

Management Action Record 2014

The GEF Management Action Record (MAR) tracks the level of adoption, by the GEF Secretariat and/or the GEF Partner Agencies (together here referred to as GEF Management), of GEF Council decisions that have been made on the basis of GEF EO recommendations. The MAR serves two purposes: “(1) to provide Council with a record of its decision on the follow-up of evaluation reports, 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

The MAR were first presented in APR 2005 and, thereafter, it has been presented annually to the Council through APR. In past 10 years the GEF IEO has gained experience in tracking actions on Council decisions and has been exploring ways to streamline the process. Feedback from the Secretariat and the GEF Agencies also indicates that the process is burdensome and needs to be simplified. Therefore, beginning this year, the IEO is streamlining its approach to MAR. There are two key changes in the approach.

First, of the Council decisions tracked through MAR, not all will be reported on an annual basis. While progress on adoption of some Council decisions may be tracked through regular work of the GEF IEO, there are others that require a thorough assessment to determine adoption and/or where adoption is linked to a specific activity is undertaken a specific point in time in the GEF replenishment cycle. For example, decisions on mainstreaming of gender concerns, building capacity of civil society organizations, and improving supervision, are directional in nature and require a thorough analysis to assess progress. Similarly, recommendations related to improvement in strategies and policies are better tracked at the time when these strategies and policies are being, and/or have been, designed. Similarly, changes in focal area strategies and tracking tools are linked to the GEF replenishment cycle. Therefore, coverage of these issues through detailed assessments or through the comprehensive evaluation of GEF is more feasible and appropriate.

Second, where appropriate, the decisions tracked through may be graduated from MAR if a ‘substantial’ rating or higher have been achieved. So far the decisions may be graduated only if a ‘High’ rating has been achieved. The earlier approach worked fine in most situations but not in situations where the assessment yardsticks are affected by escalating expectations. For example, a decision may seek improvements in the information systems but by the time specific actions are taken, the new expectations may require further improvement in the information systems. Since such issues may continue to be relevant to GEF, the earlier approach was leading to a situation where a decision could potentially never graduate because the adoption in all likelihood may never be rated ‘high’.

This change in approach means that each year at the start of the MAR process, the GEF IEO will determine whether a decision needs to be reported on in MAR in that year. If a decision does not need to be reported that year, then the GEF IEO would list these decisions as those for which reporting has been deferred along with information on when and how the adoption of the decision will be assessed in future. The decisions where deferment is not necessary will be reported on annually.

MAR 2014 tracks 22 separate GEF Council decisions: 20 that were part of MAR 2013, and 2 new decisions that emerged from the May 2014 GEF Council meeting. Of these 22, MAR 2014 reports on level of adoption of 18 decisions. In addition to GEF Council decisions, since APR 2012 the Independent Evaluation Office has started tracking adoption of the decisions of the Least Developed Countries Fund and Special Climate Change Fund (LDCF/SCCF) Council. One decision from the LDCF/SCCF Council is tracked in MAR 2014.

Rating Approach

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 Evaluation Office for verification. The rating categories for the progress of adoption of Council decisions were agreed upon through a consultative process of the Evaluation Office, the GEF Secretariat, and the GEF Agencies. 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 or possible to verify yet:** ratings or verification will have to wait until more data is available or proposals have been further developed.
- (f) **N/A:** Not-applicable.

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.

MAR 2014 tracks management actions on GEF Council and LDCF/SCCF Council decisions based on 11 GEF Evaluation Office documents:

- (a) Annual Performance Report 2009 (GEF/ME/C.38/4, June 2010)

- (b) Evaluation of the GEF Strategic Priority for Adaptation (GEF/ME/C.39/4, October 2010)
- (c) Annual Thematic Evaluations Report 2011 (GEF/ME/C.41/02, October 2011)
- (d) Evaluation of the Special Climate Change Fund (GEF/LDCF.SCCF.11/ME/02, October 2011)
- (e) Annual Country Portfolio Evaluation Report 2012 (GEF/ME/C.42/03, May 2012)
- (f) Annual Thematic Evaluations Report 2012 (GEF/ME/C.43/02, October 2012)
- (g) GEF Annual Impact Report 2012 (GEF/ME/C.43/04, October 2012)
- (h) GEF Annual Impact Report 2013 (GEF/ME/C.45/2, October 2013)
- (i) Mid-Term Evaluation of the System for Transparent Allocation of Resources (STAR) (GEF/ME/C.45/04, October 2013)
- (j) Mid-Term Evaluation of the National Portfolio Formulation Exercise (NPFE) (GEF/ME/C.45/06, October 2013)
- (k) Annual Country Portfolio Evaluation Report 2014 (GEF/ME/C.46/04)

Of the 22 GEF Council decision that are tracked for MAR 2014, four decisions pertaining to different evaluations were screened as decisions that require detailed assessments to ascertain the progress in their adoption. These decisions pertain to four different evaluations and reports. The GEF IEO will report on the progress on these decisions when the required assessments are undertaken. The following table provides the Council decisions tracked by MAR2014 along with information on screening and the assessment of the level of adoption.

Recommendation based on Council review of GEF Annual Performance Report 2009 (GEF/ME/C.38/4).

Ref. #	Date of Council Decision	GEF EO Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2013	GEF EO Rating & Comments in MAR 2013	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2014	GEF EO Rating & Comments in MAR 2014
1	June 2010	The GEF Evaluation Office, Secretariat and the Agencies should work together in identifying and implementing measures to improve the quality of information available through PMIS on the status of projects through the project cycle, including agency compliance with deadlines for terminal evaluations.	The Secretariat notes the low compliance of the Agencies' submission of terminal evaluations within 12 months of closure. Over the past two years, the Secretariat has collected information from Agencies on closed projects; these lists should improve the Evaluation Office's ability to track projects for which terminal evaluations have not been submitted. The Secretariat welcomes the APR's recommendation to work together with the Evaluation Office and Agencies in identifying and implementing measures to better track project status through the database.	Decision on Agenda Item 9: The GEF Council, having reviewed document GEF/ME/C.38/4, Annual Performance Report 2009, as well as GEF/ME/C.38/5, Management Response to the Annual Performance Report 2009, requested the GEF Evaluation Office, the Secretariat and the Agencies to work together in identifying and implementing measures to improve the quality of information available through PMIS on the status of projects through the project cycle, including agency compliance with deadlines for terminal evaluations. The Evaluation Office is requested to report on the progress made in the Annual Performance Report 2010.	<p>Substantial. GEFSEC: main issues PMIS tackled in last year are as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Template validator and data uploader 2. Automation of STAR progress report 3. Streamlined all the letters to agencies 4. STAP now able to project screening for LDCF projects before PIF approval by council 5. The harmonized process of submission by World Bank implemented 6. Ability for the council members to directly input projects comments into PMIS instead of submitting through a Word document. 7. Aforementioned RBM dashboard is developed which will be able to track the following reports due from Agencies to GEFSEC, PIR, Midterm Reviews, Tracking tools and Terminal Evaluation Reports, and the reports not submitted by agencies. <p>World Bank response: The Bank is fully compliant in submitting Terminal Evaluations to the GEF within deadlines.</p> <p>In spite of PMIS enhancements, there is a risk that reconciliation is needed on status and duplication of effort as long as electronic systems are not interfaced. The speedy implementation of the systems reform by the Trustee may address this risk.</p> <p>UNDP response: Project teams and UNDP Country Offices continue to use</p>	<p>Medium. Improvements are noted in several areas. Project cycle related data is also improving although gaps in data for older projects still remain. Poor quality of information on project status still remains a concern as steps taken by the Secretariat have not been adequate.</p> <p>World Bank is not fully compliant with the Terminal Evaluation submission related deadlines. Several missing terminal evaluation were identified during the reconciliation process undertaken by the GEF EO and IEG as part of the IEG's evaluation of World Bank and GEF partnership. The present practice – at the request of the Bank – is that the GEF IEO retrieves the terminal evaluations for FSPs and MSPs through World Bank's intranet. Annually, the IEO tries to reconcile its lists of projects for which terminal evaluations are expected with those of the World Bank. However, this process, as evident from a substantial number of missing TEs discovered through the joint exercise taken up by IEG and IEO, has not been full proof. The idea of having an</p>	<p>Substantial. In addition to the steps detailed in MAR 2013, the Secretariat, in collaboration with the World Bank's Information Technology Department undertaken an IT needs assessment for the GEF. Assessment is also being undertaken of the progress in the Trustee FIF IT system to how it can be integrated into the overall development of a new IT system for the GEF.</p> <p>World Bank comment: The Bank remains committed to compliance in submission of its Terminal Evaluations. We feel that migration of the GEF IT system away from PMIS and integration into the broader Trustee FIF IT system under development would facilitate identification of relevant project evaluations by the IEO and ease some of the last minute reporting challenges that have been faced in the past.</p>	<p>Medium The IEO and the Secretariat are working together on this as it affects work of both.</p> <p>GEF IEO on its part has made contributions to improving the quality of data, and through regular uploads of terminal evaluations.</p> <p>The PMIS is still not zero error and unlikely to become so in short to medium run. But that remains a long term goal.</p> <p>Retired. Improvement in PMIS is an ongoing process and also the need for improvement, justifiably so, need to correspond to escalating expectations. Therefore, this decision will be retired.</p>

				<p>UNDP EO guidance for project terminal evaluations issued in 2012, which includes a review of co-financing, and the quality of terminal evaluations continues to improve.</p> <p>UNEP: We are happy to engage with the GEF Sec, other Agencies, the Trustee and STAP to make PIMS and/or the quality of information on project status as robust as possible.</p>	<p>electronic interface is a good one but unlikely to function in a situation where a significant proportion of the GEF projects (that are Blended into World Bank projects) are not marked with the World Bank Project ID that is listed in the project proposals submitted to GEF. Most of the missing terminal evaluations that were identified jointly by the IEG and GEF EO fell into this category. As long as the World Bank is not able to generate a complete and fully reliable list of GEF projects through its database, it is unlikely that World Bank will be fully compliant.</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	---	--	--

Recommendation based on Council review of GEF Evaluation of the Strategic Priority for Adaptation (GEF/ME/C.39/4).

