



# Global Environment Facility

**Leonard Good**

Chief Executive Officer  
and Chairman

1818 H Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20433 USA  
Tel: 202.473.3202  
Fax: 202.522.3240/3245  
Email: lgood@TheGEF.org

January 19, 2006

Dear Council Member,

UNDP, as the Implementing Agency for the project, ***Global: Small Grants Programme (Third Operational Phase), Tranche 2***, has submitted the attached proposed project document for CEO endorsement prior to final approval of the project document in accordance with UNDP procedures.

The Secretariat has reviewed the project document. It is consistent with the proposal approved by the Council in November 2005, and the proposed project remains consistent with the Instrument and GEF policies and procedures. The attached explanation prepared by the UNDP satisfactorily details how Council's comments and those of the STAP have been addressed. I am, therefore, endorsing the project document.

We have today posted the proposed project document on the GEF website at [www.theGEF.org](http://www.theGEF.org). If you do not have access to the Web, you may request the local field office of the World Bank or UNDP to download the document for you. Alternatively, you may request a copy of the document from the Secretariat. If you make such a request, please confirm for us your current mailing address.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be "L. Good", written in a cursive style.

cc: Alternate, Implementing Agencies, STAP



23 December 2005

*Len*  
Dear Mr. Good,

**Subject: Global: Small Grants Program (Third Operational Phase)**

Please find attached the Project Document for the proposal approved by GEF Council in November 2005 entitled Global: Small Grants Program (Third Operational Phase). With this letter, I am requesting CEO endorsement of the Project Document.

This document reflects the Council decision to reinstate USD 10 million to the submitted request for USD 50 million, thereby returning the total to the original requested amount of USD 60 million. The corresponding text and budget of the Project Document have been modified to indicate this (see pp 23-25). As is noted on the Cover Page of the attached document, the GEF contribution has been documented at USD 60 million with corresponding increases in commitments to leverage co-financing both in cash and in kind.

There have been no other comments from Council Members regarding this project.

The above-mentioned USD 60 million was approved in principle at the November 2005 Meeting for the 2<sup>nd</sup> Tranche of the Third Operational Phase (OP3). Due to cash flow problems, this funding was split into two installments. The first installment of USD 25 million was financially approved in November 2005 and is to be made available upon CEO endorsement of the attached Project Document. The second installment of USD 35 million has been requested as part of the January 2006 Intersessional Work Programme.

Thank you in advance for your kind cooperation.

*Warm regards,*  
*Yours sincerely,*  
*Frank Pinto*  
Frank Pinto  
Executive Coordinator

Mr. Leonard Good  
Chief Executive Officer and Chairman  
Global Environment Facility  
Room G6005  
1776 G Street  
Washington D.C. 20433

cc. Delfin Ganapin, Global Manager SGP/GEF

## PROJECT BRIEF

### 1. IDENTIFIERS:

<b>PROJECT NUMBER</b>	
<b>PROJECT NAME</b>	<b>Global: Small Grants Program (Third Operational Phase)</b>
<b>DURATION</b>	12 months corresponding to Year 2 of the Third Operational Phase (OP3) – March 06-February 07
<b>IMPLEMENTING AGENCY</b>	United Nations Development Programme
<b>EXECUTING AGENCY</b>	UNOPS
<b>COUNTRIES</b>	Global (92)
<b>ELIGIBILITY</b>	All participating countries have ratified the CBD and UNFCCC
<b>GEF FOCAL AREAS</b>	Biodiversity, Climate Change, International Waters, Persistent Organic Pollutants and Land Degradation
<b>GEF PROGRAMMING FRAMEWORK</b>	Operational Programs 1 – 15

### 2. SUMMARY

The Third Operational Phase (OP3) of the GEF Small Grants Programme (SGP) was approved by the GEF Council in November 2004. At that time, a one-year replenishment of US\$ 47 million was granted as the initial installment of OP3, based on the agreement that subsequent annual “rolling” financial replenishments would be provided to ensure continuity of activities within the programme approach delineated in the approved OP3 project document. As such, this modality comprises annual requests (every November) to the GEF for replenishment of the SGP in order to cover the costs of programme activities aimed at meeting the Outcomes found in the approved OP3 proposal. The proposal presented here comprises a request for the second annual replenishment and documents progress towards fulfillment of the OP3 Outcomes based on annual work plan targets.

### 3. COSTS AND FINANCING (MILLION US\$)

	<b>GEF</b>	Project	:	60.00
		<b>Sub-total GEF</b>	:	<b>60.00</b>
	<b>CO-FINANCING</b>	In cash	:	31.00
		In kind	:	31.00
	<b>TOTAL PROJECT COST</b>		:	<b>122.00</b>

### 4. OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT ENDORSEMENT: Endorsements from GEF Focal Points sought for participating countries

<b>5. <u>IA CONTACT:</u></b>	Delfin Ganapin, Global Manager <b>TELEPHONE:</b> (212) 906 6191 <b>FAX:</b> (212) 906 6568
------------------------------	--

## **Summary of SGP Operational Phase Three**

The development goal of the GEF SGP is to secure global environmental benefits in the areas of biodiversity conservation, climate change mitigation, protection of international waters, prevention of land degradation, and phasing out of persistent organic pollutants through community-based initiatives and action. The rationale of the programme is based on the proven principle that local solutions to global environmental problems exist and have been successfully implemented through the programme while at the same time recognizing that there is still an unrealized potential to enhance the impact of the programme within the GEF system as a whole. Responding to recommendations in the report of the Third Independent Evaluation of the GEF SGP, the programme will continue to focus on achieving the following principal objectives (outputs): (1) increasing the global reach of the programme, especially to address global environmental problems in vulnerable countries; (2) implementation of well-designed project portfolios that incorporate new GEF focal areas and themes; (3) strengthening of existing Country Programmes; (4) demonstration of local and global benefits of the programme and application of lessons learned and good practices; (5) enhancing sustainability of SGP-funded projects, and; (6) realization of SGP's potential as a GEF corporate programme.

### **Introduction**

1. The GEF Small Grants Programme (SGP) is implemented by UNDP on behalf of the three implementing agencies of the Global Environment Facility – UNDP, World Bank, and UNEP – and executed by the United Nations Office for Project Services (UNOPS). Launched in 1992, SGP is rooted in the belief that global environmental problems can best be addressed if local people are involved and direct community benefits and ownership are generated.
2. In twelve years of operation, SGP has worked with thousands of community-based organizations (CBOs) and non-governmental organizations (NGOs) in 92 countries in five world regions: Africa, Asia/Pacific, Arab States, Europe/CIS and Latin America/Caribbean (see Annex I). In partnership with these local organizations, SGP has demonstrated that even with small amounts of funding, local communities can undertake activities that make a significant difference in their lives and environments – all the while contributing to global environmental benefits – in ways that well complement larger, top-down development interventions.
3. Since its inception, SGP has operated in a decentralized, democratic, and transparent manner through National Steering Committees and National Coordinators. The organization of National Steering Committees - composed of national government representatives, including GEF Operational Focal Points, and civil society members representing NGOs, CBOs, academe and the private sector - provide SGP a truly country-driven character. SGP grant-making is also guided by Country Programme Strategies developed on the basis of national environment and development priorities.
4. SGP has funded close to 6,000 projects worldwide. The programme has paid especial attention to local and indigenous communities and gender concerns, and aimed for the replication, up-scaling and sustainability of its initiatives. As such, the programme has influenced national policies and donor agendas by increasing awareness of global environmental issues and communicating lessons learned, including best practices from community-based experiences.

## Contribution to the GEF mandate

5. As highlighted by the 2002 Third Independent Evaluation of the SGP<sup>1</sup>, the programme has become the “public face” or “ambassador” of the GEF and in this way has generated unprecedented levels of grassroots awareness of global environmental problems. This is based on a generally high quality portfolio of innovative and cost-effective projects that are consistent with GEF strategic criteria, as well as increased recognition by government agencies, other donors, and the general public. SGP is seen to link global, national and local environmental issues effectively through a transparent, participatory, decentralized, and country-driven approach to project planning, design and implementation, which has produced a “very high degree of national ownership of the SGP.” The SGP has successfully served as an incomparable mechanism for raising environmental awareness and building capacity across a broad spectrum of constituencies within recipient countries.

6. OPS3 and the Third Independent Evaluation of the SGP noted that “the overall long-term global benefits from SGP activities will be considerable, and are likely to exceed the global benefits generated by larger projects.” Furthermore, OP3 recommended that additional resources be allocated to the SGP and that the land degradation and POPs focal areas, and adaptation strategic priority under the climate change portfolio, be integrated into the program.

7. The SGP, with its focus on supporting local communities to build capacity and initiate new actions for co-managing their natural resources, exemplifies the implementation of GEF’s strategic priorities such as sustainable use activities both within protected areas and their buffer zones; conservation in productive landscapes and seascapes; productive uses of renewable energy; innovative demonstrations and capacity building foundational work in international waters; implementation of innovative and indigenous sustainable land management practices, and targeted capacity building and demonstration of innovative and cost-effective technologies in the POPs focal area.

8. To realize the full potential of the SGP as a GEF corporate programme, additional collaborative initiatives and projects with IAs, as well as other donor agencies, will continue to be promoted at global and country levels, again to enhance mainstreaming for sustainability and to promote replication, as well as to upscale local benefits to better contribute to global impacts. In this manner, the SGP also effectively contributes to GEF’s catalytic role in national and global environmental efforts.

9. SGP also provides GEF and the international environment and development community in general an effective pathway for reconciling global environmental goals with poverty reduction and working towards the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). Addressing poverty reduction in conjunction with environmental conservation – essentially the pursuit of sustainable development – is clearly at the forefront of the international agenda. As the Third Independent Evaluation emphasized, “this is an area where SGP is already demonstrating what is possible... establishing environmentally sustainable livelihood opportunities at local levels may be a precondition for generating long-term global environmental benefits, as well as one of the most important ways of generating these benefits.”

*Table 1 below summarizes basic information on SGP implementation since its inception in 1992.*

---

<sup>1</sup><http://sgp.undp.org/download/SGP3IE2003.rtf>

**Table 1: SGP Phases, funding, grants and numbers of participating countries**

Phase	GEF Funding (million US\$)	Actual Cofinancing in cash (million US\$)	Actual Cofinancing in kind (*) (million US\$)	Number of Participating Countries	Number of Grants
Pilot Phase (1992-1996)	18.0	5.9	NA	42	563
Operational Phase I (1996-1998)	24.0	5.4	NA	53	896
Operational Phase II (1999 -2004)					
Year 1 & 2	31.6	24.3	7.3	58	785
Year 3	22.8	19.2	8.4	63	795
Year 4	20.7	4.5	6.4	64	878
Year 5	26.9	8.6	8.5	73	739
Year 6	31.2	23	17.3	82	1,124
Cumulative OP2	133.2	79.6	47.9	82	4,321
Operational Phase III (2005 – 2008)					
Year 1(**)	47	10.5	27.3	92	214
<b>Cumulative since 1992</b>	<b>222.2</b>	<b>101.4</b>	<b>75.2</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>5,994</b>

(\*) Information on in-kind co-financing is not available for the Pilot and First Operational Phases. SGP began recording in-kind co-financing from mid-1999 when the database was designed and made operational.

(\*\*) Figures are as of end August 2005

### **The Third Operational Phase of the GEF Small Grants Program**

The Third Operational Phase (OP3) of the GEF Small Grants Programme (SGP) was approved by the GEF Council in November 2004. At that time, a one-year replenishment of US\$ 47 million was granted as the initial installment of OP3, with subsequent annual “rolling” financial replenishments to be made to ensure continuity of activities within the programme approach delineated in the approved OP3 project document. As such, this modality comprises annual requests to the GEF for replenishment of the SGP in its November Council meeting in order to cover the costs of programme activities aimed at meeting the Outcomes found in the approved OP3 proposal based on annual work plan targets.

The deliverables for Year 1 of OP3 are presented in Table 2. Discussion on progress made towards achievement of these deliverables follows.

**Table 2: SGP OP3 – Year 1 Deliverables (March 2005 – February 2006)**

<b>Year</b>	<b>Deliverables</b>	<b>Indicators</b>
End of Year 1 (Feb. 2006)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Geographic expansion of the programme.</li> <li>• Mentoring and training for new Country Programmes and NCs.</li> <li>• Strengthened roles and responsibilities for NCs and PAs</li> <li>• NSC capacity building and recognition</li> <li>• Strengthened support from UNDP COs</li> <li>• Review and analysis of mature SGP portfolios</li> <li>• Impact monitoring and knowledge management</li> <li>• Ex post study finalization</li> <li>• In-kind cofinancing</li> <li>• Operational Consultation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ten (10) additional countries included in GEF SGP in accordance with established selection criteria, at least 5 from LDCs or SIDS.</li> <li>• Strengthened system for appraising, launching, training and backstopping new countries is in place.</li> <li>• All NCs and PAs have tailored/revised TORs.</li> <li>• NSCs will have expertise or access to expertise in all GEF focal areas; recognition program for NSCs in place.</li> <li>• Procedures in place for briefing Res Reps of UNDP COs in SGP countries.</li> <li>• Strategic portfolio analysis becomes an integral part of BPR reports.</li> <li>• M&amp;E Framework and Communications Strategy revised to implement impact assessment and a shift to knowledge management.</li> <li>• Case studies of ex post study published and distributed.</li> <li>• Procedures for systematic identification and assessment of in-kind contributions are in place in all Country Programmes.</li> <li>• At least 1 upstream consultation by SGP with GEF IAs for the year.</li> </ul>

## Accomplishment of OP3 Year 1 deliverables - discussion

### I. *Geographic expansion of the programme.*

The GEF Assembly in Beijing instructed SGP to expand its participating country by ten (10) each year and to proactively facilitate the application by LDCs<sup>2</sup> and SIDS<sup>3</sup> for participation in the programme as well as to provide assistance to ensure successful implementation of SGP in these countries.

From March to October 2005, the programme has expanded to thirteen (13) new countries (with Cook Islands, Tokelau, and Nieu within a regional program) with priority given to LDCs and SIDS as shown in the Table below:

Year	New Countries	LDC	SIDS
2005	Argentina	No	No
	Benin	Yes	No
	Bulgaria	No	No
	Cameroon	No	No
	Chad	Yes	No
	Comores	Yes	Yes
	Cook Islands	No	Yes
	Haiti	Yes	Yes
	Panama	No	No
	Nieu	No	Yes
	Tokelau	No	Yes
	Uruguay	No	No
	Vanuatu	Yes	Yes

<sup>2</sup> The United Nations has designated 50 countries as least developed (LDCs): Afghanistan, Angola, Bangladesh, **Benin**, **Bhutan**, **Burkina Faso**, Burundi, **Cambodia**, Cape Verde, the Central African Republic, **Chad**, **the Comoros**, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, **Ethiopia**, Gambia, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, **Haiti**, Kiribati, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Liberia, **Madagascar**, Malawi, Maldives, **Mali**, **Mauritania**, **Mozambique**, Myanmar, **Nepal**, **Niger**, **Rwanda**, **Samoa**, Sao Tome and Principe, **Senegal**, Sierra Leone, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Sudan, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tuvalu, **Uganda**, **the United Republic of Tanzania**, **Vanuatu**, **Yemen** and Zambia. The 20 countries in bold participate in SGP; countries in bold and italics are joining the SGP in Yr 1 of OP3. Source: The Least Developed Countries Report 2004 ([http://www.unctad.org/en/docs/lcd2004annex\\_en.pdf](http://www.unctad.org/en/docs/lcd2004annex_en.pdf)).

