



GEF

Global Environment Facility

GEF/C.21/Inf.4

April 17, 2003

GEF Council
May 14-16, 2003

**ACTION PLAN TO RESPOND TO THE RECOMMENDATIONS
OF THE SECOND GEF ASSEMBLY,
THE POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE THIRD
REPLENISHMENT,
THE SECOND OVERALL PERFORMANCE STUDY OF THE GEF
AND THE WORLD SUMMIT ON SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT**

Table of Contents

I	Introduction.....	1
II.	Sources of Recommendations.....	1
	Assembly.....	1
	Replenishment.....	1
	Second Overall Performance Study of the GEF	2
	WSSD	3
III	Recommendations and Proposed Action	3
	Mandate of the GEF.....	4
	WSSD	4
	GEF at the country level	6
	Capacity Building	8
	Strategic planning	11
	Project Cycle.....	12
	Incremental Costs	13
	Catalytic Role	14
	Technology Transfer and Private Sector	15
	Measuring performance through strengthened monitoring and evaluation	16
	Other recommendations	19
	Operational programs	19
	Institutional strengthening	19
	Project fees.....	20
	Co-financing	20
	STAP.....	22
	Relations with Conventions	22
	Stakeholder participation	23
	I. Council meeting in May 2003	A1
	II. Council meeting in November 2003	A1
	III. Council meeting in May 2004.....	B2
	IV. Council Meeting in November 2004	B2

I INTRODUCTION

1. The Second Global Environment Facility Assembly was held in Beijing, China, in October 2002. Representatives from 127 GEF Participant countries, including 64 ministers, participated in the Assembly which concluded with the endorsement of the *Beijing Declaration of the Second GEF Assembly*.

2. Recognizing that the GEF should continue to evolve and apply lessons learned, the Beijing Declaration proposes recommendations under eleven headings to further strengthen the GEF to respond to its evolving challenges. In proposing these recommendations, participants took into account Council decisions, the views and proposals of the Participants attending the Assembly, the analysis and recommendations from the Second Overall Performance Study of the GEF, the third replenishment of the GEF Trust Fund, the conclusions of the World Summit on Sustainable Development, and the *CEO's Report on the Policies, Operations and Future Development of the GEF*.

3. This document present an action plan for responding to the recommendations proposed by the Second Assembly as well as related recommendations of the third replenishment of the GEF Trust Fund, the Second Overall Performance Study of the GEF, and the World Summit on Sustainable Development.

4. To the extent possible, the recommendations have been grouped under the eleven broad headings identified in the Beijing Declaration. In addition, other key recommendations that do not necessarily fit into those categories have been included at the end of the third section of this document summarizing recommendations and proposed action.

5. The document also presents in an Annex a schedule for bringing to the Council for its consideration key proposals and policies necessary to assist the GEF to respond to the recommendations.

II. SOURCES OF RECOMMENDATIONS

Assembly

6. Recommendations for enhancing the performance of the GEF are well defined in the Beijing Declaration, which includes: a GEF expanded mandate through new focal areas; allocation of resources on the basis of the third replenishment; enhancement of activities at the country level; capacity-building; strategic planning; project cycle review; incremental costs; the GEF catalytic role through co-financing, mainstreaming and replication; technology transfer and private sector engagement; and strengthened monitoring and evaluation.

Replenishment

7. Participants in the third replenishment negotiations agreed that the development of policy recommendations relating to strategic issues to be addressed by the Council during the GEF-3 period is an important part of the replenishment process, and that such recommendations should

be formulated using the OPS2 as a basis as well as other reports emanating from the GEF monitoring and evaluation program during the second replenishment period. Participants advanced recommendations with a view to increasing the GEF's emphasis on quality and results, to improving GEF's responsiveness to country needs and to the guidance of the global environmental conventions, and to making its processes more expeditious, streamlined and efficient so as to maximize impacts achieved with consideration of country performance through the resources of the third replenishment of the GEF. The policy recommendations of the third replenishment process were endorsed by the Council at its meeting in October 2002.

Second Overall Performance Study of the GEF

8. The team for the Second Overall Performance Study of the GEF (OPS2) drew ten main conclusions:

- (a) The GEF has produced significant project results that address important global environmental issues, despite some limitations acknowledged in the report.
- (b) The GEF has been responsive to the global environmental conventions.
- (c) In-country understanding of the GEF is very weak; there is poor visibility of the GEF, even on projects fully funded by it.
- (d) Stakeholder participation should be addressed more systematically.
- (e) While the GEF Secretariat and Implementing Agencies have made progress in deriving a practical approach to determine global benefits and incremental costs at the technical level, there is confusion at the country level and among other stakeholders over these definitions.
- (f) There is still room for improvements in the GEF's review and processing procedures and management of project review process.
- (g) The catalytic role of the GEF to be achieved through mainstreaming, co-financing, and replication of GEF-funded activities, is still unfocussed.
- (h) Small grants and medium-sized projects seem to have a good success rate and under many circumstances may be the best way to start new and innovative activities.
- (i) Despite encouraging evidence of GEF efforts to engage the private sector, many opportunities remain unexploited and many barriers to a wider engagement of the private sector in GEF projects still remain.
- (j) The GEF is a particularly encouraging example of constructive interagency cooperation. The GEF system has performed well overall with some weak areas in the institutional roles and responsibilities of GEF's partners.

The OPS2 team also made fourteen key recommendations in their report, and these are included in the section below.

WSSD

9. The WSSD process provided an opportunity for further promoting the GEF role in global environmental affairs. Since the beginning of the process, the GEF attached great priority to its contribution and was able to submit valuable inputs which were incorporated into the substantive discussions. In addition, the GEF positioned itself as one important actor for the implementation of WSSD outcomes.

10. The WSSD Plan of Implementation contains explicit indication of the GEF role to contribute to and facilitate the achievement of its goals and objectives, both at the sectoral and global level. It should be noted that, at the sectoral level, almost all areas in this Plan are pertinent to the GEF agenda (e.g., energy, transport, chemicals, biodiversity, oceans, land and water more specifically). The Plan of Implementation also sets out a wide range of actions required in specific areas. The new main commitments with specific targets are those relating to access to basic sanitation by 2015; minimizing the harmful effects of chemicals by 2020; restoring fishing stocks by 2015; developing integrated water resources management and water efficiency plans by 2005; setting-up a ten-year framework for programs on consumption and production patterns; and increasing substantially the use of renewable energies.

