



Independent  
Evaluation Office  
GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT FACILITY

Enhancing global environmental benefits  
through excellence in evaluation





Independent  
Evaluation Office  
GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT FACILITY





Independent  
Evaluation Office  
GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT FACILITY

# Update on the Sixth Comprehensive Evaluation of the GEF (OPS6)



# OPS6 Update

- 1 Context
- 2 Performance and Impact
- 3 Policies and Institutional Issues
- 4 Financing, Governance and Partnership





Independent  
Evaluation Office  
GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT FACILITY

# SECTION 1

# Context



Completed (17/29)

March

April

May

June

July

August

September

## Focal Area Studies

International waters

Chemicals and waste

- Land degradation
  - Climate change
  - Biodiversity

## Mainstreaming / Cross cutting

Joint GEF-UNDP

Evaluation of the Small  
Grants Programme

- The GEF Non-grant Instrument
- GEF Engagement with the Private Sector
- Evaluation of the Gender Mainstreaming Policy
- Review of the GEF Agency Minimum Standards on Environmental and Social Safeguards
  - Review of the Indigenous Peoples Policy
  - Review of the Resource Allocation System STAR



Completed (17/29)

March

April

May

June

July

August

September

## Performance and Impacts

Trends in Performance (replacing APR 2017)

A Value for Money Analysis of GEF Interventions in Land Degradation and Biodiversity

Measuring Environmental Outcomes Using Remote Sensing and Geospatial Methods

Program Evaluation of the Least Developed Countries Fund

Impact Evaluation of GEF Support to Protected Areas and Protected Area Systems

Impact of GEF Support on National Environmental Laws and Policies in Selected Countries

● Transformational Engagements

● Program Evaluation of the Special Climate Change Fund

● Evaluation of Programmatic Approaches in the GEF

● Project-Level Accomplishments/  
Progress toward Impact

● Evaluation of Integrated Approach Pilots

● Evaluation of the Illegal Wildlife Trade Program Study

● Evaluation of the Multiple Benefits of GEF Support through Its Multifocal Area Portfolio



Completed (17/29)

March

April

May

June

July

August

September

## Institutional Issues

Evaluation of the  
Expansion of the GEF  
Partnership

● Review of the GEF Approach to Results-Based Management

● GEF6 Strategy, Global Relevance

Evaluation of the GEF  
CSO Network

● Evaluation of the Knowledge Management System

● Review of the Comparative  
Advantage, Financing, and  
Governance of the GEF Partnership

## OPS6

● Early findings

● Full OPS6 report



# OPS6 Evaluation Briefs



Evaluation of Programmatic Approaches in the GEF - Brief



Climate Change Focal Area Study - Brief



Impact Evaluation of GEF Support to Protected Areas and Protected Area Systems - Brief



Review of the GEF Approach to Results-Based Management - Brief



Sixth Comprehensive Evaluation of the GEF: Update and Synthesis - Brief



Review of the Comparative Advantage, Financing, and Governance of the GEF Partnership - Brief



Evaluation of the GEF - Civil Society Organization (CSO) Network - Brief



Joint GEF-UNDP Evaluation of the Small Grants Programme (SGP) - Brief



Evaluation of the Multiple Benefits of GEF Support - Brief



The GEF Nongrant Instrument - Brief



A Value for Money Analysis of GEF Interventions in Land Degradation and Biodiversity - Brief



Land Degradation Focal Area (LDFA) Study - Brief



GEF Engagement with the Private Sector - Brief



Measuring Environmental Outcomes Using Remote Sensing and Geospatial Methods - Brief



Project-Level Accomplishments - Brief



Program Evaluation of the Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF) - Brief



International Waters Focal Area Study 2016 - Brief



Program Evaluation of the Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF) - Brief



Review of the GEF Agency Minimum Standards on Environmental and Social Safeguards - Brief



Chemicals and Waste (CW) Focal Area Study - Brief



Evaluation of the Expansion of the GEF Partnership - Brief



Transformational Engagements - Brief



Impact of GEF Support on National Environmental Laws and Policies in Selected Countries - Brief

GEF IEO website  
23 briefs



[illegible]

