



# Global Environment Facility

GEF/ME/C.28/7  
May 10, 2006

---

GEF Council  
June 6-9, 2006

Agenda Item 8

## FOUR-YEAR WORK PROGRAM AND BUDGET OF THE GEF EVALUATION OFFICE FY07-10 AND RESULTS IN FY06

**(Prepared by the GEF Evaluation Office)**

### **Recommended Council Decision**

The Council, having reviewed document GEF/ME/C.28/7 “*Four Year Work Program and Budget of the GEF Evaluation Office FY07-10 and Results in FY06*” approves the proposed principles underlying the work program for the next four years, and in particular the principle that OPS4 will be implemented by the Evaluation Office, subject to the comments made during the Council meeting. Council approves a budget of \$2,921,365 for FY07 to cover the GEF Evaluation Office’s cost of core tasks. In addition, Council approves the budget for the following special initiatives:

To be implemented in FY07

- (1) GEF EO inputs and participation to the fourth GEF Assembly (\$50,000)
- (2) an additional evaluation of GEF support at country level (\$90,000)
- (3) an evaluation of the ExAs experiences with the GEF (\$70,000); and
- (4) OPS3 ICF budget overrun (\$108,149)

To be implemented in FY07 and FY08

- (5) preparation of an international workshop on evaluation, environment and sustainable development (\$50,000)
- (6) evaluation of the Small Grants Programme (\$150,000)

Regarding FY08 through FY10, Council takes note of the proposed work program and activities and requests the Office to prepare annual budgets for Council consideration and approval in each of its June meetings.

Council agrees with the proposed arrangements for the evaluation of the Small Grants Programme to be conducted by the Office. Council requests the GEF Small Grants Programme to contribute to the cost of this evaluation from its proposed 2007 budget, in the order of \$200,000 to \$250,000 depending on approval of its full budget request for the year. This amount is to be transferred to the Office from the Small Grants Programme through the GEF Trustee. The Council recognizes that this evaluation will take the place of the final evaluation required for replenishment of a new SGP phase.

## Table of Contents

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....	1
BACKGROUND .....	3
PRIORITIES AND OBJECTIVES FOR FY07-FY10 .....	4
Evaluation .....	8
Oversight .....	9
Consultative Process .....	10
Knowledge Management .....	10
Fourth Overall Performance Study (OPS4) .....	10
Special Initiatives During FY07-FY10 .....	11
GEF Evaluation Office Budget for FY08-10 .....	11
FY07 DELIVERABLES AND BUDGET .....	14
Evaluation Program .....	14
Oversight Program .....	17
Recurring Activities .....	18
Staff .....	19
Ongoing Special Initiative .....	19
New Special Initiatives .....	20
FY07 Budget .....	23
Participation of GEF Secretariat, IAs, EAs and STAP .....	26
ANNEX 1: REVIEW OF ACHIEVEMENTS IN FY06 .....	27
Evaluation Program .....	27
Oversight Program .....	28
Consultative Process .....	29
Knowledge Management .....	29
Interaction with Council .....	30
Office Management .....	30
Evaluators' Summit, January 2006 .....	30
OPS3 Follow-up .....	30
FY06 Budget and Estimated Expenditures .....	30
Special Initiatives .....	31

## Executive Summary

1. This document presents a detailed work program for the FY07 through FY10 period and a fully detailed budget to cover the core activities of the GEF Evaluation Office in FY07. The document is presented in three parts. The first part provides a general background and context on how the Office plans to implement the four-year rolling work program. The second part presents the proposed four-year rolling work program, gives Council a description of the priorities, objectives, outcomes and expected deliverables for the FY07-10 period. The third part presents the priorities, deliverables and budget for FY07 that Council is requested to review and approve. The document has one annex which summarizes the Office's achievements in FY06.

2. The FY07-10 period will cover the entire implementation period of GEF4, including the implementation of the RAF. The Evaluation Office's main priority and objective during the next four years will be to begin preparations for and actually implement the OPS4 of the GEF in preparation for the fifth replenishment of the GEF and fourth Assembly. To accomplish this task, the Office proposes to: (1) fully implement, monitor and evaluate the recently approved GEF M&E Policy; (2) increase the evaluation coverage to all operations of the GEF and selected institutional aspects as well as responding to specific requirements from Council; (3) further strengthen the relationships with the global monitoring and evaluation community, especially GEF partners' through a consultative process and an international workshop on evaluation, environment and sustainable development; and (4) assess, disseminate and learn from results and impacts of GEF programs and projects.

3. In FY10, the Fourth Overall Performance Study (OPS4) of the GEF is expected to be delivered to the replenishment process when a new phase of the GEF, GEF 5, is expected to begin. The Office can undertake the proposed four-year rolling work program leading up to and culminating in OPS4, on the understanding that Council decides to entrust the Office with OPS4. Now that the Evaluation Office is fully independent and reporting directly to Council, there is no need to set up a separate evaluation exercise for OPS4. No additional degree of independence would be gained: after all, an independent team of evaluators for OPS4 would be funded by the Council and would report to Council, just like the GEF Evaluation Office. Two elements of OPS4 would still need to be evaluated fully independent: the stakeholder consultation within the GEF and an evaluation of the GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy and specifically the role of the GEF Evaluation Office.

4. In FY07, the Evaluation Office proposes to concentrate its work in completing the following core tasks: (1) completing two cross-cutting/thematic studies started in FY06: capacity building and incremental cost methodologies; (2) conducting a new evaluation on the catalytic effect of GEF activities; (3) one evaluation of the GEF portfolio in at least one country (to be decided) and one impact evaluation; (4) oversight program; and (5) knowledge management. In addition, the Office requests the Council to approve special initiatives to: (1) cover the cost for the GEF EO's inputs and participation to the fourth GEF Assembly; (2) conduct an additional GEF country portfolio evaluation; (3) conduct an evaluation of Executing Agencies experiences with the GEF; (4) reimburse ICF Consulting for additional costs of OPS3; (5) begin preparation for an international workshop on evaluation, environment and sustainable development (workshop to be conducted in early FY08), and (5) conduct an independent evaluation of the Small Grants Programme.

5. Annex 1 provides a summary of the Office's main achievements in FY06: full dissemination of the Third Overall Performance Study (OPS3) to all major GEF stakeholders; Council approval of the GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy in February 2006; completion of major evaluations such as the Local Benefits Study, the evaluation of GEF support to the Cartagena Protocol, and the evaluation of the GEF support to Costa Rica as the first case of an assessment of the GEF portfolio at the country level; and the 2005 Annual Performance Report (APR). In January 2006 the Office organized a meeting with the lead consultants and advisors that have worked with the Office in the past to receive feedback on how to improve the Office's programming and maximize the impact of OPS4. The Office also made important progress on several other evaluations, such as the evaluation of Incremental Cost methodologies, Impact Evaluations, capacity building and Joint Evaluation of GEF Activities and Modalities. The Office also incorporated, as planned, two new regular staff: a budget and programming staff and an evaluation officer. The Evaluation Office has joined the UN Evaluation Group (UNEG). Finally, the office officially changed its name to GEF Evaluation Office.

6. The Council is requested to review the document and approve the proposed principles underlying the work program for the next four years, and in particular the principle that OPS4 will be implemented by the Evaluation Office, subject to the comments made during the Council meeting. In addition, the Council is requested to approve a budget of \$2,921,365 for FY07 to cover the Evaluation Office's cost of core tasks and pilot activities (a 3% increase from FY06 budget). In addition, Council is also requested to review and approve the budget for the following special initiatives:

**To be implemented in FY07:**

- (1) GEF EO inputs and participation to the fourth GEF Assembly (\$50,000),
- (2) an additional evaluation of GEF support at country level (\$90,000)
- (3) an evaluation of the ExAs experiences with the GEF (\$70,000); and
- (4) OPS3 ICF budget overrun (\$108,149).

**To be implemented in FY07 and FY08:**

- (5) preparation of an international workshop on evaluation, environment and sustainable development (\$50,000),
- (6) independent evaluation of the Small Grants Programme (\$150,000).

## BACKGROUND

7. In June 2005, Council reviewed GEF/ME/C.25/3, *Four Year Work Program and Budget of the GEF Evaluation Office – FY06-09 and Results in FY05*” and approved the proposed principles underlying the work program for the four year period and the Office’s budget for FY06. The Office successfully executed the approved program for FY06 within budget and time, with few exceptions. The results of the FY06 work program are presented in Annex 1.

8. At the June 2005 meeting, Council requested that in the next four-year rolling work program (FY07-10) the Office should take into account the following issues:

- a) the terms of reference of the Office approved by Council in July 2003
- b) recommendations from OPS3 incorporated in the policy recommendations associated with the fourth replenishment of the GEF Trust Fund
- c) policy and program streamlining, actual trends in commitments, disbursements and number of projects in the GEF
- d) the outcomes of the consultative process, the new GEF monitoring and evaluation policy, and the new division of labor on monitoring and evaluation, which may lead to efficiencies in actual costs
- e) overall budget discipline, and
- f) the possibility of OPS4 building upon the evaluations of the Office.

9. This document presents a fully detailed FY07 budget to cover the core activities of the Office. The programming and budget for the following three years will remain flexible to take into account new requests from Council as well as new developments in the GEF.

10. The FY07-10 period will be influenced by the outcome of the replenishment negotiations that are not yet concluded. Furthermore, the implementation of the recently approved GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy will influence the work of the Office during the next four years. Also, the Office has been requested by the Council to conduct an independent mid-term review of the implementation of the RAF that will require extensive inputs and management from Office staff. Finally, the present four-year rolling work program begins to include GEF 5 (expected to start on FY10). Given all of these constraints, the Office proposes not to provide Council with tentative budgets figures for FY08, FY09 and FY10.

