

**GEF SUB-REGIONAL CONSULTATION FOR THE CARIBBEAN  
BRIDGETOWN, BARBADOS  
10-11 JULY 2006**

**DAY 1, 10 JULY 2006**

**Morning Session**

**Opening Statement**

On behalf of the CEO of the Global Environment Facility (GEF), its Secretariat (GEFSec), and all its GEF Implementing and Executing Agencies, Funke Oyewole of the GEFSec welcomed the Honorable Minister of the Environment of Barbados, delegates, and colleagues to the GEF sub-regional consultation. She noted that this is the seventh of a series of consultations organized throughout the world with the objective of providing a detailed update on the recent changes in GEF's policies and operational procedures, with a particular focus on the new Resource Allocation Framework (RAF).

Ms. Oyewole recalled that the GEF is the only financial mechanism set up by the international community to assist developing countries, as well as countries with economies in transition, to cope with the global dimensions and implications of their national environmental issues. Since its establishment fifteen years ago, the GEF has gone through a number of natural evolutions prompted by changes in its political environment. GEF projects must be country-driven, show identifiable global benefits, be consistent with the global conventions, have scientific and technical merit, and be financially sustainable and cost-effective. Since its inception, the GEF has funded over 1,750 projects in 155 developing countries and transition economies with over \$6 billion leveraging \$20 billion in co-financing. The GEF has also funded more than 4,000 small grants to NGOs and community-based organizations.

Ms. Oyewole remarked that the sub regional consultations which have taken place in Africa, Asia, Eastern Europe and Latin America have provided a unique opportunity to share information with GEF focal points and representatives of the GEF NGO Network, to explain the underlying rationale, goal and objectives of new GEF policies, and above all to analyze their potential implications for beneficiary countries. Most importantly, these consultations have given the GEF the opportunity to hear from its key partners, and to engage in a productive dialogue on ways and means to enhance the role of beneficiary countries in GEF's governance and decision making bodies.

Ms. Oyewole expressed sincere gratitude to the Government of Barbados for having kindly accepted to host this workshop and extended her personal appreciation to all the delegates for being present despite busy agendas. The high level of representation from so many countries was much appreciated. Ms. Oyewole was particularly pleased to note the representation of civil society and the NGO community, as well as regional organizations whose role is essential in ensuring the viability, effectiveness, and sustainability of GEF interventions on the ground.

In reviewing the agenda for the consultation, Ms. Oyewole noted that it provided ample time to present and discuss in detail the key components of the GEF's new policies, procedures and programs. She emphasized that the ultimate goal of these changes is to enhance beneficiary countries role in and ownership of GEF-funded programs. As such the role of focal points will become even more important, especially in facilitating national coordination and planning, mobilizing co-financing, and implementing the RAF. The challenge will be to deploy consultative mechanisms that actively involve all the relevant public and non public institutions and stakeholders, including civil society and NGO representatives.

Ms. Oyewole indicated that new programs and instruments approved by the GEF Council have been designed to provide the financial, technical and institutional support to improve communication and coordination within countries and constituencies. She stressed that if the new programs and policies are well internalized and effectively used, country and constituency representatives in GEF governance structures will be able to play a much more active and critical role in GEF Council decision-making processes.

Ms. Oyewole mentioned that unfortunately there would not be enough time to address the many operational issues countries have during the meeting, but that she and colleagues from the GEFSec, GEF Office of Evaluation, World Bank, UNDP, and UNEP would be available for bilateral discussions at any time between the formal sessions.

Looking ahead, remarked Ms. Oyewole, the GEF has achieved a robust replenishment for GEF 4, will be welcoming a new CEO in August who was unanimously selected by GEF Member countries to lead the GEF over the next three years, and is preparing for the Third GEF Assembly, in Cape Town, South Africa in August where she hoped to see everyone. Ms. Oyewole concluded her remarks by wishing the gathering productive and conclusive deliberations.

### **Host Country Statement**

The Honorable Elizabeth Thompson, Minister of the Environment of Barbados, welcomed the delegates to Barbados. The Minister reviewed the national and regional endeavors for environmental protection. In this regard, she noted the challenges of social and economic development, sustainable livelihoods given the increasing gap between rich and poor, the divide between governmental policy articulation and implementation, and the shrinking place of habitat protection on the donor agenda. The Minister remarked that the GEF since its inception and restructuring has provided effective assistance to countries such as Barbados, and has helped the international community understand and address the focal areas. While the GEF has been a source of assistance to SIDS, there have been a number of constraints that have prevented SIDS from fully accessing resources. To address these constraints, SIDS need assistance with, among other aspects, the following:

- Improved communication between the region and GEF.
- Regional focal point or contact with the GEF.
- GEF timelines and project cycle should be simplified and streamlined.
- More training workshops to allow the Caribbean maximum access to resources.

- IAs need to include governments in project concept and design since too often IAs go ahead without consulting national governments.

The Minister commented that Barbados has a national strategic plan for integrating social and economic development with environmental protection towards the goal of sustainable development. Through the GEF, the Biodiversity Action Plan, the National Climate Change Communication, National Policy on Biosafety, POPs National Implementation Plan (NIP) and other framework documents have been important in guiding the development of a national strategy, but the challenge ahead is national implementation and that citizens embrace these goals.

The Minister stressed that Barbados and the Caribbean region is well aware that the goal of sustainable development can only be achieved through buy in from all sectors. The GEF goal is global while sustainable development is achieved locally, for example, through community involvement in the GEF Small Grants Programme (SGP) and multi-stakeholder involvement in reforestation and land degradation, especially that of communities and NGOs. The Minister recognized that the GEF is more than a channel for funding, in that it encourages national capacity, policy, and governance; the NCSA allows countries to address these issues and concerns, and Barbados will soon be embarking on this process.

The Minister indicated that she was greatly encouraged to hear the Chair's openness to views from the region. She said that it would be remiss not to remark on the RAF. While the GEF has been a reliable source of funding for SIDS, this may decline. The RAF limits access to funding by smaller economies like Barbados in favor of larger economies, and prejudices countries like Barbados by not taking into account the social and economic vulnerabilities of SIDS. In addition there is the fact of graduation from concessionary financing and the concomitant loss of national capacity to address environmental problems. The consequences of the new GEF will be to undermine the GEF agenda and the very *raison d'être* of the GEF. This is the context for this consultation. The agenda for this meeting will allow for exchange on a broad range of issues, and will enable the sub-region to address the GEF in a strategic and united fashion. The Minister concluded her remarks by inviting other Caribbean countries to be present in the GEF assembly and make the region's voices heard.

### **Responses from the GEFSec:**

Ms. Oyewole thanked the Minister for a wonderful opening statement that challenges the GEF and the partner countries in the region to make their voices heard, and hoped this workshop would result in more information and communication flow and initiate a long-term dialogue between the GEF and the Caribbean countries.

