



Independent
Evaluation Office
GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT FACILITY

GEF Institutional Policies and Engagement



Volume 2: Policies and Engagement Evaluation—
Portfolio Review Analysis

July 2022

Policies and Engagement Evaluation

Portfolio Review Analysis

Portfolio Analysts:

Fanny Teppe

Jose Miguel Lopez

February 26, 2021

Table of Contents

<i>I.</i>	<i>Introduction</i>	1
<i>II.</i>	<i>Objectives and Methodology</i>	1
<i>III.</i>	<i>Main Messages</i>	4
<i>IV.</i>	<i>Findings</i>	6
1.	What evidence is there in project and program documents that the policy requirements (stakeholder engagement, gender and safeguards) are being met during three phases in the project/program cycle: identification, design, and implementation? Have there been changes in compliance over time? And are there any trends that emerge in terms of adherence between different agencies, focal areas, or geographies?	6
a.	Compliance with the Stakeholder Engagement Policy	6
b.	Compliance with the Gender Equality Policy	15
c.	Compliance with the Safeguards Policy.....	21
2.	To what extent are stakeholder interests represented in project documentation?	24
a.	What stakeholder groups are typically engaged during the different project phases (identification, design, implementation), and with what frequency?	24
b.	What types of engagement are used by the GEF at different phases in the project cycle? Do GEF projects tend to use one-way engagement such as knowledge sharing, or is there evidence that the GEF is using two-way engagement to give agency and voice to stakeholders?.....	25
d.	To what extent do we see evidence of inclusive and meaningful stakeholder participation in project or program documents? ²	26
e.	How often do GEF projects/programs describe efforts to engage with persons with disabilities and if so, what type of engagement typically occurs?	26
3.	Are any of the intermediate outcomes, as described in the Theory of Change of the Stakeholder Engagement Policy reflected in project and program documents?	27
4.	Are there any lessons emerging from early implementation of the new policies?.....	27
5.	To what extent do the instruments associated with the policies build off one another/show coherence (Stakeholder Engagement Plan, Gender Action Plan, Environmental and Social Management Plan?)	27
6.	To what extent is there evidence linking stakeholder engagement with project and program outcomes?	27
a.	Is there a correlation between projects that have “good” stakeholder engagement and high outcome or sustainability ratings?.....	27
	<i>Annex I: Sample statistics</i>	29
	<i>Annex II: Portfolio Analysis Protocol</i>	33
	<i>Annex III: Overview of the Stakeholder Engagement Policy Compliance Results</i>	40
	<i>Annex IV: Overview of the Gender Equality Policy Compliance Results</i>	50
	<i>Annex V: Overview of the Safeguards Policy Compliance Results</i>	54

I. Introduction

The purpose of this portfolio review is to identify and extract data from project and program documents for GEF-financed activities to assess the effectiveness and impact of the Stakeholder Engagement Policy, the Gender Policy and the Safeguards Policy from 2014 – 2020.

II. Objectives and Methodology

The review was guided by the following questions related to the effectiveness and impact of the policies.

1. What evidence is there in project and program documents that the policy requirements (stakeholder engagement, gender and safeguards) are being met during three phases in the project/program cycle: identification, design, and implementation?
 - a. Have there been changes in compliance over time and if so, to what extent does this align with key milestones related to the issuance of policies or guidance?
 - b. Are there trends that emerge in terms of adherence between different agencies, focal areas, or geographies?¹
2. To what extent are stakeholder interests represented in project documentation?
 - a. What stakeholder groups are typically engaged during the different project phases (identification, design, implementation), and with what frequency?
 - b. What types of engagement are used by the GEF at different phases in the project cycle? Do GEF projects tend to use one-way engagement such as knowledge sharing, or is there evidence that the GEF is using two-way engagement to give agency and voice to stakeholders (examples)?
 - c. To what extent is there evidence in project documents that plans for stakeholder engagement were carried out and reported on during implementation?
 - d. To what extent do we see evidence of inclusive and meaningful stakeholder participation in project or program documents?²
 - e. How often do GEF projects/programs describe efforts to engage with persons with disabilities and if so, what type of engagement typically occurs?
3. Are any of the intermediate outcomes, as described in the Theory of Change, reflected in project and program documents? These include projects that show: 1) enhanced ownership and accountability; 2) socio-economic needs met; 3) partnerships built; and 4) skill, experience and knowledge of stakeholders harnessed.
4. Are there any lessons emerging from early implementation of the new policies?
5. To what extent do the instruments associated with the policies build off one another/show coherence (Stakeholder Engagement Plan, Gender Action Plan, Environmental and Social Management Plan?)
6. To what extent is there evidence linking stakeholder engagement with project and program outcomes?

¹ This line of inquiry will provide data for a sub-question related to KQ 2(KQ 2: To what extent is there buy-in across the Partnership and support for implementing these policies?): Across the partnership, are there patterns of deviation in the way policy requirements are enacted?

² Based off the elements of meaningful and inclusive engagement in the Stakeholder Engagement Policy.

- a. Is there a correlation between projects that have “good” stakeholder engagement and high outcome or sustainability ratings?
- b. How often do terminal evaluations include stakeholder engagement as a factor for success? Is there any information about contextual factors that matter for good stakeholder engagement?

To answer the above questions, the desk review conducted a structured portfolio review of a random sample of projects. The universe under study covers GEF-financed activities that were CEO endorsed or approved from January 1, 2014 to July 10, 2020. Covering a six-year period allows the evaluation to look at the application of the policy at the project/program level for three cohorts corresponding with milestones for the Stakeholder Engagement Policy. These cut-off dates also allow us to cover projects issued under the updated Gender Equality policy (2018) and Safeguards policy (2019).

- **Cohort 1 (2014 – 2018):** Projects subject to the 1996 Public Involvement Policy, after guidelines were issued. This cohort is restricted to GEF-6 projects only. For these projects a quality at entry was conducted for projects that are still under implementation, and a full review was done for completed projects.
- **Cohort 2 (2018 – 2020):** Projects that were CEO endorsed after the issuance of the updated Stakeholder Engagement Policy on July 1, 2018 but were financed during the GEF-6 replenishment phase. The policies are unclear as to their applicability to this cohort of projects. The policies are clear on applicability to “newly submitted” projects and to “annual project implementation reports as well as mid-term reviews and terminal evaluations” of projects under implementation. Projects that are in the process of being approved/endorsed are not referenced in the policies. The GEFSEC does not consider that the new policies apply to this cohort. Therefore, these projects allow us to assess whether the requirements from the updated policies might have had spillover effects to projects close to their issuance date. As none of these projects have been completed since their endorsement, only a quality at entry was conducted.
- **Cohort 3 (2018 – 2020):** Projects that were CEO Endorsed between July 1, 2018 and July 20, 2020. This cohort is further restricted to GEF-7 projects only. These projects are subject to the 2018 Stakeholder Engagement Policy and to its requirements. As none of these projects have been completed since their endorsement, only a quality at entry review was conducted.

Several exclusions from the population should be noted. First, the portfolio excludes Small Grants Programme and the National Portfolio Formulation Exercise (NPFE) projects. Second, the universe excludes any project that was either dropped, withdrawn, rejected or is still pending approval. Third, the portfolio was further narrowed down to all medium and full-sized projects that were CEO endorsed or approved between 2014 and 2020. Lastly, the universe is further narrowed down to projects financed during the sixth or seventh GEF replenishment phase. After these exclusions, the universe yielded a total of 571 GEF projects divided into three cohorts (Table 1).

Table 1: Sample sizes

	<i>Universe</i>		<i>Random Sample</i>	
	No.	%	No.	%
Cohort 1 (CEO endorsed after 2014)	346	60.6%	183	54.5%
Cohort 2 (GEF-6 CEO endorsed after 2018)	202	35.4%	130	38.7%
Cohort 3 (GEF-7 CEO endorsed after 2018)	23	4%	23	6.8%
Total	571	100%	336	100%

A stratified sampling approach is used to ensure that each cohort within the population receives proper representation within the randomized sample of projects. Using available online sample calculators³, the evaluation team determined that it needed a sample size of 183 and 130 projects for the first and second cohort respectively to be able to draw inferences about the population with a 95% confidence level and a 5% margin of error (Table 1). Given the small population size of the third cohort, all 23 projects from the population were reviewed. The overall sample used for the evaluation is of 336 projects spanning from 2014 to 2020.

Annex I compares key characteristics of the randomized samples with their respective populations. For cohort 1 and 2, two-sample t-tests are used to determine if the means of the random sample are equal to those of the sample of projects that were not sampled. Ultimately, this allows us to validate that proper randomization was carried out, and that the random sample shares the same characteristics as the population. None of the t-tests presented for cohort 1 are above the critical value of 5% ($t=1.96$) which means that the characteristics of the random sample do not differ from those of the sample of projects that were not sampled. However, similar tests for cohort 2 projects show some imbalances due to the smaller universe ($n=202$). We find that World Bank projects, as well as projects in the Africa (AFR), Europe and Central Asia (ECA), Global (CEX) regions are over-represented in the sample of randomized projects for cohort 2 in comparison to projects that were not sampled from the same universe.

The limitations of this desk review are the following:

- Results obtained can only be extrapolated for the two periods under analysis (2014-2018 and 2018-2020) with a known confidence and margin of error. However, disaggregated findings and conclusions about agencies, focal areas or geographies may not necessarily be representative of the universe of projects in these two categories.
- The sample of projects reviewed is restricted to projects that were CEO Endorsed. This decision was made to ensure that the available documentation to review would be sufficient, and to restrict the review exercise to a reasonable number of projects. Ultimately, this means that the samples of projects reviewed are only representative of the projects that are at least at the CEO Endorsement stage. Due to their recent approval date, the population size of cohort 3 projects at CEO Endorsement stage is limited to 23 projects, which is why the evaluation team decided to review all of them.
- The reviews were conducted by three different evaluation analysts, thus, intercoder reliability can always be a threat to validity. To minimize the effect of this problem upon validity of the findings, the team used a codebook along with guidance. The codebook served as an organizing principle for categorical data analysis. The team also held regular meetings to review common questions and concerns. The team also conducted a mid and final quality check to ensure that no major disagreements in coding criteria were outstanding.

The standardized template used to extract relevant data on the compliance of the three policies can be found in Annexes II.

³ <https://www.surveymonkey.com/mp/sample-size-calculator/>

III. Main Messages

Compliance

Stakeholder Engagement

- Compliance with the Public Involvement and Stakeholder Engagement policies is mostly unmet, yet there is a slight improvement over the project cycle. The application of both policies was found to be insufficient at the identification phase and improves during the design and implementation phases. Due to the recent approval of cohort 3 projects, limited evidence is found on compliance at reporting and evaluation. Evidence also shows that projects from all cohorts comply with the requirement to allocate financial resources to ensure effective stakeholder engagement throughout the project. See Annex II for complete details.
- Results show an increased performance over time which aligns with the issuance of the new policy on Stakeholder Engagement. Among the eight requirements from the new policy which were not applicable to the old policy on Public Involvement, we find an over-time improvement for seven of them (e.g. engaging stakeholders at PIF/CEO stage; a greater diversity of types of engagement is mentioned). Due to data limitations, we are not able to assess whether compliance improved for the requirement on meaningful consultations.

Gender Analysis

- Project compliance with the eight requirements of the policy on gender equality is still a work in progress. Compliance levels with the eight policy requirements range from 61% to 87% across all project phases. Higher compliance was found in cohort 3 projects allocating resources to address gender disparities and identifying gender gaps. Lower compliance was found in cohort 3 projects submitting gender action plans and in cohort 1 projects including gender indicators in their results frameworks.
- An improved performance over time was observed on 7 out of 8 gender dimensions which aligns with the issuance of the new policy on Gender Equality. We were able to assess compliance with seven of the policy requirements under the new policy, one of them shared with the old policy.

Safeguards

- Compliance assessment with the Safeguards Policy was limited to only two requirements due to limited data, namely screening for project risk and reporting on safeguards. Compliance for these two requirements ranged between 50% to 100%. Only for the first requirement a significant positive trend was identified over time.

Relevant trends

- No major compliance or performance trends across focal areas, agencies and geographical regions identified

Non-compliance

Quality of Stakeholder Engagement

- Most typically engaged stakeholders are relatively similar across both phases in the three cohorts: national government institutions and ministries are the most engaged stakeholders, followed by international organizations, NGOs/CSOs, and the private sector. Interestingly, the participation of local actors such as NGOs/CSOs and local communities increases slightly over time. Besides, across all project phases, we find no evidence of the efforts made by GEF projects to engage with people with disabilities.
- While nonspecific words such as 'consultations' are still mostly used to describe types of stakeholder engagement activities during both identification and design phases, their use

tends to decrease over time to the profit of more specific descriptions such as workshops, meetings, and interviews, among others.

- The quality of stakeholder consultations remains limited, as per the definition on “meaningful consultations”. For instance, different categories of stakeholders are not systematically represented and involved, and consultations are not documented and disclosed publicly for all projects. Other elements such as non-discrimination of stakeholders were difficult to measure through the portfolio review exercise.

IV. Findings

1. **What evidence is there in project and program documents that the policy requirements (stakeholder engagement, gender and safeguards) are being met during three phases in the project/program cycle: identification, design, and implementation? Have there been changes in compliance over time? And are there any trends that emerge in terms of adherence between different agencies, focal areas, or geographies?**

a. Compliance with the Stakeholder Engagement Policy

Background. This portfolio review tried to assess project compliance with fifteen requirements from the Public Involvement Policy and Guidelines and the Stakeholder Engagement Policy and Guidelines across all project phases. Compliance is assessed against fifteen requirements for cohort 3 projects, among which seven are also applicable for cohort 1 and 2. Since the same survey questions were asked to all 336 projects reviewed, we are able to assess whether the updated policy has changed the identification, design, implementation and reporting of GEF-financed interventions over time. We also disaggregate the results to assess whether there are any trends that emerge in terms of adherence between different agencies, focal areas, or geographies. Detailed results for each requirement of the Public Involvement Policy, the Stakeholder Engagement Policy and their respective Guidelines can be found in Annex III.

OVERARCHING OBSERVATIONS

Finding 1. Project compliance with the different requirements of the stakeholder engagement policies is still a work in progress, yet there is a slight improvement over the project cycle. The application of both policies was found to be insufficient at the identification phase and improves during the design and implementation phases. Due to the recent approval of cohort 3 projects, limited evidence is found on compliance at reporting and evaluation. Evidence also shows that projects from all cohorts comply with the requirement to allocate financial resources to ensure effective stakeholder engagement throughout the project. See Annex II for complete details.

Finding 2. Results show an increased performance over time which aligns with the issuance of the new policy on Stakeholder Engagement. Among the eight requirements from the new policy which were not applicable to the old policy on Public Involvement, we find an over-time improvement for seven of them (e.g. engaging stakeholders at PIF/CEO stage; a greater diversity of types of engagement is mentioned). Due to data limitations, we are not able to assess whether compliance improved for the requirement on meaningful consultations (Requirement #14).

Finding 3. While some agencies, focal areas or geographies sometimes adhere more with certain policy requirements, we are not able to identify an overall trend for either of them.