11. The review of achievements in 2006 as well as an accounting of expenditures is attached as Annex 1. The main achievements of FY06 include the full dissemination of the Third Overall Performance Study (OPS3) to all major GEF stakeholders; Council approval of the GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy in February 2006; completion of major evaluations such as the Local Benefits Study, the evaluation of GEF support to the Cartagena Protocol, and the evaluation of the GEF support to Costa Rica as the first case of an assessment of the GEF portfolio at the country level; and the 2005 Annual Performance Report (APR). The Office also made important progress on several other evaluations, such as the evaluation of Incremental Cost calculations, an impact evaluation, capacity building and the Joint Evaluation of GEF Activities and Modalities. The Office incorporated, as planned, two new regular staff: a budget and programming staff and an evaluation officer. The Office has joined the UN Evaluation Group (UNEG). Finally, the office changed its name to GEF Evaluation Office.

12. This document is presented in three parts. The first part provides a general background and context on how the Office plans to implement the four-year rolling work program. The second part presents the proposed four-year rolling work program and gives Council a description of the priorities, objectives, outcomes and expected deliverables for the FY07-10 period. The third part presents the priorities, deliverables and budget for FY07 that Council is requested to review and approve. The annex summarizes the achievements in FY06 by the Office.

### **PRIORITIES AND OBJECTIVES FOR FY07-FY10**

13. The principles utilized to develop the four year rolling plan were presented to Council at its November 2004 session. Subjects may receive priority for evaluation and oversight according to the following criteria:

- Policy relevance – whether or not a subject is highly relevant in existing GEF policies
- Financial weight of the topic to be considered
- Stakeholder opinion and demand
- Public and/or media debate – whether or not a subject is “controversial” or being debated often in the media
- Evaluation coverage – ideally the programming should lead to the main potential subjects being evaluated once every replenishment period
- Evaluability – whether or not subjects can be evaluated in a cost-effective way
- International collaboration and “third party” information – whether or not collaboration may provide cost opportunities or whether or not evaluative evidence from others may be accepted.

14. Given these criteria, the Office presented a four year evaluation program in June 2005 which would provide sufficient coverage and would lead to independent evaluations of all major subjects in the GEF over a four year period, leading to an OPS4 which would be able to report on overall results of the GEF. While this program was accepted in principle, on the other hand it would only be possible to realize if the budget for the Office would continue to increase. In light of the increase of the Office’s budget for FY06, Council noted that “overall budget discipline” would need to be taken into account when preparing a budget for future years. This means that a way must be found to cover all necessary subjects in the coming years whilst remaining within “overall budget discipline”, which in the GEF discussions usually means an annual increase of 3% for the core.

15. The FY07-10 period will cover the entire implementation period of GEF4, including the implementation of the RAF. In FY10, the Fourth Overall Performance Study (OPS4) of the GEF is expected to be delivered to the replenishment process when GEF 5 is expected to begin. Predicting a work program for FY10 is not feasible at this stage so the Office has left this programming flexible.

16. In January 2006 the Office met with its lead consultants and high level advisors in The Hague, the Netherlands, to discuss how evaluations in the coming years should be planned and implemented in order to achieve a better aggregation of results in OPS4. This meeting led to several important recommendations on key questions in evaluations which would enable

integration of findings throughout evaluations in the coming years. For this purpose, the importance of the focal area evaluations was highlighted, as well as a series of evaluations of sub-sectors in the focal areas where sufficient experience had been achieved to warrant drawing in-depth lessons.

17. Furthermore, a consensus opinion emerged in The Hague that given the independence of the Office, OPS4 should be carried out by the Office itself. Two elements of OPS4 would still need to be evaluated fully independent: the stakeholder consultation within the GEF and an evaluation of the GEF M & E policy and specifically the role of the Office.

18. The subjects for cross-cutting and thematic evaluations were confirmed in The Hague as relevant and timely. In addition to these evaluation subjects, the meeting also identified the possibility of an evaluation of the role of science in the GEF. This subject was proposed given the fact that new scientific insights in environmental issues are emerging regularly, and the catalytic role of the GEF calls for an early adoption of new insights, methods and technologies. A major question in this regard was whether the GEF is aware of the most recent scientific developments relevant to its business and whether the most recent paradigms are applied in its strategies. Furthermore, the question arose whether the GEF is benefiting from the most up-to-date scientific and technological advice in the design of its projects. This issue was discussed with STAP at its most recent meeting. An exploratory process was proposed to see whether there would be scope for an evaluation of the role of science in the GEF, including the role of STAP.

19. The meeting in The Hague also recommended splitting up the planned evaluation on indigenous people into evaluation questions, which would be inserted into the focal area evaluations. The meeting noted that the subject has a high priority, but also that the interaction of GEF interventions with indigenous people differ greatly per focal area and that more insights can only be gained if the context is fully taken into account. For this reason, the evaluation of the role of indigenous people has disappeared from the work program, to be taken up in the focal area evaluations.

20. On global and regional programs the meeting in The Hague did not come to any concrete proposals. The subject was considered to be important, especially in light of the introduction of the RAF. However, from a budgetary perspective it is not possible to undertake this evaluation in the near future. One possibility is to ensure that this is a sub-evaluation in OPS4. The Country Portfolio Evaluation in Costa Rica recommends evaluating the regional programs in Central America where the GEF has provided extensive financial support. However, unless a budgetary solution can be found, this will have to wait until OPS4.

21. The Office can undertake the proposed four year rolling work program leading up to and culminating in OPS4, on the understanding that Council decides to entrust the Office with OPS4. Now that the Office is fully independent and reporting directly to Council, there is no need to set up a separate evaluation exercise for OPS4. No additional degree of independence would be gained: after all, an independent team of evaluators for OPS4 would be funded by the Council and would report to Council, just like the GEF Evaluation Office.

22. This would mean that no independent team of consultants would be hired for OPS4, but that the work would be carried out by the Office and consultants hired by the Office. As was the

case for OPS3, the TOR for OPS4 would be decided by the Council. Furthermore, as mentioned above, an independent mechanism for quality assurance would be created, and two parts of OPS4 would be undertaken independently of the Office: the stakeholder consultations and the evaluation of the GEF M & E policy.

23. It is expected that with inflation increase over the years an OPS4 on the same basis as OPS3 (outsourced to a team of consultants) would amount to more than US\$2.5 million (a reference point may be the Independent External Evaluation of FAO, which is currently running for a budget of more than US\$4 million). By integrating substantial portions of the work for OPS4 into its regular work program, the Office expects to achieve efficiencies of US\$0.5 million to \$1 million, meaning that by the end of OPS4, the Office could have conducted the overall study for \$1 million to \$1.5 million. This will imply that the Office's budget from FY08 onwards will include a relative portion of this cost under special initiatives for example (so there are no major increases in the core budget). A more detailed plan and a justification of why the efficiencies can be achieved while increasing the scope and depth of OPS4 will be presented as part of the next four year rolling work plan and budget to be submitted to Council for its June 2007 session.

24. Another special initiative that will have an impact on the Office's work program is the independent mid-term review of the RAF, since this will be a unique and one-time review. The Office will present a full proposal in 2007.

25. Some fine-tuning of the baseline budget of the Office may be necessary in future years. The Office could cover its share of the cost of certain administrative support of the GEF Secretariat from its budget, such as budget management, human resources and information technology. From the point of view of Council, this may not imply an increase of the GEF administrative budget since it will mean a shift of funding from the GEF Secretariat to the Office's budget. The Office could in turn recover some of the cost of services provided to the Secretariat in areas of portfolio management, indicator development, and results monitoring. Further clarification of the administrative relationship between the GEF Secretariat and the Office will be developed and agreed when the Office considers the administrative procedures to implement the new GEF M&E policy.

26. The Office expects that by the end of the four year programming period the following outcomes, as presented in last year's programming paper, will be achieved:

- accountability: increased legitimacy of the GEF
- better informed decisions: improved Council decisions on policies, strategies and work program; and
- learning/insight, knowledge management and dissemination: better prepared projects at entry level and better portfolio, and risk management.

27. Annex 1 presents the accomplishments for FY06 and discusses how far the Office has gone in achieving these outcomes, in particular the third bullet since the other two are associated with the entire GEF system and therefore should be measured primarily as part of OPS4. Furthermore, more detail on progress made so far by the Office is presented in Council document GEF Evaluation Office Progress Report 2006 (GEF/ME/C.28/1).

28. As the independent status of the Office matures the model that it follows for developing and implementing its work program also becomes more developed. In the last year and in the future, the Office has developed a business model with the following elements:

- the evaluation and oversight work program should be based on full synergy among all elements of its work program to increase cost-effectiveness and reduce evaluation burden to partners.
- to the extent possible and without comprising its independence, the Office will explore possibilities to bring resources (financial and technical) to help in the implementation of the work program activities, in particular those that are considered as one time special initiative.
- although field work is an essential part of any evaluation, in particular to independently assess the GEF experiences on the ground, the Office should also maximize the use of meta-evaluations of independently conducted and good quality evaluations.
- in developing evaluations and oversight activities, the Office will clearly define the universe of units of evaluation and develop a transparent and clear methodology to select representative samples.
- the Office promotes team work among its staff, at all levels, as well as with staff from other members of the GEF partnership.
- The development of approach papers and terms reference for all activities in the work program will reflect the above elements.

29. The Office will continue to promote and undertake joint evaluations. The experience so far has been very encouraging. The joint evaluation has so far led to increased cooperation both among the Agencies' evaluation departments, and between evaluation units and operational departments, as well as enhanced knowledge of GEF in the partnership. In addition to these positive results, the efforts mobilized by the Agencies for the Joint Evaluation represents a considerable financial benefit for the GEF. The consultants recruited directly by the Agencies for specific evaluation components and desk research represents an investment of around \$90,000 in consultancy fees, not counting administrative costs of travel and logistics. The organization of workshops and meetings (three undertaken, one scheduled) is shared, to estimated actual costs of \$10,000 for the host Agencies; all Agencies also cover their own costs of participation.

