

2013

GEF Civil Society /ECW Report
Dominican Republic.



Prepared by Brian James

RFP GEF NGO Network-Caribbean

27-Jul-13

Extended Constituency Workshop

Report of the Civil Society Organizations to the GEF

Introduction

The **GEF Expanded Constituency Workshop** (ECW) was held on the 1- 3 July, 2013 at the Occidental El Embajador Hotel - Santo Domingo, Dominican Republic.

The ECW aimed at keeping the GEF national focal points, convention focal points and other key stakeholders, including civil society, abreast of GEF strategies, policies and procedures and to encourage coordination.

The event was an opportunity for focal points to meet with their counterparts from other countries in the region and other GEF partners to discuss and review policies and procedures and to share lessons and experiences from development and implementation of GEF projects and their integration within national policy frameworks.

The ECW agenda spanned three days with the first days programme dedicate to meeting with Civil Society Organizations. The CSO meeting was chaired by the RFP Brian James and covered presentations about the GEF and the NGO network, an assessment of civil society engagement in GEF, core challenges experience by CSO's, review of the Public involvement policy and establishing a way forward.

The second and third day was chaired by William Ehlers with numerous presentations and hands-on practical exercises on national capacity development (NCSA), results-based management, monitoring and evaluation, and synergies in project design presented by Convention Secretariats (CBD, UNFCCC, UNCCD). The agenda also focused on discussions regarding the GEF 2020 Strategy, the new GEF Fee Policy, the project Cycle harmonization process and provided important updates about the preparations for GEF-6 and the replenishment process.

The Caribbean constituency comprises sixteen countries:

Antigua and Barbuda, Bahamas, Barbados, Belize, Cuba, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Grenada, Guyana, Haiti, Jamaica, St. Kitts and Nevis, St. Lucia, St. Vincent and Grenadines, Suriname, and Trinidad and Tobago.

Seventeen (17) CSO's participated from thirteen (13) countries at this year's ECW:

No	First and Middle Name(s) *	Last Name (Surname) *	Affiliation	Organization	Country
1	Keith	Cooper	Project Director	West End Eco-Fishing Camp Association	Bahamas

2	Reginald	Burke	Executive Coordinator	Caribbean Youth Environment Network	Barbados
3	Kemar	Saffrey	Chairman & President	The Barbados Vagrants and Homeless Society	Barbados
4	NAYARI	DIAZ	Senior Grant Officer	Protected Areas Conservation Trust (PACT)	Belize
5	Jose	Perez	Executive Director	APAMO	Belize
6	Liliana	Nunez Velis	President	Fundacion Antonio Nuñez Jimenez	Cuba
7	Clement	Richards	Program Coordinator	Movement for Cultural Awareness	Dominica
8	Ivore	Henry	Director	Believers Multi-purpose Cooperative Society Ltd.	Dominica
9	Natalia	Valerio	Asistance	Enda Dominicana	Dominican Republic
10	Mark	Ross	Founder and Co-Chairperson	Global Youth Movement-Guyana	Guyana
11	Amsale	Maryam	Chairperson/Consultant	Association of Development Agencies	Jamaica
12	Evelyn	Henville	Executive Director	Nevis Historical and Conservation Society	St. Kitts and Nevis
13	Denia	George	Programme Officer	Saint Lucia National Trust	St. Lucia
14	MARTIN	BARRITEAU	Executive Director	Sustainable Grenadines Inc.	St. Vincent and Grenadines

15	Maria Josee	Artist	Community Development Specialist	Organization of Indigenous Peoples	Suriname
16	Brian James	James	Vice President	Caribbean Forest Conservation Association	Trinidad and Tobago
17	AKILAH	JARAMOGI	Managing Director	Fondes Amandes Community Reforestation Project	Trinidad and Tobago

Generally it was a very successful interactive CSO meeting; candidates were welcomed by the RFP Brian James and Maria del Pilar Barrera – GEF Operations Officer, Civil Society Organizations/Capacity Development External Affairs. Pilar welcome participants and gave some insights on options available to CSO’s involvement in GEF programmes and projects.

