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

### **Draft report – Annexes**

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

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

### 1 Introduction

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

This document sets out the key elements of the Third Professional Peer Review ("the Review") of the evaluation function of the GEF. It describes the background of the Peer Review, the objective, the scope and general approach and methods, the composition of the Peer Review Panel ("the Panel") and the timing. This document is a revised version of the terms of reference which was presented to the Council in June 201, which incorporates clarifications based on the first meeting with the Panel held on June 21-22, 2019.

### 2 Background

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

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

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

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

### 3 The Evaluation Function in the GEF

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

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

### 4 Purpose and Use of the Review

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

strengths and those areas where improvement is necessary.

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

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

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

### 5 Subject and Scope of the Review

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

### 6 Core Assessment Criteria

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

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

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

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

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

### Evaluation Policy (Independence, Credibility and Utility)

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

### The Stakeholder Engagement Process (Independence, credibility and utility)

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

### The Evaluation Process (Independence, credibility and utility)

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

### The Work Program (Credibility and utility)

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

### Office Structure and Budget

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

### 7 Process

### Selection of the Panel

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

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

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

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

### **Panel Composition**

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

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

### Responsibility of IEO

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

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

### 8 Reporting

IEO will provide periodic updates to the Council.

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

Follow-up on accepted recommendations will be reported upon by the responsible entity within the GEF. The Panel and the IEO will provide the UNEG and ECG with feedback on the experience of the Peer Review to enable the members of both groups to learn from IEO's experience.

### 9 Review Process and tentative schedule

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

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

### 10 Panel Composition

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

### Tullia Aiazzi, international consultant

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

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

Area of focus	Criteria/detailed issues	ECG GPS/ UNEG N&S	Source of info	Method	Criteria/detailed issues	ECG GPS/ UNEG N&S	Source of info	Method	Criteria/detailed issues	ECG GPS/ UNEG N&S	Source of info	Method
	Independence	GPS 2; N.4			Credibility	GPS 2; N.3			Utility	GPS 8; N.2		
1. Govern	1. Governance of the evaluation function	tion functior	ר									
	a. IEO structural	GPS 2; N.4	Evaluation	Desk	a. IEO structural	GPS 2; N.4	Evaluation	Desk				
	from GEF		Instrument;	interviews;	from GEF		Instrument;	interviews;				
	Secretariat		records of	e-survey	Secretariat		records of	e-survey				
			Council sessions; all				Sessions; all					
			stakeholders*				stakeholders*					
	b. IEO behavioural	GPS 2; N.5;	IEO Ethical	Desk	b. IEO behavioural	GPS 2; N.5;	Ethical	Desk				
	independence and	N.6; St. 3.2	guidelines;	review;	independence and	N.6; St. 3.2	guidelines;	review;				
	evidence and		Agencies	interviews;	evidence and		Accreditation	interviews;				
	impartiality/absen		documents; all	e-sulvey	impartiality/absen		stakeholders*;	e-sulvey				
	ce of bias and		stakeholders*;		ce of bias and		IEO staff;					
	conflict of interest		evaluation		conflict of interest		evaluation					
	Agencies in IEO				Agencies in IEO							
	and Agencies				and Agencies							
	c. Segregation of	GPS 2; St.	Evaluation and	Desk	c. Segregation of	GPS 2; St.	Evaluation and	Desk				
	roles in the GEF	1.1	Monitoring	review;	roles in the GEF	1.1	Monitoring	review;				
	monitoring and		Council	ווונכו עוכאנט,	monitoring and		Council	ייינכו עוכיעט,				
	evaluation		members; IEO		evaluation		members; IEO					
			and GEF				and GEF					
			management and staff				management and staff					

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

ibility  of ion and process sparation D work n the ond Peer including from the ond Peer including for valuation 's tools to e in case ant of n endations ariat ff ff ff ff fr nent, nnce ince	Method Criteria/detailed	ECG GPS/	Source of	Method	ia/detailed	ECG GPS/	Source of	Method
dence GPS 2; N.4   Credibility  f GPS 2; GPS   Meeting and consultation   review; consultation and records;   Council   members; IEO   member	issues	N&S	into		issues	N&S	INTO	
f GPS 2; GPS Meeting and consultation review; selection process aration work the the d Peer Agencies, STAP on the ouncil om the ouncil om the records; and GEF	Credibility	GPS 2; N.3			Utility	GPS 8; N.2		
nand for St. 1.3 consultation review; selection process arration work the the deer management, souncil on the deer council on the deer consultation and GEF management, souncil on the deer cluding or consultation in case in case in tand 3; N. 13 policies, ce tand selection review; or significant policies, ce tand selection review; on the preparation of the IEO work plan (from the policies, interviews; in the preparation of the IEO work plan (from the policies, interviews; plan (from the policies, interviews; practices for policies, interviews; of significant review; of	Desk	GPS 2; GPS	Meeting and	Desk	d. Extent of	GPS 2; GPS	Meeting and	Desk
rocess aration  aration  work  the  members; IEO  plan (from the p	review;	6; St. 1.3	consultation	review;	consultation and	6; St. 1.3	consultation	review;
aration work the work work the work work work work the members; IEO and GEF and GEF wanagement, Partner Partne	interviews;		records;	interviews;	selection process in		records;	interviews;
work the			Council		the preparation of		Council	
the nd Peer and GEF management, Partner Partner Review)  on St. 1.1 Meeting and Consultation review; between Council om the members; IEO and GEF members; IEO and GEF members; IEO tools to st. 1.1 Meeting and tools to St. 1.1 Meeting and consultation review; between Council and GEF members; IEO and GEF practices for sharing evaluation tools to st. 1.1 Meeting and consultation review; of significant review; of significant review; of significant rejection of members; IEO and GEF policies, review; of significant review; of GPS 2; GPS Evaluation Desk golicies, review; appointment and staff policies, council interviews; performance assessment and dismissal			members; IEO		the IEO work plan		members;	
management, Agencies, STAP  on St. 1.1 Meeting and Desk ouncil om the rolluding or sluation tools to St. 1.1 Meeting and Desk in case nt and GPS 2; GPS council ce t and  Desk records; interviews; between Council and JEO (from the members; JEO and GEF management sharing evaluation review; of significant review; of signif			and GEF		(from the 2014		IEO and GEF	
on St. 1.1 Meeting and Desk e. Interaction review; between Council om the or cluding om the on case in case in case in tand and GEF management fiat ctor of tand and GEF golicies, and GEF golicies, cee tand are and a seessment and golicies, council staff council interviews; between Council interviews; between Council interviews; between Council and IEO (from the 2014 Second Peer Review), including practices for sharing evaluation review; of significant rejection of members; IEO and GEF golicies, and GEF golicies, interviews; of significant rejection of members; IEO and GEF golicies, review; appointment and dismissal dismissal dismissal dismissal			management		Second Peer Review)		management	
on St. 1.1 Meeting and Desk e. Interaction review; between Council om the or cluding om the one tools to in case in tand adjantation of members; IEO dations records; and GEF in tand 3; N. 13 policies, ce tand in the tools to in case it and dismissal dismissal								
on St. 1.1 Meeting and consultation review; mechanisms between Council om the or council and Peer cluding or and GEF aluation tools to in case in tard additions fait and 3; N. 13 policies, ce t and a seessment and a seessment and a seessment and a seessment and consultation and GEF application of members; IEO and GEF application and GEF applica	TAP							
ouncil consultation review; between Council members; IEO members; IEO and IEO (from the members; IEO and GEF management tools to in case in case in tand 3; N. 13 policies, ce t and a seessment and accordance tand accordance tand accordance tand accordance tand accordance tand accordance in case in case in case in case in consultation review; of significant rejection of members; IEO and GEF molicies, interviews; of significant review; of significant review	Desk	St. 1.1	Meeting and	Desk	e. Interaction	St. 1.1	Meeting and	Desk
ouncil om the occuncil om the occuncil om the occuncil om the council of the council of the council om the council of Council of the council of counc	review;		consultation	review;	mechanisms		consultation	review;
om the nd Peer cluding Peer cluding Peer cluding Peer cluding Peer cluding Peer cluding Peer Paractices for Periods to St. 1.1 Peeting and consultation Peer Peeting and tools to in case in case in case Peer Peeting and Peer Peeting and tools to in case Peeting and Peer Peer Peer Peer Peer Peer Peer Pee			records;	interviews;	between Council and		records;	interviews;
nd Peer cluding cluding by and GEF colluding or sharing evaluation tools to st. 1.1 Meeting and consultation review; of significant consultation and GEF members; IEO members; IEO dations first rand 3; N. 13 policies, ce t and stand tools to members and gere for members; IEO staff council review; of significant review; of significant review; of significant recommendations by Secretariat by Secretariat g. IEO staff appointment and dismissal dismissal dismissal	and IEO (from the		Council		IEO (from the 2014		Council	
coluding or and GEF practices for sharing evaluation tools to St. 1.1 Meeting and tools to in case in case nt f Council records; consultation review; of significant Council members; IEO and GEF mt and GEF policies, council staff ctor nt, 3; N. 13 policies, ce t and deliberate in case of significant review; of significant recommendations by Secretariat g. IEO staff appointment and dismissal dismissal dismissal			members; IEO		Second Peer		members;	
or aluation management brail practices for sharing evaluation tools to St. 1.1 Meeting and consultation review; of incase nt council records; interviews; of significant rejection of members; IEO and GEF management GPS 2; GPS Evaluation policies, retarf ctor GPS 2; GPS Evaluation staff policies, ce ce tand GEF molicies, council review; council review; appointment and council interviews; dismissal review; performance assessment and dismissal dismissal	Review), including		and GEF		Review), including		IEO and GEF	
sharing evaluation tools to St. 1.1 Meeting and consultation review; of significant rejection of members; IEO and GEF mt and 3; N. 13 policies, council staff council staff council staff rece ce t and see than a see seesment and dismissal consultation sharing evaluation review; of significant rejection of members; IEO and GEF geraluation pesk geraluation pesk geretariat gere for interviews; dismissal dismissal dismissal dismissal			management		practices for sharing		management	
tools to St. 1.1 Meeting and in case in case in case nt in case nt f council records; interviews; of significant rejection of members; IEO members; IEO and GEF management GPS 2; GPS Evaluation policies, rot, and GEF golicies, and gere for mt. 3; N. 13 policies, ce ce t and gere nt tools to consultation review; appointment and council interviews; dismissal council interviews; performance assessment and dismissal dismissal	sharing evaluation				evaluation			
in case  in case  in case  nt  nt  consultation  f  council  members; IEO  dations  dations  dations  dations  dations  interviews;  interviews;  dof significant  rejection of  members; IEO  and GEF  management  GPS 2; GPS  Evaluation  Trustee for  ctor  nt,  dof SPS 2; GPS  Evaluation  Trustee for  staff  council  GPS 2; GPS  Evaluation  Desk  appointment and  dismissal  dismissal  dismissal  dismissal  dismissal  dismissal	Desk	St. 1.1	Meeting and	Desk	f. Council's tools to	St. 1.1	Meeting and	Desk
nt records; interviews; of significant council rejection of members; IEO rejection of evaluation and GEF rata 3; N. 13 policies, retarf ctor nt, and 3; N. 13 policies, review; rejection of members; IEO recommendations by Secretariat by Secretariat policies, review; appointment and staff policies, review; appointment, review; review; appointment, review; tenure, performance assessment and dismissal	review;		consultation	review;	deliberate in case of		consultation	review;
f Council rejection of members; IEO rejection of members; IEO recommendations and GEF rotated 3; N. 13 policies, review; at aff rotand 3; N. 13 policies, review; appointment and staff policies, review; appointment and staff rotand 3; N. 13 policies, review; appointment, review; appointment, review; appointment, appointment, tenure, performance assessment and dismissal			records;	interviews;	significant rejection		records;	interviews;
dations members; IEO evaluation riat GPS 2; GPS Evaluation Thand 3; N. 13 Policies, review; appointment and staff ctor GPS 2; GPS Evaluation Totor GPS 2; GPS Evaluation Desk atff policies, review; appointment, review; tenure, performance assessment and dismissal	rejection of		Council		of evaluation		Council	
dations and GEF riat GPS 2; GPS Evaluation Desk g. IEO staff nt and 3; N. 13 policies, review; appointment and staff ctor GPS 2; GPS Evaluation Desk dismissal rustee for interviews; dismissal policies, review; appointment, appointment, appointment, appointment, tenure, performance assessment and dismissal			members; IEO		recommendations by		members;	
riat management by Secretariat  GPS 2; GPS Evaluation Desk g. IEO staff review; appointment and Trustee for interviews; dismissal staff  ctor GPS 2; GPS Evaluation Desk dismissal review; appointment, and miterview; dismissal review; tenure, performance assessment and dismissal	recommendations		and GEF		Secretariat		IEO and GEF	
nt and 3; N. 13 policies, review; appointment and staff  Trustee for interviews; dismissal staff  ctor GPS 2; GPS Evaluation Desk appointment and dismissal staff  ctor GPS 2; GPS Evaluation Peview; appointment, appointment, fenure, performance assessment and dismissal			management				management	
nt and 3; N. 13 policies, review; appointment and Trustee for interviews; dismissal staff  ctor GPS 2; GPS Evaluation Desk policies, review; appointment, ce ce t and dismissal review; performance assessment and dismissal	Desk	GPS 2; GPS	Evaluation	Desk				
r GPS 2; GPS Evaluation Desk appointment, Council interviews; dismissal staff 3; N. 13 policies, review; appointment, council interviews; tenure, performance assessment and dismissal		3; N. 13	policies,	review;				
staff r GPS 2; GPS Evaluation Desk h. IEO Director 3; N. 13 policies, review; appointment, Council interviews; tenure, performance assessment and dismissal			Trustee for	interviews;				
r GPS 2; GPS Evaluation Desk h. IEO Director appointment, council interviews; performance assessment and dismissal			staff					
3; N. 13 policies, review; appointment, Council interviews; tenure, performance assessment and dismissal		GPS 2; GPS	Evaluation	Desk				
Council interviews;		3; N. 13	policies,	review;				
			Council	interviews;				
	performance							
	assessment and							
	dismissal							