11. Seven paragraphs in the WSSD Plan of Implementation refer specifically to the GEF. The third replenishment of the Facility and the inclusion of land degradation as a new GEF focal area are highlighted, among other issues. These also include the GEF support on capacity-building in such areas as renewable energy, freshwater programs for small island developing States, and the Barbados Program of Action. An explicit reference is also made to the GEF as one of the actors to participate in a cooperative effort to strengthen inter-agency coordination to implement Agenda 21 and the outcomes of the Summit.

12. It is clear that, beyond the specific mandates contained in the WSSD Plan of Implementation, GEF activities delivered through its different focal areas and programs can be considered as a direct contribution to the post-Johannesburg process. This is particularly visible in the GEF focal areas: biodiversity, climate change, international waters, ozone layer, land degradation, and POPs. It is also true in relation to critical cross-cutting issues whose importance is at the center of the WSSD implementation: mobilization of financial resources, transfer of technology and capacity-building.

III RECOMMENDATIONS AND PROPOSED ACTION

13. Many of the recommendations emerging from the Assembly, the third replenishment process, OPS2 and WSSD are consistent with each other, and therefore, have been grouped

below under the themes that were adopted as the framework for the Beijing Declaration. Some more specific recommendations that do not necessarily fit neatly under any one theme are included at the end of this section. These recommendations are also consistent with the recommendations approved by the Conferences of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity and the Framework Convention on Climate Change which recently reviewed the effectiveness of these financial mechanisms.

14. After each thematic group of recommendations, action to achieve the recommendations is proposed.

15. The Annex to this document lists a schedule of products to be reviewed by the Council in accordance with the proposed actions.

Mandate of the GEF

16. The GEF shall be available as a financial mechanism of the UN Convention to Combat Desertification in those Countries Experiencing Serious Drought and/or Desertification, particularly in Africa, pursuant to paragraph 21 of the Convention, if the Conference of the Parties should so decide. In this regard, the Assembly requests the Council to consider any such decision of the Conference of the Parties with a view to making the necessary arrangements. (Assembly)

17. Call on the Second Assembly of the Global Environment Facility (GEF) to take action on the recommendations of the GEF Council concerning the designation of land degradation (desertification and deforestation) as a focal area of the GEF as a means of GEF support for the successful implementation of the Convention to Combat Desertification; and consequently, consider making GEF a financial mechanism of the Convention, taking into account the prerogatives and decisions of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention, while recognizing the complementary roles of GEF and the Global Mechanism of the Convention in providing and mobilizing resources for the elaboration and implementation of action programs. (WSSD)

Action:

18. *The second GEF Assembly agreed that the GEF should be available as a financial mechanism of the UN Convention to Combat Desertification, pursuant to paragraph 21 of the Convention.*

19. *It is expected that the sixth meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the UNCCD, to be held in Havana, Cuba, in August/September 2003 will consider the decision of the second GEF Assembly.*

20. *The GEF Council at its meeting in November 2003 will consider any relevant decision taken by the Conference of the Parties and any necessary follow-up to such a decision.*

WSSD

21. The GEF should assist in the implementation of the results of the WSSD through its work, consistent with its mandate and taking into account the situation of Least Developed Countries and Small Island Developing States. In particular, the GEF should take into account the importance placed by the Summit on regional and sub-regional initiatives, such as NEPAD and the Barbados Program of Action for the Sustainable Development of Small Island Developing States, and on public participation, stakeholder involvement and partnerships. (Assembly)

Action:

22. *To date, the GEF has supported 124 regional and sub-regional initiatives, with GEF support totaling US\$762.59 million.*

23. *Consistent with the Barbados Program of Action, the GEF has financed 152 national and regional projects for Small Island Developing States. The total support provided by the GEF through these projects is \$173.45million. In addition, there are 19 regional and global projects in which one or more SIDS participated. The GEF has provided grants of \$56.95million to these projects.*

24. *Within Africa, the GEF has supported 38 regional and sub-regional initiatives, with GEF support totaling US\$273 million. This includes two projects supporting the development of an Action Plan on the Environment Component of NEPAD. The first project, Development and Integration of the Environmental Component in the “Partnership for African Renewal” Program, was approved in July 2001. The second, Finalization of the Action Plan on the Environment Component of the New Partnership for Africa’s Development, was approved in September 2002*

25. *The GEF will continue to support regional and sub-regional initiatives within its six focal areas as well as in multifocal activities and through cross-cutting activities, such as capacity building.*

26. *Regarding public participation, stakeholder involvement and partnerships, the GEF has a well established policy on public participation and the monitoring and evaluation unit will take the lead in developing indicators for stakeholder participation in FY04.*

27. *The Secretariat has prepared a strategy to enhance NGO participation in GEF activities at strategic, policy and project levels. A NGO newsletter has been published and NGO outreach is regularly undertaken at meetings dealing with the global environment, in particular at meetings of the global environmental conventions. The Secretariat and the Implementing Agencies have also facilitated the involvement of NGOs, indigenous groups, and other stakeholders in projects and in Country Dialogue Workshops.*

28. *Consultations with the NGO network before each Council Meeting will be continued, and we will help conclude the process of restructuring the GEF/NGO network in order to improve its quality and performance and enhance its membership and representativeness. The Secretariat*

will continue seeking opportunities for NGOs to contribute to GEF work including through projects, country dialogue, and policy development.

