

MID-TERM REVIEW OF
THE GEF
RESOURCE ALLOCATION FRAMEWORK

Stakeholder Survey

Technical Paper #7
6 November 2008

Not edited
Not for citation or distribution

Draft

Contents	Page
Abbreviations	3
Summary of Key Findings	4
1. Introduction	5
2. Survey Design and Methodology	6
2.1. Survey Approach	6
2.2. Response Rates	7
3. Knowledge of the RAF	9
3.1 Experience or Involvement with the RAF	9
3.2 Regional Involvement	10
3.3 Focal Area Involvement	11
4. RAF Design	
4.1 Does the RAF provide effective incentives for countries to perform?	11
4.2 Does the RAF increase opportunities for synergies among focal areas?	12
4.3 Effects of Selected RAF Design Elements	13
5. RAF Implementation	13
5.1 RAF Effects on Roles and Responsibilities	13
5.2 How Successful Has the RAF Been?	14
5.3 How Has the RAF Affected Funding?	15
5.4 Factors Helping or Hindering Access to RAF Funding	15
5.5 GEF Project Submission, Review and Approval	19
5.6 Country Ownership, Transparency and Participation	19
5.7 Knowledge Sharing	22
6. RAF Strengths and Weaknesses	23
6.1 Possible Strengths and Weaknesses	23
6.2 Costs and Benefits of the RAF	27
7. Suggestions for Improvement of the RAF	27
8. Responses to the Questionnaire for GEF Focal Points	31
Annex A: Original Survey Questions	31
A.1 Online Questions	
A.2 Questions in the Paper Survey for GEF Operational and Political Focal Points	

Contacts:

Jim Fremming, consultant

Shaista Ahmed, consultant

Task Manager: Siv Tokle, GEF Evaluation Office, rafevaluation@thegef.org

ABBREVIATIONS

ADB	Asian Development Bank
AfDB	African Development Bank
BD	biodiversity
CC	climate change
CIS	Commonwealth of Independent States
CSP	GEF/UNDP Country Support Programme
EBRD	European Bank for Reconstruction and Development
ECA	Europe and Central Asia
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GEF/EO	Global Environment Facility Evaluation Office
GEFSec	GEF Secretariat
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization
IFAD	International Fund for Agricultural Development
MSP	Mediumsize Project
MTR	Mid-Term Review of the GEF RAF
NFP	Convention National Focal Point
NGO	nongovernmental organization
NEPAD	New Partnership for Africa's Development
OFP	GEF Operational Focal Point
RAF	Resource Allocation Framework
STAP	GEF Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel
SGP	GEF Small Grants Programme
SIDS	Small Island Developing States
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNEP	United Nations Environment Programme
UNIDO	United Nations Industrial Development Organization

SUMMARY OF KEY FINDINGS

This Technical Paper presents the design and methodology of the online survey utilized by the team of the Mid Term Review of the RAF, along with basic results from the survey and a display of the questions included in the survey instrument.

Findings and analyses from the broader Review, developed from a variety of activities in addition to this survey, are available from the MTR final report and other technical papers.

Major results derived from the survey include:

- The online survey was administered to eight GEF stakeholder groups; a total of 3,553 individuals were invited to participate in the survey. A total of 691 persons entered the survey website between June and early September of 2008; 421 of these indicated either that they had or did not have experience with the RAF and completed the survey. Data presented in the tables displayed in this paper are based on the universe of 691 responses. In addition, 58 GEF Operational and Political Focal Points completed paper questionnaires in association with their participation at GEF sub-regional workshops.
- Thirty-six percent of respondents found the RAF incentives to be effective for individual allocation countries, while only 25 percent found them to be effective for group allocation countries.
- Among various RAF design elements, the individual allocation is viewed the most positively, while the group allocation is viewed negatively.
- Nearly half the respondents (48 percent) found that the RAF has positively affected the role of Operational Focal Points.
- Somewhat more than half of respondents (56 percent) reported that the RAF has negatively affected the roles of the GEF Implementing Agencies (UNDP, UNEP and the World Bank).
- While opinions among NGO staff are diverse, overall they reported that their organizations' roles in preparation or implementation of GEF projects have stayed the same, or improved slightly, since initiation of the RAF.
- Opinions are divided regarding the quality of the initial (pre-RAF) process as well as of the process after RAF implementation came into place
- Aspects of the RAF viewed as particularly helpful include direct contacts between countries and the GEF Secretariat, and individual (as contrasted with group) RAF allocations. Hindering factors include closeout and re-starting of the GEF pipeline and group allocations.
- Possible strengths of the RAF recognized by majorities of respondents include that it:
 - May strengthen country roles in portfolio planning;
 - May strengthen predictability of funding;
 - May provide increased transparency in resource allocation; and
 - May empower countries in negotiating with GEF implementing or executing agencies.
- Possible weaknesses of the RAF recognized by majorities of respondents include that:
 - Allocations among countries may not be fair;
 - Allocation formulas may not be based on "best available" practice;
 - It may disadvantage some or all group allocation countries;
 - The process of awarding country allocations may not be sufficiently transparent;
 - Country allocations may be so small that they discourage development of project proposals;
 - It may place stress on the design quality of GEF projects; and
 - It may encourage delays in project development and approval.

1. INTRODUCTION

The Mid-Term Review (MTR) of the GEF Resource Allocation Framework (RAF) is intended to “evaluate the degree to which resources have been allocated to countries in a transparent and cost-effective manner based on global environmental benefits and country performance.”¹ The report from the MTR will be discussed during the GEF Council meeting in November 2008.

In addition to various other analyses, the MTR was designed to carry out a broad range of consultations with members of the GEF community, and to conduct surveys of all major stakeholders who have a role in RAF implementation to gain information regarding their experiences and perceptions. This paper forms part of the mid-term review and presents the methodology and findings from stakeholder surveys on the RAF.

[The Survey Component](#)

Several activities comprised the approach taken to gather viewpoints on the RAF from members of the GEF community. Representatives from all GEF entities referred to in the Instrument were consulted. Semi-structured interviews were conducted with samples among GEF Operational and Political Focal Points, other relevant national government stakeholders, Convention secretariats, Agency staff, GEF project staff and international and national NGOs. Care was taken to include consultations with Agencies relatively new to GEF as well as those involved in its founding, with small NGOs and large ones, and with representatives of countries with small RAF allocations and large ones. Feedback on RAF design and implementation was compared with information gathered through document review and portfolio analysis.

See the MTR report text for discussion of the approach taken for qualitative individual and group interviews, which were broadly representative of the GEF community and were guided by uniform protocols.

The qualitative data gathering notably featured consultations with GEF Focal Points at five 2007-2008 sub-regional workshops sponsored by the GEF/UNDP Country Support Programme (CSP), in Bali, Belgrade, Manila, Douala, and Windhoek. These events offered the opportunity for gathering of viewpoints through plenary sessions, group work and individual semi-structured interviews. Coverage included the full constituencies of West and Central Africa, East and Southern Africa, Eastern Europe and the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS), Middle East and Northern Africa, and Asia. A paper-questionnaire survey was also administered to the Focal Points at these consultations.

To gather quantitative as well as qualitative data on experiences and perceptions from as broad and representative a sample of members of the GEF community as possible, an online survey was used; this paper is the summary of the approach and results of this survey, supplemented by information from the paper survey administered at the sub-regional workshops.

[Structure of This Report](#)

The report begins with a description of survey design and methodology, followed by presentation of some basic “demographic” information regarding respondents’ knowledge of the RAF. Next are four sections

¹ GEF EO, *Resource Allocation Framework: Mid-Term Review, Terms of Reference*. GEF/ME/C.32/6/Rev.1, November 21, 2007, p. 7.

addressing respondent views on various key substantive themes: RAF design, RAF implementation, RAF strengths and weaknesses, and suggestions for improvement of the RAF. The final section conveys results of a paper-questionnaire survey administered to GEF Focal Points at the sub-regional workshops referred to earlier. An annex provides the survey items as administered to survey participants.

2. SURVEY DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

2.1 Survey Approach

The design of the online survey was guided by the evaluation questions included in the MTR Terms of Reference, and refined for research application by the MTR team. Of central importance was to gather information on the perceptions of stakeholders regarding possible effects of the RAF design and/or implementation on:

- Country access to GEF funding;
- Transparency and openness of participation in GEF processes; and
- Efficiency of GEF processes.

In addition, the MTR team considered it important to gather information on changes in the GEF project cycle and related reforms in GEF, since these may be seen as potential rival explanations for any identified patterns in stakeholder perceptions. Finally, it was considered to be quite helpful to gather free-response comments from individuals through the survey (available in separate annex to this paper).

Information gleaned from several early personal interviews from differing stakeholder groups also helped the team to develop and refine items included in the online survey. The online survey was pre-tested with four individuals from various stakeholder groups, refined and subsequently administered via Survey Monkey (<http://www.surveymonkey.com>) from June through early September of 2008. This online method allowed for real-time tracking of responses and confidential submission of viewpoints from survey participants.

As one may expect, the various GEF stakeholder groups approach the RAF and other GEF processes from different “starting points.” The Agencies, for example, play major roles in the design and implementation of GEF projects, and interact closely with country counterparts as well as with the GEF Secretariat and other GEF entities. NGO staff may or may not be involved in a particular project’s design or implementation, but depending upon their organizational mandate they may have a great deal of interest in the project nevertheless. Also, some NGO staff may be engaged with governments regarding prioritization of projects for a country’s GEF pipeline. Country government staff, including but extending beyond GEF Focal Points, will play central roles in project prioritization, but due to staff rotations and other factors may not be closely engaged with GEF processes, procedures and entities.

Overall, various stakeholders do play differing roles vis-à-vis GEF activities and the RAF; this carried implications for design of the survey. In addition to a “basic” survey that could be administered to staff of Agencies and some other groups, it became clear that in order for an online survey to properly reach the intended knowledgeable sample and to be readily usable by potential respondents, it would be necessary to develop specialized surveys for some particular stakeholder groups. Therefore the MTR team developed parallel surveys, with minor adjustments in the language of some items, for 7 groups in addition to the “basic” survey:

- NGO staff;
- GEF Small Grants Programme (SGP) National Coordinators;
- GEF Operational and Political Focal Points;

- Additional staff of GEF-participant country governments at various levels;
- Members of the GEF Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel (STAP) and its roster of advisors;
- Convention National Focal Points in biodiversity and climate change; and
- Convention National Focal Points in the non-RAF focal areas.

