



GEF/ME/C.54/Inf.03

June 8, 2018

GEF Council
June 24-26, 2018
Da Nang, Viet Nam

**MANAGEMENT ACTION RECORD
2017**

(Prepared by the Independent Evaluation Office of the GEF)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Management Action Record.....	1
Rating Approach.....	2
Findings	2
GEF Council Decisions with a Substantial Level of Adoption.....	3
Decisions with a Medium Level of Adoption	4
Retired Decisions	5
Decisions which IEO will continue to Track	6
Annex 1: Adoption of Council Decisions.....	7
Annex 1.a Council decision based on Annual Country Portfolio Evaluation Report 2012 (GEF/ME/C.42/03).....	7
Annex 1.b Recommendation based on Council review of the Semi-Annual Evaluation Report June 2015, section on the Joint GEF-UNDP Small Grants Programme Evaluation (GEF/ME/C.48/02).....	10
Annex 1.c Council decision based on the Evaluation of the GEF CSO Network (GEF/ME/C.50/02).....	12
Annex 1.d Council decision based on the Annual Performance Report 2015 (GEF/ME/C.50/04)	17
Annex 1.e Council decision based on the Program Evaluation of the Least Developed Countries Fund (GEF/LDCF.SCCF.20/ME/02)	22
Annex 1.f Council decision based on the Program Evaluation of the Special Climate Change Fund (GEF/LDCF.SCCF.22/ME/02).....	28
Annex 2. Recommendations for future tracking in MAR.....	31
Annex 2.a.: Recommendations for tracking in MAR2018	31
Annex 2.b.: Recommendations for tracking in MAR2019	46

TABLES

Table 1: GEF management and IEO ratings of adoption of Council decisions assessed for MAR 2015	3
Table 2: Council decisions, final GEF IEO ratings, by MAR year.....	5

MANAGEMENT ACTION RECORD

1. The GEF Management Action Record (MAR) tracks the level of adoption of GEF Council and LDCF/SCCF Council decisions that are based on the GEF Independent Evaluation Office (GEF IEO) recommendations by the GEF Secretariat and/or the GEF Partner Agencies (together here referred to as GEF Management). The MAR serves two purposes: “(1) to provide Council a record of its decisions based on the evaluation reports presented by the GEF IEO, the proposed management actions, and the actual status of these actions; and (2) to increase the accountability of GEF Management regarding Council decisions on monitoring and evaluation issues.”¹
2. MAR 2017 reports on level of adoption of 6 decisions. These include 4 GEF Council decisions and 2 LDCF/SCCF Council decisions. These decisions were based on GEF IEO recommendations from 6 evaluations:
 - (a) Annual Country Portfolio Evaluation Report 2012 (GEF/ME/C.42/03)
 - (b) Semi-Annual Evaluation Report June 2015, section on the Joint GEF-UNDP Small Grants Programme Evaluation (GEF/ME/C.48/02)
 - (c) Evaluation of the GEF CSO Network (GEF/ME/C.50/02)
 - (d) Annual Performance Report 2015 (GEF/ME/C.50/04)
 - (e) Program Evaluation of the Least Developed Countries Fund (GEF/LDCF.SCCF.20/ME/02)
 - (f) Program Evaluation of the Special Climate Change Fund (GEF/LDCF.SCCF.22/ME/02)
3. Of the 6 decisions reported in MAR2017, 5 decisions had also been reported on in MAR2016. One LDCF/SCCF council decision – taken during the calendar year 2017 has been added. Details on level of adoption of these decisions is provided in Annex 1.
4. In 2017 the GEF council endorsed all 58 GEF IEO recommendations presented in the May and November 2017 Semi-Annual Evaluation Reports. These recommendations are not included for tracking in MAR 2017, as it is still too early to track their adoption. They are listed in Annex 2.
5. Additionally, the November 2017 council decision regarding the Semi-Annual Evaluation Report also took note of the OPS6 recommendations and advised the GEF Secretariat to address them in programming for GEF-7. These recommendations will not be tracked in MAR

¹ GEF Council, “Procedures and Format of the GEF Management Action Record.” GEF/ME/C.27/3., GEF Council November, 2005.

because they were at a strategic level and do not correspond to specific actions that may be tracked.

RATING APPROACH

6. For each tracked GEF Council and LDCF/SCCF Council decision that is reported on, self-ratings are provided by GEF Management on the level of adoption along with commentary as necessary. Ratings and commentary on tracked decisions are also provided by the GEF IEO for verification. The rating categories for the progress of adoption of Council decisions were agreed upon by the GEF IEO, the GEF Secretariat, and the GEF Agencies, through a consultative process. Categories are as follows:

- (a) **High:** Fully adopted and fully incorporated into policy, strategy or operations.
- (b) **Substantial:** Decision largely adopted but not fully incorporated into policy, strategy or operations as yet.
- (c) **Medium:** Adopted in some operational and policy work, but not to a significant degree in key areas.
- (d) **Negligible:** No evidence or plan for adoption, or plan and actions for adoption are in a very preliminary stage.
- (e) **Not rated:** ratings or verification will have to wait until more data is available or proposals have been further developed.
- (f) **N/A:** Not-applicable (see commentary).

7. The Council decisions may be graduated or retired from the MAR because of one or more of the following reasons:

- (a) **Graduated** due to high or, where appropriate, substantial level of adoption of Council decision
- (b) **Retired** as the Council decision has become less relevant, or subsequent Council decisions have made high level of adoption of the decision difficult, or further progress on adoption of the decision is likely to be slow and long drawn. An automatic reason for retirement would be if a decision has been reported on in the MAR for five years.

The GEF IEO keeps track of the reasons for removing a decision from the MAR.

FINDINGS

8. Convergence on ratings of decisions tracked in MAR 2017 is lower than usual, with management providing a higher rating than the IEO in 4 of 6 cases. Of the 6 Council decisions tracked in MAR 2017, all were rated for their level of adoption. Ratings between IEO and management matched in only 2 of the 6 cases, while in the other four, management rated level of adoption of decisions to be substantial while GEF IEO rated level of adoption as medium.

Table 1 compares GEF management and IEO ratings for these decisions. Table 2 presents the final ratings of the decisions at the point of their graduation or retirement from the MAR.

Table 1: GEF management and IEO ratings of adoption of Council decisions assessed for MAR 2015

Management rating	IEO rating				Sum of management ratings
	High	Substantial	Medium	Negligible	
High	0	0	0	0	0
Substantial	0	1	4	0	5
Medium	0	0	1	0	1
Negligible	0	0	0	0	0
Sum of GEF IEO ratings	0	1	5	0	6

Note: Highlighted cells show agreement between GEF management and GEF IEO ratings; cells to the right of the highlighted diagonal represent higher ratings by management than by the IEO.

GEF Council Decisions with a Substantial Level of Adoption

9. Adoption of the decision based on the Evaluation of the GEF CSO Network was rated substantial by both the IEO and GEF management. The decision had set up an ad-hoc working group of council members to develop an updated vision of the relationship between the GEF and civil society in consultation with relevant stakeholders, and encouraged the CSO Network to establish a working group to interact with the Council Working Group on an updated vision for the Network. The Ad-Hoc Working Group on Civil Society presented an Updated Vision to Enhance Civil Society Engagement with the GEF to at the GEF Council's 53rd meeting. At the same council meeting the Secretariat presented an updated Policy on Stakeholder Engagement with the GEF. Council has requested GEF Secretariat to present a progress report on the implementation of the Updated Vision for information to the 55th Council in the fall of 2018.

Decisions with a Medium Level of Adoption

10. GEF IEO rated adoption of five of the six decisions as medium. One of these was based on the Annual Country Portfolio Evaluation Report of 2012. It requested the Secretariat to reduce the burden of monitoring requirements of multifocal area projects to a level comparable to that of single focal area projects. The GEF is streamlining its results-based management system for GEF-7 by focusing on tracking 11 core indicators and 25 sub-indicators. Although, Agencies may still need to track more indicators for multi-focal area projects than single focal area projects, the overall burden will decrease substantially. Therefore, the decision is no longer relevant and will be retired from the MAR.

11. Another decision related to burden of monitoring requirements, also with level of adoption rated as medium, was based on the 2015 Annual Performance Report. The decision endorsed the recommendation that GEF needs to reassess its approach to tracking tools for GEF-7, and should also assess the burden and utility of its biodiversity tracking tools and other alternatives. Management rated level of adoption as substantial, however, as revised results-based management approach is still under development by the Secretariat, level of adoption is rated medium by the IEO. Unlike the previous decision, where a shift to a new approach has made the decision irrelevant, in this case an alternative to tracking tools is still under development. Therefore, GEF IEO decision will monitor the decision during the next fiscal year.

12. The decision based on the review of the Semi-Annual Evaluation Report June 2015, section on the Joint GEF-UNDP Small Grants Programme Evaluation, requested the Secretariat and UNDP to continue upgrading the SGP Country Program, and to revisit the criteria for selection of countries for upgrading. In this case level of adoption was rated as medium by both management and IEO. Management reported that UNDP and Country Program Management Team, in consultation with the GEF Secretariat and relevant stakeholders, will revisit the criteria for upgradation in GEF 7, and will focus on consolidating and scaling up successful on-the-ground actions in the existing 15 Upgraded Country Programs for community based landscape planning and management.

