GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT FACILITY
INVESTING IN OUR PLANET

GEF/STAP/C.48/Inf.03/Rev.01
May 22, 2015

48th GEF Council Meeting
June 02 – 04, 2015
Washington, D.C.

KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT IN THE GEF: STAP INTERIM REPORT

Knowledge Management in the GEF:

STAP Interim Report

Introduction

STAP has long championed the role of Knowledge Management (KM) as an intrinsic part of the GEF's mandate and responsibility in the delivery of Global Environmental Benefits[1] and environmentally sustainable development. The GEF's potential for utilizing its knowledge through appropriate KM and knowledge management systems (KMS) is immense – see Box 1 for definitions[2] of KM[3] and KMS. KM features prominently in STAP's current Work Program, including in support of the newly-evolving Integrated Approach Pilots (IAPs).

BOX 1: Definitions

Knowledge Management (KM): the systematic processes, or range of practices, used by organizations to identify, capture, store, create, update, represent, and distribute knowledge for use, awareness and learning across the organization.

Knowledge Management Systems (KMS): any kind of IT system that stores and retrieves knowledge, improves collaboration, locates knowledge sources, mines repositories for hidden knowledge, captures and uses knowledge, or in some other way enhances the KM process.

Knowledge Products and Services: These refer to outputs such as databases, publications, maps (knowledge products) and outcomes such as awareness raising, information sharing, and capacity building (knowledge services).

STAP has identified a suite of issues, including scientific and technical areas that should be considered in order to create a comprehensive and scientifically robust KM Strategy for the GEF. Drawing on an assessment of almost 140 completed projects between GEF-2 and GEF-4, STAP concluded that at the design stage, GEF programs and projects typically provide relatively little evidence of systematic or cross-project treatment of KM needs for impact. Most program and project evidence reviewed[4] also tend to contain little information concerning how knowledge products and services generated by projects were subsequently used. Baselines for KM products or services are typically inadequately specified, and dissemination pathways are often missing.

This STAP Interim Report, which has contributed to the GEF Approach Paper on KM[5], presents observations and results of STAP's KM Work Program to date in the following areas:

1) An analysis of KM within the GEF portfolio, including evidence from the IEO[6];
2) KM experience from other institutions;
3) A review of the principles of KM systems:

[1] http://www.stapgef.org/delivering-global-environmental-benefits-for-sustainable-development-report-to-the-5th-gef-assembly/. STAP's KM contributions include independent advice on GEF's projects and programs as a part of its regular screening process, strategic and operational support for GEF programming including focal area strategies and the recently adopted Integrated Approach Pilots (IAPs) through its regular Work Program, support in reviewing the GEF resource allocation system, advice on results-based management frameworks including indicators and focal area tracking tools such as development of such as guidance on GHG accounting and reporting (GEF/C.48/Inf.09), guidance on the use of experimental project design and targeted research, and review of emerging global environmental issues such as marine debris, emerging chemicals management issues, and most recently resilience of social-ecological systems.

[2] Sources for Box 1: (KM) Buckley, S and Jakovljevic, M. eds. (2013). Knowledge Management Innovations for Interdisciplinary Education: Organizational Applications. IGI Global, Hershey PA, USA; (KMS) Definition based on Frost, A. (2010). Knowledge Management Systems.

[3] As adopted in the GEF Knowledge Management Approach Paper (GEF/C.48/07/Rev.01).

[4] Sources for the analysis were: Project Implementation Reports (PIRs), Terminal Evaluation Reports (TERs), Implementation Completion Reports (ICPs) and, if available, and Country Portfolio Evaluations (CPEs).

[5] GEF/C.48/07/Rev.01 (https://www.thegef.org/council-meeting-documents/gef-knowledge-management-approach-paper).

[6] GEF IEO (2015). Meta-Analysis of Evaluative Evidence Contained in Country Level Evaluations on the GEF Support to Knowledge Management. Internal Document, Apr 2015.

This report concludes with observations and recommendations on how the GEF's KM initiative might progress towards a future GEF KM Strategy and Action Plan.

(1) The Knowledge Base from the Existing GEF Portfolio

A meta-analysis[7] of 138 projects[8] was undertaken for the type of KM employed, the KM products and services delivered, and the KM outcomes achieved (see Annex I for the template used to review projects/programs as part of this analysis). One-third of reviewed projects made direct reference to the generation of 'knowledge' and/or 'information'. Knowledge products and contributions to knowledge management reviewed by STAP included explicit results such as databases, websites, training centers, technology transfer, and information sharing and access, as well as less tangible (or tacit) results such as capacity/skills building, awareness raising, and innovation and technology transfer.

