

# Management Action Record (MAR) 2011

## 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 12 separate GEF Council and decisions based on 9 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 9 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 Country Portfolio Evaluation Report 2009 (GEF/ME/C.35/1, June 2009)
- Annual Report on Impact 2009 (GEF/ME/C.36/2, November 2009)
- Annual Country Portfolio Evaluation Report 2010 (GEF/ME/C.38/2 June 2010)
- 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)
- Annual Thematic Evaluations Report 2011 (GEF/ME/C.41/2 October 2011)

---

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

**Management Action Record 2011**  
**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
1. 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>Substantial</b></p>	<p>Progress Apr '11 – Apr 2012:</p> <p>A proposal for the fee reform is being submitted for council decision. The Agencies are required to ensure that the appropriate level of resources received from fees is directed toward supervision of projects.</p> <p>World Bank response: Project fees cover the full project cycle from project formulation through supervision to closing. The efforts needed for formulation for GEF approval remain high and represent a trade-off with funds for supervision. The Bank has addressed this by revising its budget coefficients to provide more funds for supervision relative to formulation. It should be noted that GEF requests for additional information at any stage of the project cycle have implications on the use of project fees. Current Bank average fee structure, which stands below 10% fee, and the GEF fee review process underway which proposes further cuts, preclude the possibility of additional supervision requests being addressed in a meaningful manner (e.g. special cross-</p>	<p><b>New rating:</b>  <b>Medium</b></p> <p><b>Previous rating:</b>  <b>Medium</b></p>	<p>The November 2011 Council formed a working group to develop a Fees proposal for the June 2012 Council. A proposal has been agreed to by the group members and will be presented in the June 2012 Council. This proposal includes a sliding fee structure. While it is a positive step away from the current one fits all approach, it is also not clear to what extent implementation costs of MSPs were considered in the decision. The Evaluation Office will continue assessing the extent to which fees are sufficient and used for the intended purposes.</p>

Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Rating* in Progress of Adoption			
			Mgmt	Comments	GEF EO	Comments
				<p>cutting focus issues, such as gender mainstreaming).</p> <p>UNDP response: UNDPs three-tiered quality assurance system continues to ensure that project supervision is provided at the country, regional and global levels. This system has consistently received high ratings from the GEF Evaluation Office. GEF SEC ad-hoc requests are increasing and are often directed by GEF SEC directly to field staff by- passing UNDP-GEF central coordination. This places an extra burden on the staff who should primarily provide supervision support to projects. This also leads to inefficiencies that could be avoided if better coordinated by GEF.</p>		
<p>2. 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> <b>High</b></p>	<p>Progress Apr '11 – Apr 2012:</p> <p>UNDP response: The UNDP EO has issued detailed guidance for project terminal evaluations which address these issues.</p> <p>World Bank response: As has been previously reported, 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</p>	<p><b>New rating:</b> <b>Substantial</b></p> <p><b>Previous rating:</b> <b>Substantial</b></p>	<p>Terminal evaluations reporting on sustainability, of outcomes, quality of M&amp;E Systems and reporting of co-financing have improved significantly. An area of concern that still remains, particularly with UNDP is the criteria used to define co-financing.</p>

Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Rating* in Progress of Adoption			
			Mgmt	Comments	GEF EO	Comments
				<p>ratings scale. Implementation Completion and Results Reports (ICR) [standard World Bank terminal evaluation] are completed within 6 months of project closure. The IEG so far has reviewed every ICR for GEF funded projects.</p> <p>UNEP response: Terms of Reference for UNEP independent Terminal Evaluations include these issues. In addition, yearly PIRs include reporting on co-financing.</p>		

**Management Action Record 2011**  
**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
3. 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>	<p><b>Nov. 2007 – Decision on Agenda Item 9 - ... (c) strengthening country programme oversight.</b></p>	<p><b>New rating:</b>  <b>Substantial</b></p>	<p>Progress Apr '11 – Apr 2012:</p> <p>The Secretariat has attended all regional meetings in 2011-2012 and discussed operational and programmatic requirements for the program with National Coordinators of all country programs. Coordination meetings/consultations with CPMT are regularly convened. A learning mission is planned for the end of 2012 and country program audit frameworks will be developed afterwards.</p> <p>UNDP response: Risk monitoring of country programmes is in place. Several monitoring and trouble-shooting missions to SGP country programmes were undertaken during the past year. As OP5 implementation gets underway a new round of risk based audits will be commenced in 2013.</p> <p>The SGP Public website is currently under review with a view to improve transparency and access to key information for country stakeholders, including a strengthened feedback system.</p>	<p><b>New rating:</b>  <b>Substantial</b></p> <p><b>Previous rating:</b>  <b>Substantial</b></p>	<p>Audits of country programs continue. Information collected through the country program audits is shared with the management chain in the Secretariat.</p> <p>The establishment of an Ombudsman for addressing complaints is a positive development and appears to be functioning appropriately</p> <p>Challenges remain with respect to the monitoring systems that are used in the program as a monitoring currently required is to taxing and often inappropriate for small grants.</p>

