



GEF COUNCIL DECISIONS 2006

GEF Council Decisions 2006

Decision by Mail – February 2006	1
Decision 1/2006 Report to the Eighth CoP of the CBD	1
Decision 2/2006 Report to the Second CoP of the Stockholm Convention	1
Decision by Mail - March 2006	1
Decision 3/2006 Intersessional Work Program	1
28th Council Meeting – June 2006	2
Decision 4/2006 GEF Annual Performance Report and Management Response	2
Decision 5/2006 GEF Portfolio Performance Report	3
Decision 6/2006 Costa Rica Portfolio.....	3
Decision 7/2006 Evaluation Office Four Year Rolling Plan and Budget	4
Decision 8/2006 Proposed Amendments to GEF Instrument and Rules of Procedure of the Council .	5
Decision 9/2006 Proposal by the Executive Director of UNEP on the Composition of STAP 4.....	6
Decision 10/2006 Relations with Conventions and other Institutions	6
Decision 11/2006 Status Report on the Special Climate Change Fund	7
Decision 12/2006 Strategy for Financing Biosafety Activities.....	8
Decision 13/2006 Work Program	8
Decision 14/2006 Third GEF Assembly	10
Decision 15/2006 Corporate Budget, FY07	10
Decision 16/2006 Progress Report on the Implementation of the RAF	11
Decision 17/2006 Appointment of CEO/Chair of the Facility.....	12
Decision 18/2006 Private Sector Strategy.....	12
Decision 19/2006 Confirmation of Constituencies.....	13
Decision 20/2006 Other Business.....	14
Decision by Mail – August 2006	14
Decision 21/2006 Intersessional Work Program	14
29th Council Meeting – August 2006	21
Decision 22/2006 Fourth Replenishment of the GEF Trust Fund	21
Decision 23/2006 Remaining Issues Related to Work Program circulated for Approval by Mail on June 12, 2006.....	21
Decision 24/2006 Governance of the Climate Change Funds.....	24

Decision 25/2006	Amendments to the Instrument.....	26
Decision by Mail – September 2006	26
Decision 26/2006	Global Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund, Phase 2.....	26
Decision by Mail – October 2006	28
Decision 27/2006	Report to the twelfth CoP of the UNFCCC.....	28
Decision by Mail – November 2006	28
Decision 28/2006	Amendments of the Rules of Procedure of the Council	28
30th Council Meeting – December 2006	28
Decision 29/2006	Evaluation Office Progress Report.....	28
Decision 30/2006	Evaluation of Incremental Cost Assessment	28
Decision 31/2006	Evaluation of Experience with Executing Agencies	29
Decision 32/2006	Evaluation of GEF Project Cycle and Modalities.....	30
Decision 33/2006	Rules, Procedures and Objective Criteria for Project Selection, Pipeline Management and Cancellation Policy	31
Decision 34/2006	Results Management Framework.....	33
Decision 35/2006	Strategies for Focal Areas.....	34
Decision 36/2006	Business Plan	34
Decision 37/2006	Implications of Amending the Instrument to Reflect the Designation of the GEF as Financial Mechanism of the UNCCD	34
Decision 38/2006	Strategy for Financing Biosafety and Management Response.....	35
Decision 39/2006	Roles and Comparative Advantages of the GEF Agencies.....	35
Decision 40/2006	Report on Project Data Reconciliation.....	36
Decision 41/2006	Review of Financial Statements.....	36
Decision 42/2006	Progress Report on Implementation of the RAF	36
Decision 43/2006	Other Business.....	37
Annex	38
Annex to Decision 22/2006	Statements on the GEF-4 replenishment.....	38

Decision by Mail – February 2006

Decision 1/2006 Report to the Eighth CoP of the CBD

1. The Council, having reviewed the draft [Report of the GEF to the eighth session of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity](#), approves the report for submission to the second session of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention.

Decision 2/2006 Report to the Second CoP of the Stockholm Convention

1. The Council, having reviewed the draft [Report of the GEF to the second session of the Conference of the Parties to the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants](#), approves the report for submission to the second session of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention.

Decision by Mail - March 2006

Decision 3/2006 Intersessional Work Program

1. The Council reviewed the proposed intersessional [work program](#) transmitted to Council on February 15, 2006 and approves it subject to the following as requested in comments submitted to the Secretariat by Council Members.
2. The Council finds that with the exception of:
 1. **Regional (Dominica, St. Lucia, St. Vincent and Grenadines):** Implementation of Pilot Adaptation Measures in Coastal Areas of Dominica, St. Lucia and St. Vincent & the Grenadines,
 2. **Mexico:** Integrated Energy Services for Small Localities of Rural Mexico,
 3. **Global:** Supporting Country Early Action on Protected Areas,
 4. **China:** Conservation and Sustainable Utilization of Wild Relatives of Crops,
 5. **Ghana:** Ghana Urban Transport, and
 6. **Pakistan:** Sustainable Land Management for Combating Desertification (Phase 1),

each project presented to it as part of the work program is or would be consistent with the Instrument and GEF policies and procedures and may be endorsed by the CEO for final approval by the Implementing or Executing Agency, provided that the CEO circulates to the Council Members, prior to endorsement, draft final project documents

fully incorporating the [Council's comments](#) on the work program accompanied by a satisfactory explanation by the CEO of how much such comments and comments of the STAP reviewer have been addressed and a confirmation by the CEO that the project continues to be consistent with the Instrument and GEF policies and procedures¹.

3. With respect to the following projects:

1. **Regional (Dominica, St. Lucia, St. Vincent and Grenadines):** Implementation of Pilot Adaptation Measures in Coastal Areas of Dominica, St. Lucia and St. Vincent & the Grenadines, and
2. **Mexico:** Integrated Energy Services for Small Localities of Rural Mexico,

the Council requests the Secretariat to arrange for Council Members to receive the draft final project documents and transmit to the CEO within four weeks any concerns they may have prior to CEO endorsing the project document for final approval by the Implementing or Executing Agency. The projects may be reviewed at a subsequent Council meeting at the request of at least four Council Members.

4. With respect to the following projects:

1. **Global:** Supporting Country Early Action on Protected Areas,
2. **China:** Conservation and Sustainable Utilization of Wild Relatives of Crops,
3. **Ghana:** Ghana Urban Transport, and
4. **Pakistan:** Sustainable Land Management for Combating Desertification (Phase 1),

the Council requests that the project proposals be deferred for consideration at the June 2006 Council meeting.

28th Council Meeting – June 2006

Decision 4/2006 GEF Annual Performance Report and Management Response

1. The Council, having reviewed the document GEF/ME/C.28/2 [Annual Performance Report 2005](#) requests that the GEF Evaluation Office report on follow-up to the following four decisions:

¹ One Council Member, in light of national legislation regarding the country's voting position for development projects financed by certain development institutions, opposed the following project proposal: *Cuba: Mainstreaming and Sustaining Biodiversity Conservation in Three Productive Sectors of the Sabana Camaguey Ecosystem.*

- (a) The GEF Secretariat should redraft project review guidelines and standards to ensure compliance with the new M&E minimum requirements. Further consideration should also be given to ways to enhance the contribution of STAP reviews during the process.
 - (b) The GEF Secretariat should support Focal Area Task Forces with corporate resources to continue the development of indicators and tracking tools to measure the results of the GEF operations in the various focal areas.
 - (c) The Evaluation Office should continue its oversight of project-at-risk systems and interact with the Implementing and Executing Agencies and report to Council on progress.
 - (d) The Implementing and Executing Agencies should share, in accordance with their operational policies and procedures, mid-term and terminal evaluations with the GEF focal points in a timely way.
2. GEF partner agencies need to continue to follow-up on the recommendations made in last year's APR regarding the need to improve terminal evaluation reports.

Decision 5/2006 GEF Portfolio Performance Report

- 1. The Council, having reviewed GEF/ME/C.28/4, [GEF Portfolio Performance Report 2005](#), welcomes the indication that the GEF portfolio under implementation in 2005 was performing satisfactorily across all focal areas, based on project implementation reports submitted by the GEF agencies.
- 2. The Council recognizes the need for harmonization of monitoring tools across the agencies to ensure more coherent aggregation of findings at the GEF corporate level. The Council requests the Secretariat, in collaboration with the Implementing and Executing Agencies and STAP, to develop a comprehensive results-based management framework for the GEF to be implemented in GEF-4 which will incorporate monitoring and reporting at three levels: corporate, programmatic (focal area) and projects. The Secretariat is requested to submit a proposal for an overall GEF Results-Based Management Framework to the Council for review at its meeting in December 2006. The annual Portfolio Performance Report should be fully integrated into the overall GEF Results-Based Management Framework.

Decision 6/2006 Costa Rica Portfolio

- 1. The Council, having reviewed the document GEF/ME/C.28/5, [GEF Country Portfolio Evaluation – Costa Rica \(1992 – 2005\)](#), takes note of the findings and recommendations.