Ref #	Date of Council Decision	GEF EO Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2013	GEF EO Rating & Comments in MAR 2013	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2014	GEF EO Rating & Comments in MAR 2014
2	Nov. 2010	The GEF should continue providing explicit incentives to carry on the mainstreaming of resilience and adaptation into the GEF focal areas, as a means of reducing risks to the GEF portfolio.	We support the recommendation that the GEF should continue to provide incentives to carry on the mainstreaming of resilience and adaptation into the GEF focal areas, and note that some of the proposals for achieving this may include the application of screening tools and safeguards, as well as the mobilization of further financial incentives. The Secretariat has started to address some of the factors that still prevent the integration and mainstreaming of climate change adaptation across the GEF focal areas, including: The GEF Secretariat taking the first steps to create a screening tool for adaptation as outlined in GEF/C.35/inf.7 – “Incorporating Climate Change Adaptation into GEF Projects”; (b) The STAP is preparing a (currently in draft) study clarifying the scientific rationale of reducing climate change risks and enhancing resilience of the GEF focal areas and; (c) The GEF Secretariat is exploring possibility of providing financial incentives, both through strategic priorities in each GEF focal area and	Decision on Agenda Item 9: The Council, having reviewed documents, Evaluation of the GEF Strategic Priority for Adaptation (GEF/ME/C.39/4) and Management Response to the Evaluation of the GEF Strategic Priority for Adaptation (GEF/ME/C.39/5), requested the Secretariat to develop and implement screening tools. These tools will serve as a first step to ensure the mainstreaming and targeting of adaptation and resilience, to reduce the risks from climate change in GEF focal areas and its activities. The Council further requested the Secretariat to report to its November 2012 meeting on steps taken and progress made, including indicators for RBM and M&E.	Medium. GEFSEC –CCA: Further progress has been achieved by beginning to mainstream adaptation considerations across focal areas. A number of integrated approaches proposed for GEF-6 notably incorporate resilience to climate change, such as the Sustainable Cities program. As at March 2014, the GEF has invested \$100.75 million of LDCF/SCCF resources in 20 multi-trust fund projects and programs, continuing to explore synergies, where relevant, between adaptation and various GEF focal areas (such as climate change mitigation, biodiversity and international waters.) A growing number of initiatives outside of the adaptation program reflect attempts to incorporate adaptation to climate change within GEF TF-funded projects and programs. . The GEF is in early stages of institution-wide discussions to reach agreement on the nature, scope and design of a tool to systematically screen for climate risks across the GEF-6 portfolio. This endeavor will be guided by institutional needs and demand, and informed by the efforts towards climate risk screening that are being made by other development agencies. World Bank response: The WB IDA17 Replenishment includes explicit goals to mainstream climate adaptation, and the	Medium: GEFIEO acknowledges the progress made on mainstreaming resilience and adaptation into GEF focal areas through Multi Trust Fund projects and encourages the Secretariat to complete the next steps outlined in Council Document GEF/C.43/Info.06.	Medium: Progress continues to be made to mainstream adaptation across the focal areas. As of September 26 2014 \$104.81 million of LDCF/SCCF resources had been allocated for multi-trust fund projects and programs The GEF continues to discuss internally on the most effective way to systematically screen for climate risks across the GEF-6 portfolio. It is expected that the internal restructuring of the GEF Sec and the establishment of the GEF Programs Unit will allow for better mainstreaming of climate resilience as well as adaptation throughout the GEF portfolio.	Medium: : GEFIEO acknowledges the continued progress on mainstreaming resilience and adaptation into GEF focal areas through Multi Trust Fund projects and encourages the Secretariat to complete the next steps outlined in Council Document GEF/C.43/Inf.06 “Enhancing Climate Change Resilience in GEF Projects: Update on GEF Secretariat Efforts”, or update the Council on revised next steps. Retired.

			<p>through the use of resources from the Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF) and the Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF) during GEF-5. (GEF/ME/C.39/5 October 2010)</p>		<p>Bank has developed internal climate-risk screening tools for its regular portfolio. However, mainstreaming of adaptation in GEF projects would be helped by streamlining of MFA processes; simplification of the GEF Tracking Tools (AMAT), and GEF financial incentives to address adaptation on its grants.</p> <p>UNEP: Addressing climate resilience in the GEF Program is a work in progress, and STAP continues to strongly support this effort. Over the next year STAP Land Degradation and Adaptation Panel Members, with support of the STAP Chair, will be leading an effort on identifying indicators of ecosystem resilience - particularly agro-ecosystem resilience in the context of the GEF integrated approach pilot on food security in Africa.</p>			
--	--	--	--	--	---	--	--	--

Recommendation based on Council review of GEF Annual Thematic Evaluations Report 2011 (GEF/ME/C.41/02).

Ref. #	Date of Council Decision	GEF EO Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2013	GEF EO Comments in MAR 2013	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2014	GEF EO Rating & Comments in MAR 2014
3	Nov. 2011	As GEF-5 strategies were approved and are now under implementation, NCSA experiences and lessons learned should be incorporated in a new GEF strategic framework for capacity development for GEF-6.	The Secretariat takes note of the evaluation's first recommendation "As GEF-5 strategies were approved and are now under implementation NCSA experiences and lessons learned should be incorporated in a new GEF strategic framework for capacity development for GEF-6." The Secretariat believes that capacity development is better achieved if situated within projects and programs that are directed towards GEF focal area objectives and therefore would take into consideration the findings of the review while developing the overall programming approach for GEF-6.	Decision on Agenda Item 8: The Council, having considered document GEF/ME/C.41/02, Annual Thematic Evaluations Report 2011 and document GEF/ME/C.41/03, Management Response to the Annual Thematic Evaluations Report 2011, requested the Secretariat to incorporate NCSA experiences and lessons learned in the programming approach for GEF-6.	Substantial. GEFSEC: The CCCD strategy has been applied and the resources allocated fully used for projects that build upon the NCSAs. The strategy for GEF6 has also taken this into account and will complete the process of helping countries to resolve the challenges identified in the NCSAs. UNEP: We continue to encourage the GEF to move to more comprehensive cross cutting CD approaches that would reflect key drivers of change and help move GEF investments achieve stronger transformational change.	Medium: GEFIEO acknowledges the progress made on GEF-6 programming but the strategy has yet to be adopted. This decision will be graduated after the new strategy has been adopted.	High: As of December 2014, GEF, with assistance from UNDP and UNEP has supported the implementation of NCSAs in 146 countries. 23 NCSA follow-up projects, i.e., Cross-Cutting Capacity Development (CCCD) projects were implemented by UNDP and 3 by UNEP, all funded under the GEF-3 and GEF-4 cycles. An independent assessment of these CCCD (so-called CB2) projects was conducted in 2013-2014. The results of this assessment can be found at: http://www.thegef.org/gef/capacity_development . Other publications on NCSAs and CCCD can also be found there. During GEF-5, 40 CCCD projects were approved for implementation (32 by UNDP and 8 UNEP) for a total of \$42.4 million. The total funding allocated for CCCD projects during GEF-5 was US\$ 44 million, therefore 96.4% of the available funds were approved in that period. The GEF-6 CCCD strategy, which includes an allocation of \$34 million, was adopted by the Council and is being disseminated at the ECWs and other GEF workshops.	High: This decision will be graduated. Graduated

Recommendation based on Council review of GEF Annual Thematic Evaluations Report 2011 (GEF/ME/C.41/02).

Ref. #	Date of Council Decision	GEF EO Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2013	GEF EO Rating & Comments in MAR 2013	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2014	GEF EO Rating & Comments in MAR 2014
4	Nov. 2011	Knowledge products of NCSAs, including toolkits on how to conduct them, should be made available to agencies and GEF workshops such as Multi-Stakeholder Dialogues.	The Secretariat welcomes the finding that the Global Support Program (GSP) improved the implementation of NCSAs. The Secretariat will work through the Country Support Program (CSP) to ensure that the evaluation's second recommendation that "Knowledge products of NCSAs, including toolkits on how to do them, should be made available to agencies and GEF workshops such as Multi-stakeholder dialogues," is implemented. Relevant materials and toolkits will be updated and distributed through the Expanded Constituency Workshops (ECWs) and Multi-stakeholder dialogues.	Decision on Agenda Item 8: The Council, having considered document GEF/ME/C.41/02, Annual Thematic Evaluations Report 2011 and document GEF/ME/C.41/03, Management Response to the Annual Thematic Evaluations Report 2011, requested the Secretariat to make available knowledge products of NCSAs, including toolkits on how to conduct them, to agencies and GEF workshops such as Multi-Stakeholder Dialogues as well as to GEF focal points.	High. GEFSEC: The ECWs continued to dedicate full session to CCCD based on the NCSAs and this has led to numerous countries to initiate CCCD projects. The eligible countries that have yet to apply for a CCCD project will be encouraged to do so in GEF6. The material needed is available.	Substantial. As noted in the IEO's MAR assessment the ECW sessions on NCSAs mark a substantial progress from the baseline. On other aspects the difference in opinion with the Secretariat is on the extent progress has been made. The Office will keep tracking this issue.	High: The ECWs that have begun during the GEF-6 replenishment period continue to dedicate one session to the CCCD strategy and to encourage countries to make use of this source of funding to improve their capacities to comply with their commitments under the MEAs.	High: This decision will be graduated. Graduated

Recommendation based on Council review of Annual Country Portfolio Evaluation Report 2012 (GEF/ME/C.42/03).

