



# Global Environment Facility

GEF/C.27/Inf.5  
October 24, 2005

---

GEF Council  
November 8-10, 2005

## REVIEW OF THE NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATION NETWORK OF THE GEF

## **NOTE BY THE SECRETARIAT**

The GEF NGO Network Central Focal Point requested the GEF Secretariat to finance an independent review of the GEF NGO Network in order to identify ways to improve the effectiveness of the network. In response to this request, the Secretariat collaborated with the NGO Central Focal Point to prepare the Terms of Reference (TORs) for the review and recruited an independent consultant to undertake the review.

The independent review of the NGO Network is being presented to the Council for information at its meeting in November 2005.

The GEF Secretariat proposes to follow-up on this review by preparing proposals for Council consideration at its meeting in June 2006 to address the main findings and conclusions of the review. In preparing these proposals, the GEF Secretariat will seek the views and input of Council Members, the members of the NGO network, and the Implementing and Executing Agencies.

Council Members are therefore invited to submit their views and comments on the review to the Secretariat by January 31, 2006 to assist the Secretariat in developing proposals on next steps for Council consideration in June 2006.

## Table of Contents

Introduction.....	1
Background and Description of the Network .....	2
GEF Policy Shaping the Role of the NGO .....	2
Structure and Operations of the Network .....	4
Accreditation System.....	4
Structure and Duties of the Network .....	4
Evolution of the Network’s Operations and Focus.....	5
NGOs Activities During the Council Sessions .....	6
GEF Funding for the Network .....	6
Role of Indigenous Peoples (IP) in the Network .....	7
Role of Secretariat’s NGO Coordinator.....	8
Network’s relationship with government focal points (GFPs).....	8
Network’s relationship with Implementing Agencies (IAs).....	8
Assessment of the Network .....	9
Survey Objectives .....	10
RFP survey assessment .....	10
NGO survey results.....	11
Effectiveness and Accountability of the Network .....	12
Network Activity on the Regional and Country Levels .....	12
The Network Involvement in the Council .....	13
Low Morale and Poor Team Spirit .....	14
Lack of Long-Term strategy .....	15
Lack of Accountability to Network Guidelines.....	15
Insufficient Resources and Need for Capacity Building .....	16
Diminished Role of International NGOs .....	16
Relationship between Secretariat/Council and Network .....	17
Funding/Resources for the Network.....	17
The Secretariat -Network Interaction .....	18
Lack of a Secretariat/Council Partnership with the NGO Network.....	19
NGO Coordinator of the Secretariat .....	19
The NGO database and GEF Website .....	20
Accreditation Process .....	20
Role of the Office of Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E).....	20
Conclusions and Recommendations .....	22
Conclusions.....	22

Recommendations.....	23
Strengthen Accountability and Effectiveness.....	23
Secretariat and NGO Network partnership.....	26
Funding and Staffing.....	26
ATTACHMENT A.....	28
ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	28
Analysis of the Guidelines.....	28
Goals and Strategies.....	28
Electoral system.....	28
Nominations/Qualifications for RFP.....	28
Action Plans by Candidates.....	28
Succession, Revocation.....	28
Re-Arranging Sections of Guidelines.....	29
Recommendations.....	29
Goals and Strategies.....	29
Electoral System.....	29
Nominations/Qualifications for RFP.....	29
Action Plans by Candidates.....	29
Elections process.....	29
Re-Arranging Sections of Guidelines.....	30
ATTACHMENT B – Surveys.....	31

## INTRODUCTION

1. In early 2005 the Secretariat, in discussions with NGO Network's Central Focal Point representative, agreed to undertake an independent review of the NGO Network. The Secretariat also reasoned that it was timely to review the system for the first time in the Network's 10-year existence.
2. The Non-Governmental Organizations (NGO) Network of the Global Environment Facility (GEF) was established in May 1995, following the GEF Council's decision to establish a formal role for NGOs with the GEF Council and Assembly and Secretariat. The Network was created to more effectively implement its interactions with the Council, Secretariat, and the implementing partners. It is a volunteer structure of environmental and sustainable development-oriented NGOs accredited by the GEF, whose environmental work parallels at least one of the focal areas of the GEF.
3. This review of GEF's NGO Network, pursuant to the Terms of Reference, will:
  - (a) Review management and operational practices of NGO Network; roles and responsibilities of the Network; identify shortcomings and how best the Network can be managed and supported
  - (b) Review awareness and involvement of NGOs in the Network, including recommendations to address identified problems.
  - (c) Review electoral procedures for Regional Focal Points (RFPs) pursuant to the "Guidelines"; identify any ambiguity; make recommendations to address the weaknesses and problems
  - (d) Examine how the Council and Secretariat and Implementing Agencies (IAs) could more actively collaborate with the NGO Network to strengthen the latter's role in influencing the GEF's policy development and program implementation on the national and local levels.
  - (e) Examine the current structure of the NGO Network and makes recommendations on how to increase its effectiveness.
4. This report presents the results of the independent review and makes recommendations for the Network's future activities. The report contains three sections:
  - a) History and background: This section includes: (a) GEF policy and practices shaping the NGO role in the institution's operations, and (b) description and background of structures and management of the NGO Network, including its relationship with the Secretariat, implementing agencies, and government focal points;

- b) **Assessment of the Network:** This section addresses the effectiveness of the Network, in answering key questions outlined in this section of the report. It also assesses the impact of the Secretariat and implementing agencies on the Network's ability to carry out its activities.
- c) **Conclusions and Recommendations:** This section summarizes the assessment of the Network and presents recommendations for the Network's future direction.

5. The review findings pull from results of two surveys (one of the NGOs and one of the elected leaders of the Network), Council documents, and interviews with NGOs, Council members and implementing agency representatives, and memos from these various individuals and institutions.

6. Lastly, in Attachment C is an analysis with recommendations of the Network's document of procedures and goals, known as "Guidelines for the Coordination Committee of the GEF-NGO Network", including its electoral procedures.

## **BACKGROUND AND DESCRIPTION OF THE NETWORK**

### **GEF Policy Shaping the Role of the NGO**

7. From the GEF's inception, during its Pilot Phase, the NGOs have been active in shaping its policies and projects. Subsequent GEF documents and decisions have reaffirmed and expanded that role. Section VI of the "Instrument for the Establishment of the Restructured GEF"-- the document creating the permanent GEF structure--titled "Cooperation with Other Bodies", allows for the role of NGOs and other members of civil society in "GEF project preparation and execution."

8. In addition, the New Delhi statement of the First GEF Assembly noted, "The GEF should increase consultations with NGOs and local communities concerning GEF activities; GEF should develop and implement an action plan to strengthen country-level coordination and promote genuine country ownership of GEF-financed activities, including the active involvement of local and regional experts and community groups in project design and implementation."

9. The GEF's policy paper of June 1996, "Public Involvement in GEF-Financed Projects" furthered solidified the NGO role in the GEF activities. The paper notes that "The GEF Council approved the principles presented herein as a basis for public involvement in the design, implementation, and evaluation of GEF-financed projects". Paragraph 15 refers specifically to NGOs in stating, "In collaboration with the Implementing Agencies, explore ways in which roles of NGOs and other stakeholders can be strengthened in project preparation, design, implementation, and evaluation..." That paragraph concludes with: "Ensure that funding is available to recipient governments, executing agencies, and as appropriate, NGOs for conducting effective public involvement."

10. During the GEF's Pilot Phase in the early 1990's, NGOs informally but actively shared their views with "Participants" (Participating governments who subsequently made up the Council and Assembly) and IAs about GEF project and policies. In May 1991, the Participants established official NGO consultations prior to each semiannual Participants Meetings among NGOs. The consultations would "provide an opportunity for NGOs to express their views about GEF activities and to have a substantive dialogue with Implementing Agencies about GEF projects and policies" (from "Technical Note on NGO Relations"). Participants were invited to also attend these consultations. The NGOs subsequently were able to present their views at the Participants' Meetings.

11. Based on the recommendations of a tripartite task force formed in May 1993, the NGO consultations would evolve from a forum of NGOs and IAs discussing GEF projects and policies, to one that would promote "a dialogue among Participants, NGOs and Implementing Agencies". The task force, for example, concluded that there should be advanced preparation and circulation of written NGO views; in turn participating governments prepare "their position and responses to NGO concerns" (from "Technical Note on NGO Relations").

12. In the GEF Council document, "Technical Note on NGO Relations" of July 1994, it concluded that "...While the GEF during its Pilot Phase had few formal rules on NGO participation, NGOs were involved in a broad range of GEF activities from general policy discussions to project development at the local level. "With the restructuring of the GEF, it is timely to consider a more systematic relationship between the GEF and NGOs."

13. The Council subsequently approved the first NGO consultation to take place prior to its January 1995 session.

14. At its January 1995 session, the GEF Council agreed to invite NGOs to be a part of its biannual deliberations. They would be chosen from the GEF's Network of accredited NGOs. The CEO would invite five NGO reps to attend and participate in Council meetings and five to observe the Council session. The latter observed the proceedings on closed circuit television.

15. The Council adopted criteria that the NGOs would take into account in choosing which NGOs would attend the Council, pursuant to the principles of self-selection and independence of the Network. The criteria, drawn up by the Secretariat with NGO input, include: the principle of broad-based geographic representation; experts on the GEF thematic scopes; those NGOs most suited to address Council agenda items at any given session; a "balance of international, national and local (including indigenous) representation", NGOs representing a "broad base of interests"; and rotation among NGOs at Council sessions, while taking into account the importance of continuity.

## **Structure and Operations of the Network**

### *Accreditation System*

16. All NGOs accredited by the GEF are automatically members of the Network. Accreditation primarily requires that the applying NGO engage in one or more of the “focal areas” of the GEF. These focal areas are: biological diversity, land degradation/desertification and de-forestation, persistent organic pollutants (POPS), climate change, international waters, and ozone depletion.
17. Pursuant to the Council’s intent, the simple accreditation application process is designed to encourage small environmental organizations to apply.

### *Structure and Duties of the Network*

18. The current structure consists of elected individuals each associated with an NGO, and each or whom represent at the GEF Council and Assembly a region, encompassing more than one country, of NGO constituencies. These individuals are called Regional Focal Points (RFPs) and comprise the “Coordination Committee” of the Network.
19. The Network’s Coordination Committee, after considerable discussion, adopted in May 2003 the “Guidelines for the Coordination Committee of the GEF-NGO Network” (hereafter referred to as the Guidelines).
20. The Guidelines superseded the “By-Laws for the Board of the GEF-NGO Network”, drawn up in 2001 by a previous structure of regional focal points. One of the motivations for developing the Guidelines was to better clarify the responsibilities of the RFPs and to render a more effective performance by the Network.
21. The Guidelines focus primarily on the structure and procedures of the NGO Network. The document includes: detailed electoral procedures; specify responsibilities for the Regional Focal Points (RFPs ) and Central Focal Point (CFP); procedures for revoking committee members; conditions under which the Coordination Committee can be dissolved; and provisions under which to change the Guidelines.
22. The opening two paragraphs of the Guidelines state the goals and philosophy of the Network. The Network’s goals are “...to strengthen and influence the work of the GEF at all levels...” and “...integrate NGOs’ interests in GEF operations,...and to influence and monitor GEF operations to be more effective in general”.
23. The Coordination Committee is made up of seventeen RFPs, two representing donor NGO constituencies (North America and Western Europe) and fifteen representing NGO constituencies from recipient and in-transition countries (including a representative of indigenous peoples). The Guidelines call for designated RFPs to double as experts on the seven



thematic areas of the GEF to provide the Coordination Committee with “technical and professional guidance”.

24. In theory, the RFP to which the NGO is associated provides the necessary resources for the RFP to carry out his/her duties. In practice, most RFPs have said these resources have proven to be inadequate.