The Council requests the GEF Evaluation Office to report through the Management Action Record on follow-up to the following decisions:

- (a) The GEF Evaluation Office should continue to conduct GEF Country Portfolio Evaluations in other countries, selected with transparent criteria and within the possibilities of the Office's budget approved by Council.
 - (b) The GEF Secretariat is requested to take steps to improve the information mechanisms in the GEF, most notably the GEF website, to make essential operational information available at the national level.
 - (c) The GEF Evaluation Office is invited to continue to interact with the government of Costa Rica on the evaluation report and to report back to Council on Costa Rica's response to the evaluation.
 - (d) The GEF Evaluation Office is requested to present to Council, at its December 2006 meeting, a short note on the criteria to select countries for future Country Portfolio Evaluations.
2. Council reiterates its decision of June 2005 that "the transparency of the GEF project approval process should be increased" and requests the GEF Secretariat to reinforce its efforts to improve this transparency.

Decision 7/2006 Evaluation Office Four Year Rolling Plan and Budget

1. The Council, having reviewed document GEF/ME/C.28/7 "[*Four Year Work Program and Budget of the GEF Evaluation Office FY07-10 and Results in FY06*](#)" and GEF/ME/C.28/7/Corr.1 approves the proposed principles underlying the work program for the next four years, subject to the comments made during the Council meeting. Council approves a budget of \$2,906,634 for FY07 to cover the GEF Evaluation Office's cost of core tasks. In addition, Council approves the budget for the following special initiatives:

For FY07:

- (a) GEF EO inputs and participation to the third GEF Assembly (\$25,000)
- (b) an evaluation of the Executing Agency experiences with the GEF (\$70,000); and
- (c) payment of the OPS3 ICF budget overrun (\$108,149)

For FY07 and FY08:

- (a) preparation of an international workshop on evaluation, environment and sustainable development (\$25,000)
 - (b) evaluation of the Small Grants Programme (\$290,000).
2. Council agrees with the proposed arrangements for the evaluation of the Small Grants Programme to be conducted by the Office. Council requests the GEF Small Grants Programme to contribute to the cost of this evaluation from its proposed 2007 budget, in the order of \$110,000. This amount is to be transferred to the Office from the Small Grants Programme through the GEF Trustee. The Council recognizes that this evaluation will take the place of the final evaluation required for replenishment of a new SGP phase.
3. Regarding FY08 through FY10, Council takes note of the proposed work program and activities and requests the Office to prepare annual budgets for Council consideration and approval in each of its June meetings. The Evaluation Office is requested in future budget proposals to provide an integrated budget with clearer guidance and priorities for special initiatives. The Office will also prepare for Council consideration a more detailed proposal on the suggested role of the Evaluation Office in OPS4. The Evaluation Office is also requested to provide more information on how external funding relates to the independence of the Office and how potential conflicts of interest are prevented.
4. Council agrees to the establishment of a new special initiative on evaluation capacity building to support junior professional evaluators from developing countries at the GEF Evaluation Office, made possible with a generous grant of the government of Sweden.

Decision 8/2006 Proposed Amendments to GEF Instrument and Rules of Procedure of the Council

1. The Council, having reviewed document GEF/ME/C.28/8 *Proposals to fully reflect the independence of the Evaluation Office in the main documents of the GEF* ([Proposed Options to Operationalize the Select Modalities of Interaction between the Council and the Evaluation Office](#)) agrees on the general approach proposed in option 2. The Rules of Procedure of the Council will be amended to fully reflect in a short and concise way the M&E policy adopted in February 2006 and the TOR of the independent M&E unit of July 2003. A proposal will be developed in consultation with Council Members, which will be presented to Council by the Evaluation Director for approval on a no-objection basis.

**Decision 9/2006 Proposal by the Executive Director of UNEP on the Composition of STAP
4**

1. The Council, having reviewed the [Proposal of the Executive Director of UNEP on the Composition of STAP 4](#) (document GEF/C.28/2), approves the composition of STAP proposed by the Executive Director of UNEP on the basis of the recommendations put forward by the Search Committee for the Partial Reconstitution of STAP. The Council agrees to the more flexible system of STAP membership that has been developed in response to the finding of the OPS3 regarding the need to improve the responsiveness of STAP.
2. The Council fully supports the recommendation that Yolanda Kakabadse continue as Chair of STAP and that her term be renewed by two years. It also supports the proposal that Michael Stocking serve as Vice-Chair.
3. The Council welcomes the nine new members of STAP and expresses its sincere appreciation to the outgoing members of STAP for their contributions to the work of the GEF.
4. Council reviewed the proposed changes in the STAP roster selection process, welcomes the change and requests STAP to report back to the Council on its implementation. STAP is also requested to ensure that reviewers are free of conflict of interest.
5. STAP is requested to collaborate with the Secretariat, the Implementing and Executing Agencies and the Evaluation Office in the development of indicators for the focal areas, and to cooperate with the Secretariat on the process of project review with a view to avoiding duplication while strengthening the scientific and technical aspects of project proposals.
6. Council requests the Chair of STAP to review, in cooperation with the Secretariat, GEF agencies and the Evaluation Office, the current terms of reference of STAP and to develop a proposal for Council review to update the terms of reference to enhance the role and relevance of STAP in the GEF.
7. Council further requests that STAP extend its work at the regional level, including dissemination of STAP reports and other relevant information.

Decision 10/2006 Relations with Conventions and other Institutions

1. The Council, having reviewed document GEF/C.28/3, [Relations with Conventions and Other Institutions](#), welcomed the progress made in supporting the international

environmental conventions, and GEF collaboration with the UN Commission on Sustainable Development and other international processes relevant to GEF's mandate.

2. The Council requests the Secretariat and the Implementing and Executing Agencies to continue to seek opportunities to work with recipient countries to develop and implement projects consistent with the decisions of the Conventions. The Secretariat is requested to maintain its consultations with the Implementing Agencies, Executing Agencies and Convention Secretariats to promote continued responsiveness to convention guidance and to keep the Council informed of the progress that is being made.
3. The Council approves the *Memorandum of Understanding between the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification in those Countries Experiencing Drought and /or Desertification, particularly in Africa (UNCCD) and the Global Environment Facility on Enhanced Collaboration*.
4. Due to time constraints, the Council agrees the information in paper GEF/C.28/3 on the Strategic Approach to International Chemicals Management (SAICM) will be discussed at the Council meeting in December 2006.

Decision 11/2006 Status Report on the Special Climate Change Fund

1. The Council reviewed and approves the [Programming Paper for Funding the Implementation of NAPAs under the LDC Trust Fund](#) (document GEF/C.28/18). The Council notes with appreciation the commitments that have been pledged to support the implementation of the National Adaptation Plans of Actions in the Least Developed Country parties to the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change.
2. The Council takes note of the information provided in document GEF/C.28/4 ([Status Report on the Climate Change Funds](#)) on the current status and approved operations under the Least Development Countries Fund (LDCF) and the Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF). The Council welcomes the new pledges that have recently been made to each of the funds.
3. The Council also notes the information on discussions taking place within the Conference of the Parties serving as the Meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol (COP/MOP) regarding the Adaptation Fund and reaffirms the GEF's capacity to manage the Fund in accordance with the guidance from the COP/MOP.

Decision 12/2006 Strategy for Financing Biosafety Activities

1. The Council reviewed the [GEF Strategy for Financing Biosafety Activities](#) proposed in document GEF/C.28/5 and requests that the Secretariat to revise the document to be consistent with the [Elements \(for a Biosafety Strategy\)](#) (document GEF/C.27/12) and [Evaluation](#) (document GEF/ME/C.28/Inf.1) findings, taking into account the points raised in the discussion during the Council meeting, as well as written comments from Members of the Council submitted to the Secretariat by July 15, 2006, for consideration by Council at its meeting in December 2006.
2. The Council further requests that the Secretariat and the Implementing Agencies prepare a management response to the [Evaluation of the GEF Support to Biosafety](#) (document GEF/ME/C.28/Inf.1).

Decision 13/2006 Work Program

1. The Council discussed the proposed [work program](#) submitted as document GEF/C.28/6 and expressed its concern that the work program had not been distributed to the Council four weeks in advance of the Council meeting as provided for in the Council's Rules of Procedure.
2. The Council agrees to approve, subject to comments made during the Council meeting and additional comments that may be submitted to the Secretariat by June 23, 2006:
 - (a) the following four projects proposals that were initially submitted for Council approval in the February 2006 Intersessional Work Program and were resubmitted for Council review as part of the June 2006 work program,
 - (i) *Global: Supporting Country Early Action on Protected Areas* (UNDP),
 - (ii) *China: Conservation and Sustainable Utilization of Wild Relatives of Crops* (UNDP);
 - (iii) *Ghana: Ghana Urban Transport* (World Bank); and
 - (iv) *Pakistan: Sustainable Land Management for Combating Desertification, Phase 1* (UNDP); and
 - (b) project proposals for *Global: Small Grants Program, Third Operational Phase, Year 2, Tranche 3*, and *Regional African Rift Geothermal Development Facility (ARGeo)* (UNEP/World Bank).

