Main Conclusions and Recommendations

OPS5 is a comprehensive evaluation that assesses the performance, institutional effectiveness, and impact of the GEF. Overall performance studies are undertaken to inform the next replenishment cycle of the GEF and to identify potential improvements.

OPS5 builds on a solid evidence base:

Analysis of full GEF portfolio
- 969 projects approved since the close of OPS4
- 491 completed projects
- 3,566 projects from pilot phase through Sept. 30, 2013

Field-level evidence
- 91 small grants projects
- 54 countries
- 116 full- and medium-size projects

Evaluations and studies
- 21 technical documents
- 33 evaluations and studies
Global environment trends continue to decline

The replenishment may show no increase in purchasing power, while the GEF has accepted more obligations

By the numbers

Higher level of funding leads to better progress toward impact

50% of completed projects with GEF funding $1 M are likely to be continued and expanded by governments and other stakeholders

84% of completed projects with GEF funding $10 M are likely to be continued and expanded by governments and other stakeholders

The GEF plays a relatively small but catalytic role in global public funding
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$10 billion

$100 billion

versus

$1 trillion

Annual GEF funding

Global public funding for environmental issues

Funding needs for action on global environmental issues

Global public subsidies that lead to overexploitation of natural resources and environmental degradation
Resource mobilization and strategic choices in the GEF need to reflect the urgency of global environmental problems

Make replenishment arrangements more flexible

Encourage donors to contribute to GEF based on their priorities, without being constrained by inflexible pro rata burden-sharing arrangements

Broaden the financing base and invite the EC to become a donor

By the numbers

A soft pipeline with 60% coverage of available money would provide a one-time speeding-up of up to $400 million in transfers to recipient countries

100% → 60% = $400 M

Speeded-up delivery for projects
Key messages

The business model of the GEF is no longer appropriate and leads to growing inefficiencies

The GEF project cycle is slow

![Geographic representation of the GEF project cycle]

2.5 yr from concept submission to implementation

6 mo. * 20 mo. * 5 mo. * 5 yr (avg) 8 mo. (avg)

* for 50% of projects, while remaining 50% is still at an earlier stage

The GEF network is complex and overburdened

GEF decision-making structure on policies, guidance, and strategic priorities

Growing number of actors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Recommendation 2**

**OPS5**

### Key messages

The business model of the GEF needs major overhaul in the GEF-6 period

The move toward programming and programmatic approaches should continue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Council should approve programming proposals and programmatic approaches</th>
<th>Project proposals should be cleared by the CEO</th>
<th>STAP quality assurance role should shift to screening programs and portfolios</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The GEF should shift cofinancing considerations to the CEO endorsement and GEF Agency approval stages</td>
<td>The GEF network should redefine the inclusion of partners at decision points, focusing on Council and country-level decisions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Limit the number of outcome indicators

Revitalize public involvement policy

Invigorate the corporate strategy for the Small Grants Programme (SGP)

---

1. GEF-5
2. GEF-6
3. GEF
4. GEF
The intervention logic of the GEF is catalytic and successful in achieving impact over time.

**Key messages**

The intervention logic of the GEF is not only successful at the national level, but also regionally and globally.

**Progress toward impact**

- **Broader adoption**
  - Sustaining
  - Mainstreaming
  - Replication
  - Scaling-up
  - Market change

- **Behavioral change**
  - Criteria:
    - Economically feasible
    - Socially acceptable
    - Environmentally sound

**Impact**

- Improved environmental status
- Stress reduction

**By the numbers**

- **20%**
  - Only 20% of projects show progress toward impact

- **80%**
  - More than 80% have satisfactory outcomes

- **7%**
  - Only 7% of projects show no progress toward impact

- **93%**
  - 93% of GEF projects deliver excellent outcomes

**GEF areas of contribution**

- **Implementation Strategies**
  - Implementing mechanisms & bodies
  - Technologies & approaches
- **Financial mechanisms for implementation & sustainability**
- **Institutional Capacity**
  - Policy, legal & regulatory frameworks
  - Governmental structures & arrangements
- **Informal processes for trust building & conflict resolution**
- **Knowledge & Information**
  - Information sharing & access
  - Monitoring & evaluation
  - Knowledge generation
- **Awareness raising**
- **Skills building**

**Conclusion**

GEF projects deliver excellent outcomes.
To maximize results, the intervention model of the GEF needs to be applied where it is most needed and supported by a better business model.

**Key messages**

- More attention to activities that boost broader adoption of GEF initiatives by governments and other stakeholders
- Involve civil society and the private sector in projects, programs, national and regional priority setting, and analysis

**Strengthen Strategic Role of the STAP**

- Revitalize the SGP Steering Committee

**Targeted research, focus on learning from completed projects**

- The committee should provide strategic guidance to the program

**Adopt an action plan to implement the GEF Gender Mainstreaming Policy**

- Implement knowledge management and capacity development strategy

**Community of practice of project proponents on better design and implementation**