Ref. #	Date of Council Decision	GEF EO Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2013	GEF EO Rating & Comments in MAR 2013	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2014	GEF EO Rating & Comments in MAR 2014
5	June 2012	Project approval and implementation in Small Island Developing States should be more flexible and context-specific.	The Secretariat takes note of the remaining conclusions in the 2012 ACPER, including the unique challenges faced by Small Island Developing States (SIDS) in developing and implementing projects. With respect to recommendation one "Project approval and implementation in Small Island Developing States should be more flexible and context specific," caution should be exercised in order not to give the impression that each country's unique needs can be met in every case. The specific example of Cuba outlined in paragraph 84 provides an appropriate example where such generalization would be impractical/infeasible. Nevertheless, the GEF Secretariat supports the recommendation that calls for increased flexibility to SIDS whenever it is indeed feasible.	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," and having taken note of the two Country Portfolio Evaluations in Nicaragua and OECS (GEF/ME/C.42/Inf.02) requested the Secretariat: 1) To consider ways to make project approval and implementation in Small Island Developing States more flexible and context-specific.	Negligible. Within the scope of the GEF's project cycle procedures, the Secretariat continues to encourage Agencies to pay attention to the specific needs of the SIDS in project preparation and implementation, through the project review process. As mentioned in the management response, it is not feasible to tailor approval and implementation procedures and/or standards for specific groups of countries. World Bank response: Agree with the rating. We would welcome any simplification to help support project approval and implementation in SIDS/LDCs, addressing capacity needs, and suggest that the GEF Secretariat convene meeting to address this discussion. We would also suggest that the GEF considers such flexibility for fragile and conflict states. We would suggest higher fees be considered for SIDS/LDCs and fragile and conflict states to ensure the appropriate level of support as per the example of other funding mechanisms (e.g. IDA).	Negligible. GEF IEO finds no evidence of measures that will make project approval and implementation in SIDS more flexible and context-specific.	Negligible: The Secretariat response remains the same as in MAR 2013.	Negligible. GEF IEO still finds no evidence of measures that will make project approval and implementation in SIDS more flexible and context-specific. The IEO does acknowledge the practical difficulties in making improvements as it requires a balancing between two competing policy objectives – uniformity at the corporate level for simplicity, and customization to become context specific. Retired. The GEF IEO will retire this decision from MAR.

Recommendation based on Council review of Annual Country Portfolio Evaluation Report 2012 (GEF/ME/C.42/03).

Ref #	Date of Council Decision	GEF EO Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2013	GEF EO Rating & Comments in MAR 2013	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2014	GEF EO Rating & Comments in MAR 2014
6	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 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 currently no multifocal area projects under implementation that require tracking tools from more than one focal area.	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," 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.	Medium GEFSEC: GEF-6 programing has taken a review of indicators, and they have been streamlined and reflected in the programming document World Bank response: We urge acceleration of progress on this issue under streamlining. There are missed opportunities to simplify in GEF-6 proposals (e.g. requiring at least two focal areas for SFM, increases monitoring complexity). UNDP response: The M&E requirements for multifocal area projects need to be formalized and clearly explained in a GEF policy document. UNEP: We anticipate that the interagency working group on streamlining will make progress on this issue.	Medium. The GEF-6 Programming Document has covered integrated approaches in detail. That section specifically refers to replacing the traditional GEF tracking tools with a limited set of key outcome indicators to track achievements, to be tested by the lead agency in a pilot programmatic approach. These indicators will replace the traditional tracking tools and offer a simplified framework to tracking multi-focal area results, and against which projects submitted under a single Integrated Approach will be reviewed for GEF eligibility. Once aggregated, funding for the pilot would only be tracked against this pilot-specific results framework.	Substantial: GEFSEC is undertaking a process to consolidate and align tracking tools with the GEF-6 strategy. Through this initiative the indicators have been simplified to focus on those most relevant to the portfolio level reporting needs of the individual focal areas, but also efforts are being made to identify synergy across focal areas on a simplified TT for MFA projects. The process is still ongoing but the result will be tools which is now much more amenable for use in both single and multi-focal area projects.	Medium: GEF IEO acknowledges that a process of consolidation and alignment of tracking tools (TT) with the GEF-6 strategy has been launched and is now ongoing. However, design of simplified TTs for MFA projects still has to be finalized. During the process the number of tracked indicators have been reduced for some focal areas. It is not clear, however, how the concern related to multi-focal projects is being tackled.

Recommendation based on Council review of Annual Country Portfolio Evaluation Report 2012 (GEF/ME/C.42/03).

Ref #	Date of Council Decision	GEF EO Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2013	GEF EO Rating & Comments in MAR 2013	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2014	GEF EO Rating & Comments in MAR 2014
7	June 2012	South-South cooperation should be enabled as components of national, regional and global projects where opportunities for exchange of technology, capacity development and/or sharing of best practices exist.	The Secretariat takes note of recommendation three that "South-South cooperation should be enabled as components of national, regional and global projects where opportunities for exchange of technology, capacity development and/or sharing best practices exist." The Secretariat agrees as is stated in paragraph 89 that enabling South-South cooperation should not be in the form of funding from GEF project financial resources to those Southern countries providing South-South support.	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," and having taken note of the two Country Portfolio Evaluations in Nicaragua and OECS (GEF/ME/C.42/Inf.02) requested the Secretariat: 3) To enable South-South cooperation activities as components of national, regional and/or global projects where opportunities for exchange of technology, capacity development and/or sharing of best practices exist.	Medium World Bank response: We have included south-south collaboration in GEF programmatic approach, but these 'glue' parts of programs tend to be under-funded. To embed this more systematically in project design, we suggest more discussion on the implementation of this recommendation, including some form of funding from GEF grants. UNDP response: South-south cooperation remains a high corporate priority in UNDP as noted in the UNDP Strategic Plan for 2014-2017. FAO comment: FAO has been mainstreaming SSC in its program and projects. In 2012, a SS and resource mobilization division was created to assist and develop member countries capacities in SSC.	Medium. Some progress has been made through inclusion of South-South cooperation in programming and policy documents by a few GEF Agencies. The GEFIEO will continue to look for evidence of project-level application of this Council Decision in its ongoing and future country level evaluations.	Medium. IFAD comment: A key priority for operational effectiveness is South-South and Triangular Cooperation. Strategic approaches already developed will be consolidated under the IFAD 10 period. FAO update: SSC continues to be an organizational priority and a key element in FAO's programmes and projects. World Bank comment: 'Medium'. South-south collaboration and other forms of knowledge exchange that serve as 'glue' for projects/programs tend to be under-funded or not funded. To encourage more systematic embedding of S-S cooperation/knowledge exchange in project/program design, we recommend integrating implementation of this recommendation into the design of the GEF-6 Knowledge Management Strategy and Work Plan, and budgeting for this	Screened out because of the revised approach. Adoption not rated. (One more GEF Agency has joined the previous year's group in stating that SSC and triangular cooperation are priorities in their programming and policy documents. Hopefully, this will translate into SSC cooperation agreements and/or activities embedded into projects and operations in a budget neutral way from the GEF funding point of view.) Deferred. The Council decision is a directional decision. This decision will be revisited for the next comprehensive evaluation of the GEF.

							through some form of funding from GEF grants.	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	---	--

Recommendation based on Council review of Annual Thematic Evaluations Report 2012 (GEF/ME/C.43/02).

Ref #	Date of Council Decision	GEF EO Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2013	GEF EO Rating & Comments in MAR 2013	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2014	GEF EO Rating & Comments in MAR 2014
8	Nov. 2012	An explicit discussion of envisaged causal linkages and chains of causality in line with current scientific knowledge should form the basis for the formulation of GEF-6 Strategies.	The Secretariat will consider the specific causal linkages and pathways presented in this report for each focal area when developing the GEF-6 strategies. As stated in the evaluation and as was undertaken in GEF-5, the scientific community represented by the STAP panel, together with experts that may be engaged through Technical Advisory Panels, will play a central role to ensure the latest scientific knowledge is fully taken into account in strategy development.	Decision on Agenda Item 10: The Council, having considered document GEF/ME/C.43/02, Annual Thematic Evaluations Report 2012 and document GEF/ME/C.43/03, Management Response to the Annual Thematic Evaluations Report 2012, requested the Secretariat to ensure that: a) An explicit discussion of envisaged causal linkages and chains of causality in line with current scientific knowledge forms the basis for the formulation of GEF-6 Strategies.	Medium GEFSEC: Reflected in GEF-6 strategies. World Bank response: We would welcome discussion of causal links, as we have found that more thought needs to go into how such overarching chains of causality can apply pragmatically to GEF projects. Further, a credible causal link map for multi-focal projects would be welcome. UNEP: In implementing the GEF-6 strategies, UNEP believes STAP can play a useful role in identifying the scientific knowledge required to form the basis for articulating and monitoring chains of causality in both projects and portfolios of projects. STAP welcomes the opportunity to work with GEFSec and the Agencies to tease these linkages out, where appropriate.	Medium. The GEF IEO is in agreement with the GEF Secretariat's assessment. The Office notes the progress in the proposed strategies for GEF-6.	Medium: The Secretariat response remains the same as in MAR 2013.	Medium: The GEF-6 strategies have already been formulated and taken into account drivers of environmental degradation. Further progress on this topic may take place when the topic of the GEF strategies opens up for discussion again for GEF-7. Retired. The Office will revisit the issue when it conducts the next comprehensive evaluation of GEF.

