

**Sixth Comprehensive Evaluation of the GEF (OPS6)**

**Approach Paper for the**

**Chemicals and Waste Focal Area Study**

**29 August 2016**

## Contents

<b>1. Introduction .....</b>	<b>2</b>
1.1. Background.....	2
1.2. Purpose, Objectives, Scope, and Audience .....	2
1.3. Key Roles and Responsibilities.....	3
<b>2. Study Design.....</b>	<b>3</b>
2.1. Methods.....	3
2.2. Quality Assurance .....	5
2.3. Limitations .....	5
<b>3. Work Plan .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Appendix A. Study Matrix .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Appendix B. Case Study Selection for Projects under Implementation .....</b>	<b>1</b>

# 1. Introduction

## 1.1. Background

The Global Environment Facility's (GEF) Chemicals and Waste (CW) focal area is intended to play a catalytic role in leveraging resources from national governments and incentivizing the private sector to contribute more to the achievement of elimination and reduction of harmful chemicals and waste. Prior to GEF-5, GEF support to address harmful chemicals and waste were not grouped in a single focal area, but instead involved activities primarily related to ozone depleting substances (ODS), persistent organic pollutants (POPs), and mercury. For the GEF-5 period, those activities were consolidated in the Chemicals focal area; in GEF-6, those activities form the CW focal area.

The long-term goal of the CW focal area strategy as formulated in GEF-6 Programming Directions is to prevent the exposure of humans and the environment to harmful chemicals and waste of global importance, including POPs, mercury, and ODS, through a significant reduction in the production, use, consumption, and emissions/releases of those chemicals and waste.

The GEF serves as the financial mechanism to the Stockholm Convention on POPs, on an interim basis, and the Minamata Convention on Mercury. In addition, on a voluntary basis, GEF provides funding to assist eligible Countries with Economies in Transition under the Montreal Protocol on ODS. The GEF also provides support to the Strategic Approach to International Chemicals Management (SAICM), and indirectly supports the Basel and Rotterdam Conventions through addressing POPs waste, life-cycle management of chemicals, and information exchange on trade and movement of POPs and POPs waste.

Since its establishment, the GEF has allocated over US\$900 million<sup>1</sup> into projects related to harmful chemicals and waste, including multi-focal area projects. During GEF-6, GEF plans to allocate US\$554 million to the CW projects and programs.

## 1.2. Purpose, Objectives, Scope, and Audience

The main purpose of the CW focal area study is to assess the relevance, performance, results, progress to impact, and lessons learned through GEF support to the issues of chemicals and waste. Based on the evidence, and an analysis of the GEF's CW focal area strategy, the study will provide insights and lessons for the focal area going forward.<sup>2</sup> The findings of this study and other complementary GEF Independent Evaluation Office (IEO) evaluations (e.g., on multiple benefits and programmatic approaches) will also feed into the Sixth Comprehensive Evaluation of the GEF.

The broad objectives of the CW focal area study are:

---

<sup>1</sup> Data as of September 30, 2013, the Fifth Overall Performance Study of the GEF (OPSS)

<sup>2</sup> While chemicals and waste activities have undergone review as part of other GEF Independent Evaluation Office (IEO) evaluations, neither the GEF-5 Chemicals focal area nor the GEF-6 focal area have undergone a comprehensive focal area study. A Study of the Impacts of GEF Activities on Phase-Out of Ozone Depleting Substances was completed in 2000.

1. Assess the relevance of the strategy to the guidance of the conventions.
2. Present a synthesis of CW results and progress towards impacts.
3. Assess the approaches and mechanisms through which results have been achieved.
4. Assess efficiency and performance of the CW portfolio.
5. Identify lessons learned and scaling up opportunities for GEF-7.

To meet these objectives, the CW focal area study will answer a set of key evaluation questions, which are listed in the study matrix in Appendix A. The study will draw on existing evaluative evidence generated by the GEF IEO, GEF Agencies, and relevant chemical conventions, and will primarily provide an update on the evaluative evidence since OPS5.

The audience for this study includes the GEF Council, the relevant chemical conventions, GEF Secretariat, GEF Agencies, and GEF member countries, as well as the GEF CSO Network.

### 1.3. Key Roles and Responsibilities

A consulting firm, ICF International (ICF), was selected through a competitive process to conduct this CW Focal Area Study. The team is led by the Team Leader, Mr. Mark Wagner, and the Deputy Team Leader, Ms. Jessica Kyle. The ICF team is responsible for performing all information-gathering and analysis as described in this approach report, and will prepare the major evaluation products described in Section 5. The ICF team will report directly to the GEF IEO (represented by Ms. Geeta Batra and Ms. Sara El Choufi).

