

Management Action Record 2013

1. 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 IEO 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.”¹

The format and procedures for the MAR were approved by the GEF Council at its November 2005 meeting. They call for the MAR to be updated and presented to the Council for review and follow-up on an annual basis.

MAR 2013 tracks 30 separate GEF Council decisions: 21 that were part of MAR 2012, and 9 new decisions that emerged from the November 2013 GEF Council meeting. In addition to GEF Council decisions, since APR 2012 the Independent Evaluation Office has started tracking adoption of the decisions of the Least Developed Countries Fund and Special Climate Change Fund (LDCF/SCCF) Council. One decision from the LDCF/SCCF Council’s November 2011 meeting is tracked in MAR 2013.

2. Rating Approach

The rating categories for the progress of adoption of Council decisions were agreed upon in a consultative process by the GEF IEO with inputs from the GEF Secretariat and the GEF Agencies. The rating categories 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.

The Council decisions may be graduated or retired from the MARs for several reasons. When a Council decision is dropped from MAR it may be because of one or more of the following reasons:

- **Graduated** due to high level of adoption of Council decision

¹ GEF Council, “Procedures and Format of the GEF Management Action Record.” GEF/ME/C.27/3., GEF Council November, 2005.

- **Retired** as the Council decision has become less relevant, or subsequent Council decisions have made high level of adoption of the decision difficult, or further progress on adoption of the decision is likely to be slow and long drawn.

3. Documents Considered in this Analysis

MAR 2013 tracks management actions on GEF Council and LDCF/SCCF Council decisions based on 15 GEF Evaluation Office documents:

- Annual Performance Report 2006 (GEF/ME/C.31/1, May 2007)
- Joint Evaluation of the Small Grants Program – 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 Performance Report 2009 (GEF/ME/C.38/4, June 2010)
- Evaluation of the GEF Strategic Priority for Adaptation (GEF/ME/C.39/4, October 2010)
- Annual Thematic Evaluations Report 2011 (GEF/ME/C.41/02, October 2011)
- Evaluation of the Special Climate Change Fund (GEF/LDCF.SCCF.11/ME/02, October 2011)
- Annual Performance Report 2011 (GEF/ME/C.42/01, May 2012)
- Annual Country Portfolio Evaluation Report 2012 (GEF/ME/C.42/03, May 2012)
- Annual Thematic Evaluations Report 2012 (GEF/ME/C.43/02, October 2012)
- GEF Annual Impact Report 2012 (GEF/ME/C.43/04, October 2012)
- GEF Annual Impact Report 2013 (GEF/ME/C.45/2, October 2013)
- Mid-Term Evaluation of the System for Transparent Allocation of Resources (STAR) (GEF/ME/C.45/04, October 2013)
- Mid-Term Evaluation of the National Portfolio Formulation Exercise (NPFE) (GEF/ME/C.45/06, October 2013)

Recommendation based on Council review of GEF Annual Performance Report 2006 (GEF/ME/C.31/1).

Ref. #	Date of Council Decision	GEF EO Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2012	GEF EO Rating & Comments in MAR 2012	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2013	GEF EO Rating & Comments in MAR 2013
1	June 2007	Special attention is required to ensure continued and improved supervision in the new project cycle, through ensuring adequate funding in project fees.	The Results-based Management Framework (RBM) that is presented for Council discussion will provide the platform for the Secretariat to develop tools to monitor the portfolio, in coordination with the GEF agencies. While developing these tools, care will be taken to ensure that they do not duplicate, but rather build on, the monitoring activities undertaken by the agencies. The agencies will ensure that the appropriate level of resources received from fees are directed toward supervision of projects.(GEF/ME/C.31/2, May 2007)	Decision on Agenda Item 6: The Council, having reviewed document GEF/ME/C.31/1, GEF Annual Performance Report 2006, and document GEF/ME/C.31/2, Management Response to GEF Annual Performance Report 2006, takes notes of the recommendations and the management response and decides that: (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.	Substantial. The proposal for the fee reform was approved by Council in June 2012. The proposal was prepared with participation of GEF Agencies, GEF Secretariat staff and Council Members. The proposed fee level was decided after a careful discussion and analysis and has been agreed that it is largely commensurate with the project cycle management services activities carried out by the Agencies. A few additional streamlining measures for project cycle were subsequently approved by the Council in November 2012 to further reduce Agency burden in the project cycle activities. Information requested from Agencies are not new requirements but part of the routine project monitoring and continued improvement of the GEF database. UNDP response: Efforts to streamline the GEF project cycle commensurate with the reduction in fees progressed well in 2012. Further efforts however are needed in 2013, notably in addressing corporate services. In addition, GEF requests for ad hoc information have not declined and continue to have implications on the use of the reduced fees. Finally, the agreed streamlining changes to the project cycle urgently need to be integrated into the GEF project and programmatic approach cycles paper (GEF/C.39/Inf.3) in order to increase transparency and reduce confusion. IDB: Supervision of GEF projects is done by the IDB's technical staff in its country offices with support from headquarters when required. Funding from projects fees and the IDB's own resources are utilized to ensure a high standard of supervision. World Bank response: This recommendation and management response seem to have	Medium. As per the new fee changes approved by the Council in June 2012, the top rate for project fee has been reduced from 10 percent to 9.5 percent. Whereas for projects over \$10 M in GEF grant the project fee has reduced from 10 percent to 9 percent. The reduced rate has remained same for project approved under programmatic approach and also for the SGP. There is little information on how stream lining of activities is translating into greater resources for supervision and monitoring activities during implementation. Especially, so because project fees have lowered.	Medium. World Bank response: In monitoring supervision efforts and the effects of fee reduction, we find that the simplification has not led to more funds available for supervision. We urge a push for deeper streamlining. An ongoing Bank-wide budget reform will aim to curtail costs further, but is also focused on ensuring full cost recovery from externally funded programs like GEF. UNDP response: UNDP continues to support the strengthening of country level supervision of projects. UNEP: We welcome the second round of streamlining discussions and efforts to codify some written policy on streamlining supervision. UNEP's Office for Operations is currently undertaking a quality of supervision study, which will feed into these discussions. We hope to identify parameters for the contribution that STAP can make to the GEF monitoring efforts. FAO response: Day to day supervision of national GEF projects is done by FAO country offices; the day to day supervision of regional or global projects is done by regional offices or HQ.	Medium. Although concrete data on this topic is not available, the GEF IEO acknowledges that the GEF Council's decision to reduce project fees may have led to lower level of resources being available for supervision. The Council made this trade-off for greater organizational efficiency. There are several efforts on in the GEF – especially those related to streamlining of the project cycle – that aim at efficiency gains in other areas where possible. This, in due course, may mitigate some of the effects of the lower project fees. The GEF IEO will retire this decision from the MAR acknowledging that the subsequent decisions by the Council make it difficult for the agencies to fully adopt the decision.

				<p>been overtaken by events (i.e. the 2013 new fee structure). The Bank had earlier addressed this recommendation by revising its budget coefficients to provide more funds for supervision relative to formulation. The current Bank average fee (below 10% fee) and the GEF fee reduction will preclude possibility of sustaining increased funds for supervision. 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. With an overall reduction in fees, protection against cuts also for supervision cannot be guaranteed. The Bank will continue to monitor its supervision efforts and the effects of fee changes.</p> <p>UNEP Response: Efforts in 2012 have aimed at streamlining procedures for reducing transaction costs of project preparation steps. However, we estimate that these efforts may have only addressed 40% of UNEP's current shortfall in cost recovery (evidence cannot be given until at least a year has gone by). We urge the GEF Sec to comply with the Council decision to go to a second round of streamlining, and consider stronger reforms including addressing the costs of corporate services. We support GEF Sec's plans to codify unwritten policies and practices, so as to allow a transparent discussion with a view to further streamlining.</p>		<p>Additional technical advice and supervision is provided by technical staff in decentralized or HQ offices.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--	---	--

Recommendation based on Council review of GEF Annual Performance Report 2006 (GEF/ME/C.31/1).

Ref. #	Date of Council Decision	GEF EO Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2012	GEF IEO Rating & Comments in MAR 2012	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2013	GEF IEO Rating & Comments in MAR 2013
2	June 2007	All GEF agencies will need to ensure that terminal evaluation reports include adequate information on sustainability of outcomes, quality of M&E systems and reporting on co-financing.	Evaluation reports prepared for GEF-financed projects are expected to meet the minimum requirement 3 of the GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy. In line with these requirements, agencies will ensure that terminal evaluation reports include information on sustainability of outcomes, quality of M&E systems, and assessment of co-financing realized. (GEF/ME/C.31/2, May 2007)	Decision on Agenda Item 6: The Council, having reviewed document GEF/ME/C.31/1, GEF Annual Performance Report 2006, and document GEF/ME/C.31/2, Management Response to GEF Annual Performance Report 2006, takes notes of the recommendations and the management response and decides that: (d) all GEF agencies should ensure that terminal evaluation reports include adequate information on sustainability of outcomes, quality of monitoring and evaluation systems and reporting on co-financing, in line with the minimum requirements for project evaluation in the GEF M&E Policy.	Substantial. UNDP response: The UNDP EO guidance for project terminal evaluations issued in 2012, which includes a review of co-financing, is being used at the project and country level and the quality of terminal evaluations continues to improve. UNDP is under the impression that further guidance on co-financing is to be prepared by GEFSEC and looks forward to receiving this guidance. UNEP Response: We urge the GEFSec to fast track the proposed review of co-financing policy so as to address country and agency concerns.	Substantial. The coverage of M&E issues in terminal evaluations submitted by UNDP and UNEP has shown improvement over the years. The self-appraisal by UNDP and UNEP is fairly accurate. The quality of coverage of M&E issues in terminal evaluations (for full size projects) submitted by the World Bank has remained high. For other agencies observations are too few.	Substantial. World Bank response: The evaluation of GEF projects is mainstreamed into the Bank's regular systems, which include risk to sustainability and M&E. Additionally, GEF co-financing reporting should be considered for streamlining in the new GEF co-financing policy. As required by the M&E Policy, Implementation Completion and Results Reports (ICR) are completed within 6 months of project closure. UNDP response: Project teams and UNDP Country Offices continue to use UNDP EO guidance for project terminal evaluations issued in 2012, which includes a review of co-financing, and the quality of terminal evaluations continues to improve. UNEP: We have an Environmental, Social and Economic Safeguards Framework in the making. It is going into a pilot testing phase. The quality of UNEP's M&E systems is high, according to the GEF's Independent Evaluation Office's assessment.	Substantial. Since 2007 coverage of M&E issues has improved in terminal evaluations submitted by UNDP and UNEP. In the terminal evaluations (ICRs and IEG reviews) submitted by the World Bank for full size projects, quality of information on M&E has remained high. However, quality of information on M&E in terminal evaluations (i.e. implementation completion memorandum) for full size projects that do not meet the World Bank threshold for ICRs and for MSPs remains below par. For other agencies observations are too few. Overall, reporting on outcomes and sustainability has improved. However, despite some progress substantial improvement in reporting on M&E and co-financing has been difficult. Terminal evaluations are often conducted at a time when financial details of the project are not yet fully available. This adds another barrier to improvement in quality. This Council decision will

							<p>FAO response: Sustainability of outcomes as well as monitoring activities are systematically part of the TORs of terminal evaluations. For GEF projects, FAO includes reporting on co-financing.</p>	<p>be retired from the MAR as complete adoption of the decision is difficult and unlikely. The Office will continue to track this through its assessment of quality of terminal evaluation reports.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	---	--

Recommendation based on Council review of Joint Evaluation of the Small Grants Program – Executive Version (GEF/ME/C.32/2).

