

# Management Action Report 2010

## Overview

The GEF Management Action Record (MAR) tracks the level of adoption, by the GEF Secretariat and/or the GEF agencies (together here referred to as GEF Management), of GEF Council decisions that have been made on the basis of GEF EO recommendations. The MAR serves two purposes: “(1) to provide Council with a record of its decision on the follow-up of evaluation reports, the proposed management actions, and the actual status of these actions; and (2) to increase the accountability of GEF management regarding Council decisions on monitoring and evaluation issues.” \*

MAR 2011 tracks 21 separate GEF Council and decisions based on 16 GEF Evaluation Office documents.

## Rating Approach

The rating categories for the progress of adoption of Council decisions were agreed upon in the consultative process of the Evaluation Office with the GEF Secretariat and the GEF Agencies and are as follows:

- **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.

## Documents Considered in this Analysis

MAR 2011 tracks management actions on GEF Council decisions based on 16 GEF Evaluation Office documents:

- Annual Performance Report 2006 (GEF/ME/C.31/1, May 2007)
- Joint Evaluation of the Small Grants Programme—Executive Version (GEF/ME/C.32/2, October 2007)
- Annual Report on Impact 2007—Executive Version (GEF/ME/C.32/4, October 2007)
- Annual Country Portfolio Evaluation Report 2009 (GEF/ME/C.35/1, June 2009)
- GEF Annual Report on Impact 2009 (GEF/ME/C.36/2, November 2009)
- Role of Local Benefits in Global Environmental Programs Part One: Nature and Conclusions of the Study (GEF/ME/C.27/4, October 2005)
- Evaluation of Incremental Cost Assessment (GEF/ME/C.30/2, Nov 2006)
- Evaluation of the GEF Activity Cycle and Modalities (GEF/ME/C.30/6, Nov 2006)
- Evaluation of the GEF Support to Biosafety (GEF/ME/C.28/Inf.1, May 2006)
- Annual Performance Report 2005 (GEF/ME/C.28/2/Rev.1, May 2006)

---

\* GEF Council, “Procedures and Format of the GEF Management Action Record.” GEF/ME/C.27/3., GEF Council November, 2005.

- Annual Country Portfolio Evaluation Report 2008 (GEF/ME/C.33/4, Mar 2008)
- Mid-term Review of the Resource Allocation Framework (GEF/ME/C.34/2, Oct 2008)
- Annual Country Portfolio Evaluation Report 2010 (GEF/ME/C.38/2 June 2010)
- GEF Annual Performance Report 2009 (GEF/ME/C.38/4 June 2010)
- Review of the Earth Fund (GEF/ME/C.39/2 and GEF/ME/C.39/1 October 2010)
- Evaluation of the Strategic Priority for Adaptation (GEF/ME/C.39/4 October 2010)

**Management Action Record 2010**  
**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*(See End of Document for Ratings Definitions)			
			Mgmt	Comments	GEF EO	Comments
1. UNDP and UNEP need to involve social and institutional expertise in project supervision.	<p>- 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.</p> <p>- 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.</p>	<p><b>Jun. 2007 – Decision on Agenda Item 6</b> - UNDP and UNEP should involve social and institutional expertise in project supervision where appropriate;</p>	<p><b>New rating:</b> <b>High</b></p> <p><b>Previous rating:</b> <b>High</b></p>	<p>Progress Feb '10 – Feb 2011:            UNEP: UNEP has largely addressed this recommendation, through :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Implementation of social safeguard system for all projects at the development, and implementation supervision stages, and training of project supervisors in the same.</li> <li>b) Application of UNEP's updated Gender Policy to all projects, including training of all project supervisors</li> <li>c) Ensuring that all projects which work at the local community level engage such expertise</li> <li>d) Ensuring that all projects that aim to improve institutional frameworks engage environmental lawyers and governance expertise</li> <li>e) Drawing upon UNEP's internal expertise on environmental governance where necessary</li> </ul> <p>UNEP requests that this recommendation be graduated.</p> <p>UNDP: UNDP has addressed this recommendation through:            Application of UNDP gender policy            Mandatory rating of gender relevance of projects in UNDP ATLAS ERP system            Application of UNDP GEF guidance on measuring capacity development where appropriate            Involvement of social and institution expertise in project supervision,</p>	<p><b>New rating:</b> <b>No longer relevant</b></p> <p><b>Previous rating:</b> <b>Substantial</b></p>	<p>EO has previously verified that since 2006, the Agencies have made progress in addressing social issues across the GEF project cycle. This year, EO was not able to verify the extent to which progress has taken place. Nevertheless, this recommendation is <b>now superseded</b> by the GEF5 Program Document which specifies that the GEF Secretariat develop a Gender and Social Policy.</p> <p>At the Spring 2011 Council meeting, GEF Secretariat will be presenting a proposal to adopt two new policies for the GEF: A Policy on Environmental and Social Safeguards and a Policy on Gender Mainstreaming.</p> <p>These policies will establish the GEF minimum requirements with regards to gender and social issues and applicable to all GEF partner Agencies.</p> <p>Once the policy is approved by Council, the EO will later carry out a review to assess the extent to which the policy is implemented.</p>