Recommendation based on Council review of Annual Thematic Evaluations Report 2012 (GEF/ME/C.43/02).

Ref #	Date of Council Decision	GEF EO Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2013	GEF EO Rating & Comments in MAR 2013	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2014	GEF EO Rating & Comments in MAR 2014
9	Nov. 2012	GEF-6 Strategies should enable a more flexible and strategic approach to developing Multi-Focal Area projects which would be able to adopt elements from several focal areas in a consistent manner.	The Secretariat fully agrees with Recommendation 2 that GEF-6 strategies should “enable a more flexible and strategic approach to developing Multi-Focal Area projects, which would be able to adopt elements from several focal areas in a consistent manner.” The Secretariat and the Agencies have initiated discussions in regards to the streamlining measures, and will continue to work with our partners to develop a more coherent strategy for Multi-Focal Area projects in GEF-6.	Decision on Agenda Item 10: The Council, having considered document GEF/ME/C.43/02, Annual Thematic Evaluations Report 2012 and document GEF/ME/C.43/03, Management Response to the Annual Thematic Evaluations Report 2012, requested the Secretariat to ensure that: b) GEF-6 Strategies enable a more flexible and strategic approach to Multi-Focal Area projects, which would be able to adopt elements from several focal areas in a consistent manner.	Medium GEFSEC: Reflected in GEF-6 strategies WB Response: Reference to comment on point 13, we fully agree with the recommendation to revisit the approach to MFAs. The partnership has not yet fully addressed how to deal with programmatic or multifocal area projects in a simple and consistent manner. UNEP: We anticipate that the interagency working group on streamlining will make progress on this issue.	Medium. GEF Secretariat and GEF IEO agree that progress on this decision has been medium. As also pointed out by the World Bank the partnership has not yet fully addressed how to deal with multifocal area projects in a simple and consistent manner.	Medium: The programming dialogues that are undertaken at the National Dialogues and the Extended Constituency Workshops clearly reflects upon the GEF2020 vision of applying integrated thinking leading to long term sustainability and impact than a range of smaller projects would be able to achieve. This effects that countries and GEF agencies are working towards combining national priorities into concepts addressing multiple issues, some within single focal areas, but there is a clear tendency to moving towards more strategic multi focal area projects for achieving multiple environment and development benefits at appropriate scales.	Medium: The GEF Secretariat and GEF IEO agree on the rating on the progress on this decision. The GEF Secretariat still has not fully addressed how to deal with multifocal area projects in a simple and consistent manner. This issue will be tracked in a more detailed manner through the proposed GEFIO evaluation on multiple benefits. Retired. GEF-6 strategies have already been formulated.

Recommendation based on Council review of Annual Thematic Evaluations Report 2012 (GEF/ME/C.43/02).

Ref #	Date of Council Decision	GEF EO Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2013	GEF EO Rating & Comments in MAR 2013	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2014	GEF EO Rating & Comments in MAR 2014
10	Nov. 2012	GEF-6 Strategies should be based on systematic considerations of potential pathways from GEF activities to the broader adoption of GEF results to further define and strengthen the GEF's catalytic role.	The Secretariat and the Agencies are committed to considering potential ways GEF and LDCF/SCCF activities can lead to transformational impacts. As part of the GEF-6 strategy development process, the Secretariat will take Recommendation 3 into account and consider "potential pathways from GEF activities to the broader adoption of GEF results to further define and strengthen the GEF's catalytic role."	Decision on Agenda Item 10: The Council, having considered document GEF/ME/C.43/02, Annual Thematic Evaluations Report 2012 and document GEF/ME/C.43/03, Management Response to the Annual Thematic Evaluations Report 2012, requested the Secretariat to ensure that: c) GEF-6 Strategies include a strengthened articulation of potential pathways from activities to the broader adoption of results to maximize the GEF's catalytic role.	Medium GEFSEC: Reflected in GEF-6 strategies WB response: Reference to comment on point 15; we agree with the potential higher impact of such projects, but application of this concept requires further discussion on practical and financial implications for projects of shifting focus to broader adoption across focal areas and the portfolio in the longer term; and what the GEF should do less of. UNEP: In addition to reiterating our earlier comment, UNEP suggests that the GEF consider reporting on focal area impacts over a longer time frame. Often impacts are not felt until years after a project has ended and often the impacts are the result of multiple interventions. A longer reporting horizon would focus attention on the sustainability and impact of the focal area portfolio.	Not possible to verify yet. Progress on this is difficult to ascertain at the moment. This may be assessed through a systematic analysis of projects that are CEO Endorsed during GEF 6. A review of the designs of the earlier cohorts of GEF-6 projects may provide more information on adoption of the Council's decision.	Medium: The Secretariat response remains the same as in MAR 2013.	Not possible to verify yet. The approach adopted by the 2020 Strategy seeks to address drivers of environmental degradation. The TOC approach has therefore been adopted at the strategic level. Mainstreaming these at the project level might take time as this would be a significant operational change. Retired. GEF 6 Strategies have already been formulated.

Recommendation based on Council review of Annual Thematic Evaluations Report 2012 (GEF/ME/C.43/02).

Ref #	Date of Council Decision	GEF EO Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2013	GEF EO Rating & Comments in MAR 2013	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2014	GEF EO Rating & Comments in MAR 2014
11	Nov. 2012	GEF-6 Strategies should revisit the GEF's overall approach to capacity development in response to concerns voiced by the conventions.	The Secretariat agrees with Recommendation 5 and will revisit the GEF's overall approach to capacity development as part of the GEF-6 strategy discussion. While the Secretariat agrees that capacity development is included as part of activities within focal areas, flexibility for standalone capacity development is useful and necessary.	Decision on Agenda Item 10: The Council, having considered document GEF/ME/C.43/02, Annual Thematic Evaluations Report 2012 and document GEF/ME/C.43/03, Management Response to the Annual Thematic Evaluations Report 2012, requested the Secretariat to ensure that: d) GEF-6 Strategies revisit the GEF's overall approach to capacity development in response to concerns voiced by the conventions.	Medium GEFSEC: Reflected in GEF-6 strategies UNEP: We look forward to working with the GEF to enhance capacity development efforts in GEF-6.	Medium The GEF IEO is in agreement with the Secretariat's rating. The decision is reflected in the proposals for the GEF-6 strategies. However, these proposals have not yet been adopted.	High The proposals have been adopted as part of the programming documents of the replenishment and approved by the Council and communicated to the Assembly.	High: This decision will be graduated. Graduated

Recommendation based on Council review of GEF Annual Impact Report 2012 (GEF/ME/C.43/04).

Ref #	Date of Council Decision	GEF EO Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2012	GEF EO Rating & Comments in MAR 2012	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2014	GEF EO Rating & Comments in MAR 2014
12	Nov. 2012	[This Council Recommendation comes from a complete reading of the report (GEF Annual Impact Report 2012), and is not linked to any individual GEF EO recommendation]	[No direct response given to this Council decision, as it was not linked to a specific GEF EO recommendation].	<p>Decision on Agenda Item 11: The Council, having reviewed document GEF/ME/C.43/04, "GEF Annual Impact Report 2012", and document GEF/ME/C.43/05, "Management Response to the GEF Annual Impact Report 2012", took note of the considerable achievements of GEF support to the South China Sea and adjacent areas including, amongst others, that in 21 of 26 cases where comparative data could be obtained, GEF has supported initiatives that reduced environmental stress and improved or maintained socioeconomic conditions.</p> <p>Given the important contributions that GEF support has made to addressing regional transboundary concerns, and the role of the GEF as a critical player in the region, as noted by the report, the Council requested the Secretariat to:</p> <p>1) Take into account the findings and recommendations of this evaluation when screening future proposals submitted for GEF funding in the South China Sea and adjacent areas, most notably:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • when choosing areas for expansion, that the conditions conducive to broader adoption are present in those areas; • that the distinctive competencies within the GEF partnership are more fully drawn on to mainstream transboundary environmental concerns among sectorial ministries • that systems for managing risks and trade-offs are specified; • that more attention is given to the support of actions that address regional environmental goods and services; • that cash and in-kind co-financing for regional services provided by GEF projects reach sustainable levels by project end; 	<p>Medium GEFSEC: The Recommendations have been informing the SCS proposal potentially to be included in the May 2014 WP. Specifically: 1) the areas that will be chosen for investments on the ground will be conducive for broader adoption by the participating countries. Among others this is done by assuring that regional and national important coastal habitats (such as mangroves, coral reefs, sea grass beds and brackish water lagoons etc.) offering important breeding grounds and biodiversity hotspots. The investments will enable the setup of national and regional level cooperation towards improved and better informed Coastal habitat management.</p> <p>2) The proposed actions in the proposed SCS project will be identifying opportunities regionally and nationally towards long-term financial sustainability of the South China Sea investments, this will primarily be done by working towards an output that will be delivering</p>	<p>Medium. This council decision covers six critical aspects of GEF support to IW as related to GEF financing in the SCS. There has been progress in addressing some aspects of the decision, such as the progress in financing the follow up to the SCS SAP and a project focused on fishing refugia and other regional public goods. Nevertheless project design for follow up financing for PEMSEA is still under development. It is in this stream of financing were the evaluation concerns were more prominent on regional goods, the proper management of risks, to ensuring project expansion meet preconditions for broader adoption and ensuring financial sustainability of regional mechanisms. . The GEF Secretariat reported that these issues have been pointed out several times in the review process of follow up projects that are now being prepared in the region. Full assessment of the extent to which this decision has been take up will only be possible once the SCS SAP and follow up PEMSEA projects have</p>	<p>Medium: The project mentioned in MAR13 (Scaling up the Implementation of the Sustainable Development Strategy for the Seas of East Asia), has subsequently been CEO Endorsed in May 2014. The project is designed to catalyze actions and investments at the regional, national and local levels to rehabilitate and sustain coastal and marine ecosystem services and build a sustainable coastal and ocean-based economy in the East Asian region. To do so the project will build linkages between sustainable development of river basins, coastal and marine areas and local, national and regional investment processes. Further, the project will support enabling policies, institutional arrangements and</p>	<p>Screened out because of the revised approach. Adoption not rated.</p> <p>(The various recommendations of the SCS Impact Evaluation will for the most part take time to implement as new projects are approved. Progress in the direction of the evaluation recommendations will require evaluative assessments looking specifically at the extent to which new projects have incorporated recommendations.)</p> <p>Deferred. The IEO will carry out this assessment as part of the planned evaluation on programmatic approaches. This evaluation will assess the extent to which recommendations remained relevant and the progress made towards the recommendations. The decision is graduated from MAR.</p>