GEF at the country level

29. The GEF should consult with each country on the range of operational tools and programming options developed for accessing GEF assistance (e.g. the small grants program, enabling activities, medium-sized projects, the programmatic approach, and strategic partnerships) so as to tap the most appropriate tools to address needs and enhance performance and effectiveness. (Assembly)

30. The GEF should continue to enhance its partnership with civil society, including non-governmental organizations, local communities and indigenous peoples' organizations, at the country level. In this regard, the GEF should seek to expand the Small Grants Program to more countries, and in particular to the Least Developed Countries and Small Island Developing States. (Assembly)

31. National operational focal points should be strengthened to effectively carry out their responsibilities in the GEF. (Assembly)

32. In addressing specific country needs, Participants recommend that the GEF, through country and regional dialogue workshops and the Implementing Agencies' country programming efforts, consult with the country on the range of operational tools and programming modalities that have been developed for accessing GEF assistance with a view to using the most appropriate tools to address the country needs and to enhance performance and effectiveness at the country level. (Replenishment)

33. The GEF should continue ongoing efforts to support capacity development of operational focal points, the national GEF coordinating structures, and the country dialogue workshops. Furthermore, OPS2 recommends that the GEF Secretariat help empower operational focal points by providing better information services on the status of projects in the pipeline and under implementation. To that end, the GEF Council should allocate special funding, administered by the GEF Secretariat, to support the organization of regular in-country GEF portfolio review workshops, carried out by the national operational focal points with participation by the related convention focal points, IAs, and EAs. (OPS2)

Action:

34. *A basic principle of the GEF is that projects are country-driven and based on national priorities aimed at supporting sustainable development. GEF project preparation and implementation provide for consultation with, and participation of, appropriate beneficiaries and affected groups of people. GEF's performance at the country-level is key to its operational success in meeting strategic priorities.*

35. *At its meeting in May 1999, the Council approved activities and associated financial resources to strengthen constituency and country level coordination in recipient countries for a*

three-year period. The Council requested the GEF Secretariat to reach agreement with the Implementing Agencies on the modalities for providing support: (i) to improve the coordination and consultation role of the Council Members representing recipient country constituencies; and (ii) to strengthen the national coordination role of the national focal points.

36. The GEF Secretariat and the Implementing Agencies reached agreement on guidelines for the provision of support to strengthen the national coordination activities of the GEF national focal points and support to the Council Members. Support is provided to the focal point and Council Members through one of the country offices of the Implementing Agencies. Each Implementing Agency prepared administrative arrangements necessary to facilitate the transfer of resources to its field offices in accordance with its internal rules and procedures.

37. As of FY03, 128 countries have received or are in the process of receiving support for their national focal points. It is proposed that this support be evaluated, in consultation with the national focal points, during FY04 and based on findings of the evaluation, a proposal will be made to the Council at its meeting in May 2004 on means to continue strengthening the national focal points consistent with the recommendation of the second GEF Assembly. Pending a Council decision on new proposals to strengthen focal points and support Council Members, the GEF will continue to provide support to focal points and Council Members that so request in accordance with the decision approved by the Council in May 1999. An analysis of the support provided to date is presented in document GEF/C.21/Inf.12. Resources necessary to continue this support in FY04 have been requested in the GEF Corporate Budget.

38. Since 1996, UNDP on behalf of the GEF family and in close consultation with the Secretariat and other Implementing Agencies has coordinated the organization of 39 national and 4 regional or sub-regional workshops to promote country ownership and awareness building by means of country-level dialogue. These workshops informed a broad-based national audience about the GEF, its mission, strategy, policies and procedures. An independent evaluation of the country dialogue workshops was completed in October 2002.

39. UNDP has prepared, in partnership with the GEF Secretariat and the other Implementing Agencies, a new project proposal for a National Consultative Dialogue Initiative. Under this proposal, the first phase of the project will be focused on 11 constituency-based, sub regional workshops to immediately engage all countries in understanding the strategic priorities and operational modalities of the GEF and also to solicit countries views on the design and scope of country level consultations during the second phase of the project. It is proposed that up to 45 national consultative dialogues be organized during the second phase of the project.

40. The proposed objectives of the national consultations are:

- (i) To promote in-depth understanding of the GEF's strategic priorities, business plan, policies and procedures, including the range of operational tools that have been developed for accessing GEF assistance, and to share lessons learned from GEF project implementation reviews,*

- (ii) *To conduct a dialogue with national stakeholders on national strategies, processes and implementation challenges related to global environmental issues,*
- (iii) *To continue strengthening country coordination and engagement in GEF activities by promoting at the national level coordination among multiple stakeholders and synergies amongst the GEF focal areas and convention issues,*
- (iv) *To promote the implementing agencies' efforts to mainstream GEF activities into national planning frameworks, such as national sustainable development strategies and poverty reduction strategies. (See the project entitled, GEF National Consultative Dialogue Initiative, included in the work program proposed for approval by the Council at its meeting in May 2003).*

41. *At its meeting in October 2002, the Council welcomed the replenishment of the Small Grants Program, which included a provision for expansion to 5 countries during 2003. The Council also requested the GEF Secretariat to work with the Small Grants Program and UNDP to prepare for Council review a strategy to expand the program to more countries. This strategy will be presented to the Council for its review in November 2003.*

Capacity Building

42. Capacity building is essential to achieving results and improving performance at the country level. The capacity needs and priorities of recipient countries should be identified and addressed in a systematic way if such countries are to be effective in addressing global environment issues. Where a need is identified for capacity building, removal of policy barriers or strengthening of other conditions that contribute to project success, such capacity building needs or barriers should be addressed as a first step. (Assembly)

43. In addressing capacity building, the GEF should foster synergies amongst the global environmental conventions and coordinate enabling and capacity building activities to achieve effectiveness, efficiency, and better mainstreaming of global environmental issues into the sustainable development agenda. Medium sized projects should play an important role in GEF action for capacity building, particularly in Least Developed Countries and Small Island Developing States. (Assembly)

44. Participants recommend that the GEF Secretariat and Implementing Agencies propose to the Council means to rationalize and coordinate activities in the field of enabling activities and capacity building to achieve effectiveness and efficiency. (Replenishment)

45. Participants also recommend that the GEF Secretariat and the Implementing Agencies give attention to the special needs of the least developed countries and small island developing states among them, particularly their needs for capacity building, consistent with recommendations aimed at maximizing results. (Replenishment)

46. The GEF should adopt a cautious approach to funding any new rounds of enabling activities to the same convention. All such activities must be assessed for their effectiveness in responding to the convention guidance and to country needs. It is important to assess the use of national reports, national communications, and national action programs within the strategic frameworks for a country's national sustainable development program and for GEF's programming and project preparation activities.(OPS2)

47. Utilize financial instruments and mechanisms, in particular the Global Environment Facility (GEF), within its mandate, to provide financial resources to developing countries, in particular least developed countries and small island developing States, to meet their capacity needs for training, technical know-how and strengthening national institutions in reliable, affordable, economically viable, socially acceptable and environmentally sound energy, including promoting energy efficiency and conservation, renewable energy and advanced energy technologies, including advanced and cleaner fossil fuel technologies. (WSSD)