				including local communities and other stakeholders, where appropriate UNDP requests that this recommendation be graduated.		
2. Special attention is required to ensure continued and improved supervision in the new project cycle, through ensuring adequate funding in project fees.	<p>- 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.</p> <p>- The agencies will ensure that the appropriate level of resources received from fees is directed toward supervision of projects.</p>	<p><b>Jun. 2007 – Decision on Agenda Item 6 -</b> 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;</p>	<p><b>New rating:</b>  <b>Medium</b>  <b>Previous rating:</b> <b>Substantial</b></p>	<p>Progress Feb '10 – Feb 2011:</p> <p>GEFSEC: The Secretariat is working with the Agencies to develop a fee reporting matrix that will be submitted for discussion at the May 2011 Council meeting.</p> <p>Working with the Council and Agencies, the Secretariat has finalized a TOR for an independent review of administrative expenses of the Agencies. Consultant selection is underway.</p> <p>UNEP: UNEP has analyzed its standard costs for project supervision, and applies this through requiring IA Task Managers create and apply individual "Project Supervision Plans". We also hope that the ongoing External Review of the Admin Fee system will help to develop a harmonized system across Agencies.</p> <p>UNDP: Through UNDPs three-tiered quality assurance system, project supervision is provided at the country level, regional level and global level. This has consistently received high ratings from the GEF Evaluation Office.</p> <p>WB: We have provided comments to GEFSec on the proposed RBM tools. It must be noted that the fees cover the full project cycle from project formulation and supervision through closing. GEF requests for additional information at any stage have implications on the amounts available from the fees. The efforts needed for formulation for GEF approval remain high and represent a trade-off with funds for supervision. Nevertheless the Bank has recently revised its budget coefficients to provide more funds for supervision relative to</p>	<p><b>New rating:</b>  <b>Medium</b>  <b>Previous rating:</b> <b>Not possible to verify yet</b></p>	<p>Agreed. Fee structures are being reviewed. The EO will assess progress in implementation of any recommendations from the review.</p>

				formulation.		
3. 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 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 costs. A GEF Operations Manual is under development with an expected completion date of August 2007.</p>	Jun. 2007 – Decision on Agenda Item 6 - UNEP should develop a systemic approach to supervision of its GEF portfolio;	<p><b>New rating:</b> <b>High</b></p> <p><b>Previous rating:</b> <b>Medium</b></p>	<p>Progress Feb '10 – Feb 2011:</p> <p>UNEP refers to the Management Response already given in 2010, and believes that this recommendation has been fully addressed. The steps taken in 2009-2010 are continuing to be maintained and steps are underway to gradually institutionalize these beyond the GEF portfolio. UNEP requests that this recommendation be graduated.</p>	<p><b>New rating:</b> <b>High</b></p> <p><b>Previous rating:</b> <b>Substantial</b></p>	UNEP has developed and put into place a systemic approach to supervision of its GEF portfolio. In future quality of supervision reviews, the Office will assess the extent to which this system has resulted in improvements on the quality of supervision.

<p>4. All GEF agencies will need to ensure that terminal evaluation reports include adequate information on sustainability of outcomes, quality of M&amp;E systems and reporting on co-financing.</p>	<p>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&amp;E systems, and assessment of co-financing realized.</p>	<p>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&amp;E Policy.</p>	<p><b>New rating:</b></p> <p><b>Substantial</b></p> <p><b>Previous rating:</b></p> <p><b>High</b></p>	<p>Progress Feb '10 – Feb 2011:</p> <p>UNEP: The "Review of Outcomes to Impacts" method that the GEF EO has developed is a standard part of the terms of reference of all Terminal Evaluations and provides the necessary information on the sustainability of outcomes of a project. The evaluation of the quality of M&amp;E systems is the focus of specific sections in all Terminal Evaluation reports and co-financing is assessed under the parameter "financial planning and management" of each Terminal Evaluation report. Attached is a template and example of the terms of reference for a UNEP/GEF Terminal Evaluation that provides evidence of our compliance. UNEP therefore believes that it fully meets this recommendation.</p> <p>UNDP: UNDP, with the support of the GEF EO, has instituted a thorough review process of terminal evaluations that looks at these issues. UNDP has prepared detailed guidance for the design of the terminal evaluations which includes addressing these issues.</p> <p>WB: The evaluation of GEF projects is mainstreamed into the Bank's regular supervision and evaluation systems, based on a set of standardized and harmonized (with that of the Bank's Independent Evaluation Group - IEG) evaluation criteria, and an internationally accepted ratings scale. Implementation Completion Report (ICR) [standard World Bank terminal evaluation] are completed within 6 months of project closure. The IEG reviews every ICR for GEF funded projects.</p> <p>IFAD: Please note that IFAD's portfolio is still under implementation – no project grants are at closure.</p> <p>IFAD will ensure that these criteria are duly included in the final review.</p>	<p><b>New rating:</b></p> <p><b>Substantial</b></p> <p><b>Previous rating:</b></p> <p><b>Substantial</b></p>	<p>UNEP, UNDP and the World Bank have put in place systems to review and provide feedback on the quality of terminal evaluations. Progress has been made in this regard but the extent of TE improvement on the specific aspects indicated in this recommendation will be reported in APRs to come.</p>
---	---	--	---	---	--	---

