



CELEBRATING TWENTY YEARS

**GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT FACILITY**  
INVESTING IN OUR PLANET

# **GEF Expanded Constituency Workshop**

## **Pacific Islands Constituency**

**27 - 29 September, 2011**

**Honiara, Solomon Islands**

The GEF Expanded Constituency Workshop took place in Honiara, Solomon Islands on the 27<sup>th</sup> to 29<sup>th</sup> September 2011.

<b>Welcoming Remarks</b>	<u>Chair:</u> Rence Sore, OFP and PFP Solomon Islands <u>Vice Chair:</u> GEF Secretariat
<b>Government Representative</b>	Government
<b>GEF Secretariat</b>	GEF Secretariat – William Ehlers
Introduction to the Workshop Objectives, Agenda, Materials and Resources	<u>Chair:</u> Rence Sore, OFP and PFP Solomon Islands <u>Vice Chair:</u> GEF Secretariat  GEF Secretariat – William Ehlers

The meeting was opened by Rence Sore, OFP and PFP of the Solomon Islands who welcomed participants to the Solomon Islands and stated that he was looking forward to a fruitful meeting.

The following text summarizes the discussion from the sessions that took place:

<b>Session 1</b>	
Monitoring and Evaluation Policy in the GEF <i>Q&amp;A session</i> <i>Discussion</i>	<u>Chair:</u> Mario Ximenes, OFP Timor Leste <u>Vice Chair:</u> GEF Secretariat <u>Rapporteur:</u> Jiang Ru, World Bank  GEF Evaluation Office – Robert van den Berg
GEF Pacific Alliance for Sustainability Update <i>Q&amp;A session</i> <i>Discussion</i>	<u>Chair:</u> Taulealeausumai Laavasa Malua, OFP Samoa <u>Vice Chair:</u> GEF Secretariat <u>Rapporteur:</u> James Roop, ADB  GEF Agency – Greg Sherley, UNEP

### 1.1 Monitoring and Evaluation Policy in the GEF

### 1.2 GEF Pacific Alliance for Sustainability Update

<b>Session 2</b>	
GEF - An Introduction (history,	<u>Chair:</u> Utami Andayani, OFP Indonesia

structure) <i>Q&amp;A session</i> <i>Discussion</i>	<u>Vice Chair:</u> GEF Secretariat <u>Rapporteur:</u> Aru Mathias, FAO  GEF Secretariat – William Ehlers
GEF-5 System for Transparent Allocation of Resources (STAR) – Operational Procedures <i>Q&amp;A session</i> <i>Discussion</i>	<u>Chair:</u> Tania Temata, OFP Cook Islands <u>Vice Chair:</u> GEF Secretariat <u>Rapporteur:</u> Jay Roop, ADB  GEF Secretariat – William Ehlers

## 2.1 GEF - An Introduction (history, structure)

## 2.2 GEF-5 System for Transparent Allocation of Resources (STAR) – Operational Procedures

<b>Session 3</b>	
GEF Project Cycle and Review Process GEF Programmatic Approach <i>Q&amp;A session</i> <i>Discussion</i>	<u>Chair:</u> Taulealeausumai Laavasa Malua, OFP Samoa <u>Vice Chair:</u> GEF Secretariat <u>Rapporteur:</u> James Roop, ADB  GEF Secretariat – Claudia Ortiz

## 3.1 GEF Project Cycle, Review Process and GEF Programmatic Approach

<b>Session 4</b>	
Adaptation and the GEF: Adaptation Fund and LDCF/SCCF <i>Q&amp;A session</i> <i>Discussion</i>	<u>Chair:</u> Farran Redfern, OFP Kiribati <u>Vice Chair:</u> GEF Secretariat <u>Rapporteur:</u> Greg Sherley, UNEP  GEF Secretariat – Claudia Ortiz  Adaptation Fund Secretariat – Mikko Ollikainen

## 4.1 Adaptation and the GEF: Adaptation Fund and LDCF/SCCF

<b>Session 5</b>	
GEF Focal Area and Cross Cutting Strategies:	<u>Chair:</u> Albert Williams, OFP Vanuatu <u>Vice Chair:</u> GEF Secretariat

Biodiversity – Nicole Glineur, GEFSEC Land Degradation International Waters – Nicole Glineur, GEFSEC Sustainable Forest Management Climate Change – Claudia Ortiz, GEFSEC Chemicals – Jiang Ru, World Bank Capacity Development – William Ehlers, GEFSEC <i>Q&amp;A</i> <i>Discussion</i>	<u>Rapporteur:</u> Katarina Atalifo, SGP  GEF Secretariat  GEF Agencies
--	---