30. The advantage of joint work is especially illustrated by the field visits. By making use of existing planned missions by the Agencies to cover GEF joint evaluation interviews, we have been able to expand the outreach to countries. The direct costs for these missions have been taken in charge by the partner Agencies. By May, four country visits by Agencies have taken place to Asia, Latin-America and Africa; underway and to be completed are at least six other countries in Europe, Asia, Africa and the Caribbean. The alternative cost for the GEF to undertake these visits would amount to more than \$90,000 dollars, at a conservative estimate. Such additional coverage would not have been feasible for the Evaluation Office alone, neither in financial or staff time terms. All in all the investments by the Agencies, though new and additional funding, considerably exceed the budget provided by the GEF for the joint evaluation.

31. Tables 1 and 2 present the timetable for implementation of activities proposed under the Office's work program for the FY07-10 period and the actual activities completed in FY06. The work program is divided in core activities in five areas: evaluation, oversight, consultative process, knowledge management and OPS4 and a series of special initiatives.

## **Evaluation**

32. As presented in last year's programming document, the Office proposes to conduct evaluations in four main areas:

- GEF focal areas, operational programs and strategic priorities
- GEF support to countries and projects impacts
- Cross-cutting and thematic studies
- Institutional and procedural issues.

33. Starting in FY08 and continuing in FY09, the Office will conduct **evaluations of all GEF focal areas**, operational programs and strategic priorities. When appropriate these evaluations will include the evaluation of GEF3 Strategic Priorities since projects approved within this framework will start to produce results in GEF4. The level of efforts will depend on the particular focal areas and available budget. These are essential inputs to the OPS process. In addition and to support evaluations of entire GEF focal areas or programs the Office will conduct in-depth evaluations of selected technical issues or topics. The topic(s) will be decided taking into account comments from Council, discussions with other GEF partners and potential synergies with other evaluations in the work program. Some examples of possible topics are: cluster evaluations in the International Waters focal area of projects working within large marine ecosystems or Nutrient Reduction Programs (these projects represent an important part of GEF investments in international waters and have reached a level of maturity that allows the assessment of catalytic and environmental results); cluster of projects working with industrial energy efficiency since it is connected with a new priority in GEF4; market transformation for energy efficiency or renewable energy; additive or aggregate contribution from site level protected areas biodiversity impacts to global biodiversity; and assessment of processes to assess changes in status of biodiversity at the global level.

34. In FY06 the Office conducted an **evaluation of the GEF portfolio in Costa Rica** as a pilot case. This exercise proved to be worthwhile, as the first time the entire GEF support to a country was evaluated across all focal areas and Implementing and Executing Agencies. More details on this evaluation are provided in the achievements for FY06 Annex 1 and the report is presented to Council as GEF/GEFME/C.28/5. It is proposed to continue this type of evaluations in the future, at least one country per year and as part of the Office's core budget. Criteria for selecting countries are under development as well as terms of reference to conduct this type of evaluations.

35. Regarding the approach for **evaluating GEF impacts**, the experience in FY06 determined that the initial required step was an assessment of possible methodologies to be used, rather than conducting a pilot right away. Once a methodology is developed, a pilot evaluation will be conducted during FY07 before confirming the feasibility of this modality and

incorporating further impact evaluations into the core activities of the Office. More information about this evaluation pilot is presented in the achievements for FY06 Annex.

36. Within the **cross-cutting and thematic evaluations** the Office proposed to conduct a series of evaluations during the FY06-09 period. Further analysis and as suggested by the Evaluators Summit, it was decided that two of the topics should be pursued as full evaluations (capacity building and catalytic role of the GEF) but the other topic (GEF work with indigenous people) should be considered in all evaluations conducted by the Office, specially focal areas studies, rather than evaluating it as a separate subject. The idea here is that if all evaluations conducted by the Office in the near future consider the topic of indigenous people OPS4 will be able to prepare a meta-evaluation to synthesize the evaluative evidence. In addition, participants to the Evaluators Summit suggested that the Office should conduct an evaluation of the Role of Science in the GEF, a fundamental aspect in all GEF activities, programs and mandate and potentially a very important input to OPS4 (STAP will be involved).

37. Two evaluations were proposed in last year's programming paper regarding **institutional and procedural issues**: an evaluation of incremental costs methodologies and an evaluation of regional/global projects. For an evaluation of regional and global projects no funding will be available in the regular budget in the coming years. It is proposed to undertake this evaluation as part of OPS4. Furthermore, the joint evaluation of the GEF activity cycle and modalities is of course focused on organizational and process issues.

## Oversight

38. According the GEF M&E Policy, the Office will increasingly play an oversight and validation role for the implementation, enforcement, monitoring and evaluation of this policy. Some of this shift has already taken place as reported by this year's Annual Performance Report (GEF/ME/C.28/2), by the work conducted under the Joint Evaluation and the Portfolio Performance Report (GEF/ME/C.28/4). The Office will continue to work closely with the GEF partners to develop greater consistency and comparability of information reported, and by building on existing systems. The Office will also continue to strengthen its working relationships with the evaluation offices of other GEF agencies through the consultative process, by participating in evaluation groups, such as the UN Evaluation Group and through ensuring synergies among possible common evaluations.

39. During this period, the Office will conduct the following oversight activities:

- Implementation, mainstreaming and monitoring of the GEF M&E Policy.
- Continuation of the **Annual Performance Report**, reporting on the quality of M&E systems across the GEF partnership. The 2005 APR is presented to Council at this meeting as GEF/ME/C.28/2. Annually, the APRs reports on the following issues: accomplishments of results, processes and factors that affect attainment of results, quality of monitoring and evaluation, the Management Action record, report on agency environmental and social responsibility, reporting on special topics (presented in alternated years).
- Assist the GEF partnership in the development and strengthening of program indicator.

- Mainstreaming of GEF concerns in IAs and EAs internal reviews and feedback systems.
- The Office will continue to work with IA and EAs providing feed back on monitoring and evaluation systems.

### **Consultative Process**

40. The GEF Policy on Monitoring and Evaluation was approved by the GEF Council in February 2006. It was developed based on a series of consultations with various GEF internal and external partners, including bilateral meetings with all of the evaluation departments of Implementing and Executing Agencies. The consultation process will continue in the next period on issues related to the implementation of the Policy, exchanges and mutual cooperation on evaluation work programs and on sharing of lessons learned.

41. The Office also initiated in FY06 an additional round of consultations with evaluation experts and lead consultants of the Office's major evaluations. The main objective of these consultations was to receive inputs from this group of experts on how to improve the efficiencies and impacts of the Office's work program. The first of these meetings took place in January 2006 and it is planned to continue, mainly on an annual basis, throughout the period.

### **Knowledge Management**

42. The Office has embedded its strategy for knowledge sharing and feedback in the GEF Policy on Monitoring and Evaluation. The knowledge management strategy for the Office emphasizes its role in contributing independent and evaluative evidence to the GEF repositories of knowledge. The approach is multi-pronged: (a) enhance integration with existing KM system in the Agencies; (b) promote a culture of learning through better outreach to project and country level by providing easily accessible learning products; and (c) promote the application of lessons learned arising from GEF evaluations through a targeted dissemination strategy for evaluation products.

### **Fourth Overall Performance Study (OPS4)**

43. The GEF has undergone four independent evaluations (including the one for the Pilot Phase in 1993, OPS1 in 1997, OPS2 in 2001 and OPS3 in 2005). Each of these evaluations contributed to the decision-making processes of the GEF Replenishment and Assembly. It is proposed that the Fourth Overall Performance Study (OPS4) will start in FY09 to be completed in FY10 to contribute to the fifth replenishment of the GEF. The TOR for the GEF Evaluation Office requires that the Office arranges for this comprehensive external study, which should address overriding issues like global impact and benefits of GEF programs, as well as the appropriateness of the GEF's institutional arrangements, policies, strategies, programs and priorities.

44. The content of OPS4, in specific terms, will be decided at a later time. The Office proposes that OPS4 is managed and implemented by the Office, which by FY09 will have a full complement of staff and evaluations as inputs. Two aspects should be contracted out to be fully independent: a worldwide stakeholder consultation and an independent evaluation of monitoring

and evaluation in the GEF. This arrangement will create savings of up to \$1 million by reducing duplications of work done by the Office and any outside firm.

### **Special Initiatives during FY07 to FY10**

45. The following list includes the names of the proposed Special Initiatives that the Office will request funding support from Council in the coming years. Further description of these proposals will be included in the Office's budget document of the year for which the funding is requested. Other will be added in future work program papers.

- Joint Evaluation: the GEF activities and modalities (implemented in FY06-07)
- OPS3 budget overrun (FY06-07)
- GEF EO inputs in Fourth GEF Assembly (FY07)
- Evaluation of GEF Executing Agencies experiences with the GEF (FY07)
- Additional evaluations of GEF Portfolio Evaluation (FY07)
- International Workshop on Evaluation, Environment and Sustainable Development (FY07-08)
- Evaluation of GEF Small Grants Programme (FY07-08)
- Mid-term evaluation of RAF implementation (FY08-09)

### **GEF Evaluation Office Budget for FY07-10**

46. The Office's budget to support the FY08, FY09 and FY10 work program is not presented in this document, only the one for FY07 for which Council is requested approval. Given budget constraints and uncertainties about future replenishments and the Office proposal to implement OPS4, the Office decided that it is not possible to forecast the budget requirements this far in advanced. The Office will prepare a budget for FY08 for the June 2007 Council meeting.