However, few projects and programs reviewed were found to contain adequate information about KM baselines and the design of KM for impact. The design of GEF investments tended to focus on near-term outcomes as opposed to broad adoption and behavioral change leading to sustained impact. In particular, there is a general lack of planning for the use of KM products in the development of Project Identification Forms (PIFs). The exceptions are often where projects build on a preceding phase and cite KM products achieved. For example, the Amazon Region Protected Areas Project (ARPA, GEF ID 771), on its own, might have been one that merely generated KM products without systemic impact. However, the subsequent phases II and III[9] ultimately led to the integration of the KM products in a nationally robust way, both sustained and scaled up. This was due to the fact that these phases were designed to learn from and address the deficits discovered during phase I. Another example is the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment (MA, GEF ID 770). Both dissemination and outreach were built into the design of this project. It produced a series of authoritative and peer-reviewed reports, with a large volume of material packaged for different audiences. Uptake of the MA has been widespread and the outputs of the project are widely cited. However, in this case the knowledge user community has not necessarily been the GEF constituency, and policymakers were not part of the original process. Both of these factors have reduced the overall impact of this GEF project. Finally, across all projects, knowledge products tend to be solely in the English language – thus limiting country-level uptake.

There are relatively few examples in the portfolio that may serve as good replication models for the design of KM at the project level. One of them is the IWCAM project (Integrating Watershed and Coastal Areas Management in the Caribbean Small Island Developing States, GEF ID 1254) that addressed the coastal management knowledge and capacity needs of 13 Caribbean islands. KM-related components drew upon knowledge from a set of regional demonstration projects leading to: (i) the collection of lessons from demonstrations of IWCAM practices, and their dissemination and replication; (ii) the establishment of a regional center for storage of indicators-related information and training; and (iii) the facilitation of regional integration and networking aimed at policy reforms using training and other tools to raise awareness.

---

[7] Sources for the analysis were: Project Implementation Reports (PIRs), Terminal Evaluation Reports (TERs), Implementation Completion Reports (ICPs) and, if available, and Country Portfolio Evaluations (CPEs). TEs and TERs (and CPEs to some extent) were drawn on for evidence of likely impact of KM, however the evidence of actual impact was hard to obtain as only in minority of projects were internet searches successful in locating ex-post impacts attributable to KM products. The projects selected for review are not necessarily representative of the GEF country constituency or of focal areas supported, but the cohort for the assessment was sufficiently large and results are robust to understand trends and patterns of GEF support for knowledge generation, transfer and uptake.

[8] These are projects included in OPS-5 which were identified as having significant knowledge products. In total 138 projects were reviewed; 41% full-size; 59% medium-size; from all focal areas; multi-scale.

[9] http://programaarpa.gov.br/en/

The adoption and behavioural change sought by GEF projects and programs often depends upon the sustained availability of the KM products generated by these investments over the long term, and with clear responsibilities for their maintenance assigned and resourced. Three main factors regarding the sustainability of KM products as a precondition leading to their possible impact were identified as essential in the analysis undertaken by STAP:

1) access to and maintenance the repository of data and/or information generated through GEF projects;
2) continuing institutional and financial support; and
3) mainstreaming the knowledge products and services created through these investments with local institutions.

An increasingly common tool for sustaining the availability of KM products for dissemination and replication is the project website. Websites created for hosting databases and other knowledge products are regularly cited in terminal evaluations (TEs). Of the 138 projects reviewed, 78 (56%) cited websites. However, 27 websites (35% of those cited) were no longer accessible, while several of the accessible sites do not appear to have been maintained or updated since project closure. Projects such as the Regional Environment Information Project (GEF ID 47) may result in knowledge resource centers which persist long after the project is completed, but are often evaluated at project closure as likely unsustainable unless staff and resources are maintained.