## 5.1 GEF Focal Area and Cross Cutting Strategies

<b>Session 6</b>	
GEF and the conventions: Reports to the conventions Technology Transfer <i>Q&amp;A session</i> <i>Discussion</i>	<u>Chair:</u> Gillian Nedelec Doone, PFP Micronesia <u>Vice Chair:</u> GEF Secretariat <u>Rapporteur:</u> Greg Sherley, UNEP  GEF Secretariat – William Ehlers
GEF and Civil Society <i>Q&amp;A session</i> <i>Discussion</i>	<u>Chair:</u> Sauni Titania Tongatule, OFP Niue <u>Vice Chair:</u> GEF Secretariat <u>Rapporteur:</u> Lynelle Popot, UNDP  GEF Secretariat – William Ehlers

## 6.1 GEF and the Conventions

The GEF Secretariat introduced the relationship between GEF and the four Conventions: United Nations Convention on Climate Change, United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification, Convention on Biological Diversity, and the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants. The GEF Secretariat highlighted the reporting process to the Conventions and various ways in which recipients can access funding for their reporting requirements.

One participant asked about the amount of money they can access for national reports. The GEF Secretariat responded that \$200,000 is usually more than enough to cover national reports for most countries. However, if a country provides good justification for more resources, then these could be access, too much money for many countries. The cap is \$500,000 USD.

Another participant asked if the umbrella project on National Communications from UNEP had already been approved and if a country could submit one project proposal under the umbrella project? The GEF Secretariat responded that the country could talk to UNEP since the umbrella program has already been approved.

Furthermore, the participant asked if the country could do one report which includes reporting on Land Degradation, POP's and National Communications or if these could all be included in one project. The GEF Secretariat responded that the GEF has been working with UNEP on what would be the format to do reporting across conventions. However, the process is not that advanced yet.

Finally, the participant mentioned that the reason they would like to include all reports in one, is due to the cap in project management costs. There are high costs in the country and now there is a cap on the salaries for the people who implement the actions. The GEF Secretariat requested the country to draft this request in a 1 or 2 page report, so he may officially provide an answer following the workshop.

An additional participant asked why each country is "entitled" to \$500,000 only and if this number would change since more resources are needed for reporting activities. The GEF Secretariat responded that there the countries are not entitled to this amount, but rather, that each country can access up to \$500,000 for reporting purposes, but most countries use less. The amount set as standard is indicative, and it is the result of studies and practical experience by the GEF and the Conventions. The GEF has to administer the money in a way that responds to the convention. If a country were to try to access more funding, they would have to justify it and if the need to exceed the cap of \$500,000 they would have to use their STAR allocation.

A final participant asked if for the umbrella project there will still be a fee withdrawn from the \$500,000 for each country that would go to UNEP. The GEF Secretariat responded that this is not so, but rather, UNEP has already deducted the fee from the umbrella project, not for each individual report.

## **6.2 GEF and Civil Society**

The GEF Secretariat introduced the relationship between GEF and civil society organizations. During the life of the GEF, about 30% of projects' executions are carried out with the participation of CSOs. It is also true that since then, there has been a relative decline on their participation and this is linked, in part to more government intervention. Now, the GEF is stimulating governments to engage with CSOs to integrate efforts.

An Agency asked if the GEF has considered coordinating SGPs to make a larger umbrella project to avoid duplication. On this regard, the GEF Secretariat responded that the proposal to obtain additional funding for SGP has been on the table but not materialized. He added that every country program under SGP has to be in line with the overall national strategy on environment so coordination is expected.

A participant asked who sits in the coordination committee? Are CSO's represented? And also some of the regional organizations are trying to get accreditation to UNFCCC, can they do so for GEF? The GEF Secretariat responded that the NGOs are represented in a coordination committee that has a Central Focal Point that runs the GEF NGO Network; currently it is an NGO in Malaysia. The Central Focal point is aided by 15 regional coordinators and indigenous people coordinators. The GEF has expanded participation at the Council so not only the regional coordinator represents the countries but rather a variety of CSOs come to Council meetings.

For accreditation, the GEF Secretariat said that the GEF has "dropped" that term. CSOs can register to become a member of the GEF NGO Network on their website by filling out a form.

Another participant commented that all SGPs should allow revising strategies and it is about time that the government is genuinely engaged in this through OFPs, this document is widely consulted. SGP country teams make an effort to collect information and have a checklist which is very effective. Country clearance needs to show this before the project is approved. All SGP projects are related to national strategies.