## 2. Study Design

The key questions will be answered through a mixed methods approach using both quantitative and qualitative analytical methods and tools. The study is guided by a matrix that identifies the key questions, indicators, relevant sample, expected sources of evidence, and methods. As noted above, this study matrix is provided in Appendix A.

### 2.1. Methods

Methods and tools will include:

- A documentation review of GEF policy, strategy, and guidance documents related to the CW focal area, as well as related documentation on the project cycle.
- A thematic evaluation synthesis of CW focal area-related evaluations conducted by GEF IEO and Independent Evaluation Offices of the GEF Agencies (excluding terminal evaluations of GEF projects). The thematic synthesis will provide a historical perspective and an overview of recurring findings, issues, themes, and lessons learned in relation to GEF focal areas.
- A portfolio analysis of trends in GEF CW focal area performance and implementation based on verification of PMIS data, Annual Performance Reports (APR), and terminal evaluations of the GEF projects. A database will be compiled to allow aggregation and analysis of results. These data will include basic project information from PMIS such as countries and regions, financing (and co-financing), implementing and executing institutions, themes, and GEF activity cycle information. Data will also be extracted from available terminal evaluations on verified ratings for outcomes and sustainability of

outcomes, quality of implementation, quality of project execution, realized co-financing, and quality of M&E design and implementation.

- An update of the progress toward impact (P2I) desk analysis based on the GEF Theory of Change Framework.<sup>3</sup> Building on P2I analysis conducted for OPS5, the studies will analyze CW focal-area-related terminal evaluations of GEF projects. The analysis will aggregate the available evidence on longer-term results and factors that contribute or hinder to broader adoption of results in the CW focal area.
- Case studies to investigate progress toward impact, as well as key themes of interest to OPS6, including private sector engagement, policy and regulatory reform, and the value of integrated or multi-focal area approaches.<sup>4</sup> Three closed projects will be selected based on recentness of project completion (no earlier than 2010), and representation across different chemicals (i.e., POPs versus ODS), lead implementing agencies, single versus multi-country projects, private sector engagement, and policy/regulatory reform.<sup>5</sup> Because no multi-focal area projects with CW components have closed and been subject to terminal evaluations, three active multi-focal area projects will be selected as case studies based on maturity in terms of implementation status, single versus multi-country projects, and coverage of integrated approaches, industrial parks, and gold (see Appendix B for selection note). Projects that have been under implementation for longer present a better possibility for observing change in terms of results or at least progress toward results.
- A quality at entry review with an objectives mapping exercise to assess coherence between GEF CW focal area strategy in the GEF-6 Programming Directions and CW projects that received at least PIF approval during GEF-6.
- An expert review of the coherence of the CW focal area strategy in the GEF-6 Programming Directions with the guidance of the conventions, using a guidance-strategy mapping exercise, as an update to the Evaluation of the GEF Focal Area Strategies (2012).

Key informant interviews will be primarily, but not exclusively, conducted as part of one or more of the methods described above, to provide input on key questions, including related to the coherence of the GEF CW strategy with the conventions, GEF support for conventions for which it is not the financial mechanism, transparency of the project cycle, and private sector engagement. Key stakeholders to be interviewed include: the GEF Secretariat, Secretariats of relevant conventions (Stockholm, Minamata, Basel, Rotterdam, Montreal Protocol), and involved implementing agencies (UNEP, UNDP, UNIDO, World Bank, FAO, and AfDB). For P2I case studies, a limited number of project proponents (e.g., GEF focal point, executing agency) and beneficiaries may also be interviewed, to the extent that they can be readily identified and located.

Triangulation of the information gathered and results of the qualitative and quantitative analyses will be conducted to determine trends and identify main findings and lessons learned.

---

<sup>3</sup> GEF IEO. 2016. Sixth Comprehensive Evaluation of the GEF (OPS6) Approach Paper. See Annex II.

<sup>4</sup> Case studies will be conducted via desk review and a limited number of telephone interviews. No travel is envisioned to support case study development.

<sup>5</sup> These case studies will be selected after a preliminary terminal evaluation review, to identify projects with private sector engagement and/or policy and regulatory reform objectives. Thirty CW projects have closed in 2010 or later and have been subject to terminal evaluations.