3. The Council finds that , with the exception of *China: Conservation and Sustainable Utilization of Wild Relatives of Crops*, and *Pakistan: Sustainable Land Management for Combating Desertification, Phase 1*, each of the above projects is or would be consistent with the Instrument and GEF policies and procedures and may be endorsed by the CEO for final approval by the Implementing or Executing Agency, provided that the CEO circulates to the Council Members, prior to endorsement, the draft final project document fully incorporating the Council's comments on the project proposal accompanied by a satisfactory explanation by the CEO of how such comments and comments of the STAP reviewer have been addressed and a confirmation by the CEO that the project continues to be consistent with the Instrument and GEF policies and procedures.
4. With respect to *China: Conservation and Sustainable Utilization of Wild Relatives of Crops*, and *Pakistan: Sustainable Land Management for Combating Desertification, Phase 1*, the Council requests the Secretariat to arrange for Council Members to receive draft final project documents and to transmit to the CEO within four weeks any concerns they may have prior to the CEO endorsing the project documents for final approval by the Implementing or Executing Agency. The projects may be reviewed at a further Council meeting at the request of at least four Council Members.
5. In light of the fact that the work program is exceptionally large and recognizing its late distribution to the Council, the Council requests that the remaining project proposals in the work program be re-circulated as an intersessional work program for decision by mail immediately after the close of the Council meeting. The Council should be provided a six-week period in which to consider the proposed work program. The Council also agrees that any project proposals that are not approved by mail should be submitted for Council discussion and consideration at the special Council meeting to be held on August 28, 2006, in Cape Town, South Africa.
6. The Council agrees that the project proposals included in the intersessional work program referred to in the paragraph above will fall under GEF-3 policies and should be financed from GEF-3 available resources. In light of the GEF-4 replenishment discussions now nearing completion, the Council recognizes that no funds beyond those required to finance the intersessional work program will be available for commitment to projects under GEF-3. However, should any funds become available as a result of a Council decision not to approve, on the basis of technical or GEF policy considerations, the full funding required to finance the intersessional work program, such released funds will be available for commitment under GEF-3 policies until the GEF-4 Effective Date.

7. The Council requests the Trustee and the Implementing and Executing Agencies to complete their work on reconciling data on project financing and to report back to the Council at its meeting in December 2006.
8. The Secretariat is requested to develop, in consultation with the Implementing and Executing Agencies and the Trustee, clear rules, procedures and objective criteria for project selection and management of the pipeline, including a policy for cancellation of projects to be submitted to the Council for review in December 2006.

Decision 14/2006 Third GEF Assembly

1. The Council expresses its sincere appreciation for the generous offer of South Africa to host the third GEF Assembly and to the donors that have made voluntary contributions to assist in defraying the host country costs of convening the Assembly.
2. The Council reviewed document GEF/C.28/7, [Note on the Organization of the Third Assembly](#), and welcomes the arrangements that are being made for the Assembly and associated meetings. The Council reviewed several alternative proposals for the Assembly's agenda, and there is general agreement that the agenda circulated as GEF/C.28/CRP.3 ([Revised Alternative Agenda and Timetable for the Third GEF Assembly](#)) is the best basis for organizing the Assembly.
3. The Council requests the Secretariat to finalize the agenda taking into account the comments made during the meeting, and in particular, to endeavor to increase the opportunities for ministerial statements. The Council confirms that there should be oral presentations of the highlights of the three high-level roundtables during the final plenary and that the Chair's Summary should be a short, factual record of the meeting with decisions of the Assembly appended to it.

Decision 15/2006 Corporate Budget, FY07

1. The Council reviewed the proposal for a corporate budget presented in document GEF/C.28/8 ([Corporate Budget FY07](#)) and approves² a FY07 Corporate Budget of \$27.556 million comprising:
 - (a) \$24.492 million for six GEF units (Secretariat, UNDP, UNEP, World Bank, STAP and Trustee) for their planned corporate management activities and deliverables; and

² The Council Member representing the US opposed the budget.

(b) special initiatives in the amount of \$3.064 million.

2. The distribution of the amounts (\$m) above among the Secretariat, Implementing Agencies, STAP, and Trustee is agreed as follows:

Agency	Base Budget	Special Initiatives	Total
Secretariat	11.964	2.814	14.778
World Bank	3.250	0	3.250
UNDP	2.932	0	2.932
UNEP	2.875	0	2.875
STAP	1.931	0	1.931
Trustee	1.540	0.250	1.790

3. In approving the corporate budget, the Council confirmed the importance of strengthening the relationship between the GEF Secretariat and the NGO network and requests the Secretariat to increase its efforts to address civil society and NGO issues utilizing existing staff resources. The Council concluded that the case for a new position of NGO coordinator had not been sufficiently made and requests the Secretariat to inform the Council how it proposes to address relations with NGOs at its meeting in December 2006.
4. The Council requests the Secretariat to include in its policy proposals for Council consideration an indication of the cost of their implementation so that the Council can consider appropriate budgetary constraints during its policy discussions.

Decision 16/2006 Progress Report on the Implementation of the RAF

1. The Council, having reviewed GEF/C.28/12, [Progress Report on Implementing the Resource Allocation Framework](#), takes note of the work being undertaken by the Secretariat and the Implementing and Executing Agencies to ensure the effective implementation of the RAF in GEF-4. The Council welcomes, in particular, the consultations with recipient countries that are being undertaken to assist them in the transition to the RAF and requests the Secretariat and the agencies to provide continuing support and guidance to recipient countries, including the preparation of a handbook to assist national focal points and other stakeholders.

2. The Council requests the Secretariat:
 - (a) to strengthen its outreach and communications with the Conventions in order to enhance the understanding of the RAF;
 - (b) to report to the Council issues and challenges raised at the sub-regional consultations; and
 - (c) to continue to monitor the implementation of the RAF and to report to the Council any relevant developments;
3. The Council also requests the Secretariat and the Implementing and Executing Agencies to assist the national focal points in fulfilling their central role at the national level in implementing the RAF.
4. The Council further requests the Secretariat, in consultation with the Implementing and Executing Agencies, to report to the Council at its meeting in December 2006 further progress achieved in implementing RAF.

Decision 17/2006 Appointment of CEO/Chair of the Facility

1. The Council unanimously approves the [appointment](#) of Ms. Monique Barbut as CEO/Chairperson of the Facility for a three year term beginning July 14, 2006. The Council expresses its strong support for the appointment of Ms. Barbut and recognizes her broad experience in environment and development and her managerial and leadership skills. The Council looks forward to working with her and to providing her its full support.

Decision 18/2006 Private Sector Strategy

1. The Council, having reviewed document GEF/C.28/14, [GEF Strategy to Enhance Engagement with the Private Sector](#), welcomes the strategy and notes that it has been prepared in response to the policy recommendation of the third replenishment of the GEF Trust Fund calling on the GEF Secretariat, in collaboration with the Implementing and Executing Agencies, to develop a new strategy to better engage the private sector, taking into account previous practices and policies. The policy recommendation also calls for the GEF, in preparing the strategy, to consult with private sector actors to identify perceived constraints to working with the GEF. It also recommends that clear operational guidelines should be elaborated in order to define the scope of GEF collaboration with private sector activities.

2. The Council expresses its appreciation for the consultative process that has been followed in preparing the strategy, including consultations with the private sector, and notes that the strategy incorporates the comments that had been made by Council Members at their last meeting.
3. The Council welcomes the operational guidelines that have been proposed to enhance private sector participation in GEF activities, and requests that they be submitted to the Council in December 2006 for endorsement, taking into account the comments made during the meeting, together with operational guidance on the use of non-grant instruments (see paragraph 4(b) below.)
4. The Council supports the further development of the following three instruments proposed to enhance private sector engagement, and in this regard, the Council requests:
 - (a) the IFC, in collaboration with the GEF Secretariat and the Regional Development Banks, and in consultation with other Implementing and Executing Agencies, to elaborate its proposal to enhance financing through a public/private sector partnership, including clear information on its management, decision making and rules to avoid conflicts of interest, for consideration at the Council meeting in December 2006.
 - (b) the Trustee and the Secretariat, in collaboration with the World Bank and the Regional Development Banks, and in consultation with the other Implementing and Executing Agencies, to consider the feasibility of, and to develop operational policies and guidance as appropriate, for the use of non-grant instruments, building upon an assessment of the GEF experience in the use of non-grant instruments; and
 - (c) the Secretariat to explore tools and opportunities for strengthening knowledge sharing and information dissemination aimed at promoting engagement with the private sector within the context and budget of on-going GEF knowledge management activities.
5. The Council recognizes that there are alternative instruments that will be brought to the Council for its consideration in the future.