To construct the sampling frame for the survey it was necessary to develop a census of GEF stakeholders knowledgeable of the RAF, relying upon self-identification of the relevance of one's experience with the RAF subject matter. It was not possible to readily know or estimate, in advance of the administration of a survey, the number and identities of people within the GEF community (including all stakeholder groups) who have the basic familiarity with the RAF that would qualify them to answer our survey questions based on a foundation of at least some minimal amount of applicable experience and knowledge. Starting from several contact lists used in earlier GEF/EO evaluations (most especially the Joint Evaluation of the GEF Activity Cycle and Modalities), and subsequently making contact with knowledgeable persons for any possible and relevant updates to these lists, the MTR team constructed a sampling frame constituting eight stakeholder groups and a total of 2,960 first-round prospective online respondents.

The MTR Team “cast a broad net” in creating the sampling frame, to ensure that as many stakeholders as possible with knowledge of the RAF's design and/or implementation would be invited to participate in the survey. The number of direct recipients of invitations was very large, and initial recipients were encouraged to pass these invitations along to colleagues who may also have been informed of the RAF. In this way, an estimated total of 3,553 individuals were invited to participate in the survey. The initial invitation asked that the names and email addresses of the indirect invitees be shared with the MTR team, to assist in monitoring of response patterns and rates.

2.2 Response Rates

Using generally accepted standards for computation of response rates, the overall response rate for the online survey is **19.4 percent** (See table 1.). This is an acceptable rate considering the online mode, the large sample of invitees and the filtering of the sample required to obtain persons knowledgeable of the RAF while covering a large universe of stakeholders. A total of 691 people attempted the survey, with a response rate of 19.45 percent. Approximately 421 people completed the survey, but had either had no or had no experience with the RAF, with a response rate of 11.85%. Approximately 286 of those said they had experience with the RAF and completed the survey with a response rate of 8.05%.

Response rates varied considerably across stakeholder groups. The rates for staff of international and national non-governmental organizations (27.8 %) and for the “basic” survey distributed to staff of GEF agencies, the Secretariat, and international donor agencies as well as to members and alternate members of the GEF Council (17.9 %), were relatively low; this is likely at least partially explained by the extensive use of forwarded invitations among these two groups (See Column C of Table 1). Rates of completing the survey (See Columns I and J) are quite high, indicating that:

- Among those who took the survey the targeting was effective, and
- Respondents were sufficiently motivated by the subject matter to complete a rather long online survey.

Regarding those represented in the sub-regional workshop paper survey responses, eighty countries were represented by one or more Focal Points or designees. A total of 76 questionnaires were completed and returned. Eighteen of these were double responses from the same country or were returned anonymously (thus disallowing a country identification), resulting in 58 country responses. Therefore the country-wise response rate for the sub-regional workshop questionnaires is 58/76, or **76.3 percent**.

Table 1. Online Survey Response and Completion Rates by Stakeholder Group

(A) Stakeholder Group	(B) Number of Direct Recipients of GEF/EO Invitation to Participate in Survey	(C) Number of Additional Recipients Via Forwarding ²	(D) Total Number of Recipients of Invitation to the Survey	(E) Number Who Entered the Online Survey	(F) Number Who Completed Survey (Including Those Who Had No Experience w/RAF) ³	(G) Number Who Had Experience w/ RAF & Completed Survey	(H) Response Rate ⁴ (%)	(I) Overall Completion Rate ⁵ (%)	(J) Refined Completion Rate ⁶ (%)
1. Basic RAF survey ⁷	1,141	154	1,295	204	144	107	15.8	70.6	74.3
2. OFP/PFP ⁸	417	0	417	32	17	15	7.7	53.1	88.2
3. NGO staff	620	225	845	235	118	55	27.8	50.2	46.6
4. SGP National Coordinators	80	0	80	53	42	42	66.3	79.2	100.0
5. STAP panel and roster	654	0	654	104	69	45	15.9	66.3	65.2
6. Participant government staff	39	60	99	40	23	18	40.4	57.5	78.3
7. Convention National Focal Points in BD& CC	4	154	158	23	8	4	14.6	34.8	50.0
8. Convention NFPs non-RAF Focal Areas	5	0	5	0	0	0	0.0	--	--
Total	2,960	593	3,553	691	421	286	19.4 %	60.9 %	67.9 %

² This number is an estimate based on reports, as requested by the MTR team in the initial invitation email message, from the group of initial invitees (as counted in Column B). The actual number of additional recipients may have been larger or smaller than reported here.

³ A screening question at the beginning of the survey asked the respondent, "Have you had experience or involvement with the GEF Resource Allocation Framework (RAF)?" If the answer was "no," responses were not included in data analysis.

⁴ Complete and partial responses as a percent of all invitation recipients: Column (E)/ Column (D).

⁵ Percent of survey enterers who completed the survey: (F)/(E).

⁶ Percent of survey completers who reported experience with the RAF: (G)/(F).

⁷ The basic survey was distributed to GEF agency staff, GEF Council members and alternates, GEF Secretariat staff and staff of international donor agencies.

⁸ This includes only responses to the online survey. Response rate for the paper survey of GEF Focal Points is discussed in the text.

Looking at patterns of response within selected sub-groups of stakeholders, Tables 2a through 2c show that, as expected, the groups with larger universes and likelihoods of more immediate engagement with the RAF responded in larger numbers. Staff from national or local NGOs and of national governments constitute the largest respondent sub-groups within the larger relevant categories. Also, the relatively larger universe of SGP country programme with both RAF and core funding is represented with the largest segment of responses among SGP survey participants.

Table 2. Patterns of Response across Stakeholder Sub-Groups

a. NGOs & Private Sector

From the following categories, how would you primarily identify yourself for this survey concerning the RAF? (Please select just one category)		
	Response Percent	Response Count
International NGO	38	44
National/local NGO	50	58
Private sector	11	13
Total NGO/Private Sector	100%⁹	115

b. Government Staff

From the following categories, how would you primarily identify yourself for this survey concerning the RAF? (Please select just one category)		
	Response Percent	Response Count
National government	85	29
Provincial/state or local government	6	2
Other	9	3
Total Government Staff	100%	34

c. SGP

What is your country programme's status in terms of access to RAF funds? (Please select one)		
	Response Percent	Response Count
RAF only country programme	14	6
RAF and core country programme	62	26
Core fund country programmes	24	10
Total SGP	100%	42

3. KNOWLEDGE OF THE RAF

3.1 Experience or Involvement with the RAF

Three-fourths of survey participants self-identified as having had experience or involvement (of any kind) with the GEF RAF (see table 3). In this analytical breakdown, the highest rate of familiarity was among GEF Focal Points, while the lowest was among staff of NGOs and the private sector.

⁹ Percentages may not total to 100 due to rounding.

Table 3. Experience with the RAF

Have you had experience or involvement with the GEF Resource Allocation Framework (RAF)?							
	Basic Survey	NGOs & Private Sector	Convention NFPs (BD & CC)	Operational & Political FPs	STAP	Government Staff	Total
Yes	80% (159)	67% (148)	78% (18)	90% (28)	78% (80)	87% (34)	76% (467)
No	21% (41)	33% (74)	22% (5)	10% (3)	22% (23)	13% (5)	24% (151)

SGP not included (GEF experience assumed).

Another way of identifying familiarity with the RAF is to consider the time period during which an individual has had experience with the GEF. While experience before GEF-4 can of course be helpful, if one does not have GEF-4 experience one is unlikely to be familiar with RAF implementation and its effects. Majorities – in most cases large majorities – of survey respondents did have GEF-4 experience (see Table 4).

Table 4a. Respondents' Periods of Experience with the GEF

Please identify the periods during which you have had experience with the GEF (Check all that apply)							
	Basic Survey (%)	NGOs & Private Sector (%)	Convention NFP (BD & CC) (%)	Operational & Political FPs (%)	SGP (%)	Participant Gov. Staff (%)	Total (%)
GEF before 2003	67	40	50	6	51	56	25
GEF Phase 3 (2003-2006)	87	62	25	75	64	72	35
GEF Phase 4 (2007- present)	93	84	50	94	74	94	41
Respondents	(n = 104)	(n = 55)	(n = 4)	(n = 16)	(n = 53)	(n = 18)	(n = 250)

Note: Percents total to more than 100 due to multiple available responses.

Table 4b: STAP Panel and Roster Members' Recent Experience with GEF Projects

Have you had experience or involvement with GEF projects over the last 2-3 years?		
	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	78%	80
No	22%	23
Total	100%	103

3.2 Regional Involvement

The coverage among geographical regions in which respondents have been involved with GEF activities is predictably broad (see Table 5).

Table 5. Regional Involvement with GEF Activities

In which region(s) have you been involved with GEF activities? <i>(Check all that apply)</i>								
	Basic Survey (%) (n = 105)	NGOs (%) (n = 56)	Convention NFP (BD & CC) (%) (n = 4)	SGP (%) (n = 16)	Political and Operational Focal Points (%) (n = 16)	Gov. Staff (%) (n = 18)	STAP (%) (n = 46)	Total (%) (n = 261)
Africa	50	43	0	31	25	17	50	26
Asia *	50	38	25	26	6	39	54	26
Eastern Europe and Central Asia	32	13	0	17	25	44	26	16
Latin America and the Caribbean	33	32	50	26	44	17	22	19
Global	31	21	25	2	6	6	39	15

Percents total to more than 100 due to multiple available responses.

* Asia includes Western Asia and Pacific Islands. Africa includes North Africa.

3.3 Focal Area Involvement

Since the RAF thus far has involved only the climate change and biodiversity focal areas, it is informative to know the focal area experience of survey respondents (see Table 6). Note that our survey question calls upon the respondent to identify the focal areas in which she or he is “actively involved,” without defining this term. Therefore the data may underestimate or overestimate the true extent of involvement in a focal area.

Biodiversity and climate change are the most common focal areas of respondent involvement, across all surveyed stakeholder groups.

Table 6. Focal Area Involvement

In which GEF Focal Area(s) have you been actively involved? <i>(Select all that apply)</i>				
Focal Area	Basic Survey (%) (n = 103)	Operational and Political Focal Points (%) (n = 16)	Government Staff (%) (n = 18)	STAP (%) (n = 46)
Biodiversity	79	88	89	48
Climate Change	69	100	83	48
International Waters	42	56	50	33
Ozone Depletion	15	31	33	7
Land Degradation	47	44	50	20
POPs	30	63	44	17
Other	0	0	6	0

Percents total more than 100 due to multiple-category responses.

