



GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT FACILITY
EVALUATION OFFICE

**AUDIT TRAIL OF COMMENTS ON THE
OPS5 DRAFT APPROACH PAPER**

May 9, 2012

Audit Trail of Comments on the OPS5 draft Approach Paper

Country/Agency	Comment	GEF EO Reply
Overall Comments for OPS5 draft Approach Paper		
Canada	Perhaps the OPS-4 went a little too far in focusing on impacts, to the detriment of info on outputs and outcomes. While we recognize the need to focus on impacts, it is also important for contributors to be able to provide data on more tangible, short-term project outputs and outcomes, such as # of hectares conserved, quantity of GHG emissions avoided, etc..., particularly when discussing broader GEF replenishment issues with political and financial decision-makers.	Validating the GEF-5 outcomes according to the tracking tools has been included in OPS5.
Canada	OPS-5 should assess the effectiveness of the GEF in providing support to recipient country Parties for MEA reporting. Within this context, it would be helpful for OPS-5 to examine the effectiveness and sustainability of capacity-building activities and investments associated with this MEA reporting.	The obligations of countries to the conventions have been included in the key questions for the first report of OPS5.
France	We support this well framed initiative and especially because it is conducted under the “meta evaluation” approach, which we will follow with high interest.	Noted with thanks.
Japan	We believe that the GEF agencies play a critical role in delivering GEF projects. At the same time, it should be carefully analyzed whether the expansion of the agencies, to the current of 10 institutions from the original 3, has contributed to improvement in the efficiency and effectiveness of the GEF’s operations.	This has been included in key question (11) for the final report of OPS5.
Japan	The GEF’s mandate has continuously expanded in accordance with the guidance by the conventions to address arising global environmental needs. However, given the limited resource availability, each focus area will be provided with limited resource allocations, which poses a question on the effectiveness of the GEF’s intervention on these areas. We believe that OPS5 should analyze this issue.	Has now been included in a new sub-study in table 2, focusing on whether the GEF has sufficient resources to achieve its (many) objectives.

Country/Agency	Comment	GEF EO Reply
Japan	Explore how and the extent to which the GEF identify and respond to the various needs of the recipient countries at different sector and level such as capacity building support, funding investment and enhancement of knowledge management at sub-regional, national and regional level;	This has been strengthened throughout the TORs, also based on the comments of others.
Norway	The proposed objectives and methods provide a thorough response to the specific needs of the GEF Council, the GEF Assembly and the replenishment process. The draft also anticipates the needs of the conventions and the general public.	Noted with thanks.
Norway	<p>Based on the discussions of OPS4, what is in the power of GEF to influence and what follows from other factors needs to be identified. This basic understanding is incorporated in the proposed study, but its consequences for the portfolio and for the perception of GEF as funding mechanism could be even more explicitly stated.</p> <p>Some factors regarding the portfolio are due to processes inside the recipient countries, together with the agencies acting on behalf of the GEF, other factors can be changed by the Council and Assembly. This concerns the choice of projects as well as the time taken at each stage from inception to disbursement. In the case of biodiversity, for instance, there was an instance where the country representative to the convention complained that their biosafety project had not received support from GEF. It turned out that the project had not been given priority by the recipient country. In other cases, the time elapsed between project proposal and commitment was needed by the agency that was to use the funds, not by the GEF secretariat.</p> <p>Many speakers in the current discussion about financial mechanisms in the Rio+20 context call for reforms to make access to funding easier and faster. There is however a need to distinguish between reforms in the recipient countries, constraints due to limited funding and reforms that can be carried out by GEF. The OPS could help making this debate more constructive by separating out framework conditions that make it difficult to obtain FDI, loans and grants, as well as the need for safeguards, and seek to identify elements that can be changed when creating GEF6.</p>	<p>Throughout the TORs efforts have been made to better identify factors that help or hinder – however, given the fact that it needs to remain a relatively short guidance document for OPS5, this has not been incorporated everywhere.</p> <p>Specific concerns have been noted.</p>

