



Independent  
Evaluation Office  
GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT FACILITY

Enhancing global environmental benefits through  
excellence in evaluation



Independent  
Evaluation Office  
GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT FACILITY



Independent  
Evaluation Office  
GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT FACILITY

# Sixth Comprehensive Evaluation of the GEF (OPS6)

**Draft final report**

# Outline

- 1** Objective, Quality Assurance, Methodology, Limitations
- 2** GEF Portfolio
- 3** Strategic Relevance
- 4** Performance and Impact
- 5** Focal Areas
- 6** Programmatic Approaches and Integrated Approach Pilots
- 7** Institutional Framework
- 8** Conclusions and Recommendations

## SECTION 1

# Overview



**OPS6 Overview**

**Objective**

To provide solid evaluative evidence to inform the replenishment negotiations for

**GEF-7**

**Methodology**

**29** evaluations and studies

Mix of qualitative and quantitative approaches including geospatial analysis

Formative approaches to evaluate ongoing programs

**Limitations**

**Limitations imposed by data and timing**

OPS6 Overview

## Quality assurance panel

Dr. Hans Bruyninckx

Dr. Holly Dublin

Prof. Osvaldo Feinstein

Dr. Sunita Narain

Dr. Kazuhiko Takemoto

Statement on quality of OPS6 included in annex A


## GEF-6 Overview

# Portfolio (as of June 30, 2017)


444 projects

\$2.4 billion


### Focal areas




### Modalities



### Agencies



### Regions





## OPS6 Overview

# Strategic relevance

**Conventions.** Main funding mechanism for:



Also relevant to the



**Countries**

More than  
**140**  
recipient  
countries


Support for  
middle  
income  
countries  
remains  
important

Support to  
**LDCs and  
SIDS**  
has increased

## GEF Overview

# Relevance to agencies

Share of GEF Portfolio by lead agency in million \$





Independent  
Evaluation Office  
GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT FACILITY

## SECTION 2

# Performance and Impact

## Performance and Impact



Satisfactory outcomes



of projects have outcomes that are likely to be sustained

### Drivers of good performance:

- Project design
- Quality of implementation and execution
- Materialized co-financing

- Performance and sustainability of outcomes > in **middle income countries**
- Institutional capacity challenges in Africa

## PERFORMANCE AND IMPACT

# Broader adoption and transformational change



of projects achieved  
broader adoption



of projects achieved  
environmental stress reduction

### Mechanisms for broader adoption:

- + Mainstreaming and replication
- Scaling-up and market change

### Success factors for transformational change:

- Clear ambition in designs
- Addressing market reforms through policies
- Mechanisms for financial sustainability
- Quality of implementation and execution
- May be achieved by projects of different size

## PERFORMANCE AND IMPACT

# Examples: transformational change

### Uruguay

Wind power  
2008: 0%  
2016: 33%

### Africa

1.3 mln – quality  
solar lanterns;  
  
Private market  
transformed

### Amazon

13.2 mln ha – strict  
protection  
10.8 mln ha –  
sustainable use

### China

Wind power  
2005: 1.3 GW  
2015: 129.3 GW

### Namibia

98% PAs improved;  
  
Doubled number of  
wild dogs, leopards,  
cheetahs, lions  
(2004–12)



Independent  
Evaluation Office  
GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT FACILITY

## SECTION 3

# Focal Areas

# Performance and Impact

## FOCAL AREA STUDIES

# Common findings

*Relevant to conventions*

***Strong performance ratings on outcomes with limited variation***


***Sustainability of outcomes (Land degradation & Biodiversity)***

***M&E Design (International Waters and Chemicals)***

***M&E Implementation (International Waters, Chemicals and Multifocal)***

***Variation in private sector engagement***

***Transformational change***





## FOCAL AREA STUDIES

# Biodiversity: Addresses specific drivers and pressures of biodiversity loss

---

Increase in the biodiversity **mainstreaming** portfolio with focus on reforms, and improved outcomes


---

Percent of forest loss in GEF supported protected areas was **half** that of protected areas not supported


---

### Access to Benefits Sharing

Support to 100 countries in development **legislation** and discovery of “promising compounds”; project designs often “overpacked”



# GEF-supported PAs have **23% less forest loss**





**FOCAL AREA STUDIES**

**Climate change**

**Niche areas in changing  
landscape**

Upstream approaches  
including policy reform  
to accelerate market  
development and create  
an enabling  
environment for  
investment