4. RAF DESIGN

4.1 Does the RAF provide effective incentives for countries to perform?

A key question for the MTR is the extent to which the RAF thus far has provided effective incentives for countries to improve their performance relevant to GEF projects. Table 7 provides survey data regarding

respondent views concerning incentives for countries receiving individual allocations, while Table 8 presents data concerning incentives for countries in the group allocation. If we group responses in the “to a great extent” and “to a moderate extent” categories for a sum of positive responses, a clear distinction is apparent: Thirty-six percent of respondents found the incentives to be effective for individual allocation countries, while only 25 percent found them to be effective for group allocation countries. This result reinforces a broad array of similar findings from the qualitative interviews.

Table 7. Providing Incentives for Individual Allocation countries

To what extent does the RAF provide effective incentives for INDIVIDUAL ALLOCATION countries to improve their performance over time?		
	Response count	Response percent
To a great extent	30	13
To a moderate extent	54	23
To a slight extent	55	24
Not at all	47	20
Don't know/Not sure	45	19
Total	231	100%

Data are from the following stakeholder groups: Political & Operational FPs, Agencies, Council Members, GEFSec, NGOs, Convention NFP (BD & CC), STAP

Table 8. Providing Incentives for Group Allocation Countries

To what extent does the RAF provide effective incentives for GROUP ALLOCATION countries to improve their performance over time?		
	Response count	Response percent
To a great extent	15	6
To a moderate extent	44	19
To a slight extent	39	17
Not at all	79	34
Don't know/Not sure	55	24
Total	232	100%

Data are from the following stakeholder groups: Political & Operational FPs, Agencies, Council Members, GEFSec, NGOs, Convention NFPs (BD & CC), STAP

4.2 Does the RAF increase opportunities for synergies among focal areas?

Among the questions included in the MTR Terms of Reference was concerning the extent to which the RAF has expanded opportunities for synergies among GEF focal areas. This is a topic dealt with in some detail in the MTR report main text; to address it calls for utilizing more than simply an item on an online survey. But to gather information on a broad basis among GEF stakeholders on this issue, the MTR team did include an item on this topic.

Responses were varied, but the weight of viewpoints did not show an observed supportive relationship between the RAF and cross-FA synergies. Approximately thirty percent of respondents told us that the RAF has increased opportunities for synergies to a great or moderate extent, while about 53 percent found that it does so only to a slight extent or not at all (see Table 9).

Table 9: The RAF and Opportunities for Synergies across Focal Areas

To what extent has the RAF increased opportunities for synergies between climate change and biodiversity work, or with other focal areas? (Select one)		
Answer Options	Response Count	Response Percent
To a great extent	28	11
To a moderate extent	48	19
To a slight extent	59	24
Not at all	72	29
Don't know/Not sure	43	17
Total	250	100%

Data are from the following stakeholder groups: Political & Operational FP, Agencies, Council Members, GEFSec, NGOs, Convention NFP (BD & CC), STAP, Government Staff

4.3 Effects of Selected RAF Design Elements

Among the most widely discussed issues of the RAF design are the 50 percent rule; the group and individual allocations; and the set-aside for allocations to global and regional projects. The online survey included a compound item that asked respondents about the overall positive or negative effects of each of these. As may be seen in Table 10, none of these design elements elicited a majority of positive responses. Among the three, the individual allocation received the most reports of positive effect, while the group allocation received the least.

Table 10: Effects of Selected RAF Design Elements

Based on your experience and knowledge what has been the overall effect of the following RAF design elements on GEF programming and delivery?								
(A) Design Element	(B) Very Negative (%)	(C) Somewhat negative (%)	(D) Neither negative nor positive (%)	(E) Some-what positive (%)	(F) Very positive (%)	(G) Total Negative (%) (A+B)	(H) Total Positive (%) (E+F)	(I) Don't know (%)
The 50% rule	29	22	10	11	3	51	14	27
The group allocations	30	27	11	9	3	58	12	18
The individual allocations	15	17	13	24	17	32	41	14
Allocations to global and regional projects	20	21	16	20	6	41	26	18

See subsequent sections of this paper for more data, collected through survey items that grouped a variety of topics together, on RAF design issues.

5. RAF IMPLEMENTATION

5.1 RAF Effects on Roles and Responsibilities

The effects of RAF implementation on the roles and responsibilities of various GEF entities and partners is an important area of review within the MTR, examined through application of multiple methods. For the online survey, the data indicate that many stakeholders are unsure of how the RAF may have affected the roles of various groups or entities in the GEF community (see Table 11). Two other particular findings are noteworthy, however:

- Nearly half the respondents (48 percent) find that the RAF has positively affected the role of Operational Focal Points; and
- Somewhat more than half of respondents (56 percent) reported that the RAF has negatively affected the roles of the GEF Implementing Agencies (UNDP, UNEP and the World Bank).

Table 11: RAF Effects on Roles

In general, how has the RAF affected the roles and contribution of the following groups towards GEF objectives? (Check one for each row)				
Group	Negatively (%)	Positively (%)	Don't Know/Not Sure (%)	Response Count
The GEF Council	28	31	41	181
The GEF Secretariat	32	39	29	180
The STAP	14	19	67	173
The GEF Trustee	18	20	63	174
The GEF Implementing Agencies (UNDP, UNEP, IBRD)	56	30	14	182
The GEF Executing Agencies (AfDB, ADB, EBRD, IADB, FAD, FAO, UNIDO)	40	26	34	177
Country Operational Focal Points	41	48	11	183
International NGOs	32	22	46	174
Project execution partners	41	28	31	176
National or local NGOs	40	24	36	176
Private sector organizations	28	18	54	174

Data are from the following stakeholder groups: Political & Operational FP, Agencies, Council Members, GEFSec, NGOs

The survey targeted to staff of NGOs and private sector organizations included a similar question geared to their experience (see Table 12). NGO staff reported that their organizations' roles in preparation or implementation of GEF projects have stayed the same, or improved slightly, since initiation of the RAF.

Table 12: Change in NGO Roles in Preparation or Implementation of GEF Projects

To what extent has the role of your organization in the preparation/implementation of GEF projects improved or worsened since initiation of the RAF? (Check only one)		
Answer Options	Response Count	Response Percent
Improved A Great Deal	4	7
Improved Moderately	14	24
Stayed About The Same	19	32
Worsened Moderately	9	15
Worsened A Great Deal	5	9
Don't Know/Not Sure	8	14
Total	59	100%

5.2 How Successful Has the RAF Been?

Table 13 (next page) presents data on responses to a list of concerns that arguably are relevant both to RAF design and implementation. While none of the possible areas of achievement listed were viewed as successful by large majorities of respondents, transparency of RAF processes, encouraging programmatic approaches and promoting projects and outcomes congruent with country interests received the relatively highest marks on this question. Substantial minorities of respondents on each item viewed the RAF as moderately or very unsuccessful, however.

5.3 How Has the RAF Affected Funding?

When asked about their view of the RAF's effects on funding in various GEF activity areas (Table 14), many stakeholders are not sure or do not know. For some activities, however, there are some distinguishable patterns in responses. Notably larger percentages of individuals responding that the RAF "negatively" affects an item are present for global and regional projects, NGOs and civil society, and projects in focal areas other than BD and CC. The GEF is seen as positively affecting funding by a majority of respondents in the cases of the SGP, mediumsize projects, climate change projects and biodiversity projects.

Table 14. RAF Effect on Funding in Selected Areas

In what ways has the RAF affected the funding of: (Check one for each row)				
Activity or Thematic Area	% Negatively	% Positively	% Not at all	% Don't Know/ Not Sure
Enabling activities	28	22	15	35
Global and regional projects	38	29	8	25
The Small Grants Programme	25	29	12	34
Least Developed Countries	31	29	6	34
Small Island Development States	26	24	6	45
NGOs and civil society	35	27	6	32
Medium-Sized Projects	28	32	13	27
Full-Sized Projects	32	31	12	25
Climate Change Projects	27	32	11	31
Biodiversity Projects	27	32	9	32
Projects in focal areas other than CC and BD	23	18	15	43

Data are from the following stakeholder groups: Government staff, Political & Operational FP, Agencies, Council Members, GEFSec, NGOs, SGP, Convention NFP (BD & CC)

5.4 Factors Helping or Hindering Access to Funding Under the RAF

One item in the online survey combined several factors, of RAF design or implementation or of the broader GEF context, and asked respondents to assess the extent to which each may have helped or hindered country access to GEF funding under the RAF (see Tables 15a and 15b next page). Items viewed as particularly helpful include direct contacts between countries and the GEF Secretariat and individual (as contrasted with group) RAF allocations. Hindering factors include closeout and re-starting of the GEF pipeline and group allocations.