Country/Agency	Comment	GEF EO Reply
Norway	Essential information for the replenishment will be the focal area achievements. This should as far as possible sum up quantitative and qualitative results (e.g. tonnes of greenhouse gas equivalents saved and cost per tonne). Council has agreed to use proxy indicators in some fields, but where specific data can be found this should be used.	Validating the GEF-5 outcomes according to the tracking tools has been included in OPS5.
Norway	One type of achievement which is not easily measured is whether financial support from GEF has contributed to country ratification and follows up of the conventions. We would appreciate that this aspect is kept in mind during the study.	This will be taken up in key question (1) of the first report – the Office has considerable evidence on this issue.
GEF Secretariat	International Context: The challenging international context within which the sixth replenishment will be negotiated is discussed briefly in paragraphs 6-9. The Secretariat believes that the approach outlined is too general and abstract. The Secretariat would like to see OPS5 more explicitly address the potential impact fragmented funding may have on the GEF and if there has been any impact to date with the newer funds that have been established. Moreover, the COP agreement to establish the Green Climate Fund and GEF’s role in supporting the transitional committee and establishing the interim secretariat are missing completely from any discussion within OPS5. An evaluative perspective on these issues is important to include as an overarching umbrella under which OPS5 is conducted and may help to establish where GEF’s strengths or weaknesses may lie within this evolving architecture.	This has been incorporated in a new key question (2) in the final report.
GEF Secretariat	GEF-5 Reforms: The approach paper tackles the issue of the GEF-5 reforms as if each reform is discrete and can be evaluated as a standalone issue. The major example of this is selecting to evaluate only the NPFs instead of the NPFs within the broader reform of the Country Support Program (CSP). As outlined in Annex B of the summary of negotiations of the fifth replenishment “Participants have developed the policy recommendations for the GEF-5 on two main pillars: (i) enhancing country ownership; and (ii) improving effectiveness and efficiency of the GEF partnership.” The Secretariat suggests that OPS5 be structured to explore to what extent these pillars have been successful given the reforms that have been put in place. In addition to looking at the CSP as a complete program, OPS5 should also examine the implementation of the GEF’s	Key question (5) has been reformulated to recognize the overarching principles of enhancing country ownership and improved effectiveness and efficiency. Results Based Management was already included in the list of reform processes that would need attention.

Country/Agency	Comment	GEF EO Reply
	Results Based Management Framework and its central place in the GEF-5 strategy development, including that all focal area (and corporate program) strategies have been developed with results-frameworks that are integrated within the overall corporate results framework.	
GEF Secretariat	Adaptation: While the approach paper states upfront that the intent is to include adaptation, and that the findings will be presented to the LDCF/SCCF Council, the document does not mention adaptation benefits anywhere. Global Environmental benefits (GEBs) do not apply to LDCF and SCCF; this will need to be corrected. Paragraphs, 23, 24, 27, 28 and 30 will need to be amended to take this into account.	Adaptation challenges have been added where appropriate.
GEF Secretariat	International Waters: The IW focal area does not have a convention associated with it and this should be taken into account when undertaking the evaluation as the approach paper is written there is no caveat for this. In addition, the regional focus of IW does not lend itself well to the country portfolio evaluations (CPEs) and the OPS5 approach relies heavily on these evaluations. The Secretariat would like OPS to take this (no international convention) into consideration when looking at the IW portfolio in particular.	Key question (1) of the first study has been reformulated to incorporate the special situation for international waters.
GEF Secretariat	OPS5 will be informing the sixth replenishment of the GEF, throughout the document it is referred to as the fifth replenishment	Noted and error corrected.
FAO	The Approach Paper is very clear about the lessons that have been learnt from previous rounds (OPS3 and OPS4), and how the GEF Evaluation Office intends to modify its approach in the light of these observations. In particular the notion that the three Quality Assurance Advisers will become involved early on in the process makes good sense. The Approach Paper is less explicit about the role of the Reference Team: whether all (or how many) of the GEF Agencies will be involved, whether the role of the Reference Team will be purely reactive (responding to studies/papers submitted by the Evaluation Team) or also pro-active (pursuing some aspects relevant to OPS5 in their respective agencies).	More information has been added on the specific roles of the quality advisors and the reference group and when they will be involved.

FAO	The overall approach is interesting, in particular the use of a meta-evaluation as your main source for assessing GEF interventions. We are also using meta-evaluation as well increasingly as a complementary source of information in our thematic and strategic evaluations. In the case of GEF, and as mentioned in the paper, the work is made easier as all the evaluations have followed similar approaches and methods. However, GEF has a broad array of interventions and evaluations do not necessarily address the same issues. You will still need to define frameworks for comparison and analysis that go beyond the standard evaluation criteria. Another issue we face in the use of meta-evaluations, is the uneven quality of evaluations (and this, in spite our quality assurance system). You may still need to do some analysis first of the quality of evaluations and some kind of meta-evaluations in the sense of the OECD/DAC definition (mentioned in a footnote).	The quality of terminal evaluations in the GEF is reviewed annually. A framework for analysis will be developed in the start-up phase of the first report.
UNEP	UNEP welcomes the involvement of STAP in the development of insights into environmental problems and trends. In addition, UNEP notes that the GEO-5 will have just been concluded when OPS-5 starts this process, and believes that the full report of GEO-5 would be of immense value to GEF EO. UNEP welcomes a closer dialogue with GEF EO to consider how to use this information and make it available to the OPS-5 team.	Noted and appreciated! A reference to GEO-5 has been included.
UNEP	Currently, the approach paper is silent on the relationship between OPS5 and the, soon to be initiated, Global Partnership Review of WB in the GEF of the Independent Evaluation Group of the World Bank. To what extent are these evaluations complementary or duplicative?	More references to this and other independent evaluations of GEF Agencies have now been included.
World Bank	We are disconcerted that Agencies are not mentioned in Stakeholder interaction.	Interaction has been included in paragraph 48.
World Bank	We note the emphasis on meta-evaluation both in OPS5 report 1 and 2, while many of the sub-studies in report 2 will be ‘updating existing insights’. Once an ‘insight’ is there and presented, it is likely more difficult to get a new and fresh take on the issue. It is difficult to see from the Paper what will be re-circulated in meta-form and what will be new and additional assessment and evidence, which also makes it difficult to see any gaps (further confounded by having two OPS5 reports). Together, it makes the report	We humbly disagree. Meta-evaluations were not included in OPS4 and one report emerged at the end of the process – the set-up of OPS5 is different from that of OPS4. Whether OPS5 will regurgitate old insights depends on the