**Table 1. GEF Evaluation Office Core Activities and Implementation Timetable**

Activity	FY06 (actual)	FY07	FY08	FY09	FY10
<b>Evaluation</b>					
<i>Program Studies</i>			Biodiversity		
			Climate change		
			International Waters		
			Ozone Program		
			POPs (joint)		
			Land Degradation		
<i>Country and Impact Evaluations</i>	Costa Rica Country Evaluation	One country Evaluation	Two country evaluations	Two country evaluations	One country evaluation
	Impact Evaluation Approach Paper	Impact Evaluation of a cluster of projects	Impact Evaluation of a cluster of projects	Impact Evaluation of a cluster of projects	Impact Evaluation of a cluster of projects
<i>Cross-cutting/thematic issues</i>	Support to Local Benefit Study				
		Capacity Building			
		Catalytic effect of the GEF			
		Scoping study	Role of Science		
<i>Institutional and procedural Issues</i>		Incremental Cost			
	Options of interaction with Council				
<i>Other Evaluations</i>					
<b>Oversight</b>					
<i>Program indicators</i>	International Waters Land Degradation	International Waters Land Degradation	TBD	TBD	TBD
	APR				
	MAR				
<b>Consultative Process</b>					
<b>Knowledge Management</b>					
<b>Management/Advisory Support</b>					
<b>OPS3 Follow-up</b>					
<b>OPS4</b>					

**Table 2. GEF Evaluation Office On-going and Proposed Special Initiatives and Implementation Table**

Activity	FY06 (actual)	FY07	FY08	FY09	FY10
<b>Special Initiatives</b>					
	Joint Evaluation				
	Biosafety				
		International Workshop on evaluation, environment and sustainable development			
		GEF EO inputs to 3 <sup>rd</sup> Assembly			
		Evaluation of ExAs experience			
		Additional Country Evaluation	Additional Country Evaluation	Additional Country Evaluation	Additional Country Evaluation
				OPS4	
					GEF EO inputs to 4th Assembly
				RAF mid-term evaluation	
			Small Grants Programme		

## **FY07: DELIVERABLES AND BUDGET**

47. In FY07, the Office proposes to concentrate its work in completing the following core tasks: (1) completing two cross-cutting/thematic studies started in FY06: capacity building and incremental cost methodologies; (2) conducting a new evaluation on the catalytic effect of GEF activities; (3) one evaluation of the GEF portfolio in at least one country (country to be decided); (4) oversight program; and (5) knowledge management. Further exploration needs to be done on the projects impact evaluations; therefore, it is proposed to keep them as pilot activities in the FY07 work program. In addition, the Office will request the Council to approve special initiatives to: (1) begin preparation for an international workshop on evaluation, environment and sustainable development (workshop to be conducted in early FY08); (2) cover the cost for the GEF EO's inputs to the fourth GEF Assembly; (3) conduct an additional GEF country portfolio evaluation ; (4) conduct an evaluation of Executing Agencies experiences with the GEF; (5) begin the evaluation of the Small Grants Programme; and (6) reimburse ICF Consulting for additional costs of OPS3.

48. Following Council's request to ensure overall budget discipline an opportunity has been created by the retirement of one of the Office's staff. Instead of recruiting a replacement right away, the Office has decided to wait and use this staff's salary to cover the cost of a few additional activities.

49. If Council approves the full proposed budget and Special Initiatives, the following activities will be fully implemented and if possible completed by the end of FY07 (general details of these activities are presented in the previous sections).

### **Evaluation Program**

50. The Evaluation Program consists of two thematic evaluations (capacity building and the catalytic effect of GEF investments), the completion of the evaluation of incremental costs methodologies, at least one GEF Country Portfolio Evaluation (country to be decided at a later time), an exploratory exercise to evaluate the role of science in the GEF, and a pilot evaluation of the impact of a cluster of GEF projects.

#### Thematic Evaluation on GEF Capacity Building Initiatives and Programs

51. Capacity building is a key issue and major priority for the global environmental conventions, as it is for the GEF. The GEF emphasis on capacity building is articulated in its Operational Strategy as a process to "support and ensure the sustainability of global environmental benefits," which is reaffirmed in the latest strategic priorities in each of GEF's focal area strategies. GEF's efforts for capacity building are implemented through all of its project modalities. These include in particular regular and medium sized projects, enabling activities in climate change, biodiversity and land degradation and national capacity self assessments. To date, evaluation of GEF capacity building activities has been piecemeal and largely focused on project implementation processes. The OPS3 called for a more thorough examination of capacity building. The GEF Council accepted and supported the GEF Evaluation Office proposal in 2004 to launch a broader evaluation of capacity building. The focus of this evaluation will be on the global environmental impacts, as well as relevance, effectiveness and efficiency of capacity building activities at individual, institutional and overall level.

52. The Office is currently developing various methodological options for the assessment of capacity building impacts. It is expected that this evaluation will be completed towards the end of FY07 and the exact timetable for the evaluation will be made available in the approach paper which is expected by June 30<sup>th</sup> 2006. One important consideration in determining the exact scope of the evaluation is the possible budget. The budget assigned for this evaluation in FY07, US\$135,000, will only cover an internal and desk-review type of evaluation. The Office will explore possible additional funding from other partner institutions or bilateral donors.

#### Thematic Evaluation on the Catalytic Effect of GEF Activities

53. One of the key GEF operational principles indicates that “in seeking to maximize global environmental benefits, the GEF will emphasize its catalytic role and leverage additional financing from other sources.” Therefore, this topic has high policy relevance. Several evaluations conducted by the Office have identified that this principle, and in particular the replication dimension (i.e., scaling up) is difficult for project proponents to understand, does not have clear guidance from the GEF and, in general terms, it is usually not reported although it could potentially have great impact on the GEF’s role. Given the difficulties with understanding the subject, the first challenge will be to develop an evaluation methodology. For example, it is important to distinguish between the various concepts in use and the different means through which the GEF potential produces catalytic effects: knowledge products/contribution to international public goods; demonstration of these products; replication and scaling up. Other important issues, central to the catalytic effects of the GEF and that should be considered when developing the evaluation methodology, are: time, scale and attribution. Interventions take place in a set time span, usually short, but desired results only appear much later; projects usually are designed and implemented at a more reduced scale than the scale they seek to affect (a critical question would be: are the GEF interventions like to lead to the future benefits at the desired scale?); and the problem of attribution, while always present in evaluation is magnified in GEF projects again because GEF affect processes that transcend the time or scale of GEF intervention (thus it is likely that there are many actors involved in addressing the same problems, many unknown to GEF), and GEF also seeks work in partnerships (one potential solution is to focus on “contribution” rather than on “attribution”). The critical question in this evaluation should be: what is GEF’s catalytic impact? High collaboration potential is expected with other institutions within and outside the GEF since this is a topic of interest for many aid donors and recipient countries.

54. The Office will conduct an evaluation on this important principle of the GEF. An approach paper and terms of reference are expected to be ready for discussion with GEF partners and general public during the first part of the fiscal year. The Office will contract a team of evaluators to work together with Office staff. Given the complexity of this evaluation, the final report will not be ready until mid FY08. Further explanation of this evaluation was presented in the previous section. The evaluation’s proposed budget is \$135,000.

#### Evaluation of Incremental Cost Methodologies

55. The evaluation begun in March 2006 and will be completed October 2006 and presented at the December 2006 Council meeting. It has two objectives: (i) an evaluation of methods used for assessment of incremental costs; and (ii) evaluation of stakeholder involvement in negotiation. In addressing these objectives the evaluation will take into consideration the

existing incremental costs policy and procedures. The evaluation will also take account of the findings and conclusions of previous studies and evaluations, including the 'Local Benefits Study' with regards to the definition and generation of domestic/local and global environmental benefits. The evaluation's approach paper and terms of reference are available within the Office's page of the GEF web site. The evaluation team (see Annex 1 for an update on progress) will complete data collection by July 2006 while the analysis and report drafting will take place from August through September. The team will conduct several visits to IAs/EAs as well as to project proponents in several regions of the world. An additional \$90,000 is requested in FY07 to complete the evaluation.

#### GEF Country Portfolio Evaluation

56. The Costa Rica experience proved that this type of evaluations is feasible, viable and useful for the entire GEF system. In particular, the government of Costa Rica and other national GEF stakeholders considered that this exercise was very useful in the context of creating a baseline and taking stock for the implementation of the RAF. The requested budget (\$90,000) is estimated to be a minimum amount to cover the cost of one country evaluation. The Office is also requesting Council for additional funding under a special initiative to cover the cost of an additional country evaluation. Depending if Council approves one or two, the Office will decide which country to select. The proposal is that having budget for both evaluations would allow the Office to conduct an evaluation of a large GEF recipient country (for example, one of the large RAF countries) and an evaluation of a smaller GEF country but located in a more remote part of the world (higher cost), for example a LDC in Africa or an SIDS in the South Pacific.

#### Pilot: Impact Evaluations

57. Following the completion of the methodology assessment at the end of FY06, the Office will undertake a pilot evaluation to test the methodology. Although the methodology is under development at this time, it is anticipated that the pilot impact evaluation will take a theory-based approach to evaluating a thematic or regional cluster of projects in the biodiversity focal area.

#### Exploration: Role of Science in the GEF

58. In FY07, the Office proposes to conduct an exploratory assessment of the feasibility of evaluating this topic by consulting with major partners in the GEF, in particular with STAP. It is proposed to look for examples in the GEF where science and technology were successfully integrated into GEF operations and examples where the inclusion of science and technology posed problems. This scoping study would reveal whether there is a need for a full fledged evaluation or whether the emerging issues could be tackled in other evaluations, like the focal area evaluations or the evaluation of the catalytic role of the GEF. This scoping study is proposed as a joint exercise of STAP and the GEF Evaluation Office. If this exercise is concluded feasible, the evaluation will actually be proposed for FY08.