<b>Session 7</b>	
Pre-PIF Process, How to Prepare A PIF and Review of a PIF	<p><u>Chair:</u> Russ Kun, OFP Nauru  <u>Vice Chair:</u> GEF Secretariat  <u>Rapporteur:</u> Lynelle Popot, UNDP</p> <p>GEF Secretariat – William Ehlers, Nicole Glineur</p> <p>GEF Agencies – Jiang Ru, World Bank</p>

### 7.1 Pre-PIF Process, How to Prepare A PIF and Review of a PIF

<b>Session 8</b>	
GEF Agencies Panel <i>Q&amp;A</i> <i>Discussion</i>	<p><u>Chair:</u> Sebastian Marino, OFP Palau  <u>Vice Chair:</u> GEF Secretariat  <u>Rapporteur:</u> Mikko Ollikainen, Adaptation Fund</p> <p>GEF Secretariat – Claudia Ortiz</p> <p>GEF Agencies</p>

### 8.1 GEF Agencies Panel

ADB introduced the competitive advantages of ADB, pointing among other things to good relations with Ministries of Finance in various countries. He introduced the priorities of the organization, including climate change mitigation and adaptation, capacity building, promoting partner coordination, and facilitating access to funds. He also introduced the GEF-ADB portfolio in the Pacific, which consists of 5 projects, with US\$35.8M of grant funding.

A participant asked about its inclusion in the participants of the Coral Triangle Initiative: it had appeared there earlier but not anymore in the presentation given by ADB. The ADB representative responded that the country was not included as a part of that initiative because it had been included in other projects already. It had been erroneously included in some information materials but that had been corrected.

Another participant asked whether Millennium Development Goal projects such as ones targeting poverty reduction could be supported by ADB. The ADB representative responded that this is possible, if the theme is included in the ADB partnership strategy with the country. He added that ADB has different areas highlighted in the strategy compared to that of the World Bank. The World Bank contributed that in the case of the World Bank, the Country Assistance Strategies (CAS) are the basis for cooperation between the Bank and countries.

UNEP pointed in his presentation to the need for donor coordination, for the purposes of cost-efficiency, and said that he personally spends much time on building linkages. The goal of regional cooperation should be to produce as much added value and inclusive benefits as possible. He added that UNEP had prepared a database of all UNEP project activities in the Pacific, and said he would be happy to share it with those interested. He also referred to the importance of partnerships with NGOs and working with regional organizations such as SPREP and SPC.

A participant asked why UNDP seemed to be the most active agency in the field of environment in the Pacific, even though UNEP is the UN program with specific focus on environment. The UNEP representative responded that globally speaking, UNDP is much bigger than UNEP, and that also other UN agencies such as FAO and UNESCO are implementing environment related projects. He added that despite UNEP's small size in the region, the regional office gets support from the organization's global network.

An additional participant mentioned that it had been approached by UNEP, enquiring about interest to participate in an umbrella project for enabling activities. She wanted to know, what the benefits of going through an umbrella program would be, instead of utilizing the direct access modality. The UNEP representative responded that there are reasons why umbrella approach would be better, for example from inclusiveness point of view, but he said he could understand why countries would want to opt for direct access.

The World Bank introduced the basic features of World Bank Group financing, including instruments, and the regional presence, which relied on a regional office in Sydney,

Australia, and some country offices. He clarified that GEF is a major instrument in World Bank work, and listed the current and planned GEF projects by country.

A participant lamented the absence of a World Bank country office in the North Pacific, and suggested that the Bank identify such a location for access. The World Bank representative responded that he would raise this issue in an internal meeting later during the week and that the exchange should also be continued with countries.

Another participant asked whether and how projects could be funded in countries that were not members of the World Bank. She mentioned that this prevented her country from accessing fairly large amounts of money. The World Bank representative responded that the World Bank could not directly support activities in countries that are not its members but that he would be happy to raise the issue in the World Bank internally.

FAO described the regional presence of FAO in the region, including a regional office in Apia, Samoa, and main areas of work. He said that FAO's competitive advantage relates to its convening power in the areas of work, databases, and networks, which would be available for the countries, too. He also referred to FAO's recently approved regional forest conservation project, worth USD \$6.5 million, which illustrated FAO's ability to bring together Ministries of Agriculture and Forestry with Ministry of Environment.

A participant stated that coordination between projects should be improved, and referred to a situation in their country where the coordination between an FAO food security and livelihoods project and the regional PACC project has been difficult. The FAO representative responded that the FAO welcomes strengthening collaboration in countries.