Ramesh Ramankutty took the opportunity to respond to the Minister on the lack of communication with GEFSec by highlighting that Ms. Oyewole is the "human face" of the GEF, and that she will make sure that the GEFSec and IAs respond to country concerns. In terms of the implementation of the RAF, the intention is that concepts and projects should respond to national priorities and not IA wishes.

## **Delegate Introductions**

Delegates introduced themselves. Participants included GEF operational and political focal points and NGO representatives from countries in the Caribbean, and representatives from the GEF Secretariat and the GEF Implementing and Executing Agencies. (See attached participant list.)

### **Presentation: GEF Update**

Sam Wedderburn (World Bank)

Mr. Wedderburn discussed the origins, institutional framework, and financial history of the GEF; GEF focal areas and project cycle; and new focal areas, modalities, and strategic priorities (SPs) adopted in GEF 3 which will continue in GEF 4, including new funds for adaptation to climate change.

#### Key Points:

- The GEF was created in 1991, at a time when there was much concern about sustainable development, and initially focused on three focal areas: biodiversity, climate change, and international waters.
- The GEF is a network organization, and each component or institution has its responsibilities.
- The fourth replenishment of the GEF is about to be finalized at approximately the same level as before, \$3 billion.
- Many new developments have taken place in GEF 3 and will continue into GEF 4:
- New focal areas: Land degradation and POPs.
- GEF is the financial mechanism for the biodiversity, climate change, and POPs focal areas, and a financial mechanism for the international waters and land degradation focal areas.
- Strategic priorities were introduced for each focal area based on experience, new directions in the conventions, and calls for more focus during GEF 3.
- Biosafety became a strategic priority in the biodiversity focal area.
- New funds for adaptation to climate change – 4 funds, 3 of which are operational:
  - ⇒ Special Pilot for Adaptation (SPA) comes out of GEF trust fund so incremental costs criteria and global benefits criteria apply.
  - ⇒ Least Developed Country Fund for Climate Change (LDCF) supports preparation and implementation of National Adaptation Programs of Action (NAPAs).
  - ⇒ Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF) is available to all participants.
  - ⇒ Adaptation Fund (AF) is not yet in operation, and conversations on governance are ongoing.
- The National Capacity Self-Assessments (NCSAs) have begun in almost every country.
- Development Marketplace in 2005: 700 projects were submitted and typically 70-80 are selected.
- The project cycle is the aspect of the GEF which receives most negative criticism – it is said that projects “disappear into a black hole,” and the Minister’s concerns in this regard are well

taken. An evaluation is being carried out on the project cycle and will hopefully provide suggestions for improvement and making it more effective.

## **Questions and Answers on GEF Update:**

Key Issues:

- Project cycle
- Transition from GEF 3 to GEF 4
- Fourth replenishment
- Adaptation funds
- CBD COP and support for SIDS and island biodiversity

Q1 We want feedback from the GEF on changes in the project cycle and timeframes for approval. We face many challenges in project development because of attrition in ministries, officers who have difficulty in preparing proper projects, and lack of knowledge about linkages to the broader picture. Our countries need capacity building in design and development, but also in seeing the broader picture.

A1 The evaluation of the project cycle undertaken by the GEF Evaluation Office will be presented to the December Council. The preparation of GEF projects is a longtime subject of debate and discussion, and there is much room for improvement. Factors that affect project submission include delays at national level involving legislation, IA procurement of consultants, etc. Strengthening country capacity to prepare a more holistic strategy for the environment is important. An interesting approach in some countries is the preparation of a GEF strategy that links national and global priorities, and identifies the kinds of support needed from GEF over the short, medium, and long-term.

Q2 What is the process for projects presented by the private sector?

A2 Private sector entities can approach an IA directly, but concepts must be endorsed by the OFP, so the project cycle is the same as for any other GEF proposal.

Q3 When did GEF 3 end in order to know what happened to projects in the pipeline? What are the expectations regarding the fourth replenishment?

A3 We are currently in GEF 3 and the GEF Council and donors have agreed that this will continue until GEF 4 becomes effective. The donors met on June 5<sup>th</sup> and almost came to a conclusion about replenishment, with a figure of \$3.1 billion plus, but some countries wish to negotiate an additional contribution. The replenishment becomes effective when there is a document presented to the board of the World Bank – which acts as trustee for GEF funds – and this meeting is scheduled for October. Optimistically, GEF 4 will become operational by the end of the year. There are no more resources available for this period. The June GEF Council work program was of a size unprecedented in the history of GEF. Several members complained that there was not enough time to adequately review the proposals, so only six of 76 projects were approved, including SGP; the remaining 70 will be considered in the intercessional in August.

Q4 At the Brazil Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) Conference of the Parties (COP), there were decisions on the program of work on island biodiversity and the SIDS program with calls for funding and special windows from the GEF. How has GEF reacted to these calls?

A4 CBD COP guidance is operationalized by the GEF in the operational programs (OPs) and more recently in the strategic priorities (SPs) which are approved by Council. The OPS 3 evaluation found that the biodiversity program has responded fairly well to the recommendations of the COP and programs of work. The RAF puts the responsibility even more strongly on countries to prioritize which of the recommendations will be implemented.

Q5 In GEF 4 what is the split between traditional and new adaptation funds, between those with incremental criteria and those without?

A5 Only one of the adaptation funds, SPA, is from the GEF trust fund which means that projects must meet incremental cost criteria and have global benefits. About half of this fund has been programmed, and the remaining can be programmed in GEF 4. LDCF has \$100 million available; the only country that is eligible in the Western Hemisphere is Haiti. SCCF has about \$40-50 million available with a pipeline of \$30 million. These funds are separately pledged by donors, and in October there will be another donor pledge meeting so more contributions may be made to the fund. AF is based on a 2% tax on the proceeds of the CDM certified emission reductions (CER). The question of who will be operating this fund has not been settled, so in the COP there was a discussion about whether it should be GEF or some other institution. Over the period 2008-2012, there will be some \$100-800 million available, and about \$300 would be a reasonable estimate.

Q6 In terms of transition period, where will resources for approved projects come from – from GEF 3 or GEF 4? What rules apply – those of GEF 3 or GEF 4? If GEF 4 applies, then we may need to pull our projects, therefore, we need more precision on what exactly we need to do.

A6 In the GEF 3 – GEF 4 transition, we have to consider both the RAF and the current work program. GEF 4 becomes effective when a set of legal actions are completed, and we are currently still in GEF3. All our resources have been used up to support the \$470 million work program to approve 70 proposals. If the Council agrees not to approve certain projects, then these resources will be opened up for MSPs, NCSAs, etc. in GEF 3. Additional resources for GEF 3 could come from IAs “returning” approved projects.

