

A GEF  
ANNUAL  
REPORT

# GEF Annual Country Portfolio Evaluation Report 2014





GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT FACILITY  
INDEPENDENT EVALUATION OFFICE

# GEF Annual Country Portfolio Evaluation Report 2014

November 2014

EVALUATION REPORT NO. 95

*This report was presented to the GEF Council in May 2014.*

© 2014 Global Environment Facility Independent Evaluation Office  
1818 H Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20433  
Internet: [www.gefeo.org](http://www.gefeo.org)  
Email: [gefevaluation@thegef.org](mailto:gefevaluation@thegef.org)

All rights reserved.

The findings, interpretations, and conclusions expressed herein are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the GEF Council or the governments they represent.

The GEF Independent Evaluation Office does not guarantee the accuracy of the data included in this work. The boundaries, colors, denominations, and other information shown on any map in this work do not imply any judgment on the part of the GEF concerning the legal status of any territory or the endorsement or acceptance of such boundaries.

#### **Rights and Permissions**

The material in this work is copyrighted. Copying and/or transmitting portions or all of this work without permission may be a violation of applicable law. The GEF encourages dissemination of its work and will normally grant permission promptly.

ISBN-10: 1-933992-62-X

ISBN-13: 978-1-933992-62-4

#### **Credits**

*Director of the GEF Independent Evaluation Office:* Juha I. Uitto

*Team Leader:* Carlo Carugi, Senior Evaluation Officer, GEF Independent Evaluation Office

*Editing and design:* Nita Congress

*Cover photos (top to bottom):* Street vendors in Makoth Village, Bombali District in the Northern Province of Sierra Leone, by Anna Viggh; view of the Red Sea from the Danakil Depression, Eritrea, by Baljit Wadhwa; flamingoes in the saline alkaline Big Momella Lake, Arusha National Park, Tanzania, by Baljit Wadhwa.

Evaluation Report No. 95

A FREE PUBLICATION

# Contents

<b>FOREWORD</b> .....	<b>v</b>
<b>ACKNOWLEDGMENTS</b> .....	<b>vi</b>
<b>ABBREVIATIONS</b> .....	<b>vii</b>
<b>1. INTRODUCTION</b> .....	<b>1</b>
1.1 Background.....	1
1.2 Objectives, Scope, Methods, and Limitations .....	4
<b>2. CONCLUSIONS</b> .....	<b>7</b>
2.1 Results.....	7
2.2 Relevance .....	15
2.3 Efficiency.....	16
<b>3. RECOMMENDATIONS</b> .....	<b>21</b>
<b>ANNEXES</b>	
A. Conclusions, Recommendations, and Lessons .....	23
B. Management Response .....	27
<b>REFERENCES</b> .....	<b>29</b>
<b>TABLES</b>	
1.1 Resource Allocation to National Projects by Focal Area (million \$).....	3
1.2 Number of National Projects by GEF Agency .....	3
1.3 Number of National Projects by Focal Area .....	3
1.4 Project Coverage of Each CPE/CPS.....	5
2.1 Extent of Broader Adoption in the Sub-Saharan Africa Cohort of Projects .....	8
2.2 Percentage of Sub-Saharan and Global Projects Whose Progress toward Impact Was Affected by Various Contributing and Hindering Factors .....	9
2.3 Progress toward Impact in Completed Projects in Eritrea, Sierra Leone, and Tanzania .....	11



# Foreword

This seventh *Annual Country Portfolio Evaluation Report* (ACPER) provides a synthesis of the main conclusions and recommendations coming from country-level evaluations conducted in the Sub-Saharan Africa region. These include two country portfolio evaluations—one conducted in Eritrea and one in Tanzania—and one country portfolio study conducted in Sierra Leone. The final reports of these three evaluations are provided on the Global Environment Facility (GEF) Independent Evaluation Office’s [website](#).

In addition to the three specific evaluations mentioned above, this ACPER presents a comprehensive analysis of progress toward environmental impact in the Sub-Saharan Africa region. This analysis, introduced for the first time with this ACPER, has been conducted using data from the 90 terminal evaluations undertaken in the region, a subset of the cohort of 473 terminal evaluations analyzed in the GEF’s Fifth Overall Performance Study.

This report was presented to the GEF Council at its May 2014 meeting. As a result of that

discussion, the Council requested the Secretariat to explore and pursue, where appropriate, the use of established Small Grants Programme country programs as service providers to implement community-level activities for full- and medium-size projects. The Council also asked the Secretariat and the GEF Agencies to pay greater attention to national knowledge exchange and to promote dissemination of data and information in the relevant national languages.

The Office is extremely grateful for the positive engagement of country stakeholders with these evaluations and for their comments, suggestions, and insights. This report was completed when Rob D. van den Berg was Director of the GEF Independent Evaluation Office. The Office remains fully responsible for the content of this report.



Juha I. Uitto  
Director, Evaluation Office

# Acknowledgments

---

This report was prepared by Carlo Carugi, Senior Evaluation Officer and Team Leader for country-level evaluations in the Independent Evaluation Office of the Global Environment Facility (GEF); he also managed the Sierra Leone country portfolio study. Baljit Wadhwa, Senior Evaluation Officer, managed the Tanzania and Eritrea country

portfolio evaluations. Sara El Choufi and Simon Blower, Consultants, served as research assistants.

Government officials of the countries included in this report were all highly supportive and provided full cooperation to these evaluation efforts. The teams are also grateful for the advice and logistical support provided by the GEF Agencies.

# Abbreviations

---

ACPER	Annual Country Portfolio Evaluation Report	OPS5	Fifth Overall Performance Study
AfDB	African Development Bank	POP	persistent organic pollutant
CPE	country portfolio evaluation	ROtI	review of outcomes to impacts
CPS	country portfolio study	SGP	Small Grants Programme
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations	STAR	System for Transparent Allocation of Resources
FSP	full-size project	UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
GEF	Global Environment Facility	UNEP	United Nations Environment Programme
IFAD	International Fund for Agricultural Development	UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
M&E	monitoring and evaluation	UNIDO	United Nations Industrial Development Organization
MSP	medium-size project		

All dollar amounts are U.S. dollars unless otherwise indicated.



# 1. Introduction

The seventh *Annual Country Portfolio Evaluation Report* (ACPER) provides a synthesis of the main conclusions and recommendations emerging from the evaluative evidence contained in the country portfolio evaluations (CPEs) and country portfolio studies (CPSs) conducted by the Independent Evaluation Office of the Global Environment Facility (GEF) in the Sub-Saharan Africa region. This set of evaluations includes one CPS in Sierra Leone and two CPEs in Eritrea and Tanzania.

Support from the GEF to these countries began in 1992 in Eritrea and Tanzania, and in 1998 in Sierra Leone. These countries were chosen for portfolio evaluation based on a standardized selection process and criteria (GEF EO 2010) that took into account the size, diversity, and maturity of their portfolio of projects. As with previous country-level evaluations, consultations were held with all major GEF stakeholders, particularly those residing in the countries. Several visits to project sites were also undertaken.

The Sierra Leone CPS was conducted in parallel with the United Nations Development Programme's (UNDP's) Assessment of Development Results for Sierra Leone (2008–2013). The national consultant conducting the CPS was also responsible for coverage of the UNDP energy and environment portfolio under the Assessment of Development Results. As with previous CPEs undertaken in tandem with another evaluation office, this parallel effort provided advantages for both the GEF and the UNDP independent evaluation offices; these included enabling a broader comparison of issues

across sectors in a postconflict country in the process of building state institutions, a lower evaluation burden on the country, and cost savings.

The evaluative phase of the Tanzania CPE was conducted between December 2012 and September 2013; the Eritrea CPE was conducted between February and September 2013. The evaluative phase of the Sierra Leone CPS was conducted between September 2013 and February 2014. The draft report of the Tanzania CPE distributed for comment in February 2014 is being finalized, and the draft reports on the Eritrea CPE and the Sierra Leone CPS will be distributed for comment in April 2014. The final reports for all three evaluations will be completed by the end of the second quarter of 2014.

As of this writing, all three evaluations have completed their evaluative phase, and a final stakeholder consultation workshop on the evaluation has been conducted in the respective country. The findings and conclusions that emerged from these evaluations, along with recommendations identified during the workshops, have been included in the respective draft reports and considered in this report.

## 1.1 Background

The Sub-Saharan Africa region began participating in the GEF during the pilot phase in 1991. Since then, the GEF has invested around \$1.09 billion, with an additional \$5.61 billion in cofinancing, through 548 active or completed national projects

in the region.<sup>1</sup> Active national projects account for 40.9 percent of the total Sub-Saharan portfolio, or \$2.74 billion (including both GEF funding and cofinancing); the completed projects account for the remaining 59.1 percent, or \$3.97 billion in GEF funding and cofinancing. Most of the projects, active and completed, are in the biodiversity and climate change focal areas (213 and 164 projects, respectively); the next largest set of projects is in the multifocal area (69 projects), followed by the land degradation (51 projects), persistent organic pollutant (POP) (46 projects), and international waters (5 projects) focal areas. No projects in this region were conducted in the ozone-depleting substances focal area.