Table 13: Perceived Success of the RAF in Related Areas

How successful has the RAF been in:							
(A) Area of Achievement	(B) Very Unsuccessful (%)	(C) Moderately Unsuccessful (%)	(D) Moderately Successful (%)	(E) Very Successful (%)	(F) Total Un- successful (B+C) (%)	(G) Total Successful (D+E) (%)	(H) Don't Know (%)
Making its "rules of the game" available to GEF stakeholders in a transparent and accessible way?	17	19	44	11	36	55	10
Rewarding countries based on their performance in biodiversity and climate change portfolios?	14	22	33	7	36	40	24
Encouraging global and regional projects?	22	23	30	11	45	41	14
Encouraging programmatic approaches?	15	17	42	12	33	54	13
Promoting projects and outcomes of relevance to country interests	14	18	38	22	32	60	7

Data are from the following stakeholder groups: Government staff, Political & Operational FP, Agencies, Council Members, GEFSec, NGOs, STAP, SGP, Convention NFP (BD & CC)

Table 15a: Factors Potentially Helping or Hindering Access to GEF Funding

Please indicate your viewpoint concerning whether the following factors have helped or hindered country access to GEF funding under the RAF: (Select one for each row)						
Factor	A Helpful Factor (%)	A Hindering Factor (%)	Both a Helpful Factor and a Hindering Factor (%)	Neither a Helpful Factor Nor a Hindering Factor (%)	Don't know/Not sure (%)	Response Count
Country eligibility criteria for GEF funding	42	27	26	24	7	153
The GEF activity cycle	32	33	23	23	15	149
Co-financing requirements	11	52	40	19	8	151
Closeout and re-starting of the GEF pipeline	11	70	18	9	16	152
Changes in the project cycle	24	46	31	13	15	147
Use of programmatic approaches (such as PAS Coral Triangle Initiative and Sustainable Forest Management)	35	23	29	11	26	151
Direct contacts between countries and GEF Secretariat	56	20	28	12	12	153
Termination of GEF agencies corporate budget	19	39	15	10	39	152
Method of scoring global environmental benefits for climate change	21	28	25	14	38	151
Method of scoring global environmental benefits for biodiversity	25	29	24	16	31	153
Method of scoring based on country portfolio performance	18	36	26	18	25	153
Method of scoring based on country environmental policies and institutional capacity	24	31	26	17	29	150
Group allocations	14	60	18	8	21	154
Individual allocations	58	25	14	8	16	153
Floors in country allocations	28	32	17	14	29	151
Exclusions to the RAF allocation formula (for global and regional projects the Small Grants Programme and targeted supplements)	40	31	15	13	25	151
The 50% rule	13	51	14	8	24	159
Information and assistance provided to countries regarding utilization of RAF resources	51	31	21	9	16	148

Data are from the following stakeholder groups: Government staff, Political & Operational FP, Agencies, Council Members, GEFSec, NGOs, and Convention NFP (BD & CC)

Table 15b: SGP National Coordinators' View of Factors Potentially Helping or Hindering Access to GEF Funding

Please indicate your viewpoint concerning whether the following factors have helped or hindered country programme access to GEF funding under the RAF. (Select one response for each row)						
	A Helpful Factor	A Hindering Factor	Both a Helpful Factor and a Hindering Factor	Neither a Helpful Factor Nor a Hindering Factor	Don't Know/Not Sure	Response Count
The 50% rule	25%	20%	38%	5%	13%	40
Universal ceiling fund to country programmes (\$600k/year for RAF only country programmes and \$300k/year for RAF/core country programmes)	16%	39%	21%	11%	13%	38
Fund access criteria and processes decided by GEF Secretariat and Programme Steering Committee	29%	34%	22%	2%	12%	41
The process of RAF strategy development for providing SGP funds	63%	15%	5%	15%	2%	41
Government officials' presence in the National Steering Committee	69%	2%	19%	7%	2%	42
GEF Secretariat's direct communications with Operational Focal Points	62%	7%	17%	7%	7%	42
Competition among GEF implementing and executing agencies	5%	52%	12%	14%	17%	42
Guidance from the SGP Central Programme Management Team	95%	0%	2%	2%	0%	42
Information and assistance provided to countries regarding utilization of RAF resources	83%	8%	3%	3%	5%	40
Other factor(s)	45%	45%	0%	0%	9%	11

5.5 GEF Project Submission, Review and Approval

The process of submission, review and approval of proposed GEF projects is not, strictly speaking, part of the RAF, but it is closely intertwined with the allocation framework. As the data in Tables 16 and 17 show, opinions are divided regarding the quality of the initial (pre-RAF) process as well as the process after RAF implementation came into place. If we examine the sums of “somewhat good” and “very good” assessments, quality is uniformly seen to have improved, though not by much, on all three dimensions of transparency, simplicity and efficiency. At the same time, data for “somewhat poor” plus “very poor” also show declines in quality across all three dimensions. Stakeholders clearly have widely differing experiences and perceptions regarding the review process.

Table 16. Quality of Project Review Process Before the RAF

Please indicate your assessment of GEF project submission, review and approval BEFORE initiation of the RAF on the following factors: (Check one for each row)							
(A) Quality Dimension	(B) % Very Poor	(C) % Somewhat Poor	(D) % Somewhat Good	(E) % Very Good	(F) % Don't Know/Not Sure	(G) % Poor (B+C)	(H) % Good (D+E)
Transparency	15	27	30	16	11	42	46
Simplicity	22	30	26	11	11	52	37
Efficiency	20	31	27	9	12	52	36

Data are from the following stakeholder groups: Government staff, Political & Operational FP, Agencies, Council Members, GEFSec, NGOs, SGP, Convention NFP (BD & CC)

Table 17. Quality of Project Review Process After Initiation of the RAF

Please indicate your assessment of GEF project submission review and approval AFTER initiation of the RAF on the following factors: (Check one for each row)							
(A) Quality Dimension	(B) % Very poor	(C) % Somewhat poor	(D) % Somewhat good	(E) % Very good	(H) % Don't know/ Not Sure	(F) % Poor (B+C)	(G) % Good (D+E)
Transparency	20	19	35	17	10	39	51
Simplicity	20	27	27	14	12	47	41
Efficiency	21	25	27	13	14	46	40

Data are from the following stakeholder groups: Government staff, Political & Operational FP, Agencies, Council Members, GEFSec, NGOs, SGP, Convention NFP (BD & CC)

5.6 Country Ownership, Transparency, and Participation

Country drivenness is a core principle of the GEF, closely related to transparency of GEF processes and quality of participation in country decision making regarding GEF activities. As shown in Tables 18 through 20, the viewpoints on the trend in country engagement in the project cycle since initiation of the RAF are sharply contrasted, between those of GEF Focal Points and others. The FPs who responded to the survey indicated much greater country engagement under the RAF, while Agencies, Council Members and staff of the Secretariat indicated a reduction in such engagement. Note, however, that the sample sizes for the FP and participating government staff responses are too small to ensure statistical reliability of the online survey data from these stakeholder groups.

Table 18: Country Engagement in the Project Cycle: Views of Council Members and Staff of Agencies and the Secretariat

For each of the stages of the project cycle given below, please indicate the extent to which participating country governments are more or less engaged under the RAF as compared with before the RAF was implemented in 2007: (Check one for each row)			
Project Stage	Less Engaged under RAF (%)	More Engaged (%)	Don't Know/Not Sure (%)
Project identification	22	64	14
Consultations with country stakeholders	31	48	21
Review by GEF Implementing or Executing Agencies	35	46	19
Review by GEF Secretariat	22	43	35
CEO endorsement/approval	22	43	35
Project start-up	25	33	42
Implementation/ supervision	25	24	50

Table 19: Country Engagement in the Project Cycle: Views of Operational and Political Focal Points

For each of the stages of the project cycle given below, please indicate the extent to which your government has been more or less engaged under the RAF as compared with before the RAF was implemented in 2007: (Check one for each row)				
Project Stage	Response Count	Less Engaged under RAF (%)	More Engaged (%)	Don't Know/Not Sure (%)
Project identification	16	6	81	13
Consultations with country stakeholders	16	6	88	6
Review by GEF Implementing or Executing Agencies	15	7	87	7
Review by GEF Secretariat	15	13	87	0
CEO endorsement/approval	15	20	73	7
Project start-up	15	7	73	20
Implementation/ supervision	15	7	67	27

Table 20: Country Engagement in the Project Cycle: Views of Government Staff

For each of the stages of the project cycle given below, please indicate the extent to which participating country governments are more or less engaged under the RAF as compared with before the RAF was implemented in 2007: (Check one for each row)					
Project Stage	Response Count	Less Engaged	Engaged About the Same Amount	More Engaged	Don't Know/Not Sure
Project identification	18	6%	28%	61%	6%
Consultations with country stakeholders	18	11%	17%	67%	6%
Review by GEF Implementing or Executing Agencies	17	12%	35%	41%	12%
Review by GEF Secretariat	17	6%	24%	65%	6%
CEO endorsement/approval	17	6%	24%	53%	18%
Project start-up	18	6%	28%	50%	17%
Implementation/ supervision	18	17%	28%	50%	6%

Effective participation in project selection, prioritization and implementation often calls for engagement of NGOs, at international, national and/or sub-national levels, in priority setting and other activities. Tables 21 through 24 present data related to this issue, based on responses from staff of NGOs. NGO involvement in priority setting is present, but not extensive, as indicated by the fact that 31 percent of NGO respondents noted that their organization has not been involved in this activity since 2007. When NGOs are involved, the nature of their involvement may vary from case to case, but the most common form of engagement is in consultations that included various non-governmental stakeholders' representatives. While 40 percent of NGO staff reported that this involvement has increased moderately or a great deal since the RAF was initiated, a majority said that it has not increased or in fact has decreased. Finally, in recognition that the extensiveness and quality of NGO participation is likely to be the product of more than just one factor, 55 percent of respondents who observed a change in the level of participation since initiation of the RAF observed that this appeared to be due, to some extent, to the RAF itself, while others reported that the RAF has played little or no part in this change.

Table 21: NGO Involvement in Pipeline Priority Setting

Since 2007, to what extent has your organization been involved in priority setting for the RAF country pipeline and in development of GEF projects? (Check only one)		
Extent	Response Percent	Response Count
To a great extent	20	12
To a moderate extent	25	15
To only a slight extent	17	10
Not at all	31	18
Don't know	7	4
Total	100%	59

Table 22: Forms of NGO Involvement in Pipeline Priority Setting

In what way(s) have you participated in priority-setting for your country's GEF pipeline? (Check all that apply)		
Method of Participation	Response Percent	Response Count
Led or participated in consultation(s) with government representatives	21	11
Led or participated in consultation(s) that included non-governmental stakeholders (this may include NGOs, private sector representatives, etc.)	38	20
Communicated with one or more Implementing or Executing Agencies	19	10
Communicated with the GEF Secretariat	11	6
Other	11	6
Total	100%	53

Table 23: Increase or Decrease in NGO involvement in Priority Setting Since Initiation of the RAF

Has this involvement increased or decreased since initiation of the RAF? (Check only one)		
Extent of Increase or Decrease	Response Percent	Response Count
Increased a great deal	7	4
Increased moderately	33	20
Has neither increased nor decreased	35	21
Decreased moderately	8	5
Decreased a great deal	5	3
Don't know	12	7
Total	100%	60

Table 24: RAF as a Cause of Change in NGO Role in Prioritization

If you indicated a change in your organization's involvement in prioritization of the country pipeline, to what extent would you say this change is due to the RAF's design or implementation, as compared to other factors? (Check only one)		
Due to the RAF?	Response Percent	Response Count
Not due to the RAF at all	15	8
Due to the RAF in small part	40	21
Mostly due to the RAF	15	8
Completely due to the RAF	3.	2
Don't Know	25	13
Total	100%	52

Finally, we asked staff of NGOs about the levels of support their organizations have received from various other sources in connection with implementation of the RAF(see Table 25). Note that this is not intended as a measure of the quality of overall support received from other organizations, but instead of the levels of support for involvement of the respondent's organization in implementation of the RAF. The sample of NGO respondent generally displayed considerable variation of opinion regarding such support from country governments, GEF entities, other NGOs, and so on. Of particular note is that GEF Agencies are identified as the group of organizations with the largest percentages of response indicating support to NGOs to a moderate to great extent.