**Management Action Record 2011**  
**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			
			Management Comments	GEF EO	Comments	
4. 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>	<p><b>New rating:</b> <b>Substantial</b></p>	<p>Progress Apr ‘11 – Apr 2012:</p> <p>The principal feature of successful private sector engagement on phase-out of ODS was focused collaboration on the application of key technologies for replacement of ODS. In other focal areas there is a similar need to collaborate with private sector partners but without a singular focus on only one approach. The Revised Strategy for Enhanced Engagement with the Private Sector (GEF 41.09.Rev.01) as approved by Council in November 2011 has the financial tools that will allow MDBs to establish collaborative PPP and make key investments in technologies and business models for all focal areas where appropriate.</p> <p>WB response: The Bank and the IFC have participated to the full extent possible in a dialogue with the GEF Secretariat regarding the private sector strategy, which were not primarily driven by ODS lessons.</p>	<p><b>New Rating:</b> <b>Substantial</b></p> <p><b>Previous rating:</b> <b>Medium</b></p>	<p>The GEF strategy for engagement with the private sector was presented and approved at the November 2011 Council meeting. 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.</p>

## Management Action Record 2011

### 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
5. The GEF should focus attention on countries in exceptional situations concerning limited access to International Financial Institutions, like Syria.	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: 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>N/A</b>	Progress Apr '11 – Apr 2012:  The secretariat continues to find this recommendation from the GEFEO very much out of context and bordering on the absurd given the international political situation; and has no intention of taking any action whatsoever in response.	<b>New Rating:</b>  <b>Negligible</b>  <b>Previous rating:</b> <b>Negligible</b>	This issue is broader than just the country of Syria and concerns obtaining a better understanding of how many countries have limited access to GEF funds as a result of not being a member of an IFI and how to address the problem, should there be one. Council requested a survey of countries in exceptional situations be conducted. This has not yet been initiated.

## Management Action Record 2011

### 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
<p>6. The Secretariat consider provision of specific M&amp;E training to the national focal point mechanism through the Country Support Program; and</p> <p>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 M&amp;E policy</p>	<p>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&amp;E policy in November 2010.</p>	<p><i>June 2010. Decision on Agenda Item 8:</i> The Secretariat should consider provision of specific M&amp;E training to the national focal point mechanism through the Country Support Program; and</p> <p>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 revision of the M&amp;E policy.</p>	<p><b>New rating:</b></p> <p><b>High</b></p>	<p>Progress April 11 – Apr 2012:</p> <p>The revised 2010 M&amp;E policy takes this issue into account and was approved in November 2010</p> <p>The Secretariat has developed training on monitoring and RBM for the second round of the Extended Constituency Workshops. The training focuses on providing operational focal points with the information on how to access monitoring reports, how to review them, and provides a basis for understanding the RBM system at the Secretariat. The training session is accompanied by few exercises tailored specifically to Operational Focal Points needs.</p> <p>World Bank response: FY11 represented a period of transition with respect to RBM, following adoption of the revised M&amp;E policy in November 2010. FY11 saw consolidation, standardization and generation of monitoring tools, including for focal areas in which they had not been in use in the past. While the Bank expects the process to prove smoother for FY12, we would recommend that, in addition to strengthening M&amp;E training for national and operational focal points, the Secretariat, via GEF Sec FA</p>	<p><b>New Rating:</b></p> <p><b>High</b></p> <p><b>Previous rating:</b></p> <p><b>Negligible</b></p>	<p>In the FY20121 rollout of the Extended Constituency Workshops, the Secretariat has developed a training session on RBM. The revised GEF M&amp;E policy also sets the minimum requirement for GEF Agencies to systematically involve OFPs in M&amp;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 at country level.</p>



Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Rating in Progress of Adoption			
			Mgmt	Comments	GEF EO	Comments
				<p>teams, prepare virtual training tools to educate Agencies and project teams on requirements, and the various tools, by focal area.</p> <p>UNEP response: Some countries have already started Annual portfolio review exercises, supported by GEFSec and Agencies, eg. India.</p>		