Projects in the pipeline in the biodiversity and climate change focal areas will be subject to the RAF and must be re-endorsed by the OFP to be considered in GEF 4. There are other resources available for the other focal areas. On June 5 the donors agreed on resource envelopes for each focal area, and what would go from these envelopes to SGP and cross-cutting capacity building (CCCB), and the LDC-SIDS. The GEF Council will endorse the replenishment package in August and then this will go to the World Bank board of trustees.

Q7 In terms of the RAF, it was our understanding that the CBD COP calls for SIDS support were outside of the RAF.

A7 The GEF does not have a separate window for island biodiversity, but the GEFSec does incorporate CBD guidance.

Q8 What is the role of the agencies in this process and how can they help us with changes in the project cycle?

A8 The Inter-American Development Bank (IADB) is an executing agency for this region. There is good deal of interest in incorporating good practices by other agencies. The GEF Evaluation Office has been carrying out consultations in various countries to make sure they are receiving proper guidance from the agencies; the report on this should be available in November.

The World Bank as IA believes shortening the project cycle is very important. The average time to project approval is 33 months; in the LAC region it is slightly less, this year 22 months from project concept to approval.

The GEFSec and the IAs have come up with ideas about rethinking the project cycle. For the past several years the GEFSec has been preoccupied with the RAF and did not want to bring it forward, but the Evaluation Office evaluation will come up with recommendations that will inform proposals for reforming the project cycle in 2007. Reforms will involve shortening time required without sacrificing capacity and stakeholder involvement.

### **Presentation: Introduction to the Resource Allocation Framework (RAF)**

Ramesh Ramankutty (GEFSec)

Mr. Ramankutty reviewed the concept of the RAF, how and why it was constituted, the design process, and the political undercurrents in its evolution. The RAF reflects developments in international development over the past twenty-five years, particularly the notion that grants are most effective in situations where there are supporting conditions. Such allocation frameworks have emerged in the World Bank, the regional development banks, and more recently IFAD. It was thought that the GEF should follow these precedents in other agencies and have an allocation framework

Mr. Ramankutty recalled that RAF negotiations began in 2001. The RAF was one of five key recommendations that emerged in the GEF 3 replenishment. It was submitted to the GEF Council meeting just before the Beijing Assembly, agreed in 2002, and adopted in 2005 in a special meeting after a long and difficult process of negotiation. In May 2003 the GEF Council, after much heated discussion, established a technical working group (TWG) on the RAF, asking then CEO Mohammed El-Ashry to recommend experts from other agencies. Mr. Ramankutty chaired the TWG in 2003 and briefly discussed some of its conclusions. Most allocation frameworks have two components: 1) country policies and institutions and 2) the needs of the country (per capita income index used here). On the GEF side the mandate was clear, but not all focal areas could be included at once, so it was decided to start with biodiversity and climate change where there are indicators which may not be perfect but are a beginning. Biodiversity and climate change also account for two-thirds of GEF resources in a replenishment period. The

TWG recommendations went to Council in November 2003, that is, two focal areas and an allocation framework based on two measures – global benefits and country performance. The TWG would be disbanded by the end of 2003 and responsibility for further developing the RAF passed on to the GEFSec working with IAs. There was extensive discussion over the next two years and the RAF was finally adopted in September 2005.

#### Key Points:

- The planning framework includes set-asides of \$990 million each for biodiversity and climate change and then specific envelopes for other focal areas by SPs and also for SGP, CCCB, and LDS-SIDS.
- Letter from GEF CEO informed countries about RAF procedures and tentative allocations.
- RAF applies to resources allocated beginning in GEF 4 (approximately December 2006).
- RAF only applies to biodiversity and climate change, but the GEF Council has agreed to expand RAF to other unspecified focal areas in about two years time and has instructed the GEFSec to come up with indicators, etc.
- RAF country and group allocations are derived from the Global Benefits Index (GBI) and Global Performance Index (GPI).
- The GBI for the biodiversity focal area involves ecoregion and species representation and threats in terrestrial areas and species representation in marine areas.
- The GBI for the climate change focal areas is calculated using the baseline greenhouse gas emissions (in industrial, energy, and transport sectors) adjusted by the factor of carbon intensity.
- The GPI is a combination of three factors: the quality and implementation of the project portfolio, institutions and regulatory frameworks in the environmental sector, and the broad framework of country institutions and policies. The performance indicators were borrowed from the World Bank's Country Policy and Institutional Assessment (CPIA)
- The RAF resource envelopes for the biodiversity and climate change focal areas in GEF 4 are apportioned in the following manner:
  - ⇒ 5% for global and regional projects
  - ⇒ 5% for SGP and cross-cutting capacity building projects
  - ⇒ 90% to individual countries and group of countries (of which 75% to individual countries and the remainder to group)
- The ceiling for an individual country allocation is 10% of the biodiversity envelope and 15% of the climate change envelope.
- The minimum allocation for a country is \$1 million per focal area, or \$2 million for the four-year period.
- when GEF 4 allocations are finalized with receive another letter from GEF CEO
- SGP and CCCB are not expected to have changes in operations, although will be funded from four sources.
- The 50% rule means that only 50% of the allocation may be used in the first two years; the remainder is an indicative amount for planning purposes. At the end of the first two years, there will be a re-allocation based on the re-application of the RAF formula using updated GBI and GPI. However, it is not expected that the reallocated amount will differ significantly from the initial amount.



- OFP endorsements are necessary to use allocations, but utilization is commitment not disbursement.
- The RAF will be reviewed by the GEF Evaluation Office after two years in 2008, and after four years in conjunction with OPS4.

### **Questions and Answers on the RAF:**

Key Issues:

- RAF allocations
- GBI and GPI

A constituency meeting was called to ensure that full advantage was being taken of the consultation and to determine what requests should be made to the GEF to maximize resources under the RAF.

Q1 Concerns were raised about how RAF allocations were derived. SIDS are heavily disadvantaged if the biodiversity GBI gives 80% weighting to terrestrial and 20% to marine areas. The climate change GBI privileges those who are contributing to the problem, not solving it like we are. In assessing performance, the World Bank system means that we will always be disadvantaged because we do not have experience with the World Bank, rather with UNEP and UNDP. We feel that because there has been little work done with marine species and establishing standards for comparison, again this is to our disadvantage. Tremendous advantage is given to countries with large land masses and vascular plant families. We feel this is unfair. We want the GEF evaluation of the RAF to address the discrepancies. We also want special windows in the GEF for island biodiversity and SIDS. We want to contribute to the development of the GEF RAF. We do not have a problem with RAF but rather with how resources are allocated under the RAF, disadvantaging countries that are not land-based, that are too small, and that do not have experience with the World Bank. We think these issues are relevant for other SIDS, and we hope to bring them up in the GEF Assembly.