IDENTIFICATION – PIF STAGE

Finding 4. At PIF stage, policy compliance with the four requirements ranged from 40% to 95%. In general, a positive performance trend was found over time.

Requirement #1: “GEF Partner Agencies are required to include in GEF project and program documentation identification of affected and participating stakeholders from civil society, including Indigenous Peoples (...)” (Guidelines Public Involvement Policy, p.7) and “The potential roles of

different stakeholders and project beneficiaries, including civil society organizations and local communities, in each stage of the project should be identified.” (Stakeholder Engagement Policy, p.8).

Applicable to: All three cohorts

Guidance: The portfolio review team referred to the section entitled “stakeholders” found in the PIF. In this section, the team assessed whether any stakeholders were identified either by their name or their group. If this section was not available, the portfolio review team looked for evidence of identification of affected or participating stakeholder throughout the PIF.

Compliance finding: Portfolio review data shows 95% of cohort 1 and 2 projects complied with this requirement. Among cohort 3 projects that submitted a PIF (n=10), 90% of them identified affected and participating stakeholders in their PIF.

Changes over time: While this requirement is the same across all cohorts, we find that compliance levels remain relatively stable over time, with only a 5pp decrease between cohort 1 and cohort 3 projects.

Relevant trend across focal areas, agencies and geographical regions: A third of the projects that have identified stakeholders at the identification phase are from the LAC region, which is higher than the share of that region in the sample.

Requirement #2: *“In Program Framework Documents and Project Identification Forms submitted for Work Program entry or CEO Approval, Agencies provide a description of any consultations conducted during project development (...)”* (Stakeholder Engagement Policy, p.9)

Applicable to: Cohort 3 projects

Guidance: The portfolio review team referred to the section entitled “stakeholders” found in the PIF document to find evidence on whether stakeholders were engaged during project identification.

Compliance finding: 60% of cohort 3 projects that submitted a PIF reported that they engaged with stakeholders during project identification.

Changes over time: While this was not a requirement for cohort 1 and 2 projects, we find an increase of 38pp between cohort 1 and 3 which aligns with the issuance of the new policy on Stakeholder Engagement.

Relevant trend across focal areas, agencies and geographical regions: Among the projects that did engage stakeholders at identification, climate change projects have engaged more stakeholders at identification (61%), relatively to their sample share. A higher share of UNDP projects complied with this requirement (40%), relatively to their sample share. Lastly, projects from the ECA and LAC regions are the most compliant with this requirement (33% each).

Requirement #3: *“In Program Framework Documents and Project Identification Forms submitted for Work Program entry or CEO Approval, Agencies provide a description of any consultations conducted during project development (...).”* (Stakeholder Engagement Policy, p.9)

Applicable to: Cohort 3 projects

Guidance: If evidence was found on whether stakeholders were engaged during the identification phase, the portfolio review team reported how these engagements were described. All open-ended answers were then recoded into the following categories: Only general wording using (e.g. "Consultations"); Meetings; Workshops; Assessments or Surveys; Interviews; Field Visits; Focus Groups; Other. As several types of engagement were often mentioned, the above categories are not mutually exclusive hence they do not add up to a 100%.

Compliance finding: 67% of cohort 3 projects that engaged stakeholders during projects identification (n=6) did not specify the type of consultations and used general wording such as “consultations”. 17% of projects that described stakeholder engagement at PIF stage mentioned having involved stakeholders during meetings, and another 17% during interviews.

Changes over time: We find that a greater diversity of types of engagement is mentioned in cohort 2 in comparison to cohort 1 and less general wording such as “consultations” is used. This greater diversity is not reflected in the 10 projects from cohort 3 that have engaged stakeholders at identification.

Relevant trend across focal areas, agencies and geographical regions: Too few projects to disaggregate findings.

Requirement #4: “GEF Partner Agencies are required to include in GEF project and program documentation identification of affected and participating stakeholders from civil society, including Indigenous Peoples, and to describe how they will be consulted with and engaged in the project” (Guidelines Public Involvement Policy, p.7) and “In Program Framework Documents and Project Identification Forms submitted for Work Program entry or CEO Approval, Agencies provide a description (...) on how Stakeholders will be engaged in the proposed activity, and means of engagement throughout the project/ program cycle.” (Stakeholder Engagement Policy, p.9)

Applicable to: All projects

Guidance: The portfolio review team looked for evidence of whether plans were made to engage stakeholders throughout the project in the stakeholder section of the PIF. The evaluation team paid close attention to the types of engagements and the role of non-government stakeholders.

Compliance finding: 45% and 49% of cohort 1 and 2 respectively complied with this requirement and included information on how stakeholders will be engaged throughout the project cycle. We also find that 40% of cohort 3 projects included information on how stakeholders will be engaged throughout the project cycle (n=4). Between 30-40% of projects from all cohorts mentioned that stakeholders will be engaged but did not provide any details on the type of engagement or timing.

Changes over time: Compliance is relatively stable over time, but there is an improvement between cohort 1 and cohort 2 projects.

Relevant trend across focal areas, agencies and geographical regions: For cohort 2, we find that among the projects that did describe how stakeholders will be consulted with, included those that did not give information on the type of engagement or timing, climate change projects have well complied with this requirement, relatively to their sample share. For cohort 3, we find that relatively to their sample share, we find that global projects do not include much information on whether stakeholders will be engaged throughout the project cycle, while projects implemented in the Asia and Africa region do. We also find that projects led by UNEP and UNIDO comply better with this requirement in comparison to other agencies, and with respect to their sample weight.

DESIGN – CEO ENDORSEMENT STAGE

Finding 5. Overall, compliance with the requirements for the design phase ranges between 13% to 100%, and we see an improvement in terms of identification and engagement rates since the identification phase.

Requirement #5: “GEF Partner Agencies are required to include in GEF project and program documentation identification of affected and participating stakeholders from civil society, including Indigenous Peoples (...)” (Guidelines Public Involvement Policy, p.7) and “The potential roles of different stakeholders and project beneficiaries, including civil society organizations and local communities, in each stage of the project should be identified.” (Guidelines Stakeholder Engagement Policy, p.8).

Applicable to: Cohort 3 projects

Guidance: The portfolio review team referred to the section entitled “stakeholders” found in the CEO Endorsement document or in the Prodoc. In this section, the team assessed whether any stakeholders were identified either by their name or their group. If this section was not available, the portfolio review team looked for evidence of identification of affected or participating stakeholder throughout the documents.

Compliance finding: 94-100% of all cohorts complied with this requirement and identified key stakeholders.

Changes over time: Compliance has increased over time, reaching 100% for cohort 3 projects.

Relevant trend across focal areas, agencies and geographical regions: There are no trends to note as almost all projects complied with this requirement.

Requirement #6: “GEF Partner Agencies are required to include in GEF project and program documentation identification of affected and participating stakeholders from civil society, including Indigenous Peoples, and to describe how they will be consulted with and engaged in the project” (Guidelines Public Involvement Policy, p.7) and “At CEO Endorsement/ Approval, Agencies present Stakeholder Engagement Plans or equivalent documentation, with information regarding Stakeholders who have been (...) engaged (...)” (Stakeholder Engagement Policy, p.9).

Applicable to: All projects

Guidance: The portfolio review team referred to the section entitled “stakeholders” found in the CEO Endorsement document or in the Prodoc to find evidence on whether stakeholder were engaged during project design.

Compliance finding: Among cohort 1 projects that submitted a CEO Endorsement document (n=181), we found evidence that 70% of them engaged stakeholders during project design. 84% of cohort 2 projects complied with this requirement and lastly 87% of the projects reviewed from cohort 3 (n=20) engaged stakeholders during the projects design phase.

Changes over time: While this was not a requirement for cohort 1 and 2 projects, we find a compliance increase of 17pp between cohort 1 and 3 which aligns with the issuance of the new policy on Stakeholder Engagement.

Relevant trend across focal areas, agencies and geographical regions: There are no notable trends to discuss for this cohort.

Requirement #7: “At CEO Endorsement/ Approval, Agencies present Stakeholder Engagement Plans or equivalent documentation, with information regarding Stakeholders who have been (...) engaged (...).” (Stakeholder Engagement Policy, p.9).

Applicable to: Cohort 3 projects

Guidance: If evidence was found on whether stakeholders were engaged during the design phase, the portfolio review team reported how these engagements were described. All open-ended answers were then recoded into the following categories: Only general wording using (e.g. "Consultations"); Meetings; Workshops; Assessments or Surveys; Interviews; Field Visits; Focus Groups; Other. As

several types of engagement were often mentioned, the above categories are not mutually exclusive hence they do not add up to a 100%.

Compliance finding: 40% of cohort 3 projects that engaged stakeholders during project design (n=20) did not specify the type of consultations and used general wording such as “consultations”. 50% of projects that described stakeholder engagement at CEO Endorsement stage mentioned having involved stakeholders during meetings, 30% during workshops, 15% during field visits, 15% during assessments or surveys, 10% during interviews and 9% through focus groups. Please note that these categories are not mutually exclusive, as most projects described more than one type of consultation, hence they don’t add up to a 100%.

Changes over time: Similar to the identification phase, we find a greater diversity of the types of engagement mentioned between cohort 1 and 2, and a smaller share of projects using general wording such as “consultations”. Evidence is somehow limited for cohort 3 as only 6 projects have described types of engagement that took place at design.

Relevant trend across focal areas, agencies and geographical regions: There are no notable trends to discuss for this cohort.

Requirement #8: “GEF Partner Agencies are required to include in GEF project and program documentation identification of affected and participating stakeholders from civil society, including Indigenous Peoples, and to describe how they will be consulted with and engaged in the project” (Guidelines Public Involvement Policy, p.7) and “At CEO Endorsement/ Approval, Agencies present Stakeholder Engagement Plans or equivalent documentation, with information regarding Stakeholders who (...) will be engaged (...) and timing of engagement throughout the project/ program cycle.” (Stakeholder Engagement Policy, p.9).

Applicable to: All projects.

Guidance: The portfolio review team looked for evidence of whether plans were made to engage stakeholder throughout the project in the stakeholder section of the CEO Endorsement document or in the Prodoc. The evaluation team paid close attention to the types of engagements and the role of non-government stakeholders.

Compliance finding: Around 71% of projects from cohort 1 and 2 complied with this requirement and 79% of cohort 3 did.

Changes over time: Compliance has increased over time (+7pp) between cohort 1 and 3.

Relevant trend across focal areas, agencies and geographical regions: There are no notable trends to discuss.

Requirement #9: “Each GEF-financed project should include a stakeholder engagement plan that summarizes these activities and the possible partnerships to be promoted by the project as well as provide documentation on stakeholder engagement” (Guidelines Public Involvement Policy, p.8) and “The Plan, or equivalent document, reflects and clearly describes actions on Stakeholder Engagement. Building on the above, these include the following minimum elements: The stakeholders, their relevant interests, and why they are included ; The steps and actions to achieve meaningful consultation and inclusive participation, including information dissemination ; Roles and responsibilities for implementation of the Plan ; The timing of the engagement throughout the project cycle ; The budget for stakeholder engagement throughout the project cycle and, where applicable, for related capacity-building to support this engagement ; Key indicators of stakeholder engagement during project implementation, and steps that will be taken to monitor and report on progress and issues that arise” (Guidelines Stakeholder Engagement Policy, p.10).

Applicable to: All projects.

Guidance: The portfolio review team looked for the SEP in the CEO endorsement document, in the project document or saved separately in the project files. The team considered that an SEP should include a description of participating stakeholders and planned activities. As per the Stakeholder Engagement Guidelines, minimum elements of an SEP are the following: The stakeholders, their relevant interests, and why they are included; The steps and actions to achieve meaningful consultation and inclusive participation, including information dissemination; Roles and responsibilities for implementation of the Plan; The timing of the engagement throughout the project cycle; The budget for stakeholder engagement throughout the project cycle and, where applicable, for related capacity- building to support this engagement; Key indicators of stakeholder engagement during project implementation; Steps that will be taken to monitor and report on progress and issues that arise; Documentation of stakeholder engagement in the identification and design phase; The role of stakeholders in project execution is identified; Identification of how concerns will be addressed, including how stakeholders input will be built into project implementation.

Compliance finding: 79% and 92% of cohort 1 and 2 respectfully submitted an SEP or equivalent document and we find that 85% of the projects reviewed from cohort 3 have submitted an SEP or equivalent project documents that describe stakeholder engagement or provide supporting documentation. We find that some SEPs lack minimum elements of the plan as they mostly identify stakeholders and their interest, as well as roles and responsibilities.

Changes over time: Compliance has increased over time (+13pp) between cohort 1 and 2. We find a slight reduction between cohort 2 and 3 (-7pp) which should be interpreted with caution as more projects from cohort 3 get reviewed, we expect compliance to follow the same upward trend.

Relevant trend across focal areas, agencies and geographical regions: There are no notable trends to discuss.

Requirement #10: *“The Plan should be made publicly available by the Agency in a form and language appropriate to the relevant stakeholders and disseminated proactively to them. It should also be posted by the GEF Secretariat on its website as part of the project documentation.”* (Guidelines Stakeholder Engagement Policy, p.11).

Applicable to: Cohort 3 projects.

Guidance: The portfolio review team looked for any indication that the SEP was shared to other stakeholders by reviewing the SEP or equivalent document.

Compliance finding: It was not possible to assess this requirement for a majority of cohort 3 projects (87%). Another 13% of cohort 3 projects made their SEP publicly available but there was no information on whether it was done in a form and language appropriate to the relevant stakeholders and disseminated proactively.

Changes over time: Compliance has increased over time (+13pp) between cohort 1 and 2 and (+6pp) between cohort 1 and 3.

Relevant trend across focal areas, agencies and geographical regions: Too few projects to disaggregate findings.

IMPLEMENTATION

Finding 6. All projects from cohort 3 comply with the requirement to report on progress, challenges and stakeholder engagement outcomes in the PIRs, they, however, reporting is not made against the SEP or equivalent stakeholder engagement plans informed at design phase.

Requirement #11: “Agencies oversee the implementation of Stakeholder Engagement as set out in the documentation submitted at CEO Endorsement/ Approval, and include information on progress, challenges and outcomes in their annual project implementation reports (...).” (Stakeholder Engagement Policy, p.10).

Applicable to: Cohort 3 projects.

Guidance: The portfolio review team looked for any reporting made on stakeholder engagement in the latest PIR submitted.

Compliance finding: Because most of the PIR templates used by GEF agencies have a built-in section on stakeholder engagement, we find that compliance among cohort 3 projects reach 100%. However, these projects do not report against plans made in their SEP or equivalent.

Changes over time: While this was not a requirement for cohort 1 and 2 projects, we find an increase of 12pp between cohort 1 and 3 which aligns with the issuance of the new policy on Stakeholder Engagement. No change was found between cohort 1 and 2.

Relevant trend across focal areas, agencies and geographical regions: There are no trends to note as almost all projects complied with this requirement.

REPORTING AND EVALUATION

Finding 7. There is limited evidence to assess compliance at this phase, but we find that less than a fourth of the projects comply with the requirement of involving stakeholders in the process of monitoring and reporting.