## 2.2. Quality Assurance

The Team Leader will be primarily responsible for managing quality assurance, with oversight from the IEO. Should unforeseen events require a deviation from agreed plans, the Team Leader will inform the IEO immediately and ensure a course of action is agreed upon. The Team Leader is responsible for the timely delivery of all study outputs, ensuring efficient document control and authorial as well as managerial approval of final inputs to the report. The study team will adhere to high professional standards in collecting and analyzing data at every stage.

## 2.3. Limitations

Several potential limitations or challenges can be identified. First, the validity of analysis based on data in the GEF PMIS is subject to the accuracy of those data; this challenge will be addressed by cross-checking data with the GEF Secretariat or Agencies, where information is unclear. Another limitation is the small size of the dataset for answering certain questions. For example, questions on multi-focal area projects rely on analysis of just 10 projects approved in GEF-5 and -6. Finally, for P21 case studies, lack of recall or the unavailability of certain stakeholders may be a limitation, given that some projects may have been completed several years prior to this study. Staff turnover, especially in government offices, could limit the team’s access to specific individuals who were directly involved in GEF activities.

## 3. Work Plan

A concise progress report (1-2 pages) will be produced for the IEO’s report to the GEF Council meeting in October 2016. The final report will be delivered to the IEO no later than November 15, 2016.

The main product will be the CW focal area study report. The outline for the draft report will be developed by ICF and agreed in advance with the IEO. The evaluation report will include a summary, main text, annexes, and references. The total report will be 30-40 pages, excluding annexes. The annexes will include any instrumentation, supporting data and analysis, and sources of information.

Table 3-1 presents the work schedule for the evaluation from contract execution (July 22, 2016) through the end of the contract period (November 15, 2016).

**Table 3-1. Work Schedule**

No.	ICF Activity	Timeframe	Milestone/Deliverable
<b>PHASE 1: INCEPTION AND APPROACH PAPER</b>			
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Hold information gathering meetings and initial consultations with the GEF IEO and GEF Secretariat.</li> <li>▪ Obtain and review relevant documents and data from GEF and other sources described in the methodology above.</li> </ul>	Jul – Aug 2016	

No.	ICF Activity	Timeframe	Milestone/Deliverable
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Develop and deliver draft Approach Paper to IEO.</li> <li>▪ Finalize Approach Paper based on comments received from IEO.</li> </ul>	Aug 2016	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Draft Approach Paper (Aug 22, 2016)</li> <li>▪ Final Approach Paper (within one week of receipt of comments)</li> </ul>
<b>PHASE 2: DATA GATHERING AND ANALYSIS</b>			
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Conduct documentation review, evaluation synthesis, and portfolio analysis.</li> </ul>	Aug – Sep 2016	
4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Conduct P21 desk analysis, interviews, quality at entry, and expert review.</li> </ul>	Sep – Oct 2016	
5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Triangulate across methods and conduct additional analyses, as needed (e.g., gaps fillings).</li> </ul>	Oct 2016	
<b>PHASE 3: REPORT WRITING</b>			
6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Prepare concise progress report for GEF Council meeting in October 2016.</li> </ul>	Sep 2016	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Progress report (Sep 9, 2016)</li> </ul>
7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Prepare the preliminary draft evaluation report and submit for WSP review and fact-checking (approximately 50 pages plus relevant annexes).</li> </ul>	Oct 2016	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Draft Study Report (Oct 28, 2016)</li> </ul>
8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Incorporates feedback from the GEF IEO and submit the final study report.</li> </ul>	Oct – Nov 2016	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Final Study Report (November 15, 2016)</li> </ul>

## Appendix A. Study Matrix

The study will be guided by the matrix provided in Table A-1 below. While this matrix serves as an initial guide for the study, it is not intended to limit the methods and sources for information collection. The matrix should be seen as a living tool for the study, with the ability to evolve as new information is gathered over the course of the assignment.