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

							Policy				Policy	
e-surveys	* 0		Evaluation Policy	e-surveys			2010 Evaluation	e-surveys			2010 Evaluation	
review,	reports, all	12	GEF and IEO actions with the 2010	review,	reports, all	12	the GEF and IEO	review,	reports, all	12	the GEF and IEO	
Desk	Documents,	GPS 1; N.	עו	Desk	Documents,	GPS 1; N.	n. Compliance of	Desk	Documents,	GPS 1; N.	n. Compliance of	
					management	1.2	development and approval of the 2019 Evaluation Policy		management	1.2	development and approval of the 2019 Evaluation Policy	
				Interviews	IEO and GEF	GPS 1; St.	m. Process for the	Interviews	IEO and GEF	GPS 1; St.	m. Process for the	
	management				management				management			
	IEO and GEF		its work		IEO and GEF		IEO and its work		IEO and GEF		IEO and its work	
interviews	procedures;		bearing on IEO and	interviews	procedures;		with a bearing on	interviews	procedures;		with a bearing on	
review;	and		procedures with a	review;	and		and procedures	review;	and		and procedures	
Desk	GEF policies	GPS 1	<ol> <li>Other policies and</li> </ol>	Desk	GEF policies	GPS 1	<ol> <li>Other policies</li> </ol>	Desk	GEF policies	GPS 1	I. Other policies	
	members											
	י טוארט, רכט				0.000							
	management				DAC members				DAC members			
	N&S IEO				management,				management,			
	and UNEG				IEO		standards		IEO		standards	
	Standards		evaluation standards		UNEG N&S		evaluation		UNEG N&S		evaluation	
	Practice		international		Standards and		international		Standards and		international	
interviews	Good		policies with	interviews	Good Practice		policies with	interviews	<b>Good Practice</b>		policies with	
review;	policies; ECG	N.12		review;	policies; ECG	N.12	the GEF Evaluation	review;	policies; ECG	N.12	the GEF Evaluation	
Desk	Evaluation	GPS 1;	y of the	Desk	Evaluation	GPS 1;	k. Consistency of	Desk	Evaluation	GPS 1;	k. Consistency of	
	management		the 2014 Second Peer Review)									
	IEO and GEF		mechanism (from									
	members;		Action Records									
interviews;	Council	1.4	of the Management									
review;	mechanism;	N.14, St.	SS									
Desk	MAR	GPS 8;	j. Appropriateness									
						ť		interviews;	Council	t	allocation	
						13		review.	policies	13	for buildest	
						GPS 3: N.		Desk	Evaluation	GPS 3: N.	i. Approval process	
		GPS 8; N.2	Utility			GPS 2; N.3	Credibility			GPS 2; N.4	Independence	
	info	N&S	issues		into	N&S	issues		into	N&S	issues	focus
Method	Source of	ECG GPS/	ia/detailed	Method	Source of	ECG GPS/	Criteria/detailed	Method	Source of	ECG GPS/	Criteria/detailed	Area of
	•	/				/				/		•

