

GEF Council  
November 16-18, 2010  
Washington, D.C.

Agenda Item 12

**WORK PROGRAM**  
**SUBMITTED FOR GEF COUNCIL APPROVAL**

**Recommended Council Decision**

The Council, having reviewed document GEF/C.39/5, *Work Program Submitted for GEF Council Approval*, approves the work program contained therein, comprising \_\_\_\_ project concepts, subject to comments made during the Council meeting and additional comments that may be submitted, in writing to the Secretariat by December 2, 2010.

The approved work program is comprised of the following \_\_\_\_ Project Identification Forms (PIFs):

[List of free-standing PIFs]

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1. This is the first work program presented for GEF Council review and approval in GEF-5. This is also the first work program under the System for Transparent Allocation of Resources (STAR) that is being implemented in three focal areas, i.e. biodiversity, climate change and land degradation.
2. Constituting this work program was a challenge for the GEF Secretariat and its partners. As part of the GEF-5 replenishment process, focal area strategies were developed to consider result-based management frameworks. Together, with the GEF-5 policy recommendations, centered on enhancing country ownership, and improving the effectiveness and efficiency of the GEF partnership, the overarching objective was to focus on impacts through GEF-5 programming.
3. A total of 37 Project Identification Forms (PIFs) were reviewed by the GEF Secretariat towards consideration for this work program. While reviewing the proposals, in addition to the technical quality of the proposals, the GEF Secretariat paid particular attention to: (i) the incremental explanations of the proposal, based on the clarity of the baseline project; (ii) the comparative advantage of the GEF Agency; (iii) the alignment with GEF strategies and reforms; and (iv) the utilization of resources from the country's allocations under the STAR. Most of the proposals did not respond to GEF-5 goals and policies.

### **Incrementality**

4. The GEF finances incremental costs of projects. Therefore, it is important that proposals be based on a clear articulation of the baseline and its financing, and the incremental activities proposed for GEF financing. In this work program, most of the project proposals did not articulate how the baseline was constructed and financed. Several projects proposed relatively low levels of cofinancing with the attendant risk of the GEF financing all or part of the baseline.

### **Comparative Advantage of the GEF Agency**

5. Several proposals did not align with the comparative advantage of Agencies in terms of their institutional mandates and strategies, the amount of cofinancing the Agency is bringing to the project, and the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country. During replenishment discussions, some Agencies expressed skepticism of the national portfolio formulation exercises (NPFs) and that in some cases there may be redundancies given the planning processes that the Agencies undertake with countries such as the Country Assistance Strategies (CASs), and UN Development Assistance Frameworks (UNDAFs). However, while reviewing the PIFs, it was not evident that planning exercises were located within the context of such strategies. Furthermore, some Agencies submitted proposals that overlapped with the mandates of other GEF Agencies. While countries can indeed choose the GEF Agency that they would like to work with, it is critical that the Agency meets the comparative advantage criteria in order to avoid heavy transaction costs for the GEF.

## **GEF-5 Strategies and Reforms**

6. Proposals were reviewed for responsiveness to the results-driven agenda and strategic objectives of GEF-5. Some proposals proposed pilot projects that were so small that there seem to be no potential for scale-up towards achieving impact. Other proposals requested significant GEF grants to develop policies without any reference to implementation/enforcement plans for such policies.

### **STAR Allocation of Countries**

7. The Secretariat reviewed proposals for evidence of clear country ownership regarding use of STAR allocations and that the proposed PIF is the best use of such resources. Some PIFs were requesting close to full use of the resources available under the STAR. In particular, for those countries with full flexibility to use their STAR allocations, there was no corresponding evidence of country ownership nor did the proposal demonstrate that it was the best use of the allocation.

## **The Proposed Work Program**

8. In summary, very few proposals qualified for the work program. Given these circumstances, and the fact that the level of resources available in the GEF Trust Fund was limited, in addition to the Small Grants Program, the Secretariat proposes four full-sized PIFs for the work program.

9. The proposed work program consists of five new proposals, including the Small Grants Program, requesting GEF project grants totaling \$150.69 million (see Annex A for the financial details of proposals). Associated with these proposals are requests for Agency fees to meet the project cycle management costs, totaling \$6.99 million. In total, \$157.68 million is requested from the GEF Trust Fund.