13. GEF IEO rated level of adoption for both LDCF/SCCF council decisions as medium although Management had rated it substantial. One of the decisions, which was based on the Program Evaluation of the Least Developed Countries Fund, endorsed the evaluation's three recommendations: that the GEF Secretariat should explore and develop mechanisms to ensure predictable, adequate and sustainable financing of the fund, that GEF Secretariat should make efforts to improve consistency regarding understanding and application of GEF gender mainstreaming policy and Gender Equality Action Plan (GEAP) to the LDCF and that GEF Secretariat should ensure that data in PMIS is up to date and accurate. Though management reports that the GEF Secretariat has made sustained efforts to inform recipient countries on the resource availability, IEO found that a systemic mechanism to promote predictable and adequate financing for the LDCF is still missing. On the second and third recommendations the IEO found gaps in compliance with the gender analysis requirements and that the gaps in improving quality of information in PMIS has not been fully addressed.

14. The other decision was based on the Program Evaluation of the Special Climate Change Fund. The decision endorsed the three recommendations of the evaluation: that the GEF

Secretariat should prioritize development of mechanisms that ensure predictable, adequate and sustainable financing for the Fund, that the GEF Secretariat should articulate and publicly communicate the SCCF's niche within the global adaptation finance landscape along with an explicit statement regarding the SCCF's relation with the Green Climate Fund, and that GEF Secretariat should ensure that PMIS data is up to date and accurate. For the first and third recommendations, the Secretariat still needs to develop a more systematic mechanism to promote predictable and adequate financing and make substantial progress in quality of information in PMIS. For the second recommendation, the IEO found that elements of the SCCF's niche are being discussed with countries within the context of the GEF programming Strategy on Adaptation for the LDCF/SCCF for 2018 to 2022. The Secretariat still needs to articulate and publicly communicate the SCCF's niche within the global adaptation finance landscape.

Retired Decisions

15. A decision, based on the Annual Country Portfolio Evaluation Report of 2012, that requested the Secretariat to reduce the burden of monitoring requirements of multifocal area projects to a level comparable to that of single focal area projects is being retired. Level of adoption of the decision was rated as medium by the IEO. As the GEF is moving its results-based management system towards tracking 11 core indicators and 25 sub-indicators from GEF-7 onwards for all projects, the decision is no longer relevant.

Table 2: Council decisions, final GEF IEO ratings, by MAR year

Rating at Exit: Final Rating at Graduation or Retirement from MAR							
MAR	High	Substantial	Medium	Negligible	Not Rated/ Possible to Verify Yet	Not Applicable	Total
2005	5	15	7	3	-	-	30
2006	5	1	-	-	-	-	6
2007	7	8	-	-	2	-	17
2008	5	-	-	-	-	-	5
2009	5	-	-	-	-	-	5
2010	9	3	4	3	-	2	21
2011	2	-	-	-	-	-	2
2012	-	-	-	-	-	-	0
2013	5	1	1	1	2	-	10
2014	4	2	6	1	1	-	14
2015	1	2	0	0	0	0	3
2016	1	3	1	0	0	0	4
2017	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Total	49	35	20	8	5	2	117

Decisions which IEO will continue to Track

16. IEO will continue to track the remaining five decisions (that have not been retired) in the next MAR. Of the five progress on four was rated medium and on one as substantial. Even through the progress on adoption of the decision based on the Evaluation of the GEF CSO Network, requesting both the Council and the CSO network to set up parallel working groups to create an updated vision for the network, is rated substantial, the IEO will track it in the next MAR because further progress on adoption is possible.

ANNEX 1: ADOPTION OF COUNCIL DECISIONS

Annex 1.a Council decision based on Annual Country Portfolio Evaluation Report 2012 (GEF/ME/C.42/03).

Ref #	Date of Council Decision	GEF IEO Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2016	GEF IEO Rating & Comments in MAR 2016	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2017	GEF IEO Rating & Comments in MAR 2017
1	June 2012	The burden of monitoring requirements of multifocal area projects should be reduced to a level comparable to that of single focal area projects.	The Secretariat has had many discussions with Agencies related to recommendation two “The burden of monitoring requirements of multifocal area projects should be reduced to a level comparable to that of single focal area projects.” It should also be noted that using tracking tools for multifocal area projects was only introduced in GEF-5, so it may be premature to draw this conclusion at	Decision on Agenda Item 8: The Council, having reviewed document GEF/ME/C.42/03, “Annual Country Portfolio Evaluation Report 2012,” document GEF/ME/C.42/04, “Management Response to the Annual Country Portfolio Evaluation Report 2012,”	Medium: Further to the self-assessment carried out as part of the 2015 MAR, consolidated tracking tools have been developed for and applied across the three IAPs, although there is still scope to further reduce the burden of monitoring, particularly of other MFA projects and	Medium: GEFIEO acknowledges the work started on consolidating tracking tools and applied to the three IAPs, and agrees with the Secretariat that more efforts in that direction are needed going forward. GEF IEO will continue to track adoption of this decision.	Substantial: Taking into account the findings, conclusions and recommendations of OPS6, and the Secretariat’s analysis on key policy and operational issues, the Participants to the seventh replenishment of the GEF Trust Fund (GEF-7) request that the Secretariat “present for Council consideration an updated results architecture, with a view to promoting [, <i>inter alia</i> ,] simplification, with	Medium: the GEF is moving its Results-based Management system towards tracking 11 core indicators and 25 sub indicators from GEF-7 onwards. These indicators, which replace the focal area tracking tools, represent a considerable reduction in the burden for collecting the related data as compared with tracking tools. The core

		<p>this time. Furthermore, one should remember that these new tools are required only three times during the life of the project, a very reasonable requirement: at CEO endorsement, mid-term, and project completion. Additionally, for multifocal area projects, the Secretariat does not require the full set of tracking tools be applied. Rather, as the language in paragraph 86 suggests, the tools should only be completed for the “essential focal area indicators that need to be monitored throughout multifocal area projects.” There are</p>	<p>and having taken note of the two Country Portfolio Evaluations in Nicaragua and OECS (GEF/ME/C.42/Inf.02) requested the Secretariat: 2) To reduce the burden of monitoring requirements of multifocal area projects to a level comparable to that of single focal area projects.</p>	<p>programs. Looking forward, the Secretariat’s proposed programming directions and policy agenda for GEF-7 include a proposal to introduce an enhanced corporate results framework to capture all relevant global environmental benefits across all GEF-financed activities, using a limited number of carefully selected core indicators. Based on the Secretariat’s proposal, each</p>		<p>fewer, more relevant indicators and more streamlined reporting on project and program -level results”.</p> <p>In response to this request, the Secretariat will replace the focal area -specific tracking tools with eleven core indicators with associated sub-indicators that will be applied to capture the expected and achieved results of GEF projects and programs throughout the project cycle, starting with projects approved in GEF-7 as well as GEF-6 projects under preparation and implementation.</p>	<p>indicators will be applied regardless the support modality (programs, full and medium size projects, SGP, among others) or intervention typology (single or multifocal area). Tracking tools of projects and programs under implementation will be continued, and will be phased out in the next year or two upon project and/or program completion.</p> <p>This decision is retired as it has become irrelevant.</p>
--	--	--	---	---	--	---	---

			currently no multifocal area projects under implementation that require tracking tools from more than one focal area.		project or program would have to report data against applicable core indicators at concept stage, at CEO Endorsement/ Approval, during implementation and at completion. The new Project Management Information System (PMIS) would facilitate a more efficient aggregation of and reporting on expected and actual results across those indicators.			
--	--	--	---	--	--	--	--	--

Annex 1.b Recommendation based on Council review of the Semi-Annual Evaluation Report June 2015, section on the Joint GEF-UNDP Small Grants Programme Evaluation (GEF/ME/C.48/02)

Ref #	Date of Council Decision	GEF IEO Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2016	GEF IEO Rating & Comments in MAR 2016	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2017	GEF IEO Rating & Comments in MAR 2017
2	June 2015	The GEF and UNDP should continue upgrading, building on strengths while addressing the weakness identified. The criteria for selection of countries for upgrading should be revisited.	UNDP and CPMT, in consultation with the GEF Secretariat, will continue to refine operationalization of the upgrading policy. The Secretariat welcomes the four suggestions listed under this recommendation and will work with the GEF Secretariat to design and execute these recommended changes in GEF-7, in particular to ensure all around	The Council, having reviewed GEF/ME/C.48/02 , Semi-Annual Evaluation Report of the GEF Independent Evaluation Office: June 2015, section on the Joint GEF-UNDP Small Grants Programme Evaluation, and GEF/ME/C.48/03 , Management Response to the Semi-Annual Evaluation	Medium: The process of upgrading is underway with six additional countries upgraded in GEF-6, with separate SGP FSPs financed through countries' STAR allocations and with co-financing from partners (including Egypt, Indonesia, Kazakhstan,	Medium: GEF IEO acknowledges the progress made in upgrading to more countries. New countries have been added to the list of upgraded countries, however the upgrading criteria has yet not been revisited. This remains an	Medium: GEF-7 will focus on consolidating and scaling up successful on-the-ground actions in the existing 15 Upgraded Country Programmes (UCP) for community-based landscape planning and management, refining and systematizing the community-based landscape approach	Medium: GEF IEO will track the revisiting of the upgrading criteria in the next MAR.

