



# Global Environment Facility

GEF/ME/C.28/1  
May 12, 2006

---

GEF Council  
June 6-9, 2006

Agenda Item 7

## GEF EVALUATION OFFICE: PROGRESS REPORT FROM THE DIRECTOR

**(Prepared by the GEF Evaluation Office)**

### **Recommended Council Decision**

The Council, having reviewed document GEF/ME/C.28/1 *GEF Evaluation Office: Progress Report from the Director* and having taken note of the work on on-going evaluations, the implementation of the GEF M&E policy, the consultative process and the Office's international cooperation and knowledge management activities, requests the Evaluation Office to:

1. Continue to develop the country portfolio evaluations
2. Present a proposal for an Agency Performance Overview Matrix at the Council session of December 2006
3. Explore the possibility to extend the consultative process on M&E issues to country level evaluation capacities

## **Executive Summary**

1. The GEF Evaluation Office is presently conducting a series of evaluations on cross-cutting issues, institutional procedures and principles, country level support and impact. The Office found some of the evaluations proposed for this year more complex than initially thought, requiring development of appropriate methodologies and approaches.

2. The **Joint Evaluation of the GEF Activity Cycle and Modalities** and the evaluation of **Incremental Cost Calculation** are on track and reports will be presented to the December 2006 meeting of Council. After initial steps to develop the approach paper for the **Impact Evaluation**, an extensive additional effort has been undertaken to develop an appropriate evaluation methodology for a first pilot evaluation to be undertaken in FY07. The **Capacity Building Evaluation** did not start in FY06 as originally proposed due to the extra attention in staff time that needed to be devoted to the Evaluation of the GEF Support to the Cartagena Protocol. Before the end of FY06 an approach paper will be published on the website. The evaluation itself will start in the first half of FY07.

3. The Office completed the first **Country Portfolio Evaluation** in Costa Rica. The final report is presented to Council as GEF/ME/C.28/5. The experience in Costa Rica clearly indicated that this type of evaluation is feasible and valid. The report strongly recommends that this type of evaluation should be continued. The Office is now preparing terms of reference for future Country Portfolio Evaluations based on the experience gathered in Costa Rica. Some of the lessons gathered include the importance of ensuring support of focal points, collaborating with consultants that are based in the country and have independent credibility, and the need to develop clear and transparent criteria to select countries for portfolio evaluations.

4. The Office is developing better tools and methodologies on a continuous basis to keep the standards of our work on a high professional level. Furthermore, the development of an **Agency Performance Overview Matrix** has started for inclusion in the Annual Performance Report in future years, containing indicators on project outcomes and sustainability, on processes affecting results and on the quality of M&E, as well as on learning. The purpose will be to provide the GEF Council with an independent assessment of the performance of the Implementing Agencies, Executing Agencies and the GEF Secretariat. On the basis of consultations with these agencies, a proposal will be presented to Council at its December 2006 session,

5. The new **GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy** was approved by Council through a written procedure on February 6, 2006. The Office is mainstreaming the new M&E policy through-out the GEF system in four ways: dissemination, development of guidance and administrative procedures, support of monitoring, and oversight and performance feedback.

6. The Council at its meeting of November 2005 requested the Office to develop a proposal for an **M&E training program** to be presented in June 2006, in order to introduce

the new policy and minimum requirements for M&E to the appropriate staff. Consultations held since the approval of the new policy lead to the conclusion that the need for training varies greatly throughout the GEF partnership. Rather than introducing a self-standing training program, the way forward seems to integrate the new M&E policy as much as possible in existing training and introduction programs. This means that no proposal has been formulated for Council's consideration at this moment in time.

7. The consultative process with M&E partners in the GEF is proceeding as planned. An emerging challenge is to interact with independent evaluators in recipient countries. The Office will explore possible ways of reaching out to national evaluation capacities and creating a network through which the GEF can ensure involvement of independent evaluation capacity on the country level. The proposed international workshop on evaluating sustainable development will be an important vehicle for this purpose.

8. The Office has introduced new ways of publishing and disseminating its products. Two series of publications (of Evaluation Reports and of Evaluation Documents) have started and new summaries of evaluations, "Signposts", are now available. The Office will continue to explore possibilities to use the new media to full advantage.