	seem too much like OPS4, which had a vast range of issues and many findings and recommendations.	evaluative evidence found.
World Bank	One clear gap is programmatic approaches. In June 2010, C.38.5/Rev.1, Council paper promised a review of the programmatic approach as a modality (not the results); this is overdue. While it was unclear who should do this review, this would be an excellent opportunity and a key element in OPS given the weight of programs in this replenishment. In the paper, programmatic approach is only mentioned as part of the portfolio analysis.	Thanks for reminding us of this and it is now included in table 2 as a bullet under the reform processes.
World Bank	We also suggest taking a look at the effect of OPS4, as OPS5 will be the same vein. We gather you are doing that already, but are not sure where and how that will be presented. From the many recommendations, it is clear that the implementation seems uneven or low or ineffective. Such lessons are important if OPS5 will be baked in the same form.	Lessons from OPS4 will be presented to the Council in the Progress Report of the Director of Evaluation in November 2012.
Introduction		
Paragraph 1		
Canada	Typographical error: the first line of the document should be “sixth” replenishment – not “fifth”.	Corrected throughout the document. Thanks!
Paragraph 2-5		
Norway	The introduction and context chapters contains some material that is already well known to the Council and could be shortened (§§2 and 3).	Some edits were made.
Canada	Could additional details be provided on what stakeholders will be included in the “broadened” consultation processes?	Sentence has been deleted as it just meant to express that consultation process would be more intense.
France	Could you provide more details on the workshop planned for June 2012 and will it be possible to get the main conclusions?	The TORs should contain limited information.

World Bank	Suggest clarifying more on the “initiative to learn lessons from recent comprehensive evaluations of funds, agencies and global programs”, “workshop in June 2012”; by whom, identification of best practices for whom?	The workshop results will be presented to the Council in the Progress Report of the Director of Evaluation in November 2012.
Context of Fifth Replenishment of the GEF		
Paragraphs 6-9		
World Bank	We note and agree that “These contextual factors will need to be taken into account in OPS5 in order to better understand the results and achievements of the GEF”. The factors seem to refer to scientific developments and insights in environmental problems and trends (STAP); strategic information to the replenishment (by GEFSec) (what factors?); international developments that member countries discuss (?). We would suggest a more comprehensive and clear discussion of contextual factors here, beyond what partners in the GEF network would provide anyway. What will EO look at? What are big issues in context that need to be considered? This would help the OPS to be strategic.	This paragraph has been revised.
Objective and Audience		
Paragraphs 11+12		
Norway	The chapters on objective and audience sets out important presuppositions and could be elaborated: §11 does not mention the conventions. §12 is not entirely clear on whether there will be time to incorporate Council comments to the first report in the second report, or if the work will run concurrently.	These paragraphs have been amended.

Objective and key questions for the first report		
Paragraph 13		
Canada	Perhaps within the context of OPS-5 key questions (a) and (h), OPS-5 could also look at the extent to which the GEF has met the needs of developing country Parties to meet their specific MEA obligations. How does the GEF support provided thus far line-up (or not) with recipient countries' MEA obligations? Where are the biggest gaps?	This has been included in table 1 under the extent to which country needs have been met.
China	On the key issues to be included in the first report we would suggest to add one issue, i.e. to what extent the needs of the recipient countries are met (adequacy of resources, quality and quantity of services...etc.). Although it is a bit sensitive at this moment to discuss adequacy of resources considering the fiscal situation of donors and vastly different views on financial needs, it would also be a mistake to ignore it, since the OPS5 is supposed to serve the 6th replenishment of GEF and we will need to argue for more resources based on evidence.	The issue of meeting the needs of recipient countries has been added as key question (8) in the first report. The issue of adequacy of resources has also been added as key question (3) of the final report.
Secretariat	The term "finished projects" is used; it is preferable to use "completed projects" as that is the term used for the GEF's project cycle	Thanks and corrected throughout the TORs.
GEF NGO Network	On point (e) add "...and the effectiveness of engagement of key stakeholders (including civil society organisations) in GEF project and programme design and implementation"	Has been added in key question (8) of the final report.
UNEP	Please clarify exactly what types of costs will be reviewed in the category of "management costs and fees"? We hope that this will be a comprehensive review of all management and administrative costs of the GEF, including the Agency Fees, executing agency Project Management Costs, and the Corporate Budget, and that it will be done in collaboration with all entities so as not to constitute a special audit, but a comprehensive review leading to recommendations for greater effectiveness and efficiency.	The TORs are not the place to provide full details on management costs and project fees. Thanks for the offer to help with this issue.