25. The RFPs, as called for in the Guidelines, are responsible for keeping the NGO constituencies apprised of information on GEF policies and activities. The RFPs are also responsible for conveying concerns and issues of their NGO constituencies to the GEF Secretariat and Council.

26. The RFPs elect a Central Focal Point (CFP) from among themselves. The CFP’s duties include coordinating with the RFPs on numerous activities, e.g., administering the travel grant for all the NGOs participating in GEF meetings, coordinating the development of the agendas for the NGO participation at the Council and associated meetings, coordinating with RFPs in the reporting on proceedings of GEF meetings to the Network, and providing a six-monthly financial and activity report to the RFPs and the GEF Secretariat. According to meeting notes of the Coordination Committee, the group amended the Guidelines shortly before its adoption, whereby the CFP, once elected, would resign from the post of RFP. The CFP, once elected, would call for the election in his/her region. Elections would then be held to fill the vacant RFP position. As an apparent oversight, the Guidelines were not changed to include that amendment.

27. The RFP and CFP collaborate on writing up and distributing a summary of the Council’s proceedings and of the NGO consultations. In the recent past, the GEF’s NGO Coordinator has posted these reports on the GEF website, under the NGO section. They have been part of the council record placed online at GEF since May 2003. They provide a valuable record of the NGO positions and actions taken at a given Council session and/or NGO consultation. Apparently the reports prior to May 2003 are not online or readily accessible.

#### *Evolution of the Network’s Operations and Focus*

28. In the last ten years, six CFP’s have served the NGO Network. Its first three served from 1996 to 1999, while working for the World Conservation Union (IUCN), the multilateral international conservation organization.

29. These three were followed by two other CFP’s, associated with NGOs other than IUCN. The first of these two was subsequently asked to resign by many of the regional focal points due reportedly to misuse of GEF funds for travel grants. The second CFP, following challenges by some of the RFPs to his management style and perceived inadequate performance, was asked to resign.

30. The current CFP has held the position since March 2002. For the first year, she reportedly served as CFP on an interim basis until May 2003, and formally was endorsed by the RFPs following adoption of the Guidelines. The CFP is the first from a “southern” country. Her predecessors were either from the U.S. or Western Europe.

31. The focus of the Network has evolved from the early days. The Network came together “out of the woodwork” as the first CFP described it, by a corps of Washington, D.C.-based NGOs. They were energized by the GEF Council decisions to systematize the NGO role in Council sessions. To the mind of the first CFP, taking on this position while serving as IUCN’s Senior Advisor for multilateral issues, fit neatly within the IUCN mission of empowering the conservation movement in the GEF process.

32. Under the first CFP in the mid to late 1990’s Network’s, representatives focused their energy on influencing the Council proceedings, facilitating the participation of those NGOs most suited to address specific issues at the Council and NGO consultations. The RFPs, thus, did not always automatically attend each council meeting. The CFP described a network of Regional Focal Points who had active access to some 300-500 NGOs. Servicing the Network’s NGOs was generally limited to distributing summary reports on Council and NGO consultation proceedings.

33. The Network’s intent during this period was less on strengthening the NGO influence on GEF activities in the regions and countries, as it seeks to do so currently. Rather, in the 1990s, as described by the first CFP, Network officials focused on educating the NGO community in general about the often arcane processes of the GEF by distributing published material.

34. The current system, at least in theory, seeks to have an impact on both the GEF’s Council level and the GEF’s project activity on the national and local levels by building a strong interactive Network of accredited NGOs.

#### *NGOs Activities During the Council Sessions*

35. Prior to the NGO consultations, the NGOs hold a preparatory meeting. At this “prep” meeting, the NGOs decide which NGO delegate(s) will attend the Council sessions and which will be observers, and other Council-related issues. The NGOs also meet to address internal issues related to the Network. Regular interaction between NGOs and Council members, determined by the issues, takes place out in the lobby during breaks.

#### *GEF Funding for the Network*

36. The Secretariat’s corporate budget, with Council approval, each year has provided a travel budget to enable “southern” NGOs to attend the Council and NGO Consultation sessions. The current budget of \$50,000 allows for 16 NGO representatives, from recipient countries and countries in transition, to attend each Council session. As of November 2004, the travel funds have increased to \$50,000 from \$44,000 to allow the Network to cover travel costs of two additional experts on the two new “focal areas” of the GEF – desertification and persistent organic pollutants.

37. The attending NGOs often comprise a combination of RFPs, the CFP and NGOs who are asked to present a case study of a GEF-financed project. The budget for the Network is managed by the CFP through its associated NGO on the premise that the Network is better suited to find more cost-effective deals than the Secretariat. In addition to the \$50,000 travel budget, the

Secretariat has budgeted \$6,000 to cover cost incidentals related to the NGO activities during the Council sessions, e.g. lunches, translators, costs of presentations. The travel grant includes 10% of the \$50,000 which goes to the NGO associated with the CFP to cover the administrative costs incurred by the CFP's duties.

### *Role of Indigenous Peoples (IP) in the Network*

38. The Secretariat's initiative in 2000 led to the inclusion of indigenous peoples as members of the NGO Network for the first time. The Council had already determined, in its 1995 list of criteria for selecting NGOs to attend the Consultation and Council sessions, that "indigenous organizations" should be part of the Network. Since they often traditionally live in areas of rich biological diversity, indigenous communities can play a significant role in GEF activities to protect global biodiversity.

39. The former CEO met regularly with indigenous groups, usually while attending the Conference of Parties for the Convention on Biological Biodiversity (CBD). In 2000 and 2001, the Secretariat funded two indigenous representatives to attend the NGO consultation, in order to consult with the NGO Network members about the terms by which IP would join the Network. The Secretariat was committed to the indigenous peoples participating in the Council sessions and the NGO consultations, but refused to consider increasing travel funds to cover the two additional NGO attendees.

40. Reportedly the Secretariat's commitment to indigenous people was partially politically motivated: the former CEO sought to avoid the GEF being criticized for not having indigenous peoples represented at the Council sessions and consultations, especially on the eve of the GEF Assembly in Beijing.

41. The Network officers and the indigenous representatives disagreed on conditions under which IP would be incorporated into the Network. Despite the GEF Council including IP as one group among others eligible for joining the Network members, the IP community reportedly viewed themselves as a parallel and separate entity to the Network and pressed to have 5 seats in the council sessions. Some Network representatives CFP and RFPs argued that the people of the indigenous community by their own definition were not NGOs, therefore could not really be a part of the Network's structure. Further, they noted, the indigenous community should have its own system of global representatives that paralleled the NGO Network. Lastly, some Network members suggested that including IP in the Network risked opening it to appeals for membership from the other "major groups", as defined by United Nations.

42. The matter was partially resolved in 2003. The Network agreed to include a designated representative as an RFP for indigenous groups and absorb the travel budget for the additional representative. The larger issue of integrating the IP into the Network's goals and priorities remains unresolved. While the Network includes a representative for IP, the Guidelines were drawn up prior to the addition of an IP representative and therefore don't address how to integrate them given their unique non-NGO structure in the Network. Since, 2002, two IP representatives have successively participated in the Network. The current IP representative has requested the Coordination Committee to consider including two representatives to cover the

world's IP – a reasonable request, assuming they are accountable to the Guidelines as the other RFPs.

#### *Role of Secretariat's NGO Coordinator*

43. The NGO coordinator is the Secretariat's main contact with the NGO Network. The current Coordinator took over in February 2005, when his predecessor left the part-time position to become a full-time project manager. The basic duties of the NGO Coordinator include: accrediting NGOs; responding to queries or comments from NGOs; coordinating with the Network CFP and other NGOs leading up to and during Council sessions and NGO consultations; and maintaining the database of accredited members.

44. Regarding the accreditation process, the NGO Coordinator determines eligibility based primarily on the information provided in the application. If an applying NGO is eligible, the Coordinator sends a letter of approval to the NGO. The CFP and the RFP representing the accredited NGO are sent a copy of the letter of acceptance.

45. Four staff persons of the Secretariat have held the position of NGO coordinator. They have all been full-time Secretariat staff working in unrelated areas, while at the same time carrying out the coordinator's responsibilities on a part-time basis. For example, the coordinator preceding the current one was a full-time project manager for climate change while carrying out the NGO coordinator on a part-time basis. (For a brief period she handled the coordinator responsibilities full time.)

#### *Network's relationship with government focal points (GFPs)*

46. Member governments of the GEF designate a political GFP and an operational GFP. Political focal points are responsible for GEF governance issues, and operational GFPs are responsible for GEF program coordination in a given country.

47. The RFP is expected to develop a relationship with his/her regions' GFPs, since the latter can be a rich source of information on country-level GEF activity and policies. The RFP's relationship often depends on the government's level of comfort with NGO involvement in establishing government priorities related to GEF-financed activities. The RFP relationship varies widely from region to region.

#### *Network's relationship with Implementing Agencies (IAs)*

48. No formal relationship exists with the NGO Network and the three Implementing Agencies: UNEP, UNDP and World Bank. The three have the opportunity to regularly interact at the biannual NGO-GEF consultations and Council sessions. The nature of the relationship has varied with each IA.

49. Over the past 10 years, the UNEP/GEF has had an active interest in engaging the NGO Network, as well as meeting the needs of indigenous peoples. In May 1996, it sponsored two consultative meetings with these two groups.

50. UNEP subsequently drafted two funding proposals reflecting the issues raised at the consultative meetings – one to increase capacity building for the NGO Network and a second to strengthen the needs of indigenous peoples.

51. Some members of the NGO Network’s Coordination committee in 2002 collaborated with UNEP on a medium-sized project (MSP) proposal on capacity building.

52. The Small Grants Program (SGP) administered by UNDP, has an active cadre of program grantees from the NGO and community-based organizations (CBOs). The SGP staff is interested in encouraging their grantees to join the GEF Network. The SGP staff is also interested in more collaborative work with the NGO Network in the regions and in influencing the Council.

53. The UNDP’s GEF office, which coordinates the National Dialogue Initiative workshops (NDI) program involving government focal points, systematically sends to the CFP and RFPs the list of NGOs that the participating governments have invited to GEF’s National Dialogue Initiative Workshops. Some have commented on the list and made minor recommendations or changes.

54. The UNDP has the most extensive Network of field offices of the implementing agencies. It therefore offers a good opportunity for the NGOs on the ground to develop a close relationship with the agency.

55. The World Bank as a GEF IA has not been as proactive with the Network as the other two IAs. The Bank’s Civil Society Group engages NGOs around the world. The NGO Network could engage this Group to find common ground.

#### **ASSESSMENT OF THE NETWORK**

- a) This assessment answers the following questions:
- b) How active is the NGO Network in GEF activities on the national and local levels? Are the RFPs successfully performing their duties as laid out in the “Guidelines”? Is there effective interaction between RFP and NGO? Is there a strong level of NGO awareness and participation in the Network?
- c) How active is the Network in Council deliberations, and NGO consultations?
- d) What role can capacity building and other resources play in the Network’s effectiveness?
- e) What impact do the practices and policies of the Secretariat and Council have on the Network’s effectiveness?

## **SURVEY OBJECTIVES**

56. Two surveys were undertaken: one of the NGOs in the Network and one of the Regional Focal Points. Out of a pool of approximately 500 potential respondents (it is not clear how many current NGOs are on the Secretariat's Network list), 30 NGOs responded. Out of 12 RFPs, 10 answered. The timeframe for the questions was May 2004 to May 2005. Low survey return by the NGOs could be attributed in part to the outdated database.

57. The survey was taken to help determine whether the minimal level of duties was being carried out by RFPs, as described in the Guidelines, to understand the NGO-RFP relationship, and to understand how the RFPs and NGOs assess the Network.