Requirement #12: “In addition, wherever feasible, the process of monitoring and reporting may include “participatory monitoring” by stakeholders.” (Guidelines Stakeholder Engagement Policy, p.12).

Applicable to: Cohort 3 projects.

Guidance: The portfolio review team looked for references of ‘participatory monitoring’ and ‘community monitoring’ across all project documents. The team also looked for whether CSO/NGOs were given monitoring roles.

Compliance finding: 22% of cohort 3 projects (n=5) mentioned participatory monitoring in their project documents.

Changes over time: While this was not a requirement for cohort 1 and 2 projects, we find a slight increase of 5pp between cohort 1 and 3 which aligns with the issuance of the new policy on Stakeholder Engagement.

Relevant trend across focal areas, agencies and geographical regions: There are too few projects to disaggregate findings.

Requirement #13: “Terminal Evaluations (...) will include, where applicable, a section on the degree and manner of involvement of civil society organizations and other stakeholders, including indigenous populations.” (Guidelines Public Involvement Policy, p.9) and “Agencies oversee the implementation of Stakeholder Engagement as set out in the documentation submitted at CEO Endorsement/ Approval,

and include information on progress, challenges and outcomes in their (...) terminal evaluations.” (Stakeholder Engagement Policy, p.10).

Applicable to: All projects

Guidance: The portfolio review team reviewed all terminal evaluation (n=8) to assess this requirement. Due to the recent approval of cohort 2 and 3 projects, terminal evaluations were only reviewed for cohort 1 projects.

Compliance: 6 out of the 8 projects (75%) that have a TEs reported against the stakeholder engagement plan or assessed the quality of stakeholder engagement in their TE. Given the low number of projects with TEs available, it was not possible to identify relevant trends regarding the way of reporting. However, it was noted that reporting on stakeholder engagement was sometimes done in a specific section or across the document where deemed relevant to support some findings. TEs did not have a specific template for reporting on stakeholder engagement. Finally, limited information was found on quality of stakeholder engagement, however it was noted that some projects described very briefly if stakeholder engagement occurred, the contribution of stakeholder engagement to project performance, and lessons learned.

Changes over time: N/A

Relevant trend across focal areas, agencies and geographical regions: There are too few projects to disaggregate findings.

ALL PHASES

Finding 8. While an attempt was made to assess meaningful stakeholder engagement, there are too few projects under implementation to assess any compliance. We find high compliance for resource allocation for all cohorts.

Requirement #14: *“Stakeholders are engaged in meaningful consultations where they are able to express their views on project plans, benefits, risks, impacts, and mitigation measures that may affect them.” (Stakeholder Engagement Policy, p.10) and “There are several key elements to “meaningful consultation”. As reflected in the policies of some GEF’s agencies, meaningful consultation and participation is a two-way process that: Begins early in the project identification and planning process to gather initial views; Encourages stakeholder feedback and engagement in the project development and design process; Continues during the development and implementation of a project; Is based on the prior disclosure and dissemination of relevant, transparent, objective, meaningful and easily accessible information in a timely manner and culturally appropriate format; Considers and responds to feedback; Supports active and inclusive engagement with project affected parties; Is free of external manipulation, interference, coercion, discrimination, and intimidation; Is documented and disclosed” (Guidelines Stakeholder Engagement Policy, p. 3)*

Applicable to: Cohort 3 projects.

Guidance: There are several key elements to “meaningful consultation”. As reflected in the policies of some GEF’s agencies, meaningful consultation and participation is a two-way process that: Begins early in the project identification and planning process to gather initial views; Encourages stakeholder feedback and engagement in the project development and design process. Continues during the development and implementation of a project; Is based on the prior disclosure and dissemination of relevant, transparent, objective, meaningful and easily accessible information in a timely manner and culturally appropriate format; Considers and responds to feedback; Supports active and inclusive engagement with project affected parties; Is free of external manipulation, interference, coercion, discrimination, and intimidation; Is documented and disclosed. Each of the above categories were searched for in the project documentation for projects under implementation using specific keywords as an attempt to assess meaningful consultations.

Compliance: An attempt was made to assess meaningful engagement/consultations (requirement new policy) but due to the high proportion of projects at CEO Endorsement stage we cannot derive an answer on compliance for cohort 3 projects. Among the four projects from cohort 3 that were under implementation, four of the eight elements are most commonly mentioned: Different categories of stakeholders are represented and involved (26%); The stakeholder consultation process is ongoing and iterative through the project cycle, starting as early as possible (13%); It is equitable and non-discriminatory, and ensure that vulnerable groups (e.g. women, the poor) are given a voice (9%).

Changes over time: It is not possible to compare meaningful consultations across cohorts due to less availability of documents for cohort 2 projects.

Relevant trend across focal areas, agencies and geographical regions: There are too few projects to disaggregate findings.

Requirement #15: *“GEF Partner Agencies will include in project budgets, as needed, the necessary financial and technical assistance to recipient governments and project executing agencies to ensure effective public involvement.”* (Guidelines Public Involvement Policy, p.3) and *“Agencies propose and allocate adequate resources in their respective program and project budgets to promote effective Stakeholder Engagement throughout the program and project cycles.”* (Stakeholder Engagement Policy, p.10).

Applicable to: *All projects.*

Guidance: The portfolio review team looked for this information in terminal evaluation reports, or in documents associated with design phase (CEO endorsement, Project Document, SEP), also in tables associated with financing for project activities (if an activity under the project is SE) and in staff listing. Resource allocation includes funding for consultations, stakeholder engagement staff, training/capacity building, and knowledge management or communications resources.

Compliance: 96-97% of projects from cohort 1 and 2 respectfully comply with this requirement while we found that 91% of cohort 3 projects do.

Changes over time: Compliance with this requirement is relatively stable over time, but we note a 1pp increase between cohort 1 and 2 and a 5pp decrease between cohort 1 and 3.

Relevant trend across focal areas, agencies and geographical regions: There are no trends to note as almost all projects complied with this requirement.

b. Compliance with the Gender Equality Policy

Background. This portfolio review tried to assess project compliance with eight requirements from the Policy on Gender Equality across all project phases. While all the eight requirements were applicable to cohort 3 projects, only one requirement was applicable to projects from cohort 1 and cohort 2. Consequently, compliance was mostly assessed for project from cohort 3. Regardless, this portfolio review assessed adherence to the eight requirements for projects from cohort 1 and 2 to analyze performance over time. Due to limited data availability it was only possible to assess compliance with six policy requirements. Policy compliance was not possible to be assessed when project documents such as project implementation reports or terminal evaluations were needed. This was the case of projects from cohort 3 that were still under implementation at the time the portfolio review was conducted.

OVERARCHING OBSERVATIONS

Finding 7. Project compliance with the eight requirements of the policy on gender equality is still a work in progress. Compliance levels with the eight policy requirements range from 61% to 87% across all project phases. Higher compliance was found in cohort 3 projects allocating resources to address gender disparities (87%) and identifying gender gaps (83%). Lower compliance was found in cohort 3 projects submitting gender action plans (61%) and in cohort 1 projects including gender indicators in their results frameworks (61%). Detailed results for each requirement of the Policies on Gender Mainstreaming and on Gender Equality and its Guidelines can be found in Annex IV.

Finding 8. Results show an increased performance over time with respect to gender which aligns with the issuance of the new policy on Gender Equality. We were able to assess compliance with seven of the policy requirements under the new policy, one of them shared with the old policy. Increased performance was showed in the seven requirements across time. Performance over time with the remaining requirement (reporting on gender in terminal evaluations) was not possible to be assessed due to limited data on evaluation for cohort 2 and cohort 3 projects.

Finding 9. While some agencies, focal areas or geographies sometimes adhere more with certain requirements on gender equality, it was not possible to identify an overall trend for either of them.

IDENTIFICATION – PIF STAGE / DESIGN – CEO ENDORSEMENT STAGE

Finding 10. Compliance at identification/design phase was assessed based only on the requirement about the submission of a gender analysis. Data suggests a 70% compliance at this phase provided that 16/23 projects submitted a gender analysis at identification or design phase. We see a strong positive trend across cohorts and with respect to the findings from the past evaluation of the Policy on Gender Mainstreaming.

Requirement #1: “Provide a Gender Analysis at Identification/design” (2018 Policy on Gender Equality, p. 12)

Applicable to: Cohort 3 projects

Guidance: The definition of a gender analysis, as described in the Policy on Gender Equality was followed to assess compliance with this requirement. The portfolio review team looked for documentation that identified or described gender difference and their relevance for the specific project. For example, the following elements related to gender equality were looked for in project documentation: i) analysis of factors and trends that shape behaviours, ii) activity profile of men and women, iii) access, control and decision-making profile; and iv) entry points to ensure equal

participation and benefits. The portfolio review team made a determination on the existence of a gender analysis or equivalent when some of the elements above were soundly described, either in a specific “gender analysis” document or in sections of other relevant project documents.

Compliance: Portfolio review data shows a 70% (16/23) compliance of cohort 3 projects with submitting a gender analysis or equivalent at identification or design phase.

Changes over time: It was identified that 33% of projects from cohort 1 and 58% of projects from cohort 2 also submitted a gender analysis or equivalent even though this was not an applicable requirement for them. This implies a considerable increase of 37 percentage points across time from cohort 1 to cohort 3 projects, and 25 percentage points from cohort 1 to cohort 2.

Comparison with Evaluation on Gender Mainstreaming. An improvement in the three elements on the status on gender analysis was identified when compared to the results of the evaluation on gender mainstreaming. The number of gender analysis shared increased 54 percentage points. It was also noted that the number of projects that planned to or undertook a gender analysis but did not share it decreased 29 percentage points. Finally, the number of projects that did not mention a gender analysis also decreased 26 percentage points. This can be summarized in the following table.

Gender analysis:	Evaluation on Gender Mainstreaming – Quality at entry for OPS6 projects (n=223)	Evaluation on Policies and Engagement at the GEF – Cohort 1+2 projects approved after 2018 (n=153)
Shared	5%	59% (+Δ54 pp)
Planned or took place but not shared	47%	18% (- Δ29 pp)
Not Mentioned	48%	22% (- Δ26 pp)

Relevant trend across focal areas, agencies and geographical regions: No relevant trends identified.

DESIGN – CEO ENDORSEMENT STAGE

Finding 11. Compliance at design phase was assessed based on four policy requirements below related to the submission of gender action plans, the identification of roles, needs and livelihoods for both women and men, the identification of most relevant gender gaps and the inclusion of gender indicators. Policy compliance with the four requirements at CEO endorsement stage ranged from 61% to 83%. In general, a positive performance trend was found over time.

Requirement #2: “Submit a Gender Action Plan at design phase” (2018 Policy on Gender Equality, p. 12)

Applicable to: Cohort 3 projects

Guidance: The definition of a gender action plan, as described in the Policy on Gender Equality was followed to assess compliance with this requirement. The portfolio review team looked for documentation that provided for specific gender-responsive measures to address differences, identify impacts, risks and opportunities. The portfolio review team made a determination on the existence of a gender action plan or equivalent when actions or activities for the purposes mentioned above were soundly described either in a specific “gender action plan” document or in sections of other relevant project documents.

Compliance: Portfolio review data shows a 61% (14/23) compliance of cohort 3 projects with submitting a gender action plan or equivalent at design phase.

Changes over time: It was identified that 25% of projects from cohort 1 and 55% of projects from cohort 2 also submitted a gender analysis or equivalent despite the fact that this requirement was not applicable to them. This implies a considerable increase of 36 percentage points across time from cohort 1 to cohort 3 projects and 30 percentage points from cohort 1 to cohort 2 projects.

Relevant trend across focal areas, agencies and geographical regions: Climate change was noted as the focal area with the larger number of projects from cohort 2 that submitted a gender action plan (60%) when compared against the total number of cohort 2 projects that come from this focal area (40%). In the same way, UDNP was identified as the agency with the higher number of cohort 2 projects that submitted a gender action plan (50%) relatively to its share (30%). Lastly, for cohort 1 projects Asia stands out as the geographical region where projects submitted a gender action plan (30%) relatively to its share (15%).

Requirement #3: “Identify roles, needs and livelihoods separately for women and men” (Gender Guidelines, p. 11)

Applicable to: Cohort 3 projects

Guidance: The portfolio review team tried to identify in project documents if roles, needs and livelihoods were identified separately for both women and men in order to ensure that gender differences, gender-differentiated impacts or risks were considered by projects.

Compliance: Portfolio review data shows a 73% (11/15) compliance of cohort 3 projects that identified either roles, needs and livelihoods separately for women and men in project documents.

Changes over time: It was identified that 70% of projects from cohort 1 and 93% of projects from cohort 2 also submitted a gender analysis or equivalent even though this requirement was not applicable to them. This implies a slight increase of 3 percentage points across time from cohort 1 to cohort 3 projects and a considerable increase of 23 percentage points from cohort 1 to cohort 3. There is also a considerable decrease in performance from cohort 2 to cohort 3 projects of 20 percentage points which could be related to a sampling bias resulting from a relatively smaller number of cohort 3 projects reviewed for which it was possible to assess this element (15) in comparison with those from cohort 2 (73).

Relevant trend across focal areas, agencies and geographical regions: About 50% of the projects from cohort 1 and cohort 2 that identified roles, needs and livelihoods separately for women and men came from UNDP which is higher to its relative share of around 30% in both cohorts.

Requirement #4: “Identify gender equality gaps” (2018 Policy on Gender Equality, p. 12, GEF-7 templates for PIF and CEO endorsement).

Applicable to: Cohort 3 projects

Guidance: The following three most relevant gender gaps for GEF projects were searched for in project documentation: i) women’s participation and decision making; ii) socioeconomic benefits or services; iii) access to and control of natural resources. Although for GEF-7 projects, this question was directly asked in the PIF, PFD, CEO Request or MSP request templates, the portfolio review team also looked at all project documents to try to identify compliance with this requirement.

Compliance: Portfolio review data shows 83% (19/23) compliance of cohort 3 projects with identifying at least one out of the three most relevant gender gaps. The gender gap most commonly identified in

this cohort was related to women's participation and decision making (64%), followed by socioeconomic benefits or services (55%) and access to land and control over natural resources (48%).

Changes over time: It was identified that 42% of projects from cohort 1 and 67% of projects from cohort 2 also identified at least one gender gap despite the fact that this requirement was not applicable to them. This implies a considerable increase of 41 percentage points across time from cohort 1 to cohort 3 projects and 25 percentage points from cohort 1 to cohort 2 projects.

Relevant trend across focal areas, agencies and geographical regions: No relevant trends identified.

Requirement #5: "The agency has a system to monitor and evaluate progress in gender mainstreaming, including the use of gender disaggregated monitoring indicators" (2012 Policy on Gender Mainstreaming, p. 3) and "Provide sex-disaggregated and gender sensitive indicators" (2018 Policy on Gender Equality, p. 12)

Applicable to: Cohort 1, Cohort 2 and Cohort 3 projects

Guidance: The portfolio review team adopted the same approach to assess compliance with the two requirements above under the two policies. This involved the identification of gender sensitive indicators, sex disaggregated indicator or both. The portfolio review team used the following definitions to assess policy compliance with this requirement: i) Gender sensitive indicators allow for the demonstration of progress toward achieving gender equality or the empowerment of women; ii) Sex disaggregated indicators are those that report different for women/men.