Ref. #	Date of Council Decision	GEF EO Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2012	GEF EO Rating & Comments in MAR 2012	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2013	GEF EO Rating & Comments in MAR 2013
3	Nov. 2007	Country program oversight needs to be strengthened.	The management takes note of this recommendation and will consider a system to regularly audit the country programs. The GEF ombudsman will also be involved in handling complaints related to the SGP, and this would be appropriately announced on the SGP and GEF websites.	Decision on Agenda Item 9: The Council, having reviewed Document GEF/ME/C.32/2, Joint Evaluation of the Small Grants Program – Executive Version, as well as Document GEF/ME/C.32/3, Management Response to the Joint Evaluation of the Small Grants Program, takes note of the conclusions and recommendations and requests the SGP Steering Committee to implement the recommendations by: (c) Strengthening country program oversight.	Substantial: Coordination meetings/consultations with CPMT continued to be regularly convened. The programmed learning mission was conducted to India, where several projects were visited. UNDP response: Plans are underway for risk based Audits to take place in 2013. The GEF Ombudsman has served as conduit for issues or complaints raised on GEF SGP to be resolved. A process for complaints or for conflict resolution has also been posted in the GEF SGP global website. As of the present the few complaints received have been appropriately and fully resolved. SGP is reporting on an annual basis in OP5 through its Annual Monitoring Report (AMR) which draws upon annual reports for each SGP country program. In addition, selective case studies may be carried out on a portfolio of projects within a theme (e.g. CBA) or a sub-program (i.e. COMPACT landscape approach). Discussions have commenced on improving and streamlining SGP's monitoring system in line with the programmatic landscape/seascape focused approach outlined by SGP as part of the design of GEF6.	Substantial	High GEFSEC: All issues have been resolved and the design for the OP6 of SGP takes all elements into account. UNDP response: A process for complaints or for conflict resolution has been posted in the GEF SGP global website with SGP working with the UNDP Ombudsman as needed.. Complaints received have been appropriately followed up and resolved. Links with the GEF CSO Network Regional Focal Points as part of a feedback mechanism have also been strengthened SGP reports on an annual basis in OP5 through its Annual Monitoring Report (AMR) which draws upon annual reports for each SGP country program. In addition, selective case studies may be carried out on a portfolio of projects within a theme (e.g. CBA) or a sub-program (i.e. COMPACT landscape approach). Discussions have commenced on improving and streamlining SGP's monitoring system in line	High. GEFIO acknowledges the progress made on addressing all concerns about country program oversight and the fact that an audit approach is now permanently embedded in the SGP system.

							<p>with the programmatic landscape/seascape focused approach outlined by SGP as part of the design of GEF6. SGP will also take on board recommendations on M&E coming from the ongoing SGP Evaluation (2013-2014). SGP has also conducted follow up Regional Country Programme Workshops particularly where there are new participating countries; special missions were also organized as needed.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Recommendation based on Council review of Annual Country Portfolio Evaluation Report 2009 (GEF/ME/C.35/1)

Ref. #	Date of Council Decision	GEF EO Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2012	GEF EO Rating & Comments in MAR 2012	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2013	GEF EO Rating & Comments in MAR 2013
4	June 2009	The GEF should focus attention on countries in exceptional situations concerning limited access to International Financial Institutions, like Syria.	-	Decision on Agenda Item 7: The Council, having reviewed document GEF/ME/C.35/1, Annual Country Portfolio Evaluation Report-2009, document GEF/ME/C.35/2, Management Response to the Annual Country Portfolio Evaluation Report-2009, and having taken note of the three Country Portfolio Evaluations in Cameroon, Egypt, and Syria (GEF/ME/C.34/Inf. 3 and GEF/ME/C.35/Inf. 2-3) requested the Secretariat to: (b) Conduct a survey of countries in exceptional situations concerning limited access to GEF partner International Financial Institutions, like Syria.	N/A. Limited access to IFIs by certain countries may result from larger political considerations that are beyond the remit of the Secretariat and the GEF network.	Negligible. Council requested that a survey be done, and it has not been done.	GEFSEC: N/A Limited access to IFIs by certain countries may result from larger political considerations that are beyond the remit of the Secretariat and the GEF network.	Negligible. The Secretariat continues to feel that conducting a survey of countries in exceptional situations concerning limited access to GEF partner International Financial Institutions - as decided by Council - is politically impracticable and beyond their remit. The GEF IEO will continue to be alert on this issue and will continue to consider it in future country level evaluation work. However, noting that further progress on this is unlikely, the Office will retire this decision.

Recommendation based on Council review of GEF Annual Report on Impact –2009 (GEF/ME/C.36/2).

Ref. #	Date of Council Decision	GEF EO Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2012	GEF EO Rating & Comments in MAR 2012	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2013	GEF EO Rating & Comments in MAR 2013
5	Nov. 2009	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 (GEF/ME/C.36/3, Nov 2009).	<p><i>Decision on Agenda Item 8:</i> The Council, having reviewed document GEF/ME/C.36/2, “GEF Annual Report on Impact –2009,” and document GEF/ME/C.36/3, “Management Response to the GEF Annual Report on Impact–2009,” took note of the Annual Report’s findings and decided that:</p> <p>(b) 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.</p>	High/Completed: As directed by Council in November 2011, the GEF worked closely with Agencies to develop operational modalities for the GEF-5 PPP. These were documented in <i>Operational Modalities for Public Private Partnership Programs</i> (GEF C.42.Inf.08). The PPP programs submitted by AfDB and IBD were approved by Council June 2012. Additional PPPs are in process. As noted earlier the strategy was not primarily driven by ODS lessons, yet the positive private sector engagement on ODS focal area projects are reflected in the private sector strategy and modalities, which focus on reducing risk to help engage private sector investment for innovative approaches in all focal areas.	Unable to assess. The management response indicates that it is developing operational modalities for the GEF-5 PPP. The Evaluation Office is presently undertaking a review to assess GEF involvement in the private sector. The review would provide more information on GEF’s engagement with the private sector and the extent management has operationally moved in engaging it.	High/Completed. GEFSEC: The GEF-5 private sector set-aside has been used to support four innovative public-private partnerships with IDB, EBRD and AfDB. Agencies are using the set-aside for loans, equity investments, and structured financing. Co-financing has averaged higher than 10:1. Focal areas served include climate change and bio-diversity. Demand for the set-aside has been high. Positive experience has informed GEF-6 replenishment discussions and helped identify opportunities to mainstream private sector engagement across the GEF. WB response: Regrettably, the GEF-5 Operational Modalities approach has not enabled the IFC/WB to engage fully under the current private sector strategy. Further approaches to streamlining should be sought in GEF-6, for key issues such as delegated authority and reflow targets.	Not Rated. OPS5 pointed out that the private sector is involved in GEF projects in various capacities. It also pointed out areas in which more attention is warranted. Recommendations in OPS 5 encompassed this council decision so the tracking of this decision will be subsumed within the tracking of OPS 5 recommendations. Due to coverage of issues relevant to this decision in OPS-5, the decision is retired .

Recommendation based on Council review of GEF Annual Performance Report 2009 (GEF/ME/C.38/4).

Ref. #	Date of Council Decision	GEF EO Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2012	GEF EO Rating & Comments in MAR 2012	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2013	GEF EO Rating & Comments in MAR 2013
6	June 2010	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.	The Secretariat notes the low compliance of the Agencies' submission of terminal evaluations within 12 months of closure. Over the past two years, the Secretariat has collected information from Agencies on closed projects; these lists should improve the Evaluation Office's ability to track projects for which terminal evaluations have not been submitted. The Secretariat welcomes the APR's recommendation to work together with the Evaluation Office and Agencies in identifying and implementing measures to better track project status through the database.	Decision on Agenda Item 9: The GEF Council, having reviewed document GEF/ME/C.38/4, Annual Performance Report 2009, as well as GEF/ME/C.38/5, Management Response to the Annual Performance Report 2009, requested the GEF Evaluation Office, the Secretariat and the Agencies to 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.	<p>Substantial</p> <p>PIR Reports were used to update the project statuses in PMIS, specially the agency approval dates.</p> <p>Used the analysis done by GEFEO's office on the statuses of completed projects to update the statuses in PMIS.</p> <p>Aforementioned RBM dashboard is currently under development which will be able to track the following reports due from Agencies to GEFSEC, PIR, Midterm Reviews, Tracking tools and Terminal Evaluation Reports, and the reports not submitted by agencies.</p> <p>Each year at the end of reporting period, if the agency had not submitted Terminal Evaluations which are due, GEFSEC follows up on each project with agency to get PIR, Midterm Reviews, Tracking tools and Terminal Evaluation Reports.</p> <p>UNDP response: UNDP has spent more time in 2012 than in previous years responding to detailed requests from the GEF EO to review and complete data extracted from PMIS. This has significant implications on the use of the reduced fees.</p> <p>UNEP Response: We urge concerted discussion between GEFSec, Agency, Trustee, GEF EO, and STAP on PMIS, and Knowledge Management in general.</p>	<p>Medium. The concerns related to poor quality of information on project status still remain. The Evaluation Office undertook a fairly comprehensive exercise to verify quality of information in PMIS on project status. The exercise made it obvious that for a significant proportion of the projects the status reported by PMIS was obsolete. Of the 1200 project records verified, in more than 900 instances the status reported in the PMIS did not correspond to the actual situation. The results were shared with the Secretariat. Whether corrective measures have been undertaken to address the concerns have been effective is yet to be verified by the Office.</p> <p>Much of the focus of the Secretariats efforts has been on reporting and following up on submission of information. Quality of information – especially for the projects from earlier periods – has not received as much attention.</p>	<p>Substantial.</p> <p>GEFSEC: main issues PMIS tackled in last year are as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Template validator and data uploader 2. Automation of STAR progress report 3. Streamlined all the letters to agencies 4. STAP now able to project screening for LDCF projects before PIF approval by council 5. The harmonized process of submission by World Bank implemented 6. Ability for the council members to directly input projects comments into PMIS instead of submitting through a Word document. 7. Aforementioned RBM dashboard is developed which will be able to track the following reports due from Agencies to GEFSEC, PIR, Midterm Reviews, Tracking tools and Terminal Evaluation Reports, and the reports not submitted by agencies. <p>World Bank response: The Bank is fully compliant in submitting Terminal Evaluations to the GEF within deadlines.</p> <p>In spite of PMIS enhancements, there is a risk that reconciliation is needed on status and duplication of</p>	<p>Medium.</p> <p>Improvements are noted in several areas. Project cycle related data is also improving although gaps in data for older projects still remain. Poor quality of information on project status still remains a concern as steps taken by the Secretariat have not been adequate.</p> <p>World Bank is not fully compliant with the Terminal Evaluation submission related deadlines. Several missing terminal evaluation were identified during the reconciliation process undertaken by the GEF EO and IEG as part of the IEG's evaluation of World Bank and GEF partnership. The present practice – at the request of the Bank – is that the GEF IEO retrieves the terminal evaluations for FSPs and MSPs through World Bank's intranet. Annually, the IEO tries to reconcile its lists of projects for which terminal evaluations are expected with those of the World Bank. However, this process, as evident from a</p>

						<p>effort as long as electronic systems are not interfaced. The speedy implementation of the systems reform by the Trustee may address this risk.</p> <p>UNDP response: Project teams and UNDP Country Offices continue to use UNDP EO guidance for project terminal evaluations issued in 2012, which includes a review of co-financing, and the quality of terminal evaluations continues to improve.</p> <p>UNEP: We are happy to engage with the GEF Sec, other Agencies, the Trustee and STAP to make PIMS and/or the quality of information on project status as robust as possible.</p>	<p>substantial number of missing TEs discovered through the joint exercise taken up by IEG and IEO, has not been full proof. The idea of having an electronic interface is a good one but unlikely to function in a situation where a significant proportion of the GEF projects (that are Blended into World Bank projects) are not marked with the World Bank Project ID that is listed in the project proposals submitted to GEF. Most of the missing terminal evaluations that were identified jointly by the IEG and GEF EO fell into this category. As long as the World Bank is not able to generate a complete and fully reliable list of GEF projects through its database, it is unlikely that World Bank will be fully compliant.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	---

Recommendation based on Council review of GEF Evaluation of the Strategic Priority for Adaptation (GEF/ME/C.39/4).