UNDP is the dominant GEF Agency in the region, responsible for implementation of 48.5 percent of GEF national projects in Sub-Saharan Africa. It is followed by the World Bank with 23.6 percent (which includes one project jointly implemented with the International Finance Corporation), and the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) with 19.3 percent. Other GEF Agencies and entities are responsible for much smaller percentages of the portfolio: the United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO), 4.9 percent; the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD), 1.8 percent; the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), 0.9 percent, the GEF Secretariat, 0.7 percent; and the African Development Bank (AfDB) (0.2 percent). The countries in the region

---

<sup>1</sup> The Sub-Saharan Africa region consists of 49 countries: Angola, Benin, Botswana, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Comoros, the Democratic Republic of Congo, the Republic of Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Djibouti, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Gabon, The Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Kenya, Lesotho, Liberia, Madagascar, Malawi, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mozambique, Namibia, Niger, Nigeria, Rwanda, São Tomé and Príncipe, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Somalia, South Africa, South Sudan, Sudan, Swaziland, Tanzania, Togo, Uganda, Zambia, and Zimbabwe. Two countries, South Sudan and Somalia, do not have any active or completed GEF projects.

with the largest national portfolios—in terms of both number and dollar value of projects—are (in descending order of portfolio size) South Africa, Nigeria, Ghana, Madagascar, and Uganda. Collectively, these countries account for 16.2 percent of the region's national GEF projects and 38 percent of the total GEF funding and cofinancing committed to national projects in the region as a whole.

The GEF country portfolios of Eritrea, Sierra Leone, and Tanzania collectively include 55 national projects in five GEF focal areas: 23 in climate change, 19 in biodiversity, 5 multifocal, 4 in land degradation, and 4 in POPs. They include no projects in the international waters or ozone-depleting substances focal area. Total GEF financing in the three countries was \$128.3 million, with \$793.9 million in cofinancing (table 1.1). In biodiversity, the national portfolios analyzed totaled approximately \$54.7 million in GEF financing and around \$128.1 million in cofinancing. Financing for climate change in the national portfolios analyzed totals approximately \$47.4 million in GEF grants and \$293.2 million in cofinancing. In land degradation, the GEF has invested around \$9.3 million with \$46.0 million cofinancing. The GEF has invested approximately \$13.4 million with \$66.6 million cofinancing in multifocal area projects. In POPs, GEF financing was approximately \$3.6 million, with \$3.5 million in cofinancing. As is true for the region as a whole, UNDP is the main channel for GEF support with 26 projects, followed by the World Bank and UNEP with 8 projects each.

The GEF portfolios included in this ACPER are briefly described below and summarized in tables 1.1, 1.2, and 1.3.

- **Eritrea.** Eritrea's participation with the GEF began in 1992, shortly after its independence. Since then, the country has been involved in 12 national projects totaling \$22.6 million in GEF support and \$41.6 in cofinancing. The main GEF Agency is UNDP with six national projects. It is followed by the World Bank with two projects; and FAO, IFAD, UNEP, and UNIDO with one

**TABLE 1.1 Resource Allocation to National Projects by Focal Area (million \$)**

Country	Biodiversity		Climate change		Land degradation		Multifocal		POPs		Total	
	GEF	Cofinancing	GEF	Cofinancing	GEF	Cofinancing	GEF	Cofinancing	GEF	Cofinancing	GEF	Cofinancing
Eritrea	11.31	11.41	2.45	2.95	6.17	23.93	0.20	0.02	2.50	3.24	22.60	41.60
Sierra Leone	7.08	22.18	18.61	106.90	0.50	0.44	0.22	0.02	0.39	0	26.79	129.54
Tanzania	36.31	94.46	26.29	183.31	2.63	21.65	12.95	66.54	0.71	0.21	78.90	366.20
Total	54.69	128.05	47.35	293.16	9.30	46.02	13.36	66.57	3.60	3.45	128.3	793.86

SOURCE: GEF Project Management Information System and GEF Agencies.

**TABLE 1.2 Number of National Projects by GEF Agency**

Country	UNDP	UNEP	WB	UNIDO	FAO	UNDP-WB	IFAD	AfDB	WB-IFC	Total
Eritrea	6	1	2	1	1	0	1	0	0	12
Sierra Leone	7	2	2	2	0	0	1	1	0	15
Tanzania	13	5	4	4	0	1	0	0	1	28
Total	26	8	8	7	1	1	2	1	1	55

SOURCE: GEF Project Management Information System and GEF Agencies.

NOTE: IFC = International Finance Corporation; WB = World Bank.

**TABLE 1.3 Number of National Projects by Focal Area**

Country	Biodiversity	Climate change	Land degradation	Multifocal	POPs	Total
Eritrea	4	3	2	1	2	12
Sierra Leone	3	9	1	1	1	15
Tanzania	12	11	1	3	1	28
Total	19	23	4	5	4	55

SOURCE: GEF Project Management Information System and GEF Agencies.

project each. The portfolio comprises four projects in biodiversity, three in climate change, two in land degradation, two in POPs, and one multifocal. Half of the national portfolio is composed of enabling activities. Eritrea is also participating in 10 regional and 2 global projects. Two terminal evaluations are available for Eritrea.

- **Sierra Leone.** Since 1996, the GEF has allocated about \$26.8 million, with about \$129.5 million in cofinancing, to Sierra Leone through 14 national projects and the national component of 1 global project (the Umbrella Programme for National Communications to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate

Change [UNFCCC], GEF ID 4498). These projects consist of three in biodiversity, nine in climate change, one in land degradation, one multifocal, and one in POPs. National projects are evenly spread within the GEF project cycle, with six completed/closed, five ongoing, and four approved or endorsed. UNDP, with seven projects totaling \$10.2 million, has been the main channel for GEF support in Sierra Leone to date, followed by the World Bank and UNIDO (with two projects each, totaling \$6.8 and \$2.2 million, respectively), AfDB and IFAD with one project each (\$4.2 million and \$2.7 million, respectively), and UNEP with two projects (totaling \$0.6 million). In addition,

Sierra Leone is a participant in 12 regional and 4 global projects.

- **Tanzania.** Tanzania's participation with the GEF began during the first GEF phase in 1992. As of July 2012, the GEF had allocated \$78.9 million through 28 approved national projects (12 in biodiversity, 11 in climate change, 1 in land degradation, 3 multifocal, and 1 in POPs). These activities involved aggregated cofinancing commitments of \$366.2 million. Fourteen of these projects have been completed, 10 are under implementation, and 4 are approved or pending approval. In addition, Tanzania is involved in 39 regional and 14 global projects supported by the GEF. Fourteen terminal evaluations are available for projects in the Tanzania national portfolio.

## 1.2 Objectives, Scope, Methods, and Limitations

Evaluation work in the Sub-Saharan Africa region is being conducted by GEF Independent Evaluation Office staff and consultants with extensive experience with each country. The Eritrea and Tanzania CPEs followed country-specific terms of reference developed from the standard CPE terms of reference (GEF EO 2012a) and adapted to each country using information collected and feedback received during the scoping phase. The Sierra Leone CPS followed the standard CPS terms of reference (GEF EO 2012b). In compliance with the standard terms of reference, the CPEs and CPS included in this ACPER were conducted with the following objectives:

- Evaluate the **effectiveness** and **results** of GEF support in a country, with attention to the sustainability of achievements at the project level and progress toward impact on global environmental benefits<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> *Effectiveness*: the extent to which the GEF activity's objectives were achieved, or are expected to be achieved, taking into account their relative importance; *results*: in

- Evaluate the **relevance** and **efficiency** of the GEF support in a country from several points of view: national environmental frameworks and decision-making processes, the GEF mandate and the achievement of global environmental benefits, and GEF policies and procedures<sup>3</sup>
- Provide **additional evaluative evidence** to other evaluations conducted by the Office
- Provide **feedback and knowledge sharing** to (1) the GEF Council in its decision-making process to allocate resources and to develop policies and strategies; (2) the country on its participation in, or collaboration with, the GEF; and (3) the different agencies and organizations involved in the preparation and implementation of GEF-funded projects and activities

The main focus of the CPEs and CPS included in this ACPER was on projects supported by the GEF at all stages (preparation, implementation, and completion) within national boundaries. The Small Grants Programme (SGP) was assessed against the respective national strategy and not on the basis of each individual SGP grant. Project ideas from either governments or GEF Agencies included in the respective pipelines were not considered in the analysis. In addition to the national projects, the GEF portfolios assessed included some regional and global projects selected according to a set of criteria including the presence in the country of a project coordination unit and/or project sites, the importance of the project focal area to the country,

---

GEF terms, results include direct project outputs, short-to medium-term outcomes, and progress toward longer-term impact including global environmental benefits, replication effects, and other local effects.

<sup>3</sup> *Relevance*: the extent to which the activity is suited to local and national environmental priorities and policies and to global environmental benefits to which the GEF is dedicated; *efficiency*: the extent to which results have been delivered with the least costly resources possible.

and the existence of a clear connection to national projects.

The stage of each project determined the evaluation focus. For example, **completed** projects were assessed against the usual three evaluation criteria—namely, effectiveness and results (outputs, outcomes, and impacts), relevance, and efficiency.

**Ongoing** projects were assessed in terms of relevance and efficiency. Projects **under preparation**—that is, those with an approved project identification form (PIF) or project preparation grant—were assessed primarily in terms of relevance, with some eventual limited assessment of efficiency.

The results and sustainability of GEF support, particularly at the global environmental benefits level, were given special attention. Table 1.4 presents the project portfolios covered in the CPEs and CPS included in this ACPER.

The Office’s country-level evaluations team continues to strive to update and further develop the set of quantitative and qualitative methods and tools used in these evaluations. Country-level evaluation processes, methods, and tools can be found on the Office [website](#). A new method for analysis of country ownership has been tested during the country-level analysis conducted in the framework of the first report of the GEF’s Fifth Overall Performance Study (OPS5). A framework was elaborated and used for a meta-analysis of country-level evidence; the framework is based on the five pillars of the Paris Declaration (ownership, alignment, harmonization, managing for results, and mutual accountability). A full description of the framework and analysis conducted is provided in GEF EO 2013c. The Office plans to develop this framework

beyond meta-analysis with a view toward using it for original evaluative data gathering in future country-level evaluations. Other tools are being developed for country-level analysis of private sector and civil society organization engagement, and gender mainstreaming.

