

Global Environment Facility

GEF/C.31/Inf.9 June 4, 2007

GEF Council June 12-15, 2007

PROGRESS REPORT ON IMPLEMENTING THE RAF

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 1. The GEF Council approved a system to allocate GEF resources, Resource Allocation Framework (RAF), at a Special Meeting of the Council held August 31- September 1, 2005. Council has reviewed progress reports and provided additional guidance on the implementation of the RAF at its meetings on November 2005, June 2006 and December 2006. In particular, Council reviewed Document GEF/C.30/11, *Progress Report on Implementing the RAF*, in December 2006 and requested the Secretariat to continue its efforts to ensure a smooth transition to the RAF for recipient countries, to continue to monitor the implementation of the RAF, and to report to the Council on a regular basis.
- 2. Document GEF/C.30/11, *Progress Report on Implementing the RAF* informed the Council in December 2006 of the CEO's decision to initiate direct dialogues with recipient countries to ensure that GEF 4 resources are programmed in accordance with: (i) the strategic directions as outlined in the GEF 4 focal area strategies: (ii) country priorities emerging from national sustainable development programs and global environmental commitments; and (iii) the comparative advantage of the GEF agencies. The Secretariat has completed the initial round of consultations with eligible recipient countries over the six month period beginning October 19, 2006 and ending April 25, 2007.
- 3. This report highlights the major elements of implementing the RAF between November 2006 and May 2007. It provides a summary of the process and content and of the direct dialogues with countries. It reflects on the accomplishments and lessons learned from these dialogues. These direct dialogues have not only provided recipient countries with a significant new mechanism for understanding the implementation of the RAF but also have opened up channels of direct communications between countries and the GEF regarding specific projects.
- 4. This report informs the Council of the current status in programming resources available in the biodiversity and climate change focal areas under the RAF. It also informs that Council of some additional issues on the RAF that have arisen during the implementation process.

Table of Contents

| Executive Summary | ii |
|--|----|
| Background | 1 |
| Direct Dialogues with recipient countries | 2 |
| Other Country Consultations | 5 |
| Programming and Utilization of Allocations under the RAF | 5 |
| Changes in Eligibility and Allocations | 6 |
| Next Steps | 7 |

Annex 1: RAF allocation and Utilization Report

Background

- 1. The GEF Council approved a system to allocate GEF resources, Resource Allocation Framework (RAF), at a Special Meeting of the Council held August 31- September 1, 2005. Council has reviewed progress reports and provided additional guidance on the implementation of the RAF at its meetings on November 2005, June 2006 and December 2006. In particular, Council reviewed Document GEF/C.30/11, *Progress Report on Implementing the RAF*, in December 2006 and requested the Secretariat to continue its efforts to ensure a smooth transition to the RAF for recipient countries, to continue to monitor the implementation of the RAF, and to report to the Council on a regular basis. The Council also requested the Secretariat to present an information document on the Small Grants Programming based on its discussions about the SGP in the context of RAF.
- 2. The GEF has put a variety of mechanisms in place to support recipient countries in their engagement with the GEF including sub-regional workshops, the National Dialogue Initiative, the Country Support Program, and the Council Member Support Program. The significant changes brought forth by the RAF as well as new policy and process reforms introduced in 2006 to streamline and enhance the effectiveness of GEF programming have necessitated direct dialogues between recipient countries and the GEF Secretariat.
- 3. Document GEF/C.30/11, *Progress Report on Implementing the RAF* informed the Council in December 2006 of the CEO's decision to initiate direct dialogues with recipient countries to ensure that GEF 4 resources are programmed in accordance with: (i) the strategic directions as outlined in the GEF 4 focal area strategies: (ii) country priorities emerging from national sustainable development programs and global environmental commitments; and (iii) the comparative advantage of the GEF agencies. These direct dialogues have not only provided recipient countries with a significant new mechanism for understanding the implementation of the RAF but also have opened up channels of direct communications capable of responding to additional recipient country concerns as they emerge. The Secretariat has completed the initial round of consultations with eligible recipient countries over the six month period beginning October 19, 2006 and ending April 25, 2007.

This report highlights the major elements of implementing the RAF between November 2006 and May 2007. It begins with a summary of the direct dialogues with countries and the other country outreach activities under the preexisting mechanisms that have taken place during this six month period. This is followed by a status report on the programming of resources in the biodiversity and climate change focal areas. The final section of this report informs the Council of some additional issues on the RAF that have arisen during the implementation process. The information document on programming resources under the Small Grants Program in relation to RAF allocations of countries is separately available as, GEF/C.31/Inf.4, *Information Note on the Management of the Small Grants Program*. It defines the level of resources available to each country in the context of the RAF and includes guidelines on the expansion of the SGP to additional countries.

-

¹ Joint Summary of the Chairs, Special Meeting of the GEF Council, August 31- September 1, 2005. The RAF, as agreed by the Council is available as information document, GEF/C.27/Inf8/Rev.1, *The GEF Resource Allocation Framework*.

