



Progress Toward Impact

Overall Performance Study of the GEF

Carlo Carugi
GEF Evaluation Office
Istanbul, April 14-15, 2010

OPS4



GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT FACILITY
EVALUATION OFFICE

Introduction

- ❑ **OPS4** is an independent study to assess the extent to which the GEF is achieving its objectives and to identify potential improvements.
- ❑ **OPS4** is a working document of the 5th Replenishment of the GEF and will be presented to the Assembly in May 2010.
- ❑ Final report was presented to the third replenishment meeting, 13-14 October, 2009.

OPS4



Scope

- ❑ 16 key questions identified in ToR (www.gefeo.org)
- ❑ All projects and project proposals until June 30, 2009 were studied:
 - *2,389 finished, on-going and approved projects: \$ 8,772 M.*
 - *Project Terminal evaluations since OPS3: 215.*
- ❑ OPS4 built on OPS3, 24 evaluation reports of the Evaluation Office, and evidence from:
 - *57 countries, visited after OPS3*
 - *9 special country case studies*
 - *10 additional project visits*
 - *Literature and desk reviews, interviews, surveys*
- ❑ Consultations with representatives of all stakeholders

OPS4



Limitations

- All 16 key questions answered, but varying degrees of depth;
- Need more work on:
 - *The involvement of civil society and the private sector in the GEF*
 - *Resources management in the GEF*
 - *Cost-effectiveness*
 - *Impact analysis – project oriented*
- Two major evaluations of the Evaluation Office have led to on-going reform processes:
 - *The reform of the project cycle; positive indications but it is too soon for an evaluative judgments*
 - *The reform of the RAF*
- Impact evidence in the GEF is still limited to the 3 implementing agencies: World Bank, UNDP and UNEP.

OPS4

Report overview

- ❑ GEF in a Changing World
 - International Context
 - Resource Mobilization
 - Convention Guidance
 - The Catalytic Nature of the GEF
 - Programming Resources
- ❑ Progress toward Impact
 - From Hypothesis to Evidence
 - Focal Area and Multi Focal Area Progress
- ❑ Issues affecting Results
 - Performance
 - The GEF as a Learning Organization
 - Resources Management
- ❑ Governance and Partnership

The full document, annexes, methodological and technical documents related to **OPS4** can be found in www.gefeo.org

OPS4



OPS4 Main conclusions (1)

- ❑ Funding gap:
 - International funding gap on global environmental problems
 - GEF Replenishments led to less funds in real terms
 - GEF now has more Focal Areas, more guidance, and more countries

- ❑ The GEF contributed to progress toward impact
 - 70% of finished projects see progress toward global environmental benefits,
 - further follow-up action from national partners is essential to achieve global environmental benefits

- ❑ GEF project performance is satisfactory
 - the GEF projects are **effective** in producing outcomes,
 - the average score over the GEF-4 period of 80% exceeding the GEF Council objective of 75%

OPS4



OPS4 Main conclusions (2)

- ❑ The **efficiency** of the GEF can and should be further improved
 - emphasis on programming,
 - less time spent on project identification,
 - enhanced fee structure,
 - more integrated learning (look at lessons from IW Learn),
 - results-based management framework that includes progress to impact measurements (logframes, tracking tools, impact)
- ❑ “Inability to deliver” is a perception linked to pre-approval phase
 - reform processes are underway and show promise
 - GEF should move from focal area programming toward programming on a national level
- ❑ The GEF partnership brings added value – its tensions need to be resolved
- ❑ Governance is adequate but could improve
 - Substantive role of Assembly / meet more often
 - Clearer delineation of governance/management roles

OPS4



OPS4 recommendations

- ❑ Interaction between the GEF and the conventions need to be improved.
- ❑ Improvements in resource management should focus on
 - developing a new system for reserving funds for project ideas
 - reforming fiduciary standards and the fee system
- ❑ The GEF Council should address tensions within the GEF partnership and provide guidance on roles and responsibilities.
- ❑ If the GEF-5 replenishment recommendations include strong proposals concerning programming, efficiency and partnership, OPS4 supports the highest level of replenishment for the GEF.

OPS4



Consultation with Focal Points: Main Conclusions

□ ROLE:

- The GEF provides valuable support to countries to address global environmental issues

□ RELEVANCE:

- GEF support is largely seen as relevant to global environmental issues and to conventions
- GEF operations could be more relevant to national priorities.

□ RESULTS:

- Important contributions on capacity building and strengthening of institutions and of environmental legislative frameworks
- Short term funding of GEF operations is seen as a factor hampering sustainability and long term results

OPS4



GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT FACILITY
EVALUATION OFFICE

Consultation with Focal Points: Main Conclusions (cont.)

□ PERFORMANCE:

- Insufficient transparency in decision making across the GEF system.
- Unclear criteria and process for project identification and approval which cause confusion and delays.
- GEF co-funding requirements should be more flexible.
- Agency performance varies greatly, several general concerns need to be addressed.

Follow up:


- Need to better codify roles and responsibilities with regards to focal points
- Need to strengthen country M&E
- Need to make co-funding requirements more flexible

OPS4



GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT FACILITY
EVALUATION OFFICE

In brief

- 
- ❑ The GEF shows good progress toward impact
 - ❑ Outcome performance is satisfactory
 - ❑ “Inability to deliver” is perception linked to pre-approval phase
 - Reform processes are underway and show promise
 - Moving from focal area project support toward programming on a national level would bring GEF further in line with Paris Declaration on aid effectiveness
 - ❑ Funding of the GEF has several issues of concern:
 - International funding gap on global environmental problems
 - Funding gap on guidance from the conventions
 - Funding gap in full scale support in several groups of countries (LDCs, SIDS, Fragile states)
 - ❑ The GEF partnership brings added value – its tensions need to be resolved
 - ❑ If the GEF-5 replenishment recommendations include strong proposals concerning programming, efficiency and partnership, the Fourth Overall Performance Study supports the highest level of replenishment for the GEF

OPS4





Thank you

Carlo Carugi

ccarugi@thegef.org

OPS4



GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT FACILITY
EVALUATION OFFICE