10. To further improve transparency, starting with this first work program in GEF-5, the GEF Secretariat review sheet for each PIF will henceforth be posted on the GEF website along with the PIF proposals.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

MAIN FEATURES OF THE PROPOSED WORK PROGRAM .....	1
STATUS OF THE USE OF GEF-5 RESOURCES .....	1
DISTRIBUTION OF GEF PROJECT GRANTS BY FOCAL AREA AND REGION .....	2
DISTRIBUTION OF PROPOSALS BY GEF AGENCY .....	3
COFINANCING .....	3
GEF FOCAL AREA STRATEGIES AND THE WORK PROGRAM .....	4
GEOGRAPHIC BALANCE OF PROJECTS IN THE WORK PROGRAM .....	5
INNOVATIVE ELEMENTS AND REPLICATION POTENTIAL .....	5
RESOURCE PROGRAMMING IMPLICATIONS .....	6
SUMMARY OF THE STAND-ALONE PIFs IN THE NOVEMBER 2010 WORK PROGRAM .....	7

### **List of Annexes:**

Annex A: Project Proposals Submitted for Council Approval, November 2010

Annex B: Historical Trend Analysis

### **List of Tables:**

Table 1: GEF Resources Requested in the November 2010 Work Program by Focal Area

Table 2: Status of Resources Programmed under GEF-5 by Focal Area and Corporate Program

Table 3: Distribution of GEF Project Grants in the November 2010 Work Program by Region and Focal Area

Table 4: Distribution of Proposals by Agency in the November 2010 Work Program

Table 5: Distribution of Cofinancing in the November 2010 Work Program by Cofinanciers

*It is requested that Council Members send their technical comments electronically (in Word file) to the GEF Secretariat's program coordination registry at: [gcoordination@TheGEF.org](mailto:gcoordination@TheGEF.org) by December 2, 2010.*

## MAIN FEATURES OF THE PROPOSED WORK PROGRAM

1. The work program presented by the Secretariat for GEF Council review and approval is the first work program in GEF-5. This is also the first work program under the System for Transparent Allocation of Resources (STAR) in the biodiversity, climate change and land degradation focal areas.
2. The proposed work program consists of five new FSP proposals, documented in PIFs, requesting GEF project grants totaling \$150.69 million (see Annex A for the financial details of these proposals). Associated with these proposals are requests for fees totaling \$6.99 million for the GEF Agencies to meet the project cycle management costs, resulting in a total request of \$157.68 million from the GEF Trust Fund.
3. Table 1 shows the amount of GEF resources requested in this work program totaling \$157.68 million and the number of projects by focal area. This table shows the number of projects with attribution to a single focal area. Multi-Focal Area (MFA) <sup>1</sup> is listed in a separate line and does not distribute allocations to each focal area that may be involved.

**Table 1. GEF Resources Requested in the November 2010 Work Program by Focal Area (\$ million)**

<b>Focal Area</b>	<b>Number of Projects</b>	<b>GEF Project Grant</b>	<b>Agency Fees*</b>	<b>Total GEF Resources Requested in this WP</b>
Biodiversity	2	6.43	0.64	7.07
Climate Change	1	7.09	0.71	7.80
Multi-focal	1	134.62	5.38	140.00
Ozone Depleting Substances	1	2.55	0.26	2.81
<b>Total</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>150.69</b>	<b>6.99</b>	<b>157.68</b>

\* With the exception of SGP with Agency fee at 4%, Agency fees are normally calculated as 10 percent of the GEF Project Grant (new request for Council approval) plus PPG fees that have not been paid previously at the time the PPG was approved by the CEO.

## STATUS OF THE USE OF GEF-5 RESOURCES

4. This is the first work program since GEF-5 replenishment became effective on July 19, 2010. Total resources programmed for GEF-5 to date, including Agency fees, amount to \$157.68 million, as shown in Table 2. This represents 3.75% of the original target allocations available in GEF-5.

<sup>1</sup> MFA projects are projects that may involve funding from different focal areas. However, in this work program, the Small Grants Program is the only multifocal allocation.