Direct Dialogues with recipient countries

Process

- 4. In October 2006, the Secretariat established a system to initiate direct dialogues with all countries eligible under the RAF. Countries that had sent a prioritized list of proposals for financing from their respective allocations prior to September 15, 2006 were contacted first.
- 5. The Secretariat sent notifications to country Operational Focal Points, inviting them to participate in a teleconference with a technical team from the Secretariat at a mutually convenient time. Focal Points were also asked to invite colleagues from the convention focal points, line ministries and other relevant national stakeholders for the teleconferences.
- 6. The Secretariat constituted a country-specific technical call team composed of a representative each from the Corporate team, the Operations and Business Strategy team, the Biodiversity team, the Climate Change team and, when applicable, a representative from the other focal area teams. All members of the above GEF teams took part in one or more teleconference calls during the six month period.
- 7. Subsequent to each teleconference, the Secretariat prepared a summary of the discussions which was sent to the Operational Focal points and shared with all of the GEF Agencies. The Operational Focal Points were also informed of the openness of the Secretariat to further queries and concerns on the implementation of the RAF and in supporting countries to program the resources being made available to them under the RAF.
- 8. Subsequent to their participation in the teleconference, a number of countries have followed up by holding additional national discussions and consultations subsequent to which they advised the Secretariat of changes in their programming approach or priorities. In these instances, when necessary, the appropriate technical representatives of the Secretariat teams have held follow up discussions with the country. Additionally, the Secretariat has advised the country to work with a GEF Agency to develop the concepts in line with the GEF focal area strategy and to submit it to the Secretariat for review and approval.

Content

- 9. The first part of each discussion focused on general issues about the RAF and its implementation. Countries were informed that the RAF is new to the Secretariat, as it is for all countries and GEF partners. Additionally, the RAF is being implemented in the context of changes in the focal area strategies and efforts to streamline the project cycle so that it takes no more than 22 months on average to approve projects. These changes are expected to be in place by the June 2007 Council Meeting.
- 10. Each country was reminded that the RAF provides greater predictability in the level of resources that are available to it during GEF-4 so that the country could make strategic decisions regarding the use of these resources. Each country could use up to 50% of the available allocations during the first 2 years. The remaining allocations would be subject to reallocation

based on changes in the GEF Benefits Index and GEF Performance Index of all eligible countries during the midterm reallocation.

- 11. The Secretariat reconfirmed the initial indicative allocations of all countries with individual allocations. For countries in the group, the applicable rules for accessing the group resources and the rationale behind them were explained. Similarly, whenever applicable, the Secretariat confirmed the resources that would be available to each country under the Small Grants Program and the rules that would be applicable in accessing them.
- 12. Countries were provided an overview of the existing biodiversity and climate change GEF focal area strategies and the expected revisions to them. Focal area program managers provided guidance to countries based on their knowledge of the emerging discussions and the needs of each country.
- 13. Countries were also informed that given the limited pool of resources through the Global and regional exclusion, the CEO had decided to defer consideration of projects until a clear set of policies could be defined for their use in the context of the revised focal area strategies. Further countries were informed that the LDCF and SCCF adaptation funds are not governed by the RAF and remains unchanged from the existing practices. With respect to the Strategic Pilot on Adaptation (SPA), the resources were being made available through the Global and Regional Exclusion in the climate change focal area.
- 14. During these direct dialogues, a number of countries also raised issues about the RAF design, its bias against countries with low capacity, and against those with significant marine diversity such as the SIDS. The secretariat indicated that these issues could more readily be addressed as part of the mid-term review of the RAF and stated that the Evaluation Office is taking the initial steps in scoping out the process and content of the mid-term review.

Issues about specific priorities and projects

15. The second part of each discussion focused on the specific priorities and projects of the country. Fifty-five countries had provided a prioritized list of projects for funding in GEF-4 prior to September 15, 2006, as originally requested by the Secretariat. Many additional countries developed prioritized lists for their countries in preparation for the dialogues with the Secretariat.

3

² Countries in the group do not have individual allocations. Instead they collectively access the resources made available to the group. There are 93 countries in the group with an allocation of \$146.8 million in biodiversity. There are 115 countries in climate change with an allocation of \$148.6 million. No country in the group can access more than \$3.5 million in biodiversity and \$3.1 million in climate change. To ensure fairness, a project less than \$1 million from a country in the group will be reviewed in a national context. Additional resources will be reviewed in the context of the demand for these resources from all countries in the group.

³ The development of both of these rules occurred after an initial set of dialogues had already taken place with countries, so when applicable, some countries were informed of these rule changes either in the follow-up letter to the dialogue or through a separate follow-up call or supplementary letters.