Q2 The RAF was a recommendation of GEF 3, but it was not a voluntary process with which we were all in agreement. It was an initiative of the donor countries, and we want to make this clear. While we may not make a big impact on the global environment, we suffer more from global climate change so we want to know how the GEFSec intends to address this discrepancy.

Q3 The presentation can only be categorized as disturbing. My concerns are crystallized in the fact that countries with weak capacity are ranked lower so a cycle begins that penalizes less developed countries with less capacity and resources. SGP also has fewer resources. These issues should be addressed in the future.

Q4 Our countries were not consulted in the calculations of the RAF. This is a new dimension of what globalization has done to us to our detriment. When the GEF was established we thought it was in pro of sustainable development; now we have to add the GEF to what the World Bank, IMF, and WTO have done to us. We want a meaningful response from the GEF and World Bank; we need equity and balance, and policy translated to action.

Responses by Mr. Ramankutty:

Yes, there is a political overlay to these GEF Council decisions. The Council wants to know what issues about the RAF are being raised by the countries, and were not satisfied with the broad report made to the June Council. We have to report back to Council on the feedback from these consultations and also post the minutes of the meetings on the gefweb. The Council intends to keep the RAF under review.

Biodiversity weights will also be kept under review and can be revisited if there is strong feedback about them. The climate change measure reflects the way that the GEF focuses on climate change issues, that is, mitigation. The major focus on adaptation will happen outside of the RAF with other GEF funds.

As for the GPI and countries that have not worked with the World Bank and so may not be covered by the CPIA, other indicators fill the gap, for example, IFAD indices were also used. The CPIA covers more than 135 countries. The performance distribution is a normal bell curve while the GBI is an exponential distribution. Combining the two, the result is an exponential distribution and so the GBI drives the allocation. The World Bank on this occasion does not bear responsibility for RAF; it has only provided data.

David Todd of the GEF Evaluation Office provided further information on plans for a mid-term evaluation of the RAF:

The Evaluation Office has been asked to undertake an evaluation after two years of the RAF. The Office has already recorded a number of questions and concerns regarding the extent to which countries were not consulted in the process, funding to SIDS, how the benefits and performance indices were constructed, the effects of the RAF on the SGP, and also whether the RAF is relevant, effective, efficient, and will it produce sustainable results. These are potential points to incorporate in the TORs for the mid-term review. It is very important that constituencies make their concerns heard in Council.

### **Afternoon Session**

#### **Presentation: Managing Resources under the GEF Resource Allocation Framework (RAF)** Ramesh Ramankutty (GEFSec)

M. Ramankutty explained that since the RAF was approved, the inter-agency RAF implementation team comprised of the GEFSec and the ten IAs and EAs have developed guidelines and a communication approach. The GEFSec has also addressed the issue of the current management of GEF resources. Mr. Ramankutty encouraged countries to develop a risk management strategy about how many concepts to prioritize and endorse. Re-endorsements are only required for the biodiversity and climate change focal areas covered by the RAF. Historically in the GEF, 30% of concepts do not make it from pipeline entry to work program inclusion, so it behooves countries to “overprogram” somewhat to make sure that there are enough concepts in the pipeline to drive the process of managing resources. The suggested target date of 15 September for submission of concept re-endorsements is not a hard and fast

deadline, but rather a means of letting the GEFsec know about the proposals that countries would like to include in the December Council work program.

#### Key Points:

- Letters from GEF CEO Len Good to OFPs in April-May 2006 set out the guidelines for OFPs, and included the list of each country's concepts under development, and an initial indication of the country or group allocation.
- OFPs are encouraged to embark on consultations to arrive at national priorities that will inform project concept endorsement.
- Once the fourth replenishment is finalized, final allocations amounts will be communicated to countries and groups.
- Re-endorsement of concepts signals that national priorities have been determined and that these concepts may use country/group allocations.
- The endorsements are only necessary for projects in the biodiversity and climate change focal areas that fall under the RAF.
- Large projects that GEF council is considering in the intercessional do not need another endorsement.
- Countries that expect to participate in the December GEF Council work program should submit list of concept endorsements by 15 September 15 2006.
- Countries are encouraged to endorse enough concepts to ensure that their allocations will be used. Based on past experience, GEFSec recommends over-programming at 130-150% of the four-year allocations.
- GEFSec will manage programming levels for the group at 150% of the four-year allocation.
- For regional projects, countries should confirm the amount to be used of the country/group allocation. The IA implementing a regional project will work with participating countries to determine the distribution.
- Use of allocations in the replenishment period:
  - ⇒ Countries may commit only 50% of allocations in the first two years.
  - ⇒ Unused allocations at the end of the first two years will be carried over to the final two years of replenishment period.
  - ⇒ At the end of replenishment period, remaining allocations will return to GEF Trust Fund.
- To ensure that the resources are used up during this four-year period, the pipeline of projects must be maintained.
- To help countries meet the challenge of the RAF, there are new and continuing support options for countries: the National Dialogue Initiative (NDI) and the Country Support Program (CSP).

#### **Questions and Answers on Managing Resources under the RAF:**

##### Key Issues:

- Regional projects
- GBI and GPI calculations and rankings
- EAs
- SGP
- COP guidance

Q1 It is a misnomer to call them country allocations since in reality we have regional programs. If regional projects are not supported, this will discourage what the GEF was set up to do – to encourage regional collaboration. The GEF should make a demarcation between national and regional monies.

A1 The difficulty of using country allocations for regional project participation is indeed an issue.

Q2 About the GBI and GPI distributions, resulting in the GBI driving allocations – is this really the case? What is the difference between IAs and EAs, especially in terms of the IADB's role? Can the GEF be considered counterpart financing for IADB?

A2 The weights we used were such that the combined distribution would be close to matching the historical distribution.

The pilot and restructured GEF operated with three IAs – UNDP, UNEP, and the World Bank. In 1999 the Council agreed to expand opportunities to seven additional agencies – the EAs – to implement projects. A review of the IAs and EAs is due to Council in August and then the GEFSec will carry out the actions arising from the Council's decisions on the matter.

IADB has experience with GEF projects throughout the region. Countries wishing to work with the agency will have to comply with IADB policies on procurement and financial management.

Q3 When will the other focal areas be included in RAF, assuming that this will occur after some proper assessment of RAF implementation in the biodiversity and climate change focal areas? What is the status of SGP? Can we use the RAF for SGP? Are there other formal channels for sending in comments on the RAF before the GEF Assembly? When will the recommendations of the mid-term review of the RAF be applied? When the crunch comes in GEF 4 implementation you will need an extra presence and clear channels of communication with the countries.

A3 The Council has mandated that the RAF be extended to the other focal areas by 2010 if feasible, and the GEFSec is to develop the relevant indicators, but this is at a very preliminary stage.