			<p>compliance with the SGP Operational Guidelines.</p> <p>The Secretariat agrees with the recommendation that upgrading remains voluntary for LDCs and SIDS and that changes to the process for accessing STAR funds by non-upgraded countries through the global project should be clear and agreed.</p>	<p>Report of the GEF Independent Evaluation Office: June 2015, section on the Joint GEF-UNDP Small Grants Programme Evaluation, requests the Secretariat and UNDP to:</p> <p>(1) Continue upgrading the SGP Country Program, building on strengths while addressing the weaknesses identified by the evaluation. The criteria for selection of countries for upgrading should be revisited.</p>	<p>Peru, Sri Lanka, and Thailand).</p> <p>Looking forward, an updated GEF SGP implementation arrangement paper for OP7 will be prepared and presented to the Council in 2018, while reflecting the IEO's recommendations and lessons learned from OP5 and OP6.</p>	<p>area for improvement. This will be tracked in the next MAR.</p>	<p>embraced by UCPs in GEF-6.</p> <p>Based on the lessons from UCP implementation and the recommendations of the Joint 2015 evaluation, UNDP and CPMT, in consultation with the GEF Secretariat and relevant stakeholders, will revisit the upgrading criteria.</p>	
--	--	--	---	---	--	--	---	--

Annex 1.c Council decision based on the Evaluation of the GEF CSO Network (GEF/ME/C.50/02)

Ref #	Date of Council Decision	GEF IEO Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2016	GEF IEO Rating & Comments in MAR 2016	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2017	GEF IEO Rating & Comments in MAR 2017
3	June 9 th , 2016	Recommendation 1: A contemporary vision for the CSO Network be created within the new GEF architecture . The vision should inter alia a) clarify the Network's role, b) set out a shared understanding amongst all parts of the Partnership of the	<p>The Secretariat agrees with the recommendation that a new vision should be developed for the GEF CSO Network within the GEF Partnership. The Secretariat looks forward to collaborating with the CSO Network and other partners to develop that vision.</p> <p>Regarding the recommendation to the GEFSEC and CSO Network to develop clear</p>	<p>The Council, having reviewed GEF/ME/C.50/02, Evaluation of the GEF Civil Society Organization (CSO) Network, and GEF/ME/C.50/03, Management Response to the Evaluation of the GEF Civil Society Organization Network, decides to set up an ad-hoc working group of interested Council Members to develop an updated vision of the relationship</p>	<p>Substantial:</p> <p>Recommendation 1: An Ad-Hoc Working Group of interested Council Members has developed a draft vision and action plan for Council review (document GEF/C.52/Inf.13).</p> <p>Recommendation 2: The Council, at its 51st meeting in October</p>	<p>Substantial:</p> <p>An Ad-Hoc Working Group of interested Council Members has prepared a progress report on their work thus far including a draft proposed vision for the CSO Network and plans to operationalize that vision. The progress report will be</p>	<p>Substantial:</p> <p>In November 2017 at its 53rd meeting, the GEF Council approved an Updated Vision to Enhance Civil Society Engagement with the GEF. The Updated Vision was the result of a consultative process conducted by the Ad-Hoc Working Group of</p>	<p>Substantial</p> <p>Recommendation 1: The Ad-Hoc Working Group on Civil Society presented at the 53rd Council meeting of the GEF an Updated Vision to Enhance Civil Society Engagement with the GEF (GEF/C.53/10/Rev.01,) , The Council requested the GEF</p>

Ref #	Date of Council Decision	GEF IEO Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2016	GEF IEO Rating & Comments in MAR 2016	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2017	GEF IEO Rating & Comments in MAR 2017
		<p>Network's contribution in guarding the global commons and c) identify a modality to finance Network activities.</p> <p>Recommendation 2: The GEFSEC and CSO Network should develop clear rules of engagement which guides cooperation</p>	<p>rules of engagement that guide cooperation and communications, the Secretariat is pleased to report that cooperation with the new management of the Network has been strengthened through more frequent formal communication and participation of the CSO Network representatives in various task forces and working groups, including the one on public</p>	<p>between the GEF and civil society, and a plan to achieve it, in consultation with relevant stakeholders, and report back to the Council at its first meeting in 2017. The Council encourages the CSO Network to establish a working group that includes balanced representation of CSO Stakeholder views, to interact with the Council Working Group on a new, updated vision for the Network,</p>	<p>2016, and having reviewed document GEF/C.51/09/Rev.01, <i>Recommendations of the Working Group on Public Involvement</i>, "[requested] the Secretariat to present an updated policy on stakeholder engagement and access to information for consideration at its 53rd meeting in [November] 2017." (Joint</p>	<p>the basis for consultation at the 52nd meeting in May 2017 with the Working Group established by the CSO Network for this purpose.</p> <p>The IEO will continue to track adoption of this decision.</p>	<p>interested Council Members.</p> <p>The GEF Secretariat has started implementing the Updated Vision in preparation for the 54th Council meeting and the Sixth GEF Assembly.</p>	<p>Secretariat to present a progress report on the implementation of the Updated Vision for information to the 55th Council in the fall of 2018.</p> <p>Recommendation 2: The GEFSEC presented an updated Policy on Stakeholder (GEF/C.53/05/Rev.01) Engagement at the 53rd meeting of</p>

Ref #	Date of Council Decision	GEF IEO Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2016	GEF IEO Rating & Comments in MAR 2016	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2017	GEF IEO Rating & Comments in MAR 2017
		<p>and communications. These could be adjusted as needed.</p> <p>Recommendation 3: The CSO Network should continue to build itself as a mechanism for strengthening civil society participation in the GEF at the global, regional and</p>	<p>involvement. The Secretariat will assess jointly with the CSO Network regarding whether additional mechanisms are needed to further enhance cooperation.</p>	<p>including governance, policies, guidelines and cooperation mechanisms.</p>	<p>Summary of the Chairs: 51st GEF Council Meeting, October 25–27, 2016). The Secretariat, in close collaboration with the multi-stakeholder Working Group on Public Involvement, has launched consultations on the updated Policy. The updated Policy presents an opportunity to further clarify</p>			<p>the Council. While the CSO Network was part of the multi-stakeholder Working Group that was consulted in the development of the Policy, the Policy itself is focused on Agencies and the Secretariat. Clear rules of engagement that guide cooperation and communicatio</p>

Ref #	Date of Council Decision	GEF IEO Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2016	GEF IEO Rating & Comments in MAR 2016	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2017	GEF IEO Rating & Comments in MAR 2017
		<p>national levels, paying particular attention to: membership development, capacity building and value-added working relationships across the Partnership.</p> <p>Recommendation 4: The CSO Network should strengthen its</p>			<p>how affected and interested stakeholders, including CSOs, will be engaged in GEF operations and governance.</p> <p>Recommendations 3 and 4 are directed to the CSO Network rather than the Secretariat and Agencies.</p>			<p>ns remain outstanding.</p>

Ref #	Date of Council Decision	GEF IEO Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2016	GEF IEO Rating & Comments in MAR 2016	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2017	GEF IEO Rating & Comments in MAR 2017
		governance, with particular attention to: annual work plans, cooperation with IPAG, terms for the Network's Regional Focal Points and the complaints process.						

Annex 1.d Council decision based on the Annual Performance Report 2015 (GEF/ME/C.50/04)

Ref #	Date of Council Decision	GEF IEO Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2016	GEF IEO Rating & Comments in MAR 2016	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2017	GEF IEO Rating & Comments in MAR 2017
4	June 9 th , 2016	The GEF needs to reassess its approach to tracking tools for GEF-7. It should also assess the burden and utility of its biodiversity tracking tools and other alternatives.	The Secretariat notes the report's recommendation that the GEF needs to reassess its approach to tracking tools for GEF-7. The Secretariat agreed with the findings of the evaluation that significant progress has been made in meeting the OPS-5 recommendation that the tracking tools be simplified and the reporting burden on Agencies be reduced.	The Council, having reviewed GEF/ME/C.50/04, Annual Performance Report 2015, and GEF/ME/C.50/05, Management Response to the Annual Performance Report 2015, takes note of the conclusions of the evaluation and endorses the recommendation.	Medium: See #1 above. Further to the self-assessment carried out as part of the 2015 MAR, consolidated tracking tools have been developed for and applied across the three IAPs, although there is still scope to further reduce the burden of monitoring, particularly of	Medium. Some progress in terms of reduction of burden is evident in the proposal described in Secretariat's response. In the coming year, when the proposal will take a concrete shape, it will be possible to fully assess the progress in adoption of the Council decision. MAR will continue	Substantial: See #1 above. Taking into account the findings, conclusions and recommendations of OPS6, and the Secretariat's analysis on key policy and operational issues, the Participants to the seventh replenishment of the GEF Trust Fund (GEF-7) request that the Secretariat	Medium. The direction that the Secretariat plans to take is consistent with the Council decision and the request from the participants of the GEF-7 replenishment. While the intent has been clearly articulated by the Secretariat, the detailed plans that will be implemented