**Table 2. Status of Resources Programmed under GEF-5 by Focal Area and Corporate Program (\$ million)**

GEF-5 Focal Area	Target Allocations in GEF-5		Resources Requested through this Work Program Including Fees		Total GEF-5 Resources Programmed*			% of GEF-5 Resources Used
	Amount	%	Grant	Fees	Grant	Fees	Total	
Biodiversity	1,070.00	25.48%	6.43	0.64	6.43	0.64	7.07	0.66%
Climate Change	1,250.00	29.76%	7.09	0.71	7.09	0.71	7.80	0.62%
International Waters	420.00	10.00%	-	-	-	-	-	0.00%
Ozone Depletion	25.00	0.60%	2.55	0.26	2.55	0.26	2.81	11.22%
Sound Chemicals Management and Mercury Reduction	20.00	0.48%	-	-	-	-	-	0.00%
Land Degradation	380.00	9.05%	-	-	-	-	-	0.00%
CSP and Capacity Building	70.00	1.67%	-	-	-	-	-	0.00%
Small Grants Program	140.00	3.33%	134.62	5.38	134.62	5.38	140.00	100.00%
SFM/REDD-Plus Program	250.00	5.95%	-	-	-	-	-	0.00%
Outreach to Private Sector	80.00	1.90%	-	-	-	-	-	0.00%
Corporate Budget	120.00	2.86%	-	-	-	-	-	0.00%
<b>Total: Resources Programmed</b>	<b>4,200.00</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>150.69</b>	<b>6.99</b>	<b>150.69</b>	<b>6.99</b>	<b>157.68</b>	<b>3.75%</b>

\* Total GEF-5 resources programmed are inclusive of all the resources approved to date and resources requested in this work program.

1. The Small Grants Program (SGP), which is a corporate program, is programmed from resources made directly available to the SGP under the replenishment, in addition to resources earmarked by countries under the STAR in the biodiversity, climate change and land degradation focal areas.
2. Funds for MFA projects were charged to the different focal areas with respect to their allocations in the project documents. Hence, there is no line item for MFAs in this table.

#### DISTRIBUTION OF GEF PROJECT GRANTS BY FOCAL AREA AND REGION

5. Table 3 shows the regional distribution of project proposals in this proposed work program. Of the total GEF project grants of \$150.69 million requested in this work program, 89 percent under global is attributed to the Small Grants Program 5<sup>th</sup> Operational Phase. Other regions include Europe and Central Asia region, which receives 6 percent, followed by the Latin America and Caribbean region, which receives 3 percent, and the remaining share of 2 percent goes to the Asia region.

**Table 3. Distribution of GEF Project Grants in the November 2010 Work Program by Focal Area and Region (\$ million)**

Focal Area	Asia	Europe and Central Asia	Latin America and the Caribbean	Global	Total
Biodiversity	2.43	-	4.00	-	6.43
Climate Change	-	7.09	-	-	7.09
Multi-focal	-	-	-	134.62	134.62
Ozone Depleting Substances	-	2.55	-	-	2.55
<b>Total</b>	<b>2.43</b>	<b>9.64</b>	<b>4.00</b>	<b>134.62</b>	<b>150.69</b>
<b>% resources programmed for region</b>	<b>1.61%</b>	<b>6.40%</b>	<b>2.65%</b>	<b>89.34%</b>	<b>100.00%</b>

#### DISTRIBUTION OF PROPOSALS BY GEF AGENCY

6. Table 4 shows the distribution of project proposals by GEF Agency. Many Agencies submitted proposals for this work program. However, projects by only four Agencies – EBRD, UNDP, UNIDO, and the World Bank - are being considered in this work program. Agency fee requests in this work program, calculated based on the latest fee policy approved by the Council in December 2006, amount to \$6.99 million.