The GEF KM system for International Waters (IW), IW:LEARN, has been considered as a model for expansion to other focal areas. However, while knowledge, information and lessons learned are entered in the IW:LEARN database, it is unclear (in the absence of any audit trail) to what extent this resource is drawn upon for future projects or its use tracked by the GEF Secretariat and the GEF agencies. As with other global projects that are presumed to be 'owned' by the GEF, the evaluator was concerned that "…Sustaining the benefits of IW:LEARN 2 (GEF ID 1893) will probably occur if and only if IW:LEARN 2 experiences and lessons learned are mainstreamed into GEF IW projects and institutionalized by the implementing agencies and by the GEFSEC within the IW core function of the GEFSEC. This suggestion is directed to the GEFSEC, the World Bank Group, UNDP and UNEP."

Evidence for 'ownership'[10] of KM products is mixed and often difficult to identify. Many GEF global and regional projects may initially generate KM products but they require considerable effort to be made useful to countries more directly or the GEF Partnership. Country ownership of global and regional projects by the GEF partnership, including the uptake of KM products and services they generate, is typically difficult to determine. Often this relates to the fact that knowledge generated by these projects is poorly integrated into the knowledge base of either the GEF or its implementing agencies. Unless an external champion of KM products generated by global and regional projects is already identified in the design stage (as for example in the case of the Coral Reef Targeted Research and Capacity Building for Management project - GEF ID 1531:), a KM 'adoption gap' may exist. Consequently, orphaned KM products are often not taken up by the GEF partnership. Similarly, for many national projects, the failure to recruit policy champions and advocates for change with KM products has been lacking. Again, there have been exceptions, including the Brazil National Biodiversity project (Probio, GEF ID 58) where strong country ownership, involving extensive buy-in from government agencies and NGOs, resulted in the formation of the National Biodiversity Commission which continues to this day.

[10] 'Ownership' not necessarily in the legal sense but rather refers to "curation", i.e., the person or institution feeling a bond of belonging or having a close guardianship of the KM product.

The above findings resonate with the STAP's review of the GEF Targeted Research Modality (2012), which concluded that TR projects approved under the 1997 policy have not consistently contributed to improving the quality and effectiveness of the GEF[11]. In the absence of a process that systematically identifies priority research needs, subsequent uptake pathways for research results, and mechanisms to identify the necessary resources for such research within the GEF or its agencies, the Targeted Research Modality is now largely irrelevant with respect to the improvement of GEF strategies, processes and methods. However, the needs for adaptive management, solutions-oriented research, and learning within GEF Programs continue. STAP has provided recommendations in its 2012 Report to tackle these challenges, while concomitantly addressing the needs of countries. A current example of how these issues are being addressed in the GEF Program is found in the Food Security and Commodities IAPs, which have included specific adaptive management and learning components in the initial design of these investments.

Concomitantly, the STAP analysis found that portfolio learning at different scales is evident in that there are several notable examples of national projects that overcame barriers to achieving regional and global impact. Examples include IWCAM, as outlined above, which successfully replicated watershed and coastal management practices at the regional scale guided by a clear theory of change and use of the IW:LEARN website. Also notable was the Building Local Capacity for Energy Efficiency project (GEF ID 2244). Although a Bulgarian national project, this represents a good example of KM products that on their technical merits were adopted regionally.

The evidence contained in the 24 country-level evaluations conducted by the GEF Independent Evaluation Office (IEO) illustrates that there is an interaction among the four components of knowledge management identified in the GEF Generic Theory of Change:

1) knowledge generation,
2) information sharing and access,
3) awareness raising, and
4) monitoring and evaluation (M&E).

The preparation and implementation of national strategies and action plans has often led to awareness raising of policy makers and communities. This greater level of awareness has resulted in the development of various national plans and policies. Information dissemination within communities has also helped raise environmental awareness and establish the long term sustainability of interventions.

The GEF has played an important role in supporting countries to fulfil their obligations to a range of international environmental conventions through, for example, the creation of inventories for GHG emissions, persistent organic pollutants (POPs), and flora and fauna. Doing so has helped countries to establish baselines and monitor changes over time. For example, in Brazil, the second national GHG inventory was used as a reference in establishing the national GHG emissions targets for 2020. In addition, several catalytic impacts were reported in Egypt's CPE, where the preparation of reports to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) resulted in climate change being institutionalized into government policies and being elevated to the national agenda.

The most common form of broader adoption of knowledge was replication, which refers to the knowledge products and services being replicated in different geographical areas and regions reported in 13 country-level evaluations. For example, GEF supported programs on marine and coastal environmental management in Philippines were replicated throughout the region.

