

# Professional Peer Review of the Independent Evaluation Function of the Global Environment Facility

## Draft report – Annexes

<b>Annex 1.</b>	<b>Final Terms of Reference, July 2019</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Annex 2.</b>	<b>Profiles of Peer Review Panel members and Adviser</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Annex 3.</b>	<b>Normative Framework for the Professional Peer Review of the GEF Independent Evaluation Function</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Annex 4.</b>	<b>Bibliography and reference documents</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>Annex 5.</b>	<b>List of interviewed stakeholders</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>Annex 6.</b>	<b>Key data on the Peer Review e-survey questionnaire</b>	<b>31</b>
<b>Annex 7.</b>	<b>Analysis of GEF evaluation policies against the UNEG Norms and Standards and ECG Standard Operational Practices</b>	<b>32</b>

## **Annex 1. Final Terms of Reference, July 2019**

### **1 Introduction**

The Professional Peer Review of the Evaluation Function is conducted in line with the Framework for Professional Peer Reviews of Evaluation Functions in Multilateral Organizations, and the Good Practice Standards of the Evaluation Co-operation Group. The last such peer review of the IEO was conducted in 2014.

This document sets out the key elements of the Third Professional Peer Review (“the Review”) of the evaluation function of the GEF. It describes the background of the Peer Review, the objective, the scope and general approach and methods, the composition of the Peer Review Panel (“the Panel”) and the timing. This document is a revised version of the terms of reference which was presented to the Council in June 2011, which incorporates clarifications based on the first meeting with the Panel held on June 21-22, 2019.

### **2 Background**

The Global Environment Facility (GEF) operates in 183 countries in partnership with international institutions, civil society organizations (CSOs), and the private sector to address global environmental issues while supporting national sustainable development initiatives. Since 1992, the GEF has provided over \$17 billion in grants and mobilized an additional \$88 billion in financing for more than 4000 projects in 170 countries. An independently operating financial organization, the GEF provides grants for projects related to biodiversity, climate change, international waters, land degradation, the ozone layer, persistent organic pollutants (POPs), mercury, sustainable forest management, food security, and sustainable cities. Projects and programs are implemented by 18 Agencies comprising UN organizations, Multilateral Development Banks, National Agencies and International CSOs.

The GEF also serves as financial mechanism for the following conventions:

- CBD Convention on Biological Diversity
- United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC)
- UN Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD)
- Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants
- Minamata Convention on Mercury

The GEF, although not linked formally to the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer (MP), supports implementation of the Protocol in countries with economies in transition.

### **3 The Evaluation Function in the GEF**

Evaluation in the GEF is intended to enhance accountability, to learn what works and in what context, and to inform the formulation of GEF’s programming directions, policies and procedures, and focal area strategies. GEF Agencies are responsible for monitoring, mid-term reviews and terminal evaluations of projects and programs. Evaluation offices in the Agencies review the terminal evaluations and submit these to the IEO.

The IEO is an independent unit within the GEF. IEO’s mandate is to independently assess the relevance, effectiveness, and efficiency of GEF programs and activities, and their contribution to Global Environment Benefits. The IEO validates terminal evaluations of projects and programs to ensure that the ratings are consistent with the evidence and the methods applied are consistent with the guidelines, and conducts performance, corporate, thematic and country evaluations. The IEO reports directly to the GEF Council (“the Council”), which decides on the IEO work program and budget and oversees IEO’s work.

### **4 Purpose and Use of the Review**

The main purpose of the proposed Review is to enhance the evaluation function in the GEF partnership, by reviewing IEO’s mandate, role and performance. The objectives are to clearly identify IEO’s main

strengths and those areas where improvement is necessary.

The Review will provide the Council with information on the effective performance of the Independent Evaluation Office of the GEF, and with findings that may apply more broadly to the evaluation function of the GEF partnership.

The final report of the Review, including its recommendations, will be presented at the GEF Council meeting in June 2020, for the Council's consideration of any proposed change in the mandate, direction or structure of the IEO and/or of the evaluation function. A response to the report and its recommendations will be prepared by each responsible entity in the GEF.

The findings of the Review will also be discussed with the evaluation units of the GEF Agencies to improve the quality of evaluations across the GEF partnership and presented to the ECG and UNEG members as feedback on the quality of evaluation in one of the multilateral organizations.

## **5 Subject and Scope of the Review**

The Review will build on the findings of the 2009 and 2014 Reviews of the IEO, including an assessment of the implementation of the recommendations of that review. The Review will cover the time period 2014-2019 and will provide a snapshot of IEO's performance against evaluation good practice standards, drawing on the Framework for Professional Peer Reviews of Evaluation Functions in Multilateral Organizations and the ECG Review Framework for the Evaluation Function in Multilateral Development Banks and other relevant assessment frameworks as appropriate. The Review will assess performance against the 2010 Policy, as well as review the recently approved 2019 Policy.

## **6 Core Assessment Criteria**

Consistent with good practice standards, the core assessment criteria which will be applied to all dimensions of the Review presented above include:

- A. **Independence** of evaluations and the evaluation system(s). The evaluation process should be impartial and independent in its function from the process concerned with the policy making, the delivery, and the management of assistance. A requisite measure of independence of the evaluation function is a recognized pre-condition for credibility, validity and usefulness.
- B. **Credibility** of evaluations. The credibility of evaluation depends on the expertise and independence of the evaluators, on the degree of transparency and inclusiveness of the evaluation process and on the quality of the evaluation products. Credibility requires that evaluations should report successes as well as failures. Recipient countries should, as a rule, fully participate in evaluation in order to promote credibility and commitment. Whether and how the organization's approach to evaluation fosters partnership and helps building ownership and capacity in developing countries merits attention as a major theme.
- C. **Utility** of evaluations. As in most organizations, IEO's aim is to encourage the active application and use of evaluations at all levels of management, while ensuring that objectivity and impartiality is maintained throughout the evaluation process. To have an impact on decision-making, evaluation findings must be perceived as relevant and useful and be presented in a clear and concise way and should fully reflect the different interests and needs of the many parties involved in development co-operation. Also, evaluation topics must be aligned with institutional priorities and reports must be timely. Importantly, each review should bear in mind that ensuring the utility of evaluations is only partly under the control of evaluators. It is also critically a function of the interest of managers, and member countries through their participation on governing bodies, in commissioning, receiving and using evaluations.

The core assessment criteria will be applied in the following thematic areas of focus for this review, which are based on the outcomes of a rapid self-assessment conducted within the IEO. The themes below, in addition to others identified by the Panel in its preliminary discussions, will be included in the final Normative Framework of the Peer Review.

Relevance of the Evaluation Program to the GEF (Credibility and Utility)

- Strategic direction of the IEO, with special attention to the alignment and relevance of IEO's work to the GEF's vision and strategic priorities and engagement across the partnership and other key stakeholders (including GEF Agencies, Political Focal Points, Operational Focal Points, clients and other stakeholders);
- IEO's contribution to the field of environmental evaluation and whether it applies state-of-the-art approaches.

Evaluation Policy (Independence, Credibility and Utility)

- The recently re-designed evaluation policy of the GEF, as well as other policies and procedures which have a bearing on IEO and its work, in particular the extent to which the evaluation policy is consistent with international good practice standards.

The Stakeholder Engagement Process (Independence, credibility and utility)

- The role and choice of reference groups
- Consultation throughout the evaluation process and after
- Interactions with Agencies, Council, OFPs in countries, STAP

The Evaluation Process (Independence, credibility and utility)

- Design of approach papers and concept notes and their consistency
- Evaluation team structures (team leadership, use of consultants, etc.)
- Data management and processing and efficiencies in the process
- Country case studies
- Quality of evaluations (methods, clarity of writing, evidence for conclusions)
- Management response and follow-up
- Dissemination and knowledge management

The Work Program (Credibility and utility)

- Number of evaluations and the balance across products
- Selection of topics

Office Structure and Budget

- Office staffing structure
- Staff profiles, skills and responsibilities
- Budget management (overall and evaluations)
- Delegation in the use of resources

## **7 Process**

Selection of the Panel

The Review will be conducted by a Panel of three independent members, supported by an Adviser, who have been selected by the IEO in adherence to the criteria outlined below. The Panel members will be chosen for their high international professional stature, evaluation expertise, and deep knowledge of environmental issues.

The selection criteria for the Panel will include a combination of the following:

- High international professional stature and deep knowledge of environmental issues and challenges on the ground;
- Knowledge of the context and use of independent evaluation in multilateral organizations;

- Professional evaluation expertise and standing in the evaluation community, or high-level experience and expertise in an oversight discipline;
- Senior-level expertise in the management and conduct of evaluations in peer organizations;
- Representation from the UN Agencies and Multilateral Development Banks.

### Panel Composition

A number of important considerations are taken into account when composing the Panel membership: (i) relevant professional experience; (ii) independence – to avoid any potential or alleged conflict of interest or partiality, the panel members don't have any close working relationship to GEF that might influence the Panel's position and deliberations; and (iii) balanced regional and gender representation. The selected Panel members will have no financial or other relationships with the GEF or IEO over the last five years that might influence their assessments, deliberations and conclusions.

The Panel will be assisted by a lead Adviser responsible for data collection and information gathering; preliminary assessment of the collected information which is to form the basis for more detailed information gathering through structured and semi-structured interviews. The Adviser will provide the Panel with a consolidated information base, specifying the sources. With the benefit of the information assembled by the Adviser, its examination by the members of the Panel, and observations provided by GEF on the information gathered, the Panel will canvass the views of IEO staff, senior Secretariat staff, other senior staff in the Agencies and partner organizations, and a selection of Council Members, through a variety of tools. The Adviser will also be responsible for drafting the report of the Review.

### Responsibility of IEO

IEO serves as the main contact point within GEF for the Panel and its Adviser. IEO will provide requested information and data, including:

- the names and details of contact persons whom the Panel or its Adviser wish to contact, including contact points in GEF Agencies,
- the complete list of IEO's evaluations,
- an e-library accessible via internet: and
- any other information as appropriate.

## **8 Reporting**

IEO will provide periodic updates to the Council.

The Panel will discuss its draft report with the IEO and will be fully responsible for the content of the report. The Panel's Chair will present the final report to the GEF Council.

Follow-up on accepted recommendations will be reported upon by the responsible entity within the GEF.

The Panel and the IEO will provide the UNEG and ECG with feedback on the experience of the Peer Review to enable the members of both groups to learn from IEO's experience.

## **9 Review Process and tentative schedule**

<b>Activity</b>	<b>Responsibility</b>	<b>Period/deadline</b>
Kick-off meeting	IEO and Panel	20-21 June 2019
Updated version of ToR	IEO	20 July
Advanced Normative Framework, check list interviews IEO staff	Adviser and Panel	20 July 2019
Feedback from IEO on data sources and facilitate access to documents	IEO	20 July 2019
Desk review and interviews with IEO staff	Adviser	July-August 2019
Advanced notes with key issues and check-lists	Adviser	10 September 2019
IEO self-assessment, light version	IEO	September 2019
Discussion of the advanced notes and issues identified through the desk review and interviews	Panel and Adviser	30 September 2019
Additional tools preparation	Adviser and Panel	Mid-October 2019

Attendance of Earth-Eval 3	Michael Spilsbury	30 September-4 October 2019
E-surveys to Agencies and Focal Points	Adviser and Panel	October 2019
Visit to GEF and World Bank headquarters in Washington, and to UNDP headquarters in New York to conduct interviews	Panel and Adviser	13-23 October 2019
Interviews with Partner Agencies and Conventions	Adviser and Panel members	November 2019
Country visits for cluster evaluations tbd	Adviser, Panel members?	November 2019-January 2020
Panel Chair and Members to meet with GEF Council Members; panel wrap-up	Panel and Adviser	15-21 December 2019
Draft report to Panel	Adviser	20 January
Panel discussion first draft	Panel and Adviser	3 February 2020
First draft to IEO	Adviser and Panel	20 February
Comments to Panel	IEO	1 March
Second draft to IEO and Secretariat	Adviser and Panel	15 March
Comments to Panel	IEO and Secretariat	30 March
Final report	Adviser and Panel	15 April 2020
Presentation of the final report to the Council by Panel Chair	Panel chair	10 June 2020

#### 10 Panel Composition

- Dr Saraswathi Menon, former Director of UNDP Independent Evaluation Office and past-Chair of UNEG (Chair of the Panel)
- Dr Marvin Taylor- Dormond, Director General of Independent Evaluation, Asian Development Bank
- Dr Michael Spilsbury, Director, Evaluation Office, United Nations Environment (UNEP)
- Ms. Tullia Aiazzi (Adviser)

## **Annex 2. Profiles of Peer Review Panel members and Adviser**

### Mrs Saraswathi Menon, former Director of UNDP Independent Evaluation Office and past-Chair of UNEG, Chair of the Panel

Dr Saraswathi Menon has worked in development, focussing on human rights, policy and evaluation for over thirty years. She joined the United Nations Development Programme as a member of the team that prepared the first six Human Development Reports. Among other assignments, she subsequently served as UN Resident Coordinator and UNDP Resident Representative in Mongolia (2000-2003) and the Director of the UNDP Evaluation Office (2003-2011), at which time she was also the first elected chair of the United Nations Evaluation Group. She joined UN Women in the year of its inception as the first Director of Policy in 2011. She has been involved in peer reviews of evaluation functions in ADB and IFAD and most recently was a member of the team commissioned by the World Bank Board's Committee on Development Effectiveness to review the World Bank's Independent Evaluation Group.