58. Given the low percentage of NGO respondents, obviously the survey risks not accurately portraying the views of the community. It was therefore important to complement the survey results with documents and interviews of NGOs and others familiar with the Network. Nevertheless, the survey results provide insightful data that justifies further exploration of the NGOs viewpoints.

### *RFP survey assessment*

59. The survey results indicate a mixed record of achievement on the part of the RFPs in servicing their NGO constituencies. A total of 44.4% rarely, if ever, sent GEF information to the NGOs in their region in the last year (22.2% rarely, and 22.2% didn't have the information to send). An equal percentage (44.4%) sent out GEF information twice or more in the year indicated.

60. A majority (44.4%) "rarely" gathered concerns of the NGO constituencies and conveyed them at the Council sessions or NGO consultations (versus 33.3% who had done so twice or more in the designated year).

61. The survey indicates that the RFPs were somewhat better in distributing reports on the Council proceedings. Some 66.7% distributed reports of the May 2004 Council proceedings and NGO consultations. Curiously, only 44.4% distributed reports on the November 2004 proceedings.

62. Although the survey indicates many are not passing on information to NGO constituencies, the survey results show that a large majority have contacted more than half of "their" NGOs, (77.8%--see below) for reasons that are not clear. However, this statistic is completely contradicted by the NGO survey that asked whether their RFPs had contacted them. (see below, the section on NGO survey results)

*Approximately what proportion of the accredited NGOs in your region have you contacted in the last year?*

	COUNT	PERCENTAGE
Very small proportion	0	0%
About half of them	0	0%
<b>Majority of them</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>77.8%</b>
Other(*)	6	66.7%
<b>Total respondents</b>	<b>9</b>	

(\*)  
 Had to compile new details of these focal points in order to contact them, as the details indicated on the GEF website were outdated  
 Communication is one-sided, practically no feedback  
 I have only just started - but I would expect only a small number of major NGOs  
 My region is poor for the approach of GEF NGO Network. But within my last mandate I have been in most of the Countries of my region for finding NGOs. But I still optimist and I continue my re  
 I use the GEF secretariat accreditation address and also post letters/info to those not connected to email.  
 There are no indigenous NGOs in my region that are involved in the GEF process, and my work is with indigenous people.

63. The RFPs generally had a better record of contacting the implementing agencies and being aware of regional GEF activities, including the Small Size Grants program (SGP) and Medium-sized projects (MSP). Some 55.6% “collaborated” with Implementing Agencies at least twice in the designated year of the survey. Also, 77.8% are knowledgeable about GEF activities in their region.

64. Apparently, based on results noted earlier, RFPs are not passing on their awareness of GEF activities to the NGO constituencies.

*NGO survey results*

65. The NGO survey paints a more consistently negative picture of the RFP-NGO interaction. One of the most serious discrepancies between the RFP and NGO surveys concerns the RFPs contacting their NGO constituencies. A total of 72.4% of NGOs noted that they had no contact or did not know their RFPS (44.8% had no contact and 27.6% did not know their RFP). Some 65.5% of the NGOs describe their relationship with their RFP as “non-existent”. This contrasts with the 77.8% of the RFP’S who state that they had contacted more than 50% of their NGOs (see above).

66. It is also worth noting the NGOs critical remarks made of the RFPs in the “other” category of the survey question below. (Note those that are in bold.)

*Which below best describes your relationship with the RFP for your region?*

	COUNT	PERCENTAGE
Close and consultative	2	6.9%
Good, but could be better	1	3.4%
Regular	1	3.4%
A more responsive relationship is needed	4	13.8%
Non-existent	19	65.5%
Other(*)	10	34.5%
Total respondents	29	
(*) [bold added for emphasis] <b>Only during the last election crisis</b> <b>I wish he would make a short summary of the main things happening within the Council</b> and circulate to everybody. As an example, just going to the council meeting I found he's been at the France Conference <b>Having been a member of the Network for six years, we have had no contact from any RFP.</b> <b>Hopefully the new RFP for North America will be better</b> There is not RFP in our area (as far as we know) <b>I only received from him one communication in relation to the election process</b> There has been a vacancy South Asia did not have an RFP for a while now Irregular <b>The RFP is unknown by our NGO. No communications received from the RFP to date.</b>		

67. Only 6.9 % described their relationship with their RFP as “close and consultative”. Some 51.9% did not vote in an election for their RFPs. Both RFP and NGOs were in agreement of suggested changes to the GEF website for the benefit of NGOs.

### **Effectiveness and Accountability of the Network**

#### *Network Activity on the Regional and Country Levels*

68. Within the current NGO Network system, there is a serious lack of coordination and communication between the RFPs and their NGO constituencies. The survey results support this conclusion. There have been and are clearly competent RFPs doing effective work in their respective regions, but evidence indicates that the Network system is barely operable on the ground. There is scant communication flow between the RFP and his/her constituents. A majority of the NGOs indicate they are highly dissatisfied with the RFPs that represent them.

69. The survey revealed the majority of NGO respondents complain of not being a part of an NGO Network. One NGO, after receiving the Secretariat’s notice of the pending survey, responded that he was encouraged by this communication – the first one in years since he had become a member of the Network. He hoped it would not be the last.

70. The survey generated a number of ideas from NGOs and RFPs about ways to strengthen the Network. This seems to be an indication that, despite complaints, the NGO respondents are prepared to be engaged.



71. This lack of RFP-NGO interaction apparently has been a longstanding problem. The “Overall Performance Strategy of 2002: First Decade of the GEF” (OPS2) concludes “The NGO focal points system established by the GEF-NGO Network appears, with few exceptions, to be ineffective in information dissemination”.

72. In gathering data for OPS3, the staff of the GEF’s Office of Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) sponsored regional workshops for NGOs. The staff reported that some attending NGOs complained about their non-relationship with their RFPs. M&E staff also noted that only a small percentage of the Network’s RFPs were helpful in coordinating NGOs to attend the workshops, despite the added incentive that M&E paid the NGOs to attend.

### *The Network Involvement in the Council*

73. The RFPs and other members of the Network have been far more involved in the Council’s issues than the GEF’s project activity on the local levels. The Network has weighed in on many key issues before the Council. They have played a leadership role in the creation of medium-sized projects (MSPs) and are part of the Secretariat’s working group on small medium-sized grants, and have actively sought to influence the contentious Resource Allocation (RAF) debate in the last few years.

74. A number of seasoned NGO attendees to the Council note that in its ten years of existence the NGOs Network members have shown an increasing sophistication in preparing and articulating their positions on many Council agendas, having advanced from what one former NGO member described as “sitting in the lobby with tomatoes in hand”.

75. The increased preparation and adeptness in discussing Council issues seems to have declined in the last year or so. This appears to be partly due to be a decreased number of RFPs and the increased tension among the Network’s RFPs (see more on this below). One-quarter of the RFP positions are currently vacant. Another factor appears to be the loss of staff responsible for multilateral affairs at active Washington, D.C.-based international NGOs. This staff, some of whom have yet to be replaced, was active during Council sessions and had played an important role as Network members and/or collaborating with the Network in the strategies and preparation of issues before the Council.

76. There is a strong perception by those attending and/or observing the Council that the NGO presence and involvement has weakened over the years. Impromptu interviews were taken with some longstanding Council members and implementing agency representatives who attended the June 2005 session. They were asked to compare the NGO presence and impact on Council sessions and NGO consultations currently to those in the past. Virtually all perceived the NGO presence over the years had lost its numbers and its impact.

77. “They used to be more fiery. The room [for the NGO-GEF Consultations] used to be filled with NGOs”, noted one IA director. A Western European Council member noted he, at one time, regularly met with the NGOs from his country during the Council sessions. He observed they no longer attend. Noted another Council member: “They act now more like civil servants--like me”. An IA director based outside the U.S. said he could no longer justify

bringing his staff who engage with NGOs to the Council sessions and NGO Consultations. Another Council member of a donor country noted he was open to consider funding for the Network activities but had not been recently approached by the NGOs.

78. A Council member from the Near East region observed that larger numbers of Council members attended the NGO consultations in the past, at a time when he perceived more active NGO involvement. He even suggested that the consultation session be renamed to include the word “Council” to encourage once more higher Council attendance.

79. Despite their numerous problems, the Coordination Committee, in the true fashion of NGO activism, rose to the occasion during the June 2005 Council session. It devised a strategy of getting the Council members’ attention on the NGOs statement on the Resource Allocation Framework (RAF) issue – probably the most pressing issue currently facing the Council. The RFPs creatively publicized their statement by distributing it to the Council, accompanying it with flowers for each Council member. The Secretariat CEO expressed appreciation for the NGOs efforts during the Council session. The Network also coordinated some impressive presentations at the NGO consultation.

#### *Low Morale and Poor Team Spirit*

80. In-fighting and personality conflicts currently plague the RFPs. Conflict especially exists between the CFP and the RFPs. It has caused loss of morale, undermined team spirit, and created distraction from the work of the Network. Secretariat funding for updating an NGO guidebook reportedly intensified the inter-personal conflict based on how the funding would be allocated.

81. Many RFPs interviewed are keenly aware of this fractionalization and saw the need, for the sake of the Network’s effectiveness, to move beyond this situation. To date, there appears to be little indication of successfully addressing the problem. Reportedly it was in this context of marked deterioration of the Network’s effectiveness, that the current CFP initiated discussions with the Secretariat. It was then jointly agreed that the Secretariat would conduct an independent review of the Network that would include recommendations to strengthen the Network’s performance.

82. Currently, there are at least four vacant RFP positions – Southeast Asia, South Asia, Eastern Central Europe, and Western Europe. The Network had informally decided to add China as a single constituency given that it is the largest recipient of GEF funding. After considerable effort the Network was able to recruit two successive representatives from the Peoples Republic, the first one’s term beginning shortly after the GEF Assembly in Beijing, in October 2002. The second representative was committed to become a candidate in future elections, but did not follow up on her promise. No successor has yet been found. These vacancies obviously leave large sections of the globe not represented by the Network, adding to its ineffectiveness.

### *Lack of Long-Term strategy*

83. The Guidelines state the general aim of the Network (see the quotes above). There appears to be no clear long-term or short-term strategy of how to achieve these goals. The Committee does not appear to have established priorities, especially given the limited resources available and volunteer nature of the Network members.

### *Lack of Accountability to Network Guidelines*

84. A number of examples emerged from interviews that indicate the Network's Coordinating Committee does not always hold itself accountable to its Guidelines on some key issues. Under the 2003 Guidelines, six elections have taken place. In a few of those elections, there were serious allegations of electoral violations raised by both NGOs in some of the affected regions as well as by some members of the Coordination Committee. Based on memos and emails during the time of some of the elections, allegations included shortening by several weeks the five week period required for the elections to be held; misinformation about which votes were cast for which candidate; and no action plan drawn up by some of the candidates. As a committee, the elected RFPs and CFP have not responded to these allegations made, including whether or not to undertake an electoral investigation.

85. In addition to not addressing allegedly questionable electoral procedures, other actions by the Committee that appear to violate the word if not the spirit of the Guidelines came to light in interviews with NGOs and others who have worked with the Network:

- a) Some numbers of RFPs appear to be seriously under-performing their duties as described in the Guidelines possibly making them eligible for revocation provisions, as pursuant to the Guidelines.
- b) A group of RFPs and other NGOs from various regions volunteered to undertake the extensive exercise to write the Guidelines.. In the spirit of transparency, however, it is not clear how widespread discussions with the NGO constituencies took place or whether their opinions were sought in any systematic way. The majority of the Network's NGOs who responded to the survey has not read the Guidelines or does not have a copy. The Guidelines were not posted on the GEF website.
- c) The CFP requested the GEF Secretariat to undertake this review report without endorsement by the Coordinating Committee of RFPs.