**Table A-1. Study Matrix**

Key Questions	Indicators/Basic Data/What to Look for	Relevant Sample	Sources of Information	Methods
<b>RELEVANCE</b>				
How relevant are the GEF CW investments in relations to the guidance and decisions of the conventions, informing the GEF CW mandate?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Coherence between GEF-6 Programming Directions and the guidance and decisions of the Conventions</li> <li>▪ Coherence between approved GEF projects and GEF-6 Programming Directions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Focal area projects that received at least PIF approval during GEF-6 (25 projects); a sample of GEF-5 projects can be added if resources allow</li> <li>▪ Guidance and decisions from Stockholm Convention COP.6 and 7; and Minamata Convention INC 6 and 7</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Guidance of the Stockholm Convention to the GEF</li> <li>▪ Decisions of the Stockholm Convention and Minamata Convention</li> <li>▪ CW project documents</li> <li>▪ Reviews and reports on the effectiveness of the GEF as financial mechanism</li> <li>▪ GEF-6 CW Focal Area Programming Directions</li> <li>▪ Stockholm and Minamata Convention secretariats</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Expert review</li> <li>▪ Quality at entry</li> <li>▪ Evaluation synthesis</li> <li>▪ Key informant interviews</li> </ul>
How relevant are the CW investments for SDGs implementation, the GEF Integrated Approaches programs (e.g. sustainable cities) and GEF multifocal area projects?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Coherence between approved GEF projects and the SDGs</li> <li>▪ Evidence of integrated approaches in approved GEF CW projects</li> <li>▪ Trends in CW multi-focal area investments</li> <li>▪ Relevance of approved CW projects to key themes of interest, including private sector involvement, policy and regulatory reform, and gender</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Focal area projects that received at least PIF approval during GEF-6 (25 projects); a sample of GEF-5 projects can be added if resources allow</li> <li>▪ Multi-focal area projects approved in GEF-5 and -6 (10 projects)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ CW project documents</li> <li>▪ GEF-6 Programming Directions</li> <li>▪ GEF IEO Programmatic Approaches study</li> <li>▪ GEF IEO Multiple Benefits Evaluation</li> <li>▪ SDGs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Documentation review</li> <li>▪ Quality at entry</li> </ul>

Key Questions	Indicators/Basic Data/What to Look for	Relevant Sample	Sources of Information	Methods
To what extent did the CW focal area give consideration to proposals by nominated Stockholm Convention Centers with regard to the delivery of technical assistance on a regional basis?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Coherence between approved GEF projects and the Stockholm Convention regional and subregional centers</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Focal area projects that received at least PIF approval during GEF-6 (25 projects); a sample of GEF-5 projects can be added if resources allow</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ CW project documents</li> <li>▪ Convention documents</li> <li>▪ Decision SC-6/16 (endorsing regional and subregional centers)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Quality at entry</li> <li>▪ Key informant interviews</li> </ul>
To what extent has the GEF supported ratification and early implementation of the Minamata Convention?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Evidence of enabling activities and other projects supporting early implementation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Focal area projects that received at least PIF approval during GEF-6 (25 projects); a sample of GEF-5 projects can be added if resources allow</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ CW project documents</li> <li>▪ GEF-6 Programming Directions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Documentation review</li> <li>▪ Portfolio review</li> <li>▪ Key informant interviews</li> </ul>
What are the benefits of the GEF CW indirect and/or voluntary support to chemical conventions for which it is not a financial mechanism, including Montreal Protocol, Basel and Rotterdam Conventions, and SAICM? How did such benefits and support materialize?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Evidence of project activities with expected benefits related to the phaseout of ozone depleting substances, trade or movement of POPs waste, lifecycle management, and/or sound international management of chemicals and waste (SAICM)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Focal area projects that received at least PIF approval during GEF-6 (25 projects); a sample of GEF-5 projects can be added if resources allow</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ CW project documents</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Quality at entry</li> <li>▪ Portfolio review</li> <li>▪ Key informant interviews</li> </ul>

**EFFECTIVENESS AND RESULTS**



Key Questions	Indicators/Basic Data/What to Look for	Relevant Sample	Sources of Information	Methods
<p>What are the impacts of the CW investments on production, use, consumption, and emissions/releases of the chemicals and waste?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Improvements in ecological status and/or reductions in stress on ecological systems</li> <li>▪ Tons of POPs, mercury, ODS, and other chemicals and waste of global concern phased out, reduced or disposed</li> <li>▪ Cost per ton for each chemical/waste</li> <li>▪ Evidence of outcomes related to policy and regulatory reform</li> <li>▪ Factors that contribute to or hinder progress toward impact</li> <li>▪ <i>Progress toward impact on:</i></li> <li>▪ Elimination of the use of PCBs in equipment by 2025</li> <li>▪ Environmentally sound waste management of liquids containing PCBs and equipment contaminated with PCBs, having a PCB content above 0.005 per cent, in accordance with paragraph 1 of Article 6 and part II of Annex A of the Stockholm Convention, as soon as possible and no later than 2028</li> <li>▪ Elimination or restriction of the production and use of newly listed POPs</li> <li>▪ Elimination of the production and use of DDT, except for parties that have notified the GEF Secretariat of their intention to produce and/or use it</li> <li>▪ For parties that produce and/or use DDT, restriction of such production and/or use for disease vector control in accordance with WHO recommendations and guidelines on the use of DDT and when locally safe, effective and affordable alternatives are not available to the party in question</li> <li>▪ Use of best available techniques for new sources in the categories listed in part II of Annex C of the Stockholm Convention</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ CW projects with TEs (36 projects completed between 2006 and 2016)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Terminal evaluations</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ P2I desk analysis</li> <li>▪ P2I case studies</li> </ul>