Decision 19/2006 Confirmation of Constituencies

1. The Council confirms the following [constituency groupings](#):

(i) Burundi, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Congo, Congo D.R., Equatorial Guinea, Gabon, and Sao Tome and Principe

(ii) Benin, Cote d'Ivoire, Ghana, Guinea, Liberia, Nigeria, Sierra Leone and Togo

Decision 20/2006 Other Business

1. The Council notes that due to time constraints it was unable to consider the following agenda items:

(a) agenda item 7, [Evaluation Office Progress Report](#)

(b) agenda item 18, [Review of Financial Statements](#)

(c) agenda item 19, [Review of the Fee System](#)

(d) agenda item 24, [Roles and Comparative Advantages of the GEF Agencies](#)

(e) agenda item 25, [Participation of NGOs in the GEF](#)

The Council agrees to consider these agenda items at its meeting in December 2006 and to include their consideration in an earlier part of that meeting.

2. The Council agrees that the Chairs should circulate to the Council Members by mail, for their review and comment, any additional text on comments, understandings and clarifications that the Chairs consider should be included in a highlights section to this summary.

Decision by Mail – August 2006

Decision 21/2006 Intersessional Work Program

1. The Council reviewed the proposed [work program](#) transmitted for approval by mail by July 24, 2006, and agrees to the following.

2. The Council approves a work program comprised of the following fifty four (54) project proposals:

Biodiversity

1. **Global (Cote d'Ivoire, Ghana, Indonesia, Malaysia):** Biodiversity and Agricultural Commodities Program (BACP) (World Bank/IFC) (GEF Grant: \$7.00 m)

2. **Global:** Building the Partnership to Track Progress at the Global Level in Achieving the 2010 Biodiversity Target (Phase I) (UNEP) (GEF Grant : \$3.64 m)

3. **Global (China, Ecuador, Morocco, Uganda):** Conservation and Use of Crop Genetic Diversity to Control Pests and Diseases in Support of Sustainable Agriculture (UNEP) (GEF Grant : \$3.41 m)
4. **Argentina:** Sustainable Forestry Development Project (World Bank) (GEF Grant : \$7.00 m)
5. **Bosnia-Herzegovina:** Forest and Mountain Protected Areas Project (World Bank) (GEF Grant : \$3.40 m)
6. **Botswana:** Wildlife Conflict Management and Biodiversity Conservation for Improved Rural Livelihoods (World Bank) (GEF Grant : \$5.50 m)
7. **China:** Guangxi Integrated Forestry Development and Biodiversity Conservation (World Bank) (GEF Grant : \$5.25 m)
8. **Congo:** Agricultural Development and Rural Road Rehabilitation Project (World Bank) (GEF Grant : \$3.50 m)
9. **Congo DR:** Support to ICCN's Program for the Rehabilitation of the National Parks Network (World Bank) (GEF Grant : \$7.00 m)
10. **Ethiopia:** Sustainable Development of the Protected Area System (UNDP) (GEF Grant : \$9.00 m)
11. **India:** Biodiversity Conservation and Rural Livelihoods Improvement (World Bank) (GEF Grant : \$11.50 m)
12. **Indonesia:** Fisheries Revitalization Project (FRP) (World Bank) (GEF Grant : \$8.00 m)
13. **Jordan:** Integrated Ecosystem and Natural Resource Management in the Jordan Rift Valley (World Bank) (GEF Grant : \$6.15 m)
14. **Kazakhstan:** Conservation and Sustainable use of Biodiversity in the Kazakhstani Sector of the Altai-Sayan Mountain Ecoregion (UNDP) (GEF Grant : \$2.40 m)
15. **Serbia and Montenegro:** Transitional Agriculture Reform (World Bank) (GEF Grant : \$4.50 m)
16. **Seychelles:** Mainstreaming Biodiversity Management into Production Sector Activities (UNDP) (GEF Grant : \$3.70 m)
17. **Sierra Leone:** Wildlife Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Project (World Bank) (GEF Grant : \$5.00 m)
18. **Uruguay:** Catalyzing the Implementation of Uruguay's National Protected Area System (UNDP) (GEF Grant : \$2.50 m)

19. **Venezuela:** Expanding Partnerships for the National Parks System
(resubmission) (World Bank) (GEF Grant : \$6.00 m)

Biodiversity (Biosafety)

20. **Regional (Mexico, Colombia, Costa Rica, Peru, Brazil) :** Latin America: Multi-country Capacity-building in Biosafety (World Bank) (GEF Grant : \$5.00 m)

Climate Change

21. **Regional (Senegal, Gambia, Guinea-Bissau, Mauritania, Cape Verde):**
Adaptation to Climate Change - Responding to Coastline Change and Its Human Dimensions in West Africa through Integrated Coastal Area Management.
(UNDP) (GEF Grant : \$3.30 m)

22. **Regional (Kenya, Ghana):** Lighting the "Bottom of the Pyramid" (World Bank/IFC) (GEF Grant : \$5.40 m)

23. **Regional (Argentina, Brazil, Mexico):** Regional Sustainable Transport Project
(World Bank) (GEF Grant : \$20.80 m)

24. **Regional (Fiji, Papua New Guinea, Solomon Islands, Marshall Islands, Vanuatu):**
Sustainable Energy Financing (World Bank/IFC) (GEF Grant : \$9.48 m)

25. **Bangladesh:** Improving Kiln Efficiency for the Brick Industry (UNDP) (GEF Grant : \$3.00 m)

26. **Ghana:** Development of Renewable Energy and Energy Efficiency (World Bank)
(GEF Grant : \$5.50 m)

27. **Guinea:** Electricity Sector Efficiency Improvement (World Bank) (GEF Grant: \$4.50 m)

28. **India:** Coal Fired Generation Rehabilitation Project (World Bank) (GEF Grant: \$45.40 m)

29. **India:** Enabling activities for Preparing India's Second National Communication to UNFCCC (UNDP) (GEF Grant: \$3.50 m)

30. **India:** Market Transformation through Consumer Awareness Programs for Energy Efficiency Standards and Labeling (UNDP) (GEF Grant : \$5.50 m)

31. **Indonesia:** Bus Rapid Transit and Pedestrian Improvements in Jakarta (UNEP)
(GEF Grant : \$5.81 m)

32. **Jordan:** Promotion of a Wind Power Market (World Bank) (GEF Grant : \$6.00 m)

33. **Kenya:** Development and Implementation of a Standards and Labeling Programme in Kenya (UNDP) (GEF Grant : \$2.00 m)

34. **Mongolia:** Heating Energy Efficiency (World Bank) (GEF Grant : \$7.20 m)
35. **Mongolia:** Renewable Energy and Rural Electricity Access (World Bank) (GEF Grant: \$3.50 m)
36. **Morocco:** Energy Efficiency Codes in Residential Buildings and Energy Efficiency Improvement in Commercial and Hospital Buildings in Morocco (UNDP) (GEF Grant: \$3.00 m)
37. **Namibia:** Barrier Removal to Namibian Renewable Energy Programme (NAMREP), Phase II (UNDP) (GEF Grant: \$2.60 m)
38. **Nicaragua:** Promotion of Environmentally Sustainable Transport in Metropolitan Managua (UNDP) (GEF Grant : \$3.88 m)
39. **Philippines:** Philippines Sustainable Energy Finance Program (World Bank/IFC) (GEF Grant : \$5.30 m)
40. **Rwanda:** Sustainable Energy Development Project (SEDP) (World Bank) (GEF Grant: \$4.50 m)
41. **Sri Lanka:** Portfolio Approach to Distributed Generation Opportunity (PADGO) (Phase 1) (World Bank/IFC) (GEF Grant : \$3.60 m)
42. **Tanzania:** Energizing Rural Transformation Project (World Bank) (GEF Grant: \$6.50 m)
43. **Vietnam:** Hanoi Urban Transport Development (World Bank) (GEF Grant: \$9.80 m)
44. **Zambia:** Promotion of Renewable Energy to Increase Access to Electricity (World Bank) (GEF Grant : \$4.50 m)

International Waters

45. **Regional (Senegal, Nigeria, Ghana, Kenya, Mozambique, Seychelles, Tanzania, Cameroon, Gambia):** Demonstrating and Capturing Best Practices and Technologies for the Reduction of Land-sourced Impacts Resulting from Coastal Tourism (UNEP) (GEF Grant : \$ 5.39 m)

Land Degradation

46. **Regional (Tajikistan, Kyrgyzstan):** Sustainable Land Management in the High Pamir and Pamir-Alai Mountains - and Integrated and Transboundary Initiative in Central Asia Phase I (UNEP) (GEF Grant : \$3.00 m)
47. **Senegal:** Groundnut Basin Soil Management and Regeneration (UNDP) (GEF Grant : \$3.66 m)

Multi-focal Areas

48. **Regional (Costa Rica, Panama):** Sustainable Environmental Management for Sixaola River Basin (IADB) (GEF Grant : \$3.50 m)
49. **Antigua And Barbuda :** Demonstrating the Development and Implementation of a Sustainable Island Resource Management Mechanism in a Small Island Developing State (UNDP) (GEF Grant : \$3.00 m)
50. **Brazil :** Caatinga Conservation and Sustainable Management Project - Mata Branca (World Bank) (GEF Grant : \$10.00 m)
51. **Mozambique :** Zambezi Valley Market Led Smallholder Development (World Bank) (GEF Grant : \$6.20 m)
52. **Sri Lanka :** Participatory Coastal Zone Restoration and Sustainable Management in the Eastern Province of Post-Tsunami Sri Lanka (IFAD) (GEF Grant : \$6.92 m)

Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs)

53. **Global (Argentina, India, Lebanon, Philippines, Senegal, Vietnam, Latvia, Tanzania):** Demonstrating and Promoting Best Techniques and Practices for Reducing Health-care Waste to Avoid Environmental Releases of Dioxins and Mercury (UNDP) (GEF Grant : \$10.33 m)
54. **Regional (Nigeria, Ghana):** Regional Project to Develop Appropriate Strategies for Identifying Sites Contaminated by Chemicals listed in Annexes A, B and/or C of the Stockholm Convention (UNIDO) (GEF Grant : \$2.00 m)

3. With respect to the following nine (9) project proposals approved as part of the work program, the Council requests the Secretariat to arrange for Council Members to receive the draft final project documents and transmit to the CEO within four weeks any concerns they may have prior to the CEO endorsing the project document for final approval by the Implementing or Executing Agency. The projects may be reviewed at a subsequent Council meeting at the request of at least four Council Members.