Risk sharing  
approaches

Piloting  
innovative  
technologies

Collaborating  
with other  
climate funds and  
MDBs to scale up  
investments

**FOCAL AREA STUDIES**

**Climate change: Examples**



**China**



**Bosnia and Herzegovina**



**Mauritius**

297 projects  
1.37 billion

## FOCAL AREA STUDIES

# Climate change adaptation (LDCF/SCCF)



of projects have a high to very high probability of delivering tangible adaptation benefits

- Highly relevant to UNFCCC COP guidance and the GEF Adaptation Strategy
- Agriculture, NRM and climate information systems / disaster risk management



of completed projects received sustainability ratings in the likely range

- Resource availability: Constraint to actual scaling up

## FOCAL AREA STUDIES


# International waters

Support to multiple regional and global treaties

High level of contemporary relevance

Planetary boundaries and environmental tipping points

Significant emphasis on knowledge and learning



Dominance of marine and ocean investments



Decline of the funding envelope



## FOCAL AREA STUDIES

# International waters: Examples



Pacific Islands



GloBallast



Hai River Basin

FOCAL AREA STUDIES

# Land degradation

## Strategy

Shift towards **integrated landscape**

Shift from linkages towards land degradation **neutrality**



**Climate risks, contextual factors, restoration**

## Portfolio

High level  
of effort in

**Africa**

Addresses the  
local  
socioeconomic

**drivers**



## FOCAL AREA STUDIES

# Land degradation



Gambia



Tanzania



Cuba

FOCAL AREA STUDIES

# Chemicals and waste



Strong government ownership



Private sector commitment



Balancing hard outcomes metrics against relatively softer interventions



Promoting sector-wide approaches

## FOCAL AREA STUDIES

# Chemicals and waste



Georgia



China



Mauritius



77% satisfactory outcomes  
61% likely sustainable

## FOCAL AREA STUDIES

# Multifocal

Share of portfolio is growing

Pilot GEF-1 GEF-2 GEF-3 GEF-4 GEF-5 GEF-6



## FOCAL AREA STUDIES

# Multifocal



Majority of projects  
generated multiple benefits



Potential to enhance  
synergies and mitigate trade-  
offs



Institutional  
arrangements for  
sectoral integration

**FOCAL AREA STUDIES**

**Multifocal**

Enhancing synergies

Mitigating trade-offs through value addition



Senegal



Brazil



China


# Do GEF interventions yield positive returns on investment?



Land degradation

43.52  
tC/ha

\$1:1.08




Biodiversity

\$1:1.04

## LAND DEGRADATION


# Value for money: Factors



Lag time of  
4.5 to 5.5 years for  
impacts to be  
observed



Access to electricity  
associated with higher  
impact



Higher impact observed  
in areas with poor initial  
conditions



Vegetation productivity



forest loss and  
land fragmentation





Independent  
Evaluation Office  
GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT FACILITY

## SECTION 3

# Programmatic and Integrated Approach Pilots

## PROGRAMMATIC APPROACHES

### Findings



Program child projects perform slightly better than standalone projects



Outcome performance, cost effectiveness and efficiency decline with increased complexity



Coherence in project-program objectives has improved, but results focused on projects rather than programs

PROGRAMMATIC APPROACHES

# Global Wildlife Program



Relevant to biodiversity strategy

Comprehensive theory of change addressing illegal wildlife trade

Global coordination grant

Simplified M&E framework



Gaps in geographic and species coverage

Structural limitations caused by funding mechanism

Political will and corruption not explicitly addressed

Minimal funding for demand reduction

## INTEGRATED APPROACH PILOTS

Designed to build on **linkages** and **connections** across focal areas  
Formative evaluation based on **30** child projects approved



### Sustainable cities

Challenges to rapid urbanization in 28 cities



### Commodities

Tropical Deforestation caused by soy, beef and palm oil in 4 producing countries



### Food Security

Smallholder agriculture and food value chains in 12 African countries

## INTEGRATED APPROACH PILOTS

### Relevance




GEF has an important convening role



Countries/cities relevant to drivers of environmental degradation



Draw on comparative strength of the Agencies and think tanks



of respondents agree that IAP child projects will address conventions at multiple levels