As with previous country-level evaluations, statistical data and scientific sources were consulted in the course of the CPEs and CPS reported on here, particularly with regard to national environmental indicators, wherever available. Interviews were conducted with representatives of all GEF stakeholders in the countries concerned, and numerous field visits were made. As mentioned, each evaluation included a national consultation workshop to discuss and receive feedback on the respective key preliminary findings. The quantitative analysis used indicators to assess the efficiency of GEF support using projects as the unit of analysis (e.g., analyzing project preparation and implementation duration and costs). Progress toward impact was assessed through review of outcome to impact (ROtI) field studies (three in Tanzania, two in Eritrea, and one in Sierra Leone). Additionally, the evaluation referred to data for the Sub-Saharan Africa region drawn from 90 terminal evaluations used in the OPS5 analysis of broader adoption and progress to environmental impact.

In both the Eritrea and Tanzania CPEs, the Office applied its usual systematic triangulation of evaluative evidence. This triangulation ensures that cross-analysis of information results in better understanding of the contributions of the GEF initiatives in the country portfolios analyzed. The Office has conducted an analysis of how effective

**TABLE 1.4 Project Coverage of Each CPE/CPS**

Country	Type of evaluation	Number of projects included in the evaluation				Completed national projects
		National full- and medium-size projects	SGP projects	Enabling activities	Regional and global projects	
Eritrea	CPE	6	Yes	6	12	8
Sierra Leone	CPS	9	Yes	6	16	6
Tanzania	CPE	21	Yes	7	53	14

systematic triangulation has been in achieving its goal of identifying key preliminary evaluation findings at the end of the data-gathering and analysis phase. The analysis, which drew on the nine evaluations in which systematic triangulation has been applied to date, found that for 91 percent of the initial evaluation questions, the method allows for identification of strong findings, contradictory evidence, and/or gaps in the analysis; this subsequently leads to ways of conducting further evaluative work and finalizing the identification of findings. In order to contribute to the evaluation community's discussion of mixed-methods evaluation, staff of the GEF Independent Evaluation Office have submitted an article to prospective peer-reviewed evaluation journals for publication.

Joint work with GEF member countries and Agencies continues to be pursued in conducting country-level evaluations. This ACPER includes one such joint effort, the Sierra Leone CPS. Additionally, national evaluation expertise was drawn on in the form of national independent quality assurance/peer review panels in both the Eritrea and Tanzania CPEs. These panels not only provided scientific, technical, and methodological support to these evaluations, but also increased their credibility, ownership, and potential use in the country—largely through follow-up actions involving the recommendations addressed to the countries themselves.

GEF country-level evaluations face a number of limitations and challenges. The following were at play in the CPEs and CPS summarized in this report:

- Difficulty in defining the portfolio prior to evaluations continues to be a limitation in

country-level evaluations as well as in many other evaluations conducted by the Office. To address this limitation, country portfolios extracted from the GEF's Project Management Information System were carefully cross-checked with GEF Agencies and national stakeholders at the early stages of the evaluation.

- In all three countries, the GEF is not the only international institution operating in the environmental sector. Caution must therefore be exercised in attributing any changes as being due to the interventions of the GEF, and assessments of contribution need to take realistic account of the number and scale of other inputs. This is particularly true for macrolevel changes in the field of environmental policies, strategies, and national plans.
- In the three portfolios analyzed, the evaluation teams experienced difficulty in obtaining accurate data on some of the GEF's earlier activities. Furthermore, the quality of evaluative evidence relevant to completed projects is variable, particularly regarding quantitative trend data, making it difficult to build a comprehensive overview of results and contribution. The teams addressed this limitation through triangulation and by cross-checking with sources and key informants.
- Because the UNDP Sierra Leone Assessment of Development Results was postponed in order to schedule it in line with United Nations programming activities in the country, the GEF CPS conducted in tandem with the UNDP effort also had to be postponed.

## 2. Conclusions

### 2.1 Results

Results are presented in terms of the aggregate outcomes and impacts of GEF support. Achievements are presented in terms of the GEF contribution toward addressing global and national environmental issues as well as national-level priorities, including raising awareness and building national institutions and capacities. Reporting on results begins with a concise description of the main findings of a progress-to-impact analysis in the Sub-Saharan Africa region. This analysis was conducted using data from the terminal evaluations undertaken in the region and submitted from 2005 to 2012; these were extracted from the cohort analyzed in OPS5.

In assessing GEF support's extent of progress toward impact, OPS5 focused on the importance of broader adoption mechanisms at work during—and especially after—GEF projects, and the factors that contributed to or hindered this progress. Specifically, the analysis sought to assess and detail the status of the following at project completion: (1) the extent and scale of broader adoption; (2) the extent and scale of environmental impact, expressed in terms of either environmental stress reduction and/or improved environmental status; and (3) the factors contributing to and hindering progress toward impact, including those factors directly related to the project and those associated with the larger context in which the project operates. The OPS5 analysis identified five mechanisms for broader adoption to take place:

- **Sustaining.** A GEF intervention continues to be implemented without GEF support through clear budget allocations, implementing structures, and institutional frameworks defined by the government and/or other stakeholders. The sustained flow of the intervention's benefits helps demonstrate these benefits and provides incentives for adoption by other stakeholders.
- **Mainstreaming.** Information, lessons, or specific results of the GEF are incorporated into broader stakeholder mandates and initiatives such as laws, policies, regulations, and programs.
- **Replication.** GEF-supported initiatives are reproduced or adopted at a comparable administrative or ecological scale, often in another geographical area or region.
- **Scaling-up.** GEF-supported initiatives are implemented at a larger geographical scale, often expanded to include new aspects or concerns that may be political, administrative, or ecological in nature.
- **Market change.** GEF-supported initiatives catalyze market transformation by influencing the supply of and/or demand for goods and services that contribute to global environmental benefits.

OPS5 conducted the analysis using a cohort of 473 terminal evaluations. Of these, 90 were from Sub-Saharan Africa. Analysis of this cohort indicates that over 54 percent of the 90 projects successfully implemented most or some broader

adoption initiatives, compared to 60 percent of the global portfolio's projects (table 2.1). Across the Sub-Saharan Africa portfolio, environmental impact was reported—either in the form of environmental stress reduction or environmental status change—in 48 percent of the projects (43); the comparable share of projects globally was 65 percent.

The most common project-related factors **contributing to progress toward impact** in the Sub-Saharan cohort were good engagement of key stakeholders (42 percent) and good coordination with/continuity of previous/current initiatives (38 percent); the most common contextual factors contributing to progress toward impact were country/government support (57 percent) and previous/current related initiatives (52 percent) (table 2.2). The most common project-related factors **hindering progress toward impact** were poor project design (42 percent) and no activities to sustain momentum (29 percent); the most common contextual factors were other unfavorable political conditions/events (40 percent), unfavorable economic conditions/drivers/events (28 percent), and lack of government/country support (28 percent).

There is some divergence between Sub-Saharan and global trends with regard to project-related contributing factors. Two factors—broader adoption processes initiated using project resources and highly relevant technology/approach—are

less commonly found for Sub-Saharan projects than globally: about or just less than a quarter of regional projects compared to over a third of global projects cite either of these two contributing factors (table 2.2). Conversely, good coordination with or continuity of previous/current initiatives (38 percent) appears somewhat more frequently as a contributing project-related factor in the region than globally: 38 percent versus 30 percent.

The data were examined more closely to identify which factors were associated with more versus less successful projects. For the 41 Sub-Saharan projects that were partially successful or unsuccessful in achieving broader adoption, the most frequently cited inhibiting factors were poor project design (20 projects), no activities to sustain momentum (15 projects), and inappropriate and/or insufficient technology approach (11 projects). For the 49 moderately and highly successful projects, the most frequently cited contributing factors were good coordination with or continuity of previous/current initiatives (23 projects), good engagement of key stakeholders (21 projects), and highly relevant technology/approach (13 projects).

This analysis provides further context to—and in some cases confirms—the conclusions and findings emerging from the three country-level evaluations conducted in the Sub-Saharan Africa region. These conclusions are presented in the remainder of this chapter.

**TABLE 2.1** Extent of Broader Adoption in the Sub-Saharan Africa Cohort of Projects

Extent	Number	Percent
Most broader adoption initiatives adopted/implemented	13	14.44
Some broader adoption initiatives adopted/implemented	36	40.00
Some broader adoption initiated	27	30.00
No significant broader adoption taking place	14	15.56
Total	90	100.00

NOTE: *n* = 90.