Ref #	Date of Council Decision	GEF IEO Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2016	GEF IEO Rating & Comments in MAR 2016	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2017	GEF IEO Rating & Comments in MAR 2017
					<p>other MFA projects and programs. Looking forward, the Secretariat’s proposed programming directions and policy agenda for GEF-7 include a proposal to introduce an enhanced corporate results framework to capture all relevant global environmental benefits across all GEF-financed</p>	to track this decision	<p>“present for Council consideration an updated results architecture, with a view to promoting [, <i>inter alia</i>,] simplification, with fewer, more relevant indicators and more streamlined reporting on project and program -level results”.</p> <p>In response to this request, the Secretariat will replace the focal area -</p>	<p>were still under preparation at the point this exercise was undertaken.</p> <p>The development on further adoption of the decision will also be tracked in the next MAR. By that time the revised RBM approach would have been fully developed.</p>

Ref #	Date of Council Decision	GEF IEO Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2016	GEF IEO Rating & Comments in MAR 2016	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2017	GEF IEO Rating & Comments in MAR 2017
					<p>activities, using a limited number of carefully selected core indicators. Based on the Secretariat's proposal, each project or program would have to report data against applicable core indicators at concept stage, at CEO Endorsement/ Approval, during implementation and at</p>		<p>specific tracking tools with eleven core indicators with associated sub-indicators that will be applied to capture the expected and achieved results of GEF projects and programs throughout the project cycle, starting with projects approved in GEF-7 as well as GEF-6 projects under preparation and</p>	

Ref #	Date of Council Decision	GEF IEO Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2016	GEF IEO Rating & Comments in MAR 2016	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2017	GEF IEO Rating & Comments in MAR 2017
					<p>completion. The new Project Management Information System (PMIS) would facilitate a more efficient aggregation of and reporting on expected and actual results across those indicators.</p> <p>A unified results architecture based on a system of core indicators could</p>		implementation.	

Ref #	Date of Council Decision	GEF IEO Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2016	GEF IEO Rating & Comments in MAR 2016	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2017	GEF IEO Rating & Comments in MAR 2017
					contribute towards reducing the burden of monitoring across the GEF as a whole, clarifying expectations, simplifying communication, and improving the quality, completeness and timeliness of information captured at the project level.			

Annex 1.e Council decision based on the Program Evaluation of the Least Developed Countries Fund (GEF/LDCF.SCCF.20/ME/02)

Ref #	Date of Council Decision	GEF IEO Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2016	GEF IEO Rating & Comments in MAR 2016	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2017	GEF IEO Rating & Comments in MAR 2017
5	June 9 th , 2016	<p>Recommendation 1: The GEF Secretariat should explore and develop mechanisms that ensure the predictable, adequate and sustainable financing of the Fund.</p> <p>Recommendation 2: The GEF Secretariat should make efforts to</p>	<p>The Secretariat appreciates the findings of the report and agrees with the GEF IEO that enhancing financial predictability can improve the effectiveness of the LDCF. The Secretariat notes that the means to address this need falls within the purview of the donors of the fund.</p> <p>In line with the GEF Gender Equality Action Plan the Secretariat will</p>	<p>The LDCF/SCCF Council, having reviewed document GEF/LDCF.SCCF.20/ME/02, Program Evaluation of the Least Developed Countries Fund, and GEF/LDCF.SCCF/20/ME/03, Management Response to the Program Evaluation of the Least Developed Countries Fund, took note of the conclusions of the evaluation and endorsed the recommendation</p>	<p>Substantial: Since the adoption of the Council decision, donors have increasingly put an emphasis on enhancing the predictability of financing under the LDCF, exemplified by Belgium's three-year commitment made at the 21st LDCF/SCCF Council meeting in October 2016.</p>	<p>Medium Rec. 1 Medium: Efforts made by the Secretariat to report on available resources and the pipeline under the LDCF are welcome. The IEO encourages the Secretariat to develop a more systematic mechanism to promote the predictable, adequate and</p>	<p>Substantial As stated in the previous management response, the means to address the need for predictable, adequate, and sustainable financing falls within the purview of the donors as well as the LDCF/SCCF Council. The GEF Secretariat continues to make efforts to update</p>	<p>Medium Rec. 1 Medium: The Secretariat's continued efforts to update recipient countries on resource availability under the LDCF at meetings are welcome. The IEO encourages the Secretariat to develop a more systematic mechanism to promote the</p>

Ref #	Date of Council Decision	GEF IEO Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2016	GEF IEO Rating & Comments in MAR 2016	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2017	GEF IEO Rating & Comments in MAR 2017
		<p>improve consistency regarding their understanding and application of the GEF gender mainstreaming policy and the Gender Equality Action Plan (GEAP) to the LDCF.</p> <p>Recommendation 3: The GEF Secretariat should ensure that the data in</p>	<p>continue to work to ensure that LDCF projects mainstream gender, noting that gender performance of the LDCF portfolio has improved considerably. As part of the overall upgrade of the GEF project management information systems, the Secretariat will also endeavor to correct, verify and update the relevant LDCF project data.</p>	<p>s taking into account the Management Response.</p>	<p>The Secretariat has also made an effort to report to LDCs on available resources under the LDCF, and on the precise number of projects and resources requested in the pipeline of technically cleared projects, in its presentations at the LDC Expert Group (LEG) side event during the</p>	<p>sustainable financing of the LDCF.</p> <p>Rec. 2 Medium: It is encouraging that projects that have been technically cleared in the past year are expected to carry out a gender gap analysis during project preparation prior to CEO Endorsement/ Approval. The Secretariat should monitor compliance</p>	<p>recipient countries on the resource availability at negotiations, LDC briefings, and other meetings. The Secretariat is also supporting projects from the pipeline as resources become available.</p> <p>On recommendation 2, the Secretariat continues to work with countries and agencies to</p>	<p>predictable, adequate and sustainable financing of the LDCF.</p> <p>Rec. 2 Medium: It is encouraging that projects coming to the LDCF/SCCF Council for approval are expected to carry out a Gender Gap Analysis during project preparation prior to CEO Endorsement/ Approval and gender mainstreaming</p>

Ref #	Date of Council Decision	GEF IEO Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2016	GEF IEO Rating & Comments in MAR 2016	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2017	GEF IEO Rating & Comments in MAR 2017
		the Project Management Information System is up to date and accurate.			<p>Marrakesh Climate Change Conference on November 8, 2016 and at the 31st meeting of the LEG on March 7-10, 2017 in Bonn, Germany. The GEF Secretariat also continues to inform GEF Agencies and recipient countries upon request.</p> <p>With respect to GEAP, the GEF Secretariat</p>	<p>with this and the quality of the analysis. The issuance of guidance on the implementation of the gender mainstreaming policy would be helpful.</p> <p>Rec. 3 Negligible: While work is progressing on the upgrade of the GEF project management information system it has not resulted in a clear picture</p>	<p>ensure GEAP is referenced as a minimum criterion prior to technical clearance. All projects coming to the LDCF/SCCF Council for approval and expected to carry out a Gender Gap Analysis during project preparation and prior to the CEO Endorsement/ Approval.</p> <p>The Secretariat has been negotiating</p>	<p>is being discussed with countries within the context of the GEF Programming Strategy on Adaptation for the LDCF/SCCF for 2018 to 2022. The Secretariat should monitor compliance with the completion of a Gender Gap Analysis during project preparation.</p> <p>Rec. 3 Negligible:</p>

Ref #	Date of Council Decision	GEF IEO Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2016	GEF IEO Rating & Comments in MAR 2016	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2017	GEF IEO Rating & Comments in MAR 2017
					has ensured that any incoming funding requests under the LDCF explicitly reference the GEAP as a minimum criterion to be fulfilled before technical clearance. As a result, projects that were technically cleared in the period since the Council decision are expected to carry out a	of progress towards improving the quality of information. The IEO will continue to track adoption of this decision.	with donors and recipients the GEF Programming Strategy on Adaptation for the Least Developed Countries Fund and the Special Climate Change Fund for 2018 to 2022. Gender relevance and further mainstreaming are being discussed with countries within the context of the new strategy development, to be	While work is progressing on the upgrade of the GEF project management information system it has not resulted in a clear picture of progress towards improving the quality of information. The IEO will continue to track adoption of this decision.

Ref #	Date of Council Decision	GEF IEO Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2016	GEF IEO Rating & Comments in MAR 2016	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2017	GEF IEO Rating & Comments in MAR 2017
					<p>Gender Gap Analysis during project preparation, and prior to CEO Endorsement/ Approval.</p> <p>The Secretariat has further initiated work to correct, verify and update relevant LDCF project data as part of the overall upgrade of the GEF project management</p>		<p>discussed and adopted at the 24th LDCF/SCCF Council in June 2018.</p> <p>Recommendation 3 continues to be addressed within the overall upgrade of the ongoing GEF project management information systems.</p>	

Ref #	Date of Council Decision	GEF IEO Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2016	GEF IEO Rating & Comments in MAR 2016	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2017	GEF IEO Rating & Comments in MAR 2017
					information systems.			

