

TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR GEF COUNTRY PORTFOLIO EVALUATION INDIA

(Approved by Rob D. van den Berg, Director, GEF Evaluation Office on 5th of June 2012)

Background

1. Country Portfolio Evaluation (CPE) is one of the main streams of work of the GEF Evaluation Office.¹ By capturing aggregate portfolio results and performance of the GEF at the country level they provide useful information for both the GEF Council and the countries. Its purpose is to provide an assessment of how GEF supported activities are implemented at the country level, the results of these activities, and how these are linked to the GEF mandate and national priorities. CPEs' relevance and utility will increase in GEF-5 with the increased emphasis on country ownership and portfolio development at the country level.
2. With an area of 3.29 million km² India is the seventh largest country in the world. It has a population of more than 1.2 billion, which makes it the second most populous country. India has experienced rapid economic growth over the last 20 years and is rapidly emerging as a major economic power. India has a very wide range of ecosystems and habitats, and is known for its rich biodiversity. Rapid population growth, gaps in institutional capacities, and tradeoffs made for rapid economic development has, however, put India's significant natural resources under pressure. Given the size of its geographical area, population and its economic growth, India is also important for any global strategy for climate change mitigation and adaptation.
3. Since its inception GEF has, therefore, been supporting projects in India to generate global environmental benefits. Up to April 2012, GEF had allocated US\$ 340 million through 49 approved national projects in India. Fourteen (29 percent) of these national projects have been completed and 22 (45 percent) are under implementation. In addition, India is also a participant country in 16 regional and global projects supported by the GEF. All the GEF focal areas – other than ozone depleting substances – are represented in the India portfolio: climate change mitigation accounts for 41 percent of the GEF funding.
4. India has been selected for a CPE because its GEF project portfolio is relatively large, mature and diverse, and it has not yet been adequately covered by the Evaluation Office through its work.

¹ The completed Country Portfolio Evaluations (CPEs) include Nicaragua; OECS countries; Moldova; Turkey; Syria; Cameroon; Egypt; South Africa; Benin; Madagascar; Samoa; Philippines; and, Costa Rica. The ongoing Country Portfolio Evaluations include India; Brazil; and Cuba. In addition two Country Portfolio Studies (CPSs), which are of less intensity than CPEs have been undertaken in El Salvador, Jamaica and Timor Leste.

5. This document presents the country specific Terms of Reference (ToRs) for the India CPE. It is based on the standard terms of reference for GEF country portfolio evaluation approved by the Director of the GEF Evaluation Office in September 2010. The standard TORs may be accessed at

http://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/documents/EO_CPE_STORs_ENG.pdf . The country specific terms of reference for the India incorporate inputs received from the key stakeholders during the pre-scoping and scoping mission undertaken by the Office. However, care has been taken to ensure that the country specific terms of reference for India is consistent with the standard terms of reference to allow comparisons across countries.

6. The India CPE is being conducted fully and independently by the GEF Evaluation Office through a national firm. The Office is ensuring quality of the evaluation through a national quality assurance panel. The Office is drawing on support of the GEF Focal Points for India (both political and operational) and GEF agencies for implementation of this evaluation.

Objectives

7. The purpose of GEF CPE (India) is to provide GEF Council with an assessment of how GEF supported activities are implemented in India, a report on results from projects and assess how these projects are linked to national environmental and sustainable development agendas as well as to the GEF mandate of generating global environmental benefits within its focal areas. The India CPE would contribute to the shared objectives of the country portfolio evaluations:

- i. independently evaluate the **relevance** and **efficiency**² of the GEF support in a country from several points of view: environmental frameworks and decision-making processes; the GEF mandate and the achievement of global environmental benefits; and GEF policies and procedures;
- ii. assess the **effectiveness** and **results**³ of completed projects aggregated at the focal area;
- iii. provide additional evaluative evidence to other evaluations conducted or sponsored by the Office; and
- iv. provide **feedback** and **knowledge** sharing to (1) the GEF Council in its decision making process to allocate resources and to develop policies and strategies; (2) the Country on its participation in, or collaboration with the GEF; and (3) the different agencies and organizations involved in the preparation and implementation of GEF funded projects and activities.

8. The India CPE will aim to bring to the attention of Council different experiences and lessons on how the GEF is implemented in India. The India CPE is not aimed at evaluating the performance of GEF Agencies, national entities (agencies/departments, national governments or involved civil society organizations), or individual projects.