9. The Office is active in various international evaluation forums and meetings to ensure that new developments, international norms and standards and possibilities for collaboration and interaction are taken up. The M&E work in the GEF benefits in two ways. First of all, the highest international norms and standards continue to be applied. Secondly, the joint evaluation of the GEF activity cycle and modalities shows that substantial efficiencies can be achieved through international collaboration where feasible and possible.

## **Introduction**

10. At the Council meeting of June 2005 a Progress Report was presented for the first time to Council as an Information Document. The report was discussed and Council requested that the second progress report would be a Working Document. This report contains information on on-going evaluations, on development of tools for future use, on the consultative process on M & E issues in the GEF, the implementation and mainstreaming of the new GEF M & E policy, the international activities of the GEF Evaluation Office (the Office), and the knowledge management and dissemination activities. The Progress Report complements and adds to the information provided in the Four Year Work Program and Budget and Results from FY06 (GEF/ME/C28/7).

## **On-going Evaluations**

11. The Office is presently conducting a series of evaluations on cross-cutting issues, institutional procedures and principles, country level support and impact. Most of the proposed work in support of the evaluation program was successfully completed. In addition, the Office has established an impressive network of partners across the Implementing and Executing Agencies as well as throughout the world interested in pursuing the evaluation principles of accountability and lessons learning. The Office also found some of the evaluations proposed for this year more complex than initially thought, requiring development of appropriate methodologies and approaches. For example, the completion of the evaluations of GEF impacts, capacity building and of the incremental costs calculations have been delayed until the end of calendar year 2006.

12. The **Joint Evaluation of the GEF Activity Cycle and Modalities** is on track to deliver a report to the GEF Council at its session in December 2006. The management group of the evaluation, in which the evaluation offices of UNDP, UNEP, the World Bank, the Asian Development Bank and UNIDO participate, met early May in Vienna, Austria, to discuss progress and intermediary products. A database has been assembled of all projects funded by the GEF, for which additional information is still sought. A survey under stakeholders is ongoing. Several desk studies are nearing completion. Furthermore, a number of field visits have been undertaken and will continue in the coming months. The draft report will be discussed at a seminar at the end of September.

13. The evaluation of **Incremental Cost Calculation** has started in March 2006 and is ongoing. The evaluation team has been assembled. One part of the evaluation will focus on the compliance of incremental cost calculations with the guidelines which will be completed in the coming months, before June 30, 2006. Furthermore, a survey will take place of stakeholders, which is expected to be ready for launch in early June 2006. The evaluation team is currently making arrangements for interviews with Implementing Agency at their headquarters in Washington, New York and Nairobi. In addition to this several field visits to key GEF operational centers are planned to gain inputs from field-based Implementing and Executing

Agency staff, Government and NGO project proponents involved in preparation of Incremental Costs Assessments:

- Kenya (May 2006): Under implementation
- Malaysia / Thailand (June 2006): Planning underway
- Panama (June 2006): Planning underway

14. The evaluation team is also collecting inputs from similar globally mandated programs with additionality and/or 'incremental-like' principles. To this end a visit to the Global Fund for AIDS, TB and Malaria is planned for May 2006 to collect experiences on the operation of their 'financial and programmatic gap analysis' which is similar to GEF Incremental Costs assessment. It is expected that the Global Funds experiences will provide an important external context for the findings of this evaluation. All data collection is expected to be completed by July 31st 2006 while the analysis and report drafting will take place from August through September. The evaluation will be completed for the GEF Council meeting scheduled for December 2006.

15. In FY06 the Office began to develop an approach to **impact evaluation** within the GEF, and initially it was envisioned that the pilot impact evaluation would be completed by the end of FY06. After initial steps to develop the approach paper for the evaluation, it was determined that an extensive additional effort would be necessary to develop a methodology appropriate for the challenge of evaluating impacts within the context of the GEF. It is necessary to ensure that impact evaluation of GEF support be cost-effective and produce findings in a manner that satisfies the needs of all GEF stakeholders. Therefore, the work undertaken thus far has focused on identifying and exploring the methodology that will be used in the pilot exercise, which will be carried out in FY07.