**TABLE 2.2** Percentage of Sub-Saharan and Global Projects Whose Progress toward Impact Was Affected by Various Contributing and Hindering Factors

Factor	Sub-Saharan Africa	Global
<b>Project-related contributing</b>		
Good engagement of key stakeholders	42.22	48.2
Good coordination with/continuity of previous/current initiatives	37.78	29.6
Highly relevant technology/approach	25.56	36.2
Broader adoption processes initiated using project resources	23.33	39.3
Follow up initiatives using GEF resources	6.67	7.8
Good project design (other than those mentioned above)	5.56	9.3
Adaptation of project to changing contexts	5.56	5.5
Previous GEF support	5.56	5.5
Extended implementation period	1.11	1.7
<b>Contextual contributing</b>		
Country/government support	56.67	56.7
Previous/current related initiatives (by government, global events, etc.)	52.22	55.4
Other stakeholder support (e.g., donors, private sector)	38.89	42.3
Other favorable political conditions/events	18.89	17.5
“Champions”	6.67	6.1
Favorable economic conditions/drivers/events	6.67	9.1
Favorable social conditions/drivers/events	4.44	4.0
Favorable environmental conditions/drivers/events	2.22	3.0
<b>Project-related hindering</b>		
Poor project design (other than factors above)	42.22	37.6
No activities to sustain momentum	28.89	24.7
Inappropriate/insufficient technology/approach	16.67	16.1
Poor project management	13.33	13.7
Insufficient time for implementation	12.22	10.8
Inability to adapt project to changing context	1.11	5.9
<b>Contextual hindering</b>		
Other unfavorable political conditions/events	40.00	39.5
Unfavorable economic conditions/drivers/events	27.78	31.1
Lack of government/country support	27.78	25.8
Lack of other stakeholder support (e.g., donors, private sector)	20.00	18.2
Unfavorable social conditions/drivers/events	20.00	14.0
Unfavorable environmental conditions/drivers/events	11.11	7.2

SOURCE: GEF EO 2013d (global figures).

NOTE:  $n = 90$ .

**CONCLUSION 1: GEF support has played an important role in creating the enabling framework necessary to underpin the development of environmental policy and laws in the three countries analyzed in the Sub-Saharan Africa region.**

In recent years, several country-level evaluations and ACPERs have acknowledged the effectiveness of GEF foundational support to least developed countries and small island developing states in creating an enabling framework for environmental management through enabling activities in all GEF focal areas. Drawing on available country-level evidence to date, the first OPS5 report reiterated the importance and uniqueness of GEF foundational support to least developed countries and small island developing states (GEF EO 2013b). The effectiveness of such support is again confirmed in the three country-level evaluations conducted in the Sub-Saharan Africa region, albeit with a few exceptions.

GEF support has been particularly effective in developing institutional and individual capacity for environmental management in the three countries. In Tanzania, GEF support has helped create the conditions in which to develop national environmental policies and laws, including several national plans and strategies needed for implementation of international environmental agreements. Notably, the Marine and Coastal Environment Management Project (GEF ID 2101) facilitated important changes in the development of the marine environmental legal framework in Tanzania.

GEF started work in Sierra Leone in 1996, when the project Enabling Sierra Leone to Prepare Its First National Communication in Response to Its Commitments to UNFCCC (GEF ID 296) entered the pipeline. However, because of the disruption caused by the country's civil war, the project did not begin implementation until 2002. This project, together with other GEF enabling activities implemented between 2001 and 2008, resulted in the preparation of consolidated national environmental strategies and plans. These projects also enabled Sierra Leone to meet its obligations to

the international environmental agreements. And, in turn, these plans provided a basis for the development of national full- and medium-size projects (FSPs and MSPs) to comprehensively address the environment and natural resource management. A number of such projects have been developed and commenced operation since 2010 with GEF funding. Enabling activities also contributed to the 2008 amendment of Sierra Leone's Environmental Agency Act.

Half of the GEF portfolio under review in Eritrea consists of enabling activities. These activities across all focal areas have enabled priorities to be defined and commitments focused on the various international environmental agreements. These enabling activities have led to, for example, Eritrea's National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan, its National Adaptation Program for Action (NAPA), and its National Action Plan (NAP) for land degradation activities. They have also enhanced the environmental knowledge, understanding, and capabilities of personnel of all ranks within the executing ministries and communities.

Although the GEF portfolio overall has been effective in laying the foundation for future action on Eritrea's environmental protection—and the country did ratify major international environmental agreements and approve the final reports of its enabling activities—full implementation of those national reports and strategies has not yet been achieved. At present, several significant environmentally related items of legislation remain in draft form and have not been promulgated into legally binding acts. While environmental protection has not been particularly hampered by the lack of a full policy framework, key enforcement tools are not in place to abate and deter environmental degradation and allow for further evolution in sustainable land and coastal management—which would result from, for example, secure land tenure laws. The official endorsement of all elements of national environmental legislation, which has been in draft for almost a decade, will facilitate better environmental management in the country. Full

implementation of such policies as the national coastal policy identified and drafted in the National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan, the forest and wildlife policy, and the wildlife conservation and development policy is intended to guide enhanced conservation of globally significant flora and fauna.

**CONCLUSION 2: Positive results at completion have been achieved beyond foundational support, leading in some cases to progress toward impact.**

Analysis of postcompletion progress toward impact was conducted for the 7 terminal evaluations available for projects in Eritrea, Sierra Leone, and Tanzania in the OPS5 cohort of 90 terminal evaluations for the region (table 2.3). All projects were at least partially successful, with five moderately successful and one highly successful in achieving progress toward environmental impact. The only partially successful project was Conservation Management of Eritrea’s Coastal, Marine and Island Biodiversity (GEF ID 411).

The most common contextual factor contributing to progress toward impact in this cohort is country/government support (six projects); the most common contextual hindering factor

is unfavorable economic conditions/drivers/ events (five projects). Highly relevant technology/ approach, broader adoption processes initiated using project resources, and good engagement of key stakeholders are all equally important project-related contributing factors; each was found in four projects. The most common project-related hindering factor was poor project design, which was cited in three projects. A certain degree of caution must be exercised with the results of this analysis due to the small cohort of terminal evaluations— at the time it was conducted in connection with OPS5, only 7 of the completed 17 FSPs and MSPs in the three portfolios analyzed in this ACPER had terminal evaluations available.

This caveat notwithstanding, three project-related factors for achieving progress toward impact emerging from this analysis are worth mentioning: enhancing coordination and fostering engagement of key stakeholders, initiating broader adoption processes during the project to foster sustained flow of benefits after completion, and ensuring sound and realistic project design.

OPS5 impact analysis clearly indicates that broader adoption mechanisms need to be incorporated into project design. Although country/government support is a context-related contributing

**TABLE 2.3 Progress toward Impact in Completed Projects in Eritrea, Sierra Leone, and Tanzania**

GEF ID	Project title (country)	Focal area	GEF Agency	Modality	Broader adoption	ESR	ESC
411	Conservation Management of Eritrea’s Coastal, Marine and Island Biodiversity (Eritrea)	BD	UNDP	FSP	PS		
780	Development of Mnazi Bay Marine Park (Tanzania)	BD	UNDP	FSP	MS		✓
803	Development of Jozani-Chwaka Bay National Park, Zanzibar Island (Tanzania)	BD	UNDP	MSP	MS	✓	
1170	Conservation and Management of the Eastern Arc Mountain Forests (Tanzania)	BD	WB	FSP	HS		✓
1196	Transformation of the Rural Photovoltaics Market (Tanzania)	CC	UNDP	FSP	MS	✓	
1734	Development and Management of the Selous-Niassa Wildlife Corridor (Tanzania)	BD	UNDP	MSP	MS		✓
2151	Novel Forms of Livestock & Wildlife Integration Adjacent to Protected Areas in Africa (Tanzania)	BD	WB	MSP	MS		

**NOTE:** BD = biodiversity; CC = climate change; ESR = environmental stress reduction; ESC = environmental status change; HS = highly successful; MS = moderately successful; PS = partially successful; WB = World Bank.

factor, projects can foster the conditions that are necessary to sustain country/government ownership and support after completion, especially in least developed countries. Examples include any activity aimed at fostering inclusiveness and consultation, developing capacity, or providing information that the government considers essential for its own sustainable development/green growth agenda.

The above analysis from OPS5 data is complemented by the findings from the three country portfolios analyzed in this ACPER, which confirm the overall positive outcomes achieved at completion, with few exceptions. At the project level, among the 14 completed projects for which a terminal evaluation is now available in the Tanzania national portfolio, 2 (15 percent) were rated highly satisfactory in terms of outcomes achievement, 10 (71 percent) were rated satisfactory, 1 (8 percent) was rated moderately satisfactory, and 1 was rated unsatisfactory. In Eritrea, the two projects with available terminal evaluations were both rated satisfactory in terms of outcomes achievement. However, the GEF Independent Evaluation Office, in conducting its review of the terminal evaluations, downgraded this rating to moderately unsatisfactory for one of the projects—Conservation Management of Eritrea’s Coastal, Marine and Island Biodiversity.

ROtI analysis conducted on three completed projects in Tanzania and the two completed in Eritrea was consistent with—and, in some cases, upgraded—the ratings of the respective terminal evaluation reviews. For example, environmental status changes were observed in the Development of Jozani-Chwaka Bay National Park, Zanzibar Island, project (GEF ID 803) in terms of the now-healthy numbers of colobus monkey endemic to that area. The market change supported by the Transformation of the Rural Photovoltaics Market (GEF ID 1196) in Tanzania has contributed to a stable regulatory system for solar energy, although the displacement of greenhouse gases due to any installed capacity is not quantified or at scale.

Progress to impact was also demonstrated after completion of the Conservation Management of Eritrea’s Coastal, Marine and Island Biodiversity project, which contributed to mainstreaming scientific information and—along with other factors—to thus-far sustained protection of globally significant species of coastal/marine flora and fauna. ROtI analysis conducted on the only completed project included in the Sierra Leone CPS, the Sustainable Land Management Project (GEF ID 3510) showed low or negligible progress toward impact.