Annex 1.f Council decision based on the Program Evaluation of the Special Climate Change Fund (GEF/LDCF.SCCF.22/ME/02)

Ref #	Date of Council Decision	GEF IEO Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2017	GEF IEO Rating & Comments in MAR 2017
6	May 25 th , 2017	<p>Recommendation 1: Reaffirming and strengthening a recommendation from the previous SCCF Program Evaluation in 2011, the GEF Secretariat should prioritize the development of mechanisms that ensure predictable, adequate and sustainable financing for the Fund, given its support for, and focus on innovation</p> <p>Recommendation 2: The GEF Secretariat should articulate and publicly communicate the SCCF's niche within the global adaptation finance landscape, to include</p>	<p>The Secretariat appreciates the findings of the report and notes the recommendation for the SCCF to focus on innovation. Based on the deliberations by the LDCF/SCCF Council and the endorsement of that finding, the GEF Secretariat will continue to articulate and publicly communicate the role of the SCCF externally. The Secretariat agrees with the GEF IEO that enhancing financial</p>	<p>The Council, having reviewed document GEF/LDCF.SCCF.22/ME/02, Program Evaluation of the Special Climate Change Fund and GEF/LDCF.SCCF.22/ME/03, Management Response to the Program Evaluation of the Special Climate Change Fund, takes note of the conclusions of the evaluation and endorses the recommendations taking into account the Management</p>	<p>Substantial</p> <p>As stated in the previous management response, the means to address the need for predictable, adequate, and sustainable financing falls within the purview of the donors as well as the LDCF/SCCF Council.</p> <p>The Secretariat has been negotiating with donors and recipients the GEF Programming Strategy on Adaptation for the</p>	<p>Medium</p> <p>Rec. 1 That elements of sustainable financing of the SCCF is being discussed with countries in the context of the Secretariat's negotiation of the GEF Programming Strategy on Adaptation for the LDCF/SCCF for 2018 to 2022 is welcome. The IEO encourages the Secretariat to develop a more systematic mechanism to promote the predictable, adequate and</p>

Ref #	Date of Council Decision	GEF IEO Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2017	GEF IEO Rating & Comments in MAR 2017
		<p>an explicit statement regarding the SCCF's relation with – and complementarity to – the Green Climate Fund.</p> <p>Recommendation 3: The GEF Secretariat should ensure that PMIS data is up to date and accurate.</p>	<p>predictability can improve the effectiveness of the SCCF. The Secretariat notes that the means to address this need falls within the purview of the donors of the fund. As part of the overall upgrade of the GEF project management information systems, the Secretariat will also endeavor to correct, verify and update the relevant SCCF project data.</p>		<p>Least Developed Countries Fund and the Special Climate Change Fund for 2018 to 2022. Elements referred to in IEO's recommendations 1 and 2 are being discussed with countries within the context of the new strategy development, to be discussed and adopted at the 24th LDCF/SCCF Council in June 2018.</p> <p>Recommendation 3 continues to be addressed within the overall upgrade of the ongoing GEF</p>	<p>sustainable financing of the SCCF.</p> <p>Rec. 2 The IEO acknowledges that elements of the SCCF's niche is being discussed with countries within the context of the GEF Programming Strategy on Adaptation for the LDCF/SCCF for 2018 to 2022. The IEO encourages the Secretariat to articulate and publicly communicate the SCCF's niche within the global adaptation finance landscape.</p>

Ref #	Date of Council Decision	GEF IEO Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2017	GEF IEO Rating & Comments in MAR 2017
					project management information systems.	<p>Rec. 3 While work is progressing on the upgrade of the GEF project management information system it has not resulted in a clear picture of progress towards improving the quality of information.</p> <p>The IEO will continue to track adoption of this decision.</p>

ANNEX 2. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE TRACKING IN MAR

Annex 2.a.: Recommendations for tracking in MAR2018

Ref #	Evaluation Title	SAER 2017 Recommendations
1	Chemicals and Waste Focal Area Study (GEF/ME/C.52/Inf.03)	Strategies for scaling up. More attention needs to be paid during project design and implementation to considering strategies for scaling up and particularly financial mechanisms to support private sector engagement and sustainability. The GEF cannot finance the collection and destruction of every ton of legacy POPs, nor cannot it fund the conversion of every industrial facility to cleaner production processes. A more robust theory of change is needed for how the GEF’s demonstration activities will catalyze broader action and impact in the CW focal area. This may involve the development of innovative private sector partnerships, economic instruments, and financial models, as envisioned in the GEF-6 CW Focal Area Strategy under Program 1; such efforts deserve continued support in GEF-7. In particular, as the GEF CW portfolio evolves and focus changes, attention should be paid to ensure that remaining legacy POPs are not orphaned, especially given that cost, ownership, and other barriers are diminishing the efficacy of the demonstration effect for these projects. Different solutions will likely be required for LDCs and SIDS versus middle income countries.
2	Chemicals and Waste Focal Area Study (GEF/ME/C.52/Inf.03)	Support for reforms. The GEF may also want to consider providing more support for broad-based regulatory reform and sector-wide approaches, to address chemicals and waste issues more holistically.

Ref #	Evaluation Title	SAER 2017 Recommendations
3	Chemicals and Waste Focal Area Study (GEF/ME/C.52/Inf.03)	The GEF should also not forget its ozone depletion program , which may have new relevance with the recent adoption of the Kigali Amendments to the Montreal Protocol. In the coming years, some CEITs may need support to meet these new obligations, and opportunities are likely to arise for MFA collaborations with the climate change focal area, especially on energy efficiency.
4	Chemicals and Waste Focal Area Study (GEF/ME/C.52/Inf.03)	Better monitoring practices. Given the challenges this study faced in tallying the verified results of the GEF CW focal area, the GEF’s monitoring procedures deserve more scrutiny. Tracking tools should be consistently submitted and clearly identified as annual or terminal submissions, and terminal results reported by indicator should match values in the terminal evaluation. Project proposals should consistently incorporate resources designated for monitoring and evaluation (M&E).
5	Chemicals and Waste Focal Area Study (GEF/ME/C.52/Inf.03)	Communications among the GEF partnership organizations is an area for continued attention. Given an evolving and expanding landscape of opportunities, it is important that all aspects of communication are transparent and collaborative and that country perspectives drive the process. To facilitate the process, a more structured set of partnership planning meetings that fosters ongoing dialogue on resource availability over the replenishment period, focus or priority among strategic objectives and program areas, and transparency of the project pipeline process would be helpful in reducing pockets of confusion.
6	Climate Change Focal Area Study (GEF/ME/C.53/Inf.02)	The GEF should place continued emphasis on its work on the enabling environment, and innovative projects in climate change mitigation to support market transformation. The GEF should continue to focus on piloting and demonstrating technologies and financial approaches that could be scaled up by other actors. The GEF should explore its potential to be an incubator for countries to test and refine their approaches prior to seeking large-scale finance through other partners. These are areas where the GEF has shown strong results and a comparative advantage. The GEF should also continue to emphasize

Ref #	Evaluation Title	SAER 2017 Recommendations
		innovative and cutting edge projects in its LDCF, and SCCF portfolios, to advance climate change adaptation knowledge and practice.
7	Climate Change Focal Area Study (GEF/ME/C.53/Inf.02)	The GEF Secretariat should take measures to ensure reporting against GEB targets. To understand what past results have been achieved, the GEF Secretariat and the Agencies should ensure post-completion reporting against GEB targets, specifically GHG emissions mitigated.
8	Evaluation of Gender Mainstreaming in the GEF (GEF/ME/C.52/Inf.09)	The GEF Secretariat should consider a revision of its policy to better align with best practice standards. As a financial mechanism for five major international environmental conventions and a partnership of 18 agencies, this should include anchoring the policy in the gender-related decisions of the conventions and best practice standards from the GEF Agencies. In the revisions of the policy, the GEF Secretariat should take into account that policies rooted in rights-based frameworks result in more effective gender mainstreaming. Given the effectiveness of the GEF Gender Partnership, the GEF Secretariat should consider the partnership as the vehicle for stakeholder engagement in the updating of its policy. Lastly, the policy should provide greater guidance on gender analysis, and on the responsibilities of the GEF Agencies vis-à-vis the GEF Secretariat.