- 16. Countries (a) identified their priorities, (b) often described the stakeholder consultation process used to establish these priorities, and (c) elaborated on how these priorities fit within their respective national development agendas.
- 17. The Secretariat commented on the match between the proposed priorities and projects in the context of the evolving focal area strategies and indicated whether the projects would be ineligible, eligible if prepared appropriately, or possibly eligible if changed in specific ways. Additionally, in a number of instances, the Secretariat raised issues about the Agencies proposed for a specific project in the context of the ongoing Council deliberations on the comparative advantage of agencies.
- 18. The discussions on each priority project were ended once a clear understanding had been reached between the country and the Secretariat. In a few instances, follow-up discussions were scheduled to resolve outstanding issues that could not be resolved in a mutually satisfactory manner. Countries were also advised to partner with an appropriate agency to assist with the development of the project and the transmittal of the Project Information Form (PIF) for the project to the GEF Secretariat.
- 19. A number of countries were unable to present a prioritized list prior to the dialogues. In these instances, the Secretariat took the opportunity to review the historical engagement between the country and the GEF and provided suggestions for priority consideration by the country.

Accomplishments and Lessons Learned

- 20. The direct dialogues between recipient countries and the GEF Secretariat have opened a significant new avenue for GEF's strategic engagement with countries. The Secretariat has successfully completed the initial round of direct dialogues with recipient countries. A total of 129 countries were called during this six-month effort. There have been no dialogues with the remaining countries either because the countries do not have GEF focal points or because the countries have not been able to agree to a mutually convenient time for a dialogue with the GEF Secretariat despite multiple attempts to do so.
- 21. This new engagement has generally been well received by recipient countries who have expressed appreciation for them. It has been particularly well received by countries with limited national capacities and by countries with limited or no prior engagement with the GEF. Countries have also appreciated their ability to directly discuss and reach an understanding about specific projects that have been rejected or considered inappropriate for GEF funding instead of waiting for an intermediated response through the Agencies.
- 22. The initial set of dialogues has clearly highlighted the need for strengthening the country relations and communications aspects of the GEF Secretariat to enhance its effectiveness and efficiency in delivering results for countries.

Other Country Consultations

- 23. In addition to the direct dialogue with countries, the GEF has also discussed the RAF with select countries at 4 sub-regional dialogues, 3 national dialogue initiative consultations, and 13 constituency meetings. ⁴ The GEF has also held bilateral discussions with countries at the margins of other ad hoc meetings such as the African Ministerial Conference on the Environment (AMCEN) on the Global Environment Facility Strategic Investment Program for Sustainable Land Management in Sub-Saharan Africa, held in Burkina Faso on April 24-25, 2007
- 24. During 2007, Sub-regional workshops have been held in Turkey, for the Eastern and Central Europe Region, Thailand, for the East and Central Asian region, Nairobi, for the Eastern and Southern Africa Region, and Senegal for the West and Central Africa region. Additional Sub-Regional Workshops are also being scheduled for Latin America, Caribbean, Pacific, South Asia and Middle East and North Africa during the remainder of 2007.
- 25. The issues discussed at each Sub-regional workshop are determined based on the feedback from countries in prior sub-regional workshops. Unlike the sub-regional workshops in 2006 which were highly dominated by discussions on the RAF, the workshops in 2007 have discussed the RAF in the context of a broader set of GEF policies and processes such as the revised focal strategy and the project cycle.

Programming and Utilization of Allocations under the RAF

- 26. Following agreement on the GEF-4 replenishment, the initial indicative allocations under the RAF were publicly disclosed in September 2006. GEF-4 became effective on February 8, 2007. Resource programming under the RAF has been delayed somewhat because of (i) the delayed effectiveness of the GEF (ii) the evolution of the project cycle and associated procedures and processes, and (iii) the evolution of the GEF focal area strategies, (iv) the need for national consultations and discussions to ascertain national priorities for utilizing the available resources, and (v) the provisions of the RAF including the 50% rule.⁵
- 27. The utilization of country and group allocations by focal area are summarized in Annex 1. As of June 1, 2007 countries had utilized a total of \$3.8 million in biodiversity allocations and \$3.2 million in climate change allocations. With the approval of the June program, less than 10% of the resources available in each focal area (\$42.8 million in biodiversity and \$84.5 million in climate change) will have been utilized. The current pipeline of projects under preparation for the remainder of 2007 includes an additional \$125.2 million in biodiversity and \$95.8 million in climate change. It is expected that programming in these two focal areas will pick in FY08 so that almost 50% of the resources available in these focal areas will have been utilized by the end of FY08.

⁴ During 2007, thirteen constituency meetings have been held by Council Members from Benin, Moldova, Philippines, Argentina, Thailand (2), Cape Verde, Cameroon, Malawi, Djibouti, Switzerland (2), Bahamas. In addition, 3 national dialogues have been held in Honduras, Iran and Mozambique.

5

⁵ The initial indicative allocations under the RAF are for the 4 years of GEF-4. However, countries can only utilize upto 50% of these allocations in the first half of GEF-4. The remaining 50% will be reallocated to countries and the group at the midpoint of GEF-4 based on a reapplication of the RAF formula using updated values of the GBI and GPI indicators.