**Management Action Record 2011**  
**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
7. 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>Substantial</b>	Progress April 11 – Apr 2012:  1. Data gathered through the AMR process on the GEF's active portfolio has been used to update project status since 2009.  2. The Secretariat will issue an RBM guidance document by June 2012 which includes clearly defined process for submission, through the AMR process, including that TEs should be submitted to the EO not the Secretariat.  3. The Secretariat has developed a RBM dashboard within PMIS specifically aimed at identifying and flagging project status for the AMR process. The dashboard will be tested for 2012 reporting process.  World Bank response: As was indicated for FY10, while some discussion has taken place, we would welcome being fully involved in design and testing of PMIS aspects. We believe the review undertaken by the Trustee as requested by the Council provides 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	<b>New rating:</b>  <b>Medium</b>  <b>Previous rating:</b> <b>Negligible</b>	GEFSEC has received a review of GEF systems from the Trustee. Based on the findings and in consultation with the Agencies, updates to the PMIS have been occurring since 2009. The EO will continue to work in coordination with the Secretariat to update information on the status of projects through the end of the project cycle.

Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Rating in Progress of Adoption			
			Mgmt	Comments	GEF EO	Comments
				<p>issue and we believe this annual reporting is best vehicle for monitoring the portfolio. The Bank and EO has agreed on parameters for submitting TEs, for FY11 submissions are fully compliant.</p> <p>UNDP response: UNDP continues to provide quality-checked data from project supervision to GEFSEC on an annual basis for uploading to PMIS. UNDP understood that a review of PMIS and information systems in GEF was being undertaken but this appears to have stalled and/or has not been made public.</p> <p>UNEP response: UNEP has systematically forwarded all TEs generated in GEF-4 to today, to GEFSec for uploading in PMIS. UNEP is also systematically forwarding all TEs to national focal points.</p>		

**Management Action Record 2011**  
**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
8. 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</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 (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</p>	<p><b>New rating:</b></p> <p><b>High</b></p>	<p>Progress April 11 – Apr 2012:</p> <p>A revised private sector strategy has been developed, presented, and approved by Council and is under implementation.</p> <p>As requested at the November 2010 Council meeting, the GEF Secretariat presented a revised strategy for private sector engagement at the May 2011 Council meeting. Additional details and analysis were requested by Council. In consultation with agency partners, a revised strategy was developed. The revised strategy was approved at the November 2011 Council meeting. The Council then requested the GEF Secretariat to work with agency partners to develop Operational Modalities for the Public Private Partnership (PPP) Programs under the revised strategy and encouraged agencies to prepare PPP Programs for potential inclusion in the June Work Program. The Operational Modalities have been prepared in coordination with the agencies and will be presented as an information document at the June 2012 Council meeting. Two PPP Programs have been cleared by the CEO for inclusion in the June Work Program to be presented to Council.</p>	<p><b>New rating:</b></p> <p><b>High</b></p> <p><b>Previous rating:</b></p> <p><b>Substantial</b></p>	<p>The GEF strategy for engagement with the private sector was presented and approved at the November 2011 Council meeting.</p>

	<p>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>operations of the new Fund and (4) expanded access to the Fund.</p>		<p>World Bank response: The Bank and the IFC contributed to the EOs Review of the Earth Fund and the review of GEF Engagement with the Private Sector. We also participated in a dialogue with the GEF Secretariat regarding the private sector strategy (which replaces the second phase of the Earth Fund). Full agreement on pragmatic operational mechanisms has not been reached, precluding submissions from WBG at this stage.</p>		
--	---	--	--	---	--	--

## Management Action Record 2011

### 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
9. 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>New rating:</b> <b>Substantial</b></p>	<p>Progress April 11– Apr 2012:</p> <p>The STAP has successfully completed the review of tools and methods to increase climate resilience of GEF projects and programs, and has brought together related GEF agencies in a workshop to share the agency specific knowledge on the matter. It has designed a “Climate risk screening tool and resilience enhancement measures for GEF - PIFs and PFDs” to be implemented during the STAP project review process. The Secretariat, with its members from adaptation, natural resources and business strategy, is working to build on the screening tool and devise a methodology mainstream resilience into all the GEF focal areas.</p> <p>World Bank response: The new option of multi-TF projects with GEF, LDCF, SCCF is welcome and adds such incentives for such projects. No other incentives are currently noted; rather additional requirements/screening represents barriers and in the project cycle beyond Bank’s risk assessment in the Operational Risk Assessment Framework in PAD. Possible fee reductions</p>	<p><b>New rating:</b> <b>Substantial</b></p> <p><b>Previous rating:</b> <b>Medium</b></p>	<p>The "Climate Risk Screening Tool" devised by STAP in consultation with GEFSEC, GEF EO, the GEF Agencies as well as external experts can make a significant contribution to mainstream climate risk considerations into GEF projects across focal areas. Findings from the SPA evaluation informed the design process of the screening tool.</p> <p>The recently adopted and launched Adaptation Monitoring and Assessment Tool (AMAT), while only applied to climate change adaptation projects under the LDCF/SCCF, can serve as a source of information and experience to further improve mainstreaming of resilience and adaptation into the GEF focal areas.</p>

Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Rating in Progress of Adoption			
			Mgmt	Comments	GEF EO	Comments
				would further disincentivize additional requirements.		Especially the new option to combine funds from GEF with LDCF/SCCF in multi-trust fund projects will open opportunities for synergy.
10. 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> <b>Substantial</b></p>	<p>Progress April 11-April 2012</p> <p>The Secretariat has monitors the implementation of the SPA portfolio through the GEF Trust Fund AMR; A section on SPA projects is included annually in the AMR both for part I and part II.</p> <p>The Adaptation Task Force is working on providing guidelines to the evaluations of SPA projects for further analysis of future impacts.</p> <p>World Bank response: As indicated in FY11, the SPA has been completed and evaluated. The introduction of additional evaluation objectives cannot be credibly applied retroactively to specific projects.</p> <p>The Bank is of the opinion that the adoption of the new Adaptation Monitoring and Assessment Tool (AMAT), which also applies to the needs of the SPA, and agreement reached with respect to timing of in-depth assessment of results (at MTR and TER) within the context of the reform of the AMR process, negates the need to have separate guidelines for</p>	<p><b>New rating:</b> <b>Substantial</b></p> <p><b>Previous rating:</b> <b>Medium</b></p>	<p>Guidelines for evaluations of SPA projects are being developed simultaneously with an update for guidelines for terminal evaluations of GEF projects.</p> <p>Building on the experiences from monitoring LDCF/SCCF projects (AMAT tool) for the further monitoring of the implementation of SPA projects as outlined in the management response is a welcome course of action. For continued efforts to evaluate and draw lessons learned on climate change resilience from SPA project, findings from the GEF EO's wider work on climate change adaptation, especially the LDCF and SCCF</p>

Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Rating in Progress of Adoption			
			Mgmt	Comments	GEF EO	Comments
				mid-term and terminal evaluation of adaptation projects.		evaluations, also need to be taken into account.



**Management Action Record 2011**  
**Annual Thematic Evaluations Report 2011 (GEF/ME/C.41/02 October 2011)**  
**Management Response (GEF/ME/C.41/03 October 2011)**

Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Rating in Progress of Adoption			
			Mgmt	Comments	GEF EO	Comments
<p>11. The Council, having considered document GEF/ME/C.41/02, <i>Annual Thematic Evaluations Report 2011</i> and document GEF/ME/C.41/03, <i>Management Response to the Annual Thematic Evaluations Report 2011</i>, requests the Secretariat to incorporate NCSA experiences and lessons learned in the programming approach for GEF-6.</p>	<p>1. The following document presents the management response to GEF/ME/C.41/03, <i>Management Response to the Annual Thematic Evaluations Report 2011</i>, prepared by the GEF Evaluation Office. The management response has been prepared by the GEF Secretariat in consultation with the GEF Agencies.</p> <p>2. The Secretariat welcomes the evaluation of the NCSAs and takes note of the associated findings. The report focuses on the relevance, efficiency, and main achievements of the NCSAs both at the local and aggregate level. As concluded in the evaluation, the NCSA initiative “is the first assessment of environmental capacity needs and capacity development priorities at the national level with a global reach.” The innovative approach and extensive reach of the NCSA initiative makes the lessons, experiences, and recommendations particularly useful.</p> <p>3. As the evaluation concludes, the NCSA initiative was a central part of the GEF strategic framework for capacity development starting in 2001. The report notes that lessons from NCSAs have “provided direct feedback in the GEF for the development of the GEF-5 Cross-Cutting Capacity Development (CCCD) Strategy that includes five</p>	<p>Nov.2011 - <i>Decision on Agenda Item 8</i> – requested the Secretariat to incorporate NCSA experiences and lessons learned in the programming approach for GEF-6.</p>	<p><b>New rating:</b></p> <p><b>Medium</b></p>	<p>Progress Nov 11-April 2012</p> <p>A coordination meeting with agencies and convention secretariats is planned to discuss how better to integrate NCSA results in capacity development approach of the GEF and to better respond to convention guidance on capacity development especially in preparation of GEF6 replenishment.</p>	<p><b>New rating:</b></p> <p><b>Not possible to verify yet</b></p>	<p>The decision was taken in November 2011 and programming for GEF-6 has not started yet.</p>

Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Rating in Progress of Adoption			
			Mgmt	Comments	GEF EO	Comments
	<p>objectives.” In addition, the Secretariat in collaboration with UNDP and UNEP has developed a tracking tool with indicators to track the results of the GEF-5 capacity development objectives. This tool is being piloted with applicable projects approved in GEF-5. The Secretariat will coordinate with Agencies, particularly UNDP and UNEP, to analyze the experience and relevance of the capacity development tracking tool.</p> <p>4. The Secretariat takes note of the fact that while 132 NCSAs have been completed (87%) they were not necessarily followed up by adequate investments to address capacity development priorities identified. The Secretariat is pleased that the evaluation found that the NCSA initiative was “highly relevant to the national sustainable development agendas and to the capacity development strategies of implementing agencies and of multilateral environmental agreements (MEAs).” The Secretariat also notes that despite obvious potential synergies between NCSAs and conventions processes, the evaluation found that little uptake of NCSA results were observed through the implementation processes of these conventions.</p> <p>5. The Secretariat takes note of the evaluation’s first recommendation “As GEF-5 strategies were approved and are now under implementation NCSA experiences and lessons learned should be incorporated in a new GEF strategic framework for capacity development for GEF-6.”</p>					

Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Rating in Progress of Adoption			
			Mgmt	Comments	GEF EO	Comments
	<p>The Secretariat believes that capacity development is better achieved if situated within projects and programs that are directed towards GEF focal area objectives and therefore would take into consideration the findings of the review while developing the overall programming approach for GEF-6.</p> <p><i>Agency Response:</i>  6. UNDP, as the Implementing Agency (IA) responsible for the bulk of the NCSAs, is supportive of the evaluation and supports all of its recommendations. Specifically, UNDP is encouraged by: "...the evaluation's finding that the Global Support Program (GSP) launched in 2005 improved the implementation of NCSAs. UNDP believes the partnership between the GEF Secretariat, UNEP and UNDP has been productive and provides an excellent example of a cost-effective and efficient collaboration that builds on comparative advantages which adds value and sound technical support to the countries. Furthermore, UNDP agrees that the GSP outputs and knowledge base (resource kit, monitoring framework/indicators, lessons, etc.), should be shared and utilized more extensively. In conclusion, UNDP supports countries' aspirations to develop their capacities to implement the Rio Conventions, including the need to improve public awareness of the global environment, mainstream environmental priorities into sectoral development policies, programmes and plans, and undertake environmental fiscal reform. The</p>					

Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Rating in Progress of Adoption			
			Mgmt	Comments	GEF EO	Comments
	NCSA evaluation supports the global demand and need for critical cross-cutting capacities that are central to meeting and sustaining global environmental objectives. As we move forward in partnership with the GEF Secretariat, UN agencies, Convention Secretariats, donors, CSOs, and other partners, UNDP strives to continuously build upon existing strategies and development plans including country-driven integrated assessments such as the NCSAs, and promote cross-cutting and cross-sectoral approaches.”					
12. The Council requests the Secretariat to make available knowledge products of NCSAs, including toolkits on how to conduct them, to agencies and GEF workshops such as Multi-Stakeholder Dialogues.	1. The Secretariat welcomes the finding that the Global Support Program (GSP) improved the implementation of NCSAs. The Secretariat will work through the Country Support Program (CSP) to ensure that the evaluation’s second recommendation that “Knowledge products of NCSAs, including toolkits on how to do them, should be made available to agencies and GEF workshops such as Multi-stakeholder dialogues, ” is implemented. Relevant materials and toolkits will be updated and distributed through the Expanded Constituency Workshops (ECWs) and Multi-stakeholder dialogues.	Nov.2011 - <i>Decision on Agenda Item 8 –</i>  The Council, requested the Secretariat to make available knowledge products of NCSAs, including toolkits on how to conduct them, to agencies and GEF workshops such as Multi-Stakeholder Dialogues as well as to GEF focal points.	<b>New rating:</b>  <b>Medium</b>	Progress Nov 11-April 2012  The Secretariat will prepare a targeted publication on capacity development to enhance dissemination of results achieved through NCSAs. The Secretariat will make an effort to disseminate the publication during ECW’s, Multistakeholder seminars and Familiarization seminars that are attended by OFP’s and PFP’s.	<b>New rating:</b>  <b>Not possible to verify yet</b>	The decision was taken in November 2011 and there has not been enough time to develop NCSA knowledge products.