Table 25. NGO Perceptions of Sources of Support

In general, to what extent have the following organizations or individuals supported your organization's involvement in implementation of the RAF? (Check one for each row)					
Organizations or Individuals	Not at all (%)	To a slight extent (%)	To a moderate extent (%)	To a great extent (%)	Don't Know/ Not Sure (%)
GEF Agencies	20	15	33	18	13
Country governments	22	27	19	24	8
GEF Operational Focal Point	19	25	19	29	8
GEF Political Focal Point	32	18	18	15	17
The GEF Secretariat	27	15	22	20	17
Other NGOs	22	19	29	12	17
Other organizations (please specify)	30	7	13	3	47

5.7 Knowledge Sharing

One of the key factors behind the quality of transparency and participation in GEF processes, including the RAF, is the level of sufficiency of relevant information provided to stakeholders. Tables 26 and 27 provide data on this matter based on responses from NGO staff as well as the STAP panel and roster. The NGO staff were somewhat less satisfied with the information provided them than were the STAP personnel. For the NGO respondents, project and country eligibility were the relatively strong areas for which a majority identified information as sufficient. With the STAP panel and roster, on the other hand, information in all topic areas except for (a) ratings and indices, and (b) status of the project pipeline were given majorities as sufficient.

Table 26: Sufficiency of Information Provided to NGO Staff

To what extent has information concerning the following topics been sufficient for your needs in working with GEF activities under the RAF? (Check one for each row)				
Topic Area	Insufficient (%)	Sufficient (%)	Don't Know/ Not Sure (%)	Response Count
Project eligibility	25	58	17	59
Country eligibility	20	61	19	59
GEF Benefits Index & GEF Performance Index and country ratings	32	42	25	59
Actual funding allocations	47	37	15	59
Status of the project pipeline (approvals, etc.)	40	43	17	58
GEF policies and procedures	38	47	16	58

Table 27: Sufficiency of Information Provided to STAP Panel and Roster

To what extent has information concerning the following topics been sufficient for your needs in working with GEF activities under the RAF? (Select one for each row)				
Topic Area	Response Count	Insufficient (%)	Sufficient (%)	Don't Know/ Not Sure (%)
Project eligibility	52	23	65	12
Country eligibility	52	17	67	15
Ratings and indices	52	31	44	25
Actual funding allocations	51	25	55	20
Status of the project pipeline (approvals, etc.)	52	35	50	15
GEF policies and procedures	52	31	58	12

6. RAF STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES

6.1 Possible Strengths and Weaknesses

Participants in the online survey were given two series of statements regarding major possible strengths and weaknesses of RAF design or implementation, and were asked to indicate the extent to which they found each statement true. Regarding possible strengths, statements with majorities finding them mostly or completely true include that the RAF:

- May strengthen country roles in portfolio planning;
- May strengthen predictability of funding;
- May provide increased transparency in resource allocation; and
- May empower countries in negotiating with GEF implementing or executing agencies (see Table 28).

Table 28: Strengths of the RAF

Please indicate the extent to which the following possible areas of strength are true so far in application of the Resource Allocation Framework:							
(A) Possible Strength	(B) Completely Untrue (%) (n)	(C) Mostly untrue (%) (n)	(D) Mostly true (%) (n)	(E) Completely true (%) (n)	Untrue (B+C) (%) (n)	True (D+E) (%) (n)	Don't Know (%) (n)
May strengthen country roles in portfolio planning	6% (15)	19% (50)	49% (129)	14% (36)	25% (65)	63% (165)	13% (34)
May provide increased transparency in resource allocation	9% (23)	25% (65)	44% (115)	8% (21)	34% (88)	52% (136)	14% (37)
May support equity among countries in access to GEF funding	18% (41)	30% (66)	28% (62)	7% (15)	48% (107)	35% (77)	17% (38)
May strengthen predictability of funding	8% (22)	14% (36)	45% (119)	18% (48)	22% (58)	63% (167)	14% (38)
May strengthen incentives to countries to perform	10% (25)	28% (74)	39% (103)	10% (26)	38% (99)	49% (129)	13% (35)
May empower countries in negotiating with GEF implementing or executing agencies	8% (22)	24% (63)	38% (99)	16% (41)	32% (85)	53% (140)	15% (39)
May enhance the external image of GEF as a performance-oriented organization	17% (45)	21% (54)	32% (85)	10% (26)	38% (99)	42% (111)	20% (53)

Groups Included: Political & Operational FP, Agencies, Council Members, GEFSec, NGOs, Convention NFP (BD & CC), STAP, Government Staff, SGP

A free-response item was included in the survey regarding possible strengths of the RAF. Thirty-nine responses were given by stakeholders, although many of these were in substance comments about RAF weaknesses or problems. Comments about RAF strengths included:

- "May enhance the synergy among focal areas...may encourage the development of country GEF strategy that may in turn lead to better implementation of national environmental action plans and Conventions."
- "GEF mostly has the right intentions in trying to introduce GEF PAS but it has not done thorough groundwork before deciding on implementing this programme."
- "It puts the onus on countries to take on the responsibility to program GEF resources, thus decreasing dependency. They can not complain anymore as the ball is in their court from the start of each GEF phase. Thus, you have countries that, by the start of the 3rd year of GEF-4, and once the 50% rule is no longer in play, who will have programmed all of their resources, and others who have programmed hardly anything. This will be a very revealing statistic."
- "RAF may empower governments in negotiating with implementing or executing agencies. But it does also weaken the implementing or executing agencies vis-a-vis governments. It may also enhance interactions between government and SGP. However, it makes SGP more vulnerable to political influences."
- "May enhance interactions between government agencies and civil society stakeholders."
- "Strategically and constructively aligning interventions, at the local, national, sub-regional, regional and global levels, GEF RAF policy-anchored strategies, obligations, priorities, responsibilities and practices, to be or are being implemented by the Government, private sector and the civil society (via GEF SGP) with a view towards collectively and symbiotically attaining and sustaining global environmental benefits, while also fostering the incremental costs of sustainable development for the

GEF MSPs and GEF FSPs, and nurturing the sustainable livelihoods of the marginalized, disadvantaged and impoverished communities for the GEF SGPs."

- "May encourage countries to develop national criteria in endorsing biodiversity GEF proposal."
- "...[T]he allocation amount within RAF for some specific countries is clear from the beginning - better possibility for allocation strategies per country"

Regarding possible weaknesses of the RAF, majorities of respondents found several statements to be true or mostly true (see Tables 29a and 29b). This included that the RAF:

- Allocations among countries may not be fair;
- Allocation formulas may not be based on "best available" practice;
- May disadvantage some or all group allocation countries;
- Process of awarding country allocations may not be sufficiently transparent;
- Country allocations may be so small that they discourage development of project proposals;
- May place stress on the design quality of GEF projects; and
- May encourage delays in project development and approval.

Table 29a: Weaknesses of the RAF

Please indicate the extent to which the following possible areas of weakness have been shown to be true so far in application of the Resource Allocation Framework.							
(A) Possible Weakness	(B) Completely untrue (%) (n)	(C) Mostly untrue (%) (n)	(D) Mostly true (%) (n)	(E) Completely true (%) (n)	Untrue (B+C) (%) (n)	True (D+E) (%) (n)	Don't Know (%) (n)
Allocations among countries may not be fair	2% (6)	19% (54)	39% (110)	20% (58)	21% (60)	59% (168)	19% (55)
Allocation formulas may not be based on "best available" practice	2% (5)	16% (45)	41% (116)	22% (61)	18% (50)	63% (177)	20% (55)
May disadvantage some or all group allocation countries	2% (5)	13% (32)	39% (93)	26% (61)	15% (37)	64% (154)	20% (48)
May disadvantage some or all individual allocation countries	7% (16)	22% (53)	35% (84)	15% (35)	29% (69)	50% (119)	21% (51)
Process of awarding country allocations may not be sufficiently transparent	5% (13)	20% (56)	37% (104)	22% (62)	25% (69)	59% (166)	16% (46)
Country allocations may be so small that they discourage development of project proposals	2% (4)	15% (36)	37% (88)	34% (83)	17% (40)	71% (171)	12% (30)
May place stress on the design quality of GEF projects	4% (9)	19% (45)	38% (90)	22% (53)	23% (54)	60% (143)	17% (41)
May encourage delays in project development and approval	5% (15)	25% (71)	31% (86)	25% (70)	31% (86)	56% (156)	14% (39)

Groups Included: Political & Operational FP, Agencies, Council Members, GEFSec, NGOs, Convention NFP (BD & CC), STAP, Government Staff, SGP

Table 29b: SGP National Coordinators' View of the Weaknesses of the RAF

Please indicate the extent to which the following possible areas of weakness have been shown to be true, so far, in application of the Resource Allocation Framework. (Check one option for each row)				
	% Untrue	% True	% Don't Know/ Not sure	Response Count
Allocations among countries may not be fair	14%	62%	24%	42
Allocations among countries may not be based on "best available" practice	12%	64%	24%	42
Group allocation countries are disadvantaged as they cannot give RAF funding to SGP from group allocation	5%	80%	15%	41
Process of awarding allocations may not be sufficiently transparent	27%	54%	20%	41
Universal fund ceiling to country programmes (\$600k/year for RAF only country programmes and \$300k/year for RAF/core country programmes) may lead to loss of efficiency and flexibility of SGP	17%	76%	7%	42
May encourage delays in project approval	34%	54%	12%	41
May shift decision making power in favor of the GEF Secretariat	20%	58%	23%	40
SGP's 'neutral' role may be weakened due to strong government influence on RAF allocation	29%	69%	2%	42
The long process of negotiation for small amounts of funds may reduce SGP efficiency as whole	7%	90%	2%	42

Stakeholders provided 67 responses to an open-ended question regarding possible weaknesses in the RAF. A sample of these responses is below, followed by a tabular summary.