Key Evaluation Questions

9. The India Country Portfolio Evaluation will be guided by following key questions that should be answered based on the analysis of the evaluative information and perceptions collected during the evaluation exercise. These questions are:

² **Relevance**: the extent to which the objectives of the GEF activity are consistent with beneficiaries' requirements, country needs, global priorities and partners' and donors' policies; **Efficiency**: a measure of how economically resources/inputs (funds, expertise, time, etc.) are converted to results.

³ **Results**: the output, outcome or impact (intended or unintended, positive and/or negative) of a GEF activity; **Effectiveness**: the extent to which the GEF activity's objectives were achieved, or are expected to be achieved, taking into account their relative importance.

Effectiveness, results and sustainability

- a) Are GEF supported projects and activities effective in producing short term outcomes, attainment of intermediary stages and long term impacts at the project, focal area and country level?
- b) What has been the effect and contribution of GEF activities on the legal framework, policies, and regulatory environment of India?
- c) What are the factors that are aiding and/or hindering achievement of results? What are the mechanisms (such as replication, upscaling, mainstreaming, and/or market transformation) through which long term impacts are being achieved?
- d) Is GEF support effective in producing results which last in time and continue after project completion? To what extent are follow up actions that would build on GEF supported activities being supported by other actors?
- e) Is the scale of GEF support adequate to make any significant impact on the country's efforts?
- f) Is GEF support effective in producing results related to the dissemination of lessons learned in GEF projects and with partners?

Relevance

- a) Is GEF support relevant to the national sustainability development agenda and environmental priorities?
- b) Is GEF support relevant to the existing country development needs and emerging challenges?
- c) How are GEF projects and programs conceived and developed? How do agencies identify proposals and develop them?
- d) Is GEF support relevant to national action plans?
- e) Is the GEF support in the country relevant to the objectives linked to the different Global Environmental Benefits (GEBs) in biodiversity, greenhouse gases, international waters, land degradation, and chemicals focal areas?
- f) Are the GEF and its Agencies supporting environmental and sustainable development prioritization, country ownership and decision-making process of the country?
- g) To what extent have GEF supported activities also received support from the country and from other donors?

Efficiency

- a) How much time, effort and financial resources does it take to formulate and implement projects, by type of GEF support modality? How have time-delays, if any, affected the project activities and deliverables?
- b) Is the administrative budget of projects sufficient to ensure quality in project implementation?
- c) How important is cofinancing, how well is it integrated in projects, and what is the extent and what are the ways in which it is actually materializing? Is co-financing a deterrent in conceiving good projects? What are the trade-offs being made to meet the cofinancing requirement of the GEF?

- d) What are the roles, types of engagement and coordination among different stakeholders during various stages of the project cycle?
- e) Are there synergies among GEF Agencies, national institutions, and GEF support and other donors, in GEF programming and implementation?
- f) What role does Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) play in increasing project adaptive management and overall efficiency?
- g) How efficiently is the GEF support for communication and outreach being utilized and are related policies being complied with?

10. Each of these questions is complemented by indicators, potential sources of information and methods in an evaluation matrix. A standard version of the CPE evaluation matrix is annexed to this document.

Scope and Limitations

11. The CPE will cover all types of GEF supported activities in the country at different stages of the project cycle (pipeline, on-going and completed) and implemented by all GEF Agencies in all focal areas, including applicable GEF corporate activities such as the Small Grants Programme and a selection of regional and global programs that are of special relevance to the country. However, the main focus of the evaluation will be the projects implemented within the country boundaries, i.e. the national projects, be these full-size, medium-size or enabling activities.⁴

12. The stage of a project will determine the expected focus of its assessment (see Table 1).

Table 1. Focus of evaluation according to stage of project

Project Status	Focus			
	<i>Relevance</i>	<i>Efficiency</i>	<i>Effectiveness (short term outcomes)</i>	<i>Long term impacts and intermediary stages</i>
Completed	Full	Full	Full	Full / partial / likelihood ⁵
On-going	Full	Partially	Likelihood	Likelihood
Pipeline	Expected	Processes	Not applicable	Not applicable

13. The GEF does not establish country programs that specify expected achievements through programmatic objectives, indicators, and targets. However, since 2010 GEF has started supporting countries in undertaking national portfolio formulation exercises on a voluntary basis. These exercises serve as a priority setting tool for countries and as a guide for GEF Agencies as they assist recipient countries. India completed its portfolio formulation exercise in 2011 (http://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/documents/document/India_NPFD.pdf). The priorities laid out in the document prepared after the portfolio formulation exercise in India will serve as a framework to assess relevance of various recent projects to national priorities. However, for past projects some degree of retrofitting may be required. The India CPE will be also conducted taking note of relevant national and GEF Agencies' strategies, country programs and/or planning frameworks as a basis for assessing the aggregate results, efficiency and relevance of the GEF country portfolio.