In the first session, the RFP Brian James presented on the GEF and the GEF NGO Network. His presentation entailed an overview of the GEF outlining the historical background of the GEF, the GEF Structure and Stakeholders, Thematic areas of focus, Small Grants programme, Project types-FSPs and MSPs. Capacity building initiatives by GEF, the Caribbean constituency countries were identified, Accredited NGO’s, GEF Focal points-PFP, OFP, RFP, responsibilities of an RFP, benefits of being a GEF NGO Network Member and criteria for Membership.

In the second session, Aaron Zazueta, Chief Evaluations officer from the GEF Evaluations office presented, Aaron gave an overview of the analytical framework used for OPS5 re: background, problems and funding, the global gap, outcome and impact conclusions, broader adoption measures, focal area achievements, country level evidence, performance issues and key issues in the final OPS5 report.

Mr. Zazueta also had an interactive questions and answers session that seek to provoke discussion on answering the questions on relevance of GEF support in home country and support of national priorities. The question was also raised of how GEF support contributed to home country sustainable development agenda and environmental policies. (See appendix item)

In the third session, the focus was on identifying key issues to bring to the attention of government representatives, the core challenges faced and ways to enhance the level of CSO engagement. A very interactive session that produced an outcome **Statement by CSO’s** that seek to point the way forward for greater engagement between GEF and CSO’s.

Statements by CSOs on identifying issues that hinder relations between GEF and CSOs

- Development of a Comprehensive Advocacy and Communication Strategy that bridges the gaps that currently exist in GEF funded countries using branding tools. This is to increase the visibility of GEF among the populace and raise awareness on environmental issues. This should be then supported by budgetary allocations at the GEF country programme.
- There needs to be an increase in support of technical and other Human resource in GEF country offices since these are currently under-staffed, and there is much need for support for GEF Country coordinators as well as projects.
- It was noted that there is a lack of coordination between some of GEF country programmes and GEF-SGP, this needs to be addressed since presently these two programmes operate in a vacuum. The CSO's are of the view that these programmes should be complementing each other rather than operate in isolation. The opinion of CSO's is they should be engaged in consultation with government for the formulation of projects as this would ensure the building of relationship between government and civil society where these do not exist.
- One of the main issues identified by all the CSO's present is that GEF should increase and facilitate capacity building for CSO in the GEF – SGP so they can function effectively and efficiently in the execution of GEF projects.
- Unanimous support was given for the strengthened and continued involvement and where applies the reinforcing of the rights of Indigenous peoples in projects.
- Access to information by some CSO's was identified as another key issue as they pointed out that they are in some cases unaware of the basic requirements for proposals, what projects are funded under each GEF focus areas and country strategies and programmes.
- It was advocated for the GEF to offer technical support to countries to facilitate the documentation of models and successful projects under the GEF- SGP in the Caribbean on country websites of the best practices to be shared among CSO's in SGP countries.
- CSO's identified as a barrier the technical language which is used by GEF and governments since documents currently existing are not CSO user friendly.
- While technology allows for sharing of information across geographic boundaries, the CSO's are seeking for GEF and governments to facilitate the sharing of project experiences thru regional workshops and best practice exchange visits among CSO's implementing GEF - SGP activities and in other cases using more experienced CSO's to mentor inexperienced CSO's within the GEF-SGP.
- Governments should conduct consultations on developing national portfolio where this is not currently happening and it was suggested that GEF should seek to address this issue where peculiarities of countries differ.

- CSO's are advocating for the appointment of CSO focal points in each country to represent CSO's, this person would be the bridge between CSO's, GEF, GEF – SGP and the government focal point.
- Wherever there exist such groups as; a large population of indigenous peoples, diversity in the population etc, CSO's are advocating for specific representation of these groups via CSO/NGO focal points to ensure GEF public policy is adhered to.
- CSO's are requesting government support for the establishing of a "Green Fund" with GEF technical support using the CIDA experience, the Trinidad model as well as the Sustainable financing model from the OECS countries so that this can operate as a mechanism of co-financing for SGP countries.
- Review of policies where these exist and implementation of an environmental tax in cases where none exist to address environmental issues and from which it can be used to support GEF- SGP CSO projects.

In the fourth session, this was a break out group session with the group's review of the Public Involvement Policy. Generally the groups felt this was a good policy but lacks implementation, and offered recommendations for minor changes. There suggestion was for more pressure by the GEF to ensure implementation is carried out.