16. Although the final methodology proposal is not yet complete, a general approach has been identified. It is proposed that the methodology for impact evaluation build on theory-based approaches, and be tailored to the GEF context. The GEF portfolio is far too large for the Office to begin to evaluate the impact of a statistically representative sample of projects. However, the adoption of a theory-based approach will enable empirical results to be used to assess the robustness of the theories of change underlying the key strands of the portfolio. Furthermore, the adoption of a perspective from the "realistic evaluation" approach will enable the studies to focus on the extent to which the theories have promoted effective mechanisms, which in turn have been appropriately adapted to specific project contexts to generate the desired impacts, whilst avoiding or minimizing any unexpected and undesirable impacts. Even within focal areas there is an extremely wide range of project approaches to various environmental challenges. Thus, the impact evaluation approach will have to be flexible in its application of the proposed model and key questions. It is anticipated that the complete methodology will be proposed by the end of FY06.

17. The Office completed the first **Country Portfolio Evaluation** with a pilot case of Costa Rica. The final report is presented to Council as GEF/ME/C.28/5. The experience in Costa Rica clearly indicated that this type of evaluation is feasible and valid even when the GEF

does not have a country program but rather a cohort or portfolio of projects approved at different times and within different contexts. The evaluation was able to answer the two key questions proposed in the TOR about the relevance and efficiency of the GEF portfolio in the Costa Rica. Regarding reporting on results, the evaluation was able to gather evidence that several of the projects have actually produced important global environmental benefits, particularly in climate change and biodiversity. Furthermore, the evaluation seems to be an important tool to report how the GEF is implemented in a country and how these apparently ad hoc projects do fit within the national environmental strategy and the country's response to the global conventions for which GEF is the financial mechanism.

18. The report strongly recommends that this type of evaluation should be continued. The Office is now preparing terms of reference for future Country Portfolio Evaluations based on the experience gathered in Costa Rica. Some of the lessons gathered include:

- Country Portfolio Evaluations are valid and feasible even if there is no GEF strategy to evaluate against. The group of projects implemented in the country forms the GEF portfolio to be evaluated.
- The key questions on relevance and efficiency are appropriate. Aggregation of results from projects is only possible at the focal area level and not at the national level.
- It is difficult to include regional and global projects in a Country Portfolio Evaluation since they require a different level of analysis and are approved and implemented within a different context. To keep evaluations costs within limits, those regional and global projects that have their Project Implementing Units within the country under evaluation could be included.
- It is very important to be able to use consultants that are based in the country and have independent credibility.
- 4-5 months is the minimum time necessary to evaluate a medium size country like Costa Rica with a portfolio of \$38 million and about 15 projects implemented between 1992 through 2005. Evaluations of countries with larger portfolio may take longer.
- The choice of Costa Rica was appropriate as a pilot, particularly as an example of a medium to small size GEF country.
- There should be clear and transparent criteria to select countries for portfolio evaluations.

19. The **Capacity Building Evaluation** did not start in FY06 as originally proposed due to the extra attention in staff time that needed to be devoted to the Evaluation of the GEF Support to the Cartagena Protocol. Before the end of FY06 an approach paper will be finalized and published on the website. The evaluation itself will start in the first half of FY07.

## **Development of Tools and Methodologies**

20. The Office is developing better tools and methodologies on a continuous basis to keep the standards of our evaluation work on a high professional level.

21. An **Agency Performance Overview Matrix** is under development for inclusion in the Annual Performance Report in future years. Gradually the oversight work of the Office in various areas of performance will lead to the development of performance indicators at the GEF Agency level and in turn will provide an overview of the performance of Agencies. The purpose of this overview will be to provide the GEF Council with an independent assessment of specific aspects of the performance of GEF agencies, including Implementing Agencies, Executing Agencies and the GEF Secretariat. The report will also provide timely feedback to GEF Agencies by pointing out strengths and weaknesses and making recommendations on ways to strengthen performance.

22. A relatively large and diverse number of agencies participate in the GEF system. Agencies have different structures, cultures and ways to manage information. These differences place limitations on the type and number of performance indicators on which comparable information can be obtained. Another important issue is the small number of GEF operations by some agencies, which limits the extent to which robust conclusions could be drawn from the data. To address this limitation the Office will assess performance on certain indicators on a biannual basis and/or will cluster two years into one cohort. The Office will use conventional tests to determine differences between groups and to assess trends and tendencies. Also the Office will include real numbers and percentages when presenting findings in a tabular or graphical form and will be cautious in the kind of conclusions it draws when numbers of observations are small.

23. Given the diverse nature of the indicators that are assessed, the Office will use different evaluative tools to obtain the information needed. The APR and the Focal Area Program Evaluations will be the two main instruments used to gather information. Other evaluations, such as the joint evaluation of the GEF activity cycle and specific thematic evaluations will also be used to obtain information when appropriate. Reporting on specific parameters will also take place at different intervals (annually, biennially or every 4 years).