<sup>3</sup> The following is the list of 48 Small Island Developing States (SIDS), with the 23 SGP participating countries in bold, non-self governing islands in italics, and OP3 Yr 1 entrant countries in bold and italics: *American Samoa*, **Antigua and Barbuda**, *Aruba*, Bahamas, Bahrain, **Barbados**, **Belize**, Cape Verde, **Comoros**, **Cook Islands**, **Cuba**, Cyprus, **Dominica**, **Dominican Republic**, **Federated States of Micronesia**, **Fiji**, *Guam*, **Grenada**, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, **Haiti**, **Jamaica**, Kiribati, Maldives, Malta, **Marshall Islands**, **Mauritius**, Nauru, *Netherlands Antilles*, **Niue**, **Palau**, **Papua New Guinea**, **Samoa**, Sao Tome and Principe, **St. Kitts and Nevis**, **St. Lucia**, **St. Vincent and the Grenadines**, Seychelles, Singapore, Solomon Islands, **Suriname**, Timor-Leste, **Tokelau**, Tonga, **Trinidad and Tobago**, Tuvalu, *US Virgin Islands*, **Vanuatu**. Source: Office of the High Representative for the Least Developed Countries, Landlocked Developing Countries and Small Island Developing States (<http://www.un.org/special-rep/ohrls/sid/list.htm>).

## Number of SGP projects

With the 92 countries participating in SGP, the programme has (as of September 2005) reported completions of 2,810 projects and 2,864 under execution. There are also 257 projects under preparation.

## ***II. Mentoring and training for new Country Programmes and NCs***

The SGP Central Programme Management Team (CPMT) and UNOPS have increasingly relied on experienced NCs to take lead responsibility for new country appraisal missions. These experienced NCs are well-placed to undertake these missions because of their knowledge and understanding of SGP procedures, familiarity with country conditions, and ability to negotiate obstacles and arrive at solutions. This has been done on an ad hoc basis, but has now been made more systematic with clear guidelines for country appraisal, report preparation, and follow-up activities. Mentoring by senior NCs of newly-recruited NCs has also become standard practice. In this way, SGP has expanded and could further expand to new countries as it has built a strong support structure from its more mature country programmes.

*Since March 2005:*

- The capacities of National Coordinator, as well as selected Programme Assistants and NSC members were strengthened at the SGP Global Workshop in Istanbul. Aside from exchanges of best practices and lessons learned, targeted training activities were also conducted. National Coordinators were provided training to build their communications and networking skills through the facilitation of experts from a capacity development firm, Performance Consulting International. On the more technical aspects of GEF focal areas, learning and discussion sessions were provided to further clarify guidance on the new focal areas of land degradation and POPs<sup>4</sup>. Additional guidance was also provided to strengthen understanding of the International Waters focal area as it should be applied to SGP in order to expand the programme's portfolio in this focal area. A similar session was provided in regard to SGP project development in the adaptation field of the climate change focal area.
- Presentations to strengthen guidance in GEF focal areas have been participatory in nature, analyzing and discussing information and experience of the NCs and NSCs with the aim of implementing projects in these focal areas in a more comprehensive and focused way within the GEF guidelines. This will enable portfolio representation of these new focal areas to grow in the overall SGP portfolio.
- All National Coordinators have taken the Project in Controlled Environment (PRINCE 2) training with accreditation provided to 80% of the NCs (20% opted to take the accreditation exam in another venue to be determined). PRINCE 2 is an internationally recognized project management method used in the public and private sector. Training was conducted through UNDP's Central Business Unit while the accreditation exam was managed by the United Kingdom Office of Government Commerce (OGH). This training has strengthened the skills of SGP National

---

<sup>4</sup> A Strategic Guidance Paper has been developed for the POPs Focal Area, which was first circulated to selected NCs and NSC members with experience in the POPs focal area. The Draft POPs Strategic Guidance Paper was discussed with Implementing Agencies and IPEN NGOs (International Pops Elimination Network) to produce a final draft which was then reviewed by the IA focal points. The finalized POPs Strategic Guidance Paper was launched at COP1 of the Stockholm Convention and, through a partnership with IPEN, distributed to all NGOs working in the area of POPs.

Coordinators to prepare better projects and project portfolios as well as improve their monitoring and evaluation.

- The capacity of NCs to manage their Country Programmes effectively has been bolstered in those countries selected for audit in 2005. SGP has decided to expand these audits to include management audits. Thus NCs were given guidance on improving their program management through audits conducted in Bolivia, Brazil, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Egypt, Guatemala, Kenya, Tanzania, Tunisia and Uganda.
- A growing number of more experienced National Coordinators have traveled to candidate countries on SGP appraisal missions. Clear guidance has been developed to aid them in the management of these missions. The participation of experienced NCs in these missions not only saves on costs (i.e. travel is within region) but also has the advantage of having a mission handled by one who already knows what is needed for the successful start-up of an SGP Country Programme. It also prepares these experienced NCs to be mentors later of the NCs of newly started up Country Programmes. These missions also improve the capacities of NCs to present the SGP from a more global perspective. It allows comparative assessment of issues, conditions and opportunities with those of their own Country Programs.
- New NCs have made training/learning visits to mature Country Programmes. This has provided them with a more comprehensive picture of how an SGP Country Programme should function, based on actual observation of SGP activities as well as sharing of lessons learned and accumulated experience from the mentor NC, NSC and other programme partners. Below is a list indicating the training/learning sessions conducted by mature Country Programmes for new National Coordinators:

NC SGP Belarus	<i>by</i>	SGP Poland & Lithuania
NC SGP Botswana	<i>by</i>	SGP Zimbabwe
NC SGP Cambodia	<i>by</i>	SGP Thailand
NC SGP Cuba	<i>by</i>	SGP Dominican Republic
NC SGP Fiji	<i>by</i>	SGP Philippines
NC SGP Kazakhstan	<i>by</i>	SGP Lithuania
NC SGP Lebanon	<i>by</i>	SGP Jordan
NC SGP Macedonia	<i>by</i>	SGP Poland
NC SGP Madagascar	<i>by</i>	SGP Tanzania
NC SGP Mozambique	<i>by</i>	SGP Tanzania
NC SGP Namibia	<i>by</i>	SGP Zimbabwe
NC SGP Niger	<i>by</i>	SGP Mali and Egypt
NC SGP Papua New Guinea	<i>by</i>	SGP Philippines
NC SGP Romania	<i>by</i>	SGP Lithuania
NC SGP Rwanda	<i>by</i>	SGP Uganda
NC SGP Samoa	<i>by</i>	SGP Philippines
NC SGP Syria	<i>by</i>	SGP Jordan
NC SGP Yemen	<i>by</i>	SGP Jordan

- At the same time, a Guidebook for National Coordinators has been developed for new NCs to help them to better understand how the programme operates on a daily basis. This Guidebook serves as well to provide guidance to NSC members, including the UNDP Country Office, on how the programme operates. The Guidebook includes the following topics:
  - Contact Information for all SGP staff
  - How to set up an SGP office
  - Training for new NCs

- Establishment of the National Steering Committee (NSC).
- Drafting of the Country Programme Strategy (CPS)
- Grant Allocation
- Information campaign & launch of the Programme
- Answers to Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs)

### ***III. Strengthened roles and responsibilities for National Coordinators and Programme Associates***

- All the National Coordinators and Programme Assistants hosted by UNDP Country Offices have been shifted from service contracts to UNOPS Fixed Term contracts. As such, they are considered UN staff and receive improved benefits as well as higher expectations in terms of professionalism and work ethics.
- Seven National Coordinators based on experience, merit and proven capacity have been designated as Senior NCs. As part of their responsibilities (see TOR in Annex II), the Senior NCs are required to devote 25% of their time to corporate and global assignments, which include mentoring and on-the-job training of new National Coordinators. Senior NCs have also started to actively participate in appraisal and trouble-shooting missions, responding to queries from junior NCs, and in drafting and review of specific guidebooks and other programme guidance materials.
- Senior NCs have also taken the lead role in planning, organizing and implementing the programme's upcoming regional workshops, in identifying and producing knowledge products, and in developing regional approaches to programming, particularly in regard to strategic projects. All these additional tasks allow the programme to utilize its built up capacity and institutional strengths for further expansion to other countries.
- Experienced Programme Assistants with proven capacity have also been raised to the Programme Associate level and given greater responsibilities (see TOR in Annex II), with more expected to follow pending performance evaluation. Programme Associates have been given the responsibility to also manage particular projects, thus allowing National Coordinators to focus more on additional initiatives especially those related to impact assessment, knowledge management, policy linkages, and the development of financial and institutional sustainability of the Country Programme.
- The capacity of SGP country teams will be further strengthened in Year Two by providing for needed internal expertise, manpower support, and links to various institutions for additional technical and/or logistical support. In Year 2, CPMT will design and implement an internal capacity building program to ensure that Country Program teams are able to function at a high level of performance and satisfaction. An initial part of this process will be a capacity needs assessment to identify what management, planning and other skills need to be strengthened. The SGP performance evaluation system, strengthened in Yr 1 to increasingly reflect UNDP's Results and Competence Assessment (RCA) system, will be utilized. In addition, the audits of Country Programmes, expanded in Yr 1 to include management audits will also advise on what additional management skills are needed by particular country teams. More SGP staff, both NCs and PAs, can now benefit from on-line UNDP learning resources, for example, to broaden their substantive knowledge (e.g. rights-based approach as it is linked to environmental programmes), as well as leadership skills (e.g. people management, building partnerships, negotiation, creative thinking, risk management, etc.).

#### *IV. NSC capacity building and recognition*

- NSC capacity building is implemented by providing greater opportunities for NSC members to be involved in programme activities beyond project reviews and approval. For this reason, NSC members in 32 countries participated in SGP's Ex Post Study of randomly selected projects that began in 1999 and ended three years ago, joining the independent experts from national research and academic institutions in project visits and assessing sustainability factors. In this way the study was also able to capitalize on the acquired institutional memory of a large number of NSC members regarding the projects under study. Involved NSC members were then able to share with their colleagues needed improvements in design, review, and monitoring of SGP projects so that sustainability is better assured.
- NSC involvement in both regional and global programme assessment and planning has become standard practice in the programme. During the five regional workshops held between February 2004 and January 2005, fifty-four (54) NSC members received updates on GEF and SGP strategic directions. In plenary and small groups they took part in strategic discussions and shared their insights in regard to the future orientation of regional initiatives and collaboration. In June 2005, sixteen (16) selected NSC members took part in the 4th SGP Global Workshop in Istanbul. Historically, SGP Global Workshops had no NSC participation. The objective of an expanded NSC participation was for committed and experienced NSC members to be able to engage in the programme's global strategic planning and programming. At the same time they were able to understand the OP3 shifts of the programme to better help strengthen their Country Programmes in relation to these shifts. They are also expected to share the discussions and agreements of the Global Workshop with their colleagues in other countries, particularly within their region. Their attendance at regional and global workshops is linked to building the network of NSC members regionally and globally thus strengthening SGP's influence in national, regional and global environmental governance.
- An agreement was made for direct links to be established between NSC Chairs or NSC focal persons with the Global Manager and Central Programme Management Team. This facilitates consultations with NSCs at the global level and further strengthens "country-drivenness" of SGP. This also recognizes the country expertise available for guiding country programmes as well as for conflict resolution within country programmes. A Directory of NSC Chairs and Focal Persons has been developed for this purpose. A Directory of NSC Experts has also been compiled to facilitate exchange of volunteer expertise across SGP countries and at the same time lessen dependence on external consultants and save on costs.
- In addition, given the increasing demands placed on the voluntary contribution of experts taking part in SGP NSCs, a number of SGP country programmes have formed technical subcommittees to address particular technical topics. Others have been formed to "pre-screen" projects nearer the sites themselves, as for example in the case of the Local Consultative Bodies (LCBs), developed by SGP's Community Management of Protected Areas Conservation (COMPACT) sub-programme. In countries where there are significant numbers of indigenous peoples, SGP country programmes have also worked with UNDP to form indigenous peoples' advisory committees. In instances where SGP is responsible for the selection of community grants on behalf of other projects (i.e. World Bank 'Nile Basin' GEF project), the programme has developed reciprocal arrangements whereby the additional burden on the Country Programme is appropriately compensated.

- Certificates of Recognition have been distributed to NSC members. This is usually done in appropriate ceremonies such as during Environment Day or UN Volunteers Day celebrations. All Country Programmes have also been instructed to network all NSC members, past and present, to constitute a country “SGP Family”.

#### ***V. Strengthened support from UNDP COs***

- A “Friends of SGP” group of UNDP Resident Representatives has been launched to work with CPMT and senior UNDP GEF management to address SGP-UNDP CO relationships. This group will serve as a bridge between Resident Representatives and SGP, communicating relevant issues, improving understanding of programme goals and procedures within the CO context, helping to clarify reporting lines, and promoting resource mobilization and mainstreaming. This mechanism will also be used to brief new Resident Representatives and Deputy Resident Representatives assigned to SGP countries, and to support new country appraisal missions and start up.
- “Friends of SGP” met formally in Istanbul at the SGP Global Workshop. The group drafted a note to all UNDP Resident Representatives outlining the successes of and challenges to the programme and recommending the establishment of a stronger compact between UNDP Country Offices and SGP Country Programs to ensure their continued success. The “Friends of SGP” also agreed to facilitate SGP attendance at meetings of UNDP Resident Representatives where the programme would be able to raise awareness of its achievements and importance.
- Increasingly, UNDP Country Offices (e.g. India, Iran, Mexico, Pakistan, Tanzania, Trinidad and Tobago,) have succeeded, with country partner approval, to allocate TRAC resources to SGP as cofinancing. A similar agreement, particularly on the use of TRAC resources to defray administrative costs, has been agreed with the UNDP Country Office in Comoros. An agreement has also been made in Cambodia for UNDP resources allocated to governance projects to be used as a complement to those of SGP’s environment projects.

#### ***VI. Review and analysis of mature SGP portfolios***

- During the period under review, a great deal of work was devoted to improving the development of the Country Programme Strategies (CPS) to make them more effective management and strategic planning tools for all Country Programmes. One output of this effort is the revision of all CPS to make them more strategic in terms of focus and orientation.
- As a consequence of an improved approach to Country Programme Strategies, the previous Biannual Programme Review has been modified to make it a Country Programme review report aligned to the assessment of Country Programme progress at the end of an Operational Phase. Thus, the Biannual Review will be converted to a Triannual Review (TPR) to take place at the end of SGP OP3 with the aim of assessing progress toward longer-term strategic goals identified in the CPS. This will be supplemented with annual reviews of the work plan in both operational and strategic terms i.e. their utility in function of meeting the CPS strategic goals.
- After the Climate Change Focal Area portfolio review in 2003, SGP followed up with its Biodiversity Focal Area portfolio review. Based on the SGP review of almost 3,000 biodiversity projects completed as of November 2004, SGP initiated steps to generate a series of thematic working papers for Year 2 of OP3. The first working paper that has been targeted focuses on the portfolio of SGP projects addressing apiculture around the world. In September 2005, SGP also completed the first draft of an inventory of biodiversity-based products sustainably managed and marketed by SGP projects. The inventory has identified roughly 670 such projects and has sorted

a range of biodiversity-based products into distinct categories including fisheries, medicinal plants, timber, non-timber forests products, as well as handicrafts. A draft strategic guidance paper was prepared for the International Waters focal area through a participatory process and is currently in circulation with the IAs. Based on the new approach of aligning SGP projects with Strategic Action Programmes and other GEF initiatives, a mapping exercise of countries and SAPs around the globe was concluded and is now available on the SGP website.

- An added aspect in SGP's strategic portfolio review is the analysis of the achievements of mature country portfolios. For example, the Lithuania Country Programme conducted a review of its portfolio of projects resulting in a report with a range of important lessons that were shared globally at the 4<sup>th</sup> SGP Global Workshop. A similar exercise has been done in Chile. Poland has also completed a review of its mature sustainable transport portfolio under the Climate Change focal area. Over the rest of SGP OP3 Year 1, reviews of mature portfolios will be requested of ten other countries.
- Other portfolio analysis related to this indicator achieved during the period under review includes the analysis of land degradation aspects in climate change projects. This review provided ideas on what sort of land degradation projects communities are interested in, to help develop a strategy for the implementation of community land degradation projects.
- For an efficient and effective framework for portfolio reviews, a guide has been developed to assist Country Programmes to strategically carry out portfolio analysis. The thrust of the guide is to integrate such portfolio reviews, through TPRs, into the final reports of SGP OP3 achievements in each country.