### Mr Marvin Taylor-Dormond, Director General of Independent Evaluation, Asian Development Bank

Dr Marvin Taylor-Dormond, former finance vice-minister of Costa Rica where he led the country's most comprehensive tax and customs reform in the late 1990s, has a PhD in public finance and economic development from Carleton University and the University of Ottawa, Canada. After holding senior posts at the Central American Bank for Economic Integration, where he established the bank's capacities in the monitoring and evaluation of strategies, programs and projects, and was chief economist and head of evaluation from 2003–2006, Dr Taylor-Dormond joined the WBG in 2006; at the Independent Evaluation Group (IEG), he headed the International Finance Corporation and Multilateral Guarantee Agency function as Director for Independent Evaluation (2006-2011), later Director for Private Sector Evaluation Department (2011-2015), and Director for Financial, Private Sector and Sustainable Development Department (2015-2016). He currently serves as Director General of the Independent Evaluation at the Asian Development Bank.

### Mike Spilsbury, Director Evaluation Office, UNEG representative

Dr Spilsbury has more than 24 years of evaluation experience, including with the CGIAR on impact assessment. He has been a senior staff member of the UNEP Evaluation function since 2005, and its Head since 2013. Dr Spilsbury chaired Peer Reviews of UNICEF, UNODC and UNFPA and is currently UNEG Co-Chair of Peer Review sub-group.

### Tullia Aiazzi, international consultant

Ms Aiazzi has more than thirty years of professional experience in development, including at field level. She has worked as an evaluator since the late 1990s, including for twelve years as evaluator and senior evaluator in FAO. Her experience includes evaluations at all organizational levels. Among her recent assignments, she supported as consultant the Professional Peer Review of the UNODC and of UNICEF.

**Annex 3. Normative Framework for the Professional Peer Review of the GEF Independent Evaluation Function**

Area of focus	Criteria/detailed issues	ECG GPS/ UNEG N&S	Source of info	Method	Criteria/detailed issues	ECG GPS/ UNEG N&S	Source of info	Method	Criteria/detailed issues	ECG GPS/ UNEG N&S	Source of info	Method
	<b>Independence</b>	GPS 2; N.4			<b>Credibility</b>	GPS 2; N.3			<b>Utility</b>	GPS 8; N.2		
<b>1. Governance of the evaluation function</b>												
	a. IEO structural independence from GEF Secretariat	GPS 2; N.4	Evaluation policies; GEF Instrument; records of Council sessions; all stakeholders*	Desk review; interviews; e-survey	a. IEO structural independence from GEF Secretariat	GPS 2; N.4	Evaluation policies; GEF Instrument; records of Council sessions; all stakeholders*	Desk review; interviews; e-survey				
	b. IEO behavioural independence and evidence and perceptions about impartiality/absence of bias and conflict of interest in IEO and Agencies in IEO and Agencies	GPS 2; N.5; N.6; St. 3.2	IEO Ethical guidelines; Agencies' accreditation documents; all stakeholders*; evaluation consultants	Desk review; interviews; e-survey	b. IEO behavioural independence and evidence and perceptions about impartiality/absence of bias and conflict of interest in IEO and Agencies in IEO and Agencies	GPS 2; N.5; N.6; St. 3.2	Ethical guidelines; Accreditation documents; all IEO staff; evaluation consultants	Desk review; interviews; e-survey				
	c. Segregation of roles in the GEF between monitoring and evaluation	GPS 2; St. 1.1	Evaluation and Monitoring policies; Council members; IEO and GEF management and staff	Desk review; interviews;	c. Segregation of roles in the GEF between monitoring and evaluation	GPS 2; St. 1.1	Evaluation and Monitoring policies; Council members; IEO and GEF management and staff	Desk review; interviews;				



Area of focus	Criteria/detailed issues	ECG GPS/ UNEG N&S	Source of info	Method	Criteria/detailed issues	ECG GPS/ UNEG N&S	Source of info	Method	Criteria/detailed issues	ECG GPS/ UNEG N&S	Source of info	Method
	<b>Independence</b>	GPS 2; N.4			<b>Credibility</b>	GPS 2; N.3			<b>Utility</b>	GPS 8; N.2		
	d. Extent of consultation and selection process in the preparation of the IEO work plan (from the 2014 Second Peer Review)	GPS 2; GPS 6; St. 1.3	Meeting and consultation records; Council members; IEO and GEF management, Partner Agencies, STAP	Desk review; interviews;	d. Extent of consultation and selection process in the preparation of the IEO work plan (from the 2014 Second Peer Review)	GPS 2; GPS 6; St. 1.3	Meeting and consultation records; Council members; IEO and GEF management	Desk review; interviews;	d. Extent of consultation and selection process in the preparation of the IEO work plan (from the 2014 Second Peer Review)	GPS 2; GPS 6; St. 1.3	Meeting and consultation records; Council members; IEO and GEF management	Desk review; interviews;
	e. Interaction mechanisms between Council and IEO (from the 2014 Second Peer Review), including practices for sharing evaluation	St. 1.1	Meeting and consultation records; Council members; IEO and GEF management	Desk review; interviews;	e. Interaction mechanisms between Council and IEO (from the 2014 Second Peer Review), including practices for sharing evaluation	St. 1.1	Meeting and consultation records; Council members; IEO and GEF management	Desk review; interviews;	e. Interaction mechanisms between Council and IEO (from the 2014 Second Peer Review), including practices for sharing evaluation	St. 1.1	Meeting and consultation records; Council members; IEO and GEF management	Desk review; interviews;
	f. Council's tools to deliberate in case of significant rejection of evaluation recommendations by Secretariat	St. 1.1	Meeting and consultation records; Council members; IEO and GEF management	Desk review; interviews;	f. Council's tools to deliberate in case of significant rejection of evaluation recommendations by Secretariat	St. 1.1	Meeting and consultation records; Council members; IEO and GEF management	Desk review; interviews;	f. Council's tools to deliberate in case of significant rejection of evaluation recommendations by Secretariat	St. 1.1	Meeting and consultation records; Council members; IEO and GEF management	Desk review; interviews;
	g. IEO staff appointment and dismissal	GPS 2; GPS 3; N. 13	Evaluation policies, Trustee for staff	Desk review; interviews;	g. IEO staff appointment and dismissal	GPS 2; GPS 3; N. 13	Evaluation policies, Trustee for staff	Desk review; interviews;				
	h. IEO Director appointment, tenure, performance assessment and dismissal	GPS 2; GPS 3; N. 13	Evaluation policies, Council	Desk review; interviews;	h. IEO Director appointment, tenure, performance assessment and dismissal	GPS 2; GPS 3; N. 13	Evaluation policies, Council	Desk review; interviews;				

Area of focus	Criteria/detailed issues	ECG GPS/ UNEG N&S	Source of info	Method	Criteria/detailed issues	ECG GPS/ UNEG N&S	Source of info	Method	Criteria/detailed issues	ECG GPS/ UNEG N&S	Source of info	Method
	<b>Independence</b>	GPS 2; N.4			<b>Credibility</b>	GPS 2; N.3			<b>Utility</b>	GPS 8; N.2		
	i. Approval process for budget allocation	GPS 3; N.13	Evaluation policies, Council	Desk review, interviews;		GPS 3; N.13						
									j. Appropriateness and user-friendliness of the Management Action Records mechanism (from the 2014 Second Peer Review)	GPS 8; N.14, St. 1.4	MAR mechanism; Council members; IEO and GEF management	Desk review, interviews;
	k. Consistency of the GEF Evaluation policies with international evaluation standards	GPS 1; N.12	Evaluation policies; ECG Good Practice Standards and UNEG N&S; IEO management, UNEG, ECG and DAC members	Desk review, interviews	k. Consistency of the GEF Evaluation policies with international evaluation standards	GPS 1; N.12	Evaluation policies; ECG Good Practice Standards and UNEG N&S; IEO management, UNEG, ECG and DAC members	Desk review, interviews	k. Consistency of the GEF Evaluation policies with international evaluation standards	GPS 1; N.12	Evaluation policies; ECG Good Practice Standards and UNEG N&S; IEO management, UNEG, ECG and DAC members	Desk review, interviews
	l. Other policies and procedures with a bearing on IEO and its work	GPS 1	GEF policies and procedures; IEO and GEF management	Desk review, interviews	l. Other policies and procedures with a bearing on IEO and its work	GPS 1	GEF policies and procedures; IEO and GEF management	Desk review, interviews	l. Other policies and procedures with a bearing on IEO and its work	GPS 1	GEF policies and procedures; IEO and GEF management	Desk review, interviews
	m. Process for the development and approval of the 2019 Evaluation Policy	GPS 1; St. 1.2	IEO and GEF management	Interviews	m. Process for the development and approval of the 2019 Evaluation Policy	GPS 1; St. 1.2	IEO and GEF management	Interviews				
	n. Compliance of the GEF and IEO actions with the 2010 Evaluation Policy	GPS 1; N.12	Documents, reports, all stakeholders*	Desk review, interviews, e-surveys	n. Compliance of the GEF and IEO actions with the 2010 Evaluation Policy	GPS 1; N.12	Documents, reports, all stakeholders*	Desk review, interviews, e-surveys	n. Compliance of the GEF and IEO actions with the 2010 Evaluation Policy	GPS 1; N.12	Documents, reports, all stakeholders*	Desk review, interviews, e-surveys

Area of focus	Criteria/detailed issues	ECG GPS/ UNEG N&S	Source of info	Method	Criteria/detailed issues	ECG GPS/ UNEG N&S	Source of info	Method	Criteria/detailed issues	ECG GPS/ UNEG N&S	Source of info	Method
	Independence	GPS 2; N.4			Credibility	GPS 2; N.3			Utility	GPS 8; N.2	GEF and IEO management , Agencies coordination and evaluation units	Interviews, e-survey
									o. Mechanisms for the consideration, acceptance/rejection , uptake and follow-up by the GEF Secretariat of relevant recommendations in Partner Agencies' evaluations	GPS 7; N.14, St. 1.4		
<b>2. Positioning and performance of IEO within the function</b>												
	p. IEO's structural relationship with GEF secretariat	GPS 6; N. 4, St. 1.1	GEF Evaluation policies and MOUs, GEF Instrument, procedures and policies, Council deliberations, IEO and GEF management	Desk- review; interviews;	p. IEO's structural relationship with GEF secretariat	GPS 6; N. 4, St. 1.1	GEF Evaluation policies and MOUs, GEF Instrument, procedures and policies, Council deliberations, IEO and GEF management	Desk- review; interviews;	p. IEO's structural relationship with GEF secretariat	GPS 6; N. 4, St. 1.1	GEF Evaluation policies and MOUs, GEF Instrument, procedures and policies, Council deliberations , IEO and GEF management	Desk- review; interviews;
	q. IEO's structural relationship with STAP	GPS 6; N. 4, St. 1.1	GEF Evaluation policies and MOUs, GEF Instrument, procedures and policies, Council deliberations, IEO, GEF and STAP management	Desk- review; interviews;	q. IEO's structural relationship with STAP	GPS 6; N. 4, St. 1.1	GEF Evaluation policies and MOUs, GEF Instrument, procedures and policies, Council deliberations, IEO and STAP management	Desk- review; interviews;	q. IEO's structural relationship with STAP	GPS 6; N. 4, St. 1.1	GEF Evaluation policies and MOUs, GEF Instrument, procedures and policies, Council deliberations , IEO and STAP management	Desk- review; interviews;

