



OPS4 Technical Document # 10

Stakeholder Consultation Matrix of Findings

Issues	Sub-regional meetings				E-survey ¹
	Focal Points	Civil Society Organizations ²	Agencies	Conventions	
On GEF role and value added					
1. The GEF has an important unique role in supporting countries to address global environmental issues	It is the only predictable multilateral fund available for environmental issues. Had Focal Points not been supported by the GEF, global environmental issues would receive little attention by their governments given the many competing demands for resources.	The GEF allows countries to tackle global environmental issues which otherwise might not be, due to limited funding and other priorities. In some countries the GEF is the only available funding for the environment. The GEF also provides an opportunity for interaction between Conventions.	The GEF provides an important alternative to bilateral funding. In addition, in many regions (i.e. MENA) and countries (those that have graduated from ODA), GEF is the only source of funding for the environment.		Main message: The GEF plays a major role as a funding mechanism for the environment. The partnership modality is relevant for today's environmental benefits. Biodiversity and Climate Change are the two areas where the GEF has a value added.
	Raised in 4 out of 8 consultations	Raised in 7 out of 9 consultations and confirmed in the survey	Raised in 3 out of 7 consultations		
2. The GEF has played an important role within the Agencies, but this may be affected by changes in the relation between the GEF SEC and the Agencies			The GEF has helped mainstreaming environmental issues in Agencies' portfolios. Concerns include the decrease of WB-implemented GEF projects and the lack of participation of Agencies in GEF decision-making.		
			Raised in 3 out of 7 consultations		
3. The GEF role is constrained by limited funding				The GEF cannot play a major role in addressing global environmental issues with only \$ 2-3 billion	
				Raised in 3 out of 4 consultations	
4. The GEFs role needs to adapt to the current environmental agendas				Global focus on environmental issues has changed since the '90s, when the GEF funded mostly climate projects. Later, many other organizations become involved. The GEF should revisit its role in climate change (particularly in adaptation) and in biodiversity (shift from conservation to sustainable development).	
				Raised in 2 out of 4 consultations	
5. The GEF should strengthen its brand recognition		GEF brand recognition at the local level is very low. The SGP at the local level it is mostly associated with UNDP. FSPs and MSPs are rarely known or identified with the GEF, and their accomplishments are often not well publicized and communicated.			
		Raised in 4 out of 9 consultations			
6. The GEF has played a		The GEF supported the Central			

¹ Main messages come from at least two thirds of total survey respondents. Other issues include those mentioned the most in response to open-ended questions.

² CSOs were also consulted through a survey to obtain individual feedback prior to each sub-regional meeting. Survey results support the issues raised in the meetings and are reported here where relevant.

supporting role in the fulfillment of other international agreements that promote regional integration		American Environment and Development Commission and other peace agreements in Central America. It created regional commissions in East Africa and Eastern Europe on international waters. The GEF could support solving transboundary issues in “conflicting” borders, and developing synergies among countries involved.			
		<i>Raised in 5 out of 9 consultations</i>			
7. The GEF can play an important role in promoting integration between Conventions				This will help the Conventions ability to achieve greater global environmental benefits. Opportunities for synergies exist between Sustainable Land Management, Climate change and Biodiversity.	
				<i>Raised in 2 out of 4 consultations</i>	
8. Areas the GEF should drop, add and/or integrate					Other issues: Focal Points, Council Members and Agencies think the GEF should drop ODS and leave it to the Montreal Protocol. Some FPs suggested the GEF to leave out forestry, add adaptation and comprehensive management of chemicals rather than just POPs.

On GEF relevance

1. GEF support is relevant to global environmental issues and to Conventions	GEF support has helped countries to meet their commitments to Conventions.	The GEF is relevant to addressing global environmental concerns and to meet their commitments to Conventions.	The GEF is relevant to the Conventions, but interaction with them is weak. Reporting to COPs is not sufficient. It is perceived that the GEF aims at more independence from the COP, and pays little attention to COP guidance.		Main message: the GEF is relevant to global environmental benefits and to Conventions. The GEF has followed Conventions guidance and has been relevant to national policies.
	<i>Raised in 6 out of 8 consultations</i>	<i>Raised in 6 out of 9 consultations and confirmed in the survey</i>	<i>Raised in 3 out of 7 consultations</i>		
2. GEF operations could be more relevant to national priorities	The issue of adaptation to climate change was frequently mentioned as an issue that the GEF is not giving sufficient attention to.	The GEF is led by governments who have not prioritized environment in the national agenda. As project proposals need to be adapted to GEF requirements (have to be “GEFable”), they risk losing relevance to national priorities in that process. Projects taking too long being developed risk losing relevance to national priorities.	Many GEF “cookie-cutter” projects aim at developing countries capacities to comply with conventions, and are therefore not relevant to national priorities. Identification of national priorities is a lengthy process. Global environmental concerns are not always priority issues for all countries.		Other issues: unresolved tensions exist between global environmental benefits and national priorities, all the more in LDCs. The GEF should increase its commitment to national relevance and ownership.
	<i>Raised in 4 out of 8 consultations</i>	<i>Raised in 8 out of 9 consultations</i>	<i>Raised in 4 out of 7 consultations</i>		
3. GEF operations could better incorporate the sustainable development needs of local populations		While the SGP addresses local people needs, FSPs tend to be too distant from them. Linking SGP projects and Global Environmental Benefits is a challenge, but could be improved.			
		<i>Raised in 8 out of 9 consultations</i>			

