolling basis	Even under the current project cycle, project documents for CEO endorsement are submitted on a rolling basis while the other stages of the project cycle, including the pipeline entry and work program inclusion follow the GEF project processing calendar, partly aimed at overlapping with the bi-annual Council Meeting. A rethinking of the project cycle will certainly include a review of the possibility of submissions at all stages of the project cycle on a rolling basis. The Secretariat is already implementing an approach where project identification review and project concept review occurs on a rolling basis.	Dec. 2006 - Decision on Agenda Item 9 – c) Allow projects to be endorsed by the CEO on a rolling basis;	New rating as of Jan '08: High	Progress May '07 – January '08: CEO endorsement of fully documented project proposals has already been under implementation even in the current project cycle and there will be no change on this aspect. The proposed new project cycle recommends other project cycle stages to be reviewed for possible submission on a rolling basis.	High	Agreed
See all the above	See all the above	Dec. 2006 - Decision on Agenda Item 9 – d) Expedite the project cycle.	New rating as of Jan '08: Substantial	Progress May '07 – January '08: The proposed project cycle aims to limit project processing and preparation time to an average of 22 months, from the current 66 months.	Not possible to verify yet	As management says, the actual expediting of the cycle is yet to be evaluated since the new project cycle has only been implemented for less than 8 months. To identify potential bottlenecks and promote accountability, a system to track and report transparently on each step (and time) remains a priority.

*Level of adoption may be rated in six ways: **High:** Fully adopted and fully incorporated into policy, strategy or operations; **Substantial:** Decision largely adopted but not fully incorporated into policy, strategy or operations as yet; **Medium:** Adopted in some operational and policy work, but not to a significant degree in key areas; **Negligible:** No evidence or plan for adoption, or plan and actions for adoption are in a very preliminary stage; **N/A:** Non-applicable; **Not possible to verify yet:** verification will have to wait until more data is available or proposals have been further developed.

Management Action Record – February 2008
Evaluation of the GEF Support to Biosafety (GEF/ME/C.28/Inf.1, May 2006)
Management Response (GEF/ME/C.30/8, Nov 2006)

Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision ‡	Rating in Progress of Adoption *			
			Mgmt	Comments	GEF EO	Comments
Future assistance should be better planned and customized to each participating county.	We agree with this recommendation. A stock taking-assessment of the biosafety capacity in participating countries, as a first step in project design, has been proposed. The analysis will include an independent identification and analysis of the necessary aspects to tailor the support to identified needs at country level and at regional and sub-regional level resulting in targets that are measurable and clearly defined. Regional approaches will have flexibility in terms of issues addressed to target specific needs of countries within a region. In addition, we recognize that a thematic approach can be the best way to support a group of countries lacking competence in a particular field. The proposed strategy will promote issue-specific projects based on a previous assessment of needs in countries.	Dec. 2006 – Decision on Agenda Item 15 - The Council reviewed the proposed Strategy for Financing Biosafety (GEF/C.30/8/Rev.1) and approves it as an interim basis for the development of projects for implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety until such time as the focal area strategies are approved by the Council. The Council invites the Implementing and Executing Agencies, under the coordination of the GEF Secretariat and based on their comparative advantages, to collaborate with the GEF to provide assistance to countries for the implementation of the protocol.	New rating as of Jan '08: High	Progress May '07 – January '08: Focal Area Strategies, that fully integrate the Strategy for Financing Biosafety, have been approved by Council. The "Program Document for GEF Support to Biosafety during GEF-4" is before the Council for approval in its April 08 meeting. The Program Document requires all biosafety projects to be designed on the basis of a stock-taking analysis that will identify participating countries' real needs. All Biosafety projects under the Biosafety Program will develop a stock taking analysis during project preparation, to better tailor the support provided to real country needs. UNEP has been working with the GEF Sec and other GEF Agencies with a comparative advantage in biosafety to develop a program framework for biosafety. All PIFs submitted for GEF consideration include stock-taking as part of the PPG activities or as the first component of project implementation.	Medium	Council approved the <i>Biodiversity Focal Area Strategy</i> (GEF/C.31/10) by mail in October 2007, but Council has not yet approved the <i>Program Document for GEF Support to Biosafety during GEF-4</i> .