28. An issue that has often proven confusing during these initial few months of RAF implementation is that of Agency fees. The initial guidelines sent to Operational focal points and discussed during the 2006 sub-regional consultations indicated that all allocations and utilizations would be reported net of Agency fees. In contrast, the public disclosure of the initial indicative allocations in September 2006, were done inclusive of the Agency fees in anticipation of reforms to the Agency fee structure. This change has led to confusion for recipient countries and to Agency staff. As a result, country endorsement letters for projects submitted for the June work program have often not included the Agency fees. The secretariat has agreed, on an exceptional basis for all projects through the June 2007 work-program, to accept the endorsement letters that do not specifically include Agency fees as having endorsed the associated fees. Henceforth, the Secretariat has developed new country endorsement letter templates for use by countries when they submit project endorsement letters that explicitly specifies the total funding request form the GEF for project as well as the associated Agency fees.

Changes in Eligibility and Allocations

- 29. Since the public disclosure of the initial indicative allocations of GEF-4 in September 2006, the eligibility of a number of countries for the climate change and biodiversity focal areas has changed. Under the RAF, the resources allocated to countries which are no longer eligible can be reallocated to other eligible countries during the reallocation process at the mid point of GEF-4. Countries that become newly eligible for financing under the RAF in a focal area are immediately part of the corresponding focal area group and can collectively access the resources available to countries in that group.
- 30. Poland informed the GEF Secretariat that it would like to voluntary withdraw from being a recipient of GEF grants. Estonia, Hungary, Latvia and Lithuania have graduated from both the World Bank and UNDP technical assistance and hence are no longer eligible for GEF funding in biodiversity and climate change effective September 17, 2006, April 13, 2007 and April 2007 respectively. The total individual allocations in climate change for the four countries with individual allocation were \$52.9 million. All five countries were part of the group in biodiversity and Estonia was a part of the group for climate change as well. With the graduation of these five countries, three EU countries (Bulgaria, Romania, and Slovakia) and two EU accession countries (Croatia and Turkey) remain eligible for GEF funding under the RAF.
- 31. Two countries, Timor Leste and Montenegro have become newly eligible for GEF financing for both the biodiversity and climate change focal areas under the RAF. Accordingly, both countries are immediately part of the group in both focal areas and can collectively access the resources available to countries in the group. The allocations for both of these countries will be determined based on the GEF Benefits Index and GEF Performance Index at the time of the mid-term reallocation of resources.

⁶ Subsequent to the start of the direct dialogues with countries, the GEF embarked in discussions on reforming the Agency fee and corporate budgets available to the Implementing Agencies.

6

Next Steps

32. The RAF implementation process has been complicated by efforts to enhance the effectiveness of the GEF by streamlining the project cycle and associated business processes. At the June 2007 meeting, Council will consider proposals for a new project cycle, GEF/C.31/7, Project Cycle, clarifications on the Comparative Advantages of the GEF Agencies, GEF/C.31/5, and revisions to the Focal Area Strategies and Strategic Programming for GEF4, GEF/C.31/10, and the development of a Results-based Management System, GEF/C.31/11. The Secretariat has attempted to convey the changes as they have been instituted to countries as well as GEF Agencies through various channels including the direct dialogues discussed above. The discussions with countries clearly indicate the inadequacy of these interim arrangements and channels. The Secretariat has requested specific additional resources to strengthen the Secretariat's capacity to deliver up-to date timely information to all partners as part of the corporate budget for FY08. Additionally, upon the completion of the various proposals under Council consideration in June 2007, the Secretariat will prepare revised a new GEF Operations Manual including new revised Guidelines for Operational Focal points on the implementation of the RAF.

Development of Indicators in other focal areas

33. The Secretariat had initiated discussions in the interagency focal area taskforces in June 2006 (a) to inform each taskforce on the implementation of the RAF and how it would affect the conduct of GEF business and (b) to initiate a preliminary discussion on the development of indicators for the respective focal areas not currently covered by the RAF. Further development of the indicators during FY07 was slowed down for two reasons. First, the primary need in FY07 was the transition to and implementation of the RAF. Second, the ongoing development of the focal area strategies with a strong focus on results and the development of indicators for measuring the same also created an alternative approach to the development of the indicators for the RAF. Specifically, indicator development efforts were channeled to the development of results indicators in the focal area strategies. The finalization and Council approval of the focal area strategies with results indicators in June 2007 will provide a solid platform for developing indicators for the RAF during FY08. The Secretariat expects to deliver for Council review in November 2008 proposed indicators for the other focal areas, as agreed to in the policy recommendations of the GEF-4 replenishment.

RAF Country/Group Allocation Utilization Report*

| Country | Country/Group Allocation** | Utilization** | Pipeline** | Available for Programming** |
|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------|---------------|------------|--------------------------------|
| Biodiversity | | | | |
| Summary for Biodiversity | | | | |
| Countries with Individual Allocation | 753.200 | 2.700 | 141.208 | 609.293 |
| Countries in Group | 146.800 | 1.116 | 24.593 | 121.092 |
| Regional/Global Exclusion | 50.000 | - | 2.219 | 47.781 |
| Total for Biodiversity | 950.000 | 3.815 | 168.019 | 778.165 |

Page 1 of 13
Biodiversity

^{*} All amounts in US\$M and include GEF Agency Fees.