48. Accelerate national and regional implementation of the Program of Action [for Sustainable Development of Small Island Developing States], with adequate financial resources, including through GEF focal areas, transfer of environmentally sound technologies and assistance for capacity-building from the international community (WSSD)

49. Provide support, including for capacity-building, for the development and further implementation of:

- (i) Freshwater programs for small island developing States, including through the GEF focal areas. (WSSD)

Action:

50. *Capacity building is a strategic priority of the GEF that cuts across all focal areas, and the GEF Secretariat, in consultation with the Implementing and Executing Agencies, is developing a strategic framework to give greater focus to capacity building in the GEF. The issue of capacity building has become a major priority within the global conventions, the GEF and the international community. Recent events, such as the WSSD and the Second GEF Assembly, reconfirmed the priority of building the capacity of developing countries.*

51. *In May, 1999, the GEF Council, aware of the growing importance being assigned by the conventions to capacity building as well as the fragmentation of efforts within GEF activities to address this need, approved the 18-month Capacity Development Initiative (CDI) as a strategic partnership between the GEF Secretariat and UNDP, for the preparation of a comprehensive approach for developing the capacities needed at the country level to meet the challenges of global environmental action.*

52. *The CDI was undertaken to (i) make a broad assessment of capacity building needs of developing countries and countries with economies in transition; (ii) take stock of earlier and ongoing efforts to assist national capacity building; and (iii) prepare a strategy and a GEF-specific action plan to provide enhanced and sustained assistance for the purpose. The CDI was*

undertaken in a highly consultative manner, based on national inputs, regional expertise, contributions by NGOs and bilateral/multilateral agencies, and the discussions of the global conventions on climate change, biological diversity, and desertification. The findings of the CDI and the actions proposed were presented in the paper GEF/C.17/6/Rev1, Elements of Strategic Collaboration and a Framework for GEF Action for Capacity Building for the Global Environment.

53. *Several key principles to guide the process of capacity building emerged during the assessment phase of the CDI. These include: (i) the importance of building on existing capacities; (ii) the need for countries to prioritize their actions in implementing global conventions to which they are Parties; (iii) the critical importance of national ownership in ensuring that built capacities are sustained; (iv) the need to adjust capacity building programs to individual countries; and (v) the necessity of coordination and linkage with ongoing efforts, and integration with other sustainable development initiatives.*

54. *Capacity building activities will be operated in a country-centered manner, exploiting opportunities for enhanced decision making at the country level and expedited project delivery whenever possible. The strategy will also seek to build on synergies with Implementing and Executing Agencies' regular capacity development activities. The four elements of the emerging strategy are:*

- (i) *Capacity Building Elements in Projects. Regular GEF projects will continue as a major source of financing for capacity building by targeting capacities necessary to achieve project objectives and goals. Capacity building within investment projects will also be expanded to include not only the needs of the agency/institutions/individuals mainly responsible for project implementation or benefiting from it, but other such actors whose involvement is indirect yet important in the overall context. Capacity building financing within investment projects will be separately identified so that the total GEF financing allocated to capacity building can be monitored.*
- (ii) *Targeted capacity building within the Focal Areas. Each of the six focal areas of the GEF include capacity building either as a strategic priority or as activities supported within their strategic priorities. Targeted, free standing capacity building projects will primarily be designed as medium sized projects. Targeted capacity building within the focal areas will seek to enhance the GEF's responsiveness to the guidance of the conventions.*
- (iii) *Enabling Activities. Enabling activities will be more strictly defined as activities necessary to assist countries to meet their reporting requirements under the conventions. These will be supported within the context of capacity development work ongoing in a country. Within a broader program for capacity building it will be possible to limit enabling activities to reporting requirements since other capacity building aimed at*

enabling countries to implement the conventions will be addressed under the other modalities described in this paragraph.

- (iv) *Cross-cutting capacity building projects will support capacity building activities outside the scope of any one focal area but common to achieving the goals of all focal areas. Such activities, particularly focusing on LDCs and SIDS, will include: (i) foundational capacity building, to establish the basic capacity of a country to meet its global environmental and sustainable development goals; and (ii) support to those countries that need to enhance their performance to access GEF funds. In some cases, a regional approach to meeting capacity building needs might be more feasible.*

55. *In developing capacity building projects, countries are expected to draw from the national capacity needs self-assessments that GEF will continue to support. It is estimated that across the entire GEF portfolio, approximately a billion US dollars will be directed towards capacity building over the next three years. For more details, see the GEF Business Plan (GEF/C.21/9). Targets and indicators will be established when the details of the strategy are developed and submitted for Council review and decision during November 2003.*

Strategic planning

56. The GEF should enhance its strategic business planning for allocating scarce GEF resources to high priority areas within and among focal areas, taking into account national priorities, with a view towards maximizing the impact of these resources on global environmental improvements and promoting sound environmental policies and practices worldwide. (Assembly)

57. Participants request the GEF Secretariat to work with the Council to establish a system for allocating scarce GEF resources within and among focal areas with a view towards maximizing the impact of these resources on global environmental improvements and promoting sound environmental policies and practices worldwide. (Replenishment)

58. In this connection, Participants request the GEF Secretariat to prepare, in consultation with the Council, a paper for Council review and decision at its meeting in May 2003. A draft paper that can be used as a basis of consultation should be circulated to Council Members by February 1, 2003. The paper should propose an allocation system, for which implementation should be initiated immediately after a Council decision in May 2003, based on the core principles of selectivity, accountability, and results. (Replenishment)

59. The system should establish a framework for allocation to global environmental priorities and to countries based on performance. Such a system would provide for varied levels and types of support to countries based on transparent assessments of those elements of country capacity, policies and practices most applicable to successful implementation of GEF projects. This system should ensure that all member countries can be informed as to how allocation decisions are made. (Replenishment)

60. As allocation system should establish a framework for allocation to global environmental priorities and to countries based on performance. Such a system would provide for varied levels and types of support to countries based on transparent assessments of those elements of country capacity, policies and practices most applicable to successful implementation of GEF projects. This system should ensure that all member countries can be informed as to how allocation decisions are made. (Replenishment)

61. The GEF Secretariat and Implementing Agencies are requested to collaborate in presenting a new strategic approach to business planning for consideration by the Council at its meeting in May 2003. The strategic plan should be based on the performance allocation system that will also be discussed and approved by the Council in May 2003. (Replenishment)