				<p>UNIDO: UNIDO Evaluation group has mainstreamed these requirements into the TOR template for GEF project evaluations. All evaluations carried out so far (after UNIDO gained direct access to GEF) contain the relevant information.</p> <p>IDB: As of Feb 2011 none of the projects in the IDB-GEF portfolio have closed.</p> <p>Two specific actions will ensure that all Terminal Evaluations comply with the minimum GEF M&amp;E requirements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Review by the IDB-GEF Coordination Team of all Terms of Reference for evaluations.</li><li>- The IDB-GEF Team will also undertake a Terminal Evaluation Review that is fully consistent with GEF EO guidance.</li></ul>		
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

## Management Action Record 2010

### 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
5. 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><b>Nov. 2007 – Decision on Agenda Item 9 –</b> 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><b>New rating:</b>  <b>High</b>  <b>Previous rating:</b> <b>High</b></p>	<p>Progress Feb '10 – Feb 2011:  The GEF Council has adopted decision GEF/C.36/4 - small grants programmed: Execution arrangements and upgrading policy for GEF-5.  UNDP: The new project proposal has fully reflected needs of the program and management costs are determined on basis of service rendered.</p>	<p><b>New rating:</b>  <b>High</b>  <b>Previous rating:</b> <b>Substantial</b></p>	<p>The SGP proposal for GEF5 does allocate resources to management costs based on specific services provided. The management cost of SGP as a percentage of GEF grant is likely to reduce during GEF5 from 32% in GEF3. The extent to which this is actually accomplished needs to be verified when SGP is independently evaluated during GEF5.</p>
6. 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.	<p>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.</p>	<p><b>Nov. 2007 – Decision on Agenda Item 9 – ... (b)</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.</p>	<p><b>New rating:</b>  <b>High</b>  <b>Previous rating:</b> <b>Substantial</b></p>	<p>Progress Feb '10 – Feb 2011:  The GEF Council has adopted decision GEF/C.36/4 - small grants programmed: execution arrangements and upgrading policy for GEF-5. Upgraded country programs will be managed separately from the global program and at the same time issues of growth and complexity of the program have been addressed.</p>	<p><b>New rating:</b>  <b>High</b>  <b>Previous rating:</b> <b>Medium</b></p>	<p>The Evaluation Office agrees with the assessment that major changes have been made in the management system of the SGP adequately reflecting the essence of the GEF Council decision. In next few years there will be evidence on how the effectiveness of the changes made in management system. This should indeed be tracked in the evaluation for GEF5.</p>



Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Rating in Progress of Adoption*			
			Mgmt	Comments	GEF EO	Comments
7. Country programme oversight needs to be strengthened.	<p>- The management takes note of this recommendation and will consider a system to regularly audit the country programs.</p> <p>- The GEF ombudsman will also be involved in handling complaints related to the SGP, and this would be appropriately announced on the SGP and GEF websites.</p>	<b>Nov. 2007 – Decision on Agenda Item 9 - ... (c)</b> strengthening country programme oversight.	<p><b>New rating:</b> <b>High</b></p> <p><b>Previous rating:</b> <b>Substantial</b></p>	<p>Progress Feb '10 – Feb 2011: GEF Secretariat started to participate in relevant SGP monitoring and country-start-up missions and contributing significantly to program implementation by providing technical support and advice on program implementation and further enhancement is planned for country program monitoring. GEFSEC is fully committed to participate in monitoring missions as much as possible.</p> <p>UNDP: A blanket audit of SGP country programmes has been accomplished and risk-based selective follow up audits have been planned for GEF-5.</p> <p>Two issues have already been successfully managed and resolved through the GEF Ombudsman.</p> <p>A process for handling complaints has been drafted and will be posted on the SGP and GEF websites following due consultation at the GEF-5 regional workshops.</p>	<p><b>New rating:</b> <b>Substantial</b></p> <p><b>Previous rating:</b> <b>Not possible to verify yet.</b></p>	<p>While participation of GEF Secretariat is important to help Secretariat learn more about functioning of the SGP, it is not clear how effective this will be in strengthening the overall oversight of the country programs.</p> <p>Blanket coverage of country programs through audits addresses some of the concerns raised in the evaluation. However, bottlenecks in terms of free sharing of the information collected through these audits with the management chain in the Secretariat and making this information to the independent evaluation teams is not yet resolved.</p> <p>Strengthening of process for addressing complaints is a positive development. However, at the moment the Evaluation Office does not have a sufficiently nuanced understanding of the process to comment on its effectiveness.</p>
8. 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.	<b>Nov. 2007 – Decision on Agenda Item 9 - ... (d)</b> further strengthening Monitoring and Evaluation.	<p><b>New rating:</b> <b>High</b></p> <p><b>Previous rating:</b> <b>Substantial</b></p>	<p>Progress Feb '10 – Feb 2011: A new project has fully addressed this issue by allocating resources and establishing a framework for M&amp;E.</p> <p>UNDP: The GEF-5 project document has allocated additional resources for further strengthening Monitoring and Evaluation.</p>	<p><b>New rating:</b> <b>High</b></p> <p><b>Previous rating:</b> <b>Substantial</b></p>	Compared to the GEF3 and 4 proposals M&E plan of the GEF5 SGP proposal is stronger. The logical framework and M&E plan give considerably more attention to tracking results and provide adequate resources. Many of the indicators are output indicators – however, these could be understood given the nature and scope of the activities undertaken as part of this programme. The roles and responsibilities for M&E have been specified, and activities appear to be supported with adequate budget. The program database has also been strengthened.

Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Rating in Progress of Adoption*			
			Mgmt	Comments	GEF EO	Comments
9. The current criteria for access to SGP resources should be revised to maintain cost efficiency.	<p>- 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 quo</i> shutting most of the LDCs and several SIDS based on the approved funding by the Council.</p> <p>- 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)</p> <p>- 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>	<p><b>Nov. 2007 – Decision on Agenda Item 9 - ... (e)</b> proposing a revision of the current criteria for access to SGP resources to maintain cost efficiency.</p>	<p><b>New rating:</b></p> <p><b>High</b></p> <p><b>Previous rating:</b></p> <p><b>Medium</b></p>	<p>Progress Feb '10 – Feb 2011:</p> <p>The GEF Council has adopted decision GEF/C.36/4 - SMALL GRANTS PROGRAMME: EXECUTION ARRANGEMENTS AND UPGRADING POLICY FOR GEF-5. Under this policy, country programs of SIDS and LDC are not considered for upgrading and their resources will be increased from global project. In addition to that, if countries desire, they can allocate additional resources for SGP from their STAR allocations. Cost efficiency has been addressed in GEF-5 project document.</p>	<p><b>New rating:</b></p> <p><b>High</b></p> <p><b>Previous rating:</b></p> <p><b>Negligible</b></p>	<p>The Evaluation Office agrees with the assessment.</p>
10. 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>- 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.</p> <p>- The evaluation report suggests an alternative of initiating “independent franchise” to continue the SGP outside the SGP management. This is possible and will be investigated by the SGP Steering Committee.</p>	<p><b>Nov. 2007 – Decision on Agenda Item 9 - ... (f)</b> 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><b>New rating:</b></p> <p><b>High</b></p> <p><b>Previous rating:</b></p> <p><b>High</b></p>	<p>Progress Feb '10 – Feb 2011:</p> <p>The GEF Council with the decision GEF/C.36/4 - SMALL GRANTS PROGRAMME: EXECUTION ARRANGEMENTS AND UPGRADING POLICY FOR GEF-5 has fully addressed this issue.</p> <p>UNDP: The GEF Council with the decision GEF/C.36/4 - SMALL GRANTS PROGRAMME: EXECUTION ARRANGEMENTS AND UPGRADING POLICY FOR GEF-5 has fully addressed this issue by adopting a policy and initially selecting 10 SGP country programmes for upgrading. Upgraded country programmes will be managed as independent Full Size Projects and will continue to receive inputs from the global SGP. Six(6) of these are currently presenting their technically cleared PIFs to the Council for approval.</p>	<p><b>New rating:</b></p> <p><b>High</b></p> <p><b>Previous rating:</b></p> <p><b>Medium</b></p>	<p>To address the issue of cost effectiveness, the SGP is also seeking additional resources for development projects. While these projects are not focused on global environment benefit, since it will help meet some part of the fixed management costs, it will help in increasing the cost efficiency of the program.</p>

Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Rating in Progress of Adoption*			
			Mgmt	Comments	GEF EO	Comments
				Cost efficiency is being addressed in GEF-5 through the mobilization of additional cofinancing, including through the SGP serving as a delivery mechanism for non-GEF related projects and programmes, in order to increase the grant to management cost ratio.		

**Management Action Record 2010**  
**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
11. 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.	<b>Nov. 2007 – Decision on Agenda Item 10</b> – 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.	<b>New rating:</b>  <b>High</b>  <b>Previous rating:</b> <b>High</b>	Progress Feb '10 – Feb 2011:  Natural Resources team: The vast majority of protected area projects are aimed at enhancing the sustainability of protected area systems, through interventions that 1) secure financial sustainability; 2) improve coverage of under-represented ecosystems, thus enhancing ecological sustainability; and 3) increase individual and institutional capacity. These three pillars of sustainability, particularly one and three, are fundamental for the institutional continuity of the protected area system and its sustainability. Hence, the issue of institutional continuity is embedded in the project intervention strategies themselves and has been indicated at PIF stage and CEO endorsement.  Monitoring of project progress towards strengthening individual and institutional capacity building and protected area system sustainability is measured at the project level through the project monitoring and evaluation plan specific to the targets of each project, for example, per-cent reduction in protected area funding gap, establishment of sufficient and reliable budget to cover all recurring management costs, increased capacity etc. These targets are presented in individual project logframes. With regards to financial sustainability, a key pillar of institutional continuity is tracked through the GEF tracking tool for protected area projects and in particular the Protected Area	<b>New rating:</b> <b>High</b>  <b>Previous rating:</b> <b>Substantial</b>	The EO agrees that mechanisms have been put in place across the project cycle to ensure institutional continuity. In future evaluations, the EO will assess the effectiveness of these mechanisms.

Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Rating in Progress of Adoption *			
			Mgmt	Comments	GEF EO	Comments
				<p>Financing Scorecard.</p> <p>UNDP: UNDP addresses institutional continuity in the design, implementation and evaluation of its protected area projects. In particular, UNDP has pioneered the development of the Protected Areas Financing Scorecard which is now used extensively throughout the worlds as a tool to assess financial continuity.</p> <p>WB: The World Bank proposes that the monitoring of progress towards institutional continuity associated with PA projects be linked with the agreement recently reached under the 'reform of the AMR' process. This would allow for existing mechanisms – the BD tracking tool – to assess risks to sustainability of institutional continuity 3 times during the course of a project's implementation – at CEO endorsement, mid-term and terminal evaluation – in order to determine the level of progress being made.</p>		

## Management Action Record 2010

### Annual Country Portfolio Evaluation Report 2009, (GEF/ME/C.35/1, June 2009)

### Management Response to the Annual Country Portfolio Evaluation Report-2009 (GEF/ME/C.35/2, June 2009)

Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Rating in Progress of Adoption			
			Mgmt	Comments	GEF EO	Comments
12. The GEF should address the significant gap of available resources for combating land degradation to support key challenges facing countries like Egypt, Syria, and Cameroon.	We find the comment regarding land degradation to be slightly contradictory. Underfunding is an issue that applies across the whole GEF portfolio, and we note that land degradation is not the only area where a higher resource level would help countries to better meet their environmental priorities.	<i>June 2009. Decision on Agenda Item 7: Explore within the GEF partnership modalities to address the significant gap of available resources for combating land degradation to support key challenges facing countries like Egypt, Syria, and Cameroon</i>	<p><b>New rating:</b></p> <p><b>High</b></p> <p><b>Previous rating:</b></p> <p><b>Medium</b></p>	<p>Progress Feb '10 – Feb 2011:</p> <p>The new System for Allocation of Transparent Resources (STAR) implemented in GEF-5 now makes available resources for all GEF eligible countries, including all three highlighted in this recommendation. Furthermore, guidelines on use of STAR resources allows countries to focus on the LD agenda if they so choose. While none of the three countries are “flexible”, GEF Sec is working with the UNCCD Sec to ensure that Parties are fully informed about the opportunities now presented by the STAR, and in the context of GEF now being formally accepted as a Financial Mechanism of the Convention. Egypt will likely program its STAR allocation under the Deserts Ecosystems and Livelihoods Program being developed by the World Bank MENA Region. Cameroon is part of the Lake Chad Basin, for which an integrated land and water management program is being considered.</p> <p>UNEP: UNEP suggests that this matter be graduated since the GEF-5 STAR allocation now has been extended to LD Focal Area.</p> <p>UNDP: As the GEF-5 STAR allocation extends to the LD focal area, UNDP recommends that this issue be graduated.</p>	<p><b>New Rating:</b></p> <p><b>High</b></p> <p><b>Previous rating:</b></p> <p><b>Medium</b></p>	<p>Agreed. The new STAR system makes available resources for land degradation.</p>

Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Rating in Progress of Adoption			
			Mgmt	Comments	GEF EO	Comments
13. The GEF should focus attention on countries in exceptional situations concerning limited access to International Financial Institutions, like Syria.	- - -	<i>June 2009. Decision on Agenda Item 7: Conduct a survey of countries in exceptional situations concerning limited access to GEF partner International Financial Institutions, like Syria.</i>	<b>New rating:</b>  <b>High</b>  <b>Previous rating:</b> <b>Negligible</b>	Progress Feb '10 – Feb 2011:  The GEF Council at its November 2009 meeting adopted a decision on the System for Transparent Allocation of Resources (STAR) that replaces the RAF, which was the former GEF resource allocation system used in the 4th replenishment period of the GEF.  For GEF5, all countries, including Syria have STAR allocations and can put forth projects based on national priorities. As a result, the recommendation from this Evaluation and the associated Council decision is considered with access to finance for projects with GEB in Syria provided through the new STAR.	<b>New Rating:</b>  <b>Negligible</b>  <b>Previous rating:</b> <b>Negligible</b>	The issue goes beyond availability of resources for countries like Syria, as these would not be used if GEF partner international financial institutions do not work in those countries. The survey mentioned in the decision is expected to improve understanding on how to address this problem.  With the GEF-5 replenishment completed, resources should now be available to conduct this survey.