⁴ The review of selected regional projects will feed in the aggregate assessment of the national GEF portfolio described above.

⁵ Depending on the time lag after completion, nature of a project and contextual conditions, the extent to which long term impacts and/or achievement of intermediary stages may be assessed for a project may differ. The focus of enquiry would also, therefore, change.

14. GEF support is provided through partnerships with many institutions operating at many levels, from local to national and international level. It is therefore challenging to consider GEF support separately. The India CPE will not attempt to provide a direct attribution of development results to the GEF, but address the contribution of the GEF support to the overall achievements, i.e. to establish a credible link between what GEF supported activities and its implications. The evaluation will address how GEF support has contributed to overall achievements in partnership with others, by questions on roles and coordination, synergies and complementarities and knowledge sharing.

15. The assessment of results will be focused, where possible, at the level of outcomes and impacts rather than outputs. Project-level results will be measured against the overall expected impact and outcomes from each project. Progress towards impact of completed projects that are sufficiently mature (i.e. completed at least since 2 years), and where direct or proximate indirect impacts may be expected, will be looked at through field Reviews of Outcome to Impact (ROtI) studies. In all four such ROtI assessments are planned. The implementation progress for projects under implementation will be field verified for a sample of projects. Desk reviews will be undertaken for all completed, under implementation, and in pipeline projects that have been approved by the GEF Council. For specific analysis dropped, canceled and submitted proposals may also be included.

16. Expected impacts at the focal area level will be assessed in the context of GEF objectives and indicators of global environmental benefits. Outcomes at the focal area level will be primarily assessed in relation to catalytic and replication effects, institutional sustainability and capacity building, and awareness. The inclusion of regional and global projects increases the complexity of this type of evaluations since these projects are developed and approved under different context (i.e. regional or global policies and strategies) than national countries. However, a representative number of regional and global projects will be included based on criteria such as the relevance of the regional project for the country, the implementation unit being located in the country, among others.

17. The context in which these projects were developed, approved and are being implemented constitutes another focus of the evaluation. This includes a historic assessment of the national sustainable development and environmental policies, strategies and priorities, legal environment in which these policies are implemented and enforced, GEF Agencies country strategies and programs and the GEF policies, principles, programs and strategies.

Methodology

18. The India CPE is being conducted by staff of the GEF Evaluation Office and a national firm. The Evaluation Team is led by a Task Manager (from the GEF Evaluation Office), who is supported by a national quality assurance panel to ensure quality of evaluation processes and products. The team includes technical expertise on the national environmental and sustainable development strategies, evaluation methodologies, and GEF focal areas. The selected firm qualifies under the GEF Evaluation Office Ethical Guidelines, and its undertaking the evaluation does not raise concerns related to conflict of interest. The operational focal point of India and his team is a resource in facilitating the CPE process by identifying interviewees and source documents; and in organizing interviews, meetings and field visits.

19. The methodology includes a series of components using a combination of qualitative and quantitative evaluation methods and tools. The expected sources of information include:

- Project level: project documents, project implementation reports, terminal evaluations, mid-term reviews, terminal evaluation reviews, reports from monitoring visits, and any other technical documents produced by projects;

- Country level: national sustainable development agendas, environmental priorities and strategies, GEF-wide, focal area strategies and action plans, global and national environmental indicators;
- Agency levels: country assistance strategies and frameworks and their evaluations and reviews;
- Evaluative evidence at country level from other evaluations implemented either by the Office, by the independent evaluation offices of GEF Agencies, or by other national or international evaluation departments;
- Interviews with GEF stakeholders, including the GEF Operational Focal Point and all other relevant government departments, bilateral and multilateral donors, civil society organizations and academia (including both local and international NGOs with a presence in the country), GEF Agencies, SGP and the national UN conventions' Focal Points;
- Interviews with GEF beneficiaries and supported institutions, municipal governments and associations, and local communities and authorities;
- Surveys with GEF stakeholders in the country;
- Field visits to selected project sites, using methods and tools developed by the Office such as the Guidelines for Terminal Evaluation Reviews (TER) or the Review of Outcomes to Impact (ROtI) Handbook;
- Information from national consultation workshops.