Criteria/detailed ECG GPS/ issues UNEG N&S  Independence GPS 2; N.4  Independence of IEO within  p. IEO's structural GPS 6; N. 4, relationship with GEF secretariat  q. IEO's structural GPS 6; N. 4, st. 1.1 STAP  GPS 6; N. 4, St. 1.1 STAP		management								וומוומאכוווכוונ			
Method Criteria/detailed ECG GPS/ Source of issues UNEG UNEG Info States Interviews: STAP Info States Info Interviews: STAP Info States Info States Info Interviews: It States In		, IEO and				management				STAP			
Method Criteria/detailed ECG GPS/ Source of NASS Info  Issues UNEG WASS  Credibility GPS 2; N.3 Utility GPS 2; N.3 Utility GPS 8, N.2  Credibility GPS 2; N.3 Utility GPS 8, N.2  Credibility GPS 6; N. 4, GEF Evaluation Desk-relationship with St. 1.1 procedures and policies, and poli		deliberations				IEO and STAP				IEO, GEF and			
Method   Criteria/detailed   ECG GPS/   Source of   WNEG   Info   WNEG		and policies,				Council				Council			
Method Criteria/detailed loung with confinerviews: STAP  Method Criteria/detailed loung which confinerviews: STAP  Method Criteria/detailed long which confinerviews: secretariat interviews: STAP  Method Criteria/detailed long which confinerviews was source of uniter of loung which confiner interviews: source of uniter of loung which confiners which		procedures				and policies,				and policies,			
Method Criteria/detailed issues   Credibility   GPS 2; N.3   Credibility   GPS 3; N.4   GEF and iEO and generation   GPS 7; Credibility   GPS 8; N.2   GEF and iEO and generation   GPS 6; N.4   GEF and iEO and generation   GPS 6; N.4   GEF and policies, and policies, and policies, and policies, and policies, and interviews; STAP   GEF structural   GPS 6; N.4   GEF and policies and interviews; STAP   GEF structural   GPS 6; N.4   GEF and policies and interviews; STAP   GEF structural   GPS 6; N.4   GEF and policies and policies and policies and interviews; STAP   GEF structural   GPS 6; N.4   GEF and policies and policie		Instrument,				procedures				procedures			
Method Criteria/detailed ECG GPS/ Source of UNEG UNEG Info  Issues  Credibility  Credibility  GPS 2; N.3  Credibility  GPS 2; N.3  Credibility  GPS 2; N.3  Credibility  GPS 2; N.3  Credibility  GPS 5; N.4  GPS 5; N.4  GPS 6; N.4, GEF Evaluation Interviews: GEF secretariat Interviews: Secretariat Inter	ווורפו עופעעט,			2	ווונכו עוכיעט,	Instrument,		2	iiitel views,	Instrument,		2	
Method Criteria/detailed ECG GPS/ Source of UNEG UNEG Issues Credibility GPS 2: N.3 Utility GPS 8: N.2 Utility GPS 8: N.2 Credibility GPS 2: N.3 Utility GPS 8: N.2 Coordination on Desk- Interviews; GEF secretariat GPS 6: N. 4, GEF Evaluation on Desk- It Coordination It Coordination on Desk- It Coordination It Coordination It Coordination It Coordination It Coordination It Coordination It Coord	review;		St. 1.1	onship with	review;	policies and	St. 1.1	relationship with	review;	policies and	St. 1.1	relationship with	
Method Criteria/detailed issues Council interviews; GEF secretariat interviews; GEF secretariat it interviews; GEF secretariat it it interviews; GEF secretariat it it interviews; GEF secretariat it	Desk-		N. 4,		Desk-	GEF Evaluation	GPS 6; N. 4,	q. IEO's structural	Desk-	GEF Evaluation	GPS 6; N. 4,	q. IEO's structural	
Method         Criteria/detailed issues         ECG GPS/ UNEG info         Source of info         Method issues         Criteria/detailed issues         ECG GPS/ UNEG info         Source of UNEG info         UNEG info         UNEG info         ECG GPS/ Info         Source of UNEG info         UNEG info         UNEG info         INA.S.         Info           Credibility         GPS 2; N.3         GPS 2; N.3         O. Mechanisms for GPS 7; info         GPS 8; N.2         GPS 8; N.2         W&S         GPS 8; N.2         Info         MAS.S         GPS 8; N.2		management											
Method criteria/detailed issues   CG GPS/   Source of   Method issues   Credibility   GPS 2; N.3   Conciliation   Credibility   GPS 8; N.2   Conciliation   Conciliation   Credibility   GPS 8; N.2   Conciliation   Concil		, IEO and GEF				management				management			
Method criteria/detailed issues UNEG info  Credibility GPS 2; N.3 Utility GPS 8; N.2  Credibility GPS 2; N.3 Utility GPS 8; N.2  Credibility GPS 2; N.3 Utility GPS 8; N.2  On Desk- review; relationship with St. 1.1 MoUs, GEF secretariat GEF secretariat GEF secretariat GEF secretariat GEF secretariat GEF secretariat Geliberations.  GEF secretariat GPS 6; N. 4, GEF Evaluation procedures and policies, and po		deliberations				IEO and GEF				IEO and GEF			
Method Criteria/detailed issues   Credibility   Credibility   GPS 2; N.3   Credibility   GPS 3; N.2   Credibility   GPS 2; N.3   Credibility   GPS 3; N.2   Credibility   GPS 4; N.2   Credibility   GPS 4; N.2   Credibility   GPS 6; N.4   GEF and IEO   Credibility   Credibility   GPS 6; N.4   GEF and IEO   Credibility   Credibility   Credibility   Credibility   Credibility   GPS 6; N.4   GEF and IEO   Credibility   C		Council				deliberations.				deliberations,			
Method criteria/detailed issues UNEG UNEG UNEG N&S WASS WASS WASS WASS WASS WASS WASS WA		procedures and policies				and policies,				and policies,			
Method criteria/detailed issues   Credibility   GPS 2; N.3   Credibility   GPS 3; N.2   Credibility   GPS 4; N.2   Credibility   GPS 6; N.4   GEF Evaluation   Criteria/detailed   Criteria/detailed		Instrument,				procedures				procedures			
Method issues Criteria/detailed louneg with off issues Criteria/detailed louneg with off issues Credibility GPS 2; N.3 Credibility GPS 3; N.2 Credibility GPS 3; N.3 Credibility GPS 4; N.4 Credibility GPS 5; N.4 Agencies ond follow upby the GEF Secretariat of Februation on Desk- relevant recommendations in Partner Agencies evaluation of Februation Partner Agencies evaluation of Februation on Desk- relationship with GEF St. 1.1 Mollicies and molty, GEF evaluation on the view; relationship with GEF St. 1.1 Eva		MoUs, GEF				Instrument,				Instrument,			
Method issues       Criteria/detailed issues       ECG GPS/ Info       Source of issues       Method issues       Criteria/detailed UNEG UNEG UNEG Info       ECG GPS/ Info       Source of issues       UNEG Info       UNEG Info       M&S       UNEG Info       MAS       MAS       Info       O. Mechanisms for the consideration, acceptance/rejection 1.4, Agencies vup by the GEF and IEO up by the GEF Secretariat of relevant recommendations in relevant recommendations in relevant relationship with GEF St. 1.1       Desk- valuation review; relationship with GEF St. 1.1       Desk- valuation review; relationship with GEF St. 1.1       Desk- valuation review; relationship with GEF St. 1.1       For Info       Method issues       Criteria/detailed UNEG Info       ECG GPS/ N.2       Source of unesting in recommendations in relevant units	interviews;			secretariat	interviews;	MoUs, GEF		GEF secretariat	interviews;	MoUs, GEF		GEF secretariat	
Method Criteria/detailed issues UNEG UNEG UNEG UNEG UNEG UNEG Section of Issues UNEG UNEG UNEG UNEG UNEG UNEG UNEG UNEG	review;	uation	St. 1.1	GEF	review;	policies and	St. 1.1	relationship with	review;	policies and	St. 1.1	relationship with	
Method issues       Criteria/detailed issues       ECG GPS/ Imfo       Source of info       Method issues       Criteria/detailed issues       ECG GPS/ Imfo       Source of issues       UNEG       UNEG       UNEG       Imfo         Credibility       GPS 2; N.3       O. Mechanisms for the consideration, acceptance/rejection up by the GEF       V.14, St. Agencies coordination and relevant recommendations in Partner Agencies' evaluation       N.14, St. Agencies coordination units	Desk-		GPS 6: N 4	n IFO's structural	Desk-	GFF Evaluation	GPS 6: N 4	n. IFO's structural	Desk-	GFF Evaluation	GPS 6: N 4	n IFO's structural	
Criteria/detailed issues       ECG GPS/ UNEG       Source of Independence       Method Issues       Criteria/detailed Info       ECG GPS/ Info       Source of Independence       Method Issues       Criteria/detailed Info       ECG GPS/ Info       Source of Info       Method Issues       Criteria/detailed Info       ECG GPS/ Info       Source of Info       Method Issues       Criteria/detailed Info       ECG GPS/ Info       Source of Info       Method Issues       Criteria/detailed Info       ECG GPS/ Info       Source of Info       Method Issues       Criteria/detailed Info       ECG GPS/ Info       Source of Info       Method Issues       Criteria/detailed Info       ECG GPS/ Info       Source of Info       Method Issues       Criteria/detailed Info       ECG GPS/ Info       Source of Info       Method Issues       Criteria/detailed Info       ECG GPS/ Info       Source of Info       UNEG       UNEG       Info         Independence       GPS 2; N.4       Credibility       GPS 2; N.3       GPS 3; N.2       Info										າ the function	of IEO within	ning and performance	2. Position
Criteria/detailed issues       ECG GPS/ UNEG       Source of issues       Method issues       Criteria/detailed issues       ECG GPS/ UNEG info       Source of issues       Method issues       Criteria/detailed UNEG info       Criteria/detailed issues       Criteria/detailed UNEG info       Criteria/detailed issues       Criteria/detailed UNEG info       Criteria/detailed UNEG info       Criteria/detailed UNEG info       Criteria/detailed issues       Criteria/detailed UNEG info       Criteria/detailed issues       Criteria/detailed UNEG info       Criteria/detailed issues       Criteria/detailed UNEG info       Criteria/detailed info       Criter				evaluations									
Criteria/detailed issues     ECG GPS/ Source of Info     Source of Info     Method issues     Criteria/detailed Info     ECG GPS/ Source of Info     Source of Info     Method Info     Criteria/detailed Info     ECG GPS/ Source of Info     Method Info     Criteria/detailed Info     ECG GPS/ Info     Source of Info     Method Info     Criteria/detailed Info     ECG GPS/ Info     Source of Info     Method Info     Criteria/detailed Info     ECG GPS/ Info     Source of Info     Method Info     Criteria/detailed Info     ECG GPS/ Info     Source of Info     Method Info     Criteria/detailed Info     ECG GPS/ Info     Source of Info     Method Info     Criteria/detailed Info     <				Partner Agencies'									
Criteria/detailed issues     ECG GPS/ info     Source of issues     Method issues     Criteria/detailed issues     ECG GPS/ info     Source of issues     Method issues     Criteria/detailed issues     ECG GPS/ info     Source of issues     Method issues     Criteria/detailed issues     ECG GPS/ info     Source of info       Independence     GPS 2; N.4     GPS 2; N.4     Credibility     GPS 2; N.3     Utility     GPS 8; N.2     UNEG info       O. Mechanisms for the consideration, upby the GEF     N.14, St. Agencies out on the consideration out of the consid		UIIII		recommendations in									
Criteria/detailed issues       ECG GPS/ UNEG       Source of info       Method issues       Criteria/detailed issues       ECG GPS/ UNEG       Source of info       Method issues       Criteria/detailed issues       Course of info       M&S         Independence       GPS 2; N.4       Credibility       GPS 2; N.3       M&S       UNEG       Info       M&S </td <td></td> <td>evaluation</td> <td></td> <td>relevant</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>		evaluation		relevant									
Criteria/detailed ECG GPS/ Source of issues UNEG Info  Independence GPS 2; N.4 Credibility GPS 2; N.3 Credibility GPS 2; N.3 Credibility GPS 2; N.3 Credibility GPS 2; N.3 Credibility GPS 3; N.4 Credibility GPS 2; N.3 Credibility GPS 3; N.4 Credibility GPS 3; N.5 Credibility GPS 4; N.5 Credibility GPS 6; N.5 Credibility GPS 6; N.2 Credibility GPS 6; N.2 Credibility GPS 8; N.2 Credibility		and		up by the GEF									
Criteria/detailed ECG GPS/ Source of issues UNEG Info issues N&S  Independence GPS 2; N.4 Credibility GPS 2; N.3 Credibility GPS 3; N.3 Credibility GPS 3; N.3 Credibility GPS 4; N.3 Credibility GPS 5; N.3 Credibility GPS 6; N.3 Credibility GPS 6; N.3 Credibility GPS 8; N.2 Credibility GPS 8; N.2 Credibility GPS 8; N.3 C		coordination		, uptake and follow-									
Criteria/detailed issues       ECG GPS/ UNEG N&S       Source of info       Method issues       Criteria/detailed issues       ECG GPS/ UNEG N&S       Source of info       Method issues       Criteria/detailed info       ECG GPS/ Source of info       Method issues       UNEG Info       UNEG Info       UNEG Info       UNEG Info       Info<		, Agencies	1.4	acceptance/rejection									
Criteria/detailed issues       ECG GPS/ UNEG N&S       Source of info       Method issues       Criteria/detailed info       ECG GPS/ Source of info       Method issues       Criteria/detailed info       ECG GPS/ Source of info       Method issues       UNEG info       UNEG info       UNEG info       Method issues       UNEG info       Method issues       UNEG info       Method issues       UNEG info       ONEG info       Method issues       UNEG info       Info       ONEG info<	e-survey		N.14, St.	the consideration,									
Criteria/detailed issues       ECG GPS/ UNEG N&S       Source of info       Method issues       Criteria/detailed issues       ECG GPS/ UNEG N&S       Source of info       Method issues       Criteria/detailed info       ECG GPS/ UNEG Info       Method issues       Criteria/detailed info       ECG GPS/ UNEG Info       Method issues       UNEG INFO       UNEG INFO <th< td=""><td>Interviews,</td><td>GEF and IEO</td><td>GPS 7;</td><td>o. Mechanisms for</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></th<>	Interviews,	GEF and IEO	GPS 7;	o. Mechanisms for									
Criteria/detailed ECG GPS/ Source of Method   ECG GPS/ Source of   Method   Criteria/detailed   ECG GPS/   Source of   Source of   Method   Criteria/detailed   ECG GPS/   Source of   Info   I			GPS 8; N.2	Utility			GPS 2; N.3	Credibility			GPS 2; N.4	Independence	
Criteria/detailed ECG GPS/ Source of Method   ECG GPS/ Source of   Method   Criteria/detailed   ECG GPS/   Source of   Method   Criteria/detailed   ECG GPS/   Source of   Info													
Criteria/detailed ECG GPS/ Source of Method Criteria/detailed ECG GPS/ Source of Info			N&S				N&S				N&S		
Criteria/detailed FCG GDS/ Source of Method Criteria/detailed FCG GDS/ Source of Method Criteria/detailed FCG GDS/ Source of			Ş	issues		info	UNEG	issues		info	UNEG	issues	focus
	Method		_	Criteria/detailed	Method	Source of	FCG GPS/	Criteria/detailed	Method	Source of	ECG GPS/	Criteria/detailed	Area of