Ref #	Date of Council Decision	GEF EO Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2012	GEF EO Rating & Comments in MAR 2012	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2013	GEF EO Rating & Comments in MAR 2013
7	Nov. 2010	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.	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: 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”; (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; (c) The GEF Secretariat is exploring possibility of providing financial incentives, both through strategic priorities in each GEF focal area and	Decision on Agenda Item 9: The Council, having reviewed documents, Evaluation of the GEF Strategic Priority for Adaptation (GEF/ME/C.39/4) and Management Response to the Evaluation of the GEF Strategic Priority for Adaptation (GEF/ME/C.39/5), requested the Secretariat to 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. 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&E.	Substantial. Progress Apr 2012– Apr 2013: In November 2012, the Secretariat updated the Council on efforts to enhance climate resilience in GEF projects through Council Document GEF/C.43/Inf.06, Enhancing Climate Change Resilience in GEF Projects: Update on GEF Secretariat Efforts. The GEF has made considerable progress in harnessing the synergies between climate change adaptation and its other focal areas. As at April 2013, the GEF has invested \$61.1 million of LDCF/SCCF resources in 12 projects and programs accessing resources from multiple trust funds, including the BD, CCM, IW and LD focal areas of the GEF Trust Fund. AMAT is applied consistently across all projects and programs accessing resources from the LDCF and the SCCF. The GEF will work to further harness these synergies in GEF-6. UNDP response: UNDP has begun to use the AMAT and initial feedback is that the AMAT is onerous and its value-added contribution is unclear to the country and the Agency. Before the AMAT structure is considered for further expanded use, UNDP suggests that GEFSEC undertake a comprehensive lessons learned exercise almost immediately	Substantial: The progress made so far is welcome. The Evaluation Office encourages the Secretariat to complete the next steps outlined in Council Document GEF/C.43/Info.06: finalize the draft document that outlines climate resilience considerations across all focal areas, and improve GEF-6 focal area strategies and RBM indicators to better incorporate resilience.	Medium. GEFSEC –CCA: Further progress has been achieved by beginning to mainstream adaptation considerations across focal areas. A number of integrated approaches proposed for GEF-6 notably incorporate resilience to climate change, such as the Sustainable Cities program. As at March 2014, the GEF has invested \$100.75 million of LDCF/SCCF resources in 20 multi-trust fund projects and programs, continuing to explore synergies, where relevant, between adaptation and various GEF focal areas (such as climate change mitigation, biodiversity and international waters.) A growing number of initiatives outside of the adaptation program reflect attempts to incorporate adaptation to climate change within GEF TF-funded projects and programs. The GEF is in early stages of institution-wide discussions to reach agreement on the nature, scope and design of a tool to systematically screen for climate risks across the GEF-6 portfolio. This endeavor will be guided by	Medium: GEFIEO acknowledges the progress made on mainstreaming resilience and adaptation into GEF focal areas through Multi Trust Fund projects and encourages the Secretariat to complete the next steps outlined in Council Document GEF/C.43/Info.06.

			<p>through the use of resources from the Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF) and the Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF) during GEF-5. (GEF/ME/C.39/5 October 2010)</p>		<p>with a view to streamlining and improving the value of the tracking tool in programming in GEF-6. The review should consider, given the purpose of the AMAT tool, whether the mechanics of the tool is the most appropriate in comparison to other alternative, more simplified designs of the tool.</p> <p>UNEP's Response: We support UNDP and Executive Office comments but urge that STAP be involved, given the new Adaptation STAP member embedded in the GEF STAP team.</p>		<p>institutional needs and demand, and informed by the efforts towards climate risk screening that are being made by other development agencies.</p> <p>World Bank response: The WB IDA17 Replenishment includes explicit goals to mainstream climate adaptation, and the Bank has developed internal climate-risk screening tools for its regular portfolio. However, mainstreaming of adaptation in GEF projects would be helped by streamlining of MFA processes; simplification of the GEF Tracking Tools (AMAT), and GEF financial incentives to address adaptation on its grants.</p> <p>UNEP: Addressing climate resilience in the GEF Program is a work in progress, and STAP continues to strongly support this effort. Over the next year STAP Land Degradation and Adaptation Panel Members, with support of the STAP Chair, will be leading an effort on identifying indicators of ecosystem resilience - particularly agro-ecosystem resilience in the context of the GEF integrated approach pilot on food security in Africa.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	---	--	--	--

Recommendation based on Council review of GEF Evaluation of the Strategic Priority for Adaptation (GEF/ME/C.39/4).

Ref #	Date of Council Decision	GEF EO Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2012	GEF EO Rating & Comments in MAR 2012	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2013	GEF EO Rating & Comments in MAR 2013
8	Nov. 2010	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 (GEF/ME/C.39/5 October 2010)	Decision on Agenda Item 9: The Council, having reviewed documents, Evaluation of the GEF Strategic Priority for Adaptation (GEF/ME/C.39/4) and Management Response to the Evaluation of the GEF Strategic Priority for Adaptation (GEF/ME/C.39/5)...r requested the Secretariat to continue monitoring the implementation of the SPA to ensure lessons can be learned from the portfolio. It requested the Evaluation Office, STAP and the Adaptation Task Force to provide guidelines in 2012 for evaluations of SPA projects to learn from the outcomes and impacts of the projects.	Substantial. Progress Apr 2012– Apr 2013: The Secretariat continues to monitor the SPA portfolio as part of the AMR process. UNDP response: UNDP is not aware of any evaluation guidelines for SPA projects, and understands that the updated guidelines for terminal evaluations have not been finalized. See UNDP response to items 7 regarding the AMAT. UNEP Response: We welcome guidelines on evaluation of SPA projects in consultation, to be carried out with Agencies and STAP.	Substantial. Revised guidelines for terminal evaluations which apply to SPA projects are nearly finalized.	High. GEFSEC-CCA: Progress Apr 2013– Mar 2014: The GEF SEC continues to monitor the SPA portfolio as part of the AMR process. The GEF SEC intends to gather lessons learned from SPA projects (as well as the LDCF and SCCF portfolios) and disseminate them in a book within FY15. World Bank response: New Bank projects addressing adaptation have embedded these goals into design and as such these will be evaluated with the rigor of regular evaluations. We would prefer guidance on adaptation evaluations to be mainstreamed into regular guidelines. UNEP: UNEP welcomes an effort to develop guidelines on evaluation of adaptation projects including the SPA projects in consultation with Agencies and STAP. In particular, STAP will work closely with the GEF Secretariat and GEF Partners in developing guidance and indicators on adaptation co-benefits so they are accurately reflected in future project design.	High. Revised guidelines for terminal evaluations which apply to SPA and LDCF/SCCF projects are nearly finalized. This decision will be graduated.

Recommendation based on Council review of GEF Annual Thematic Evaluations Report 2011 (GEF/ME/C.41/02).

Ref. #	Date of Council Decision	GEF EO Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2012	GEF EO Comments in MAR 2012	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2013	GEF EO Rating & Comments in MAR 2013
9	Nov. 2011	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.	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." 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.	Decision on Agenda Item 8: The Council, having considered document GEF/ME/C.41/02, Annual Thematic Evaluations Report 2011 and document GEF/ME/C.41/03, Management Response to the Annual Thematic Evaluations Report 2011, requested the Secretariat to incorporate NCSA experiences and lessons learned in the programming approach for GEF-6.	Medium. The programming directions for GEF-6 are under discussion. The new way of doing business will provide an opportunity to incorporate ideas arising from the NCSAs into those strategies as they evolve throughout the replenishment process. UNEP Response: We welcome efforts to refine and expand the limited mandate given to CCCD in GEF 5, particularly in moving to more comprehensive cross cutting CD approaches reflecting key drivers of change that can help move GEF investment to stronger transformational change.	Medium: Programming for GEF-6 is ongoing and the Secretariat should continue to incorporate NCSA experiences and lessons learned in the programming approach for GEF-6.	Substantial. GEFSEC: The CCCD strategy has been applied and the resources allocated fully used for projects that build upon the NCSAs. The strategy for GEF6 has also taken this into account and will complete the process of helping countries to resolve the challenges identified in the NCSAs. UNEP: We continue to encourage the GEF to move to more comprehensive cross cutting CD approaches that would reflect key drivers of change and help move GEF investments achieve stronger transformational change.	Medium: GEFIEO acknowledges the progress made on GEF-6 programming but the strategy has yet to be adopted. This decision will be graduated after the new strategy has been adopted.

Recommendation based on Council review of GEF Annual Thematic Evaluations Report 2011 (GEF/ME/C.41/02).

Ref. #	Date of Council Decision	GEF EO Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2012	GEF EO Rating & Comments in MAR 2012	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2013	GEF EO Rating & Comments in MAR 2013
10	Nov. 2011	Knowledge products of NCSAs, including toolkits on how to conduct them, should be made available to agencies and GEF workshops such as Multi-Stakeholder Dialogues.	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.	Decision on Agenda Item 8: The Council, having considered document GEF/ME/C.41/02, Annual Thematic Evaluations Report 2011 and document GEF/ME/C.41/03, Management Response to the Annual Thematic Evaluations Report 2011, 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.	<p>High: The Secretariat produced a publication on NCSAs and the results and lessons learned from the process. In addition, the ECWs for 2013 contain a session dedicated to NCSAs and the possibilities to address the needs identified therein.</p> <p>UNEP Response: We suggest that the recommendation should be revised because the dissemination of NCSA products may now be outdated given that GEF 5 moved on to CCCD projects. We agree to conducting joint Knowledge Management exercises among the GEF Sec and Agencies implementing the CCCD portfolio.</p>	<p>Substantial. The ECW sessions dedicated to NCSAs is a welcome exercise. The publication the Secretariat produced predates the evaluation; therefore the Evaluation Office encourages the Secretariat to make available other knowledge products of NCSAs. Regarding UNEP's comment, Council decisions cannot be revised.</p>	<p>High. GEFSEC: The ECWs continued to dedicate full session to CCCD based on the NCSAs and this has led to numerous countries to initiate CCCD projects. The eligible countries that have yet to apply for a CCCD project will be encouraged to do so in GEF6. The material needed is available.</p>	<p>Substantial. As noted in the IEO's MAR assessment the ECW sessions on NCSAs mark a substantial progress from the baseline. On other aspects the difference in opinion with the Secretariat is on the extent progress has been made. The Office will keep tracking this issue.</p>

Recommendation based on Council review of GEF Annual Performance Report 2011 (GEF/ME/C.42/01).