Suggested changes:

Section IV – Under scope of application: Nothing is in the document about **YOUTH** involvement and this should be added.

Under stakeholder participation: to add at the bottom to indigenous people – youth, and person's with special needs.

A general statement was the document does not speak in a broad sense about people involvement: how, what, why, when, where (5Ws). The document must promote active CSO participation at all stages of engagement.

The Policy also does not have anything on raising the awareness of the public. They felt this should be defined and articulated.

In the final session on the way forward, generally the comments were and summarized:

- There should be an all-out effort by CSO's in their home countries to form themselves into a body that has greater capacity to sought funding and manage large projects.
- Many CSO's were not aware of the existence of Focal Points in their home country and don't know how effective they are in promoting the GEF
- GEF can use CSO's who have capacity to assist other CSO's in capacity development

- The GEF brand is very weak in comparison to other funding agencies; there is a need for constant reinforcement in the media. Very little people know about the GEF.
- Countries should set up internship measures with University students to assist CSO's with project development.
- GEF is too academic and not on the ground with grassroots who are the true pulse of the people and community.

- Suggestion to have a GEF NGO Network, Youth NGO Network.

In conclusion all participants felt that the meeting was a tremendous success, they felt honored to be selected and involve in contributing to the development of the GEF and by extension the NGO Network. The participants said that they felt inspired from the wealth of information and knowledge gained from this experience with the GEF. CSOs shared that they will continue to spread the word and reach of the GEF and would join the NGO Network.

On behalf of the group, I must say thank you to Pilar Barrera, Aaron Zazueta, William Ehlers and others of the GEF family that gave of their time and tremendous support in the successful hosting of the CSO meeting and ECW.

Brian James
RFP GEF NGO Network-Caribbean
Vice President CFCA

Appendix 1

Feedback responses captured from participants at the meeting:

1) Purpose of attending the meeting:

- Meet and share with other CSO/NGOs on the progress of GEF-SGP programme.
- To obtain information on GEF NGO Network
- To meet and discuss as well as learn about the various challenges and solutions faced by the community of GEF implementers.
- Strengthen the role of the SGP in Cuba and bring to this meeting vision from Cuban NGO and our gaps or strengths that we must work to make it more effective. Obtain Information from other Caribbean CSO facing GEF mechanism.
- Involvement in processes –GEF. As SGP steering committee member I am involved in part of GEF finance, etc. but not involved in “Bigger GEF fund” in strategy, policy, etc. While projects effects people’s life. Need for CSO is big.
- To share information about my organization and participate in the CSO meeting, develop partnership and network with other NGOs and CBO within the region.
- To gain knowledge on how to be successful on a grant and provide feedback on my concerns.
- To evaluate methods of engaging CSOs and make recommendations for improvement.
- To understand how GEF should be operating in country and to be established networking.
- Want the SGP to be more beneficial to NGOs and communities.
- To learn from my colleagues ways to improve our CSO programmes in Grand Bahama.
- To share experiences and perspectives and learn from Caribbean partners. To learn more about GEF and its work

2) Agenda (Usefulness, relevance to GEF and issues in the region, other comments or suggestions):

- Very relevant need for space, say 10 minutes to present. Best practice for countries projects.
- Very useful.
- The agenda was on point.
- It’s perfect.
- Quite useful especially looking at core challenges and NGOs.
- Agenda was very well planned and executed.
- The agenda was useful. It generated good discussion which exposed the experiences of the different member participants.
- Few items on the agenda that allowed enough time for sound discussion.
- Was engaging- very good.
- This is my first GEF workshop and the information learned was invaluable.
- Agenda was specific and realistic and quite relevant.

3) Feedback on the value of participation in the meeting for you/your organization:

- Very important and useful feedback.
- Information provided was very useful
- This was an excellent meeting, great participation by delegates and very relevant information on implementation issues related to the GEF. The information was very useful.
- Reinforces our knowledge of the mechanisms of GEF and maybe we can help the understanding between the different stakeholders in Cuba in this process.
- Recognition of other SGP in other countries issues. While I was worried about Suriname progress in program, I now realize we are doing okay in communication plans in implementation to involve more stakeholders, etc.
- Informative, important sharing model with others and learning what others are doing in the region.
- A very mature group and had more to converse and share than time allowed.
- The meeting revealed that there is still a lot of information that needs to be shared among the CSO network.
- Pleasantly surprised with the high frank and open discussion by colleagues.
- Very useful – would join up to the network.
- This group was special as everyone had something to contribute.
- Participation was very useful as a lot was learnt from GEF. A lot of opportunities for better networking and collaboration were identified.