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • that adequate coordination and management of risks within the GEF partnership be given attention. 	<p>stronger financial sustainable and formal arrangements for regional cooperation in the management of the marine and coastal environment in the South China Sea, primarily through working with COBSEA.</p> <p>Finally, as the recommendations have been noted by the IW Task Force, the recommendations continuously inform upcoming and planned GEF IW investments in other regions, i.e. when choosing areas for expansion, ensuring that the conditions conducive to broader adoption are present in those areas, making sure that the projects benefit from the unique competencies that exists within the GEF partnership towards continue to working with the national ministries to mainstream the regionally agreed transboundary water issues into local, national and regional actions.</p> <p>World Bank response: We will reflect this in future proposals for SCS. Meanwhile, this also relates to a larger issue of how GEF programmatic approaches should be designed, managed, coordinated and</p>	<p>been designed and approved.</p>	<p>legal environments to scale up IMC implementation on the ground, coupled with mobilization of broader technical and investment support. Finally, the project will deliver a self-sustaining, country-owned, regional mechanism governing and managing LMEs and coastal waters, rebuilding and sustaining ecosystems services and reducing the impacts of climate change on coastal populations in the East Asian Seas region.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	---	------------------------------------	--	--

					<p>resourced, for which further streamlining is needed.</p> <p>UNEP hopes that the May 2014 Council submission of the South China Seas (SCS) Strategic Action Programme (SAP) implementation project will provide another opportunity to implement this recommendation. The SCS SAP implementation project will assist countries in meeting the targets of the approved SAP for the marine and coastal environment of the SCS through implementation of the National Action Plans in support of the SAP, and through strengthening regional co-ordination for SCS SAP implementation</p> <p>In response to bullet 4 - The SCS SAP implementation project also has a set of activities looking at improved national and regional values for the Total Economic Values of coastal habitats for use in development planning and decision-making.</p>			
--	--	--	--	--	---	--	--	--

Recommendation based on Council review of GEF Annual Impact Report 2012 (GEF/ME/C.43/04).

Ref #	Date of Council Decision	GEF EO Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2013	GEF EO Rating & Comments in MAR 2013	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2014	GEF EO Rating & Comments in MAR 2014
13	Nov. 2012	Recommendation 5 from the GEF Annual Impact Report 2012: A more robust programmatic approach should be developed for GEF IW support to the SCS and adjacent area...GEF engagements with the magnitude of support given in the SCS and adjacent areas require more robust tracking and reporting of multiagency commitments to communication, coordination and introspection among IW projects, and a common focus on global benefits. GEF has introduced the stocktaking meetings for this purpose, but as indicated above, they have only skirted around critical GEF partnership issues. Given the structural nature of the interactions among agencies (being equals), the responsibility for more robust tracking and reporting with regards to multi-agency collaboration and cooperation should be placed on the GEF Secretariat. This new function should be approached as an instrument for adaptive management. It should also allow for inputs from the various GEF stakeholders, including country representatives, and seek to identify and tackle critical issues affecting the functioning of the partnership and the	The Secretariat and Agencies appreciate Recommendation 5 that “A more robust programmatic approach should be developed for GEF IW support to the SCS and adjacent areas.” Subsequent to the implementation of the projects in the SCS, the GEF has recognized the importance of a programmatic approach in the region and has made several changes in how programming is undertaken. This includes a medium-sized project (MSP) for the recently approved World Bank programmatic approach in the SCS with the mandate to coordinate the program. In addition to measures taken within specific programmatic approaches and projects, we are supporting robust dialogues through the Inter-Agency Focal Area Task Forces which are chaired by the GEF Secretariat as a forum for further collaboration and cooperation. It should also be noted, that in the case of the SCS regional project, there was no attempt prior to the approval of these projects to think of strategic partnerships, programmatic approaches or similar constructs.	The Council, having reviewed document GEF/ME/C.43/04, “GEF Annual Impact Report 2012”, and document GEF/ME/C.43/05, “Management Response to the GEF Annual Impact Report 2012”, took note of the considerable achievements of GEF support to the South China Sea and adjacent areas including, amongst others, that in 21 of 26 cases where comparative data could be obtained, GEF has supported initiatives that reduced environmental stress and improved or maintained socioeconomic conditions. Given the important contributions that GEF support has made to addressing regional transboundary concerns, and the role of the GEF as a critical player in the region, as noted by the report, the Council requested the Secretariat to: 2) Adopt a more robust tracking and reporting approach to ensure Agency accountability for collaboration and cooperation in the South China Sea and the East Asian Seas.	Medium GEFSEC: In the SCS area, for the proposed upcoming SCS SAP Implementation project, execution will happen through COBSEA, Secretariat. COBSEAs mandate is to be a regional institutional mechanism, with nine countries being a member. As an example systems will be setting up at national and regional level to track results of the implementation of the SAP issues. These systems will then allow for setting up an enhanced information database for coastal habitat and land based sources of marine pollution to better inform local, national and regional priority setting and follow up actions. UNEP: Should the South China Sea (SCS) Strategic Action Programme (SAP) implementation project be approved, it will have a component looking at strengthening knowledge-based action planning for the management of coastal habitats and land-based pollution to reduce environmental degradation of the SCS.	Negligible Collaboration and cooperation among agencies is critical in international waters and country oversight of projects is also important to build country ownership of outcomes and processes. Nevertheless the key point of this recommendation is related to ensuring the accountability for interagency collaboration. This requires the establishment of clear responsibilities for coordination and communication among agencies and an accountability structure that can be verify interaction across agencies and funding streams. So far stock taking meetings have not function as accountability instruments and there has been no entity or mechanisms in place to ensure accountability or frank discussion on aspects related cooperation and	Medium: The project “Scaling up the Implementation of the Sustainable Development Strategy for the Seas of East Asia” will facilitate cooperation among a number of regional bodies, among other through Signed Partnership Agreements between PEMSEA and YSLME Commission, WCPF Commission and other regional governance mechanisms to enable planning, coordination and implementation among the respective SAPs, while addressing EAS program sustainability and integration with broader regional cooperation frameworks. Further, cooperation, collaboration and coordination is consistently being carried out through the IW Task Force,	Medium: The coordination of GEF support with other regional initiatives is an important step to ensure the effectiveness of GEF support in the SCS. While the IW task force can be used to exchange information among Agencies, there is still no clarity of the mechanism put in place to monitor and ensure coordination and cooperation accountability among initiatives and regional institutions supported by the GEF in the SCS and adjacent areas.

		execution of the broader GEF strategy in the region.			<p>Activities under this component have been designed to support consensus building on the information and data to be used in planning and implementing the required local, national and regional reforms required to address the degradation of coastal habitats, land-based pollution, and the adoption of stronger and more formal arrangements for regional co-operation in the management of the marine and coastal environment of the South China Sea. Given the geopolitical sensitivities characterizing the SCS region, such a consensual approach is deemed necessary in: tracking and reporting on results of SAP implementation; generating agreement among the region's scientists and policy makers on the analytical approaches used to prioritize options and reforms required to address environmental problems; fostering strengthened multi-lateral cooperation; and planning interventions that deliver both local results for beneficiary communities and high transboundary impacts.</p>	<p>collaboration across agencies and streams of financing. The responses provided so far continue to be agency specific and do not address the purpose of the recommendation.</p>	<p>for the region in question as well as the rest of the regions IW are engaged in.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--	---	---	--

Recommendation based on Council review of GEF Annual Impact Report 2012 (GEF/ME/C.43/04).