Ref #	Date of Council Decision	GEF EO Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2012	GEF EO Rating & Comments in MAR 2012	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2013	GEF EO Rating & Comments in MAR 2013
11	June 2012	There is early evidence of inclusion of Operational Focal Points in monitoring and evaluation plans at project entry, as required in the new GEF M&E policy. GEF Agencies should continue in this direction and enhance their efforts to specify how OFPs will be engaged, when feasible and relevant, in project or program monitoring and evaluation.	<p>The Secretariat is encouraged by the finding that GEF Projects are beginning to specify how Operational Focal Points (OFPs) will be informed and where feasible, involved in M&E activities. The engagement of OFPs is a new requirement in the M&E policy and intended to reflect the efforts of countries to establish or improve national monitoring and evaluation, and include an emphasis on increased country ownership. The Secretariat and Evaluation Office have collaborated to introduce this new monitoring and evaluation minimum requirement and explain its implications through the Expanded Constituency Workshops (ECWs).</p> <p>The Secretariat supports the recommendation of the APR that GEF Agencies should enhance their efforts to specify how OFPs will be engaged, when feasible and relevant, in project or program monitoring and evaluation.</p>	Decision on Agenda Item 7: The Council, having reviewed document GEF/ME/C.42/01, "Annual Performance Report 2011," and document GEF/ME/C.42/02, "Management Response to the Annual Performance Report 2011," noted that evidence emerges that the GEF Agencies are starting to involve GEF Operational Focal Points in a more systematic manner in monitoring and evaluation. The Council requested the GEF Agencies to continue to enhance their efforts to specify how Operational Focal Points will be engaged, when feasible and relevant, in project or program monitoring and evaluation.	<p>Medium: The ECWs have incorporated session conducted by the EO on the role of OFPs in Monitoring and Evaluation.</p> <p>UNDP response: The UNDP EO guidance for project terminal evaluations issued in 2012, which outlines the role of OFPs, is being used at the project and country level and the quality of terminal evaluations continues to improve. In addition, OFPs increasingly provide substantive input to the PIR for UNDP supported projects.</p> <p>UNEP Response: UNEP systematically shares PIRs, MTE and TEs with OFPs. In addition, OFPs are involved in TORs of MTE and TEs. UNEP has also invited OFPs to consider providing upstream views on PIRs and is awaiting their responses. One issue encountered is the wish by some countries to question the independence of MTE and TEs, and it would be useful for this issue, which is already in GEF Policy, to be reiterated by GEF EO Director at forthcoming council meetings.</p>	<p>Not possible to verify yet. Some of the actions – as per the responses from UNDP and UNEP – are starting to take place. World Bank has not yet provided a response. Overall, the progress made on this issue is difficult to verify at this moment. The Office will track this issue in future.</p>	<p>Medium World Bank response: We continue to encourage OFP engagement in concert with the client, based on established responsibilities of Borrower and/or Grant recipient with regards to monitoring, supervision, performance assessment and evaluation for Bank projects.</p> <p>UNEP: UNEP reiterates its previous response, which explained that UNEP systematically shares PIRs, MTE and TEs with OFPs. In addition, OFPs are involved in TORs of MTE and TEs.</p> <p>FAO response: OFPs are invited to participate in MTE and TE meetings. TORs for these evaluations include a meeting with the OFP. Generally, the PIRs and final evaluation reports are shared with OFP.</p>	<p>Not possible to verify yet. Although some actions are starting to take place it is yet not possible to verify the extent of it. This is bound to be a long term effort and will require a systematic tracking of progress on adoption of this decision.</p> <p>This decision will be retired from the MAR at this point but will be looked at by the GEF IEO in detail during GEF-6.</p>

Recommendation based on Council review of Annual Country Portfolio Evaluation Report 2012 (GEF/ME/C.42/03).

Ref. #	Date of Council Decision	GEF EO Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2012	GEF EO Rating & Comments in MAR 2012	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2013	GEF EO Rating & Comments in MAR 2013
12	June 2012	Project approval and implementation in Small Island Developing States should be more flexible and context-specific.	The Secretariat takes note of the remaining conclusions in the 2012 ACPER, including the unique challenges faced by Small Island Developing States (SIDS) in developing and implementing projects. With respect to recommendation one "Project approval and implementation in Small Island Developing States should be more flexible and context specific," caution should be exercised in order not to give the impression that each country's unique needs can be met in every case. The specific example of Cuba outlined in paragraph 84 provides an appropriate example where such generalization would be impractical/infeasible. Nevertheless, the GEF Secretariat supports the recommendation that calls for increased flexibility to SIDS whenever it is indeed feasible.	Decision on Agenda Item 8: The Council, having reviewed document GEF/ME/C.42/03, "Annual Country Portfolio Evaluation Report 2012," document GEF/ME/C.42/04, "Management Response to the Annual Country Portfolio Evaluation Report 2012," and having taken note of the two Country Portfolio Evaluations in Nicaragua and OECS (GEF/ME/C.42/Inf.02) requested the Secretariat: 1) To consider ways to make project approval and implementation in Small Island Developing States more flexible and context-specific.	[No rating provided] UNEP Response: The streamlining reform may have helped so far (evidence still outstanding) but there was no streamlining specific to SIDS and LDCs. We recommend a special attention to this in the second round of streamlining reforms.	Negligible. GEF EO finds no evidence of SIDS specific streamlining so far.	Negligible. Within the scope of the GEF's project cycle procedures, the Secretariat continues to encourage Agencies to pay attention to the specific needs of the SIDS in project preparation and implementation, through the project review process. As mentioned in the management response, it is not feasible to tailor approval and implementation procedures and/or standards for specific groups of countries. World Bank response: Agree with the rating. We would welcome any simplification to help support project approval and implementation in SIDS/LDCs, addressing capacity needs, and suggest that the GEF Secretariat convene meeting to address this discussion. We would also suggest that the GEF considers such flexibility for fragile and conflict states. We would suggest higher fees be considered for SIDS/LDCs and fragile and conflict states to ensure the appropriate level of support as per the example of other funding mechanisms (e.g. IDA).	Negligible. GEF IEO finds no evidence of measures that will make project approval and implementation in SIDS more flexible and context-specific.

Recommendation based on Council review of Annual Country Portfolio Evaluation Report 2012 (GEF/ME/C.42/03).

Ref #	Date of Council Decision	GEF EO Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2012	GEF EO Rating & Comments in MAR 2012	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2013	GEF EO Rating & Comments in MAR 2013
13	June 2012	The burden of monitoring requirements of multifocal area projects should be reduced to a level comparable to that of single focal area projects.	The Secretariat has had many discussions with Agencies related to recommendation two "The burden of monitoring requirements of multifocal area projects should be reduced to a level comparable to that of single focal area projects." It should also be noted that using tracking tools for multifocal area projects was only introduced in GEF-5, so it may be premature to draw this conclusion at this time. Furthermore, one should remember that these new tools are required only three times during the life of the project, a very reasonable requirement: at CEO endorsement, mid-term, and project completion. Additionally, for multifocal area projects, the Secretariat does not require the full set of tracking tools be applied. Rather, as the language in paragraph 86 suggests, the tools should only be completed for the "essential focal area indicators that need to be monitored throughout multifocal area projects." There are currently no multifocal area projects under implementation that require tracking tools from more than one focal area.	Decision on Agenda Item 8: The Council, having reviewed document GEF/ME/C.42/03, "Annual Country Portfolio Evaluation Report 2012," document GEF/ME/C.42/04, "Management Response to the Annual Country Portfolio Evaluation Report 2012," and having taken note of the two Country Portfolio Evaluations in Nicaragua and OECS (GEF/ME/C.42/Inf.02) requested the Secretariat: 2) To reduce the burden of monitoring requirements of multifocal area projects to a level comparable to that of single focal area projects.	Substantial. The current approach to tracking tools for multifocal areas is that the tools should only be completed for the "essential focal area indicators that need to be monitored throughout multifocal area projects." UNDP response: UNDP has at least one MFA project under implementation that has completed both the BD and CCM tracking tools. This increase in the monitoring and reporting requirements has significant implications on the use of the reduced fees. UNEP Response: Such streamlining has not yet been done and we urge fast tracking discussion between GEFSec and Agencies to arrive at recommendations to Council.	Negligible. GEF EO finds no evidence that tracking tools burdens for MFAs have been reduced.	Medium GEFSEC: GEF-6 programing has taken a review of indicators, and they have been streamlined and reflected in the programming document World Bank response: We urge acceleration of progress on this issue under streamlining. There are missed opportunities to simplify in GEF-6 proposals (e.g. requiring at least two focal areas for SFM, increases monitoring complexity). UNDP response: The M&E requirements for multifocal area projects need to be formalized and clearly explained in a GEF policy document. UNEP: We anticipate that the interagency working group on streamlining will make progress on this issue.	Medium. The GEF-6 Programming Document has covered integrated approaches in detail. That section specifically refers to replacing the traditional GEF tracking tools with a limited set of key outcome indicators to track achievements, to be tested by the lead agency in a pilot programmatic approach. These indicators will replace the traditional tracking tools and offer a simplified framework to tracking multi-focal area results, and against which projects submitted under a single Integrated Approach will be reviewed for GEF eligibility. Once aggregated, funding for the pilot would only be tracked against this pilot-specific results framework.

Recommendation based on Council review of Annual Country Portfolio Evaluation Report 2012 (GEF/ME/C.42/03).

Ref #	Date of Council Decision	GEF EO Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2012	GEF EO Rating & Comments in MAR 2012	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2013	GEF EO Rating & Comments in MAR 2013
14	June 2012	South-South cooperation should be enabled as components of national, regional and global projects where opportunities for exchange of technology, capacity development and/or sharing of best practices exist.	The Secretariat takes note of recommendation three that “South-South cooperation should be enabled as components of national, regional and global projects where opportunities for exchange of technology, capacity development and/or sharing best practices exist.” The Secretariat agrees as is stated in paragraph 89 that enabling South-South cooperation should not be in the form of funding from GEF project financial resources to those Southern countries providing South-South support.	Decision on Agenda Item 8: The Council, having reviewed document GEF/ME/C.42/03, “Annual Country Portfolio Evaluation Report 2012,” document GEF/ME/C.42/04, “Management Response to the Annual Country Portfolio Evaluation Report 2012,” and having taken note of the two Country Portfolio Evaluations in Nicaragua and OECS (GEF/ME/C.42/Inf.02) requested the Secretariat: 3) To enable South-South cooperation activities as components of national, regional and/or global projects where opportunities for exchange of technology, capacity development and/or sharing of best practices exist.	Medium. The Secretariat looks for opportunities in collaboration with agencies to support South-South collaboration. See following response from UNEP. UNEP Response: We welcome the recent approval of the SCCF project ‘Enhancing Capacity Knowledge and Technology to Build Climate Resilience of Vulnerable Developing Countries’ that is based on South-South Cooperation . It is too early to see results but we propose more attention to this issue in the GEF portfolio, including finding ways and means to facilitate them through a targeted CCCD assessment project in GEF 6.	Not possible to verify yet. Too few projects to date.	Medium World Bank response: We have included south-south collaboration in GEF programmatic approach, but these ‘glue’ parts of programs tend to be under-funded. To embed this more systematically in project design, we suggest more discussion on the implementation of this recommendation, including some form of funding from GEF grants. UNDP response: South-south cooperation remains a high corporate priority in UNDP as noted in the UNDP Strategic Plan for 2014-2017. FAO comment: FAO has been mainstreaming SSC in its program and projects. In 2012, a SS and resource mobilization division was created to assist and develop member countries capacities in SSC.	Medium. Some progress has been made through inclusion of South-South cooperation in programming and policy documents by a few GEF Agencies. The GEFIO will continue to look for evidence of project-level application of this Council Decision in its ongoing and future country level evaluations.