20. The quantitative analysis will use indicators to assess the relevance and efficiency of GEF support using projects as the unit of analysis (that is, linkages with national priorities, time and cost of preparing and implementing projects, etc.) and to measure GEF results (that is, progress towards achieving global environmental impacts) and performance of projects (such as implementation and completion ratings). Available statistics and scientific sources, especially for national environmental indicators, will also be used.

21. The Evaluation Team will use standard tools and protocols for the CPEs and adapt these to the national context. These tools include a project review protocol to conduct the desk and field reviews of GEF projects and interview guides to conduct interviews with different stakeholders.

22. The CPE will include visits to project sites. The criteria for selecting the sites will be finalized during the implementation of the evaluation, with emphasis placed on both ongoing and completed projects. The evaluation team will decide on specific sites to visit based on the initial review of documentation and balancing needs of representation as well as cost-effectiveness of conducting the field visits.

23. Quality assurance on evaluation methods, tools and processes used will be performed at key stages of the process (ToRs, draft and final CPE reports) by two renowned independent national experts that are familiar with GEF, its activities, and the country specific context of India.

Process and Outputs

24. The CPE commences, once the country is selected and has agreed to undergo the CPE and other preparatory work and preliminary data gathering has been undertaken. Some of the steps involved in the CPE process have already been completed. The steps involved in the full process are as follows:

- Pre scoping: secure government support, in particular from GEF Operational Focal Points. The operational focal point was requested to provide support to the

evaluation such as: identification of key people to be interviewed, support to organize interviews, field visits and meetings, and identification of main documents. His agreement on the implementation structure of the evaluation and on national quality assurance panel was obtained. The operational focal point has expressed support for the evaluation and his team has been helping the evaluation team in moving forward with the evaluation.

- Scoping of the evaluation: the scope of the evaluation has been defined through consultations with national stakeholders on key issues that need to be included in the analysis; A stakeholder consultation workshop was conducted to present the standard terms of reference for the evaluation and to receive comments to develop country specific terms of reference; individual meetings were also conducted with some of the key stakeholders for consultations.
- The revised country specific terms of reference, with annexed evaluation matrix, have been shared with the quality assurance panel for feedback. The final terms of reference for India country portfolio evaluation, after its approval by the GEF Evaluation Office Director, will be shared with the stakeholders and disclosed publicly.
- Launch the evaluative phase, collect information and review literature to extract existing reliable evaluative evidence.
- Prepare specific inputs to the CPE, including:
 - the **GEF Portfolio Database** which describes all GEF support activities within the country, basic information (GEF Agency, focal area, implementation status), project cycle information, GEF and co-financing financial information, major objectives and expected (or actual) results, key partners per project, etc.
 - **Country Environmental Legal Framework** which provides an historical perspective of the context in which the GEF projects have been developed and implemented. This document will be based on information on environmental legislation, environmental policies of each government administration (plans, strategies and similar), and the international agreements signed by the country presented and analyzed through time so to be able to connect with particular GEF support.
 - **Global Environmental Benefits Assessment** which provides an assessment of the country's contribution to the GEF mandate and its focal areas based on appropriate indicators, such as those used in the System for the Transparent Allocation of Resources (STAR) (biodiversity, climate change and land degradation) and others used in projects documents.
- Prepare desk reviews for all the completed, under implementation, and council approved projects.
- Conduct field verification of a representative sample of projects that are under implementation.
- Conduct intensive field studies (field ROTI) of completed national projects.
- Conduct interviews, discussions, surveys, literature review, and stakeholder workshops to gather information on specific issues covered through the country portfolio evaluation.
- Conduct the evaluation analysis and triangulation of collected information and evidence from various sources, tools and methods. This will be done during a second mission in the country by the Office staff to consolidate the evidence gathered so far and fill in any eventual information and analysis gaps before getting to findings, conclusions and

preliminary recommendations. During this mission, additional analysis, meetings, document reviews and/or field work might be undertaken as needed;