[11] GEF/STAP/C.43/Inf.02

Mainstreaming of knowledge into broader stakeholder initiatives was noted in 3 country-level evaluations. In India, a community-based approach to protected area management pioneered by the GEF India Ecodevelopment project (GEF ID 84) had been mainstreamed, gaining a wider support in the country. The knowledge generated with GEF support has been sustained through the transfer of knowledge to further GEF projects and national initiatives after project completion. In Madagascar, the biodiversity database established by the GEF enabling activities has been used for creating new protected areas and ecological monitoring programs results of which informed environmental impact assessments for sectoral investments.

The analysis above supports the notion that the GEF's comparative advantage in KM is at the level of portfolio learning particularly at national scale, the primary GEF client base, but also at regional and global scales. Furthermore, its information dissemination mechanisms have emphasized collaborating and coordinating activities across the network of GEF partners within and beyond national borders.

(2) KM Experience from Other Institutions

Over the last two decades, development agencies have embraced a new discourse on 'knowledge'. Several GEF agencies have developed KM Strategies, including ADB (2013), FAO (2011), IFAD (2007), UNDP (2014), and the World Bank (2010). The World Bank, for instance, declared itself to be the "knowledge bank" for development aid in 1996. ADB's long-term strategic framework, Strategy 2020, identifies "knowledge solutions" as a driver of change for stimulating growth and synergizing broader assistance in its operations.[12] It is incumbent on the GEF to take notice of how other institutions, particularly GEF Partners, address KM and use KMS to enhance their mandates. There is a community of practice in KM that itself can provide guidance as to what the GEF should include in any new KM Strategy, and there is a need for whatever systems the GEF implements to be acceptable to its partner agencies and countries.

Two specific approaches practiced successfully by development agencies in this regard are 'Communities of Practice' (CoP)[13] and South-South Exchanges. Communities of practice and thematic networks, along with informal communication and learning practices, are used to share formal (explicit) and informal (tacit) knowledge. They have evolved in some international agencies as in the Asian Development Bank, where groups who share an interest in a specific field self-organize, discuss a problem they face regularly in their work, and subsequently establish a knowledge practice around that topic. STAP encourages the GEF to explore utilizing existing CoPs and South-South exchanges in support of their own KM needs.

South-South Exchange platforms are typically used to share examples of success and learning between countries and to help individual countries identify their learning needs. The South–South Knowledge Exchange (SSKE) hub at the World Bank, for example, supports the transfer of knowledge through a central repository for information, including best practices and a library of results stories. The facility aims to meet immediate operational knowledge gaps by catalyzing the sharing of country experiences between practitioners, and mainstreaming demand-driven South–South knowledge exchange into bank-financed operations. A GEF example is the Global Assessments of Impacts and Adaptation to Climate Change in Multiple Regions and Sectors project (AIACC, GEF ID 874). This

[12] Source: Knowledge Management Directions and Action Plan (2013-2015): Supporting "Finance ++" at the Asian Development Bank. http://www.adb.org/documents/knowledge-management-directions-and-action-plan-2013-2015

[13] Communities of practice are groups of people who share a concern or a passion for something they do and who interact regularly to learn how to do it better. (Source: Wenger, E. (n.d.). *Communities of practice: A brief introduction.* http://www.ewenger.com/theory/communities_of_practice_intro.htm)

initiative enhanced research collaboration and actively encouraged the formation of multi-sectoral and multi-country teams. The AIACC strengthened the capacity of developing country governments, academic institutions, communities and other stakeholders to assess climate change impacts, adaptation measures and the residual vulnerabilities. The sub-project assessments helped fill large information gaps highlighted by the Third Assessment Report of the IPCC.

The GEF's internal model of a thematic community of practice is IW:LEARN, which over the last 15 years has grown from an informal gathering to an organized network providing a KM exchange and learning platform for GEF IW practitioners at local, national, and international levels. IW: LEARN provides a range of KM products and activities including:

1. an information management platform at www.iwlearn.net, which is a content management system;
2. the GEF International Waters Biennial Conferences;
3. project "twinning" exchanges promoting peer-to-peer learning and South-South cooperation;
4. targeted training workshops addressing common capacity building needs;
5. regional dialogue processes fostering transboundary and South-South cooperation among projects and national partners within a geographical region; and
6. a range of products capturing experiences and results.