Area of focus	Criteria/detailed issues	ECG GPS/ UNEG N&S	Source of info	Method	Criteria/detailed issues	ECG GPS/ UNEG N&S	Source of info	Method	Criteria/detailed issues	ECG GPS/ UNEG N&S	Source of info	Method
	<b>Independence</b>	GPS 2; N.4			<b>Credibility</b>	GPS 2; N.3			<b>Utility</b>	GPS 8; N.2		
	r. IEO's structural relationship with Partner Agencies' coordination units	GPS 6; N. 4, St. 1.1	GEF Evaluation policies, Agencies' accreditation documents; Partner Agencies' coordination units	Desk-reviews; interviews; e-survey	r. IEO's structural relationship with Partner Agencies' coordination units	GPS 6; N. 4, St. 1.1	GEF Evaluation policies, Agencies' accreditation documents; Partner Agencies' coordination units	Desk-reviews; interviews; e-survey	r. IEO's structural relationship with Partner Agencies' coordination units	GPS 6; N. 4, St. 1.1	GEF Evaluation policies, Agencies' accreditation documents; Partner Agencies' coordination units	Desk-reviews; interviews; e-survey
	s. IEO's structural relationship with Partner Agencies' evaluation units	GPS 6; N. 4, St. 1.1	GEF Evaluation policies, Agencies' accreditation documents, Agencies' evaluation units	Desk-reviews; interviews; e-survey	s. IEO's structural relationship with Partner Agencies' evaluation units	GPS 6; N. 4, St. 1.1	GEF Evaluation policies, Agencies' accreditation documents, Agencies' evaluation units	Desk-reviews; interviews; e-survey	s. IEO's structural relationship with Partner Agencies' evaluation units	GPS 6; N. 4, St. 1.1	GEF Evaluation policies, Agencies' accreditation documents, Agencies' evaluation units	Desk-reviews; interviews; e-survey
	t. IEO's engagement with the partnership and other stakeholders including Council, GEF Secretariat, Conventions, STAP, GEF Agencies' coordination and evaluation units, Political Focal Points, Operational Focal Points, private sector, civil society, academia and the public in	GPS 2; St. 4, 6	All stakeholders and other key informants*	Interviews; e-survey/s	t. IEO's engagement with the partnership and other stakeholders including Council, GEF Secretariat, Conventions, STAP, GEF Agencies' coordination and evaluation units, Political Focal Points, Operational Focal Points, private sector, civil society, academia and the public in	GPS 2; St. 4, 6	All stakeholders and other key informants*	Interviews; e-survey/s	t. IEO's engagement with the partnership and other stakeholders including Council, GEF Secretariat, Conventions, STAP, GEF Agencies' coordination and evaluation units, Political Focal Points, Operational Focal Points, private sector, civil society, academia and the public in participating countries.	GPS 2; St. 4, 6	All stakeholders and other key informants*	Interviews; e-survey/s

Area of focus	Criteria/detailed issues	ECG GPS/ UNEG N&S	Source of info	Method	Criteria/detailed issues	ECG GPS/ UNEG N&S	Source of info	Method	Criteria/detailed issues	ECG GPS/ UNEG N&S	Source of info	Method
	<b>Independence</b>	GPS 2; N.4			<b>Credibility</b>	GPS 2; N.3			<b>Utility</b>	GPS 8; N.2		
	participating countries.				participating countries.							
	u. Inclusiveness of the evaluation process (PR 2014), in particular the consultation process throughout	GPS 4; St. 4.6	All stakeholders*	Desk-review; interviews; e-survey	u. Inclusiveness of the evaluation process (PR 2014), in particular the consultation process throughout	GPS 4; St. 4.6	All stakeholders*	Desk-review; interviews; e-survey	u. Inclusiveness of the evaluation process (PR 2014), in particular the consultation process throughout	GPS 4; St. 4.6	All stakeholders*	Desk-review; interviews; e-survey
<b>3. Relevance</b>												
					v. Overall perception about relevance of IEO's evaluation work	N.2, N.3	All stakeholders*	Interviews; e-survey/s	v. Overall perception about relevance of IEO's evaluation work	N.2, N.3	All stakeholders*	Interviews; e-survey/s
					w. Alignment of IEO's strategic direction with the GEF's vision and priorities (from the 2014 Second Peer Review)	GPS 6; St. 1.4	GEF strategic documents, evaluation plans and list of reports, Council members, IEO and GEF management	Desk review; interviews;	w. Alignment of IEO's strategic direction with the GEF's vision and priorities (from the 2014 Second Peer Review)	GPS 6; St. 1.4	GEF strategic documents, evaluation plans and list of reports, Council members, IEO and GEF management	Desk review; interviews;
					x. Coverage of the GEF's vision and priorities, including the Conventions, through IEO's evaluation product mix	GPS 6; St. 1.4	GEF and Conventions' strategic documents, evaluation plans and list of reports; Conventions' managers	Desk review; interviews;	x. Coverage of the GEF's vision and priorities, including the Conventions, through IEO's evaluation product mix	GPS 6; St. 1.4	GEF and Conventions' strategic documents, evaluation plans and list of reports; Conventions' managers	Desk review; interviews;

Area of focus	Criteria/detailed issues	ECG GPS/ UNEG N&S	Source of info	Method	Criteria/detailed issues	ECG GPS/ UNEG N&S	Source of info	Method	Criteria/detailed issues	ECG GPS/ UNEG N&S	Source of info	Method
	<b>Independence</b>	GPS 2; N.4			<b>Credibility</b> y. Relevance of the scope of each category of IEO evaluations to the accountability and learning needs of immediate stakeholders, taking into account IEO's comparative advantage	GPS 2; N.3	Evaluation reports; all stakeholders*	Desk review; interviews;	y. Relevance of the scope of each category of IEO evaluations to the accountability and learning needs of immediate stakeholders, taking into account IEO's comparative advantage	GPS 8; N.2	Evaluation reports; all stakeholders*	Desk review; interviews;
					aa. Integration of socio-economic and gender perspectives in IEO's evaluation product mix	N.8, St. 4.7	Evaluation guidelines and reports; IEO staff and consultants; GEF Council and management	Desk review; SWAP assessment of IEO; interviews	aa. Integration of socio-economic and gender perspectives in IEO's evaluation product mix	N.8, St. 4.7	Evaluation guidelines and reports; IEO staff and consultants; GEF Council and management	Desk review; SWAP assessment of IEO; interviews
					bb. IEO's ability to influence and bring about change	GPS 8; N.2, N.3	MARS, Council members; IEO and GEF management	Desk review; interviews	bb. IEO's ability to influence and bring about change	GPS 8; N.2, N.3	MARS, Council members; IEO and GEF management	Desk review; interviews
<b>4. Effectiveness</b>												
					aa. Integration of socio-economic and gender perspectives in IEO's evaluation product mix	N.8, St. 4.7	Evaluation guidelines and reports; IEO staff and consultants; GEF Council and management	Desk review; SWAP assessment of IEO; interviews	aa. Integration of socio-economic and gender perspectives in IEO's evaluation product mix	N.8, St. 4.7	Evaluation guidelines and reports; IEO staff and consultants; GEF Council and management	Desk review; SWAP assessment of IEO; interviews
					bb. IEO's ability to influence and bring about change	GPS 8; N.2, N.3	MARS, Council members; IEO and GEF management	Desk review; interviews	bb. IEO's ability to influence and bring about change	GPS 8; N.2, N.3	MARS, Council members; IEO and GEF management	Desk review; interviews

Area of focus	Criteria/detailed issues	ECG GPS/ UNEG N&S	Source of info	Method	Criteria/detailed issues	ECG GPS/ UNEG N&S	Source of info	Method	Criteria/detailed issues	ECG GPS/ UNEG N&S	Source of info	Method
	<b>Independence</b>	GPS 2; N.4			<b>Credibility</b>	GPS 2; N.3			<b>Utility</b>	GPS 8; N.2		
					cc. Coverage, accessibility and quality of Management Responses to evaluation reports	N.14, St. 1.4	MRS, Council members, IEO and GEF management	Desk review; interviews	cc. Coverage, accessibility and quality of Management Responses to evaluation reports	N.14, St. 1.4	MRS, Council members, IEO and GEF management	Desk review; interviews
					dd. Quality of Management Action Records and degree of follow-up of IEO recommendations	GPS 8; N.14, St. 1.4	MARS, Council members; IEO and GEF management	Desk review; interviews	dd. Quality of Management Action Records and degree of follow-up of IEO recommendations	GPS 8; N.14, St. 1.4	MARS, Council members; IEO and GEF management	Desk review; interviews
	ee. IEO's contribution to accountability and learning	GPS 8; N.2, N.3	Evaluation reports and OPS; Management Responses; MARS; Peer review reports; GEF management, Council members	Desk review; interviews	ee. IEO's contribution to accountability and learning	GPS 8; N.2, N.3	Evaluation reports and OPS; Management Responses; MARS; Peer review reports; GEF management, Council members	Desk review; interviews	ee. IEO's contribution to accountability and learning	GPS 8; N.2, N.3	Evaluation reports and OPS; Management Responses; MARS; Peer review reports; GEF management, Council members	Desk review; interviews
					ff. Extent to which IEO fosters learning from evaluations and contributes to a learning culture within the GEF (from the 2014 Second Peer Review)	GPS 7; N.2, N.3	Evaluation reports and OPS; Management Responses; MARS; Peer review reports; GEF management, Council members	Desk review; interviews	ff. Extent to which IEO fosters learning from evaluations and contributes to a learning culture within the GEF (from the 2014 Second Peer Review)	GPS 7; N.2, N.3	Evaluation reports and OPS; Management Responses; MARS; Peer review reports; GEF management, Council members	Desk review; interviews

Area of focus	Criteria/detailed issues	ECG GPS/ UNEG N&S	Source of info	Method	Criteria/detailed issues	ECG GPS/ UNEG N&S	Source of info	Method	Criteria/detailed issues	ECG GPS/ UNEG N&S	Source of info	Method
	<b>Independence</b>	GPS 2; N.4			<b>Credibility</b> gg. Extent to which IEO contributes to learning from evaluations of environmental initiatives in the international evaluation community	GPS 2; N.3	Guidance, reports, presentations; IEO; UNEG and ECG members, Partner Agencies evaluation units	Desk review; attendance of Earth-Eval; interviews;				
									<b>Utility</b> gg. Extent to which IEO contributes to learning from evaluations of environmental initiatives in the international evaluation community	GPS 7; St. 2.3	Guidance, reports, presentation s; IEO; UNEG and ECG members, Partner Agencies evaluation units	Desk review; attendance of Earth-Eval; interviews;
					hh. Extent to which GEF integrates the feedback from IEO/agencies' evaluations into new project design	GPS 7; N. 2	GEF Secretariat; Agencies' coordination units	Interviews; e-survey				
					ii. IEO contribution to evaluation capacity development in recipient countries	GPS 4; N.9	Political and Operational Focal Points; national agencies; other national stakeholders	Interviews, e-survey				
					jj. IEO contribution to evaluation capacity development in Partner Agencies	GPS 4; N.9	Partner Agencies coordination and evaluation units	Interviews, e-survey				
<b>5. Quality of IEO's evaluation work</b>												



Area of focus	Criteria/detailed issues	ECG GPS/ UNEG N&S	Source of info	Method	Criteria/detailed issues	ECG GPS/ UNEG N&S	Source of info	Method	Criteria/detailed issues	ECG GPS/ UNEG N&S	Source of info	Method
	<b>Independence</b>	GPS 2; N.4			<b>Credibility</b>	GPS 2; N.3			<b>Utility</b>	GPS 8; N.2		
	Kk. IEO quality assurance systems, including the role and choice of the reference group	GPS 5; St. 4.6, 5.1	QA framework; IEO and GEF management	Desk-review; interviews	Kk. IEO quality assurance systems, including the role and choice of the reference group	GPS 5; St. 4.6, 5.1	QA framework; IEO and GEF management	Desk-review; interviews	Kk. IEO quality assurance systems, including the role and choice of the reference group	GPS 5; St. 4.6, 5.1	QA framework; IEO and GEF management	Desk-review; interviews
					Il. IEO validation process of terminal evaluations	GPS 5; St. 5.1	Validation process framework/ procedures; IEO staff	Desk-review; interviews	Il. IEO validation process of terminal evaluations	GPS 5; St. 5.1	Validation process framework/ procedures; IEO staff	Desk-review; interviews
									mm. Quality and usefulness of IEO guidelines and guidance documents	GPS 5; St. 2.2	Documents; Partner Agencies evaluation units; IEO staff; IEO consultants	Desk-review, interviews, e-survey
	mn. Perception of the overall quality of IEO evaluation reports	GPS 5; St. 4.9, 4.10	Council members; IEO and GEF management; Political and Operational Focal Points; Conventions managers; other stakeholders*	Interviews, e-survey	mn. Perception of the overall quality of IEO evaluation reports	GPS 5; St. 4.9, 4.10	Council members; IEO and GEF management; Political and Operational Focal Points; Conventions managers; other stakeholders*	Interviews, e-survey	nn. Perception of the overall quality of IEO evaluation reports	GPS 5; St. 4.9, 4.10	Council members; IEO and GEF management; Political and Operational Focal Points; Conventions managers; other stakeholders*	Interviews, e-survey
					oo. IEO's application of state-of-art approaches in evaluation	GPS 5; St. 2.3	IEO evaluation reports; IEO staff; STAP; Partner agencies' evaluation units	Desk-review; interviews, e-survey				