- Conduct a national stakeholder consultation workshop for the Government and national stakeholders, including project staff, donors and GEF Agencies, to present and gather stakeholders' feedback on the main CPE findings, conclusions and preliminary recommendations to be included in an aide-mémoire. The workshop will also be an opportunity to verify eventual errors of facts or analysis in case these are supported by adequate additional evidence brought to the attention of the Evaluation Team;
- Prepare and circulate to stakeholders and peer reviewers a draft CPE report, which incorporates comments received at the national stakeholder consultation workshop;
- Consider the eventual incorporation of comments received to the draft report and prepare the final CPE report, and submit it to the quality assurance panel for their feedback before finalization.⁶

Key Milestones

25. The evaluation process commenced in October 2011. It is expected to be complete in January 2013. The key milestones of the evaluation are presented here below:

Milestone	Expected date of completion
Preparatory work, preliminary data gathering	Completed
Scoping mission	Completed
Drafting country-specific ToRs/evaluation matrix	Completed
Quality control/peer review, finalization and disclosure of ToRs	June 2012
Launching evaluation phase, literature review, data gathering	May 2012
Finalization of the GEF country portfolio database	June 2012
Country Environmental Legal Framework	July 2012
Global Environmental Benefits Assessment	Completed
Field studies	August 2012
Data collection/interviews and project review protocols	August 2012
Consolidation and triangulation of evaluative evidence, additional analysis/gap-filling	Aug-Sept 2012
Presentation of key preliminary findings in a national consultation workshop	Oct-Nov 2012
Draft CPE report sent out to stakeholders and peer reviewers for comments	Nov-Dec 2012
Incorporation of comments received in a final CPE report	December 2012
Final CPE report	December 2012
Country response to the CPE	January 2013

⁶ The GEF Evaluation Office will bear full responsibility for the content of the report.

CPE Report Outline

26. The CPE report should be a concise, stand-alone document organized along the following general table of contents:

CHAPTER 1. Main Conclusions and Recommendations

Background

Objectives, Scope and Methodology

Conclusions

- Relevance
- Efficiency
- Results and effectiveness

Recommendations

CHAPTER 2. Evaluation Framework

Background

Objectives and Scope

Methodology

Limitations

CHAPTER 3. Context

[country]: General description

Environmental resources in key GEF support areas

The environmental legal framework in [country]

The environmental policy framework in [country]

The Global Environmental Facility: General description

CHAPTER 4. The GEF portfolio in [country]

Defining the GEF Portfolio

Activities in the GEF Portfolio

Evolution of GEF Support by Focal Area and by GEF Agency

Corporate, Regional and Global Programs

CHAPTER 5. Results of GEF support to [country]

Global Environmental Impacts

Catalytic and Replication Effects

Institutional Sustainability and Capacity Building

Results by Focal Area

CHAPTER 6. Relevance of the GEF support in [country]

Relevance of GEF Support to the Country's Sustainable Development Agenda and Environmental Priorities

Relevance of GEF Support to Country's Development Priorities and Challenges

Relevance of GEF Support to National Action Plans within GEF Focal Areas

Relevance of GEF Support to the achievement of Global Environmental Benefits

Relevance of the GEF Portfolio to Other Global and National Institutions

CHAPTER 7. Efficiency of GEF supported activities in [country]

Time, Effort, and Financial Resources Required for Project formulation

Coordination and synergies

Monitoring and Evaluation for Project Adaptive Management

Roles and Responsibilities among Different Stakeholders in Project Implementation
The GEF Focal Point Mechanism in the Country
Learning

ANNEXES

- A. Country Response
- B. Country-specific Terms of Reference
- C. Evaluation Matrix
- D. Interviewees
- E. Sites Visited
- F. Workshop Participants
- G. GEF Portfolio in [country]
- H. Bibliography