## INTEGRATED APPROACH PILOTS

### Design



Coherence in objectives between program and child projects

Emphasis on knowledge exchange

Designed for scale up, replication and market transformation

Gender and resilience addressed



Demonstration of program additionality

Specification and measurement of GEB Targets

Alignment between project and program outcome indicators

## INTEGRATED APPROACH PILOTS

### Process



Relevant selection of countries, cities and agencies but process varied

Set-aside funds provided incentives for countries



Agency, city and country selection process not always clear

Under estimate of time to design and launch a complex program

Limited private sector participation

## INTEGRATED APPROACH PILOTS

### Lessons

#### Design

- ✓ Demonstration of GEF additionality and comparative advantage
- ✓ Alignment of objectives between child projects and programs should translate into alignment of indicators
- ✓ Standardized measurements for GEB targets

#### Process

- ✓ Agency selection based on comparative advantage
- ✓ Transparency and clear criteria for agency and country selection
- ✓ Clarity on partnership arrangements

#### Monitoring progress

- ✓ Effectiveness of knowledge platforms
- ✓ Program and Project Outcomes





Independent  
Evaluation Office  
GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT FACILITY


## SECTION 4

# Institutional Framework



# INSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORK

## Financing



Exchange rate  
volatility

\$ £ ¥ €

Donors have  
delivered on funding  
commitments



Fragmentation in  
donor funding



Ability to offer grants  
and  
non-grants  
appreciated


460 projects  
\$2,5 million in GEF investments

## INSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORK

### Private sector



Not an area of comparative advantage



Operational restrictions constrain engagement



Climate change investments feature heavily



**Needs to be seen as a partner, not only a source of funding**

91 projects  
\$732.6 million in GEF investments

## INSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORK

# Non-grant instrument



Greater diversity in use of NGI, beyond climate change



Technical assistance plays a significant role




Accessing NGI funds



In-house capital markets expertise

## INSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORK

# System for Transparent Allocation of Resources (STAR)



Enhanced resource allocation transparency and predictability



Complex



GEF-6 STAR increases in allocation to least developed countries

**SHORTFALL**

**19%**

Country allocations

**33%**

Allocation for non-SIDS, non-LDCs

## INSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORK

### Governance



73%: GEF is effectively governed

CSO network is relevant

Council has good regional balance  
and is transparent



Transparency in management

COI risks of CSOs serving as GEF agencies

Limited delegation from Council to committees

Independent Chair

## INSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORK

# Health of expanded partnership



Increase in access to new capacities

New agencies are catching up quickly

70%: STAP provides high quality knowledge




Inter agency competition counterproductive

Efficiency trade offs with expansion


STAP can play a stronger unifying role

**INSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORK**

**Gender**



**Modest improvements**



**Gender analysis = higher gender ratings**



**Policy does not provide a clear framework**



**Gender Partnership is evolving into a platform to build a constituency**





## INSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORK

# Safeguard policies and indigenous people



Catalytic role in many GEF agencies



GEF projects that include indigenous peoples has increased substantially



Gaps in the GEF Minimum Standards



Most agencies fully consistent with obligations under Minimum Standard 4:IP



Absence of guidance on safeguards reporting during project implementation



UNDP SGP is primary modality for engagement with IPs

**INSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORK**

**PMIS, RBM, Knowledge management:  
PROGRESS OBSERVED**



**Project Management  
Information System**

Data quality needs to keep up with partnership needs



**Results-Based  
Management**

Promotes accountability, limited learning



**Knowledge Management**

Used, and facilitates information sharing and, but access is limited

# Comparative advantage

## RELEVANCE

1. Serves multiple conventions and broad range of environmental issues
2. Strong Support to LDCs and SIDS

## PERFORMANCE

3. Long history of good performance
4. Ability to address linkages and synergies between focal areas

## TRANSFORMATIONAL

5. Ability to Create an enabling environment in countries through legal and regulatory reforms
6. Delivers innovative financial models and risk-sharing approaches

# Recommendations

## Strategic

1. Strategic positioning
2. Transformational change
3. Integration based on additionality

## Financial

4. Financial management
5. Private sector management

## Policies

6. Gender equality
7. Safeguards and indigenous people

## Institutional

8. Operational governance
9. Systems for data, monitoring and knowledge



Independent  
Evaluation Office  
GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT FACILITY

# Sixth Comprehensive Evaluation of the GEF (OPS6)

**Draft final report**