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

Area of	Criteria /detailed	FCG GPS/	Source of	Method	Criteria/detailed	FCG GPS/	Source of	Method	Criteria/detailed	FCG GPS/	Source of	Method
focus	issues		info		issues	UNEG N&S	info			UNEG N&S		
	Independence	GPS 2; N.4			Credibility	GPS 2; N.3			Utility	GPS 8; N.2		
	participating countries.				participating countries.							
	u. Inclusiveness of the evaluation process (PR 2014), in particular the consultation process	GPS 4; St. 4.6	All stakeholders*	Desk- review; interviews; e-survey	u. Inclusiveness of the evaluation process (PR 2014), in particular the consultation process throughout	GPS 4; St. 4.6	All stakeholders*	Desk- review; interviews; e-survey	u. Inclusiveness of the evaluation process (PR 2014), in particular the consultation process throughout	GPS 4; St. 4.6	All stakeholders *	Desk- review; interviews; e-survey
the state of the s	throughout				throughout							
					v. Overall perception about relevance of IEO's evaluation work	N.2, N.3	All stakeholders*	Interviews; e-survey/s	v. Overall perception about relevance of IEO's evaluation work	N.2, N.3	All stakeholders *	Interviews; e-survey/s
					w. Alignment of IEO's strategic	GPS 6; St. 1.4	GEF strategic documents,	Desk review;	w. Alignment of IEO's strategic direction	GPS 6; St. 1.4	GEF strategic documents,	Desk review;
					direction with the GEF's vision and		evaluation plans and list	interviews;	with the GEF's vision and priorities (from		evaluation plans and list	interviews;
					priorities (from the 2014 Second Peer		of reports, Council		the 2014 Second Peer Review)		of reports, Council	
					Review)		members, IEO and GEF management				members, IEO and GEF management	
					x. Coverage of the GEF's vision and	GPS 6; St. 1.4	GEF and Conventions'	Desk review;	x. Coverage of the GEF's vision and	GPS 6; St. 1.4	GEF and Conventions'	Desk review;
					priorities, including the Conventions,		strategic documents,	interviews;	priorities, including the Conventions,		strategic documents,	interviews;
					through IEO's evaluation product		evaluation plans and list		through IEO's evaluation product		evaluation plans and list	
					m x		or reports; Conventions' managers		mx		or reports; Conventions' managers	
												1

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

	0											
Interviews	members;		about change	Interviews	management		about change					
review;		N.3	influence and bring	review;	members; IEO	N.3	influence and bring					
Desk	MARs,	GPS 8; N.2,	bb. IEO's ability to	Desk	MARs, Council	GPS 8; N.2,	bb. IEO's ability to					
											eness	4. Effectiveness
	management				management							
	and				and							
interviews	<b>GEF Council</b>			interviews	<b>GEF Council</b>		product mix					
of IEO;	consultants;		product mix	of IEO;	consultants;		IEO's evaluation					
assessment	IEO staff and		in IEO's evaluation	assessment	staff and		perspectives in					
SWAP	and reports;		gender perspectives	SWAP	reports; IEO		and gender					
review;	guidelines		socio-economic and	review;	guidelines and		socio-economic					
Desk	Evaluation	N.8, St. 4.7	aa. Integration of	Desk	Evaluation	N.8, St. 4.7	aa. Integration of					
	units											
	coordination											
	Agencies		Impacts									
e-survey	Conventions;		Environmental									
interviews;	STAP;		assessing Global									
review;	reports;		IEO's role in									
Desk	Evaluation		z. Boundaries of									
			advantage				advantage					
			comparative				IEO's comparative					
			into account IEO's				taking into account					
			stakeholders, taking				stakeholders,					
			immediate				immediate					
			learning needs of				learning needs of					
			accountability and				accountability and					
			evaluations to the	,			evaluations to the					
interviews;	S		category of IEO	interviews;	stakeholders*		category of IEO					
review;	reports; all		scope of each	review;	reports; all		scope of each					
Desk	Evaluation		y. Relevance of the	Desk	Evaluation		y. Relevance of the					
		GPS 8; N.2	Utility			GPS 2; N.3	Credibility			GPS 2; N.4	Independence	
	ě	N&S	Š		Č	N&S			i	N&S	i di	000
		UNEG	issues		info	UNEG .	issues	-	info	UNEG	issues	focus
Method	Source of	FCG GPS/	Criteria/detailed	Method	Source of	FCG GPS/	Criteria/detailed	Method	Source of	FCG GPS/	Criteria/detailed	Area of

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

	members				members							
	management , Council				management, Council		Second Peer Review)					
	reports; GEF		Peer Review)		GEF		(from the 2014					
	review		the 2014 Second		review reports;		within the GEF					
	MARs; Peer		within the GEF (from		MARs; Peer		learning culture					
	Responses;		learning culture		Responses;		contributes to a					
	Management		contributes to a		Management		evaluations and					
interviews	OPS;		from evaluations and	interviews	OPS;		learning from					
review;	reports and	N.3	IEO fosters learning	review;	reports and	N.3	IEO fosters					
Desk	Evaluation	GPS 7; N.2,	ff. Extent to which	Desk	Evaluation	GPS 7; N.2,	ff. Extent to which					
	members				members				members			
	, Council				Council				Council			
	management				management,				management,			
	reports; GEF				GEF				GEF			
	review				review reports;				review reports;			
	MARs; Peer				MARs; Peer				MARs; Peer			
	Responses;				Responses;				Responses;			
	Management		learning		Management		learning		Management		learning	
interviews	OPS;		accountability and	interviews	OPS;		accountability and	interviews	OPS;		accountability and	
review;	reports and	Ν.3	contribution to	review;	reports and	N.3	contribution to	review;	reports and	N.3	contribution to	
Desk	Evaluation	GPS 8; N.2,	ee. IEO's	Desk	Evaluation	GPS 8; N.2,	ee. IEO's	Desk	Evaluation	GPS 8; N.2,	ee. IEO's	
							recommendations					
	management		recommendations				up of IEO					
	IEO and GEF		of follow-up of IEO		management		degree of follow-					
interviews	members;	1.4	Records and degree	interviews	and GEF	1.4	Action Records and					
review;	Council	N.14, St.	Management Action	review;	members; IEO	N.14, St.	Management					
Desk	MARs,	GPS 8;	dd. Quality of	Desk	MARs, Council	GPS 8;	dd. Quality of					
			evaluation reports				evaluation reports					
	(		Responses to		(		Responses to					
	management		Management		management		Management					
interviews	IEO and GEF		quality of	interviews	and GEF		quality of					
review;	members,	1.4	accessibility and	review;	members, IEO	1.4	accessibility and					
Desk	MRs, Council	N.14, St.	cc. Coverage,	Desk	MRs, Council	N.14, St.	cc. Coverage,					
		0, 14.2	Otility			0, 14:0	Credibility			C1 3 6, 14.4	illaebellaelice	
		GDS 8: N 2	11+:11:+			GPS 2: N 3	Crodibility			GPS 2: N A	Indonondono	
		Ş				Š				Ş		
	Into	N&S ONEG	Issues		Into	N&S ONEG	Issues		Inio	N&S	Issues	Tocus
Method	Source of	ECG GPS/	Criteria/detailed	Method	Source of	בנים פאין	Criteria/detailed	Method	Source of	בכים פויא/	Criteria/detailed	Area or
	,	100 000				100 000				100000		•

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

	units											
	evaluation		Partner Agencies									
	and		development in									
	coordination		capacity									
e-survey	Agencies		to evaluation									
Interviews,	Partner	GPS 4; N.9	jj. IEO contribution							_		
	stakeholders											
	national											
	other											
	agencies;											
	executing		recipient countries									
	national		development in									
	Focal Points;		capacity									
e-survey			to evaluation									
Interviews,		GPS 4; N.9	ii. IEO contribution									
			project design									
	units		evaluations into new							_		
	coordination		IEO/agencies									
	Agencies'		feedback from									
e-survey	Secretariat;		GEF integrates the									
Interviews;	GEF	GPS 7; N. 2	hh. Extent to which							_		
	units											
	evaluation		community		units		community					
	Agencies		evaluation		evaluation		evaluation					
	Partner		international		Agencies		international					
interviews;	members,		initiatives in the	interviews;	Partner		initiatives in the					
Eval;	and ECG		environmental	Eval;	ECG members,		environmental					
of Earth-	s; IEO; UNEG		evaluations of	of Earth-	IEO; UNEG and		evaluations of					
attendance	presentation		learning from	attendance	presentations;		learning from					
review;	reports,	2.3	IEO contributes to	review;	reports,	2.3	IEO contributes to					
Desk	Guidance,	GPS 7; St.	gg. Extent to which	Desk	Guidance,	GPS 7; St.	gg. Extent to which			_		
		GPS 8; N.2	Utility			GPS 2; N.3	Credibility			GPS 2; N.4	Independence	
		N&S				N&S				N&S		
	info	UNEG	issues		info	UNEG	issues		info	UNEG	issues	focus
Method	Source of	ECG GPS/	Criteria/detailed	Method	Source of	ECG GPS/	Criteria/detailed	Method	Source of	ECG GPS/	Criteria/detailed	Area of