UNEP	We understand that the QaE study is only looking at the QaE of the M&E of projects, not the whole project. Please clarify.	More aspects of quality at entry have been evaluated in the past and can be evaluated in coming APRs, so this should not be restricted to one aspect.
STAP – Ravi	<p>Additional thoughts for questions:</p> <p>Assessment of the “replicability” of the project activities or outcomes, since sustainability is difficult to measure.</p> <p>Assessment of the innovativeness of the project concept vs. replication of the model or technology or intervention – Is it more of the same?</p> <p>Quality of Baselines and methods of impact measurements.</p> <p>Cost- effectiveness of achieving global environment benefit (e.g. \$/ t CO2).</p> <p>Positive or negative implications of the project interventions beyond the project boundary; e.g. Impact of Protected Area on near-by communities or impact of REDD / SFM / LULUCF projects on local communities depending on forest.</p>	Thanks for these thoughts and we will take them up where feasible when designing the sub-studies of the final report for OPS5.
Meta Evaluation Approach		
Table 1		
Norway	The evaluation questions in table 1 on guidance from conventions should consider country portfolio proposals and the response from GEF, as well as implementation by agencies.	This has been included under the key issue of country ownership and extent to which country needs have been met in table 1.
Norway	Even for the first report, evaluation questions on focal area achievements should aim at uncovering numerical and qualitative data where this can be found. (e.g. tonnes of greenhouse gas equivalents saved, cost per tonne).	Has been included in the key issue of achievements of the GEF at the project level in table 1.
GEF Secretariat	The matrix includes “trends in performance issues, including co-funding, management costs and fees, quality at entry, and supervision” In terms of “co-funding” is the paper	Co-funding has been changed to co-financing throughout the TORs.

	intending to refer to co-financing? If so, the Secretariat recommends that a new term is not introduced. In addition, using management cost and fees is confusing. The GEF has project management costs intended for project implementing units, but there is never any management fee. If the intended meaning is Agency fee then the Secretariat suggests explicitly referring to Agency fee.	“Management costs and fees” has been changed to “management costs and project fees”.
GEF NGO Network	Under evaluation question and trends in ownership add: “Extent of broad stakeholder engagement at country level”	Has been included in table 1.
UNIDO	<p>The review protocol (maybe for a sub-cohort) could have a qualitative focus, looking into some of the following issues:</p> <p>Relevance: while I am aware that OPS5 is for the council, not the beneficiary countries, I would include a section on GEF contribution to local benefits (maybe taking contributions to MDG 7 as a starting point; UNIDO could contribute a report for the organization. Others might have something similar). This would take into account the findings of the local benefits study, that local benefits are key to sustainability and (global) impact.</p> <p>Trends in performance issues: the meta-evaluation should try looking at the recommendations of the TEs and try clustering them, a lot about performance issues can be learned from frequently recurring recommendations.</p> <p>Co-finance (probably the following is something you will do anyway): I would suggest to also look into the qualitative side of it. Some case studies could beef up the mere analysis of funding data. E.g. how does private sector co-funding perform in comparison with Government and international co-funding.</p>	These suggestions will be taken on board when the sub-studies for the final report are designed.
UNIDO	Regarding the assessment of the Catalytic role: it is not clear how it will be assessed by classifying in foundation, demo and investment; maybe we have the same problem here as with the oversimplified TOC (see comment above); suggest that to be clarified briefly in the approach paper.	A full justification of this classification has been given in OPS4 and has since been in continuous use in CPEs.
UNIDO	By May 2012 UNIDO can offer a thematic evaluation on POPs which might be relevant to be used for OPS5.	Thanks and noted!

World Bank	<p>With the emphasis on meta-evaluation, it would be useful to have a full list included of the evaluations that would be the basis of this. Also, it is difficult to see from the Paper what will be re-circulated in meta-form.</p> <p>For example, (table 1) mentions Focal area strategy evaluations (under relevance); we've only seen climate change, will you do the same for the other 5 FAs? But it also says these will 'consolidate relevance information'; if so that's just a meta- evaluation?</p> <p>'Lower level of coverage on field ROTIs which should be compensated for by increased investment in impact evaluations'(table 1) – does this mean that you will do more impact evaluations for OPS5, or is a general statement? Does not EO conduct impact evaluation through ROTI, so this would MENA more Rotis (or is this Agency impact evaluation)?</p> <p>Under longer-term impact of the GEF (table 1), what is meant by "... longer term and programmatic GEF support ..." Vs 'normal' GEF support through projects (supposed to lead to long-term impact)? The methodology focuses on (existing) ROTIs i.e. projects, so the evaluation question would need adjustment.</p>	<p>All GEF EO evaluations will be included. Relevant independent evaluations of the GEF Agencies' evaluation offices will also be used.</p> <p>The Focal Area Strategies evaluation will tackle all focal areas.</p> <p>Not all EO impact evaluations are ROTIs – the aim is that we achieve a good balance between the various impact methodologies that we have.</p> <p>We aim to take the programmatic approach into account and will not use project methodology to evaluate this. The reference to "longer term impact" has been removed.</p>
Paragraph 15-17		
World Bank	<p>The various databases as basis for analysis are not clear. The EO will "... build up a portfolio database that can provide a solid basis for further work" (?); "The Secretariat is currently working on [PMIS] improvements, but in any case the Evaluation Office will need a full portfolio database and analysis as a basis for OPS5". The database of GEF interventions lead to identification of the cohort of projects for OPS5..". Will you use PMIS or set up your own database? If you set up your own, based on what and how will it be reconciled /validated? How will the cohort be determined (derived from existing evaluations or other? How will the cohort be used for meta or field work or other?</p>	<p>The GEF Evaluation Office will build its own database for OPS5, as it is accustomed to do for all its evaluations. We will aim to validate the database in collaboration with the Secretariat, the GEF Agencies and the Trustee.</p> <p>Cohort dates are now included in the TORs.</p>
GEF Secretariat	<p>PMIS: paragraph 16, p. 4 deals with project status and claims that "the current PMIS, emerged and this started off with solid basic information and claims that "over time this database has deteriorated and this process may have turned into a vicious cycle." Is the claim that since 2009, the data in the PMIS has deteriorated? If the EO has evidence for</p>	<p>The Secretariat is well aware of the problems of PMIS and is actively working to improve the database, which we support. On receiving data from EO: we</p>