Compliance: Portfolio review data shows a 61% compliance of cohort 1 projects with providing any type of gender indicators (e.g. sex-disaggregated, gender-sensitive or both). Compliance with this requirement for cohort 2 and cohort 3 projects was equivalent to 78% and 70% (16/23), respectively. Both types of indicators were provided by most projects from cohort 2 (50%) and cohort 3 (48%), while sex disaggregated indicators was more widely reported in cohort 1 (26%).

Changes over time: Although, compliance over time improved 9 percentage points from cohort 1 to cohort 3 projects and 17 percentage points from cohort 1 to cohort 2 projects, there was a slight decrease of 8 percentage points from cohort 2 to cohort 3. As before, this decrease in compliance could be related to a sampling bias with relatively fewer number of projects in cohort 3 as compared to cohort 2.

Comparison with Evaluation on Gender Mainstreaming. Due to a change in reporting since the Evaluation on Gender Mainstreaming, we were not able to compare results on gender indicators with OPS6 data. On the one hand, in the Evaluation on Gender Mainstreaming, the question on gender indicators had the following three answer options: (1) whether the project had included gender-disaggregated indicators; (2) whether the project had included gender-sensitive indicators; (3) none are mentioned. On the other hand, the Evaluation on Policies and Engagement at the GEF adopted the reporting of previous evaluations such as the 2020 LDCF Evaluation and included the following answer options: (1) Both types of indicators were included; (2) only gender-disaggregated indicators were included; (3) only gender-sensitive indicators were included; (4) the project plans to include either indicator; (5) none are mentioned. Given that the option on whether the project plans to include either indicator was not present in the Evaluation on Gender Mainstreaming, we are not able to aggregate answer options to make them comparable across both evaluations.

Relevant trend across focal areas, agencies and geographical regions: No relevant trends identified.

IMPLEMENTATION

Finding 12. Compliance at implementation phase was assessed based only on the requirement about reporting on gender-responsive measures in project implementation reports. We found full compliance with this requirement from cohort 3 projects, however only 3 projects had PIRs available. Nevertheless, we noted a positive project performance over time.

Requirement #6: “Provide information on gender-responsive measures in project implementation reports and mid-term reviews” (2018 Policy on Gender Equality, p. 12)

Applicable to: *Cohort 3 projects*

Guidance: Agencies oversight on the implementation of gender-responsive measures was searched for in project implementation reports and mid-term reviews. The portfolio review team looked for evidence of reporting on gender in specific sections or throughout these documents.

Compliance: There was limited data to assess compliance with this requirement given that only 3 projects from cohort 3 had at least one PIR available. Portfolio review data shows that the three projects with PIRs reported on gender-responsive measures, with all of them having a specific section dedicated for this purpose.

Changes over time: It was identified that 86% of projects from cohort 1 and 90% of projects from cohort 2 that had at least one PIR available, they also reported on gender-responsive measures despite the fact that this requirement was not applicable to them. Generally, mid-term reviews were not available. Reporting on gender-responsive measures was generally done in one specific section on PIRs. Overall, there is a slight increase in compliance of 14 percentage points from cohort 1 to cohort 3 projects and an increase of 4 percentage points from cohort 1 to cohort 2.

Relevant trend across focal areas, agencies and geographical regions: No relevant trends identified.

REPORTING AND EVALUATION

Finding 13. Compliance at reporting phase was assessed based only on the requirement about reporting on gender-responsive measures in terminal evaluations. Compliance or trend over time was not possible to assess given the limited number of terminal evaluations.

Compliance: There is high level of project compliance in cohort 3 with allocating resources to address gender disparities. Although, this was not a requirement for projects in the previous cohorts, the percentage of projects that allocated resources for the same purposes is high in cohort 2 (90%) and relatively smaller in cohort 1 (71%). An overall positive trend was identified over time.

Requirement #7: “Provide information on gender-responsive measures in terminal evaluations” (GE 2018 Policy on Gender Equality, p. 12)

Applicable to: *Cohort 3 projects*

Guidance: Agencies oversight on the implementation of gender-responsive measures was searched for in terminal evaluations available. The portfolio review team looked for evidence of reporting on gender in specific sections or throughout terminal evaluation documents.

Compliance: There is no data to assess compliance with this requirement given there were no terminal evaluations available for cohort 3 projects. All projects from cohort 3 were under implementation when the portfolio review took place.

Changes over time: Changes over time could not be assessed because there were no terminal evaluations available for this cohort 2 and cohort 3, and only 8 evaluations for cohort 1 projects. 6 out of the 8 terminal evaluations available from cohort 3 reported on gender-responsive measures.

Relevant trend across focal areas, agencies and geographical regions: No relevant trends identified.

RESOURCE ALLOCATION

Finding 14. Compliance with resource allocation to address gender disparities was 87% (20/23). Although, this was not a requirement for projects in cohort 1 and 2, resource allocation was also relatively high and with a positive trend over time.

Requirement #8: “Adequate resources to deliver on gender-responsive measures” (Gender Guidelines, p. 15)

Applicable to: *Cohort 3 projects*

Guidance: The portfolio review team looked for evidence of resource allocation to address gender disparities in documents associated with design phase or terminal evaluations. For example, this included funding for gender specialist, training/capacity building, knowledge management or communication resources with a gender focus. It is important to point out that adequacy of resources was not assessed.

Compliance: Portfolio review data shows 87% (20/23) compliance of cohort 3 projects with allocating resources to address gender disparities.

Changes over time: It was identified that 71% of projects from cohort 1 and 90% projects from cohort 2 allocated resources to address gender disparities despite the fact that this requirement was not applicable to them. This represents a considerable increase of around 16 percentage points from cohort 1 to cohort 3, and 19 percentage points from cohort 1 to cohort 2. It was also noted a slight decrease of 3 percentage points from cohort 2 to cohort 3, which may be attributed to the lower number of projects reviewed in cohort 3 in comparison to cohort 2.

Relevant trend across focal areas, agencies and geographical regions: No relevant trends identified.

c. Compliance with the Safeguards Policy

Background. Compliance with the requirements of the Safeguards Policy was only possible for projects from cohort 3 given the recent approval of this policy. Initially, compliance with four policy requirements across all project phases was envisioned. However, due to limited data (e.g. no availability of documents or safeguards categorizations used by projects not aligned to the Safeguards Policy) it was possible to assess compliance of only two requirements. Furthermore, this portfolio review analyzed performance over time by comparing projects from cohort 3 with those from cohort 1 and cohort 2, even though the two requirements were mandatory to only cohort 3.

OVERARCHING OBSERVATION

Finding 15. Compliance of projects from cohort 3 was only possible for two Safeguards Policy requirements, namely projects being screened for a safeguards risks and projects reporting on safeguards. Policy compliance with the two requirements ranged from 50% to 100%. Regarding performance over time, there is a significant increase from cohort 1 to cohort 2 in the number of projects that have a safeguards risk screening. Only for the second requirement a negative trend was identified from cohort 2 to cohort 3. This can be attributed to a sampling bias related to a smaller number of projects reviewed from cohort 3 as compared to the previous cohorts. Detailed results for each requirement of the Safeguards Policy can be found in Annex IV.

IDENTIFICATION – PIF STAGE / DESIGN – CEO ENDORSEMENT STAGE

Finding 16. Compliance with the Policy on Safeguards at the identification and design phase was only assessed based on the requirement for projects to have a safeguards risk categorization. It was found that all of projects from cohort 3 (14/23) for which the requirement was mandatory had a safeguards risk screening. A positive trend of the number of projects that had a safeguards risk categorization was also identified across time from cohort 1 to cohort 2, and cohort 1 to cohort 2. Compliance with the identification of safeguards triggered was not possible to be assessed.

Requirement #1: “Screen for all risks associated with the thematic areas of the GEF safeguards and to categorize the projects based on the level and magnitude of risks” (Safeguards Policy, p. 21)

Applicable to: *Cohort 3 projects*

Guidance: The portfolio review team used the most commonly referred categories (A,B,C) or descriptions (high, moderate, low) applied by projects for safeguards risk screening. Although this requirement was effective as of July 2019 as per the approval of the Safeguards Policy, this portfolio review captured safeguards risk screening from projects approved before July 2019 whenever available.

Compliance: 14/23 (61%) of projects from cohort 3 where approved before July 1, 2019, the effective date of the Safeguards Policy. All 14 projects were assigned a safeguards risk category. Most of these projects were designated with the low and moderate (6 projects to each) descriptor from the low to high risk scale, followed by the B and C (1 project to each) category from the A to C scale. We were unable to identify safeguards risk categories for 9/23 (40%) of projects from cohort 3 that were approved before the Safeguards Policy was effective in July 2019.

Changes over time: An increase of 97 percentage points was identified in the number of projects that have been assigned a safeguards risk category from cohort 1 to cohort 2. An increase of decrease 24 percentage points was also found from cohort 1 to cohort 3. The latter significant positive change may be attributed to a sampling bias related to a smaller number of projects reviewed from cohort 3 (14/23 for which the Safeguards Policy was mandatory) as compared to cohort 1 (183).

Relevant trend across focal areas, agencies and geographical regions: No relevant trends identified.

Requirement #2: “Indicate which safeguards areas are applicable (or have been “triggered” for the project)” (Safeguards Policy, p. 18)

Applicable to: *Cohort 3 projects*

Guidance: Safeguards triggered by projects were compared against nine thematic areas in the Safeguards Policy. When projects didn’t align to these safeguards strictly the “Not Able to Assess” answer option was chosen.

Compliance: It was not possible to assess compliance with this requirement given that for most of the projects reviewed from cohort 3 (21), either no safeguards were triggered or the safeguards triggered did not correspond with the categories in the portfolio review template.

Changes over time: Not able to assess given that all projects from cohort 1 and 96% of projects from cohort 2 were approved before July 2019, consequently either their screening for risk did not align with the categories in the portfolio review template or they did not have any risk screening.

Relevant trend across focal areas, agencies and geographical regions: Not able to assess.

IMPLEMENTATION

Finding 17. Compliance at the implementation phase was assessed with respect to only the requirement on reporting on safeguards at project mid-term either on PIRs or MTRs. Assessment compliance was not possible given that only 2/14 projects from cohort 3 for which the requirement was mandatory had PIRs available. It was noted however it was noted that only 1 out of the 2 reported on safeguards. It was also noted that reporting on safeguards on PIRs from cohort 1 to cohort 2 remained almost unchanged.

Requirement #3: “Provide information on the implementation of relevant environmental and social management measures at project mid-term” (Safeguards Policy, p. 19)

Applicable to: *Cohort 3 projects*

Guidance: Reporting on safeguards was searched for on PIRs or MTRs either at a specific section or throughout these documents. Generally, the portfolio review team did not find MTRs available.

Compliance: 14/23 (61%) of projects from cohort 3 where approved before July 1, 2019, the effective date of the Safeguards Policy. Compliance with reporting on safeguards in PIRs or MTRs for cohort 3 projects was difficult to assess given that only 2/14 projects for which the requirement was mandatory had PIRs available and none of these projects had MTRs. It was found that only 1 project out of the 2 that had a PIR available reported on safeguards.

Changes over time: Reporting on PIRs basically remained the same from cohort 1 to cohort 2 projects at around 78%. If we consider the total number of projects contained in cohort 3, a decrease of 10 percentage points is identified from cohort 1 to cohort 3. However, a decrease of 27% points is identified if we only consider the projects from cohort 3 for which the requirement was mandatory. As before, this negative trend may related to a sample bias resulting from a smaller number of projects reviewed from cohort 3 as compared to cohort 1 and the actual availability of PIRs (3 for cohort 3 and 150 for cohort 1). PIRs normally had a section for reporting on safeguards but the elements reported vary across agencies. Information about environmental and social management measures was very limited. Most common elements reported are related to the status or update of the safeguard risks

categories since project design, new risks identified (if any) and mitigation measures implemented. Very few projects reported on challenges.

Relevant trend across focal areas, agencies and geographical regions: No relevant trends identified.

REPORTING AND EVALUATION

Finding 18. Not able to assess compliance given that no projects from cohort 3 were completed. Changes over time were able to be assessed either given that projects from cohort 2 had no terminal evaluations available and only 8 projects from cohort 1 had terminal evaluations available.

Requirement #4: “Provide information on the implementation of relevant environmental and social management measures at project completion” (Safeguards Policy, p. 19)

Applicable to: *Cohort 3 projects*

Guidance: The portfolio review team looked for MTRs

Compliance: Unable to assess given that terminal evaluations from cohort 3 were not available due to the fact that all projects reviewed were in their early implementation stage.

Changes over time: Not possible to assess given that only 8 projects from cohort 1 and no projects from cohort 2 had terminal evaluations available. It was noted that 3/8 projects with terminal evaluations available reported on safeguards, generally in a specific section.

Relevant trend across focal areas, agencies and geographical regions: Not able to assess.

2. To what extent are stakeholder interests represented in project documentation?

a. What stakeholder groups are typically engaged during the different project phases (identification, design, implementation), and with what frequency?

General finding:

Stakeholders are, on average, shown to be more engaged during project design (80%) than during projects identification (36%). In their composition, engaged stakeholders are relatively similar across both phases in the three cohorts (from most to least): national government institutions and ministries, international organizations, NGOs/CSOs, and the private sector. Local actors such as NGOs/CSOs and local communities show a higher engagement rate across time. In fact, NGOs/CSOs replaced national government institutions and ministries as the most engaged type of stakeholders in both phases over time. The engagement of the private sector in the identification phase remained stable across time and elevated in prominence in the design phase. Lastly, while data on stakeholder engagement during project implementation is limited, reviews show that at least 88% of the project implementation reports from cohort 1 (n=132) and cohort 2 (n=36) tracked stakeholder engagement, while for cohort 3 this corresponded to 100% (n=3).

Identification:

- On average, 36% of all the projects reviewed (all cohorts combined) provided evidence that stakeholders were engaged during the identification phase. Engagement during this phase has increased over time: 60% of the projects reviewed from the third cohort reported engaging stakeholders during project identification against 22% from the first cohort.
- Among the stakeholders most typically engaged during project identification, national governments (17%), international organizations (14%) and the private sector (14%) are the three stakeholder groups that are most typically mentioned in cohort 1. For cohort 2 and cohort 3, the three stakeholder groups that are most typically mentioned are national government institutions and ministries (20% in cohort 2, 24% in cohort 3), NGOs/CSOs (19% in cohort 1, 24% in cohort 3) and the private sector (12% in cohort 2 and 19% in cohort 3).
- Please note that the categories of stakeholders above are not mutually exclusive, as most projects described more than one type of stakeholders engaged. Consequently, the indicator on the most typically engaged stakeholders is related to the total number of times stakeholders were engaged across all projects in the identification phase as opposed to the total number of projects that engaged that particular type of stakeholders.
- It is also worth stressing the increased participation of NGOs/CSOs (+10pp) from cohort 1 to cohort 2 projects as well as the increased participation of NGOs/CSOs (+15 pp) and local communities (+11 pp) from cohort 1 to cohort 3 projects. The latter finding should be analyzed carefully given the relative difference of projects reviewed for which it was possible to assess engagement at identification phase in cohort 1 (24/183) and cohort 2 (6/23).