24. One important limitation is that several Executing Agencies do not have a sufficiently large portfolio of projects completed and under implementation to be reported on in a GEF Agency Performance Overview Matrix. As a minimum, data on 20 projects or interventions would need to be available to be able to include an agency.

25. A first proposal for an Agency Performance Overview Matrix will be discussed with the GEF Secretariat, the Implementing and Executing Agencies in the framework of the consultative process and the preparations for the 2006 Annual Performance Report. On the basis of these consultations, a proposal will be presented to Council at its December 2006 session. The

proposal will contain indicators on project outcomes and sustainability, on processes affecting results and on the quality of M&E, as well as on learning.

26. On several other methodological issues work was done in FY06. As stated above, various impact evaluation methodologies and approaches to evaluation of capacity building were discussed and explored as part of the preparation of the Office's work in that area. Furthermore, internal discussions took place on the use of evaluation matrixes to ensure consistent gathering and analysis of data in evaluations. The Office aims to incorporate the most relevant and up-to-date methodologies in its evaluations where appropriate.

### **Implementation of the New M & E policy**

27. The new GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy was approved by Council on a no-objection basis through mail on February 6, 2006. The Office is mainstreaming the new M&E policy thought-out the GEF system in four ways: dissemination, development of guidance and administrative procedures, support of monitoring, and oversight and performance feedback.

28. **Dissemination of the new policy.** The Office has made the new policy available on the internet and is in the process of publishing and distributing hard copies among the key GEF stakeholders. The Office also presents and discusses the new policy at the Sub-regional Consultations with GEF Focal Points. The Office will also work with the GEF Secretariat to incorporate M&E and GEF M&E minimum requirements in various training programs and the focal points training workshop.

29. **Development of guidance and administrative procedures.** The Office will develop further guidance on the minimum M&E requirements, on project terminal evaluations and on criteria for the development of program indicators. Terminal evaluation guidelines will address the content, evaluation ratings, process, timing requirements and independence of terminal evaluations. Criteria for the development of program indicators will provide overall parameters for indicators developments including among others, scientific validity, consistency with agency monitoring and supervision systems, and viability. The Office will also support the GEF Secretariat in development of guidance on project monitoring. Furthermore, administrative procedures will be established which fully cover the interaction of the Office with its administrative host, the World Bank, and the GEF Secretariat, which provides certain administrative support. These administrative procedures follow the TOR of the independent M&E unit as established by Council in July 2003.

30. **Support to the establishment of portfolio and program monitoring systems.** During FY06 the Office has provided support to the GEF Secretariat in various aspects related to the Secretariat's new monitoring roles. When requested, the Office provided assistance to the Project Performance Report process and provided comments on the Secretariats proposal for performance monitoring. The Office also supports the International Waters Task Force to define scientific based indicators for environmental results and catalytic impact for nutrient reduction projects and to define baseline indicators for ground water projects. The Office has

also worked with the Land Degradations Task Force to further define the global environmental benefits in this focal area and to put in place an indicator system conceptual framework for the focal area. In the coming year the Office will continue to work with the GEF Secretariat and other GEF Agencies to further develop and strengthen monitoring in the GEF system. Furthermore, the Office participates in the Steering Committee responsible for the redesign of the GEF Project Management Information System (PMIS).

31. **Oversight and performance feedback.** The Office has put in to place a system to assess project M&E as part of the Annual Performance Report that provides GEF agencies with precise information of the performance of several aspect of project monitoring and evaluation. Quick action taken by Implementing Agencies as a result of the feedback provided by the 2004 APR contributed to a noticeable improvement of terminal evaluation reports submitted to the Office during FY05. Steps undertaken by UNDP and UNEP are also likely to significantly enhance the independence of the process of GEF projects terminal evaluations. The early interaction on preliminary findings of the 2005 APR on the quality of M&E projects at entry has also contributed to attention of the GEF Secretariat for a further enhancement of program indicators. The 2005 APR has also established a baseline on projects compliance of M&E minimum requirements that will be used to track progress in the implementation of the policy during project design. The Office will continue to track and provide feedback on the efficacy of the policy and processes that GEF agencies put in place to implement the new GEF M&E Policy.