4. COP guidance needs to be better integrated into GEF Strategic Programs				The GEF has its strategic program for the whole replenishment period, but the COP often comes up with new ideas and guidance. Where does the GEF find the money to fund those new areas of priority?	
				<i>Raised in 3 out of 4 consultations</i>	
On GEF performance					
1. There is insufficient transparency in decision making across the GEF system	Largely perceived by FPs. In some cases there are no consultations and no information flow from the country representing the constituency. Country representation in the GEF Council not always represents recipient countries' interest.	Project identification is not transparent. In some cases, CSOs had no knowledge of who was the GEF FP in their country. The RAF is leading to the centralization of decision making in FPs and to a tendency to exclude CSOs from GEF funding.		Project selection criteria are unclear and not transparent. It is not always clear why certain projects are rejected and others are approved.	
	<i>Raised in 7 out of 8 consultations</i>	<i>Raised in 8 out of 9 consultations</i>		<i>Raised in 2 out of 4 consultations</i>	
2. Unclear criteria and process for project identification and approval cause confusion and delays	GEF procedures are rigid, complex and inefficient. Despite recent minor improvements, time continues to be long. Direct access was raised in two consultations as a possible solution.	Long project cycles not only present a challenge to CSOs to plan future activities due to uncertainty, but also increase the difficulty to secure co-funding		The project cycle process is still too long.	
	<i>Raised in 8 out of 8 consultations</i>	<i>Raised in 8 out of 9 consultations</i>		<i>Raised in 2 out of 4 consultations</i>	
3. GEF co-funding requirements should be more flexible	The ratio of GEF funding to co-funding should be differentiated by regions, i.e. smaller countries have greater difficulties than others in putting forward co-funding for GEF-projects.	Co-funding requirements constrain CSO access to other GEF funding.	There are no established rules on co-funding. Within GEF SEC, requirements vary a lot depending on the focal area, the country, and sometimes even the project reviewer.		
	<i>Raised in 3 out of 8 consultations</i>	<i>Raised in 9 out of 9 consultations</i>	<i>Raised in 3 out of 7 consultations</i>		
4. Insufficient interaction with Focal Points during project identification and implementation	Focal Points only see the agencies at the time of country endorsement. Cases of PIFs submitted without country endorsements were signaled.				
	<i>Raised in 7 out of 8 consultations</i>				
5. The GEF should clarify agencies' role in both project preparation and implementation	Comparative advantage and track record in the region should be considered when choosing an agency.				
	<i>Raised in 7 out of 8 consultations</i>				
6. Need to better codify FPs roles and responsibilities	Agencies, and to some extent the GEF Secretariat, do not keep FPs sufficiently informed during project preparation. FPs have no clear role in implementation and evaluation.				
	<i>Raised in 7 out of 8 consultations</i>				
7. Focal Point is an added responsibility of lower priority with respect to other responsibilities	The RAF has increased Focal Points involvement, but in most cases these are unfunded mandates.				
	<i>Raised in 4 out of 8 consultations</i>				