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

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

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

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

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

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

Area of Curteria/detailed ELG GPS 2, N.3 URGE of Method States VASS Info S	,	) : · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	-00 000 /	,	-		-22 222	•	:	) : · · · : · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			:
Independence GPS 2; N.4 Credibility GPS 2; N.3 Utility GPS 8; N.2 Utility GPS 8; N.2 IEO budget adequacy, use facularly, use f	focus	issues	UNEG N&S	info	Metriod	issues	UNEG N&S	info	Method	a/ detalled	73/		Method
ddd. Budget:  adequacy, use flexibility, flexibility, allocation to other ECG members  delevacy for dellevery of work- plair, gender and geographical lanes.  flexibility, seporting lanes.  flexibility, seporting lanes.  GFS 3; lEO records; politics; skill mix dellevery of work- dellevery of work- plair, gender and geographical balance of staff; mobility; reporting lanes.  flexibility, allocation members lead equacy for dellevery of work- dellever		Independence	GPS 2; N.4			Credibility	GPS 2; N.3			Utility	GPS 8; N.2		
GPS 3; IEO budget data; IEO and GEF management; world Bank ork- th GPS 3; IEO budget review; adequacy, use GEF management; world Bank world Bank Trustee  th GEF management; world Bank review; for different products, comparison of some key performance indicators with other ECG members  ECG members  GPS 3; IEO records; Desk vork- and GEF management; interview; and roles in teams; consultant/staff ratio management ataff management aration later and later	6. Efficienc	су											
GEF  Management;  ducts,  of  fireviews  flexibility, allocation  management  world Bank  Trustee  key performance indicators with other  ECG members  ED and GEF  mix  N.10  GPS 3;  ED records;  profles; skill mix and  mix  N.10  GPS 3;  ED ond GEF  management;  world Bank  rustee  frustee  and  GPS 3;  ED orecords;  profles; skill mix and  delivery of work- plan; gender and geographical balance of staff; mobility, reporting lines.  GPS 3; St.  GPS 3; St.  ED records;  profles; skill mix and geographical balance of staff; mobility, reporting lines.  GPS 3; St.  ED records;  profles; skill mix and geographical balance of staff; mobility, reporting lines.  GPS 3; St.  ED records; review; reporting lines.  GEF management and staff; GEF management geographical balance of evaluation teams; gender and geographical balance of evaluation teams; management management management and staff; management management management management of evaluation teams.						ddd. Budget:	GPS 3;	IEO budget	Desk	ddd. Budget:	GPS 3;		Desk
management; world Bank  Of  Trustee  th  Trustee  th  Trustee  th  Trustee  th  Trustee  th  Trustee  th  th  to different  world Bank  comparison of some key performance indicators with other  ECG members  Activities  Activity of work- plan; gender and geographical balance of staff; mobility; reporting lines.  Trustee  Trustee  Trustee  of staff; mobility; reporting lines.  IEO records; review; reporting lines.  IEO records; review; and roles in teams; leadership models and staff; GEF management and staff; management and staff; management geographical balance of evaluation teams: geographical balance of evaluation teams: management management products, product						flexihility	N. LO	GFF	interviews	flexibility allocation	N. LO		interviews
ducts, of ducts, or some of some the theory of the the the the the products, or some the the the the products, or ship or less						allocation to		management;		to different		management	
comparison of some key performance indicators with other the holds of the key performance indicators with other th						different products,		World Bank		products,		; World Bank	
th    Common ce   Indicators with other						comparison of		Trustee		comparison of some		Trustee	
th    Common of the content of the c						some key				key performance			
th  ECG members  ECG and GEF  Fruit and N.10  Frustee  Of staff; mobility;  reporting lines.  Frustee  Of staff; mobility;  reporting lines.  ECG members  FRUSTALIA  FR						performance				indicators with other			
E GPS 3; IEO records; Desk eee. Staffing: GPS 3; IEO and GEF veview; profiles; skill mix and N.10 management interviews adequacy for World Bank and Trustee  aff; orting orting GPS 3; St. IEO records; rship voles and staff; GEF and staff; GEF management aution ear and geographical balance of evaluation teams; gender and geographical balance of evaluation teams.						indicators with				ECG members			
E GPS 3; IEO records; Desk mix N.10 IEO and GEF review; profiles; skill mix and N.10 management; wy for work- and and management; interviews adequacy for work- and aff; porting lines.  Trustee GPS 3; St. IEO records; rship oles management ation ar and ar						other ECG							
mix N.10 lEO and GEF review; profiles; skill mix and N.10 management; vfor vork- and aff; vork- and left restricted aff; or corting lation ar and left management ar and left lation learns.						members							
mix N.10 IEO and GEF review; profiles; skill mix and N.10 management yfor yfor vork- ork- and and delivery of work- world Bank and delivery of work- plan; gender and geographical balance of staff; mobility; reporting lines.  IEO records; Desk review; reporting lines.  IEO records; review; leadership models and staff; GEF management ation management arion geographical balance of evaluation teams; gender and geographical balance of evaluation teams.						eee. Staffing:	GPS 3;	IEO records;	Desk		GPS 3;		Desk
y for wanagement; interviews adequacy for World Bank ork- and World Bank Trustee geographical balance of staff; mobility; reporting lines.  IEO records; Desk review; reporting lines.  IEO records; review; leadership models on staff; GEF and staff; GEF and staff; GEF lation reams; gender and geographical balance of evaluation teams; gender and geographical balance of evaluation teams.  World Bank delivery of work-plan; gender and geographical balance of evaluation teams. (GPS 3; St. IEO records; IEO management and geographical balance of evaluation teams.)						profiles; skill mix	N.10	IEO and GEF	review;	profiles; skill mix and	N.10	management	review;
and delivery of work- and Trustee Trustee  Trustee plan; gender and geographical balance of staff; mobility; reporting lines.  GPS 3; St. IEO records; Desk review; reporting lines.  IEO records; Desk fff. Evaluation teams: GPS 3; St. IEO records; review; leadership models 4.8 IEO management and staff; GEF management and geographical balance of evaluation teams: management geographical balance of evaluation teams						and adequacy for		management;	interviews	adequacy for		Bank	interviews
aff; orting rship 4.8 IEO records; Desk roles and staff; GEF and s						delivery of work-		World Bank		delivery of work-		Trustee	
aff; orting geographical balance of staff; mobility; reporting lines.    GPS 3; St.   IEO records;   Desk review;   leadership models   4.8   IEO records;   leadership models   leadership models   4.8   IEO records;   leadership models   4.8						pian; gender and		Trustee		plan; gender and			
orting  orting  GPS 3; St.   IEO records;   Desk   Fff. Evaluation teams: GPS 3; St.   IEO records; review;   leadership models   4.8   IEO records; and roles in teams;   consultant/staff ratio   in evaluation teams;   and staff; GEF   gender and   geographical balance   of evaluation teams   management   management   geographical balance   of evaluation teams   management   mana						geographical balance of staff:				geographical balance of staff: mobility:			
n GPS 3; St. IEO records; Desk fff. Evaluation teams: GPS 3; St. IEO records; rship 4.8 IEO review; leadership models 4.8 IEO management and staff; GEF management interviews consultant/staff ratio in evaluation teams; gender and geographical balance of evaluation teams						mobility; reporting				reporting lines.			
n GPS 3; St. IEO records; Desk fff. Evaluation teams: GPS 3; St. IEO records; rship 4.8 IEO review; leadership models 4.8 IEO management and staff; GEF leadership models 4.8 IEO management consultant/staff ratio in evaluation teams; gender and geographical balance of evaluation teams						lines.							
rship 4.8 IEO review; leadership models 4.8 IEO oles management interviews and roles in teams; consultant/staff ratio lation er and staff; GEF management geographical balance of evaluation teams of evaluation teams.						fff. Evaluation	GPS 3; St.	IEO records;	Desk	fff. Evaluation teams:	GPS 3; St.		Desk
oles management interviews and roles in teams; and staff; GEF consultant/staff ratio and staff; GEF in evaluation teams; gender and geographical balance of evaluation teams						teams: leadership	4.8	IEO	review;	leadership models	4.8	IEO	review;
and staff; GEF consultant/staff ratio in evaluation teams; gender and geographical balance of evaluation teams						models and roles		management	interviews	and roles in teams;			interviews
taff management in evaluation teams; gender and geographical balance of evaluation teams						in teams;		and staff; GEF		consultant/staff ratio		and staff;	
arand gender and geographical balance of evaluation teams						consultant/staff		management		in evaluation teams;		GEF	
er and						ratio in evaluation				gender and		management	
ams						teams; gender and				geographical balance			
evaluation teams						geographical				of evaluation teams			
evaluation teams						balance of							
						evaluation teams							

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

				Area of focus
			Independence	Criteria/detailed issues
			GPS 2; N.4	ECG GPS/ Source of UNEG info
				Source of info
				Method
		ggg. Adequacy of GEF project budget allocation for midterm reviews/evaluation s and Terminal evaluations by Partner Agencies	Credibility	Criteria/detailed issues
		GPS 3; N.13	GPS 2; N.3	ECG GPS/ UNEG N&S
		Project budgets; GEF management; Partner agencies coordination and evaluation units		Source of info
		Desk review; interviews; e-survey		Method
iii. Efficiency of the data management and processing approaches	hhh. Delegation in the use of resources within IEO		Utility	Criteria/detailed issues
			GPS 8; N.2	ECG GPS/ Source of UNEG info
IEO staff	IEO management and staff			Source of info
Interviews	Interviews			Method

### Annex 4. Bibliography and reference documents

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

-. 2012. Big Book on Evaluation Good Practice Standards

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

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

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

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

Global Environment Facility Evaluation Office. 2007. Ethical Guidelines

- —. 2009. Approach to tracking GEF Council decision by the GEF Partnership.
- —. 2013. Annual Performance Report
- 2013. Management Action Record
- —. 2014. Fifth Overall Performance Study of the GEF (OPS5). At the Crossroads for Higher Impact. All related documents.
- 2014. Guidance Document: Monitoring and Evaluation in the LDCF/SCCF

