

### PRESENTATION TO THE GEF 57<sup>th</sup> COUNCIL MEETING

December 201



### Today

### Semi-Annual Evaluation Report

### Methodological approach to post-completion verification

Strategic country cluster evaluation of the small island developing states



### **Semi-Annual Evaluation Report**



December 2019

**SAER: OUTLINE** 

I. Peer Review of the Independent Evaluation Function

**I.2** Evaluation work in progress

I.3 Knowledge Management

Peer review of the independent evaluation function

### Purpose

#### To enhance the evaluation function in the GEF

#### **Thematic focus**

Relevance, evaluation policy, stakeholder engagement Work program Office structure and budget Core assessment criteria Independence Credibility Utility

### Evaluation work in progress

### JUNE 2020

#### DECEMBER 2020

- Strategic country cluster evaluation: African biomes
- Strategic country cluster evaluation: least developed countries
- Evaluation of GEF engagement in fragile and conflict-affected situations
- Annual Performance Report 2020
- The LDCF (Least Developed Countries Fund) program evaluation
  - Approach paper for OPS7

- Innovation and risk management in the GEF: evaluative findings and lessons
- Evaluation of GEF support to the sustainable forest management and REDD+ projects
  - Evaluation of GEF medium-sized projects and enabling activities
  - Evaluation of GEF Small Grants Program

### **OPS7:** preliminary timeline

(assuming timeline for GEF-8 replenishment negotiations is similar to GEF-7)

June 2020 – approach paper for OPS7

 Spring 2021 – early findings and briefs for the first replenishment meeting

---- Fall 2021 – full draft report for replenishment

December 2021 – final report to the GEF Council

### Knowledge Management

### Knowledge products (June 2020)





Sustainable fisheries

GEF freshwater portfolio review Country and constituency evaluation notes Health co-benefits of chemical and waste projects



### IEO stakeholder engagement and knowledge needs assessment

### survey results



# 2015 – first GEF IEO stakeholder survey and needs assessment

### What has IEO done in response to the 2015 survey?



Prepared focal area studies and meso-level evaluations



Developed tailored communications for constituency meetings and ECWs



**Revamped IEO website** 

### Why survey stakeholders in 2019?

To obtain feedback on the quality and use of IEO evaluations and knowledge products To inform the IEO knowledge and learning work

To improve the quality of IEO work towards OPS7

To provide information for the Peer Review of the GEF's Independent Evaluation Function

### Stakeholder survey — 1114 responses

Sept. 25 to Oct. 9, 2019 3 languages

### 704 GEF Partnership (25% response rate)

- 244 GEF Agencies, executing agencies, projects
- 202 GEF CSO Network
- **182 GEF OFP/PFP** and their staff
- **19 GEF Secretariat**
- II STAP
- 46 Convention secretariats

37 GEF Council (33% response rate)

373 External stakeholders(3% response rate)

181 National and local government
106 Civil society organizations
86 Other (multilateral/bilateral, private, academia, media, independent consultants)

### Stakeholder survey — Satisfaction with IEO evaluations



### Stakeholder survey — Use of IEO evaluations



Of respondents reported using IEO evaluations

Designing programs Assessing performance Providing advice Reference Designing policies Course of action Sharing

### Stakeholder survey — Relevance of GEF-7 evaluations

Comprehensive evaluation (OPS7)

Evaluation of impact programs

Evaluation of institutional frameworks

Annual performance reports

Evaluation of GEF policies

)	96%	
	94%	
	94%	
	94%	
	93%	

### Stakeholder survey — Dissemination channels

#### **Effectiveness during GEF-6**



### Stakeholder survey — Suggestions

### For dissemination

- F2F and online events
- Evaluation summaries

### For learning products

Lessons on

- design and implementation
- stakeholder engagement
- Synthesis notes by
- focal area and theme



### For the website

- Strengthen the search function
- Increased use of visuals, photos, videos
- A more visible MAR



Third International Conference on Evaluating Environment and Development

Integrating environmental sustainability in evaluating transformational change

Evaluating at the nexus of natural and human systems

Increasing evaluation utility and influence

Real-time and formative evaluations

Managing for longer-term sustainability

### Knowledge management and dissemination contd.



**IEO** website





#### Sharing evaluation methods



ECG, UNEG, UNCCD COP14, National Evaluation Capacities Conference SHIPDET(Shanghai International Program for Development Evaluation Training)



### **Semi-Annual Evaluation Report**



December 2019



## Methodological approach to post-completion verification

#### **GEF IEO**

December 2019

### Why do post-completion?

GEF-supported interventions typically aim to achieve impacts that often require time beyond the period of GEF funding

