



Global Environment Facility

GEF/C.33/6
March 21, 2008

GEF Council
April 22-25, 2008

Agenda Item 11

FROM PROJECTS TO PROGRAMS: CLARIFYING THE PROGRAMMATIC APPROACH IN THE GEF PORTFOLIO

Recommended Council Decision

The Council, having reviewed document GEF/C.33/6, *From Projects to Programs: Clarifying the Programmatic Approach in the GEF Portfolio*, endorses the objectives and basic principles for programmatic approaches and considers programmatic approaches to support more effectively the sustainable development agenda of developing countries and countries with economies in transition.

The Council also approves the procedures for developing specific Programs using a programmatic approach as outlined in the paper, including the use of the template for presenting the summary of a Program through a Program Framework Document (PFD).

The Council adopts the following clarification to paragraph 11 of the Project Cycle paper GEF/C.31/7/Rev. 1 – as approved in June 2007 and revised in November 2007:

Beginning in FY08, programmatic approaches for GEF funding will only be submitted to Council at its meetings, not intersessionally. Documentation for securing approval for, and guiding implementation of, a specific Program developed using a programmatic approach will be a Program Framework Document (PFD). PFDs will be presented to the Council in a work program. Council shall review the PFD and endorse the overall objective and scope of the Program. PFDs will also identify, to the extent possible, all projects to be financed under the Program. These projects must, nevertheless, be presented as PIFs to Council for approval. All available PIFs will be presented for Council approval in the same work program as contains the Program's PFD. Depending on the operational nature of the Program, Council may approve an amount to be set aside for the Program, even if not all PIFs for the listed projects under the Program have been presented in the work program. When the remaining PIFs are ready, and have been cleared by the CEO, they will be presented for approval, in future work programs. All approved PIFs will be posted on the GEF web site. PIFs can only be approved once the PFD for the overarching Program has been endorsed by the Council.

Table of Contents

Background.....	1
Introduction.....	1
Clarifying the GEF Programmatic Approach.....	2
Minimum Standards for GEF Supported Programmatic Approaches.....	4
Presentation of the Programmatic Approach.....	5
Program Processing and Approval Procedures.....	6
Cancellation or Drop of Projects under the Program.....	8
Annex 1. Program Framework Document	9
Annex 2. Programmatic Initiatives Supported by the GEF since 1992	18

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1. Over the past years, a growing number of organizations and governments have employed programmatic approaches for financing to more effectively support the sustainable development agenda. The GEF is well positioned to promote programmatic approaches because of its mandate, particularly the drive for a catalytic use of resources related to the protection of global environmental goods and services in the context of sustainable development. As the GEF has increasingly invested in programmatic approaches of different kinds over the past years, the moment seems to be opportune to provide the Council a decision document on GEF's position on programmatic approaches.

2. This paper clarifies the programmatic approaches that the GEF has undertaken to date and elaborates on how future programmatic approaches will be implemented. This paper takes into consideration Council comments on a series of past papers on the subject that were presented over time at Council meetings. The latest Council decision on the subject was in connection with an earlier Council decision on the new GEF project cycle, where approval procedures for the programmatic approaches submitted in the November 2007 Council work program were adopted. This paper further clarifies the current approval process as summarized below:

- a) Council shall review the Program Framework Document (PFD), endorse the overall objective and scope of the Program.
- b) Depending on the operational nature of the Program, some Programs may call for an upfront approved maximum amount which the Program could fund. In such a case, Agencies for such Programs may request Council to approve an amount to be set aside for the Program. Upon endorsement of the PFD, Council would also approve the requested set aside amount for the Program.
- c) Council shall review individual PIFs submitted under a Program, together with the PFD, and approve (reject) the requested GEF amount for the PIFs.
- d) Remaining full-sized projects (FSPs) associated with the Program, whose PIFs are not ready at the time the PFD is submitted to Council, may be submitted separately in future work programs as detailed in the PFD document.
- e) PIFs for medium-sized projects (MSPs) and enabling activities (EAs) under a Program will be processed as usual, except they can be submitted for CEO approval only after the respective PFD has been endorsed by Council.
- f) Approved PIF amounts under a Program will draw down from the maximum amount for the Program that was set aside, if applicable.
- g) The PFD shall explicitly state the time period during which any project associated with the Program may be submitted for approval following Council endorsement of the PFD.
- h) Similar to all types of projects, final project documents for all Council-approved PIFs under the Program shall be submitted for CEO endorsement once the projects are fully prepared, and these will be circulated to Council for comments.