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Annex 5. List of interviewed stakeholders

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

ia; areas of	CIRCUITS, ECTO	Standards 2016 (only	Operational	Policy	Evaluation Policy	and gans
Tocus		ntary o				9 9 9 0
Overarching purpose:	N. 1 - Within the United Nations system, it is the responsibility of evaluation managers and evaluators to uphold and			The Policy refers to, and adopts to a very large extent, the	The Policy refers to, and adopts to a very large extent,	The absence of a commitment to the SDGs is
	promote, in their evaluation practice, the principles and values to which the United Nations is committed. In particular, they			international principles and values of evaluation.	the international principles and values of	a gap, considering that the 2019
	should respect, promote and contribute to the goals and targets set out in the				evaluation. There is however no	Policy was prepared after
	2030 Agenda for Sustainable				meaningful	the GEF made
	Development				reference to the SDGs.	a formal commitment
						to contribute
						to the Agenda 2030.
A. Independence	N. 4 - Independence of evaluation is		1.C. Structural	Independence is one	Independence is	The lack of
_	necessary for credibility, influences the		Independence: The	of the Principles of	one of the	reference to
	ways in which an evaluation is used and		CED's governance,	Evaluation in the GEF.	Principles of	no
•	allows evaluators to be impartial and free		organization and	The Policy clearly and	Evaluation in the	requirement
	from undue pressure throughout the		resources make it	repeatedly states the	GEF. The Policy	for clearance is
• -	evaluation process. The independence of the evaluation function comprises two		the IFI's	FO expressed at the	reneatedly states	the
	key aspects — behavioural independence		Management. 1.G.	organizational level	ίυ	independence
-	and organizational independence.		Rights of Access:	through the link	of the evaluation	of EO/IEO is
	Behavioural independence entails the		The CED has	between EO and the	function in the	clearly stated
	ability to evaluate without undue		unrestricted access	Council, with no line	GEF and affirms	throughout
	have the full freedom to conduct their		staff and	Secretariat. An MoU	responsibility for	circ policy.
	evaluative work impartially, without the		counterparties.	between GEF CEO	IEO independence	
	risk of negative effects on their career		5.A. Reporting Line:	and EO Director	rests with the GEF	
<b>D</b> 5	development and must be able to freely		The CED transmits	established the rules	Council. This is	
	independence of the evaluation function		Board, without		GEF Instrument	
	underpins the free access to information		Management	distinction between	amended in May	

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

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

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

Main and sub-	UNEG Norms, 2016	Relevant UNEG	Standard	GEF 2010 Evaluation	GEF 2019	Comments
criteria; areas of focus		Standards 2016 (only Operational complementary ones) Practices, EG practice, 20:	Operational Practices, ECG Good practice, 2012	Policy	Evaluation Policy	and gaps
B. Credibility	N. 3 - Evaluations must be credible.			Credibility is one of	Credibility is one	
	Credibility is grounded on independence,			the Principles of	of the Principles of	
	impartiality and a rigorous methodology.			Evaluation in the GEF.	Evaluation in the	
	Key elements of credibility include			The Policy makes an	GEF. The Policy	
	transparent evaluation processes,			explicit commitment	makes an explicit	
	inclusive approaches involving relevant			to credibility in	commitment to	
	stakeholders and robust quality assurance			evaluation, which	credibility in	
	systems. Evaluation results (or findings)			depends on	evaluation, which	
	and recommendations are derived from			consistency and	depends on	
	— or informed by — the conscientious,			dependability of data.	consistency and	
	explicit and judicious use of the best			The Policy also	dependability of	
	available, objective, reliable and valid data			mentions the need	data. The Policy	
	and by accurate quantitative and			for transparency,	also mentions the	
	qualitative analysis of evidence.			rigour, ethical	need for	
	Credibility requires that evaluations are			concerns, and	transparency,	
	ethically conducted and managed by			professional	rigour, ethical	
	evaluators that exhibit professional and			competencies,	concerns, and	
	cultural competence.			though not explicitly	professional	
				linked to the concept	competencies,	
				of credibility.	though not	
					explicitly linked to	
					the concept of	
					credibility.	

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

Main and sub-	UNEG Norms, 2016			F 2010 Evaluation	GEF 2019
focus		complementary ones)	Practices, ECG Good practice, 2012	Policy	evaluation Policy
Ethics	N. 6 - Evaluation must be conducted with	St. 3.2 - All those		es an	The Policy does
	the lightest standards of lifegrity and	eligaged iii desigiiiiig,		explicit ciduse on	IIOt IIIdke dily
	respect for the beliefs, manners and	conducting and		Ethical behaviour in	reference to
	environment: for human rights and	should conform to		evaluations.	although as stated
	gender equality; and for the 'do no harm'	agreed ethical			above, the
	principle for humanitarian assistance.	standards in order to			definition of
	Evaluators must respect the rights of	ensure overall			integrity fully
	institutions and individuals to provide	credibility and the			embraces ethical
	information in confidence, must ensure	responsible use of			considerations,
	that sensitive data is protected and that it	power and resources			which corresponds
	cannot be traced to its source and must				to the definition of
	with those who provided the relevant				Ethical behaviour in the 2010 Policy
	information. Evaluators should obtain				
	informed consent for the use of private				
	information from those who provide it.				
	When evidence of wrongdoing is				
	uncovered, it must be reported discreetly				
	to a competent body (such as the relevant				
	office of audit or investigation).				
Transparency	N. 7 - Transparency is an essential			Transparency is one	Transparency is
	element of evaluation that establishes			of the Principles of	one of the
	stakeholder ownership and increases			and the Policy	evaluation in the
	public accountability. Evaluation products			associates it with	GEF and the Policy
	should be publicly accessible.			clarity of	associates it with
				ication about	clarity of
				the evaluation,	communication
				consultation with	about the
				stakeholders, access	evaluation,
				to documents.	consultation with
					stakeholders,

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

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

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

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

Main and sub-	UNEG Norms, 2016	Relevant UNEG	Standard	GEF 2010 Evaluation	GEF 2019	Comments
focus			Practices, ECG Good practice, 2012			0.7
	governance and management needs. The evaluation budget should be		3.A. Selection: The CED's staff are	should be endorsed by Council. With	establishes that EO's budget	
	commensurate to the size and function of		appointed by the	regards to financial	should be	
	the organization.		CED's head or	resources, however,	endorsed by	
	The governing body and/or the executive		designee.	mention is only made	Council. With	
	head are responsible for appointing a		3.C. Opportunities:	of 'adequate	regards to	
	professionally competent head of		Staff should not be	resources'.	financial	
	evaluation and for fostering an enabling		career		resources,	
	environment that allows the head of		disadvantaged by		however, mention	
	evaluation to plan, design, manage and		having worked in		is only made of	
	conduct evaluation activities in alignment		the CED.		'adequate	
	with the UNEG Norms and Standards for		4.B. Determination		resources'.	
	Evaluation. The governing body and/or		of Budget: The			
	the executive head are responsible for		CED's budget is			
	ensuring that evaluators, evaluation		approved by the			
	managers and the head of the evaluation		Board.			
	function have the freedom to conduct		4.C. Adequacy of			
	their work without risking their career		Budget: The CED's			
	development. Management of the human		budget is			
	and financial resources allocated to		commensurate with			
	evaluation should lie with the head of		its work program.			
	evaluation in order to ensure that the					
	evaluation function is staffed by					
	professionals with evaluation					
	competencies in line with the UNEG					
	Competency Framework.					
	Where a decentralized evaluation					
	function exists, the central evaluation					
	function is responsible for establishing a					
	framework that provides guidance, quality					
	assurance, technical assistance and					
	professionalization support.					
2. Independent			A. Appointment:	The Policy meets all	The Policy meets	
leadership of the			The CED's head is	Good Practices on the	all Good Practices	
CED			selected and	appointment,	on the	

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

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

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

	UNEG Norms, 2016		Standard	010 Evaluation	9	Comments
focus		complementary ones)	Practices, ECG Good practice, 2012	rolicy	Evaluation Policy	and
Selection and composition of		St. 4.8 - The evaluation team should be		Within the Principle of Impartiality.	Within the Principle of	
evaluation teams		selected through an		provisions are made	Impartiality,	
		open and transparent		for the impartial and	provisions are	
		process, taking into		unbiased selection of	made for the	
		account the required		evaluators.	impartial and	
		competencies, diversity			unbiased selection	
		in perspectives and			of evaluators.	
		accessibility to the local			Behavioural	
		population. The core			independence of	
		members of the team			evaluators is also	
		should be experienced			required.	
		ר אמוממנטוט:				
3. Evaluation Planning	19					
Evaluation plan		St. 1.3 - Evaluations	4.A. Work Program:	The Policy clarifies	The Policy clarifies	The lack of
and reporting		should have a	The CED consults on	that EO Director	that EO Director	contingency
		mechanism to inform	its work priorities,	presents both a four-	presents both a	plans for ad-
		the governing body	but determines its	year and an annual	four-year and an	hoc evaluation
		and/or management on	work program	work-plan and budget	annual work-plan	requests
		the evaluation plan and	independently of	to GEF Council for	and budget to GEF	contributes to
		on the progress made in	Management.	discussion and	Council for	the confusion
		plan implementation.		endorsement. The	discussion and	and lack of
		The evaluation plan		scope of each	endorsement. The	clarity and
		should be based on an		evaluation product is	scope of each	transparency
		explicit evaluation		also described.	evaluation	in IEO
		policy and/or strategy,		Adequate M&E plans	product is also	management,
		prepared with utility		and resources are	described.	and this was
		and practicality in mind		also foreseen and	Adequate M&E	frequently
		and developed with a		consultation with	plans and	mentioned by
		clear purpose, scope		stakeholders is	resources are also	IEO staff
		and intended use for		foreseen. Minimum	foreseen and	during the
		each evaluation (or		Requirement 4	consultation with	interviews.
		each cluster of		provides for the	stakeholders is	
		evaluations).		consultation,	foreseen.	