## **VII. *Impact monitoring and knowledge management***

### Impact monitoring and assessment

- At the SGP Global Workshop in June 2005, a major agreement reached dealt with the immediate shift for all country programmes to an impact-oriented approach. Where previous SGP deliverables and monitoring were based on outputs (their impacts to be later determined through estimates using surrogate values as well as through portfolio reviews and case studies), it was agreed that shifts would be made in project design, implementation and monitoring so that targeted outcomes and impacts, at project and country programme levels, are identified and measured. These shifts have to be implemented within Yr 1 of SGP's OP3. The results of these shifts can be expected in the coming annual reports of country programmes as well as from the second series of portfolio reviews next year.
- To increase the potential for project impacts, SGP has revised the approach and format of the Country Program Strategy (CPS) so that it builds on a results-based planning framework consisting broadly of a hierarchy of Outputs, Outcomes and Impacts (see Annex III for the new CPS Outline). As part of this reorientation of the CPS, country programmes are encouraged to focus geographically and/or thematically so that projects can achieve synergies among themselves and take advantage of economies of scale where possible, reducing administrative and support costs. Project synergies are leveraged as a result of a program approach that identifies Outcomes to be sought at the level of the geographic region or thematic area. Outputs leading to the desired Outcomes are produced by one or more small grants projects. Synergies among projects within a geographical focus will allow for potentially greater learning as well as an increased capacity to negotiate donor and other support and develop innovative approaches to longer-term sustainability.

- In a results-based planning framework, each level of results is accompanied by targets and indicators so that progress and/or success in achieving Outcomes and Outputs can be assessed and lessons learned. Individual project results are evaluated in terms of project objectives as well as in terms of the contribution of the project to a broader Output or Outcome.
- An indicator system has been devised by SGP with two primary uses: (1) produce data for reports to GEF Council demonstrating the broad global impacts of the SGP portfolio, and; (2) produce data to inform the management of the individual Country Programmes and their pursuit of strategic Outcomes and Impacts at the geographic and/or thematic levels. These are the two central aspects of the SGP monitoring and evaluation practice. The list of indicators can be found in Annex IV.
- A technical note to guide the SGP Country Programmes in the assessment of community contributions to the reduction and avoidance of GHGs has been developed and circulated to all Country Programmes, and is available on the SGP website. Its aim is to complement the Impact Assessment System by providing technical information relevant to the assessment of global environmental benefits related to climate change activities.
- The strengthened SGP Impact Assessment System has combined the results-based Country Programme Strategy and the set of global indicators with other elements of the current M&E practice, such as the ex-post studies and portfolio reviews. Please see Annex V for a detailed description of the SGP Impact Assessment System.
- The shift to a more impact-oriented programme also included providing for geographic focusing in SGP country programmes. SGP experience with one of its special project provided the methodology. Timed to coincide with the start of the second phase of the “Community Management of Protected Areas Conservation” (COMPACT) co-financed with the United Nations Foundation (UNF), SGP/UNF hosted a workshop in September 2005 in Arusha, Tanzania. SGP National Coordinators from 12 countries, the UNESCO World Heritage Center, IUCN and other international partners discussed the application of the landscape planning approach to maximize SGP impacts to address the 2010 targets of the CBD. Key themes in the workshop included: (1) targeting of World Heritage sites as “critical building blocks” in the protection of globally important ecoregions, hotspots and regional development strategies; (2) development of a new modality for transboundary decision-making with collaboration between two SGP National Steering Committees; (3) mainstreaming of the COMPACT landscape approach as an integral part of the new SGP Country Programme Strategies, and; (4) official recognition by the World Heritage Committee of the COMPACT model of community co-management of natural WH sites.

#### Knowledge Management

- SGP has broadened its approach to sharing lessons learned including Communications and Knowledge Management Strategies based on the same principle as that of the UNDP-GEF: *to leverage lessons learned from projects and to replicate successes*. Critical additions by SGP include monitoring of the impact of its knowledge products and services as well as the networking of critical users to assure utility and effectiveness. As such SGP has contributed to UNDP’s practice-based knowledge structure as well as GEF-wide knowledge management activities and processes.
- In Merida, Mexico, in May 2005, SGP Mexico hosted the GEF SGP/Equator Initiative Regional Exchange Workshop. This workshop is the culmination of a year long effort in knowledge management with contributions from UNDP’s Bureau of Development Policy, UNDP’s LAC SURF and the Equator Initiative. Sixty (60) participants from Latin America and the Caribbean

attended, comprising community leaders, field practitioners, researchers and UNDP program officers, half with successful local community based experiences to share with the other half. Twenty-four case studies were developed and presented and are now available on the Equator Initiative website. The workshop led to the formulation of six (6) regional and subregional initiatives. Results of the workshop were also consolidated to provide input to the UN Millennium Review Summit.

- As a follow-up to a consultation workshop “Making the GEF SGP and Millennium Ecosystem Assessment work for Indigenous Peoples” held during the U.N. Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues in 2004, SGP organized a follow-up thematic workshop in May 2005 to provide practical examples and training in innovative mechanisms to increase access to the GEF SGP for indigenous peoples and local communities. Three sessions with indigenous peoples representatives were held to: (a) present on-going efforts, audio-visual and other alternative proposal formats to improve direct access by indigenous communities to grants and other support services available from GEF SGP; (b) form an “indigenous support network” to disseminate awareness and monitor progress on SGP grant access by indigenous communities, and; (c) channel practical advice and suggestions from indigenous peoples to SGP National Coordinators and National Steering Committee members.
- The SGP has continued to work jointly with the World Bank Small Grants Programme and the World Bank Grants Facility for Indigenous Peoples in consolidating successful experiences and lessons learned. SGP joined a Global Grantmaking for Small Grants Workshop from which a booklet has resulted for use by other development practitioners. SGP also joined the World Bank Grants Facility for Indigenous Peoples in a workshop to share lessons learned and best practices with other funders for indigenous community concerns during the last UN Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues last May 2005. SGP approaches and methodology for working with indigenous communities were shared with other funders such as the Canadian International Development Agency, International Fund for Agricultural Development, Pan American Health and Education Foundation, First Nations Development Institute, First Peoples Worldwide, Global Environmental Facility, International Finance Corporation’s Corporate Citizenship Facility, UN Voluntary Fund for Indigenous Populations, International Funders for Indigenous Peoples, Ford Foundation, Seed Foundation, and the European Initiative for Democracy and Human Rights of the European Union. SGP has agreed to maintain informal networking with these funders.
- Experience covering more than 12 years enables the SGP to be effective in sharing lessons learned. In the Mid Term Review of the EC-supported Promotion of Tropical Forests (PTF) Small Grants Program, the independent consultants concluded that “the lessons learned by all participating countries from the GEF SGPs, with respect to operational and programme issues, are invaluable pointers for the direction and operating procedures of the PTFs. It was clear to the Consultant that the PTF COs (country officers) make direct use of the existing GEF SGP mechanisms and networks and liaise closely and cordially with the GEF SGP in ensuring close complementarity between the two programmes ... Consultation and collaboration between the two programmes was noted by the Consultant to be a tangible cornerstone for an admirable foundation for the SGP PTFs.” This shows the added value that SGP can provide its partners such as in the case of the PTF where it used the existing National Steering Committees of SGP for the review and approval of its projects and where complementation between the two programs were fully explored for coordinated and/or joint grantmaking.
- In its increasing emphasis on knowledge management, SGP has focused on developing knowledge products specifically designed for various stakeholders and key audiences: grantees, CBOS, NGOs, national governments, GEF Council, GEFSEC, the Implementing Agencies (IAs), other donor agencies, SGP National Coordinators, SGP National Steering Committee (NSC)

members, multilateral organizations, and the scientific community. Such knowledge products and services and their dissemination are outlined in Annex VI.

- Publications from CPMT in 2005 include: *Responding to Climate Change, Generating Local Benefits* (translated into French and Spanish for COP-11); *Factsheet for CSD – 13: SGP and CWI*; *Factsheet on SGP and POPS*.
- Important country publications disseminated include:

Bolivia – *Small Grants Programme Operational Phase II 2002-2004 – April 2004*

*Memory of projects Year 4 – Operational Phase II – May 2005*

Ecuador – *Soluciones locales a problemas ambientales globales - May 2003*

Dominican Republic – *PPS Compartiendo Experiencias 2001-2003 – 2004*

Jordan – *101 Local Initiatives to Project the global environment*

Lithuania – *Linking the interests of the Environment and Society GEF SGP Three Years in Lithuania -2004*

Mali – *Le PPS/FEM au Mali – Dix années de Pédagogie en faveur de l 'environnement – Dec. 2004*

Peru – *Experiencias Comunitarias Exitosas del Programa de Pequeñas Donaciones en Perú*

In DVD format:

Poland – *10 years of GEF/SGP in Poland*

Philippines – *SGP through the eyes of our partners – Small Beginnings, Infinite possibilities*

Egypt – *GEF SGP Egypt 2004*

Thailand – *Environmentally Smart Community*

Mauritania – *Actions locales pour la durabilité de l'environnement*

Iran – *GEF Small Grants Programme – I.R. Iran*

## **VII. Ex post study finalization**

- The ex post study of 128 SGP projects in 32 countries has been completed with the participation of 32 selected country institutions and teams. These are projects initiated before 1999 and completed at least 3 years ago. The ex post study reports produced from the successful exercise provide a wealth of information from which lessons learnt can be derived from completed projects of the pilot and second phases. An initial analysis of the reports has been done (see Annex VII). A more comprehensive analysis of the reports, which total more than 1500 pages, has been started in order to derive the full benefits of the study. The reports will be made available to the SGP network for further analysis, and, with the participation of interested researchers and research institutions, important knowledge products will be prepared as planned for Year Two of SGP OP3. The reports and knowledge products, such as thematic reviews, will be disseminated to NCs, NSCs, grantees, donors and other Implementing Agencies of the GEF.
- The ex post study for tracking impacts of SGP projects has already been replicated in some countries like Lithuania where it has been used to assist the Country Programme to better develop, select and implement SGP projects. Agreement has been reached with all Country Programmes to mainstream the ex post methodology, with improvements learnt from this exercise, into their M&E systems for consolidation into the larger SGP Impact Assessment System. SGP also intends to further replicate the improved ex post study methodology in Country Programmes using local resources and partnerships established through the global SGP ex post study.

### ***VIII. In-kind cofinancing***

- The target for Yr 1 of SGP OP3 is the development of procedures for the systematic identification and assessment of in-kind contributions in Country Programmes. Such procedures, already successfully implemented in various Country Programmes, were presented at the June 2005 SGP Global Workshop and have now been consolidated into an SGP Resource Mobilization Guidebook.
- SGP's cofinancing commitments for OP3 are one-to-one, half in cash and half in-kind, to be reckoned at the end of the operational phase. Near midway through Year 1 of OP3 (August 05), SGP has registered cofinancing commitments in cash of US\$ 10.5 M and in-kind of US\$ 27.3 M. With trends in cofinancing from Country Programmes and with cofinancing agreements developed with UNF, UNV, the Global Mechanism, UNDP's South-South Cooperation Facility and the Community Water Initiative, targets for Yr 1 of SGP OP3 will be met.

### ***IX. Operational Consultation***

- Preparations for Operational Consultation with the GEF Secretariat and Implementing Agencies took place at the SGP Global Workshop in Istanbul in June 05. SGP's first Operational Consultation took place in August 2005 to review ways to further strengthen SGP in light of its current growth, taking into account the addition of two new focal areas (land degradation and POPs) and plans to increase its global reach. Items discussed at the meeting included (a) fuller realization of SGP's potential as a GEF corporate program by establishing closer working relationships with GEF Implementing Agencies; (b) status of the Strategic Projects; (c) SGP's Impact Assessment System, and; (d) graduation policy issues for SGP.
- The Operational Consultation was successful in identifying potential areas of action with GEFSec and the IAs for mainstreaming SGP into MSPs and FSPs. The IAs agreed to engage IA focal points in exploring SGP participation during the early planning and design of larger projects. GEFSec also committed to send a guidance note to GEF Operational Focal Points encouraging them to explore potential SGP involvement in the implementation of proposed projects forwarded to them for consideration. There was also agreement to discuss with GEF Task Forces the incorporation in project review criteria the strong consideration of community participation in projects which could then use SGP as the delivery mechanism.

### III. WORK PLAN FOR SGP OP3 - YEAR 2 (February 2006 – February 2007)<sup>5</sup>

SGP OP3 Year Two continues progress made in Yr 1. Below is the set of expected deliverables and their indicators for Year Two. The workplan is based on meeting these deliverables by February 2007.

Year	Deliverables	Indicators
End of Year 2 (Feb. 2007)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Geographic expansion of the programme</li> <li>• Capacity building of SGP country teams</li> <li>• SGP Country Projects Portfolio development</li> <li>• Strategic focusing of SGP Country Programmes</li> <li>• Lessons learning/knowledge management</li> <li>• Development of project sustainability strategies</li> <li>• Operational Consultation</li> <li>• Mainstreaming with IAs and EAs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ten (10) additional countries included in GEF SGP in accordance with established selection criteria, at least 5 from LDCs or SIDS.</li> <li>• SGP country teams have needed internal expertise, manpower support, and links to various institutions for additional technical and/or logistical support to cope with workload.</li> <li>• Established SGP Country Programmes have funded a significant number of grants in the new GEF focal areas of land degradation and POPs.</li> <li>• Established SGP Country Programmes have well-defined, strategic thematic and geographic project clusters or lines of action.</li> <li>• At least two (2) thematic and/or ex post case studies implemented and findings disseminated.</li> <li>• Country Programmes prepare project sustainability strategies (to include payment of ecological services, environmentally sustainable products, revolving funds, etc.).</li> <li>• At least 1 upstream consultation by SGP with GEF IAs for the year.</li> <li>• Analysis made on how many full-sized projects with IAs and EAs have/ could have SGP components or could use SGP's approaches and strategies.</li> </ul>

<sup>5</sup> Taken from Annex F2 of the approved Project Document

#### **IV. Detailed description of SGP OP3 - Year 2 deliverables**

##### ***I. Geographic expansion of the programme***

- Country applications for participation in SGP have continued to come in. SGP has taken a proactive approach to inform LDCs and SIDS on procedures to apply, and applications from these countries are expected to increase. Ten (10) of these applications will be given priority based on potential environmental benefits and readiness to commit to SGP's community-based approach, civil society participation and national governance structure (NSC). Need for the programme will also be a major consideration, thus priority will be given to LDCs and SIDS. At least five LDC or SIDS countries will become part of SGP by February 2007.
- SGP will make increased use of experienced National Coordinators in country appraisal, programme launching, and follow-up activities. Incoming country NCs will be assigned a mentor among the more experienced NCs operating under similar conditions and/or facing similar challenges.
- Appraisal and start up materials and tools developed in Yr 1, will be used to the fullest. Experience from new appraisals and start up, however, will also be used to continuously improve on these materials and tools.
- It is expected that with the new countries starting in 2005 and becoming fully operational plus the ten (10) new ones started in 2006, SGP would reach a global total of approximately 2000 projects initiated in Year Two of OP3.