Some examples of broader adoption mechanisms in place in Eritrea and Tanzania are worth mentioning. **Mainstreaming** in Tanzania has been fostered through GEF support to development of a cadre of trained professionals in environmental fields and to the creation of environmental management institutions in the region (among others, the Lake Victoria Basin Commission and the Deep Sea Fishing Authority). Some aspects of the Transformation of the Rural Photovoltaics Market project, such as the installation of solar photovoltaic systems in schools and dispensaries around the Jozani-Chwaka Bay National Park, were **replicated** by subsequent SGP grants. The overall project approach was also replicated in three other regions (Kagera, Mara, and Shinyanga). In Eritrea, the research unit within the Ministry of Marine Resources established with support from the Conservation Management of Eritrea’s Coastal, Marine and Island Biodiversity project is now **mainstreaming** its research in other institutions, including universities abroad. This mainstreaming is providing valuable information exchange on, among other things, sea and coastal migratory birds; the nesting grounds of several turtle species; and species of crab, coral reef, seagrass, and dugong.

In Eritrea, as observed and reported by stakeholders as well as by communities engaged in the country’s two sustainable land management projects—Strategic Investment Program: Catchments and Landscape Management (GEF ID 3362) and Strategic Investment Program: Sustainable

Land Management Pilot Project (GEF ID 3364)—the capacity of communities to use drip irrigation in small farms, build bench terraces, and manage nurseries has been enhanced in addition to implementation of land degradation measures. The GEF’s land degradation portfolio has also included a community component dedicated to improved energy-saving stoves. These have been constructed by and largely benefited women and have achieved significant **replication** among Eritrean households in village communities through the SGP. Overall, GEF-supported projects to combat land degradation have demonstrated solid results through activities such as reforestation while enhancing farm productivity.

Examples of **scaling-up** include the Jozani-Chwaka Bay National Park project, which promoted a program to enable sustainable increases in income in communities around the forest reserve. This program has been considerably expanded from its original scope since project completion.

An example of **market change** is the reduction in tariffs on the solar panels supported by the Transformation of the Rural Photovoltaics Market project; this tariff reduction helped reduce market barriers to solar photovoltaic system installation in rural areas.

**CONCLUSION 3: Likelihood of sustainability is mixed; it has been most successful when pursued through the fostering of institutional and individual capacity development and the promotion of livelihood activities through community-based approaches (e.g., the SGP).**

GEF projects have applied approaches intended to foster sustainability in terms of the continued flow of environmental benefits as well as of overall results achieved. The most successful efforts have been those aimed at developing local capacities as well as linking local community benefits to improved environmental management. This success was achieved through parallel and sometimes synergistic support within the GEF portfolio, using the FSP, MSP, and SGP modalities. In some cases,

the likelihood of postproject sustainability was lower than with project funding.

Specific measures have been taken in Tanzania to provide a basis for sustainability, including capacity and institutional development and the development and implementation of environmental management systems. For example, GEF support to institutional development of the Jozani-Chwaka Forest Reserve allowed it to be upgraded to a national park, and a management plan was developed in consultation with local stakeholders. These outcomes have been maintained and in some cases expanded. There are now 736 savings and credit groups, compared with 47 at project completion, reported to stimulate income-generating activities. Conversely, gains from the long-completed Conservation and Management of the Eastern Arc Mountain Forests project (GEF ID 1170) were thought to be under threat due to failure to implement a sustainable financing strategy to secure funding for the project’s long-term objectives. More recent evidence suggests, however, that sustainability of the fund may be greater than anticipated, with the government of Germany providing €2 million for conservation efforts.

Another important approach to sustainability has been through efforts to link local community benefits to improved environmental management. For example, in the Eastern Arc Mountains forests project, support for local livelihoods helped generate support for environmental management. More importantly, SGP grants—which by definition link environmental conservation activities with sustainable livelihoods—have been used creatively in Tanzania. Many have been implemented in parallel with FSPs and MSPs to provide community stimulus to participate in environmental management by supporting income-generating activities.

For example, through the Small Grants Kilimanjaro COMPACT Project, the SGP is delivering the community-based components of the ongoing Strategic Investment Program: Reducing Land Degradation on the Highlands of Kilimanjaro project (GEF ID 3391), supporting community-based

organizations for tree planting, shade-grown coffee, and beekeeping—which are in line with both SGP and the FSP’s objectives. Another example is the Development and Management of the Selous-Niassa Wildlife Corridor Project (GEF ID 1734), which obtained support from the SGP to finance local initiatives to promote income-generating activities in a broad range of villages in the project area.

Similarly, the Eastern Arc Mountains forests project obtained SGP funding to promote butterfly farming as an income-generating activity around Amani Nature Reserves, in order to reduce pressure on forest products. This initiative promoted butterfly farming in the Eastern Usambara Mountains, resulting in conservation of biodiversity, since butterfly farmers and their communities are conserving natural forests to protect host plants for butterfly farming. This activity introduced by the SGP has been successfully replicated by the GEF FSP implemented near Jozani-Chwaka Bay National Park. And the above-mentioned example of the SGP project Installation of Solar Photovoltaic Systems in Schools and Dispensaries around Jozani-Chwaka Bay National in Zanzibar also extended the activities of this GEF FSP, resulting in improved access to electricity and lighting.

In Eritrea, the catchments and landscape management project and the sustainable land management pilot project provide specific examples of linking local livelihood benefits and sustainability. Another example is the widespread dissemination of improved stoves introduced by the SGP; these have become an income-generating activity for women, many of whom are the single head of their household. Continual power interruption in all areas of the country connected to the national grid has forced many urban and rural households to build these stoves. In parallel, the SGP has provided opportunities for a number of communities and nongovernmental organizations to learn from each other’s experiences and to replicate the results of GEF support. Several communities in and

around project sites are engaged in nature-based conservation activities.

A challenge related to the sustainability of results in Eritrea remains the limited capacity at both the individual and institutional levels, despite capacity strengthening having been targeted in numerous enabling activities (6 of 12 national projects), as well as in dedicated training components of FSPs aimed at government staffs and institutions. Another challenge for Eritrea has been to continue to support and scale-up projects once funding has ended, despite the government’s efforts to sustain the outcomes achieved. The exit strategies put in place have not adequately addressed the financial, technical, and managerial sustainability of project outcomes.

#### **CONCLUSION 4: Wider dissemination and uptake of project-derived lessons at the national level have been hampered by language barriers.**

This conclusion is drawn specifically from the Tanzania CPE, but its relevance goes beyond that country and is applicable to several other GEF countries. The Tanzania CPE highlights the fact that a number of GEF-supported activities, including the enabling activities, have targeted the preparation of important documents for dissemination and use nationally and internationally. These projects also included lessons—shared directly with communities and groups at the local level—on conservation and restoration know-how, organizational improvement, technology adoption, scaling-up, and marketing. While earlier GEF projects in Tanzania commonly entailed translation of project materials into the local language, stakeholders reported that almost all recent GEF project documents, reports, and learning products (print and online) in Tanzania are written in English, which is understood by less than 20 percent of the population. Moreover, this documentation is highly technical, meaning that many project participants and environmental stakeholders can neither understand nor share the content.

## 2.2 Relevance

The relevance of GEF support was assessed against each country's national development and environmental agendas, the GEF mandate, and country responsibilities and obligations to the global conventions.

**CONCLUSION 5: GEF support has been and remains relevant to the countries' environmental priorities as well as to their sustainable development needs, with a few exceptions.**

The three portfolios analyzed confirm strong relevance to national environmental conservation and sustainable development needs and priorities in all the GEF focal areas, with a few exceptions in Eritrea.

Over the last 20 years, GEF support has played a significant role in helping raise awareness of the environment as a vital cross-cutting issue for the sustainable development of Tanzania. It has also laid the foundation for the mainstreaming of environmental issues into a range of sectoral policies and plans. Most projects in the GEF Tanzania portfolio are well aligned to national priority areas as delineated by the government. More specifically, GEF support is contributing to the national sustainable agenda stated in MKUKUTA II and MKUZA II (the National Strategy for Growth and Reduction of Poverty II 2010–2015 and the Zanzibar Strategy for Growth and Reduction of Poverty 2010–2015) by contributing to activities that have a positive impact on biodiversity conservation, restoration of ecosystems, demonstration of green energy sources, improvement of health care and primary and secondary school education (indirectly, through solar photovoltaic systems), irrigation to increase agricultural productivity, and other income-generating activities important to communities and the national welfare. Similarly, the relevance of the SGP is demonstrated by strong support of the Tanzanian government, even though its activities are executed by civil society organizations, nongovernmental organizations, and community groups with the assistance

of UNDP. Government support was reconfirmed under the Tanzania National Portfolio Formulation Exercise, during which the sum of \$3.6 million was suggested as an appropriate amount for the SGP out of Tanzania's total allocation through the System for Transparent Allocation of Resources (STAR) of \$27.43 million.

The GEF portfolio has been relevant to Sierra Leone's sustainable development agenda and needs. It addresses one of the main pillars of Sierra Leone's national development strategy—namely, Pillar 2, Managing Natural Resources of its Agenda for Prosperity (Government of Sierra Leone, n.d.), the nation's third Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper. GEF enabling activities have been catalytic and have laid the foundation for follow-up activities in biodiversity and climate change, making it possible for the country to fulfill its obligations to the global conventions. GEF support in the area of climate change is highly relevant in allowing the country to address issues related to the adaptation and mitigation of climate change, including the development of adaptive agricultural production systems. GEF support in the area of desertification and land management has fit well with local needs in that it has addressed one of the most pressing constraints in agriculture, which is the principal livelihood of the rural population: soil fertility and land degradation.

GEF enabling activities have been relevant to the national sustainable development agenda of Eritrea, as demonstrated by the fact that the government officially endorsed the various planning documents and action plans produced by these projects. The Wind Energy Applications project (GEF ID 1136) provided foundational support; it was also relevant to the country's piloting of renewable energy sources and put in place a policy structure that would allow a renewable energy sector to develop. The country's two sustainable land management projects were developed in 2002, when Eritrea launched its National Action Plan to combat desertification and mitigate the effects of drought. However, while these GEF-supported

activities have been relevant to the country's needs in terms of sustainable land management, Eritrea's Land Law No. 58 of 1994, which empowers communities in land use and related land management aspects, has yet to be approved.