**Table 4. Distribution of Proposals by Agency in the November 2010 Work Program (\$ million)**

Agency	Number of Projects	GEF Project Grant	Agency Fees	Total GEF Resources Requested in this WP
EBRD	1	7.09	0.71	7.80
UNDP	2	138.62	5.78	144.40
UNIDO	1	2.55	0.26	2.81
World Bank	1	2.43	0.24	2.67
<b>Total</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>150.69</b>	<b>6.99</b>	<b>157.68</b>

#### COFINANCING

7. Cofinancing associated with the proposed work program amount to \$188.47 million which, when added to the GEF grant amount of \$150.82 million, yields a total project cost of \$339.28 million. Each dollar of GEF grant is thus matched by \$1.25 in cofinancing as compared to the historical average of \$1: \$4.3.<sup>2</sup> Table 5 shows the distribution of cofinancing levels in the projects proposed by cofinancier and by focal area. In this work program, civil society organizations (CSOs) provided a large share of cofinancing, at \$53.22 million, followed by GEF Agencies at \$48.65 million, and Governments at \$30.85 million. A ratio of cofinancing obtained by focal area is as follows: climate change provides 84 percent, ozone depleting substances

<sup>2</sup> Historical cofinancing trends can be found in Table B.1 in Annex B.



provides 69 percent, biodiversity provides 60 percent, and multifocal area provides 50 percent. On average, cofinancing will provide 56 percent of total project costs in this work program.

**Table 5. Distribution of Cofinancing in the November 2010 Work Program by Cofinanciers (\$ millions)**

Type	Biodiversity	Climate Change	Multi-focal Area	Ozone Depleting Substances	Total
GEF Project Grant	6.43	7.09	134.62	2.55	150.69
PDF/PPG	0.13	-	-	-	0.13
Total GEF Grant	6.56	7.09	134.62	2.55	150.82
<i>Co-Financier</i>					
Bilateral	0.40	-	8.40	-	8.80
Foundation	-	-	1.40	-	1.40
GEF Agency	0.20	38.00	10.40	0.05	48.65
Government	5.45	0.50	24.90	-	30.85
Multilateral	0.30	-	12.70	-	13.00
CSO	1.10	-	52.12	-	53.22
Other	-	-	17.80	-	17.80
Private Sector	2.35	-	6.90	5.50	14.75
Total Cofinancing	9.80	38.50	134.62	5.55	188.47
Total Project Cost	16.36	45.59	269.23	8.10	339.28
GEF: Cofinancing Ratio	1.49	5.43	1.00	2.18	1.25
Percentage Cofinancing	59.90%	84.45%	50.00%	68.52%	55.55%

#### GEF FOCAL AREA STRATEGIES AND THE WORK PROGRAM

8. Biodiversity. The two biodiversity project proposals presented in this work program cover two of the five objectives of the biodiversity strategy: i) Improving the sustainability of protected areas systems; and ii) mainstreaming biodiversity conservation into production landscapes and seascapes.
9. Climate Change. The only project proposal presented in this work program under the climate change focal area is closely aligned with Objective 2 of the climate change mitigation strategy: Promote market transformation for energy efficiency in industry and the building sector.
10. Ozone Depleting Substances. The project “*Phase-out of CFC consumption in the manufacture of aerosol metered-dose inhalers (MDIs) in the Russian Federation*” addresses a relatively large remaining use of CFCs, for metered-dose inhalers. MDI production was not covered by the original CFC phase out plans in Russia supported by the GEF; and in recent years, similar projects have been funded in developing countries for conversion of MDI manufacturing lines to CFC-free inhalers. The project builds on a mission of experts of the Technology and Economics Assessment Panel mandated by the Meeting of the Parties to the

Montreal protocol to investigate the issue. The project will phase out 241 ODP tons of CFCs (and related 2 million tons of CO<sub>2</sub> eq). The beneficiary enterprises are cofinancing almost 70% of the project costs which strengthens the cost effectiveness and sustainability of the GEF investment.