Another participant complained about slow implementation in a food security project in their country, and he requested that FAO look into its mechanisms. The FAO representative responded that the project is being implemented, and that the national coordinator was the key person to be contacted on issues related to the project. In addition to project managers, each country has an FAO national coordinator.

UNDP introduced the environment portfolio of the UNDP in the East Asia and Pacific region. He said that the GEF and the Adaptation Fund are two main instruments the UNDP works within environment in the region. He presented the list of GEF projects by status, and the pipeline, and said that UNDP is increasingly focusing on multifocal area activities, because issues are very interlinked, especially in smaller countries.

In the Panel discussion that followed, a participant asked how the Agencies work with CSOs and NGOs. The UNEP representative stressed that while there was not protocol of doing this, networking with the organizations is key, and conservation NGOs are important for the agencies' work. All speakers concurred that the question which organizations were relevant depended on the projects, and would be best addressed at the project planning phase.

Another participant asked, whether there was any formal mechanism between the UN agencies in terms in coordination of projects. The World Bank representative stated that there are country-level consultations coordinated by the national focal points, which the agencies are invited to participate. The UNDP representative added that all countries go through an UNDA exercise, and that it was the key instrument through which common country programming would take place.

<b>Session 9</b>	
Country Support Programme <i>Q&amp;A session</i> <i>Discussion</i>	<u>Chair:</u> Tuaga Pasuna, PFP Tuvalu <u>Vice Chair:</u> GEF Secretariat <u>Rapporteur:</u> Connie Siliota, SGP  GEF Secretariat – William Ehlers

### 9.1 Country Support Programme

The GEF Secretariat presented on the country support program. He explained the NPFE process. The Secretariat also explained that the Expanded Constituency Workshops are different from the past Sub-regional Workshops since the GEF now integrates other partners, such as civil society and convention focal points, instead of only the GEF Focal Points. He also explained that in the past OFPs would express that they faced limitations in fulfilling the GEF related tasks and therefore the GEF is now providing \$9,000 to facilitate this job. In this regard, OFP's are expected to submit a report on what they did and how they have spent the money to fulfill their responsibilities towards the GEF. These activities should clearly reinforce the mandate of OFPs. The GEF Secretariat also explained the Familiarization Seminars the GEF holds are directed to Agencies and OFPs.

A participant asked for clarification on the time frame between the application to a NPFE and the disbursement of the resources. The GEF Secretariat responded that this would depend on the time it takes for the GEF Secretariat and the country to agree on the budget.

Another participant asked about the possibility of accumulating country support resources if these are not used during one year. The GEF Secretariat responded that this is not possible

<b>Session 10</b>	
GEF Small Grants Programme <i>Q&amp;A session</i> <i>Discussion</i>	<u>Chair:</u> Analiza Rebueta Teh, OFP Philippines <u>Vice Chair:</u> GEF Secretariat <u>Rapporteur:</u> Akihiot Kono, UNDP  GEF Secretariat – William Ehlers

	SGP National Coordinator - Connie Siliota, Solomon Islands
--	---

## 9.1 GEF Small Grants Programme

The GEF Secretariat introduced the Small Grants Programme (SGP) at the GEF. He explained that the work of the SGP is at the community level across all focal areas. SGP is the public face of the GEF as it works exclusively with civil society and community-based organizations. He mentioned that SGP is coordinated and implemented by UNDP and that the grants are up to USD \$50,000. The program has been working since 1992. For SIDS and LDCs there is an allocation of \$250,000 a year and that STAR resources can also be assigned to SGP.

One participant commented that SGP has budgeted some of the communities. However, he said that the grant does not support salary and administration costs of organizations. The GEF Secretariat responded that the GEF Evaluation Office found that the administrative costs of SGPs are not that high and emphasized the importance of co-financing to support issues such as higher administrative costs. Some of these matters are characteristics of the program. It is the responsibility of the Agency to find co-financing.

Another participant commented that it is hard for NGOs to get involved with SGPs. They urged GEF Political Focal Points and GEF Operational Focal Points to cooperate.

An additional participant commented on the importance of having different gender indicators for different regions and having gender specialists in the SGP committees. To this comment, the GEF Secretariat responded by requesting the NGO to develop a paper on such differences, in order to inform the GEF on gender inclusion criteria on projects.

A final participant commented that in GEF-4 the NGO's could access resources for capacity building as opposed to GEF-5. The participant followed by saying that this money is still necessary as the country does not have civil societies with fundraising capacities, so the country needs the money for training people to do this and to execute projects. The GEF Secretariat responded that the SGPs are not meant for capacity building nor training people on fundraising for CSOs.