

Management Action Record – April 2009
Role of Local Benefits in Global Environmental Programs
Part One: Nature and Conclusions of the Study (GEF/ME/C.27/4, October 2005)
Management Response (GEF/ME/C.27/5, Oct 2005)

Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Rating in Progress of Adoption			
			Mgmt	Comments	GEF EO	Comments
1. Where local benefits are an essential means to achieve and sustain global benefits, the GEF portfolio should integrate them more strongly into its programming.	We agree with this recommendation. As noted above, the GEF has substantially strengthened its ability to address global-local linkages in our programming through its GEF-3 and 4 Programming Documents, and strategic priority setting.	Nov 2005 - Decision on Agenda item 7(d) 1. Where local benefits are an essential means to achieve and sustain global benefits, these should be more systematically addressed in all stages of the project cycle in GEF activities.	Previous rating: High New rating: High	Progress Feb '08 – April '09: The GEF-4 strategic document for each focal area has highlighted and recognized the linkages between global and local benefits, when relevant. For the ongoing focal area strategy development for GEF-5, each focal area's technical advisory group has articulated these linkages, including poverty and gender issues. The GEFSEC will hire a consultant in 2010 to help integrate social impacts and benefits, including health, employment, gender and livelihood support in Focal Area tracking tools.	Previous Rating: Medium New Rating: Medium	Socio-economic issues, such as poverty and gender, cannot be effectively mainstreamed into GEF approaches without appropriate in-house expertise. The hiring of temporary consultants does not solve this structural weakness.

Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Rating in Progress of Adoption			
			Mgmt	Comments	GEF EO	Comments
2. Integration of local benefits should be more systematically carried forward into all stages of the project cycle	We agree with this recommendation, particularly in those instances where local benefits are essential means to achieve and sustain global benefits. For the past years, we have made initial efforts in incorporating approaches and tools within the project cycle to strengthen the global-local benefit linkages. For example, stakeholder identification and development of public participation strategies are required in appropriate stages of the project cycle. Social assessment and social experts are utilized during project preparation, implementation, and monitoring and evaluation period. We will review and strengthen these approaches through the ongoing review of the GEF project cycle and appraisal criteria, while making sure that these remain simple and do not make the project review process more complex.	Nov 2005 - Decision on Agenda item 7(d) 1. Where local benefits are an essential means to achieve and sustain global benefits, these should be more systematically addressed in all stages of the project cycle in GEF activities.	Previous rating: High New rating: High	Progress Feb '08 – April '09: New studies were carried out by the GEF Secretariat on Indigenous Peoples involvement (April 2008) and Gender Mainstreaming (Nov 2008) in GEF projects. Number of recommendations and next steps were identified through the studies to systematically address the issues in the GEF projects and project cycle, and efforts are being made to implement them.	Previous Rating: Medium New rating: Medium	As above
3. GEF activities should include processes for dealing with trade-offs between global and local benefits in situations where win-win results do not materialize.	We agree with the study that the assumption that projects involving the GEF would always result in “win-win” gains in both development and global environmental management, is not realistic. Some of the projects require an assessment of the potential for “win-win” gains or “trade-off” outcomes between global environmental and local livelihood benefits. The issue is discussed as part of the project design and sustainability analysis for each project at appropriate stages of the project cycle.	Nov 2005 - Decision on Agenda item 7(d) 2. GEF activities should include processes for dealing with trade-offs between global and local benefits in situations where win-win results do not materialize.	Previous rating: High New rating: High	Progress Feb '08 – April '09: All focal areas have discussed the issue of trade-offs in the GEF-4 focal area strategies, and will continue to do so for the GEF-5 strategies. The STAP study on trade-offs between global environment and local livelihood issues on Land Degradation focal area, which was conducted in '07 is also informative for other focal areas.	Previous rating: Medium New rating: Medium	As above

Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Rating in Progress of Adoption			
			Mgmt	Comments	GEF EO	Comments
4. In order to strengthen generation of linkages between local and global benefits, the GEF should ensure adequate involvement of expertise on social and institutional issues at all levels of the portfolio.	As the findings of the study indicate, the involvement of expertise on social and institutional issues may have been incoherent during the early days of GEF programming. Today, it is a regular practice at every stage of the project cycle to involve appropriate expertise and tools related to social and institutional issues by all Implementing Agencies. Stakeholder consultation, participatory rural assessments, and social assessments are widely used in GEF projects by structuring multi-disciplinary project teams that include social scientists. In fact, the study's own data show that 80 percent of the most recently approved projects have involved social assessment, while it was only 39 percent in the study's overall sample. The ongoing review of the GEF project cycle and appraisal criteria will assess the relevance of having these tools and approaches as operational requirements for future projects.	Nov 2005 - Decision on Agenda item 7(d) 3. In order to strengthen generation of linkages between local and global benefits, the GEF should ensure adequate involvement of expertise on social and institutional issues at all levels of the portfolio.	Previous rating: High New rating: High	Progress Feb '08 – April '09: Socio-economic and institutional assessments are an integral part of the project documents that are submitted by the GEF Agencies. A recent study showed that 80% of recently approved projects have included social assessments.	Previous rating: Medium New rating: Medium	As above

*Level of adoption may be rated in six ways: **High**: Fully adopted and fully incorporated into policy, strategy or operations; **Substantial**: Decision largely adopted but not fully incorporated into policy, strategy or operations as yet; **Medium**: Adopted in some operational and policy work, but not to a significant degree in key areas; **Negligible**: No evidence or plan for adoption, or plan and actions for adoption are in a very preliminary stage; **N/A**: Non-applicable; **Not possible to verify yet**: verification will have to wait until more data is available or proposals have been further developed.

Management Action Record – April 2009
Evaluation of Incremental Cost Assessment (GEF/ME/C.30/2, Nov 2006)
Management Response (GEF/ME/C.30/3, Nov.2006)

Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Rating in Progress of Adoption *			
			Mgmt	Comments	GEF EO	Comments
No recommendation	N/A	Dec. 2006 - Decision on Agenda Item 7 - monitoring for progress towards achieving global environmental benefits and for achieving co-funding should be included in Project Information Reports and the Portfolio Performance Report;	<p>Previous rating: Medium</p> <p>New rating: Medium</p>	<p>Progress Feb '08 – Apr '09: The BD and IW FAs have consolidated the use of their score cards for application to GEF-4 projects.</p> <p>The LD FA will develop a simple tracking tool for application in GEF-5 based on the RBM framework for the focal area.</p> <p>During the 2008 PIR exercise, projects were asked to pilot the tracking tool developed for the POPs focal area. The tracking tool will be further refined for the next 2009 PIR based on that exercise.</p> <p>Projects are required to report on realization of co-financing (which is one step in the application of the IC principle) through the PIR process following the mid-term review and following the terminal evaluation.</p> <p>As part of the reform process in the context of the 5th replenishment of the GEF, the GEF project cycle will be further simplified. Still, the IC principle will be a center piece of any GEF project or program finance</p>	<p>Previous rating: Medium</p> <p>New rating: Medium</p>	GEF tracking tools are under implementation, including global benefits reporting. No systematic analysis of the responses from tracking tools has been completed so far.
On-going efforts need to be strengthened to have a better identification of global environmental benefits in GEF activities, including improved dissemination and raising of awareness of the focal area strategic priorities and objectives.	The GEF will develop an outreach program on operational issues that will facilitate the dissemination and awareness-raising on agreed global environmental benefits, focal area strategic priorities and objectives. This will enable countries to fully participate in the dialogue on negotiating the agreed incremental costs of achieving/optimizing global environmental benefits in GEF-supported interventions.	Dec. 2006 - Decision on Agenda Item 7 - On-going efforts should be strengthened to have a better identification of global environmental benefits in GEF activities, including improved dissemination and raising of awareness of the focal area strategic priorities and objectives.	<p>Previous rating: Substantial</p> <p>New rating: Substantial</p>	<p>Progress Feb '08 – April '09: The focal area strategies for GEF-5 will spell out concretely the agreed global environmental benefits for each focal area. Linked to it, projects will have to fill out tracking tools that will show the intervention logic and link outcomes to impacts which are linked to GEB.</p> <p>Part of the GEF-5 replenishment documentation set is a paper on clarifying the principles of incrementality and additionality resulting in a recommendation to stay</p>	<p>Previous rating: Substantial</p> <p>New rating: Substantial</p>	Preparation is underway but strategies will have to be discussed and agreed during the replenishment.

Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Rating in Progress of Adoption *			
			Mgmt	Comments	GEF EO	Comments
				with the 'incremental cost' principle but applied in the operational guidelines. GEF has outlined a KM strategy for GEF-5, the groundwork for which will be laid out in the final year of GEF-4. A budget for this final year has been put forward in the business plan.		
See above	The GEF Secretariat, together with the GEF agency partners will meet in the coming months to refine the proposed new approach to incremental costs and develop an outreach program on related operational issues. A proposal will be presented to the Council for review at its June 2007 meeting.	Dec. 2006 - Decision on Agenda Item 7 - The Council requests the GEF Secretariat to incorporate in the paper on the revised project cycle to be presented to the Council in June 2007, new operational guidelines to implement the above sub-paragraphs.	Previous rating: Medium New rating: Substantial	Progress Feb '08 – April '09: The operational manual now refers to the Operational Guidelines for the application of the IC principle.	Previous rating: Medium New rating: Substantial	Guidelines have incorporated IC principle.

*Level of adoption may be rated in six ways: **High:** Fully adopted and fully incorporated into policy, strategy or operations; **Substantial:** Decision largely adopted but not fully incorporated into policy, strategy or operations as yet; **Medium:** Adopted in some operational and policy work, but not to a significant degree in key areas; **Negligible:** No evidence or plan for adoption, or plan and actions for adoption are in a very preliminary stage; **N/A:** Non-applicable; **Not possible to verify yet:** verification will have to wait until more data is available or proposals have been further developed.

**Management Action Record – April 2009 –
Evaluation of the GEF Activity Cycle and Modalities (GEF/ME/C.30/6, Nov 2006)
Management Response (GEF/ME/C.30/7, Nov 2006)**

Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Rating in Progress of Adoption *			
			Mgmt	Comments	GEF EO	Comments
The identification phase should be kept to a minimum of establishing project eligibility, whether resources are in principle available and whether the concept is endorsed by recipient countries	The recent introduction of a Project Identification Form (PIF) by the GEF Secretariat aims to focus project eligibility upstream to weed out ineligible project ideas without resorting to unnecessary GEF financing. The GEF Secretariat will continue reviewing the optimal timing and implementation procedures for a PIF and explore how best it fits into the current as well as future streamlined project cycle.	Dec. 2006 - Decision on Agenda Item 9 – a) Focus the project identification phase on establishing project eligibility, resource availability, country endorsement and agreed agency comparative advantage;	Previous rating: Substantial New rating: substantial	Progress Feb '08 – April '09: Using PIFs in a work program for Council approval has been fully implemented since the new project cycle was approved by Council in June 2007. The streamlining of the review process is has also been fully adopted through the simplification of review criteria focusing only on the project eligibility, resources availability and agreed agency comparative advantage.	Previous rating: Medium New rating: Substantial	The proposal of the new project cycle was approved by Council. The process is currently under implementation.
The Work Program as presented to Council should move towards the strategic level	We agree with the recommendation that the work program presentation to the Council should be in a strategic context, whereby the Council can review the work program as it applies to GEF strategic directions, country priorities, innovative thrust of the portfolio, etc. The GEF Secretariat and the Agencies will take up this challenge in the coming months as we develop options(s) for a revised project cycle.	Dec. 2006 - Decision on Agenda Item 9 – b) Move the work program from being project-based to being program-based in line with GEF strategies and policies;	Previous rating: Substantial New rating: substantial	Progress Feb '08 – April '09: In its effort to move work programs towards a more strategic direction, the GEF Secretariat submitted to Council in April 2008 a programmatic approach (PA) paper aimed at defining the programmatic approaches, clarifying the scope, approval procedures, and value-added as compared to project based approach. Efforts will continue to further refine PA and promote its wider application through FY10 and continued into GEF-5.	Previous rating: Substantial New rating: Substantial	Paper on Programmatic Approaches was approved by Council. Implementation of the Approach has started.
See all the above	See all the above	Dec. 2006 - Decision on Agenda Item 9 – d) Expedite the project cycle.	Previous rating: Substantial New rating: medium	Progress Feb '08 – April '09: The GEF Secretariat's new database system is designed to track the elapsed time between various stages of the project cycle. A review of the implementation progress of the new project cycle was undertaken after the first year (July 1, 2007 – June 2008) of its launching and found progress has been made in this initial year; however limited data has prevented a more in-depth analysis.	Previous rating: Not possible to verify yet New rating: Not possible to verify yet	The Evaluation Office is currently doing a review of the PIF process that will be included as part of the OPS4.