11. Multi-focal Area: The Small Grants Program (SGP) proposal covers all focal areas and capacity development. The distribution of investments by focal area is: 43 percent in biodiversity, 27 percent in climate change, 19 percent in land degradation, six percent in international waters, and five percent in POPs. The project objective of the SGP is the global environmental benefits secured through community-based initiatives and actions during GEF-5 operational phase. Across all GEF focal areas the SGP empowers local communities to seek integrated multi-focal area solutions that can be replicated and scaled-up, and helps spark successful initiatives that grow beyond SGP's initial support. SGP contributes to the building of networks, and strengthens civil society to unlock local capacity for solutions to these critical environmental problems. More than 60 percent of SGP grants target poor communities in participating countries, which have the greatest need for assistance. At least 15 percent of SGP grants target indigenous peoples, who possess the knowledge and experience to create sustainable solutions to environmental challenges. While the SGP seeks solutions integrated across focal areas, the specific strategic objectives adopted by the Steering Committee are designed to address the global environmental problems described above. These strategic objectives are in-line with the GEF-5 strategic priorities, and are the means to long-term impact level results. For GEF-5, it is anticipated that the SGP Core funding will support at least 1,820 projects (should the maximum grant amount \$50,000 is utilized) to as much as 3,640 projects (at the average grantmaking of \$25,000 per project).

#### GEOGRAPHIC BALANCE OF PROJECTS IN THE WORK PROGRAM

12. Biodiversity: One project is being implemented in Latin America and the Caribbean region (Chile), and the other in the Middle East and North Africa region (Yemen).

13. Climate Change: The project proposal is in the Eastern Europe and Central Asia region (Kazakhstan).

14. Multi-focal Area: The project will be implemented globally and will be supporting communities and civil society organizations in 127 countries.

#### INNOVATIVE ELEMENTS AND REPLICATION POTENTIAL

15. Biodiversity: The biodiversity mainstreaming project in Chile is addressing the threat to biodiversity caused by invasive alien species (IAS), the second largest threat to biodiversity after habitat change. Chile recognized that invasive alien species are a significant threat to its biodiversity and especially its island ecosystems where IAS are being introduced through trade, transport, and tourism. Despite Chile's robust system of inspection for exotic species dangerous to health and agriculture there are deficiencies in the control of IAS pathways that endanger

biodiversity. The GEF project will help address these deficiencies by developing the policy, legal, regulatory and financial framework that will regulate and transform the practices of the trade, transport and insular tourism sectors to reduce the risk of IAS introduction and spread through these three pathways. The project will also pilot surveillance and control measures in a high biodiversity environment threatened by IAS—the Juan Fernandez archipelago (JFA), with the aim that the experiences gained can then be replicated to other island ecosystems in the country.

16. Climate Change: The project “*Reducing GHG Emissions through a Resource Efficiency Transformation Programme – ResET – for Industries*” in Kazakhstan will establish a fund to lend to enterprises adopting efficient technologies and practices. It will leverage additional financing for industrial enterprises that opt for highly efficient equipment and processes, especially if an internationally accredited integrated resources management standard is implemented as part of the programme.

17. Multi-focal Area: SGP objectives are tied to the international conventions implementation which the GEF supports. SGP will support projects and will develop the capacity of CSOs to implement these conventions, which strengthens the ability of the GEF to deliver environmental impacts and global environmental benefits. Consistent with previous practice, SGP will contribute to GEF reporting using tracking tools on progress and results supporting implementation of the conventions to ensure accountability and support knowledge sharing. Facilitating the engagement of community-level stakeholders in global environmental dialogues, also promotes the sharing of on-the-ground real world examples, and allows national and international stakeholders the potential to truly understand current environmental problems and possible solutions. The global SGP will continue operating in partner countries with the same implementation approach that has proven effective previously. A revised Country Programme Strategy (CPS) in each country will outline the SGP priorities for use of allocated resources, and will articulate in detail how the SGP supports national and GEF strategic priorities.

#### RESOURCE PROGRAMMING IMPLICATIONS

18. Biodiversity: The total amount of GEF-5 resources being programmed for the biodiversity focal area amount to \$6.43 million. Total cofinancing amounts to \$9.8 million.

19. Climate Change: The total amount of GEF-5 resources being programmed for the climate change focal area is \$7.09 million. Total cofinancing for this project is \$38.5 million.

20. Ozone Depleting Substances: The ODS project in this work program amounts to \$2.55 million with a leverage of cofinancing at \$5.55 million.

21. Multi-focal Area: The total amount of GEF-5 resources being programmed for the Small Grants Program amount to \$134.62 million with a cofinancing amount equal to the GEF amount. With the approval of the SGP in this work program, total resources for the program in GEF-5 is 100 percent fully utilized.