86. The Network's recent history has shown that adhering to the Network's governing structure has been problematic. Based on an exchange of memos among Network members, the ouster of the preceding CPF in 2001 by a number of the RFPs does not appear to have been done in complete accordance with the then existing By-Laws.

87. A few years ago, the RFPs attempted to address the issue of accountability of their work, and agreed to fill out a matrix designed by one of them. Reportedly many did not complete it. The effort died.

88. The Network needs to establish a rigorous system of accountability as an incentive to follow its Guidelines or other commitments it has made as a group. It also needs incentives to adhere to that structure. The Network over the years has been able to accomplish much on the basis of goodwill, an honor system and commitment to the cause. When conflict arises, the structure needs “laws” to resolve the problems.

#### *Insufficient Resources and Need for Capacity Building*

89. Many RFPs in the personal interviews have described various problems in carrying out their work: frustration with non-responsive NGO constituencies; lack of translation of important GEF documents; and insufficient resources to bring regional NGOs and RFPs together for consultation, training, exchanging ideas, etc. All the “southern” RFPs interviewed said insufficient resources are a major obstacle to carrying out their work.

90. The Draft Third Overall Performance Study (OPS3) notes that, based on NGO interviews, “Lack of resources is a constraint to NGO participation in the Network.”

91. RFPs and NGOs in interviews expressed a need to increase their capacity to better engage NGOs. Some RFPs expressed frustration in failing to persuade NGOs to join the Network, or to get involved in elections. One RFP, representing a region where there are few NGOs, complained that the NGOs are only interested in joining the Network if there is assurance they will get funding. Another RFP, recently elected to the Network, sent out a questionnaire to get a better sense of the NGOs in her region. She was frustrated with the lack of response. These and other examples indicate a need for training in how to energize and motivate the NGOs in their respective regions. The alleged electoral transgressions, if accurate, may indicate a need for capacity building to learn to better conduct regional elections, a process only recently established under the Guidelines.

92. The OPS3 also concluded that the Network was not effectively disseminating GEF information to multi-stakeholders due to “varying levels of capacity with respect to modes of communication”.

#### *Diminished Role of International NGOs*

93. The international NGOs (INGOs) have had a major impact on the formation and operation of the Network. Following the permanent establishment of the GEF, the INGOs, have slowly but notably diminished their role in the “monotonous work of maintaining the system” as one former CFP described it. Other factors fully discussed above have contributed to their diminished role, which has a deleterious impact on the Network’s interaction with the Council.

94. The INGOs continue to play an influential role in steering GEF funding through their local and regional partners globally, but primarily outside the Network system. In recent years,

the North American NGOs especially have been increasingly active in attempting to influence the U.S. government on its replenishment policies regarding the GEF.

## **Relationship between Secretariat/Council and Network**

### *Funding/Resources for the Network*

95. For years, the Network's RFPs have appealed to the Council and Secretariat for funding, both formally and informally. These requests were usually made either to cover basic administrative costs, e.g. printing, translations, mailings, email, or to cover specified activities, such as regional consultations with NGO constituents. In order for the Council to act on funding requests, the Secretariat's support is frequently essential. This scenario is not always the case. The Council rejected the Secretariat's 1995 recommendation to fund regional consultation workshops for the NGOs.

96. The Secretariat has rejected these Network appeals on more than one occasion. Its rationale for denying this funding has varied with circumstance and time. Its reasons have included: undermining the independence of the Network, political rivalry between the Secretariat and IAs proposing funding for the NGO Network, poor quality of the funding proposal and the NGOs not adequately making their case for funding.

97. Regarding the first reason, the former CEO, coming from an NGO background, felt strongly that additional funding, beyond granting many of the "southern" NGOs travel and per diem to the Council sessions, would compromise their independence, and advised the NGOs to go seek donor funding.

98. Some Secretariat positions became evident or were spelled out in response to UNEP's proposed funding for strengthening the NGO Network's capacity. Since 1996, Network members have collaborated with UNEP/GEF in devising grant proposals for capacity building for the Network NGOs. The Secretariat was not supportive of these proposals. Both UNEP and Secretariat sources familiar with the situation note that political vying for power likely played a role. The 1990's represented a time when the young GEF entity was settling into its new permanent structure. A UNEP proposal eager to empower the GEF's NGO Network could be seen as a commentary on the CEO's neglect of the Network. Another source familiar with UNEP's proposals during this period concludes that the major reason for rejecting the proposal was the poor quality of the proposal.

99. A revised 2002 version of the 1996 medium-sized grant proposal was rejected by the Secretariat, based on two reasons, one being that the Secretariat was limited by its "mandate" (presumably being limited to provide the Network travel grants) and second, the Network needed to first make its case for more funding. The Secretariat's memo notes,

"As we have suggested on numerous occasions to the NGOs, if they believe there is a need to revisit the Council's decisions, we encourage them to have a thorough independent evaluation of their experience and to make a case for any recommendations

to the Council. Without a clear mandate to expand our support, we cannot consider funding through a project.”

100. The Secretariat is clearly familiar with the Network’s numerous appeals for funding. Instead of waiting for an “independent evaluation” or for the Network to “make a case” to the Council, the Secretariat has not explored pro-actively with the Network what is needed from the Network to resolve this chronic problem. The Council in 1995 prohibited the Secretariat from funding regional consultation workshops. The Council should review this 10-year old decision. The GEF’s 1996 document discussed earlier in this review, “Public Involvement in GEF-Financed Projects”, stated that funding may be necessary for the NGOs to be “effective”.

#### *The Secretariat -Network Interaction*

101. Apart from the funding issue, there is ample evidence of a positive relationship between the Network and Secretariat. Both the past and present CEOs have actively endorsed and promoted the substantive role of the NGOs Network in the Council and in GEF’s project activities.

102. The Secretariat, during the Council deliberations on the restructuring of the GEF, played a key role behind the scenes to include NGOs in Council deliberations. With France stubbornly resisting, the Secretariat pressed for a Council consensus. . . . Currently, the Secretariat prepares substantive presentations for the NGO-GEF Consultations. The CEO at each Consultation undertakes a ‘Q and A’ with the NGOs, providing a forum for substantive discussion. In a “don’t ask, don’t tell” practice, the Secretariat in recent times quietly has allowed more than the requisite number of NGOs to observe the Council proceedings. (An attempted reversal of that practice at the June 2005 session was withdrawn..) The Secretariat has indicated it is supportive of NGO future efforts to update the Council policy restricting the number of NGO observers to five.

103. Gone are the days when an NGO reportedly was told by Secretariat staff, during the GEF’s Pilot Phase, to avoid interaction with Council members. Lastly, as a further indication of cooperation, the Secretariat agreed to fund this independent review of the Network, at the request of the Network’s Central Focal Point.

104. On the other hand, the continued “tradition” of turning down the Network’s request for additional resources needs to be seriously reviewed.

### *Lack of a Secretariat/Council Partnership with the NGO Network*

105. The GEF Secretariat and Council have no apparent long-term strategy for engaging the NGO Network as a key partner. Both the Network and the GEF have a vested interest in an effective Network of NGOs. This partnership can be critical to the GEF successfully pursuing its mandate of engaging civil society at all levels of the GEF's work. A strong active Network could provide the GEF a needed service in furthering the GEF's mandate of engaging local stakeholders and helping the GEF strengthen and maintain its impact on the ground.

106. A Network of engaged, independent NGOs knowledgeable about the GEF process and activities in their regions, for example, can be called upon to contribute to the annual M&E evaluation workshops. A recent draft study by M&E examined the success of sustainable livelihoods, in GEF's quest for linking global benefits to local benefits. The study found that GEF's sustainability portfolio often rested on a weak stakeholder base.

107. Some of the involved NGOs were "born" suddenly to become recipients of GEF funding and had little relevant knowledge or local experience. The Network can be a potential source of genuine, qualified NGOs for the GEF and its IAs.

108. Apart from having provided it with the travel grants and assisting and interacting during the Council sessions and NGO Consultations, the Secretariat largely has neglected the Network. The NGO Network, especially between Council sessions, appears to be a low priority for the Secretariat.

109. Over the last ten years, the Council and Secretariat have made financial and policy investments, yet apparently has not routinely, if at all, held the Network accountable to these investments. For example, regarding policy, the Council and Secretariat has not followed up on whether the Network representative have faithfully applied the criteria, devised with NGO input, for helping the Network determine which NGOs attend which Council sessions. The Secretariat and Council apparently have not ensured that their financial investment through travel grants is reaping the expected benefits for the GEF.

110. Just as the Secretariat and Council have been actively involved and invested funding in the Country Dialogue Workshops (CDW) to engage government representatives, they need also to be actively engaged in finding or providing resources to promoting NGO activity through the Network.

111. While the CDW forums are clearly useful forums for NGO participation, they are not a substitute to efforts to engage and strengthen the NGO Network as a potentially potent tool for the GEF.

### *NGO Coordinator of the Secretariat*

112. Apart from these standard duties described above, the Coordinator has taken on additional responsibilities depending upon the personality and the status of the Network's relation with the Secretariat at any given time. For example, the former CEO reportedly took a

personal interest in addressing the serious weaknesses in the Network at that time, and tasked the NGO coordinator to increase the membership of the Network.

113. The current NGO Coordinator carries out this job part-time, and on a temporary basis until such time the Secretariat hires a staff person for this work. The coordinator's duties were added to his already full-time responsibilities in February 2005 when the previous coordinator left the position. Like the previous coordinators' duties, the work of the current Coordinator continues to be part-time.

114. The minor but unnecessary conflict between the NGO Network and the Secretariat over the number of NGOs to be allowed to observe Council proceedings at the June 2005 session is one example of the need for clear communications and skillful negotiating by the Coordinator. The position requires a balance between being an advocate for the NGOs and protecting the Secretariat's interests, all the while keeping a perspective of what is ultimately beneficial for the GEF.

115. A former coordinator noted that the position is an isolated one at the GEF; there is no active integration of the Coordinator's responsibilities with other sections of the GEF Secretariat.

#### *The NGO database and GEF Website*

116. The so-called list of several hundred NGOs found on the web is badly outdated and virtually unusable. It has been in this poor condition for a few years. As a result, no one has an accurate idea of the current number of GEF accredited NGOs. A former RFP noted that following her request to the Secretariat, it took two years to receive the list of NGOs in the region she represented.

117. The Secretariat is aware that the GEF website is not user friendly and therefore NGOs accessing relevant information from the website, can be a confusing, frustrating task. The Secretariat is in the process of updating and reforming its website.

#### *Accreditation Process*

118. To its credit, the current accreditation process is simple and easy to navigate, in order to encourage small NGOs to join the Network. The goal of accreditation, however, to only increase membership apparently. The application process needs to be designed to encourage NGOs who are capable and willing to advance specified goals of the NGO Network. Joining the Network should be perceived as joining a club of limited membership, whose members are qualified to further the goals of the Network and the GEF. Lastly it is important to continue the simplicity of applying for accreditation, to encourage the smaller NGOs to join.

#### **Role of the Office of Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E)**

119. Currently the M&E office does not evaluate the Network in its Overall Performance Strategy (OPS) of the GEF. Yet the role of civil society, including NGOs in general, is evaluated in the OPS. Given the systemized relationship between the Network and the GEF, no



evaluation of the Network would appear to be an obvious omission. Regular evaluation could provide valuable recommendations in how to shape and maintain a viable NGO Network. For example, M&E could examine the impact of the Network on GEF's policy development, or how active the Network is in GEF projects and in educating the communities about the GEF through information dissemination. Lastly, in light of the fact that some indigenous peoples (IP) are represented in the Network, the GEF Office of M&E will reportedly evaluate in 2006 the role of indigenous peoples (IP) in GEF operations.

## CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

### Conclusions

120. The GEF's long acclaimed unique model of a network of NGOs engaged in both its decision-making body and its activities on the regional and country-levels is ineffective. The Network as a group of NGOs strengthening the role of NGOs in local GEF-sponsored activities through monitoring and/or active involvement appears to be minimal to virtually nonexistent. Its current role is almost exclusively engaging the Council and Secretariat twice a year. The latter role, moreover, in the last year has notably weakened.

121. There are clearly some competent and active RFPs and NGOs in the Network, but apparently not in sufficient numbers to affect the overall poor performance between RFPs and their NGO constituencies. There is a serious lack of adherence to the Network's Guidelines by RFPs, including carrying out basic duties. The elected members of the Network lack a long-term vision in implementing their general goals as stated in the Guidelines. Also, no mechanism exists by which strategies are devised and carried out to realize these goals.

122. There appears to be little evidence that the Network, under its current precarious status, can successfully bring itself back from the brink of eventual demise. Therefore, an independent outside entity that prescribes and monitors a specific strategy for "reviving" the Network is important to establish. This entity would be akin to an "ombudsman" in an organization, whose establishment in this case could be likely in place until such time that the Network is able to function efficiently on its own.

123. Insufficient resources and a need for capacity building also have been major obstacles to the Network's achievements.

124. Regarding resources, the Secretariat, apart from its logistical help of travel grants and assistance in preparation for the Council sessions, has largely left the Network to its own devices. It has consistently discouraged or rejected any additional funding. It has chosen to not engage the Network to examine more fully and to resolve the factors underlining the latter's chronic requests for more funding.

125. Just as the Network lacks a long-term vision, the GEF Secretariat and Council have no long-term strategy for engaging the NGO Network. Both have a vested interest in an effective Network of NGOs providing a valuable service and should engage the Network accordingly. A strong active Network could provide a critical service in furthering the GEF's mandate of engaging local stakeholders and helping the GEF strengthen and maintain its impact on the ground.

126. INGOs slowly over the years gradually have diminished their interaction in the Network. After their important role in the hard fought achievement of placing NGOs at Council table, there has been declining interest in "the monotonous work of maintaining an NGO system", as a long-term NGO activist described it. The INGOs continue to play a critical role in the GEF,

including attempts to streamline the GEF processes and advocating governments regarding the replenishment issues, but this activity occurs largely outside Network structure.

127. The larger international NGOs should re-engage with the faltering Network. Through partnering with local NGOs in many countries, the INGOs can encourage their local partners to join and be active in the Network. INGOs also have the resources to help strengthen the ability of RFPs to more successfully engage their NGO constituencies.

128. The Secretariat and Council, its implementing partners and the NGO community all have a vested interest to take time and resources to re-energize the Network.

129. This review concludes that the current structure of the NGO Network, in the absence of key factors, has yet to be given an opportunity to succeed. Under the current structure, with more accountability to its goals, a re-defined partnership with the GEF, and appropriate resources and capacity building, the NGO Network could deliver much needed services to the GEF.

## **Recommendations**

130. The Recommendations, with a few exceptions, focus on three themes:

- a) Increasing Network's accountability and effectiveness, i.e., strengthen Network's management, increase accountability to its guidelines, goals, responsibilities, etc; re-focus the accreditation process; strengthen outreach
- b) Strengthening an active partnership between the Secretariat and Council and the NGO Network;
- c) Exploring funding and other support to build capacity for the Network.

131. An Analysis of the Guidelines and Recommendations, including its electoral procedures, is located in Attachment C.

### *Strengthen Accountability and Effectiveness*

--Ombudsman System:

132. The Network's Coordination Committee of RFPs should put in place a structure of accountability, for a designated period of time.

- a) The Network in collaboration with GEF could appoint for a specified period of time an "ombudsman", an independent person or persons (e.g., the NGO Coordinator, or a designated NGO) who will monitor the work of the RFPs.
- b) Specific work plans and priorities with timelines should be established and adhered to by the Network, in collaboration with the Secretariat.

- c) The entity would be a repository of indicators of work achievement drawn up by the Coordination Committee and Secretariat, collaboratively. The designated person(s) would be automatically and routinely copied on all correspondence and emails that send information to NGO constituencies.
- d) The person(s) would assess periodically the RFP's ability to meet agreed upon goals and report its results to the Network's Coordination Committee and the Secretariat as well as the NGO Network.
- e) Repeated failure of an RFP to meet agreed upon indicators of work could be grounds for his/her revocation, pursuant to the Guidelines

--Teleconferences:

133. On regular basis (e.g., every 6 months) RFPs should hold a teleconference involving the Secretariat Regional Focal Points (possibly other pertinent persons)to: share lessons learned, share obstacles to overcome, and generate solutions.

--Elections:

134. The Network's RFPs and CFP have a responsibility to their NGO constituencies to investigate questionable elections that may have violated Guideline provisions. The Network could designate a third party to undertake an investigation, such as the Secretariat's NGO Coordinator, or another NGO who is not a member of the Network's Coordination Committee. The decision of the designated person or NGO would be final.

135. Should a re-election(s) be necessary, the Network could seek donor funding to request an NGO which specializes in electoral procedures to coordinate the new election(s). The U.S.-based International Foundation for Electoral Structures (IFES), for example, specializes in electoral procedures around the world

--Re-focus Accreditation goals:

136. The NGO Coordinator should confer with the Network on how to design the application for accreditation process which best promotes GEF's mandates. further the goals of the Network

137. Devise minimal, measurable standards that must be met by the NGO applicant in order to be accredited. The standard letter of acceptance also should outline specifically what the NGO can expect as accredited members – what they will receive as information and what are their responsibilities as members of the Network.

138. The NGO Coordinator, in collaboration with the Network, should devise a system by which he/she confers with a third person, e.g., the relevant Regional Focal Point, before approving the applicant.

139. Develop a profile of each NGO member – what are their strengths; how have they been active; what other NGOs have they worked with; whether involved in GEF activity in past.

140. Establish a form by which each NGO is asked to submit a brief, informal update periodically on the status of their work as it relates to GEF's focal areas. Any NGO who fails repeatedly to provide such an update over a defined period of time will be asked to leave the Network.

141. Establish a process by which an NGO can give notification to leave or is asked to leave the Network

--Database of NGOs, Website Improvement:

142. The Secretariat should designate immediately a staff person responsible for updating this database in a specified period of time, inform the NGO Network of this undertaking, and invite them to share their regional lists to assist in the update. In addition, the RFPs and their designated focal area of expertise should be incorporated into the data base.

143. Confer extensively with the Network's NGOs and RFPs and CFP on how best to design the website for NGOs to have easy access to relevant information. For example, develop the NGO section with sufficient linkages to updated, relevant data.

144. Ensure that the database is periodically updated and determine who will be responsible for this job. This could involve distributing a form periodically asking NGOs to update their contact information.

--Outreach:

*Strengthen Outreach:*

145. The RFPs and NGO Coordinator should explore with M&E the possibility of contacting those NGOs who attend M&E regional workshops (as part of collecting data for the OPS) to recruit them as members of the Network. A substantial number of the NGOs which attended the M&E regional workshops were not members of the NGO Network.

146. Collaborate with the Small Grants Program Director to invite the NGO grantees of the program to join the NGO Network.

147. Engage with the World Bank's Civil Society Group, which meets regularly with local NGOs around the world, as another potential source of membership to the Network.

148. Both the GEF offices of UNDP and UNEP have experience in public participation activities and have had on their staff NGO coordinators. The Network's RFPs should consult and exchange ideas with the two offices on lessons learned in working with NGOs.

149. There are a number of thematic NGO networks (e.g., climate change, energy, biodiversity) which exist separately from the GEF Network.

### *Secretariat and NGO Network partnership*

150. A clearly defined and more collaborative relationship between the Network and the Secretariat/Council should be established to ensure that the Network's goals parallel the GEF's needs. Both entities should collaborate on establishing a long-term vision, and a means of how to carry out that vision. The Council and Secretariat, as part of this effort, should revisit the 1999 NGO paper, produced by members of the Network, "Improving GEF Country Level Coordination: Experiences, Views and Recommendations from the NGO community". The Council expressed its eagerness to read the forthcoming document shortly after its completion. There has been no follow-up since then, although some of the issues the paper raises remain relevant today.

151. The Secretariat and the Network together should approach the CEOs of International NGOs on convening a conference or workshop on specific ways the general NGO community can help strengthen the Network's effectiveness. The conference attendees must include a representational proportion of small-sized and mid-sized NGOs.

152. The position of NGO Coordinator at the GEF should be full-time. The Secretariat should confer with the NGO Network and possibly others in the broader NGO community on the Coordinator's job description and responsibilities. This collaboration will help ensure the NGO Coordinator's duties reflect the more interactive NGO and Secretariat/Council relationship. The Coordinator, for example, should prepare a presentation about his/her work program for the coming half year regarding NGO activities. The Secretariat should seriously consider a Coordinator with some experience with the NGO community.

153. The Secretariat should consider a civil society task force (similar to the MSP task force) that will develop a four-year plan (to parallel the time-frames of the GEF Assembly) outlining the GEF-Civil Society/NGO activities. This plan would be presented at the next GA for endorsement. The plan would pull on lessons learned from implementation of specific recommendations in this report, (e.g., Network regional consultations or reports of the Network's ombudsman).

154. At the briefings held for new Council members, the Secretariat should include an NGO briefing (by the CFP) on the importance of GFPs interacting with NGOs in their country and at the NDIs.

### *Funding and Staffing*

155. Explore whether the CFP's responsibilities should become full-time work. Many of the former CFPs were able to carry out their work with the support of paid interns. "Southern" NGOs may not have that luxury. Possibly private funds could underwrite this position. If a paid position, strict rules of rotation would be drawn up. The World Bank's Staff Exchange Program should be examined in terms of its rules of rotation.

156. The Network's Coordination committee should explore with the Secretariat proposals for funding of specific needs of the Network, such as: [below, use 1,2,3 or a,b,c]

- a) Regularly scheduled regional consultations
- b) RFP funding for specific office costs, e.g. translations of GEF documents, printing, mailings; teleconferences; summarizing reports, distributing guidebooks, etc.
- c) Training on techniques to better engage NGOs in the Network.

157. Funding sources to explore include matching funds from private sources and/or donor governments. Re-visit UNEP's interest in proposing capacity building for the Network.

158. Explore ways to engage the implementing agencies and NGOs in the capacity building of *the Network*.

#### *Other Recommendations*

##### --Indigenous Communities' Involvement:

159. The Secretariat and the Network's Coordination Committee should establish a small working group, which includes Network NGOs and members of the indigenous community to explore how indigenous peoples can better integrate into the Network's structure and goals.

160. If the working group considers keeping the status quo, i.e. "RFPs" representing indigenous peoples, it should request designating at least 2 RFPs for global indigenous communities as members of the Coordinating Committee. The budget for travel grants should be increased accordingly.

##### --Role of Office of Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E):

161. Consider that the independent Office of Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) in the GEF evaluate the NGO Network. The NGO Network serves as an essential and critical part of the GEF institutional structure, and therefore should be included in the Overall Performance Study (OPS) of GEF's effectiveness

## **ATTACHMENT A**

### **ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

#### **Analysis of the Guidelines**

##### *Goals and Strategies*

162. In addition to the Guidelines' opening section, "Purpose, Aim and Philosophy", there is no provision indicating how these goals would be realized

##### *Electoral system*

163. The Guidelines provide confusing information on whether the NGO is elected or the RFP associated with the NGO is elected. Section 2 states that each region "elects a representative NGO, which nominates an individual to be a focal point, called a Regional Focal Point (RFP)."