Design:

- 80% of the projects involved stakeholders in the design phase (all cohorts combined). The level of engagement has increased over time: 87% of the projects reviewed from the third cohort reported engaging stakeholders during project identification against 70% from the first cohort.
- Among the stakeholders most typically engaged during project design, national governments (17%), NGOs/CSOs (16%) and “others” (12%) are the three stakeholder groups that are most typically mentioned in cohort 1 project. For cohort 2 the three stakeholder groups that are most typically mentioned are NGOs/CSOs (19%), national government institutions and ministries (16%) and international organizations (12%). Finally, for cohort 3 the three stakeholder groups that are most typically mentioned are NGOs/CSOs (21%), national government institutions and ministries (19%) and the private sector (15%).

- As in the identification phase, the indicator on the most typically engaged stakeholders is related to the total number of times stakeholders were engaged across all projects in the design phase as opposed to the total number of projects that engaged that particular type of stakeholders.
- It identified a slight increased participation of local communities (+3pp) and NGOs/CSOs (+4pp) from cohort 1 to cohort 2. Furthermore, there was a slight increased participation of local communities (+1pp), NGOs/CSOs (+6pp), private sector (+6pp) and academia (+5pp) from cohort 1 to cohort 3. As before, the latter finding should be analyzed carefully given the relative difference of projects reviewed for which it was possible to assess engagement at design phase in cohort 1 (129/183) and cohort 2 (20/23).

Implementation:

- While the PRT does not track which stakeholders were engaged during project implementation, we have information on the extent to which project implementation reports reported against the SEP or any planned stakeholder engagement activities.
- On average, 92% of the project reviewed tracked stakeholder engagement during project implementation in their PIRs. This figure is also constant over time.

- b. What types of engagement are used by the GEF at different phases in the project cycle? Do GEF projects tend to use one-way engagement such as knowledge sharing, or is there evidence that the GEF is using two-way engagement to give agency and voice to stakeholders?**

General finding:

While generic words such as ‘consultations’ are still mostly used to describe types of stakeholder engagement activities we also find evidence of two-way engagement processes where stakeholders are engaged and consulted during meetings, interviews and workshops, among others. However, there is less supportive evidence that stakeholders are given as much agency during the project implementation phase, as we find little evidence of their participation in project governance at the project and/or local level, as well as in the monitoring process.

Identification:

In all projects reviewed at identification (all cohorts combined) we find that 55% of them did not specify the type of consultations and used general wording such as “consultations”, another 22% engaged stakeholders during meetings, 16% during workshops and 11% through interviews. Lastly, engagement through field visits, focus groups, assessment or surveys, all account for less than 5% each.

Design:

In all projects reviewed at design (all cohorts combined) we find that 41% of them did not specify the type of consultations and used general wording such as “consultations”, another 45% engaged stakeholders during meetings, 44% during workshops, 15% through field visits and 11% through assessment or surveys. Lastly, engagement through field visits, focus groups, interviews, all account for less than 10% each. It is important to note that stakeholder engagement activities were generally better in project documents from the design phase as compared to the identification phase (e.g. the level of detail improved).

Implementation:

There is limited evidence on plans to involve ground-level stakeholders (indigenous peoples, women, disabled persons or civil society organizations, community-based organizations and groups representing them) in project governance. About 19% of them are planned to be included in project governance at the project level-only, 8% at the community/ local level and approximately 9.5% at both levels.

Figures on participatory monitoring show that a large majority of projects across the three cohorts does not typically engage stakeholders in the monitoring process throughout implementation. Only 20% of both projects show evidence of participatory monitoring across all three cohorts.

c. To what extent is there evidence in project documents that plans for stakeholder engagement were carried out and reported on during implementation?

General finding:

While a large majority of projects reviewed reported on stakeholder engagement activities carried out during project implementation (ref: Q2a), these activities were not consistently reported against plans made during project design. We found that 81% of the projects that reported stakeholder engagement activities in their PIR did not include a specific reference showing consistency with originally planned activities.

d. To what extent do we see evidence of inclusive and meaningful stakeholder participation in project or program documents?²

General finding:

Data from project documents suggests that projects from all three cohorts are incorporating the different elements of a meaningful consultation at different degrees. The most common elements found in project documents are the representation and involvement of different categories of stakeholders (44%), a consultation process that is ongoing and iterative throughout the project cycle (32%), a consultation process that is equitable and non-discriminatory (29%), and finally a consultation process that is systematically documented and disclosed (16%). In average across all cohorts, these four elements were found in at least 30% of the projects.

The remaining elements of meaningful consultation (prior information and appropriate language, confidentiality of information, transparency and factual information, and relevant aspects documented and disclosed) were found in less than 10% of the projects reviewed for projects from all three cohorts

While the elements of a meaningful consultation were more commonly found in projects from cohort 1, this should be analyzed with care. This is because projects from cohort 1 normally allow for a better assessment of the meaningful consultation elements given that the project's documentation is more complete.

e. How often do GEF projects/programs describe efforts to engage with persons with disabilities and if so, what type of engagement typically occurs?

General finding:

Across all project phases, we find no evidence of the efforts made by GEF projects to engage with people with disabilities. There is, however, limited evidence of their identification at design phase which is relatively stable across both cohorts.

Identification:

Among all projects reviewed, we find no evidence of GEF projects engaging with persons with disabilities during project identification, nor are they identified as affected or participating stakeholders.

Design:

Only around 3% of the projects from cohort 1 and cohort 2 identified persons with disabilities as relevant stakeholders in their design project documents. However, we found no evidence of actual engagement of persons with disabilities in the design phase of the projects in any cohort.

3. Are any of the intermediate outcomes, as described in the Theory of Change of the Stakeholder Engagement Policy reflected in project and program documents?

General finding:

There is evidence that projects are incorporating the intermediate outcomes of GEF's theory of change to a different degree. Average data from both cohorts suggest that most projects incorporate the intention to address the social and economic needs of affected people (68%), enhance country ownership (47%) or harness the knowledge and expertise of stakeholders (35%). The intention to enhance accountability was mentioned to a lesser extent (19%). Project review data also suggests that cohort 2 projects incorporate all the intermediate outcomes more often than cohort 1 projects. This is particularly the case of intermediate outcomes related to enhance accountability and harness the knowledge and expertise of stakeholders.

For GEF 7 projects only (cohort 3 projects) we find that 69% of the projects reviewed address the social and economic needs of affected people; 22% aim at enhancing country ownership; 35% harness the knowledge and expertise of stakeholders and 17% intend to enhance accountability of local stakeholders.

4. Are there any lessons emerging from early implementation of the new policies?

General finding:

Nothing to add in relation to this from the question "Do you have anything else to add about this project that stood out while reviewing it, or any information about it that would be useful to keep track of".

5. To what extent do the instruments associated with the policies build off one another/show coherence (Stakeholder Engagement Plan, Gender Action Plan, Environmental and Social Management Plan?)

General finding: More than a third of GEF-7 projects reviewed (35%) show signs that the instruments associated with the policies may be building off one another. Another 30% also have two or more of these instruments but no evidence was found that they build on each other.

This question was only assessed for cohort 2 and 3. 35% of the projects from cohort 2 have at least two of the following documents: SEP, GAP or ESMP; and there is evidence that they build off each other or they refer among themselves. 38% of cohort 2 projects have at least two of these documents but evidence that they build off each other or refer among themselves was not found.

6. To what extent is there evidence linking stakeholder engagement with project and program outcomes?

a. Is there a correlation between projects that have "good" stakeholder engagement and high outcome or sustainability ratings?

General finding:

As GEF-7 programming is still underway, only a small number of projects endorsed after 2018 have submitted a terminal evaluation. We are therefore not able to derive a correlation between projects that have a “good” stakeholder engagement and high outcomes/sustainability ratings.

Only 8 projects that were completed have terminal evaluations in which outcome ratings are reported. This low number of projects does not allow us to estimate a statistically significant correlation coefficient between stakeholder engagement and outcome/sustainability rating.

- b. How often do terminal evaluations include stakeholder engagement as a factor for success? Is there any information about contextual factors that matter for good stakeholder engagement?**

General finding:

Less than 10% of all projects reviewed (n=32) describe stakeholder engagements as a factor of success for the project in their most recent reporting document. Among those, good participation, high commitment and ownership and involving ground-level stakeholders were key for the projects to achieve their goals. On the other hand, about 26% (n=89) reported that contextual or project-related factors have hindered stakeholder engagement, the COVID-19 pandemic being the first reason put forward.

Annex I: Sample statistics

Focal areas across random sample and population (Cohort 1)

	<i>Projects not sampled (A)</i>		<i>Random Sample (B)</i>		<i>Population (C)</i>		<i>T-test (A-B)</i>
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
Biodiversity	25	15.3%	24	13.1%	49	14.2%	0.59
Chemicals and Waste	15	9.2%	15	8.2%	30	8.7%	0.33
Climate Change	42	25.8%	57	31.1%	99	28.6%	-1.10
International Waters	5	3.1%	11	6.0%	16	4.6%	-1.30
Land Degradation	8	4.9%	4	2.2%	12	3.5%	1.38
Multi Focal Area	68	41.7%	72	39.3%	140	40.5%	0.45
Total	163	100%	183	100%	346	100%	

Focal areas across random sample and population (Cohort 2)

	<i>Projects not sampled (A)</i>		<i>Random Sample (B)</i>		<i>Population (C)</i>		<i>T-test (A-B)</i>
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
Biodiversity	18	25.0%	21	16.2%	39	19.3%	1.53
Chemicals and Waste	7	9.7%	11	8.5%	18	8.9%	0.3
Climate Change	21	29.2%	53	40.8%	74	36.6%	-1.64
International Waters	3	4.2%	6	4.6%	9	4.5%	-0.15
Land Degradation	4	5.6%	4	3.1%	8	4.0%	0.86
Multi Focal Area	19	26.4%	35	26.9%	54	26.7%	-0.08
Total	72	100%	130	100%	202	100%	

Focal areas across random sample and population (Cohort 3)

	<i>Population</i>	
	No.	%
Biodiversity	2	8.7%
Chemicals and Waste	2	8.7%
Climate Change	9	39.1%
International Waters	3	13.0%
Land Degradation	2	8.7%
Multi Focal Area	5	21.7%
Total	23	100%

Types of project across random sample and population (Cohort 1)

	<i>Projects not sampled (A)</i>		<i>Random Sample (B)</i>		<i>Population (C)</i>		<i>T-test (A-B)</i>
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
FSP	111	68.1%	112	61.2%	223	64.5%	1.33
MSP	52	31.9%	71	38.8%	123	35.5%	-1.33
Total	163	100%	183	100%	346	100%	

Types of project across random sample and population (Cohort 2)

	<i>Projects not sampled (A)</i>		<i>Random Sample (B)</i>		<i>Population (C)</i>		<i>T-test (A-B)</i>
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
FSP	45	62.5%	90	69.2%	135	66.8%	-0.97
MSP	27	37.5%	40	30.8%	67	33.2%	0.97
Total	72	100%	130	100%	202	100%	

Types of project across random sample and population (Cohort 3)

<i>Population</i>		
	No.	%
FSP	9	39.1%
MSP	14	60.9%
Total	23	100%

Lead Agencies across random sample and population (Cohort 1)

	<i>Projects not sampled (A)</i>		<i>Random Sample (B)</i>		<i>Population (C)</i>		<i>T-test (A-B)</i>
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
ADB	2	1.2%	6	3.3%	8	2.3%	-1.27
AfDB	5	3.1%	4	2.2%	9	2.6%	0.51
BOAD	1	0.6%		0.0%	1	0.3%	1.06
CAF			1	0.5%	1	0.3%	-0.94
CI	7	4.3%	4	2.2%	11	3.2%	1.11
DBSA	2	1.2%	1	0.5%	3	0.9%	0.68
ERDB			3	1.6%	3	0.9%	-1.64
FAO	8	4.9%	14	7.7%	22	6.4%	-1.04
Funbio	1	0.6%		0.0%	1	0.3%	1.06
IADB	4	2.5%	4	2.2%	8	2.3%	0.17

IFAD	5	3.1%	7	3.8%	12	3.5%	-0.38
IUCN	5	3.1%	4	2.2%	9	2.6%	0.51
UNDP	67	41.1%	62	33.9%	129	37.3%	1.39
UNEP	27	16.6%	30	16.4%	57	16.5%	0.04
UNIDO	10	6.1%	19	10.4%	29	8.4%	-1.42
WWF-US	2	1.2%	1	0.5%	3	0.9%	0.68
World Bank	17	10.4%	23	12.6%	40	11.6%	-0.62
Total	163	100%	183	100%	346	100%	

Lead Agencies across random sample and population (Cohort 2)

	<i>Projects not sampled (A)</i>		<i>Random Sample (B)</i>		<i>Population (C)</i>		<i>T-test (A-B)</i>
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
AfDB	0	0.0%	5	3.8%	5	2.5%	-1.68
BOAD	0	0.0%	1	0.8%	1	0.5%	-0.74
CAF	2	2.8%	1	0.8%	3	1.5%	1.13
CI	2	2.8%	5	3.8%	7	3.5%	-0.39
DBSA	1	1.4%	0	0.0%	1	0.5%	1.35
ERDB	0	0.0%	1	0.8%	1	0.5%	-0.74
FAO	8	11.1%	13	10.0%	21	10.4%	0.25
FECO	1	1.4%	0	0.0%	1	0.5%	1.35
IADB	0	0.0%	2	1.5%	2	1.0%	-1.05
IFAD	1	1.4%	0	0.0%	1	0.5%	1.35
IUCN	2	2.8%	1	0.8%	3	1.5%	1.13
UNDP	26	36.1%	42	32.3%	68	33.7%	0.54
UNEP	26	36.1%	36	27.7%	62	30.7%	1.24
UNIDO	2	2.8%	9	6.9%	11	5.4%	-1.24
WWF-US	1	1.4%	2	1.5%	3	1.5%	-0.08
World Bank	0	0.0%	12	9.2%	12	5.9%	-2.69
Total	72	100%	130	100%	202	100%	

Lead Agencies across random sample and population (Cohort 3)

	<i>Population</i>	
	No.	%
CAF	1	4.3%
CI	2	8.7%
ERDB	1	4.3%
FAO	6	26.1%
UNDP	4	17.4%
UNEP	4	17.4%
UNIDO	1	4.3%
World Bank	4	17.4%

Total	23	100%
--------------	-----------	-------------

GEF Regions across random sample and population (Cohort 1)

	<i>Projects not sampled (A)</i>		<i>Random Sample (B)</i>		<i>Population (C)</i>		<i>T-test (A-B)</i>
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
AFR	43	26.4%	48	26.2%	91	26.3%	0.03
Asia	34	20.9%	28	15.3%	62	17.9%	1.35
CEX	16	9.8%	30	16.4%	46	13.3%	-1.80
ECA	17	10.4%	22	12.0%	39	11.3%	-0.47
LAC	31	19.0%	31	16.9%	62	17.9%	0.50
REG	22	13.5%	24	13.1%	46	13.3%	0.10
Total	163	100%	183	100%	346	100%	

GEF Regions across random sample and population (Cohort 2)

	<i>Projects not sampled (A)</i>		<i>Random Sample (B)</i>		<i>Population (C)</i>		<i>T-test (A-B)</i>
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
AFR	22	30.6%	60	46.2%	86	38.2%	-2.18
Asia	16	22.2%	31	23.8%	49	21.8%	-0.26
CEX	5	6.9%	2	1.5%	13	5.8%	2.02
ECA	9	12.5%	3	2.3%	17	7.6%	2.98
LAC	12	16.7%	18	13.8%	34	15.1%	0.54
REG	8	11.1%	16	12.3%	26	11.6%	-0.25
Total	72	100%	130	100%	225	100%	

GEF Regions across random sample and population (Cohort 3)

	<i>Population</i>	
	No.	%
AFR	4	17.4%
Asia	2	8.7%
CEX	6	26.1%
ECA	5	21.7%
LAC	4	17.4%
REG	2	8.7%
Total	23	100%

Annex II: Portfolio Analysis Protocol

Basic Project Information

1. Name Reviewer
2. GEF ID
3. Project Name
4. Is gender mentioned in the project objective?
5. Project Objective
6. Project Components
 - Component 1
 - Component 2
 - Component 3
 - Component 4
 - Component 5
 - Component 6
 - Component 7
 - Component 8
7. Does the project have a risk assessment rating?
8. Are any civil society organizations (NGOs, women's groups, etc.) listed as executing partners?
9. If yes, please specify the name of the main executing partner listed
 - Name of contact person
 - Name of the CSO/NGO
 - Position
 - Email Address
 - Phone Number
10. Which cohort does this project belong to?