	<p>this, the Secretariat would appreciate receiving the actual data the paragraph is based on to improve our data quality. Since 2009, the Secretariat has systematically been updating project status on a yearly basis and therefore from the Secretariat’s perspective project status information has in fact become more reliable, particularly for projects that have been under implementation since 2009. It is extremely important that any inconsistencies the EO finds in the PMIS through any of the evaluations that the EO undertakes are shared with the Secretariat in order that a) any errors found can be fixed in the database and b) so that solutions can be discussed and developed for any systemic issues identified.</p>	<p>note with interest that the Secretariat is interested in the validated data we have and we applaud this – and are at the same time surprised by the rather aggressive tone of this comment. All our validated databases for evaluations are available and published. The Secretariat has not been interested in our data in the past.</p>
<p>Final Report of OPS5 and Questions</p>		
<p>Paragraph 18</p>		
<p>China</p>	<p>On key questions of final report of OPS5 on item (e), certainly we welcome private sector role in addressing environmental issues, however we also need to be realistic in our expectation since environmental protection is by nature public goods where government plays a major role, and we have very limited success so far in practice. So we would encourage you to examine the role of both public and private, international and domestic partners, instead of focusing exclusively on private sector and civil society.</p>	<p>We fully agree to these remarks and would like to point out that the broader perspective will be pursued in the Focal Area Strategies evaluation. In the final report we will examine specifically the role of the private sector and civil society organizations, as Council has asked for this.</p>
<p>Japan</p>	<p>How and to what extent will the GEF scale up the level of investment? It is obvious that the GEF could not respond to all the funding needs of the recipient countries all by itself. Therefore, the GEF should demonstrate pilot projects and programs and scale up investment by, for example, encouraging investment of the private sector and enhancing participation of CSOs. In this connection, we would also like the OPS5 to focus on the engagement with the private sector and to identify and analyze the current situation and the barriers of the private resource mobilization.</p>	<p>Some more emphasis has been put on reporting on the catalytic role of the GEF and on issues like co-financing and mobilizing resources.</p>

France	We believe that the topics described in the first key issue for the final report would require to be defined more accurately in order to maximize the relevance and usefulness to GEF of the related analysis and conclusions.	We have attempted to provide more details but a fully justified definition of all concepts cannot be done within the narrow confines of a terms of reference. It will be taken up in the further design of the work for OPS5.
France	<p>An update of the SGP evaluation could cover the following issues: the purpose of each individual SGP often remains unclear and oscillates between a long term assistance to all CBOs/CSOs projects in each SGP countries (without clear phasing out strategies or capacity improvement process with clear steps) and the purpose of creating sustainable and long lasting capacities amongst CBOs/CSOs beneficiaries (then with a clear purpose of step by step improvement and capacity building goal). We suggest this longer term impacts dimension to be considered in the update of the SGP evaluation in order to draw conclusions and make recommendations for GEF6 future SGPs, for instance, by proposing output indicators on CBOs/CSOs with sufficient sustainable capacities (instead of just indicating the number of CBOs/CSOs' funded projects).</p> <p>As already mentioned at the last council meeting, there is a need for output indicators on biodiversity conservation, climate change attenuation or adaptation, desertification/land degradation reduction, transboundary waters management, POPs reduction and concrete indicators of CBOs/CSOs capacities improvements.</p>	These issues are important and we have taken note on this – and will take them up in the design of the sub-study on SGP. On the issue of output indicators for SGP: this has been noted within SGP itself and will also be taken up in the sub-study.
Norway	For the second report, §18a it would be valuable if the relationship between the adaptation fund and the LDCF/SSCF was used as an example.	We will take this into consideration when designing the sub-study.
Norway	§18b should include other cross cutting projects besides forests, in particular GEFs dryland efforts. Since measures that benefit several conventions have come to form a substantial proportion of our projects, the extent to which synergies are documented should be part of the review.	Synergies will be included and text to that effect has been added. On dryland efforts: if the GEF does not have a cross-cutting strategy on this issue, it will be difficult to take it into account.