An opportunity to enhance the overall relevance of GEF support exists in the Eritrean renewable energy sector. In its national communications to the UNFCCC in 2001 and 2012, Eritrea identified a number of renewable energy sources including geothermal, wind, and solar energy. But even though 99 percent of the country's electricity is generated using fossil fuels—and despite rising fuel costs and a lack of access to energy—the government has yet to fully develop those alternative energy sources. And aside from the Wind Energy Applications project, there have been no further GEF interventions in this area. The promotion of alternative and renewable energy production in areas with no access to pre-existing grids, both at the household and industrial unit levels, would be strongly relevant to the country's needs and should be pursued in GEF-6 (2014–18).

**CONCLUSION 6: Diverse degrees of ownership have been observed in the three portfolios analyzed.**

---

Discussions with key stakeholders revealed a consensus viewpoint that, as a result of the STAR, government ownership of the GEF portfolio has increased in GEF-5 (2010–14) and that governments have become more empowered in setting priorities and making funding decisions on their environmental priorities where these overlap with global environmental issues. The use of the countries' own financial and other resources along with donor funding demonstrates ownership in Tanzania and Eritrea. Both have been successful in mobilizing their own resources as well as cofinancing from international sources. Sierra Leone showed weaker ownership, except for enabling activities.

GEF projects in Eritrea have been strategically prioritized by the GEF operational focal point, taking into account existing opportunities and

constraints, relevance to the national agenda, and project objectives. Ownership is further demonstrated by the fact that GEF projects in Eritrea originate within national institutions, including the Department of Environment and the Ministry of Agriculture.

Important support was given by the Tanzanian government for GEF projects (initially mainly in kind). Further, it has taken several measures to help ensure the sustainability of results of completed projects, notably by allocating funds to maintain key activities. While much of this funding is provided by international partners, there has been a substantial increase in the budgeting of national funds dedicated to address environmental issues: from T Sh 28.4 billion in 2006/07 to T Sh 151.7 billion in 2009/10. Although the government's resources are strained, it does provide funds of its own to support various institutions that contribute to global environmental benefits.

The GEF Sierra Leone portfolio has been mainly designed by the GEF Agencies. The government and other stakeholders have committed to activities at various stages of design and implementation, but cannot be said to have led the process, except in the case of the enabling activities involving national communications to the UNFCCC.

## 2.3 Efficiency

The efficiency of GEF support was assessed in terms of the time, effort, and financial resources needed to prepare and implement GEF projects; the different roles and responsibilities of the various GEF stakeholders (national, international, and local); and the synergies between projects and these stakeholders.

**CONCLUSION 7: Project design factors, particularly overly ambitious objectives, have often caused implementation overruns.**

---

This conclusion confirms the importance of realistic project design, which was highlighted by the progress to impact analysis described [earlier](#).

In Sierra Leone as compared to GEF averages, FSPs take much longer to plan and get started; they then take longer to implement. In Eritrea, all six FSPs in the national portfolio have taken more than 18 months to move from work program entry to Chief Executive Officer approval. In Tanzania, project document review found that FSPs have consistently overly ambitious objectives, which lead some of them to incur substantial time overruns.

In Sierra Leone, while the GEF enabling activities and MSP prepared after the civil war took less than the 22-month preparation limit imposed for GEF-4 (2006–10), the FSPs now under implementation and designed under GEF-4 and GEF-5 took significantly longer to move through the project cycle than the prevailing GEF limitations (22 months under GEF-4 and 18 months under GEF-5). All GEF Agencies, whether with or without resident representation in the country, have experienced project delays. These delays have been due to the time needed to gather background information in a situation where no centralized data banks on environmental issues exist, thus necessitating field data collection from target communities; the process of identifying and recruiting consultants, often international, given the limited human resource capacity available in collaborating national institutions; and the extended procedures for project approval in the GEF Agencies. However, there are recent welcome indications that project cycle durations are becoming shorter.

Overly ambitious project design was the reason for delay and difficulties in achieving project outcomes in the Sustainable Land Management Project, as reported in the ROtI study conducted in the framework of the Sierra Leone CPS. The project was not able to achieve more than 3 of the 10 project sites proposed in the original project documents. Furthermore, the ROtI analysis indicates that capacity developed in the project is already being lost, just 12 months after project completion. Possible reasons include limited human resources and the fact that key personnel are no longer in their positions and thus cannot follow up

on project activities. The project was also slated to submit a draft national action plan for sustainable land management for approval by the parliament, but it did not draft the required legislation.

In Eritrea, stakeholders indicated that GEF project formulation processes are perceived as complex and time-consuming. The Conservation Management of Eritrea's Coastal, Marine and Island Biodiversity project was supposed to close in 2003, but instead ended five years later. The Wind Energy Applications project was supposed to close in 2007, but instead closed in 2009. Enabling activities have also extended beyond their intended run time: three of five such projects were delayed; the first by one year, and the other two by two years.

Unrealistic project design can have a negative effect on achievement of results and likelihood of sustainability. For example, the Conservation Management of Eritrea's Coastal, Marine and Island Biodiversity project originally intended to cover the whole of the Red Sea coast of Eritrea and its islands. While the scope was later revised to focus on more limited coverage, precious time and resources were exhausted.

In Tanzania, the reforms introduced during GEF-4 have not improved performance over GEF-3 (2003–06) at any stage of the project cycle. While implementation of the three closed FSPs were not delayed, the three ongoing FSPs have all already extended their original intended duration by one to three years. Of the five closed MSPs, the completion of one was delayed by one year; completion of the MSP now under implementation has been delayed by two years. Completion of all six closed enabling activities was delayed, as is that of the one ongoing activity. Stakeholders have indicated that, even with project formulation support, the GEF project preparation process remains complex and time-consuming. Also, national institutions have noted major challenges both in terms of understanding the nature of cofinancing and in meeting its requirements—which stakeholders have suggested, on occasion, threaten the grant nature of GEF funding.

**CONCLUSION 8: Monitoring and evaluation is mixed in the three portfolios, and efforts are deployed to improve the situation where needed.**

Despite efforts in specific projects, monitoring and evaluation (M&E) systems in Tanzania are not yet uniformly regarded as an important asset to the design, management, and adaptation of projects; also, insufficient emphasis is placed on M&E by national partners and project managers. In Eritrea, M&E systems are in place but have yet to be fully used for adaptive management—although some progress is being made to improve the situation. In Sierra Leone, M&E systems are in place and are appropriate thus far.

In the Tanzania Eastern Arc Mountains forests project, the M&E system was weak and failed to facilitate adaptive management of this “problem” project. In the Jozani-Chwaka Bay National Park project, the interests of multiple financiers resulted in a confusing and top-heavy M&E system. Issues in the Development of Mnazi Bay Marine Park project (GEF ID 780) included managers ignoring recommendations from the midterm review, the lack of a coherent M&E framework, and an unrevised logframe.

In other projects, substantial efforts have been made to strengthen both current and future M&E capacity. During the Mainstreaming Climate Change in Integrated Water Resources Management in Pangani River Basin project (GEF ID 2832), an M&E study was undertaken which led to a series of recommendations for skills building surrounding M&E tasks. The integration of M&E into the project’s work plan is seen as an important achievement.

Most GEF projects in Eritrea use M&E systems and have project implementation reports; two underwent terminal evaluations. However, not all of these reports were available in the GEF Project Management Information System. Monitoring information was not adequately employed to make timely corrections of problematic issues, especially those related to outcome sustainability. A case in point is the Conservation Management

of Eritrea’s Coastal, Marine and Island Biodiversity project, where supervision (or lack thereof) allowed the overly ambitious project to continue without redefining its parameters. In the Wind Energy Applications project, supervision reports did not record the inappropriate procurement of technical services, equipment, and supplies; this not only led to delays, but also affected the sustainability of the project’s off-grid wind energy component.

The executing institutions for GEF-supported projects in Eritrea have made progress in terms of establishing mechanisms for M&E. Unfortunately, as referred to in Conclusion 9, these institutions came together infrequently to discuss procedural and operational matters related to GEF projects. More could be done in terms of formally sharing and reporting on project results on a regular basis. Interviews with relevant government officials reveal that a lack of funds, a shortage of transport facilities, and limited human capacity are formidable constraints in putting effective M&E systems into practice.

M&E has played a limited role thus far in the relatively young GEF portfolio in Sierra Leone. Only the sustainable land management project has been evaluated, as the only other projects completed thus far were enabling activities, which do not require a terminal evaluation. To date, M&E system design, budgeting, and implementation seem to be in order. Agencies manage their projects on the basis of monitoring data, most of which concern progress against input and output targets, with some consideration of progress toward outcomes. In general, M&E designs for projects are satisfactory; project documents outline a set of objectively verifiable indicators for all expected outcomes and provide baseline information on the status of the indicators at project inception. M&E systems include participatory elements that ensure that local communities (including project beneficiaries) and partners are involved in the process. In biodiversity projects, the GEF Tracking Tool for Biodiversity is being used to measure the achievement of project objectives.

Adequate budgetary provision has been made for M&E in all GEF projects in Sierra Leone, and allocations are within the established guidelines for GEF-4 and GEF-5. The quality of M&E system implementation so far seems satisfactory. Project coordinators are carrying out their responsibilities for day-to-day monitoring of implementation progress based on logframe indicators and project annual work plans and milestones. All GEF Agencies undertake periodic monitoring of implementation progress through quarterly meetings with project management teams and external supervision missions. Midterm reviews are undertaken to systematically determine any midcourse corrections needed.