**Terminal evaluations for all GEF countries**  
Site visits to 41 countries

A world map with a light gray background. Countries are outlined in black. Countries that are members of the Global Environment Facility (GEF) are highlighted in a solid red color. These include Mexico, Central American countries (Guatemala, El Salvador, Honduras, Nicaragua, Costa Rica, Panama), Caribbean countries (Cuba, Haiti, Dominican Republic, Jamaica, Trinidad and Tobago, Guyana, Suriname, French Guiana), South American countries (Venezuela, Colombia, Ecuador, Peru, Bolivia, Paraguay, Uruguay, Argentina, Chile, Brazil), and African countries (Libya, Tunisia, Algeria, Mauritania, Mali, Niger, Chad, Sudan, Ethiopia, Eritrea, Djibouti, Somalia, Kenya, Uganda, Rwanda, Burundi, Tanzania, Zambia, Zimbabwe, Botswana, Namibia, South Africa, Mozambique, Swaziland, Lesotho, Madagascar, Mauritius, Seychelles, Comoros, Reunion, Mayotte, French Polynesia, New Caledonia, Wallis and Futuna, Tokelau, Marshall Islands, Micronesia, Palau, Nauru, Kiribati, Tuvalu, Samoa, Tonga, Vanuatu, Solomon Islands, Papua New Guinea, Timor-Leste, Indonesia, Malaysia, Brunei, Philippines, Thailand, Laos, Cambodia, Vietnam, Myanmar, Bangladesh, India, Pakistan, Afghanistan, Tajikistan, Uzbekistan, Turkmenistan, Kyrgyzstan, Georgia, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Republic of Moldova, Ukraine, Belarus, Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, Poland, Czech Republic, Slovakia, Hungary, Romania, Bulgaria, Greece, Turkey, Cyprus, Israel, Jordan, Iraq, Kuwait, Saudi Arabia, Yemen, Oman, United Arab Emirates, Qatar, Bahrain, Oman, Iran, and Australia.



# GEF relevance



**United Nations**  
Framework Convention on  
Climate Change



**Convention on**  
Biological Diversity



**United Nations**  
Convention to Combat  
Desertification



**Evolution of the focal  
areas strategies**



**Commitment to the  
mandate alongside  
innovation**



**Spread across  
countries and  
sectors**



**Responsiveness to  
convention  
secretariats**



## SURVEY RESULTS

# Comparative advantages of the GEF



Broad coverage of  
environmental issues



Alignment with MEAs  
and conventions





## SURVEY RESULTS

# Comparative advantages of the GEF





## STRATEGIC DIRECTIONS

# Toward an integrated approach



Multifocal projects  
Programmatic approach



Addressing the drivers of  
environmental degradation

... while meeting Convention requirements





Independent  
Evaluation Office  
GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT FACILITY

## SECTION 2

# Performance and Impact





# Continued good performance



of the 581 completed projects have **satisfactory** outcome and implementation ratings



sustainability ratings of moderately likely or above



## FOCAL AREA STUDIES

# International waters



Highly relevant

Challenging  
transboundary  
conditions require  
cooperation

A catalyst for integration

74% satisfactory outcomes



Limited funding

Portfolio imbalance

Challenge in engaging the private  
sector

Missed opportunities in linking  
regional priorities with STAR





## FOCAL AREA STUDIES

# Chemicals and waste

78% satisfactory outcomes



Highly relevant

An improved partnership

Good private sector  
engagement



Scaling up results need improvement

Challenges in sector-wide approaches  
and regulatory reform focus

Need for better results tracking



## FOCAL AREA STUDIES

# Land degradation

78% satisfactory outcomes



Highly relevant

Effective in producing global environmental benefits

Greater scope leads to greater benefits



Inadequate attention to socioeconomic drivers

Need to integrate land degradation neutrality

M&E tools could be strengthened



## FOCAL AREA STUDIES

# Climate change



Integrated approaches

Multifocal area approaches

Strengthening the  
enabling environment

Private sector engagement

77% satisfactory outcomes



Identification of synergies  
with other funds



# Multifocal area

77% satisfactory outcomes



Designed to produce multiple benefits



Emphasis on integration

**BD+LD+CC**

Most common combination



Challenges from complexity



# Multifocal area



86%

Achieved positive **environmental outcomes** consistent with the combination of focal areas



88%

Achieved positive **socioeconomic outcomes** (primarily increased income or access to capital)



86%

Reported some form of **broader adoption** (mainly through mainstreaming and sustaining)



# Programmatic approaches



Addresses  
environmental drivers



Perform better than  
standalone projects,  
except in complex  
programs



Improved  
program  
coherence



Efficiency declines  
with increased  
complexity



ISSUES

# Programmatic approaches



Managing  
complexity



Managing coordination  
effectively



Measuring program  
performance



Program design



# Small grants program




Success in securing Global Environmental Benefits




Attention to community level benefits, poverty and livelihoods



More successful at mainstreaming gender than other GEF projects



Differing views on the extent to which SGP should address socio-economic priorities