**Management Action Record 2010**  
**GEF Annual Report on Impact 2009, (GEF/ME/C.36/2, Nov 2009)**  
**Management Response to the GEF Annual Report on Impact –2009 (GEF/ME/C.36/3, Nov 2009)**

Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Rating in Progress of Adoption			
			Mgmt	Comments	GEF EO	Comments
14. The GEF should consider further investment and capacity development to assist countries with economies in transition to address the remaining threats to the ozone layer.	We fully agree with this recommendation. Continuing support to eligible CEITs to meet Montreal Protocol obligations should continue to be a cornerstone of GEF programs, and it is one of the three objectives proposed for the GEF-5 chemicals strategy. Regarding destruction specifically, we would note that this is not an obligation under the Protocol, and that the policy discussions under the Protocol have only recently progressed. In view of the costs and uncertainties involved, we believe support should be provided on a pilot basis and in coordination with other GEF programs dealing with hazardous waste, notably POPs and International Waters.	<i>Nov 2009. Decision on Agenda Item 8: GEF-5 strategy proposals, prepared by the Secretariat, should include further investment and capacity development to assist countries with economies in transition to address the remaining threats to the ozone layer.</i>	<b>New rating: High</b>  <b>Previous rating: High</b>	Progress Feb '10 – Feb 2011:  The GEF-5 strategy for chemicals includes provisions for further investments in economies in transition to support countries meet their reporting obligations under the Montreal Protocol, including implementation of HCFCs phase out plans.  UNEP: GEF-5 Programming Document fully addresses this issue, including the possibilities of synergies between Ozone and Climate Change. UNEP recommends that this decision be graduated.  UNDP: As the GEF-5 Results Frameworks outlined included in the Programming Document fully addresses this issue, including the possibilities of synergies between Ozone and Climate Change, UNDP recommends that this issue be graduated.	<b>New Rating: High</b>  <b>Previous rating: Substantial</b>	GEF 5 strategy includes further funding for investments in economies in transition to support meeting their reporting obligations under the Montreal protocol
15. The GEF should learn from the positive private sector engagement in the reduction of Ozone Layer Depletion focal area and incorporate similar approaches into its efforts to engage the private sector in other focal areas.	We fully agree with this recommendation, although again some context is necessary. There is strong engagement with the private sector because this is where the majority of the ODS consumption/production lies; there is no parallel in any other GEF focal area to this situation. We also agree in general with most of the "lessons for consideration" that are proposed, although their actual applicability would have to be assessed in detail.	<i>Nov 2009. Decision on Agenda Item 8: The Secretariat should incorporate lessons from the positive private sector engagement in the Ozone Layer Depletion focal area into its efforts to engage the private sector, where possible and as appropriate, in other focal areas.</i>	<b>New rating: High</b>  <b>Previous rating: Substantial</b>	Progress Feb '10 – Feb 2011:  A document outlining a strategy for engagement with the private sector is under preparation for discussion at the May 2011 Council meeting.	<b>New Rating: Medium</b>  <b>Previous rating: Substantial</b>	The document presented by the Secretariat to Council is an important first step. The EO in future reviews will assess the extent to which positive private sector lessons have been applied to the engagement of the private sector in GEF Ozone Layer Depletion projects. At the May 2011 meeting, GEFO is also submitting a meta-evaluation reviewing GEF's engagement with the private sector as input to the private sector strategy.



## Management Action Record 2010

### Annual Country Portfolio Evaluation Report 2010 (GEF/ME/C.38/2 June 2010)

### Management Response to the Annual Country Portfolio Evaluation Report 2010(GEF/ME/C.38/3, June 2010)

Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Rating in Progress of Adoption			
			Mgmt	Comments	GEF EO	Comments
16. The GEF Agencies should systematically involve Operational Focal Points in M&E activities by sharing M&E information with them in a timely manner;	We support the recommendation that Focal Point involvement be enhanced in M&E activities. As part of the M&E policy review, focal points will be involved in monitoring. As roles and responsibilities are further elaborated, the policy should address ways for the GEF Agencies to more systematically involve operational focal points in M&E, in addition to sharing information in a timely manner.	<i>June 2010: Decision on Agenda Item 8:</i> GEF Agencies should systematically involve Operational Focal Points in M&E activities by sharing information with them in a timely manner.	<b>New rating:</b>  <b>Substantial</b>	Progress July 2010 – Feb 2011: GEFSEC: Engagement with OFPs is now one of the minimum requirements of the revised M&E policy that Agencies will need to adhere to  UNEP: UNEP's Task Managers regularly comply with this decision. However, in order to strengthen compliance, the UNEP GEF Coordination Office will henceforth submit the completed MTR and TEs formally to the OFPs and continue to track them in its data base (which is also to become accessible to OFPs by the end of 2011).  UNDP: This recommendation is embedded in the new GEF M&E policy. UNDP will continue to involve OFPs in project M&E.  WB: We are taking steps to promote more systematic information to the Focal Points. Such information will have to correspond to the new WB Access to Information Policy which ensures a full and systematic public disclosure of information.	<b>New Rating:</b>  <b>No longer relevant</b>	The revised GEF M&E policy sets the minimum requirement for GEF Agencies to systematically involve OFPs in M&E activities by sharing information with them in a timely manner. The EO will need to review during GEF-5 and through cited examples, or OPS5 if this is complied with at country level.
17. The Secretariat consider provision of specific M&E training to the national focal point mechanism through the Country Support Program; and The Evaluation Office to strengthen, in collaboration with the Secretariat on monitoring issues, the role of Operational Focal Points in monitoring and evaluation in the proposals for revision of	The Secretariat will review its current consultation process with operational focal points to identify cost effective ways to deliver guidance and support in the areas of monitoring and results-based management, as a follow up to the approval of a revised M&E policy in November 2010.	<i>June 2010. Decision on Agenda Item 8:</i> The Secretariat should consider provision of specific M&E training to the national focal point mechanism through the Country Support Program; and The Evaluation Office should strengthen, in collaboration with the Secretariat on monitoring issues, the role of Operational Focal Points in monitoring and evaluation in the proposals for	<b>New rating:</b>  <b>Negligible</b>	Progress July 2010 – Feb 2011:  While the Secretariat began implementing the CSP as from January 2011, it has not yet developed a training session on M&E that can be incorporated into the Expanded Constituency Workshops. This will be done during 2011 to be incorporated to the ECWs in 2012.	<b>New Rating:</b>  <b>Negligible</b>	Agreed.