**CONCLUSION 9: Mechanisms for coordination and synergies among GEF Agencies and national institutions, and among GEF- and other donor-supported projects and activities, have been set up, with mixed results.**

In Tanzania, networks have been developed between GEF projects, national institutions, and other donor-supported projects. For example, GEF national steering committee members are selected from within and across the public sector, civil society organizations, the private sector, academia, and other international partners. This cross-section gives the potential for good communication and synergy across related activities in the environmental sector—for example, coordinated successful lobbying of the government to provide fiscal incentives for solar photovoltaic technology. However, the committee does not meet regularly, thus losing opportunities for greater synergy.

While mechanisms for networking among GEF Agencies, national institutions, GEF projects, and other donor-supported projects and activities exist in Eritrea, they have not been fully effective in securing better synergies in GEF project programming and implementation. The Eritrean operational focal point has on several occasions chaired a steering committee to guide discussions on portfolio formulation and SGP initiatives, among

other items. Also, all GEF-supported projects have a national steering committee that was formed to guide the project management unit and set priorities for project activities. However, the potential for increased synergy and collaborative efforts among the agencies and national institutions involved in programming and implementation could be further realized. Roles and areas of cooperation for the government and UNDP—the dominant GEF Agency in the country’s portfolio—are clearly specified for interactions including and extending beyond GEF projects. In practice, these mechanisms are functioning adequately.

Eritrean national institutions could be better informed of each other’s related activities. There are few forums in which interested parties can discuss the challenges of sustainable livelihoods, land degradation, and biodiversity loss. For example, coordination through the national steering committees of the two sustainable land management projects is weak. More synergies were apparent at the subnational level (i.e., between line ministries and local administrations), but less transparent coordination was observed between the various national executing agencies and the operational focal point. There is a tendency for institutions to move forward with their own agendas with no definite schedule for meetings and contact. Improvements were noted, particularly greater awareness and willingness among all those concerned. Efforts have been under way to achieve a more synergistic approach across the various Eritrean departments involved in the implementation of GEF projects. No evidence is available to assess meaningful synergistic approaches among Eritrean national institutions for GEF-supported activities.

Partnership, collaboration, and synergy have been good in Sierra Leone. Most GEF projects have required cross-ministerial collaboration and coordination as climate change, land degradation, and biodiversity are seen as cross-cutting issues. Projects generally obtained support across ministries and agencies through a broad participatory process involving cross-sectoral steering committees and

working groups. Projects were implemented by a management team that maintained strong linkages with all relevant stakeholders through committees and workshops, and projects generally exploited complementarities with relevant actors within universities, ministries, departments, and

agencies. Additionally, there was some interaction with other donor projects in the same focal area; this was particularly true for biodiversity projects. However, there were little or no formal linkages with civil society organizations or private sector organizations.

## 3. Recommendations

The findings and conclusions emerging from the CPEs and CPS conducted in the Sub-Saharan Africa region lead to the following recommendations.

**RECOMMENDATION 1: The GEF should explore and pursue, where appropriate, the use of established SGP country programs as service providers to implement community-level activities for FSPs and MSPs.**

Previous evaluations conducted by the GEF Independent Evaluation Office, and as discussed in the OPS5 technical document on GEF engagement with civil society organizations (GEF EO 2013a), have underscored the importance of the SGP in its successful work in linking communities to environmental management, particularly through income-generating activities. This role is particularly evident in those least developed countries where an SGP country program is well established.

The national SGP program in Tanzania has been effective, and many SGP projects have been implemented in parallel to, integrated into the overall activities of, and/or synergized with FSPs and MSPs. In some cases, the SGP is formally delivering the community-based component of an FSP. In Eritrea, the SGP is being used to replicate activities introduced by the two land degradation FSPs in other regions of the country. Overt and more strategic integration would enable consistent use of accumulated SGP expertise and experience for effective delivery of GEF project activities at the community level, while optimizing the use of GEF

resources (i.e., saving costs due to the pre-existence of SGP institutional structures, staff, and work procedures in a country).

From a global perspective, the SGP is a highly successful GEF modality, but it is also perceived as having diverted resources away from the development of stand-alone GEF projects, and is often isolated from the overall GEF portfolio of projects in a country. Better integration of well-established SGP national programs with the respective overall GEF country portfolio—possibly through a formal mandate to deliver the community-level components of those projects with activities that need the active participation of local communities—would increase the likelihood of sustainability and generate cost savings to the GEF as a whole. It is therefore recommended that the SGP—in Tanzania as well as in other GEF member countries, where appropriate—be structured so that it can more formally receive funding from the budgets of larger GEF projects to deliver community-based activities focusing on sustainable livelihoods.

**RECOMMENDATION 2: The GEF should pay greater attention to national knowledge exchange and promote dissemination of data and information in the relevant national languages.**

ACPER 2013 concluded that effective communication and outreach as well as uptake of lessons facilitated broader adoption, and that lessons from past interventions are being mainstreamed in the formulation of most recent GEF projects (GEF EO 2014). Dissemination of project-produced lessons,

information, and data contribute to broader adoption and facilitate progress toward environmental impact.

Building on additional evidence from the Tanzania CPE, this ACPER highlights an issue that often hinders national use of the knowledge

produced by GEF projects: the fact that, in most cases, GEF documentation is in English. Language barriers could be overcome by requiring that project design include adequate budget allocations to translate relevant knowledge products and other project documentation into the local language.

# Annex A: Conclusions, Recommendations, and Lessons

Results	Conclusions		Recommendations	Lessons
	Relevance	Efficiency		
<b>Tanzania</b>				
Overall, GEF-supported projects and enabling activities have delivered results in a satisfactory manner.	GEF support has been and remains relevant to national sustainable development and environmental management priorities.	Projects consistently have a greater implementation overrun with few exceptions. National stakeholders perceive GEF project processes to be time-consuming and complex.		
GEF projects have delivered results in several GEF focal areas, both at the field level and for the enabling environment, including through enhanced institutional capacity at the national and local levels. In several instances, projects have made progress to long-term impacts.	GEF support has been relevant to a variety of objectives linked to global environmental benefits related to the biodiversity, climate change, international waters, land degradation, and chemicals focal areas.	There has been no major coordination between national budget procedures and the preparation and funding of GEF project proposals.		
The GEF has supported many measures intended to facilitate sustainability of environmental results. This has often been achieved, although not necessarily at the same level as during project funding.	The mainland government of Tanzania and the government of Zanzibar have been supportive of GEF activities across focal areas, as demonstrated by the use of government and donor funds to continue environmental protection initiated with GEF support.			

Conclusions				
Results	Relevance	Efficiency	Recommendations	Lessons
The GEF has been partially effective in disseminating results and lessons learned from projects, but has overemphasized English-language documentation and web-based means, neither of which is widely accessible.			Lessons and knowledge from GEF projects should be enhanced among GEF and other sustainable development stakeholders, particularly with regard to translating knowledge management materials into Swahili to ensure the broadest distribution.	
Several GEF-supported activities have contributed toward global environmental benefits by fostering sustainable livelihood and development approaches.			Where appropriate, the GEF SGP Steering Committee should pursue the systemic use of national SGP programs as service providers to implement community-level activities for FSPs and MSPs.	
GEF activities have contributed to facilitating broader adoption through a combination of mainstreaming, replication, scaling-up, and market change.				
		Mechanisms for more networking among GEF Agencies, national institutions, and GEF projects and other donor-supported projects and activities exist; however, they have not been fully effective toward better synergies in GEF project programming and implementation.	The GEF operational focal point should pursue ways of ensuring greater coordination and synergies among all parties engaged in the GEF portfolio, including with regard to portfolio M&E.	
		There have been weaknesses in the M&E systems of a number of GEF projects, while others are reported to have been satisfactory.	The GEF should encourage efforts to engage the GEF operational focal point in M&E-related activities.	

Conclusions				
Results	Relevance	Efficiency	Recommendations	Lessons
<b>Sierra Leone</b>				
GEF support has successfully followed the catalytic path as envisaged in the GEF Instruments, from foundation to demonstration to investment in FSPs identified through the foundation activities.	GEF support to Sierra Leone has been relevant to its strategic development plan and priorities, as well as to efforts to fulfill its obligations under the international agreements to which it is a signatory and to contribute to the achievement of global environmental benefits.	All GEF Agencies active in Sierra Leone have experienced problems in keeping projects within their intended time limits.		
GEF support in the biodiversity, climate change, and international waters focal areas has helped Sierra Leone raise the profile of environmental issues, establish national priorities, and begin addressing critical biodiversity conservation issues that are of global significance and climate change adaptation measures of national importance.		The GEF portfolio has been executed within GEF guidelines as far as distribution of costs is concerned and has successfully leveraged significant cofinancing.		
GEF support in some focal areas, especially land degradation and POPs, has had limited results and has not succeeded in establishing the intended foundation that would enable the country to address critical issues in these focal areas.		Partnership, collaboration, and synergies have been good in the GEF portfolio. However, there are challenges in developing formal linkages with civil society organizations, local government, and the private sector.		The GEF should ensure that the projects it supports do not have overly ambitious designs in terms of expected outputs and outcomes, given the size and duration of its interventions and the amount of cofinancing secured.