ANNEX 1

Key question	Indicators/basic data	Sources of information	Methodology
Effectiveness, Results and Sustainability			
<p><i>Are GEF supported projects and activities effective in producing short term outcomes, attainment of intermediary stages and long term impacts at the project, focal area and country level?</i></p>	<p>Outcomes, intermediary states, and impacts (including unintended impacts) achievements at project, focal area and country levels.</p> <p>Factors that have aided and/or hindered progress towards impact and achievement of impact.</p>	<p>Project staffs and beneficiaries, national and local government representatives</p> <p>Key stakeholders and other knowledgeable individuals</p> <p>ROtl studies</p> <p>Project related documentation, other studies, and independently conducted evaluations by others.</p>	<p>Focus group discussions and individual interviews</p> <p>ROtl Methodology</p> <p>Desk reviews</p>
	<p>Ratings on achievement of project outcomes (i.e., self-ratings and independent ratings)</p>	<p>Project-related reviews (implementation reports, terminal evaluations, TE reviews, etc.)</p>	<p>Desk reviews, project review protocols</p> <p>GEF Portfolio aggregate analysis</p>
	<p>Changes in global benefit indexes and other global environmental indicators</p>	<p>Evaluative evidence from projects and donors, Global Environmental Benefits Assessment</p>	<p>Literature review, meta analysis of evaluation reports</p>
<p><i>What has been the effect and contribution of GEF activities on the legal framework, policies, and regulatory environment of India?</i></p>	<p>Accomplishments in terms of influence on legal framework, policies and regulatory environment</p> <p>GEF contributions within the context of other actors</p> <p>Enablers and choke points</p>	<p>Project staffs, national and local government representatives</p> <p>Key stakeholders and other knowledgeable individuals</p> <p>Relevant studies, and independently conducted evaluations by others.</p>	<p>Focus group discussions and individual interviews</p> <p>ROtl Methodology</p> <p>Literature review</p>
<p><i>What are the factors that are aiding and/or hindering achievement of results? What are the mechanisms through which long term impacts are being achieved?</i></p>	<p>Prevalence and extent processes replication, mainstreaming, upscaling, market change and sustenance are facilitating achievement of long term impacts.</p> <p>Factors that have aided and/or hindered progress towards impact and achievement of impact.</p>	<p>Project staffs and beneficiaries, national and local government representatives</p> <p>Key stakeholders and other knowledgeable individuals</p> <p>ROtl studies</p>	<p>Focus group discussions and individual interviews</p> <p>ROtl Methodology</p>
<p><i>Is GEF support effective in producing results which last in time and continue after project completion? To what extent are follow up actions that would build on GEF supported activities being</i></p>	<p>Risks to sustenance of results achieved at the local and national levels</p> <p>Prevalence of follow up actions by other actors that build on GEF achievements</p>	<p>Project staffs and beneficiaries, national and local government representatives</p> <p>Key stakeholders and other knowledgeable individuals</p>	<p>Focus group discussions and individual interviews</p> <p>ROtl Methodology</p>

<i>supported by other actors?</i>		ROtI studies	
<i>Is the scale of GEF support adequate to make any significant impact on the country's efforts?</i>	<p>Actual scale versus desired scale to problems through GEF projects</p> <p>Intensity at which problems are addressed by the GEF projects</p> <p>Assumed and actual role of other actors including follow up actions</p>	<p>Project staffs and beneficiaries, national and local government representatives</p> <p>Key stakeholders and other knowledgeable individuals</p> <p>ROtI Studies</p> <p>Field Verifications</p>	<p>Focus group discussions and individual interviews</p> <p>ROtI</p> <p>Field Verifications</p>
<i>Is GEF support effective in producing results related to the dissemination of lessons learned in GEF projects and with partners?</i>	<p>GEF projects incorporate lessons from preceding GEF projects</p> <p>Lessons from GEF projects and activities are being incorporated by GEF agencies in projects and activities that are not supported by GEF</p> <p>Knowledge sharing publications by the Evaluation Office and the Secretariat are deemed at useful by the GEF partners.</p>	<p>Project staffs and beneficiaries, national and local government representatives</p> <p>Key stakeholders and other knowledgeable individuals – especially in agencies</p>	<p>Focus group discussions and individual interviews</p>
Relevance			
<i>Is GEF support relevant to the national sustainability development agenda and environmental priorities?</i>	<p>GEF support is within the country's sustainable development agenda and environmental priorities</p> <p>Level of GEF funding compared to other ODA in the environmental sector</p> <p>GEF support has country ownership and is country based (i.e., project origin, design and implementation)</p>	<p>Relevant country level sustainable development and environment policies, strategies and action plans</p> <p>Project-related documentation (project document and logframe, implementation reports, terminal evaluations, TE reviews, etc.), PMIS, Agencies' project databases</p> <p>Available databases (international as WB, OECD, etc., and national, i.e. dept. of statistics, other)</p> <p>Government officials, agencies' staff, donors and civil society representatives</p> <p>Country Legal Environmental Framework</p>	<p>Desk review, GEF portfolio analysis by focal area, Agency, modality and project status (national)</p> <p>Stakeholder consultation (focus groups, individual interviews)</p> <p>Literature review, timelines, historical causality, etc.</p>
<i>Is GEF support relevant to the existing country development needs and</i>	<p>GEF supports development needs (i.e., income generating, capacity building) and reduces challenges</p>	<p>Relevant country level sustainable development and environment policies, strategies and action plans</p>	<p>Desk review, GEF portfolio analysis by focal area, Agency, modality and project status (national)</p>