^{**} As of date June 01, 2007

| Country | Country/Group Allocation** | Utilization** | Pipeline** | Available for Programming** |
|--------------------------------|-------------------------------|---------------|------------|--------------------------------|
| Countries with Individual Allo | cations | | | |
| Afghanistan | 3.500 | - | - | 3.500 |
| Algeria | 3.700 | - | 0.224 | 3.476 |
| Argentina | 14.500 | - | - | 14.500 |
| Bolivia | 11.400 | - | - | 11.400 |
| Brazil | 63.200 | - | 36.727 | 26.473 |
| Cameroon | 11.900 | - | 3.080 | 8.820 |
| Cape Verde | 4.100 | - | - | 4.100 |
| Chile | 15.700 | - | 6.204 | 9.496 |
| China | 44.300 | 0.487 | 19.366 | 24.447 |
| Colombia | 36.600 | - | - | 36.600 |
| Congo DR | 9.600 | - | - | 9.600 |
| Costa Rica | 12.000 | 0.250 | 9.600 | 2.150 |
| Cote d'Ivoire | 3.600 | - | 0.300 | 3.300 |
| Cuba | 14.700 | - | - | 14.700 |
| Dominican Republic | 5.800 | - | 2.775 | 3.025 |
| Ecuador | 23.200 | - | 5.010 | 18.190 |
| Egypt | 4.300 | - | - | 4.300 |
| Ethiopia | 7.700 | - | - | 7.700 |
| Fiji | 5.100 | - | - | 5.100 |
| Guatemala | 8.200 | - | 4.501 | 3.699 |
| Haiti | 4.100 | - | - | 4.100 |
| Honduras | 6.800 | - | - | 6.800 |
| India | 29.600 | - | 0.334 | 29.266 |
| Indonesia | 41.400 | 1.090 | 9.630 | 30.680 |
| Iran | 6.700 | - | - | 6.700 |
| Jamaica | 5.100 | - | - | 5.100 |
| Kazakhstan | 5.500 | - | - | 5.500 |
| Kenya | 7.900 | 0.873 | 0.527 | 6.500 |
| Lao PDR | 5.200 | - | - | 5.200 |
| Madagascar | 24.200 | - | 0.500 | 23.700 |
| Malawi | 4.200 | - | 0.130 | 4.070 |
| Malaysia | 15.200 | - | - | 15.200 |
| Mauritius | 5.600 | - | - | 5.600 |
| Mexico | 54.600 | - | 8.012 | 46.589 |
| Mongolia | 3.800 | - | - | 3.800 |
| Morocco | 4.300 | - | - | 4.300 |
| Mozambique | 6.800 | - | - | 6.800 |

^{*} All amounts in US\$M and include GEF Agency Fees.

Countries in the group have collective access to US\$M 146.80 in GEF - 4. No country in the group can access more than US\$M 3.50 in GEF - 4.

Page 2 of 13

Biodiversity

^{**} As of date June 01, 2007

| | Country/Group | | | Available for |
|---|---------------|---------------|------------|---------------|
| Country | Allocation** | Utilization** | Pipeline** | Programming** |
| Namibia | 6.500 | - | - | 6.500 |
| Nicaragua | 4.000 | - | 1.994 | 2.007 |
| Nigeria | 5.600 | - | - | 5.600 |
| Pakistan | 5.100 | - | 0.372 | 4.728 |
| Panama | 11.200 | - | - | 11.200 |
| Papua New Guinea | 12.500 | - | - | 12.500 |
| Peru | 25.300 | - | 10.392 | 14.908 |
| Philippines | 21.300 | - | 0.560 | 20.740 |
| Russian Federation | 25.300 | - | 4.985 | 20.315 |
| Seychelles | 5.300 | - | 2.180 | 3.120 |
| South Africa | 22.500 | - | 13.005 | 9.495 |
| Sri Lanka | 6.400 | - | - | 6.400 |
| Sudan | 4.300 | - | - | 4.300 |
| Tanzania | 12.800 | - | - | 12.800 |
| Thailand | 9.200 | - | - | 9.200 |
| Turkey | 6.100 | - | - | 6.100 |
| Uganda | 4.000 | - | 0.800 | 3.200 |
| Venezuela | 16.700 | - | - | 16.700 |
| Vietnam | 10.200 | - | - | 10.200 |
| Zambia | 5.100 | - | - | 5.100 |
| ubtotal for Countries with ndividual Allocation | 753.200 | 2.700 | 141.208 | 609.293 |

^{*} All amounts in US\$M and include GEF Agency Fees.