Third Professional Peer Review of the GEF Independent Evaluation Function, Annex 3

Area of focus	Criteria/detailed issues	ECG GPS/ UNEG N&S	Source of info	Method	Criteria/detailed issues	ECG GPS/ UNEG N&S	Source of info	Method	Criteria/detailed issues	ECG GPS/ UNEG N&S	Source of info	Method
	<b>Independence</b>	GPS 2; N.4			<b>Credibility</b>	GPS 2; N.3			<b>Utility</b>	GPS 8; N.2		
	pp. Assessed quality of evaluation outputs, including approach papers, concept notes, studies and country case studies	GPS 5; St. 4.9, 4.10	Evaluation outputs	Desk-review	pp. Assessed quality of evaluation outputs, including approach papers, concept notes, studies and country case studies	GPS 5; St. 4.9; St. 4.10	Evaluation outputs	Desk-review	pp. Assessed quality of evaluation outputs, including approach papers, concept notes, studies and country case studies	GPS 5; St. 4.9; St. 4.10	Evaluation outputs	Desk-review
					qq. Technical competence, objectivity and credibility of evaluation teams	GPS 5; N.10; St. 3.1	Evaluation reports; GEF management; Partner agencies coordination and evaluation units	Desk-review; interviews, e-survey				
					rr. Adequacy of evidence and technical validity of evaluations	GPS 5; St. 4.5; St. 4.9	MRS; Evaluation reports; GEF management; STAP, Conventions, Partner Agencies' coordination units	Desk-review; interviews, e-survey				
					ss. Transparency of evaluation process	GPS 2; N.7	All stakeholders	Interviews; e-survey				
					tt. Criteria for assessing results and performance	GPS 5; St. 4.5	Guidance documents; GEF management; STAP; Partner agencies coordination	Desk-review; interviews; e-survey				

Area of focus	Criteria/detailed issues	ECG GPS/ UNEG N&S	Source of info	Method	Criteria/detailed issues	ECG GPS/ UNEG N&S	Source of info	Method	Criteria/detailed issues	ECG GPS/ UNEG N&S	Source of info	Method
	<b>Independence</b>	GPS 2; N.4			<b>Credibility</b>	GPS 2; N.3	and evaluation units		<b>Utility</b>	GPS 8; N.2		
					uu. Ownership among stakeholders for evaluation products (PR 2014)	GPS 4; St. 4.6	All stakeholders	Desk-review; Interviews; e-survey				
					vv. Quality of OPS	GPS 5; St. 4.9; St. 4.10	OPS reports; Council minutes and members; GEF management; STAP; Partner Agencies coordination and evaluation units	Desk-review; interviews; e-survey				
					ww. Evaluative evidence for OPS	GPS 5; St. 4.5; St. 4.9	OPS reports; Council minutes and members; GEF management; STAP; Partner Agencies coordination and evaluation units	Desk-review; interviews; e-survey	xx. Timeliness, frequency and use of OPS by the Council and Assembly	GPS 8; St. 4.1	Council members;	Interviews

Area of focus	Criteria/detailed issues	ECG GPS/ UNEG N&S	Source of info	Method	Criteria/detailed issues	ECG GPS/ UNEG N&S	Source of info	Method	Criteria/detailed issues	ECG GPS/ UNEG N&S	Source of info	Method
	Independence	GPS 2; N.4			Credibility	GPS 2; N.3						
					ccc. Integration of gender equality perspective in IEO's validations of terminal evaluations by Partner Agencies	N.8; St. 4.7	Guidelines; Annual Performance Report; SWAP on gender equality; IEO records; IEO staff; Partner agencies coordination and evaluation units	Desk review; interviews; e-survey	ccc. Integration of gender equality perspective in IEO's validations of terminal evaluations by Partner Agencies	N.8; St. 4.7	Guidelines; Annual Performance Report; IEO staff; Partner agencies coordination and evaluation units	Desk review; interviews; e-survey
									yy. Timeliness in planning and completion of evaluations	GPS 8; St. 4.1	IEO workplans and annual/semi-annual reports; IEO and GEF management	Desk review; interviews
					zz. Stakeholder satisfaction with each category of IEO products (PR 2014)	GPS 4; N.2	All stakeholders	Interviews; e-survey	aaa. Dissemination of evaluation products	GPS 7; St. 4.11	IEO records; all stakeholders, ECG and UNEG members	Interviews; e-survey
					bbb. Accessibility of evaluation products	GPS 7; St. 4.11	IEO records; all stakeholders, ECG and UNEG members	Interviews; e-survey				

Area of focus	Criteria/detailed issues	ECG GPS/ UNEG N&S	Source of info	Method	Criteria/detailed issues	ECG GPS/ UNEG N&S	Source of info	Method	Criteria/detailed issues	ECG GPS/ UNEG N&S	Source of info	Method
	Independence	GPS 2; N.4			Credibility	GPS 2; N.3			Utility	GPS 8; N.2		
<b>6. Efficiency</b>												
					ddd. Budget: adequacy, use flexibility, allocation to different products, comparison of some key performance indicators with other ECG members	GPS 3; N.13	IEO budget data; IEO and GEF management; World Bank Trustee	Desk review; Interviews	ddd. Budget: adequacy, use flexibility, allocation to different products, comparison of some key performance indicators with other ECG members	GPS 3; N.13	IEO budget data; IEO and GEF management; World Bank Trustee	Desk review; Interviews
					eee. Staffing: profiles; skill mix and adequacy for delivery of work-plan; gender and geographical balance of staff; mobility; reporting lines.	GPS 3; N.10	IEO records; IEO and GEF management; World Bank Trustee	Desk review; Interviews	eee. Staffing: profiles; skill mix and adequacy for delivery of work-plan; gender and geographical balance of staff; mobility; reporting lines.	GPS 3; N.10	IEO and GEF management; World Bank Trustee	Desk review; Interviews
					fff. Evaluation teams: leadership models and roles in teams; consultant/staff ratio in evaluation teams; gender and geographical balance of evaluation teams	GPS 3; St. 4.8	IEO records; IEO management and staff; GEF management	Desk review; interviews	fff. Evaluation teams: leadership models and roles in teams; consultant/staff ratio in evaluation teams; gender and geographical balance of evaluation teams	GPS 3; St. 4.8	IEO records; IEO management and staff; GEF management	Desk review; interviews

Third Professional Peer Review of the GEF Independent Evaluation Function, Annex 3

Area of focus	Criteria/detailed issues	ECG GPS/ UNEG N&S	Source of info	Method	Criteria/detailed issues	ECG GPS/ UNEG N&S	Source of info	Method	Criteria/detailed issues	ECG GPS/ UNEG N&S	Source of info	Method
	<b>Independence</b>				<b>Credibility</b>				<b>Utility</b>			
		GPS 2; N.4			ggg. Adequacy of GEF project budget allocation for midterm reviews/evaluations and Terminal evaluations by Partner Agencies	GPS 2; N.3				GPS 8; N.2		
									hhh. Delegation in the use of resources within IEO		IEO management and staff	Interviews
									iii. Efficiency of the data management and processing approaches		IEO staff	Interviews

#### **Annex 4. Bibliography and reference documents**

Evaluation Cooperation Group, 2009. Review Framework for the Evaluation Function in Multilateral Development Banks

— 2012. Big Book on Evaluation Good Practice Standards

Global Environment Facility. 2003. Terms of Reference for an Independent Monitoring and Evaluation Unit

- 2010. The GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy
- 2010. Accreditation procedures for GEF Partner Agencies.
- 2011. GEF policies on Environmental and Social Safeguards and Gender Mainstreaming
- 2012. Fee policy for GEF Partner Agencies
- 2012. Principles and guidelines for engagement with indigenous peoples
- 2014 to 2019. All Management Responses to all reports issued by EO/IEO
- 2015 to 2019, all “Highlights of the Council’s Discussions”
- 2015 to 2019, all “Joint Summary of the Chairs”
- 2015, 2019, Instrument for the Establishment of the Restructured Global Environment Facility
- 2017. Guidelines for Project and Program Cycle Policy
- 2017. GEF policy on Gender Equality
- 2017. Highlights of the LDCF/SCCF Council’s Discussions
- 2017. Joint Summary of the Chairs of the LDCF/SCCF Council
- 2018. GEF Policy on Stakeholder Engagement
- 2018. Updated Results Architecture for GEF-7
- 2018. GEF Minimum Fiduciary Standards for GEF Partner Agencies
- 2018. Project and Program Cycle Policy
- 2018. GEF Policy on Access to Information
- 2018. Measures to Enhance the Sustainability of GGE Projects and Programs
- 2018. Policy on Access to Information
- 2019. Policy on Environmental and Social Safeguards
- 2019. GEF Policy on Monitoring
- 2019. Guidelines on Core Indicators and Sub-indicators
- 2019. Review of GEF minimum standards
- 2019. Further Work on the Sustainability of GEF Projects and Programs
- 2019. Highlights of the LDCF/SCCF Council’s Discussions
- 2019. Joint Summary of the Chairs of the LDCF/SCCF Council
- 2019. Joint Work Program for Least Developed Countries Fund and Special Climate Change Fund

Global Environment Facility Monitoring and Evaluation Office. 2005. The GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy

— 2005. Procedures and format of the GEF Management Action Record

Global Environment Facility Evaluation Office. 2007. Ethical Guidelines

- 2009. Approach to tracking GEF Council decision by the GEF Partnership.
- 2013. Annual Performance Report
- 2013. Management Action Record
- 2014. Fifth Overall Performance Study of the GEF (OPSS). At the Crossroads for Higher Impact. All related documents.
- 2014. Guidance Document: Monitoring and Evaluation in the LDCF/SCCF

Global Environment Facility Independent Evaluation Office. 2014. Work Program and Budget of the GEF Independent Evaluation Office

- 2015. Addressing Gender in evaluations, draft.
- 2015. Knowledge Management Needs Assessment.
- 2015. Four-Year Work Program and Budget of the GEF Independent Evaluation Office – GEF-6

- 2015 to 2018 IEO UNSWAPs
- 2015 to 2019. All “Semi-annual evaluation report”
- 2014 to 2019. All “Annual Performance Report”
- 2014 to 2019. All “Management Action Record”
- 2016. IEO and the SDGs.
- 2016. International Waters Focal Area Study, Council and published versions
- 2016. Evaluation of the GEF Civil Society Organization Network, Council and published versions
- 2016. Country Portfolio Evaluation in Tajikistan 1999-2015, Council and published versions
- 2017. Guidelines for GEF Agencies in Conducting Terminal Evaluation for Full-sized Projects
- 2017. Sixth Overall Performance Study of the GEF (OPS6). The GEF in the Changing Environmental Finance Landscape. All related reports
- 2017. Terminal Evaluation Review form
- 2017. Evaluation of Gender Mainstreaming in the GEF, Council and published versions
- 2017. Evaluation of the Integrated Approach Pilot (IAP) Programs, Council and published versions
- 2017. LDCF/SCCF Annual Evaluation Report 2016
- 2017. Land degradation Focal Area study, Council and published versions
- 2017. Evaluation of GEF’s engagement with the Private Sector, Council and published versions
- 2017. Impact of GEF support on national environmental laws and policies, Council and published versions
- 2017. LDCF/SCCF Programme Evaluation of the SCCF, Council and published versions
- 2017. Biodiversity Focal Area Study, Council and published versions
- 2017. Formative Review of the Integrated Approach Pilot (IAP) Programs
- 2017. Evaluation of Knowledge Management, Council and published versions
- 2017. Evaluation of the GEF’S System for Transparent Allocation of Resources (STAR), Council and published versions
- 2017. FY18 Work Program and Budget for the Independent Evaluation Office of the GEF under the LDCF and SCCF
- 2018. Evaluation of Programmatic Approaches in the GEF, Council and published versions
- 2018. An Evaluative Approach to Assessing GEF’s Additionality
- 2018. Evaluation of the GEF-UNIDO Cleantech Innovation Programme, Council and published versions
- 2018. Evaluation of GEF’s support to Biodiversity mainstreaming, Council and published versions
- 2018. Annual Performance Report Project Data Collection Instrument
- 2018. Annual Performance Report Project Performance Instrument
- 2018. GEF IEO Sustainability Review: Post Completion Assessment of Project Performance
- 2019. The GEF Evaluation Policy
- 2019. Four-Year Work Program and Budget of the GEG Independent Evaluation Office – GEF-7
- 2019. A Methodological Approach for Post-Completion Verification
- 2019. Terminal Evaluation Report Review Guidelines. Washington
- 2019. Knowledge Management Needs Assessment. Washington
- 2019. Work Plan and Budget 2019-2023
- 2019. LDCF/SCCF Annual Evaluation Report
- 2019. Evaluation of GEF support to scaling up impacts, Pre and Post Council version
- 2019. Value for Money Analysis of GEF interventions in support of Sustainable Forest Management, Council and published versions
- 2019. Strategic Country Cluster Evaluation of the Small Island Developing States, Council version
- 2019. LDCF/SCCF Annual Evaluation Report.
- 2019. Audit Trail draft GEF Evaluation Policy
- 2019. GEF IEO Self-assessment Retreat report and summary
- 2019. Mexico portfolio Note
- 2019. Peru portfolio Note
- IEO presentations to Council, ECWs, various events; infographics, articles.