## SUMMARY OF THE STAND-ALONE PIFs IN THE NOVEMBER 2010 WORK PROGRAM <sup>3</sup>

### **Biodiversity**

1. **Chile** : Strengthening National Frameworks for IAS Governance - Piloting in the Juan Fernandez Archipelago (UNDP) (GEF Project Grant : \$4,000,000)
2. **Yemen** : Leopards and Landscapes: Using a Flagship Species to Strengthen Conservation in the Republic of Yemen (World Bank) (GEF Project Grant : \$2,430,000)

### **Climate Change**

3. **Kazakhstan** : Reducing GHG Emissions through a Resource Efficiency Transformation Programme (ResET) for Industries in Kazakhstan (EBRD) (GEF Project Grant : \$7,090,000)

### **Multi Focal Area**

4. **Global** : 5<sup>th</sup> Operational Phase of the GEF Small Grants Programme (UNDP) (GEF Project Grant : \$134,615,385)

### **Ozone Depleting Substances**

5. **Russian Federation** : Phase-out of CFC Consumption in the Manufacture of Aerosol Metered-dose Inhalers (MDIs) in the Russian Federation (UNIDO) (GEF Project Grant : \$2,550,000)

---

<sup>3</sup> Financial details of the PIFs submitted in the November 2010 Work Program are presented in Annex A.

# PROJECT PROPOSALS SUBMITTED FOR COUNCIL APPROVAL

Under the GEF Trust Fund

November 2010

All amounts shown in US\$.

#	GEF ID	Country	Agency	Project Title	PPG Amt	PPG Fees Paid	GEF Project Grant	Project Agency Fees	GEF Grant	Cofin.	Total Project Cost
<b><u>Biodiversity</u></b>											
1	4330	Chile	UNDP	Strengthening National Frameworks for IAS Governance - Piloting in Juan Fernandez Archipelago			4,000,000	400,000	4,000,000	6,900,000	10,900,000
2	4201	Yemen	World Bank	Leopards and Landscapes: Using a Flagship Species to Strengthen Conservation in the Republic of Yemen	130,000	13,000	2,430,000	243,000	2,560,000	2,900,000	5,460,000
<b>Sub total for Biodiversity</b>					<b>130,000</b>	<b>13,000</b>	<b>6,430,000</b>	<b>643,000</b>	<b>6,560,000</b>	<b>9,800,000</b>	<b>16,360,000</b>
<b><u>Climate Change</u></b>											
3	4348	Kazakhstan	EBRD	Reducing GHG Emissions through a Resource Efficiency Transformation Programme (ResET) for Industries in Kazakhstan			7,090,000	709,000	7,090,000	38,500,000	45,590,000
<b>Sub total for Climate Change</b>							<b>7,090,000</b>	<b>709,000</b>	<b>7,090,000</b>	<b>38,500,000</b>	<b>45,590,000</b>
<b><u>Multi Focal Area</u></b>											
4	4329	Global	UNDP	5th Operational Phase of the GEF Small Grants Programme			134,615,385	5,384,615	134,615,385	134,615,385	269,230,770
<b>Sub total for Multi Focal Area</b>							<b>134,615,385</b>	<b>5,384,615</b>	<b>134,615,385</b>	<b>134,615,385</b>	<b>269,230,770</b>

All amounts shown in US\$.

#	GEF ID	Country	Agency	Project Title	PPG Amt	PPG Fees Paid	GEF Project Grant	Project Agency Fees	GEF Grant	Cofin.	Total Project Cost
<b><u>Ozone Depleting Substances</u></b>											
5	4387	Russian Federation	UNIDO	Phase-out of CFC Consumption in the Manufacture of Aerosol Metered-dose Inhalers (MDIs) in the Russian Federation			2,550,000	255,000	2,550,000	5,550,000	8,100,000
<b>Sub total for Ozone Depleting Substances</b>							<b>2,550,000</b>	<b>255,000</b>	<b>2,550,000</b>	<b>5,550,000</b>	<b>8,100,000</b>
<b><u>Grand Total</u></b>					<b>130,000</b>	<b>13,000</b>	<b>150,685,385</b>	<b>6,991,615</b>	<b>150,815,385</b>	<b>188,465,385</b>	<b>339,280,770</b>

## Annex B: Historical Trends Analysis

### Historical Cofinancing Trends by Focal Area

1. Table B.1 shows the historical trend in total cofinancing amounts and ratios. Cofinancing performance has steadily increased over the history of the GEF. The cofinancing ratio average for GEF-4 is 6 which is the highest among the GEF phases so far, while the overall historical average is 4.3. GEF-5 starts with a relatively low cofinancing ratio at 1.25 due to the SGP which takes up the majority of the work program resources with a cofinancing ratio that is the lowest among the focal areas.