<p>emerging challenges?</p>	<p>The GEF's various types of modalities, projects and instruments are in coherence with country's needs and challenges</p> <p>Effect of federal structure of the country on GEF operations and result achievement</p>	<p>Project-related documentation (project document and logframe, implementation reports, terminal evaluations, TE reviews, etc.), PMIS, Agencies' project databases</p> <p>Government officials, agencies' staff, donors and civil society representatives</p> <p>Country Legal Environmental Framework</p>	<p>Stakeholder consultation (focus groups, individual interviews)</p> <p>Literature review, timelines, historical causality, etc.</p>
<p>How are GEF projects and programs conceived and developed? How do agencies identify proposals and develop them?</p>	<p>Project and program development process</p> <p>Role of agencies and focal point, and other actors.</p>	<p>Agency staff, government officials, focal point and past focal points, civil society organizations.</p> <p>Field verification</p>	<p>Interviews, discussions, and consultations.</p> <p>Field verifications</p>
<p>Is GEF support relevant to national action plans?</p>	<p>GEF support linked to the national environmental action plan (NEAP); national communications to UNFCCC; national POPs; National Capacity Self-Assessment (NCSA); adaptation to climate change (NAPA), etc.</p>	<p>GEF-supported enabling activities and products (NCSA, NEAP, NAPA, national communications to UN Conventions, etc.)</p> <p>Stakeholder consultation (focus groups, individual interviews)</p>	<p>Interviews, discussions, and consultations.</p> <p>Desk review</p>
<p>Is the GEF support in the country relevant to the objectives linked to the different Global Environmental Benefits (GEBs) in biodiversity, greenhouse gases, international waters, land degradation, and chemicals focal areas?</p>	<p>Project outcomes and impacts are related to the RAF and STAR Global Benefit Index (for biodiversity and climate change and land degradation) and to other global indicators for POPs and international waters</p> <p>GEF support linked to national commitments to Conventions</p>	<p>National Conventions action plans, RAF, STAR, BD scorecard, etc.</p> <p>Project-related documentation (project document and logframe, implementation reports, terminal evaluations, TE reviews, etc.), PMIS, Agencies' project databases</p> <p>Government officials, agencies' staff, donors and civil society representatives</p> <p>Global Environmental Benefits Assessment</p>	<p>Desk review, project field visits, project review protocols</p> <p>Literature review, timelines, historical causality, etc.</p> <p>GEF portfolio analysis by focal area, Agency, modality and project status (national)</p> <p>Stakeholder consultation (focus groups, individual interviews)</p> <p>Literature review</p>
<p>Are the GEF and its Agencies supporting environmental and sustainable development prioritization, country ownership and decision-making process of the country?</p>	<p>GEF Agencies' support to national environment and sustainable development prioritization, country ownership and country decision-making process</p>	<p>GEF Secretariat staff and technical staff from GEF Agencies</p> <p>Government officials, agencies' staff, donors and civil society representatives</p> <p>GEF Instrument, Council decisions, focal area strategies, GEF4 programming strategy, GEF Agencies' country strategies and plans</p> <p>Project-related documentation (project document and logframe, implementation</p>	<p>Stakeholder consultation (focus groups, individual interviews)</p> <p>Desk review, GEF portfolio analysis by focal area, Agency, modality and project status (national)</p>