^{**} As of date June 01, 2007

| Country | Country/Group Allocation** | Utilization** | Pipeline** | Available for Programming* |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------|---------------|------------|-------------------------------|
| Countries in Group | | | | |
| Albania | | - | 1.988 | |
| Angola | | - | - | |
| Antigua And Barbuda | | - | - | |
| Armenia | | - | 1.000 | |
| Azerbaijan | | - | - | |
| Bahamas | | - | - | |
| Bangladesh | | - | - | |
| Barbados | | - | - | |
| Belarus | | - | - | |
| Belize | | - | - | |
| Benin | | - | - | |
| Bhutan | | - | 0.980 | |
| Bosnia-Herzegovina | | - | - | |
| Botswana | | - | - | |
| Bulgaria | | - | 1.040 | |
| Burkina Faso | | - | - | |
| Burundi | | - | - | |
| Cambodia | | - | - | |
| Central African Republic | | - | - | |
| Chad | | - | - | |
| Comoros | | - | - | |
| Congo | | - | - | |
| Cook Islands | | - | - | |
| Croatia | | - | - | |
| Djibouti | | - | - | |
| Dominica | | - | - | |
| El Salvador | | - | 0.600 | |
| Equatorial Guinea | | - | - | |
| Eritrea | | - | - | |
| Estonia | | - | - | |
| Gabon | | - | - | |
| Gambia | | - | - | |
| Georgia | | - | 0.297 | |
| Ghana | | - | 0.410 | |
| Grenada | | - | - | |
| Guinea | | - | - | |
| Guinea-Bissau | | - | - | |

^{*} All amounts in US\$M and include GEF Agency Fees.

Countries in the group have collective access to US\$M 146.80 in GEF - 4. No country in the group can access more than US\$M 3.50 in GEF - 4.

Page 4 of 13

Biodiversity

^{**} As of date June 01, 2007

| Country | Country/Group Allocation** | Utilization** | Pipeline** | Available for Programming** |
|-----------------------|-------------------------------|---------------|------------|--------------------------------|
| Guyana | | - | - | |
| Hungary | | - | - | |
| Jordan | | - | - | |
| Kiribati | | - | - | |
| Korea DPR | | - | - | |
| Kyrgyzstan | | - | - | |
| Latvia | | - | - | |
| Lebanon | | - | - | |
| Lesotho | | - | 1.000 | |
| Liberia | | 0.056 | 0.750 | |
| Libya | | - | - | |
| Lithuania | | - | - | |
| Macedonia | | - | 0.950 | |
| Maldives | | - | - | |
| Mali | | - | - | |
| Marshall Islands | | - | - | |
| Mauritania | | - | - | |
| Micronesia | | - | - | |
| Moldova | | - | - | |
| Myanmar | | - | - | |
| Nauru | | - | - | |
| Nepal | | - | 0.212 | |
| Niger | | - | - | |
| Niue | | - | - | |
| Palau | | - | - | |
| Paraguay | | - | 5.500 | |
| Poland | | - | - | |
| Republic Of Korea | | - | - | |
| Romania | | - | 7.550 | |
| Rwanda | | - | - | |
| Samoa | | - | - | |
| Sao Tome and Principe | | - | - | |
| Senegal | | - | - | |
| Sierra Leone | | - | - | |
| Slovak Republic | | 1.060 | - | |
| Solomon Islands | | - | - | |
| St. Kitts And Nevis | | - | 0.191 | |
| St. Lucia | | - | - | |

^{*} All amounts in US\$M and include GEF Agency Fees.

Countries in the group have collective access to US\$M 146.80 in GEF - 4. No country in the group can access more than US\$M 3.50 in GEF - 4.

Page 5 of 13

Biodiversity

^{**} As of date June 01, 2007

| Country | Country/Group Allocation** | Utilization** | Pipeline** | Available for Programming** |
|--------------------------------|-------------------------------|---------------|------------|--------------------------------|
| St. Vincent and Grenadine | | - | - | |
| Suriname | | - | - | |
| Swaziland | | - | - | |
| Syria | | - | - | |
| Tajikistan | | - | - | |
| Togo | | - | - | |
| Tonga | | - | - | |
| Trinidad and Tobago | | - | - | |
| Tunisia | | - | 0.112 | |
| Turkmenistan | | - | - | |
| Tuvalu | | - | - | |
| Ukraine | | - | 2.013 | |
| Uruguay | | - | - | |
| Uzbekistan | | - | - | |
| Vanuatu | | - | - | |
| Yemen | | - | - | |
| Yugoslavia | | - | - | |
| Zimbabwe | | - | - | |
| ubtotal for Countries in Group | 146.800 | 1.116 | 24.593 | 121.092 |

Page 6 of 13 Biodiversity

^{*} All amounts in US\$M and include GEF Agency Fees.