the M&E policy.		revision of the M&E policy.			
-----------------	--	-----------------------------	--	--	--

**Management Action Record 2010**  
**GEF Annual Performance Report 2009 (GEF/ME/C.38/4 June 2010)**  
**Management Response (GEF/ME/C.38/5 June 2010)**

Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Rating in Progress of Adoption			
			Mgmt	Comments	GEF EO	Comments
18. The GEF Evaluation Office, Secretariat and the Agencies should work together in identifying and implementing measures to improve the quality of information available through PMIS on the status of projects through the project cycle, including agency compliance with deadlines for terminal evaluations.		Jun.2010 - <i>Decision on Agenda Item 9</i> – The GEF Evaluation Office, the Secretariat and the Agencies should work together in identifying and implementing measures to improve the quality of information available through PMIS on the status of projects through the project cycle, including agency compliance with deadlines for terminal evaluations. The Evaluation Office is requested to report on the progress made in the Annual Performance Report 2010.	<b>New rating:</b>  <b>Medium</b>	<p>Progress July 2010 – Feb 2011:</p> <p>GEFSEC: Trustee is just finishing an independent review of GEF systems. Based on the findings of the review, the Secretariat, in consultation with the Trustee and the Agencies will chart a way forward to upgrade the PMIS.</p> <p>UNDP: UNDP continues to provide quality-checked data from project supervision to GEFSEC on an annual basis for uploading to PMIS. This system is proven to work well and meets the needs of both UNDP on project monitoring and GEFSEC on portfolio monitoring.</p> <p>WB: While some discussion has taken place, we would appreciate being fully involved in design and testing of PMIS aspects. We believe the review undertaken by the Trustee as requested by the Council will provide useful information to guide such efforts. Any changes should be based on the principle of avoiding duplication of data entry to avoid discrepancies. The annual AMR process has also discussed the issue and we believe this annual reporting is best vehicle for monitoring the portfolio.</p>	<b>New rating:</b>  <b>Negligible</b>	While there has been some progress in improving the quality of information in the PIMS, progress has been slow.

**Management Action Record 2010**  
**Review of the Earth Fund (GEF/ME/C.39/2 and GEF/ME/C.39/Inf.1 October 2010)**  
**Management Response to the GEF Earth Fund Review (GEF/ME/ C.39/3 October 2010)**

Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Rating in Progress of Adoption			
			Mgmt	Comments	GEF EO	Comments
19. The GEF Secretariat should prepare for the May 2011 Council meeting a revised strategy for enhancing engagement with the private sector that includes a plan for the implementation of the second phase of the Earth Fund.	<p>The Secretariat believes that the Council should make a clear decision as to what it means to reconstitute the Earth Fund. The Secretariat supports reconstituting the Earth Fund if the Council agrees that it will be part of a bold initiative to build a strong and more direct partnership with the private sector. It will need to have its own trust fund and governing arrangement that includes the private sector and with streamlined approval procedures. We believe that potential private sector partners seek full engagement, a management team that listens frequently and carefully to private sector needs, and highly flexible and responsive implementation options.</p> <p>If the Council does not support this approach, then it is not clear that a reconstituted Earth Fund will provide the strategic foundation that the GEF needs for furthering its engagement with the private sector. As an alternative, Agencies could propose private sector projects for funding, which would be approved by Council following a rolling, one-stop approval process similar to that used currently for Earth Fund projects. The Secretariat would devise rules for the use of the \$80 million private sector allocation as an incentive mechanism, aimed at leveraging indicative country allocations under the STAR.</p>	<p>November 2010 - <i>Decision on Agenda Item 8</i> – The GEF Secretariat should prepare for the May 2011 Council meeting a revised strategy for enhancing engagement with the private sector that includes a plan for the implementation of the second phase of the Earth Fund. This plan should take into account comments made during this Council meeting and should move the revised Earth Fund away from a business-as-usual, project-by-project approach and towards a partnership with the private sector at the strategic level. It should also present</p> <p>(1) objectives that are realistic given the funding level, (2) a strategy and modalities in which management and governance are strengthened, including the involvement of the private sector in fund-governance and in raising capital; (3) a communication strategy to disseminate the establishment and operations of the new Fund and (4) expanded access to the Fund.</p>	<p><b>New rating:</b></p> <p><b>Medium</b></p>	<p>Progress December – Feb 2011:</p> <p>A strategy is under preparation for discussion at the May 2011 Council meeting.</p>	<p>New rating:</p> <p><b>Substantial</b></p>	<p>GEFEO notes that preparation of a new Private Sector Strategy is underway by the Secretariat, with a paper to be presented to Council in May 2011. The Decision will be graduated once Council has approved the new Strategy.</p>