BACKGROUND

1. At its meeting in December 1999, the Council, under Agenda item 11 on the Corporate Business Plan (GEF/C.14/11), supported in principle the proposed evolution of GEF support to recipient countries through programmatic approaches. In response to a request by Council from that same meeting, the GEF Secretariat prepared a paper, *GEF Programmatic Approach: Criteria and Processes for its Implementation*. At the May 2000 meeting, Council members made some preliminary comments, which were followed by submission of written comments from several Council members. Feedback was also received through the GEF-NGO network.
2. At the December 2000 meeting, the Secretariat was requested to provide Council with an updated paper on the programmatic approach, while recognizing that it is still a “work in progress.” In May 2001, an information paper, *The GEF Programmatic Approach: Current Understandings* (GEF/C.17.Inf.11), was presented to Council. No comments were received and no further related papers have been brought forward for a Council decision since then.
3. At its meeting in June 2007, the Council reviewed the *GEF Project Cycle* (GEF/C.31/7; GEF/C.31/7Corr.1) and approved the revised project cycle for immediate application. For programmatic approaches, Council specifically requested inclusion of Program documents in the work program, with all the projects to be financed under the Program identified and the PIFs for the concepts presented.
4. At its meeting in November 2007, the Council under Agenda item 15 *Other Business* adopted a revision to paragraph 11 Council Approval of Umbrella Programs of the project cycle paper GEF/C.31/7/Rev.1 – as approved in June 2007. This change was made in relation to a discussion on Agenda item 12, *Work Program* (GEF/C.C.32/6 Rev.1), during which Council discussed not only the approval procedures for three proposed programmatic approaches, but the presentation of the programmatic approaches themselves.
5. Since the GEF has increasingly invested in programmatic approaches of different kinds over the past years, the moment seems to be opportune to provide the Council a decision document on GEFs’ position on programmatic approaches, their added value, their basic principles and the approval procedure. This paper is based on the information paper *The GEF Programmatic Approach: Current Understandings* (GEF/C.17.Inf.11) and enriched with decisions taken by Council after 2001 that are relevant to programmatic approaches.

INTRODUCTION

6. Over the past years, a growing number of organizations and governments have employed programmatic approaches for financing to more effectively support the sustainable development agenda of developing countries and countries with economies in transition. This process received further support from the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness, which encourages efforts by countries and organizations to harmonize, align and manage aid for results using a set of measurable indicators and related targets.
7. The GEF is well positioned to promote programmatic approaches because of its mandate, particularly the drive for a catalytic use of resources related to the protection of global

environmental goods and services in the context of sustainable development. It is important to emphasize that a medium to long-term programmatic approach to financing is not a new paradigm to the GEF. Over the past years, all GEF focal areas have promoted various types of programmatic approaches, most prominently the International Waters and the Land Degradation focal areas. Annex 2 summarizes all programmatic approaches supported by the GEF since its pilot phase.

8. The programmatic approach, as a viable and attractive tool for allocating GEF resources in a more strategic and results-oriented way, was further strengthened by Council's approval of the following decision documents:

- *Focal Area Strategies and Strategic Programming for GEF-4* (GEF/C.31/10);
- *Results-based Management Framework* (GEF/C.31/11); and
- *Comparative Advantages of the GEF Agencies* (GEF/C.31/5; GEF/C.31/5Corr.1)

CLARIFYING THE GEF PROGRAMMATIC APPROACH

9. It is important to clarify what the programmatic approach is. For example, the GEF programmatic approach:

- (a) will be pursued on a pragmatic basis where there is a strong rationale for it; hence the request for a programmatic approach may come from various stakeholder groups, including the country/-ies or the GEF Secretariat in partnership with the countries;
- (b) will supplement the project-based approach, both in general, and within the context of the country/-ies in which the programmatic approach is applied. In fact, it is anticipated that a Program will in most cases be implemented through a set of interlinked projects (both full and medium sized projects); and
- (c) if justified, will not preclude the application of GEF funds through regular project modalities outside the scope and context of the Program.

Objective and Principles

10. The overall objective of the GEF programmatic approach is to secure larger-scale and sustained impact on the global environment through integrating global environmental objectives into national or regional strategies and plans using partnerships. The GEF programmatic approach, undertaken in partnership with the country/-ies, and other partners (including NGOs, the scientific community or the private sector), would support the implementation of medium to long-term Programs, consistent with the GEF focal area strategies, and provide:

- (a) enhanced opportunities to generate synergies across the focal areas of the GEF within the framework of national and/or regional sustainable development;
- (b) an enhanced scope for catalyzing action, replication and innovation;

- (c) improved opportunities for maximizing and scaling up global environmental benefits; and
- (d) an opportunity for interested donors or other partners (including the private sector) to invest additional and focused funding based on the scope of the Program.

11. To ensure effective achievement of the overall objective set out above, the GEF programmatic approach must observe the following *overarching strategic principles*:

- (a) be country-owned, and build on national priorities designed to support sustainable development, as identified within the context of national and/or regional planning frameworks;
- (b) emphasize GEF's catalytic role and leverage additional financing from other sources (e.g. donors, private sector, NGOs).
- (c) be based on an open and transparent process of multi-stakeholder representation - from dialogue to implementation - in conformity with the GEF public involvement policy;
- (d) be cost-effective and seek to maximize global environmental benefits.

Value-added of the Programmatic Approach

12. For a programmatic approach to be successful, it should provide a clear added value for the country/-ies and other partners. Some of the key benefits for each partner in engaging in a programmatic approach are summarized here.