Norway	§18c could be more explicit in separating recipient country factors, agency factors and GEF specific factors that will help achieve the desired changes (see above under the general comments).	Agreed and noted.
Secretariat	Include “capacity development”	Agreed and noted.
Secretariat	Bullet (a) should read “Trends in global environmental problems, climate change adaptation challenges, and the relevance of the GEF to these problems, as well as the emergence of new financing channels.	Adaptation challenges and the emergence of new funds have been included.
STAP - Ravi	<p>Synergy or convergence among different conventions – Climate change, biodiversity and land degradation.</p> <p>Delivery of global environment benefits vs local socio-economic/ environmental benefits – synergy or trade-off.</p> <p>Role of GEF in the context of Cancun / Durban agreements (Aim of stabilizing warming at < 2°C) or achieving Aichi targets, etc.</p> <p>Quality and utility of GEF tracking tool, RBM, APR, PIF screening, etc. systems used by GEF.</p> <p>Relevance of science / STAP for formulating GEF6 strategies.</p>	Thanks for these thoughts, which we will take up when designing the specific sub-studies.
Paragraph 19		
World Bank	“This approach paper presents how each of these issues would be translated into specific studies to be undertaken – if these would become part of OPS5.” Given the open nature of possible specific themes at this stage, we do not find that it is clear how each of these issues would be translated into specific studies to be undertaken, or how the studies would be undertaken (presumably table 2). Will you have approach papers for each of these; if so that would be good to indicate, and comments may be provided then? If not, more information is desirable in this approach paper. We count 10 sub-studies plus the FAS evaluations?	The sub-studies are shown in tables 1 and 2 – however, they await Council approval. We envisage interaction on the sub-studies but have not yet identified how this can best take place, i.e. through approach papers or through other means.

Approach for the Final Report		
Table 2		
Norway	In table 2 the evaluation questions and new funding channels should include an assessment of relative sizes and costs	Agreed and noted.
GEF Secretariat	We support having OPS-5 evaluate the role of STAP within the GEF and assess client satisfaction with STAP's products. We encourage, however, that the assessment also examine STAP governance issues. We believe OPS-5 should evaluate whether the following arrangements currently serve GEF's broader interests: (a) the stipulation in the GEF Instrument that UNEP shall "operate as the liaison between the Facility (GEF) and the STAP" and (b) the arrangement that the UNEP office responsible for coordinating UNEP's GEF projects is also responsible for oversight of STAP.	Key question regarding STAP has been reformulated to take this into account.
GEF Secretariat	<p>Under reform processes: "Art 28 expansion" should be termed "Broadening the GEF Partnership"</p> <p>Under reform processes: the term "modalities update" needs further clarification</p> <p>Under reform processes: it is important to note that many of the NPFs are completed or close to completion</p> <p>Under cross-cutting policies, all policies should be referenced with footnotes so it is clear which policy is being evaluated</p> <p>Under cross-cutting policies, knowledge management falls under the GEF's overall Results Based Management policy and is outlined as such within the revised 2010 M&E Policy, it is unclear why this is pulled out as a separate cross-cutting issue</p>	These suggestions have been noted and where appropriately included in the TORs.
GEF NGO Network	Under Evaluation Question and In-depth look and FAS add: "Consultation process by which the Focal area strategies were developed"	The formulation process of the focal area strategies has now been included.

GEF NGO Network	Under scope and limitations and CSO and private sector: “however be limited to the last two GEF periods.” The decline in CSO involvement in FSP and MSP implementation in GEF 4-5 should be compared with levels in GEF 2-3	This will be taken up when designing the sub-study. This comparison may not be possible due to lack of reliable data.
GEF NGO Network	Cross-cutting policies, change “participation” to “public involvement”	Done.
World Bank	One question is certainly relevant and strategic; we welcome assessment of the “Health” of the GEF Network and Partnerships. Please broaden the evaluation questions (beyond “Extent to which the network and the current partnerships support achievements of the GEF”) to look at factors that may facilitate and/or hinder the functioning of the partnership and results, as well how the partnership can be mutually supportive to its partners, as a two-way street. We note that this will involve an electronic survey and interviews with stakeholders and partners, which may not be adequate in this case. You should be able to find evidence from all the other sub-components that speak directly to how the partnership functions, including from the reform process studies.	Agreed and suggestions incorporated.
UNEP	We welcome a review of the “Health” of the GEF Network and Partnerships, and suggest that it be conducted in tandem with the review of the Governance of the GEF as the two are intricately linked.	Thanks for the suggestion – we will look at this when designing the two sub-studies.
UNIDO	Private sector: study should be linked to the issue of emergency of new funding channels and co-finance (qualitative aspect)	Noted for the formulation of the sub-study.
UNIDO	Health of GEF partnerships: will it take the early results of new GEF agencies (broadening the partnership) into account? Can we include an analysis of the existing partnerships between old GEF agencies and the national agencies they partner with? Have the most capable of them registered as new agencies?	This goes beyond the current questions and it may not be feasible to do this, as it would mean expanding the sub-study into a full blown evaluation.