59. Following up on earlier findings from the International Waters, Biodiversity and OP12 program evaluations several questions were identified: Is the GEF aware of scientific developments relevant to its business, and are the most recent paradigms applied in its strategic thinking? Are the programs and strategies of the GEF based on the most up-to-date insights in what works and why in global environmental issues? Are the GEF's interventions and projects

based on high quality analysis and knowledge on what works and why? What should be the appropriate role of STAP on all these levels? Were the appropriate levels of expertise and analysis engaged and applied? How is causality perceived in strategies, programs and interventions? Have chains of causality been adequately identified and addressed? Have the hypotheses, predictions and assumptions been adequately peer-reviewed? How are environmental benefits measured? These questions should take into account that there is usually a tendency to create simplistic focus on the statistical significance of key relationships. Any comprehensive evaluation of the role of science in the GEF should also include an evaluation of STAP. The objective of an evaluation of this type would be to understand how to better integrate STAP into the functioning of the GEF: could STAP help in defining scientific indicators to measure project accomplishments? Can 15 people adequately represent the different technical disciplines and perspectives on all the issues addressed by GEF? Is guidance received by STAP members and roster sufficient and used appropriately? Who determines which STAP members will review incoming concepts and proposals?

### **Oversight Program**

60. The Oversight Program in FY07 will include the following main activities:

#### Implementation of GEF M&E Policy

61. In FY07 will determine the actual impact of this policy in the GEF system through the Office's consultative process (for example, how diminish overlaps with IAs/EAs own requirements and processes) and to the Office's future work program. In addition, the Office will develop a training program for the different GEF stakeholders. As explained earlier, it is proposed that the Policy is evaluated within the context of OPS4 by an independent consultant or panel.

#### Annual Performance Report (APR)

62. The 2006 APR will be prepared for June 2007 Council. The APR will continue report on following issues:

- Accomplishments of results, including verified ratings of project outcomes and project sustainability of outcome ratings as reported by project terminal evaluations.
- Processes and factors that affect attainment of results, including such factors as quality of monitoring of supervision, quality control of project at entry, relationship between project delays and outcomes, realization of co-financing and effects of co-financing in project outcomes and learning, flexibility and adaptability of GEF operations.
- Quality of monitoring and evaluation, including such topics as quality project M&E systems, quality of agencies risk monitoring and quality of terminal evaluations.
- The management action record, which reports on the progress of implementation of Council decisions.
- Report on agency environmental and social responsibility presented through the existence or not of agency carbon programs, recycling and energy efficiency programs, codes of conduct, and "social safeguards" for example.

- As subjects addressed by the APR increase and to prevent excessive length of the APR, reporting on some topics will be presented in alternated years. In 2006, the APR will include an assessment of the quality of supervision conducted by IAs and EAs.
- In the coming years as more information on projects is obtained, the Office will report on trends and correlations on various aspects of GEF operations.
- The APR will also be used as an instrument to follow-up on issues identified by other evaluations carried out by the Office.

### Program Indicators

63. In FY07, the Office will continue to support the work in the development and implementation of catalytic impact indicators in nutrient reduction, groundwater and land degradation. In the case of indicators for nutrient reduction, the Office will continue to work in partnership with the GEF Secretariat, the World Bank, the IW Task Force and scientists from the Iowa State University. The indicator framework will be tested in Rumania and presented in a workshop with all nutrient reduction partnership member countries for comments and to identify next steps for the adoption of the methodology across the Black Sea countries. Regarding groundwater, the Office and the GEF Secretariat in partnership with the UNESCO's International Hydrological Program Working Group will develop a set of guidelines for the identification and definition of stress reduction and environmental status indicators consistent with GEF IW indicators framework that reflect the current state of knowledge and science. The guidelines and other methodological tools developed by the group will be also tested in select GEF IW projects prior to their wider dissemination. Finally, the Office will also continue to work with the Land Degradation Task force in adapting over sustainable land management indicators to specific GEF needs to demonstrate results in the accomplishments of global environmental benefits in this focal area.

### Mainstreaming of GEF Concerns in IAs and EAs

64. The Office will promote the mainstreaming of GEF concerns in IAs and EAs internal reviews and feedback systems, including rating criteria and practices, establishment and enhancement of "project at risk" system, development of TORs for final evaluations and selection of evaluators. The Office will continue to work with IA and EAs providing feed back on monitoring and evaluation systems, further refining guidance for terminal evaluations and ensuring the independence of the evaluation of GEF projects.

### **Recurring Activities**

65. The Office will continue its program of recurring activities such as (description of these activities are in previous sections):

- knowledge management
- interaction with Council
- consultative process
- management
- cross-support to GEF partners institutions

## **Staff**

66. The Office will recruit two more staff although these additions will have no budget implications. One of the staff will be recruited to work on knowledge management issues and his or her cost is already included as part of the knowledge management budget. The other staff will be paid by a trust fund provided by the Swedish government in support of a junior professional with expertise in evaluation from a developing country. Once these two recruitments are completed the Office will have the following complement of staff:

- Director
- Chief Evaluation Officer
- 3 Senior Evaluation Officers<sup>1</sup>
- 2 Evaluation Officers
- 1 Operations Evaluation Officer
- 2 junior professionals
- 1 staff assistant

## **On-going Special Initiative**

### Joint Evaluation of GEF Activities and Modalities (FY06-07)

67. Council approved this special initiative in June 2005. The evaluation is underway and the Office is not requesting any further funding (a progress update is presented in Annex 1). The Terms of Reference for this evaluation are located in the GEF web site within the Office's pages. This evaluation aims to review experience in the programming and management of GEF support activities and recommend improvements. It will demonstrate the strengths and weaknesses in the cycle and modalities, analyze constraints, and provide recommendations to increase the efficiency and effectiveness of GEF operations and modalities.

68. The key evaluative questions are:

- Is the GEF activity cycle efficient?
- Is the GEF activity cycle effective?
- Are the GEF modalities efficient?
- Are the GEF modalities effective?
- Are the GEF modalities relevant?

69. The GEF Evaluation Office and the Implementing and Executing Agencies evaluation offices jointly undertake this evaluation. The evaluation also collaborates closely with the IAs/EAs coordination and monitoring units, the GEF Secretariat, and other partners.

---

<sup>1</sup> As explained above, one of the staff retired at the end of FY06 but he will be not replaced right away making available some additional fund to cover the cost of evaluation activities.

## **New Special Initiatives**

70. The Office would like to propose the following special initiatives to be implemented in FY07. Some of them will continue through FY08 with no additional request of funding.

### GEF EO Inputs and Participation in Fourth GEF Assembly (FY07)

71. The GEF and the government of South Africa will host the Fourth GEF Assembly in August 2006 in Capetown. The Office will have to be present at this event with specific material developed for that particular audience. Council is requested to approve \$50,000 to cover the cost of 3 staff members and the work of consultant to write an overview of evaluative evidence in the GEF on specific issues relevant to the Assembly agenda. Issues to be considered include: the impact of GEF activities on global environmental trends, opportunities for synergies between focal areas, the development/environment nexus, and the role of GEF in Africa.

### Additional GEF Country Portfolio Evaluation (FY07)

72. Council has received the Country Portfolio Evaluation for Costa Rica (GEF/ME/C.28/X). The evaluation concluded that this type of evaluations is valid and feasible and recommended that Council continues to support them. The present budget for the Office can only include one of these evaluations for next fiscal year. To begin creating a critical mass of these evaluations and to be able to cover a potential demand given the implementation of RAF, the Office requests Council to include a special initiative to cover the cost of an additional country in FY07.

73. The evaluation was able to answer important questions for Council such as the relevance and efficacy of the GEF support to the country and identify extensive results produced by the projects, even some of them many years after completion (something that terminal evaluations can not accomplish). The budget for the Costa Rica case was about \$70,000 (a country with a medium size GEF portfolio, about \$37 million implemented over 14 years). The Office estimates that an evaluation for a country with a larger portfolio will cost closer to \$100,000. Having two countries in the FY07 work program will provide the opportunity to cover a large country (such as one of the big RAF recipients) and a country with smaller GEF portfolio, such as an LDC or SIDS.

### Evaluation of the Executive Agencies Experience with the GEF (FY07)

74. The draft Policy Recommendations for the Fourth Replenishment of the GEF Trust Fund (GEF/R.4/30, December 1, 2005) stated that “As a result of the GEF-3 reforms, seven international agencies were granted direct access to GEF funds. Evidence to date indicates that there remains significant potential for enhancing the involvement of these agencies”, and asked the Office to prepare a review of the experience of Executing Agencies (ExA) for Council consideration in December 2006.

75. The evaluation would aim to (a) Identify and analyze how the Executing Agencies are working with the GEF; and (b) Provide recommendations to enhance the involvement of the Executing Agencies in the GEF. It should consider the evolution of the Agency participation; and assess the main strengths and weaknesses in the ExA experience with the GEF. The evaluation would be presented as a separate working paper to the GEF Council, while building

on the on-going Joint Evaluation of the GEF activity cycle and modalities, and taking account of the Council discussion on agency comparative advantages in June 2006.

76. The Joint Evaluation of the GEF activity cycle and modalities will provide information on the Agency experience with GEF project development and implementation. Complementary evaluative work would address additional review of related documentation; and data analysis of the ExA portfolio; select semi-structured interviews with stakeholders; observation missions of Agency systems and select review of project documents. A belated Replenishment decision would imply a June 2007 submission to Council. Council is requested to approve \$70,000 for this special initiative.

#### OPS3 ICF Budget Overrun (FY07)

77. The OPS3 budget increased due to activities requested by the GEF Council and the Office and not included in the original contract granted to ICF Consulting. The additional work requested to ICF included:

- Additional visits and workshops in Cuba and Fiji.
- Interim report presented at the March 2005 meeting of Council members in Paris.
- Upgraded Executive Summary to include a more detailed overview of the full report than asked for in the original planned summary.