##### ***II. Capacity building of SGP country teams***

- The capacity of SGP country teams will be further strengthened by providing for needed internal expertise, manpower support, and links to various institutions for additional technical and/or logistical support.
- In Year 2 of SGP OP3, CPMT will design and implement an internal capacity building program to ensure that the Country Program teams are able to function at a high level of performance and satisfaction. An initial part of this process will be a systematic capacity needs assessment to identify what management, planning and other skills need to be strengthened. In this, results of the SGP performance evaluation system - strengthened in Yr 1 to reflect essential characteristics of UNDP's RCA system - will be utilized. In addition, the audits of country programmes, expanded in Yr 1 to include management audits will also advise on what additional management skills are needed by particular country teams.
- Specific skills and knowledge expected to be of use to Country Programme planning and management will form the basis for capacity building. For example, there will be a need to ensure that there is solid capacity for the implementation of community-based adaptation (CBA) projects built within each of the participating Country Programmes. The application of appropriate methodologies for the calculation of global benefits (e.g., reduction in GHGs) from SGP projects is another needed skill. Importance would be given to strengthening skills that would enhance the ability of country teams to report with accuracy, assess the efficiency and value of specific interventions, and present the program and its impacts in a more authoritative manner.
- A number of SGP country teams have begun to introduce new modalities to support the added workload of a growing portfolio of projects funded by the SGP in partnership with other donors. Promising examples include the secondment of technical advisors from bilateral donors for

specific geographic regions, as developed by SGP in Kenya with German DED assistance, along with a global framework agreement for the placement of national United Nations Volunteers (UNVs) in support of clusters of SGP projects in and around globally significant protected areas. In the Pacific, Australian Youth Ambassadors have been closely associated with a growing number of SGP projects in the field. The acquisition of additional support from other institutions such as interns from universities, JPOs, and additional staff from partners will be a priority of Yr 2.

- Capacity will also be strengthened by expanding the expertise base and network links of the National Steering Committee. All Country Programmes will review their NSCs as regards additional membership, particularly to increase links of SGP to institutions involved in policy reform and to the private sector, especially in those places where a significant number of projects are graduating into marketing activities for sustainability. A strategy will be required of each Country Programme for building the NSC into an institution that promotes the Country Programme's sustainability, in particular in regard to limited or potentially decreasing GEF resources.

### ***III. SGP Country Portfolio development***

- In Yr 2, established SGP Country Programmes will fund a significant number of grants in the new GEF focal areas of land degradation and POPs. Through strategic projects, SGP's International Waters portfolio will also be expanded to account for a greater share of SGP successes.
- CPMT has worked in Yr 1 to address the two new focal areas of land degradation and POPs in a comprehensive manner. First, strategic guidance papers for both focal areas have been prepared and sent to all National Coordinators to orient them as to what is potentially eligible for funding. Second, partnerships with key organizations and networks have been developed to ensure that SGP participates in the ongoing discussion of approaches, measures, and alliances for reduction of POPs and land degradation, as well as facilitating the demand for small grants in countries around the world. In the POPs focal area the newly established partnership with the International POPs Elimination Network will encourage the development of many POPs projects in SGP Countries. In the land degradation focal area, partnership with the Global Mechanism has already been started in Yr 1. The SGP will also actively participate in the enabling activities related to POPs and the land degradation focal areas.
- The National Coordinators have been urged to accept projects in the areas of land degradation and POPs and to facilitate the development of at least one project in each focal area in each eligible country in Year 1. At the end of Year 1, the experience with project development and implementation will be assessed and the approach to building a global project portfolio in these focal areas will be evaluated and adapted, as needed. In Year 2, CPMT intends to prepare more detailed resource guides, utilizing built up experience, in each new focal area to complement the strategic guidance papers prepared in Year 1 to further facilitate the development and execution of successful projects.
- In yr two, SGP, in collaboration with UNDP/GEF, will initiate implementation of the GEF-financed full-scale project entitled Community-Based Adaptation (CBA) in ten countries as part of broader efforts to pilot the GEF's Strategic Priority on Adaptation (SPA).

### ***IV. Strategic focusing of SGP Country Programmes***

- Year 2 activities will lead to the development of well-defined, strategic thematic and geographic project clusters or lines of action in SGP country programmes. There will also be clearer focus given on themes related to vulnerable groups such as women and indigenous communities.
- SGP Country Programmes in Year 2 will continue to receive technical assistance from CPMT in the revision, adaptation and implementation of their Country Program Strategies. In Year 1, CPS formulation guidelines were produced and training was carried out to help NCs strengthen their skills in result-based planning and management. Revision of existing CPS's and formulation of new CPS's that are more strategically focused and impact-oriented was initiated in Year 1. Follow-up guidance and training will be provided at the SGP Regional Workshops scheduled to take place in the early part of Year 2.
- As part of the process of strengthening Country Programs, Senior Coordinators at the regional level will work to promote interactions and cross-learning between countries, involving both NCs and key NSC members. This will facilitate learning by NCs, as well as programming of both the new Strategic Projects and national projects within a sub-regional context, either geographically or thematically.
- The CPS guidebook produced in Year 1 will be supplemented by specific materials designed to aid National Coordinators and National Steering Committees in designing, adapting and implementing the geographic or thematic focus of the Country Program Strategy. These may include a series of how-to guidance notes regarding such things as stakeholder participatory research, developing proposals with non-literate groups, identifying, using and protecting traditional ecological knowledge, marketing and branding of region-specific products, etc.

#### V. *Lessons learning/knowledge management*

- In Yr 2, SGP will strengthen its knowledge management system based on experience and lessons learned from Yr 1. Following the SGP Global Workshop in Istanbul, SGP has been pursuing efforts to develop new approaches for access to SGP funding for indigenous peoples, as well to apply landscape-level planning tools for the clustering of biodiversity projects around globally significant protected areas. Thematic case studies would focus on these topics. Regional workshops in 2006 would then be used to disseminate the findings in the form of training of national coordinators on these two themes: (1) in the use of participatory video techniques both for enhancing access to the programme for vulnerable groups and for the protection of traditional ecological knowledge, and; (2) mainstreaming of the COMPACT landscape planning approach to at least eight additional SGP countries who will in future be using participatory conceptual models and landscape-level baselines to prioritise appropriate SGP interventions in and around globally significant protected areas. On the knowledge management side, activities with the CBD Secretariat and the UNESCO with which SGP has partnership agreements, will be aimed at incorporating the SGP COMPACT approach into the management and monitoring methodologies of the World Heritage Convention.
- Timed to coincide with the Eighth Meeting of the Parties of the Convention on Biological Diversity to be held in Curitiba, Brazil, SGP plans to host a global thematic workshop in March 2006 on the topic of marketing and certification of biodiversity-based products. The key aims of the workshop will be: (i) to examine the existing portfolio of SGP projects in marketing, labeling and certification of biodiversity-based/agrobiodiversity/ agroforestry products; (ii) based on the draft SGP global inventory, to engage a range of technical expertise in analysing the specific needs of small producers; (iii) to address particular concerns and needs of sub-categories of SGP products ranging from honey, timber, medicinal plants, aquaculture, (wild) forest products, handicrafts and others; (iv) to discuss the possibility of "common minimum standards" for small

producers as a foundation for a wide range of value-added labels and certification schemes ranging from specific products to wider “landscape” and protected areas based approaches. In addition, the workshop is expected to result in a pipeline of strategic projects in the domain of certification and biodiversity-based standards.

- In the climate change focal area, thematic case studies and follow-up workshops will be held on the topics of Community-Based Adaptation and lessons learned in SGP’s portfolio of sustainable transport projects. Another group of themes will tackle the role of micro-financing mechanisms in enhancing community participation in climate change projects and best practices in promoting sustainable productive end uses from energy services derived from SGP climate change projects. This latter group of themes is important in that it also provides input to the development of sustainability strategies – a deliverable of Yr 2 of SGP OP3.
- Integration of different focal areas has been ongoing in SGP projects, as demonstrated by the case-study of land degradation components in climate change projects. Therefore country experiences of integration would be discussed, documented and shared in regional workshops, reported and disseminated, especially tackling the measurement of impacts of integrated projects.
- International waters focal area projects are now being developed strategically in alignment with GEF Strategic Action Programmes for international water bodies. A portfolio analysis and lessons learnt from international waters projects will consolidate previous experiences and guide the new phase of SGP international waters projects.
- Dissemination of SGP ex post study reports and lessons learnt will continue through the SGP website. Thematic analysis of the ex post case study reports will continue regarding project design, awareness-raising, project sustainability, the role of markets in project success, policy impact, and community indicators of project impacts and environmental benefits.
- SGP has strengthened its communications strategy as it is now linked to a Knowledge Management System that is itself linked to SGP's Impact Assessment System. Part of the new improvements in all these include incorporation of a number of new options in the SGP intranet including a new workspace to be used as a global e-filing system. The shift to knowledge management also means that SGP publications and other knowledge products will be tailor-made to particular key stakeholders. There will also be monitoring of impacts of its communications activities and networking of its knowledge product users.

The SGP at the global and country programme levels will continue its quality work with media with express targets to get into mainstream print media as well as radio and TV. With the Resource Allocation Framework and the need for SGP to be able to access added funds from country RAF allocations, messages that clarify the complementation of SGP's community-based approach with national environmental and development programs would be disseminated widely. In parallel, focused communication approaches will also be directed at country GEF Focal Points and other relevant country policy decision-makers using the SGP National Steering Committees (where GEF Focal Points are either Chairs or key members) as entry points. SGP will also work to the fullest to participate in communications activities related to this as would be implemented by IAs and the GEFSEC.

SGP further plans to actively support the GEF NGO Network in expanding the size and representativeness of its constituency. The SGP is well positioned for this role as it has worked with many local NGOs on the ground and knows who the "real" ones are. SGP country teams (National Coordinator and Programme Assistant), who go on many site visits and conduct many NGO/CBO consultations, could also help the GEF NGO Network communicate with local NGOs.

An expanded and more representative constituency for the GEF NGO Network would be a very potent communications conduit on GEF matters.

## **VI. *Development of project sustainability strategies***

- Country Programmes in Yr 2 are expected to be ready to prepare project sustainability strategies (potentially including payment of ecological services, environmentally sustainable products, revolving funds, etc.). In mature country programmes strategic positioning of projects that integrate marketing, utilization of microcredit services, creation of revolving and trust funds, and others related to replication, upscaling and sustainability will be given importance.
- According to the approved Second GEF Overall Performance Study (2002), “To the extent that the GEF/SGP projects have generated wide stakeholder participation, built local capacity in project management, successfully raised significant co-financing, and routinely involved income-generating activities, their chances of sustainability are good. However, it is important to ensure that the income-generating components of SGP projects are based on good feasibility studies and incorporate business-oriented management approaches.” Thus, activities related to building capacity of SGP’s country teams and stakeholders to prepare good feasibility studies and to manage projects in a business-oriented manner will be supported.
- National Coordinators and the National Steering Committee need to be able to distinguish the economic and financial feasibility of specific interventions to ensure that they will be sustainable once project funding comes to an end. In this regard, guidelines will be included in the revised Resource Mobilization Strategy on developing cofinancing partnerships with the private sector. NSCs will be encouraged to include members from the private sector who can advise on micro-enterprises, sustainable marketing, and business plans.
- A geographic or thematic focus of a CPS will encourage greater sustainability by creating sufficient critical mass of a particular set of small enterprises (both in terms of numbers and integration). This will result in greater potential for marketing, for investment, and for economies of scale. The new CPS approach will place greater emphasis at the Outcome level of results, which will include outcomes in terms of global environmental benefits, poverty alleviation and good governance. NCs will receive guidance and training in specific aspects of feasibility analysis at their respective regional workshops.
- Project sustainability also depends on the presence of an enabling policy environment. Identification of needed policy reforms to support community-based sustainable production, marketing, and reinvestment will be made. Follow-up lobbying will also have to be organized through the NSC, particularly its government members as well as SGP’s network of grantees, allied NGOs, partners in academe, and donor agencies..
- SGP will also further strengthen its links with GEF Focal Points. GEF Focal Points are already represented in the SGP National Steering Committees with a significant number of them elected as Chairs. At the country programme level, the National Coordinator will organize regular one-on-one briefings on the programme’s progress and strategic plans particularly for those too busy to attend all of the NSC meetings. Through the GEF Focal Point, the National Coordinator will also conduct orientation and briefings with relevant government agencies. At the global level, CPMT will establish special communications with GEF Focal Points on the programme’s progress, strategic directions, and critical issues on global environmental governance. All these strengthen the sustainability of both SGP projects and the programme given the expected increase in government support, improved links to policy-making, and the mainstreaming of the SGP approach into larger development plans and practice.

## **VII. Operational Consultation**

- At least one Operational Consultation (OC) will be carried out. Building on previous Operational Consultations, the OC(s) in Yr 2 will be more definite in terms of the identification of projects within each IA portfolio with which SGP can work to assure its participation and mainstreaming.

## **VIII. Mainstreaming with IAs and EAs**

- Analysis will be made of SGP's mainstreaming into full-sized projects as well as how many other full-sized projects with IAs and EAs could have SGP components or could use SGP's approaches and strategies.
- At present, SGP is mainstreamed into the Nile Transboundary Environmental Action Project and the Niger River Basin Project. It has just signed a Letter of Cooperation with the Partnership for Environmental Management of the Seas of East Asia (PEMSEA) where PEMSEA local government participants will cofinance community-based coastal management projects with SGP. SGP is also a partner in the implementation of the EC-supported Promotion of Tropical Forests Small Grants Program. A review will be made in Yr 2 of how SGP has executed its role as a microgrants delivery mechanism and/or cofinancing partner for these full-sized projects with the aim to develop a model for similar mainstreaming in other full-sized projects.
- At the same time, the model will help assess which other full-sized projects in the upstream planning pipeline of IAs and EAs could also benefit from SGP's participation. The Operational Consultations in Yr 2 will provide appropriate entry for SGP to look explore project pipelines and then later to support SGP's mainstreaming into the identified projects.

## **V. INDICATIVE PROGRAMME BUDGET – YEAR TWO SGP OP3**

Table 2, below, presents the budget for Year 2 of OP3, from 16 February 2006 through 15 February 2007. The following key elements have been taken into consideration: (i) programme expansion to 10 new countries, at least 5 of which will be LDCs and/or SIDS which will require more intensive strategic guidance, monitoring and support; (ii) preparation of knowledge products and dissemination of lessons learned; (iii) more targeted effective support to SGP national teams for enhancement of SGP portfolios and project design for cost-effectiveness, impact-oriented results and monitoring; and (iv) building effective partnerships for co-financing and project/programme sustainability.

A total of \$60 million is being requested from GEF. This conforms to the Yr 2 budget as proposed in SGP's OP3 ProDoc where SGP has planned to cover increased grant making as well as the higher administrative costs of bringing in new countries, particularly LDCs and SIDS. Regional workshops would be critical activities to build the capacity of all SGP Country Programmes to manage new institutional and resource environments under the RAF, scale up country level impacts to regional and global levels, to develop strategic projects, as well as strengthen linkages such as between SIDS Country Programmes. The budget will also cover increased partnership and resource mobilization activities. These activities foresee greater participation of UNDP Country Offices in SGP meetings and workshops, although in principle, this would have to be covered not from the SGP budget but from UNDP contributions. Where appropriate, National Coordinators of countries adjacent to those applying for participation in SGP will be utilized for appraisal missions to establish links and intensify follow-up possibilities. The role of National Coordinators and technical expert members of National Steering

Committees from mature Country Programmes will also be further enhanced to cover what is foreseen as increased demand for technical assistance from new countries.

Accordingly, \$45.0 million will be allocated to SGP country programmes<sup>6</sup> for grant-making to local NGOs and communities, while the remaining balance of \$15.0 million will finance global activities, local operations in programme countries, and a 6% UNOPS support cost to execute project activities and grants disbursement and monitoring. This follows the 25:75 ratio of non-grant vis-à-vis grant allocation practiced in the programme. It should be noted that with the amount being requested from GEF, it is expected that a total co-financing amount of \$62 million, 50% in cash and 50% in-kind, would be mobilized.

As SGP is becoming more institutionalized in terms of its programming policies and orientation and because of the urgent need to adapt its expansion within the limitations of the new Resource Allocation Framework (RAF), a review of CPMT's staffing level and structure was carried out. The result is incorporated in the budget table below. It is proposed to cancel the second Deputy Global Manager (Operations) post at L-5 level and to substitute two mid-level Environmental Specialist posts – one for Land Degradation with added responsibilities in M&E, and the second for Partnerships/Special Projects (given the need to increase SGP's partnerships for greater resource mobilization) with additional responsibilities in supporting the biodiversity portfolio which is the largest in the programme (see Annex VIII). Moreover, with the added function of managing SGP's adaptation program in the Climate Change portfolio, the CC post has been upgraded one level higher, from L3 to L4. The net budgetary change is minimal, but will bring much needed strength to CPMT as it seeks to expand the programme in more difficult LDCs and SIDs countries, hasten programme sustainability in its mature countries, disseminate relevant knowledge products and translate lessons learned into larger development policy.