Global Environment Facility Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel, 2019. Achieving more enduring outcomes from GEF investment.

Peer Review. 2009 The evaluation function of the Global Environment Facility (GEF). Final Report  
— . 2014. Report of the Second Professional Peer Review of the GEF Evaluation Function

UNEG. 2011. UNEG Framework for Professional Peer Reviews of the Evaluation Function of UN organizations  
— . 2016. Norms and Standards for Evaluation

World Bank. 2015. World Bank Policy: Access to Information

**Annex 5. List of interviewed stakeholders**

Category of stakeholder	Agency, unit	Title	First name	Family name	Role
Council Member	Angola	Mr	Demosthenes	Amos	Secretary General, Amos Group and Foundation
Council Member	Angola, Representative of the Constituency for Angola, Botswana, Lesotho, Malawi, Mozambique, Namibia, South Africa, Eswatini, Zambia, Zimbabwe	Mr	Julio Ingles	Joao Ferreira	Advisor to the Minister and GEF Operational Focal Point, Ministry of Environment
Council Member	Australia	Mr	Peter	Elder	Director, Climate and Environment Funds, Global Development Branch, Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade, Multilateral Development and Finance Division
Council Member	Australia	Ms	Anna	Mallard	Officer, Climate and Environment Funds, Global Development Branch, Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade, Multilateral Development and Finance Division
Council Member	Canada	Ms	Heidi	Karst	Officer, Environment Division, Global Issues and Development Branch, Global Affairs
Council Member	Canada	Ms	Anar	Mamdani	Director, Environment Division, Global Issues and Development Branch, Global Affairs
Council Member	China	Mr	Xia	Lyu	Director, International Financial Institution Division 1, Department of International Economic and Financial Cooperation, Ministry of Finance
Council Member	Ecuador, representative of the Constituency for Brazil, Colombia and Ecuador	Ms	Adriana Leticia	Flachier Troya	Advisor of Environment and Sustainable Development Affairs, Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Human Mobility
Council Member	Finland	Ms	Maria	Forslund	UN Development System and Certain Environmental Conventions, Unit for Sustainable Development and Climate Policy, Department for Development Policy, Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Council Member	France	Mr	Leonardo	Puppetto	Head of Multilateral Financing for Development and Climate, Ministry of Economy and Finance
Council Member	Germany	Ms	Kordula	Mehlhart	Head of Division Climate Finance, German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development

*Third Professional Peer Review of the GEF Independent Evaluation Function, Annex 5*

Council Member	India, Representative of the Constituency for Bangladesh, Bhutan, India, Maldives, Nepal, Sri Lanka	Ms	Aparna	Subramani	World Bank Executive Director, Indian Administrative Service
Council Member	Jamaica, Representative of the Constituency for Antigua And Barbuda, Bahamas, Barbados, Belize, Cuba, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Grenada, Guyana, Haiti, Jamaica, St. Kitts And Nevis, St. Lucia, St. Vincent and Grenadines, Suriname, Trinidad and Tobago	Ms	Gillian	Guthrie	Senior Director, Ministry of Water, Land, Environment and Climate Change
Council Member	Japan	Mr	Yoshitomo	Kondo	Director, Development Issues, International Bureau, Ministry of Finance
Council Member	Japan	Ms	Hitomi	Taniguchi	Development Policy Division, International Bureau, Ministry of Finance
Council Member	Japan	Mr	Ran	Yagasa	International Cooperation Specialist, International Cooperation and Sustainable Infrastructure Office, Ministry of the Environment
Council Member	Mexico	Ms	Maria Fernanda	Montero	GEF Operational Focal Point
Council Member	Mexico, Representative of the Constituency for Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Venezuela	Ms	Brenda Guadalupe	Ciuk Cano	Director General for Financial Institutions, Ministry of Finance and Public Credit and GEF Political Focal Point
Council Member	Niger, Representative of the Constituency for Burkina Faso, Cabo Verde, Chad, Guinea-Bissau, Mali, Mauritania, Niger, Senegal, Gambia	Mr	Dan	Bakoye Chaibou	Statisticien/Planificateur/Amenagiste, Ministry of Planning, PPCR Strategic Coordination Unit
Council Member	Paraguay	Ms	Graciela Soledad	Mirela Martinez	Director, Strategic Planning and GEF Operational Focal Point, Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development
Council Member	Sweden	Ms	Maria	Olson	Deputy Director, Ministry for Foreign Affairs, Global Agenda Department/Climate Group
Council Member	Switzerland	Mr	Konrad	Specker	Deputy Head, Global Programme Climate Change and Environment, Swiss Development Cooperation

*Third Professional Peer Review of the GEF Independent Evaluation Function, Annex 5*

Council Member	Switzerland, Representative of the Constituency for Azerbaijan, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyz Republic, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan	Mr	Stefan Marc	Schwager	Head, International Climate and Biodiversity Finance and the GEF, Federal Office of the Environment
Council Member	The Netherlands	Ms	Marjolein	Geusebroek	Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Council Member	United Kingdom	Ms	Hannah	Boyne	GEF Desk, Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs
Council Member	United Kingdom	Ms	Thea	Edwards	Head of ODA, International Strategy and ODA Wildlife, International, Climate and Forestry Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs
Council Member	United States of America	Mr	James	Woodsome	Treasury Department
Council Member	United States of America	Mr	Mathew	Haarsager	Deputy Assistant Secretary, MIB Operations and Policy, Treasury Department
Council Member	United States of America	Ms	Elizabeth	Lien	Treasury Department
Council Member	United States of America	Ms	Liz	Nichols	State Department
CSO	GEF CSO Network	Mr	Akhteruzzaman	Sano	GEF CSO Network Chair and Regional Focal Point for the South East Asia Region
CSO	GEF CSO The Nature Conservancy	Ms	Julie	Bounns	Senior Policy Advisor, Global Policy, Institutions and Conservation Finance
GEF Secretariat	GEF	Ms	Naoko	Ishii	Chief Executive Officer and Chairperson
GEF Secretariat	GEF Council Secretariat	Mr	William	Ehlers	Secretary to the Council, Coordinator-Country Relations
GEF Secretariat	GEF, Policy, Partnerships, and Operations Unit	Ms	Yasemin	Biro-Kirtman	Knowledge Management Coordinator
GEF Secretariat	GEF, Policy, Partnerships, and Operations Unit	Ms	Francoise	Clothes	Director, Strategy and Operations
GEF Secretariat	GEF, Policy, Partnerships, and Operations Unit	Ms	Gabriella	Richardson	Senior Gender Specialist
GEF Secretariat	GEF, Programs Unit	Mr	Ulrich	Apel, PhD	Senior Environmental Specialist, Programs Unit
GEF Secretariat	GEF, Programs Unit	Mr	Gustavo A.	B. da Fonseca, PhD	Director of Programs
GEF Secretariat	GEF, Programs Unit	Mr	Mohammed Imam	Bakarr	Lead Environment Specialist, Program Strategy, Programs Unit

*Third Professional Peer Review of the GEF Independent Evaluation Function, Annex 5*

GEF Secretariat	GEF, Programs Unit	Mr	Christian	Severin	Coordinator, International Waters Focal Area, Senior Environmental Specialist
GEF Secretariat	GEF, Programs Unit	Mr	Mark	Zimsky	Biodiversity Focal Area Coordinator, Senior Biodiversity Specialist, Regional Coordinator Latin America, Programs Unit
IEO	GEF Independent Evaluation Office (IEO)	Mr	Anupam	Anand	Evaluation Officer
IEO	GEF Independent Evaluation Office (IEO)	Ms	Geeta	Barra	Deputy Director, Chief Evaluator
IEO	GEF Independent Evaluation Office (IEO)	Mr	Carlo	Carugi	Senior Evaluation Officer
IEO	GEF Independent Evaluation Office (IEO)	Ms	Evelyn	Chihugyu	Program Assistant
IEO	GEF Independent Evaluation Office (IEO)	Ms	Sara	El Choufi	Evaluation Analyst
IEO	GEF Independent Evaluation Office (IEO)	Mr	Francisco	Grahammer	Information officer
IEO	GEF Independent Evaluation Office (IEO)	Ms	Malac	Kahir	Research Assistant
IEO	GEF Independent Evaluation Office (IEO)	Ms	Mannella	Koukoui	Senior Executive Assistant
IEO	GEF Independent Evaluation Office (IEO)	Ms	Kyoko	Matsumoto	Senior Evaluation Officer
IEO	GEF Independent Evaluation Office (IEO)	Mr	Neeraj	Negi	Senior Evaluation Officer
IEO	GEF Independent Evaluation Office (IEO)	Mr	Juan José	Portillo	Senior Operations Officer
IEO	GEF Independent Evaluation Office (IEO)	Ms	Jeneen	Reyes Garcia	Evaluation Officer
IEO	GEF Independent Evaluation Office (IEO)	Mr	Gabriel	Sidman	Evaluation Officer
IEO	GEF Independent Evaluation Office (IEO)	Ms	Keniya	Temenko	Knowledge Management Officer
IEO	GEF Independent Evaluation Office (IEO)	Mr	Juha	Uitto	Director
IEO	GEF Independent Evaluation Office (IEO)	Ms	Anna	Viggh	Senior Evaluation Officer
IEO	GEF Independent Evaluation Office (IEO)	Ms	Molly	Watts Sohn	Evaluation Analyst
IEO	GEF Independent Evaluation Office (IEO)	Ms	Peixuan	Zhou	Evaluation Analyst
Partner Agency	Conservation International (CI)	Ms	Orissa	Samaroo	Senior Director, GEF Policy and Portfolio Management
Partner Agency	Conservation International (CI)	Mr	Joshua	Weil	Senior Director of Risk Management & Compliance
Partner Agency	FAO Office of Evaluation (OED)	Ms	Rachel	Bedouin	Senior Evaluation Officer
Partner Agency	FAO Office of Evaluation (OED)	Mr	Masahiro	Igarashi	Director
Partner Agency	FAO Office of Evaluation (OED)	Ms	Amélie	Solal-Céigny	Evaluation Officer
Partner Agency	FAO, GEF Coordination Unit	Ms	Geneviève	Braun	Programme Officer, GEF Coordination Unit, Climate and Environment Division, Climate, Biodiversity, Land and Water Department
Partner Agency	FAO, GEF Coordination Unit	Mr	Jeffrey	Griffin	Senior Coordinator, GEF Unit, Climate and Environment Division, Climate, Biodiversity, Land and Water Department

*Third Professional Peer Review of the GEF Independent Evaluation Function, Annex 5*