Identification – PIF Approval

11. Is there a PIF/PFD?
12. Does the PIF/PFD identify affected and participating stakeholders?
13. If yes, please select the type of stakeholders identified (select all that apply)
 - Indigenous peoples
 - Local communities
 - NGOs
 - CSOs
 - Women and girls
 - Men and boys
 - People with disabilities

- Local authorities/government
- National government institutions and ministries
- Indigenous peoples' organizations (national or local)
- Women's organizations (national or local)
- Farmer's organizations (national or local)
- Youth and children's organizations (national or local)
- International organizations (including multilateral development banks)
- Private sector
- Academic/research institutions
- Media
- Only general wording was used (e.g. "stakeholders")
- Other namely (e.g. migrants, youth, the poor)

14. Is there any evidence that stakeholders were engaged during project identification?

15. If yes, please describe which stakeholders were engaged during project identification (please check all that apply)

- Indigenous peoples
- Local communities
- NGOs
- CSOs
- Women and girls
- Men and boys
- People with disabilities
- Local authorities/government
- National government institutions and ministries
- Indigenous peoples' organizations (national or local)
- Women's organizations (national or local)
- Farmer's organizations (national or local)
- Youth and children's organizations (national or local)
- International organizations (including multilateral development banks)
- Private sector
- Academic/research institutions
- Media
- Only general wording was used (e.g. "stakeholders")
- Other please specify - (youth, etc.)

16. If yes, please describe how they were engaged during identification (focus groups, public information campaigns, etc.).

17. Is there any information on plans for how stakeholders will be engaged throughout the project cycle?

- Yes, the PIF/PFD includes information on how stakeholders will be engaged including mechanisms for engaging

18. If yes, please select how stakeholders will participate throughout the project cycle description.

- Designing of activities
- Implementation of activities

- Monitoring, evaluation, and reporting
- N/A

Design – CEO Endorsement

19. Is there a CEO Request Document?

20. Does the CEO/MSP Request identify affected and participating stakeholders?

21. If new information is presented, please select the type of stakeholders identified (select all that apply)

- Indigenous peoples
- Local communities
- NGOs
- CSOs
- Women and girls
- Men and boys
- People with disabilities
- Local authorities/government
- National government institutions and ministries
- Indigenous peoples' organizations (national or local)
- Women's organizations (national or local)
- Farmer's organizations (national or local)
- Youth and children's organizations (national or local)
- International organizations (including multilateral development banks)
- Private sector
- Academic/research institutions
- Media
- Only general wording was used (e.g. "stakeholders")
- Other namely (e.g. migrants, youth, the poor)

22. Were stakeholders involved in the design of the project?

23. If yes, please describe which stakeholders were engaged during project design (please check all that apply)

- Indigenous peoples
- Local communities
- NGOs
- CSOs
- Women and girls
- Men and boys
- People with disabilities
- Local authorities/government
- National government institutions and ministries
- Indigenous peoples' organizations (national or local)
- Women's organizations (national or local)
- Farmer's organizations (national or local)
- Youth and children's organizations (national or local)
- International organizations (including multilateral development banks)
- Private sector
- Academic/research institutions

- Media
 - Only general wording was used (e.g. "stakeholders")
 - Other please specify - (youth, etc.)
24. If yes, please describe how they were engaged during design (focus groups, public information campaigns, etc.). Please include source and text.
25. Is there any information on plans for how stakeholders will be engaged throughout the project cycle?
26. If new information is presented, please select how stakeholders will participate throughout the project cycle
- Designing of activities
 - Implementation of activities
 - Monitoring, evaluation, and reporting
 - N/A
27. Are any of these elements (from the Evaluation's Stakeholder Engagement Policy Theory of Change) present in the project logic? (Select all that apply)
- The project aims for enhanced country ownership
 - The project aims for enhanced accountability
 - The project aims to address the social and economic needs of affected people
 - The project harnesses the knowledge and expertise of stakeholder (i.e. the project is built on the traditional knowledge and practices of local communities)
 - N/A not present
28. Does the project incorporate lessons learned related to stakeholder engagement from a previous project (GEF-funded or otherwise)?
29. Is there a stakeholder engagement plan (SEP) or equivalent that summarizes stakeholder engagement activities and provides documentation?
- No, there is no mention of a SEP/project documents don't describe stakeholder engagement activities or provide supporting documentation.
 - No, but there are plans to include or develop an SEP at a later phase
 - Yes, there is a SEP that describes stakeholder engagement activities or provide supporting documentation.
 - Yes, project document describes stakeholder engagement activities or provide supporting documentation.
 - Yes, there is a SEP or equivalent, but it does not describe stakeholder engagement activities or provide supporting documentation
30. If project documents include a SEP or equivalent, please identify the elements included in the SEP (select all that apply)
- The stakeholders, their relevant interests, and why they are included
 - The steps and actions to achieve meaningful consultation and inclusive participation, including information dissemination
 - Roles and responsibilities for implementation of the Plan
 - The timing of the engagement throughout the project cycle
 - The budget and/or resources for stakeholder engagement throughout the project cycle and, where applicable, for related capacity-building to support this engagement
 - Key indicators of stakeholder engagement during project implementation

- Steps that will be taken to monitor and report on progress and issues that arise
- Description of past or ongoing stakeholder engagement
- The role and/or responsibilities of stakeholders for stakeholder engagement, including project execution
- Identification of how concerns will be addressed, including how stakeholders input will be built into project implementation
- Information on means of engagement (focus groups, information campaigns, etc.)
- None of the above

31. If there is a SEP or equivalent, is there documentation or evidence to show that it was made publicly available in a form and language relevant to the stakeholders and disseminated proactively to them?

32. Does the OFP Letter of Endorsement confirm that the project has been discussed with stakeholders?

33. Did the project receive a project preparation grant (PPG), and if so was any of it used for stakeholder engagement activities?

Indigenous Peoples

34. Does the project directly benefit indigenous peoples as part of the other stakeholders identified?

35. Does the results framework include indicators to track indigenous peoples' involvement/engagement in the project?

Gender

36. Is gender considered in project activities, outcomes, or results?

37. Did stakeholder consultations include individuals or groups with a gender perspective (e.g., ministries of women, non-government organizations focused on promoting gender equality, women's rights, or the empowerment of women)?

38. Does the project include a gender analysis or equivalent?

39. Does the project include a gender action plan (GAP) or equivalent?

40. Were roles, needs, and livelihoods separately identified for men and women (note that the question is looking for a separation between men and women, not roles, needs, and livelihoods)

- Closing gender gaps in access to and control over natural resources
- Improving women's participation and decision making
- Generating socioeconomic benefits or services for women

41. Does the projects' results framework include gender/sex disaggregated or gender specific indicators?

Safeguards

42. Does the project have an environmental and social assessment or equivalent?

43. Were any conducted stakeholder consultations planned as a result of the safeguards policy?

44. What safeguards risk category was assigned to the project?

45. What safeguard areas were considered applicable to the project?

Coherence

46. If the project has at least two of the following documents: SEP or equivalent, GAP and ESMP, is there evidence that these instruments build off or refer to each other?

Implementation

47. Are there any PIRs or MTR?

48. In the PIR or MTR is there any reporting on gender?

49. Is there any reporting in the documentation (PIRs or MTRs) against the SEP or planned stakeholder engagement activities from design phase?

50. If yes, does the report against the plan show consistency with originally planned activities?

51. In the PIR or MTR, is there any reporting on the implementation of safeguards?

52. If there is reporting on the implementation of safeguards, what issues/challenges have been identified?

Reporting and Evaluation

53. Is there evidence that the project included participatory monitoring?

54. If project implementation is closed, is there a terminal evaluation?

55. What is the project outcome rating in the TE?

56. What is the project sustainability rating in the TE?

57. Does the TE report on implementation against the stakeholder engagement plan (or equivalent) or assess the quality of the stakeholder engagement?

58. Does the Terminal Evaluation report on gender?

59. In the Terminal Evaluation, is there any reporting on the implementation of safeguards?

60. If there is reporting on the implementation of safeguards, what issues/challenges have been identified?

Resource Allocation

61. Is there documentation/evidence of resource allocation for stakeholder engagement?

62. Is there documentation/evidence of resource allocation for addressing gender disparities?

63. Is there evidence that ground level stakeholders (indigenous peoples, women, (any other e.g. disabled) or civil society organizations, community-based organizations or groups representing them) are involved in project governance?

64. To what extent do we see any of the following elements of meaningful stakeholder engagement in the project documentation? (Select all that apply)
- The stakeholder consultation process is ongoing and iterative through the project cycle, starting as early as possible
 - Different categories of stakeholders are represented and involved
 - It is equitable and non-discriminatory, and ensure that vulnerable groups (e.g. women, the poor) are given a voice
 - It is transparent and based on factual information, including about the scope of consultation and ability of stakeholders to influence project decisions
 - Stakeholders had prior information about aspects of the project, in a language, format and manner that is appropriate, clear and accessible
 - Confidentiality of information and stakeholder was provided if requested or if there was a concern about retaliation
 - The consultation process was systematically documented and aspects of it were disclosed publicly
 - Relevant aspects of the consultation process were disclosed publicly
 - None of the above
 - U/A Project is only at CEO endorsement phase
65. Are there any contextual/project-related factors that might have hindered stakeholder engagement?
66. Does the most recent reporting document (PIR, MTR, or TE) describe stakeholder engagement, consultations, or any related concepts as a factor for success?
67. Do you have anything else to add about this project that stood out while reviewing it, or any information about it that would be useful to keep track of?

Annex III: Overview of the Stakeholder Engagement Policy Compliance Results

Cohort 1 – 2014 Public Involvement Policy + Guidelines	Cohort 2 – 2014 PIP Guidelines / Spillovers 2018 SE Guidelines	Cohort 3 – 2018 Stakeholder Engagement Policy + Guidelines
Identification		
<p>Requirement: Identify affected stakeholders from civil society including indigenous people</p> <p>Findings: Among the projects that submitted a PIF (n=109), 94.5% of them identified affected and participating stakeholders in their PIF.</p> <p>Disaggregated findings: Consistent with the relative shares of agencies, focal areas and regions.</p>	<p>Findings: Among the projects that submitted a PIF (n=99), 95% of them identified affected and participating stakeholders in their PIF.</p> <p>Disaggregated findings: Consistent with the relative shares of agencies, focal areas and regions.</p>	<p>Requirement: Identify key stakeholders at the identification phase.</p> <p>Findings: Among the projects that submitted a PIF (n=10), 90% of them identified affected and participating stakeholders in their PIF.</p> <p>Disaggregated findings: A third of the projects that have identified stakeholders at the identification phase are from the LAC region, which is higher than the share of that region in the sample.</p>
<p>Requirement: N/A</p> <p>Findings: Among the projects that submitted a PIF (n=108), 22.2% of them engaged stakeholders during project identification.</p> <p>Disaggregated findings: Among the projects that did engage stakeholders at identification, climate change projects have engaged more stakeholders at identification</p>	<p>Findings: Among the projects that submitted a PIF (n=99), 25.2% of them engaged stakeholders during project identification.</p> <p>Disaggregated findings: Among the projects that did engage stakeholders at identification, AfDB projects have engaged more stakeholders at identification (12%), relatively to their sample share.</p>	<p>Requirement: Mobilize key stakeholders at the identification phase.</p> <p>Findings: Among the projects that submitted a PIF (n=10), 60% of them engaged stakeholders during project identification.</p> <p>Disaggregated findings: Among the projects that did engage stakeholders at identification, climate change projects have engaged more stakeholders at identification</p>

<p>(54.1%), relatively to their sample share. A higher share of UNDP projects complied with this requirement (50%), relatively to their sample share. Lastly, projects from the Asia region are the most compliant with this requirement (25%).</p>		<p>(60.7%), relatively to their sample share. A higher share of UNDP projects complied with this requirement (40%), relatively to their sample share. Lastly, projects from the ECA and LAC regions are the most compliant with this requirement (33.3% each).</p>
<p>Requirement: N/A</p> <p>Findings: 61% of cohort 1 projects that engaged stakeholders during projects identification (n=23) did not specify the type of consultations and used general wording such as “consultations”.</p> <p>17% of projects that described stakeholder engagement at PIF stage mentioned having involved stakeholders during workshops, another 13% during meetings, 9% during interviews, and 4% through assessments or surveys.</p> <p>Please note that these categories are not mutually exclusive, as most projects described more than one type of consultation, hence they don’t add up to a 100%.</p> <p>Disaggregated findings: Too few projects to disaggregate findings.</p>	<p>Findings: 38% of cohort 2 projects that engaged stakeholders during projects identification (n=26) did not specify the type of consultations and used general wording such as “consultations”.</p> <p>Another 35% of projects mentioned that meetings took place during project development, and another 15% of projects engaged stakeholders through workshops, and 8% through interviews. The share of projects that engaged stakeholders through assessment or surveys, field visits, focus groups or other types of engagement is the same and is equal to 4%.</p> <p>Please note that these categories are not mutually exclusive, as most projects described more than one type of consultation, hence they don’t add up to a 100%.</p> <p>Disaggregated findings: Too few projects to disaggregate findings.</p>	<p>Requirement: Provide a description of any consultations conducted during project development.</p> <p>Findings: 67% of cohort 3 projects that engaged stakeholders during projects identification (n=6) did not specify the type of consultations and used general wording such as “consultations”.</p> <p>17% of projects that described stakeholder engagement at PIF stage mentioned having involved stakeholders during meetings, and another 17% during interviews.</p> <p>Please note that these categories are not mutually exclusive, as most projects described more than one type of consultation, hence they don’t add up to a 100%.</p> <p>Disaggregated findings: Too few projects to disaggregate findings.</p>