Ref #	Date of Council Decision	GEF EO Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2013	GEF EO Rating & Comments in MAR 2013	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2014	GEF EO Rating & Comments in MAR 2014
14	Nov. 2012	The findings of this (GEF Annual Impact Report 2012) evaluation should be considered when developing the GEF 6 International Waters Focal Area and, when applicable, the strategies of other focal areas.	The Secretariat as stated in Recommendation 8 will consider the findings from the SCS evaluation when developing the GEF-6 IW strategies.	Decision on Agenda Item 11: The Council, having reviewed document GEF/ME/C.43/04, "GEF Annual Impact Report 2012", and document GEF/ME/C.43/05, "Management Response to the GEF Annual Impact Report 2012", took note of the considerable achievements of GEF support to the South China Sea and adjacent areas including, amongst others, that in 21 of 26 cases where comparative data could be obtained, GEF has supported initiatives that reduced environmental stress and improved or maintained socioeconomic conditions. Given the important contributions that GEF support has made to addressing regional transboundary concerns, and the role of the GEF as a critical player in the region, as noted by the report, the Council requested the Secretariat to: 3) Take in to account the findings and recommendations of this evaluation when developing the GEF 6 International Waters Strategies	Medium GEFSEC: Reflected in GEF-6 strategies	Medium. As many of the topics addressed by the evaluation are central to the GEF approach to IW support, GEF 6 have move in the direction of some of the recommendations. As this are long term processes it cannot be expected that rapid progress can be made on all recommendations. Nevertheless it is also not clear in the GEF 6 Programming Directions document how the partnership will handle the key operational concern raised by the evaluation referring to the accountability for coordination and collaboration across agencies and streams of funding.	Medium: Funding projects along the GEF 6 IW strategy will continue to make advancements towards the recommendations. As mentioned under #13, cooperation, collaboration and coordination is consistently being carried out through the IW Task Force, for the region in question as well as the rest of the regions IW are engaged in. Finally, the project recently endorsed supporting PEMSEA, will be focusing on facilitating cooperation among a range of regional institutions and arrangements.	Medium: . Given the shifts in the GEF Strategy during GEF-6 and the 2020 vision of the GEF, the Council decision is no more applicable. Retired.

Recommendation based on Council review of GEF Annual Impact Report 2013 (GEF/ME/C.45/1).

Ref #	Date of Council Decision	GEF EO Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2013	GEF EO Rating & Comments in MAR 2013	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2014	GEF EO Rating & Comments in MAR 2014
15	Nov. 2013	The current focus on interventions that tackle barriers to broader adoption in a comprehensive way should be continued and where necessary further strengthened in GEF-6.	The GEF Secretariat appreciates and welcomes the acknowledgement that the shift towards tackling broader adoption in a more comprehensive way is visible in GEF-5 projects. The GEF Secretariat agrees that this effort should be continued especially toward ensuring a quicker progress toward impact. The GEF Secretariat looks forward to the final report of OPS5 on how to further strengthen the ongoing effort. The GEF Secretariat also agrees with the conclusion on the continued need to tackle barriers to broader adoption in a comprehensive way.	The Council, having reviewed document GEF/ME/C.45/1, "Annual Report on Impact", and document GEF/ME/C.45/2, "Management Response to the Annual Report on Impact," notes the considerable achievements of GEF support to Climate Change Mitigation in China, India, Mexico and Russia. It notes that in several projects progress toward impact was slowed down by barriers to change that were not fully included in project design and implementation. However, it is also noted that the current portfolio of mitigation support has shifted towards tackling broader adoption in a more comprehensive way in mitigation support in GEF-5. The Council requests the Secretariat to include this emphasis and where necessary further strengthen it in the proposals for GEF-6.	Medium GEFSEC: Reflected in GEF-6 strategies WB response: Reference to comment on point 15 and 22. We agree with the importance of such projects, but the partnership has not yet been able to discuss practical application of this concept to project design. In principle, all or most projects attempt broad adoption, and it remains unclear what additional strengthening is needed.	Substantial. The proposed GEF 6 Climate change strategy continues to move towards comprehensive approaches that seek to tackle market barriers and support the development of policy context.	Substantial: GEF 6 strategies encourage Agencies to use comprehensive approaches to tackling market barriers. More multi-focal area (MFA) projects are under development in GEF-6 than in GEF-5. Guidance and support through NDI and NPFE are supporting the submission of projects which address drivers and causes of global environment degradation, and stress strategies to remove barriers to generating global environment benefits.	Screened out because of the revised approach. Adoption not rated. (Substantial progress has been made on this decision.) Deferred. Reporting on this decision will be deferred till the next comprehensive evaluation.

Recommendation based on Council review of GEF Annual Impact Report 2013 (GEF/ME/C.45/1).

Ref #	Date of Council Decision	GEF EO Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2013	GEF EO Rating & Comments in MAR 2013	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2014	GEF EO Rating & Comments in MAR 2014
16	Nov. 2013	The measurement of GHG emission reduction, both direct and indirect, needs to be further improved. STAP should be requested to formulate a targeted research project to ensure that over time assessments of direct and indirect GHG emission reductions can be verified.	The GEF Secretariat recognizes the usefulness of developing ex-post GHG emission reductions verification. As stated in the response to Conclusion 5, however, verifying ex-post emission reductions will entail policy and organizational changes along with methodological improvement. To address the need to improve the measurements of GHG emission reduction and verification, the GEF Secretariat suggests to initiate a dialogue, including STAP, on how direct and indirect GHG emission reductions from GEF projects may be verified.	The Council requests the GEF Secretariat, in collaboration with STAP and other relevant entities, to continue its work on the improvement of the methodology of GHG emission reduction calculations, and to engage in a dialogue to improve (i) the assessment of direct GHG emission reduction during project implementation and at completion, and (ii) improved estimation of indirect GHG emission reduction. The Council requests the GEF Secretariat to report back by the next Council meeting with proposals on the way forward	<p>High</p> <p>GEFSEC: The GEF secretariat organized a brainstorming session on 20 February, 2014 and a dialogue meeting on 24 March, 2014 to identify proposals for the way forward to improve the methodologies of GHG emission reduction calculations used for GEF projects. Both meetings involved representatives from STAP, the GEF agencies, the GEF Independent Evaluation Office and experts involved in the design of methodologies of GHG emission reduction calculations. Based on this dialogue, the GEF secretariat drafted concrete proposals to improve (i) the assessment of direct GHG emission reduction during project implementation and at completion, and (ii) the estimation of indirect GHG emission reductions. These proposals are presented to the GEF Council as an information document.</p> <p>WB response: The World Bank has begun greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions accounting for all energy and forestry investment lending projects which have agreed methodologies and are at Concept Note Approval stage on or after July 1, 2013. This will be expanded to the transport sector in July 2014, and covering all relevant</p>	<p>Substantial:</p> <p>The GEF secretariat has demonstrated leadership in working with STAP and other agencies to address the request by council. The process of dialogue and exchange that has started is very promising and likely to lead to the needed improvements and agreement in the measurement of GHG emission reductions.</p>	<p>Substantial: In November 2014, the GEF and STAP formulated a research project to improve GEF GHG accounting methodologies. In the project, three Working Groups (WG) are formed and a consulting firm is engaged. The WG members come from the representatives of the GEF Council, STAP, the GEF IEO, GEF Agencies, the UNFCCC, CSOs (WRI, and REN21) and GEF SEC staff.</p> <p>WG 1 is working on improving measurement of GHG emissions reduction for EE, RE, and transport projects. WG 2 is working on developing methodological framework and guideline for LULUCF or AFOLU projects. WG 3 is designing strategies for operationalizing the GEF new methodological frameworks and guideline.</p>	<p>Substantial: The GEF Secretariat with STAP has set up working groups that include the GEF Agencies and other stakeholders to address the monitoring issues related to GHG emissions pointed out in the evaluation. This is a promising initiative that also seeks to establish communication with other initiatives seeking to harmonize GHG emission monitoring.</p>

					<p>sectors and projects by end of June 2016. Moreover, the World Bank will initiate the reporting of GHG emissions on a portfolio basis after July 2017. This does not include the concept of “indirect” benefits.</p> <p>The World Bank has been engaged in the “dialogue” initiated by GEFSec, and is engaged more broadly in a process of harmonization across MDBs. Given complexity of projects and operational designs, this is a medium term goal.</p> <p>UNEP: STAP stands ready to work with the GEF Secretariat and GEF Partners, including through the development of a targeted research project, in the development of new tools for the measurement of direct and indirect emission reductions from GEF Projects.</p>		<p>The GEF/STAP project will close in June 2015.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	---	--	--	--

Recommendation based on Council review of Mid-Term Evaluation of the STAR (GEF/ME/C.45/04, October 2013)