Ref #	Evaluation Title	SAER 2017 Recommendations
9	Evaluation of Gender Mainstreaming in the GEF (GEF/ME/C.52/Inf.09)	<p>The GEF Secretariat with its partners should develop an action plan for implementation of the gender policy in GEF-7. An appropriate gender action plan should support the implementation of the potentially revised policy on Gender Mainstreaming, and should include continued focus on developing and finalizing comprehensive guidelines, tools and methods. This should be done in collaboration with the GEF Gender Partnership, drawing on the knowledge and best practice standards of GEF Agencies, other climate funds, the secretariats of relevant conventions and other partners. Upstream analytical work on the associated links between gender equality and project performance across GEF programmatic areas would support mainstreaming.</p>
10	Evaluation of Gender Mainstreaming in the GEF (GEF/ME/C.52/Inf.09)	<p>To achieve the objectives of institutional strengthening and gender mainstreaming the GEF Secretariat should ensure that adequate resources are made available. During GEF-7 institutional capacity within the Secretariat and its staff on gender mainstreaming will need strengthening, and resources within the agencies which have strong institutional gender focus and expertise should be leveraged.</p>
11	Evaluation of Programmatic Approaches in the GEF (GEF/ME/C.52/Inf.01/Rev.01)	<p>The GEF should continue ensuring that programs are relevant to the national environmental priorities of the participating countries while meeting the requirements of the Conventions;</p>
12	Evaluation of Programmatic Approaches in the GEF (GEF/ME/C.52/Inf.01/Rev.01)	<p>M&E should be implemented at the program levels, with a clear demonstration of the additionality of the program over projects.</p>

Ref #	Evaluation Title	SAER 2017 Recommendations
13	Evaluation of Programmatic Approaches in the GEF (GEF/ME/C.52/Inf.01/Rev.01)	The GEF should continue with appropriate programmatic interventions, addressing issues that are likely to impede outcomes and performance, efficiency, and management, as they become multidimensional;
14	Evaluation of the Integrated Approach Pilots (GEF/ME/C.53/Inf.04)	Assess the value addition of the knowledge platforms in a mid-term review to ensure they generate the necessary traction and provide overall support to program implementation. For many interviewed stakeholders, the most important innovative feature in the IAPs is the hub project-supported knowledge platforms. The platforms are viewed as a forum for learning about innovations, exchange ideas and to showcase child projects. The knowledge platforms will require a strong commitment and support by all participating entities to provide the services and benefits they have been designed for. Their contribution towards overall program objectives should be assessed, to ensure they generate the envisioned additionality and support to program implementation.
15	Evaluation of the Integrated Approach Pilots (GEF/ME/C.53/Inf.04)	Standardize the indicators, tracking tools and metrics across the IAPs to demonstrate program additionality through M&E. Indicators, tracking tools and metrics should be made uniform to enable aggregation within each IAP and for the three IAPs altogether. This should be done to clearly demonstrate the additionality brought by these pilot initiatives.
16	Evaluation of the Integrated Approach Pilots (GEF/ME/C.53/Inf.04)	Assess the role of global environmental benefit (GEB) targets, clarifying whether they are meant as aspirational goals, or as hard targets, and they will be measured at the program level. A mid-term review of the IAPs should take place to assess issues of additionality, effectiveness and efficiency at the mid-term stage of the IAP programs. Given a lack of clarity as to whether GEB targets are aspirational or hard targets, the review should clarify the role of GEB targets, and explain how the GEF aims to assess GEB goals at the program level.

Ref #	Evaluation Title	SAER 2017 Recommendations
17	Evaluation of the Multiple Benefits of GEF 's Multifocal Area (MFA) Portfolio (GEF/ME/C.53/Inf.05)	<p>Identify conditions appropriate for the implementation of MFA projects at the project design and review stage. MFA projects are not required to be integrated, or to seek synergies and mitigate trade-offs. However, projects successful at enhancing synergies and mitigating trade-offs have common conditions and characteristics that have enabled them to maximize the benefits of having multiple focal area objectives. GEF agencies must ensure that the environmental issues and management approaches targeted by MFA projects allow for such synergies while managing the higher transaction costs. Existing capacities and institutional arrangements for sectoral integration at the corporate and country levels should be assessed as part of the MFA project design and approval process. Opportunities for good stakeholder engagement, partnerships to leverage resources from multiple sectors, and integration in project interventions, should be considered in this assessment.</p>
18	Evaluation of the Multiple Benefits of GEF 's Multifocal Area (MFA) Portfolio (GEF/ME/C.53/Inf.05)	<p>Streamline and enhance monitoring and reporting of MFA projects, including their synergies and trade-offs. Although attempts have been made at the program level to remove repetitive and irrelevant indicators from the tracking tools, streamlining of monitoring and reporting tools in MFA projects is needed at the institutional level. Project monitoring tools should also measure and report the synergies generated and trade-offs mitigated.</p>
19	Evaluation of the Multiple Benefits of GEF 's Multifocal Area (MFA) Portfolio (GEF/ME/C.53/Inf.05)	<p>Develop shared guidance on the conditions for designing, reviewing, and implementing MFA projects across the GEF partnership. While strategic priorities have been developed for each focal area, none specify how and which focal area synergies might best contribute to the GEF's vision. As a starting point, members of the GEF partnership need to continue developing a common understanding of key concepts, such as "multiple benefits," "synergies," "trade-offs," and "integration" with the involvement of STAP. Building on the findings of this evaluation, the GEF should develop guidance on the conditions under which MFA projects should be designed and implemented, to enhance synergies across focal areas. Minimum criteria or standards for MFA project design and monitoring would ensure that the benefits of focal area integration are maximized, while transaction costs at the corporate and country levels are managed.</p>

Ref #	Evaluation Title	SAER 2017 Recommendations
20	Impact of GEF Support on National Environment Laws and Policies (GEF/ME/C.52/Inf.05)	Strengthen plans for legal and policy reforms presented in project documents. GEF plays a very important role in the environmental policy and regulatory reform agenda in client countries. When reforms are contemplated, GEF should ensure that project documents clearly differentiate among policies, statutes, regulations, and administrative directives. If a specific environmental law is identified, the document should describe how it fits into the government's legislative/regulatory agenda with specific details on the extent of support from key stakeholders, including government officials, parties directly affected, and the general population.
21	Impact of GEF Support on National Environment Laws and Policies (GEF/ME/C.52/Inf.05)	Develop and implement projects or specific program components that focus solely on legal and/or policy reforms. Rather than embedding work on legal reforms in a component of a project, GEF should consider structuring some entire projects around advancing a specific set of legal reforms, particularly in countries with limited institutional capacity. This should focus on putting laws in place that are needed to meet goals defined in international conventions for which GEF serves as the designated financing mechanism. As GEF seeks to achieve more transformational change through its programmatic approaches, and mainstream private sector engagement, the role of policy reform will become even more important.
22	Impact of GEF Support on National Environment Laws and Policies (GEF/ME/C.52/Inf.05)	Improve M&E and learning from the reform process. GEF should consider modifying the PMIS to enable projects components that deal with legal reforms to be identified and tracked in the system. Evaluations should be more rigorous, including an assessment of project activities undertaken to advance legal reforms, resulting changes in the content and wording of laws, and the extent to which laws achieved stated aims. Thus, follow up on implementation should be carried out two to three years after project closure to assess the impacts and document lessons learned.
23	Land Degradation Focal Area Study (GEF/ME/C.52/Inf.02)	Implementing LDN with an appropriate mix of interventions. While being cognizant of cost-effectiveness, context, and country priorities, LDFA should also consider restoration activities along with SLM. SLM practices are intended to help avoid and reduce land degradation while ecosystem restoration will help reverse the process. Newer projects in GEF-6 increasingly focus on achieving LDN targets and therefore would benefit from

Ref #	Evaluation Title	SAER 2017 Recommendations
		distinguishing between the two complementary pathways—SLM, and ecosystem restoration, to be able to measure progress toward the LDN targets.
24	Land Degradation Focal Area Study (GEF/ME/C.52/Inf.02)	Give due consideration to complex contextual factors within an integrated approach framework. While LDFA’s strategic focus has appropriately moved toward integrated approaches, complex contextual factors including drought, food insecurity and migration should be given due consideration during project design. The LDFA is highly relevant to areas with land degradation, including Africa, particularly with its distressed emigration hotspots. While neither land degradation nor drought are the primary drivers, they increase food insecurity and vulnerability and therefore may exacerbate the risk of conflict or migration
25	Land Degradation Focal Area Study (GEF/ME/C.52/Inf.02)	Assess climate risks to LDFA initiatives and design adaptive management responses to such risks. Unsustainable land management practices which the GEF LDFA strategies aim to ameliorate, have a direct and clear linkage to climate change. The effects of climate change are likely to affect many land-based activities including ecosystem functions and services. Broader application of the RAPTA framework is encouraged.
26	Land Degradation Focal Area Study (GEF/ME/C.52/Inf.02)	Strengthen M&E tools, and methods of knowledge dissemination. The development and continued improvement of the tracking tool is a step in the right direction but will be inadequate to assess project impacts in the long run. The tracking tools should include additional biophysical indicators, increasingly available through geospatial data, to set baselines and measure progress of land productivity to track both GEB’s and LDN targets. Precise geospatial information on project locations is imperative for carrying out accurate M&E of LD projects. The LDFA should consider integrating the indicators proposed by the UNCCD's Land Degradation Neutrality (LDN) framework. The benefits and impacts of sustained SLM practices and restoration measures are not fully accounted for in the current M&E system. Recognition therefore should be given to the fact that it might be

Ref #	Evaluation Title	SAER 2017 Recommendations
		necessary to set a sufficiently longer time frame in monitoring projects striving to achieve LDN.
27	Private Sector (GEF/ME/C.52/Inf.04)	The GEF can address operational restrictions to private sector engagement through pursuit of a private sector window.
28	Private Sector (GEF/ME/C.52/Inf.04)	The GEF should encourage policy and regulatory reform for its cascade effect on private sector environmental investments.
29	Private Sector (GEF/ME/C.52/Inf.04)	Intensify efforts to develop a broader strategy for private sector engagement beyond climate change.
30	Private Sector (GEF/ME/C.52/Inf.04)	Improve outreach to GEF recipients of funds, GEF Agencies, and private sector entities.