The upgrading policy brought challenges



M&E remains too complex



# 4 NECESSARY CONDITIONS for successful transformational change



Ambitious  
objectives



High-quality  
implementation



Self-sustaining  
mechanism



Financially  
sustainable



## STRONG POINTS

# Legal and regulatory reform



**GEF has  
contributed to  
enactment of  
environmental laws**



**Many factors  
influence reform**



**Often overly optimistic  
about the likelihood and  
pace of legal reform**



ISSUES

## Legal and regulatory reform



**Capacity  
building and  
enabling  
activities**



**Institutional  
capacity and  
political will**



**Stability of  
government**



**Technical  
capacity**





**Ownership**




## DEMONSTRATING IMPACT

# Land Degradation (multifocal): Madhya Pradesh, India





# DEMONSTRATING IMPACT Biodiversity






## DEMONSTRATING IMPACT


# Biodiversity: Global

### Forest cover loss (2000-2012)





## Al Hashemiah Reserve, Jordan GEFID#5026 (2013-2017)



2015 May - Aug



2013 May - Aug





**DEMONSTRATING IMPACT**

**Biodiversity (multifocal): Jordan**



## DEMONSTRATING IMPACT

# International waters: Lake Victoria






VALUE FOR MONEY

## Land degradation

**\$1:1.08**


Globally positive impacts on forest cover



Lag time of 4.5-  
5.5 years for  
larger impact



Access to electricity  
associated with  
larger impact




Larger impact  
observed in areas with  
poor initial conditions



VALUE FOR MONEY  
**Biodiversity**

**\$1:1.04**

Positive impact on forest cover and vegetation productivity



Noticeable impact  
after 1<sup>st</sup> year



Access to  
electricity linked  
to larger impact



Performance  
improved as projects  
increased in size



## STRONG POINTS

# Private sector programs


80% satisfactory outcomes



High co-financing  
ratio of 8:1



GEF is a  
valued  
partner



Technical  
knowledge



Helps  
mitigate risk



Flexible  
financing  
instruments





## CHALLENGES

# Private sector programs

80% satisfactory outcomes



**Skewed  
portfolio**



**Need to find  
comparative  
advantage**



**Raise awareness  
of the GEF**



**Improve  
processes and  
mechanisms**



# Nongrant instruments

78% satisfactory outcomes

## LOAN

Most popular

## EQUITY

More prevalent recently

## GUARANTEES

Mixed evidence on effectiveness

## ISSUES

Diversification beyond climate change

Monitoring complexity in financial structures

Setting realistic targets for reflows

Defining a niche for the GEF



## SECTION 3

# Policies and Institutional Issues



# New policies have positive impact

- ✚ Consolidation of the project cycle
- ✚ Cancellation policy
- ✚ Harmonization pilot with the World Bank




# Results-based management system




**Streamlining the results framework**



**Improved corporate reporting**



**Remains complex**



**Focus on shorter-term results**



**PMIS database needs upgrading**



# Knowledge management is getting attention



Only 1 in 3 respondents happy  
with mechanisms in place

BUT




Recognition of shortcomings  
and efforts under way



Positive contribution  
of STAP



# Safeguard policies



Catalyst among many GEF Agencies to strengthen existing safeguard policies



Gaps in the GEF  
Minimum Standards



Need for enhanced  
monitoring and reporting







Independent  
Evaluation Office  
GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT FACILITY


## SECTION 4

# Financing, Governance, and Health of the Partnership






# Financing



**Modest funding to meet global needs**



**Co-financing consistent with policy (6:1)**



**STAR encourages country ownership but leads to fragmentation of resources**





# Financing: STAR

STAR is a key component of GEF's ability to support environmental activities in a wide range of countries

STAR is a key component of GEF's ability to meet country objectives

STAR ensures an equitable resource allocation overall

STAR is being implemented efficiently

STAR enables the delivery of regional projects

STAR enables partnerships between the public and private sectors

72.4%

66.6%

57.4%

48.7%


29.8%

24.7%






# Partnership



**From 10 to  
18 agencies**



**Increase in access  
to new capacities  
and networks**




**More competition  
and higher  
transaction costs**





# Partnership

Share of GEF Portfolio by lead agency in million \$






# Civil Society Organizations Network

## Strong points




## Issues






# Good governance



**Overall, the GEF is  
effectively governed**





# Update on the Sixth Comprehensive Evaluation of the GEF (OPS6)