Biodiversity

1. **Global (Cote d'Ivoire, Ghana, Indonesia, Malaysia):** Biodiversity and Agricultural Commodities Program (BACP)
2. **Congo DR:** Support to ICCN's Program for the Rehabilitation of the National Parks Network
3. **India:** Biodiversity Conservation and Rural Livelihoods Improvement

4. **Jordan:** Integrated Ecosystem and Natural Resource Management in the Jordan Rift Valley

Biodiversity (Biosafety)

5. **Regional (Brazil, Colombia, Costa Rica, Mexico, Peru):** Latin America: Multi-country Capacity-building in Biosafety

Climate Change

6. **Regional (Argentina, Brazil, Mexico):** Regional Sustainable Transport Project
7. **India:** Coal Fired Generation Rehabilitation Project
8. **India:** Market Transformation through Consumer Awareness Programs for Energy Efficiency Standards and Labeling

Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs)

9. **Regional (Nigeria, Ghana) :** Regional Project to Develop Appropriate Strategies for Identifying Sites Contaminated by Chemicals listed in Annexes A, B and/or C of the Stockholm Convention

4. With respect to the remaining forty five (45) project proposals approved as part of the work program, the Council finds that each project proposal presented to it is, or would be, consistent with the Instrument and GEF Policies and procedures, and may be endorsed by the CEO for final approval by the Implementing or Executing Agency, provided the CEO circulates to the Council Members, prior to endorsement, draft final project documents fully incorporating the [Council's comments on the work program](#) accompanied by a satisfactory explanation by the CEO of how such comments and comments of the STAP reviewer have been addressed and a confirmation by the CEO that the project continues to be consistent with the Instrument and GEF policies and procedures.
5. With respect to the following sixteen (16) project proposals, the Council requests that the proposals be deferred for consideration to the special meeting of the Council to be held on August 28, 2006.

Biodiversity

1. **Global:** Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund, Phase 2
2. **Global:** Institutionalizing Payments for Ecosystem Services

Biodiversity (Biosafety)

3. **Regional (Benin, Burkina Faso, Mali, Senegal, Togo) :** West African Regional Biosafety Project

Climate Change

4. **Global (Bangladesh, Bolivia, Niger, Samoa, Guatemala, Jamaica, Kazakhstan, Morocco, Namibia, Vietnam)** : Community-based Adaptation (CBA) Programme
5. **Global:** Solar Water Heating Market Transformation and Strengthening Initiative (Phase 1)
6. **Regional (Ethiopia, Kenya, Malawi, Swaziland, Tanzania, Uganda, Sudan):** Cogen for Africa
7. **Regional (Burundi, Kenya, Malawi, Mozambique, Rwanda, Tanzania, Uganda, Zambia):** Greening the Tea Industry in East Africa
8. **Argentina:** Energy Efficiency
9. **Egypt:** Bioenergy for Sustainable Rural Development
10. **Egypt:** Sustainable Transport

Land Degradation

11. **Regional (Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan, Tajikistan):** Central Asian Countries Initiative for Land Management (CACILM) Multi-country Partnership Framework, Phase 1
12. **Burkina Faso:** Partnership Programme for Sustainable Land Management (CPP), Phase 1

Multi-focal Areas

13. **Regional (Albania, Algeria, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, Egypt, Lebanon, Libya, Macedonia, Morocco, Serbia and Montenegro, Syria, Tunisia, Turkey):** World Bank-GEF Investment Fund for the Mediterranean Sea Large Marine Ecosystem Partnership (Tranche I)
14. **Philippines:** National Program Support for Environment and Natural Resources Management Project (NPS-ENRMP)

Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs)

15. **Brazil:** Development of a National Implementation Plan in Brazil as a First Step to Implement the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs)
16. **China:** Alternatives to DDT Usage in the Production of Anti-fouling Paint

29th Council Meeting – August 2006

Decision 22/2006 Fourth Replenishment of the GEF Trust Fund

1. The Council, having reviewed the [Summary of Negotiations on the Fourth Replenishment of the GEF Trust Fund](#) (Document GEF/C.29/3) welcomes the successful conclusion of the replenishment, takes note of the Summary and endorses the Replenishment Resolution, the policy recommendations and the allocation of resources among focal areas set forth in Table 1 of the programming paper.
2. The Council requests the CEO/Chairperson of the Facility to transmit this Summary to the World Bank with a request that the World Bank Executive Directors be invited to adopt Annex C to this Summary, *Resolution No.____, The Global Environment Facility Trust Fund: Fourth Replenishment of Resources*, thereby authorizing the World Bank, as Trustee of the GEF Trust Fund, to manage the resources made available under the GEF-4.
3. The Council expresses its appreciation to all donors from developed and developing countries for their generous contributions to the GEF-4 replenishment which is the highest level of resources committed to the GEF for a replenishment period. The strong replenishment is recognition of the importance of the GEF as a mechanism to address global environmental issues and will enable the GEF to fulfill its roles as the, or a, financial mechanism to the global environmental agreements.
4. Two Council Members requested that their statements on the replenishment agreement be recorded in this joint summary. The statements are annexed to this summary.

Decision 23/2006 Remaining Issues Related to Work Program circulated for Approval by Mail on June 12, 2006

1. The Council reviewed the proposed [work program](#) submitted to Council in document GEF/C.29/4 and approves the work program comprising the following 15 project proposals, subject to comments made during the Council meeting and additional comments that may be submitted to the Secretariat by September 11, 2006.
 1. Global: Institutionalizing Payments for Ecosystem Services
 2. Regional (Benin, Burkina Faso, Mali, Senegal, Togo): West African Regional Biosafety Project

3. Global (Bangladesh, Bolivia, Niger, Samoa, Guatemala, Jamaica, Kazakhstan, Morocco, Namibia, Vietnam): Community-based Adaptation (CBA) Programme
 4. Global: Solar Water Heating Market Transformation and Strengthening Initiative, Phase
 5. Regional (Ethiopia, Kenya, Malawi, Swaziland, Tanzania, Uganda, Sudan): Cogen for Africa³
 6. Regional (Burundi, Kenya, Malawi, Mozambique, Rwanda, Tanzania, Uganda, Zambia): Greening the Tea Industry in East Africa
 7. Argentina: Energy Efficiency
 8. Egypt: Bioenergy for Sustainable Rural Development
 9. Egypt: Sustainable Transport
 10. Regional (Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan, Tajikistan): Central Asian Countries Initiative for Land Management (CACILM) Multi-country Partnership Framework, Phase 1
 11. Burkina Faso: Partnership Programme for Sustainable Land Management (CPP), Phase 1
 12. Regional (Albania, Algeria, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, Egypt, Lebanon, Libya, Macedonia, Morocco, Serbia and Montenegro, Syria, Tunisia, Turkey): World Bank-GEF Investment Fund for the Mediterranean Sea Large Marine Ecosystem Partnership, Tranche 1⁴
 13. Philippines: National Program Support for Environment and Natural Resources Management Project
 14. Brazil: Development of a National Implementation Plan in Brazil as a First Step to Implement the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants
 15. China: Alternatives to DDT Usage for the Production of Anti-fouling Paint.
2. With respect to the following four proposals approved as part of the work program, the Council requests the Secretariat to arrange for Council Members to receive draft final project documents and to transmit to the CEO within four weeks any concerns they may have prior to the CEO endorsing a project document for final approval by the

³ The U.S opposed the project on grounds that it benefits Sudan.

⁴ The U.S opposed the project on grounds that it benefits Syria and the West Bank.

Implementing or Executing Agency. Such projects may be reviewed at a further Council meeting at the request of at least four Council Members.