4) What action do you plan to do to follow up the meeting:

- To join the NGO network.
- Disseminate info on NGO Network to local CSOs.
- Discuss and possibly seek to set up a national NGO dialogue on the GEF.
- Will organize a joint workshop with SGP and local CB and other CSO to achieve better application of funds with better proposals.
- Organization level – pushes for membership NGO/CSO network; Get more involved in IP network; Presentation of public policy during steering committee meeting.
- Share information Work with regional organization that attended this meeting.
- Meet with my country's focal point. Contract fellow participants to share some of their successes in grants and learn from them.
- Network with NGOs/CSOs in the region; Share country experience.
- Join the GEF NGO Network.
- Join the network; Strengthen CSO in countries I work.
- Meet with my project coordinator to review items learned.
- Discuss internally within my organization the benefits of the GEF NGO network and the consideration of joining. Also discuss with the SGP office.

5) Any comments or suggestions for improvement in the organization of future meetings:

a) Travel/ Accommodation/ Logistic Issues

- This hotel was fine except for the limited English of staff.
- All arrangements were satisfactory, in fact, excellent.
- Well-organized.
- Satisfactory.

b) Meeting organization and programme.

- Create space for NGO/CSO to present. Best practice.
- Don't start too early if people come in late. Better to start and end a little later.
- The staff was extraordinary in their plans and getting us to the DR. Well done!
- Keep this practice of a separate CSO meeting.
- Good meeting.
- Participatory- which is good.
- Good.

6) Any suggestions to enhance the work of the GEF NGO Network?

- Get NGO/CSO to join the NGO network.
- Attempt to provide information on the GNN to CSOs in every country.
- Better communications needed with the broad constituency.
- I will promote the network in Suriname. It is not known.
- More public awareness.
- NGO and CSO need to get an email list to stay in contact. Everyone should register online.
- Create ease of access to information about GEF processes/projects.
- Give more support for the Regional Focal Point.
- The network must be strengthened; Raise awareness.
- More exposure in member countries.
- Network should more proactively seek NGOs to become members to strengthen the network.

7) Any other comments?

- A press statement on meeting should be prepared for dissemination to local CSOs
- Liked the relaxed atmosphere, good floor for discussions, etc.
- This meeting can help to get the word out; create a list to share with CSOs.
- Brian was excellent in providing timely information prior to the conference. Great job!

Feedback responses captured from participants at the meeting

Feedback on Implementation of Public Involvement Policy. Practical Exercise (ECW Meeting)

- 1) **Are OFPs, GEF Agencies or CSOs operating in respective countries familiar with the Public Involvement Policy and is it applied in the development and implementation of GEF related programmes and projects?**
 - No but elements of the policy are already being used.
 - The individuals/groups identified are not aware of the Public Involvement Policy. However, the principles outlined in the policy are utilized as a matter of government policy to provide opportunities for engagement regarding what is considered a priority the way forward in addressing issues. This is done not just in regards to GEF projects but across the board.
 - Yes, all parties are aware of GEF PIP and is applied in all development and implementation of GEF programmes and projects. It is also a national policy.
 - OFP is aware of its existence but unfamiliar with in depth details. CSO is aware of its existence and familiar with these details but language is a bit technical.
 - We are now familiar with the PIP and would be providing comments and solutions.
 - We know/are aware of that policy, however we are not familiar with it.
 - No- part of best practices by gov't to involve the public.
 - They are participating but in the majority of the cases, they don't work with the civil society and they apply only to the politics of GEF's projects or programmes because it is known but not in the civil society.