Key Questions	Indicators/Basic Data/What to Look for	Relevant Sample	Sources of Information	Methods
How have CW investments contributed to a strengthened lifecycle management of chemicals?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence of impacts on lifecycle management of chemicals</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CW projects with TEs (36 projects)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Terminal evaluations</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>P2I desk analysis</li> <li>P2I case studies</li> </ul>
What are the impacts of CW projects on food security, water, SCP, sustainable cities, other GEF focal areas?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence of impacts on food security, water, sustainable consumption and production, and sustainable cities (including impacts related to the IAPs)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CW projects with TEs (36 projects)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Terminal evaluations</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>P2I desk analysis</li> <li>Content analysis using word searches</li> <li>P2I case studies</li> </ul>
What are the impacts of CW investment on LDCs and SIDS?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Impacts in LDCs and SIDS</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CW projects with TEs in LDCs and SIDS— GEF ID 1802 [Tanzania], 2865 [Sudan, Yemen], and 3205 [Mauritius] and may include global projects (to the extent that impacts on LDCs and SIDS can be discerned)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Terminal evaluations</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>P2I desk analysis</li> </ul>
What co-benefits do CW investments achieve with other GEF focal areas, such as climate change mitigation and adaptation, land degradation, international waters, and biodiversity?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence of results related to climate change, land degradation, international waters, and biodiversity</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CW projects with TEs (36 projects)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Terminal evaluations</li> <li>GEF IEO Multiple Benefits Evaluation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>P2I desk analysis</li> <li>Content analysis using word searches</li> </ul>
<b>EFFICIENCY</b>				

Key Questions	Indicators/Basic Data/What to Look for	Relevant Sample	Sources of Information	Methods
What are the trends in performance and implementation of the GEF CW portfolio?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Project outcomes and sustainability ratings and trends</li> <li>▪ Quality of implementation and project execution ratings and trends</li> <li>▪ Co-financing trends (proposed versus materialized; sources)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ CW projects with TEs (36 projects)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ PMIS data</li> <li>▪ APRs</li> <li>▪ Terminal evaluations</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Portfolio analysis</li> </ul>
What has been the experience and the performance of the implementing and project agencies (including the direct access option)?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ By agency, project outcomes and sustainability ratings and trends</li> <li>▪ By agency, quality of implementation and project execution ratings and trends</li> <li>▪ By agency, cofinancing (proposed versus materialized)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ CW projects with TEs (36 projects)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ PMIS data</li> <li>▪ APRs</li> <li>▪ Terminal evaluations</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Portfolio analysis</li> </ul>
How and to what extent did the CW focal area ensure transparency of the project approval process?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Evidence of specific approaches implemented by the CW focal area to support project approval transparency</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ NA</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ GEF policy documents</li> <li>▪ Convention documents</li> <li>▪ Other IEO evaluations (as relevant)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Documentation review</li> <li>▪ Evaluation synthesis</li> <li>▪ Key informant interviews</li> </ul>
What type of stakeholders have been involved with activities funded through the CW focal area and how has such involvement been ensured?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Stakeholder participation and public awareness ratings</li> <li>▪ Types of stakeholders involved (e.g., government, NGOs, private companies, etc.)</li> <li>▪ Evidence of gender considerations</li> <li>▪ Mechanisms for stakeholder engagement, including best practices and lessons learned</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ CW projects with TEs (36 projects)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Terminal evaluations</li> <li>▪ Other IEO evaluations (as relevant)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ P2I desk analysis</li> <li>▪ Content analysis using word searches</li> <li>▪ Evaluation synthesis</li> </ul>
What is the level of country ownership activities funded through the CW focal area and how has country ownership been ensured?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Country ownership and drivenness ratings</li> <li>▪ Relevance to national development and environmental agendas, including NIPs</li> <li>▪ Contributing factors to ensuring country ownership</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ CW projects with TEs (36 projects)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Terminal evaluations</li> <li>▪ OPS5 Meta-evaluation on country ownership and drivenness</li> <li>▪ Other IEO evaluations (as relevant)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ P2I desk analysis</li> <li>▪ Evaluation synthesis</li> </ul>