Partner Agency	IFAD Environment, Climate, Gender and Social Inclusion Division (ECG)	Ms	Margarida	Astralaga	Director
Partner Agency	IFAD Environment, Climate, Gender and Social Inclusion Division (ECG)	Ms	Liza	Leclerc	Climate and Environment Coordinator
Partner Agency	IFAD Independent Office of Evaluation (IOE)	Mr	Fabrizio	Felloni	Deputy Director
Partner Agency	IFAD Independent Office of Evaluation (IOE)	Mr	Oscar	Garcia	Director
Partner Agency	Inter-American Development Bank (IDB)	Mr	Juan Pablo	Bonilla	Sector Manager, Climate Change and Sustainable Development Sector
Partner Agency	Inter-American Development Bank (IDB)	Ms	Alexandra	Ortega Rada	IDBG-GEF specialist, IDBG-GEF Technical Coordination Unit, Climate Change and Sustainable Development Department
Partner Agency	International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN), Global Environment Facility and Green Climate Fund	Ms	Sheila	Aggarwal-Khan	Director
Partner Agency	UNIDO Independent Evaluation Division	Mr	Johannes	Dohinger	Chief
Partner Agency	UNIDO Independent Evaluation Division	Ms	Thuy Tu	Le	Evaluation Officer
Partner Agency	UNIDO, Partnerships Coordination Division	Mr	Juergen	Hierold	Chief and GEF Coordinator
Partner Agency	UNIDO, Office of Evaluation and Internal Oversight	Mr	Javier	Guamizo	Director
Partner Agency	United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)	Ms	Nancy	Bennet	GEF Coordinator
Partner Agency	United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)	Ms	Yoko	Watanabe	Small Grant Programme Coordinator
Partner Agency	United Nations Development Programme Independent Evaluation Office (UNDP/IEO)	Mr	Alan	Fox	Chief, Corporate Evaluation, Independent Evaluation Office
Partner Agency	United Nations Development Programme Independent Evaluation Office (UNDP/IEO)	Mr	Indran	Naidoo	Director, Independent Evaluation Office
Partner Agency	World Bank Group	Ms	Riikka	Noppa	Senior Human Resources Business Partner, GEF Human Resources Senior Officer
Partner Agency	World Bank Group	Mr	Christopher	Warner	Senior Natural Resources Management Specialist
Partner Agency	World Bank Group, Independent Evaluation Group	Mr	Jorge C.	Carbajo Martinez	Director, Financial, Private Sector and Sustainable Development Department

*Third Professional Peer Review of the GEF Independent Evaluation Function, Annex 5*

Partner Agency	World Bank Group, Independent Evaluation Group	Ms	Allison	Evans	Director General, Evaluation and Vice President
Partner Agency	World Bank Group, Independent Evaluation Group	Mr	Christopher	Nelson	Senior Evaluation Officer, Public Sector Evaluation
Partner Agency	World Wide Fund for Nature - US	Mr	Hervé	Lefevre	GEF Coordinator
STAP	GEF Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel (STAP)	Ms	Rosina	Bierbaum, PhD	STAP Chair
STAP	GEF Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel (STAP)	Ms	Guadalupe	Duron	Programme Officer
STAP	GEF Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel (STAP)	Ms	Virginia	Gorsevski	Programme Officer
STAP	GEF Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel (STAP)	Mr	Chris	Whaley	STAP Secretary

**Annex 6. Key data on the Peer Review e-survey questionnaire**

Stakeholder group	Targeted entities, n.*	Reached entities, n.	Responses to the questionnaire, n.	Rate of response %	Number of respondents providing open-ended comments
<b>IEO Consultants</b>	130	123	41	33%	21
<b>Multilateral Environmental Convention Secretariats</b>	5 conventions through 15 email addresses	5 conventions through 15 email addresses	4 conventions	80%	4
<b>OFF/PFPs</b>	297 through 453 email addresses	278 through 407 email addresses	33 OFF/PFP	11.8%	15
<b>GEF Agencies</b>	28 through 104 email addresses	28 through 104 email addresses	19	67.8%	12
<b>Total</b>	460	434	97	22.3%	52

\* With the exception of IEO consultants, for whom one email address corresponded to one consultant, for all other categories of stakeholders, multiple e-mail addresses were available for virtually each organization and unit. Hence the difference between the number of entities and the number of email addresses.



**Annex 7. Analysis of GEF evaluation policies against the UNEG Norms and Standards and ECG Standard Operational Practices**

Main and sub-criteria; areas of focus	UNEG Norms, 2016	Relevant Standards 2016 (only complementary ones)	UNEG Standard Operational Practices, ECG Good practice, 2012	GEF 2010 Evaluation Policy	GEF 2019 Evaluation Policy	Comments and gaps
Overarching purpose:	N. 1 - Within the United Nations system, it is the responsibility of evaluation managers and evaluators to uphold and promote, in their evaluation practice, the principles and values to which the United Nations is committed. In particular, they should respect, promote and contribute to the goals and targets set out in the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development			The Policy refers to, and adopts to a very large extent, the international principles and values of evaluation.	The Policy refers to, and adopts to a very large extent, the international principles and values of evaluation. There is however no meaningful reference to the SDGs.	The absence of a commitment to the SDGs is a gap, considering that the 2019 Policy was prepared after the GEF made a formal commitment to contribute to the Agenda 2030.
<b>A. Independence</b>	N. 4 - Independence of evaluation is necessary for credibility, influences the ways in which an evaluation is used and allows evaluators to be impartial and free from undue pressure throughout the evaluation process. The independence of the evaluation function comprises two key aspects — behavioural independence and organizational independence. Behavioural independence entails the ability to evaluate without undue influence by any party. Evaluators must have the full freedom to conduct their evaluative work impartially, without the risk of negative effects on their career development and must be able to freely express their assessment. The independence of the evaluation function underpins the free access to information		1. C. Structural Independence: The CED's governance, organization and resources make it independent from the IFI's Management. 1. G. Rights of Access: The CED has unrestricted access to the IFI's records, staff and counterparties. 5. A. Reporting Line: The CED transmits its products to the Board, without Management	Independence is one of the Principles of Evaluation in the GEF. The Policy clearly and repeatedly states the independence of the EO, expressed at the organizational level through the link between EO and the Council, with no line of reporting to the Secretariat. An MoU between GEF CEO and EO Director established the rules for EO independence. At the time, the distinction between	Independence is one of the Principles of Evaluation in the GEF. The Policy clearly and repeatedly states the independence of the evaluation function in the GEF and affirms that the responsibility for IEO independence rests with the GEF Council. This is also stated in the GEF Instrument amended in May	The lack of reference to no requirement for clearance is irrelevant as the independence of EO/IEO is clearly stated throughout the policy.

Main and sub-criteria; areas of focus	UNEG Norms, 2016	Relevant Standards 2016 (only complementary ones)	Standard Operational Practices, ECG Good practice, 2012	GEF 2010 Evaluation Policy	GEF 2019 Evaluation Policy	Comments and gaps
	<p>that evaluators should have on the evaluation subject. Organizational independence requires that the central evaluation function is positioned independently from management functions, carries the responsibility of setting the evaluation agenda and is provided with adequate resources to conduct its work. Organizational independence also necessitates that evaluation managers have full discretion to directly submit evaluation reports to the appropriate level of decision-making and that they should report directly to an organization's governing body and/or the executive head. Independence is vested in the Evaluation Head to directly commission, produce, publish and disseminate duly quality-assured evaluation reports in the public domain without undue influence by any party.</p>		<p>clearance or Management-imposed restrictions on content: 5.B. Primary Stakeholder: The CED's primary stakeholder is the Board.</p>	<p>organizational and behavioural independence was not yet made in the UNEG N&amp;S. The Policy also states that evaluation reports are directly and simultaneously issued by EO to Council and Secretariat without previous clearance. EO Director has the full responsibility for reporting to the Council, for all EO evaluation activities, and for the staff and budget of the Office.</p>	<p>2014: Behavioural independence is mentioned only in relation to evaluation teams. The Policy also states that evaluation reports are directly and simultaneously issued by EO to Council and Secretariat, but it does not mention that no previous clearance is required.</p>	
<p><i>Disclosure policy</i></p>		<p>St. 1.5 - The organization should have an explicit disclosure policy for evaluations. To bolster the organization's public accountability, key evaluation products (including annual reports, evaluation plans, terms of reference, evaluation reports and management</p>	<p>5.E. Disclosure: The CED's disclosure policy is explicit, and consistent with the IPI's general disclosure policy.</p>	<p>Disclosure is one of the Principles of evaluation in the GEF, and the Policy states that this applies both to evaluation reports by EO as well as to access for EO to relevant information and reports by Partner Agencies</p>	<p>Disclosure is one of the Principles of evaluation in the GEF, and the Policy states that in this respect, IEO follows the World Bank Policy on Access to Information.</p>	<p>The WB Access to Information Policy does not fully cover the requirements of an evaluation function. IEO should develop its own Disclosure Policy and</p>

Main and sub-criteria; areas of focus	UNEG Norms, 2016	Relevant Standards 2016 (only complementary ones)	UNEG Standard Operational Practices, ECG Good practice, 2012	GEF 2010 Evaluation Policy	GEF 2019 Evaluation Policy	Comments and gaps
Governance and Independence of the CED		responses) should be publicly accessible.	1.F. Scope of Responsibility: The CED reports on all determinants of the IFI's operational results.	The Policy governs the evaluation function across the Partnership, including Partner Agencies, with regards to GEF-funded activities.	The Policy governs the evaluation function across the Partnership, including Partner Agencies, with regards to GEF-funded activities. IEO has the mandate to evaluate all GEF-funded activities. The GEF Instrument also states that the "Council shall...ensure that GEF policies, programs, operational strategies and projects are monitored and evaluated on a regular basis"	include it in a future version.

Main and sub-criteria; areas of focus	UNEG Norms, 2016	Relevant Standards 2016 (only complementary ones)	UNEG Standard Operational Practices, ECG Good practice, 2012	GEF 2010 Evaluation Policy	GEF 2019 Evaluation Policy	Comments and gaps
<p><b>B. Credibility</b></p>	<p>N. 3 - Evaluations must be credible. Credibility is grounded on independence, impartiality and a rigorous methodology. Key elements of credibility include transparent evaluation processes, inclusive approaches involving relevant stakeholders and robust quality assurance systems. Evaluation results (or findings) and recommendations are derived from — or informed by — the conscientious, explicit and judicious use of the best available, objective, reliable and valid data and by accurate quantitative and qualitative analysis of evidence. Credibility requires that evaluations are ethically conducted and managed by evaluators that exhibit professional and cultural competence.</p>			<p>Credibility is one of the Principles of Evaluation in the GEF. The Policy makes an explicit commitment to credibility in evaluation, which depends on consistency and dependability of data. The Policy also mentions the need for transparency, rigour, ethical concerns, and professional competencies, though not explicitly linked to the concept of credibility.</p>	<p>Credibility is one of the Principles of Evaluation in the GEF. The Policy makes an explicit commitment to credibility in evaluation, which depends on consistency and dependability of data. The Policy also mentions the need for transparency, rigour, ethical concerns, and professional competencies, though not explicitly linked to the concept of credibility.</p>	

Main and sub-criteria; areas of focus	UNEG Norms, 2016	Relevant Standards 2016 (only complementary ones)	UNEG Standard Operational Practices, ECG Good practice, 2012	GEF 2010 Evaluation Policy	GEF 2019 Evaluation Policy	Comments and gaps
<i>Impartiality</i>	N. 5 - The key elements of impartiality are objectivity, professional integrity and absence of bias. The requirement for impartiality exists at all stages of the evaluation process, including planning an evaluation, formulating the mandate and scope, selecting the evaluation team, providing access to stakeholders, conducting the evaluation and formulating findings and recommendations. Evaluators need to be impartial, implying that evaluation team members must not have been (or expect to be in the near future) directly responsible for the policy setting, design or management of the evaluation subject.		3. D. Conflict of Interest: The CED ensures that its staff have no conflict of interest in their evaluation work.	Impartiality is one of the principles of evaluation in the GEF. It is stated that impartiality must inform the entire evaluation process. Absence of bias is also mentioned, though no reference is made to integrity.	Impartiality is one of the principles of evaluation in the GEF. It is stated that impartiality must inform the entire evaluation process. Absence of bias is also mentioned. With regards to integrity, the Policy provides a definition strongly skewed towards the ethical elements of integrity, which corresponds to the definition of Ethical behaviour in the 2010 Policy. In this respect, EO issued in 2007 An Ethical Guidelines for evaluation that delves into the fine detail of the topic.	