1. Regional (Benin, Burkina Faso, Mali, Senegal, Togo): West African Regional Biosafety Project
 2. Global (Bangladesh, Bolivia, Niger, Samoa, Guatemala, Jamaica, Kazakhstan, Morocco, Namibia, Vietnam): Community-based Adaptation (CBA) Programme
 3. Global: Solar Water Heating Market Transformation and Strengthening Initiative, Phase 1
 4. Argentina: Energy Efficiency
3. With respect to the remaining eleven proposals approved as part of the work program, the Council finds that each project proposal presented to it as part of the work program is, or would be, consistent with the Instrument and GEF policies and procedures and may be endorsed by the CEO for final approval by the Implementing or Executing Agency, provided that the CEO circulates to the Council Members, prior to endorsement, draft final project documents fully incorporating the Council's comments on the work program accompanied by a satisfactory explanation by the CEO of how such comments and comments of the STAP reviewer have been addressed and a confirmation by the CEO that the project continues to be consistent with the Instrument and GEF policies and procedures.
4. With respect to the following three proposals:
1. Regional (Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan, Tajikistan): Central Asian Countries Initiative for Land Management (CACILM) Multi-country Partnership Framework, Phase 1
 2. Burkina Faso: Partnership Program for Sustainable Land Management (CPP), Phase 1
 3. Regional (Albania, Algeria, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, Egypt, Lebanon, Libya, Macedonia, Morocco, Montenegro, Serbia, Syria, Tunisia, Turkey): World Bank-GEF Investment Fund for the Mediterranean Sea Large Marine Ecosystem partnership (Tranche 1)
- The Council approves them on the understanding that any sub-project to be financed through the larger project or program will be circulated to Council Members for comment during a three-week period prior to CEO approval of the sub-project.
5. The Council requests the Secretariat to prepare for its consideration at the Council meeting in December 2006 a policy paper clarifying the procedures to be followed for

the approval of sub-projects developed under larger programs and umbrella projects approved by the Council. The Council will decide at the time it approves the policy paper whether the agreed procedures will be applied to the projects listed in paragraph 12 above.

6. Council's approval of the project proposals, Regional (Ethiopia, Kenya, Malawi, Swaziland, Tanzania, Uganda, Sudan): *Cogeneration for Africa* and Regional (Burundi, Kenya, Malawi, Mozambique, Rwanda, Tanzania, Uganda, Zambia): *Greening the Tea Industry in East Africa* is contingent upon UNEP securing agreement prior to CEO endorsement from the World Bank/IFC or one of the regional development banks with direct access to the GEF to jointly implement the project. If after one year UNEP has not found a partner from among such GEF financial institutions, the project is to be removed from the work program and returned to the pipeline until an appropriate partner can be found.
7. With respect to the project proposal, *Global, Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund, Phase 2*, the Council agrees that the proposed decision to approve the project, including the conditions that will need to be addressed prior to CEO endorsement, will be circulated for Council approval by mail in accordance with paragraphs 43 to 45 of the Rules of Procedure for the Council. The proposed decision will be circulated for a three-week review period. If at the end of the three weeks there is no objection, the decision on the project proposal will be approved. If there is an objection raised by any Member to the proposed decision, the CEO will include the consideration of the project proposal as an agenda item for the next Council meeting.

Decision 24/2006 Governance of the Climate Change Funds

1. The Council reconfirms that for purposes of the Least Developed Countries Fund for Climate Change (LDCF) and the Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF), the GEF will function under the guidance of the Conference of the Parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (COP) ([Governance of the Climate Change Funds](#)). For purposes of the Adaptation Fund (AF), the GEF will function under the guidance of the Conference of the Parties serving as the Meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol (COP/MOP).
2. The Council reconfirms that the policies and procedures and the governance structure of the GEF will apply to the climate change funds, managed by the GEF in accordance with the decisions of the COP or the COP/MOP, unless the Council decides it is necessary to modify such policies and procedures to be responsive to the guidance of the COP or COP/MOP.

3. The Council also confirms that the policies and procedures separately established for the climate change funds will not apply or be taken to establish any precedent for the operation of the GEF Trust Fund.
4. The administrative costs of managing each fund will be financed solely from the resources of the relevant fund.
5. The Council agrees that the general decision making principles applied to the operation of the LDCF and the SCCF, as approved by the Council at its May 2002 meeting on the basis of Document GEF/C.19/6, [Arrangements for the Establishment of the New Climate Change Funds](#), should be modified as follows.
6. With respect to decision making for the LDCF and SCCF, the Council will meet as the Council for the LDCF and the SCCF (hereafter referred to as the LDCF/SCCF Council.) Any Council Member is eligible to take part in the LDCF/SCCF Council. Any Council Member may choose to participate in the LDCF/SCCF Council or to attend as an observer. A formal vote by the LDCF/SCCF Council will be taken where consensus cannot be achieved. Such vote will be conducted by a double weighted majority, that is, an affirmative vote representing both a 60 percent majority of GEF Participants represented on the LDCF/SCCF Council and a 60 percent majority of the total contributions to such fund. The total contributions will be calculated based on the actual cumulative payments made to the respective fund.
7. Pursuant to the request of the SBI inviting relevant institutions to submit information on issues raised in the compilation document on the AF and recalling decision 10/CP.7 in which the Conference of the Parties decided that the adaptation fund shall be operated and managed by an entity entrusted with the financial mechanism of the Convention, the Council agrees that should the COP/MOP give further guidance to the GEF on the management of the AF, the Council would meet as the Council for the AF. Decisions of the Council on matters concerning the operation of the fund would be taken by consensus among all Council Members representing Participants that are parties to the Kyoto Protocol. A formal voting procedure would be agreed by the Council meeting as the Council for the AF following further guidance of the COP/MOP and taking into account the GEF Instrument.
8. Notwithstanding any other provision of this decision, any decisions or actions directly affecting only the LDCF, the SCCF and the AF, respectively, will be delegated to the LDCF/SCCF Council and the AF Council, as appropriate. The LDCF/SCCF Council and the AF Council cannot amend this delegation of authority without approval of the GEF Council.

9. The Council requests the Secretariat and the Trustee to make necessary arrangements to effect the changes reflected in this decision.

Decision 25/2006 Amendments to the Instrument

1. The Council requests the Secretariat to prepare for its consideration at the Council meeting in December 2006 a paper that analyzes the legal, operational and financial implications of an amendment to reflect in the Instrument the designation of the GEF as a financial mechanism of the UNCCD. The Council agrees that should it reach agreement on such a proposed amendment to the Instrument, it will implement the amendment in good faith pending a formal adoption by the next Assembly.

Decision by Mail – September 2006

Decision 26/2006 Global Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund, Phase 2

1. In approving the [Global: Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund, Phase 2](#) project, the Council agrees that the general objectives of the CEPF are very important, but believes that the fund needs to address urgently the numerous issues which may affect the fund's cost-effectiveness, impact and accountability to the Council and the general public. Therefore, specifically for the project, Council agrees on the following conditions for CEO endorsement:
 - (a) The costs of Component 2A (Enabling local civil society groups to play a greater role in key aspects of project implementation), 3 (Effective monitoring and knowledge sharing) and 4 (Global priorities, business planning and project execution) should be capped at 24% of the total project costs of the fund.
 - (b) Council understands that program management costs for sub-grantees would also be capped as in CEPF-1 at 13%.
 - (c) CEPF funds would be targeted to projects that create global environmental benefits that are executed by civil society and the private sector, and any capacity building would be towards assisting implementation of those specific projects.
 - (d) The World Bank confirms that the environmental and social safeguards policies, the Bank's accountability and anti-corruption mechanisms, including hotline, were in place during CEPF-1. The Bank also confirms that, as in the case with all Bank-implemented GEF financed projects, CEPF projects are

reviewable by the Inspection Panel, provided the Panel's eligibility criteria are met.

- (e) The World Bank Implementation Completion Report of the first phase of the project shows a rating of satisfactory or above, as confirmed by IEG review.
 - (f) The CEPF puts in place a clear exit strategy, and indicates that it will not seek further support from the GEF Trust Fund.
 - (g) The operational manual has been revised to establish:
 - i. That all GEF financed projects, including CEPF projects, are subject to the World Bank environment and social safeguards policies, and all applicable accountability and anti-corruption mechanisms;
 - ii. Procedures for circulation to the GEF Council and other indirect donors of all subprojects of \$1 million and over for a three-week review period prior to CEO approval;
 - iii. Measures cleared by the World Bank Legal Department that ensure that CEPF operates in a manner that is free of conflicts of interest, including that an applicant for CEPF funding cannot participate in the decision-making process related to that application;
 - iv. Requirements that all projects target direct global environmental benefits, track results, and be evaluated in a manner consistent with GEF's monitoring and evaluation policy;
 - v. That the consideration of intellectual property rights that may be derived from or relate to a CEPF project does not explicitly or implicitly provide an undue comparative advantage to any grant applicant, nor does it impede opportunities for fair and balanced private sector investment;
 - vi. A plan for stronger outreach to the private sector.
2. If after one year, these steps have not been taken, the project is to be removed from the work program.
3. Not required for CEO endorsement: In general, any GEF support for funds such as CEPF should be limited to a one-time effort to catalyze their creation and provide initial funding, but with no further funding commitments.