### What do we want to find out?

The extent to which outcomes achieved continue to progress beyond project completion

### 2

The extent to which the conditions allowing longer-term outcomes to be achieved are present and contribute to progress

### What do we measure?

#### Outcomes



Environmental impacts

Social impacts



Synergies and trade-offs



Broader adoption and transformational change

### Influencing factors



#### **SELECTION CRITERIA**



Minimum of 4-5 years past project closure



Applicability of lessons to be learned for future interventions

# For which interventions?

Potential for contribution to larger thematic evaluations

### Use of **geospatial analysis** in post-completion evaluations

#### **GEF'S YELLOW SEA PORTFOLIO**



## Use of geospatial analysis

in post-completion evaluations

Geospatial analysis of remote sensing images — useful for measuring change over time

Change on Earth's surface can correlate with environmental indicators of GEF projects

Repeated images in same area show environmental indicators before, during and after project implementation

Guide to selection of projects for field verification



### Evaluation of GEF portfolio – Yellow Sea Large Marine Ecosystem



Evaluation of GEF's portfolio — Yellow Sea Large Marine Ecosystem

Interviews with project and other stakeholders helped understand the trends



# **Conclusions** — **Geospatial analysis** for post-completion evaluations

#### PROS

Geospatial analysis is unbiased, quantitative, low-cost and provides data for multiple points in time

#### CONS

Limited to detectable indicators and quality of sensors, difficult to attribute trends specifically to projects or other causes

### **USE IN COMBINATION** With other methods

#### **Template for Post-Completion Data**

This template is to be used to organize all information collected from various sources into a standardized format. This format allows information to be pulled out for further analysis, as well as comparison across a set of post-completion evaluations. It uses the **intervention** as a unit of analysis so that multiple GEF-supported projects & programs that promote the **same technologies/approaches with explicitly linked objectives**, can be analyzed together as a coherent package through which the GEF aims **to achieve a specific impact in a specific sector within a specific geographical area**, such as a city, country, or ecosystem (*e.g. sustainable forest management in the southern dryland regions of Ethiopia, DDT elimination in small-scale farms in Gansu province*). The post-completion evaluation uses the implementation end date of the most recent project as the starting point for assessing post-completion outcomes.

The template is meant to capture information comprehensively such that it can be used as a reference document for various analyses for both current and future evaluation objectives, without duplicating the data collection effort from many of the documents. Context-specific interview questions will need to be developed for each post-completion evaluation to allow the template to be filled in accurately and reliably. The format of the report will also depend on the relative importance of findings to be communicated following the analysis of this <u>template, but</u> would generally follow the outline in Annex 3.

#### 1. Intervention information

1.1.a.	What is the GEF-supported intervention that is being assessed post-completion?	
1. <u>1.b.</u>	Which geographical area/s did it aim to cover?	

1.2.	PROJECT INFORMATION	GEF ID	Add or delete columns according to number of projects included in analysis
	Project Title		
	Country/ Countries		
	GEF Agency		
	GEF grant amount (actual)		
	Co-financing total (actual)		



## Methodological approach to post-completion verification

#### **GEF IEO**

December 2019


# Strategic country cluster evaluation of the Small Island Developing States

**GEF IEO** 

December 2019



#### **ENVIRONMENTAL CHALLENGES**





#### Sea level rise



Coastal and coral reef degradation



Deforestation



Land degradation



Threats to marine resources and biodiversity



**Waste management and water quality** 



Harmful mining methods

# **SIDS: common** context but heterogeneous challenges



#### High cost of living



Solution States Vulnerability to natural disasters



Difficulty mobilizing financial resources



Indebtedness



Governance issues



Limited institutional capacity

SOCIO-ECONOMIC **CHALLENGES** 



# Evaluation — Objectives and key questions

Cross

Cutting

Issues

#### Objectives

d	1. Relevance and Performance of the GEF from the countries' perspective		2. Deeper understanding of the determinants of outcome sustainability		
	Key questions				
	<b>1.</b> Relevance and performance of the GEF support	<b>2.</b> Environmental and socio-economic context	<b>3.</b> Drivers of Sustainability		
	<b>1.</b> Gender and gende	er equality			
	<b>2.</b> Resilience and risk	x management			
	<b>3.</b> Private sector eng	agement			