164. In practice, it is the individual RFP who runs for election, is elected, and who represents a given region. This is confirmed by the provision in the guidelines (section 4) which stipulates that the RFP can maintain his/her position should they move to another accredited NGO "as long as [the latter] commits itself to provide the necessary resources to support his/her role as RFP". This means the so-called elected NGO has no option to nominate a successor. The departing RFP has all the rights to maintain his/her position as elected NGO, by, in effect, appointing a new NGO.

##### *Nominations/Qualifications for RFP*

165. In addition to simply being nominated by the NGO, an RFP candidate needs to possess pertinent qualifications that are standard across regions. For example, are they required to be an officer, an employee of the NGO, have a certain level of experience in GEF activities, have some experience in grass roots organization, or a certain level of education? There should be a standard form to be completed by a nominee.

##### *Action Plans by Candidates*

166. The Guidelines' description of the action plan required of each candidate is limited and somewhat confusing for the candidate to follow.

##### *Succession, Revocation*

167. The section of the Guidelines on succession and revocation should be in the main body and not placed at the end of the RFP's responsibilities (see the Terms of Reference section in the Guidelines).

168. It is unlikely that an outgoing RFP, who is leaving under unfavorable conditions, will conduct an election and train his/her successor. A third party should be given this responsibility.



### *Re-Arranging Sections of Guidelines*

169. The Guidelines incorrectly state that the election process for the RFP and CFP is attached as Annex 2. It is in Section 4 of the document.

### **Recommendations**

#### *Goals and Strategies*

170. In addition to the Guidelines' opening section, "Purpose, Aim and Philosophy" the Network needs, either in the Guidelines or another document, a stated commitment to regularly devise strategies, priorities, and action plans to implement its general philosophy.

#### *Electoral System*

171. The Guidelines should be amended to clarify whether the NGO is elected or the RFP candidate(s) associated with the NGO(s).

#### *Nominations/Qualifications for RFP*

172. Standard qualifications across regions should be established for the RFP candidates. A standard form should be drawn up to be completed by the nominee(s).

173. Certain items in the "RFP Toolbox" in Annex 2 of the Guidelines should be included in the candidates' qualifications – such as having a computer with internet connection – and therefore should be placed in the Guidelines' qualification section.

#### *Action Plans by Candidates*

174. The Guidelines should provide more explicit instructions of the contents of the action plan required of each nominee. A standard form should be drawn up to maintain parity across regions. This standard form should be as simple as possible. The form should include a commitment by the nominated NGO to provide the necessary resources for the RFP to carry out his/her prescribed duties.

#### *Elections process*

175. If the RFP is running again for re-election, a third party in the region should be designated to conduct the election. If the Network wants to encourage competition, and only one candidate is nominated, it can extend the time to receive nominations. The one nominee would not need to re-apply.

176. A standard voting form should be drawn up which should specify which individual or group of individuals in the voting NGO must sign the ballot.

177. The Network might want to consider a contingency if the votes are not received by the deadline. A warning could be sent to the RFP/person conducting the elections. One could allow the voting period to re-open.

178. There should be minimum percentage of votes cast to ensure truer representation. An alternative requirement would be a candidate needs to have a minimum percentage of votes cast to win. This provision requires a contingency if either or both of the thresholds are not met. One can call for a re-vote or another alternative determined by a regional group/organization.

179. It should be determined who will count and receive the votes – possibly by an independent party. Also it should be determined how the candidates will be notified.

180. To adjudicate an election dispute, one can establish a small group of members and set up a simple process for receiving, reviewing and adjudicating disputes. This body's decision would be final.

#### *Re-Arranging Sections of Guidelines*

181. Section 4 mixes election procedures with the candidate's required qualifications. The two issues should be in separate sections.

182. Revocation procedures should not be part of the job descriptions, located in the Annex of the Guidelines. These procedures should be included in the main body of the Guidelines.

## ATTACHMENT B – SURVEYS

### NGOs QUESTIONNAIRE

#### I. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

1. What region are you from?

REGION	COUNT	PERCENTAGE
Western Africa	7	23.3%
Eastern Africa	2	6.7%
Southern Africa	1	3.3%
Northern Africa	1	3.3%
South Asia	2	6.7%
South East Asia	3	10%
Eastern Asia	1	3.3%
Western Asia	0	0%
Middle East	1	3.3%
Pacific	1	3.3%
Western Europe (donor)	1	3.3%
Eastern Europe	2	6.7%
Russia	0	0%
North America (donor)	3	10%
Mesoamerica	2	6.7%
South America	2	6.7%
Caribbean	1	3.3%
<b>Total respondents</b>	<b>30</b>	

2. Are you aware of the GEF's NGO Network?

	COUNT	PERCENTAGE
Yes	26	86.7%
No	4	13.3%
<b>Total respondents</b>	<b>30</b>	

3. Are you aware of the biannual NGO-GEF Consultation meetings and GEF Council meetings?

	COUNT	PERCENTAGE
Yes	19	63.3%
No	11	36.7%
<b>Total respondents</b>	<b>30</b>	

4. Has your NGO attended any of the NGO-GEF Consultations?

	COUNT	PERCENTAGE
--	-------	------------

1-3	10	33.3%
4-6	2	6.9%
6 or more	1	3.3%
None	17	56.7%
<b>Total respondents</b>	<b>30</b>	

5. In what capacity have you attended the Consultation?

	<b>COUNT</b>	<b>PERCENTAGE</b>
As RFP	1	3.3%
As thematic expert	4	13.3%
As NGO network member	15	50%
Other(*)	14	46.7%
<b>Total respondents</b>	<b>29</b>	
(*) - Of fourteen responses ten have never attended - One attended as a presenter - Two were not applicable		

## II. OPERATIONS AND MANAGEMENT OF THE NGO NETWORK

6. Do you have access to a copy of the "Guidelines for the Coordination Committee of the GEF-NGO Network of 2003?"

	<b>COUNT</b>	<b>PERCENTAGE</b>
Yes and have read it	5	17.2%
Yes, but have not read it	1	3.4%
No	16	55.2%
I don't know what the "Guidelines" are	7	24.1%
<b>Total respondents</b>	<b>29</b>	

7. Do you think the information on the GEF website pertaining to NGOs is helpful?

	<b>COUNT</b>	<b>PERCENTAGE</b>
Yes	8	27.6%
No	3	10.3%
I rarely use it	11	37.9%
It could be improved	3	10.3%
Other(*)	7	24.1%
<b>Total respondents</b>	<b>29</b>	
(*) - The majority did not know of the website existence - Lack of computer equipment and internet access for some southern NGOs. This is a major ICT problem in Africa because of poverty.		

8. What kind of information would you like to see on the GEF website's section on NGOs?

	<b>COUNT</b>	<b>PERCENTAGE</b>
Updated list of all accredited NGOs in the regions, and lists of RFPs, Implementing Agencies, government focal points, and members of the GEF Secretariat	24	82.8%
GEF project cycle handbook in English	19	65.5%
GEF project cycle handbook in local language	8	27.6%
Presentation of GEF organization (PowerPoint, slides, etc.) in English	13	44.8%
Presentation of GEF organization (PowerPoint, slides, etc.) in local language	7	24.1%
Repertoire of recent case studies from constituents highlighting best practices	15	51.7%
Other(*)	8	27.6%
<b>Total respondents</b>	<b>29</b>	
(*) - NGOs do not need all that much information, they need participation in the GEF and country dialogues - On the page for Projects there should be a field for the Executing Agencies - List of GEF projects that involve indigenous peoples - NGO Programme supported by GEF - Clear method description of how to apply for a GEF grant, and all mentioned above - Opportunities and project offers - Best Practices: two kinds: 1) Effective NGO representation and participation in GEF activities, with frank discussion of limitations; 2) Good and Bad examples (maybe some as projects that were never funded) of NGO management of GEF projects. - Invitations to GEF Council and GEF-NGO Network consultations elsewhere.		

9. In the past year, about how often did your Regional Focal Point (RFP) contact you?

	<b>COUNT</b>	<b>PERCENTAGE</b>
Regularly	2	6.9%
Not at all	13	44.8%
Occasionally	6	20.7%
I don't know my RFP	8	27.6%
<b>Total respondents</b>	<b>29</b>	

10. How often in the past year have you contacted your RFP to pass on your views or ideas concerning GEF policies or programs?

	<b>COUNT</b>	<b>PERCENTAGE</b>
Regularly	2	6.9%
Not at all	15	51.7%
Occasionally	7	24.1%
I don't know my RFP	5	17.2%
<b>Total respondents</b>	<b>29</b>	

11. Are you aware of the role that the GEF's NGO Coordinator plays? Have you had contact with him/her?

	COUNT	PERCENTAGE
Yes	8	27.6%
No	9	31%
It is unclear how his/her role relates to my work directly or indirectly	6	20.7%
Other(*)	9	31%
<b>Total respondents</b>	<b>29</b>	
(*) Strong majority either don't know about the NGO coordinator or confused him/her with a RFP. Either the RFP has not contacted the NGO or vice versa.		

12. What best describes your understanding of the role of the Central Focal Point (CFP) of the Network?

	COUNT	PERCENTAGE
Active and effective	5	17.2%
Regular	0	0%
Not effective	5	17.2%
Don't know	16	55.2%
Other	3	10.3%
<b>Total respondents</b>	<b>29</b>	
(*) - We believe this will be better. The members of the network in my region shall be better served. - The CFP has change at least four times so I doubt if there is a continuity that gives the CFP any role.		

13. Have you been aware in the last year of any of the GEF's activities in your region, especially the Small Grants Program and the Medium-Sized projects?

	COUNT	PERCENTAGE
Yes	13	44.8%
No	9	31%
I expect to obtain that information from my RFP	4	13.8%
I don't have the capacity to gather that information	0	0%
Other(*)	6	20.7%
<b>Total respondents</b>	<b>29</b>	

(\*)

- When I want this kind of information I consult the web
- Expecting information from our RFP, but there is no RFP in our region
- Not relevant to North America
- I learnt about the SGPs via UNDP newsletter subscription. I receive no information on MSPs
- Only by personal researches
- Small Grant Program just sent out a note, first time ever

14. Have you submitted or tried to submit a proposal for GEF funding?

	COUNT	PERCENTAGE
Yes	16	55.2%
No	13	44.8%
<b>Total respondents</b>	<b>29</b>	

15. Are you in touch with NGOs in your region that have implemented or are implementing GEF projects?

	COUNT	PERCENTAGE
Yes	13	44.8%
No	16	55.2%
<b>Total respondents</b>	<b>29</b>	

16. Are you familiar with issues raised by NGOs that result from having developed GEF projects?

	COUNT	PERCENTAGE
Yes	11	37.9%
No	18	62.1%
<b>Total respondents</b>	<b>29</b>	

17. In your opinion, what level of NGO and other civil society participation occurs in GEF projects implemented in your area?

	COUNT	PERCENTAGE
High level of participation	3	10.3%
Medium level of participation	3	10.3%
Low level of participation	5	17.2%
Not sure	10	34.5%
Other(*)	8	27.6%
<b>Total respondents</b>	<b>29</b>	

- (\*)
- No GEF projects in our area (as far as we know)
  - The public is unaware of this
  - NA, for North America
  - They participate as recipients of grants
  - Working on different countries, this level of participation is irregular and not always coherent
  - Is all politics of the elite NGOs
  - NGO input is sometimes sought for proposals, but then ignored in implementation
  - The RFP must tell the members.