		reports, terminal evaluations, TE reviews, etc.), PMIS, Agencies' project databases	
<i>To what extent have GEF supported activities also received support from the country and from other donors?</i>	GEF activities, country commitment and project counterparts support GEF mandate and focal area programs and strategies	<p>GEF Instrument, Council decisions, focal area strategies, GEF4 programming strategy.</p> <p>Project-related documentation (project document and logframe, implementation reports, terminal evaluations, TE reviews, etc.), PMIS, Agencies' project databases</p> <p>Government officials, agencies' staff, donors and civil society representatives</p> <p>GEF Secretariat staff and technical staff from GEF Agencies</p> <p>Global Environmental Benefits Assessment</p> <p>Country Legal Environmental Framework</p>	<p>Desk review, GEF portfolio analysis by focal area, Agency, modality and project status (national)</p> <p>Stakeholder consultation (focus groups, individual interviews)</p> <p>Literature review, timelines, historical causality, etc.</p>
<i>How innovative are GEF projects?</i>	<p>Ability to promote new ideas</p> <p>Willingness to support projects that entail higher risks of failure</p>	<p>Present and past focal points, agencies, civil society organizations, and other key stakeholders</p>	Interviews and stakeholder consultation.
	Efficiency		
<i>How much time, effort and financial resources does it take to formulate and implement projects, by type of GEF support modality? How have time-delays, if any, affected the project activities and deliverables?</i>	<p>Process indicators: processing timing (according to project cycle steps), preparation and implementation cost by type of modalities, etc</p> <p>Incidence, causes and consequences of delays</p> <p>Projects drop-outs from PDF and cancellations</p>	<p>Project-related documentation (project documents and logframes, implementation reports, terminal evaluations, TE reviews, etc.), PMIS, Agencies project databases, RAF pipeline</p> <p>GEF Secretariat and Agencies' staff and government officials</p> <p>National and local government officials, donors, NGOs, beneficiaries</p>	<p>Desk review, GEF portfolio analysis, timelines</p> <p>Interviews, field visits, project review protocols</p>
<i>Is the administrative budget of projects sufficient to ensure quality in project</i>	Sufficiency of budget to meet project administration costs –tradeoffs being made by executing agencies to work within the	National and local government officials, donors	<p>Interviews and focus group discussion</p> <p>Field verifications</p>

implementation?	provided support for administrative costs	Executing agencies Field Verifications	Survey
How important is cofinancing, how well is it integrated in projects, and what is the extent and what are the ways in which it is actually materializing? Is cofinancing a deterrent in conceiving good projects? What are the trade-offs that are being made to meet the cofinancing requirement of the GEF?	Scale of cofinancing and nature of activities supported through cofinancing Integration of cofinancing supported activities within the project design The extent project management has control and oversight over activities supported through cofinancing Timeliness of cofinancing contributions and delays in project development due to cofinancing requirements Level of materialization of cofinancing	Project documents, PIRs, terminal evaluations Project staff, agency staff, government officials, focal point, and past focal points.	Interviews and focus group discussion Field verifications ROtI
What are the roles, types of engagement and coordination among different stakeholders during various stages of the project cycle?	Level of participation Roles and responsibilities of GEF actors especially GEF agencies and focal point at different stages in project life cycle Coordination among GEF projects Existence of a national coordination mechanism for GEF support	Project-related reviews (implementation reports, terminal evaluations, TE reviews, etc.) Project staff, government officials GEF Secretariat staff and technical staff from GEF Agencies	Desk review and meta analysis of evaluation reports, interviews and field verifications Interviews, institutional analysis
Are there synergies among GEF Agencies, national institutions, and GEF support and other donors, in GEF programming and implementation?	Appreciation each other's projects by GEF agencies, national institutions, and other donors. Effective communication, technical support, and coordination among GEF project agencies and organizations; among national institutions; and other donors.	Project-related reviews (implementation reports, terminal evaluations, TE reviews, etc.) GEF Agency staff, national executing agencies (NGOs, other), other donor organizations, national institution representatives	Desk review and meta analysis of evaluation reports, interviews and field visits
What role does Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) play in increasing project adaptive management and overall efficiency	Quality of M&E inputs including quality of baseline information in projects Quality and level of adaptive management applied to projects and programs	Project-related reviews (implementation reports, mid-term evaluations, terminal evaluations, TE reviews, etc.) GEF Secretariat and Agencies' staff and government officials	Desk review Stakeholder consultations (focus groups and individual interviews) Field verifications

	<p>Level of independence, quality and timeliness of external evaluations</p> <p>Projects and programs compliance with GEF and GEF Agency M&E policies</p>	<p>National and local government officials, donors, NGOs, beneficiaries</p> <p>Evaluations of other donors' funded projects</p>	<p>Meta analysis of evaluation reports</p>
<p><i>How efficiently is the GEF support for communication and outreach being utilized and are related policies being complied with?</i></p>	<p>Cost effective utilization of the communication and outreach component of GEF projects</p> <p>Level of compliance with GEF policies on visibility of GEF</p>	<p>Government officials</p> <p>Agency staff</p> <p>Project staff</p>	<p>Interview of key stakeholders</p> <p>Field verification of project under implementation</p>