For the countries:

- (a) a more strategic level interaction with the GEF, especially in the context of the GEF resources allocated through the Resource Allocation Framework (RAF);
- (b) enhanced opportunities to pool resources among countries through regional and global programs and from various GEF focal areas;
- (c) improved opportunities for horizontal and vertical integration of global environmental concerns into decision making at the national level;
- (d) increased opportunities to coordinate and mobilize co-financing nationally and from a multiplicity of sources, including donors and the private sector;
- (e) increased flow of knowledge exchange between projects, including good practices; and

For the GEF:

- (a) sustained country ownership through the integration of global environmental issues in the national and regional planning and development processes;
- (b) a platform for interested donors to leverage additional financing based on scope of a program;
- (c) increased opportunities to maximize global benefits and synergies across global environmental issues in line with the GEF replenishment strategy;
- (d) improved prospects to achieve and report on measurable and larger-scale results, including impacts on the global environment; and

For GEF Agencies:

- (a) strengthened incentives for engagement and fit with their own country engagement strategies and comparative advantages;
- (b) enhanced opportunities to maximize synergies between the GEF and their institutional mandates;
- (c) a common program management and results structure, and coordinated knowledge management under one strategic framework;
- (d) better predictability and less duplication throughout GEF Agency's portfolio; and
- (e) increased commitment and willingness of GEF Agencies to harmonize M&E functions to facilitate corporate reporting.

MINIMUM STANDARDS FOR GEF SUPPORTED PROGRAMMATIC APPROACHES

13. A GEF programmatic approach represents a partnership between the country/-ies, the GEF and other interested stakeholders, such as the private sector, donors or the scientific community. The partnership with the GEF would represent a commitment by the country/-ies to implement its priorities towards global environmental objectives. The scope of a Program would build upon available national or regional sustainable development plans, such as well advanced energy plans/policies, national biodiversity strategies, national land use plans/policies for sustainable land management (including national action programs to combat desertification and/or national forest programs), national implementation plans for the Stockholm Convention or strategic action plans for international waters. The GEF programmatic approach would in all cases be demand driven - revolving around a commonly identified issue that also affects the global environment.

14. The circumstances in a country or countries would determine if a GEF programmatic approach is indeed the appropriate way forward. Some criteria to guide this decision would include:

- (a) a high level of political and economic commitment to the environment, and in particular, the proposed Program;
- (b) a commitment to work across sectoral ministries and agencies to integrate global environmental issues into the national planning and development processes;
- (c) a clear commitment to allocate RAF and domestic financial resources; and the willingness of donors to align their funding under the Program;
- (d) an open transparent process/system that proactively encourages multi stakeholder involvement throughout the development, and during implementation, of the Program; and
- (e) cooperation, collaboration, and joint programming with the GEF Agencies, and other partners towards the common objectives of the Program.

15. In the case of a regional or global Programs, these criteria would have to be observed collectively by the participating countries.

PRESENTATION OF THE PROGRAMMATIC APPROACH

16. Any stakeholder group (including countries, GEF Agencies, civil society, etc.) may seek GEF support through a programmatic approach. Agreement to develop an approach would lead to the development of a Program Framework Document (PFD) for the defined scope of the Program. This would be done with the full engagement and participation of key agencies in the country, sector specialists, civil society, the broader GEF partnership, and other interested donors and development agencies.

17. The PFD, guided by the strategic principles and operational considerations in relation to the proposed scope of the Program, would articulate the priorities, and identify the initial set of projects and/or project ideas to launch the Program. A key element of a Program is that it should provide opportunities to address the enabling environment, local investments and cross-cutting elements in a more comprehensive, yet focused way, than is currently possible through an individual project.

18. More importantly, the PFD will also articulate how the Program will work in a sequenced manner through projects within it, to foster increased horizontal and vertical integration of global environmental issues into the country/-ies development agenda.

19. The presentation in the PFD will contain the following key information:

- (a) Background and Program rationale;
- (b) Value-added of the Program (including cost-effectiveness);
- (c) Program objective and results;
- (d) Consistency of the Program with national/regional priorities/plans/policies;

- (e) Alignment with GEF focal area strategy/-ies;
- (f) Expected global environmental benefits;
- (g) Type of operations and potential scope of projects under the Program;
- (h) Risks and mitigation measures;
- (i) Program coordination, monitoring and evaluation; and
- (j) Other relevant information, including Program implementation, indicative total GEF amount, potential co-financing and sources, the Program results-framework, a list of potential projects and the Program implementation timeline.

PROGRAM PROCESSING AND APPROVAL PROCEDURES

20. Following the revised paragraph 11 of the GEF Project Cycle (Summary of the Chairs *Decisions on Agenda Item 15 - Other Business*; paragraph 28), this paper further clarifies that for every specific programmatic approach proposed to Council, a PFD will be submitted in a work program at one of the Council meetings. The submission of the PFD should include the endorsement of the relevant country Operational Focal Point. The PFD will identify the anticipated number of projects to be financed under the Program and will include PIFs for all or some of the projects. Annex 1 provides a template for a PFD which requests basic information regarding the Program.