Evidence from other agencies also illustrates the importance of introducing robust M&E processes to assess the impacts of KM and use of KMS. Review of knowledge management systems in international financial institutions has pointed to the lack of indicators and measurement systems linking KM with business impact as a barrier for further investments in KM.[14] Impact metrics are particularly difficult for assessing tacit knowledge. In partnership with the Independent Evaluation Office, the GEF should review experiences in this regard, both in the private and public sectors, in order to develop a consistent system for monitoring performance and measuring impact of its KM activities linked to its corporate RBM and staff performance systems. Common KM indicators, for instance, were developed by the Multilateral Organization Performance Assessment Network (MOPAN) representing 19 donor countries with a common interest in assessing the organizational effectiveness of the major multilateral organizations[15].

The development community has made substantial efforts in making information about their operations available through open-data initiatives[16]. For example, the World Bank Open Development initiative has made the institution a global leader in freely-available and searchable information and data.[17] The initiative is founded on the hypothesis that knowledge, information, and research foster innovation, thereby increasing transparency and trust. UNEP as well has developed an open access on line repository for environmental data and information used in national and regional assessments[18]. By following the example of leading development agencies, especially including those already in the GEF partnership, the GEF could become a leader in KM for innovation.

(3) Principles of Knowledge Management Systems Relevant to the GEF

[14] https://www.ecgnet.org/document/knowledge-management-international-financial-institutions

[15] http://www.mopanonline.org/commonapproach/

[16] As proposed in the GEF Knowledge Management Approach Paper GEF/C.48/07/Rev.01, Paragraph 14 c.

[17] See http://www.worldbank.org/open/

[18] UNEP Live is UNEPs knowledge integrator and is being developed to support assessment processes. It makes accessible relevant national, regional and global data and indicators, knowledge providers and databases, assessment results/publications, maps as well as near-real time data.

The GEF's KM potential is substantial but largely unrealized. New GEF initiatives can significantly benefit from information and learning based on past experience. Likewise, more mature GEF projects and programs typically contain knowledge products which can assist in improving the design of future initiatives (whether or not these are GEF investments) and improve the generation of global environmental benefits. The design of many projects can potentially support regional and cross-regional knowledge sharing and learning. With appropriate co-financing and multi-stakeholder involvement, the structure of projects has the potential to foster learning and the development of KM products. The multi-focal area project modality and the new Integrated Approach Pilots (IAPs) should encourage learning across disciplines, including the social and biophysical sciences.

Knowledge-generation should be an objective built into the design of all GEF projects and programs at the outset and clearly reflected at concept (PIF) stage. In order to achieve this, strategies need to be included that encourage activities such as knowledge baselines, sharing and uptake pathways, research, inventory and the curation of data, and open access to data and information generated through GEF investments. Project-level KM strategies, however, must be more than the supply of open-access information – they need to capture both 'explicit' and 'tacit' knowledge. Tacit knowledge that is largely intuitive and experiential will include beliefs, attitudes and values. While tacit knowledge is often the best source for innovation, it is typically the hardest to store and retrieve.

Three broad categories of KMS are identifiable. In increasing order of sophistication, they are: enterprise-wide KMS; knowledge-work systems; and intelligent systems. Typologies of KMS include expert systems to diagnose problems; groupware to facilitate collaboration; document and content management systems to store and share information in a variety of media; decision-support systems to guide choices through sets of rules for specific purposes; and simulation systems to model scenarios. The GEF's own PMIS as currently used is an enterprise-wide system for document storage and retrieval. By comparative standards the PMIS is unsophisticated and relatively unfriendly for new users, which contributes to a reported low uptake in its read-only restrictive form by countries and GEF focal points.

(4) Concluding Observations and Recommendations

Knowledge is arguably our most valuable commodity in the GEF, enabling the GEF Partnership both to learn from past experiences and carry forward lessons for wider uptake and impact. Next to their role as knowledge generators, GEF Partners are essential knowledge brokers and have a wealth of experience in KM and can support the GEF to develop its own KM Strategy.

The GEF is presently moving towards a more integrated, solutions-oriented institutional structure following similar trends in other development-related organizations (e.g., WB and UNDP). The Integrated Approach Pilots are the first such examples in the GEF portfolio. Support for KM in the IAPs should expand beyond specific products (i.e., explicit knowledge) towards learning and knowledge sharing among practitioners (i.e., tacit knowledge) through existing networks and communities of practice including South-South collaboration. This effort should bring together agencies, local and national governments, civil society and science bodies.