SGP is funded from each focal area of the GEF. Under the current replenishment, if biodiversity, climate change, and the other focal areas contribute 5%, then this amounts to \$110 million for the SGP which is not subject to the RAF. This can be supplemented by country contributions which will require discussions with UNDP SGP. One idea is to match the resources from the global contribution with country contributions to maintain SGP funding levels.

We will present a progress report on implementation of the RAF to the December Council meeting, and a significant portion of the report will be based on these consultations. Minutes from the consultations are posted on the gefweb. The constituency does have a council member

and alternate and both are authorized to make statements on behalf of the constituency. So if the constituency wishes to do this then the GEFSec will make it available to the Council. In addition, any document that the constituency wants to prepare can be annexed to the report to the December Council on progress of the RAF. Delegates should be aware that there are a number of resources available to focal points, a list of which is included in the materials distributed. We need entry point for dialogue and then we can resolve problems together.

On the application of the mid-term review recommendations, this will depend on which of the findings and recommendations the Council agrees to incorporate and its instructions to the GEFSec.

It is an understatement that GEF 4 implementation will be difficult! The GEFSec has a relatively small staff, and we need cooperation among all the ten IAs and EAs to make it work.

Q4 In terms of the group allocations for biodiversity and climate change, if all countries in the group apply for the maximum then there will not be sufficient funds and there will be intense competition. What was the thinking behind this? If 50% of the allocation is for the first two years, then will the rest be received in the second two years? If regional programs count against each country's RAF, we will have to think carefully about contributing to regional programs. This is one of the more educational sessions we have attended on the GEF, and we appreciate the comments from different countries in the region.

A4 It is indeed a paradox that if all countries apply to the maximum, then there will not be sufficient resources. However, we intend to come up with rules to ensure equity and fairness.

Q5 The issue of RAF resources and regional programs must be addressed. If a country rating goes up, will it receive more resources? Is the reverse true? And what is the impact of individual or poor performance on the whole group?

A5 Changes in performance rates make a difference in country positions, but only make a change in terms of a few spaces up and down in rankings. But if the GBI changes, this could mean a change in country ranking. A country could move from group allocation in the first two years to individual allocation in the second two years.

Q6 How do COP recommendations regarding biodiversity and climate change feed into GEF Council deliberations? In the last climate change COP, strong statements were made – do these reach the Council?

A6 Regarding Montreal COP guidance, in general it is taken up by the GEFSec and IAs and discussed by interagency taskforces. If any changes are needed in the GEF operational strategy or programs, then these are proposed to the Council which makes the relevant decisions. The GEF council will certainly keep COP concerns in mind as the RAF develops.

Q7 In terms of M&E, project appraisal, and performance ranking, what about the case of Grenada and the hurricane of 2004?

A7 PIRs include both project progress and progress towards development objectives, but PIRs are always done in the context of risks and other circumstances. Therefore, in the case of hurricanes, the rating will not be low but rather satisfactory given the circumstances.

Q8 There are still some questions about regional projects: Since the IAs push SIDS to develop regional rather national projects, perhaps there could be separate allocations for country and regional projects.

A8 It is true that in the biodiversity and climate change focal areas, regional projects have historically been 10-15%, and at the same time it has been rumored that many of these were IA-driven. At the end of the RAF negotiations, it was decided that 5% or about \$50 million would target global projects that are considered critical and that countries are not undertaking. The rest could be matching resources for regional projects that countries put together. As regional projects emerge, they should have the support of countries which has not always been the case in the past.

Q9 Regarding performance indicators, is it possible to ask for a review of that assessment?

A9 The CPIA is prepared by World Bank teams in different countries every six months and there are 16 indicators involved in this. The World Bank does reveal the indicators for the IDA countries.

Q10 Utilization in terms of commitment not disbursement – would this apply regardless of whether a proposal is successful or not? What about proposals that are undertaken by IAs and EAs without OFP endorsement?

A10 If concepts are endorsed by OFPs as recommended, then there will be little risk of concepts creeping in via IAs without national knowledge.

## **DAY 2, 11 JULY 2006**

### **Morning Session**

Ms. Oyewole of the GEFSec introduced the morning session on the Country Support Program (CSP) by noting that the CSP is a capacity strengthening program targeted to the focal points. The CSP constitutes one of many other tools available to countries. It should be emphasized that this tool was under development before the RAF was approved, thus the CSP is not an antidote to the RAF. CSP is not yet fully programmed, and so the feedback from working groups and plenary will be very important in making it operational.

### **Presentation: Country Support Program (CSP) for Focal Points**

Stephen Gold (CSP) and Kristin Mclaughlin (UNEP/GEF)

Mr. Gold covered the development of the CSP, its objectives, components, implementation, and budget. He located the CSP in the broader context of mainstreaming and integration of the GEF in national processes, and that the focal points are facilitators of those processes. Mr. Gold indicated that the CSP was developed principally in response to needs expressed by the focal points, as well as the recommendations of OPS 3, the third GEF replenishment, and the evaluation of the Focal Point Support Programme. The CSP is meant to complement the National Dialogue Initiative, and was approved by the GEF Council in November 2005. It is a four-year program (2006-2009), jointly implemented by UNDP and UNEP, and guided by an inter-agency advisory committee composed of the GEFSec and the IAs.

The CSP has three components:

1. Direct support to focal points (implemented by UNEP)
2. Regional exchange and training workshops (implemented by UNDP)
3. Knowledge management framework (implemented by UNDP)

Of the total project budget of \$12 million, the majority of funds – about \$6.8 million – are for Component 1, direct support to countries. The CSP commenced implementation in March 2006 with these sub-regional consultations. According to the project document, Components 2 and 3 – the regional exchange and training workshops and knowledge management – will begin implementation in 2007. Funds are available now in Component 1. The MoU was sent to countries in April and resent in June, and the types of activities eligible for support are outlined in Annex A.

Ms. Mclaughlin elaborated on Component 1 which covers the following:

- Up to \$8,000/year in direct support to countries and focal points for four years.
- Funds for travel to two constituency meetings per year per constituency.
- Funds for participation of new focal points in GEF familiarization seminars.

Ms. Mclaughlin indicated that direct support resources are available to countries upon signature of the MoU and completion and approval by the GEFSec of the annual workplan (template has been distributed). UNEP has a full-time fund management officer and once workplan has been approved, funds can be transferred in fourteen days. Although the sub-component of

constituency meeting participation is not yet operational, it will cover two constituency meetings per year – tickets and DSA – and transactions will be processed using a special database which is being designed now. Familiarization sessions will take place at the time of GEF Council meetings.

Mr. Gold stressed that Components 2 and 3 will be developed according to the needs expressed by the focal points in these sub-regional consultations, as well as through other national strategies and ongoing processes such as the National Capacity Self-Assessment (NSCA). It is an ongoing process, and focal points can come back after six to twelve months and say that needs have changed, and the CSP will respond accordingly.