<p>Requirement: Describe how affected stakeholders will be consulted with and engaged in the project</p> <p>Findings: 45% of the projects reviewed included information on how stakeholders will be engaged throughout the project cycle. 40% mentioned that stakeholders will be engaged but did not provide any details on the type of engagement or the timing. Lastly, 15% did not include any information on whether stakeholders will be engaged.</p> <p>Disaggregated findings: There are no notable trends to discuss for this cohort.</p>	<p>Findings: 49% of the projects reviewed included information on how stakeholders will be engaged throughout the project cycle. 40% mentioned that stakeholders will be engaged but did not provide any details on the type of engagement or timing. Lastly, 10% did not include any information on whether stakeholders will be engaged.</p> <p>Disaggregated findings: Among the projects that did describe how stakeholders will be consulted with, included those that did not give information on the type of engagement or timing, climate change projects have well complied with this requirement, relatively to their sample share.</p>	<p>Requirement: Provide information on how stakeholders will be engaged and means of engagement throughout the project/program cycle.</p> <p>Findings: 40% included information on how stakeholders will be engaged throughout the project cycle (n=4). 30% mentioned that stakeholders will be engaged but did not provide any details on the type of engagement or timing (n=3). Lastly, 30% did not include any information on whether stakeholders will be engaged (n=3).</p> <p>Disaggregated findings: Relatively to their sample share, we find that global projects do not include much information on whether stakeholders will be engaged throughout the project cycle, while projects implemented in the Asia and Africa region do. We also find that projects led by UNEP and UNIDO comply better with this requirement in comparison to other agencies, and with respect to their sample weight.</p>
Design		
<p>Requirement: Identify affected stakeholders from civil society including indigenous people</p> <p>Findings: At CEO Endorsement stage, 94% of the projects reviewed identified key stakeholders and about 8% of those</p>	<p>Findings: At CEO Endorsement stage, almost 100% of the projects reviewed identified key stakeholders, and 6% of those presented the same information that is in the PIF.</p>	<p>Requirement: Identify key stakeholders at the design phase.</p> <p>Findings: At CEO Endorsement stage, 100% of the projects reviewed identified key stakeholders, and only one of those (4%) has</p>

<p>presented the same information as what was included in the PIF.</p> <p>Disaggregated findings: There are no trends to note as almost all projects complied with this requirement.</p>	<p>Disaggregated findings: There are no trends to note as almost all projects complied with this requirement.</p>	<p>presented the same information that was in the PIF.</p> <p>Disaggregated findings: There are no trends to note as almost all projects complied with this requirement.</p>
<p>Requirement: N/A</p> <p>Findings: Among the projects that submitted a CEO Endorsement document (n=181), 70% of them engaged stakeholders during project design.</p> <p>Disaggregated findings: There are no notable trends to discuss for this cohort.</p>	<p>Findings: 84% of the projects reviewed from cohort 2 engaged stakeholders in the project design.</p> <p>Disaggregated findings: There are no notable trends to discuss for this cohort.</p>	<p>Requirement: Mobilize key stakeholders at the design phase.</p> <p>Findings: 87% of the projects reviewed from cohort 3 engaged stakeholders during the projects design phase.</p> <p>Disaggregated findings: There are no notable trends to discuss for this cohort.</p>
<p>Requirement: N/A</p> <p>Findings: 52% of cohort 1 projects that engaged stakeholders during project design (n=124) did not specify the type of consultations and used general wording such as “consultations”.</p> <p>38% of projects that described stakeholder engagement at CEO Endorsement stage mentioned having involved stakeholders during workshops, 37% during meetings, 13% during field visits, 6% during assessments or surveys, 6% during interviews, 5% through focus groups and another 2% are other types of engagement.</p>	<p>Findings: 32% of cohort 2 projects that engaged stakeholders during project design (n=107) did not specify the type of consultations and used general wording such as “consultations”.</p> <p>65% of projects that described stakeholder engagement at CEO Endorsement stage mentioned having involved stakeholders during workshops, 49% during meetings, 17% during field visits, 13% during interviews, 11% during assessments or surveys, 9% through focus groups and another 1% are other types of engagement.</p>	<p>Requirement: Provide a description of any consultations conducted during project design.</p> <p>Findings: 40% of cohort 3 projects that engaged stakeholders during project design (n=20) did not specify the type of consultations and used general wording such as “consultations”.</p> <p>50% of projects that described stakeholder engagement at CEO Endorsement stage mentioned having involved stakeholders during meetings, 30% during workshops, 15% during field visits, 15% during assessments or</p>

<p>Please note that these categories are not mutually exclusive, as most projects described more than one type of consultation, hence they don't add up to a 100%.</p> <p>Disaggregated findings: UNDP and the World Bank are the two agencies that mention the most engaging stakeholders through "consultations" without adding further details.</p>	<p>Please note that these categories are not mutually exclusive, as most projects described more than one type of consultation, hence they don't add up to a 100%.</p> <p>Disaggregated findings: UNDP and the UNEP are the two agencies that mention the most engaging stakeholders through "consultations" without adding further details.</p>	<p>surveys, 10% during interviews and 9% through focus groups.</p> <p>Please note that these categories are not mutually exclusive, as most projects described more than one type of consultation, hence they don't add up to a 100%.</p> <p>Disaggregated findings: Among cohort 1 projects, the World Bank is the agency that engages the most stakeholders through "consultations" without adding further details.</p>
<p>Requirement: Describe how affected stakeholders will be consulted with and engaged in the project.</p> <p>Findings: At CEO Endorsement stage, 71% of the projects reviewed included information on how stakeholders will be engaged including mechanisms for engaging and among those 7% presented the same information that is in the PIF. 15% disclosed limited information on the type of engagement or timing. Lastly, 13% did not include any information on whether stakeholders will be engaged.</p> <p>Disaggregated findings: There are no notable trends to discuss for this cohort.</p>	<p>Findings: At CEO Endorsement stage, 70% of the projects reviewed included information on how stakeholders will be engaged including mechanisms for engaging and 6% of those presented the same information that is in the PIF. Less than a fourth of the projects reviewed (24%) disclosed limited information on the type of engagement or timing. Lastly, 5% did not include any information on whether stakeholders will be engaged.</p> <p>Disaggregated findings: There are no notable trends to discuss for this cohort.</p>	<p>Requirement: Provide information on how stakeholders will be engaged and means of engagement throughout the project/program cycle.</p> <p>Findings: At CEO Endorsement stage, 78% of the projects reviewed included information on how stakeholders will be engaged including mechanisms for engaging and 4% of those presented the same information that is in the PIF. 17% of the projects reviewed disclosed limited information on the type of engagement or timing. Lastly, 4% did not include any information on whether stakeholders will be engaged.</p> <p>Disaggregated findings: There are no notable trends to discuss for this cohort.</p>

<p>Requirement: Include an SEP with stakeholder activities, potential partnerships and documentation on stakeholder engagement.</p> <p>Findings: 79% of the projects reviewed submitted an SEP or equivalent document, 18% did not submit such document or describe stakeholder engagement activities, 2% submitted an SEP that did not describe engagement activities and lastly 1% planned to include or develop an SEP at a later phase.</p> <p>94% of cohort 1 projects identify stakeholders, their relevant interest and while they are included in their SEP, 86 identify their role and responsibilities and 66% mention the timing of the engagement. Another 42% describe past or ongoing stakeholder engagement and 33% include the budget needed to engage stakeholders throughout the project. The remaining categories were mentioned in 30% of cohort 1 projects, or less.</p>	<p>Findings: A large majority of projects have a SEP or equivalent project documents that describe stakeholder engagement or provide supporting documentation (92%); Very few projects have a SEP/equivalent documentation that is not explicit enough (2%) or do not have a SEP/equivalent documentation but intend to include it at a later phase (2%). Lastly, 4% of the projects reviewed did not submit an SEP or equivalent document.</p> <p>The vast majority of cohort 2 projects identify the stakeholders, their relevant interest and while they are included (95) the role and responsibilities of stakeholders (89%) and the timing of the engagement (75%); provide description about past stakeholder engagement activities (61%); or included a budget covering stakeholder engagement related expenses (61%). The remaining of the categories were mentioned in 40% or less of the projects.</p>	<p>Requirement: Include a SEP that document public engagement during project development and preparation, including summary reports of stakeholder’s consultations, data on stakeholders/beneficiaries)</p> <p>Findings: 85% of the projects reviewed submitted an SEP or equivalent document, 11% did not submit such document or describe stakeholder engagement activities, 2% submitted an SEP that did not describe engagement activities and lastly 1% planned to include or develop an SEP at a later phase.</p> <p>91% of cohort 1 projects identify stakeholders, their relevant interest and while they are included in their SEP, 78% identify their role and responsibilities, 60% include some information on the means of engagement and another 52% mention the timing of the engagement. 47% of cohort 3 projects describe past or ongoing stakeholder engagement, 39% mention how concerns will be addressed and 26% include the budget needed to engage stakeholders throughout the project. The remaining categories were mentioned in 17% of cohort 3 projects, or less.</p>
---	--	--

<p>Requirement: N/A</p> <p>Findings: No evidence on whether the SEP was made publicly available was found for a large majority of projects (93%). Very few projects showed evidence that the SEP/equivalent was made public in a form and language that were appropriate or that they were disseminated proactively (7%).</p> <p>Disaggregated findings: Too few projects to disaggregate findings.</p>	<p>Findings: It was not possible to assess this requirement for a majority of cohort 2 projects (91%). Very few projects for which it was possible to assess this requirement showed evidence that the SEP/equivalent was made public on a form and language that were appropriate or that they were disseminated proactively (8%)</p> <p>Disaggregated findings: Too few projects to disaggregate findings.</p>	<p>Requirement: The SEP should be made publicly available by the agency in a form and language appropriate to the relevant stakeholders and disseminated proactively.</p> <p>Findings: It was not possible to assess this requirement for a majority of cohort 3 projects (87%). Another 13% of cohort 3 projects made their SEP publicly available but there was no information on whether it was done in a form and language appropriate to the relevant stakeholders and disseminated proactively.</p> <p>Disaggregated findings: Too few projects to disaggregate findings.</p>
Implementation		
<p>Requirement: N/A</p> <p>Findings: 88% of the project reviewed (n=132) tracked stakeholder engagement during project implementation in their PIRs.</p> <p>Disaggregated findings: There are no trends to note as almost all projects complied with this requirement.</p>	<p>Findings: 88% of the project reviewed (n=36) tracked stakeholder engagement during project implementation in their PIRs.</p> <p>Disaggregated findings: There are no trends to note as almost all projects complied with this requirement.</p>	<p>Requirement: To report on progress, challenges and stakeholder engagement outcomes in the PIRs.</p> <p>Findings: 100% of the project reviewed (n=3) tracked stakeholder engagement during project implementation in their PIRs.</p> <p>Disaggregated findings: There are no trends to note as almost all projects complied with this requirement.</p>
Reporting and evaluation		

<p>Requirement: N/A</p> <p>Findings: 17% of cohort 1 projects (n=31) mentioned participatory monitoring in their project documents.</p> <p>Disaggregated findings: Too few projects to disaggregate findings.</p>	<p>Findings: 21% of cohort 2 projects (n=27) mentioned participatory monitoring in their project documents.</p> <p>Disaggregated findings: Too few projects to disaggregate findings.</p>	<p>Requirement: Wherever feasible, the process of monitoring and reporting may include 'participatory monitoring' by stakeholders.</p> <p>Findings: 22% of cohort 3 projects (n=5) mentioned participatory monitoring in their project documents.</p> <p>Disaggregated findings: Too few projects to disaggregate findings.</p>
<p>Requirement: Terminal Evaluations, should include a section on the degree and manner of involvement of civil society organizations and other stakeholders, including indigenous populations.</p> <p>Findings: 6 out of the 8 projects that have a TE reported against the stakeholder engagement plan or assessed the quality of stakeholder engagement in their TE. This is equivalent to 75%.</p> <p>Disaggregated findings: Too few projects to disaggregate findings.</p>	<p>Findings: Not possible to assess this requirement as all cohort 2 projects were still under implementation.</p> <p>Disaggregated findings: N/A</p>	<p>Requirement: To report on progress, challenges and stakeholder engagement outcomes in the MTR and TE.</p> <p>Findings: Not possible to assess this requirement as all cohort 3 projects were still under implementation.</p> <p>Disaggregated findings: N/A</p>
All phases		
<p>Requirement: N/A</p> <p>Findings: Different categories of stakeholders are represented an involved: 79%</p>	<p>Findings: U/A Project is only at CEO endorsement phase: 69% (n=90) Different categories of stakeholders are represented an involved: 48%</p>	<p>Requirement: Projects should aim for meaningful consultations.</p> <p>Findings: U/A Project is only at CEO endorsement phase: 83% (n=19)</p>

<p>The stakeholder consultation process is ongoing and iterative through the project cycle, starting as early as possible: 57%</p> <p>It is equitable and non-discriminatory, and ensure that vulnerable groups (e.g. women, the poor) are given a voice: 52%</p> <p>The consultation process was systematically documented and aspects of it were disclosed publicly: 20%</p> <p>None of the above: 11%</p> <p>U/A Project is only at CEO endorsement phase: 9%</p> <p>Stakeholders had prior information about aspects of the project, in a language, format and manner that is appropriate, clear and accessible: 8%</p> <p>It is transparent and based on factual information, including about the scope of consultation and ability of stakeholders to influence project decisions: 7%</p> <p>Relevant aspects of the consultation process were disclosed publicly: 7%</p> <p>Confidentiality of information and stakeholder was provided if requested or if there was a concern about retaliation: 3%</p> <p>Please note that the above categories are not mutually exclusive hence they don't add up to 100%.</p>	<p>The stakeholder consultation process is ongoing and iterative through the project cycle, starting as early as possible: 26%</p> <p>It is equitable and non-discriminatory, and ensure that vulnerable groups (e.g. women, the poor) are given a voice: 25%</p> <p>The consultation process was systematically documented and aspects of it were disclosed publicly: 25%</p> <p>Stakeholders had prior information about aspects of the project, in a language, format and manner that is appropriate, clear and accessible: 7%</p> <p>Relevant aspects of the consultation process were disclosed publicly: 2%</p> <p>None of the above: 2%</p> <p>Please note that the above categories are not mutually exclusive hence they don't add up to 100%.</p>	<p>Different categories of stakeholders are represented an involved: 26%</p> <p>The stakeholder consultation process is ongoing and iterative through the project cycle, starting as early as possible: 13%</p> <p>It is equitable and non-discriminatory, and ensure that vulnerable groups (e.g. women, the poor) are given a voice: 9%</p> <p>Stakeholders had prior information about aspects of the project, in a language, format and manner that is appropriate, clear and accessible: 4%</p> <p>The consultation process was systematically documented and aspects of it were disclosed publicly: 4%</p> <p>None of the above: 4%</p> <p>Please note that the above categories are not mutually exclusive hence they don't add up to 100%.</p>
<p>Requirement: Include necessary financial and technical assistance to ensure effective public involvement.</p>	<p>Findings: 97% of the projects reviewed (n=126) showed evidence of resources</p>	<p>Requirement: Allocate adequate resources to promote effective Stakeholder Engagement.</p>