78. ICF was not able to present the real cost of the new requests until the OPS3 exercise was finalized. On his letter from January 4, 2006, the Director of GEF Evaluation Office sent to Council Members a request to approve an increase of US\$108,149 of the budget of OPS3 to cover additional expenses incurred by ICF Consulting. In a letter sent to the Council on February 16, 2006, the Director of GEF EO acknowledges that this issue was not resolved by mail and based on the Rules of Procedure for the GEF Council this will be included in the agenda for the Council meeting for June 2006. The requested increase represents less than 5% of the original approved overall budget for OPS3 and no more than half of the actual overspending of ICF Consultancy. With this settlement no further claims will be made by ICF Consulting.

#### International Workshop on Evaluation, Environment and Sustainable Development (FY07-08)

79. The Office has developed a proposal for an international workshop on the results, methods and capacities in the areas of environment and sustainable development. In FY07, the Office proposes to complete the proposal by focusing the scope and conducting extensive dialogue with potential partners and other interested parties in co-sponsoring this workshop. The proposed workshop will take place in early FY08 (most likely September 2007).

80. Through the sharing of experience and knowledge gained in environmental and sustainable development evaluations, the workshop expects to:

- enhance the quality of evaluations, and the interventions, dealing with environmental and sustainable development done by the GEF and its partners;
- facilitate the identification of best practices in measuring and evaluating results, which could become transparent and benchmark standards for evaluation practice

(and would also contribute to the harmonization and enhancement of evaluation in this area); and

- develop a network of experts and institution on which GEF EO, and evaluation offices of partner agencies, could draw upon for their evaluations, thus expanding the pool of expertise to which evaluation offices currently have access to.

81. As a by-product of this workshop, GEF EO would raise its profile, becoming a leading convener of expertise in monitoring and evaluation of environmental and sustainable development interventions. It would also expand significantly its stock of knowledge on results and methods of environmental and sustainable development evaluations, as well as on existing capacities at the country level for this type of evaluations. Furthermore, by expanding its knowledge of results of evaluations of environmental and sustainable development issues, the GEF could be able to enhance the quality of the design of its interventions.

82. In order to ensure the relevance of the international workshop for the GEF and its partners, the workshop will focus on results and evaluation methods coming within the context of the GEF, and implications in terms of capacities. The final proposal will contain a series of themes, in environment, development, and evaluation in which the workshop will focus on. For each theme, the workshop would discuss results emerging from evaluations and the methods through which those results were assessed, as well as the gaps that would require further work. Furthermore, the discussion on results and methods in key areas may also elicit higher interest and support from donors, facilitating the cofinancing of "workshop segments" (for example, funding particular synthesis papers and/or regional workshops).

83. The total resources required by an international workshop of this kind, which partly may be covered by partners, could be of the order of \$250,000 (taking into account some other workshops of this kind, that were held at the World Bank's facilities in Washington DC). The budget requested from Council (\$50,000) would cover the costs of preparatory work (for example, regional consultations, and technical background papers). The workshop itself would be undertaken with partners and the Office will actively seek co-funding.

#### Evaluation of Small Grants Programme (FY07-08)

84. The Small Grants Programme will be completing its third phase by December 2007. At the end of each phase, the program must complete an evaluation. The Office was requested by the Program and the GEF Secretariat to conduct the next independent evaluation. The SGP allocated in its budget \$300,000 for Year 3 (2007) for evaluation activities including country and project evaluations as well as for an independent evaluation (this funding is not part of the SGP allocations to support the program at the country level but is part of the administrative cost). The SGP would be able to allocate between \$200,000 and \$250,000 depending on the approval by Council of its 2007 budget and the evaluation activities the Program may have to support. Although this may seem a generous budget Council is requested to supplement it by \$150,000 (the budget for the recently completed evaluation of biosafety, another global program, was about \$500,000). This is an additional and special evaluation for the Office and therefore, should not be part of its core work program. An independent evaluation of the SGP would be a very important and relevant input to the GEF system and in particular Council and to OPS4. The estimated \$400,000 value for the evaluation seems to be adequate for a program that has received so far about \$222 million from GEF and about \$180 million on co-financing, and works in 92

countries with an estimated 6,000 grants. Following the experience of the biosafety evaluation, UNDP will be requested to transfer the \$300,000 to the Office through the GEF Trustee.

### **FY07 Budget**

85. To be able to deliver the work program for FY07 described above the Office will require \$2,921,365 for the core and pilot tasks (a 3% increase from last year) and \$718,000 for the special initiatives. Any changes to the budget will imply that the Council will need to decide which outputs should be cut.

86. Following Council requests, the Office's budget is also incorporated in the GEF Corporate budget.

**Table 3. Budget for FY07 According to Activities**

	<b>Activity Task</b>	<b>FY07 for Council Approval Budget</b>
<b>FIXED COSTS</b>		
<b>Staff Costs (salaries, benefits and training)</b>		
	Staff salaries and benefits	\$ 1,563,865
	Staff training	\$ 15,000
	<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>\$ 1,578,865</b>
<b>General Costs</b>		
	<i>Office Space, Equipment and Supplies</i>	\$ 135,000
	<i>Communications and Internal Computing</i>	\$ 140,000
	<i>Resp. Hospitality &amp; Food</i>	\$ 5,000
	<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>\$ 280,000</b>
	<b>Subtotal Fixed Costs</b>	<b>\$ 1,858,865</b>
<b>VARIABLE COSTS</b>		
<b>Evaluations</b>		
	Capacity Building	\$ 135,000
	Catalytic role	\$ 135,000
	Evaluations of GEF Support (Country Level)	\$ 90,000
	Impact evaluations	\$ 90,000
	Incremental Cost (completion)	\$ 90,000
	Role of Science (exploration)	\$ 40,000
	<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>\$ 580,000</b>
<b>Oversight</b>		
	Program indicators	\$ 15,000
	GEF Annual Performance Report	\$ 145,000
	Management Action Record (MAR)	\$ 7,500
	<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>\$ 167,500</b>
<b>Consultative Process</b>		
	<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>\$ 40,000</b>
<b>Knowledge Management</b>		
	<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>\$ 145,000</b>
<b>Management &amp; Advisory Support</b>		
	<b>Office Management</b>	\$ -
	<b>Travel</b>	\$ 70,000
	<b>STC Advisors</b>	\$ 20,000
	<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>\$ 90,000</b>
<b>Publications, Media, Web</b>		
	<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>\$ 40,000</b>
	<b>Subtotal Variable Costs</b>	<b>\$ 1,062,500</b>
	<b>Total Core (increase from FY06)</b>	<b>\$ 2,921,365 3%</b>

**Table 4. FY07 budget for Council approval by expense categories**

<i>Expense Categories</i>	<i>FY07 for Council Approval</i>
<b>Staff Costs</b>	
Salaries and Benefits	<b>1,563,865</b>
Travel	60,000
Training	15,000
<b>Sub-total</b>	<b>1,818,865</b>
<b>Consultants</b>	
Fees (long-term)	160,000
Fees (short-term)	300,000
Travel	152,500
<b>Sub-total</b>	<b>612,500</b>
<b>Contractual Services</b>	
Contracts with firms	200,000.00
<b>Sub-total</b>	<b>200,000</b>
<b>Publications, media, web and outreach</b>	30,000
<b>Sub-total</b>	<b>30,000</b>
<b>General Operations</b>	
Office Space, equipment and supplies	125,000
Communications and Internal Computing	130,000
Representation and Hospitality	5,000
<b>Sub-total</b>	<b>260,000</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,921,365</b>

**Table 5. Budget for new special initiatives**

<i>Expense Category</i>	<i>FY07</i>	<i>FY08</i>	<i>Total</i>
<b>International Workshop</b>			
Staff Costs	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Staff Travel	\$ 16,000	\$ 40,000	\$ 56,000
Consultant Fees	\$ 50,000	\$ 31,000	\$ 81,000
Consultant Travel	\$ 16,000	\$ 16,000	\$ 32,000
Contingencies	\$ 10,000	\$ 10,000	\$ 20,000
Workshop		\$ 61,000	\$ 61,000
<b>Sub-total</b>	<b>\$ 92,000</b>	<b>\$ 158,000</b>	<b>\$ 250,000</b>
GEF Contribution	\$ 40,000	\$ 10,000	\$ 50,000
Co-funding	\$ 52,000	\$ 148,000	\$ 200,000
<b>Evaluation of Small Grants (Additional)</b>			
Staff Costs			
Staff Travel	\$ 16,000	\$ 16,000	\$ 32,000
Consultant Fees	\$ 20,000	\$ 20,000	\$ 40,000
Consultant Travel	\$ 16,000	\$ 16,000	\$ 32,000
Contingencies	\$ 5,000	\$ 5,000	\$ 10,000
<b>Sub-total</b>	<b>\$ 57,000</b>	<b>\$ 57,000</b>	<b>\$ 114,000</b>
<b>GEF EO Assembly</b>			
Staff Costs			
Staff Travel	\$ 40,000		\$ 40,000
Consultant Fees	\$ 10,000		\$ 10,000

Consultant Travel			
Contingencies			
<b>Sub-total</b>	<b>\$ 50,000</b>		<b>\$ 50,000</b>
<b>Evaluation of ExAs</b>			
Staff Costs			
Staff Travel	\$ 9,000		\$ 9,000
Consultant Fees	\$ 35,000		\$ 35,000
Consultant Travel	\$ 26,000		\$ 26,000
Contingencies			
<b>Sub-total</b>	<b>\$ 70,000</b>		<b>\$ 70,000</b>
<b>GEF Country Portfolio Eval. (Additional)</b>			
Staff Costs			
Staff Travel	\$ 24,000		\$ 24,000
Consultant Fees	\$ 50,000		\$ 50,000
Consultant Travel	\$ 8,000		\$ 8,000
Contingencies	\$ 8,000		\$ 8,000
<b>Sub-total</b>	<b>\$ 90,000</b>		<b>\$ 90,000</b>
<b>OPS3 Overrun</b>			
Staff Costs			
Staff Travel			
Consultant Fees	\$ 77,000		\$ 77,000
Consultant Travel	\$ 33,000		\$ 33,000
Contingencies			
<b>Sub-total</b>	<b>\$ 110,000</b>		<b>\$ 110,000</b>
<b>Total Special Initiatives</b>	<b>\$ 469,000</b>	<b>\$ 215,000</b>	<b>\$ 684,000</b>

### Participation of GEF Secretariat, IAs, EAs and STAP

87. The other GEF partners will be requested to participate in the Office's work program at different levels depending on the activity or task and their comparative advantage. The financial resources for their participation are included in their respective budgets and are not reflected in the Office's budget. Furthermore, the GEF partners will also present their own activities to support the GEF M&E Policy in their own communications to the Council.