Paragraph 20		
UNIDO	In how far will the sub-studies on trends in global environmental problems draw on know-how in GEF agencies? The study should not exclusively rely on scientific evidence, but also take into account in how far global problems are also concerns of developing countries. The Agencies and local partners could sure provide valuable insights (survey).	We humbly beg to differ. Surveys are unreliable for gathering scientifically valid insights, even from such august collaborators as staff from the GEF Agencies.
Paragraphs 21 + 22		
Norway	On postponing the peer review of the evaluation office itself until 2014 is a reasonable conclusion on this aspect.	Thanks and noted.
FAO	“governance work for OPS4 was undertaken by an independent external consultant, given the fact that the GEF Evaluation Office would be biased to evaluate the Council”, but that this time around, the GEF Evaluation Office would simply update the main findings of the OPS4 sub-study through a desk review of their own as they don’t expect any new issues to emerge. This may be a valid assumption, but it would probably carry more weight if this assumption could be validated independently.	As described in the TOR, the decision to involve an outside perspective may be taken on the basis of the evidence gathered in the sub-study of OPS5.
World Bank	We note that OPS5 will not address all the issues that were raised in OPS4. The only ones mentioned for exclusion though, are peer review of the GEF Evaluation Office and governance (yet governance is in scope of paper 2?). On the other hand, there does not seem to be many new issues either, that were not looked at to some extent earlier. It is of course pragmatic to have continuity in the assessment, but it somehow makes it less clear if the OPS5 will bring new knowledge or issues. While the Council may give issues for the final report, the current ones are the same as for OPS4.	The paragraph concerning exclusion now contains more information. OPS4 remains very comprehensive and it would be difficult to identify many new issues.

Methodological Considerations		
Figure: Theories of Change		
China	<p>We would suggest to include institutional capacity as one of the fundamental elements, as is demonstrated by our GEF projects over the years, capacity is as important an element as governance framework and knowledge and information, and it proved to be key constraint for many countries.</p> <p>Regarding the three type of activities supported by GEF, i.e. fundamental elements, demonstration elements and investment elements, the way we put it help frame our thinking. However in practice one project often have three elements or at least two elements, so it is hard to put projects into one specific category. And in many cases it is difficult to define and differentiate between the demonstration and investment elements. Even in a typical GEF project you may classify as investment project (e.g. if blended with loans), the GEF money is just seed money and used typically in policy development, capacity building, incentives, monitoring and evaluation, etc.</p>	<p>The figure has been reformatted and boxes and circles have been renamed as a result of all comments received.</p> <p>Institutional capacity is now more immediately recognizable.</p> <p>The interaction between elements has now received more emphasis.</p>
FAO	<p>On the generic theory of change, it may be that the “four paths” are generally accepted GEF philosophy, but it would appear that while the first three paths (replication>up-scaling>mainstreaming) are relatively straightforward, the fourth (market change) is more narrowly defined, and perhaps not on the same level as the other three paths.</p>	<p>Agreed and this is partly the reason why the figure has been reformatted.</p>
FAO	<p>With respect to the TOC, it is a good conceptual framework. However, how much does it relate to GEF’s own strategy? Shouldn’t it build on what GEF sets for itself and how the Organization structures its works and defines its pathways? These links seem to be missing and this makes the TOC a purely conceptual representation. The use of the TOC should also be clarified. It is a common framework that evaluators will use for structuring data and conducting comparison analysis. It is a framework through which the GEF work will be analyzed. You may need to elaborate and clarify then the statement made in the AP that the TOC is not a “standard” against which GEF support will be measured.</p>	<p>The framework is presented as based on evaluative evidence of how the GEF has aimed to achieve success</p>
UNEP	<p>The GEF ‘Theory of Change’ presented in all of the approach papers is rather too schematic and although interesting, in its current form would be better described as a</p>	<p>We humbly beg to differ. We feel that as a heuristic tool the framework should not</p>

	<p>‘Conceptual Framework for GEF Investments’. As a Theory of Change it does not adequately map out major causal pathways, or the actors that are involved in them. For example the figure implies that causality flows from ‘foundational’ to ‘demonstration’ to ‘investment’ phases to achieve GEBs which is not always the case; whilst this flow is a GEF investment strategy. As a framework to explore the effectiveness of causal pathways that link GEF investments to Global Environmental Benefits it is too generic to be of substantive utility in evaluation.</p> <p>As a conceptual framework, it would benefit from a reminder that GEF is “incremental” on other financing and therefore its role is “catalytic” more than anything else. Also, the Foundational Category does not capture the full richness of what GEF does. The description could be expanded to include:</p> <p>Foundational elements include support to the generation of knowledge and information, as well as to the governance framework that will enable the necessary changes to take place. Typically, GEF supports countries to prepare planning and reporting frameworks for the Conventions, conduct upstream assessments, reviews, investigation, and modeling to ensure innovative and science-based impacts, and integrate policy and legal reform in its projects.</p> <p>Furthermore, we suggest adding to the diagram for the Foundational category, the following:</p> <p>A third main bubble called cross-cutting “Capacity Building”. While capacity building is spread throughout the causal pathway, the GEF does conduct stand-alone foundational CB to generate synergies and cross-cutting impacts.</p> <p>To add to the “Knowledge and Information” category :</p> <p>Assessments (e.g. Targeted Research; R&D in the context of specific sectors within a project or program; modeling; assessments)</p> <p>Reporting (to conventions)</p> <p>To add to the “Governance frameworks” category the word Planning (e.g. Enabling Activities; scenario building through mainstreaming of environment; local government planning frameworks; etc.)</p>	<p>map out all major causal pathways and describe all actors involved. The figure presents the framework, not the Theory of Change of the GEF, which we fully understand to be much more complicated than this framework.</p> <p>The catalytic role of the GEF is included in the framework.</p> <p>Suggestions on reformulating various aspects have been taken into account as far as possible.</p>
--	---	--