Main and sub-criteria; areas of focus	UNEG Norms, 2016	Relevant UNEG Standards 2016 (only complementary ones)	Standard Operational Practices, ECG Good practice, 2012	GEF 2010 Evaluation Policy	GEF 2019 Evaluation Policy	Comments and gaps
Ethics	N. 6 - Evaluation must be conducted with the highest standards of integrity and respect for the beliefs, manners and customs of the social and cultural environment; for human rights and gender equality; and for the 'do no harm' principle for humanitarian assistance. Evaluators must respect the rights of institutions and individuals to provide information in confidence, must ensure that sensitive data is protected and that it cannot be traced to its source and must validate statements made in the report with those who provided the relevant information. Evaluators should obtain informed consent for the use of private information from those who provide it. When evidence of wrongdoing is uncovered, it must be reported discreetly to a competent body (such as the relevant office of audit or investigation).	St. 3.2 - All those engaged in designing, conducting and managing evaluations should conform to agreed ethical standards in order to ensure overall credibility and the responsible use of power and resources		The policy includes an explicit clause on Ethical behaviour in evaluations.	The Policy does not make any reference to ethical behaviour, although as stated above, the definition of integrity fully embraces ethical considerations, which corresponds to the definition of Ethical behaviour in the 2010 Policy.	
Transparency	N. 7 - Transparency is an essential element of evaluation that establishes trust and builds confidence, enhances stakeholder ownership and increases public accountability. Evaluation products should be publicly accessible.			Transparency is one of the Principles of evaluation in the GEF and the Policy associates it with clarity of communication about the evaluation, consultation with stakeholders, access to documents.	Transparency is one of the Principles of evaluation in the GEF and the Policy associates it with clarity of communication about the evaluation, consultation with stakeholders,	

Main and sub-criteria; areas of focus	UNEG Norms, 2016	Relevant Standards 2016 (only complementary ones)	UNEG Standard Operational Practices, ECG Good practice, 2012	GEF 2010 Evaluation Policy	GEF 2019 Evaluation Policy	Comments and gaps
C. Utility	N. 2 - In commissioning and conducting an evaluation, there should be a clear intention to use the resulting analysis, conclusions or recommendations to inform decisions and actions. The utility of evaluation is manifest through its use in making relevant and timely contributions to organizational learning, informed decision-making processes and accountability for results. Evaluations could also be used to contribute beyond the organization by generating knowledge and empowering stakeholders.			Utility is one of the Principles of evaluation in the GEF. The Policy refers to virtually all the elements included in the Norm, with the exception of empowerment.	access to documents. Utility is one of the Principles of evaluation in the GEF. The Policy refers to virtually all the elements included in the Norm, with the exception of empowerment.	
Timeliness and intentionality		St. 4.1 - Evaluations should be designed to ensure that they provide timely, valid and reliable information that will be relevant to the subject being assessed and should clearly identify the underlying intentionality.		The policy defines timeliness as an important feature of evaluations. Intentionality is not explicitly mentioned but is subsumed within Utility.	The policy defines timeliness as an important feature of evaluations. Intentionality is not explicitly mentioned but is subsumed within Utility.	

Main and sub-criteria; areas of focus	UNEG Norms, 2016	Relevant Standards 2016 (only complementary ones)	UNEG Standard Operational Practices, ECG Good practice, 2012	GEF 2010 Evaluation Policy	GEF 2019 Evaluation Policy	Comments and gaps
<i>1. Evaluation Policy and governance of the evaluation function</i>						
<i>Enabling environment</i>	N. 11 - Evaluation requires an enabling environment that includes an organizational culture that values evaluation as a basis for accountability, learning and evidence-based decision-making; a firm commitment from organizational leadership to use, publicize and follow up on evaluation outcomes; and recognition of evaluation as a key corporate function for achieving results and public accountability. Creating an enabling environment also entails providing predictable and adequate resources to the evaluation function.			The Policy assigns to the Council the responsibility for creating an enabling environment for evaluation in the GEF, including with regards to independence, transparency, freedom from pressure and career repercussion for staff, disclosure, systematic consideration of evaluation reports, etc.	The Policy assigns to the Council the responsibility for creating an enabling environment for evaluation in the GEF, including with regards to independence, transparency, freedom from pressure and career repercussion for staff, disclosure, financial resources, systematic consideration of evaluation reports, etc.	
<i>Institutional framework for evaluation</i>		St. 1.1 - The organization should have an adequate institutional framework for the effective management of its evaluation function.		The Policy clearly states the separation of EO from the Secretariat apart from administrative issues. As of May 2014, the GEF Instrument also clarifies the independence of EO/IEO from the	The Policy refers to the GEF Instrument that established the independence of IEO from the Secretariat, while being part of it.	



Main and sub-criteria; areas of focus	UNEG Norms, 2016	Relevant UNEG Standards 2016 (only complementary ones)	Standard Operational Practices, ECG Good practice, 2012	GEF 2010 Evaluation Policy	GEF 2019 Evaluation Policy	Comments and gaps
<i>Evaluation policy</i>	N. 12 - Every organization should establish an explicit evaluation policy. Taking into account the specificities of the organization's requirements, the evaluation policy should include a clear explanation of the purpose, concepts, rules and use of evaluation within the organization; the institutional framework and roles and responsibilities; measures to safeguard evaluation independence and public accountability; benchmarks for financing the evaluation function that are commensurate with the size and function of the organization; measures to ensure the quality and the use of evaluations and post-evaluation follow-up; a framework for decentralized evaluations; where applicable; and provision for periodic peer review or external assessment. The evaluation policy should be approved by the governing body and/ or the executive head to ensure it has a formally recognized status at the highest levels of the organization. References to evaluators in the policy should encompass staff of the evaluation function as well as evaluation consultants.	St. 1.2 - Organizations should establish an evaluation policy that is periodically reviewed and updated in order to support the evaluation function's increased adherence to the UNEG Norms and Standards for Evaluation.	1.A CED Mandate: The CED's mandate is specifically approved through a Board resolution. 1.B Mandate Coverage: The CED mandate establishes its mission, scope of responsibilities and independence.	The 2010 Policy includes provisions for virtually all the features and elements listed in the Norm. Benchmarks for financial resources are not made explicit, although reference to 'adequate resources' is made. The M&E Policy was endorsed by the Council and fully reflects the Council's responsibility and oversight over the evaluation function in the GEF.	The 2019 Policy includes provisions for virtually all the features and elements listed in the Norm. Benchmarks for financial resources are not made explicit, although reference to 'adequate resources' is made. The Policy was endorsed by the Council and fully reflects the Council's responsibility and oversight over the evaluation function in the GEF.	The only weakness is found in the definition of EO/LEOs budget. This could be easily amended through a fixed share of GEF replenishment allocated to IEO.
<i>Responsibility for the evaluation function</i>	N. 13 - An organization's governing body and/or its executive head are responsible for ensuring the establishment of a duly independent, competent and adequately resourced evaluation function to serve its		1.D. Oversight: The CED mandate establishes that the Board oversees the CED's work.	The Policy meets all the requirements established in the Norm and establishes that EO's budget	The Policy meets all the requirements established in the Norm and	See previous point

Main and sub-criteria; areas of focus	UNEG Norms, 2016	Relevant Standards 2016 (only complementary ones)	UNEG Standard Operational Practices, ECG Good practice, 2012	GEF 2010 Evaluation Policy	GEF 2019 Evaluation Policy	Comments and gaps
	<p>governance and management needs. The evaluation budget should be commensurate to the size and function of the organization.</p> <p>The governing body and/or the executive head are responsible for appointing a professionally competent head of evaluation and for fostering an enabling environment that allows the head of evaluation to plan, design, manage and conduct evaluation activities in alignment with the UNEG Norms and Standards for Evaluation. The governing body and/or the executive head are responsible for ensuring that evaluators, evaluation managers and the head of the evaluation function have the freedom to conduct their work without risking their career development. Management of the human and financial resources allocated to evaluation should lie with the head of evaluation in order to ensure that the evaluation function is staffed by professionals with evaluation competencies in line with the UNEG Competency Framework.</p> <p>Where a decentralized evaluation function exists, the central evaluation function is responsible for establishing a framework that provides guidance, quality assurance, technical assistance and professionalization support.</p>		<p>3.A. Selection: The CED's staff are appointed by the CED's head or designee.</p> <p>3.C. Opportunities: Staff should not be career disadvantaged by having worked in the CED.</p> <p>4.B. Determination of Budget: The CED's budget is approved by the Board.</p> <p>4.C. Adequacy of Budget: The CED's budget is commensurate with its work program.</p>	<p>should be endorsed by Council. With regards to financial resources, however, mention is only made of 'adequate resources'.</p>	<p>establishes that EO's budget should be endorsed by Council. With regards to financial resources, however, mention is only made of 'adequate resources'.</p>	
<p>2. Independent leadership of the CED</p>			<p>A. Appointment: The CED's head is selected and</p>	<p>The Policy meets all Good Practices on the appointment,</p>	<p>The Policy meets all Good Practices on the</p>	

Main and sub-criteria; areas of focus	UNEG Norms, 2016	Relevant Standards 2016 (only complementary ones)	UNEG Standard Operational Practices, ECG Good practice, 2012	GEF 2010 Evaluation Policy	GEF 2019 Evaluation Policy	Comments and gaps
			<p>appointed by the Board or representative thereof.</p> <p>B. Contract Renewal: Renewal of the CED head's contract can only be authorised by the Board.</p> <p>C. Termination: Only the Board is able to terminate the contract of the CED's head on the basis of predefined policy.</p> <p>D. Authority &amp; Remuneration: The CED's head holds grade-rank and remuneration comparable to the level immediately below Vice-President or equivalent.</p> <p>E. Performance Assessment: The performance of the CED's head is assessed by the Board.</p>	<p>contract renewal, performance assessment and termination of EO Director, and possibly with regards to rank and remuneration.</p>	<p>appointment, contract renewal, performance assessment and termination of EO Director, and possibly with regards to rank and remuneration.</p>	

Main and sub-criteria; areas of focus	UNEG Norms, 2016	Relevant UNEG Standards 2016 (only complementary ones)	Standard Operational Practices, ECG Good practice, 2012	GEF 2010 Evaluation Policy	GEF 2019 Evaluation Policy	Comments and gaps
Head of Evaluation		St. 2.1 - The head of evaluation has the primary responsibility for ensuring that UNEG Norms and Standards for Evaluation are upheld, that the evaluation function is fully operational and duly independent, and that evaluation work is conducted according to the highest professional standards.	4.D. Accountability and Transparency: The CED is accountable for its application of financial resources.	The Policy is in line with the GPS.	The Policy is in line with the GPS.	
Responsiveness of the evaluation function		St. 2.3 - The head of evaluation should provide global leadership, standard setting and oversight of the evaluation function in order to ensure that it dynamically adapts to new developments and changing internal and external needs. The management of the	Virtually all the requirements established in the Standard are met in the Policy, through various principles, clauses and statements. The Evaluation Capacity Development seems to refer here to internal/corporate	Virtually all the requirements established in the Standard are met in the Policy, through various principles, clauses and statements. Only Evaluation Capacity Development is	Virtually all the requirements established in the Standard are met in the Policy, through various principles, clauses and statements. Only Evaluation Capacity Development is	

*Third Professional Peer Review of the GEF Independent Evaluation Function, Annex 7*

Main and sub-criteria; areas of focus	UNEG Norms, 2016	Relevant Standards 2016 (only complementary ones)	UNEG Standard Operational Practices, ECG Good practice, 2012	GEF 2010 Evaluation Policy	GEF 2019 Evaluation Policy	Comments and gaps
		evaluation function should include: - Raising awareness and/or building evaluation capacity; - Facilitating and managing of evaluation networks; - Designing and implementing evaluation methodologies and systems; - Ensuring the maintenance of institutional memory through user-friendly mechanisms; and - Promoting the systematic compilation of lessons.		capacity development, which is indirectly addressed by the Policy.	not mentioned at all in this Policy.	

Main and sub-criteria; areas of focus	UNEG Norms, 2016	Relevant Standards 2016 (only complementary ones)	UNEG Standard Operational Practices, ECG Good practice, 2012	GEF 2010 Evaluation Policy	GEF 2019 Evaluation Policy	Comments and gaps
<b>2. Management of evaluations</b>						
<b>Professionalism</b>	N. 10 - Evaluations should be conducted with professionalism and integrity. Professionalism should contribute towards the credibility of evaluators, evaluation managers and evaluation heads, as well as the evaluation function. Key aspects include access to knowledge; education and training; adherence to ethics and to these norms and standards; utilization of evaluation competencies; and recognition of knowledge, skills and experience. This should be supported by an enabling environment, institutional structures and adequate resources.		3. B. Skills: The CED's staff should have adequate skills to conduct evaluations.	The Policy calls for a competent EO Director, for the credibility of evaluations and for the competence of evaluators who contribute to all evaluations of GEF-funded activities.	The Policy calls for a competent EO Director, for the credibility of evaluations and for the competence of evaluators who contribute to all evaluations of GEF-funded activities.	
<b>Competencies</b>		St. 3.1 - Individuals engaged in designing, conducting and managing evaluation activities should possess the core competencies required for their role in the evaluation process.		The Policy refers to senior and competent evaluators, and to the recruitment of local evaluators whenever possible	The Policy refers to senior and competent evaluators, and to the recruitment of local evaluators whenever possible	

Main and sub-criteria; areas of focus	UNEG Norms, 2016	Relevant Standards 2016 (only complementary ones)	UNEG Standard Operational Practices, ECG Good practice, 2012	GEF 2010 Evaluation Policy	GEF 2019 Evaluation Policy	Comments and gaps
Selection and composition of evaluation teams		St. 4.8 - The evaluation team should be selected through an open and transparent process, taking into account the required competencies, diversity in perspectives and accessibility to the local population. The core members of the team should be experienced evaluators.		Within the Principle of Impartiality, provisions are made for the impartial and unbiased selection of evaluators.	Within the Principle of Impartiality, provisions are made for the impartial and unbiased selection of evaluators. Behavioural independence of evaluators is also required.	
3. Evaluation Planning and reporting		St. 1.3 - Evaluations should have a mechanism to inform the governing body and/or management on the evaluation plan and on the progress made in plan implementation. The evaluation plan should be based on an explicit evaluation policy and/or strategy, prepared with utility and practicality in mind and developed with a clear purpose, scope and intended use for each evaluation (or each cluster of evaluations).	4.A. Work Program: The CED consults on its work priorities, but determines its work program independently of Management.	The Policy clarifies that EO Director presents both a four-year and an annual work-plan and budget to GEF Council for discussion and endorsement. The scope of each evaluation product is also described. Adequate M&E plans and resources are also foreseen and consultation with stakeholders is foreseen. Minimum Requirement 4 provides for the consultation,	The Policy clarifies that EO Director presents both a four-year and an annual work-plan and budget to GEF Council for discussion and endorsement. The scope of each evaluation product is also described. Adequate M&E plans and resources are also foreseen and consultation with stakeholders is foreseen.	The lack of contingency plans for ad-hoc evaluation requests contributes to the confusion and lack of clarity and transparency in IEO management, and this was frequently mentioned by IEO staff during the interviews.