Ref #	Evaluation Title	SAER 2017 Recommendations
31	Private Sector (GEF/ME/C.52/Inf.04)	Dedicate appropriate resources to tracking, monitoring, and evaluation of the private sector portfolio by improving tagging and retrieval capabilities of the PMIS database.
32	Review of GEF's Engagement with Indigenous Peoples (GEF/ME/C.53/Inf.07)	Establish and strengthen dedicated funding opportunities for indigenous peoples' projects/organizations. Indigenous peoples remain limited as beneficiaries in the support they receive from GEF. To date, support has come primarily through the SGP which, by design, is limited in scale and scope. Dedicated funding outside STAR would address the systemic challenges and operational constraints to increased indigenous peoples' engagement. Simultaneously, strengthening the SGP and other GEF project oriented grant mechanisms, such as the Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund, or creating incentives to engage IPLCs could also help improve access.
33	Review of GEF's Engagement with Indigenous Peoples (GEF/ME/C.53/Inf.07)	Update relevant Policies and Guidelines to reflect best practice standards concerning indigenous peoples, including a rights-based approach to engagement. Internationally, safeguard norms regarding Indigenous Peoples have changed. This manifests in a number of GEF Agency standards that have emerged since 2012. To remain at the leading edge and continue to serve the field of practice with advanced thinking about how best to safeguard the rights of indigenous peoples, a recalibration is required. Attention should be given to provisions related to the right to self-determination and to free, prior and informed consent (FPIC) as they pertain to consultations with indigenous peoples concerning GEF projects.
34	Review of GEF's Engagement with Indigenous Peoples (GEF/ME/C.53/Inf.07)	Review the Indigenous Peoples' Advisory Group's role for operational constraints. IPAG is unequivocally viewed as an important and advantageous body to guide GEF's decision making and engagement with indigenous people. To increase its effectiveness, GEF should undertake several steps including a review of succession planning and "on-boarding" for IPAG members to preserve knowledge of outgoing members and to orient new ones, and a review of the existing scope/limitations of the IPAG's mandate and its relationship with the Indigenous Peoples Focal Points (IPFP) embedded within the CSO Network. GEF should

Ref #	Evaluation Title	SAER 2017 Recommendations
		clarify IPAG's communication/engagement role for more formal contacts with regional and global networks of indigenous peoples; consider an increase in the staff time and resources allocated by the GEFSEC IP focal point to IPAG activities; translation requirements for relevant documents such that IPAG is able to engage in English, French, Spanish
35	Review of GEF's Engagement with Indigenous Peoples (GEF/ME/C.53/Inf.07)	Facilitate dialogue between indigenous peoples and local communities and GEF Government Focal Points. One of the major hurdles for greater engagement of indigenous peoples in GEF projects is acceptance by national governments in some of the countries that GEF operates. The GEF through its relationships with national governments can help to increase prominence of indigenous peoples' activities and encourage mainstreaming of IP issues into environmental programming. In this regard, GEF should seek opportunities for a higher profile of indigenous peoples in GEF projects and a higher profile at GEF events such as Extended Constituency Workshops and Council meetings.
36	Review of GEF's Engagement with Indigenous Peoples (GEF/ME/C.53/Inf.07)	Monitor application of Minimum Standard 4 and Indigenous Peoples' portfolio. A greater flow of information should come from tracking the environmental and social risks of the GEF portfolio. Currently there is no requirement that Agencies report on compliance with safeguards, leaving the GEF portfolio vulnerable. Agencies should inform GEF of the safeguard risk categorization assigned to projects involving indigenous peoples and keep GEF informed of safeguards implementation issues through monitoring and reporting. Similarly, projects need to be tagged to allow for systematic retrieval. As part of the tagging, further definition within the GEF of what is considered indigenous peoples' engagement should ensue. Finally, GEF could encourage Agencies to use mid-term and terminal evaluation templates that capture indigenous peoples' engagement and results.
37	Review of Knowledge Management (KM) in the GEF (GEF/ME/C.53/Inf.08)	The GEF Secretariat should place a high priority on improving the quality and the availability of project-level documentation from a KM perspective, including lessons learned during design and implementation. To ensure minimum standards of consistency in KM across GEF agencies and projects, clear guidance should be provided to Agencies on, for example, the typology of knowledge products to be generated during and after project implementation, and the capture and storage of such information. As the PMIS is currently

Ref #	Evaluation Title	SAER 2017 Recommendations
		under revision, efforts should be made to ensure that it becomes the key platform for storing and sharing project-level documentation throughout the project lifecycle. The revisions to this platform should be made in consultation with the GEF Agencies and other parts of the partnership to ensure access for GEF Agencies, project and program staff and countries. The platform should facilitate easy uploading, downloading, and analysis of project and program documents from design through supervision and finally completion.
38	Review of Knowledge Management (KM) in the GEF (GEF/ME/C.53/Inf.08)	The GEF Secretariat and the KM Advisory Group, should develop a plan to connect across GEF Agency KM systems, generate knowledge products and organize learning activities across focal areas, agencies and cross cutting themes. The partnership would benefit from a clear work plan on learning activities and knowledge products to be generated within and across focal areas in collaboration with GEF agencies, along with a proposed resource envelope and enhanced internal capacity. Ideally these products would draw on lessons from across the partnership, including from agencies, STAP, Conventions and countries, and would support strategic decision making and planning at the portfolio and corporate levels. Mechanisms to disseminate and share such knowledge products should also be clearly articulated in the plan.
39	Review of Results-Based Management in the GEF (GEF/ME/C.52/Inf.07)	Update the GEF RBM Framework. The GEF RBM framework of 2007 needs to be updated to reflect the evolved understanding of RBM across the GEF Partnership. During GEF-6, the focus has been on inputs, outputs and in some cases outcomes of GEF activities. The updated framework needs to address the indicators for drivers of environmental degradation and long term impacts of GEF activities so that these are also tracked systematically. GEF should also incorporate the relevant SDG indicators in its results framework for GEF-7 (and beyond).
40	Review of Results-Based Management in the GEF (GEF/ME/C.52/Inf.07)	Upgrade the PMIS to facilitate reporting on achievement of targets. Reporting on results also needs to give adequate attention to past results. Given that GEF-4 and GEF-5 Programming Directions documents had specified targets for those replenishment periods, there is a case for reporting on the actual achievement of these targets. It may be the case that past gaps in the submission of tracking tools, availability of tracking tool data, and data quality, is a constraint. Therefore, it is imperative that measures are put in place to

Ref #	Evaluation Title	SAER 2017 Recommendations
		ensure that these bottlenecks are mitigated. Upgrading of the PMIS has been delayed by several years; this upgrade needs to be completed with urgency.
41	Review of Results-Based Management in the GEF (GEF/ME/C.52/Inf.07)	Address the shortcomings of the focal area tracking tools. GEF needs to rethink the approach to tracking tools for the biodiversity and multiple focal area projects. Although streamlining of the biodiversity tracking tools may be challenging, GEF may consider alternatives such as tracking changes in the protected areas through GIS and remote sensing based tools, coupled with targeted learning missions. Streamlining of the approach to tracking results of the multifocal projects was recommended by OPS-5 and by the GEF-6 Policy Recommendations. However, no direct progress has been made on this front. Given that multifocal projects have emerged as an important modality, the burden for tracking of the results needs to be rationalized.

Ref #	Evaluation Title	SAER 2017 Recommendations
42	Review of the GEF Policy on Minimum Standards on Environmental and Social Safeguards (GEF/ME/C.52/Inf.08)	<p>Review the GEF Minimum Standards. While the key requirements of the GEF safeguards remain relevant and aligned with international good safeguards practice, a high-level comparative review identified a range of gaps in thematic coverage in the GEF Minimum Standards that appear germane for the types of environmental and social risks present in the GEF portfolio. A review and potential update of the GEF Minimum Standards may be warranted. A phased, collaborative review process could be undertaken, with more targeted analyses of potential gap areas. A potential revision process would need to strike a proper balance between addressing relevant policy gaps in the GEF Standards while avoiding such extensive changes that would require wholesale revisions to often newly adopted safeguard frameworks of many GEF Agencies. Avenues for minimizing costs of a review and potential update would need to be identified.</p>
43	Review of the GEF Policy on Minimum Standards on Environmental and Social Safeguards (GEF/ME/C.52/Inf.08)	<p>Improve safeguards monitoring and reporting. GEF should consider tracking social and environmental risks at the portfolio-level and ensuring a “flow-through” of monitoring information on safeguards implementation. Agencies should inform GEF of the safeguards risk categorization assigned to projects/programs and keep GEF informed of safeguards implementation issues through monitoring and reporting. Where available, this should ideally build off Agency systems rather than duplicating them. GEF could issue guidance regarding safeguards-related reporting in annual reporting and project/program evaluations. Increased GEF attention of safeguards implementation reporting may support and strengthen relatively new safeguards systems among some GEF Agencies and promote greater consistency.</p>