62. The new strategic business plan should be a performance-based, three year plan, that includes priorities for action to maximize results and impacts on the ground and to fulfill the mission of the GEF to achieve global environmental benefits in its focal areas. The strategic business plan should provide an indicative financial planning framework, based on focal areas and program priorities, that provides reasonable predictability for the involvement of the GEF in the medium term, linked to indicators of strategic relevance, programmatic consistency, and expected outcomes. The strategic business plan should be reviewed and approved annually by the Council. Such review should take into account, among other things, changes that may emerge from country priorities, convention guidance and lessons learned from the GEF monitoring and evaluation activities. (Replenishment)

63. The GEF should regularly seek to update and clarify priorities identified by the global environmental conventions by strengthening its dialogue with the conventions based on results and outcomes achieved, lessons learned, and other information emanating from the GEF monitoring and evaluation activities (OPS2)¹

Action:

64. *The Council has before it for review and approval a proposal on Programming Resources for enhanced Performance and Results at Country Level (GEF/C.21/8) as well as a Business Plan for FY04-06 (GEF/C.21/9)*

Project Cycle

65. The GEF should continue to be a cutting-edge, country-driven facility that is creative, responsive and capable of programming sustainable global environmental benefits. In this regard, the GEF project cycle should be reviewed, in cooperation with the Implementing and

¹ This recommendation was recently echoed in the decisions of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity and to the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change. See Decision VI/17, paragraph 7, of the Sixth Meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity and Decision 5/cp.8, paragraph 2, of the Eighth Session of the Conference of the Parties of the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change.

Executing Agencies as well as national operational focal points, with a view towards making it more simple and efficient and taking into account lessons learned and findings of the GEF monitoring and evaluation program. (Assembly)

66. Participants recommend that the GEF Implementing Agencies continue, in their dialogue with countries, to rigorously address the performance indicators related to expected success of a project at the country level, including country ownership, replicability, sustainability, public involvement, monitoring and evaluation, and co-financing. Such indicators should also address assessment of project results and global environmental impacts. (Replenishment)

67. Participants recommend that the Council formulate stricter criteria for project and program quality, including criteria on co-financing, on the basis of monitoring and evaluation experience and lessons learned by the GEF. (Replenishment)

68. Welcome the successful and substantial third replenishment of the GEF, which will enable it to address the funding requirements of new focal areas and existing ones and continue to be responsive to the needs and concerns of its recipient countries, in particular developing countries, and further encourage GEF to leverage additional funds from key public and private organizations, improve the management of funds through more speedy and streamlined procedures, and simplify its project cycle. (WSSD)

Action:

69. *In the ongoing work on streamlining the internal procedures of the project cycle, the Secretariat and the Implementing Agencies will specifically work on ways to delegate initial technical reviews according to the agreed Project Review Criteria to the proposing agencies – a format for reporting on these technical reviews as an executive summary was developed and presented to the Council. During its October 2003 meeting, Council “welcomed the proposed format for executive summaries of GEF project proposals presented in document GEF/20/Inf.4, and agreed that the Secretariat, in consultation with the Implementing and Executing Agencies, should keep the format under continuous review.....” Further updating of the GEF Project Cycle paper and the associated Project Review Criteria will be needed to incorporate the relevant Council decisions and understandings since June 2000, and to incorporate additional streamlining of the internal procedures. The results of this work will be submitted to Council in November 2003.*

70. *In the FY04 work program proposed for the GEF monitoring and evaluation unit, it is proposed that work on developing indicators be continued as a priority. Reports on indicators for biodiversity and international waters activities will be completed in FY03. Additional work will be undertaken to develop more precise indicators for “sustainable use” in biodiversity projects. Indicators for stakeholder participation will be developed as will indicators for capacity building activities.*

Incremental Costs

71. GEF should continue its efforts to make more understandable the concept of agreed incremental costs and global benefits by countries and staff of the Implementing and Executing Agencies. Efforts should be aimed at linking global environmental benefits and incremental costs in a negotiating process that partner countries and the GEF would use to reach agreement on incremental costs, recognizing that the process for determining incremental costs should be transparent, flexible and pragmatic. (Assembly)

72. The GEF Secretariat and the Implementing Agencies should continue their efforts to develop simpler guidance and communication for recipient countries on the determination of incremental costs and global benefits, including dissemination of a framework for increasing recipient's involvement in the process of estimating these costs. (Replenishment)

73. To improve the understanding of agreed incremental costs and global benefits by countries, IA staff, and new EAs, OPS2 recommends that the 1996 Council paper on incremental costs (GEF/C.7/Inf.5) be used as a starting point for an interagency task force. This group would seek to link global environmental benefits and incremental costs in a negotiating framework that partner countries and the GEF would use to reach agreement on incremental costs. This should be tested in a few countries, and revised based on the experience gained, before it is widely communicated as a practical guideline for operational focal points, IAs, and GEF Secretariat staff. (OPS2)

Action:

74. *Essential to the overall financial efficiency of the GEF in obtaining global environmental benefits is the principle that GEF finances only the incremental costs of an agreed activity. In consultation with the Implementing Agencies and Executing Agencies, the Secretariat will: (i) develop simpler guidance and communication for recipient country officials on the determination of incremental costs and global environmental benefits; (ii) draft a framework for reaching agreement with countries on incremental cost. Among other things, such a framework would ascertain the involvement of beneficiaries and appropriate cost sharing; and (iii) assist the Implementing and Executing Agencies to pilot this approach in a few countries.*

Catalytic Role

75. The GEF should strengthen its catalytic role, through mainstreaming, cofinancing, and particularly the replication of successful activities on a much larger scale. (Assembly)

76. The international community should (a) enhance the integration of sustainable development goals as reflected in Agenda 21 and support for implementation of Agenda 21 and the outcomes of the Summit into policies, work programs and operational guidelines of relevant United Nations agencies, programs and funds, GEF and international financial and trade institutions within their mandates, while stressing that their activities should take full account of national programs and priorities, particularly those of developing countries, as well as, where appropriate, countries with economies in transition, to achieve sustainable development; (WSSD)

Action:

77. *The initial commitment of the Implementing Agencies to the GEF had been in developing their GEF activities in areas of their institutional comparative advantage, as provided for in the Instrument. The issue for the Implementing Agencies in the years since the restructuring in 1994 became one of deepening those commitments by integrating their GEF activities into their regular work programs and taking global environmental considerations into account in those programs. Progress on these issues has been reported to Council by the Implementing Agencies. Given the magnitude of the resources required for the global environment, the Implementing Agencies and the Executing Agencies will need to continue mainstreaming and deepening their commitment to the GEF.*

78. *The National Consultations to be organized during the third replenishment period will have as one of their objectives the promotion of the implementing agencies' efforts to mainstream GEF activities into national planning frameworks, such as national sustainable development strategies and poverty reduction strategies.*

Technology Transfer and Private Sector

79. The GEF should enhance technology transfer by strengthening public-private partnerships and technology cooperation, both North/South and South/South. (Assembly)

80. Recognizing previous efforts to engage the private sector, the GEF should develop a new strategy, in dialogue with private sector entities, to better engage the private sector with greater emphasis on the development of an enabling environment and market-oriented strategies to enhance sustainability and replication. Such a strategy should aim to further improve operational procedures so as to expand GEF partnerships with the private sector. (Assembly)

81. Participants recommend that the GEF Secretariat, in collaboration with the Implementing and Executing Agencies, develop a new strategy to better engage the private sector, taking into account previous practices and policies. Participants recommend that the GEF, in preparing the strategy, consult with private sector actors to identify perceived constraints to working with the GEF. Clear operational guidelines should be elaborated in order to define the scope of GEF collaboration with private sector activities. (Replenishment)

82. In particular, OPS2 recommends that the GEF should engage the private sector more effectively in all phases of the project cycle, including securing adequate GEF Secretariat expertise in this field. (OPS2)

83. It should seek to create an enabling environment in which more specific, market-oriented strategies and expanded GEF operational modalities enable timely interaction with the private sector, thereby forming the basis for long-term sustainability of GEF activities. (OPS2)

Action:

84. *The Monitoring and Evaluation Unit is undertaking a Review of GEF Engagement with the Private Sector. An interim report from this review, GEF/C.21/Inf.16 has been provided to the Council. A final report will be prepared by June 2003, and submitted to the Council for discussion during the November 2003 meeting.*

85. *Based on the findings of this review, and other experiences regarding work with the private sector, the GEF Secretariat, in collaboration with the Implementing Agencies and Executing Agencies, is preparing a new strategy to engage better the private sector.² Some of the elements of this emerging strategy are described in GEF/C.21/Inf.9, Preliminary Private Sector Strategy, submitted to this Council meeting as an information document. GEF, in developing and implementing this strategy, will consult with private sector actors to identify perceived constraints to working with the GEF. The full strategy would be submitted for Council review and approval at the November 2003 meeting.*

Measuring performance through strengthened monitoring and evaluation

86. The GEF should ensure that strategic goals and priorities established in the strategic business plan are linked to programmatic and project performance indicators, including expected outcomes that can be monitored and measured with a view to assessing progress towards fulfilling such strategic goals. (Assembly)

87. In this regard, the GEF monitoring and evaluation unit, for purposes of evaluation, should be made independent, reporting directly to the Council. The GEF should establish procedures to disseminate lessons learned and best practices to ensure more systematic use of the results and outputs of GEF projects for the improvement of planning and subsequent activities. (Assembly)

88. Participants recommend that the GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Unit, the Secretariat and the Implementing and Executing Agencies develop a common interagency approach on indicators to be used as practical guidelines for more systematic monitoring of such activities and document best practices of stakeholder participation. (Replenishment)

89. The GEF Secretariat and Implementing and Executing Agencies should collaborate to ensure that strategic goals and priorities established in the strategic business plan are linked to programmatic and project performance indicators, including expected outcomes that can be monitored and measured with a view to assessing progress towards fulfilling such strategic goals. Indicators should be designed with a view to assessing global environmental impacts achieved from the GEF resources. All projects must include clear and monitorable indicators, plans for monitoring and supervision, and identification of risks and other factors designed to improve quality at entry and to maximize impact. There should be a transparent system for the monitoring of these indicators and outcomes and for informing the Council on an annual basis. (Replenishment)

² See previous paper on modalities *Engaging the Private Sector in GEF Activities*, GEF/C.13/Inf.5 May 1999 and the paper *Funds and Trust Funds*, GEF/C.12/Inf.5 October 1998 addressing a number of issues raised by Council on the use of funds.

90. Participants request that for each replenishment, projections of outcomes for the forthcoming replenishment period be provided so that countries better understand the outcomes and impacts expected to be achieved with the resources to be provided. The replenishment process should also be informed of the results and impacts achieved during the previous replenishment, such as through an independent overall performance study as was the case for GEF-3, and this information should be provided in advance of the replenishment process. (Replenishment)

91. The GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Unit and the Secretariat, in collaboration with the Implementing and Executing Agencies, should establish concrete indicators to measure progress in mainstreaming. Participants requested the Implementing Agencies to submit annual status reports on their mainstreaming strategies to the Council. (Replenishment)

92. Participants recommend that a high priority be placed on strengthening monitoring and evaluation of GEF projects. Participants also recommend that the roles and responsibilities for monitoring and evaluation among the GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Unit, the Secretariat and the Implementing and Executing Agencies be reviewed by the Council together with recommendations aimed at developing a partnership approach to monitoring and evaluation responsibilities in order to increase complementarity. Drawing upon its technical expertise, the GEF Secretariat and the Monitoring and Evaluation Unit should have a more participatory role in the Implementing and Executing Agencies' project implementation reviews with regard to determining progress toward achieving GEF objectives while recognizing that accountability for project monitoring and supervision of implementation lies with the Implementing and Executing Agencies. More specifically, Participants recommend that the following actions be undertaken:

- (a) the GEF monitoring and evaluation unit, for purposes of evaluation, should be made independent, reporting directly to the Council, with its budget and work plan determined by the Council and its head proposed by the GEF CEO and appointed by the Council for a renewable term of five years;
- (b) a process for Council oversight of monitoring and evaluation should be established;
- (c) the GEF Secretariat and Implementing and Executing Agencies should establish a procedure to disseminate lessons learned and best practices emanating from the monitoring and evaluation activities;
- (d) a formal "feedback loop" should be established between evaluation findings and management activities to ensure more systematic use of the results and outputs of GEF projects for the improvement of planning and subsequent activities;
- (e) the GEF Secretariat and the Implementing and Executing Agencies are called upon to report annually to the Council on their response to relevant recommendations of OPS2 and the replenishment documents;