Main and sub-criteria; areas of focus	UNEG Norms, 2016	Relevant UNEG Standards 2016 (only complementary ones)	Standard Operational Practices, ECG Good practice, 2012	GEF 2010 Evaluation Policy	GEF 2019 Evaluation Policy	Comments and gaps
		<p>Plan preparations should include adequate consultations with stakeholders, especially the intended users - The plan should be supported with adequate human and financial resources in order to ensure the quality of evaluations conducted under the framework.</p> <p>- The evaluation plan should have established, clear guidelines to manage and finance ad-hoc requests for evaluations.</p>		<p>engagement and participation of GEF Operational Focal Points at country level as relevant. There is no provision for contingency management of ad-hoc evaluation requests, although M&amp;E Plans are considered dynamic instruments that may need adjustments.</p>	<p>Minimum Requirement 4 provides for the consultation, engagement and participation of GEF Operational Focal Points at country level as relevant. There is no mention of contingency plans for ad-hoc evaluation requests.</p>	
<p><b>4. Evaluation quality</b></p> <p><i>Human rights and gender equality</i></p>	<p>N. 8 - The universally recognized values and principles of human rights and gender equality need to be integrated into all stages of an evaluation. It is the responsibility of evaluators and evaluation managers to ensure that these values are respected, addressed and promoted, underpinning the commitment to the principle of 'no-one left behind'.</p>			<p>The Policy does not make any provision to integrate values and principles of human rights and gender equality in the GEF evaluation function.</p>	<p>The Policy makes provisions to integrate values and principles of gender equality in the GEF evaluation function, but it includes no reference to human rights nor to the SDGs and the principle of</p>	<p>The absence of references to gender equality in the 2010 Policy was a serious gap. In the 2019 Policy, despite the strong improvement on gender issues, the gap</p>



Main and sub-criteria; areas of focus	UNEG Norms, 2016	Relevant Standards 2016 (only complementary ones)	UNEG Standard Operational Practices, ECG Good practice, 2012	GEF 2010 Evaluation Policy	GEF 2019 Evaluation Policy	Comments and gaps
					no-one left behind.	remains on human rights, also considering GEF's work with Indigenous Groups and the negative impact of climate change on rights such as Right to Food and Right to Water.
Evaluation guidelines		St. 2.2 - The head of evaluation is responsible for ensuring the provision of appropriate evaluation guidelines. Evaluation guidelines should follow the UNEG Norms and Standards and incorporate its relevant elements. Although guidelines may need to be prepared for different types of evaluations or for different types of users, the guidelines should generally cover: - The roles and responsibilities in		The Policy assigns responsibility to EO to develop guidelines for the implementation of the policy and on other aspects of evaluation.	The Policy assigns responsibility to IEO to develop guidelines for the implementation of the policy and on other aspects of evaluation.	

Main and sub-criteria; areas of focus	UNEG Norms, 2016	Relevant UNEG Standards 2016 (only complementary ones)	Standard Operational Practices, ECG Good practice, 2012	GEF 2010 Evaluation Policy	GEF 2019 Evaluation Policy	Comments and gaps
<p><i>Terms of reference</i></p>		<p>setting up, managing, conducting, quality controlling, reporting and disseminating evaluations;                      - The process of evaluation;                      - Stakeholder involvement;                      - Guidance on methodologies and quality control;                      - Reporting,                      dissemination and the promotion of learning;                      For decentralized evaluations, the guidance should cover overall planning and resourcing.</p>		<p>The Policy refers to evaluation TORs and Approach Papers and the consultation process for their preparation, but only refers to dissemination plans with regards to its contents.</p>	<p>The Policy refers to evaluation TORs and Approach Papers and the consultation process for their preparation, but only refers to dissemination plans with regards to its contents.</p>	<p>No significant gap.</p>

Main and sub-criteria; areas of focus	UNEG Norms, 2016	Relevant UNEG Standards 2016 (only complementary ones)	Standard Operational Practices, ECG Good practice, 2012	GEF 2010 Evaluation Policy	GEF 2019 Evaluation Policy	Comments and gaps
Evaluation scope and objectives		St. 4.4 - Evaluation scope and objectives should follow from the evaluation purpose and should be realistic and achievable in light of resources available and the information that can be collected.		The Policy defines in detail the purpose of evaluations, but it does not discuss topics such as scope and objectives.	The Policy defines in detail the purpose of evaluations, but it does not discuss topics such as scope and objectives.	No significant gap.
Methodology		St. 4.5 - Evaluation methodologies must be sufficiently rigorous such that the evaluation responds to the scope and objectives, is designed to answer evaluation questions and leads to a complete, fair and unbiased assessment.		The Policy calls for rigorous evaluation methodology and through Minimum Requirement 3, for the description of the evaluation methodology in Project and Program Evaluations.	The Policy calls for rigorous evaluation methodology and through Minimum Requirement 3, for the description of the evaluation methodology in project Terminal Evaluations.	

Main and sub-criteria; areas of focus	UNEG Norms, 2016	Relevant UNEG Standards 2016 (only complementary ones)	Standard Operational Practices, ECG Good practice, 2012	GEF 2010 Evaluation Policy	GEF 2019 Evaluation Policy	Comments and gaps
Stakeholder engagement and reference groups		St. 4.6 - Inclusive and diverse stakeholder engagement in the planning, design, conduct and follow-up of evaluations is critical to ensure ownership, relevance, credibility and the use of evaluation. Reference groups and other stakeholder engagement mechanisms should be designed for this purpose.	1.E. Consultative Framework: The CED has full autonomy, but works in consultation with the IFI's operational departments; 5.C. Other Stakeholders: The CED is also guided by the interests of other relevant internal and external stakeholders.	The Policy frequently mentions stakeholders as part of the M&E process, and broadly encourages/envisages engagement with them. Through Minimum Requirement 4: Engagement of Operational Focal Points, it also clarifies how Partner Agencies should engage with these. No specific mention is made of EO engagement with OFPs.	The Policy frequently mentions stakeholders as part of the Evaluation, including a definition of 'stakeholder engagement' which is fostered. Through Minimum Requirement 4: Engagement of Operational Focal Points, it also clarifies how Partner Agencies should engage with these. No specific mention is made of EO engagement with OFPs.	
Evaluation report and products		St. 4.9 - The final evaluation report should be logically structured and contain evidence-based findings, conclusions and recommendations. The products emanating from evaluations should be designed to the		Through its Minimum Requirement 3: Project and Program Evaluation, the Policy provides guidance on the conduct of an evaluation and on the report structure. Provisions for utility are included among	Through its Minimum Requirement 3: Project Terminal Evaluations, the Policy provides guidance on the conduct of an evaluation and on the report structure.	This is a minor gap, also considering the diversity of IEO's reports.

Main and sub-criteria; areas of focus	UNEG Norms, 2016	Relevant Standards 2016 (only complementary ones)	UNEG Standard Operational Practices, ECG Good practice, 2012	GEF 2010 Evaluation Policy	GEF 2019 Evaluation Policy	Comments and gaps
		needs of its intended users.		the Principles of Evaluation in the GEF.	Provisions for utility are included among the Principles of Evaluation in the GEF. No provisions are included for IEO managed evaluations.	
<i>Recommendations</i>		St. 4.10 - Recommendations should be firmly based on evidence and analysis, clear, results-oriented and realistic in terms of implementation.		The Policy does not make any provision for the quality of recommendations.	The Policy does not make any provision for the quality of recommendations; the analysis so far suggests that only the 2017 Guidelines for Terminal Evaluations provide some guidance on the quality of recommendations, and this does not affect IEO's evaluations.	
<i>Quality assurance systems</i>		St. 5.1 - The head of evaluation should ensure that there is an appropriate quality assurance system.		The Policy includes an explicit provision on this topic.	The Policy includes an explicit provision on this topic.	
<i>5. Follow-up and use of evaluations</i>						

Main and sub-criteria; areas of focus	UNEG Norms, 2016	Relevant Standards 2016 (only complementary ones)	UNEG Standard Operational Practices, ECG Good practice, 2012	GEF 2010 Evaluation Policy	GEF 2019 Evaluation Policy	Comments and gaps
<p><i>Evaluation use and follow-up</i></p>	<p>N. 14 - Organizations should promote evaluation use and follow-up, using an interactive process that involves all stakeholders. Evaluation requires an explicit response by the governing authorities and/or management addressed by its recommendations that clearly states responsibilities and accountabilities. Management should integrate evaluation results and recommendations into its policies and programmes. The implementation of evaluation recommendations should be systematically followed up. A periodic report on the status of the implementation of the evaluation recommendations should be presented to the governing bodies and/or the head of the organization.</p>	<p>St. 1.4 - The organization should ensure that appropriate mechanisms are in place to ensure that management responds to evaluation recommendations. The mechanisms should outline concrete actions to be undertaken in the management response and in the follow-up to recommendation implementation.</p>	<p>5. D. Recommendations: The CED monitors and reports on the implementation of CED recommendations by Management.</p>	<p>The Policy makes thorough provisions on the Management Response and the Management Action Record, and the regular presentation of the report on the status of progress in implementing recommendations.</p>	<p>The Policy makes thorough provisions on the Management Response and the Management Action Record, and the regular presentation of the report on the status of progress in implementing recommendations.</p>	
<p><i>Management response and follow up</i></p>				<p>The Policy is fully explicit and clear about the need for mechanisms to be established for the preparation of Management Responses to evaluation recommendations.</p>	<p>The Policy is fully explicit and clear about the need for mechanisms to be established for the preparation of Management Responses to evaluation recommendations.</p>	

Main and sub-criteria; areas of focus	UNEG Norms, 2016	Relevant UNEG Standards 2016 (only complementary ones)	Standard Operational Practices, ECG Good practice, 2012	GEF 2010 Evaluation Policy	GEF 2019 Evaluation Policy	Comments and gaps
<i>Communication and dissemination</i>		St. 4.11 - Communication and dissemination are integral and essential parts of evaluations. Evaluation functions should have an effective strategy for communication and dissemination that is focused on enhancing evaluation use.	5.F. Dissemination: The CED employs an appropriate range of dissemination activities for its disclosed products.	The Policy is explicit and clear about the need for adequate and transparent communication and dissemination of evaluation findings and reports. Evaluation Approach Papers/Tors are required to also include a dissemination plan.	The Policy is explicit and clear about the need for adequate and transparent communication and dissemination of evaluation findings and reports. Evaluation Approach Papers/Tors are required to also include a dissemination plan.	
<b>6. Networking and external relations</b>						
<i>National Evaluation Capacity Development</i>	N. 9 - The effective use of evaluation can make valuable contributions to accountability and learning and thereby justify actions to strengthen national evaluation capacities. In line with General Assembly resolution A/RES/69/237 on building capacity for the evaluation of development activities at the country level, national evaluation capacities should be supported upon the request of Member States.			The Policy explicitly encourages GEF Partner Agencies to contribute to National Evaluation Capacity Development at the local level, with particular attention to evaluation of environmental themes.	There is no reference to National Evaluation Capacity Development.	NECD is not a must for evaluation functions and it is perfectly acceptable that IEO decided not to include it within its mandate.