focus areas of Wile Norms, 2015 Sandards 2016 (only Operational Controllation of Controllation of Complementary ones) Sandards 2016 (only Operational Complementary ones) Practices, ECG Good Complementary ones, ECG Complementary ones) Practices, ECG Good Complementary ones, ECG Complementary on							
complementary ones) Practices, PCG Good  Plan preparations Should include adequate consultations with stakeholders, especially the intended users. The pilm should be supported with adequate human and the participation of GEF operational version of GEF operations. The pilm should users. The pilm should have especially the intended users. The pilm should users. The pilm should have especially the intended users. The pilm should have especially the intended users. The pilm should have espatiation of the policy devaluation of the policy does not to provision to provision of the policy does not to provision to provision of the policy does not to provision to provision of the principles of human rights and gender equality in the GEF evaluation function, but it medicales not on the principle of no-one left behind'.  Intended to participation of GEF Requirement 4 department and which sale and provision of the principle of the participation of the participation of the participation of the principle of the participation of the participation of the principle of the participation of the participation of the principle of the participation of the participation of the participation of the principle of the participation of the participation of the principle of the participation of the principle of the participation of the par	and sub- ia; areas of	UNEG Norms, 2016	2016	Standard Operational	2010 Evaluation Y	uation Po	Comments and gaps
Should include adequate consultations participation of GEF provides for the adequate consultations with stakeholders, especially the intereded users. The plan should be supported with adequate human and be supported with adequate human and financial resources in order to ensure the quality of evaluations conflictions.  In the evaluation plan should be supported with adequate human and financial resources in order to ensure the quality of evaluations and epotes.  In the evaluation plan should have evaluation and ender the equality in the GEF evaluation for contingency and principles of human rights and gender responsibility of evaluation. It is the evaluation managers to ensure that these values are reported, addressed and principles of more requests not the principle of no-one left behind'.  All N. 8 - The universally recognized values and principles of more requests of the evaluation integrate values and principles of human rights and gender equality in the GEF evaluation, but it innuction, but it innuction, but it innuctions and evaluation function.  The Policy does not integrate values and principles of human rights and pender equality in the GEF evaluation function. The GEF evaluation function increases are reference to human rights nor to the SDGs and the principle of no-one left behind'.	tocus		complementary ones)	practices, ECG Good practice, 2012			
adequate consultations with stakeholders, with stakeholders, especially the intended users - The plan should be supported with adequate human and financial resources in order to ensure the quality of evaluation should have equality need to be integrated into all stages of an evaluation respected, addressed and promoted, underprinning the commitment to the principle of 'no-one left behind'.  adequate human and financial resources in order to ensure the quality of evaluation framework The evaluation plan should have evaluation plan should have evaluation. It is the responsibility of evaluation respected, addressed and promoted, underprinning the commitment to the principle of 'no-one left behind'.  adequate human and financial resources in conducted under the quality of evaluation should have evaluation plan should have evaluation plan should have evaluation plan should have evaluations.  The Policy does not requests.  The Policy does not requests of integrate values and principles of human rights and gender equality in the GEF responsibility of evaluation managers to ensure that these values are respected, addressed and promoted, underprinning the commitment to the principle of 'no-one left behind'.			Plan preparations		engagement and	Minimum Requirement 4	
with stakeholders, especially the intended users - The plan should be supported with adequate human and financial resources in order to ensure the quality of evaluations conducted under the framework The evaluation plan should have established, clear guidelines to manage evaluation requests for evaluation requests of an evaluation responsibility of evaluation managers to ensure that these values are responsibility of evaluation managers to ensure that these values are responsibility of evaluation managers to ensure that these values are responsibility of evaluation managers to ensure that these values are evaluation requests for evaluations.  The Policy does not requests of human rights and gender evaluation requests of make any provision to integrate values and principles of human rights and gender responsibility of evaluations requests.  The Policy does not requests of human rights and gender evaluation requality in the eff evaluation function, but it managers to ensure that these values are evaluation function, but it more its no provision GEF Operational for contingency and contingency blans requests, although for contingency managers are contingency evaluation requests.  The Policy does not requests.  The Policy does not requests of human reported, and principles of function, but it managers reported, addressed and promoted, underprinning the commitment to the principle of no-one left behind.			adequate consultations		Operational Focal	provides for the	
especially the intended be supported with be supported with adequate human and financial resources in order to be subported with adequate human and financial resources in order to be integrated into all responsibility of evaluation and principles of no-one left behind".    Separational between the intended besupported with be supported with be sources in order to ensure that financial resources in order to ensure that financial resources in order to ensure that financial resources in order to ensure that finance ad-hoc requests, although relevant. There is considered dynamic contingency plans and finance ad-hoc requests for a manage and principles of human rights and gender evaluations.    Separational devaluation for contingency plans are requests for a manage and principles of human rights and gender responsibility of evaluation and principles of human requests for a make any provision to principles of human requests for a make any provision to integrate values and principles of human requests for a make any provision to principles of integrate values and principles of human requality in the GEF evaluation function, but it includes no reference to human rights nor to the SDGs and the principle of for one left behind".			with stakeholders,		Points at country	consultation,	
be supported with adequate human and adequate human and adequate human and financial resources in order to ensure the quality of evaluations conducted under the conducted under the framework.  The evaluation plan should have established, clear guidelines to manage and principles of human rights and gender responsibility need to be integrated into all stages of an evaluation responsibility of evaluation responsibility of evaluation and principle of no-one left behind'.  The plans hould be supported with adequate human and principle of no-one left behind'.  The plans hould adequate human and principle of no-one left behind'.  The plans hould adequate human and principle of no-one left behind'.  The plans hould adequate human and principle of no-one left behind'.  The plans hould adequate human and principle of no-one left behind'.  The plans hould adequality in evaluation function. Integrate values and principle of no-one left behind'.  The plans hould adequality in the principle of no-one left behind'.  The policy makes and principles of human respected, addressed and promoted, underprinciple of no-one left behind'.			especially the intended		level as relevant.	engagement and	
be supported with adequate human and adequate human and adequate human and the financial resources in order to ensure the quality of evaluations order to ensure the quality of evaluations to manage ad-hoc requests for evaluation. It is the responsibility of evaluation and principles of an evaluation are responsibility of evaluation are responsibility of evaluations are respected, addressed and promoted, underpinning the commitment to the principle of 'no-one left behind'.    Description of conducted under the quality of evaluations and promoted with adequation in the principle of the principle of for-one left behind'.    Description of contingency plans are contingency plans are responsibility of evaluation in the principle of 'no-one left behind'.    Description of contingency level as contingency plans are requests for evaluation plan should have and promoted with principle of 'no-one left behind'.    Description of contingency level as contingency plans are requests for evaluation in the principle of 'no-one left behind'.    Description of contingency plans are requests for evaluation plan should have instruments that may for ad-hoc need adjustments. The Policy does not requests.    The Policy does not integrate values and principles of purman and principles of integrate values are requality in the GEF evaluation function. Includes no reference to human rights nor to the SDGs and the principle of 'no-one left behind'.			users - The plan should		There is no provision	participation of	
Integrate values and principles of 'no-one left behind'.  Activation of the principle of 'no-one left behind'.  Activation of adequate human and financial resources in corder to ensure the quality of evaluations order to ensure the quality of evaluations and principle of 'no-one left behind'.  Activation of country level as to ensure the quality of evaluation plan should have established, clear guidelines to manage and finance ad-hoc requests for evaluations.  All N. 8 - The universally recognized values and principles of human rights and gender evaluation. It is the responsibility of evaluation and principles of no-one left behind'.  All N. 8 - The universally recognized values and principles of human rights and gender evaluation function. It is the responsibility of evaluation and principles of human rights and gender evaluation function. It is the principle of 'no-one left behind'.  All N. 8 - The universally recognized values and principles of human rights and gender evaluation function. It is the requality in the GEF evaluation function.			be supported with		for contingency	GEF Operational	
order to ensure the quality of evaluations requests, although rome the famework.  In the evaluation plan shocked under the famework.  In the universally recognized values and principles of human rights and gender respected, addressed and promoted, undergine to ensure that these values are respected, addressed and promoted, undergine be commitment to the principle of 'no-one left behind'.  In the valuation of country level as order the equality in the GEF evaluation for ad-hoc requests for evaluation for ad-hoc requests for evaluation. It is the responsibility of evaluation and principles of integrate values are respected, addressed and promoted, underpinning the commitment to the principle of 'no-one left behind'.  In the policy does not integrate values and principles of integrate values and principles of integrate values and principles of rights and gender equality in the GEF evaluation function, but it includes no reference to human rights nor to the SDGs and the principle of the SDGs and the principle of th			adequate human and		management of ad-	Focal Points at	
requests, although recognized order to ensure the quality of evaluations are condingency plans are contingency plans are considered dynamic instruments that may for ad-hoc.  The evaluation plan should have established, clear guidelines to manage and finance ad-hoc requests for equality need to be integrated into all stages of an evaluation managers to ensure that these values are responsibility of evaluators and evaluation managers to ensure that these values are responsibility of monoted, underpinning the commitment to the principle of for o-one left behind".  The Policy makes and principles of human approxision to integrate values and principles of human approximation. It is the responsibility of evaluators and evaluation managers to ensure that these values are responsibility of evaluators and evaluation function. Includes no reference to human rights nor to the SDGs and the principle of for o-one left behind".			financial resources in		hoc evaluation	country level as	
duality of evaluations conducted under the framework.  -The evaluation plan should have established, clear guidelines to manage and finance ad-hoc requests for equality need to be integrated into all stages of an evaluation. It is the responsibility of evaluators and evaluation managers to ensure that these values are respected, addressed and promoted, underpinning the commitment to the principle of 'no-one left behind'.    M. 8. The universally recognized values   And principles of human rights and gender responsibility of evaluation that these values are responsibility of evaluation to the principle of 'no-one left behind'.    M. 8. The universally recognized values   And principles of human rights and gender equality in the GEF evaluation function. It includes no reference to human rights nor reference to human rights nor to the SDGs and the principle of the			order to ensure the		requests, although	relevant. There is	
conducted under the framework.  The evaluation plan should have established, clear guidelines to manage and principles of human rights and gender respected, addressed and promoted, underpinning the commitment to the principle of no-one left behind'.  considered dynamic instruments that may for ad-hoc requests for evaluation plan should have evaluation plan should have established, clear guidelines to manage and finance ad-hoc requests for evaluations.  In N. 8. The universally recognized values and gender evaluation it is the responsibility of evaluators and evaluation managers to ensure that these values are respected, addressed and promoted, underpinning the commitment to the principle of no-one left behind'.  Considered dynamic instruments that may for ad-hoc need adjustments. requests.  Requests.  The Policy does not integrate values and provisions to integrate values and principles of human rights and gender equality in the GEF evaluation function. Function, but it includes no reference to human rights nor to the SDGs and the principle of human rights nor to the SDGs and the principle of human rights nor to the SDGs and the principle of human rights nor to the SDGs and the principle of human rights nor to the SDGs and the principle of human rights nor to the SDGs and the principle of human rights nor to the SDGs and the principle of human rights nor to the SDGs and the principle of human rights nor to the SDGs and the principle of human rights nor to the SDGs and the principle of human rights nor to the SDGs and the principle of human rights nor to the SDGs and the principle of human rights nor to the SDGs and the principle of human rights nor to the SDGs and the principle of human rights nor to the SDGs and the principle of human rights nor the SDGs and the principle of human rights nor the SDGs and the principle of human rights nor the SDGs and the principle of human rights nor the sDGs and the principle of human rights nor the sDGs and the principle of human rights nor the sDGs and the principle of huma			quality of evaluations		M&E Plans are	no mention of	
requests.  and principles of human rights and gender respected, addressed and promoted, underprinning the commitment to the principle of 'no-one left behind'.  In the wall attion plan should have evaluation plan should have established, clear guidelines to manage and finance ad-hoc requests for evaluations.  In the Policy does not requests for evaluation make any provision to integrate values and principles of human rights and gender respected, addressed and promoted, underpinning the commitment to the principle of 'no-one left behind'.  In the Policy does not requests of make any provision to integrate values and principles of human rights and gender equality in the GEF evaluation. It is the respected, addressed and promoted, underpinning the commitment to the principle of 'no-one left behind'.  In the Policy makes and principles of integrate values and principles of rights and gender equality in the GEF evaluation to the SDGs and the principle of the SDGs and the substitution that the sevaluation that the			conducted under the		considered dynamic	contingency plans	
and principles of human rights and gender responsibility of evaluation and principle of 'no-one left behind'.  The evaluation plan should have established, clear guidelines to manage and finance ad-hoc requests for evaluation includes no principle of 'no-one left behind'.  The evaluation plan schabilished, clear guidelines to manage and finance ad-hoc requests for manage and principles of make any provision to integrate values and principles of make any provision to integrate values and principles of human rights and gender equality in the GEF evaluation function. Includes no function, but it includes no human rights nor to the SDGs and the principle of 'no-one left behind'.			framework.		instruments that may	for ad-hoc	
should have established, clear guidelines to manage and finance ad-hoc requests for equests of human rights and gender responsibility of evaluations.  The universally recognized values and principles of human rights of an evaluation. It is the responsibility of evaluators and evaluation managers to ensure that these values are respected, addressed and promoted, underpinning the commitment to the principle of 'no-one left behind'.  The Policy does not integrate values and integrate values and integrate values and principles of human rights and gender equality in the GEF evaluation function. Includes no reference to human rights nor to the SDGs and the principle of the principle			- The evaluation plan		need adjustments.	evaluation	
established, clear guidelines to manage and finance ad-hoc requests for evaluations.  The policy does not requests for evaluation. It is the responsibility of evaluators and evaluation managers to ensure that these values are respected, addressed and promoted, underpinning the commitment to the principle of 'no-one left behind'.  Established, clear guidelines to manage and finance ad-hoc requests for evaluations.  The Policy makes make any provision to provisions to integrate values and integrate values and principles of human rights and gender equality in the GEF evaluation function, but it includes no reference to human rights onr to the SDGs and the principle of 'no-one left behind'.			should have			requests.	
guidelines to manage and finance ad-hoc requests for requests for and principles of human rights and gender equality need to be integrated into all stages of an evaluation. It is the responsibility of evaluators and evalues are responsibility of evaluators and promoted, underpinning the commitment to the principle of 'no-one left behind'.  By idelines to manage and hoc requests for requests for revolues and gender equality in the GEF evaluation function. It is the responsibility of evaluation function. It is the responsibility in the GEF evaluation function. It is the requality in the GEF evaluation function. It is the responsibility of evaluation function. It is the requality in the GEF evaluation function. It is the requality in the GEF evaluation function. It is the requality in the GEF evaluation function. It is the requality in the GEF evaluation function. It is the responsibility of evaluation function. It is the requality in the GEF evaluation function. It is the requality in the GEF evaluation function. It is the requality in the GEF evaluation function. It is the requality in the GEF evaluation function. It is the responsibility of evaluation function. It is the requality in the GEF evaluation function. It is the requality in the GEF evaluation function. It is the requality in the GEF evaluation function. It is the requality in the GEF evaluation function. It is the requality in the GEF evaluation function. It is the requalit			established, clear				
and finance ad-hoc requests for evaluations.  The Policy makes and principles of human rights and gender responsibility of evaluation. It is the responsibility of evaluation addressed and promoted, underpinning the commitment to the principle of 'no-one left behind'.  The Policy makes and make any provision to provisions to integrate values and integrate values and principles of human rights nor reference to human rights nor to the SDGs and the principle of			guidelines to manage				
requests for evaluations.    Inditiv			and finance ad-hoc				
Inality   Inal			requests for				
nolity       N. 8 - The universally recognized values       The Policy does not and principles of human rights and gender equality need to be integrated into all stages of an evaluation. It is the responsibility of evaluators and evaluation managers to ensure that these values are respected, addressed and promoted, underpinning the commitment to the principle of 'no-one left behind'.       The Policy makes make any provision to provisions to provisions to integrate values and principles of human integrate values and principles of integrate values and principles of human rights and gender equality in the GEF evaluation function. Includes no reference to human rights nor to the SDGs and the principle of			evaluations.				
nd N. 8 - The universally recognized values and principles of human rights and gender equality need to be integrated into all stages of an evaluation. It is the responsibility of evaluators and evalues are respected, addressed and promoted, underpinning the commitment to the principle of 'no-one left behind'.  The Policy does not make any provision to provisions to integrate values and integrate values and principles of human rights and gender equality in the GEF evaluation function. It is the gender equality in the GEF evaluation function, but it includes no reference to human rights nor to the SDGs and the principle of	4. Evaluation quality	,					
and principles of human rights and gender equality need to be integrated into all stages of an evaluation. It is the responsibility of evaluators and evaluation managers to ensure that these values are respected, addressed and promoted, underpinning the commitment to the principle of 'no-one left behind'.  and principles of human integrate values and integrate values and principles of human rights and gender equality in the GEF evaluation function. It is the evaluation function. It is the gender equality in the GEF evaluation function, but it includes no reference to human rights nor to the SDGs and the principle of	Human rights and	N. 8 - The universally recognized values			The Policy does not	The Policy makes	The absence of
integrate values and integrate values and principles of human evaluation evaluation evaluation rights and gender equality in the GEF evaluation function. so the rights and gender equality in the GEF evaluation function. evaluation function. function, but it includes no reference to human rights nor to the SDGs and the principle of	gender equality	and principles of human rights and gender			make any provision to	provisions to	references to
principles of human and principles of human rights and gender equality in the GEF evaluation evaluation function. Includes no reference to the SDGs and the principle of the principle of the soft and principles of principles of human rights nor to the SDGs and the principle of		equality need to be integrated into all			integrate values and		gender
ation rights and gender equality in the GEF evaluation function. reference to human rights nor to the SDGs and the principle of		stages of an evaluation. It is the			principles of human	and principles of	equality in the
equality in the GEF the GEF evaluation function. function, but it includes no reference to human rights nor to the SDGs and the principle of		responsibility of evaluators and evaluation			rights and gender	gender equality in	2010 Policy
reference to human rights nor to the SDGs and the principle of		managers to ensure that these values are			equality in the GEF	the GEF evaluation	was a serious
includes no reference to human rights nor to the SDGs and the principle of		respected, addressed and promoted,			evaluation function.	function, but it	gap. In the
reference to human rights nor to the SDGs and the principle of		underpinning the commitment to the				includes no	2019 Policy,
4 9		principle of 'no-one left behind'.				reference to	despite the
						human rights nor	strong
						to the SDGs and	improvement
issues, the gap						the principle of	on gender
							issues, the gap