Key Questions	Indicators/Basic Data/What to Look for	Relevant Sample	Sources of Information	Methods
To what extent has the private sector been involved or mainstreamed with the CW portfolio and how has such involvement been ensured?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Co-financing trends (private sector as a source of co-financing; proposed versus materialized)</li> <li>▪ Type of private sector entities involved, and extent of involvement by entity type</li> <li>▪ Modes of private sector engagement (e.g., as beneficiary, partner, secondary executing agency, consultee)</li> <li>▪ Evidence of mechanisms for “mainstreaming” the private sector in CW investments</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ CW projects with TEs (36 projects)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ PMIS data</li> <li>▪ Terminal evaluations</li> <li>▪ Other IEO evaluations (as relevant)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Portfolio analysis</li> <li>▪ P2I desk analysis</li> <li>▪ P2I case studies</li> <li>▪ Evaluation synthesis</li> <li>▪ Key informant interviews</li> </ul>
<b>SCALING UP AND LESSONS LEARNED</b>				
What strategies has the GEF employed to scale-up CW projects through its existing programs such as Integrated Programs (IAPs), industrial parks, and involvement of the private sector?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Evidence of strategies for broader adoption through scaling up, including through IAPs, industrial parks, and private sector engagement</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ CW projects with TEs (36 projects)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Terminal evaluations</li> <li>▪ GEF IEO Evaluation of Programmatic Approaches</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Documentation review</li> <li>▪ Evaluation synthesis</li> <li>▪ Key informant interviews</li> <li>▪ P2I desk analysis</li> <li>▪ P2I case studies</li> </ul>
What are the lessons learned from the MFA projects for development of integrated programs?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Lessons learned to be based on findings from relevance (above)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ NA – Note that no MFA projects with CW components have undergone terminal evaluations to date.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Findings of the CW focal area study</li> <li>▪ GEF IEO Multiple Benefits Evaluation</li> <li>▪ GEF IEO Evaluation of Programmatic Approaches</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Triangulation</li> <li>▪ Evaluation synthesis</li> <li>▪ Key informant interviews</li> </ul>
How can lessons learned from the existing CW portfolio be adapted to the recently added chemicals under the Stockholm Convention?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Lessons learned to be based on findings on relevance, effectiveness, and efficiency (above)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ NA</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Findings of the CW focal area study</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Triangulation</li> </ul>

Key Questions	Indicators/Basic Data/What to Look for	Relevant Sample	Sources of Information	Methods
<p>What are the lessons learned of the CW portfolio on the issues of gender and stakeholder engagement, including private sector participation?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Lessons learned to be based on findings on efficiency (above)</li> </ul>	<p>NA</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Findings of the CW focal area study</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Triangulation</li> </ul>

## Appendix B. Case Study Selection for Projects under Implementation

The table below shows the list of candidates for selecting three case studies for CW projects under implementation. These candidate projects include all multi-focal area (MFA) projects with chemicals or waste components approved in GEF-5 or GEF-6. The limited number of candidates and the application of the selection criteria to cover integrated approaches, industrial parks, and gold forces the selection to the following three projects:

- GEF ID 4766 (Implementation of Eco-industrial Park Initiative for Sustainable Industrial Zones in Vietnam).
- GEF ID 4799 (Implementing Integrated Measures for Minimizing Mercury Releases from Artisanal Gold Mining).
- GEF ID 9077 (Cities-IAP: Sustainable Cities Integrated Approach Pilot (IAP-PROGRAM)).

These selected projects include the two most mature projects in terms of implementation status (4766 and 4799), as well as both single- and multi-country projects.

No.	GEF ID	Agency	Single Country	Multi-Country	Under Implementation	Integrated Approaches	Industrial Parks	Gold
1	4766	UNIDO	X		X		X	
2	4799	UNIDO		X	X			X
3	5150	UNEP	X					
4	5152	UNEP	X					
5	5299	UNEP	X					
6	5300	UNIDO		X				
7	9077	World Bank/ADB, AfDB, DBSA, IADB, UNDP, UNEP, UNIDO		X		X (Sustainable Cities Pilot)		
8	9206	UNIDO	X					
9	9234	AfDB	X					
10	9246	UNDP		X				