---

<sup>6</sup> The criteria for grant allocations to country programmes include: (1) absorptive capacity – country programmes submit their requests at the start of SGP year and such requests are assessed against known country team capacity and historical trends in delivery of grants; (2) equity and need – country programmes which have received less in previous years and where stakeholders have expressed increased needs have priority in getting increases; a cap of \$750,000 has also been put on grant allocation requests as well as actual allocations unless there are surpluses at the end of the year that no other country with lower grant allocation would need; (3) strategic value – added grant allocations are given to country programmes which develop strategic partnerships and need leveraging resources to raise co-financing and promote mainstreaming and sustainability; country programmes that participate in implementing regional and global SGP partnerships (e.g. Nile River Project, EC Promotion of Tropical Forests, COMPACT) could receive additional grant allocations to meet complementation and co-funding commitments.

There is also usually a reserve set aside in the event that very important and strategic needs for grant making come from country programmes whose grant allocations have already been fully utilized. Projections by country programmes of the level of grant commitments most likely to be made by the end of the year are made mid-year. Projected surpluses will be distributed to others that can best use the funds.

<b>Table 1: Indicative Programme Budget for Yr 2 of the Third Phase (OP3) - 2006</b>	
<b>A. Grants</b>	
GEF	45,000,000
Co-financing	31,000,000
<b>Sub-total:</b>	<b>76,000,000</b>
<b>B. Programme mobilization, strategic guidance and M&amp;E</b>	
Regional Workshop	400,000
Communication Strategy	200,000
Lessons Learned/Impact Assessment	300,000
Travel/M&E	300,000
Technical Assistance	50,000
Audits	40,000
CTs Strengthening	50,000
Evaluation	100,000
<b>Sub-total:</b>	<b>1,440,000</b>
<b>C. Programme management</b>	
<b><u>Country-level</u></b>	
Personnel	4,900,000
NHI	725,000
Premises	450,000
Equipment, operations and maintenance	1,100,000
Workshops	195,000
FM/travel	500,000
Technical assistance	135,000
Outreach	250,000
Sundry	250,000
<b>Sub-total:</b>	<b>8,505,000</b>
<b><u>Global programme-level</u></b>	
Global Manager	245,190
Deputy Global Manager	210,150
Prog Specialist (Climate Change)	180,260
Prog Specialist (Biodiversity)	151,150
Prog Specialist (Int'l Waters/POPS)	151,150
Prog Specialist (Land Degradation/M&E)	151,150
Prog Specialist (Partnerships/Special Projects)	151,150
Knowledge Facilitator	127,135
Prog Associate	80,275
Prog Associate	80,275
Equipment	20,000
Premises	80,000
Sundry	30,900
<b>Sub-total:</b>	<b>1,658,785</b>
<b>Total A (GEF)+B+C:</b>	<b>56,603,785</b>
<b>Total A+ B+C:</b>	<b>87,603,785</b>
<b>D. Administrative costs</b>	
UNOPS Support	3,396,215
<b>E. TOTAL (in cash)</b>	<b>91,000,000</b>
<b>F. In-kind resources:</b>	<b>31,000,000</b>
<b>G. GRAND TOTAL (in cash and in kind):</b>	<b>122,000,000</b>
<b>H. GEF TOTAL:</b>	<b>60,000,000</b>

**Table 3: Approved Budget for year 1 of the Third Operational Phase**

	<b>Year 1</b>
<b>A. Grants</b>	
GEF	34,000,000
<b>B. Programme mobilization, strategic guidance and M&amp;E</b>	
Regional Workshop	120,000
Communication Strategy	190,000
LL/IA	255,000
Travel/M&E	240,000
Technical Assistance	55,000
Audits	30,000
CTs Strengthening	40,000
Evaluation	100,000
Global Workshop	400,000
<b>Sub-total:</b>	<b>1,430,000</b>
<b>C. Programme management</b>	
<u>Country-level</u>	
Personnel	3,500,000
NHI	700,000
Premises	410,000
Equipment, O&M	880,000
Workshops	385,000
FM/travel	730,000
Technical assistance	200,000
Outreach	280,000
Sundry	269,984
<b>Sub-total:</b>	<b>7,354,753</b>
<u>Global programme-level</u>	
Global Manager	242,970
Deputy Manager (Oper)	208,270
Deputy Manager (Progr)	208,270
Climate Change Officer	176,850
Biodiversity Officer	176,850
ILand Mgnt / Int'l Wat/POPs Officer	176,850
Knowledge Facilitator	113,810
Prog Assist	73,000
Admin Asst	73,000
Equipment	15,000
Premises	75,000
Sundry	15,000
<b>Sub-total:</b>	<b>1,554,870</b>
<b>Total A, B, C,</b>	<b>44,339,623</b>
<b>D. Administrative costs</b>	
UNOPS Support	2,660,377
<b>E. GEF/SGP Total</b>	<b>47,000,000</b>
<b>F. CO-FINANCING:</b>	
a) In-kind resources from non-GEF sources for grant element:	17,000,000
b) Cash co-financing from non-GEF sources	17,000,000
<b>Sub-total:</b>	<b>34,000,000</b>
<b>G. GRAND TOTAL (E + F):</b>	<b>81,000,000</b>

**Table 5: Approved Programme Budget for year 6 of the second operational phase**

	Year 6
<b>A. Grants</b>	
GEF	20,500,000
Co-financing from non-GEF sources in cash	14,000,000
	34,500,000
<b>B. Programme mobilization, strategic guidance and M&amp;E</b>	
Strategic Regional and Thematic Workshops	400,000
Implementation of communications strategy (electronic networking, publications, audiovisuals)	60,000
Lessons learning, information analysis and dissemination	850,000
Visits to Country Programmes and projects, guidance and M&E	100,000
Technical assistance in GEF focal areas	80,000
Audit of 5 Country Programmes per year	30,000
Subtotal	1,520,000
<b>C. Programme management</b>	
<b>COUNTRY-LEVEL</b>	
Personnel	2,700,000
NGO contracts (NHI)	640,000
Premises	350,000
Equipment, operations & maintenance	700,000
Stakeholder workshops/training	350,000
Field monitoring	650,000
Technical assistance	180,000
Reporting/outreach	250,000
Sundry	250,000
Subtotal	6,070,000
<b>Global programme-level</b>	
Global Manager	223,000
Deputy Manager	188,000
Operations Officer	169,000
Climate Change Officer	150,000
Biodiversity Officer	150,000
Integrated Land Management & Inter. Waters Officer	150,000
Information Management Officer	120,000
Programme Associate	71,000
Programme Admin. Assistant	65,000
Equipment	10,000
Premises	60,000
Sundry	12,000
Subtotal	1,368,000
<b>D. Administrative costs</b>	
UNOPS/CO support	1,767,480
<b>E. TOTAL (in cash)</b>	<b>45,225,480</b>
In kind resources from non-GEF sources for grant element	14,000,000
<b>F. GRAND TOTAL (in cash and in kind)</b>	<b>59,225,480</b>
<b>G. GEF TOTAL:<sup>7</sup></b>	<b>31,225,480</b>

<sup>7</sup> The GEF Total corresponds to “E. TOTAL IN CASH” (\$45,225,480) – “budget line Grants co-financing from non-GEF resources in cash” (\$14,000,000) = \$31,225,480

**Table 6: Indicative Budget for OP3 2005-2007 from Project Document**

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3
<b>A. Grants</b>			
GEF	34,000,000	44,093,000	47,192,000
Co-financing	17,000,000	31,000,000	38,000,000
<b>Sub-total:</b>	<b>51,000,000</b>	<b>75,093,000</b>	<b>85,192,000</b>
<b>B. Programme mobilization, strategic guidance and M&amp;E</b>			
Regional Workshop	120,000	600,000	120,000
Communication Strategy	190,000	250,000	270,000
LL/IA	255,000	350,000	400,000
Travel/M&E	240,000	350,000	330,000
Technical Assistance	55,000	125,000	95,000
Audits	30,000	40,000	50,000
CTs Strengthening	40,000	50,000	60,000
Evaluation	100,000	200,000	300,000
Global Workshop	400,000	0	520,000
<b>Sub-total:</b>	<b>1,430,000</b>	<b>1,965,000</b>	<b>2,145,000</b>
<b>C. Programme management</b>			
<u>Country-level</u>			
Personnel	3,500,000	4,300,000	4,950,000
NHI	700,000	750,000	800,000
Premises	410,000	490,000	550,000
Equipment, operations and maintenance	880,000	1,100,000	1,375,000
workshops	385,000	450,000	475,000
FM/travel	730,000	840,000	950,000
Technical assistance	200,000	275,000	300,000
Outreach	280,000	330,000	380,000
Sundry	269,753	300,984	329,490
<b>Sub-total:</b>	<b>7,354,753</b>	<b>8,835,984</b>	<b>10,109,490</b>
<u>Global programme-level</u>			
Global Manager	242,970	267,267	293,993
Deputy Manager (Oper)	208,270	229,097	252,006
Deputy Manager (Progr)	208,270	229,097	252,006
Climate Change Officer	176,850	194,531	213,984
Biodiversity Officer	176,850	194,531	213,984
ILand Mgnt / Int'l Wat/POPs Officer	176,850	194,531	213,984
Knowledge Facilitator	113,810	125,188	137,706
Prog Assist	73,000	80,274	88,301
Admin Asst	73,000	80,274	88,301
Equipment	15,000	20,000	20,000
premises	75,000	75,000	75,000
Sundry	15,000	20,000	25,000
<b>Sub-total:</b>	<b>1,554,870</b>	<b>1,709,790</b>	<b>1,874,265</b>
Total A+B+C:	61,339,623	87,603,774	99,320,755
<b>D. Administrative costs</b>			
UNOPS Support	2,660,377	3,396,226	3,679,245
<b>GEF/SGP Total</b>	<b>47,000,000</b>	<b>60,000,000</b>	<b>65,000,000</b>
<b>E. TOTAL (in cash)</b>	<b>64,000,000</b>	<b>91,000,000</b>	<b>103,000,000</b>
<b>F. In-kind resources:</b>	17,000,000	31,000,000	38,000,000
<b>G. GRAND TOTAL (in cash and in kind):</b>	<b>81,000,000</b>	<b>122,000,000</b>	<b>141,000,000</b>
<b>H. GEF TOTAL:</b>	<b>47,000,000</b>	<b>60,000,000</b>	<b>65,000,000</b>

## **ANNEXES**

- I. Countries Participating in the Programme
- II. New TORs for: Senior National Coordinators (II-I), Programme Associates (II – II)
- III. Country Program Strategy Outline
- IV. List of Indicators for Global Impact Reporting
- V. Description of SGP Impact Assessment System
- VI. Knowledge Management Products and Services and Dissemination Strategy
- VII. Ex-Post Study Summary
- VIII. Post descriptions for Programme Specialists: Land Degradation/M&E (VIII-I),  
Partnerships/Special Projects (VIII-II)

**ANNEX I: SGP Country Programmes of the Third Operational Phase**

<b>Country</b>	<b>Date of Joining GEF/SGP</b>	<b>LDCs</b>	<b>SIDS</b>
<b>AFRICA</b>			
1. Benin	2005	LDC	
2. Botswana	1992		
3. Burkina Faso	1992	LDC	
4. Cameroon	2005		
5. Chad	2005	LDC	
6. Comoros	2005	LDC	SID
7. Cote d'Ivoire	1993		
8. Ethiopia	2004	LDC	
9. Ghana	1993		
10. Kenya	1993		
11. Madagascar	2004	LDC	
12. Mali	1993	LDC	
13. Mauritania	2001	LDC	
14. Mauritius	1995		SID
15. Mozambique	2003	LDC	
16. Namibia	2002		
17. Niger	2002	LDC	
18. Rwanda	2003	LDC	
19. Senegal	1993	LDC	
20. South Africa	2001		
21. Tanzania	1996		
22. Uganda	1996	LDC	
23. Zimbabwe	1993		
<b>NORTH AFRICA/ MIDDLE EAST</b>			
24. Egypt	1993		
25. Jordan	1992		
26. Lebanon	2001		
27. Morocco	1996		
28. Palestinian Authority	1996		
29. Syria	2004		
30. Tunisia	1993		
31. Yemen	2003	LDC	
<b>ASIA PACIFIC</b>			
32. Cambodia	2004	LDC	
33. Bhutan	1996	LDC	
34. Fiji	2003		SID
35. India	1995		
36. Indonesia	1992		
37. Iran	2000		
38. Malaysia	1996		
39. Marshall Islands	2004		
40. Federated States of Micronesia	2004		SID
41. Mongolia	2002		
42. Nepal	1993	LDC	
43. Pakistan	1993		
44. Palau	2004		SID
45. Papua New Guinea	1994		SID
46. Philippines	1992		

Country	Date of Joining GEF/SGP	LDCs	SIDS
47. Samoa	2003		SID
48. Sri Lanka	1994		
49. Thailand	1993		
50. Vietnam	1996		
<b>EUROPE</b>			
51. Albania	1996		
52. Belarus	2004		
53. <i>Bulgaria</i>	2005		
54. Kazakhstan	1996		
55. Kyrgyzstan	2001		
56. Lithuania	2000		
57. Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	2004		
58. Poland	1994		
59. Romania	2004		
60. Turkey	1993		
<b>LATIN AMERICA/ CARIBBEAN</b>			
61. <i>Argentina</i>	2005		
62. Barbados (see note 2)	1994		SID
63. Belize	1993		SID
64. Bolivia	1992		
65. Brazil	1994		
66. Chile	1992		
67. Colombia	2003		
68. Costa Rica	1993		
69. Cuba	2004		SID
70. Dominica	1994		SID
71. Dominican Republic	1993		SID
72. Ecuador	1994		
73. El Salvador	2001		
74. Guatemala	1996		
75. <i>Haiti</i>	2005	<i>LDC</i>	<i>SID</i>
76. Honduras	2001		
77. Jamaica	2003		SID
78. Mexico	1994		
79. Nicaragua	2003		
80. <i>Panama</i>	2005		
81. Peru	1996		
82. Suriname	1995		
83. Trinidad and Tobago	1995		SID
84. <i>Uruguay</i>	2005		

Notes:

All countries above are eligible under paragraph 9(b) of the GEF Instrument.

The Barbados programme is regional in scope, covering the following countries: Anguilla, Antigua and Barbuda (CBD March 9, 1993; UNFCCC February 2, 1993); British Virgin Islands, Grenada (CBD August 11, 1994; UNFCCC August 11, 1994); Montserrat, St Kitts and Nevis (CBD January 7, 1993; UNFCCC January 7, 1993); Saint Vincent and the Grenadines (CBD June 3, 1996; UNFCCC December 2, 1996); and Saint Lucia (CBD July 28, 1993; UNFCCC June 14, 1993).