Recommendation based on Council review of Annual Thematic Evaluations Report 2012 (GEF/ME/C.43/02).

Ref #	Date of Council Decision	GEF EO Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2012	GEF EO Rating & Comments in MAR 2012	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2013	GEF EO Rating & Comments in MAR 2013
15	Nov. 2012	An explicit discussion of envisaged causal linkages and chains of causality in line with current scientific knowledge should form the basis for the formulation of GEF-6 Strategies.	The Secretariat will consider the specific causal linkages and pathways presented in this report for each focal area when developing the GEF-6 strategies. As stated in the evaluation and as was undertaken in GEF-5, the scientific community represented by the STAP panel, together with experts that may be engaged through Technical Advisory Panels, will play a central role to ensure the latest scientific knowledge is fully taken into account in strategy development.	Decision on Agenda Item 10: The Council, having considered document GEF/ME/C.43/02, Annual Thematic Evaluations Report 2012 and document GEF/ME/C.43/03, Management Response to the Annual Thematic Evaluations Report 2012, requested the Secretariat to ensure that: a) An explicit discussion of envisaged causal linkages and chains of causality in line with current scientific knowledge forms the basis for the formulation of GEF-6 Strategies.	Medium. The Secretariat, is currently working with the TAGs to develop programming strategies for GEF-6. The TAGs are examining underlying drivers and causal linkages in developing such strategies.	Medium: The explicit discussion needs to continue throughout the development of GEF-6 programming strategies.	Medium GEFSEC: Reflected in GEF-6 strategies. World Bank response: We would welcome discussion of causal links, as we have found that more thought needs to go into how such overarching chains of causality can apply pragmatically to GEF projects. Further, a credible causal link map for multi-focal projects would be welcome. UNEP: In implementing the GEF-6 strategies, UNEP believes STAP can play a useful role in identifying the scientific knowledge required to form the basis for articulating and monitoring chains of causality in both projects and portfolios of projects. STAP welcomes the opportunity to work with GEFSec and the Agencies to tease these linkages out, where appropriate.	Medium. The GEF IEO is in agreement with the GEF Secretariat's assessment. The Office notes the progress in the proposed strategies for GEF-6.

Recommendation based on Council review of Annual Thematic Evaluations Report 2012 (GEF/ME/C.43/02).

Ref #	Date of Council Decision	GEF EO Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2012	GEF EO Rating & Comments in MAR 2012	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2013	GEF EO Rating & Comments in MAR 2013
16	Nov. 2012	GEF-6 Strategies should enable a more flexible and strategic approach to developing Multi-Focal Area projects which would be able to adopt elements from several focal areas in a consistent manner.	The Secretariat fully agrees with Recommendation 2 that GEF-6 strategies should “enable a more flexible and strategic approach to developing Multi-Focal Area projects, which would be able to adopt elements from several focal areas in a consistent manner.” The Secretariat and the Agencies have initiated discussions in regards to the streamlining measures, and will continue to work with our partners to develop a more coherent strategy for Multi-Focal Area projects in GEF-6.	Decision on Agenda Item 10: The Council, having considered document GEF/ME/C.43/02, Annual Thematic Evaluations Report 2012 and document GEF/ME/C.43/03, Management Response to the Annual Thematic Evaluations Report 2012, requested the Secretariat to ensure that: b) GEF-6 Strategies enable a more flexible and strategic approach to Multi-Focal Area projects, which would be able to adopt elements from several focal areas in a consistent manner.	Medium. The TAGs, in developing focal area strategies for GEF-6 are considering key integrated programs or “signature programs” towards developing multi-focal strategic interventions that address underlying drivers of degradation of global environmental commons. UNEP Response: Please see comments to point 13.	Medium: The discussion needs to continue throughout the development of GEF-6 strategies.	Medium GEFSEC: Reflected in GEF-6 strategies WB Response: Reference to comment on point 13, we fully agree with the recommendation to revisit the approach to MFAs. The partnership has not yet fully addressed how to deal with programmatic or multifocal area projects in a simple and consistent manner. UNEP: We anticipate that the interagency working group on streamlining will make progress on this issue.	Medium. GEF Secretariat and GEF IEO agree that progress on this decision has been medium. As also pointed out by the World Bank the partnership has not yet fully addressed how to deal with multifocal area projects in a simple and consistent manner.

Recommendation based on Council review of Annual Thematic Evaluations Report 2012 (GEF/ME/C.43/02).

Ref #	Date of Council Decision	GEF EO Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2012	GEF EO Rating & Comments in MAR 2012	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2013	GEF EO Rating & Comments in MAR 2013
17	Nov. 2012	GEF-6 Strategies should be based on systematic considerations of potential pathways from GEF activities to the broader adoption of GEF results to further define and strengthen the GEF's catalytic role.	The Secretariat and the Agencies are committed to considering potential ways GEF and LDCF/SCCF activities can lead to transformational impacts. As part of the GEF-6 strategy development process, the Secretariat will take Recommendation 3 into account and consider "potential pathways from GEF activities to the broader adoption of GEF results to further define and strengthen the GEF's catalytic role."	Decision on Agenda Item 10: The Council, having considered document GEF/ME/C.43/02, Annual Thematic Evaluations Report 2012 and document GEF/ME/C.43/03, Management Response to the Annual Thematic Evaluations Report 2012, requested the Secretariat to ensure that: c) GEF-6 Strategies include a strengthened articulation of potential pathways from activities to the broader adoption of results to maximize the GEF's catalytic role.	Medium. GEF-6 programming approaches, under development, articulate broader adoption approaches. UNEP Response: We suggest a brainstorming to develop innovative means to achieve this important goal. For example, how can Agencies collaborate better in reviewing each other's projects to build in lessons and results of complementary projects? Could the STAP develop a new line of Advisory Products called "Lessons learnt"?	Not possible to verify yet: GEF-6 Strategies have not been completed yet.	Medium GEFSEC: Reflected in GEF-6 strategies WB response: Reference to comment on point 15; we agree with the potential higher impact of such projects, but application of this concept requires further discussion on practical and financial implications for projects of shifting focus to broader adoption across focal areas and the portfolio in the longer term; and what the GEF should do less of. UNEP: In addition to reiterating our earlier comment, UNEP suggests that the GEF consider reporting on focal area impacts over a longer time frame. Often impacts are not felt until years after a project has ended and often the impacts are the result of multiple interventions. A longer reporting horizon would focus attention on the sustainability and impact of the focal area portfolio.	Not possible to verify yet. Progress on this is difficult to ascertain at the moment. This may be assessed through a systematic analysis of projects that are CEO Endorsed during GEF 6. A review of the designs of the earlier cohorts of GEF-6 projects may provide more information on adoption of the Council's decision.

Recommendation based on Council review of Annual Thematic Evaluations Report 2012 (GEF/ME/C.43/02).

Ref #	Date of Council Decision	GEF EO Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2012	GFE EO Rating & Comments in MAR 2012	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2013	GEF EO Rating & Comments in MAR 2013
18	Nov. 2012	GEF-6 Strategies should revisit the GEF's overall approach to capacity development in response to concerns voiced by the conventions.	The Secretariat agrees with Recommendation 5 and will revisit the GEF's overall approach to capacity development as part of the GEF-6 strategy discussion. While the Secretariat agrees that capacity development is included as part of activities within focal areas, flexibility for standalone capacity development is useful and necessary.	Decision on Agenda Item 10: The Council, having considered document GEF/ME/C.43/02, Annual Thematic Evaluations Report 2012 and document GEF/ME/C.43/03, Management Response to the Annual Thematic Evaluations Report 2012, requested the Secretariat to ensure that: d) GEF-6 Strategies revisit the GEF's overall approach to capacity development in response to concerns voiced by the conventions.	Medium. The GEF-6 programming strategies, undertaken through the TAGs are also reviewing GEF's approach to capacity development. UNEP Response: The TAG for CCCD has taken this into consideration and we are hopeful that Council will see value of these new directions including more funding to CCCD.	Medium: The review of GEF's approach to capacity development should continue throughout the development GEF-6 Strategies.	Medium GEFSEC: Reflected in GEF-6 strategies UNEP: We look forward to working with the GEF to enhance capacity development efforts in GEF-6.	Medium The GEF IEO is in agreement with the Secretariat's rating. The decision is reflected in the proposals for the GFE-6 strategies. However, these proposals have not yet been adopted.

Recommendation based on Council review of GEF Annual Impact Report 2012 (GEF/ME/C.43/04).

Ref #	Date of Council Decision	GEF EO Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2012	GEF EO Rating & Comments in MAR 2012	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2013	GEF EO Rating & Comments in MAR 2013
19	Nov. 2012	[This Council Recommendation comes from a complete reading of the report (GEF Annual Impact Report 2012), and is not linked to any individual GEF EO recommendation]	[No direct response given to this Council decision, as it was not linked to a specific GEF EO recommendation].	<p>Decision on Agenda Item 11: The Council, having reviewed document GEF/ME/C.43/04, "GEF Annual Impact Report 2012", and document GEF/ME/C.43/05, "Management Response to the GEF Annual Impact Report 2012", took note of the considerable achievements of GEF support to the South China Sea and adjacent areas including, amongst others, that in 21 of 26 cases where comparative data could be obtained, GEF has supported initiatives that reduced environmental stress and improved or maintained socioeconomic conditions.</p> <p>Given the important contributions that GEF support has made to addressing regional transboundary concerns, and the role of the GEF as a critical player in the region, as noted by the report, the Council requested the Secretariat to:</p> <p>1) Take into account the findings and recommendations of this evaluation when screening future proposals submitted for GEF funding in the South China Sea and adjacent areas, most notably:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • when choosing areas for expansion, that the conditions conducive to broader adoption are present in those areas; • that the distinctive competencies within the GEF partnership are more fully drawn on to mainstream transboundary environmental concerns among sectorial ministries • that systems for managing risks and trade-offs are specified; • that more attention is given to the support of actions that address regional environmental goods and services; • that cash and in-kind co-financing for regional services provided by GEF projects reach sustainable levels by project end; • that adequate coordination and management of risks within the GEF partnership be given attention. 	[No rating provided] UNEP Response: The June Council submissions have incorporated these recommendations and build upon agencies comparative advantages to best support countries (PEMSEA, Fish Refugia). We note, however, that the transaction costs of regional projects are still high, both for countries and agencies. Recently proposals were sent to GEF Sec and Agencies by UNEP, FAO and AfDB for consideration on streamlining regional projects which we hope can be immediately acted upon.	Not possible to verify yet: There is currently insufficient information for Evaluation Office to assess the adoption of Council's recommendation . This issue will be covered in ongoing work for OPSS, which will offer a chance for review.	Medium GEFSEC: The Recommendations have been informing the SCS proposal potentially to be included in the May 2014 WP. Specifically: 1) the areas that will be chosen for investments on the ground will be conducive for broader adoption by the participating countries. Among others this is done by assuring that regional and national important coastal habitats (such as mangroves, coral reefs, sea grass beds and brackish water lagoons etc.) offering important breeding grounds and biodiversity hotspots. The investments will enable the setup of national and regional level cooperation towards improved and better informed Coastal habitat	Medium. This council decision covers six critical aspects of GEF support to IW as related to GEF financing in the SCS. There has been progress in addressing some aspects of the decision, such as the progress in financing the follow up to the SCS SAP and a project focused on fishing refugia and other regional public goods. Nevertheless project design for follow up financing for PEMSEA is still under development. It is in this stream of financing were the evaluation concerns were more prominent on regional goods, the proper management of risks, to ensuring project expansion meet preconditions for broader adoption and ensuring financial sustainability of regional mechanisms. . The GEF Secretariat reported that these issues have been pointed out several times in the review process of follow up projects that are now being prepared in the region. Full