## **ANNEX 1. REVIEW OF ACHIEVEMENTS IN FY06**

88. The following paragraphs provide Council with a brief presentation of the Office's achievements in FY06. These achievements are measured against the proposals made in the "Four Year Work Program and Budget of the Office of Monitoring and Evaluation – FY06-09 and Results in FY05." Additional information on the progress made by the Office in FY06 is presented to Council in Council document GEF/EO/C.28/1.

89. In FY06, the Office completed most of its proposed activities including: the full dissemination of the Third Overall Performance Study (OPS3); the development and approval by Council of the GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy; the completion of major evaluations such as the Local Benefits Study, the evaluation of GEF support to the Cartagena Protocol, and the evaluation of the GEF support to Costa Rica as the first case of an assessment of the GEF activities at the country level; and the preparation of the 2005 Annual Performance Report (APR). The Office also made important progress on several other evaluations, such as the evaluation of Incremental Cost methodologies, Impact Evaluations, capacity building and Joint Evaluation of GEF Activities and Modalities. Finally, the Office officially changed its name to GEF Evaluation Office.

### **Evaluation Program**

90. The Office's evaluation work program in FY06 accomplished the proposed goal: beginning preparations for the implementation of OPS4 by conducting a series of cross-cutting and thematic evaluations. Several key inputs to the Overall Study were completed and several other ones were tested and implemented. For example, the very important and controversial review of linkages between local and global benefits was finally completed and presented to Council. The first pilot evaluation of GEF activities using a country as a unit of evaluation was completed and the Office concluded that this type of evaluations are good investment. As suggested in the FY05 work program, the proposed work program was too ambitious in expecting to complete three other major evaluations before June 2006. In particular, the internal and external debate about the approach papers for the evaluation of projects impacts, capacity building and incremental costs methodologies took much longer than anticipated so these evaluations could not start late in the fiscal year. These evaluations are relatively very cutting-edge in the evaluation profession in particularly in the area of environment and therefore had taken longer to develop a clear approach for their implementation. The following paragraphs present an update on each of the proposed evaluations for FY06.

91. **Local Benefits Study.** The Local Benefits Study has been well received inside and outside of the GEF partnership. The Office has presented the key findings and lessons of the study at several major international meetings and conferences including Convention on Biological Diversity COP held in Brazil in March 2006 and the Bio-vision Conference held in Egypt in April 2006. The Local Benefits Study is currently being prepared for publication and dissemination and will be ready for distribution at the GEF Council in June 2006 and also at the GEF Assembly in August 2006. The evaluation team has also submitted papers for publication in journals and is continuing to develop knowledge products for operational staff.

92. **Country Portfolio Evaluations.** The Office completed the first evaluation of the GEF portfolio in a country, Costa Rica. Council is presented with the report in GEF/ME/C.28/5. The

report contains several conclusions and recommendations to the Council and the government of Costa Rica. Although the GEF did not have a GEF strategic program for Costa Rica the evaluation concluded that this type of evaluations are feasible and valid and were able to answer the key questions included in the terms of reference, in particular those related to relevance and efficiency of the GEF portfolio in the country. Several lessons were gathered by this experience that were utilized to develop the more generic terms of reference for future GEF country portfolio evaluations.

93. **Evaluation of Incremental Cost Methodologies.** This evaluation begun in March 2006 and is currently ongoing. An evaluation team was formed composed of two evaluation officers from the Office, a senior environmental economist to assist with data collection and report drafting, three technical consultants to deal with the focal areas reviews and an economist to deal with the compliance review of projects. The evaluation team has completed the drafting of the literature review and project review protocols for compliance and technical quality as well as a protocol for conducting interviews. Data is being collected through desk reviews of GEF-3 projects, interviews and surveys of GEF stakeholders.

94. **Evaluation of Capacity Building.** The Office is currently developing various methodological options for the evaluation. The scope, contents and timing for the evaluation will be laid out in an approach paper by June 30, 2006.

95. **Impact Evaluation.** Following the Council's request that the Office specifically evaluate the impacts of GEF projects, a concept note for impact evaluation in the GEF context was developed by the mid-FY06. The conclusion of this concept note was that a great deal more background work was needed in order to develop an impact evaluation methodology that was cost-effective, implementable, and which would provide the kind of insights important for continued strengthening of the GEF portfolio. The Office is working with external support to (a) conduct a review of the policy and strategic framework against which GEF impacts should be measured; (b) Review a sample of GEF projects to explore the feasibility of the theory-based approach to impact evaluation; and (c) Identify linkages to relevant global environmental data sets and frameworks which can be used to support the GEF approach to impact evaluation. The proposed methodology for the pilot impact evaluation will be completed at the end of FY06. The pilot impact evaluation to test the methodology will be carried out in FY07. The methodology is initially focusing on the biodiversity focal area.

### **Oversight Program**

96. The proposed outcomes from the oversight program were fully achieved. The Annual Performance Review was completed and is presented to the Council in this meeting. This review for the first time includes a discussion on how GEF management has followed Council recommendations emanated from the Office's reports. The Office provided very important technical support to the GEF partnership regarding the development of program indicators in land degradation focal area and international waters. The following paragraphs provide a report on each of the activities conducted under the Office's Oversight Program.

97. **Annual Performance Review.** In 2005, the Office continued strengthening the Annual Performance Report. The 2005 APR includes for the first time a chapter on results and an accounting on the terminal evaluation ratings of project outcomes and sustainability. The second part reports on processes affecting project outcomes, such as delays on implementation, and a

new section on co-financing. Project monitoring and quality controls of project monitoring is given expanded attention in the third part of the report. The APR includes for the first time an assessment of control systems of quality of project monitoring during preparation and a self-assessment inventory of “projects-at-risk” systems. The APR also continues with its reporting on the quality of terminal evaluations.

98. **Program Indicators.** The Office supported the GEF Secretariat, the International Waters Focal Task Force and the World Bank in the development of indicators to measure environmental catalytic impacts of nutrient for projects in the Black Sea Nutrient Reduction Partnership. Scientists of Iowa State University are in the process of developing the indicator framework and defining scientifically valid proxies that can be used to measure environmental results and approaches to extrapolate catalytic results. The framework will be tested in Rumania and will be presented to the rest of the countries participating in the nutrient reduction partnership of the Black Sea in October and next steps for the adoption of the framework by other countries will be identified. The Office has also assisted the GEF Secretariat in the establishment of a partnership with UNESCO International Hydrological Programme (IHP) for the development of groundwater indicators. This will include assistance in developing conceptual framework for the identification of indicators, technical support and review and discussion of documents produced UNESCO’s IHP. The Office, in collaboration with the UN University, has also supported the Land Degradation Task Force to develop a framework to track results of sustainable land management activities. This framework will serve as a basis for the subsequent development of GEF specific indicators for the land degradation focal area.

### **Consultative Process**

99. The consultative process has enabled the finalization of the GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy, as well as the Evaluators Summit providing guidance of future work. After becoming a full UNEG member, the Office has furthermore taken a more active role in UNEG annual meetings and sub-committee meetings, as well as liaison with the OECD-DAC evaluation network. The Director has supported various peer reviews evaluations, in cooperation with UN agencies and the French GEF. The Office also initiated a proposal on a possible international workshop on environmental evaluation and commenced preliminary consultations.

### **Knowledge Management**

100. There were several areas in which the Office excelled regarding its Knowledge Management program, in particular through the dissemination of major evaluations such as all program studies and OPS3, conducting a side event at the Eight Conference of the Parties of the Convention of Biological Diversity, and most importantly, participating in the sub-regional workshops sponsored by the GEF Country Support Program. In addition, the Office was able to produce several knowledge products, in particular the Office launched a new communication tool called Signposts, which summarize major evaluations, conducted by the Office.

101. The Office, together with STAP, also took the initiative to promote a workshop to develop a GEF corporate knowledge management strategy. Efforts have already started to enhance integration with existing knowledge management systems of partners and to enhance outreach to project and country level by providing easily accessible learning products and targeted dissemination strategies for evaluation products.

## **Interaction with Council**

102. At the request of Council, the Office conducted a review of modalities in which other evaluation offices of the MDBs and UN organizations relate and interact with their governing boards. This report was presented to Council at its November 2005 meeting. The report was received with interest by Council which concluded that at this point in time, there was not need to change the way it relates to the Office, although there may be a need to revisit this in the future. Furthermore, the report was well received by the evaluation community since this was the first that this aspect of the governing of evaluation offices had been reviewed and studied.

## **Office Management**

103. This was the first full year for the Director. Two new staff were selected through open international competition and are now full members of the Office. They fulfilled two important gaps in the functioning of the Office: a budget/programming professional and a mid-level evaluator specialist. The Office considers that to fully complete the skills required to implement the Office's mandate, TOR and work program a knowledge management staff will be needed.