**Management Action Record – April 2009 –
Evaluation of the GEF Support to Biosafety (GEF/ME/C.28/Inf.1, May 2006)
Management Response (GEF/ME/C.30/8, Nov 2006)**

Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision †	Rating in Progress of Adoption *			
			Mgmt	Comments	GEF EO	Comments
Future assistance should be better planned and customized to each participating county.	We agree with this recommendation. A stock taking-assessment of the biosafety capacity in participating countries, as a first step in project design, has been proposed. The analysis will include an independent identification and analysis of the necessary aspects to tailor the support to identified needs at country level and at regional and sub-regional level resulting in targets that are measurable and clearly defined. Regional approaches will have flexibility in terms of issues addressed to target specific needs of countries within a region. In addition, we recognize that a thematic approach can be the best way to support a group of countries lacking competence in a particular field. The proposed strategy will promote issue-specific projects based on a previous assessment of needs in countries.	Dec. 2006 – Decision on Agenda Item 15 - The Council reviewed the proposed Strategy for Financing Biosafety (GEF/C.30/8/Rev.1) and approves it as an interim basis for the development of projects for implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety until such time as the focal area strategies are approved by the Council. The Council invites the Implementing and Executing Agencies, under the coordination of the GEF Secretariat and based on their comparative advantages, to collaborate with the GEF to provide assistance to countries for the implementation of the protocol.	Previous rating: High New rating: High	Progress Feb '08 – April '09: The <i>Program Document for GEF Support to Biosafety in GEF-4</i> was approved by Council on April 2008 and the strategy has incorporated the recommendations from the EO. Since the Program was approved by Council, a total of 18 projects have been approved totaling \$21.6M. These projects include 3 regional projects, 15 single-country projects. Twenty eight (28) countries have benefited from these projects. Another 7 single-country PIFs are being process and should be approved by June 2009.	Previous rating: Medium New rating: High	The <i>Program for GEF Support to Biosafety in GEF-4</i> has incorporated the recommendations and is under implementation.

† This Council Decision refers to *Strategy for Financing Biosafety* (GEF/C.30/8/Rev.1) and not to the GEF EO Evaluation which was an information document.

Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision †	Rating in Progress of Adoption *			
			Mgmt	Comments	GEF EO	Comments
The GEF should consider providing longer term training for building and sustaining specialist capacity in risk assessment and risk management.	We agree with this recommendation. Under the proposed Strategy, project activities will implement the Updated Action Plan for Building Capacities for the Effective Implementation of the CPB, where RA and RM capacity building have been prioritized. Project sustainability, reflected in the sustainability indicators included in the proposed Strategy, will favor the continuation of activities in countries after the end of GEF support.	See above	<p>Previous rating: High</p> <p>New rating: High</p>	The approved strategy included these recommendations. The projects under the Biosafety Program are similarly structured to include the following components: i) policy and legal framework, ii) systems to handle requests, including risk assessment and risk management, iii) monitoring, inspection, iv) public awareness and participation.	<p>Previous rating: Medium</p> <p>New rating: High</p>	Child projects of the program do include training activities in risk assessment and risk management.
The GEF should continue to emphasize awareness-raising and public participation issues, including support to the Biosafety Clearing-House.	This recommendation has been taken into account in the proposed Strategy and activities such as awareness raising, education on biosafety, access to information and public participation on decision making will be fully incorporated in project design. Activities to improve countries participation in the BCH, identified in the stock-taking analysis, will form part of project design.	See above	<p>Previous rating: High</p> <p>New rating: High</p>	<p>Progress Feb '08 – April '09: See above A new project in support of the Biosafety Clearing House was recently submitted by UNEP and is being evaluated by GEFSEC</p>	<p>Previous rating: Medium</p> <p>New rating: Substantial</p>	Child projects of the program do emphasize awareness-raising and public participation. The project in support of the Biosafety Clearing House has not yet been approved.

Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision [†]	Rating in Progress of Adoption *			
			Mgmt	Comments	GEF EO	Comments
The GEF should work toward a higher degree of donor collaboration and other cost-sharing schemes at the global and national levels.	We agree with this recommendation. Coordination of efforts at the international level will be enhanced through the exchange of information, collaboration, and work through the Coordination Mechanism for the Implementation of the Action Plan for Building Capacities for the Effective Implementation of the CPB. Complementarity of activities, with other existing biosafety capacity building initiatives, at bilateral and multilateral level, will be stressed. At national level, the definition of the role of a national coordination mechanism, that includes the promotion of synchronized and synergistic implementation of capacity building activities and the harmonized use of donor's assistance will be included in project design.	See above	Previous rating: Medium New rating: Medium	Progress Feb '08 – April '09: Co-financing of Biosafety projects do not always reach a 1:1 ratio. Efforts are being made with the Agencies and countries to increase collaboration and cost sharing, in cash or kind, to these projects.	Previous rating: Medium New rating: Medium	The EO encourages the GEF Secretariat to continue its efforts to work towards a higher degree of donor collaboration and other cost-sharing schemes at the global and national levels.
The GEF should seek advice from its Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel and other scientists as to whether and how biosafety could be better integrated strategically and programmatically into the GEF biodiversity portfolio.	This recommendation has been taken into account and the GEF Secretariat, in consultation with STAP, will explore how national capacities under RA and RM existing systems, such as those for customs and trade, can be extended to support RA and RM for LMO's.	See above	Previous rating: Medium New rating: High	Progress Feb '08 – April '09: The "Program Document for GEF Support to Biosafety in GEF-4" was approved by Council on April 2008. One of the expected outputs of the Biosafety Program is the development of strategies for Risk Assessment and Risk Management. These strategies are being considered on an individual basis for single country-projects, or regionally in the in the case of the Caribbean Regional Projects.	Previous rating: Medium New rating: Substantial	The <i>Program for GEF Support to Biosafety in GEF-4</i> was reviewed by STAP. Outputs of strategies for risk assessment and risk management have not yet been realized. GEF should also seek advice from STAP on other issues to better integrate biosafety into the GEF biodiversity portfolio.

*Level of adoption may be rated in six ways: **High**: Fully adopted and fully incorporated into policy, strategy or operations; **Substantial**: Decision largely adopted but not fully incorporated into policy, strategy or operations as yet; **Medium**: Adopted in some operational and policy work, but not to a significant degree in key areas; **Negligible**: No evidence or plan for adoption, or plan and actions for adoption are in a very preliminary stage; **N/A**: Non-applicable; **Not possible to verify yet**: verification will have to wait until more data is available or proposals have been further developed.

Management Action Record – April 2009
Annual Performance Report 2005 (GEF/ME/C.28/2/Rev.1, May 2006)
Management Response (GEF/ME/C.28/3, May 2006)

Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Rating in Progress of Adoption *			
			Mgmt	Comments	GEF EO	Comments
The GEF Secretariat should support Focal Area Task Forces with corporate resources to continue the development of indicators and tracking tools to measure the results of the GEF operations in the various focal areas.	We agree with the conclusion that although Focal Area Task Forces have made significant progress in developing indicators and tracking tools at the portfolio level, there remain some technical difficulties to be overcome to adequately address the need to measure and aggregate results at the portfolio level. Reflecting the APR 2005 recommendation that the Secretariat should support Focal Area Task Forces with corporate resources to develop indicators and tracking tools to measure the results of the GEF operations in the various focal areas, a request is being made for a <i>Special Initiative for Results-Management</i> in the FY07 Corporate Budget. This activity would be in line with the on-going efforts to develop a GEF Results Management Framework.	Jun.2006 - Decision on Agenda Item 4 - The GEF Secretariat should support Focal Area Task Forces with corporate resources to continue the development of indicators and tracking tools to measure the results of the GEF operations in the various focal areas.	Previous rating: Substantial New rating: Substantial	Three focal areas pilot tested tracking tools for the first time during the FY2008 PIR process. Results are reported on in the Annual Monitoring Report (2008), which will be presented at the June 2009 Council meeting. Climate Change, International Waters, and POPs all piloted tracking tools this year and will use the results obtained to refine their indicators for GEF-4. Biodiversity: Tracking tools for the GEF-4 biodiversity strategy have been revised to reflect learning from GEF-3. For strategic objective one, sustainability of protected area systems, a protected financing scorecard has been introduced and a revised version of the "Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool" has been developed. For strategic objective two, biodiversity mainstreaming, the tracking tool has been streamlined and improved. The GEF Secretariat developed a two-part tracking tool for Strategic objective three, safeguarding biodiversity, that will track the implementation of the national biosafety frameworks(part one) and a tool that will track the development and implementation of management frameworks for invasive alien species. A tracking tool for Access and Benefit sharing frameworks will be developed in the last FY of GEF-4.	Previous rating: Substantial New rating: Substantial	The GEF Secretariat has developed tracking tools for most focal areas and has hired a specialist to lead monitoring.

*Level of adoption may be rated in six ways: **High**: Fully adopted and fully incorporated into policy, strategy or operations; **Substantial**: Decision largely adopted but not fully incorporated into policy, strategy or operations as yet; **Medium**: Adopted in some operational and policy work, but not to a significant degree in key areas; **Negligible**: No evidence or plan for adoption, or plan and actions for adoption are in a very preliminary stage; **N/A**: Non-applicable; **Not possible to verify yet**: verification will have to wait until more data is available or proposals have been further developed.

Management Action Record – April 2009
GEF Annual Performance Report 2006 (GEF/ME/C.31/1, May 2007)
Management Response (GEF/ME/C.31/2, May 2007)

Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Rating in Progress of Adoption			
			Mgmt	Comments	GEF EO	Comments
UNDP and UNEP need to involve social and institutional expertise in project supervision.	- UNDP notes this recommendation and the findings on which it is based. While UNDP already involves social and institutional expertise in project supervision, UNDP will examine how it can further strengthen this. - UNEP acknowledges that social and institutional expertise is important for adequate supervision of specific projects. As such, UNEP will include guidance on this issue in the section of project supervision standards of its GEF Operations Manual.	Jun. 2007 – Decision on Agenda Item 6 - UNDP and UNEP should involve social and institutional expertise in project supervision where appropriate;	Previous rating: Negligible New rating: Substantial	Progress Feb '08 – April '09: UNDP: UNDP involves social and institution expertise in project supervision where appropriate. This was documented in the GEF quality of supervision assessment of 15 UNDP GEF projects undertaken this year. UNDP will continue to examine how to further strengthen this. UNEP: Since Feb. 08, UNEP has continuously improved its social and institutional expertise, in at least two ways: a) social safeguards are included as criteria in both project design, and project supervision plans. B) Knowledge of and experience with social and institutional aspects are required as part of selection of new staff members.	Previous rating: Not possible to verify yet New rating: Not possible to verify yet	The supervision review of 2009 will be presented as part of OPS4 and will include an assessment of the involvement of social and institutional expertise in supervision
Special attention is required to ensure continued and improved supervision in the new project cycle, through ensuring adequate funding in project fees.	- The Results-based Management Framework (RBM) that is presented for Council discussion will provide the platform for the Secretariat to develop tools to monitor the portfolio, in coordination with the GEF agencies. While developing these tools, care will be taken to ensure that they do not duplicate, but rather build on, the monitoring activities undertaken by the agencies. - The agencies will ensure that the appropriate level of resources received from fees are directed toward supervision of projects.	Jun. 2007 – Decision on Agenda Item 6 - special attention is required to ensure continued and improved supervision by the GEF agencies during implementation of projects and adequate funding should be provided for this supervision from the project fees;	Previous rating: High New rating: High	In addition, to the GEF EO's quality of supervision review and the AMR presented to Council every year, Agencies have agreed to report on administrative expenses on a yearly basis. Part of the agency fee is utilized for agency supervision of a project throughout the project cycle. This reporting will give a better sense of how agencies are utilizing their resources across the project cycle. Each GEF Agency will report annually on services provided and actual aggregated expenditures on corporate activities and project cycle management. The details were outlined in GEF/C.34/Inf.4	Previous rating: Not possible to verify yet New rating: Substantial	Agency agreement to track and report on services performed, and utilization of Agency fee for supervision, are important measures that will allow oversight of the extent to which sufficient resources are dedicated to this purpose. While the agreement is in place the system is not yet operational.

Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Rating in Progress of Adoption			
			Mgmt	Comments	GEF EO	Comments
				<p><i>Guidelines for Agencies' Reporting of Administrative Expenses.</i></p> <p>It is difficult to determine whether there is adequate funding through project fees until several consecutive years worth of data has been collected. However, a system is now in place to assess whether adequate funding is provided for supervision from the project fees</p>		
<p>UNEP should develop a structural approach to supervision of its GEF portfolio.</p>	<p>UNEP notes that the above recommendation is in line with UNEP's management approach to strengthen overall project supervision. UNEP is therefore pleased to report on the following changes it has put in place over the last year to improve the overall supervision of its GEF portfolio:</p> <p>(a) UNEP has undertaken an intensive exercise of improving human resource capacity for the supervision of its GEF project portfolio.</p> <p>(b) UNEP has also been developing standard processes to instill a more structured approach to project implementation supervision as follows. UNEP developed and applied an enhanced GEF Project Implementation Review (PIR) process (piloted in GEF FY06). A Project-at-Risk system was developed and piloted from GEF FY 05 for the implementation review of all its GEF projects.</p> <p>(c) UNEP is also institutionalizing a process of annual project quality of supervision reviews which will be conducted by UNEP's portfolio manager in consultation with UNEP's Evaluation and Oversight Unit. Starting with the June 07 work programme, UNEP's GEF projects once endorsed by the CEO, will include project supervision plans to be put in place before UNEP proceeds with implementation. These plans will</p>	<p>Jun. 2007 – Decision on Agenda Item 6 - UNEP should develop a systemic approach to supervision of its GEF portfolio;</p>	<p>Previous rating: Substantial</p> <p>New rating: High</p>	<p>Progress Feb '08 – April '09:</p> <p>UNEP:</p> <p>UNEP: UNEP has followed the path described in the previous comments and in addition can report that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> human resource capacity has been strengthened by hiring new staff and by targeted training for supervision The PIR process is operational, and linked to a project at risk system as of 2008 Annual project quality of supervision reviews are conducted and project supervision plans are a criterion for final Agency approval of a project. There are standard procedures in place for project development, implementation and supervision. Roles and responsibilities of an Implementing Agency of the GEF have been systematically clarified and communicated to Executing Agencies. Financial oversight and technical oversight are now linked, and outcome-based budgeting is exercised. 	<p>Previous rating: Medium</p> <p>New rating: Substantial</p>	<p>UNEP has taken many important steps towards putting in place a structural approach to supervision. While many of the elements of such system are in place, the extent to which the system is fully operational and its performance is currently under review. The conclusions of the 2009 Supervision Review will be reported in OPS4.</p>

Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Rating in Progress of Adoption			
			Mgmt	Comments	GEF EO	Comments
	establish project supervision tasks and their costings. A GEF Operations Manual is under development with an expected completion date of August 2007.					
All GEF agencies will need to ensure that terminal evaluation reports include adequate information on sustainability of outcomes, quality of M&E systems and reporting on co-financing.	Evaluation reports prepared for GEF-financed projects are expected to meet the minimum requirement 3 of the GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy. In line with these requirements, agencies will ensure that terminal evaluation reports include information on sustainability of outcomes, quality of M&E systems, and assessment of co-financing realized.	Jun. 2007 – Decision on Agenda Item 6 - all GEF agencies should ensure that terminal evaluation reports include adequate information on sustainability of outcomes, quality of monitoring and evaluation systems and reporting on co-financing, in line with the minimum requirements for project evaluation in the GEF M&E Policy.	<p>Previous rating: High</p> <p>New rating: High</p>	<p>Progress Feb '08 – April '09:</p> <p>UNDP: The UNDP evaluation office systematically provides an independent rating of the quality of terminal evaluations of UNDP GEF projects. This rating specifically addresses the sustainability of outcomes, quality of M&E systems and reporting on co-financing.</p> <p>UNEP: UNEP: UNEP requires from terminal evaluators to analyze the sustainability of outcomes, quality of M&E systems and co-financing in line with the relevant GEF policy. Through this, UNEP increased the quality of reporting on these issues.</p> <p>World Bank: The WB is pleased to note that the GEF EO has “decided that it can trust the outcome ratings provided by the IEG in the implementation completion report (ICR) reviews” and that “From next year (2007), whenever provided, the Evaluation Office will accept IEG outcome ratings”. The WBG recorded high ratings for most of the various APR indicators. In 2007, the WB issued new guidelines for ICRs that incorporate the additional requirements from GEF EO for GEF projects, including information Global Environment Objectives, sustainability, quality of M&E, and cofinancing. The elements demanded go beyond the minimum requirements in the GEF M&E Policy. For rating of sustainability, as discussed with EO, the <i>Risk to Development Outcome</i> rating has replaced the earlier “Sustainability” rating, based on realism challenges</p>	<p>Previous rating: Substantial</p> <p>New rating: Substantial</p>	<p>All Implementing agencies have taken steps towards harmonizing Terminal Evaluations with GEF Terminal Evaluations Guidelines. While there are some issues still remaining, these will be reconsidered in light of the possible changes that the EO might introduce to the GEF M&E Policy and the TE guidelines in 2010.</p> <p>Regarding the World Banks comments: in addition to the information presented in the APR, the EO has held bilateral communications with the Evaluation Offices of the Agencies to address Agency specific issues. In the Case of the World Bank, these communications have been held with IEG.</p> <p>The EO routinely sends Terminal Evaluation Reviews to agencies for comments.</p>

Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Rating in Progress of Adoption			
			Mgmt	Comments	GEF EO	Comments
				<p>in forecasting future sustainability. The ICR format has been automated so that all the elements are covered in developing the ICR. As noted in the Management Response, the generalization of the findings probably masks different practices among the agencies; for targeted follow-up, the EO should inform each Agency specifically what aspects to focus on. To ensure learning and continuous improvement, it would be helpful if the Agencies could receive a copy of the assessment for each ICR from the GEF EO, especially where enhancements are suggested.</p>		

Management Action Record – April 2009

GEF Annual Performance Report 2007 (GEF/ME/C.33/2, Mar 2008)

Management Response to the GEF Annual Performance Report 2007(GEF/ME/C.33/3, Mar 2008)

Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Rating in Progress of Adoption*			
			Mgmt	Comments	GEF EO	Comments
The GEF Secretariat, in coordination with the GEF Agencies, should conduct a formal and in-depth survey to more accurately and thoroughly assess the GEF Agencies efforts to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.	The GEF Secretariat finds that this task falls beyond the mandate of the Secretariat and should not be considered a priority. As noted by the APR, the agencies are making progress toward understanding and managing their carbon footprints and are cooperating with each other and the UN Environment Management Group in this area. This finding indicates that there is little or no formal role to play in this area for the Secretariat.	Apr. 08 – Decision on Agenda Item 7 - The Council took note of the recommendation and the management response and noted in particular the progress made by the GEF Agencies to reduce greenhouse gas emissions in their internal operations and invited the GEF Agencies to provide information on progress in June 2009.	<p>Previous rating: High</p> <p>New rating: High</p>	<p>Progress Feb '08 – April '09: An information document will be presented to Council in June 2009.</p> <p>IDB: Since 2006 the IDB calculates the carbon footprint of its corporate activities at its Headquarters, its 26 Country Offices, and its two non-regional offices on an annual basis through a centralized GHG data management. In 2008, the IDB achieved its goal to minimize its environmental footprint by making all IDB offices carbon neutral. Following its commitment to buy 100 percent of the energy consumed by its Headquarters building from a renewable source, the IDB reduces the carbon emissions associated with its own buildings' energy use (heating, cooling, computers, lighting, etc.) to zero. Also, the IDB measures yearly its consumption of energy and essential raw materials, as well as its production of waste. The IDB encourages the further improvement of its in-house environmental performance with programs like the Country Carbon Challenge, through which seven Country Offices received financial awards to implement projects with innovative solutions to reduce their carbon footprint in 2008. One of IDB's commitments for 2009 is to set specific in-house GHG emissions reduction targets.</p>	High	Agreed

* Level of adoption may be rated in six ways: **High:** Fully adopted and fully incorporated into policy, strategy/IDB or operations; **Substantial:** Decision largely adopted but not fully incorporated into policy, strategy or operations as yet; **Medium:** Adopted in some operational and policy work, but not to a significant degree in key areas; **Negligible:** No evidence or plan for adoption, or plan and actions for adoption are in a very preliminary stage; **N/A:** Non-applicable; **Not possible to verify yet:** verification will have to wait until more data is available or proposals have been further developed.

Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Rating in Progress of Adoption*			
			Mgmt	Comments	GEF EO	Comments
				<p>UNEP is proud to report that its activities may be considered as being carbon neutral. A dedicated budget has been established across UNEP and in the DGEF, to allow offsetting of our net carbon emissions. Additionally, the Division of GEF Coordination is instituting measures to further reduce its carbon footprint. Finally, UNEP as Chair of the Environment Management Group of the UN, has developed and encouraged all UN Agencies to adopt a standard methodology and formula on how to estimate their carbon footprint, and measures to reduce or offset the footprint.</p> <p>UNDP: is taking a proactive approach to managing its carbon footprint.</p> <p>WB: The generalization of the recommendation masks agency differences. In 2007, the EO considered the WBG efforts insufficient on 3 of 8 criteria. We have earlier pointed out in the Management Response that the Bank does include a climate policy in its overall strategy, through the broader greening program. The World Bank was the first Multilateral Development Bank to become carbon neutral. The WBG is currently fully in compliance with all the criteria established by GEF EO, including (a) 'centralized GHG data management' (criteria 7), incorporating expansion of its greenhouse gas inventory to include our country offices from FY08; (b) a governing strategy, as expressed in the WBG Strategic Framework on Climate Change and Development (criteria 5); and (c) with full public disclosure, see http://go.worldbank.org/EM6CI3TE40 (criteria 8).</p>		

Management Action Record – April 2009
GEF Country Portfolio Evaluation: Philippines (1992-2007) (GEF/ME/C.31/3, May 2007)
Management Response (GEF/ME/C.31/4, May 2007)

Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Rating in Progress of Adoption			
			Mgmt	Comments	GEF EO	Comments
The GEF should develop country programs and strategies for large recipients of GEF support like the Philippines.	We agree with the Evaluation Office's conclusion that the RAF has led to improvement in this area since the resources allocated need to be prioritized and shared among different national institutions and GEF Agencies, compared to the past when allocations were made on a demand basis and there was a perception that every eligible project would be funded eventually by the GEF. As RAF implementation progresses, we hope to work with recipients with large allocations to develop GEF programming strategies.	Jun. 2007 – Decision on Agenda Item 7 - The Council requests the Secretariat to prepare for Council consideration in November 2007 a proposal for development of country assistance strategies leading to better coordination and programming at the country level.	Previous Rating: Substantial New rating: medium	For the remainder of GEF-4, the GEFSEC has focused on regional programs such as the Pacific Alliance for SIDS. However, as part of the GEF-5 replenishment process, the GEFSEC is proposing to develop country programs and strategies for large recipients of GEF support.	Previous rating: Medium New rating: Medium	The GEFSEC proposals are expected to be discussed during the replenishment process.

Management Action Record – April 2009
Joint Evaluation of the Small Grants Programme – Executive Version (GEF/ME/C.32/2, Oct 2007)
Management Response (GEF/ME/C.32/3/Rev.1, Oct 2007)

Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Rating in Progress of Adoption			
			Mgmt	Comments	GEF EO	Comments
The level of management costs should be established on the basis of services rendered and cost-efficiency rather than on the basis of a stated percentage.	- While recognizing that in many cases the presence of a national coordinator to support a national steering committee is essential to demonstrate national and civil society ownership within the country, the SGP Steering Committee will review the management structure for countries having smaller allocations and explore extending multi-country management support systems that serve the purpose of assisting countries without losing cost-efficiency of its operations. - The management notes with concern the practice of providing small grants solely to pay SGP's management costs over and above the funds provided by the GEF. Such action would appear to be a violation of the GEF funding agreement. SGP management has considered these to be legitimate expenses (knowledge management products and capacity building) for helping deliver global environmental benefits. In order to resolve this point, the issue will be taken up at the next meeting of the SGP Steering Committee.	Nov. 2007 – Decision on Agenda Item 9 – The Council requests the SGP Steering Committee to implement the recommendations by: (a) Proposing a level of management costs on the basis of services rendered and cost-efficiency rather than on the basis of a stated percentage.	Previous rating: Medium New rating: Medium:	Progress Feb '08 – April '09: The steering committee made a decision to develop a new policy for countries that are in the program for up to 5 years, 5- 15 and beyond 15 years. The new policy paper is in preparatory phase. Level of project management costs will be revised In a new policy document.	Previous rating: Medium New rating: Medium	The GEF Secretariat and the SGP have carried out consultations and are currently preparing a paper for the consideration of the GEF Council.
A process needs to start to change SGP's central management system so that it becomes suitable for the new phase of growth and to address the risks of growing complexity.	We agree on the recommendation to review the central management system of the SGP and will take it up and provide a report to the Council at its next meeting.	Nov. 2007 – Decision on Agenda Item 9 – ... (b) starting a process to change SGP's central management system suitable for the new phase of growth and to address the risks of growing complexity.	Previous rating: Medium New rating: Medium	Progress Feb '08 – April '09: New policy paper will address SGP management system issues that would suit the new phase of growth.	Previous rating: Medium New rating: Medium	The GEF Secretariat and the SGP have carried out studies and consultations and are currently preparing a paper for the consideration of the GEF Council.
Country programme oversight needs to be strengthened.	- The management takes note of this recommendation and will consider a system to regularly audit the country programs. - The GEF ombudsman will also be involved in handling complaints related to the SGP, and this would	Nov. 2007 – Decision on Agenda Item 9 - ... (c) strengthening country programme oversight.	Previous rating: Medium New rating: Medium	Progress Feb '08 – April '09: Some progress has been made by participating in working meeting by the GEF Secretariat to oversee the process. SGP web site is in process of	Previous rating: Medium New rating: Substan	The SGP has put in place several measures to strengthen country program oversight.

Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Rating in Progress of Adoption			
			Mgmt	Comments	GEF EO	Comments
	be appropriately announced on the SGP and GEF websites.			improvement.	tial	
Monitoring and Evaluation needs to be strengthened further.	The M&E system will be reviewed and strengthened as per the recommendation made by the evaluation office.	Nov. 2007 – Decision on Agenda Item 9 - ... (d) further strengthening Monitoring and Evaluation.	Previous rating: Medium New rating: Medium	Progress Feb '08 – April '09: Project monitoring will be streamlined and strengthened during the second phase of SGP4 and all details on frequency and systematization of field visits for project monitoring and evaluation will be outlined in a new projects document.	Previous rating: Medium New rating: Medium	Measures have been identified but are not fully in effect.
The current criteria for access to SGP resources should be revised to maintain cost efficiency.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Funding for the LDCs and SIDS has been made possible as resources have been freed up after placing a cap on the allocations provided to existing SGP countries. The consequence of removing such a cap will be to push the SGP back to the <i>status quo</i> shutting most of the LDCs and several SIDS based on the approved funding by the Council. - A modification in the project cycle of the SGP lifted the highest cap on a per year basis from \$600,000 to \$800,000 for countries. (as explained in paragraph 21 of this management response) - The SGP Steering Committee agreed to review the graduation status of the affected Least Developed Countries and SIDS and report to the Council at its next meeting. 	Nov. 2007 – Decision on Agenda Item 9 - ... (e) proposing a revision of the current criteria for access to SGP resources to maintain cost efficiency.	Previous rating: Medium New rating: Medium	Progress Feb '08 – April '09: New criteria will be developed and proposed to the Council for adoption. At the same time Steering committee has decided that no major changes should be introduced for SIDS and LDC country programs.	Previous rating: Medium New rating: Medium	The GEF Secretariat and the SGP have carried out consultations and are currently preparing a paper for the consideration of the GEF Council.
The intended SGP country programme graduation policy needs to be revised for GEF 5 to address the risks to GEF achievements and cost effectiveness, especially in SIDS and LDCs.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The GEF Secretariat agrees to work with the GEF focal points in countries graduating from the SGP to help ensure that the SGP delivery mechanism established with GEF funding are not dismantled but rather fully utilized in their new graduated stage. This would further enhance the capacity of civil society in the country while strengthening its interaction with the Government. - The evaluation report suggests an alternative of initiating "independent franchise" to continue the SGP outside the SGP management. This is possible and will be investigated by the SGP Steering Committee. 	Nov. 2007 – Decision on Agenda Item 9 - ... (f) further developing a graduation policy for the SGP country programmes which takes into account the identified risks to GEF achievements and cost effectiveness, especially in SIDS and LDCs.	Previous rating: Medium New rating: Medium	Progress Feb '08 – April '09: Policy paper is in progress and will address these issues in full. Graduation policy will be changed into upgrading policy with increased options for country programs directly access resources from the GEF through MSP and/or FSP modality.	Previous rating: Medium New rating: Medium	The GEF Secretariat and the SGP have carried out consultations and are currently preparing a paper for the consideration of the GEF Council.

Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Rating in Progress of Adoption			
			Mgmt	Comments	GEF EO	Comments
--	--	Nov. 2007 – Decision on Agenda Item 9 - Council requests the SGP Steering Committee to report for decision of the Council on the actions taken to implement the recommendations at the April 2008 Council Meeting.	<p>Previous rating: Medium</p> <p>New rating: High</p>	<p>Progress Feb '08 – April '09: Report was presented to the Council GEF/C.35.3.</p>	<p>Previous rating: Medium</p> <p>New rating: High</p>	<p>Progress report was presented in the April 2008 Council Meeting.</p>

Management Action Record – April 2009
GEF Annual Report on Impact 2007 – Executive Version (GEF/ME/C.32/4, Oct 2007)
Management Response (GEF/ME/C.32/5, Oct 2007)

Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Rating in Progress of Adoption *			
			Mgmt	Comments	GEF EO	Comments
Protected Area projects should include a specific plan for institutional continuity, which should be included in the biodiversity tracking tools of the GEF, or through the development of an alternative system, under the direction of the GEF Secretariat.	Management proposes the following course of action: First, within the Project Information Form (PIF) as part of the presentation of the project design, the issue of post-project sustainability, including “institutional continuity”, will be addressed as relevant to each project, given that this issue affects all projects, not only those dealing with protected areas. Second, at the time of CEO endorsement and as part of the project’s sustainability strategy, the project design will identify how institutional continuity will be addressed and monitored during project implementation and how institutional continuity will be secured by the time of project closure. Finally, during the mid-term and final-evaluations, the Terms of Reference will specifically highlight this issue as an area for examination for the evaluator. We believe that this approach provides a more comprehensive remedy to the problem identified.	Nov. 2007 – Decision on Agenda Item 10 – The Council takes a note of the Annual Report’s conclusions and requests the GEF Secretariat to incorporate its recommendations into project preparation and to ensure adequate monitoring of progress towards institutional continuity.	Previous rating: Medium New rating: Substantial	Protected area project designs as presented in PIFs are presenting comprehensive intervention strategies that address the three pillars of PA system sustainability: Financing, individual and institutional capacity building and strengthening, and ecosystem representation. These principles of sustainability have remained in the protected area projects that have come back for CEO endorsement, thus providing sustained “institutional continuity” as part of project operations and implementation. Biodiversity mainstreaming projects are also including sustainability measures when government institutions are involved in developing and implementing improved policy and regulatory frameworks. Note: The only reason we could not rate this high is due to the fact that most protected area and biodiversity mainstreaming projects (PIFs) have not come back for CEO endorsement, thus precluding our ability to note that the adoption has been incorporated into operations.	Previous rating: Medium New rating: Substantial	These are good developments and we look forward to evaluating their results over time.

Level of adoption may be rated in six ways: **High:** Fully adopted and fully incorporated into policy, strategy or operations; **Substantial:** Decision largely adopted but not fully incorporated into policy, strategy or operations as yet; **Medium:** Adopted in some operational and policy work, but not to a significant degree in key areas; **Negligible:** No evidence or plan for adoption, or plan and actions for adoption are in a very preliminary stage; **N/A:** Non-applicable; **Not possible to verify yet:** verification will have to wait until more data is available or proposals have been further developed.

Management Action Record – April 2009

Annual Country Portfolio Evaluation Report 2008 (GEF/ME/C.33/4, Mar 2008)

Management Response to the Annual Country Portfolio Evaluation Report 2008(GEF/ME/C.33/5, Mar 2008)

Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Rating in Progress of Adoption*			
			Mgmt	Comments	GEF EO	Comments
The GEF should increase support to and strengthen the concept of integrated multifocal area and cross-sectoral approaches, going beyond the national boundaries, to ensure maximization of global benefits.	There has been much progress already on recommendation 1 (strengthening integrated multi-focal area approaches), as reflected in the last two Work Programs submitted to GEF Council. At the same time, it will be necessary to monitor the implementation of these integrated programs and regional approaches for evidence of higher impact and maximization of global benefits.	Apr. 08 – Decision on Agenda Item 8 - Council requests the Secretariat to: (a) continue to strengthen the concept of integrated multi-focal areas approaches, including addressing transboundary issues, and particularly adaptation to climate change and land degradation, to ensure maximization of global environmental benefits,	Rating: Substantial	Progress Feb '08 – April '09: The Secretariat has continued to strengthen the concept of integrated MFA approaches, including addressing transboundary issues. The SEC has developed programmatic approaches to issues that require cross-cutting attention. In terms of MFAs in the April 2008 WP alone (the only WP in this period) 11 MFAs were approved.	Not possible to verify yet	Support and approval for programmatic approaches have increased in recent years. Not all of the programmatic approaches are developed under an integrated approach although they tend to deal with transboundary issues. Regarding MFA projects, not all of them deal with an integrated approach or with transboundary issues (some of them indicate that the ecosystem approach will be used but others are NCSAs). It is proposed that GEF EO conducts an assessment of these MFA projects from the point of integration across focal areas.
The GEF should develop a specific and proactive engagement approach with countries in Africa, particularly Least Developing Countries (LDC) that have limited capacity to access and implement GEF.	We are pleased to note that in all three countries, the governments and national stakeholders acknowledged the value added by the GEF Agencies in the preparation of projects. We note the findings that the improvements in the GEF project cycle and the overall impact of the council-approved reforms have not yet percolated to the local level. As a concrete measure to narrow this gap, we support and are already acting on recommendation 2 to proactively engage with countries in Africa, particularly LDCs,	Apr. 08 – Decision on Agenda Item 8 - (b) further develop specific, proactive and more flexible engagement approaches with countries in Africa, particularly LDCs that have limited capacity to access and implement GEF funding, and (c) enhance country ownership through GEF programs that support national integrated policies, in accordance with national processes and institutions.	Rating: Substantial	Programmatic approach on Sustainable Forest Management (SFM) in the Congo Basin. The GEFSEC initiated a participatory process in Gabon in February 2008 to develop this program in Gabon in February 2008 which culminated in a program Framework Document that was presented and approved at the November 2008 Council including 13 project concepts with a total request for GEF resources of \$54.7 million. This program is still under implementation.	Substantial	GEF Sec has proactively engaged LDCs from Africa and other regions by establishing programs. In addition to those mentioned in GEFSEC response, Council has approved more than 30 projects under the LDC/SIDS Targeted Portfolio Approach For Capacity Development and Mainstreaming of Sustainable Land Management.