## ANNEX II - I: New TORs for Senior National Coordinators

### POST PROFILE

#### I. IDENTIFICATION OF THE POST

<b>Post Title:</b>	<b>Senior Project Manager (Sr. PM)</b>	<b>Post Number:</b>	
<b>Organizational Unit:</b>	<b>GEF-SGP</b>	<b>Post Level:</b>	<b>NO- C</b>
<b>Country/Duty Station:</b>			
<b>Post Status:</b>	New		
<b>Post Type:</b>	Project-funded		
<b>Supervisor's Title:</b>	GEF-SGP Global Manager	<b>Level:</b>	

#### II. POST'S ORGANIZATIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY:

<p><b>A.</b> Effective management of the GEF-SGP (Global Environment Facility – Small Grants Programme) local team, the SGP programme and its portfolio -- from programme strategy to individual project concept and design to technical support to SGP grantees, monitoring and evaluation -- to ensure compliance with the overall approved global SGP Strategic Framework, the SGP Operational Guidelines, the SGP annual work programme, the national environmental priorities, as well as the annual delivery of the national SGP targets.</p> <p><b>B.</b> Dedicate at least 25% of time in (i) advising and mentoring other Project Managers – in the region and elsewhere - and undertake SGP Start-up and other missions as required by CPMT; (ii) contributing to the GEF-SGP knowledge management network and discussions; and (iii) participate in key GEF-SGP workshops, international conference and other national/regional/international fora.</p> <p><b>C.</b> Building strategic partnerships with development partners, such as donors, foundations, private sector and civil society, to promote SGP and mobilize resources.</p> <p><b>D.</b> Contribution to GEF-SGP's efforts to develop effective national, regional and global networks for technical support and knowledge management, within the GEF SGP and with external institution, including academia.</p>
---

#### III. KEY RESULTS EXPECTED/MAJOR FUNCTIONAL ACTIVITIES

<b>% of Time</b>		<b>Key Results Expected/Major Functional Activities</b>
25%	1.	<p><b>Corporate GEF-SGP Functions</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>At the request of the Central Programme Management Team (CPMT) in NY, conduct special SGP assignments such as SGP start-up mission in new programme country, training of new Project Managers, representation of SGP Management at</li> </ul>

		<p>national/regional/international meetings and conferences;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mentor and advise new SGP national teams in the region and elsewhere, and provide technical support to the SGP teams in the region;</li> <li>• Actively network with other major and strategic institutions and academia and pursue knowledge acquisition/management/sharing, within the GEF-SGP network and externally.</li> </ul>
10%	2.	<p><b>Managerial Functions</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Guide the preparation of the local SGP annual workplan, including strategic and/or innovative initiatives to be undertaken/explored, the delivery and co-financing targets, and performance targets of the national SGP team members;</li> <li>• Supervise the national SGP team members and provide necessary guidance and coaching;</li> <li>• Promote and maintain a suitable environment for teamwork within the SGP team, the National Steering Committee members, and with the UNDP CO team;</li> <li>• Build and maintain an effective relationship with key partners and stakeholders, and keep CPMT, UNOPS and UNDP CO informed as appropriate.</li> </ul>
30%	3.	<p><b>PROGRAMME DEVELOPMENT AND MANAGEMENT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• KEEP ABREAST OF THE NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL CONCERNS AND PRIORITIES AS WELL AS THE SOCIO-ECONOMIC CONDITIONS AND TRENDS AS THEY RELATE TO THE GEF-SGP AND ITS FOCAL AREAS, AND ASSESS THEIR IMPACT ON SGP'S WORK AND PROGRAMME.</li> <li>• Contribute to the formulation of the Country Programme Strategy (CPS) and its biennium review and update;</li> <li>• Exercise quality control over the development of a portfolio of project ideas and concepts, and closely monitor the programme implementation progress and results;</li> <li>• Oversee the periodic stakeholder workshops and project development sessions for NGOs, Community Based Organizations (CBO) and local communities, and other stakeholders to explain about SGP, and provide advice to potential applicants in making the link between local environmental problems and the global concerns of the GEF focal areas and operational programmes;</li> <li>• Authorize and manage project planning grants as required.</li> <li>• Conduct periodic programme monitoring field visits and provide technical and operational support and guidance to SGP grantees as required;</li> <li>• Work closely with the National Steering Committee during the process of project proposal selection and approval, especially the initial appraisal of proposals and assessment of eligibility.</li> <li>• Foster operational and policy linkages between the GEF-SGP and the large or medium-sized GEF projects, planned or underway in the country, as well as those of other donors and development partners.</li> <li>• Manage the annual SGP allocations (administrative and grants), maintain the financial integrity of the programme, ensure most effective use of SGP resources;</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Oversee the SGP reporting requirements and the quality of submission and updating of the relevant UNOPS and SGP databases.</li> </ul>
20%	4.	<p><b>Resource Mobilization</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Establish and maintain close working relationships with stakeholders, advocate SGP policies, comparative advantages and initiatives, and ensure visibility.</li> <li>Assess programme interest and priorities of key donors and other development partners, develop SGP advocacy campaigns and develop/update the SGP Resource Mobilization Strategy;</li> <li>Identify opportunities and areas eligible for GEF-SGP support, and mobilize resources from the Government, donors and other partners to best leverage the GEF-SGP resources.</li> </ul>
15%	5.	<p><b>Knowledge Management</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assist in the preparation of SGP project/programme evaluation;</li> <li>Document lessons learned and best practices in SGP programme/project development, implementation, and oversight;</li> <li>Raise awareness of Programme Team on corporate strategic issues, plans and initiatives to maximize highest impact and effectiveness;</li> <li>Access UNDP's world-wide and regional knowledge, distill best practices and facilitate their dissemination within CO and to counterparts and partners;</li> <li>Document lessons learned and best practices in SGP programme development, implementation, and oversight;</li> <li>Actively network and acquire access to global best practices, share them with other local and international stakeholders and ensure their incorporation into the SGP portfolio and project design process;</li> </ul>

#### IV. IMPACT OF KEY RESULTS / KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

Sound programme development and build up, consistency of programme focus with national needs and priorities and in the GEF-SGP Strategic Framework and the focal areas, high efficiency in the use of resources to create maximum project/programme impact, and active promotion of knowledge management and sharing. Increased trust by clients and donors and increased opportunities for visibility, partnerships and co-financing.

## V. Qualifications and Skills Required:

<b>Education:</b>	Advanced university degree in environmental fields, Environmental Economics, Business Administration or similar field.
<b>Experience:</b>	At least 15 years of relevant experience in development work, which should include programme management, preferably with an extended specialized experience in any of the GEF-SGP focal areas at the national level. A minimum of 8 years of GEF-SGP experience required.
<b>Managerial skills</b>	Effective leadership skills demonstrated Excellent analytical and writing skills Experience in working with teams and managing people. Excellent communication and interpersonal skills. Good negotiation and problem-solving skills.
<b>Language requirements:</b>	Fluency in the official national language (must be one of the six UN languages) and English or a second UN language.
<b>IT skills</b>	Proficiency in standard computer software (word-processing, excel, presentations, databases and internet)

CPMT/NY  
Rev. March 2005

ANNEX II – II Programme Assistants

**POST PROFILE**

**I. IDENTIFICATION OF THE POST**

<b>Post Title:</b>	<b>Programme Assistant</b>	<b>Post Number:</b>	
<b>Organizational Unit:</b>	<b>GEF-SGP</b>	<b>Post Level:</b>	<b>GS-5</b>
<b>Country/Duty Station:</b>			
<b>Post Status:</b>	New		
<b>Post Type:</b>	Project-funded		
<b>Supervisor's Title:</b>	Project Manager (PM)	<b>Level:</b>	<b>NO-B</b>

**II. POST’S ORGANIZATIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY:**

Effective day-to-day substantive, administrative and financial support to the national SGP team and the National Steering Committee to ensure the smooth operation and management of the GEF-SGP (Global Environment Facility – Small Grants Programme) programme portfolio, timely and efficient response to queries from different grantees and stakeholders, closely monitoring the achievement of the national annual SGP delivery and co-financing targets, and updating of relevant databases .

**III. KEY RESULTS EXPECTED/MAJOR FUNCTIONAL ACTIVITIES**

<b>% of Time</b>		<b>Key Results Expected/Major Functional Activities</b>
<b>40%</b>	<b>1.</b>	<p><b>Support to Programme implementation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Contribute to day-to-day support to programme/project implementation and ensuring conformity to expected results, outputs, objectives and work-plans;</li> <li>• Assist the PM in prescreening project concepts and project proposals, and evaluate the financial part of the project proposals;</li> <li>• Assist the PM in development and amendment of application forms and other management tools, requirements of the programme and other SGP documents</li> <li>• Advise potential grantees on technical project preparation issues, and Report to PM and NSC on project development activities, as required;</li> <li>• Provide day-to-day support to new and already approved projects and the grantees, as required;</li> <li>• Assist the PM in project implementation and monitoring, including participation in field visits;;</li> <li>• Organize SGP advocacy events, workshops, round-tables, missions for PM and other SGP events;</li> <li>• Maintain working-level contacts with NGOs, governmental institutions, donors,</li> </ul>

		<p>other SGP stakeholders, and participate at events for SGP information dissemination purposes;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Draft progress reports and other reporting material to the CPMT, UNOPS and UNDP CO, and assist NC in preparation of semi-annual and bi-annual progress reports;</li> <li>• Draft articles, publications, speeches, letters, memos and other documents on behalf of PM, and respond to queries on SGP programme matter;</li> <li>• Create and maintain SGP project database and SGP stakeholders database;</li> <li>• Maintain and update the SGP website, SGP Global database and UNDP CO website with SGP information;</li> <li>• Support and assist PM as and when needed.</li> </ul>
30%	2.	<p><b>Financial Management</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review and process payment requests from grantees and vendors through obtaining necessary clearances and authorizations and ensuring payments are effected promptly;</li> <li>• Maintain financial integrity of the programme within UNDP CO and externally, implement and monitor accounting system and databases of SGP country operational budget;</li> <li>• Prepare and maintain the grant disbursement table and calendar;</li> <li>• Review financial reports submitted by grantees and advise the NC as required;</li> <li>• Draft administrative budget proposals;</li> <li>• Enter, extract, transfer data from ATLAS and SGP database and produce reports as required;</li> <li>• Provide other financial reports as required.</li> </ul>
25%	3.	<p><b>Administrative Functions</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Procure office equipment and furniture (including communication and audio equipment, supplies etc.).</li> <li>• Manage and organize everyday office work.</li> <li>• Establish a proper filing system and maintain files and documentation in good order;</li> <li>• Draft routine correspondence and communications;</li> <li>• Prepare background information and documentation, update data relevant to the programme areas and compile background material for the PM and NSC;</li> <li>• Ensure flow of information and dissemination of materials with all concerned;</li> <li>• Follow up of travel arrangements and DSA payments for thPM and NSC members.</li> <li>• Maintain personnel files, performance evaluation reports, leave records, and other pertinent personnel/consultant records.</li> <li>• Ensure all reporting and/or submission deadlines from HQs are met;</li> <li>• Provide logistical and other support to the local SGP team and visiting missions, as required.</li> </ul>
5%	4.	<p><b>Knowledge Management</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Actively support the SGP and the NSC teams in their efforts towards knowledge management and knowledge networking.</li> </ul>

#### IV. Qualifications and Skills Required:

Education:	First University degree, preferably in Business Administration or an environmental science field.
Experience:	At least 3-5 years of relevant experience in office management, including financial reporting;
Skills	<p>Previous working experience with a UN agency an asset.</p> <p>Good communications and interpersonal skills essential;</p> <p>Excellent drafting and analytical skills required.</p> <p>Good knowledge of budget control and financial management.</p>
Language requirements:	Fluency in the official national language (must be one of the 6 UN languages), and English/second language
IT skills:	Excellent knowledge of MS Office, database and Internet use.

CPMT/NY  
Rev. March 2005

## **ANNEX III: Country Program Strategy Outline**

### **1. THE SGP IN THE COUNTRY**

#### 1.1 Introduction to the GEF and the SGP

*For old SGP country programmes:*

#### 1.2 History of the GEF and the SGP in the country

#### 1.3 Previous operational context

#### 1.4 Overview of results achieved in last operational phase

#### 1.5 Key lessons learned from previous operational phase

### **2. BASELINE SITUATION AND CONTEXTUAL ANALYSIS**

#### 2.1. Country development context and analysis/assessment

##### 2.1.1 Physical

##### 2.1.2 Economic / Political

##### 2.1.3 Environmental analysis and key challenges

###### 2.1.3.1 On GEF focal areas

###### 2.1.3.2 On MEAs – Multilateral Environment Agreements

##### 2.1.4 Institution and governance context

###### 2.1.4.1 NGO / CBO analysis

###### 2.1.4.2 Government commitment and performance

##### 2.1.5 Gender issues and concerns

##### 2.1.6 Poverty related issues and concerns

##### 2.1.7 Indigenous peoples and knowledge

##### 2.1.8 Donor programming context (mapping)

###### 2.1.8.1 Opportunities for coordination and complementation

### **3. STRATEGIC DIRECTIONS**

#### 3.1 Introduction to the GEF / SGP current operational phase

#### 3.2 National priorities

#### 3.3 Local priorities

#### 3.4 SGP niche

#### 3.5 Cross-cutting themes

- Gender concerns

- Rights-based approach

#### 3.6 Defining Country Programme Impacts

##### 3.6.1 Environment – Global Environment Impacts

###### 3.6.1.1 Biodiversity

###### 3.6.1.2 Climate Change

###### 3.6.1.3 International Waters

###### 3.6.1.4 POPs

3.6.1.5 Land Degradation

3.6.1.6 Multi-focal impacts

3.6.2 Poverty Reduction Impacts  
- include possible contributions to MDGs

3.6.3 Empowerment Impacts

3.7 Country Program Outcomes and Key Indicators

3.8 Priorities for Year One

3.9 Priorities for Year Two

3.10 Priorities for Year Three

3.11 Resource Mobilization Strategy

3.11.1 Key partnerships to be established

3.11.2 Target levels of cash and in-kind cofinancing

3.12 Sustainability Strategy

3.12.1 Project level

3.12.2 Programme level

#### **4. MONITORING AND REPORTING**

4.1 Monitoring and Evaluation System

4.2 Reporting Plan

4.3 Knowledge Management System

#### **ANNEXES**

- a. Map of critical ecosystems and hotspots of the country
- b. Map of important GEF and other donor-supported projects of relevance to SGP coordination and complementation
- c. Map of existing and/or planned geographic focal areas for SGP projects

## **ANNEX IV-I: List of Indicators for SGP Global Impact Reporting**

**Note:** For each project, the relevant environmental, poverty reduction, and empowerment indicators will be selected from the list below as per project objectives and design. As the list represents the most important indicators the SGP has identified for its global reporting, the list therefore also serves to guide project design and development. The data resulting from the monitoring and measurement of these indicators from all projects in all participating countries will eventually be aggregated and analyzed through case studies, portfolio reviews and ex-post studies to produce reports of the programme's impact at the global level.

Not all SGP projects and grantees would be able to monitor and measure all the indicators as listed particularly in small, very focused, and simple projects by community-based organizations. Identification and monitoring of indicators will have to be very selective. Furthermore, surrogate measures will be used and then translated/computed into the values indicated in this list by the National Coordinator as they are inputted in the SGP database and submitted in annual reports. In certain cases, the SGP Central Programme Management Team (CPMT) focal area specialists would have to implement thematic case studies to assess the impact of such projects.