- 2) **Is the current policy adequate to ensure CSO involvement? Is it being implemented?**
 - Yes and some elements are already implemented.
 - It appears to be adequate but may not be utilized in the manner envisioned as it only provides a blueprint and would require tailoring to the specific country context. However, the identification of the CSO Focal Point with responsibility for liaising between the CSOs, SGP and the Line Ministry/Department responsible for the implementation of the national environmental agenda appears to be an opportunity to enhance the communication between the large blocks of stakeholders.
 - Yes. Adequate.
 - No.
 - Yes. The CSO the policy is adequate and design to ensure CSO involvement. The Public Involvement Policy Is not yet implemented.
 - (i) Yes it is adequate as it captures the key principles for involvement and participation. (ii) CSOs have been applying those principles without knowledge of that policy. (iii) The policy needs to be publicized.
 - (i) Yes it only needs stronger implementation via GEF. Activities in-country. (ii) Very limited.

- Yes – little is known about it and would bring added value to GEF programme where implemented.
- No, because they do not inform the civil society of the intended benefits and of what accesses the same organizations.

3) Does the Policy provide sufficient guidance to help implementation or is additional guidance needed – if so on what?

- The policy is sufficient but I think that more details on the PIP can be shared with the general public.
- No.
- Some additional support are recommended to help with implementation of the PIP.
- Policy is sufficient for implementation!
- No. Additional sensitization and guidance needed with an evaluation phase therein.
- Yes- need guidance on how I should be implemented and bring into the main stress of the GEF programme.
- They do lack strategic lines of promotion and diffusion of their own GEF integrated politics to have an opinion on it.

4) What other steps could be taken to enhance or promote the Public Involvement Policy?

- (i) The document can be promoted by circulating the policy to the OFPs and PFPs for their information and dissemination when required to the various agencies involved in environmental project/programme formulation. (ii) It can be used as a point of reference to help enhance the existing mechanism used for community engagement in the decision-making process.
- Public awareness and consultation.
- Funding for such an activity.
- (i) Desensitization/ P Awareness need to be increased on the policy. (ii) More coordination internal and external to NGOs or gov't agencies to facilitate involvement.
- (i) More promotion on the policy. (ii) Updating it since it's 17 years old.
- (i) The web page can be friendlier and put in the Spanish language. (ii) Have a workshop of diffusions at the national level on the politics of public involvement. (iii) The focal point operation should have a more open politics and participatory of the civil society.

Appendix 3

Feedback responses captured from participants at the meeting

Practical Exercise (ECW Meeting)

- 1) **What are the current policies/ practices that support CSO engagement in implementation of global Conventions in your country/region?**
 - (i) Natural Resource and Environmental Policy System (NREPS) along with the NREPS-OSC (other stakeholders committee) which is NGO fully. (ii) National Environmental Appraisal Committee (NEAR) which has official NGO memberships. (iii) Some GEF projects have NGOs in their steering committees.
 - There is no written policy, however, practice ensuring that representation of CSO stakeholder analysis is conducted prior to meetings/workshops etc and then they are engaged in an appropriate manner.
 - There are GEF Policies however at the national level, we are not aware of any such policies.
 - (i) There is no specific/ written policy that lays out CSO or public policy involvement. (ii) CSO engagement is currently ad-hoc however CSOs are included in project planning and included in implementation eg. Revision of policies. (iii) While the level of engagement is ad-hoc, this will be more structural in the future. (iv) Projects implemented by the country are extracted from reports, strategies and other documents that included public consultation to prepare these. (v) GEF full proposal is consulted on for GEF LS projects.
 - (i) Membership on PSCS, National Committees. (ii) Participation in National Stakeholder Consultations.
 - (i) Engage CSO in stakeholder consultation. (ii) Adherence to convention policies on CSO engagement. (iii) Mechanism for provision of facilitation to generate to engage in active participation in planning workshops, monitoring of programs and development of projects. (iv) High degree of community participation- as an inherent traditional approach to CSO engagement.
 - As a matter of practice we involve CSO in sharing all information and projects. However, we have poor performance with follow-ups.
 - (i) Consultations with relevant CSOs. (ii) One-on-one sessions. (iii) Policy of government to engage CSOs.
 - (i) Engage public/ stakeholder through public consultation. (ii) IBD convention talk about civil society engagement: (a) System of National Park and Protected Areas had board-based public consultation which fed into its development. (b) EIA contributes STAR allocation to SGP. (iii) Develop of public education and awareness – PSAs
 - Overarching National Policy – public education, awareness and involvement is recognized as a fundamental prerequisite to the sustainable development pursuit, green economy and all other national development aspirations.
 - Participation in national steering committees and other stakeholder
 - Direct notifications and invitations through relevant news media. E.g: GIS.