						<p>management.</p> <p>2) The proposed actions in the proposed SCS project will be identifying opportunities regionally and nationally towards long-term financial sustainability of the South China Sea investments, this will primarily be done by working towards an output that will be delivering stronger financial sustainable and formal arrangements for regional cooperation in the management of the marine and coastal environment in the South China Sea, primarily through working with COBSEA.</p> <p>Finally, as the recommendations have been noted by the IW Task Force, the recommendations continuously inform upcoming and planned GEF IW investments in other regions, i.e. when choosing areas for expansion, ensuring that the conditions conducive</p>	<p>assessment of the extent to which this decision has been take up will only be possible once the SCS SAP and follow up PEMSEA projects have been designed and approved.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	---

						<p>to broader adoption are present in those areas, making sure that the projects benefit from the unique competencies that exists within the GEF partnership towards continue to working with the national ministries to mainstream the regionally agreed transboundary water issues into local, national and regional actions.</p> <p>World Bank response: We will reflect this in future proposals for SCS. Meanwhile, this also relates to a larger issue of how GEF programmatic approaches should be designed, managed, coordinated and resourced, for which further streamlining is needed.</p> <p>UNEP hopes that the May 2014 Council submission of the South China Seas (SCS) Strategic Action Programme (SAP) implementation project will provide another opportunity</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--	---	--

						<p>to implement this recommendation. The SCS SAP implementation project will assist countries in meeting the targets of the approved SAP for the marine and coastal environment of the SCS through implementation of the National Action Plans in support of the SAP, and through strengthening regional co-ordination for SCS SAP implementation</p> <p>In response to bullet 4 - The SCS SAP implementation project also has a set of activities looking at improved national and regional values for the Total Economic Values of coastal habitats for use in development planning and decision-making.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Recommendation based on Council review of GEF Annual Impact Report 2012 (GEF/ME/C.43/04).

Ref #	Date of Council Decision	GEF EO Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2012	GEF EO Rating & Comments in MAR 2012	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2013	GEF EO Rating & Comments in MAR 2013
20	Nov. 2012	Recommendation 5 from the GEF Annual Impact Report 2012: A more robust programmatic approach should be developed for GEF IW support to the SCS and adjacent area...GEF engagements with the magnitude of support given in the SCS and adjacent areas require more robust tracking and reporting of multiagency commitments to communication, coordination and introspection among IW projects, and a common focus on global benefits. GEF has introduced the stocktaking meetings for this purpose, but as indicated above, they have only skirted around critical GEF partnership issues. Given the structural nature of the interactions among agencies (being equals), the responsibility for more robust tracking and reporting with regards to multi-agency collaboration and cooperation should be placed on the GEF Secretariat. This new function should be approached as an instrument for adaptive management. It should also allow for inputs from the various GEF stakeholders, including country representatives, and seek to identify and tackle critical issues affecting the functioning of the partnership and the execution of the broader GEF strategy in the region.	The Secretariat and Agencies appreciate Recommendation 5 that "A more robust programmatic approach should be developed for GEF IW support to the SCS and adjacent areas." Subsequent to the implementation of the projects in the SCS, the GEF has recognized the importance of a programmatic approach in the region and has made several changes in how programming is undertaken. This includes a medium-sized project (MSP) for the recently approved World Bank programmatic approach in the SCS with the mandate to coordinate the program. In addition to measures taken within specific programmatic approaches and projects, we are supporting robust dialogues through the Inter-Agency Focal Area Task Forces which are chaired by the GEF Secretariat as a forum for further collaboration and cooperation. It should also be noted, that in the case of the SCS regional project, there was no attempt prior to the approval of these projects to think of strategic partnerships, programmatic approaches or similar constructs.	The Council, having reviewed document GEF/ME/C.43/04, "GEF Annual Impact Report 2012", and document GEF/ME/C.43/05, "Management Response to the GEF Annual Impact Report 2012", took note of the considerable achievements of GEF support to the South China Sea and adjacent areas including, amongst others, that in 21 of 26 cases where comparative data could be obtained, GEF has supported initiatives that reduced environmental stress and improved or maintained socioeconomic conditions. Given the important contributions that GEF support has made to addressing regional transboundary concerns, and the role of the GEF as a critical player in the region, as noted by the report, the Council requested the Secretariat to: 2) Adopt a more robust tracking and reporting approach to ensure Agency accountability for collaboration and cooperation in the South China Sea and the East Asian Seas.	Medium. The Secretariat and the agencies, through the Interagency task force are examining different modalities to develop a robust tracking and reporting approach. UNEP Response: Agencies and GEF Sec have reviewed and discussed these recommendations with countries concerned. The IW portfolio has different modalities for programmatic coherence. The Inter-Agency IW Task Force will provide a robust tracking tool. In addition, other mechanisms can be developed, such as cross communication between Steering Committees of the different projects; and sharing of PIRs before finalization.	Not possible to verify yet: There is currently insufficient information for Evaluation Office to assess the adoption of Council's recommendation. This issue will be covered in ongoing work for OPSS, which will offer a chance for review.	Medium GEFSEC: In the SCS area, for the proposed upcoming SCS SAP Implementation project, execution will happen through COBSEA, Secretariat. COBSEAs mandate is to be a regional institutional mechanism, with nine countries being a member. As an example systems will be setting up at national and regional level to track results of the implementation of the SAP issues. These systems will then allow for setting up an enhanced information database for coastal habitat and land based sources of marine pollution to better inform local, national and regional priority setting and follow up actions. UNEP: Should the South China Sea (SCS) Strategic Action Programme (SAP) implementation project be approved, it will have a component looking	Negligible Collaboration and cooperation among agencies is critical in international waters and country oversight of projects is also important to build country ownership of outcomes and processes. Nevertheless the key point of this recommendation is related to ensuring the accountability for interagency collaboration. This requires the establishment of clear responsibilities for coordination and communication among agencies and an accountability structure that can be verify interaction across agencies and funding streams. So far stock taking meetings have not function as accountability instruments and there has been no entity or mechanisms in place to ensure accountability or frank discussion on aspects related cooperation and collaboration across

						<p>at strengthening knowledge-based action planning for the management of coastal habitats and land-based pollution to reduce environmental degradation of the SCS.</p> <p>Activities under this component have been designed to support consensus building on the information and data to be used in planning and implementing the required local, national and regional reforms required to address the degradation of coastal habitats, land-based pollution, and the adoption of stronger and more formal arrangements for regional co-operation in the management of the marine and coastal environment of the South China Sea. Given the geopolitical sensitivities characterizing the SCS region, such a consensual approach is deemed necessary in: tracking and reporting on results of SAP implementation;</p>	<p>agencies and streams of financing. The responses provided so far continue to be agency specific and do not address the purpose of the recommendation.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

							generating agreement among the region's scientists and policy makers on the analytical approaches used to prioritize options and reforms required to address environmental problems; fostering strengthened multi-lateral cooperation; and planning interventions that deliver both local results for beneficiary communities and high transboundary impacts.	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	---	--

Recommendation based on Council review of GEF Annual Impact Report 2012 (GEF/ME/C.43/04).

Ref #	Date of Council Decision	GEF EO Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2012	GEF EO Rating & Comments in MAR 2012	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2013	GEF EO Rating & Comments in MAR 2013
21	Nov. 2012	The findings of this (GEF Annual Impact Report 2012) evaluation should be considered when developing the GEF 6 International Waters Focal Area and, when applicable, the strategies of other focal areas.	The Secretariat as stated in Recommendation 8 will consider the findings from the SCS evaluation when developing the GEF-6 IW strategies.	Decision on Agenda Item 11: The Council, having reviewed document GEF/ME/C.43/04, "GEF Annual Impact Report 2012", and document GEF/ME/C.43/05, "Management Response to the GEF Annual Impact Report 2012", took note of the considerable achievements of GEF support to the South China Sea and adjacent areas including, amongst others, that in 21 of 26 cases where comparative data could be obtained, GEF has supported initiatives that reduced environmental stress and improved or maintained socioeconomic conditions. Given the important contributions that GEF support has made to addressing regional transboundary concerns, and the role of the GEF as a critical player in the region, as noted by the report, the Council requested the Secretariat to: 3) Take in to account the findings and recommendations of this evaluation when developing the GEF 6 International Waters Strategies	Medium. Under consideration as GEF-6 programming strategies are being developed. UNEP Response: UNEP as a member of TAG for IW will continue to work with GEF Sec and Agencies to address these findings.	Not possible to verify yet: There is currently insufficient information for Evaluation Office to assess the adoption of Council's recommendation. This issue will be covered in ongoing work for OPSS, which will offer a chance for review.	Medium GEFSEC: Reflected in GEF-6 strategies	Medium. As many of the topics addressed by the evaluation are central to the GEF approach to IW support, GEF 6 have move in the direction of some of the recommendations. As this are long term processes it cannot be expected that rapid progress can be made on all recommendations. Nevertheless it is also not clear in the GEF 6 Programming Directions document how the partnership will handle the key operational concern raised by the evaluation referring to the accountability for coordination and collaboration across agencies and streams of funding.

Recommendation based on Council review of GEF Annual Impact Report 2013 (GEF/ME/C.45/1).

Ref #	Date of Council Decision	GEF EO Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2013	GEF EO Rating & Comments in MAR 2013
22	Nov. 2013	The current focus on interventions that tackle barriers to broader adoption in a comprehensive way should be continued and where necessary further strengthened in GEF-6.	The GEF Secretariat appreciates and welcomes the acknowledgement that the shift towards tackling broader adoption in a more comprehensive way is visible in GEF-5 projects. The GEF Secretariat agrees that this effort should be continued especially toward ensuring a quicker progress toward impact. The GEF Secretariat looks forward to the final report of OPS5 on how to further strengthen the ongoing effort. The GEF Secretariat also agrees with the conclusion on the continued need to tackle barriers to broader adoption in a comprehensive way.	The Council, having reviewed document GEF/ME/C.45/1, "Annual Report on Impact", and document GEF/ME/C.45/2, "Management Response to the Annual Report on Impact," notes the considerable achievements of GEF support to Climate Change Mitigation in China, India, Mexico and Russia. It notes that in several projects progress toward impact was slowed down by barriers to change that were not fully included in project design and implementation. However, it is also noted that the current portfolio of mitigation support has shifted towards tackling broader adoption in a more comprehensive way in mitigation support in GEF-5. The Council requests the Secretariat to include this emphasis and where necessary further strengthen it in the proposals for GEF-6.	Medium GEFSEC: Reflected in GEF-6 strategies WB response: Reference to comment on point 15 and 22. We agree with the importance of such projects, but the partnership has not yet been able to discuss practical application of this concept to project design. In principle, all or most projects attempt broad adoption, and it remains unclear what additional strengthening is needed.	Substantial. The proposed GEF 6 Climate change strategy continues to move towards comprehensive approaches that seek to tackle market barriers and support the development of policy context.