### **Global Environmental Indicators**

#### **Biodiversity (BD)**

1. Number of globally significant species protected by project.
2. Hectares of globally significant biodiversity area protected or sustainably managed by project.
3. Number of innovations or new technologies developed/applied.
4. Number of local policies informed in biodiversity focal area
5. Number of national policies informed in biodiversity focal area

#### **Climate Change (CC)**

1. Tonnes of CO<sub>2</sub> decreased or avoided by energy efficient and renewable energy technologies or applying environmentally sustainable transport practices introduced by SGP Project
2. Number of innovations or new technologies developed/applied
3. Number of local policies informed in climate change focal area
4. Number of national policies informed in climate change focal area

#### **International Waters (IW)**

1. Hectares of globally significant international water body or marine and coastal protected area sustainably managed or protected by SGP project
2. Hectares of fishing grounds or marine protected areas sustainably managed by project
3. Pollution discharge into International Water reduced
  - a. Kilogram (Kg) of Nitrogen (N) discharge into International Water reduced
  - b. Kilogram (Kg) of Phosphorus (P) discharge into International Water reduced
  - c. Gram per liter (g/L) of solids reduced
4. Number of innovations or new technologies developed/applied
5. Number of local policies informed in international waters focal area
6. Number of national policies informed in international waters focal area

## **Land Degradation (LD)**

1. Hectares of degraded land restored by project
2. Hectares of land sustainably managed by project
3. Tons of soil erosion prevented
4. Number of innovations or new technologies developed/applied
5. Number of local policies informed in land degradation focal area
6. Number of national policies informed in land degradation focal area

## **Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs)**

1. Reduction in the amount released into the environment or elimination of POPs through the SGP Project:
  - a. WHO-TEQ (Toxic Equivalency)/year reduction into the environment or elimination of U-POPs namely Dioxins, Furans and PCBs (Poly-chlorinated biphenyls) through the SGP project
  - b. Grams/year of Hexachlorobenzene (HCB - C<sub>6</sub>H<sub>6</sub>) eliminated or release into the environment prevented
  - c. Kilogram (Kg) of Heptachlor (C<sub>10</sub>H<sub>5</sub>Cl<sub>7</sub>) eliminated or release into the environment prevented
  - d. Kilogram (Kg) of Aldrin (also called Aldrec, Aldrex, Drinox, Octalene, Seedrin with chemical formula C<sub>12</sub>H<sub>8</sub>Cl<sub>6</sub>) eliminated or release into the environment prevented
  - e. Kilogram (Kg) of Dieldrin (also called Alvit, Octalox, Quintox with chemical formula C<sub>12</sub>H<sub>8</sub>Cl<sub>6</sub>O) eliminated or release into the environment prevented
  - f. Kilogram (Kg) of DDT (C<sub>14</sub>H<sub>9</sub>Cl<sub>5</sub>) eliminated or release into the environment prevented
  - g. Kilogram (Kg) of Endrin (C<sub>12</sub>H<sub>8</sub>Cl<sub>6</sub>O) eliminated or release into the environment prevented
  - h. Kilogram (Kg) of Chlordane (C<sub>10</sub>H<sub>6</sub>Cl<sub>8</sub>) eliminated or release into the environment prevented
  - i. Kilogram (Kg) of Mirex (C<sub>10</sub>H<sub>12</sub>) eliminated or release into the environment prevented
  - j. Kilogram (Kg) of Toxaphene (C<sub>10</sub>H<sub>10</sub>Cl<sub>8</sub>) eliminated or release into the environment prevented
2. Number of innovations or new technologies developed/applied
3. Number of local policies informed in POPs focal area
4. Number of national policies informed in POPs focal area

## **Poverty Reduction Indicators**

1. Total monetary value (US dollars) of ecosystem goods sustainably produced and providing benefit to project participants and/or community as a whole (in the biodiversity, international waters, and land degradation focal areas as appropriate)
2. Total monetary value (US dollars) of clean energy services provided to project participants and/or community as a whole (in the climate change focal area)
3. Increase in household income by increased income or reduced costs due to SGP project
4. Number of households who have benefited\* from SGP project
5. Number of individuals (gender diagggregated) who have benefited\* from SGP project

## **Empowerment Indicators**

1. Number of CBOs/NGOs participated/involved in SGP project
2. Number of CBOs/NGOs formed or registered through the SGP project
3. Number of women participated/involved in SGP project

4. Number of indigenous people participated/involved in SGP project
5. Number of value added labels/certifications/quality standards received or achieved
6. Innovative financial mechanisms put in place through SGP project
7. Number and type of support linkages established with local governments/authorities
8. Number and type of support linkages established with national government institutions
9. Total additional in cash or in kind support obtained for new initiatives and opportunities through SGP project (in US dollars)
10. Total additional in cash or in kind support obtained for sustaining, up-scaling, and replicating SGP supported project (in US dollars)

---

*\* Benefits are defined as any increase in material and spiritual wealth, food security, clean energy sources, health, education, and other conditions of well-being received by the community.*

**ANNEX V: Description of the SGP Impact Assessment System**

**Matrix of SGP’s Impact Assessment System**

	Project termination reports	Country Program Strategy	Semi-annual report	Annual Report	Biennial reports	Independent Evaluation	SGP Project Database/indicators	Thematic portfolio reviews	Case studies	Ex post studies
<i>“To monitor and evaluate results and impacts of GEF activities”<sup>8</sup></i>	X					X	x	X	x	X
<i>“To provide a basis for decision-making on amendments and improvements of policies, strategies, program management, procedures, and projects”</i>		X		X	x	X				
<i>“To promote accountability for resource use against objectives by participating countries, Partner Agencies, and executing agencies”</i>	X		X	X	X	X	x			
<i>“To document, provide feedback on, and disseminate results and lessons learned.”</i>	X							X	X	X

**X = indicates tool used to achieve M&E objectives**

**x = indicates tool that supports achievement of M&E objective**

<sup>8</sup> GEF M&E policies and procedures. P. 6

## **GEF SGP programming and context for impact assessment**

The GEF Small Grants Program currently comprises 85 Country Programs supported by a Central Program Management Team based at UNDP/New York. Each Country Program uses a Country Program Strategy to orient project identification and development. Each country's CPS unites the different projects around a strategic goal - more and more the CPS's are focused on a specific region and/or thematic area (e.g., rural renewable energy). Each CPS is developed drawing on analyses by the National Steering Committee of global, national and regional priorities manifested in such documents as NBSAPs, NAPs, NIPS, etc. This framework – national priorities grounded in a regional focus – provides the basis for identifying desired Country Program impacts and outcomes. Individual projects are thus identified and supported if they fulfill the essential criteria of contributing to meeting the CPS' desired Impacts and Outcomes.

While projects produce impacts at the local level, the ensemble of projects within a Country Program produce results that are synergistic and lead to impacts that are greater than just the sum of individual project results. When analyzing the impacts of individual projects on the production of global benefits, it is important that they are assessed in the context of Country Program efforts to produce broader outcomes and objectives in keeping with the global and national priorities found in the NBSAPs, NIPS, NAPs, etc. Individual project impacts by themselves have little impact on the global environment, but, through synergy among projects at the region level, their impacts contribute concretely to global benefits through their effect on the national priorities found in Convention-related strategies and plans.

The above programming and impact assessment structure should be kept in mind when considering the current SGP M&E system and the proposed reforms to it.

### **The current SGP Monitoring and Evaluation system**

SGP Monitoring & Evaluation is currently framed within the GEF context for M&E. As stated in the "GEF M&E Policies and Procedures". M&E policy at the GEF has four objectives:

- a) To monitor and evaluate **results** and **impacts** of GEF activities
- b) To provide a basis for **decision-making** on amendments and improvements of policies, strategies, program management, procedures, and projects
- c) To promote **accountability** for resource use against objectives by participating countries, Partner Agencies, and executing agencies
- d) To document, provide feedback on, and disseminate results and **lessons learned.**" (M&E policies and procedures. P. 6)

The current SGP M&E Framework describes tools and processes focused on capturing Impacts achieved by SGP projects and Country Programs.

Various studies produced by and for the SGP Program point to the contributions already being made to, or the achievement of, SGP/Global Impacts, through SGP projects and Country Programs. The recently finished Ex-post Studies of SGP projects note a variety of impacts and lessons learned from a sampling of 128 SGP projects and from the program as a whole.

Overall, Country Programs have started to identify and assess SGP project impacts over time. The Mexico program, for example, has been able to assess the direct global benefits of community-based biodiversity conservation and climate change mitigation activities over a period of ten years. The Brazil program has recently produced an assessment of the program's impacts over the past ten years.

A careful analysis of the current framework indicates that the SGP M&E system tends to be a) *strongest* in maintaining accountability for resource use (evidenced by multiple reports throughout the project cycle), b) *strong* in documenting and disseminating results and lessons learned through a variety of review processes (evidenced by portfolio, thematic and ex post studies), c) *in need of strengthening* in the area of providing the information and knowledge needed as a basis for decision making, primarily at the Country Program level, and d) *in need of strengthening* in the area of reporting on results and impacts at the global and country program levels.

The current SGP M&E system requires strengthening if the SGP is to enhance Country Program performance. Performance is based on the ability to identify desired impacts, outcomes and outputs (essentially, programming), monitor implementation and generation of results, and produce knowledge from analyses of the results and use it to adapt Country Program functioning in pursuit of strategic goals.

By using common tools in programming (e.g. results-based framework, common indicators), individual project results can be systematized for reliable reporting on both country (CPS Impacts and Outcomes) and broad global level results. The Country Program Strategy needs modification in order for it to become an effective adaptive management tool – this will require the integration of a results-based planning approach which uses logically derived, measurable targets and indicators that can provide the basis for analysis and learning. At the same time, the system needs to be able to report on impacts to donors and other stakeholders in a timely and cost-effective fashion.

### **The Country Program Strategy**

To increase the potential for project impacts and learning, SGP has revised the approach and format of the Country Program Strategy so that it builds on a results-based planning framework consisting broadly of a rising hierarchy of Outputs, Outcomes and Impacts. As part of this strengthening of the CPS, Country Programs are encouraged to focus geographically and/or thematically so that projects can achieve synergies among themselves and the Country Program can take advantage of economies of scale where possible, reducing administrative and support costs. Project synergies are leveraged as a result of a program approach that identifies Outcomes to be sought at the level of the geographic region (e.g., Yucatan) or thematic area (e.g., biogas) - Outputs leading to the desired Outcomes are produced by one or more small grants projects. Synergies among projects within a geographical focus will allow for potentially greater learning as well as an increased capacity to identify and negotiate donor and other support and develop innovative approaches to longer-term sustainability (e.g. policy reforms; market development).

In a results-based planning framework, each level of results is accompanied by specific targets and indicators so that progress and/or success in achieving Outcomes and Outputs can be assessed. Individual project results are evaluated in terms of the project's own objectives as well as in terms of the contribution of the project to a broader Output or Outcome. Indicators are the primary instrument for generation of information to be used as a basis for assessing performance, impact and lessons learned at project, Country Program and global levels. For project results to be broadly comparable at the country and global levels, common indicators are a requirement.

### **Targets and Indicators**

The indicator system devised by SGP to accompany the CPS will have two primary uses: one, it will produce data to inform the management of the individual Country Programmes and their pursuit of strategic Outcomes and Impacts at the geographic and/or thematic levels and two, a subset of these indicators will produce data for reports to GEF Council demonstrating the broad global impacts of the

SGP global portfolio. These two products, together with the data to be used to generate lessons for dissemination across the SGP global portfolio, represent the three central objectives of the SGP monitoring and evaluation practice.

In assessing project results, the SGP will rely on a minimum standard set of indicators, derived from the program-level impacts identified by GEF for each focal area. Each project will be required to use at least one according to project focal area. For example, project managers aiming at using globally important mangroves sustainably would choose at least one from a set of five biodiversity indicators (hectares of globally important biodiversity area sustainably managed). For each focal area there is a standard set of indicators of this type. Targets are determined as a logical step in project design (e.g., 50 hectares of globally important biodiversity area sustainably managed).

Separate sets of indicators have also been developed for sustainable livelihoods and community empowerment, given that SGP is also interested in assessing the performance of projects in terms of their effects on income generation and risk reduction, as well as stakeholder participation and capacity development.

Indicators have been standardized to facilitate aggregation and systematization of similar data at the global level (rolling up), and ultimately reporting on impacts and global benefits. It must be made clear, however, that this system is incapable of producing scientifically precise measurements of global impacts (accounting) given the extremely wide variety of conditions and circumstances surrounding the range of projects under implementation at any one time and the conditions under which impacts are assessed in 85 different countries<sup>9</sup>.

Accuracy of assessment will depend on the methods used to calculate and/or measure changes to the baseline. In certain focal areas, dependable methods are available that can provide a reasonable estimate of change (e.g., GHG emissions avoided; reduction in nitrogen, phosphorus in water or pesticide elimination) but in others the methods of estimation leave room for differing margins of error (soil erosion prevented; hectares of area protected or sustainably managed, etc.).

The IAS and its tools must remain simple and cost-effective, as the scope of SGP sectoral/thematic and geographic coverage is wide, but the present capacity of projects to report and their funding levels are currently limited. In this sense, the IAS is expected to evolve over time, through input from various countries and program stakeholders, experience, and changes to the program as a whole. On the whole, the capacities of National Coordinators and NSC members to assess impacts can and must be strengthened.

The SGP Impact Assessment System will combine these tools with other elements of the current M&E practice, such as the ex-post studies and portfolio reviews. The enhanced system itself will be piloted in a select number of Country Programs to identify potential problems or opportunities for greater effectiveness, before extending the system to all Country Programs world-wide.

The IAS is backed by and linked to *an upgraded database system* structured to better capture impacts and results, as well as key indicators and performance assessment generally. The current database has been an

---

<sup>9</sup> The total number of projects funded per year by SGP will increase from around 1000 - 1200 in Year One to approximately 1400 - 1700 by the end of Year Three.<sup>9</sup> At any one time, there may be as many as 2,000 projects under implementation addressing a large variety of issues - basically covering as many as 15 GEF Operational Programs and all Strategic Priorities with a wide variety of possible local permutations, each one dictated by a range of local factors (ecological, global significance, socio-economic, cultural, policy frameworks, etc.) in around 85 countries.

important monitoring tool and will continue now to serve impact assessment with the new indicator system. The IAS and upgraded database will not only track quantitative information but also qualitative.

Enhanced monitoring of and reporting on projects and country programs, with support by a database that systematizes reporting, should facilitate key reporting on impacts and help to demonstrate the link between projects, Country Programs and the global level. The IAS therefore also comprises an enhanced focus on performance assessment and the use of indicators, to both track progress and report on successes and challenges. This will allow the SGP to be able to ‘tell a story’ about achievements of and contributions made to Impacts that is coherent and consistent, and that meets requirements of the Council.

Each project and set of projects in a particular country program also achieve other impacts, which can be considered as being more ‘operational’ or management-related; the SGP program itself will also generate such impacts. These operational results include, but are not limited to, the following areas, and are linked to expected results from the OP3 logical framework:

- Replication of SGP Initiatives/Catalytic Effects/SGP Program Expansion (linked to Outcome 1)
- Resources mobilized, leveraged/Co-financing levels (linked to Outcome 5)
- Linkages with other GEF projects and non-GEF projects (linked to Outcome 6)
- Knowledge Management/Lesson learning and dissemination (linked to Outcome 4)
- M&E systems and processes, and reporting (linked to Outcome 2 and Outcome 4)

These key areas of results are, in fact, fundamental to the SGP program, as these are vital for its continued growth and success, as well as being important to program sustainability and ongoing improvement. The IAS will therefore also facilitate and emphasize reporting on these key results, as projects, countries, and the global program are expected to report to the GEF Council on achievements made in these areas. Therefore, in addition, Country Program Strategies will be required to list expected results in these areas, in the context of strategies prepared for their achievement, and will be expected to report on them over time.

**Annex VI: Knowledge products for various target users and their dissemination strategy**

<i>Knowledge Products/Services</i>	<i>Target Users</i>	<i>Key Objective</i>	<i>Dissemination Strategy</i>
<b>Learning by Doing – SGP Approach working paper</b>	Donors, UNDP CO	Advocacy IAs	SGP website EEG Network, Intranet SURF's, NGO Networks
<b>Portfolio Impact of CPS (Country Programme Strategies)</b>	UNDP CO, GEF Council Donors, Nat'l Gov'ts	Show impact of SGP projects	Mainstream media GEF Council Meetings Global Meetings
<b>Thematic Working Papers</b>	Donors, NCs, UNDP COs, UNDP, IAs	Learning	International fora (COPs), EEG Network, NGO networks
<b>Resource Kits</b>	NCs, NSCs, Donors	Mainstreaming, Learning	SGP website/intranet, GEF intranet, EEG Network
<b>Publications for Outreach – 2 page factsheets, SGP Brochure</b>	Donors, IAs, UNDP	Outreach	SGP website, EEG Network
<b>SGP Website</b>	Donor, UNDP, UNDO COs, GEF Secretariat, GEF Council, Communities, Public-at-large	Outreach/Learning	Links from GEF, UNDP-GEF websites, EEG workspace
<b>SGP Intranet</b>	NCs, CPMT, UNDP-GEF	Information sharing/Learning	SGP website, SGP workspace
<b>Ex-Post Study case studies</b>	Donors, NCs, UNDP, GEF Sec	Impact: to show impact of completed SGP projects	SGP website, workspace, print

## **Annex VII: GEF SGP Ex-Post Study Summary**

### **Background and Rationale**

The Global Environment Facility Small Grants Programme (GEF SGP) assists NGOs and CBOs to implement projects benefiting the global environment, livelihoods and empowerment of vulnerable sectors since 1992. Since then SGP has undergone three independent evaluations - in 1995, 1999, and 2004. These evaluations have suggested that an analysis of project impacts beyond the grant period would be worthwhile, especially since many impacts may not appear until several years after SGP projects are completed, and, even then may be difficult to measure.