- "[O]n the whole, country allocations seem to "drain" funds from the program overall and may not contribute to the "best" overall portfolio."
- "The RAF had commenced before the countries were ready to start implementing it."
- "There needs to be a decision-tree process for applying for funds. In other words applicants should be told as they complete the application whether they are eligible..."

Table 30: Areas of Weaknesses in the RAF¹⁰

Key Weaknesses
Limited Country Allocation post-RAF • Allocations seen as arbitrary, lack of transparency in allocation process • Allocations too small for countries to propose effective programs
Reduced Regional and Global projects • Lack of incentives for regional/global cooperation and projects
Group Allocation Countries at a Disadvantage • Lack of attention from Agencies • Group allocation countries too restricted
Issues with RAF Indices • High terrestrial biodiversity weighting puts SIDS at a disadvantage • Weight of performance too small to make a difference
Reduced Country Ownership/Drivenness • Decreases country-drivenness and country ownership • Pressure to submit GEF-oriented projects, less country-relevant projects
Shifts in Roles • Too much power given to GEFSec • Doesn't empower countries, it empowers GEF focal points too much

¹⁰ As identified in online free responses by GEF stakeholders.

Long Project Submission and Approval Process

- Too many steps; inefficient; time-consuming submission process; not streamlined
- Less ‘predictability’ of funding
- Lack of transparency in submission and approval process
- Lack of clarity in terms of Council decisions
- Countries can’t keep up with rules; too complex
- Not enough capacity at country-level to implement and keep up with RAF rules

6.2 Costs and Benefits of the RAF

To gain knowledge of stakeholders’ overall perceptions of the value of the RAF, the MTR team included an item in the survey that requested respondents to indicate their views of the relationship between costs and benefits of the Framework. Somewhat more than one-fourth of stakeholders (27 percent) answered “Don’t Know/ Not Sure,” but 44 percent indicated that the RAF’s costs moderately or significantly outweigh its benefits.

Table 31: RAF Costs and Benefits

How would you describe the relationship between the RAF’s costs and benefits? (Check only one)		
Cost-Benefit Relationship	Response Percent	Response Count
Costs significantly outweigh benefits	28	66
Costs moderately outweigh benefits	16	39
Costs are about equal in value to benefits	10	24
Benefits moderately outweigh costs	12	28
Benefits significantly outweigh costs	7	17
Don’t Know/ Not Sure	27	64
Total	100%	238

Groups Included: Government staff, Political & Operational FP, Agencies, Council Members, GEFSec, NGOs, STAP, SGP

7. SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT OF THE RAF

The survey concluded with an open-response item soliciting suggestions for how the RAF might be improved in the future. One hundred fifty-five responses were received. Some sample responses are given below, followed by a tabular summary of the responses.

Transparency and knowledge sharing:

- "Make a set of clear rules, make them known and respect the rules, do not change them during the process."
- "There has to be far more transparency in the decision making process, Countries have to be trained properly, through well designed training material and information materials (possibly through the Global Support Programme) on what the RAF means for them. This has to be done in the 6 UN languages and not just in English. The cost of doing something like this will far outweigh the benefits especially for GEF V."
- "Need for training workshop on RAF."
- "Create a bar chart on the GEF website that is updated every day that shows how much each country has programmed against its allocation."

Basis of allocations:

- "Should be based more on the quality of the projects proposed..."

Country Ownership:

- "To have a national commission for RAF with all Focal Points, SGP and CONAGEBIO, have help to strengthen government role in portfolio planning, coordination among projects and transparency on grant allocation."

SIDS:

- "The formula used to decided how much funding a SIDS may get does not take into consideration the vulnerability of these countries to climate change, as well as the other limiting characteristics of these countries. Vulnerability is therefore very critical for SIDS when the RAF allocations are reviewed."

SGP:

- "Keep apart money for the SGP; it is successful and encourages good practices at ground level."
- "More flexibility in terms of the ceiling of allocated amount for SGP."
- "Countries in group RAF should be allowed to allocate funds to SGP just like in individual RAF countries. Since the target for GEF funding is the people and environment, the same could be done through SGP. The lessons learnt through SGP programmes that were allocated RAF should provide the basis for such an initiative. Alternatively, countries in group RAF could be allocated more funds from core resources."

Return to pre-RAF system:

- "This reviewer would suggest that the weaknesses of the RAF outweigh the benefits, and would recommend discontinuation of the program in favor of open competition among countries/regions for project funding."

Table 32: Suggested Areas of Improvement in the RAF

Summary of Key Suggested Improvements	
Eliminate the 50% rule	• Rule is a hindering factor to pursuing RAF funds • Provide a clear allocation for a full 4 year GEF period
Disseminate More Information on the RAF	• Need for training workshop/information on RAF for stakeholders • Establish a national commission or steering committee for RAF • GEF should provide up-to-date information for countries showing how much each country has programmed against its allocation • Improve communications/protocol from GEF to countries in a timely manner, and keep it consistent
Expand RAF to other Focal Areas	
Increase Country-Drivenness	• GEF CEO should provide more independence to governments regarding choice of priority projects under the RAF • Decentralize the decision-making process currently concentrated at GEF-level
Remove the Group Allocation	• Give each country individual allocation
Adjust the RAF Indices	• Make GEB calculations transparent • Marine and terrestrial biodiversity should be equally weighted • Reassess how indices were formulated and make them fairer
Eliminate the Pool of Resources for Global and Regional Projects	
Increase Regional Cooperation	• Create incentives for transboundary cooperation (for example, use regional initiatives such as the NEPAD)
Increase Transparency	

Summary of Key Suggested Improvements
- Incorporate into RAF calculations the extent to which countries have accessed GEF funding previously, and how successful they have been in producing GEB - Indicators for allocations should be open and accessible for all countries
Increase Sensitivity to SIDS
SIDS are a special case, and should be given special treatment under RAF
Increase Access to Resources by the SGP
- Group allocation countries should be allowed to allocate funds to SGP like individual allocation countries - Flexibility in terms of allocated amount ceiling for SGP
Increase Flexibility
- More flexibility for countries to determine how their allocations may be used - Countries with good performance in utilizing GEF funds should have an opportunity to increase their allocations - Allow countries in the group to combine RAF resources from climate change and biodiversity and others into a national GEF programme, rather than going for individual MSPs which are ineffective and costly to manage - Resources not used by countries should not be returned but allocated to other countries
Make Project Cycle Quicker
Streamline the project cycle
Eliminate the RAF Altogether
Approximately 15 out of 155 responses to this item recommended abolishing the RAF entirely. An additional five responses suggested a return to the pre-RAF process.

8. RESPONSES TO QUESTIONNAIRE FOR GEF FOCAL POINTS

As we noted in Sections 1 and 2, a paper questionnaire survey was administered to GEF Operational and Political Focal Points attending four sub-regional workshops. The quantitative data collected through these surveys are displayed below. Generally speaking, the respondents to this survey were relatively more positive concerning RAF design and implementation than were other stakeholder groups.

Bringing transparency to the allocation process across the biodiversity and climate change focal areas						
% Highly effective	% Moderately effective	% Effective	% Moderately ineffective	% Highly ineffective	% Not effective	% Don't know
9% (7)	36% (27)	37% (28)	4% (27)	3% (2)	4% (3)	8% (6)

Potentially increasing achievement of global environment benefits in the biodiversity and climate change focal areas						
% Highly effective	% Moderately effective	% Effective	% Moderately ineffective	% Highly ineffective	% Not effective	% Don't know
5% (4)	32% (25)	34% (26)	12% (9)	1% (1)	4% (3)	12% (9)

Rewarding country and/or project performance in the biodiversity and climate change portfolios						
% Highly effective	% Moderately effective	% Effective	% Moderately ineffective	% Highly ineffective	% Not effective	% Don't know
5% (4)	31% (24)	27% (21)	13% (1)	1% (1)	10% (8)	12% (9)

Fairly rewarding your country's potential to achieve global environment benefits in the following: Biodiversity						
% Highly effective	% Moderately effective	% Effective	% Moderately ineffective	% Highly ineffective	% Not effective	% Don't know
7% (5)	37% (28)	29% (22)	11% (8)	0% (0)	9% (7)	7% (5)

Fairly rewarding your country's potential to achieve global environment benefits in the following: Climate Change						
% Highly effective	% Moderately effective	% Effective	% Moderately ineffective	% Highly ineffective	% Not effective	% Don't know
9% (6)	29% (20)	33% (23)	11% (8)	0% (0)	11% (8)	7% (5)

Fairly rewarding your country's potential to achieve global environment benefits in the following: Marine Terrestrial						
% Highly effective	% Moderately effective	% Effective	% Moderately ineffective	% Highly ineffective	% Not effective	% Don't know
5% (3)	34% (21)	21% (13)	10% (6)	2% (1)	16% (10)	13% (8)

Promoting projects and outcomes of relevance to country interests						
% Highly effective	% Moderately effective	% Effective	% Moderately ineffective	% Highly ineffective	% Not effective	% Don't know
12% (8)	28% (19)	33% (22)	16% (11)	1% (1)	7% (5)	1% (1)

Ensuring public involvement / participation						
% Highly effective	% Moderately effective	% Effective	% Moderately ineffective	% Highly ineffective	% Not effective	% Don't know
18% (14)	36% (28)	29% (22)	5% (4)	3% (2)	4% (3)	5% (4)

Encouraging improved (comprehensive) national development plans						
% Highly effective	% Moderately effective	% Effective	% Moderately ineffective	% Highly ineffective	% Not effective	% Don't know
7% (6)	29% (25)	33% (5)	9% (22)	3% (6)	8% (7)	11% (2)

Encouraging strategic planning with other countries to define the scope of regional programmes within country portfolios						
% Highly effective	% Moderately effective	% Effective	% Moderately ineffective	% Highly ineffective	% Not effective	% Don't know
5% (4)	30% (22)	23% (17)	14% (10)	4% (3)	10% (7)	14% (10)

Increasing donor harmonization at the country level						
% Highly effective	% Moderately effective	% Effective	% Moderately ineffective	% Highly ineffective	% Not effective	% Don't know
7% (5)	26% (19)	27% (20)	11% (8)	4% (3)	10% (7)	15% (11)

Promoting catalytic effects and leveraging financing						
% Highly effective	% Moderately effective	% Effective	% Moderately ineffective	% Highly ineffective	% Not effective	% Don't know
8% (6)	37% (27)	21% (15)	10% (7)	1% (1)	5% (4)	18% (13)