<p>Findings: 96% of the projects reviewed (n=175) showed evidence of resources being allocated for stakeholder engagement.</p> <p>Disaggregated findings: There are no trends to note as almost all projects complied with this requirement.</p>	<p>being allocated for stakeholder engagement.</p> <p>Disaggregated findings: There are no trends to note as almost all projects complied with this requirement.</p>	<p>Findings: 91% of the projects reviewed (n=21) showed evidence of resources being allocated for stakeholder engagement.</p> <p>Disaggregated findings: There are no trends to note as almost all projects complied with this requirement.</p>
--	---	---

Annex IV: Overview of the Gender Equality Policy Compliance Results

Cohort 1 – Policy on Gender Mainstreaming	Cohort 2 – Policy on Gender Mainstreaming / Spillovers New Policy on Gender Equality + Guidelines	Cohort 3 – New Policy on Gender Equality + Guidelines
Identification / Design		
<p>Requirement: N/A</p> <p>Findings: Slightly more than a third of the projects reviewed gender analysis was not mentioned in the available documentation (37%). Around a third of the projects reviewed submitted a gender analysis (33%). Finally, also around a third of the project reviewed either planned on conducting one or completed it but did not submit it (30%).</p> <p>Disaggregated findings: No relevant trends identified across focal areas, agencies and regions.</p>	<p>Requirement: N/A</p> <p>Findings: More than half of the projects reviewed submitted a gender analysis (58%) while a low percentage of projects did not mention gender analysis in the available documentation (22%), planned on conducting one or completed it but did not submit it (21%).</p> <p>Disaggregated findings: No relevant trends identified across focal areas, agencies and regions.</p>	<p>Requirement: Submit a Gender Analysis</p> <p>Findings: 70% (16/23) of projects reviewed complied with submitting a gender analysis, while 26% of them did not mention a gender analysis in the available documents. Only 4% of projects planned to conduct a gender analysis.</p> <p>Disaggregated findings: No relevant trends identified across focal areas, agencies and regions.</p>
Design		
<p>Requirement: N/A</p> <p>Findings: 60% of the projects reviewed did not mention or include any Gender Action Plan or equivalent. A fourth of the projects reviewed shared a Gender Action Plan or equivalent document (25%). Less than 15% of them either had planned to conduct later or</p>	<p>Requirement: N/A</p> <p>Findings: Slightly more than half of the projects reviewed shared a Gender Action Plan or equivalent document (55%). Around a third of projects reviewed did not mention or included any Gender Action Plan or equivalent on their documents (36%). Only</p>	<p>Requirement: Submit a Gender Action Plan</p> <p>Findings: Slightly more than two thirds of the projects reviewed shared a Gender Action Plan or equivalent document (61% or 14/23). Around one fourth of projects reviewed did not mention or included any Gender Action Plan or equivalent on their documents (26%). A</p>

<p>had already completed it but did not share it in the available document.</p> <p>Disaggregated findings: Around 30% of projects from cohort 1 that submitted a gender action plan are from Asia which is higher to its relative share of 15%.</p>	<p>9% of projects reviewed had planned to conduct later or had already completed a Gender Action Plan but did not share it.</p> <p>Disaggregated findings: About 60% of the projects that submitted a gender action plan from cohort 2 are from the climate change focal area which is relatively higher to this focal area's share of about 40%. Furthermore, about 50% of the projects from this cohort that submitted a gender action plan belong to UNDP which is relatively higher to this agency share of about 30%.</p>	<p>few projects reviewed had planned to conduct later a Gender Action Plan (13%)</p> <p>Disaggregated findings: No relevant trends identified across focal areas, agencies and regions.</p>
<p>Requirement: N/A</p> <p>Findings: About a 70% of the projects reviewed identified roles, needs and livelihoods separately for men and women.</p> <p>Disaggregated findings: About 50% of the projects from cohort 1 that identified roles, needs and livelihoods separately for women and men came from UNDP which is higher to its relative share of 30%.</p>	<p>Requirement: N/A</p> <p>Findings: Nearly all projects reviewed identified roles, needs and livelihoods separately for men and women (93%).</p> <p>Disaggregated findings: About 50% of the projects from cohort 2 that identified roles, needs and livelihoods separately for women and men came from UNDP which is higher to its relative share of around 30%.</p>	<p>Requirement: Identify roles, needs and livelihoods</p> <p>Findings: About 73% reviewed identified roles, needs and livelihoods separately for men and women (11/15)</p> <p>Disaggregated findings: No relevant trends identified across focal areas, agencies and regions.</p>
<p>Requirement: N/A</p> <p>Findings: About 42% of the projects reviewed identified at least one gender gap. Women's participation and decision making and generating socioeconomic benefits or</p>	<p>Requirement: N/A</p> <p>Findings: About two thirds of projects reviewed identified at least one gender gap (67%). The most commonly identified gap was improving women's participation and decision making (64%), followed by</p>	<p>Requirement: Identification of gender gaps</p> <p>Findings: About 83% of projects reviewed identified at least one gender gap (19/23).</p>

<p>services for women were the most commonly identified gaps (33% each). About 22% of the projects identified access to and control over natural resources as a gender gap.</p> <p>Disaggregated findings: No relevant trends identified across focal areas, agencies and regions.</p>	<p>generating socioeconomic benefits or services for women (55%) and access to and control over natural resources (48%).</p> <p>Disaggregated findings: No relevant trends identified across focal areas, agencies and regions.</p>	<p>The most commonly identified gap was improving women's participation and decision making (74% or 17/23), followed by generating socioeconomic benefits or services for women (52% or 12/23) and access to and control over natural resources (39% or 9/23).</p> <p>Disaggregated findings: No relevant trends identified across focal areas, agencies and regions.</p>
<p>Requirement: System to monitor and evaluate progress in gender mainstreaming</p> <p>Findings: Slightly less than a fifth of the projects reviewed (24%) included both, sex disaggregated and gender sensitive indicators in their results framework. 26% had only included sex disaggregated indicators and 12% had only included gender sensitive indicators. 19% planned on including either of them at a later phase and 20% did not include or mention any.</p> <p>Disaggregated findings: No relevant trends identified across focal areas, agencies and regions.</p>	<p>Requirement: N/A</p> <p>Findings: Half of the projects reviewed (50%) included both, sex disaggregated and gender sensitive indicators in their results framework. 22% had only included sex disaggregated indicators and 5% had only included gender sensitive indicators. 18% planned on including either of them at a later phase and only 5% did not include or mention any.</p> <p>Disaggregated findings: No relevant trends identified across focal areas, agencies and regions.</p>	<p>Requirement: Provide sex-disaggregated and gender sensitive indicators</p> <p>Findings: Almost half of the projects reviewed (48%) included both, sex disaggregated and gender sensitive indicators in their results framework. 13% had only included sex disaggregated indicators and 9% had only included gender sensitive indicators. 26% planned on including either of them at a later phase and only 4% did not include or mention any.</p> <p>Disaggregated findings: No relevant trends identified across focal areas, agencies and regions.</p>
Implementation		
<p>Requirement: N/A</p> <p>Findings: Around 86% of projects reviewed reported on gender in their PIRs and 14% of</p>	<p>Requirement: N/A</p> <p>Findings: Around 28% of projects reviewed reported on gender in their PIRs and 3% of</p>	<p>Requirement: Provide information on gender-responsive measures in PIRs</p>

<p>them did not. This requirement was not able to be assessed for 18% (33/183) of the projects.</p> <p>Disaggregated findings: No relevant trends identified across focal areas, agencies and regions.</p>	<p>them did not. This requirement was not able to be assessed for 68% (89/130) of the projects (89/130).</p> <p>Disaggregated findings: No relevant trends identified across focal areas, agencies and regions.</p>	<p>Findings: 3/3 projects of projects reviewed that had a PIR reported on gender responsive measures in as specific section. 20 projects from cohort 3 did not have a PIRs available.</p> <p>Disaggregated findings: Limited data (number of PIRs available) to identify trends.</p>
Reporting		
<p>Requirement: N/A</p> <p>Findings: Among the 8 projects that submitted a TE, 6 (75%) reported on gender.</p> <p>Disaggregated findings: Limited data (number of TEs available) to identify trends.</p>	<p>Requirement:</p> <p>Findings: No projects from this cohort had TE submitted given that projects reviewed were still under implementation.</p> <p>Disaggregated findings: No data available</p>	<p>Requirement: Provide information on gender-responsive measures in TE</p> <p>Findings: No projects from this cohort had TE submitted given that projects reviewed were still under implementation.</p> <p>Disaggregated findings: No data available</p>
Resource allocation		
<p>Requirement: N/A</p> <p>Findings: Around 71% of projects reviewed showed evidence of resources being allocated to address gender disparities.</p> <p>Disaggregated findings: No relevant trends identified across focal areas, agencies and regions.</p>	<p>Requirement: N/A</p> <p>Findings: Around 90% of projects reviewed showed evidence of resources being allocated to address gender disparities</p> <p>Disaggregated findings: No relevant trends identified across focal areas, agencies and regions.</p>	<p>Requirement: Adequate resources to deliver on gender-responsive measures</p> <p>Findings: Around 87% (20/23) of projects reviewed showed evidence of resources being allocated to address gender disparities.</p> <p>Disaggregated findings: No relevant trends identified across focal areas, agencies and regions.</p>

Annex V: Overview of the Safeguards Policy Compliance Results

Cohort 1 – Policy on Agency Minimum Standards on Environmental and Social Safeguards	Cohort 2 – Policy on Agency Minimum Standards on Environmental and Social Safeguards / Spillovers Safeguards Policy	Cohort 3 – Safeguards Policy
Identification / Design		
<p>Requirement: N/A</p> <p>Findings: 76% of the projects from cohort 1 were designated a safeguards risk category despite the fact that they were approved before July 2019, the effective date of the Safeguards Policy. Low and moderate categories of risks were the most commonly assigned (30% and 27% respectively) to projects in the scale from low to high, while the B and C risk were assigned the majority of times in the scale from A to C (5% each).</p> <p>Disaggregated findings: No relevant trends identified across focal areas, agencies and regions.</p>	<p>Requirement: N/A</p> <p>Findings: 85% of the projects from cohort 2 were designated a safeguards risk category, despite the fact that some of them may have been approved before July 2019, the effective date of the Safeguards Policy. Low and moderate categories of risks were the most commonly assigned (around 30% each) to projects in the scale from low to high, while the B and C risk were assigned the majority of times in the scale from A to C (6% each).</p> <p>Disaggregated findings: No relevant trends identified across focal areas, agencies and regions.</p>	<p>Requirement: Screen for all risks associated with the thematic areas of the GEF safeguards and to categorize the projects based on the level and magnitude of risks.</p> <p>Findings: 14/23 projects from cohort 3 were approved after July 2019, the effective date of the Safeguards Policy. All 14 projects for which the requirement was mandatory were designated a safeguards risk category. Low and moderate descriptors of risks were the most commonly assigned (27% each) to projects in the scale from low to high followed by the B and C categories in the scale from A to C (5% each).</p> <p>Disaggregated findings: No relevant trends identified across focal areas, agencies and regions.</p>
<p>Requirement: N/A</p> <p>Findings: N/A</p>	<p>Requirement: N/A</p> <p>Findings: Not possible to thoroughly assess performance against this</p>	<p>Requirement: Indicate which safeguards areas are applicable (or have been “triggered” for the project).</p>

<p>Disaggregated findings: N/A</p>	<p>requirement provided that it was possible to match the categories in the PRT for at most 4 projects. For the rest of the projects the N/A category was chosen.</p> <p>Disaggregated findings: N/A</p>	<p>Findings: Not possible to thoroughly assess compliance with this requirement provided that it was possible to match the categories in the PRT for at most 2 projects. For the rest of the projects the N/A category was chosen.</p> <p>Disaggregated findings: N/A</p>
Implementation		
<p>Requirement: N/A</p> <p>Findings: 77% of the projects reviewed reported on the implementation of safeguards in their PIRs.</p> <p>Disaggregated findings: No relevant trends identified across focal areas, agencies and regions.</p>	<p>Requirement: N/A</p> <p>Findings: 78% of the projects reviewed reported on the implementation of safeguards in their PIRs.</p> <p>Disaggregated findings: No relevant trends identified across focal areas, agencies and regions.</p>	<p>Requirement: Provide information on the implementation of relevant environmental and social management measures at project mid-term.</p> <p>Findings: 14 out of 23 projects from cohort 3 were approved after July 2019, the effective date of the Safeguards Policy. Only 2/14 projects had a PIR available, and only 1 of them reported on safeguards. No mid-term reviews were identified. Among the 23 projects from this cohort, only 3 had PIRs and 2 out of the 3 reported on safeguards.</p> <p>Disaggregated findings: Limited data to identify trends across focal areas, agencies and regions.</p>
Reporting		
<p>Requirement: N/A</p>	<p>Requirement: N/A</p> <p>Findings: No data to assess, projects from cohort 2 are not completed</p>	<p>Requirement: Provide information on the implementation of relevant environmental and social management measures at project completion.</p>

<p>Findings: In 3 of the 8 projects that submitted a TE we found a section on the implementation of safeguards.</p> <p>Disaggregated findings: Limited data to identify trends across focal areas, agencies and regions.</p>	<p>Disaggregated findings: N/A</p>	<p>Findings: No data to assess, projects from cohort 2 are not completed</p> <p>Disaggregated findings: N/A</p>
--	---	---


The Independent Evaluation Office of the Global Environment Facility (GEF) was established by the GEF Council in July 2003. The Office is independent from GEF policy making and its delivery and management of assistance.

The Office undertakes independent evaluations that involve a set of projects and programs implemented by more than one GEF Agency. These evaluations are typically at the strategic level, on focal areas, or on cross-cutting themes. We also undertake institutional evaluations, such as assessing the GEF resource allocation mechanism or GEF governance.

Within the GEF, the Office facilitates cooperation on evaluation issues with professional evaluation networks; this includes adopting evaluation guidelines and processes consistent with international good practices. We also collaborate with the broader global environmental community to ensure that we stay on the cutting edge of emerging and innovative methodologies.

To date, the Office has produced over 100 evaluation reports; explore these on our website: www.gefio.org/evaluations.



Independent Evaluation Office, Global Environment Facility
1818 H Street, NW Washington, DC 20433, USA
www.gefio.org  /gefio_tweets  /gefio