2) What are the (a) opportunities and (b) constraints in CSO engagement in GEF programmes?

- (a) Further engagement at Grass Roots/ Country level, Indigenous Knowledge; Leveraging of co-financing; improved project design and development. (b) Too radical a view to development; create competition for scarce resources; Inadequate capacity; Lack openness to their workings.
- (a) SGP for GLV. (b) Capacity of the CSOs to understand the language of them; Financial resources.
- We have a GEF starting committee at a national level, however, more engagement is needed. Some of the opportunities for CSO engagement in GEF programmes are – Funding to develop projects, opportunities to contribute to participate in GEF NGO consultation meetings and GEF Assembly Meeting.
- (a) National Steering Committee can be expanded; GEF working group can be expanded to include CSO; Inclusion of CSO in executive of projects. (b) Absence of a CSO structure; CSOs do not network among themselves and where this exists it's weak; CSOs lack capacity; Technical language.
- (a) CSOs work closely with local communities and understand their needs and concerns. (b) Not enough established CSOs.
- (a) Provide a means to address critical issues in their communities; High degree of community participation in community projects- as a traditional. (b) Weak organizational structure- of CSO NGO and CBO; Inadequate sustained publicity of the activities of the CSO; High degree of voluntarism which fatigues the efforts of members- where direct incentives for effort are lacking; Lack of critical skill – inadequate.
- (a) Broaden perspectives and public awareness of what is going on in the communities ; If CSO are involved from the 'get go', you can determine the skill sets and funding possibilities in the community; CSO is a source of skills and funding not found in government; Involvement of CSO will help them to understand more the requirements of the GEF. (b) CSO does not have enough info about government's policies and plans; CSO lack of understanding and appreciation of the donors' specific requirements; Lack of collaboration between CSO to gain on skills and finances; Capacity to understand the terms and conditions and financial obligations.
- (a) Participation of CSO in projects/ programs; Data input from the field; Alertness on specific issues occurring in the hinterland (i.e.: in case of a calamity). (b) Government not familiar with relevant CSOs.
- (a) Linkage and Ownership; Country Ownership; Improve project design; Better quality networks. (b) Lack of capacity to do implementation of SEF project. Challenges: No data break, difficult to get in touch with; No system – Information/data base of active NGOs cause breakdown in community. NB. SGP – would help with environment NSO.
- (a) With the addition of gender equality as a GEF principle there is room for gender groups to become engaged in the GEF movement ; Engaging civil society perform the dual purpose of strategic attention to your GEF project and ascertain level of public awareness for the project. (b) If the proper use of a communications specialist and communications media are not employed, the opportunity of the GEF project may be wasted on the public and even on the participants.

3) Highlight some of the achievements/ lessons learned from CSO engagement in GEF programmes.

- (i) Involvement functionally takes a longer time, even with payment. (ii) The quality of work is very good, so too is the community involvement which makes the whole process worthwhile. (iii) To facilitate participation in projects requires additional funding and projects are not structured that way. (iv) With the small grants programme, it was indicated to us by the UNDP Office Barbados that there should not be too much involvement and were asked to withdraw.
- Involvement in PA Technical Committee has led to more openness and transparency to GEF project execution.
- NPFF was coordinated NGO. (SLNT)
- Lessons learned from the CSO engagement in GEF programmes in Trinidad are access to granted funding to develop and build capacity within the following areas – some successful projects in Trinidad are: (i) Increased food security through Agrp-Forestry and Organic farming initiatives. Fruit and vegetable crops in the Caura Valley were grown using Integrated Pest Management and Ecological Crop Management techniques. (ii) Reforestation project addressing land degradation and loss of forest cover, addressing flooding which is associated with decreased water quality and harmful bacteria.
- (i) Creates a sense of ownership when CSO is involved. (ii) CSO involvement leads to capacity building and development.
- Implementation of several projects under GEF-SGP.
- (i) Need for continuous education and status reviews of implementation of programs/ projects. (ii) Wide spread awareness of implemented projects by communities as a result of consultation process.
- (i) Communication (ii) Capacity building.
- Achievement: Capacity strengthening to deal with community issues; Create self-sustainment. Lessons learned: Involvement of CSOs in GEF programmes gives them the opportunity to address their needs so this way GEF programmes are directly engaged with the target group and reflective to the target group issues.
- Consulted at some level. Limit experience with engaging CSO in GEF programmes.
- Highlight some of the achievements/lessons learned from CSO engagement in GEF programmes.
- CSO's offer unique perspectives to project design reflecting on-the ground realities and the clearer articulation of elements that address the issue of sustainability.
- What are the opportunities and constraints in CSO engagement in GEF programmes?
- Making grant resources available to support project implementation from consolidated fund and through expanded National SGP Programme
- Chief constraint national CSO community not sufficiently organized
- Need for a central body within government to provide assistance for organizing the CSO community and defining the mechanism for engagement
- Perception that GEF Projects are too complex and do not support remuneration.