Under Component 2 a web-based “Knowledge Management Framework” will be constructed which, while based on existing knowledge management frameworks, will include interactive means for information exchange and new guidance and information materials, such as lessons learned, to be used at the national and constituency levels. Mr. Gold mentioned that many focal points have requested information about GEF coordination mechanisms in different countries. As a response to this request, a study of GEF national coordination in five countries was conducted last year. The report, “GEF National Coordination – Lessons Learned,” is available in five languages and is on the CD which was distributed. A “Handbook for Focal Points” will be finalized and made available in multiple languages in the coming weeks.

Component 3 supports targeted capacity-building workshops for focal points through up to nine regional exchanges and trainings per year. The materials, methodologies, and tools that will be used in the workshops are yet to be developed so participants have the opportunity to influence their design.

Mr. Gold concluded his remarks by highlighting that now we are looking at much more comprehensive support for focal points. While we have \$8000 annually as before in direct support, the GEF Council has now added travel to constituency meetings, GEF familiarization seminars, the knowledge management framework, sub-regional training and exchange workshops, as well as other resources that have been compiled in the one-page, “GEF resources available to build the capacity of the GEF Focal Points,” included in the materials distributed to delegates.

Ms. Oyewole added that while we now have the CSP, the in-country systems that were already in place in terms of IA support and facilitation for focal points are unchanged. For example, the UNDP staff here has been working very closely with many of you and will continue to do so. The CSP has been designed as a flexible program. While we have provided broad guidelines, it is up to the countries to define the goals to be achieved, and to develop the activities to achieve those objectives.

### **Questions and Answers on the CSP:**

Key Issues:

- NGO participation
- \$8000 in direct support



- Support for Council members and alternates

Q1 Will the CSP be accessible to NGOs, and can NGOs contribute to the knowledge management framework?

A1 The CSP will be open to everyone and all materials will be public. Some components such as communications with focal points will be necessarily restricted. However, what benefits the focal points, benefits the country as a whole including civil society. NGOs are here in this meeting, and have participated in national dialogues along with the private sector, the academy, and other civil society organizations and institutions. The CSP is specifically focused on building capacity of focal points, but is linked to other actors in broad national context.

Q2 The coordination committee of the GEF NGO network and the GEFSec have been reviewing the performance of the network, and one of the findings is that the network requires funding in order to function. The GEFSec in April acknowledged that the network requires resources and so made a presentation to Council to request funding for the network. The committee is working with UNEP to develop a proposal for a MSP to develop capacity among NGOs in the regions.

A2 NGOs were invited to the consultation meeting because it is felt that there should be more dialogue between focal points and civil society. The participation of only a few NGOs can be supported, but hopefully they will share the content and results of these consultations with colleagues. As in the National Dialogues as well, efforts have been made to include representatives of key stakeholders in this meeting. We want to make sure that the NGO network is integrated into this program. We are like messengers to the Council or a conduit, so that when we make requests we have to do it in a way that will be well received. Since the CSP already exists, we hope to broaden it to include an NGO component. The paper was ready for the June council meeting, but there were too many items on the agenda. However, there will be a full-time civil society coordinator within the GEF corporate team.

MSPs have been a very significant source of support to NGOs, however, in this region of SIDS, because have been executing MSPs, a challenge for the future is how to get NGOs involved in executing GEF projects.

Q3 What degree of flexibility is there in Component 3 in terms of capacity building and regional-level coordination arrangements involving NGOs and wider civil society? Sustainable development cannot be achieved without integrated involvement of all stakeholders, no matter what we do as government, and is rooted in a seamless understanding of our development process.

A3 Regional-level coordination arrangements can absolutely be supported by CSP by convening subregional meetings and developing materials, and this should be fleshed out further by participants.

Q4 How was the amount of \$8000/year for 4 years set? We had difficulty in accessing these resources in the past. Was the individuality of countries taken into account? For example, there

are 20 islands in the Bahamas, component in national allocation that facilitates sub-regional coordination rather than separate sub-regional activities

A4 It is a political reality that \$8000 is about as much as the Council would approve. The Council views financial support to focal points as complementary to government support for GEF activities. To be realistic, it would be very difficult to go back to Council on this in the near future, but certainly constituencies could broach the issue. To give a bit of background and to put the CSP in context, there was a review of the existing focal point support program. As part of the review, a questionnaire was sent to all focal points, and no one questioned the \$8000 figure. However, there were questions about the way funds could be accessed since they had to be channeled through UNDP or World Bank country offices. Therefore, we have tried to make the process more transparent and quick; basically once the workplan is approved, the money is transferred. In other consultations such as this one, some of the big countries did think it was unfair to have a set figure given comparison with smaller countries, and we will take this as feedback for the future.

In the past, countries had to use the \$8000 for constituency meetings; now the \$8000 is only for national activities and support for constituency meetings is now available as additional funding. On top on this, there will be the knowledge management framework and subregional exchange and training workshops. It is an ongoing process, and this consultation allows us to build on what is already in place.

Q5 Is it possible to provide legal assistance under Component 1 and would this be included in the \$8000?

A5 There is some flexibility here in terms of provision of technical assistance, perhaps top-ups from NCSAs, or CSP materials could be developed to specifically address the needs expressed. Workshops and national meetings can be financed through Component 1, and pp. 12-13 of the "Toolkit to Access Financial Resources under the Country Support Program for Focal Points" details eligible activities.

UNDP country offices, for example, can also provide technical assistance in response to specific requests. The process now is to make the request to GEFSec which will in turn request an IA to make a staff person in the region or from headquarters available.

Q6 The NGOs which are actually working on sustainable development should be included.

A6 There is an NGO accreditation process. NGOs are accredited in their countries, and then can form part of the GEF NGO network. The process of including NGOs in this meeting was done through the regional focal point.

Q7 What is available to Council members and alternates?

A7 What is available for alternate members is attending two Council meetings a year which in itself helps to build capacity, as well as orientation sessions before Council meetings. Council

member support is a separate issue, and members are given \$4000 for constituency meetings including visiting a GEF project.

Q8 Clarifications are requested on certain sections of the MoU.

A8 MoU is a UN requirement, but we can follow up on the concerns expressed. We cannot change the MoU template here, but certainly the possibility of changing the language of the template can be discussed at higher levels in UNEP.

Q9 If we want a resource person from the GEFSec or an IA, then would that person have to be paid from the \$8000?

A9 The IAs receive a corporate budget and coordinate different activities in the region. We would not ask countries to dip into the \$8000 for a GEFSec or IA resource person.

Q10 Why couldn't the \$8000 be channeled through another agency such as UNDP? UNEP does not have the skills to do manage the funds, and agencies like UNDP already have systems set up to channel funds through country offices.

A10 UNEP was selected by the agencies based on experience with countries, but there is the option to have money paid through UNDP or directly to a national agency. UNEP is eager to demonstrate agility and responsiveness and is committed to paying funds within fourteen days of approval of the workplan.