Please select the effect of the RAF on your country's pipeline:							
No Change	Cut existing proposals	Reformulated existing proposals	Developed new proposals	Developed regional proposals	Revised entirely	Don't Know	Other
17.02% (16)	18.09% (17)	21.28% (20)	24.47% (23)	5.32% (5)	4.26% (4)	5.32% (5)	4.26% (4)

ANNEX A: ORIGINAL SURVEY QUESTIONS

A.1 Online Questions

Mid-Term Review of the GEF RAF

KNOWLEDGE OF THE RAF

Q1. Have you had experience or involvement with the GEF Resource Allocation Framework (RAF)? (Select one)

Answer Options
Yes (Please proceed to the next question)
No (Please note that this survey is intended only for those with experience with the RAF)

Q2. Have you had experience or involvement with GEF projects at any time over last 2 to 3 years? (Select one)

Answer Options
Yes (Please proceed to the next question)
No (Please note that this survey is intended only for those with experience with recent experience with GEF projects)

Q3. From the following categories, how would you primarily identify yourself for this survey concerning the RAF?
(Please select just one category)

Answer Options
GEF Council Member or Alternate
GEF Operational or Political Focal Point (current or former)
The GEF Implementing Agencies (UNDP, UNEP, IBRD) staff
The GEF Executing Agencies (AfDB, AsDB, EBRD, IADB, FAD, FAO, UNIDO) staff
National government
Provincial/state or local government
Convention National Focal Point
Convention Secretariat
GEF Secretariat
International NGO
National/local NGO
Private sector
International donor country office
Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel (STAP) or STAP Roster
Other (please specify)

Q4. From the following categories, how would you primarily identify yourself for this survey concerning the RAF?
(Please select just one category, Government Staff only)

Answer Options
National government
Provincial/state or local government
Other (please specify below)

Q5. From the following categories, how would you primarily identify yourself for this survey concerning the RAF?
(Please select just one category, NGOs only)

Answer Options
International NGO
National/local NGO
Private sector
Comments

RAF IMPLEMENTATION

Q6. Based on your experience and knowledge, what has been the overall effect of the following elements of the RAF on GEF programming and delivery? (Check one for each row)

Answer Options	Very negative	Somewhat negative	Neither negative nor positive	Somewhat positive	Very positive	Don't Know/Not Sure
The 50% rule						
The group allocations						
The individual allocations						
Allocations to global and regional projects						

Comments

Q7. In general, how has the RAF affected the roles and contribution of the following groups towards GEF objectives? (Check one for each row)

Answer Options	Very negatively	Somewhat negatively	Somewhat positively	Very positively	Don't Know/Not Sure
The GEF Council					
The GEF Secretariat					
The STAP					
The GEF Trustee					
The GEF Implementing Agencies (UNDP, UNEP, IBRD)					
The GEF Executing Agencies (AfDB, AsDB, EBRD, IADB, FAD, FAO, UNIDO)					
Country Operational Focal Points					
International NGOs					
Project execution partners					
National or local NGOs					
Private sector organizations					

Comments

Q8. How successful has the RAF been in...

Answer Options	Very Unsuccessful	Moderately Unsuccessful	Moderately Successful	Very Successful	Don't Know/Not Sure
Making its "rules of the game" available to GEF stakeholders in a transparent and accessible way?					
Rewarding countries based on their performance in biodiversity and climate change portfolios?					
Potentially increasing achievement of global environment benefits through GEF funding?					
Encouraging global and regional projects?					
Encouraging programmatic approaches?					
Promoting projects and outcomes of relevance to country interests					
Supporting public involvement/participation?					
Increasing donor harmonization at the country level?					
Promoting catalytic effects?					
Promoting leveraging in financing?					

Comments

Q9. For each of the stages of the project cycle given below, please indicate the extent to which participating country governments are more or less engaged under the RAF as compared with before the RAF was implemented in 2007: (Check one for each row, Master survey, OFP/PFP, Government Staff only)

Answer Options	Much Less Engaged under RAF	Somewhat Less Engaged	Somewhat More Engaged	Much More Engaged	Don't Know/Not Sure
Project identification					
Consultations with country stakeholders					
Review by GEF Implementing or Executing Agencies					
Review by GEF Secretariat					
CEO endorsement/approval					
Project start-up					
Implementation/ supervision					

Q10. Please indicate your assessment of GEF project submission, review and approval BEFORE initiation of the RAF on the following factors: (Check one for each row)

Answer Options	Very Poor	Somewhat Poor	Somewhat Good	Very Good	Don't Know/Not Sure
Transparency					
Simplicity					
Efficiency					

Q11. Please indicate your assessment of GEF project submission, review and approval AFTER initiation of the RAF on the following factors: (Check one for each row)

Answer Options	Very Poor	Somewhat Poor	Somewhat Good	Very Good	Don't Know/Not Sure
Transparency					
Simplicity					
Efficiency					

Q12. Please indicate your viewpoint concerning whether the following factors have helped or hindered country access to GEF funding under the RAF. (Select one response for each row)

Answer Options	A Helpful Factor	A Hindering Factor	Both a Helpful Factor and a Hindering Factor	Neither a Helpful Factor Nor a Hindering Factor	Don't Know/Not Sure
Country eligibility criteria for GEF funding					
The GEF activity cycle					
Co-financing requirements					
Closeout and re-starting of the GEF pipeline					
Changes in the project cycle					
Use of programmatic approaches (such as Coral Triangle Initiative and Sustainable Forest Management)					
Direct contacts between countries and GEF Secretariat					
Termination of GEF agencies corporate budget					
Method of scoring global environmental benefits for climate change					
Method of scoring global environmental benefits for biodiversity					
Method of scoring based on country portfolio performance					
Method of scoring based on country environmental policies and institutional capacity					

Q12. Please indicate your viewpoint concerning whether the following factors have helped or hindered country access to GEF funding under the RAF. (Select one response for each row)

Answer Options	A Helpful Factor	A Hindering Factor	Both a Helpful Factor and a Hindering Factor	Neither a Helpful Factor Nor a Hindering Factor	Don't Know/Not Sure
Group allocations					
Individual allocations					
Floors in country allocations					
Exclusions to the RAF allocation formula (for global and regional projects, the Small Grants Programme and targeted supplements)					
The 50% rule					
Information and assistance provided to countries regarding utilization of RAF resources					
Other factor(s): (please specify below)					

Comments

Q13. In what ways has the RAF affected the funding of: (Check one for each row)

Answer Options	Very negatively	Somewhat negatively	Not at all	Somewhat positively	Very positively	Don't Know/Not Sure
Enabling activities						
Global and regional projects						
The Small Grants Programme						
Least Developed Countries						
Small Island Development States						
NGOs and civil society						
Medium-Size Projects						
Full-Sized Projects						
Climate Change Projects						
Biodiversity Projects						
Projects in focal areas other than CC and BD						

Q14. What effect(s) has the RAF had on proposals to the GEF for the country program (s) you have been most involved with? (Check all situations that apply)

Answer Options	Individual Allocation Countries	Group Allocation Countries
No Change		
Existing proposals have been cut		
Existing proposals have been reformulated in design or approach		
New proposals have been developed		
Regional or global proposals have been developed		
The pipeline has been revised entirely		
Don't know		
Other (please specify below)		

Comments

Q15. How would you describe the relationship between the RAF's costs and benefits? (Check only one)

Answer Options
Costs significantly outweigh benefits
Costs moderately outweigh benefits
Costs are about equal in value to benefits
Benefits moderately outweigh costs
Benefits significantly outweigh costs
Don't Know/ Not Sure

Q16. In what way(s) have you participated in priority-setting for your country's GEF pipeline? (Check all that apply, NGOs, Government Staff only)

Answer Options
Led or participated in consultation(s) with government representatives
Led or participated in consultation(s) that included non-governmental stakeholders (this may include NGOs, private sector representatives, etc.)
Communicated with one or more Implementing or Executing Agencies
Communicated with the GEF Secretariat
Other (please specify)

Q17. What effect(s) has the RAF had on proposals to the GEF for the country program (s) you have been most involved with? (Check all situations that apply, NGOs, Government Staff only)

Answer Options	Individual Allocation Countries	Group Allocation Countries
No Change		
Existing proposals have been cut		
Existing proposals have been reformulated		
New proposals have been developed		
Regional proposals have been developed		
The pipeline has been revised entirely		
Don't know		
Other (please specify)		

Q18. To what extent has information concerning the following topics been sufficient for your needs in working with GEF activities under the RAF? (Check one for each row, NGOs, STAP, Convention BD & CC only)

Answer Options	Very Insufficient	Moderately Insufficient	Moderately Sufficient	Very Sufficient	Don't Know/ Not Sure
Project eligibility					
Country eligibility					
GEF Benefits Index & GEF Performance Index and country ratings					
Actual funding allocations					
Status of the project pipeline (approvals, etc.)					
GEF policies and procedures					

Q19. In general, to what extent have the following organizations or individuals supported your organization's involvement in implementation of the RAF? (Check one for each row, NGOs only)

Answer Options	Not at all	To a slight extent	To a moderate extent	To a great extent	Don't Know/Not Sure
GEF Agencies					
Country governments					
GEF Operational Focal Point					
GEF Political Focal Point					
The GEF Secretariat					
Other NGOs					
Other organizations (please specify below)					

Q20. To what extent has the role of your organization in the preparation/implementation of GEF projects improved or worsened since initiation of the RAF? (Check only one, NGOs only)

Answer Options

Improved A Great Deal
Improved Moderately
Stayed About The Same
Worsened Moderately
Worsened A Great Deal
Don't Know/Not Sure

Q21. To what extent is the change you reported in the previous question due to the RAF's design or implementation, as compared to other factors? (Check only one, NGOs only)

Answer Options
Not due to the RAF at all
Due to the RAF in small part
Mostly due to the RAF
Completely due to the RAF
Don't Know

Q22. Since 2007, to what extent has your organization been involved in priority setting for the RAF country pipeline and in development of GEF projects? (Check only one, NGOs only)

Answer Options
To a great extent
To a moderate extent
To only a slight extent
Not at all
Don't know

Q23. Has this involvement increased or decreased since initiation of the RAF? (Check only one, NGOs only)

Answer Options
Increased a great deal
Increased moderately
Has neither increased nor decreased
Decreased moderately
Decreased a great deal
Don't know