18. Which below best describes your relationship with the RFP for your region?

	COUNT	PERCENTAGE
Close and consultative	2	6.9%
Good, could be better	1	3.4%
Regular	1	3.4%
A more responsive relationship is needed	4	13.8%
Non-existent	19	65.5%
Other(*)	10	34.5%
<b>Total respondents</b>	<b>29</b>	

- (\*)
- Only during the last election crisis
  - I wish he would make a short summary of the main things happening within the Council and circulate to everybody. As an example, just going to the council meeting I found he's been at the France Conference
  - Having been a member of the network for six years, we have had no contact from any RFP. Hopefully the new RFP for North America will be better
  - There is not RFP in our area (as for as we know)
  - I only received from him one communication in relation to the election process
  - There has been a vacancy
  - South Asia did not have an RFP for a while now
  - Irregular
  - The RFP is unknown by our NGO. No communications received from the RFP to date.

19. Which below best describes your understanding of the role of the GEF's NGO Coordinator?

	COUNT	PERCENTAGE
Responsible for accreditation of NGOs	10	34.5%
Assists NGOs when attending GEF Councils and NGO-GEF Consultations	10	34.5%
It is unclear what his/her role is	14	48.3%
Other(*)	7	24.1%
<b>Total respondents</b>	<b>29</b>	



(\*)

- He should also help solve issues dealing with NGOs
- Coordinates country programme
- Not sure
- The coordinator is unknown by our NGO. Therefore has no role
- Has neither contacted us about GEF Council Meetings nor informed us of what is taking place.

20. Which below best characterizes the role of the Central Focal Point?

	COUNT	PERCENTAGE
Active and effective	5	17.2%
Regular	2	6.9%
Could be better	8	27.6%
I don't know	14	48.3%
<b>Total respondents</b>	<b>29</b>	

### III. NETWORK GUIDELINES FOR ELECTIONS

21. Do you think the guidelines clearly lay out the electoral process for RFPs?

	COUNT	PERCENTAGE
Yes	5	17.9%
No	5	17.9%
The guidelines are somewhat useful, but could be improved	8	28.6%
Other(*)	14	50%
<b>Total respondents</b>	<b>28</b>	

(\*)

- Majority do not know or have not seen the guidelines
- One could not get any information except the accreditation letter
- One does not know; previous policy (when he/she was there) was clear, but almost never followed in his/her region

22. Do you think elections are the best way to choose RFPs?

	COUNT	PERCENTAGE
Yes	13	46.4%
No	4	14.3%
I don't know	7	25%
Other(*)	9	32.1%
<b>Total respondents</b>	<b>28</b>	

(\*)

- Unless NGOs are fully involved through a Conference. There are some who have the advantage because of their prior closeness to GEF. They use their closeness to rig their ways in.
- Only when it is transparent
- Provided there is an area Electoral body
- The RFP should be an NGO/ Person regionally active and accepted
- Yes, unless information is disclosed. As it stands only one person knows it and keeps it for himself and elects himself.
- An assessment report on the role done by the RFP to be submitted before starting the election process
- We could have an NGO nominated from the Implementing Agencies and another elected NGO from the region
- My region has very few accredited NGOs
- The CFP must handle the network for transparency and accountability.

23. Can you think of other processes that are equally transparent?

	COUNT	PERCENTAGE
Yes	10	35.7%
No	13	46.4%
Other(*)	8	28.6%
<b>Total respondents</b>	<b>28</b>	

(\*)

- First people should know each other and their capability and then a meeting should be organized where people should express their interest. Qualification and commitment to the development process
- Election should be done when NGOs meet at workshop rather than through e-mail
- Not just now
- **Central focal point** should obtain information from interested NGO's and make selection/election supervised by **center focal point**
- Examining the capacity of the NGO/candidate to deal with regional issues
- I don't know
- Strengthen regional processes and meetings through Implementing agencies so that NGOs get to see each other and debate on issues
- If the CFP handles this process

24. Did you vote in the election of your RFP?

	COUNT	PERCENTAGE
Yes	4	14.3%
No	15	53.6%
I was not aware of an election taking place	12	42.9%
Other(*)	5	17.9%
<b>Total respondents</b>	<b>28</b>	

(\*)

- There were not such elections in the last year
- No invitations were received to that effect, therefore could not vote.
- But it was very clear and transparent

- But was not given the alternative candidates
- The CFP selected an NGO not recommended by us when we moved on rotation.

#### IV. OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF THE NGO NETWORK

25. What do you think have been the achievements/benefits of the Network?

	COUNT	PERCENTAGE
Provides a unique opportunity to influence the GEF Council and Secretariat decisions on GEF programs and policies	9	33.3%
Increased awareness of GEF activities in my country and/or region	5	18.5%
Creates an opportunity to collaborate with the other NGOs of the Network in my area on environmental activities	10	37%
Other(*)	15	55.6%
<b>Total respondents</b>	<b>27</b>	

(\*)

- While it has good intentions, the GEF NGO network actually accomplishes very little because the participants have very little in the way of concrete work
- The three above but could be better if more proactive
- not very effective, not transparent
- I haven't been involved in the network as at yet
- None of the above
- It should be all 3 together, provided it is known by the public and the civil society as a whole
- Not aware
- Unfortunately I did not know about its role until very recently
- Not sure, because I haven't been active
- I have only a few months as member of the network so I cannot measure the benefits yet
- My experience was to realized that the NGOs are same or worst than the donors that they criticizes, The lack of transparency is alarming, and was controlled by an elite off NGOs that the only interest was to profit from they participation. The example of Africa delegate and south America where the worst
- I'm not aware of the network, but then if does exist, it would create an opportunity to collaborate with the other NGOs of the network in my area on environmental issues as well as on all the issues listed above.
- I can't say until I participate myself
- Opportunity for small regional and national NGOs to participate at international level
- No achievements to date for sustainable development in my region. The Network must convene an urgent meeting to discuss pertinent issues affecting the members before things get out of hands or the network collapses. The network needs a Resource Center in my country for research on GEF and for regular consultations. This center can include an ICT for the young ones, especially the girl-child and street children to learn computing and communicate Agenda 21 issues with their peers around the world through a CLICK leading to sustainable human development by 2015 and beyond.

26. What have been the main deficiencies with the Network?

	<b>COUNT</b>	<b>PERCENTAGE</b>
Insufficient awareness by the NGOs of how the Network operates and how it can promote NGO concerns on GEF activities	15	55.6%
Insufficient interaction on all levels of the Network-between CFP and RFPs and between RFPs and NGOs	12	44.4%
Insufficient information and training to strengthen this awareness and interaction	8	29.6%
NGO Network's insufficient awareness of or collaboration with NGOs that manage or implement GEF projects	10	37%
Other(*)	11	40.7%
<b>Total respondents</b>	<b>27</b>	
(*) - It is difficult for the RFP to liaise with NGOs in the region and discuss things that have some worth. It is nearly always worthless administration - The network has been run by a small clique and has been totally ineffective in keeping others informed and promoting broader participation in GEF meetings and projects - I haven't been involved in the network as at yet - Not involved enough to have an opinion - Not aware - I can not tell about the insufficient interaction between the CFP and the RFPs but I am sure about the insufficient interaction between the RFP and the NGOs in the region - Providing energies and resources to nurture and cultivate NGO Network which is in a nascent shape would pay good dividends in programme quality and contribution of civil society opinion in GEF functioning - In the beginning I was very active, I was the first that requested transparency, rotation of delegates, guidelines for the group, in essences a change, the delegates were reluctant to change - What can be said without participation? - Two major issues: 1) Insufficient awareness/willingness by GEF to address the enormous differences between mega- international NGOs and more locally/regionally grounded groups. The GEF-NGO consultations should permit input by the megas, but should be structured to support/encourage input by the locally grounded and smaller groups. 2) I have never seen evidence of GEF taking the program's strong NGO supports and systematically embedding them in the policies and practices of the Implementing Agencies. For example, as a small regional NGO I would find it almost impossible to organize a Mid-Sized project in my region because there would be no support or active attempts to undercut the project by regional offices of the World Bank and UNDP. - Lack of information from the CFP to the members at the grassroots through the RFP. No accurate database is in place and the RFP has not realized this for years. One wonders if the RFP knows our NGO present physical and postal addresses. There has been no capacity building and training programs for the network members in my region. This is one of the major shortcomings of the coordinator for this region. Human resource development for the members is crucial.		

## RFPs QUESTIONNAIRE

### I. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

1. What region are you from?

REGION	COUNT	PERCENTAGE
Western Africa	0	0%
Eastern Africa	1	10%
Southern Africa	1	10%
Northern Africa	2	20%
South Asia	0	0%
South East Asia	0	0%
Eastern Asia	0	0%
Western Asia	1	10%
Middle East	0	0%
Pacific	0	0%
Western Europe (donor)	0	0%
Eastern Europe	1	10%
Russia	0	0%
North America (donor)	1	10%
Mesoamerica	2	20%
South America	1	10%
Caribbean	0	0%
<b>Total respondents</b>	<b>10</b>	

2. Are you aware of the GEF's NGO Network?

	COUNT	PERCENTAGE
Yes	10	100%
No	0	0%
<b>Total respondents</b>	<b>10</b>	

3. Have you attended any of the biannual NGO-GEF Consultation meetings and GEF Council meetings?

	COUNT	PERCENTAGE
1-3	2	20%
4-6	4	40%
6 or more	4	40%
none	0	0%
<b>Total respondents</b>	<b>10</b>	

### II. OPERATIONS AND MANAGEMENT OF THE NGO NETWORK

4. Do you have access to a copy of the "Guidelines for the Coordination Committee of the GEF-NGO Network of 2003?"

	COUNT	PERCENTAGE
Yes and I have read it	8	88.9%
Yes, but not read yet	0	0%
No	1	11.1%
I don't know what the guidelines are	0	0%
<b>Total respondents</b>	<b>9</b>	

5. Do you think the information on the GEF website pertaining to NGOs is helpful in your work as RFP?

	COUNT	PERCENTAGE
Yes	2	22.2%
No	1	11.1%
I don't know	1	11.1%
I rarely use it	0	0%
It could be improved	5	55.6%
Other(*)	1	11.1%
<b>Total respondents</b>	<b>9</b>	
(*) I have just started as a RFP		

6. What kind of information would you like to see on the GEF website's section on NGOs?

	COUNT	PERCENTAGE
Updated list of all accredited NGOs in the regions, and lists of RFPs, Implementing Agencies, government focal points, and members of the GEF Secretariat	7	77.8%
GEF project cycle handbook in English	3	33.3%
GEF project cycle handbook in local language	5	55.6%
Presentation of GEF organization (PowerPoint, slides, etc.) in English	5	55.6%
Presentation of GEF organization (PowerPoint, slides, etc.) in local language	5	55.6%
Repertoire of recent case studies from constituents highlighting best practices	5	55.6%
Other (*)	3	33.3%
<b>Total respondents</b>	<b>9</b>	
(*) - NGO projects, NGO interactions with implementing agencies, agenda(s) for NGO related GEF activities (country dialogue workshop, capacity building, etc.) - A clear statement of the rationale and purpose of the engagement between NGOs and the GEF Council and Secretariat - I would like to see specific projects targeted to Indigenous people. I would also like to see the policies of the GEF.		

7. The following six questions relate to the types of activities you have undertaken as Regional Focal Point (RFP) in the past year on behalf of your regional constituencies. What best describes these activities?

-Disseminate pertinent GEF documents and other information regarding GEF programs and policies, including those in your region

	COUNT	PERCENTAGE
Rarely	2	22.2%
Twice or more	4	44.4%
No-I don't have that information to distribute	2	22.2%
Other(*)	4	44.4%
<b>Total respondents</b>	<b>9</b>	
(*) Half had done it rarely or not at all.		