‡ This Council Decision refers to *Strategy for Financing Biosafety* (GEF/C.30/8/Rev.1) and not to the GEF EO Evaluation which was an information document.

Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision †	Rating in Progress of Adoption *			
			Mgmt	Comments	GEF EO	Comments
The GEF should consider providing longer term training for building and sustaining specialist capacity in risk assessment and risk management.	We agree with this recommendation. Under the proposed Strategy, project activities will implement the Updated Action Plan for Building Capacities for the Effective Implementation of the CPB, where RA and RM capacity building have been prioritized. Project sustainability, reflected in the sustainability indicators included in the proposed Strategy, will favor the continuation of activities in countries after the end of GEF support.	See above	New rating as of Jan '08: High	<p>Progress May '07 – January '08: Focal Area Strategies, that fully integrate the Strategy for Financing Biosafety, have been approved by Council.</p> <p>The “Program Document for GEF Support to Biosafety during GEF-4”, before the Council for approval in its April 08 meeting, requires all biosafety projects to be aligned with the Strategy for Financing Biosafety and, therefore, incorporate measures to support long term training in RM and RA. Projects under the Program incorporate those measures.</p> <p>All proposals pending approval of the biosafety program include training for RA and RM</p>	Medium	See above

Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision †	Rating in Progress of Adoption *			
			Mgmt	Comments	GEF EO	Comments
The GEF should continue to emphasize awareness-raising and public participation issues, including support to the Biosafety Clearing-House.	This recommendation has been taken into account in the proposed Strategy and activities such as awareness raising, education on biosafety, access to information and public participation on decision making will be fully incorporated in project design. Activities to improve countries participation in the BCH, identified in the stock-taking analysis, will form part of project design.	See above	New rating as of Jan '08: High	<p>Progress May '07 – January '08: Focal Area Strategies, that fully integrate the Strategy for Financing Biosafety, have been approved by Council.</p> <p>The “Program Document for GEF Support to Biosafety during GEF-4”, before the Council for approval in its April 08 meeting, requires all biosafety projects to be aligned with the Strategy for Financing Biosafety and, therefore, to emphasize awareness-raising and public participation issues, including support to the BCH. Projects proposed under the Program incorporate emphasize those aspects.</p> <p>All proposals pending approval of the biosafety program include training for awareness-raising and public participation issues</p>	Medium	See above

Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision ‡	Rating in Progress of Adoption *			
			Mgmt	Comments	GEF EO	Comments
The GEF should work toward a higher degree of donor collaboration and other cost-sharing schemes at the global and national levels.	We agree with this recommendation. Coordination of efforts at the international level will be enhanced through the exchange of information, collaboration, and work through the Coordination Mechanism for the Implementation of the Action Plan for Building Capacities for the Effective Implementation of the CPB. Complementarity of activities, with other existing biosafety capacity building initiatives, at bilateral and multilateral level, will be stressed. At national level, the definition of the role of a national coordination mechanism, that includes the promotion of synchronized and synergistic implementation of capacity building activities and the harmonized use of donor's assistance will be included in project design.	See above	New rating as of Jan '08: Medium	<p>Progress May '07 – January '08: Focal Area Strategies, that fully integrate the Strategy for Financing Biosafety, have been approved by Council.</p> <p>The "Program Document for GEF Support to Biosafety during GEF-4", before the Council for approval in its April 08 meeting, requires all biosafety projects to be aligned with the Strategy for Financing Biosafety and, therefore, to establish a national coordination mechanism</p> <p>No activity occurred during the reporting period. The 4th Coordination Meeting for Governments & Organizations Implementing or Funding Biosafety Capacity-Building Activities was held from 11-13 February 2008, New Delhi, India.</p> <p>The meeting, on whose Steering Committee the UNEP/GEF serves, considered proposed measures for enhancing capacity-building and guidance to facilitate implementation of the following issues: (i) Socio-economic considerations in decision-making regarding living modified organisms; (ii) LMO identification and documentation requirements under Article 18, paragraph 2, of the Protocol. The outcome of the meeting will guide the COP-MOP in its deliberations on capacity building in May. 2008 in Bonn, Germany. COP/MOP decisions will further guide future GEF portfolio development on biosafety.</p>	Medium	See above

Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision †	Rating in Progress of Adoption *			
			Mgmt	Comments	GEF EO	Comments
The GEF should seek advice from its Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel and other scientists as to whether and how biosafety could be better integrated strategically and programmatically into the GEF biodiversity portfolio.	This recommendation has been taken into account and the GEF Secretariat, in consultation with STAP, will explore how national capacities under RA and RM existing systems, such as those for customs and trade, can be extended to support RA and RM for LMO's.	See above	New rating as of Jan '08: Medium	<p>Progress May '07 – January '08: GEF Council has approved The <i>Focal Area Strategy for Biodiversity</i> which includes one strategic objective entitled "Safeguarding Biodiversity". Under this Strategic Objective the GEF will support the implementation of biosafety projects and cost-effective strategies to prevent, control and manage invasive alien species.</p> <p>The "Program Document for GEF Support to Biosafety during GEF-4", before the Council for approval in its April 08 meeting, includes a FSP proposal focused on the Development and Implementation of a National Monitoring and Control System (Framework) for Living Modified Organisms (LMOs) and Invasive Alien Species in Cameroon.</p> <p>STAP's advisory work in the Biodiversity TAG has led to biosafety being included in the Biodiversity Focal Area Strategic Program 6 now adopted by the Council</p>	Medium	Council approved the <i>Biodiversity Focal Area Strategy</i> (GEF/C.31/10) by mail in October 2007 which has included biosafety under one strategic objective entitled "Safeguarding Biodiversity," but Council has not yet approved the <i>Program Document for GEF Support to Biosafety during GEF-4</i> .

*Level of adoption may be rated in six ways: **High:** Fully adopted and fully incorporated into policy, strategy or operations; **Substantial:** Decision largely adopted but not fully incorporated into policy, strategy or operations as yet; **Medium:** Adopted in some operational and policy work, but not to a significant degree in key areas; **Negligible:** No evidence or plan for adoption, or plan and actions for adoption are in a very preliminary stage; **N/A:** Non-applicable; **Not possible to verify yet:** verification will have to wait until more data is available or proposals have been further developed.

Management Action Record – February 2008
GEF Annual Performance Report 2006 (GEF/ME/C.31/1, May 2007)
Management Response (GEF/ME/C.31/2, May 2007)

Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Rating in Progress of Adoption			
			Mgmt	Comments	GEF EO	Comments
UNDP and UNEP need to involve social and institutional expertise in project supervision.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - UNDP notes this recommendation and the findings on which it is based. While UNDP already involves social and institutional expertise in project supervision, UNDP will examine how it can further strengthen this. - UNEP acknowledges that social and institutional expertise is important for adequate supervision of specific projects. As such, UNEP will include guidance on this issue in the section of project supervision standards of its GEF Operations Manual. 	Jun. 2007 – Decision on Agenda Item 6 - UNDP and UNEP should involve social and institutional expertise in project supervision where appropriate;	Rating as of Jan '08: Negligible	<p>Progress May '07 – January '08: UNDP systematically involves social and institutional expertise in project supervision.</p> <p>UNEP-GEF is currently reviewing its entire operation and as part of this exercise will, among other things identifying (a) key skill sets needed; (b) current staff capacities; and (c) modalities to fill any gaps and costs implications. The DGEF new business plan is expected to be completed by April 08.</p>	Not possible to verify yet	GEF EO will carry out a quality of supervision review next year where it will include an assessment of the extent to which GEF Agencies involve social scientists in project supervision
Special attention is required to ensure continued and improved supervision in the new project cycle, through ensuring adequate funding in project fees.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Results-based Management Framework (RBM) that is presented for Council discussion will provide the platform for the Secretariat to develop tools to monitor the portfolio, in coordination with the GEF agencies. While developing these tools, care will be taken to ensure that they do not duplicate, but rather build on, the monitoring activities undertaken by the agencies. - The agencies will ensure that the appropriate level of resources received from fees are directed 	Jun. 2007 – Decision on Agenda Item 6 - special attention is required to ensure continued and improved supervision by the GEF agencies during implementation of projects and adequate funding should be provided for this supervision from the project fees;	Rating as of Jan '08: High	<p>Progress May '07 – January '08: The Annual Monitoring Review (AMR) has been established as the principle reporting instrument of the Secretariat's monitoring system and will be presented to Council every year, starting April 2008.</p> <p>The AMR is designed as a scoping tool that gives a snap shot of the overall health of the GEF's active</p>	Not possible to verify yet	<p>THE AMR will be presented for the first time to the GEF Council</p> <p>GEF EO will carry out a quality of supervision review next year where it will assess the changes since the review carried out in 2006 and will look into adequacy of funding for supervision</p>

Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Rating in Progress of Adoption			
			Mgmt	Comments	GEF EO	Comments
	toward supervision of projects.			portfolio of projects each fiscal year. It monitors project implementation progress, progress towards achieving global environmental objectives, and baseline identification and tracking		
UNEP should develop a structural approach to supervision of its GEF portfolio.	<p>UNEP notes that the above recommendation is in line with UNEP's management approach to strengthen overall project supervision. UNEP is therefore pleased to report on the following changes it has put in place over the last year to improve the overall supervision of its GEF portfolio:</p> <p>(a) UNEP has undertaken an intensive exercise of improving human resource capacity for the supervision of its GEF project portfolio.</p> <p>(b) UNEP has also been developing standard processes to instill a more structured approach to project implementation supervision as follows. UNEP developed and applied an enhanced GEF Project Implementation Review (PIR) process (piloted in GEF FY06). A Project-at-Risk system was developed and piloted from GEF FY 05 for the implementation review of all its GEF projects.</p> <p>(c) UNEP is also institutionalizing a process of annual project quality of supervision reviews which will be</p>	Jun. 2007 – Decision on Agenda Item 6 - UNEP should develop a systemic approach to supervision of its GEF portfolio;	Rating as of Jan '08: Substantial	<p>Progress May '07 – January '08:</p> <p>The following measures have been taken by UNEP to enhance its quality of project supervision:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) A process for a review of quality of project supervision at UNEP has been designed with input from the GEF Evaluation Office and is ready for implementation. The first review is scheduled to take place in April 08. 2) Costed project supervision plans have been made a requirement for internal project approval since October 2007. 3) Guidelines for project supervision have been developed. These will be endorsed and adopted at the DGEF staff retreat in April 08. 4) The enhanced PIR process and project-at-risk system are under implementation. 5) Quality of project 	Medium	UNEP has made important progress in the design of a supervision approach and is in the process of testing it and putting it into practice.

Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Rating in Progress of Adoption			
			Mgmt	Comments	GEF EO	Comments
	conducted by UNEP's portfolio manager in consultation with UNEP's Evaluation and Oversight Unit. Starting with the June 07 work programme, UNEP's GEF projects once endorsed by the CEO, will include project supervision plans to be put in place before UNEP proceeds with implementation. These plans will establish project supervision tasks and their costings. A GEF Operations Manual is under development with an expected completion date of August 2007.			supervision and backstopping has been integrated as a rated parameter in UNEP GEF project evaluations.		
All GEF agencies will need to ensure that terminal evaluation reports include adequate information on sustainability of outcomes, quality of M&E systems and reporting on co-financing.	Evaluation reports prepared for GEF-financed projects are expected to meet the minimum requirement 3 of the GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy. In line with these requirements, agencies will ensure that terminal evaluation reports include information on sustainability of outcomes, quality of M&E systems, and assessment of co-financing realized.	Jun. 2007 – Decision on Agenda Item 6 - all GEF agencies should ensure that terminal evaluation reports include adequate information on sustainability of outcomes, quality of monitoring and evaluation systems and reporting on co-financing, in line with the minimum requirements for project evaluation in the GEF M&E Policy.	Rating as of Jan '08: High	<p>Progress May '07 – January '08:</p> <p>Systematic review of UNDP GEF TERs by UNDP EO includes review of 1. TER's assessments of sustainability of outcomes and of 2. TER's assessment of the quality of the project's M&E</p> <p>Specific indicators used to assess TER's treatment of sustainability:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Project design measures or strategy for sustaining project results are assessed. - Policy and enabling environment factors that provide support for sustaining project results are considered. Institutional capacity for sustaining project results is considered. - Financial and technical resources required for sustaining project results 	Substantial	The 2007 Terminal evaluation review that an increasing number of evaluations present information on sustainability and quality of project M&E. Terminal Evaluations reporting on financial issues remained insufficient to rate project performance in this area in nearly half of the evaluations submitted in 2007.

Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Rating in Progress of Adoption			
			Mgmt	Comments	GEF EO	Comments
				<p>are considered.</p> <p>Specific indicator used to assess TER's treatment of M&E:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -The existence and quality of the M & E Plan are assessed, including baseline conditions, methodology and roles and responsibilities. - The extent to which M&E were sufficiently budgeted and funded during project preparation and implementation is assessed. - The effectiveness of monitoring indicators from the Project Document for measuring progress and performance is assessed. - Compliance with the progress and financial reporting requirements/ schedule is assessed, including quality and timeliness of reports. - The value and effectiveness of the monitoring and evaluation reports and process is discussed with participants and assessed. - The follow-up action, or adaptive management, taken to respond to monitoring and evaluation reports is assessed. <p>UNEP is now in the second year of implementation of the revised evaluation procedures which fully</p>		

Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Rating in Progress of Adoption			
			Mgmt	Comments	GEF EO	Comments
				comply with the GEF M&E policy, GEF TE guidelines and with this recommendation. In addition, UNEP PIR reports include ratings on a) quality of project M&E plans and b) quality of implementation of M&E plans.		
--	--	Jun. 2007 – Decision on Agenda Item 6 - The Council notes that negligible progress has been made in developing a management information system and requests the Secretariat to make this a priority activity for completion before the end of the calendar year.	Rating as of Jan '08: High	Progress May '07 – January '08: The GEFSEC has made substantial progress towards completing the in-house development of the new management information system. A country portal is now functional so that operational focal points can access real time information regarding the status of PIFs and project documents submitted to the GEFSEC for review.	Substantial	See comment on PIMS for the APR 2004 (in page 1)

Management Action Record – February 2008
GEF Country Portfolio Evaluation: Philippines (1992-2007) (GEF/ME/C.31/3, May 2007)
Management Response (GEF/ME/C.31/4, May 2007)

Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Rating in Progress of Adoption			
			Mgmt	Comments	GEF EO	Comments
The GEF should develop country programs and strategies for large recipients of GEF support like the Philippines.	We agree with the Evaluation Office's conclusion that the RAF has led to improvement in this area since the resources allocated need to be prioritized and shared among different national institutions and GEF Agencies, compared to the past when allocations were made on a demand basis and there was a perception that every eligible project would be funded eventually by the GEF. As RAF implementation progresses, we hope to work with recipients with large allocations to develop GEF programming strategies.	Jun. 2007 – Decision on Agenda Item 7 - The Council requests the Secretariat to prepare for Council consideration in November 2007 a proposal for development of country assistance strategies leading to better coordination and programming at the country level.	Rating as of Jan '08: Substantial	Progress May '07 – January '08: At the Council Meeting of November 2007 the Secretariat presented a paper on Development of Country Strategies for GEF Programming as requested. (GEF/C.32/Inf4)	Medium	Paper was presented to Council but not discussed. Paper does not provide any plan of action but rather leaves it completed to the country.
--	--	Jun. 2007 – Decision on Agenda Item 7 - The Secretariat is also requested to ensure transparency of, and better access to, information on GEF procedures and the status of projects in the GEF project cycle.	Rating as of Jan '08: High	Progress May '07 – January '08: Information has been improved on the GEF web page and on the country support program web page. Presentations have been made at subregional and constituency meetings. Communication by EXT Team country officers with OFPs has been strengthened and questions are answered on a daily basis. Individual Country portfolio pages, with password access for OFPs, that show the stage of progress of	Substantial	Information is available in the web site but practice is still not fully transparent to clients as discussed in the latest Country Portfolio Evaluations.

Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Rating in Progress of Adoption			
			Mgmt	Comments	GEF EO	Comments
				projects has been set up and is functioning.		

Management Action Record – February 2008
GEF Country Portfolio Evaluation: Samoa (1992-2007) (GEF/ME/C.31/5, May 2007)
Management Response (GEF/ME/C.31/6, May 2007)

Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Rating in Progress of Adoption			
			Mgmt	Comments	GEF EO	Comments
The proposed programmatic approach for the Pacific SIDS should take into account Samoa's experience.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - We agree with the above recommendation that the lessons from Samoa's experience with the GEF should be taken into account when developing the proposed regional programmatic approach for Pacific SIDS for implementation in GEF-4. - Considering the shared and common environmental problems faced by Samoa, the GEF proposes that in GEF-4 national projects are agreed to after considering the opportunities available for regional synergies. - The GEF Pacific program will therefore be an aggregation of nationally executed projects that will help in reducing transaction costs, ease reporting to GEF and help in raising cofinancing. 	<p>Jun. 2007 – Decision on Agenda Item 8 - requests the Secretariat to take into account Samoa's experience with the GEF in its further development of the proposed GEF-Pacific Alliance for Sustainability, including the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) the need for support for establishing an environmental framework in national policies, laws and regulations, and where this has been achieved, the need for support for implementation of the framework so as to achieve global environmental benefits; (b) recognition of the importance of marine resources; (c) recognition of the need to strengthen resilience to climate change to sustain global environmental benefits; (d) recognition of the high transaction costs in the region; and (e) the need for involving more GEF agencies in the region, as well as harmonization with recipient countries and other donors. 	<p>Rating as of Jan '08: High</p>	<p>Progress May '07 – January '08: The GEF Pacific Alliance for Sustainability has been developed, working on a regional level, with projects designed to have national activities, while utilizing opportunities for regional synergies. The program has projects in all the major focal areas of the GEF</p>	<p>High</p>	<p>Agreed. Program has taken into account recommendations from the evaluation.</p>

Management Action Record – February 2008
Joint Evaluation of the Small Grants Programme – Executive Version (GEF/ME/C.32/2, Oct 2007)
Management Response (GEF/ME/C.32/3/Rev.1, Oct 2007)

Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Rating in Progress of Adoption			
			Mgmt	Comments	GEF EO	Comments
The level of management costs should be established on the basis of services rendered and cost-efficiency rather than on the basis of a stated percentage.	<p>- While recognizing that in many cases the presence of a national coordinator to support a national steering committee is essential to demonstrate national and civil society ownership within the country, the SGP Steering Committee will review the management structure for countries having smaller allocations and explore extending multi-country management support systems that serve the purpose of assisting countries without losing cost-efficiency of its operations.</p> <p>- The management notes with concern the practice of providing small grants solely to pay SGP's management costs over and above the funds provided by the GEF. Such action would appear to be a violation of the GEF funding agreement. SGP management has considered these to be legitimate expenses (knowledge management products and capacity building) for helping deliver global environmental benefits. In order to resolve this point, the issue will be taken up at the next meeting of the SGP Steering Committee.</p>	<p>Nov. 2007 – Decision on Agenda Item 9 – The Council requests the SGP Steering Committee to implement the recommendations by: (a) Proposing a level of management costs on the basis of services rendered and cost-efficiency rather than on the basis of a stated percentage.</p>	<p>Rating as of Jan '08: Medium</p>	<p>Progress May '07 – January '08: A special working group led by UNDP has been formed and a systematic study has been commissioned by UNDP to explore various options and specific strategies to operationalize and implement each of the recommendations. This paper will be presented at the next GEF SGP Steering Committee meeting and then posted for Council consideration.</p> <p>A guidance note has been sent to all National Coordinators to stop grants supporting knowledge management and capacity building activities until the issue is resolved.</p> <p>The SGP Steering Committee has established a working group under the leadership of UNDP and involving a representative from each of the GEFSEC and the GEF NGO</p>	<p>GEF EO Medium</p>	<p>The SGP management has started to address the various council decisions through the GEF SGP Steering Committee. Nevertheless, the Steering Committee nor the working group have representation of Country Coordinators. This presents the risk that, inadvertently, new proposals won't sufficiently consider country operational issues. The Evaluation Office considers that the inclusion of some of the senior country coordinators in the Steering Committee would allow for the county programme perspective to be part of the discussions that lead to the SGP proposals to address the GEF Council decisions.</p>

Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Rating in Progress of Adoption			
			Mgmt	Comments	GEF EO	Comments
				network to prepare a paper for consideration at the next meeting of the Steering Committee. The Steering Committee will submit a report for decision to the April GEF Council Meeting.		
A process needs to start to change SGP's central management system so that it becomes suitable for the new phase of growth and to address the risks of growing complexity.	We agree on the recommendation to review the central management system of the SGP and will take it up and provide a report to the Council at its next meeting.	Nov. 2007 – Decision on Agenda Item 9 – ... (b) starting a process to change SGP's central management system suitable for the new phase of growth and to address the risks of growing complexity.	Rating as of Jan '08: Medium	Progress May '07 – January '08: SGP has started to seek support for country start up from the UNDP/GEF Regional Unit for Latin America (part of the evaluation recommendations to involve regional units of UNDP) The SGP Steering Committee has established a working group under the leadership of UNDP and involving a representative from each of the GEFSEC and the GEF NGO network to prepare a paper for consideration at the next meeting of the Steering Committee. The Steering Committee will submit a report for decision to the April GEF Council Meeting.	Medium	More involvement and direct representation of country coordinators would be particularly important during the change in the SGP management system.
Country programme oversight needs to be strengthened.	- The management takes note of this recommendation and will consider a system to regularly audit the country programs. - The GEF ombudsman will also be involved in handling complaints	Nov. 2007 – Decision on Agenda Item 9 - ... (c) strengthening country programme oversight.	Rating as of Jan '08: Medium	Progress May '07 – January '08: An audit plan to cover all SGP countries within GEF4 has been developed.	Medium	Agreed

Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Rating in Progress of Adoption			
			Mgmt	Comments	GEF EO	Comments
	related to the SGP, and this would be appropriately announced on the SGP and GEF websites.			<p>Policy of uploading all project MOAs to UNOPs for review have been set</p> <p>UNOPS has been tasked to develop an interactive web-based training module on ethics and dealing with conflict of interest issues for all NCs and NSC members to take</p> <p>GEF ombudsman with SGP has resolved one issue raised by Suriname;</p> <p>Other aspects of improving country programme oversight will be provided by the management options paper</p> <p>The SGP Steering Committee has established a working group under the leadership of UNDP and involving a representative from each of the GEFSEC and the GEF NGO network to prepare a paper for consideration at the next meeting of the Steering Committee. The Steering Committee will submit a report for decision to the April GEF Council Meeting.</p>		

Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Rating in Progress of Adoption			
			Mgmt	Comments	GEF EO	Comments
Monitoring and Evaluation needs to be strengthened further.	The M&E system will be reviewed and strengthened as per the recommendation made by the evaluation office.	Nov. 2007 – Decision on Agenda Item 9 - ... (d) further strengthening Monitoring and Evaluation.	Rating as of Jan '08: Medium	<p>Progress May '07 – January '08: Guidance note was sent to all National Coordinators to systematize field visit documentation as recommended by the evaluation.</p> <p>Database improvement is on-going.</p> <p>Other aspects of strengthening M&E will be provided by the management options paper</p> <p>The SGP Steering Committee has established a working group under the leadership of UNDP and involving a representative from each of the GEFSEC and the GEF NGO network to prepare a paper for consideration at the next meeting of the Steering Committee. The Steering Committee will submit a report for decision to the April GEF Council Meeting.</p>	Medium	Agreed
The current criteria for access to SGP resources should be revised to maintain cost efficiency.	- Funding for the LDCs and SIDS has been made possible as resources have been freed up after placing a cap on the allocations provided to existing SGP countries. The consequence of removing such a cap will be to push the SGP back to the <i>status</i>	Nov. 2007 – Decision on Agenda Item 9 - ... (e) proposing a revision of the current criteria for access to SGP resources to maintain cost efficiency.	Rating as of Jan '08: Medium	<p>Progress May '07 – January '08: A special working group led by UNDP has been formed and a systematic study has been commissioned by UNDP to explore various</p>	Medium	Agreed

Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Rating in Progress of Adoption			
			Mgmt	Comments	GEF EO	Comments
	<p><i>quo</i> shutting most of the LDCs and several SIDS based on the approved funding by the Council.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A modification in the project cycle of the SGP lifted the highest cap on a per year basis from \$600,000 to \$800,000 for countries. (as explained in paragraph 21 of this management response) - The SGP Steering Committee agreed to review the graduation status of the affected Least Developed Countries and SIDS and report to the Council at its next meeting. 			<p>options and specific strategies to operationalize and implement each of the recommendations. This paper will be presented at the next GEF SGP Steering Committee meeting and then posted for Council consideration.</p> <p>The SGP Steering Committee has established a working group under the leadership of UNDP and involving a representative from each of the GEFSEC and the GEF NGO network to prepare a paper for consideration at the next meeting of the Steering Committee. The Steering Committee will submit a report for decision to the April GEF Council Meeting.</p>		
<p>The intended SGP country programme graduation policy needs to be revised for GEF 5 to address the risks to GEF achievements and cost effectiveness, especially in SIDS and LDCs.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The GEF Secretariat agrees to work with the GEF focal points in countries graduating from the SGP to help ensure that the SGP delivery mechanism established with GEF funding are not dismantled but rather fully utilized in their new graduated stage. This would further enhance the capacity of civil society in the country while strengthening its interaction with the Government. - The evaluation report suggests an alternative of initiating "independent franchise" to 	<p>Nov. 2007 – Decision on Agenda Item 9 - ... (f) further developing a graduation policy for the SGP country programmes which takes into account the identified risks to GEF achievements and cost effectiveness, especially in SIDS and LDCs.</p>	<p>Rating as of Jan '08: Medium</p>	<p>Progress May '07 – January '08: A special working group led by UNDP has been formed and a systematic study has been commissioned by UNDP to explore various options and specific strategies to operationalize and implement each of the recommendations. This paper will be presented at the next GEF SGP</p>	<p>Medium</p>	<p>Agreed</p>

Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Rating in Progress of Adoption			
			Mgmt	Comments	GEF EO	Comments
	continue the SGP outside the SGP management. This is possible and will be investigated by the SGP Steering Committee.			<p>Steering Committee meeting and then posted for Council consideration.</p> <p>The SGP Steering Committee has established a working group under the leadership of UNDP and involving a representative from each of the GEFSEC and the GEF NGO network to prepare a paper for consideration at the next meeting of the Steering Committee. The Steering Committee will submit a report for decision to the April GEF Council Meeting.</p>		
--	--	Nov. 2007 – Decision on Agenda Item 9 - Council requests the SGP Steering Committee to report for decision of the Council on the actions taken to implement the recommendations at the April 2008 Council Meeting.	Rating as of Jan '08: Medium	<p>Progress May '07 – January '08: To be reported in the form of the management option paper being developed</p> <p>The SGP Steering Committee has established a working group under the leadership of UNDP and involving a representative from each of the GEFSEC and the GEF NGO network to prepare a paper for consideration at the next meeting of the Steering Committee. The Steering Committee will submit a report for</p>	Medium	Agreed

Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Rating in Progress of Adoption			
			Mgmt	Comments	GEF EO	Comments
				decision to the April GEF Council Meeting.		

Management Action Record – February 2008
GEF Annual Report on Impact 2007 – Executive Version (GEF/ME/C.32/4, Oct 2007)
Management Response (GEF/ME/C.32/5, Oct 2007)

Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Rating in Progress of Adoption *			
			Mgmt	Comments	GEF EO	Comments
Protected Area projects should include a specific plan for institutional continuity, which should be included in the biodiversity tracking tools of the GEF, or through the development of an alternative system, under the direction of the GEF Secretariat.	Management proposes the following course of action: First, within the Project Information Form (PIF) as part of the presentation of the project design, the issue of post-project sustainability, including "institutional continuity", will be addressed as relevant to each project, given that this issue affects all projects, not only those dealing with protected areas. Second, at the time of CEO endorsement and as part of the project's sustainability strategy, the project design will identify how institutional continuity will be addressed and monitored during project implementation and how institutional continuity will be secured by the time of project closure. Finally, during the mid-term and final-evaluations, the Terms of Reference will specifically highlight this issue as an area for examination for the evaluator. We believe that this approach provides a more comprehensive remedy to the problem identified.	Nov. 2007 – Decision on Agenda Item 10 – The Council takes a note of the Annual Report's conclusions and requests the GEF Secretariat to incorporate its recommendations into project preparation and to ensure adequate monitoring of progress towards institutional continuity.	Rating as of Jan '08: Medium	Progress May '07 – January '08: Attention is being paid to these recommendations during project preparation. As these are being implemented, we will get a sense of whether institutional continuity measures are working or not.	Medium	Agreed.

* Level of adoption may be rated in six ways: **High:** Fully adopted and fully incorporated into policy, strategy or operations; **Substantial:** Decision largely adopted but not fully incorporated into policy, strategy or operations as yet; **Medium:** Adopted in some operational and policy work, but not to a significant degree in key areas; **Negligible:** No evidence or plan for adoption, or plan and actions for adoption are in a very preliminary stage; **N/A:** Non-applicable; **Not possible to verify yet:** verification will have to wait until more data is available or proposals have been further developed.