## Management Action Record 2010

### Evaluation of the Strategic Priority for Adaptation (GEF/ME/C.39/4 October 2010)

### Management Response to the Strategic Priority for Adaptation (GEF/ME/C.39/5 October 2010)

Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Rating in Progress of Adoption			
			Mgmt	Comments	GEF EO	Comments
20. The GEF should continue providing explicit incentives to carry on the mainstreaming of resilience and adaptation into the GEF focal areas, as a means of reducing risks to the GEF portfolio.	<p>We support the recommendation that the GEF should continue to provide incentives to carry on the mainstreaming of resilience and adaptation into the GEF focal areas, and note that some of the proposals for achieving this may include the application of screening tools and safeguards, as well as the mobilization of further financial incentives. The Secretariat has started to address some of the factors that still prevent the integration and mainstreaming of climate change adaptation across the GEF focal areas, including:</p> <p>The GEF Secretariat taking the first steps to create a screening tool for adaptation as outlined in GEF/C.35/inf.7 – “Incorporating Climate Change Adaptation into GEF Projects”;</p> <p>(b) The STAP is preparing a (currently in draft) study clarifying the scientific rationale of reducing climate change risks and enhancing resilience of the GEF focal areas and;</p> <p>(c) The GEF Secretariat is exploring possibility of providing financial incentives, both through strategic priorities in each GEF focal area and through the use of resources from the Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF) and the Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF) during GEF-5.</p>	<p>November 2010 - <i>Decision on Agenda Item 7</i> – The GEF Secretariat should develop and implement screening tools. These tools will serve as a first step to ensure the mainstreaming and targeting of adaptation and resilience, to reduce the risks from climate change in GEF focal areas and its activities.</p> <p>The Council further requested the Secretariat to report to its November 2012 meeting on steps taken and progress made, including indicators for RBM and M&amp;E.</p>	<p><b>Mgmt</b></p> <p><b>New rating:</b></p> <p><b>Medium</b></p>	<p>Progress December – Feb 2011:</p> <p>Progress December – Feb 2011: The GEF and STAP Secretariats are on track to engage a consultant in order to begin the work on the implementation of the adaptation screening tool. Terms of References and the contract have been developed, and the consultant has been selected. It is expected that the work will be carried out in a two-phased approach, whereby the first phase will result in the proposal of the framework for the tool. This phase is expected to be completed by July 2011. Based on the findings/recoomendations of Phase One, the tool and an accompanying guideline will be developed.</p> <p>UNDP: New tracking tools have been developed and are being used by GEF Agencies in GEF-5. UNDP recommends that the value and efficacy of these tracking tools be evaluated by the GEF EO, with the involvement of the GEF Agencies, towards the end of GEF-5.</p>	<p><b>GEF EO</b></p> <p><b>New rating:</b></p> <p><b>Medium</b></p>	<p>Agreed.</p>

Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Rating in Progress of Adoption			
			Mgmt	Comments	GEF EO	Comments
21. Given that adaptation measures in SPA projects are still under implementation, further evaluations could provide opportunities to learn from outcomes and progress toward impact.	The Secretariat will work with the Evaluation Office to develop guidelines for mid-term and final evaluations for adaptation projects; this is included in the FY 2011 LDCF/SCCF RBM work-plan. In addition, the Secretariat is in the process of developing a comprehensive knowledge management strategy in collaboration with the Agencies, STAP, and the EO, for the GEF partnership. One of the main purposes of such a strategy is to develop a systematic process for reporting on and utilizing lessons learned. Finally, the Secretariat has developed a comprehensive Monitoring and Evaluation Framework for adaptation including the newly developed 'Adaptation Monitoring and Assessment Tool (AMAT)', a tracking tool that will systematically track the progress of certain adaptation indicators on a portfolio level. While this framework and tool was developed specifically for the Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF) and Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF), both would also apply to the needs of the SPA. Please refer to documents: GEF/LDCF.SCCF.9/inf.4 and GEF/LDCF.SCCF.9/inf.5	<p>The Secretariat should continue monitoring the implementation of the SPA to ensure lessons can be learned from the portfolio.</p> <p>The Evaluation Office, STAP and the Adaptation Task Force should provide guidelines in 2012 for evaluations of SPA projects to learn from the outcomes and impacts of the projects.</p>	<p><b>New rating:</b></p> <p><b>Medium</b></p>	<p>As a follow up to the Council Decision, the Secretariat has included a section reporting on SPA projects in the latest AMR document.</p> <p>Moreover, the GEF Adaptation Task Force (ATF), in collaboration with the EO and STAP, has developed a pilot Adaptation Tracking Tool (AMAT), to be tested and fine-tuned during GEF 5.</p> <p>This exercise will be relevant to the development of guidelines in 2012 for evaluation of SPA projects.</p>	<p><b>New rating:</b></p> <p><b>Medium</b></p>	Agreed