21. Programmatic approaches may lead to Programs that are open-ended without an agreed funding envelope. On the other hand, depending on the nature of the Program, some Programs may call for an upfront approved maximum GEF amount for the Program.¹ If justified and appropriate, within a GEF Trust Fund replenishment period, the Council may approve a maximum funding envelope to be set aside for a Program for individual projects to draw upon.

22. In any event, Council would review the PFD and endorse its concept and objective. All FSPs under the Program would follow the procedures in the GEF project cycle and would need to be presented in form of a PIF that has been cleared by the GEF Secretariat and entered into a work program. Individual PIFs submitted under the Program would be approved by Council and, on approval, would deduct resources from the total amount set aside for the Program, if applicable.

23. Each PFD would include a timeline for the presentation of PIFs for approval and projects for CEO endorsement, and the last date that CEO endorsement could take place within any GEF Trust Fund replenishment period. Submissions would need to follow that timeline or risk not being approved or endorsed. Council will be informed, via the biannual report on programming, on the financial status of approved Programs, including associated GEF amounts. In the case where a maximum funding envelope for a Program has been set aside, upon approval by

¹ The maximum GEF amount is the proposed amount for financing all the projects under the Program for project implementation, project preparation activities, as well as Agency fees.

Council/CEO of all the PIFs under the Program, or when the timeline indicates that all PIF submissions are due, any unutilized resources will be released for allocation of other activities.

24. PIFs for project concepts under the Program should be submitted together with the PFD. If PIFs are not ready for immediate presentation as part of the program framework: (i) the Council will only approve the amount of GEF resources requested for those PIFs that are ready and submitted under the PFD; and (ii) all other future PIFs for FSPs under the Program, once ready, will be presented for Council approval at subsequent work programs; in addition, (iii) PIFs for EAs and MSPs will be submitted for CEO approval, as outlined in the PFD. All projects associated with a Program will be posted on the GEF website. PIFs may only be approved after their respective PFDs have been endorsed by the Council.

25. The following sequence summarizes the development and approval procedure for the GEF programmatic approaches:

- (a) GEF Secretariat is fully involved in the development of a Program idea prior to submission to a Council work program.
- (b) A preparation grant may be provided for the development of a specific Program and its PFD.
- (c) GEF Agency presents the summary of the Program in the form of a PFD for inclusion in a work program at a Council Meeting.
- (d) GEF Agencies associated with the Program present their project PIFs (for FSPs) along with the respective PFD to GEF Secretariat for work program inclusion.
- (e) PFD as well as PIFs are copied to all GEF Agencies and STAP for comments.
- (f) GEF Secretariat reviews PFD and associated PIFs and recommends the PFD and PIFs for inclusion into the work program at one of the Council meetings. PIFs for MSPs will be processed similarly to regular MSPs, which are to be approved by the CEO under delegated authority, with the exception that CEO can approve MSPs under the Program only after Council endorsement of their respective PFDs.
- (g) Council reviews the PFD, endorses the overall objective and scope of the Program. Depending on the operational nature of a Program, Agencies may request an upfront set aside of the total amount for the Program. In such cases, Agencies will provide the rationale for such requirement in the PFD and request Council to approve a maximum amount to be set aside for the Program. Upon endorsement of the PFD, Council may or may not approve the requested set aside amount for the Program.
- (h) Council reviews individual PIFs submitted under the Program and approves the requested GEF amounts.
- (i) Remaining FSP projects associated with the Program that are not ready at the time the PFD is submitted for Council approval may be submitted separately in future work programs as detailed in the PFD document.

- (j) Final project documents for all Council-approved FSP PIFs under the Program are submitted for CEO endorsement once the projects are fully prepared, and these will be circulated to Council for comments, following similar procedures in the project cycle for regular FSPs.
- (k) PIFs for MSPs under the Program can only be approved by the CEO after Council endorsement of the PFD. EAs and MSPs under the Program can be submitted for CEO approval once they are ready and their respective PFDs have been endorsed by Council.
- (l) The PFD shall explicitly state the time period during which any project associated with the Program may be submitted for approval following Council approval of PFD.
- (m) Total GEF resources for the Program that were approved by Council for setting aside should be reported in a report from the GEF lead Agency to the Secretariat and Trustee at the time the Program is completed.² This total amount would be a summation of all approved PIFs under the Program, which could have been approved in different work programs.
- (n) Once all projects under a Program have been completed, the Program will be evaluated in compliance with the GEF M&E policy.

CANCELLATION OR DROP OF PROJECTS UNDER THE PROGRAM

26. Drop before or after CEO Endorsement/Approval: If a project whose funding is included in the amount set aside for the Program, is dropped before CEO endorsement (for FSPs) or CEO approval (for MSPs/EAs), the GEF Trustee will reverse the amount originally committed for that project. The funds will be released, which will increase the GEF funds available for Council or CEO approval for projects outside the Program.

27. Cancel after CEO Endorsement/Approval: If a project under a Program is cancelled after CEO endorsement/approval, the GEF Trustee will reverse the amount originally committed for that project. The funds will be released, which will increase the GEF funds available for Council or CEO approval for projects outside the Program.