In terms of the suitability of KMS for the GEF, systems vary greatly in terms of sophistication and capability. It is unlikely that any one KMS will serve the multiple purposes in the GEF due to the immense range of needs of the enterprise and the large number of stakeholders, including countries, that themselves have different requirements and capabilities. The GEF PMIS could be updated and upgraded to a knowledge-work-type system in order to include improved content

management capabilities but also to facilitate collaborative content creation in support of Communities of Practice and South-South collaboration. Web-based open access repositories for knowledge products, such as UNEP-Live[19], can also assist in this regard. Decision-support and simulation systems potentially hold significant promise to support innovation in the GEF partnership.

Finally, the 'enabling environment' for upgrading the importance and relevance of KM in the GEF needs attention. Incentives for the inclusion of KM in projects are few; the demand for KM products at country-level is often muted – partly because there is little feeling of ownership of project outputs; and specific modalities for knowledge-generation are often not used.

Recommendation 1. Conditions for knowledge-sharing and learning across the GEF partnership should be strengthened, particularly through the enhanced support for South-South exchanges and 'communities of practice'[20]. At country level the GEF should consider applications to assist countries to review their knowledge management needs in order to consolidate KM products and learning from past GEF projects as a baseline for future investments.

Recommendation 2. The GEF partnership should develop guiding learning questions to support KM implementation, including for the IAPs (see Annex 2 for examples in this regard which may serve as a template). The IAPs and similar Programs should become testing grounds for evolving KM practices to be expanded in GEF-7.[21]

Recommendation 3. KM should be mainstreamed systemically into the GEF project cycle, through strengthened evidence of KM initiatives at PIF stage and systemic development of KM strategies at full design stage. This should include specification of knowledge sources and development of uptake pathways (theory of change for KM).

Recommendation 4. KM and KMS functions should be included in project/program monitoring and evaluation activities. The GEF IEO should explore how to harmonize KM evaluation practices across agencies[22].

Recommendation 5. The GEF should develop its own Open Data Policy, and STAP welcomes the call to develop such a policy in the GEF Knowledge Management Approach Paper[23].

Recommendation 6. KM progress indicators should be included in the GEF Results-Based Management system and harmonized with the approaches of other agencies.

Recommendation 7. An enterprise-wide GEF KM system should be adopted (perhaps based on the current PMIS but with substantial up-grading into a content management system) with the functionality to extract, edit, file, archive and create various information demands, including for reporting, evaluating, project development and portfolio assessment at a much higher level than is currently possible.

---

[19] http://uneplive.unep.org/

[20] To establish conditions for knowledge sharing and learning across the GEF partnership, OPS-5 recommended that the "capacity development 2" (CD2) approach is well-suited for the intervention model of the GEF. CD2 focuses on mechanisms for permanent or life-long learning through knowledge brokerage. Following this advice in the project cycle will considerably enhance the GEF's impact and delivery of sustainable global environmental benefits. Critical assessment of IW:LEARN experience could inform this development.

[21] STAP has developed an initial set of GEF's corporate learning questions that could be used to start a dialogue with the GEF partnership presented in Annex 2.

[22] Where KM is addressed in GEF projects, only lower-order KM outputs feature such as information awareness through media such as websites, publications and occasionally contributions to broader databases. Rarely is information structured to provide user-friendly external access to knowledge products.

[23] GEF/C.48/07/Rev.01 (https://www.thegef.org/council-meeting-documents/gef-knowledge-management-approach-paper)

Recommendation 8. Incentives for successful dissemination of project outputs should be considered for GEF agencies, executing partners, the IEO and STAP to enhance knowledge generation and knowledge sharing.

Recommendation 9. The use of applied research in specific cases should be revisited in order to assist in the design and testing of KM methods or KMS for special purposes in GEF investments. This may include identifying a clear role for strategic engagement with the scientific community in the GEF partnership. As noted above, the IAPs in some cases have begun to map out strategies to address these needs.