8. –Gather the concerns and views of NGOs in my region regarding GEF policies and programs and communicate their views to the GEF Secretariat and/ or Council

	COUNT	PERCENTAGE
Rarely	4	44.4%
Twice or more	3	33.3%
No-I don't have that information to distribute	0	0%
Other(*)	3	33.3%
<b>Total respondents</b>	<b>9</b>	
(*) Most had done it rarely or not at all.		

9. –Distribute reports of the biannual Council proceedings and NGO-GEF Consultations for November 2004

	COUNT	PERCENTAGE
Yes	4	44.4%
No	5	55.6%
<b>Total respondents</b>	<b>9</b>	

10. –Distribute reports of the biannual Council proceedings and NGO-GEF Consultations for May 2004

	COUNT	PERCENTAGE
Yes	6	66.7%
No	3	33.3%
<b>Total respondents</b>	<b>9</b>	

11. –Collaborate with the Network's Central Focal Point (CFP) on preparing the NGO agenda for the above two meetings

	COUNT	PERCENTAGE
Yes	6	66.7%
No	2	22.2%
Other(*)	2	22.2%
<b>Total respondents</b>	<b>9</b>	
(*) 33. I am not a RFP since the May meeting 33. I try to be active in the network		

12. –Collaborate with the government operational and political focal points (OFPs and PFPs) in the countries in your region about GEF-funded projects, programs

	COUNT	PERCENTAGE
Twice or more	4	44.4%
No	2	22.2%
I don't know them	1	11.1%
Other	3	33.3%
<b>Total respondents</b>	<b>9</b>	
(*) Not done so, since I did not receive any request from my region		

13. -Collaborate as appropriate with the Implementing Agencies in your region on: GEF activities

	COUNT	PERCENTAGE
Twice or more	5	55.6%
No-I have not had the time to do this	0	0%
I don't know them	2	22.2%
Other(*)	4	44.4%
<b>Total respondents</b>	<b>9</b>	
(*) - Most said yes, involved with IAs to some degree. - Information doesn't arrive frequently, I could only participate in one evaluation meeting.		

14. Approximately what proportion of the accredited NGOs in your region have you contacted in the last year?

	COUNT	PERCENTAGE
Very small proportion	0	0%
About half of them	0	0%
Majority of them	7	77.8%
Other(*)	6	66.7%
<b>Total respondents</b>	<b>9</b>	



(\*)

- Had to compile new details of these focal points in order to contact them, as the details indicated on the GEF website were outdated
- Communication is one-sided, practically no feedback
- I have only just started - but I would expect only a small number of major NGOs
- My region is poor for the approach of GEF NGO network. But within my last mandate I have been in most of the Countries of my region for finding NGOs. But I still optimist and I continue my re
- I use the GEF secretariat accreditation address and also post letters/info to those not connected to email.
- There are no indigenous ONGs in my region that are involved in the GEF process, and my work is with indigenous people.

15. Have you been aware in the last year of any of the GEF's activities in your region, especially the Small Grants Program and the Medium-Sized projects?

	COUNT	PERCENTAGE
Yes	7	77.8%
No	0	0%
I expect to obtain that information from my RFP	0	0%
I don't have the capacity to gather that information	0	0%
Other(*)	4	44.4%
<b>Total respondents</b>	<b>9</b>	

(\*)

- GEF activities are declining in the region since joining the EU
- Again probably not relevant in donor countries
- I am in a very close relationship with SGPs and MSP
- OPS 3 Regional Consultation

16. Have you submitted or tried to submit a proposal for GEF funding?

	COUNT	PERCENTAGE
Yes	5	55.6%
No	4	44.4%
<b>Total respondents</b>	<b>9</b>	

17. Are you in touch with NGOs in your region that have implemented or are implementing GEF projects?

	COUNT	PERCENTAGE
Yes	8	88.9%
No	1	11.1%
<b>Total respondents</b>	<b>9</b>	

18. Are you familiar with issues raised by NGOs that result from having developed GEF projects?

	COUNT	PERCENTAGE
Yes	9	100%
No	0	0%
<b>Total respondents</b>	<b>9</b>	

19. In your opinion, what level of NGO and other civil society participation occurs in GEF projects implemented in your area?

	COUNT	PERCENTAGE
High level of participation	0	0%
Medium level of participation	2	22.2%
Low level of participation	5	55.6%
Not sure	1	11.1%
Other(*)	1	11.1%
<b>Total respondents</b>	<b>9</b>	
(*) Again this needs rethinking in the donor countries		

20. Are you aware of the role that the GEF's NGO Coordinator plays?

	COUNT	PERCENTAGE
Yes	5	55.6%
No	0	0%
It is unclear how his/her role relates to my work directly or indirectly	2	22.2%
Other(*)	3	33.3%
<b>Total respondents</b>	<b>9</b>	
(*) - I am, but it is hard to see the practicalities of his/her work - Yes, but I think this needs revisiting - This to be replied by accredited NGO's		

21. Which best characterizes your relationship with the Central Focal Point (CFP)?

	COUNT	PERCENTAGE
Close and consultative	5	62.5%
Good, could be better	0	0%
Regular	2	25%
A more responsive relationship is needed	1	12.5%
Non-existent	0	0%
Other(*)	2	25%
<b>Total respondents</b>	<b>8</b>	

(\*)

- I am not on the best term with her; we have differences in setting priority and management issues.
- It could be greatly improved provided there is genuine and sincere spirits.

### III. TIME AND RESOURCES

22. What best describes the proportion of your time devoted to carrying out GEF related work in the past year?

	COUNT	PERCENTAGE
A small part of my time is generally adequate to carry out GEF-related work, except during the period when preparing for the GEF Council and NGO-GEF Consultation which takes more time.	3	37.5%
I devote a substantial amount of my time to GEF-related work generally	4	50%
I devote a small proportion of my time to GEF-related work generally	0	0%
I need to devote more time but I am too busy with other obligations	1	12.5%
Other	0	0%
<b>Total respondents</b>	<b>8</b>	

23. What type of resources do you have to carry out your duties as Regional Focal Point (RFP)?

	COUNT	PERCENTAGE
Basic: Computer with internet connection	8	100%
Basic: Operational landline (also called fixed line)	4	50%
Basic: Fax Machine	6	75%
Basic: Personal email address from the NGO	8	100%
Optional: Slide projector	4	50%
Optional: Overhead projector	2	25%
Optional: Photocopy machine	5	62.5%
Optional: LCD projector	4	50%
Optional materials: Updated list of all accredited NGOs in the region, contacts of RFPs, Implementing Agencies, government focal points, GEF Secretariat	6	75%
Optional materials: GEF project cycle handbook in English	3	37.5%
Optional materials: GEF project cycle handbook in local language	1	12.5%
Optional materials: Presentation of GEF organization (PowerPoint, slides, etc.) in English	2	25%
Optional materials: Presentation of GEF organization (PowerPoint, slides, etc.) in local	1	12.5%

language		
Optional materials: Repertoire of recent case studies from constituents highlighting best practices	3	37.5%
Other(*)	3	37.5%
<b>Total respondents</b>	<b>8</b>	
(*) - Website for GEF related activities, regular meetings with NGOs from the region (mainly about other matters) - PowerPoint is out of date and UNDP specific - Guide for NGO in Spanish		

24. What one resource do you need the most that would substantially help you better carry out your duties?

	<b>COUNT</b>	<b>PERCENTAGE</b>
Training to help me contribute and advocate more constructively during the Council and NGO meetings, as well as in my region	5	62.5%
Ideas about how to better coordinate the numerous NGOs in my region	3	37.5%
Better access to relevant and recent data on GEF activities in my region	5	62.5%
Other(*)	5	62.5%
<b>Total respondents</b>	<b>8</b>	
(*) - Financial resources to have better outreach and provide assistance (training) in the region - A clearer idea of what we are trying to jointly achieve - All kind of resources but in Spanish version - Regularly I obtain from the Secretariat the updated list of all accredited NGO'S of my region. - We need to increase the indigenous' people participation at the global level. The concerns and impacts of the GEF projects are different. More financial resources are needed to secure this participation.		

#### IV. NETWORK GUIDELINES FOR ELECTIONS

25. Do you think the guidelines clearly lay out the electoral process for RFPs?

	<b>COUNT</b>	<b>PERCENTAGE</b>
Yes	3	37.5%
No	1	12.5%
The guidelines are somewhat useful but could be improved	4	50%
Other(*)	2	25%
<b>Total respondents</b>	<b>8</b>	
(*) - The guidelines need to be a lot more kept (also regarding meetings, self-evaluation, feedback)		

- This 2003 guideline was updated with the active assistance of Boni the then GEF NGO coordinator after a participative and democratic process and could only be amended/added/changed by the same process

26. Do you think elections are the best way to choose RFPs?

	COUNT	PERCENTAGE
Yes	5	62.5%
No	0	0%
I don't know	2	25%
Other(*)	4	50%
<b>Total respondents</b>	<b>8</b>	
(*) - Nomination could also work - however, it is difficult to judge one's capacity to perform quality services as RFP - Elections are but the constituency needs to be engaged - Yes, but for the reason of lack of financial resources we can't choose other way, please lead us - I don't know of other process in existence of have to choose one organisation if not by election as clearly outlined in the 2003 guidelines.		

27. Can you think of other processes that are equally transparent?

	COUNT	PERCENTAGE
Yes	4	50%
No	4	50%
Other(*)	1	12.5%
<b>Total respondents</b>	<b>8</b>	
(*) But this process should be done through participatory workshops		

28. Were you elected to your position as RFP, in the manner as outlined in the "Guidelines"?

	COUNT	PERCENTAGE
Yes	5	62.5%
No	0	0%
I became the region's RFP before the Guidelines were issued	2	25%
Other	2	25%
<b>Total respondents</b>	<b>8</b>	
(*) - I opened the participation window for indigenous' people in the GEF and I was elected in the International Indigenous Forum of Biodiversity COP 5, 2000, and my mandate was finished two years ago. - I was elected on the basis of the 2003 guidelines		

29. If not elected, how did you become RFP of your region?

	<b>COUNT</b>	<b>PERCENTAGE</b>
Endorsed by a number of NGO institutions or individuals	3	37.5%
Appointed by a number of NGO institutions or individuals	1	12.5%
Self-appointed	0	0%
Other(*)	6	75%
<b>Total respondents</b>	<b>8</b>	
(*) All note they were elected		

## V. OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF THE NGO NETWORK

30. What do you think have been the achievements/benefits of the Network?

	<b>COUNT</b>	<b>PERCENTAGE</b>
Provides a unique opportunity to influence the GEF Council and Secretariat decisions on GEF programs and policies	7	87.5%
Increased awareness of GEF activities in my country and/or region	5	62.5%
Creates an opportunity to collaborate with the other NGOs of the Network in my area on environmental activities	5	62.5%
Other(*)	2	25%
<b>Total respondents</b>	<b>8</b>	
(*) The implementation of the very important issue of Community Driven Priorities		

31. What have been the main deficiencies with the Network?

	<b>COUNT</b>	<b>PERCENTAGE</b>
Insufficient awareness by the NGOs of how the Network operates and how it can promote NGO concerns on GEF activities	4	50%
Insufficient interaction on all levels of the Network-between CFP and RFPs and between RFPs and NGOs	5	62.5%
Insufficient information and training to strengthen this awareness and interaction	3	37.5%
NGO Network's insufficient awareness of or collaboration with NGOs that manage or implement GEF projects	2	25%
Other(*)	5	62.5%
<b>Total respondents</b>	<b>8</b>	

(\*)

- Not able to have a clear program of work and to follow it up. Also, no strategic planning ahead, reactive instead of proactive
- Again it's unclear to me why we are doing this, in particular what the value is on both sides, GEF & NGOs
- Voluntary based operation and costs for the NGO of the CFP and the RFP