28. Financial closure of the Program: Upon completion of the Program, the completion report will inform on the status of all the GEF resources utilized, breaking down by the projects under the Program. If there are unapproved or unused resources remaining in the Program, these resources will be released and will increase the GEF Trust Fund available for Council or CEO approval for projects outside the Program.

² For the purpose of programmatic approaches, a Program is complete when all PIFs under the Program are approved by the Council/CEO.



PROGRAM FRAMEWORK DOCUMENT (PFD)
THE GEF TRUST FUND

ANNEX 1

Submission Date:
Re-submission Date:

PART I: PROGRAM INFORMATION

GEFSEC PROGRAM ID³:
GEF AGENCY PROGRAM ID:
COUNTRY(IES):
REGION:
PROGRAM TITLE:
GEF LEAD AGENCY:
OTHER GEF AGENCIES: (select), (select), (select)
GEF FOCAL AREA (S): (select),(select), (select)
GEF-4 STRATEGIC PROGRAM(S):
EXPECTED NUMBER OF PROJECTS UNDER THE PROGRAM DURING CURRENT GEF TRUST FUND REPLENISHMENT PERIOD:

INDICATIVE CALENDAR	
Milestones	Expected Dates
Work Program	
Submission of last project under the Program for CEO Endorsement/approval	

A. INDICATIVE FINANCING PLAN SUMMARY FOR THE PROGRAM(\$)

	Total Program*	Total Project Amount Submitted for Work Program Inclusion**	Agency Fee***
GEF			
Co-financing			
Total			

* Indicative maximum program amount for current replenishment period. Annex A provides the list of all potential projects.

** Total project amount submitted for Council approval at the time of program submission.

*** Agency fee relates to the sum of Agency fees for all projects submitted with the PFD for Council approval.

B. INDICATIVE CO-FINANCING FOR THE PROGRAM (\$) (if detail is available)

Sources of Co-financing	Name	Type of Co-financing	Amount
Project Government Contribution		(select)	
GEF Agency(ies)		(select)	
Bilateral Aid Agency(ies)		(select)	
Multilateral Agency(ies)		(select)	
Private Sector		(select)	
NGO		(select)	
Others		(select)	
Total co-financing			

³ Program ID number will be assigned initially by GEFSEC.

C. GEF RESOURCES ANTICIPATED BY FOCAL AREA(S) FOR PROGRAM

Focal Area	Total Amount (\$) ⁴
(select)	
(select)	
(select)	
TOTAL	

D. PROGRAM APPROVAL PROCEDURE

This program framework is submitted to Council for its consideration at its [month/year] meeting. The program document identifies # projects to be financed under the program and presents # PIFs for the concepts in this work program. Since # of PIFs are not ready for presentation as part of the program framework, (i) the amount requested for the program is \$##; and (ii) all other PIFs, once ready will be cleared by the CEO, and presented at subsequent work programs.

PART II: PROGRAMMATIC JUSTIFICATION

A. OBJECTIVE OF THE PROGRAM :

B. RATIONALE OF THE PROGRAM AND DESCRIPTION OF STRATEGIC APPROACH (including description of current barriers to achieve the stated objective) :

C. DISCUSS THE VALUE-ADDED OF THE PROGRAM VIS-À-VIS A PROJECT APPROACH (including cost-effectiveness):

D. DESCRIBE THE POTENTIAL GLOBAL ENVIRONMENTAL BENEFITS DELIVERED BY THE PROGRAM:

E. DESCRIBE THE CONSISTENCY OF THE PROGRAM WITH NATIONAL/REGIONAL PRIORITIES/PLANS (country ownership and driveness, project selection criteria if applicable) :

F. DESCRIBE THE CONSISTENCY OF THE PROGRAM WITH [GEF STRATEGIES](#) AND STRATEGIC PROGRAMS:

G. OUTLINE THE INSTITUTIONAL STRUCTURE OF THE PROGRAM INCL. COORDINATION AND MONITORING & EVALUATION:

H. INDICATE RISKS, INCLUDING CLIMATE CHANGE RISKS, THAT MIGHT PREVENT THE PROGRAM OBJECTIVE(S) FROM BEING ACHIEVED, AND IF POSSIBLE INCLUDING MITIGATION MEASURES THAT WILL BE TAKEN:

⁴ Estimated maximum program amount by focal area.

PART III: APPROVAL/ENDORSEMENT BY GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINTS AND GEF AGENCY(IES)

A. RECORD OF ENDORSEMENT OF GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT(S) ON BEHALF OF THE GOVERNMENT(S):

(Please attach the [GEF OFP Endorsement Template-Program](#) with this template).