32. The Council decision of November 2005 on the GEF M&E policy requested the Office to develop a proposal for an **M&E training program** to be presented to the GEF June 2006 Council, in order to introduce the new policy and minimum requirements for M&E to the appropriate staff. Consultations held since the approval of the new policy lead to the following conclusions:

33. The need for training varies greatly throughout the GEF partnership. Some partners have strong institutional knowledge on M&E issues, others lack such institutional capacity. Officials in the various agencies working on GEF issues have a wide range of expertise on M&E. Many have a solid basic understanding of M&E, some are clearly exceptional professionals, whereas some colleagues have only rudimentary knowledge. Furthermore, there is a clear differentiation of needs in three areas: roles and responsibilities as defined by the new policy, minimum M&E requirements, and monitoring and indicator development. The great variety in training needs and in areas to be covered makes it very difficult to develop one training program to cater to all needs in all areas of work.

34. Existing opportunities have created venues to start with the first steps of training: dissemination of information. Increasingly over the past few months the Office has been asked to participate in and contribute to consultative and training meetings organized by the GEF. The Sub-regional Consultations with GEF Focal Points have been the most recent example. The Office has developed presentation tools to introduce the new policy and will continue to adapt these to the circumstances, as needed.

35. These conclusions indicate that rather than introducing a self-standing training program, the way forward seems to integrate the new M&E policy as much as possible in existing training and introduction programs, using existing training tools as much as possible. This means that no proposal has been formulated for Council's consideration at this moment in time. If the need for a separate training program with separate funding would emerge at a later date, the Office will present a proposal to Council with a full justification of why the need emerged and how it can be met.

### **Consultative Process**

36. Several meetings took place in FY06 and the consultative process continues to function as hoped for by Council: to engage all partners in further development of M&E practices in the GEF, in reaching agreement on and mainstreaming the new GEF M&E policy, and in ensuring full cooperation and preventing duplication in the M&E system. This culminated in the adoption of the new GEF M&E policy in February 2006.

37. The most successful element of the consultative process so far is the joint nature of the evaluation of the GEF Activity Cycle and Modalities, which has led to substantial savings for the GEF whereas the evaluation itself has increased scope and validity.

38. The Office has also established a network of senior level evaluation experts that have participated in previous evaluations in our Office. This network will provide regular feedback to the GEF EO work program and specific products.

39. The biggest challenge for the consultative process is to reach out to evaluation partners at the country level. Whereas GEF evaluations at the country level include local evaluators as much as possible, there are often no official counterparts representing national independent evaluation units, with which an institutional collaboration could be set up. Only a few recipient countries in the GEF have independent evaluation units which would be potential partners. To link to and support national evaluation capacities is a major challenge, not only faced by the GEF Evaluation Office but by evaluation units of other donor organizations as well. The proposal to organize an international workshop for evaluation professionals on environmental and sustainable development issues has been formulated with the possibility in mind to gradually develop an international network of potential collaborators of the Office.

### **International Activities**

40. The Office is active in various international evaluation forums and meetings to ensure that new developments, international norms and standards and possibilities for collaboration and interaction are taken up. The M&E work in the GEF benefits in two ways. First of all, the highest international norms and standards continue to be applied. Secondly, the joint evaluation of the GEF activity cycle and modalities shows that substantial efficiencies can be achieved through international collaboration where feasible and possible.

41. In March 2006, the GEF Evaluation Office was accepted as a permanent member of the UN Evaluation Group. Furthermore, interaction has started with the Evaluation Cooperation Group of the International Financial Institutions (IFIs) on benchmarking of environmental evaluations. This means that the Office is now firmly connected to its peer offices in both the UN system and the IFI system. This allows the Office to ensure that the latest developments in international standards, new evaluation norms and standards, methodologies and benchmarking become available for the GEF. Furthermore, efficiencies will be achieved through joint work. Both in the UN system and with IFI partners the possibilities are being explored to do country portfolio evaluations in parallel or jointly, in order to reduce costs and benefit from the perspective of other development and environmental partners on the country level.

42. Both the UN system and the IFIs are working towards higher norms and standards and higher quality of evaluation work, which are meant to be promoted through various forms of peer review: benchmarking in case of the IFIs and peer panel reviews in the case of the UN. The latter effort is also undertaken by the DAC Evaluation Network, which has now undertaken two joint peer reviews, one on the evaluation office of UNDP and one on the evaluation system of UNICEF. It was proposed to Council in November 2005 that the GEF M&E system would be peer reviewed through this initiative of the DAC Evaluation Network, in which Germany's evaluation office of BMZ would take the lead.