Recommendation based on Council review of GEF Annual Impact Report 2013 (GEF/ME/C.45/1).

Ref #	Date of Council Decision	GEF EO Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2013	GEF EO Rating & Comments in MAR 2013
23	Nov. 2013	The measurement of GHG emission reduction, both direct and indirect, needs to be further improved. STAP should be requested to formulate a targeted research project to ensure that over time assessments of direct and indirect GHG emission reductions can be verified.	The GEF Secretariat recognizes the usefulness of developing ex-post GHG emission reductions verification. As stated in the response to Conclusion 5, however, verifying ex-post emission reductions will entail policy and organizational changes along with methodological improvement. To address the need to improve the measurements of GHG emission reduction and verification, the GEF Secretariat suggests to initiate a dialogue, including STAP, on how direct and indirect GHG emission reductions from GEF projects may be verified.	The Council requests the GEF Secretariat, in collaboration with STAP and other relevant entities, to continue its work on the improvement of the methodology of GHG emission reduction calculations, and to engage in a dialogue to improve (i) the assessment of direct GHG emission reduction during project implementation and at completion, and (ii) improved estimation of indirect GHG emission reduction. The Council requests the GEF Secretariat to report back by the next Council meeting with proposals on the way forward	<p>High</p> <p>GEFSEC: The GEF secretariat organized a brainstorming session on 20 February, 2014 and a dialogue meeting on 24 March, 2014 to identify proposals for the way forward to improve the methodologies of GHG emission reduction calculations used for GEF projects. Both meetings involved representatives from STAP, the GEF agencies, the GEF Independent Evaluation Office and experts involved in the design of methodologies of GHG emission reduction calculations. Based on this dialogue, the GEF secretariat drafted concrete proposals to improve (i) the assessment of direct GHG emission reduction during project implementation and at completion, and (ii) the estimation of indirect GHG emission reductions. These proposals are presented to the GEF Council as an information document.</p> <p>WB response: The World Bank has begun greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions accounting for all energy and forestry investment lending projects which have agreed methodologies and are at Concept Note Approval stage on or after July 1, 2013. This will be expanded to the transport sector in July 2014, and covering all relevant sectors and projects by end of June 2016. Moreover, the World Bank will initiate the reporting of GHG emissions on a portfolio basis after July 2017. This does not include the concept of "indirect" benefits.</p> <p>The World Bank has been engaged in the "dialogue" initiated by GEFSec, and is engaged more broadly in a process of harmonization across MDBs. Given complexity of projects and operational designs, this is a medium term goal.</p> <p>UNEP: STAP stands ready to work with the GEF Secretariat and GEF Partners, including</p>	<p>Substantial:</p> <p>The GEF secretariat has demonstrated leadership in working with STAP and other agencies to address the request by council. The process of dialogue and exchange that has started is very promising and likely to lead to the needed improvements and agreement in the measurement of GHG emission reductions.</p>

					through the development of a targeted research project, in the development of new tools for the measurement of direct and indirect emission reductions from GEF Projects.	
--	--	--	--	--	---	--

Recommendation based on Council review of Mid-Term Evaluation of the STAR (GEF/ME/C.45/04, October 2013)

Ref #	Date of Council Decision	GEF EO Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2013	GEF IEO Rating & Comments in MAR 2013
24	Nov. 2013	Limits for flexible use of focal area allocations for activities should be increased for countries with marginal flexibility	The Secretariat does not support this recommendation. The Secretariat has an obligation to respect the focal area allocations agreed during the replenishment negotiations. From the perspective of a country, increasing flexibility implies greater autonomy on how resources are used. Increasing flexibility means a fundamental shift in resources among focal areas that could be in gross contravention of replenishment agreements.	The Council, having reviewed document GEF/ME/C.45/04, "Mid-Term Evaluation of the System of Transparent Allocation of Resources (STAR)," and document GEF/ME/C.45/05, "Management Response to the Mid-Term Evaluation of STAR," notes the contribution of STAR to increased country ownership and country led programming in the GEF. Without prejudice to the policy recommendations related to the STAR that may emerge from the GEF-6 replenishment negotiations, the Council requests the Secretariat to take into account the following recommendations while preparing the STAR for GEF-6 for Council consideration: (a) Limits for flexible use of focal area allocations for activities could be increased for countries with marginal flexibility	Medium GEFSEC: To be discussed in STAR proposed for GEF-6 WB response: We agree that flexibility should be increased, and would be relevant not only for countries with marginal flexibility. We found that the evaluation did not provide full insight into why flexibility was relatively under-utilized by countries in GEF-5; and links, if any, with the NPFE evaluation. We hope these issues can be addressed in STAR proposal for GEF-6.	Substantial. The proposal for STAR for GEF-6 being prepared by the GEF Secretariat intends to provide full flexibility for a greater number of countries compared to GEF-5. It also proposes to increase the amount of money that counties that would have marginal flexibility would be able to use across the focal areas covered by STAR. These changes may be expected to resolve the constraints that are being faced in GEF-5. World Bank's response is peripheral to MAR as it, instead of focusing on the action taken on Council decision, focuses on the scope of the underlying evaluation and desirability of the decision. In our opinion, the reasons for lower level of utilization of flexibility are adequately discussed in the technical papers of STAR MTE (STAR Design (2) and Utilization (3)). The STAR MTE was undertaken at a time when implementation of GEF-5 was mid-way. The evaluation did find and report that although countries in the marginal flexibility category – especially those in the 7 million to 20 million range – need flexibility, the level of flexibility provided to them in STAR was not sufficient. This was discouraging several countries from using the flexibility feature to the extent they would like to. It also noted that this might be resulting into countries with total allocation in the 7 million to 20 million range showing greater

						preference for multi-focal area projects.
--	--	--	--	--	--	---

Recommendation based on Council review of Mid-Term Evaluation of the STAR (GEF/ME/C.45/04, October 2013)

Ref #	Date of Council Decision	GEF EO Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2013	GEF EO Rating & Comments in MAR 2013
25	Nov. 2013	The STAR index should be improved through specification of better indicators and updating of data.	We agree with this recommendation, recognizing that any improvement of indicators depends upon the availability of supporting data. While the Secretariat will continue to explore alternative indicators that better capture to potential for GEBs from combating land degradation, specifically desertification and deforestation, the current set of indicators will be used for the focal area GBI. Efforts will be made to update the data as appropriate and available from the original sources.	<p>The Council, having reviewed document GEF/ME/C.45/04, "Mid-Term Evaluation of the System of Transparent Allocation of Resources (STAR)," and document GEF/ME/C.45/05, "Management Response to the Mid-Term Evaluation of STAR," notes the contribution of STAR to increased country ownership and country led programming in the GEF. Without prejudice to the policy recommendations related to the STAR that may emerge from the GEF-6 replenishment negotiations, the Council requests the Secretariat to take into account the following recommendations while preparing the STAR for GEF-6 for Council consideration:</p> <p>(b) The STAR index could be improved through specification of better indicators and updating of data</p>	<p>Medium GEFSEC: To be discussed in STAR proposed for GEF-6</p>	<p>Medium GEF IEO: The Secretariat has updated the data for several indicators that constitute the GBI and GPI indices. Minor modifications in the indices have also been proposed.</p>

Recommendation based on Council review of Mid-Term Evaluation of the STAR (GEF/ME/C.45/04, October 2013)

Ref #	Date of Council Decision	GEF EO Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2013	GEF EO Rating & Comments in MAR 2013
26	Nov. 2013	The implementation of STAR can be fine-tuned on several aspects, most notably a more thorough calculation of the allocations with sufficient quality control, and improvements in the process for STAR calculation and database management.	The Secretariat welcomes the recommendation of quality control. The STAR calculations are complex ones, and the idea of independent calculations by multiple people is a positive one. The Secretariat also welcomes the recommendation for improvements in database management. The Secretariat welcomes the recommendation for improvements in the process for STAR calculations and suggests that we work more closely with the Evaluation Office to ensure that the Terminal Evaluation Report (TER) data being inputted into the model is of better quality.	The Council, having reviewed document GEF/ME/C.45/04, "Mid-Term Evaluation of the System of Transparent Allocation of Resources (STAR)," and document GEF/ME/C.45/05, "Management Response to the Mid-Term Evaluation of STAR," notes the contribution of STAR to increased country ownership and country led programming in the GEF. Without prejudice to the policy recommendations related to the STAR that may emerge from the GEF-6 replenishment negotiations, the Council requests the Secretariat to take into account the following recommendations while preparing the STAR for GEF-6 for Council consideration: (c) The implementation of STAR could be fine-tuned on several aspects, most notably a more thorough calculation of the allocations with sufficient quality control, and improvements in the process for STAR calculation and database management.	Medium GEFSEC: To be discussed in STAR proposed for GEF-6	Medium In response to the Council decision, the Secretariat has taken several measures. It has put in place a system to ensure calculation of the scores by two different staff members and its reconciliation, and has also fixed problems in calculations that were noted in the STAR MTE. The approach is still under implementation as simulations are being run and different scenarios are being developed.

Recommendation based on Council review of the Mid-Term Evaluation of the NPFE (GEF/ME/C.45/06, October 2013)

Ref #	Date of Council Decision	GEF EO Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2013	GEF EO Rating & Comments in MAR 2013
27	Nov. 2013	The NPFE initiative should continue. The revised NPFE needs to continue to be implemented by the Secretariat, to maintain neutrality between countries and agencies, and to provide funding for a country led NPFE on a voluntary basis.	The Secretariat welcomes the recommendation that "The NPFE initiative should continue, as it is highly relevant to support countries to address the pre-identification phase of project cycle". The initial experience from NPFE has been very positive in terms of setting up and / or strengthening coordination mechanisms and involving new stakeholders in discussions about future priorities at country level and should be promoted. The Secretariat agrees with the recommendation to continue to implement the revised NPFE by the Secretariat, to maintain neutrality between countries and GEF Agencies, and to provide funding for a country led NPFE on a voluntary basis.	The Council, having reviewed GEF/ME/C.45/06, "Mid-Term Evaluation of the National Portfolio Evaluation Exercise (NPFE)," and GEF/ME/C.45/07, "Management Response to the Mid-Term Evaluation of the NPFE," notes the relevance of the NPFEs to address the pre-identification phase of GEF support and its notable success in creating capacity in countries to coordinate and program GEF interventions. The Council requests the Secretariat to: (a) Include in the final replenishment proposals the continuation of NPFE support in GEF-6, to be implemented through the Secretariat	High GEFSEC: The proposal was included in the replenishment documents and accepted by the participants. WB response: We recognize the high relevance to the countries, and hope that the EO findings on the weaknesses related to inefficiency and effectiveness of the exercise will be addressed in the proposals for GEF-6. UNEP: UNEP welcomes the GEF Sec's willingness to share terms of reference for new NPFEs and believes the new process reflected therein represents and improvement.	High Full agreement with the response of the GEF SEC.