<i>(Enter Name, Position, Ministry)</i>	<i>Date: (Month, day, year)</i>
---	---------------------------------

<i>(Enter Name, Position, Ministry)</i>	<i>Date: (Month, day, year)</i>
---	---------------------------------

B. LEAD GEF AGENCY CERTIFICATION

This request has been prepared in accordance with GEF policies and procedures, meets the GEF criteria for project identification and preparation, and has been validated by participating GEF Agencies.	
<i>Name & Signature</i> GEF Agency Executive Coordinator	Program Contact Person
<i>Date: (Month, Day, Year)</i>	Tel. and Email:

ANNEX A. LIST OF PROJECTS UNDER THE PROGRAM FRAMEWORK

Projects Submitted for Council approval in this work program*:									
<u>Project Title</u>	<u>GEF Amount (\$)</u>						<u>Agency Fee (\$)</u>	<u>Total (\$)</u>	<u>Expected Submission Date</u>
	<u>Focal Area 1</u>		<u>Focal Area 2</u>		<u>TOTAL</u>				
	<u>Project</u>	<u>PPG</u>	<u>Project</u>	<u>PPG</u>	<u>Project</u>	<u>PPG</u>			
1.								Same as program framework document	
2.									
3.									
4.									
Total									
MSPs Submitted for CEO approval									
1.									
2.									
3.									
Total									
FSP Projects to be submitted in future work programs:									
1.									
2.									
3.									
4.									
Total FSPs									
MSP Projects to be submitted for CEO Approval									
1.									
2.									
3.									
4.									
Total									

Note: Fill in the focal area split, if any. If more than two focal areas involved, add columns as necessary.

* For multi-country programmatic approach, please add a column for country after the column of project title.

ANNEX B. DESCRIPTION OF PROGRAM OBJECTIVES, OUTCOMES AND OUTPUTS

ANNEX C. PROGRAM RESULTS FRAMEWORK

GEF Trust Fund Program Framework Document (PFD) Preparation Guidelines

Unlock instruction: The template, by default, is locked to allow the pulldown menu to function. However, given the need for flexibility to allow edits and/or manipulation of the tables and boxes (i.e, adding a column or row), you may need to unlock the template as follows: Go to **View >Toolbars>Forms**. You will then see a pop up menu like this.



Click on the right most icon (a lock) to unlock.

After adding lines to the table, you should click on the left box “ab” to create gray fields and then switch back to lock format where you can input information. Please note that to access the various documents through the hyperlink, the template has to be in unlock format.

Submission date and Re-submission date: This is important so that Secretariat can keep track of the business standard calculation. Please put in the date that you actually submit the PFD to GEFSEC. The re-submission date is the date the document is re-submitted to GEFSEC after reflecting comments either from GEF Agencies, GEFSEC, Convention Secretariat or STAP. GEFSEC will inform the Agencies the deadline of resubmission, if any, depending on the pursuing work program inclusion calendar.

PART I: PROGRAM INFORMATION

The first part is the Program core information and standard selections are provided to the extent possible for ease of preparation. The Strategic Programs for each focal area have to be filled in manually, due to limitations by Microsoft Word which prevented the provision of the full range selections for all focal areas. For convenience, the strategic programs (SP) in each focal area are listed below:

Biodiversity	Climate Change	International Waters	Land Degradation	POPs*	ODS*	SFM*
BD-SP1-PA Financing	CC-SP1- Building EE	IW-SP1- Coastal Marine Fisheries	LD-SP1- Agriculture	POPs-SP1- CapacityB	ODS-SP1	SFM-SP1- Financing
BD-SP2- Marine PA	CC-SP2- Industrial EE	IW-SP2- Nutrient Reduction	LD-SP2- Forest	POPs-SP2- Investment		SFM-SP2-PA Networks
BD-SP3-PA Networks	CC-SP3-RE	IW-SP3- Freshwater Basins	LD-SP3- Innovation	POPs-SP3- Demonstration		SFM-SP3- LULUCF
BD-SP4- Policy	CC-SP4- Biomass	IW-SP4- Toxics/Ice				SFM-SP4- Policy
BD-SP5- Markets	CC-SP5- Transport					SFM-SP5- Markets
BD-SP6- Biosafety	CC-SP6- LULUCF					SFM-SP6- Biomass
BD-SP7- Invasive Spp.						SFM-SP7- Forest
BD-SP8- CapacityB						

* POPs = Persistent Organic Pollutants; ODS = Ozone Depleting Substance; SFM = Sustainable Forest Management

Indicative Calendar: All the dates are expected dates and subject to change as new developments unfold. The purpose of these dates is to have an approximate timeline for the Program. Expected date for work program is self-explanatory. All programmatic approach projects should have a time limit as to when the program will be completed. Hence, the Agencies should provide an expected date for the submission of the last project under the Program and the expected Program completion date.