^{**} As of date June 01, 2007

| Country | Country/Group Allocation** | Utilization** | Pipeline** | Available for Programming** |
|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------|---------------|------------|--------------------------------|
| Climate Change | | | | |
| Summary for Climate Change | | | | |
| Countries with Individual Allocation | 751.400 | 2.130 | 167.617 | 581.653 |
| Countries in Group | 148.600 | 1.040 | 11.580 | 135.980 |
| Regional/Global Exclusion | 50.000 | - | 1.090 | 48.910 |
| Total for Climate Change | 950.000 | 3.170 | 180.287 | 766.543 |

Page 7 of 13

Climate Change

^{*} All amounts in US\$M and include GEF Agency Fees.

^{**} As of date June 01, 2007

| Country | Country/Group Allocation** | Utilization** | Pipeline** | Available for Programming** |
|------------------------------|-------------------------------|---------------|------------|--------------------------------|
| Countries with Individual Al | locations | | | |
| Algeria | 7.600 | - | - | 7.600 |
| Argentina | 13.300 | - | - | 13.300 |
| Azerbaijan | 4.100 | - | - | 4.100 |
| Bangladesh | 6.700 | - | 1.091 | 5.609 |
| Belarus | 7.900 | - | - | 7.900 |
| Bolivia | 3.100 | - | - | 3.100 |
| Brazil | 38.100 | 0.200 | 23.659 | 14.241 |
| Bulgaria | 8.500 | - | - | 8.500 |
| Cambodia | 3.300 | - | - | 3.300 |
| Chile | 6.100 | - | - | 6.100 |
| China | 150.000 | 0.350 | 65.408 | 84.242 |
| Colombia | 8.900 | - | - | 8.900 |
| Cuba | 4.200 | - | - | 4.200 |
| Egypt | 11.500 | - | - | 11.500 |
| Ethiopia | 4.900 | - | - | 4.900 |
| Hungary | 8.200 | - | - | 8.200 |
| India | 74.900 | 0.350 | 33.676 | 40.874 |
| Indonesia | 16.300 | 0.140 | 12.075 | 4.085 |
| Iran | 16.500 | - | 3.323 | 13.177 |
| Kazakhstan | 13.500 | - | - | 13.500 |
| Kenya | 3.400 | - | - | 3.400 |
| Korea DPR | 6.400 | - | - | 6.400 |
| Latvia | 3.200 | - | - | 3.200 |
| Lithuania | 3.400 | - | - | 3.400 |
| Malaysia | 11.300 | - | - | 11.300 |
| Mexico | 28.300 | 1.090 | - | 27.210 |
| Morocco | 3.800 | - | - | 3.800 |
| Nigeria | 9.300 | - | - | 9.300 |
| Pakistan | 13.200 | - | 1.065 | 12.13 |
| Peru | 4.600 | - | - | 4.600 |
| Philippines | 6.600 | - | - | 6.600 |
| Poland | 38.100 | - | - | 38.100 |
| Romania | 13.900 | - | - | 13.900 |
| Russian Federation | 72.500 | - | 10.932 | 61.569 |
| Slovak Republic | 5.700 | - | - | 5.700 |
| South Africa | 23.900 | - | 12.007 | 11.893 |
| Sudan | 5.700 | - | - | 5.700 |

^{*} All amounts in US\$M and include GEF Agency Fees.

Page 8 of 13 Climate Change

Annex 1

^{**} As of date June 01, 2007

| | Country/Group | | | Available for |
|--|---------------|---------------|------------|---------------|
| Country | Allocation** | Utilization** | Pipeline** | Programming** |
| Syria | 4.900 | - | - | 4.900 |
| Tanzania | 4.800 | - | - | 4.800 |
| Thailand | 14.700 | - | 3.291 | 11.409 |
| Turkey | 17.500 | - | - | 17.500 |
| Uganda | 3.100 | - | - | 3.100 |
| Ukraine | 18.900 | - | - | 18.900 |
| Uzbekistan | 9.300 | - | - | 9.300 |
| Venezuela | 8.800 | - | - | 8.800 |
| Vietnam | 8.500 | - | 1.091 | 7.409 |
| Subtotal for Countries with Individual Allocation | 751.400 | 2.130 | 167.617 | 581.653 |

Page 9 of 13 Climate Change

Annex 1

^{*} All amounts in US\$M and include GEF Agency Fees.

^{**} As of date June 01, 2007

| Country | Country/Group Allocation** | Utilization** | Pipeline** | Available for Programming** |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------|---------------|------------|--------------------------------|
| Countries in Group | | | - <i>p</i> | |
| Afghanistan | | - | - | |
| Albania | | - | - | |
| Angola | | - | - | |
| Antigua And Barbuda | | - | - | |
| Armenia | | - | - | |
| Bahamas | | - | - | |
| Bahrain | | - | - | |
| Barbados | | - | - | |
| Belize | | - | - | |
| Benin | | - | - | |
| Bhutan | | - | - | |
| Bosnia-Herzegovina | | - | 0.950 | |
| Botswana | | - | - | |
| Burkina Faso | | - | 0.880 | |
| Burundi | | - | - | |
| Cameroon | | - | - | |
| Cape Verde | | - | - | |
| Central African Republic | | - | - | |
| Chad | | - | - | |
| Comoros | | - | - | |
| Congo | | - | - | |
| Congo DR | | - | - | |
| Cook Islands | | - | - | |
| Costa Rica | | - | - | |
| Cote d'Ivoire | | - | - | |
| Croatia | | - | - | |
| Cyprus | | - | - | |
| Djibouti | | - | 1.000 | |
| Dominica | | - | - | |
| Dominican Republic | | - | - | |
| Ecuador | | - | - | |
| El Salvador | | - | - | |
| Equatorial Guinea | | - | - | |
| Eritrea | | - | - | |
| Estonia | | - | - | |
| Fiji | | - | - | |
| Gabon | | - | - | |