**Table B.1 Historical Trends of Cofinancing by Focal Area \***

GEF Phase	GEF Grant (\$m)	Co-financing Amount (\$m)							Total Project Cost (\$m)	Co-Financing Ratio
		BD	CC	IW	LD	MFA	ODS	POPs		
Pilot Phase	740.25	189.05	2,402.89	144.30	-	4.35	1.85	-	3,482.68	3.70
GEF - 1	1,254.62	966.03	2,322.10	217.40	-	55.21	95.20	-	4,910.56	2.91
GEF - 2	1,910.20	1,836.99	3,403.40	644.37	-	345.29	78.11	5.49	8,223.85	3.31
GEF - 3	2,895.92	2,964.04	4,822.04	2,790.28	1,157.64	1,012.61	11.49	138.50	15,792.52	4.45
GEF - 4	2,665.03	2,428.98	6,201.13	2,660.45	1,649.63	2,506.80	13.16	524.19	18,649.36	6.00
GEF - 5	150.82	9.80	38.50	-	-	134.62	5.55	-	339.28	1.25
2011	150.82	9.80	38.50	-	-	134.62	5.55	-	339.28	1.25
<b>Total</b>	<b>9,616.84</b>	<b>8,394.88</b>	<b>19,190.07</b>	<b>6,456.79</b>	<b>2,807.27</b>	<b>4,058.87</b>	<b>205.36</b>	<b>668.18</b>	<b>51,398.26</b>	<b>4.34</b>

Legend: BD – Biodiversity; CC – Climate Change; IW – International Waters; LD – Land Degradation; MFA – Multi-focal Area; ODS – Ozone Depleting Substances; POPs – Persistent Organic Pollutants

\* Table associates project preparation grants with the project grants for those periods when the project grants are approved;  
Cofinancing ratio = Cofinancing/GEF Grant

### Project Grants

2. Table B.2 contains the cumulative GEF project grants approved by Council through work programs, as well as PPGs, MSPs, and enabling activities approved by the CEO.

**Table B.2: Project Grant Trends (GEF Pilot Phase – GEF 5) by Focal Area (\$ million)**

GEF Phase	Biodiversity		Climate Change		International Waters		Land Degradation		Multi-Focal Area		Ozone Depletion		Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs)		Total
	Grant	%	Grant	%	Grant	%	Grant	%	Grant	%	Grant	%	Grant	%	
Pilot Phase	318.83	43%	280.56	38%	121.06	16%	-	0%	15.60	2%	4.20	1%	-	0%	740.25
GEF - 1	456.40	36%	507.49	40%	119.43	10%	-	0%	49.67	4%	121.63	10%	-	0%	1,254.62
GEF - 2	727.82	38%	667.23	35%	301.29	16%	-	0%	143.41	8%	43.40	2%	27.05	1%	1,910.20
GEF - 3	878.42	30%	874.35	30%	344.05	12%	205.47	7%	426.23	15%	11.96	0%	155.43	5%	2,895.92
GEF - 4	683.63	26%	744.44	28%	259.10	10%	150.05	6%	571.68	21%	10.78	0%	245.35	9%	2,665.03
GEF - 5	6.56	4%	7.09	5%	-	0%	-	0%	134.62	89%	2.55	2%	-	0%	150.82
2011	6.56	4%	7.09	5%	-	0%	-	0%	134.62	89%	2.55	2%	-	0%	150.82
<b>Total</b>	<b>3,071.67</b>	<b>32%</b>	<b>3,081.16</b>	<b>32%</b>	<b>1,144.93</b>	<b>12%</b>	<b>355.52</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>1,341.21</b>	<b>14%</b>	<b>194.53</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>427.83</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>9,616.84</b>