### **Afternoon Session**

#### **Plenary Presentations of Working Groups on the CSP: Identification of Focal Point Needs and Priorities**

##### **Working Group 1: Bahamas, Belize, Cuba, Haiti, Jamaica, Dominican Republic, and Caribbean Conservation Association (CCA)**

The group explained that it did not complete the exercise, and mostly concentrated on section 2 of the template provided. The group discussed coordinating and facilitating GEF activities and resources and initiating and establishing relations with key GEF stakeholders at the country level; building institutional memory regarding the GEF in relevant national agencies; mainstreaming global environmental concerns in national policies and strategies; and training and capacity-building needs of project proponents and other stakeholders.

- Communication and coordination among GEF political and operational focal points and convention focal points is very important.
- Project endorsement by both the political and operational focal points might be considered if this would aid in improving communications between focal points and between focal points and GEF stakeholders.
- Country activities to engage GEF stakeholders: Is this the role of the focal point?

- Identification of institutions involved with the GEF in-country: government agencies (natural resources, forestry, fisheries, agriculture), financial/planning institutes, convention committees and focal points, academia, NGOs, and private sector.
- Challenges of involving in project development ministries and government agencies that do not see the GEF as priority.
- Private sector involvement is key, especially for co-financing.
- NGOs – how to identify the appropriate means for government to work with NGOs avoiding duplication and overlap. The focal point could liaise with the CCA, GEF NGO network, and the SGP.
- Need to establish a GEF team – an inter-governmental or inter-agency committee that brings all the stakeholders together. Some of the countries in the region have coordination teams; most do not.
- Variable internet access in the region affects ability to follow up on GEF information that is web-based.
- Strong need for additional training on top of national dialogues and workshops for government agencies, NGOs, and other civil society organizations that do not have experience in developing GEF projects and are unfamiliar with GEF criteria and requirements.
- Disseminating information about the GEF means raising expectations among stakeholders. These expectations may not necessarily be met under the RAF and so constituency will be disappointed.
- To support institutional memory need to develop a database to keep better track of projects, approvals, and rejections.
- How do GEF projects fit in our overall sustainable development activities and with convention obligations and monitoring? How to identify and create linkages between GEF projects and other sustainable development projects?

#### Working Group 2: St. Lucia, St. Kitts, Grenada, Antigua, Trinidad, St. Vincent, UNEP, and SGP

This groups identified key coordination and focal point needs:

- In terms of coordinating and facilitating GEF activities and resources, most countries are on the way to establishing a GEF coordination mechanism, and some already have one.
- Communication is a problem at all levels and must be addressed in order to have effective stakeholder engagement.
- Need to target political directorate to raise their awareness of the GEF and environmental issues via a comprehensive, innovative, and attractive package to get these issues placed at a higher level nationally.
- Capacity building for M&E and reporting is needed.
- Training in project writing is necessary since these skills are lacking at national level. The aim is reduce dependency on UNDP and GEFSec assistance.

#### Working Group 3: Barbados, Dominica, Guyana, Suriname, and Trinidad and Tobago

- This group had a wide-ranging discussion, focusing on the role of the focal points:

- Institutions that are involved in GEF projects – OFP and PFP, Caribbean Community and Common Market (CARICOM), Ministries of Finance, NGOs, SGP, etc.
- Role of the PFP – policy dialogue, lobbying, liaising with GEF CEO and Caribbean constituency.
- OFP does have a political role particularly when the Minister is the OFP.
- If the OFP and PFP are in the same ministry there is less risk of communication breakdown.
- Inter-ministerial or inter-sectoral committees are valuable coordination mechanisms, and most have NGO participation.
- Major additional function of the OFP is the allocation of resources so there is a need for a mechanism to help set priorities that would be based on existing national plans and priorities.
- Training of key staff in proposal development and monitoring is necessary.
- Strengthen NGO/CBO involvement in project design and implementation.
- Specific Caribbean page on the GEF website would be useful.

### **Questions and Answers on Working Group Presentations:**

Q1 There are recommendations from all the groups about strengthening focal points. Yet we are all overworked because the GEF and various other agencies and donors have different requirements and we are SIDS with sometimes one-person ministries. We all have our responsibilities here, but the GEF should recognize the dimension of our countries and capacities. GEF coordination needs to be more holistic with integration of focal areas into our development agenda. We need recommendations for sustainable mechanisms – we cannot set up something different for every agency or donor.

A1 The limited capacity available in SIDS due to migration, constant turnover of qualified people, and other long-term problems is an important point. There is a realization on the part of the GEF about some of these realities and that we have to be realistic about the work program as well as to focus on projects that build capacity. The CSP and NCSA could play potentially important roles in terms of the coordination of all the focal points and can help with the integration of global environment concerns in national development planning. Regarding the suggestion about identification of which of the GEF focal areas and OPs fit into national development planning and strategies, some countries have developed a GEF strategy. One of the better examples so far is Vietnam whose GEF strategy was prepared in a consultative manner involving various stakeholders. Vietnam has quite a robust GEF program and is now considering preparing another GEF strategy.

Q2 The time factor in assessing projects must be considered, as it is very challenging to engage the various parties involved, especially in regional projects. This issue becomes even more critical with the RAF since we will be trying to get projects through as quickly as possible. While we can deal with project implementation, we need a structured and sustainable mechanism for assessing projects. RAF requirements will be demanding for the focal point so we need a team to make decisions. We need people who understand GEF criteria, global benefits, and cofinancing.

A2 A consultative process is not a requirement of the GEF and its partners, but rather a suggestion as we are aware that in most countries people are wearing many different hats and

have many commitments. How much time and effort should be spent on this process? This is a realistic question and it is up to each country to define how much they are going to engage. The NCSA process can be used to reduce duplication and promote efficiency. Countries should avoid the temptation to create new offices or mechanisms, and should look to apply existing mechanisms as appropriate.

Ms. Oyewole thanked the working groups for their input, acknowledging that while there was not much time for brainstorming, it is the beginning of a process. She urged delegates to discuss with the Council member and alternate present in the consultation the possibility of organizing a constituency meeting. She noted that any country can request a constituency meeting. She emphasized that the information needs expressed will be taken on board and incorporated into the knowledge management framework. Ms. Oyewole recognized the difficulty of engaging the private sector and said that a paper is being developing on this topic and will be submitted to the December Council in December. The new GEF CEO is very proactive and has many new ideas about this, so there will be something concrete for the countries.