As a consequence, the design of an Ex Post Study was initiated for SGP beginning in 2003 at the SGP Global Workshop in Nairobi with the participation of National Coordinators, National Steering Committee members and the Central Planning and Management Team (CPMT). After lengthy participatory consultations, project goals, objectives and methodology were identified and a methodological guidebook was prepared.

### **Goal and Objectives:**

The over-arching goal of the ex post study was to assess the impacts of projects supported by SGP as well as their contribution to achieving global environmental benefits. The ex post study, as a pilot exercise, aimed to assess how SGP might better track impacts over time, seeking to document longer-term project impacts, especially those related to global environmental benefits.

The four main objectives of the ex post study were the following:

- 1) Assess the sustainability of the outputs of selected SGP projects;
- 2) Describe the direct and indirect impacts of the selected SGP projects;
- 3) Identify (and where possible quantify) those impacts that contribute to achieving global environmental benefits;
- 4) Explore elements of project design that address land degradation and reduce the vulnerability of communities to the adverse effects of climate change,
- 5) Derive lessons learned for better project selection, implementation, and monitoring and evaluation towards greater benefits.

### **Methodology and Results:**

Given the diverse nature of SGP's grant portfolio, and the decentralized structure of the programme, the ex post study's methodology was designed to be flexible enough to apply to individual projects, whilst retaining coherence across countries and focal areas.

The following steps were taken based on the methodology of the ex post study:

1. Identification of countries to be part of the study,
2. Identification of projects in selected countries to be studied,
3. Identification and contracting of country study teams,
4. On- and off-site research on project case studies and reporting of country case studies,
5. Independent review and editing of project reports for quality control,
6. Preliminary Reporting on Lessons Learned for the global study,
7. Identification of possible analytical methods and knowledge management products.

### **IDENTIFICATION OF COUNTRIES TO BE PART OF THE STUDY**

Countries included in the study were all those that had four projects eligible for the ex post study. These projects needed to have been initiated prior to 1999, in the pilot or first phase of SGP operation with the aim of studying them at least three years after completion. As a result the following 32 countries were

included in the ex post study: Belize, Bolivia, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Chile, Costa Rica, Cote d'Ivoire, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ghana, Guatemala, India, Indonesia, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Mali, Mauritius, Mexico, Pakistan, Philippines, Poland, Senegal, Sri Lanka, Tanzania, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Zimbabwe.

#### **IDENTIFICATION OF PROJECTS IN SELECTED COUNTRIES TO BE STUDIED**

A stratified random sampling was conducted to select the projects to be studied from 1,214 potentially eligible projects. Stratification was based on countries selected, the ratio of focal areas in the total number of projects and number of focal area projects in a given country. As a result 128 projects out of 1,214 were selected in 32 countries, constituting a representative sample of about 10% of all projects completed between 1992 and 1999.

#### **IDENTIFICATION AND CONTRACTING OF COUNTRY STUDY TEAMS,**

SGP Country Programmes were informed in October 2004 of the selected case studies in their countries and were sent the methodology of the ex post study, the terms of reference for the country study teams, and team selection criteria. From a list of a minimum of three independent candidate research institutes, universities, and NGOs, and in a few cases national consultants, qualified institutions were selected by the corresponding NSCs. By February 2005, CPMT and UNOPS approved and finalized contractual agreements with 32 study teams to conduct the ex post study.

#### **ON AND OFF SITE RESEARCH ON PROJECT CASE STUDIES AND REPORTING OF COUNTRY CASE STUDIES**

Ex post study teams composed of a team leader and a small number of team members (3-5, depending upon the circumstances), who worked together to carry out the research and writing of all case studies for that country. The research was carried out using the detailed standard ex post methodology and was written in the format provided by the sample ex post study report.

#### **INDEPENDENT REVIEW AND EDITING OF PROJECTS REPORTS FOR QUALITY CONTROL,**

The completed draft case study reports were directly sent by study teams to an independent consultant (IC) for review and comment. NCs, NSC members or CPMT did not suggest any revisions nor were they involved in the acceptance of reports. All 128 reports from 32 countries were accepted by the IC after revisions.

#### **INITIAL REPORTING ON LESSONS LEARNT FOR THE GLOBAL STUDY**

As part of the contract the IC was requested to prepare an initial analysis of SGP ex post case studies after reading 128 reports, and to provide some lessons learned that could be used to take some initial steps towards a more successful programme. The ex post study was especially valuable in deriving some initial lessons aimed at achieving greater impacts and benefits, and to contribute towards SGP's M&E Framework. Once a full and systematic analysis has been done, these benefits are expected to be even greater.

#### **Initial Report on the Ex Post Study**

The projects ranged from those with a clear GEF focus and benefits to projects with no discernable impacts on the environment. Many projects involved efforts to popularize new technologies (solar, stoves, water desalination, waste conversion). Training and awareness campaigns, tree planting and growing of medicinal plants were also among the most popular outputs. In a large number of projects, the issue of markets for a specific product was crucial to the outcome (Brazil palm nut, Pakistan tree plantation, Mexico local medicinal plants).

## **IMPACTS**

The best projects were able to achieve clear impacts at the scale of an entire community (e.g. Indonesia Hydropower increased the availability of electricity from about 50 households to 360 households with better wattage and without generating greenhouse gases). The most common socio-economic benefits appear to be some infrastructure (e.g. a borehole, public toilets, sanitation system), new income opportunities, and an infusion of cash into the community. Claims of impacts on policy were frequent, but often very difficult to support by evidence, however, there were exceptional cases in which policy influence was achieved by a project (e.g. Philippines Coastal Resources Management, which could make a supported claim to have influenced the Infanta municipal government's policies toward regulating the use of coastal resources).

## **GLOBAL ENVIRONMENTAL BENEFITS**

In regard to global environmental benefits the projects ranged from those having very specific and measurable benefits (numbers of endangered turtles saved - *Trinidad and Tobago Leatherback Turtle*, *Belize marine turtle protection*), numbers of tree, herb, medicinal plant species planted and protected (*India ITWWS*), increased access to power without generating additional greenhouse emissions through installation of solar panels (*Kenya Kinamba*) to those having no such benefits. At their best, projects were able to produce measurable results at the scale of an entire community. *Tunisia Forest*, for example, reduced the wood cut by 500 targeted households by 55 tons annually. However, a number of projects were unable to document claims of environmental impacts or to build a strong case for making a difference with regards to species or ecosystem conservation. Most of the projects in this category are those that were essentially about some combination of capacity building and awareness-raising rather than about direct conservation activities.

## **SUSTAINABILITY OF PROJECT BENEFITS**

A large number of projects were able to sustain project benefits by generating outputs that did not require continued external financing or interventions (*Kenya Kinamba Solar Power*). In *Turkey Wastewater and Sanitation*, the high degree of community involvement from the beginning of the project meant that the community regularly cleans the filter in a filtration pond, making the whole system work smoothly. Projects that involved tree planting requiring little or no care and are owned by those who planted them also sustained benefits, as in the case of *Indonesia Sumatra*. On the other hand, a number of projects had mechanisms for sustaining benefits which were insufficient in the medium term (*Ghana Sango Lagoon*, *Senegal Water Pollution*, *Mauritius Medplant*).

## **LESSONS LEARNED**

The ex post study highlighted several good and bad examples of project design and implementation affecting project success. For projects to succeed, NCs and NSCs should select projects that:

- Show clear alignment with GEF eligibility criteria,
- Have specific objectives with measurable outcomes and impacts,
- Have done preliminary analysis of socio-economic and political power relations in the community and implications for project implementation,
- Have broad community participation in project planning and execution from the beginning,
- Have identified potential sources of economic conflict among stakeholders and strategies for avoiding or minimizing them,
- Will be executed by a NGO or CBO that has the requisite experience and administrative capability to carry out the project and is not a front for a government or private institution.

## **PROJECT DESIGN**

Project objectives should be stated precisely and simply as should the strategy for achieving them. The best projects tend to be those that are clearest about the conservation or other environmental objectives and consequently call for activities that contribute directly to them. One example of such a successful project, based on a simple and straightforward project concept, was the *Sri Lanka Chilaw Lagoon* project, which used the grant to establish a mangrove nursery and to restore 16 acres of denuded mangrove vegetation around the estuary.

### *Awareness-Raising*

Awareness-raising projects tended to suffer from being unable to demonstrate their positive impacts on the environment. Projects with awareness-raising components need to be evaluated and selected by NSCs in consideration of how they might be related more directly to achievement of project outputs.

### *Technological Choices in Project Design*

Projects based on the right technological choice are successful (*Cote d'Ivoire Improved Ovens*, for example), but inadequate research on the fit between the technology and local needs and preferences appears to be a frequent problem with such projects. For example, *Mali Solar Cookers* did not find acceptance, because of limits on both the number of days it could be used and the dishes that could be prepared with it.

### *The Importance of Planning for Markets in Project Design*

The degree of success of projects that involve the harvesting, production and sale of an ecosystem good is dependent on adequate, stable and reliable markets for products. Markets can be a significant element in success or failure of a project. In the case of *Brazil Palm Nut*, marketing development and establishment of canteens to sell the palm nut were central elements of the project's objectives.

## **COMMUNITY BUY-IN**

Community participation and buy-in is a strong predictor of project success. To enjoy such participation and buy-in, the project must usually have carried out consultations with the community, and must have reflected community perceptions of their needs, before project design was completed. Furthermore, it must reflect a strong role by significantly broad elements in the community, rather than a small group, in implementing the project.

## **STRONG COMMUNITY-BASED ORGANIZATIONS**

Strong community-based organizations, reflecting community awareness of the issue in question and of its own interests in it, as well as reasonably strong local organizational capacity, is also associated with successful projects. These are not necessarily the organizations that implement the project. What is more important is their active community involvement in and support for the project.

## **POWER INEQUALITIES AND UNDUE INFLUENCE BY GOVERNMENT**

Power inequalities in the project community have multiple implications for project implementation – all negative. Before providing a grant to a community, NCs and NSCs should make sure that the process will not be dominated by a few powerful individuals or groups. For example, in the Indonesia Loa Bakung project, in which people were not clearly informed by the local government as to what their rights were under the project, they ended their involvement by simply walking away from it. The Ghana Sango Lagoon project had great interest from government leaders, but little community involvement and apparently no involvement of women, suggesting a problem of power inequality as well.

### **OVER-RELIANCE ON A SPECIFIC INDIVIDUAL**

Projects should not rely on a particular individual, but need to involve a team of able participants. A single person can be a serious liability because of the risk that the person will leave the project through illness, death, a move away, or otherwise. A number of projects (see *Tanzania Kaoli Biogas*, for example) suffered serious setbacks for this reason.

### **CONFLICT OF INTEREST AMONG STAKEHOLDERS**

NSCs should confirm that there are no large conflicts within the community and, if they arise at a later stage, help resolve conflicts. Conflicts among stakeholders can be a serious problems with projects, particular those involving small business opportunities for beneficiaries. Examples are *Mauritius Medplants*, *Brazil Cipo* and *Chile Solar Cookers*.

### **GRANTEE CAPACITIES**

The capacity and integrity of the grantee organization is a primary factor in the outcome of the project. In a number of projects the implementing organization lacked the requisite organizational and/or technical capacity to undertake implementation, had a critically weak link or was taking advantage of the project. For example, *Indonesia TelukBintuni* collapsed well before termination because the implementing organization had only one year of experience and lacked the organizational capacity and technical knowledge to carry out such a project.

### **Knowledge Management Products**

Using the expost case studies - more than 1500 pages of distilled project descriptions - the following knowledge management products may be produced:

- STATISTICAL DATA COMPILATION,
- CATEGORICAL PROJECT REVIEWS,
- Thematic Reviews (project design and success, awareness-raising, sustainability, the role of markets, technology choice, policy impact, community indicators of impact),
- A Model Ex Post Methodology and Monitoring and Evaluation of SGP Projects.

### **Conclusion and Next Steps**

The ex post study of 128 SGP projects in 32 countries has been completed with the participation of 32 select institutions and teams. These projects constitute 10% of all SGP projects initiated before 1999 and completed at least 3 years ago.

In the future, the produced reports will be made available to the SGP network for further analysis and preparation of knowledge products. These knowledge management products will be disseminated to NCS, NSCs, grantees, donors, other partners, and other Implementing Agencies of the GEF

The ex post study has already been replicated in some countries like Lithuania, where the methodology was used and the results of which have informed measures to improve the country programme, specifically in better developing, selecting and implementing SGP projects. SGP plans in the future to mainstream the ex post methodology into the larger SGP Impact Assessment System and further replicate it in country programmes through use of local resources and partnerships established through the global SGP ex post study.

The 128 case study reports produced are a “one-of-a-kind” product that will not only inform GEF SGP regarding how to design and implement successful small grants with lasting policy and environmental

impacts, but SGP hopes that it will also be used by other agencies and donors that support environmental projects while improving livelihoods and empowerment of the world's most vulnerable communities.

### **Annex VIII-I: Programme Specialist Sustainable Land Management/ Monitoring and Evaluation (L3)**

Under the supervision of the GEF SGP Global Manager and Deputy Global Manager, the incumbent will:

- Keep track of developments in the implementation of the Convention to Combat Desertification (CCD) and other multilateral environmental treaties related to sustainable land management (SLM) relevant to the GEF SGP;
- Act as the GEF SGP focal point for discussions between the GEF Secretariat, STAP and the GEF implementing agencies regarding implementation of the CCD;
- Advise SGP country programmes during the regular revision of country programme strategies (CPS);
- Provide technical assistance and backstopping to SGP country programmes regarding information on relevant SLM approaches; responding to national coordinators' queries on project eligibility; facilitating up-scaling of SLM projects; screening and promoting SGP strategic projects;
- Prepare project write-ups and contribute to publications in collaboration with the GEF SGP Knowledge Management specialist;
- Provide strategic guidance to SGP country programmes on Monitoring & Evaluation (M&E) issues pertaining to participatory community-based approaches to project assessment;
- Contribute to the implementation of the SGP M&E framework by reviewing SGP statutory reports; monitoring information quality in the database; preparing statistical and quantitative analysis of trends in the database; identifying lessons learned and best practices; and supporting the preparation of GEF Council reports.

## **Annex VIII-II: Programme Specialist Partnerships/Special Projects (L3)**

Under the supervision of the GEF SGP Global Manager and Deputy Global Manager, the incumbent will:

- Keep track of all major partnerships established by GEF SGP with institutions at the international level including the private sector, volunteer organizations, investment funds, major environmental foundations, and conservation organizations;
- Act as the GEF SGP focal point for liaison with the UN Office for Project Services (UNOPS) in all operational matters including country programme arrangements for SGP, national host institutions, as well as career development for national coordinators and programme assistants;
- Liaise with other GEF implementing agencies concerning mainstreaming modalities where the SGP operational approach is adopted by GEF medium and full-sized projects, as well as with equivalent mainstreaming activities with other donors;
- Ensure operational efficiency for all GEF SGP sub-regional programmes involving small island developing states (SIDS) in the Pacific, Caribbean and other regions where relevant;
- Advise SGP country programmes on technical matters pertaining to relations with the private sector including community business plans, local entrepreneurs, small-scale product marketing, certification and labeling standards;
- Provide support to the four GEF SGP technical programme specialists covering the relevant focal areas of the GEF with regard to operational aspects of partnership development, implementation and reporting requirements to donors;
- Provide backstopping assistance for cross-cutting partnerships relating to SGP's contribution to the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), and legal empowerment of the poor;
- Contribute to other SGP CPMT activities such as resources mobilization, preparation of reports to the GEF Council, and communications as directed by the Global Manager.