- A. Indicative Financing Plan Summary for the Program (\$). Provide the total indicative GEF grant and co-financing amounts for the Program (column 2) and project amounts submitted together with the PFD (column 3). Please note that the co-financing amounts do not receive an Agency fee. Total in the Program column (last row, 2nd column) should match the total amount in Table C. This is the estimated maximum amount for the Program which could include project preparation grant for the projects under the Program as well as Agency fees associated with each project (PIF).
- B. Indicative Co-financing for the Program (\$): Indicate the estimated sources of co-financing by the co-financing source categories listed in the first column. Sources indicated are general categorization of co-financiers at this stage. However, if more specific information on the names of co-financiers is available, please include the names after the category (in parenthesis). In the column on types of co-financing, please pull down menu to select whether the co-financing is a grant, soft loan (or concessional loan according to OECD classification), hard loan, guarantee, in-kind contribution or unknown at this stage.
- C. GEF Resources Anticipated by focal area(s) for Program: This table provides the share of the Program amount by focal area.
- D. Program Approval Procedure: In accordance with revision of the Project Cycle paper concerning approval of programmatic framework document, please fill in the appropriate program amount and number of PIFs submitted with the program as well as those to be submitted in the future.

PART II: PROGRAM JUSTIFICATION

- A. Self-explanatory.
- B. Describe the rationale for proposing the program, including barriers to achieving the objective stated under A.
- C. Discuss the justification/value-added of the program approach as opposed to a project approach (incl. cost-effectiveness of a programmatic approach compared to a project approach).
- D. Self-explanatory.
- E. State if the proposed Program is consistent with country priorities and how it builds on ongoing programs, policies and political commitments. Responding to this question will also show country ownership of this Program.
- F. Describe the Program's consistency with the GEF focal area strategies and fit with strategic programs. All Programs/projects have to be consistent with the focal area strategies to be eligible for GEF financing.
- G. Describe the role of the GEF Lead Agency for the Program and coordination with other GEF Agencies, organizations, and stakeholders involved in related initiatives; if similar projects exist in the same country/region, including GEF projects, report on synergies/complementarity with this proposal and demonstrate that there is no duplication. Also, describe the M&E system for the program, incl. institutional arrangements and the related budget.
- H. The objective is to ensure that in designing the Program, all risks, including climate change risk have been taken into consideration and that proper measures are in place and that the Program is resilient to climate change. Please outline the risk management measures, including improving resilience to climate change that the Program proposes to undertake.

PART III: APPROVAL/ENDORSEMENT BY GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT(S) AND GEF AGENCY(IES).

- A. RECORD OF ENDORSEMENT OF GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT(S) ON BEHALF OF THE GOVERNMENT(S):** (endorsement letter(s) should be attached with the PFD)

B. LEAD GEF AGENCY CERTIFICATION: This section provides Agency’s certification to the submission as well as contact information for the Program. Please note that all participating GEF Agencies need to validate the PFD prior to the certification by the GEF Lead Agency for the program.

Annex A. List of Projects Under the Program Framework: This table has four parts and lists all the projects (FSPs and MSPs) under the Program. The first part includes all the projects (PIFs) that are ready and submitted together with the PFD for Council approval in this work program. The second part includes MSPs under the Program that have been submitted for CEO approval and are awaiting for its PFD to be endorsed by Council. The third section lists all FSPs that are to be submitted under the Program in future work programs (FSPs), and the final section lists all MSPs to be submitted for CEO approval in the future.

Annex B: Description of Program Objectives, Outcomes and Outputs: self-explanatory

Annex C: Program Results Framework: self-explanatory

Programmatic Initiatives Supported by the GEF Since 1992¹

No.	Countries	Program Title	Council Approval Date	GEF Agencies	Focal Area	GEF Funding (\$m)	Co-financing (\$m)	No of Sub-projects	Program Objective
CLIMATE CHANGE									
1	Global	National Communications Programme for Climate Change	Nov-03	UNDP, UNEP	CC	58.49	1.55	130	This is an umbrella initiative, implemented through UNDP and UNEP, to support countries prepare second national communications to the UNFCCC. Over its six-year lifetime, the initiative will provide financial assistance for up to 130 countries.
LAND DEGRADATION									
2	China	PRC/GEF Partnership on Land Degradation in Dryland Ecosystems (Phase 1 – GEF3)	OCT-02	AsDB, WB	LD	20.05	110.71	4	The overall program objective is to reduce land degradation and restore dryland ecosystems in the western region of China . The specific purpose of the program is to assist the Government to establish an effective system of integrated natural resource management.
3	Burkina Faso	Partnership Programme for Sustainable Land Management (CPP), Phase I	Aug-06	UNDP, WB, IFAD, UNEP, AfDB	LD	10.35	60.71	5	Develop and set up a platform for sustainable partnerships to enable better coordination and an integrated approach to sustainable and equitable land management
4	Cuba	Supporting Implementation of the Cuban National Programme to Combat Desertification and Drought (NPCDD)	Nov-05	UNDP, UNEP, FAO	LD	10.00	79.44	4	Established national capacity for integrated SLM ensuring inter-sectoral coordination and effective implementation of land management plans and activities