### **Presentation: Evaluation and Results in the GEF**

David Todd (GEF Evaluation Office)

Mr. Todd covered the mandate and activities of the GEF Evaluation Office, situating them in the context of the GEF monitoring and evaluation system, policy, and reporting structure. GEF M&E combines accountability and learning, and considers monitoring to be a management tool. Primary responsibility for monitoring lies with the GEFSec and for evaluation with the independent Evaluation Office. Mr. Todd specified the roles and responsibilities of the OFPs in terms of M&E processes at the national level, and also discussed the Overall Performance Studies (OPS), the Annual Performance Report (APR), project-level M&E, future portfolio monitoring, and the evaluation of the RAF.

#### **Key Points:**

- The GEF Evaluation Office is responsible for thematic and cross-cutting studies, impact assessments, country portfolio reviews, and the APR.
- Focal points could undertake their own country reviews (examples of China and Vietnam).
- Focal points should enlist the strong academic institutions in the Caribbean to participate in evaluations.
- The Evaluation Office has been conducting reviews of the project cycle – length, timings, status of projects, whether the process of approval is transparent and impartial.
- Mid-term review of the RAF after two years implementation will include questions such as those gleaned in this consultation: how were recipient countries consulted; effectiveness of transition process; effect of funding on SIDS, SGP, regional programs; reliability of indices and data; as well as the key evaluation questions of whether the RAF is relevant, effective, and sustainable?
- After 4 years the RAF will be evaluated as part of OPS 4 or separately.

#### **Questions and Answers on Evaluation:**

Q1 Wasn't the OPS 3 rather weak? How will its recommendations be taken on?

A1 The study as a whole wasn't disappointing, but like OPS 2 it could not identify results of the GEF beyond saying that it was effective. We have to get enough information in place before OPS 4 so that its results are more precise and meaningful. There is a coordinated response from the GEFSec and IAs to OPS 3, then the Council will say which recommendations are to be acted on, and the management action record will trace how recommendations are implemented.

All changes in focal areas respond directly to recommendations of OPS 3. There is progress in all focal areas, especially biodiversity, to measure advances and results, but portfolio outcomes and results remain a challenge.

There are proposals before the Evaluation Office on the longer term impacts of projects, to consider the ex-post evaluations of impact. However, funding is only available during the project period, so other sources are needed. The OPS cannot deal with projects on the ground.

Q2 Who will undertake the mid-term review of the RAF?

A2 The mid-term of the RAF will be conducted by the Evaluation Office, while monitoring of the RAF is the responsibility of the GEFSec.

Q3 In terms of the emphasis on sustainable land management, the FAO would have a role as an EA working closely with IAs in the region in project formulation and implementation. Will EAs be considered in M&E?

A3 A study of the role of EAs is about to begin, and the joint review of the project cycle involves EAs so there will be reasonable information on these issues.

Q4 What about the POPs focal area? Who decides how GEF OPs and strategies evolve?

A4 The resource allocations to the focal areas are done as part of the replenishment negotiations. The GEFSec and IAs put together a programming document that took into account aspects of OPS 3 that the Council and donors had agreed upon, as well as the historical allocations plus demand. After the donors agree on the final envelope for GEF 4, they also agree on the different allocations for the focal areas. There is the insistence that GEF should continue to allocate large shares to biodiversity and climate change as the most important conventions; the benchmark should be a third and a third. The negotiations were tied to the discussions of the RAF, and also took into consideration the new focal areas of POPs and land degradation which have slight increases.

Q5 We have come up with project ideas of serious global significance that have been generalized to other regions and globally – to what extent are these being taken into account in the evaluation of country performance?

A5 We do not keep any index of performance by country since we do not do enough of these studies. Replication is a GEF objective and you should get credit for it. IAs should want to work more with you as well.

Q6 A litmus test of GEF activities is the ratio of administration/implementation costs – how is this dealt with by the Evaluation office?

A6 While we do look at cost effectiveness or efficiency we have not found enough financial information to be able to say whether something has been effective or not. There were some indications in the local benefits study based on project documents but not the final reports.

Q7 There is weak capacity to collect baseline data in social and environmental areas. The GEF should provide support to build national capacity for data collection and M&E that is not project-based. This would allow us to look at groups of projects and impact.

A7 A fundamental question is whether there is an evaluation culture. The fact that there is only episodic project-based evaluation, and government programs are often not evaluated at all, has less to do with capacity than with the existence of an evaluation culture. This is really not the Evaluation office's purview, but perhaps the IAs can offer assistance here.

In the past, there have been several attempts to strengthen national statistical departments, but this has not been sustainable for the region. Eventually countries have to finance M&E and data collection activities, but this has not happened. We need to think more about long-term capacity to collect and analyze data and we need to come up with solutions.

IAs are responsible for project-level M&E along with the recipient. The IA's role is to support and advise, but data collection is the responsibility of the project and the recipient. The IAs and GEFSec may request additional data for monitoring at portfolio level.

Each GEFSec focal area team is responsible for monitoring outcomes at the portfolio level, and has come up with indicators and measures for each strategic priority. Individual projects report on that, and over time data collected in a database will be provided to OPS teams. The biodiversity portfolio reviews have chosen indicators that most projects are using, so that information can be collected without causing an additional burden for project managers and project implementation teams; the other focal areas are also cognizant of this.

Q8 What is the level of scientific and technical oversight at GEFSec in terms of progress in focal areas and emerging global environmental problems?

A8 The Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel (STAP) is an independent entity, administered by UNEP, and with a joint secretariat in Nairobi and Washington. Its mandate is to provide scientific and technical advice to GEF as a corporate body. It meets twice a year and participates in Council meetings and reports directly to Council. STAP provides cutting edge advice on scientific and technical developments which informs and shapes GEF strategies, performance measures and indicators, and targeted research supported by GEF. STAP also reviews FSPs and



works closely with GEF taskforces and the Evaluation Office. A key objective of the current Chair is to make STAP more relevant to the GEF.

The alternate constituency member from the Bahamas presented the statement of the Caribbean constituency, produced in response to the information presented during the consultation, to be formally submitted to the GEF CEO.

### **Closing Remarks**

Funke Oyewole (GEFSec)

Ms. Oyewole said that she was happy to receive the constituency statement and would convey it to the GEF CEO, and that it would become part of the official record of the meeting.

On behalf of the GEF family, she expressed sincere thanks for everyone's participation and comments, which will be highlighted in the report to the December Council. She hoped that the two focussed objectives of the meeting – overview of the GEF and the RAF, and feedback on the CSP and implementation of the RAF – had been fulfilled, and that the GEFSec and agencies had been able to provide guidance. She emphasized the importance of the feedback, and hoped that more would be forthcoming over the next six months.

Ms. Oyewole conveyed her gratitude to the government of Barbados and said the Minister's remarks had set the stage for the meeting by demonstrating the commitment of the government to the environment and the GEF. She thanked the UNDP country office, the UNEP regional offices, colleagues from the IAs who served as resource people, and the support team that has assisted in this consultation – Frances Lim, Gloria Wightman, and Agnes Evidente.