Community-Based Approaches:

First Reference Group Meeting Notes

Meeting Date: April 4, 2022

Main topic: officially launch the evaluation and discuss reference group member feedback on the evaluation approach paper

Participant list	
David Sheppard	IPAG
Cecilia Guerra	CAF
Renae Stenhouse	WWF-US
Genevieve Braun	FAO
Ina Salas Casaso	FAO
Susan Waithaka	GEF Secretariat
Nick Remple	UNDP
Alessandro Moscuzza	STAP
John Donaldson	STAP
Geeta Batra	GEF IEO
Carlo Carugi	GEF IEO
Malac Kabir	GEF IEO
Kate Steingraber	GEF IEO
Anna Viggh	GEF IEO
Juha Uitto	GEF IEO
Rodd Myers	GEF IEO Consultant

Juha Uitto (GEF IEO) – Introduced the evaluation and gave overview of the role of the reference group.

Kate (GEF IEO) – Introduced the evaluation's senior consultant - Rodd Myers. Summarized main points of written comments received by UNDP and CAF:

- The need to define terms used in the evaluation: Who are the communities? What do we mean by 'community-based approaches'?
- The importance of case studies, there is limited external validity if we only do two, importance of carefully selecting stakeholders for interview during field missions – need to be inclusive and tailor questions in an appropriate manner.

David (IPAG) – Stand in for Carlos Prieto (requested an earlier meeting time to accommodate stakeholders in Asia). Highlighted several points from written feedback submitted from Indigenous People's Advisory Group (IPAG) members:

- The importance of the evaluation for learning (positive and negative) and to catch lessons from successful models from the indigenous community – Indigenous and Community Conserved Areas (ICCAs), Locally Managed Marine Areas (LMMAs) in the pacific
- The importance of clarifying the mandate within the GEF for these approaches – when the GEF operates in indigenous areas, inclusion of community-based approaches is essential
- Principles of Free Prior Informed Consent (FPIC) should always be applied
- inquired about a recommendation that GEF include a tag in the portal for community-based approaches in the future
- Would like to see a reflection of the contribution of community conserved areas to GEBs in the background for the analysis
- Highlighted limitations associated with only conducting two case studies

Nick Remple (UNDP) – Emphasized the importance of reaching a consensus on defining community-based approaches due to variance in experiences and the literature. UNDP associates community-based approaches with an empowerment narrative linked to the autonomy of communities to carry out projects based on their own design, interests, and sustainable development goals, and/or environmental goals.

John Donaldson (STAP) – The introduction takes a broad definition of community-based approaches, needs clarification to sharpen the evaluation. Noted the plan to look at effectiveness by implementation mechanism, suggested also looking at the modality in which the approach is applied (example of difference in approach for an anti-poaches vs restoration project, different benefits for communities). Suggestion to think through how the evaluation looks at comparators – will there be an examination of whether the projects achieve their objectives, or will community-based approaches be compared with other approaches. Question about what factors would be taken into consideration when looking at durability.

Rene Stenhouse (WWF-US) –WWF-US has been looking at how to link community-based approaches to environmental outcomes in GEF projects, therefore they are looking forward to seeing lessons from this evaluation. Question about the evaluation question on 'influencing effectiveness': is it measuring the buy-in and support for objectives of a GEF project or explicit environmental benefits, or both? Interested in hearing more on definitions and how projects are identified as having a community-based approach. Emphasized that many WWF-US projects have community-based approaches as a crosscutting theme, wonders if the evaluation portfolio captured all of these. Finds it challenging to come up with good metrics on participation and influence.

Erik Reed (World Bank) – GEF funding associated with WBG projects has been used to leverage community-based approaches, especially in contexts where governments are less than enthusiastic. Will send more detailed comments on the approach paper.

Susan Waithaka (GEF) – Interested in the linkages between stakeholder engagement and gender policies and community-based approaches, can we say for example which stakeholders are engaged and consulted at the project level. Asked that IEO include broad perspectives from civil society in the evaluation.

Kate Steingraber (GEF IEO) – Responded to questions:

- Projects were identified through a keyword search of project title and components. Asked participants to please review the portfolio presented in the approach paper and identify if any projects were missed, will use the information to help determine whether the search criteria needs to be revised
- When looking at effectiveness, plan to look at outcome ratings (associated with GEBs) as well as other factors such as whether community-based approaches influence buy in and support for projects.
- Analysis on durability/sustainability will use factors identified in other IEO work (Annual Performance Report and Strategic Country Cluster Evaluations).

Geeta Batra (GEF IEO) – Reflected the concerns of external validity associated with a limited number of case studies, indicated that IEO is open to 4-5 case studies. Reiterated the difficulty of finding a counter factual, proposed looking at how the approach is applied to varying degrees (more involvement versus less, developing a scale) and then looking at outcomes based on this variance. Noted that there are also case studies from other IEO work that can be drawn upon. IEO will try to push the envelope, look for the relationship between community-based approaches and effectiveness with a quantitative model.

Carlo Carugi (GEF IEO) – Seconded the idea of more case studies, given the topic it seems appropriate, but highlighted the tradeoff of more time needed to complete the evaluation, will have to push back to June 2023. Asked for clarification/suggestion on where the evaluation may have missed projects or keywords.

Action Items

1. Reference group members should send any written comments on the approach paper by Friday, April 8. IEO will then finalize the approach paper and post online with an audit trail table documenting all comments received and corresponding actions taken to respond to or address them.

2. IEO will draft meeting notes and circulate to reference group members for any additions or amendments before posting on the IEO website.

3. Agencies are invited to validate the portfolio identified in the Approach Paper and suggest whether any projects or keywords associated with community-based approaches are absent. This information will help the evaluation team determine

whether they need to change the search/inclusion criteria that is applied to the whole portfolio.