5	Regional (Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan, Tajikistan)	Central Asian Countries Initiative for Land Management (CACILM) Multi-country Partnership Framework Phase 1	Aug-06	ADB	LD	20.00	134.82	10	The overall goal of the Central Asian Countries Initiative for Land Management (CACILM) Multicountry Partnership Framework (CMPF) is the restoration, maintenance, and enhancement of the productive functions of land leading to the improved economic and social well-being of those who depend on these resources while preserving the environmental functions of these lands in the spirit of UNCCD.
6	African Countries ²	Strategic Investment Program for SLM in Sub-Saharan Africa (SIP)	Jun-07	WB , UNDP, UNEP, FAO, IFAD, AfDB	LD	150.70	986.22	42	The global environmental objective is to prevent and reduce the impact of land degradation on ecosystem services in country-defined priority SSA ecosystems.
7	LDC and SIDS	LDC and SIDS Targeted Portfolio Approach for Capacity Development and Mainstreaming of Sustainable Land Management	May-04	UNDP	LD	29.00	30.95	48	Strengthen domestic (national and local level) capacity development and mainstreaming into national development strategies and policies, while improving the quality of project design, implementation, outputs and impact, and ensuring broad-based political and participatory support for the process.
INTERNATIONAL WATERS									
8	Open to all coastal countries in SSA	Strategic Partnership for a Sustainable Fisheries Investment Fund in the Large Marine Ecosystems of Sub-Saharan Africa	Nov-05	WB , FAO	IW	60.00	169.00	3+	Sustainable management of fisheries promoted in the five LMEs of Sub-Saharan Africa in order to assist coastal countries to make concrete progress towards achieving the fisheries and poverty reduction targets by the WSSD
9	Asia/Pacific	World Bank-GEF Investment Fund for the Pollution Reduction in the Large Marine Ecosystem in East Asia	Nov-05	WB	IW	80.00	621.00	7+	Reduced local, national and transboundary degradation of East Asia's marine ecosystems due to land-based pollution
10	Regional (Albania, Algeria, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, Egypt,	World Bank-GEF Investment Fund for the Mediterranean Sea Large Marine Ecosystem	May-06	WB , UNEP	IW	75.00	139.00	4+	Leveraged reforms and catalyzed investments that address transboundary pollution reduction and marine and coastal biodiversity conservation priorities identified in SAPs for the Mediterranean basin.

	Macedonia, Lebanon, Libya, Morocco, Serbia, Syria, Tunisia, Turkey)								
11	Regional (Belarus, Bosnia- Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, Czech Republic, Georgia, Hungary, Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Serbia, Slovak Republic, Slovenia)	Strategic Partnership Investment Fund for Nutrient Reduction in the Danube River and Black Sea	May-01	WB	IW	70.00	65.33	10+	Measures taken by all Black Sea basin countries to reduce nutrient levels and other hazardous substances to such levels necessary to permit Black Sea ecosystems to recover to similar conditions as those observed in the 1960s.
PERSISTENT ORGANIC POLLUTANTS (POPs)									
12	Any interested country eligible under 9(b)	Development of National Implementation Plans for the Stockholm Convention	May-01	UNEP, WB, UNDP, UNIDO	POPs	70.00	12.40	133	Strengthen national capacities to develop and formulate a National Implementation Plan (NIP) pursuant to Article 7 of the Stockholm Convention
13	All (interested) African Countries ³	African Stockpiles Program, Phase I	Aug-02	WB, FAO	POPs	25.70	35.00	4	ASP is a multi-stakeholder initiative to eliminate all stockpiles of obsolete pesticides from the African continent and help effectively prevent their re-emergence.
MULTI-FOCAL AREAS									
14	Namibia	Country Pilot Partnership for Integrated Sustainable Land Management	Nov-05	UNDP	LD, CC	10.00	51.99	4	Built and sustained capacity at systemic, institutional and individual level, ensuring cross-sectoral and demand-driven coordination and implementation of SLM activities
15	China	China Biodiversity Partnership and Framework for Action	Nov-07	UNDP, ADB, WB, IFAD, UNEP	BD, LD, CC	44.30	tbd	tbd	A significant reduction of the rate of biodiversity loss as a contribution to China's sustainable development.

16	India	Sustainable Land and Ecosystem Management (SLEM) Partnership Program	Nov-07	WB, UNDP, UNEP	BD, CC, LD	30.00	180.5	8	To restore and maintain globally significant ecosystem functions and services through enhanced local capacity, restoration of degraded areas, and dissemination, replication and scaling-up of successful SLEM best practices within and across individual Indian states. Its overall development objective is to contribute to poverty alleviation in India by promoting enhanced efficiency of natural resource use, improved land and ecosystem productivity, and reduced vulnerability to extreme weather events (droughts, floods).
17	Multi-country	Sustainable Forest Management	Nov-07	All Agencies	BD, LD, CC	60.00	tbd	open	Sustainable management of forests to achieve global benefits.
TOTAL						803.54	2,567.90		

¹ Includes previously approved and ongoing initiatives

² Countries include: Benin, Botswana, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Djiboti, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Ghana, Kenya, Lesotho, Madagascar, Malawi, Mali, Mauritania, Mozambique, Namibia, Niger, Nigeria, Rwanda, Senegal, South Africa, Sudan, Tanzania, Togo, Uganda, Gambia, Zambia

³ Phase I includes the following 7 countries: Ethiopia, Mali, Morocco, Nigeria, South Africa, Tanzania and Tunisia