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Global Environment Facility

• Partnership to address global environmental issues
• Funding mechanism to Rio Conventions and more
• US$12.5 billion in grants, with US$58 billion in co-financing since 1991
Monitoring and Evaluation in the GEF
The **GEF** M&E Policy

- Indicates the GEF minimum M&E requirements covering:
  - project design,
  - application of M&E at the project level, and
  - project evaluation.

- Defines the concepts, role, and use of monitoring and evaluation within the GEF

- Defines the institutional framework and responsibilities.

- Current M&E Policy: Approved by GEF Council in November 2010
2 overarching objectives:

- Promote **accountability** for the achievement of GEF objectives through the assessment of results, effectiveness, processes, and performance of the partners involved in GEF activities.

- Promote **learning, feedback, and knowledge sharing** on results and lessons learned among the GEF and its partners as a basis for decision making on policies, strategies, program management, programs, and projects; and to improve **knowledge** and **performance**.
Separate reporting lines for **Monitoring** (through Secretariat) and **Evaluation** (through Independent Evaluation Office)

- **Agency evaluation units**
  - Corporate evaluations
  - Project and Program Independent evaluations

- **GEF Independent Evaluation Office**
  - Project and Program evaluations

- **Agency GEF coordination units**
  - Project and Program Implementation Reports
  - Project and Program monitoring documentation
  - Terminal evaluations

- **GEF Secretariat**
  - Project and Program Implementation Reports
  - Agency Portfolio Reports
  - Project documents with M&E plans

- **GEF Council**
  - Annual monitoring report
  - Evaluation Management Response
  - Programming documents and indicators
  - Results Based Management

- **GEF projects and programs**
  - Annual monitoring report
  - Overall Performance Study (to Assembly)
  - Annual Work Program and Budget
# M&E Key Responsibilities in GEF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partner</th>
<th>Key Roles and Responsibilities in M&amp;E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| GEF Council                          | Policy-making  
Oversight  
Enabling environment for M&E                                                               |
| GEF Independent Evaluation Office    | Independent GEF evaluation  
Oversight of M&E  
Setting minimum requirements for evaluation                                                   |
| GEF Secretariat                      | GEF Results Based Management (monitoring and reporting)  
Review of GEF M&E requirements in project proposals                                               |
| Agency GEF operational units         | Monitoring of the Agency GEF portfolio  
Ensure M&E at the project level                                                                  |
| Agency evaluation units              | Project and/or corporate Agency evaluations  
Mainstreaming GEF into relevant Agency evaluation                                                  |
| STAP                                 | Advice on scientific/technical matters in M&E  
Support to scientific and technical indicators                                                   |
| Participating Countries              | Collaboration on M&E at portfolio and project levels                                                   |
| Stakeholders                         | Participation in monitoring activities and mechanisms  
Providing views and perceptions to evaluations                                                   |
The Fifth Overall Performance Study Of The Global Environment Facility (GEF)
Main Conclusions and Recommendations

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

OPS5 builds on a solid evidence base:

Analysis of full GEF portfolio

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

Field-level evidence

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

Evaluations and studies

- 21 technical documents
- 33 evaluations and studies
Conclusion 1

Global environment trends continue to decline

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

Higher level of funding leads to better progress toward impact

| 50% of completed projects with GEF funding ≥ $1M are likely to be continued and expanded by governments and other stakeholders | 84% of completed projects with GEF funding ≥ $10M are likely to be continued and expanded by governments and other stakeholders |

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$1 billion</th>
<th>$10 billion</th>
<th>$100 billion</th>
<th>$1 trillion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annual GEF funding</td>
<td>Global public funding for environmental issues</td>
<td>Funding needs for action on global environmental issues</td>
<td>Global public subsidies that lead to overexploitation of natural resources and environmental degradation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recommendation 1

OPS5

Resource mobilization and strategic choices in the GEF need to reflect the urgency of global environmental problems.

- Make replenishment arrangements more flexible
- Encourage donors to contribute to GEF based on their priorities, without being constrained by inflexible pro rata burden-sharing arrangements
- Broaden the financing base and invite the EC to become a donor
A soft pipeline with 60% coverage of available money would provide a one-time speeding-up of up to $400 million in transfers to recipient countries.
Conclusion 2 OPS5

Increasing complexity of GEF has led to growing inefficiencies

The GEF project cycle is slow

1. Project Identification
2. Council approval
3. GEF endorsement
4. Project implementation start
5. Project implementation
6. Project completion

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

* for 50% of projects, while remaining 50% is still at an earlier stage
The business model of the GEF needs to be updated in the GEF-6 period

The move toward programming and programmatic approaches should continue

- The Council should approve programming proposals and programmatic approaches
- Project proposals should be cleared by the CEO
- STAP quality assurance role should shift to screening programs and portfolios
OPS5
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Recommendation 2: OPS5

The GEF should shift cofinancing considerations to the CEO endorsement and GEF Agency approval stages.