2	INEC Norms 2016	Bolowst INFO	Ctandard	CEE 2010 Evaluation	CEE 2010	Commonto
a; areas of		s 2016 entary o		Ÿ	uation Policy	and gaps
					no-one left behind.	remains on human rights,
						also considering
						GEF's work
						with
						Indigenous
						Groups and
						the negative
						impact of
						climate change
						on rights such
						as Right to
						Food and Right
Evaluation		St. 2.2 - The head of		The Policy assigns	The Policy assigns	
guidelines		evaluation is		responsibility to EO to	responsibility to	
		responsible for ensuring		develop guidelines for	IEO to develop	
		the provision of		the implementation	guidelines for the	
		appropriate evaluation		of the policy and on	implementation of	
		guidelines. Evaluation		other aspects of	the policy and on	
		guidelines should follow		evaluation.	other aspects of	
		the UNEG Norms and			evaluation.	
		Standards and				
		incorporate its relevant				
		elements. Although				
		guidelines may need to				
		be prepared for				
		different types of				
		evaluations or for				
		different types of users,				
		the guidelines should				
		generally cover:				
		- The roles and				
		responsibilities in				

Terms of reference		Main and sub- UNEG Norms, 2016 criteria; areas of focus
		ns, 2016
St. 4.3 - The terms of reference should provide the evaluation purpose, scope, design and plan.	setting up, managing, conducting, quality controlling, reporting and disseminating evaluations; - The process of evaluation; - Stakeholder involvement; - Guidance on methodologies and quality control; - Reporting, dissemination and the promotion of learning; For decentralized evaluations, the guidance should cover overall planning and resourcing.	Relevant UNEG Standards 2016 (only complementary ones)
		Standard Operational Practices, ECG Good practice, 2012
The Policy refers to evaluation ToRs and Approach Papers and the consultation process for their preparation, but only refers to dissemination plans with regards to its contents.		GEF 2010 Evaluation Policy
The Policy refers to evaluation ToRs and Approach Papers and the consultation process for their preparation, but only refers to dissemination plans with regards to its contents.		GEF 2019 Evaluation Policy
No significant gap.		Comments and gaps

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

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

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

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

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

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