Conclusions				
Results	Relevance	Efficiency	Recommendations	Lessons
<b>Eritrea</b>				
Overall, GEF-supported projects have been effective in producing satisfactory results at the project and national levels.	GEF-supported projects were relevant to sustainable national development needs, environmental priorities, and national focal area strategies and action plans.	GEF projects have taken much longer to get started and have a greater implementation overrun.	In countries such as Eritrea with flexible allocations, the GEF should encourage integrated approaches in tackling global environmental issues.	
GEF projects have enhanced institutional and individual capacities at the national and local levels.	The government of Eritrea exhibits a high level of country ownership and commitment to GEF-supported projects.		The operational focal point should work with the government of Eritrea to promulgate any draft environmental laws and policies as these are key enforcement tools.	
Several GEF-supported activities have contributed toward environmental benefits by fostering sustainable livelihood and community-based approaches.			The GEF should continue to support the SGP in Eritrea and explore the systemic use of national SGP programs as service providers to implement community-level activities for FSPs and MSPs.	
Completed GEF projects have inadequately addressed sustainability strategies postcompletion.		There have been weaknesses in the M&E systems of a number of projects, and thus M&E has not significantly contributed to the efficiency and effectiveness of GEF support in Eritrea.	The GEF should encourage efforts to build the capacity of the operational focal point and national executing agencies in M&E-related activities.	
		Synergies and coordination in programming and implementation among GEF Agencies and Eritrean institutions, as well as among Eritrean institutions themselves, are limited.	The operational focal point should reinstate regular meetings of the National Coordinating Committee and undertake a national portfolio formulation exercise for GEF-6.	

**NOTE:** The Tanzania draft report was circulated in February 2014. Its conclusions and recommendations are considered final and are included in this table as such. The Eritrea CPE and the Sierra Leone CPS conclusions were validated at the respective final stakeholder workshops and therefore can be considered final. Areas of recommendations and/or lessons were also identified during those workshops; these are included where relevant in this table and are not necessarily in their final form.

# Annex B: Management Response

*This annex presents the management response to this report, which was presented to the GEF Council in May 2014 as GEF/ME/C.46/04. Minor editorial corrections have been made*

## B.1 Introduction

The Secretariat welcomes the seventh Annual Country Portfolio Evaluation Report which provides a synthesis of the evaluative evidence contained in the country portfolio evaluations and country portfolio studies conducted in the Sub-Saharan Africa region. These include two CPEs, one conducted in Tanzania and one in Eritrea, and one CPS conducted in Sierra Leone.

The Secretariat appreciates the work and analysis in this report, but has difficulty understanding how the project reviews related to some of the conclusions and recommendations. Nevertheless, the following are our responses to the conclusions and recommendations.

## B.2 Response to Conclusions

The Secretariat is pleased to note that GEF support has played an important role in creating the enabling framework for developing environmental policy and laws in the three countries under review. Indeed, such foundational support creates the stage for countries to pursue sustainable development. It is interesting to note that positive results at completion

have been achieved beyond foundational support, leading in some cases to progress toward impact.

The Secretariat notes the conclusion that promoting livelihood activities through community-based approaches seems to improve the likelihood of sustainability. The issue of language being a barrier for wider dissemination of project-derived lessons is one to be brought to the attention of the country operational focal points.

The Secretariat is pleased to note that, except for a few exceptions, GEF support is relevant to countries' environmental priorities as well as sustainable development needs. We note the unevenness in ownership across the three portfolios.

The issue of overly ambitious project objectives causing implementation overruns is acknowledged. We note with concern that the results for M&E and mechanisms for coordination were mixed across the three portfolios. The Secretariat will take into account this issue in project-related work going forward.

## B.3 Response to Recommendations

The Secretariat concurs with the recommendation that the GEF should explore and pursue, where appropriate, the use of established SGP country programs as service providers to implement community-level activities of other GEF-financed full- and medium-size projects. The Secretariat has included such a recommendation as part of the proposals in the Council paper on the GEF Small

Grants Programme Implementation Arrangements, presented at this Council meeting.

The Secretariat agrees with the recommendation to support national knowledge exchange and dissemination of data. As set out in the proposed Country Relations Strategy presented in the GEF-6 Programming document, the Secretariat will facilitate the organization of national dialogues and national portfolio formulation exercises that, among other things, are also meant to support knowledge exchange among key stakeholders at the national level.

Additionally, the Secretariat will also organize regional workshops to train participants on the GEF-6 focal area strategies and policy reforms, facilitate transboundary collaboration, discuss regional programming, and address integrated approaches and other issues based on thematic and geographic areas. These workshops will be one

of the vehicles to improve the knowledge sharing between the GEF and its partners and encourage South-South knowledge exchange.

Though the Secretariat cannot be responsible for the translation of project documents into national languages, it recognizes the importance of having accessible documents, in the sense that they are publicly available to the countries in their national languages and clear enough to be useful for key stakeholders. The Secretariat will raise this important issue in the relevant dialogues and processes going forward.

Translating and/or summarizing is obviously needed to reach the full potential of the project and promote greater accessibility of information; therefore, the Secretariat would encourage countries to include appropriate actions among the knowledge and communication activities of the baseline project.

# References

- GEF EO (Global Environment Facility Evaluation Office). 2010. "[Note on the Selection Process and Criteria for the GEF Country Portfolio Evaluations.](#)" Washington, DC: GEF EO.
- . 2012a. "[Standard Terms of Reference for GEF Country Portfolio Evaluations.](#)" Washington, DC: GEF EO.
- . 2012b. "[Standard Terms of Reference for GEF Country Portfolio Studies.](#)" Washington, DC: GEF EO.
- . 2013a. "[Civil Society Organizations Engagement.](#)" OPS5 Technical Document #14. Washington, DC: GEF EO.
- . 2013b. *OPS5: First Report: Cumulative Evidence on the Challenging Pathways to Impact.* Evaluation Report 79. Washington, DC: GEF EO.
- . 2013c. "[Meta-Evaluation on Country Ownership and Drivenness.](#)" OPS5 Technical Document #6. Washington, DC: GEF EO.
- . 2013d. "[Progress Towards Impact.](#)" OPS5 Technical Document #12. Washington, DC: GEF EO.
- . 2014. *GEF Annual Country Portfolio Evaluation Report 2013.* Evaluation Report 87. Washington, DC: GEF EO.
- Government of Sierra Leone. n.d. [The Agenda for Prosperity: Road to Middle Income Status.](#)



# Recent GEF Independent Evaluation Office Publications

## Evaluation Reports

94	Midterm Evaluation of the System of Transparent Allocation of Resources	2014
93	Midterm Evaluation of the National Portfolio Formulation Exercise	2014
92	GEF Annual Performance Report 2013	2014
91	GEF Annual Impact Report 2013	2014
90	Impact Evaluation on Climate Change Mitigation: GEF Support to Market Change in China, India, Mexico and Russia	2014
89	Report of the Second Professional Peer Review of the GEF Evaluation Function	2014
88	OP55: Final Report: At the Crossroads for Higher Impact—Summary	2014
87	GEF Annual Country Portfolio Evaluation Report 2013	2014
86	OP55: Final Report: At the Crossroads for Higher Impact	2014
85	Annual Thematic Evaluations Report 2012	2013
84	GEF Country Portfolio Evaluation: India (1991–2012), Volumes 1 and 2	2013
83	GEF Annual Performance Report 2012	2013
82	Evaluación de la cartera de proyectos del FMAM en Cuba (1992–2011), Volumens 1 y 2	2013
81	Avaliação de Portfólio de Projetos do GEF: Brasil (1991–2011), Volumes 1 e 2	2013
80	GEF Annual Performance Report 2011	2013
79	OP55: First Report: Cumulative Evidence on the Challenging Pathways to Impact	2013
78	Evaluation of the GEF Focal Area Strategies	2013
77	GEF Country Portfolio Study: Timor-Leste (2004–2011)	2013
76	GEF Annual Impact Report 2012	2013
75	The GEF in the South China Sea and Adjacent Areas	2013
74	GEF Annual Country Portfolio Evaluation Report 2012	2012
73	Evaluation of the Special Climate Change Fund	2012
72	GEF Beneficiary Countries of the OECS (1992–2011) (Antigua and Barbuda, Dominica, Grenada, St. Kitts and Nevis, St. Lucia, St. Vincent and the Grenadines), Volumes 1 and 2	2012
71	Evaluación de la cartera de proyectos del FMAM en Nicaragua (1996–2010), Volumens 1 y 2	2012
70	Evaluation of GEF National Capacity Self-Assessments	2012
69	Annual Thematic Evaluation Report 2011	2012
68	GEF Annual Impact Report 2011	2012
67	Estudio de la cartera de proyectos del FMAM en El Salvador (1994–2010), Volumens 1 y 2	2012
66	GEF Country Portfolio Study: Jamaica (1994–2010), Volumes 1 and 2	2012
65	GEF Annual Performance Report 2010	2011
64	GEF Annual Country Portfolio Evaluation Report 2011	2011
63	GEF Annual Impact Report 2010	2011
62	Review of the Global Environment Facility Earth Fund	2011
61	Evaluation of the GEF Strategic Priority for Adaptation	2011
60	GEF Country Portfolio Evaluation: Turkey (1992–2009)	2011
59	GEF Country Portfolio Evaluation: Moldova (1994–2009)	2011

## Evaluation Documents

ED-4	The GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy 2010	2010
ED-3	Guidelines for GEF Agencies in Conducting Terminal Evaluations	2008
ED-2	GEF Evaluation Office Ethical Guidelines	2008

## Learning Products

LP-3	The Journey to Rio+20: Gathering Evidence on Expectations for the GEF	2012
LP-2	Climate Change and the GEF	2010
LP-1	Biodiversity and the GEF	2010

To see all GEF Independent Evaluation Office publications, please visit our [webpage](#).



Global Environment Facility  
Independent Evaluation Office  
1818 H Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20433  
USA  
[www.gefeo.org](http://www.gefeo.org)