The GEF network should redefine the inclusion of partners at decision points, focusing on Council and country-level decisions.

Limit the number of outcome indicators
Revitalize public involvement policy
Invigorate the corporate strategy for the Small Grants Programme (SGP)
Conclusion

The intervention logic of the GEF is catalytic and successful in achieving impact over time.

The intervention logic of the GEF is not only successful at the national level, but also regionally and globally.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GEF projects deliver excellent outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>20%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 80% have satisfactory outcomes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recommendation 3 OPS5

To maximize results, the intervention model of the GEF needs to be updated

More attention to activities that boost broader adoption of GEF initiatives by governments and other stakeholders

Involve civil society and the private sector in projects, programs, national and regional priority setting, and analysis
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## Recommendation 3: OPS5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strengthen Strategic Role of the STAP</th>
<th>Revitalize the SGP Steering Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seek more <strong>learning</strong> from completed projects</td>
<td>The committee should <strong>provide strategic guidance</strong> to the program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adopt an action plan to implement the GEF Gender Mainstreaming Policy</td>
<td>Implement knowledge management and capacity development strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>![Map of the world with people]</td>
<td>![Meeting with people]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community of practice of project proponents on better design and implementation</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• Impact Evaluation of GEF Support to Protected Areas and Protected Area Systems

Preliminary Results and Next Steps
PARTNERS

JOINTLY WITH THE UNDP Independent Evaluation Office

WITH TECHNICAL SUPPORT FROM

• WCPA-SSC Joint Task Force on Biodiversity and Protected Areas at IUCN
• Global Land Cover Facility, University of Maryland
WHAT WE WANT TO FIND OUT

• What have been the impacts and contributions of GEF/UNDP support in biodiversity conservation in PAs and their adjacent landscapes?

• What have been the contributions of GEF/UNDP support to the broader adoption of biodiversity management measures at the country level through PAs and PA systems, and what are the key factors at play?

• Which GEF-supported approaches and on ground conditions are most significant in enabling and hindering the achievement of biodiversity management objectives in PAs and their adjacent landscapes?
HOW WE ASSESS IMPACT

• Portfolio Analysis
  ▪ Progress towards impact of almost 200 completed projects

• Global Analysis
  ▪ Forest Cover Change
  ▪ Wildlife Abundance Change
  ▪ Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool (METT)
  ▪ Statistical Analysis: Before/After GEF, With/Without GEF Support

• Case Study Analysis
  ▪ Interviews and field visits in 7 countries, 17 GEF-supported PAs and 11 non-GEF PAs
  ▪ Qualitative comparative analysis (QCA) at the PA system and PA levels
CASE STUDY ANALYSIS

3 REGIONS ◇ 7 COUNTRIES ◇ 28 PAs
Forest Cover Change Analysis

Decadal Forest Cover, Gain and Loss (2000 – 2012)

Percent Tree Cover (2000)

Cumbres de Monterrey, MEXICO

Yearly Percent of Forest Loss (2000 – 2012)
• Maximum area covered by PAs in tropical & subtropical moist broadleaf forests followed by subtropical grassland, savannas and shrublands and desert shrublands.

• Maximum loss in tropical and sub tropical grassland, savannas and shrublands followed by Montane grassland and shrublands & flooded grassland and savannas.
Wildlife Abundance Change Analysis

A time series showing a clear change in population trend of Tana River Red Colobus after the GEF project started in Tana Reserve, Kenya.

Red line shows start of GEF intervention, blue lines show population trend.

Species: *Cercocebus galeritus* (Tana River Red Colobus)

Red List Category & Criteria: Endangered C2a(ii) ver 3.1
NEXT STEPS

• Analysis and Writing: June 2014 to January 2015
• Draft Report: February 2015
• Final Report: May 2015
  ▪ To be presented to GEF Council and UNDP Executive Board
  ▪ Will inform design of future GEF support to protected areas and biodiversity conservation in general
  ▪ To be posted on
    http://www.thegef.org/gef/ImpactEvaluations
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