- (f) the monitoring and evaluation unit should establish more rigorous minimum standards for GEF-specific aspects of projects relating to GEF policies and strategies expected of monitoring and evaluation units of the Implementing and Executing Agencies;
- (g) as each of the Implementing and Executing Agencies has its own system for drawing lessons from operational experiences, the GEF monitoring and evaluation unit should facilitate more intensive interagency sharing of experiences relevant to the GEF;
- (h) all projects should include provisions for monitoring the outcomes of projects and progress toward achieving project objectives and impacts, and those existing projects which do not have such provisions and which have more than two years left in their implementation should be retrofitted to meet such monitoring standards;
- (i) the monitoring and evaluation unit should report annually to the Council on its work; and
- (j) the monitoring and evaluation unit should be provided access to all project documents of the Implementing and Executing Agencies relating to GEF-financed activities. (Replenishment)

93. With due respect for the implementing agencies' overall responsibility for project implementation and evaluation, the GEF Council should strengthen and expand the monitoring and evaluation functions of the GEF monitoring and evaluation unit so that it can play a supporting partnership role in mid-term reviews and project evaluations, particularly by providing advice on TORs for mid-term reviews and final project evaluations, contributing to the review of each of these reports, reviewing and compiling the results reported from project evaluations, and arranging adequate feedback to all GEF partners (OPS2)

Action:

94. *The Council has before it for review and approval the terms of reference for an independent monitoring and evaluation unit in the GEF (GEF/C.21/12). The Council also has before it for approval the GEF monitoring and evaluation work plan for FY03-06 (GEF/C.21/13). The work program elaborates upon the reviews and studies to be prepared as well as processes and procedures to be developed, in response to the above recommendations. In preparing the terms of reference and the work program, the following remarks of the Council at its meeting in October 2002 were taken into account:*

“The Council noted that it was difficult to clearly divide monitoring functions from those of evaluation and recommended that the monitoring and evaluation unit report directly to the Council on both issues, while maintaining a close working relationship with the GEF Secretariat and Implementing and Executing Agencies.

The Council suggested that the monitoring and evaluation unit prepare an annual strategic report on its monitoring and evaluation work and results. It requested that further consideration be given to how to maintain regular communication between the monitoring and evaluation unit and the Council.

The Council noted that the establishment of an independent monitoring and evaluation unit should not imply an expansion in the costs of staffing the current unit.”

OTHER RECOMMENDATIONS

Operational programs

95. The GEF should review and rationalize the number and objectives of operational programs in light of the lessons learned in order to ensure consistency and a unified focus on delivering global environmental benefits. Furthermore, to ensure quality outcomes that focus on global environmental benefits, OPS2 recommends that GEF make a special effort to use scientific analysis as a constant foundation for the planning and implementation of new projects in all focal areas. The science-based Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis (TDA) should continue to be the basis for facilitating regional agreements on actions to address threats to international waters and for developing strategic action programs (SAPs). OPS2 further recommends the extension of a similar approach to land degradation, as it is now becoming a new focal area. (OPS2)

Action:

96. *The GEF Secretariat and the Implementing Agencies will review experience in programming in accordance with the strategic priorities approved in the Business Plan (beginning in May 2003), and in light of that experience, will consider any need for rationalizing the number and objectives of the Operational Programs. This review will be presented in the GEF Business Plan FY06-08 (November 2004).*

Institutional strengthening

97. Participants recommend that the Council agrees that current executing agencies designated under expanded opportunities that have demonstrated their capacity and comparative advantage in developing and managing GEF projects through a portfolio of GEF activities (the Asian Development Bank and the Inter-American Development Bank) should now benefit from direct access through the GEF Secretariat to the Council for GEF project funding. It is also recommended that Council review annually, beginning in May 2003, the experience of other executing agencies designated under expanded opportunities and consider whether additional agencies should benefit from such direct access based on having satisfactorily demonstrated to the Council their capacity and comparative advantage in the management of GEF project activities. It is further recommended that an in-depth examination of the performance of the executing agencies operating under expanded opportunities, including those with direct access,

be carried out during the third replenishment period with the objective of recommending continuation and/or modification of the policy. (Replenishment)

Action:

98. *Discussions are proceeding with the Asian Development Bank and the Inter-American Development Bank on the agreements that need to be concluded between the GEF Secretariat and the banks as well as between the Trustee and the banks to ensure their direct access for GEF project funding.*

99. *A review of the performance of the executing agencies operating under expanded opportunities will be prepared for Council review in May 2004.*

100. *The Council will be invited to review annually beginning in May 2004 the experience of other executing agencies designated under expanded opportunities and consider whether additional agencies should benefit from such direct access based on having satisfactorily demonstrated to the Council their capacity and comparative advantage in the management of GEF project activities. In this period, it is expected that more project experience will be acquired on which to base such a review.*

Project fees

101. In response to the concerns raised when the GEF was established regarding cost efficiency, accountability for services provided, and monitoring of overhead costs, OPS2 recommends two measures: (i) establishing a standard set of tasks to be performed by the Implementing Agencies with fee resources and (ii) adopting a simple output-based fee payment system for Implementing Agencies using two or three payments that are phased through the life of a project and linked to specific project milestones. (OPS2)

Action:

102. *A proposal on the project fees is before the Council as GEF/C.21/10. The document includes proposals concerning a standard set of project management services and tasks to be performed by the Implementing Agencies for the fees.*

103. The document includes proposals concerning a standard set of tasks to be performed by the Implementing Agencies.

Co-financing

104. Participants request recipient countries, the Implementing Agencies and Executing Agencies and other donors to generate additional resources to leverage GEF funding. Co-financing levels should be a key consideration in considering work program inclusion. (Replenishment)

105. Participants recommend that the GEF establish a co-financing policy, with consistent criteria and reporting requirements as well as co-financing targets. Such targets should provide flexibility to take into account specific project situations. The amount of realized co-financing in a project or program should be monitored and compared to the amount of co-financing anticipated at the time of Council approval, and this indicator should be reported to the Council on a regular basis. Recalling the Council's request for a note on co-financing of GEF projects in May 2001, the Participants recommend that a proposed co-financing policy be prepared by the Secretariat, in consultation with the Implementing and Executing Agencies, for consideration by the Council at its meeting in October 2002. (Replenishment)

106. Each IA and new executing agency should be held responsible for generating significant additional resources to leverage GEF resources. A clear definition of co-financing and a set of strict co-financing criteria should be developed for different GEF project categories and country circumstances. The emphasis should be on the total amount of additional co-financing considered to constitute a significant and effective cost-sharing arrangement for each project, rather than on the quantity of co-financing forthcoming from an agency's operating programs and government contributions. Co-financing levels should be monitored and assessed annually through the interagency PIR process, as well as evaluated in the final project reports. The monitoring of replication of successful project activities should be established as a separate exercise in GEF (OPS2).