43. On the basis of the two peer reviews so far, of UNDP and UNICEF, the DAC Evaluation Network and the UN Evaluation Group have taken stock and reviewed experiences, and have decided to establish a joint task force which will further work on the peer panel review instrument. The aim is to turn this even further into an independent internationally accepted professional peer review mechanism, in which highly respected international evaluation professionals from the various evaluation communities will participate: UN, DAC, IFIs, recipient countries, NGOs, private sector and scientific community. The peer review of the GEF M&E system will take place after further developments in the joint task force, which will meet in June in Copenhagen.

44. In the UN Evaluation Group, the Office will give priority to the work on country level evaluations (where potential efficiencies can be gained by the Office) and the work on standards and peer reviews, which is being carried out by the Task Force on "Quality Stamp". The Director of the Office has been appointed co-chair of this task force.

45. The Director has been invited to become a member of a panel of international experts assembled by the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD) in Rome to advise IFAD's Office of Evaluation on updating its evaluation methodologies. The invitation was accepted and draft documents of IFAD's Office of Evaluation were reviewed and discussed at the end of 2005, which led to a report of the panel to IFAD's Office of Evaluation. The required amount of time and energy did not detract from the other duties of the Director. A meeting in Rome of the panel was attended through a teleconference link. The benefit to the Office was the input into the methodologies used by the Office and the added insight into current practices of one of the GEF M&E partner offices.

46. On invitation the Director became a member of an independent expert panel for the evaluation of the French Global Environment Facility. The panel met with and interviewed a series of stakeholders and counterparts in Paris, France, in February 2006 for three days. A series of self-evaluation documents and assessments of consultants formed the basis of the work of the panel. The resulting evaluation report was presented to the French government early March 2006.

47. More recently, the Director has been invited to become a Quality Assurance Advisor to the Independent External Evaluation of the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) of the UN in Rome. As a Quality Advisor the Director is expected to provide the FAO with an independent professional judgment on whether the evaluation is designed, implemented and reported on in such a way that the independence and quality of the evaluation are guaranteed. The ensuing work can be undertaken without detriment to the other duties of the Director. The benefit to the GEF will be a close look at how a major independent external evaluation of a UN organization takes shape and is executed and reported on, which will be of value for the further planning of OPS4. Any travel costs to Rome will be born by FAO.

48. The Director will co-host a workshop on evaluation of environmental and social sustainability at the International Program for Development Evaluation Training (IPDET) at Carlton University in Ottawa, sponsored by the World Bank, in July 2006. IPDET has become a focus for training of professional evaluators all over the world. This is a good opportunity to ensure that environmental and sustainability evaluation are on offer at this highly prestigious and highly rated program.

### **Knowledge Management and Dissemination**

49. The Office will continue to improve and further develop its strategies and tools for dissemination and feedback, as well as knowledge management. Highlights of FY06 included the international presentations of OPS3 and Office evaluations in Egypt, Japan, Brasil, Switzerland and the Netherlands, in various circumstances and for various audiences. Furthermore, in a joint effort with STAP a brainstorming workshop organized by the GEF Secretariat on knowledge management was supported in January 2006.

50. Regarding its publications, the Office decided to develop various products. Firstly, the Office will issue *Evaluation Reports*, namely the main reports that are produced by specific evaluation activities of the Office. They include all program evaluations, impact evaluations, country evaluations, thematic evaluations, organizational evaluations, as well as the Annual Performance Report and the overall performance studies. They will have ISBN numbering and be subject to tailored dissemination strategies. Evaluation Documents are presented to the Council in accordance with regular Council procedures as Working Documents.

51. Secondly, the Office will publish *Evaluation Documents* of interest to the general public or specific audiences. These documents either emanate from evaluations, such as research papers or case studies, or from other activities of the Office, such as the M&E Policy.

In addition, the Office is producing various knowledge products and ad hoc papers, brochures or web-based documentation. The knowledge product launched during the last year, the Evaluation Office *Signposts*, provide easy access to main findings and recommendations of evaluation reports or documents.

52. The website of the Office has been upgraded, but continues to be a source for concern. It is still impossible to search through evaluation reports and documents on key words. From a learning and knowledge management perspective a search engine is of crucial importance. The Office will actively pursue in FY07 new methods to improve the accessibility of its findings and to present an up-to-date picture of the completed and on-going work of the Office.