Recommendation based on Council review of the Mid-Term Evaluation of the NPFE (GEF/ME/C.45/06, October 2013)

Ref #	Date of Council Decision	GEF EO Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2013	GEF EO Rating & Comments in MAR 2013
28	Nov. 2013	It is strongly recommended to support programming exercises at the end of a GEF phase rather than at the start of a new phase, to ensure that countries are ready for the new phase when it starts. The current balance in the NPFE program should be used for NPFE support to especially LDCs and SIDS in 2014;	The Secretariat agrees with the recommendation to support programming exercises at the end of a GEF phase rather than at the start of a new phase, to ensure that countries are ready for the new phase when it starts. In this regard, the Secretariat intends to begin a new round of NPFEs in January 2014 with a view to preparing for GEF-6. The Secretariat agrees that this effort could focus especially on supporting LDCs and SIDS that so request; but the exercise will be available to all interested recipient countries.	The Council, having reviewed GEF/ME/C.45/06, "Mid-Term Evaluation of the National Portfolio Evaluation Exercise (NPFE)," and GEF/ME/C.45/07, "Management Response to the Mid-Term Evaluation of the NPFE," notes the relevance of the NPFEs to address the pre-identification phase of GEF support and its notable success in creating capacity in countries to coordinate and program GEF interventions. The Council requests the Secretariat to: (b) Use the balance of the GEF-5 NPFE support for programming exercises especially in LDCs and SIDS in 2014, to enable countries on a voluntary basis to prepare for GEF-6	High GEFSEC: The Council decided to begin a new round of NPFEs to set priorities for GEF 6 in early 2014. A communication has been sent to all countries to this effect. For those countries carrying out a National Dialogue, a component equivalent to an NPFE has been included in the agenda that will result in an NPF. WB response: Where countries decide on voluntary programming exercises, we welcome early and time-bound planning, to overcome delays experienced in GEF-5.	High The Secretariat has already invited applications from the recipient countries for NPFEs for GEF-6. This is being funded through the left over amount of GEF-5. Several countries have already submitted their expression of interest. A few have also sent applications. Thus, the Council decision is being fully complied with.

Recommendation based on Council review of the Mid-Term Evaluation of the NPFE (GEF/ME/C.45/06, October 2013)

Ref #	Date of Council Decision	GEF EO Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2013	GEF EO Rating & Comments in MAR 2013
29	Nov. 2013	The capacity development initiatives of the GEF, including NPFE, NCSA, National Dialogue Initiatives and the Capacity Development Strategy should aim to support a more comprehensive understanding of the GEF in partners and stakeholders at the country level, especially in LDCs and SIDS.	The Secretariat agrees with the recommendation "The capacity development initiatives of the GEF, including NPFE, NCSA, National Dialogue Initiatives and the Capacity Development Strategy should aim to support a more comprehensive understanding of the GEF in partners and stakeholders at the country level, especially in LDCs and SIDS" and will seek to fine tune the approach as suggested.	The Council, having reviewed GEF/ME/C.45/06, "Mid-Term Evaluation of the National Portfolio Evaluation Exercise (NPFE)," and GEF/ME/C.45/07, "Management Response to the Mid-Term Evaluation of the NPFE," notes the relevance of the NPFEs to address the pre-identification phase of GEF support and its notable success in creating capacity in countries to coordinate and program GEF interventions. The Council requests the Secretariat to: (c) Include in the final replenishment proposals capacity development initiatives for GEF-6 (including NPFE, NDI, NCSA and a follow-up to the Capacity Development Strategy of GEF-5) which aim to achieve a more comprehensive understanding of the GEF in partners and stakeholders at the country level, especially in LDCs and SIDS	High GEFSEC: The proposal was included in the replenishment programming document and accepted by the participants. WB response: We welcome the current discussions on how to make these 'GEF workshops' more effective and support essential capacity building and understanding. Capacity development can be more impactful when it is fully integrated in investment projects. UNEP: Developing a more comprehensive understanding of the GEF should enhance countries' capacities to develop GEF portfolios that reflect the multidimensional nature of the environmental challenges the GEF seeks to address.	High As per the Council decision, proposals for capacity building initiatives have been included in GEF-6.

Recommendation based on Council review of the Mid-Term Evaluation of the NPFE (GEF/ME/C.45/06, October 2013)

Ref #	Date of Council Decision	GEF EO Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2013	GEF EO Rating & Comments in MAR 2013
30	Nov. 2013	The NPFE guidelines should address information needs of the countries for programming on topics such as eligibility criteria, co-financing expectations, and funding modalities.	The Secretariat agrees with Recommendation 5 in that current NPFE guidelines should be revised to provide countries with more detailed information of key concepts and issues related to project preparation as well as to refine the content of the NPFD. To that effect the guidance for the next round of NPFEs will provide more details as suggested.	<p>The Council, having reviewed GEF/ME/C.45/06, "Mid-Term Evaluation of the National Portfolio Evaluation Exercise (NPFE)," and GEF/ME/C.45/07, "Management Response to the Mid-Term Evaluation of the NPFE," notes the relevance of the NPFEs to address the pre-identification phase of GEF support and its notable success in creating capacity in countries to coordinate and program GEF interventions. The Council requests the Secretariat to:</p> <p>(d) Update NPFE guidelines to address information needs of the countries for programming on topics such as eligibility criteria, co-financing expectations, and funding modalities.</p>	<p>High</p> <p>GEFSEC: The NPFE guidelines have been updated. Once the programming strategies have been adopted by the Council they will be included in the information packages, co-financing will be included in the issues to be discussed and funding modalities explained. The Secretariat will actively participate in all NPFEs in order to provide all advice necessary.</p> <p>WB response: We warmly welcome any guidelines that address the major issues raised in OPS5 and clarification of substantive issues that would help make the NPFE approach more effective and efficient, which requires that guidelines do address the eligibility criteria, co-financing expectations, and funding modalities.</p>	<p>Medium</p> <p>The NPFE guidelines have been updated. However, several topics such as eligibility criteria and co-financing expectations have not yet been covered in adequate detail. On co-financing – a more substantive update will also need to wait for ongoing work of the task force on updating of the co-financing policy. As of now it is unlikely that the guidelines for NPFE will adequately address the information needs on the topics such as eligibility criteria, co-financing expectations and funding modality.</p>

Recommendation based on LDCF/SCCF Council review of Evaluation of the Special Climate Change Fund (GEF/LDCF.SCCF.11/ME/02).

Ref #	Date of LDCF/SCCF Council Decision	GEF EO Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2012	GEF EO Rating & Comments in MAR 2012	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2013	GEF EO Rating & Comments in MAR 2013
LS-1	Nov. 2011	Recommendation 2: The LDCF/SCCF Council should ask the Secretariat to prepare proposals to ensure: a) transparency of the project pre-selection process; b) dissemination of good practices through existing channels; c) visibility of the fund by requiring projects to identify their funding source.	The Secretariat is pleased to fully endorse the recommendations put forth in the Evaluation... The Secretariat intends to take action in order to implement the second recommendation	Decision on Agenda Item 6: The LDCF/SCCF Council, having reviewed the document GEF/LDCF.SCCF.11/ME/02, Evaluation of the Special Climate Change Fund, and document GEF/LDCF.SCCF.11/ME/03, Management response to the Evaluation of the SCCF, notes the conclusion of the impact of funding levels and the need for continued support. The LDCF/SCCF Council requests the Secretariat to prepare proposals to ensure: a) transparency of the project pre-selection process; b) dissemination of good practices through existing channels; c) visibility of the fund by requiring projects to identify their funding source.	<p>Overall rating: Substantial</p> <p>a) High. In response to Recommendation 2-(a), the Secretariat developed a pre-selection criteria information document to be circulated during the 12th LDCF/SCCF Council meeting. The pre-selection process and criteria were included in the <i>Updated Operational Guidelines for the SCCF</i>, approved by the LDCF/SCCF Council in November 2012. The contents of this document were also posted on the GEF website, for transparency purposes, during the corresponding Work Program. (please see http://www.thegef.org/gef/https%3A/%252Fwww.thegef.org/gef/sccf/criteria) Furthermore, the Adaptation Task Force has received a written report on the pre-selection process for June 2013 SCCF Work Program.</p> <p>b) Substantive. The dissemination of good practices continues through the Annual Monitoring Report, GEFs newsletter (Greenline), and starting with the Climate COP in 2012, through the Adaptation Practitioners Days, a two day event that gathers LDCF/SCCF practitioners. The Adaptation Learning Mechanism continues to serve as a key platform for disseminating lessons and good practice on adaptation.</p> <p>c) Medium. The GEF has a communication and visibility policy, which, by default, applies. Secretariat has requested, through the Adaptation Task Force, that projects identify their funding source.</p>	<p>Overall rating: Substantial</p> <p>a) High. The EO is in agreement with the rating provided by management. The EO encourages the Secretariat to periodically assess the application of the pre-selection process and criteria.</p> <p>b) Substantive. Efforts made by the Secretariat to disseminate lessons are welcome. Continued efforts should include the preparation of a plan to systematically disseminate good practices through existing channels at the fund level.</p> <p>c) Negligible. While reference to the communication and visibility policy and requests through the Adaptation Task Force may be helpful, the Council decision calls for the Secretariat to prepare a proposal to ensure visibility of the fund, which is in addition to the GEF communication and visibility policy. SCCF visibility requires clear identification of the funding source in outreach documents, project leaflets, press releases, and websites. The Secretariat may consider adopting a logo.</p>	<p>GEFSEC-CCA: Overall rating: Substantial</p> <p>a) High. The Adaptation program has continued to improve the pre-selection process and has further improved the transparency of the process. In addition to continued use of the overall process and criteria, the GEF SEC issues a report for the GEF Agencies for each pre-selection process, including the details of evaluation committee, which includes STAP, and outcome and reasoning concerning the projects in the pre-selection pool.</p> <p>b) High. Efforts made by the GEF SEC have intensified, and include the production of a book on lessons learned from the GEF's adaptation portfolio to-date, as well as a knowledge management event at UNFCCC COP in 2013 during which practitioners associated with GEF's adaptation projects shared their experiences with the</p>	<p>Overall rating: Substantial</p> <p>a) High: The GEFIO is in agreement with the Secretariat's rating and assessment.</p> <p>b) High: The GEFIO is in agreement with the Secretariat's rating and assessment.</p> <p>c) Medium: The GEFIO acknowledges that the Secretariat's outreach effort has been intensified. The GEFIO encourages the Secretariat to prepare a proposal to ensure the visibility of the fund in a more systematic way. The GEFIO will no longer track sections a) and b) of this Council decision. However, the Office will continue tracking issues related to section c) of this decision.</p>

						<p>wider climate change audience, with plans to continue supporting knowledge dissemination events on a regular (e.g. annual) basis.</p> <p>Substantive. The GEF’s outreach effort has intensified, and thus the visibility of the funds has been increasing. In addition, the GEF SEC is further considering measures to enhance the visibility of the funds in FY15, concomitant with and appropriate to its new strategy.</p> <p>UNEP: UNEP welcomes the pre-selection process and the discussion of it at the Task Force forum, as well as the involvement of the STAP adaptation member in the selection process.</p> <p>WB response: Lessons learnt are very welcome, In numerous multi Trust Fund projects, we find that efforts should be made toward a universal approach of policies and procedures across different funds.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--