Action:

107. Co-financing and leverage are essential if GEF efforts are to have a significant positive impact on the global environment. In May 2001, Council requested a note on cofinancing of GEF projects. A paper was prepared and submitted to the Council for review at its meeting in October 2002. After review, Council requested the Secretariat to revise the paper taking into account the comments made and to submit the revised paper to Council for its review and approval in May 2003. Council also specifically requested that the Secretariat, in consultation with the Implementing and Executing Agencies, establish a database on cofinancing that would allow a better analysis of GEF experience and monitoring of cofinancing throughout project development and implementation.

108. A policy and criteria on co-financing is proposed to the Council for review and approval in document GEF/C.20/6/Rev.1). This paper identifies several issues concerning current practice – consistency in reporting, monitoring of co-financing, adequacy of co-financing levels, stability of commitment – and proposes an approach with the following elements: (i) adopting consistent criteria for reporting co-financing; (ii) monitoring and evaluating the GEF experience in co-financing; (iii) applying lessons, managing in-kind commitments, and increasing co-financing levels; and (iv) confirming commitments and reviewing substantive changes.

109. GEF will facilitate a coordinated approach to financing global environmental protection. It will do this by strengthening cofinancing of its own projects and working on programmatic approaches where countries are willing to make such commitments. But it will also help coordinate financing by providing its member countries, clients, external partners, and other

interested stakeholders with an easy, unified way to access operational and financial data on global environmental activities. By making environment-related portfolio and project data much more readily available and accessible, this information management strategy will help identify opportunities for project and programmatic collaboration, cooperation, and cofinancing; provide input for investment planning in environment protection; and facilitate financial and portfolio research and dialogue on global environmental issues.

STAP

110. Participants recommend that UNEP and the Secretariat, in consultation with the other Implementing Agencies and taking into account the views and recommendations of the STAP constituted during GEF-2 as well as the results of OPS2, present to the Council for its consideration proposals on the role of STAP. (Replenishment)

111. To strengthen the GEF system for providing science and technology inputs, OPS2 recommends appointing STAP members for staggered terms, exploring with STAP members mechanisms for improving the use of in-country scientific and technical expertise within the GEF, and seeking STAP recommendations for appropriate changes to improve the project review system and to enhance the utility of the roster of experts (OPS2)

Action:

112. UNEP and the GEF Secretariat will jointly prepare, in consultation with the other Implementing Agencies, proposals for Council review and approval at its meeting in November 2003 on STAP and its role and functions in the GEF.

Relations with Conventions

113. In this context, OPS2 also recommends that the GEF Council explore the feasibility of each country reporting directly to the appropriate convention on the effectiveness and results of GEF's country-relevant support for both enabling activities and projects.(OPS2)

114. In its dialogue with each convention that it supports, the GEF should regularly seek to update and clarify existing priorities and commitments in light of each new round of guidance it receives. (OPS2)

Action:

115. The GEF Secretariat will initiate consultations with the Secretariats to the global environmental conventions for which it operates their financial mechanisms on opportunities and proposals for improving the dialogue between the GEF and the conventions with a view to streamlining guidance to the GEF and to updating and clarifying existing priorities and

commitments when new guidance is agreed. The GEF Secretariat will report to the Council at its meeting in May 2004 of the outcome of these consultations.

Stakeholder participation

116. An interagency task force should be organized by the GEF Secretariat for the purpose of developing an effective and systematic way to document information on stakeholder consultations and participation, including the involvement of indigenous communities, in GEF-funded projects (OPS2)

Action:

117. The monitoring and evaluation unit of the GEF will take the lead in the development of indicators for stakeholder participation during FY04 and will convene a inter-agency task force to work on this issue. The indicators will be based on the work being undertaken to prepare a study on the nature and role of local benefits in GEF projects and will take into account the existing indicators of the Implementing Agencies.

**ANNEX A: SCHEDULE FOR COUNCIL REVIEW OF PROPOSALS AND POLICIES TO RESPOND TO
RECOMMENDATIONS**

I. Council meeting in May 2003

- (a) Business Plan for allocation GEF resources to high priority areas within and among focal areas
- (b) Programming resources for enhanced performance
- (c) Fee-based system
- (d) Co-financing policy
- (e) Operational program for prevention and Control of Desertification and Deforestation through Sustainable Land Management
- (f) Terms of reference for an independent monitoring and evaluation unit: work plan for monitoring and evaluation activities
- (g) Project for National Consultative Dialogue Initiative included in work program

II. Council meeting in November 2003

- (a) Consideration of decisions of the sixth meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the UNCCD concerning the designation of the GEF as a financial mechanism pursuant to paragraph 21 of the Convention
- (b) Strategy to enhance capacity building
- (c) Corporate Business Plan
- (d) Up-dated project cycle
- (e) Programmatic approach
- (f) Indicators for biodiversity and international waters
- (g) Review of GEF engagement with the Private Sector prepared by the monitoring and evaluation unit
- (h) Strategy for engagement of the private sector
- (i) UNEP/GEF Secretariat/STAP proposal on STAP and its role and functions in the GEF

- (j) Proposal prepared by GEF Secretariat/Small Grants Program/UNDP on strategy to expand the Small Grant Program to more countries
- (k) Operational program on Persistent Organic Pollutants

III. Council meeting in May 2004

- (a) Indicators for stakeholder involvement in GEF projects and for capacity building
- (b) Proposal on means to continue strengthening the national focal points
- (c) Incremental cost: simpler guidance and communication together with a framework for reaching agreement with countries on incremental costs
- (d) Review of the performance of executing agencies operating under expanded opportunities
- (e) Proposals for improving the dialogue between GEF and the Conventions

IV. Council Meeting in November 2004

- (a) Consideration of need for rationalizing the number and objectives of the operational programs in business plan