Decision by Mail – October 2006

Decision 27/2006 Report to the twelfth CoP of the UNFCCC

1. The Council, having reviewed the draft [Report of the GEF to the Twelfth Session of the Conference of the Parties to the Framework Convention on Climate Change](#), approves the report for submission to the Conference of the Parties.

Decision by Mail – November 2006

Decision 28/2006 Amendments of the Rules of Procedure of the Council

1. The following amendments have been approved by Council as of Monday, November 20, 2006:

One new sub-heading is inserted at the end of para. 2:

r. **“Evaluation Office” means the Evaluation Office of the GEF.**

Para. 19 is amended to read as follows:

19. Representatives of the Implementing Agencies, the Trustee, STAP, **and the Evaluation Office** shall be invited to attend the Council meetings.

30th Council Meeting – December 2006

Decision 29/2006 Evaluation Office Progress Report

1. The Council, having reviewed the document GEF/ME/C.30/1, [GEF Evaluation Office: Progress Report from the Director](#), takes note of the work on on-going evaluations, the implementation of the GEF monitoring and evaluation policy, and the selection criteria for country portfolio evaluations. The Council agrees to defer a decision on the process for preparing OPS4 until its next meeting in June 2007. The Council requests the Evaluation Office to prepare, taking into account the comments made by the Council, costed options on the process that could be followed to prepare OPS4, recognizing in particular, the importance of ensuring the independence and quality of the evaluation.

Decision 30/2006 Evaluation of Incremental Cost Assessment

1. The Council, having reviewed document GEF/ME/C.30/2, [Evaluation of Incremental Cost Assessment](#), and the [management response](#) (GEF/ME/C.30/3), takes note of the

conclusions of the evaluation. The Council particularly welcomes the conclusion that the principle of incremental funding is being achieved throughout the GEF.

2. On the basis of the evaluation's conclusion that the current process for incremental cost assessment and reporting does not add any value to the quality of projects, the Council decides that:
 - (a) The incremental reasoning in project objectives and design should be explicitly addressed in appropriate documentation, particularly at the project concept stage, during implementation and at completion.
 - (b) The current incremental cost assessment and reporting requirements for GEF project proposals should be reformed so as to result in a simplified demonstration of the project baseline, incremental costs and co-funding.
 - (c) Monitoring for progress towards achieving global environmental benefits and for achieving co-funding should be included in Project Information Reports and the Portfolio Performance Report.
 - (d) Terminal evaluations should evaluate achievement of global environmental benefits and co-funding, followed by an independent assessment in the Annual Performance Reports of the GEF Evaluation Office.

The Council requests the GEF Secretariat to incorporate in the paper on the revised project cycle to be presented to the Council in June 2007, new operational guidelines to implement the above sub-paragraphs.

3. On-going efforts should be strengthened to have a better identification of global environmental benefits in GEF activities, including improved dissemination and raising of awareness of the focal area strategic priorities and objectives.
4. The Council also requests the GEF Evaluation Office to record any follow-up action taken to implement this decision and to report on these actions through the Management Action Record.

Decision 31/2006 Evaluation of Experience with Executing Agencies

1. The Council, having reviewed the document GEF/ME/C.30/4, [*Evaluation of the Experience of Executing Agencies under Expanded Opportunities in the GEF*](#) and the [*management response*](#) (GEF/ME/C.30/5), takes note of its recommendations.

2. The Council requests the GEF Evaluation Office to report through the Management Action Record on the follow-up to the decision on agenda item 16 (Decision 32 / 2006 below), *Roles and Comparative Advantages of the GEF Agencies*.
3. The Council requests the Evaluation Office to consider assessing the GEF's experience with the Executing Agencies and the possible consequences for the overall GEF structure in the Fourth Overall Performance Study.

Decision 32/2006 Evaluation of GEF Project Cycle and Modalities

1. The Council, having reviewed document GEF/ME/C.30/6 [Evaluation of the GEF Activity Cycle and Modalities](#) and the [management response](#) (GEF/ME/C.30/7), takes note of the conclusions of the evaluation that:
 - (a) The GEF activity cycle is not effective, nor efficient, and that the situation has grown worse over time; nor is it cost-effective.
 - (b) GEF modalities have not made full use of trends towards new forms of collaboration that serve to foster ownership and promote flexibility, efficiency and results.
2. The Council agrees with the management response that no gains would be achieved by streamlining the current project cycle at the margins. Therefore the Council requests the Secretariat, in consultation with all the GEF entities, to present for Council review in June 2007 options for a new project cycle, with the objective of processing a proposal from identification to start of implementation in less than 22 months without compromising project quality or undermining financial accountability. This should address measures to:
 - (a) Focus the project identification phase on establishing project eligibility, resource availability, country endorsement and agreed agency comparative advantage.
 - (b) Move the work program from being project-based to being program-based in line with GEF strategies and policies.
 - (c) Allow projects to be endorsed by the CEO on a rolling basis.
 - (d) Expedite the project cycle.
3. The Council requests the GEF Evaluation Office to report through the Management Action Record on the follow-up to this decision.

Decision 33/2006 Rules, Procedures and Objective Criteria for Project Selection, Pipeline Management and Cancellation Policy

1. The Council, having reviewed document GEF/C.30/3, [Rules, Procedures and Objective Criteria for Project Selection, Pipeline Management, Approval of Sub-projects, and Cancellation Policy](#), decides that the following should be incorporated into the new project cycle that will be submitted to the Council for approval in June 2007.

General principles for the project cycle

2. The project cycle should contain clear rules and criteria and ensure transparency in decision making. A beneficiary country should be consulted prior to any decision affecting a proposal or project in its country.

Pipeline and project management

3. A transparent, time-bound system for pipeline and project management should be developed. Clear benchmarks should be established, in consultation with countries and the GEF agencies, for monitoring project progress during preparation and implementation. Criteria should be developed to help prioritize the pipeline. The monitoring of achievement of the benchmarks should be incorporated into the management information system that is under development.
4. The Secretariat should provide regular reports to the Council on action taken to manage the pipeline and to terminate or suspend projects.
5. The Council decides that the following should be applied with respect to project cancellations, terminations or suspensions.

General principles for Project Cancellations, Terminations or suspensions

6. At any stage of the project cycle, the beneficiary country, the Implementing or Executing Agency, or the Secretariat may recommend cancellation, termination or suspension of a project based on criteria approved by the Council.
7. Prior to formal approval of a project by a GEF agency, the CEO is responsible for the decision to cancel a project proposal.
8. After approval of a project by a GEF agency, the Implementing or Executing Agency is responsible for the decision to terminate or suspend a project.

Cancellation of project proposals during the preparation (prior to formal approval by the GEF agency)

9. The CEO should take a decision to cancel a project proposal on the basis of established criteria and after written consultation with the beneficiary country and the Implementing or Executing Agency.
10. If a proposal is cancelled prior to Council approval/CEO approval, it should be removed from the pipeline. The Secretariat should inform the beneficiary country and the Implementing or Executing Agency. The Trustee should also be informed if any project development funding has been approved for the proposal. The Implementing or Executing Agency should comply with the Trustee's financial rules and procedures regarding the use of GEF funds.
11. When a proposal is cancelled after Council approval/CEO approval, but before formal approval by the GEF agency, the Secretariat should inform the beneficiary country and the Implementing or Executing Agency.
12. The Implementing or Executing Agency should:
 - (a) submit an official cancellation notification to the GEF Secretariat and the Trustee
 - (b) Comply with the Trustee's financial rules and procedures regarding the use of GEF funds.

Termination or suspension of projects during implementation (after formal approval by the GEF agency)

13. Upon recommending to an Implementing or Executing Agency the termination or suspension of a project, the Secretariat should communicate to the country's GEF operational focal point the basis for such a recommendation.
14. A beneficiary country or the Implementing or Executing Agency may also recommend termination or suspension of a project. In such a case, the GEF Secretariat should be consulted before a decision is finalized.
15. The Implementing or Executing Agency should consult with the beneficiary country before taking the final decision. The agency should seek to ensure that appropriate consultations are also carried out with all the relevant government agencies that are involved in project preparation and/or implementation, and other partners, including co-financiers.
16. The Implementing or Executing Agency should:
 - (a) send an official termination or suspension notice to the government;

(b) submit an official notification of termination or suspension to the GEF Secretariat and the Trustee;

(c) follow the Trustee's financial rules and procedures regarding the use of GEF funds.

17. The Council furthermore decides that this policy should be applied to projects entering the pipeline from January 1, 2007, and requests the CEO to apply the policy to any project proposal or project that does not meet milestones agreed with the agency and the beneficiary country.

18. The Secretariat is requested to elaborate for Council review and approval, as part of the new project cycle to be reviewed by the Council in June 2007, additional criteria to guide decisions on cancellation of a project proposal and termination or suspension of a project. Until the approval of such criteria, the provisions of paragraph 23 will apply.