Time	Day1 – Monday, 1st July, 2013
8:00 – 16:00	CSO Meeting (For CSO's Only)
8:00 – 8:30	Registration
8:30 – 8:45	Welcome Remarks
8:45 – 10:15	- Introduction and Overview of GEF NGO Network - Options available to CSO's involvement in programmes and projects of GEF.
10:15 – 10:30	Coffee/Tea Break
10:30 – 11:00	Open Forum: Assessing the current level of engagement of civil society in GEF project (Survey Questionnaire)
11:00 – 12:30	Break out group discussion (2 Groups) <u>Group 1</u> Title: Identifying key issues to bring to the attention of the government representatives during the ECW - Core challenges of NGO's <u>Group 2</u> Title: Ways to enhance the level of CSO engagement at country and regional level 15mins/group) Presentation and Q/A
12:30 – 1:30	Lunch
13:30 – 15:00	Public Involvement Policy (Review) (2 groups) Feedback from Groups
15:00 – 15:15	Coffee/Tea Break
15:15 – 16:00	The Way Forward - Summary and Closing

Time	Day2 – Monday, 1st July, 2013
8:00 – 16:00	CSO Meeting (For CSO's Only)
	Day 2 – Tuesday, 2nd July 2013
8:00 – 9:00	REGISTRATION
9:00 – 9:30	Welcoming Remarks
9:30 – 10:00	Introduction to the Workshop Objectives, Agenda, Materials and Resources
10:00 – 10:15	<i>COFFEE BREAK/GROUP PHOTO</i>
10:15 – 12:30	Overview and Review (presentation) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General Overview – Structure Governance • GEF 2020 Strategy • Broadening the Partnership • Re-programming of GEF-5 Resources • New Fee Structure (Agenda Item 15) • GCF + Mercury status • GEF6 Replenishment • Streamlining project cycle + piloting WB
12:30 – 13:30	<i>LUNCH</i>
13:30 – 15:45	GEF and the Conventions (Presentation and practical exercise) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CBD, UNCCD, UNFCCC
15:45 – 16:00	<i>COFFEE BREAK</i>
16:00 – 17:30	Tracking Tools and RBM (Presentation and practical exercise) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tracking tools and Mid Term Evaluations
17:30 – 18:30	<i>Bilaterals</i>
19:00 – 20:30	<i>Reception</i>

<i>Time</i>	<i>Day 3 – Wednesday, 3rd July 2013</i>	
8:30 – 10:15	Monitoring and Evaluation: <i>How Country Stakeholders Get Involved</i> (Presentation and practical exercise) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monitoring and evaluation in the GEF • Key roles and responsibilities • GEF Evaluation Office • The GEF M&E Policy • Practical Exercise 	
10:15 – 10:30	<i>COFFEE BREAK</i>	
10:30 – 12:30	Practical Exercise – NCSAs (Presentation and practical exercise) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The practical exercise will enable participants to get fully acquainted with the CCD Strategy and to establish the basis for a project under Capacity Development. 	
12:30 – 13:30	<i>LUNCH</i>	
13:30 – 15:00	GEF – OPS5 – Evaluation Office <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EO – Continued development from 2012 (Through July '13) (Closed doors – Focal Points, CSOs only) 	
15:00 – 15:15	<i>COFFEE BREAK</i>	
15:15 to 17:00	CSO Presentation	