ANNEX 1

Project Questionnaire (to be filled using PIF, CEO endorsement document, PIRs, MTRs, TEs, website and internet search resources)

	Question
1	Project GEF ID and title
2	Project stated goal. Indicate if TR project
3	Focal area(s)
	Target Group/Country
4	Focal area objective/strategic program
5	Links to GEF and other programs or projects. Usually part of the PIF and CEO endorsement documents
6	Name of the project component addressing knowledge management and provide a brief description of what it does. Indicate if the project has used or created a dedicated KM system at the project level or supported such system (unlike individual Knowledge products)
7	List and explain each knowledge input and product/category identified in project documents and reports (e.g., information system, lessons learned notes, website, conference proceedings, testing new technology, supporting national KM system and etc.) Identify KM products/processes: [ ] – Information sharing and access [ ] – Capacity/skills building [ ] – Awareness raising [ ] – Knowledge generation/innovation/technology transfer
8	Provide budget numbers for identified KM products (GEF and co-financing) and total project GEF and co-financing budgets
9	Who are intended producer(s) and user(s) of the identified Knowledge inputs and products?
10	How widely is the product (or baseline KM) applicable (local, sub-national, national, regional and global levels)?
11	What technology was used to generate/support KM?
12	What contribution does the project make to one of the scientific fields/supported innovative scientific ideas/new technologies?
13	Is there any evidence that GEF supported Knowledge Management increased KM capacity and/or supported KM systems of the GEF agencies, GEF Conventions, private sector or etc.? Briefly describe this capacity. Support for KM systems:

	[ ] – Global [ ] – Regional [ ] – National [ ] – Local [ ] – Agency [ ] – Convention [ ] – Private sector [ ] - Other
14	Select one or more categories justifying impact of KM: "broad adoption": [ ]sustaining, [ ]mainstreaming, [ ]replication, [ ]scaling-up, and [ ]market change) "behavioral change": [ ]economically feasible, [ ]socially acceptable, [ ]environmentally sound
15	Provide projects summary and if applicable, describe in a few sentences each of the above selected processes defining KM progress towards impact (listed in question 14). Provide project summary including: (i) the evidence and assumptions used to define knowledge inputs (e.g. baselines) to justify GEF support (referenced knowledge cited **in project brief**) (ii) design of policies, projects and programs to use/deliver KM (**in GEF project documents**) (iii) their delivery on the ground (**Terminal Evaluation evidence**) If there is an evidence to support (iii), for the description please use answers to the question (14).
16	Was "broader adoption" integrated in the project design or it happened during/after project implementation? What factors contributed/hindered the process
17	If applicable, is there evidence that Knowledge products reached outside of the GEF partnership? (i.e., benefited global, regional scientific and technical networks beyond GEF direct stakeholders?)

Annex 2

Example Learning Questions to Support the GEF KM Strategy [24]
Objective: Seek to address drivers of environmental degradation
• What approaches employed by the GEF helped to account for trade-offs between the economic and non-economic values of biodiversity and ecosystem services, and informed the development of ecosystem management strategies? • How can GEF experience in integrated approaches and knowledge generation (including monitoring, metrics and indicators) help to inform decisions about sustainable urban systems? • What are the specific drivers behind socially and ecologically unsustainable consumption practices and patterns addressed by the GEF portfolio of projects? What management approaches were used by the GEF projects to address these drivers and transform existing practices?
Objective: Pursue Integrated Solutions
• How do recipient countries prioritize the management of natural resources using GEF resources choosing among different management approaches supporting biodiversity conservation and sustainable use? What is the relative importance of these approaches at different scales and in different contexts and their impact on sustainable development? • What synergies and trade-offs between food production, water use and energy use were considered by the GEF portfolio? How can these be managed to improve management of natural resources (above) and secure equitable access/benefits in GEF recipient countries? • How do GEF projects address flows (supply and demand) of energy, materials and ecosystem services between urban and rural systems? What planning processes and management practices contribute to the integrated urban and rural development?
Objective: Enhance Resilience and Adaptation
• What management practices can be employed by GEF projects to support ecosystem resilience, particularly in critical areas such as coastal cities, deltas, estuaries, wetlands,

[24] These suggested learning questions were informed by the results of a recent global consultation on global change and sustainability (Ref: Strategic Research Agenda 2014, available at: http://www.futureearth.org/media/strategic-research-agenda-2014).

islands, forests, coral reefs, and agricultural systems? • How does GEF support to efforts to mitigate and adapt to climate change contribute to assurance of human and/or ecological resilience, vulnerability or well-being in the recipient countries?
Cross-sectoral learning theme: Towards collective impact
• What forms of stakeholder engagement were effective and legitimate in reducing impacts, and increasing resilience to global environmental change?