8. Need to strengthen country M&E	FPs complained about insufficient financial and technical support for M&E country portfolio needs.				Other issues: FPs should be involved in implementation and M&E.
	Raised in 4 out of 8 consultations				
9. Accessing GEF funding (particularly accessing FSP and MSPs) is becoming increasingly difficult		SGP is the main link between GEF and CSOs. But the complexity of the RAF mechanism has constrained CSOs' access to other GEF funding.			Other issues: Agencies' staffs affirmed that the RAF should be removed as it has limited the LDCs' access to GEF funding.
		Raised in 9 out of 9 consultations			
10. Insufficient attention to capturing and disseminating lessons learned		Given its international reach, the GEF needs to improve communication and information sharing at all levels.			
		Raised in 8 out of 9 consultations			
11. Need to strengthen the GEF NGO Network		The NGO network is too weak to ensure a link between GEF and CSOs. The selection process of regional representatives and of its legitimacy is questioned. The GEF should help develop capacities of civil society.			
		Raised in 6 out of 9 consultations and confirmed in the survey			
12. Project grant documentation required for CEO Endorsement is too complex and lengthy			Grants requirements are more burdensome than for other projects. Requirements could be streamlined to Agencies' operational requirements.		
			Raised in 7 out of 7 consultations		
13. Interacting with the GEF has high transaction costs			Agencies spend more money than they get on GEF projects.		
			Raised in 5 out of 7 consultations		
14. Agencies participation in GEF decision-making processes decreased			GEF SEC is taking a more proactive role, and built in-house expertise in the context of program approaches. But it doesn't have the field knowledge needed to build such programs.	Agencies' role in the GEF system has become weaker: this has affected interaction between Agencies and Conventions. RAF has reduced the power of Implementing Agencies.	
			Raised in 6 out of 7 consultations	Raised in 3 out of 4 consultations	
15. GEF as a Network Organization needs to be strengthened			Agencies have the perception that CEO's agenda and other organizational changes had an effect on the GEF partnership. Increased competition among Agencies.		
			Raised in 5 out of 7 consultations		
16. The RAF had a negative effect on global and regional projects			This is the case with group countries. Transaction costs for preparing regional and global projects are not recognized. Co-funding is more difficult to secure.		Other issues: The RAF funding mechanism has constrained group countries' capacities to comply with conventions, and has affected regional projects.
			Raised in 4 out of 7 consultations		

17. Interaction between GEF SEC and the Conventions needs to be strengthened				Interaction mechanisms are dependent on a person to person basis. GEF SEC reporting quality should be less on technical issue and more on lessons learned on how the GEF has incorporated the COP guidance. <i>Raised in 4 out of 4 consultations</i>	
18. Agencies don't always take into account Conventions priorities				Some Conventions issues do not interest all Agencies (i.e. Biosafety). Either Agencies 'cherry picked' from National Strategies or disregarded them and did what they want. <i>Raised in 2 out of 4 consultations</i>	
On GEF results					
1. The GEF makes important contributions especially on capacity building and strengthening of institutions and of environmental legislative frameworks	The GEF helped creating an enabling environment and public awareness. But some FPs stressed the need for GEF to go beyond Enabling Activities. It is difficult to get GEF to approve projects that follow-up Enabling Activities, particularly in the cases of countries with RAF group allocations. <i>Raised in 5 out of 8 consultations</i>	In partnership with other institutions, the GEF helped building country capacities and strengthening institutions. Results include the formulation of legal frameworks, introduction of new technologies, improvement of protected areas, and reduction of emissions. <i>Raised in 7 out of 9 consultations</i>			<i>Main message:</i> the GEF has supported its stakeholders to take action to protect the global environment. Biodiversity and climate change are the two areas where the GEF is achieving most results
2. Short term funding is seen as a factor hampering sustainability	GEF's 4 year cycle makes long-term planning difficult. Lack of a phased-approach in GEF projects and long approval times hamper sustainability. <i>Raised in 4 out of 8 consultations</i>	Short-term funding of GEF operations was also seen as a factor hampering sustainability and long term results. <i>Raised in 7 out of 9 consultations</i>	Sustainability needs a long-term strategy. There are no more follow-up projects as in the past. The GEF hasn't consistently used information from Conventions prepared under enabling activities for future projects. <i>Raised in 3 out of 7 consultations</i>	The GEF should focus on long-term strategies. The GEF supported countries to comply with conventions and draft national strategies, but didn't support implementation of projects to put in practice such strategies. <i>Raised in 2 out of 4 consultations</i>	
3. Long term results of GEF are difficult to identify		Factors include: the long term nature global environmental issues and the time it takes to see impacts; the GEF M&E system is weak on tracking long-term results; overambitious objectives. <i>Raised in 7 out of 9 consultations</i>	It is still too early to show results of GEF projects implemented by the newer Agencies, which projects are either under implementation, in pipeline or under preparation. <i>Raised in 2 out of 7 consultations</i>		
4. Many catalytic results of GEF projects are not easy to measure			Capacity development, public awareness, policy development, etc, don't have tools for accurate assessment. This is particularly the case for Enabling Activities. <i>Raised in 3 out of 7 consultations</i>		