



GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT FACILITY
EVALUATION OFFICE

Annual Country Portfolio Evaluation Report 2011

***GEF Council 40
Agenda item 7
24 May 2011***



CPE Stream: Overview

- ❑ The new multi-annual CPE cycle for GEF-5 has started in FY11 in the LAC region with Nicaragua, OECS and Brazil
- ❑ CPEs assess the *relevance*, *efficiency* and *results* of the whole GEF portfolio of projects across all GEF Agencies and focal areas in a country, which is taken as unit of analysis
- ❑ The country selection process and the CPE standard terms of reference have been updated for GEF-5
- ❑ **ACPER 2011** consolidates findings from two Country Portfolio Studies conducted in El Salvador and Jamaica in collaboration with the UNDP Evaluation Office. The ACPER 2011 reflects on the CPS as a new instrument for country level evaluation work.



CPE Stream: Progress to date

- ❑ The **Nicaragua CPE** will be completed by end of FY11
 - The final workshop held on 10 May in Managua broadly confirmed the findings and provided inputs to move on to the drafting of the CPE report
- ❑ On 31 May the **OECS Cluster CPE** will hold the final workshop in St Lucia to discuss findings
 - Completion is foreseen by end of August 2011
- ❑ Preparations for the **Brazil CPE** have started
 - Possibilities for strong involvement of Brazilian evaluators are explored
- ❑ Preparations for the **Cuba CPE** will start in the coming months
- ❑ A **Meta-evaluation** has been launched with the objective to fine-tune the country level evaluation work that will take place during GEF-5



Comparison of CPE and CPS

- ❑ CPSs provide additional coverage of country portfolios, but have a reduced focus and scope when compared with CPEs
- ❑ CPSs are to be considered evaluations, designed to provide additional evaluative coverage to CPEs in all geographical regions
- ❑ CPSs are designed to be conducted in parallel with country level evaluations of other GEF Agencies' evaluation units
- ❑ Parallel country level evaluation work allows:
 - a. More informed evaluation reporting
 - b. Lower evaluation burden to the countries
 - c. Cost savings of the evaluation effort
- ❑ CPS provide findings and conclusions, but not recommendations: lessons learned are provided instead
- ❑ Standard terms of reference guide CPSs

CPSs: Background and Scope

- ❑ After positive collaboration with IEG/World Bank on Peru active engagement with other partners was pursued
- ❑ UNDP EO and GEF EO agreed to evaluate in parallel in El Salvador and Jamaica, where UNDP is the main GEF Agency, and the GEF the main funder of UNDP
- ❑ The two CPSs cover all national projects (FSP, MSP, EAs, SGP) at different stages (pipeline, on-going and completed), implemented since the start of the two countries' involvement with the GEF to date by all GEF Agencies in all focal areas:

Country	GEF funding (US mil.)	Number of projects included in the evaluation				National completed projects
		National FSPs and MSPs	SGP	Enabling activities	Regional/global projects	
El Salvador	11.41	5	Yes	6	20	6
Jamaica	11.86	6	Yes	6	15	7



CPSs: Conclusions (1)

Results

- GEF support to El Salvador and Jamaica in all Focal Areas has positively contributed to global environmental benefits
- Prospects for sustainability as well as for scaling up the initial benefits achieved are mixed
- GEF support has contributed to development of capacity in the two countries



CPSs: Conclusions (2)

Relevance

- ❑ GEF support has been relevant to the national environmental goals and priorities, as well as to the countries' efforts to fulfill its obligations under the international agreements to which they are signatory

Efficiency

- ❑ Overall, efficiency of project preparation has improved recently in the two countries
- ❑ GEF projects experience delays during implementation



CPSs: Lessons Learned

- ❑ The El Salvador and Jamaica CPSs provide country-specific lessons learned
 - These are presented together with conclusions in Annex 1 of the ACPER 2011
- ❑ Parallel work with the UNDP EO in Jamaica and El Salvador adds to the positive experience GEF EO had with IEG on a joint impact evaluation in Peru in 2009 on a cluster of BD projects.

Lesson

- ❑ Joint and/or coordinated evaluation work with the independent evaluation offices of GEF Agencies when portfolios under analysis largely coincide increases its relevance to countries, as it provides deeper insights than would otherwise be possible.



ACPER 2011

Recommendation

- Joint and/or coordinated country level evaluation work with either GEF Agencies' independent evaluation units or with independent national institutions with recognized expertise in both evaluation and environment should be pursued during GEF-5

Recommended Council Decision

- The Council requests the Evaluation Office to continue developing and implementing during GEF-5 joint and/or coordinated country level evaluation work with either GEF Agencies' independent evaluation offices or with independent national institutions with recognized expertise in both evaluation and environment