Ref #	Evaluation Title	SAER 2017 Recommendations
44	Review of the GEF Policy on Minimum Standards on Environmental and Social Safeguards (GEF/ME/C.52/Inf.08)	<p>Support capacity development, expert convening, and communications. The expanded GEF Partnership encompasses Agencies with widely diverse levels of safeguards experience and institutional capacity. Expanded networking, knowledge sharing, and expert convening may be beneficial. A number of GEF Agencies would welcome increased opportunities for knowledge sharing and capacity support regarding key challenges in addressing certain safeguard issues. GEF could seek opportunities to gain from existing international safeguard networks (not ‘recreating the wheel’) and leverage the significant safeguards expertise across the GEF Partnership. GEF and GEF Agencies could convene safeguard focused workshops during Expanded Constituency Workshops or other GEF events. GEF could also consider how best to communicate GEF’s policy requirements, including the GEF Minimum Standards, with country partners to further build a shared understanding on the need for effective safeguards implementation.</p>
45	Review of the System for Transparent Allocation of Resources (STAR) (GEF/ME/C.53/Inf.10)	<p>GEF Secretariat should develop clear protocols and quality checks on calculations. In line with the GEF-5 Mid-Term Review of STAR, the GEF Secretariat has made efforts to minimize errors in the STAR calculations. As STAR databases and equations continue to become increasingly complex, the GEF Secretariat should ensure that quality-control protocols are developed and risks to mistakes in calculations are minimized.</p>

Annex 2.b.: Recommendations for tracking in MAR2019

Ref #	Evaluation Title	SAER 2017 Recommendations
1	Biodiversity Focal Area Study (GEF/ME/C.53/Inf.03)	<p>Address practical sustainability questions more directly. The goal of project sustainability – nationally sustainable governmental ABS frameworks and the capacity to implement them domestically- relies on attention to the key factors directing national support. It will be essential for national government legislators to recognize the need of a budget allocation to run the processes associated with the implementation of the Nagoya Protocol. Monetary and non-monetary benefits accrued by private or public entities could be supporting activities not associated with the administrative process, including technology transfer and public awareness. Notable progress toward proving sustainability in this way has been achieved in some projects which are focusing on direct development of national capacities to utilize and add value to domestic Genetic Resources (GR) and ATK. This approach can be effectively scaled to each country’s needs and capabilities, and to building on that country’s capacities. Project designs should include plans for future sustainability.</p>
2	Biodiversity Focal Area Study (GEF/ME/C.53/Inf.03)	<p>Focus on technical and professional capacity-building in addition to increasing general and generic awareness. The building of “true” capacity, within the relevant governments and participating users at technical and professional levels needs to be sufficient that those parties will rarely need to seek further external assistance. In this connection, it is necessary to ensure that activities reach the intended audience in a form and at a level that they can absorb and use; that designated “capacity-building” activities do not ultimately become generic awareness raising; and that, where awareness raising is conducted, it is carefully targeted to address present needs with regard to project sustainability (parliamentary and minister-levels), and project activities (specific communities involved in the project) The above-mentioned trend in building national capacity to directly utilize domestic GR and ATK clearly points the way in this recommendation as well.</p>

Ref #	Evaluation Title	SAER 2017 Recommendations
3	Biodiversity Focal Area Study (GEF/ME/C.53/Inf.03)	<p>Adopt a tailored country-specific approach in projects. Interventions and the timing for their implementation should be tailored to be consistent with the national importance, relevance and capacities for ABS. The inclusion of too many interventions into a single project could undermine or minimize the long-term value of premature work done on interventions that are required at a later stage.</p>
4	Biodiversity Focal Area Study (GEF/ME/C.53/Inf.03)	<p>Maximize the earliest possible availability of project lessons, experiences and outputs. Evaluation planning and implementation should place greater emphasis on earlier evaluation components, such as, for example, reviewing and challenging PIRs and other internally developed reports more closely, providing clearer reporting/data standards, and calling for and executing externally conducted mid-term reviews more often. Such timely collected information made more readily available, as soon as possible, as a guide for other projects and future project design. Where possible, project outputs should be accessible, to maximize the body of ABS related technical information available.</p>
5	Biodiversity Focal Area Study (GEF/ME/C.53/Inf.03)	<p>The GEF has an important role to play in combating illegal wildlife trade, and the ongoing illegal wildlife trade crisis warrants scaling up of GEF’s work. Given the scale of the problem, additional efforts are required to combat illegal wildlife trade. As an intergovernmental organization with an established track record in addressing a range of biodiversity-related issues, the GEF has distinct advantages. With its mandate and expertise, it brings together multilateral agencies and national governments to develop and implement effective programs on the ground. Scaling up the GEF’s work requires increased funding under the GEF-7 replenishment cycle and a sharper focus on illegal wildlife trade.</p>
6	Biodiversity Focal Area Study (GEF/ME/C.53/Inf.03)	<p>Further integration of bottom-up, country-driven approaches with top-down, strategic approaches is necessary. Such integration is essential to both developing effective IWT programming and maintaining ownership and buy-in of individual countries in their projects. Adjustments to the funding mechanism for GEF IWT activities could facilitate integration of these approaches. Rather than relying solely on STAR allocation funding as under GEF-6—with the exception of funding under the global coordination grant it would be desirable to support the</p>

Ref #	Evaluation Title	SAER 2017 Recommendations
		<p>program with non-STAR funds to carry-out activities in transit- and demand- countries where investing GEF resources may not accrue Global Environmental Benefits for the participating countries. Additional non-STAR resources would benefit activities across international borders in supply countries where STAR funding may not be sufficient to cover both the domestic as well as trans-boundary activities. Private sector funding could be leveraged to address wildlife trafficking and demand issues.</p>
7	<p>Biodiversity Focal Area Study (GEF/ME/C.53/Inf.03)</p>	<p>With respect to the scope of the GEF’s illegal wildlife trade funding, there should be a strategic expansion to other species, countries, and regions. Specifically, the program should expand to cover Latin America and the Caribbean, which pose particular issues with respect to the pet trade. To protect biodiversity more broadly, it would also be beneficial to expand strategically to cover other wildlife, moving beyond elephants, rhinos, and big cats.</p>
8	<p>Biodiversity Focal Area Study (GEF/ME/C.53/Inf.03)</p>	<p>In addition to country-led national projects, stronger regional and global programming is important. Projects at both scales—country-specific projects and those at a broader scale—are important to the success of the program. Because illegal wildlife trade is ultimately an international issue, the program can be more cohesive if cross-border connections are designed as a core part of the program. This could be achieved by supporting activities across international borders with non-STAR resources. In addition, the GEF ought to consider how to engage other countries that are not yet participants in the Global Wildlife Program but are part of the larger system of illegal wildlife trade—whether they are eligible GEF recipients, like China, or non-recipients, like the United States, Europe, or Japan. The communication initiated with major international donors and their agencies should continue.</p>

Ref #	Evaluation Title	SAER 2017 Recommendations
9	Biodiversity Focal Area Study (GEF/ME/C.53/Inf.03)	<p>Political will and corruption should be explicitly and directly addressed in all IWT projects. A robust and coordinated focus on political will and corruption will ultimately help achieve the increases in arrests, prosecutions, and convictions that the GEF-6 Biodiversity Strategy prescribes. Participating countries in future GEF funded projects on poaching and illegal wildlife trade, should be encouraged to invest some financial resources in addressing corruption issues. An alternative would be for the GEF to support third parties like the International Consortium on Combating Wildlife Crime (ICWC) to engage with countries to pursue this part of the agenda as is being done in some countries.</p>
10	Biodiversity Focal Area Study (GEF/ME/C.53/Inf.03)	<p>Continue to use the simplified but relevant measures for tracking overall Program performance while reflecting the uniqueness of child projects. As is the GWP tracking tools are used, the GEF should continue to assess that experience to ensure that it matches the current expectations regarding its benefits. The lessons that emerge should then be integrated into the tracking tool and evaluation frameworks going forward. Monitoring and evaluation of all IWT projects should include the tracking of arrests, prosecutions, convictions, and penalties as appropriate. Collecting data for these sub-indicators for all projects would enable a more thorough assessment of the effectiveness of the projects, as well as the impact of corruption and political will on efforts to combat IWT. Doing so would contribute to realizing the priority set under Program 3 of the GEF-6 Biodiversity Strategy of increasing arrest and conviction rates for poaching of threatened species.</p>
11	Biodiversity Focal Area Study (GEF/ME/C.53/Inf.03)	<p>Create links between other international activities regarding demand and GEF-supported efforts. As with trafficking, it important to acknowledge a critical portion of the supply chain with respect to demand occurs in the United States and in Europe, which are not eligible GEF recipients. While this problem is, in part, outside of the scope of the GEF's activities, it must be acknowledged in working to solve this global problem on a global scale. In addition, the GEF can foster linked between demand countries and GEF-eligible countries, such as the partnership created between Mozambique and Vietnam regarding illegal wildlife trade.</p>

Ref #	Evaluation Title	SAER 2017 Recommendations
12	Biodiversity Focal Area Study (GEF/ME/C.53/Inf.03)	Sustainability of knowledge sharing components needs to be established. The knowledge sharing components of the Global Wildlife Program will facilitate the Program's further evolution. Fostering connections between experts and in-country staff, in addition to the relationships with the implementing agency technical staff, will enable the continual improvement of the programs at the ground level. The connections between countries fostered by these coordinating and knowledge sharing activities run by the WB with the coordination grant, can also facilitate the development of projects to combat illegal wildlife trade that reach across borders.
13	Review of GEF Support for Transformational Change (GEF/ME/C.52/Inf.06)	The GEF should consider developing and applying a framework for ex- ante assessments of projects or programs that are intended to be transformational to enhance impacts. This study has presented an example of a framework that could be applied.