^{*} All amounts in US\$M and include GEF Agency Fees.

Group (Climate Change)
Countries in the group have collective access to US\$M 148.60 in GEF - 4. No country in the group can access more than US\$M 3.10 in GEF - 4.

Page 10 of 13 Climate Change

^{**} As of date June 01, 2007

| Country | Country/Group Allocation** | Utilization** | Pipeline** | Available for Programming* |
|------------------|-------------------------------|---------------|------------|-------------------------------|
| Gambia | | - | - | |
| Georgia | | - | - | |
| Ghana | | - | - | |
| Grenada | | - | - | |
| Guatemala | | - | - | |
| Guinea | | - | - | |
| Guinea-Bissau | | - | - | |
| Guyana | | - | 1.000 | |
| Haiti | | - | 1.065 | |
| Honduras | | - | - | |
| Israel | | - | - | |
| Jamaica | | - | - | |
| Jordan | | - | - | |
| Kiribati | | - | - | |
| Kuwait | | - | - | |
| Kyrgyzstan | | - | - | |
| Lao PDR | | - | - | |
| Lebanon | | - | - | |
| Lesotho | | - | - | |
| Liberia | | - | - | |
| Libya | | - | - | |
| Macedonia | | - | - | |
| Madagascar | | - | 1.000 | |
| Malawi | | - | - | |
| Maldives | | - | - | |
| Mali | | - | - | |
| Malta | | - | - | |
| Marshall Islands | | - | 0.975 | |
| Mauritania | | - | - | |
| Mauritius | | - | 0.975 | |
| Micronesia | | - | - | |
| Moldova | | - | - | |
| Mongolia | | - | - | |
| Mozambique | | - | - | |
| Myanmar | | - | - | |
| Namibia | | - | - | |
| Nauru | | - | - | |
| Nepal | | - | - | |

^{*} All amounts in US\$M and include GEF Agency Fees.

Group (Climate Change)
Countries in the group have collective access to US\$M 148.60 in GEF - 4. No country in the group can access more than US\$M 3.10 in GEF - 4.

^{**} As of date June 01, 2007

| Country | Country/Group Allocation** | Utilization** | Pipeline** | Available for Programming* |
|---------------------------|-------------------------------|---------------|------------|-------------------------------|
| Nicaragua | | - | - | |
| Niger | | - | - | |
| Niue | | - | - | |
| Oman | | _ | - | |
| Palau | | - | 0.975 | |
| Panama | | - | - | |
| Papua New Guinea | | - | - | |
| Paraguay | | - | - | |
| Qatar | | - | - | |
| Republic Of Korea | | - | - | |
| Rwanda | | - | - | |
| Samoa | | - | - | |
| San Marino | | - | - | |
| Sao Tome and Principe | | - | - | |
| Saudi Arabia | | - | - | |
| Senegal | | - | - | |
| Seychelles | | - | - | |
| Sierra Leone | | - | - | |
| Singapore | | - | - | |
| Solomon Islands | | - | - | |
| Sri Lanka | | - | 0.810 | |
| St. Kitts And Nevis | | - | - | |
| St. Lucia | | - | - | |
| St. Vincent and Grenadine | | - | - | |
| Suriname | | - | - | |
| Swaziland | | - | - | |
| Tajikistan | | - | 0.975 | |
| Togo | | - | - | |
| Tonga | | - | - | |
| Trinidad and Tobago | | - | - | |
| Tunisia | | - | - | |
| Turkmenistan | | - | - | |
| Tuvalu | | - | - | |
| United Arab Emirates | | - | - | |
| Uruguay | | 1.040 | 0.975 | |
| Vanuatu | | - | - | |
| Yemen | | - | - | |
| Yugoslavia | | - | - | |

^{*} All amounts in US\$M and include GEF Agency Fees.

Page 12 of 13 ** As of date June 01, 2007 Climate Change

| Country | Country/Group Allocation** | Utilization** | Pipeline** | Available for Programming** |
|---------------------------------|-------------------------------|---------------|------------|--------------------------------|
| Zambia | | - | - | |
| Zimbabwe | | - | - | |
| Subtotal for Countries in Group | 148.600 | 1.040 | 11.580 | 135.980 |

^{*} All amounts in US\$M and include GEF Agency Fees.

Page 13 of 13