Q24. If you indicated a change in your organization's involvement in prioritization of the country pipeline, to what extent would you say this change is due to the RAF's design or implementation, as compared to other factors? (Check only one, NGOs only)

Answer Options
Not due to the RAF at all
Due to the RAF in small part
Mostly due to the RAF
Completely due to the RAF
Don't Know

Q25. How has the RAF affected your country's capacity to meet requirements of the Convention? (Select one, Convention NFP (BD & CC) only)

Answer Options	
Very negatively	
Somewhat negatively	
Neither negatively nor positively	

Somewhat positively	
Very positively	
Don't Know/Not Sure	

Q26. How have requirements of the Convention influenced your country's capacity to implement the RAF? (Select one, Convention NFP (BD & CC) only)

Answer Options	
Very negatively	
Somewhat negatively	
Neither negatively nor positively	
Somewhat positively	
Very positively	
Don't Know/Not Sure	

Q27. How has the RAF affected parties' fulfillment of their obligations under the Convention? (Select one, Convention NFP (BD & CC) only)

Answer Options	
Very negatively	
Somewhat negatively	
Neither negatively nor positively	
Somewhat positively	
Very positively	
Don't Know/Not Sure	

Q28. To what extent has your role in the preparation/implementation of GEF projects improved or worsened since initiation of the RAF? (Check only one, Convention NFP (BD & CC) only)

Answer Options	
Improved A Great Deal	
Improved Moderately	
Stayed About The Same	
Worsened Moderately	
Worsened A Great Deal	
Don't Know/Not Sure	

Q29. To what extent is the status you reported in the previous question due to the RAF's design or implementation, as compared to other factors? (Check only one, Convention NFP (BD & CC) only)

Answer Options	
Not due to the RAF at all	
Due to the RAF in small part	
Mostly due to the RAF	
Completely due to the RAF	
Don't Know	

Q30. How challenging are the following factors faced by you, as a Focal Point, in implementing the RAF? (Check one for each row, OFP/PFP only)					
Answer Options	Not challenging at all	Somewhat challenging	Moderately challenging	Very challenging	Don't Know/Not Sure
Limited institutional memory (for example, due to FP personnel change)					
Limited institutional capacity of					

government institutions					
Limited time to work on GEF activities					
Limited authority (institutional support)					
Limited information on GEF policies and procedures					
Limited financial or staff resources in my organization					
Other (please specify below)					

Q31. How much time do you give to each of the following activities under the RAF (that is, since 2007)? (Check one for each row, OFP/PFP only)					
Answer Options	No time at all	A small amount of time	A moderate amount of time	A great deal of time	Don't Know/ Not Sure
National priority-setting for allocation of funds					
Facilitating consultations/awareness					
Proposal endorsement					
Report writing					
Consulting with GEFSEC					
Consulting with GEF Agencies					
Other (please specify below)					

Q32. To what extent has the RAF provided meaningful incentives for your country to perform better in each of the following areas? (Check one for each row, OFP/PFP, Government Staff only)					
Answer Options	Not at all	To a slight extent	To a modest extent	To a great extent	Don't Know/ Not Sure
GEF country portfolio performance					
Environmental policy and institutions					
Broader institutional framework (quality of public administration, etc.)					

RAF DESIGN

Q33. To what extent does the RAF provide effective incentives for INDIVIDUAL ALLOCATION countries to improve their performance over time? (Select one. Note that in this case "performance" refers to a country's capacity, policies and practices relevant to successful implementation of GEF programs and projects.)

Answer Options
To a great extent
To a moderate extent
To a slight extent
Not at all
Don't know/Not sure

Q34. To what extent does the RAF provide effective incentives for GROUP ALLOCATION countries to improve their performance over time? (Select one)

Answer Options
To a great extent
To a moderate extent
To a slight extent

Not at all
Don't know/Not sure

Q35. To what extent has the RAF increased opportunities for synergies between climate change and biodiversity work, or with other focal areas? (Select one)

Answer Options
To a great extent
To a moderate extent
To a slight extent
Not at all
Don't know/Not sure

WEAKNESSES OF THE RAF

Q36. Please indicate the extent to which the following possible areas of weakness have been shown to be true, so far, in application of the Resource Allocation Framework. (Check one option for each item)

Answer Options	Completely untrue	Mostly untrue	Mostly true	Completely true	Don't Know/ Not Sure
Allocations among countries may not be fair					
Allocation formulas may not be based on "best available" practice					
May disadvantage some or all group allocation countries					
May disadvantage some or all individual allocation countries					
Process of awarding country allocations may not be sufficiently transparent					
May pressure countries to spend allocations when they may not be fully prepared to do so					
Country allocations may be so small that they discourage development of project proposals					
May place stress on the design quality of GEF projects					
May weaken the role of the GEF Council					
May encourage delays in project development and approval					
May shift project decision making power in favor of the GEF Secretariat					

Q37. What other important factors you would like to identify that may be areas of weakness in the RAF? (Please use the space below briefly to describe these)

Q38. Please indicate the extent to which the following possible areas of strength are true, so far, in application of the Resource Allocation Framework. (Check one option for each item)

Answer Options	Completely untrue	Mostly untrue	Mostly true	Completely true	Don't Know/ Not Sure
May strengthen country roles in portfolio planning					
May provide increased transparency in resource allocation					
May support equity among countries in access to GEF funding					
May strengthen predictability of funding					
May strengthen incentives to countries to perform					
May empower countries in negotiating with GEF implementing or executing agencies					
May enhance the external image of GEF as a performance-oriented organization					

STRENGTHS OF THE RAF

Q39. What other important factors you would like to identify that may be areas of strength in the RAF? (Please use the space below briefly to describe these)

OPEN INPUT

Q40. What are your suggestions about how the RAF could be improved?

Q41. Is there anything else you would like to comment on?

EXPERIENCE WITH THE GEF

Q42. In which region(s) have you been involved with GEF activities? (Check all that apply)

Answer Options
Africa (including North Africa)
Asia (including Western Asia and Pacific islands)
Eastern Europe and Central Asia
Latin America and the Caribbean
Global

Q43. In which GEF Focal Area(s) have you been actively involved? (Select all that apply, No NGOs, Convention NFP (BD & CC), SGP)

Answer Options
Biodiversity
Climate Change
International Waters
Ozone Depletion
Land Degradation
Persistent Organic Pollutants

Q44. Please identify the periods during which you have had experience with the GEF. (Check all that apply, No STAP)

Answer Options
GEF before 2003
GEF Phase 3 (2003-2006)
GEF Phase 4 (2007- present)

BACKGROUND INFO

Q45. What type of RAF allocation does your country currently have in the Climate Change focal area? (Please select one, Convention NFP (BD & CC), OFP/PFP)

Answer Options	
Group allocation	
Individual allocation	
Don't know/ Not sure	

Q46. What type of RAF allocation does your country currently have in the Biodiversity focal area? (Select one, Convention NFP (BD & CC), OFP/PFP)

Answer Options	
Group allocation	
Individual allocation	
Don't know/ Not sure	

Q.48 What is your country programme's status in terms of access to RAF funds? (Please select one, SGP only)

Answer Options	
RAF only country programme	
RAF and core country programme	
Core fund country programmes	

A.2 Questions in the Paper Questionnaire for GEF Operational and Political Focal Points

[Scored on scale: 0 = Don't Know, 1=Highly ineffective, 2=Not effective, 3=Moderately ineffective, 4=Moderately Effective, 5=Effective, 6=Highly Effective]

1. Score the effectiveness of the RAF in bringing transparency to the allocation process across the biodiversity and climate change focal areas.
2. Score the effectiveness of the RAF in potentially increasing achievement of global environment benefits in the biodiversity and climate change focal areas.
3. Score the effectiveness of the RAF in rewarding country and/or project performance in the biodiversity and climate change portfolios.
4. Score the effectiveness of the RAF in rewarding country and/or project performance in the biodiversity and climate change portfolios.
5. Score the effectiveness of the RAF in fairly rewarding your country's potential to achieve global environment benefits in the following: Climate Change
6. Score the effectiveness of the RAF in fairly rewarding your country's potential to achieve global environment benefits in the following: Marine Terrestrial
7. Country driven: Score the RAF for its effectiveness in promoting projects and outcomes of relevance to country interests
8. Disclosure & Public involvement: Score the RAF on its effectiveness in ensuring public involvement / participation
9. IMPLEMENTATION: Score the RAF for its effectiveness in encouraging improved (comprehensive) national development plans.
10. Score the RAF for its effectiveness in encouraging strategic planning with other countries to define the scope of regional programmes within country portfolios.
11. Score the RAF for its effectiveness in increasing donor harmonization at the country level
12. Score the RAF for its effectiveness in promoting catalytic effects and leveraging financing
13. Please rank the following challenges that Focal Points face which may hinder implementation of the RAF (Rank 1=most serious, 7=least serious):
 - a. lack of institutional memory (focal points change)
 - b. lack capacity
 - c. lack time for GEF
 - d. lack authority (institutional support)
 - e. lack information
 - f. lack resources
 - g. other (please specify)
14. Please select the effect of the RAF on your country's pipeline:
 - a. No Change
 - b. Cut existing proposals
 - c. Reformulated existing proposals
 - d. Developed new proposals
 - e. Developed regional proposals
 - f. Revised entirely
 - g. Don't Know
 - h. Other (please specify)
15. With the RAF, please rank the time you spend on each of the below (1 =most time, 5=least time)
 - a. Proposal endorsement
 - b. Facilitating consultations/awareness
 - c. National priority-setting
 - d. Report writing
 - e. Other (specify)
16. Please rank the effectiveness of the following tools to better support GEF Focal Points (1-most useful, 10=least useful)

- a. Teleconferences
- b. Direct support
- c. Direct support
- d. National Dialog Initiative
- e. GEF Familiarization Seminar
- f. Constituency Meetings/Country-specific assistance
- g. Sub-regional Workshops
- h. Country Support Programme Website
- i. Newsletter/ Talking Points
- j. Other (please specify)

Open-Ended Questions:

- 17. Please note particular Strengths of the RAF
- 18. Please note particular Weaknesses of the RAF
- 19. Do you have suggestions for improving the RAF?
- 20. Number of years you have been at your current position:

wb253688

C:\Documents and Settings\wb253688\My Documents\RAF\MY NOTES\TECH PAPERS\TECHNICAL PAPER #7 STAKEHOLDER
survey 6nov08.doc
11/07/2008 1:49:00 PM