#### Evaluation — Methods, data sources, and quality assurance

#### MIXED-METHODS APPROACH

#### QUALITY ASSURANCE



Field visits to **10 countries** (out of 39) covering **64 projects** 

Sustainability analysis based on **45 closed projects** 



**Reference Group** GEF Secretariat, GEF Agencies, STAP



**2 Peer Reviewers** GEF IEO and World Bank IEG

#### H COUNTRY COVERAGE



OPE

Sources: Esri, Airbus DS, USGS, NGA, NASA, CGIAR, N Robinson, NCEAS, NLS, OS, NMA, Geodatastyrelsen, Rijkswaterstaat, GSA, Geoland, FEMA, Intermap and the GIS user community

# PORTFOLIO ANALYSIS: GEF Support to Small Island Developing States

#### Share of support



#### **Project modality**

49 enabling activities
84 medium-sized projects
153 full-sized projects and programs
Small-Grants Programme (SGP)





Chemicals

and waste

Protected

areas



Resilience

overnance and stakeholder involvement

## GEF support to SIDS — Project performance

**Satisfactory outcomes** 

# % of projects with satisfactory outcomes, by focal area



Chemicals and waste Biodiversity International waters Multifocal Climate change Land degradation

)	100%
/	82%
5	68%
	67%
)	67%
)	63%

# GEF support to SIDS — Regional project performance

#### **Satisfactory outcomes**



Integrated Watershed and Coastal Area Management in Caribbean SIDS

(GEF ID1254)

## GEF support to SIDS — Project outcomes

Institutional and environmental outcomes

Institutional capacity and governance outcomes

Environmental outcomes



# Socio-economic outcomes and processes

Income generation and diversification



Private sector engagement



Civil society engagement



# St. Lucia case study



## GEF support to SIDS — Sustainability

'Likely sustainable' outcomes

#### % of projects rated as 'likely sustainable', by focal area





#### Sustainability — **Post-Completion** (field verification)

Sustainability is achieved over time, and seldom achieved within one GEF phase

> 81% **67%** 'Likely sustainable' at completion

(during terminal evaluation stage) Post completion sustainability

> (during evaluation field visits)

(projects in Belize, Comoros, Dominican Republic, Guinea-Bissau, Jamaica, Kiribati, Maldives, Mauritius, St. Lucia, Vanuatu)

# Sustainability — Contextual factors

# Contributing

- Legal and institutional framework supportive for environment and protected areas
- National ownership (stakeholder participation, government support, budget allocation)
- Strategic partnerships
- Sustainable financing mechanisms (national environmental funds)
- Strong institutional capacity



#### Hindering

- Low institutional capacity
- Low levels of environmental awareness
- Pressures from agriculture and tourism

# Sustainability — **Project-related** factors

# Contributing

- Training and institutional capacity building
- Adaptive project management
- Strong project teams and engaged steering committees
- Strong institutional partnerships
- Replication and scaling-up, including small-scale



#### Hindering

- Little consideration of impact and sustainability in project design
- Limited capacity building
- Lack of exit strategy and future financing

# Conclusions





GEF financing continues		
to be highly relevant in	L	
most SIDS	L	

GEF projects in SIDS are strongly aligned with the government's priorities

GEF increased commitment to SIDS over replenishment periods GEF interventions are relevant to national environmental challenges and aligned with GEF focal areas GEF is promoting ridge to reef approaches to sustainably manage natural resources, while considering productive sectors



Performance of SIDS projects was lower than the overall GEF portfolio Positive environmental, socioeconomic, and institutional outcomes in at least 75% of projects GEF supported the long-term sustainability in SIDS through multiple modalities

Regional projects have significantly higher ratings on outcomes and sustainability Three agencies have implemented more than 85% of GEF SIDS portfolio Post completion ratings of several projects have improved since project completion

# Conclusion — Additionality



GEF's main areas of additionality are strengthening institutions and assistance with legal and regulatory frameworks GEF has been given increasing attention to cross-cutting issues including gender and private sector participation

# Recommendations

Increase the number of integrated interventions



Derive greater benefits from the expanded GEF partnership

In the context of climate change mitigation, build on **GEF's** comparative advantage – waste management and renewable energy



Promote innovation, scaling up, and knowledge exchange



Continue to strengthen institutional capacity



#### Strategic country cluster evaluation of the small island developing states

**GEF IEO** 

December 2019

# **Recommended Council decisions**



- 1. The Council, having reviewed the "Semi-Annual Evaluation Report of the GEF Independent Evaluation Office: November 2019," acknowledges the progress made by the Independent Evaluation Office in the reporting period.
- 2. The Council, having reviewed the "A methodological approach for post-completion verification: November 2019", endorses the approach and supports the application of the post-completion verification methodology.
- 3. The Council, having reviewed the "Strategic Country Cluster Evaluation of the Small Island Developing States" endorses the recommendations of the evaluation.