Ref #	Date of Council Decision	GEF EO Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2013	GEF IEO Rating & Comments in MAR 2013	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2014	GEF IEO Rating & Comments in MAR 2014
17	Nov. 2013	Limits for flexible use of focal area allocations for activities should be increased for countries with marginal flexibility	The Secretariat does not support this recommendation. The Secretariat has an obligation to respect the focal area allocations agreed during the replenishment negotiations. From the perspective of a country, increasing flexibility implies greater autonomy on how resources are used. Increasing flexibility means a fundamental shift in resources among focal areas that could be in gross contravention of replenishment agreements.	The Council, having reviewed document GEF/ME/C.45/04, "Mid-Term Evaluation of the System of Transparent Allocation of Resources (STAR)," and document GEF/ME/C.45/05, "Management Response to the Mid-Term Evaluation of STAR," notes the contribution of STAR to increased country ownership and country led programming in the GEF. Without prejudice to the policy recommendations related to the STAR that may emerge from the GEF-6 replenishment negotiations, the Council requests the Secretariat to take into account the following recommendations while preparing the STAR for GEF-6 for Council consideration: (a) Limits for flexible use of focal area allocations for activities could be increased for countries with marginal flexibility	Medium GEFSEC: To be discussed in STAR proposed for GEF-6 WB response: We agree that flexibility should be increased, and would be relevant not only for countries with marginal flexibility. We found that the evaluation did not provide full insight into why flexibility was relatively under-utilized by countries in GEF-5; and links, if any, with the NPFE evaluation. We hope these issues can be addressed in STAR proposal for GEF -6.	Substantial. The proposal for STAR for GEF-6 being prepared by the GEF Secretariat intends to provide full flexibility for a greater number of countries compared to GEF-5. It also proposes to increase the amount of money that countries that would have marginal flexibility would be able to use across the focal areas covered by STAR. These changes may be expected to resolve the constraints that are being faced in GEF-5. World Bank's response is peripheral to MAR as it, instead of focusing on the action taken on Council decision, focuses on the scope of the underlying evaluation and desirability of the decision. In our opinion, the reasons for lower level of utilization of flexibility are adequately discussed in the technical papers of STAR MTE (STAR Design (2) and Utilization (3)). The STAR MTE was undertaken at a time when implementation of GEF-5 was mid-way. The evaluation did find and report that although countries in the marginal flexibility category – especially those in the 7 million to 20 million range	High Council in May 2014 approved the STAR proposal to provide increased flexibility to countries with marginal flexibility – for all countries with marginal flexibility (i.e., those with more than \$7 million in aggregate allocations) a uniform marginal adjustment of \$2 million will be provided. This is being implemented.	High The STAR for GEF-6 provides full flexibility to countries with total allocations of up to US \$ 7.0 million for use of allocated resources across focal areas covered by STAR. For the recipient countries whose STAR allocation is higher than US \$ 7.0 million it provides a marginal flexibility of up to US \$ 2.0 million for use of allocated resources across focal areas covered by STAR. This denotes a significant increase for countries that were in the US \$ 7.0 million to US \$ 20.0 million and US\$ 20 million to US \$ 100.0 million, who during GEF-5 had marginal flexibility of US \$ 0.2 million and US \$ 1.0 million respectively. Graduated

						<p>– need flexibility, the level of flexibility provided to them in STAR was not sufficient. This was discouraging several countries from using the flexibility feature to the extent they would like to. It also noted that this might be resulting into countries with total allocation in the 7 million to 20 million range showing greater preference for multi-focal area projects.</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Recommendation based on Council review of Mid-Term Evaluation of the STAR (GEF/ME/C.45/04, October 2013)

Ref #	Date of Council Decision	GEF EO Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2013	GEF EO Rating & Comments in MAR 2013	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2014	GEF EO Rating & Comments in MAR 2014
18	Nov. 2013	The STAR index should be improved through specification of better indicators and updating of data.	We agree with this recommendation, recognizing that any improvement of indicators depends upon the availability of supporting data. While the Secretariat will continue to explore alternative indicators that better capture to potential for GEBs from combating land degradation, specifically desertification and deforestation, the current set of indicators will be used for the focal area GBI. Efforts will be made to update the data as appropriate and available from the original sources.	<p>The Council, having reviewed document GEF/ME/C.45/04, "Mid-Term Evaluation of the System of Transparent Allocation of Resources (STAR)," and document GEF/ME/C.45/05, "Management Response to the Mid-Term Evaluation of STAR," notes the contribution of STAR to increased country ownership and country led programming in the GEF. Without prejudice to the policy recommendations related to the STAR that may emerge from the GEF-6 replenishment negotiations, the Council requests the Secretariat to take into account the following recommendations while preparing the STAR for GEF-6 for Council consideration:</p> <p>(b) The STAR index could be improved through specification of better indicators and updating of data</p>	Medium GEFSEC: To be discussed in STAR proposed for GEF-6	Medium GEF IEO: The Secretariat has updated the data for several indicators that constitute the GBI and GPI indices. Minor modifications in the indices have also been proposed.	High: The STAR, with updated indices, was approved by the Council in May 2014 and is under implementation.	<p>Substantial During the preparation of the STAR index for the GEF-6 period, data on indicators for the following indexes were updated:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Performance indexes - GDP based index data updated and the weight of the index increased - Update of data in carbon intensity and forest cover for the climate change benefits index - Update of data on rural population <p>Graduated. Overall, the actions taken indicate a substantial level of adoption of the Council's decision. Given that the changes in STAR indices are generally feasible only once during the replenishment period, the decision</p>

								will be retired from MAR as no further progress may be feasible for GEF-6.
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Recommendation based on Council review of Mid-Term Evaluation of the STAR (GEF/ME/C.45/04, October 2013)

Ref #	Date of Council Decision	GEF EO Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2013	GEF EO Rating & Comments in MAR 2013	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2014	GEF EO Rating & Comments in MAR 2014
19	Nov. 2013	The implementation of STAR can be fine-tuned on several aspects, most notably a more thorough calculation of the allocations with sufficient quality control, and improvements in the process for STAR calculation and database management.	The Secretariat welcomes the recommendation of quality control. The STAR calculations are complex ones, and the idea of independent calculations by multiple people is a positive one. The Secretariat also welcomes the recommendation for improvements in database management. The Secretariat welcomes the recommendation for improvements in the process for STAR calculations and suggests that we work more closely with the Evaluation Office to ensure that the Terminal Evaluation Report (TER) data being inputted into the model is of better quality.	The Council, having reviewed document GEF/ME/C.45/04, "Mid-Term Evaluation of the System of Transparent Allocation of Resources (STAR)," and document GEF/ME/C.45/05, "Management Response to the Mid-Term Evaluation of STAR," notes the contribution of STAR to increased country ownership and country led programming in the GEF. Without prejudice to the policy recommendations related to the STAR that may emerge from the GEF-6 replenishment negotiations, the Council requests the Secretariat to take into account the following recommendations while preparing the STAR for GEF-6 for Council consideration: (c) The implementation of STAR could be fine-tuned on several aspects, most notably a more thorough calculation of the allocations with sufficient quality control, and improvements in the process for STAR calculation and database management.	Medium GEFSEC: To be discussed in STAR proposed for GEF-6	Medium In response to the Council decision, the Secretariat has taken several measures. It has put in place a system to ensure calculation of the scores by two different staff members and its reconciliation, and has also fixed problems in calculations that were noted in the STAR MTE. The approach is still under implementation as simulations are being run and different scenarios are being developed.	High The Secretariat has undertaken several measures as documented by GEFE's MAR2013 commentary to ensure quality control in the STAR computations.	Substantial The Secretariat put in place a system to ensure calculation of the scores by two different staff members and its reconciliation, and has also fixed problems in calculations that were noted in the STAR MTE. To minimize error it also automated several calculations into the PMIS. The Secretariat also worked with the Independent Evaluation Office to calculate the Terminal Evaluation Review (TER) ratings data for entry into the STAR model. Graduated. These measures indicate an improvement over the approach adopted for GEF-5.

Recommendation based on Council review of the Mid-Term Evaluation of the NPFE (GEF/ME/C.45/06, October 2013)

Ref #	Date of Council Decision	GEF EO Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2013	GEF EO Rating & Comments in MAR 2013	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2014	GEF EO Rating & Comments in MAR 2014
20	Nov. 2013	The NPFE guidelines should address information needs of the countries for programming on topics such as eligibility criteria, co-financing expectations, and funding modalities.	The Secretariat agrees with Recommendation 5 in that current NPFE guidelines should be revised to provide countries with more detailed information of key concepts and issues related to project preparation as well as to refine the content of the NPF. To that effect the guidance for the next round of NPFEs will provide more details as suggested.	<p>The Council, having reviewed GEF/ME/C.45/06, "Mid-Term Evaluation of the National Portfolio Evaluation Exercise (NPFE)," and GEF/ME/C.45/07, "Management Response to the Mid-Term Evaluation of the NPFE," notes the relevance of the NPFEs to address the pre-identification phase of GEF support and its notable success in creating capacity in countries to coordinate and program GEF interventions. The Council requests the Secretariat to:</p> <p>(d) Update NPFE guidelines to address information needs of the countries for programming on topics such as eligibility criteria, co-financing expectations, and funding modalities.</p>	<p>High GEFSEC: The NPFE guidelines have been updated. Once the programming strategies have been adopted by the Council they will be included in the information packages, co-financing will be included in the issues to be discussed and funding modalities explained. The Secretariat will actively participate in all NPFEs in order to provide all advice necessary.</p> <p>WB response: We warmly welcome any guidelines that address the major issues raised in OPS5 and clarification of substantive issues that would help make the NPFE approach more effective and efficient, which requires that guidelines do address the eligibility criteria, co-financing expectations, and funding modalities.</p>	<p>Medium The NPFE guidelines have been updated. However, several topics such as eligibility criteria and co-financing expectations have not yet been covered in adequate detail. On co-financing – a more substantive update will also need to wait for ongoing work of the task force on updating of the co-financing policy. As of now it is unlikely that the guidelines for NPFE will adequately address the information needs on the topics such as eligibility criteria, co-financing expectations and funding modality.</p>	<p>High. The NPFE guidelines were updated in early 2014. These guidelines address the procedures to apply for the grant and require the submission of a draft agenda, a tentative list of participants and a draft budget. These are the key elements necessary for the preparation of the NPFE. The issues of eligibility criteria, co-funding expectations and funding modalities are necessary, together with many others, during the programming is done on a well-informed basis. GEF Staff participate at all NPFEs to provide information and guidance. Relevant Council documents are provided on all the topics under discussion, including the three mentioned above.</p>	<p>Medium The NPFE guidelines, as was noted in the GEF IEO's MAR2013 assessment, have been updated. However, several topics such as eligibility criteria and co-financing expectations have not yet been covered in adequate detail. The guidelines document is less than 500 words long and too brief to address information needs on topics such as eligibility criteria, co-financing expectations and funding modality, adequately. The guidance document does direct the reader to the GEF-6 Programming Directions document and the GEF-6 policy recommendations document, without specific references to the documents. Furthermore, the GEF Co-financing policy may be found among the council documents and not in the GEF-6 Policy Recommendations.</p> <p>Retired. Given the cyclical nature of the NPFEs, even if the guidelines were to be updated now the effort may not be as useful for the GEF-6 period.</p>