UNEP	We understand that the GEF EO has commissioned a study to review the impact that OPS-4 had in its aftermath, and suggest that the results of this study should be used to enhance the methodology and approach adopted for OPS-5. In this context the process for follow up to recommendations made by OPS5 should be articulated.	This refers to the Paris workshop on comprehensive evaluations – the results of this workshop will be taken into account. The TORs now contain a proposal for a response to OPS5 recommendations.
UNIDO	<p>TOC approach good for communication, but we should be aware of the risk that some might interpret the TOC by oversimplifying the cause-effect relations in the focal areas. This is especially true for the role of “foundational activities” as they should be clearly seen as a continuing rather than a starting element in the results chain.</p> <p>The GEF TOC is yet a bit short on defining key assumptions. Consideration should be given to the importance of local benefits as an assumption for sustainability & impact; also the key assumptions for foundational activities to translate into sustainable capacities should be worked out</p> <p>The review protocols of the meta evaluation should be used to verify key assumptions in the TOC (see also below).</p>	Thanks for these useful suggestions.
Paragraph 26		
France	“if adopted on a broad scale, could lead...”: this conditional mode touches upon the issue of the overall relevance of pilot projects and key success factor for effective demonstration effect: could it be an additional evaluative question for OPS5?	Adoption, up-scaling, mainstreaming and market change are included in the framework and in the proposed analysis in OPS5.
Paragraph 27		
France	One may be cautious when using terms such as “mainstreaming”, “replication”, “scaling up”, as they should, for the purpose of clarity, be defined and illustrated by appropriate indicators if we want to avoid mere incantation. Again, OPS5 could be an opportunity to tackle these key issues from an evaluative point of view so as to providing GEF6 with tools to measure their effective implementation.	More precise definitions and indicators will be included in the design of the sub-studies.

Paragraph 30		
Norway	Verifying business as usual assessments outlined in §30 is an essential element of the OPS5 analysis of GEFs performance in relation to its mandate and may provide valuable insights that can be used in other contexts.	We have taken note of this suggestion.
World Bank	We welcome that “Counterfactual analysis will be made explicit in OPS5 where appropriate,” although evaluations have often been unable to verify the counterfactuals. It is not clear however how OPS5 will make explicit evidence on counterfactuals, and particularly how that will be aggregated, since baseline is available at the project/activity level.	We will return to the issue of counterfactuals in the design phase of the sub-studies for the final report of OPS5.
Stakeholder Interaction		
Paragraph 38 + 39		
GEF NGO Network	“Special Meetings”: There may be a need to cover costs for additional time for CSOs or other stakeholders attending ECW meetings to interact with EO/OPS5 personnel – as done on OPS4	More CSO representatives are invited to the ECW meetings than used to be invited to the sub-regional workshops that preceded them.
FAO	Concerning the special interaction with representatives of civil society organizations, the private sector, and representatives of staff and beneficiaries involved in projects: this covers a wide range of actors, and a differentiated approach may be needed to reach these groups adequately. (Also, a better definition may be useful: beneficiaries exist at various levels – from GEF Agencies, government institutions etc down to the general public. Consultative approaches will need to be tailored to these various stakeholders.)	Thanks for these suggestions.
Timeline		
Norway	The timeline diagram at the last page only includes the June council meeting that decides on the OPS5. If the intention is to supplement the second report with material requested by council, that meeting should be on the timeline.	Reporting back to Council on and during OPS5 has now been included in a new section of the report below the timeline.

FAO	It would be helpful to define better at what point in the timeline the reference group will have to become active: if the OPS5 process is to be better guided by the group (paragraph 36), then one would expect the group to be involved on a fairly continuous basis from June 2012 onwards, but milestones in the process (review of approach papers for the meta-evaluation, selection of sub-studies, finalization of sub-studies, etc) should be specified as soon as possible.	The interaction on milestones with the reference group is now included in the text.
FAO	Regarding the timeline itself: there appears to be an inconsistency between paragraph 18 (“the final report of OPS5, which is envisaged at an appropriate moment near the end of the replenishment process, possibly at the end of 2013 or early 2014”), and paragraph 40 (“the second report should be available to the replenishment at the latest in November 2013”). Also, if the topics for the sub-studies are already known – why wait until November 2012 to start them?	One reference was to the end of the replenishment process, the other to the moment that the final report would become available. The sub-studies need to wait because staff of the Evaluation Office is human after all and cannot take on more than they can carry.