19. The Council also decides that the following project cycle policies should be addressed.

Approval of sub-projects in larger GEF projects and programs

20. Council Members express their broad support for the proposals presented in document GEF/C.30/3 for the approval of sub-projects under larger GEF projects and programs. The Council requests the Secretariat to develop for Council approval, as part of the decision on the new project cycle, policies describing the types of umbrella projects and programs to be funded by the GEF and the procedures for the approval of sub-projects under such instruments. The policies for umbrella projects should include clarification on transaction costs.

Fees

21. The Secretariat is requested to prepare a revised fee system, including provisions for tranching disbursements of fees, for discussion at the June 2007 meeting.

PDFs

22. The Secretariat is requested to prepare, for Council review and approval in June 2007, a proposal for the replacement of the current PDF process with procedures based on the financing of the actual incremental costs of project preparation.

Decision 34/2006 Results Management Framework

1. The Council reviewed document GEF/C.30/4, [*Progress Report on the Development of the Results-Based Management Framework*](#), and welcomes the progress that has been made in developing indicators in each of the focal areas and the preliminary steps that

have been taken to prepare a results-based management framework. The Council recognizes the need to ensure consistency between the results-based management framework and the revised focal area strategies, and requests the Secretariat to ensure that the revised strategies and the management framework are submitted to the Council for consideration at its meeting in June 2007.

Decision 35/2006 Strategies for Focal Areas

1. The Council reviewed document GEF/C.30/5, [Focal Area Strategies for GEF-4 – Working Drafts and Proposed Process](#), and requests the Secretariat to continue its work to review, revise and focus the focal area strategies, taking into account cross-cutting issues of sustainable forest management and sound chemicals management. The Secretariat is requested to take into account comments made during the Council meeting and to consult further with Council Members, GEF agencies, STAP, Convention Secretariats, the NGO network and relevant experts in the preparation of the revised strategies. Council Members are invited to submit written comments on the working drafts of the strategies to the Secretariat by January 15, 2007.

Decision 36/2006 Business Plan

1. The Council reviewed GEF/C.30/6, [GEF Business Plan, FY07-10](#), and notes the approaches proposed in the document towards implementing the recommendations of the Fourth Replenishment of the GEF Trust Fund and programming GEF-4 resources. Council requests the Secretariat, in consultation with GEF entities, to present the next Business Plan for Council discussion at its June 2007 meeting, reporting on the accomplishments of fiscal year 07 and outlining a plan of FY08-10.

Decision 37/2006 Implications of Amending the Instrument to Reflect the Designation of the GEF as Financial Mechanism of the UNCCD

1. The Council, having reviewed document GEF/C.30/7, [Legal, Operational and Financial Implications of an Amendment to the GEF Instrument to Reflect the Designation of the GEF as a Financial Mechanism of the UNCCD](#), agrees to recommend to the fourth GEF Assembly the following amendment to the Instrument for the Establishment of the Restructured Global Environment Facility:

A new paragraph 7 should be inserted in the Instrument which reads as follows:

The GEF shall be available to serve as a financial mechanism of the UN Convention to Combat Desertification in Countries Experiencing Serious Drought and/or Desertification, particularly in Africa (UNCCD), pursuant to article 20, paragraph 2(b), and article 21 of

the Convention. The Council shall consider and approve arrangements to facilitate collaboration between the GEF and the UNCCD and among countries with respect to affected countries, particularly in Africa.

2. The Council warmly welcomes this long overdue recognition of the importance of the issue of land degradation. Recognizing the operational and financial implications of the amendment as described in document GEF/C.30/7, and that adoption of this amendment at the next Assembly is required prior to its implementation, the Council directs the Secretariat to exercise existing legal authorities in the Instrument and in the MOU between the GEF and the UNCCD to enhance the effectiveness of GEF assistance in combating desertification in affected countries, particularly in Africa.

Decision 38/2006 Strategy for Financing Biosafety and Management Response

1. The Council reviewed the proposed [Strategy for Financing Biosafety](#) (GEF/C.30/8/Rev.1) and approves it as an interim basis for the development of projects for implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety until such time as the focal area strategies are approved by the Council. The Council invites the Implementing and Executing Agencies, under the coordination of the GEF Secretariat and based on their comparative advantages, to collaborate with the GEF to provide assistance to countries for the implementation of the protocol.

Decision 39/2006 Roles and Comparative Advantages of the GEF Agencies

1. The Council reviewed document GEF/C.30/9, [Roles and Comparative Advantages of the GEF Agencies](#), and the information presented therein on the experience of the Implementing Agencies and Executing Agencies operating under expanded opportunities (hereinafter referred to as Executing Agencies) in working with the GEF. The Council welcomes the consultations that have been undertaken by the CEO/Chairperson of the Facility with the Implementing and Executing Agencies and their agreed proposals to promote a more focused participation in GEF activities and a level playing field among the Implementing and Executing Agencies. In this regard, the Council decides that:
 - (a) GEF Implementing and Executing Agencies will focus their involvement in GEF project activities within their respective comparative advantages and assigned primary roles which will be further elaborated upon in a paper to be prepared by the Secretariat for the next Council meeting. The Executing Agencies will be granted direct access to GEF funding based on their comparative advantages.
 - (b) The corporate budget of the Implementing Agencies will be eliminated as of FY08.

- (c) The project cycle management fee for all GEF Implementing and Executing Agencies will be increased from 9 percent to 10 percent, with a cap that will ensure that no agency receives more administrative support than under the current system of fees and corporate budget. This increased fee will be applied immediately to projects managed by the Executing Agencies. For projects managed by the Implementing Agencies, the 10 percent fee will be applied beginning in FY08 when the corporate budget for the Implementing Agencies will be eliminated. The total fee amount for any Implementing Agency in a fiscal year will be capped at what it would have received under the present system of a 9 percent fee plus \$3 million in the corporate budget.
- (d) GEF Implementing and Executing Agencies will participate in the corporate activities outlined in annex 2 of document GEF/C.30/9.
- (e) The comparative advantage of a GEF Implementing and Executing Agency to manage a proposed project will be assessed by the Secretariat, in consultation with the country, during the project concept review.

Decision 40/2006 Report on Project Data Reconciliation

- 1. The Council welcomes the report of the Trustee on the [project data reconciliation](#) (document GEF/C.30/10) and encourages the Trustee to complete the reconciliation process by the end of 2006. Council decides that no new projects should be approved until the current reconciliation process is completed. Thereafter, reconciliation should be updated monthly.

Decision 41/2006 Review of Financial Statements

- 1. The Council reviewed document GEF/C.28/9/Rev.1, [Financial Statements](#), prepared by the Trustee and takes note of the financial statements and auditors' report thereon received by the Trustee for: IBRD acting as Trustee for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2005; IBRD acting as Implementing Agency for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2005; GEF Secretariat for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2005; UNDP for the fiscal year ended December 31, 2004; and UNEP for the fiscal year ended December 31, 2004.

Decision 42/2006 Progress Report on Implementation of the RAF

- 1. The Council takes note of the [Progress Report on Implementing the RAF](#) (document GEF/C.30/11) and requests the Secretariat to continue its efforts to ensure a smooth transition to the new system for recipient countries. The Secretariat is requested to

continue to monitor the implementation of the RAF and to report to the Council on a regular basis.

2. The Council, noting its discussion of the Small Grants Program (SGP) under this agenda item, requests the Secretariat to present an information document on the SGP to the June 2007 Council meeting.

Decision 43/2006 Other Business

1. The Council confirms the following [constituency grouping](#):
 - (i) Albania, Bulgaria, Croatia, Georgia, Moldova, FYR Macedonia, Poland, Romania, Serbia and the Ukraine.

Annex

Annex to Decision 22/2006 Statements on the GEF-4 replenishment

Statement of Belgium on the GEF-4 replenishment

Belgium joined this GEF-4 replenishment process, as we did in the past, with a view to fortifying the Global Environment Facility as the unique mechanism we consider it is to address global environment issues. We believe that the entire international community needs to join hands in order to make the GEF stronger, so that it can continue to support the multilateral environmental agreements for which it is the, or a, financial mechanism and through which we are complying with our commitments under the Conventions.

We are disappointed that not everyone is in a position to do so and that is the reason why Belgium is making an extra effort by going beyond its basic share to provide a supplemental contribution. We greatly welcome similar efforts by many other donors and sincerely thank the new donors, including recipient country donors, for coming on board.

Belgium wants to make it very clear that it is this effort of a limited number of donors that has allowed the level of GEF-4 replenishment to increase beyond that of GEF-3. Belgium is happy to be part of it, and we can only invite as many others as possible to join.

Statement of the United States on the GEF-4 replenishment

The United States welcomes the historic GEF-4 replenishment agreement. The United States regrets, however, the opposition by a number of Council Members to full implementation of the GEF-3 agreement with respect to the establishment of a Resource Allocation Framework to help maximize the ability of GEF funds to provide benefits for the global environment. This failure to implement the GEF-3 agreement in a timely manner led to a loss of \$70 million in incentive funding under GEF-3 and to lower available funding for GEF-4 than might otherwise have been possible.