## **Evaluators Summit, January 2006**

104. The Office organized a brainstorming meeting with senior staff, consultants and experts that have been involved in its evaluations, on January 18-19, 2006, in The Hague, the Netherlands, at the Dutch ministry of Foreign Affairs. The purpose of this meeting was to discuss the operationalization of its four year rolling work plan through a series of evaluations which would feed into (or eliminate the need for) the Fourth Overall Performance Study of the GEF and receive recommendations for inclusion of questions, data, indicators, methodologies or other appropriate evaluation aspects for upcoming evaluations of the Office. Annex 2 provides a summary of the discussions.

## **OPS3 Follow-up**

105. The OPS3 exercise is completed. The GEF EO along with ICF Consulting, are engaged in the dissemination process of the OPS3 findings, several workshops have been planned. The dissemination process is expected to be completed during the GEF Assembly. Also, the OPS3 Executive report was translated into, Arabic, Chinese, French, Russian and Spanish, these OPS3 report version will be available in the coming months.

## **FY06 Budget and estimated expenditures**

106. The following table provides a report on the Office's actual (as of April 31, 2006) and estimated (as of June 30, 2006) expenditures in FY06 and a comparison with the Council approved budget.

**Table 6. GEF Evaluation Office budget and expenditures for FY06**

FY05 Actuals	Expense Category	FY06 Budget	FY06 Estimated as of June 30, 2006
<b>\$ 1,334,937</b>	<b>Staff Costs</b>	<b>\$ 1,664,175</b>	<b>\$ 1,700,581</b>
\$ 1,249,537	Salaries and Benefits	\$ 1,589,175	\$ 1,520,581
\$ 84,885	Travel	\$ 60,000	\$ 165,000
\$ 515	Training	\$ 15,000	\$ 15,000
<b>\$ 720,550</b>	<b>Consultant Costs</b>	<b>\$ 745,000</b>	<b>\$ 657,692</b>
\$ 250,285	Long-Term Fees	\$ 67,000	\$ 245,503
\$ 272,201	Short-Term Fees	\$ 535,500	\$ 309,381
\$ 198,064	Travel	\$ 142,500	\$ 102,809
	<b>Contractual Services</b>		
\$ 268,047	Firms	<b>\$ 115,000</b>	<b>\$ 111,211</b>
\$ 37,712	<b>Publications, Media, Web and external Outreach</b>	\$ 30,000	\$ 65,291
<b>\$ 283,624</b>	<b>General Operations Costs</b>	<b>\$ 267,800</b>	<b>\$ 287,200</b>
\$ 119,331	Office Space, Equipment and Supplies	\$ 113,300	\$ 138,000
\$ 133,537	Communications and Internal Computing	\$ 144,200	\$ 144,200
\$ 30,756	Representation and Hospitality	\$ 10,300	\$ 5,000
	<b>Contingencies</b>	\$ -	\$ -
<b>\$ 2,644,870</b>	<b>Total Expenses</b>	<b>\$ 2,821,975</b>	<b>\$ 2,821,975</b>

## Special Initiatives

### Evaluation of the GEF Support to the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol

107. This special initiative, started in FY05, was completed by mid-FY06. The evaluation examined the effectiveness, efficiency and relevance of the GEF support for capacity building in biosafety. The evaluation team was composed of two members of the Office, five external senior technical specialists, and one junior consultant. The evaluation consisted of both desk review and field visit components. The field visit sample was composed of eleven countries, chosen to provide balanced regional perspectives under various stages of biosafety project execution. In addition, eight other countries were selected for non-field reviews, which included telephone interviews and desk studies. To independently review one key aspect of the GEF's support - the UNEP Toolkit - a Delphi study was carried out by the Free University of Amsterdam. This review was a key component of the evaluation, and provided important inputs to the final report. The full draft evaluation report was presented to the GEF Council in November 2005, and the final report, published in February 2006, has been well-received by all stakeholder groups. The Office presented the results of the evaluation at the 3rd COP-MOP, in Curitiba, Brazil, in March 2006, where the final report was widely distributed.

### Joint Evaluation of GEF Activities and Modalities

108. The objective of this initiative is to work collaboratively with the evaluation offices of the GEF Implementing and Executing Agencies to better understand the GEF project cycle as it is applied and implemented for different GEF types of projects or modalities. The evaluation aims to provide recommendations on how the GEF might improve the cycle and its operations. The evaluation was launched at a workshop in Washington, DC in September 2005. There are eight components of the evaluation, which build toward an integrated final report by mid-FY07. The evaluation components are being carried out jointly by the Office and the different agencies. A secondary planning/stock taking workshop was held in Washington, DC in January 2006. The

emerging messages and findings were discussed at a follow-up workshop in early May 2006 in Vienna, Austria, hosted by UNIDO. Included among the achievements of the evaluation thus far are stakeholder interviews carried out in approximately 10 countries by the end of FY06. The Joint Evaluation will also contribute to the Evaluation of the Experience of Executing Agencies under Expanded Opportunities. A wrap-up workshop to discuss the results of the Joint Evaluation is planned for September 2006.

### OPS3

109. The OPS3 exercise is completed. The GEF EO along with ICF Consulting, are engaged in the dissemination process of the OPS3 findings, several workshops have been planned. The dissemination process is expected to be completed during the GEF Assembly. Also, the OPS3 Executive report was translated into, Arabic, Chinese, French, Russian and Spanish, these OPS3 report version will be available in the coming months.

**Table 7. Budget and expenditure for Special Initiatives implemented in FY06**

#### Joint Evaluation of GEF Activities and Modalities

<i>Expense Category</i>	<i>Approved Budget</i>	<i>Disbursed (as of April 26, 2006)</i>	<i>Estimated (End of FY06)</i>	<i>FY07</i>
<b>Joint Evaluation</b>				
Staff Costs				
Staff Travel	\$ 20,000	\$ 27,654	\$ 41,754	\$ (21,754)
Consultant Fees	\$ 70,000	\$ 27,853	\$ 51,603	\$ 18,397
Consultant Travel	\$ 20,000	\$ 641	\$ 2,641	\$ 17,359
Consultation Mechanism	\$ 25,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 25,000
Contingencies	\$ 15,000	\$ 904	\$ 904	\$ 14,096
Workshop				\$ -
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 150,000</b>	<b>\$ 57,052</b>	<b>\$ 96,902</b>	<b>\$ 53,098</b>

### OPS3

<b>OPS3 Budget (As of April 26, 2006)</b>					
<b>Item 1. OPS3 Independent Team</b>					
<b>Detail</b>	<b>Initial Budget</b>	<b>Revised Budget</b>	<b>Actual FY05</b>	<b>Disbursed FY06</b>	<b>Balance (As April 26, 2006)</b>
Fees, travel, daily living expenses, administrative support.	\$ 1,064,550	\$ 1,064,550	\$ 1,064,550	\$ 40,000	
<b>Total</b>		\$ 1,104,550	\$ 1,064,550	\$40,000	\$ -
<b>Item 2. Other Consultants</b>					
<b>Details</b>	<b>Initial Budget</b>	<b>Revised Budget</b>	<b>Expenses</b>		<b>Balance</b>
Short-term International Experts Fees, Short-Term International Expert Disbursements, Local Consultant Fees	\$ 176,000	\$ 176,000	\$ 176,000		\$ -
<b>Total</b>		\$ 176,000	\$ 176,000		

<b>Item 3. GEF M&amp;E Unit</b>					
<b>Details</b>	<b>Initial Budget</b>	<b>Revised Budget</b>	<b>Expenses</b>		<b>Balance</b>
M&E Staff travel expenses for the workshops, country and field visits, communications, miscellaneous.	\$ 250,000	\$ 242,451	\$ 242,451		\$ -
<b>Total</b>		\$ 242,451	\$ 242,451		
<b>Item 4. Regional Workshops</b>					
<b>Details</b>	<b>Initial Budget</b>	<b>Revised Budget</b>	<b>Expenses</b>		<b>Balance</b>
Workshops (Argentina, Burkina-Faso, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czech Republic, Egypt, Fiji, India, Kazakhstan, South Africa, Thailand)	\$ 210,000	\$ 188,556	\$ 123,044	\$ 65,512	\$ -
<b>Total</b>		\$ 188,556	\$ 123,044		
<b>Item 5. Translation, Printing, Dissemination</b>					
<b>Detail</b>	<b>Initial Budget</b>	<b>Revised Budget</b>	<b>Expenses</b>		<b>Balance</b>
Desing, desktoping, production and publications of the OPS3 Executive Summary and Full report	\$ 150,000	\$ 138,993	\$ 28,835	\$ 110,158	\$ -
<b>Total</b>	\$ 150,000	\$ 138,993	\$ 151,879		
<b>Contingency</b>					
<b>Detail</b>	<b>Initial Budget</b>	<b>Revised Budget</b>	<b>Expenses</b>		<b>Balance</b>
Contingency	\$ 185,055	\$ 185,055			\$ -
<b>Sub-Total ( Paid to ICF Consulting)</b>			\$ 124,055		
<b>Sub-total (High Level Advisory Panel - Fees, travel &amp; meetings)</b>			\$ 61,000		
<b>Total</b>		\$ 185,055	\$ 185,055		
<b>Total</b>	\$ 2,035,605	\$ 2,035,605	\$ 1,819,936	\$ 215,670	\$ -

## Biosafety

<b>Expense Category</b>	<b>Approved Budget</b>	<b>Actual (A)</b>	<b>UNEP Contribution (B)</b>	<b>Total (A+B)</b>
<b>Biosafety</b>				
Staff Costs	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Staff Travel	\$ 15,000	\$ 11,323	\$ -	\$ 11,323
Consultant Fees	\$ 152,000	\$ -	\$ 160,951	\$ 160,951
Consultant Travel	\$ 64,000	\$ -	\$ 39,778	\$ 39,778
Delphi Method	\$ 85,000	\$ 94,437	\$ -	\$ 94,437
Contingencies	\$ 34,000	\$ 19,240	\$ 24,271	\$ 43,511
<b>Total</b>	\$ 350,000	\$ 125,000	\$ 225,000	\$ 350,000