Recommendation based on Council review of the GEF IEO Annual Country Portfolio Evaluation Report 2014 (GEF/ME/C.46/04)

Ref #	Date of Council Decision	GEF EO Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2014	GEF EO Rating & Comments in MAR 2014
21	May 2014	The GEF should explore and pursue, where appropriate, the use of established SGP country programmes as service providers to implement community level activities for FSPs and MSPs.	The Secretariat concurs with the recommendation that the GEF should explore and pursue, where appropriate, the use of established SGP country programmes as service providers to implement community-level activities of other GEF-financed full-sized projects and medium-sized projects. The Secretariat has included such a recommendation as part of the proposals in the Council paper on the <i>GEF Small Grants Program Implementation Arrangements</i> , presented at this Council meeting.	The Council, having reviewed document GEF/ME/C.46/04, "Annual Country Portfolio Evaluation Report 2014," document GEF/ME/C.46/05, "Management Response to the Annual Country Portfolio Evaluation Report 2014," requested the Secretariat: 1) To explore and pursue, where appropriate, the use of established SGP country programmes as service providers to implement community level activities for FSPs and MSPs.	High The GEF Council Document on the <i>GEF Small Grants Program Implementation Arrangements</i> (GEF/C.46/13) approved by Council in May 2014 includes a voluntary option for sustaining the efficiency and effectiveness of SGP grant-making in GEF-6, that " is to utilize the country programmes or the global programme as delivery mechanisms for relevant Full-Sized Projects". Based on this, the GEF Secretariat has started discussions with UNDP's Central Programme Management Team and Upgraded Country Programs manager in order to define some criteria for establishing the appropriateness of using this delivery mechanism as well as priority regions and countries.	Substantial: the decision has been incorporated into the SGP programming document for GEF-6, but discussion on how to operationalize it is still ongoing. During GEF-6 the GEF IEO will look into quantifiable evidence of MSPs/FSPs using SGP as service providers to deliver community level activities, both at project design (i.e. share of PIFs and/or PPGs mentioning SGP as service provider) and implementation stages (as reported in PIRs and TEs).

Recommendation based on Council review of the GEF IEO Annual Country Portfolio Evaluation Report 2014 (GEF/ME/C.46/04)

Ref #	Date of Council Decision	GEF EO Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2014	GEF EO Rating & Comments in MAR 2014
22	May 2014	The GEF should pay greater attention to national knowledge exchange and promote dissemination of data and information in the relevant national languages.	The Secretariat agrees with the recommendation to support national knowledge exchange and dissemination of data. As set out in the proposed Country Relations Strategy presented in the GEF-6 Programming document, the Secretariat will facilitate the organization of National Dialogues and National Portfolio Formulation Exercises that, among other things, are also meant to support knowledge exchange among key stakeholders at national level. Additionally, the Secretariat will also organize regional workshops to train participants on the GEF-6 focal area strategies and policy reforms; facilitate trans-boundary collaboration; discuss regional programming; address integrated approaches; and other issues based on thematic and geographic areas. These workshops will be one of the vehicles to improve the knowledge sharing between the GEF and its partners and encourage south-south knowledge exchange. Though the Secretariat cannot be responsible for the translation of project documents into national languages, it recognizes the importance of having accessible documents, in the sense that they are publicly available to the countries in their national languages and clear enough to be useful for key stakeholders. The Secretariat will raise this important issue in the relevant dialogues and processes going forward. Translating and/or summarizing is obviously needed to reach the full potential of the project and promote greater accessibility of information, and therefore, the Secretariat would encourage countries to include appropriate actions among the knowledge and communication activities of the baseline project.	The Council, having reviewed document GEF/ME/C.46/04, "Annual Country Portfolio Evaluation Report 2014," document GEF/ME/C.46/05, "Management Response to the Annual Country Portfolio Evaluation Report 2014," ... requested the Secretariat and the Agencies: 2) To pay greater attention to national knowledge exchange and promote dissemination of data and information in the relevant national languages.	High As indicated in the GEF-6 programming document, a number of countries' have been organizing NPFEs or National Dialogues where stakeholders have been able to discuss issues of common interest, exchange information and reach understanding on how best to utilize the resources available from the GEF. The cycle of ECWs has also began with good results in terms of interaction among delegations leading to exchanges of information on many levels. Different delegations have informed about or made available copies of their publications aimed at dissemination among national stakeholders.	Screened out because of the revised approach. Adoption not rated. (The GEF IEO acknowledges the Secretariat's efforts for national knowledge and information exchange in ECWs and national dialogues, among others. GEF presentations and general documentation has been translated in French and Spanish. While this is appropriate, the focus of the decision is on making sure project designs have included adequate budget provisions for translating into national languages any GEF supported knowledge products on environmental information and data, to foster wider use at national level.) Deferred. The decision is directional in orientation. The GEF IEO will track this when it assess the KM activities for the next comprehensive evaluation of the GEF.

Recommendation based on LDCF/SCCF Council review of Evaluation of the Special Climate Change Fund (GEF/LDCF.SCCF.11/ME/02).

Ref #	Date of LDCF/SCCF Council Decision	GEF EO Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2013	GEF EO Rating & Comments in MAR 2013	Management Rating & Comments in MAR 2013	GEF EO Rating & Comments in MAR 2013
LS-1	Nov. 2011	Recommendation 2: The LDCF/SCCF Council should ask the Secretariat to prepare proposals to ensure: a) transparency of the project pre-selection process; b) dissemination of good practices through existing channels; c) visibility of the fund by requiring projects to identify their funding source.	The Secretariat is pleased to fully endorse the recommendations put forth in the Evaluation... The Secretariat intends to take action in order to implement the second recommendation	Decision on Agenda Item 6: The LDCF/SCCF Council, having reviewed the document GEF/LDCF.SCCF.11/ME/02, Evaluation of the Special Climate Change Fund, and document GEF/LDCF.SCCF.11/ME/03, Management response to the Evaluation of the SCCF, notes the conclusion of the impact of funding levels and the need for continued support. The LDCF/SCCF Council requests the Secretariat to prepare proposals to ensure: a) transparency of the project pre-selection process; b) dissemination of good practices through existing channels; c) visibility of the fund by requiring projects to identify their funding source.	<p>GEFSEC-CCA: Overall rating: Substantial</p> <p>a) High. The Adaptation program has continued to improve the pre-selection process and has further improved the transparency of the process. In addition to continued use of the overall process and criteria, the GEF SEC issues a report for the GEF Agencies for each pre-selection process, including the details of evaluation committee, which includes STAP, and outcome and reasoning concerning the projects in the pre-selection pool.</p> <p>b) High. Efforts made by the GEF SEC have intensified, and include the production of a book on lessons learned from the GEF's adaptation portfolio to-date, as well as a knowledge management event at UNFCCC COP in 2013 during which practitioners associated with GEF's adaptation projects shared their experiences with the wider climate change audience, with plans to continue supporting knowledge dissemination events on a regular (e.g. annual) basis.</p> <p>Substantive. The GEF's outreach effort has intensified, and thus the visibility of the funds has been increasing. In addition, the GEF SEC is further considering measures to enhance the visibility of the funds in FY15, concomitant with and appropriate to its new strategy.</p> <p>UNEP: UNEP welcomes the pre-selection process and the discussion of it at the Task Force forum, as well as the involvement of the STAP</p>	<p>Overall rating: Substantial</p> <p>a) High: The GEFIEO is in agreement with the Secretariat's rating and assessment.</p> <p>b) High: The GEFIEO is in agreement with the Secretariat's rating and assessment.</p> <p>c) Medium: The GEFIEO acknowledges that the Secretariat's outreach effort has been intensified. The GEFIO encourages the Secretariat to prepare a proposal to ensure the visibility of the fund in a more systematic way.</p> <p>The GEFIOE will no longer track sections a) and b) of this Council decision. However, the Office will continue tracking issues related to section c) of this decision.</p>	<p>Substantial: The GEF continues to work with agencies to highlight and promote the identity of the LDCF/SCCF projects and programs through the GEF policy channel, which applies also to LDCF/SCCF (GEF communication and visibility policy in GEF/C.40/08). In addition, the GEF has been working with its agencies to increase the visibility of LDCF/SCCF funded projects through joint initiatives and using various platforms such as UNFCCC events, other conferences, press releases, announcements, publications, including the adaptation book, and a forthcoming documentary.</p>	<p>Substantial: IEO notes the continued work with agencies to highlight and promote the identity of the LDCF/SCCF projects and programs.</p> <p>Graduated. Most of the sub-decisions of the Council that were part of the original Council decision have been adopted. The decision will be graduated from MAR.</p>

					<p>adaptation member in the selection process.</p> <p>WB response: Lessons learnt are very welcome, In numerous multi Trust Fund projects, we find that efforts should be made toward a universal approach of policies and procedures across different funds.</p>			
--	--	--	--	--	---	--	--	--