* Level of adoption may be rated in six ways: **High:** Fully adopted and fully incorporated into policy, strategy or operations; **Substantial:** Decision largely adopted but not fully incorporated into policy, strategy or operations as yet; **Medium:** Adopted in some operational and policy work, but not to a significant degree in key areas; **Negligible:** No evidence or plan for adoption, or plan and actions for adoption are in a very preliminary stage; **N/A:** Non-applicable; **Not possible to verify yet:** verification will have to wait until more data is available or proposals have been further developed.

Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Rating in Progress of Adoption*			
			Mgmt	Comments	GEF EO	Comments
	including exploring more flexible country-based approaches. The GEF funded Country Support Programme (CSP) also provides support to focal points. In addition, sub-regional workshops and constituency meetings are organized where focal points receive updated information about the evolution of the GEF and its procedures from GEF Secretariat and agency resource persons. These tools are useful for interaction and learning among focal points.			West Africa Program The feasibility and support for this program was explored during GEF constituency meetings in Accra, Ghana, and Banjul, The Gambia, and during the April 2008 Council meeting. The CEO formally launched the preparation of a program in Bonn on May 28, 2008 with ministers and heads of delegations from the region attending the 9th Conference of the Parties of the CBD. A series of follow-up consultations were then held culminating in the presentation of a Program Document to the November 2008 Council that was subsequently approved. Twenty-one projects have been identified for support under the program for a total GEF financing of \$35.927 million. This program is still under implementation.		

Management Action Record – April 2009

Mid-term Review of the Resource Allocation Framework (GEF/ME/C.34/2, Oct 2008)

Management Response to the Mid-term Review of the Resource Allocation Framework (GEF/ME/C.34/3, Oct 2008)

Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Rating in Progress of Adoption [†]			
			Mgmt	Comments	GEF EO	Comments
Reallocation of unused funds should be allowed in the last year of GEF-4	We agree with the review's finding that the GEF and its Agencies should ensure that very limited unused resources be carried forward into GEF-5. While we do not foresee any overall underutilization issues, we have to be prepared for cases where several countries may not be able to utilize their respective allocations by the end of GEF-4 (June 30, 2010). We will take stock of the programming situation by December 31, 2008, and make a proposal to the Council at its Spring 2009 meeting for a reallocation of funds for programming during the last year of GEF-4 (July 1, 2009 – June 30, 2010).	Nov. 08 – Decision on Agenda Item 8 - The Council decided that: a. Reallocation of unused funds will be allowed in the last year of GEF-4.	Rating: High	Progress Feb '08 – April '09: The escalation of the global financial crisis during the past months has significantly reduced the expected funding envelope for GEF-4, and we are now facing a likely situation of shortage of funding rather than under-utilization of funds. A Council document with a proposed Council decision has been circulated to Council in March 2009 and is currently being revised in consideration of comments from council Members. A decision by mail is expected on this revised version before June Council.	High	The required flexibility is reflected in the proposals to Council.
The last phase of GEF-4, including reallocation of funds, should be implemented with full public disclosure, transparency, participation and clear responsibilities	We could not agree more with the above recommendation. An interagency process has helped us to develop proposals for reallocation and reprogramming for the consideration of the CEO. However, the excess in funds predicted in November has turned to a relative paucity of funds and so reallocation has led to the need to divert funds from relatively unused budget lines to those where there is an urgent need for support. we will continue to employ the inter-agency process as a means to disseminate information rapidly through participating Agencies and	Nov. 08 – Decision on Agenda Item 8 - b. The last phase of GEF-4, including reallocation of funds, will be implemented with full public disclosure, transparency, participation and clear responsibilities. The Council further decided that the Secretariat will present a proposal with objective rules and a transparent and equitable procedure for the reallocation of unused funds, taking into account the comments of Council Members expressed during the meeting,	Rating: High	Progress Feb '08 – April '09: The above mentioned Council document has been prepared in consultation with the GEF agencies. Agencies have commented upon draft and the next revision will be web-posted as well and the version, when approved by Council.	Medium	Council document has been prepared but not yet approved by Council nor implemented.

[†] Level of adoption may be rated in six ways: **High**: Fully adopted and fully incorporated into policy, strategy or operations; **Substantial**: Decision largely adopted but not fully incorporated into policy, strategy or operations as yet; **Medium**: Adopted in some operational and policy work, but not to a significant degree in key areas; **Negligible**: No evidence or plan for adoption, or plan and actions for adoption are in a very preliminary stage; **N/A**: Non-applicable; **Not possible to verify yet**: verification will have to wait until more data is available or proposals have been further developed.

Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Rating in Progress of Adoption [†]			
			Mgmt	Comments	GEF EO	Comments
	countries where possible.	for a decision by mail by March 2009.				
<p>Steps to improve RAF design and indices for GEF-5 should be taken as of now.</p> <p>The future issues for improvements include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Improvement of the global benefits indices and their weights 2. Increase of weight of the environmental portfolio performance 3. Improvement of predictability and cost-benefits for the group allocation, or discontinuation of the group allocation 4. Reconsideration of ceilings, floors and the 50% rule 5. Recognition of transboundary global environmental problems 6. Expanding the RAF to one integrated allocation for all focal areas. 	<p>It is not surprising that both the design and the implementation of the RAF were difficult experiences for the GEF and its different stakeholders. If a GEF-wide RAF is implemented, the Secretariat agrees with the mid-term review's finding that there is a clear need to strengthen the Secretariat to be able to play a stronger coordinating role in programming among GEF Agencies and recipient countries, in line with findings mentioned in paragraph 109 of the review regarding staff resources of comparable multilaterals with resource allocation systems such as IFAD and the Global Fund.</p>	<p>Nov. 08 – Decision on Agenda Item 8 -</p> <p>The Council also requested the GEF Secretariat, in collaboration with the GEF agencies and STAP and other stakeholders, to present steps to improve RAF design and indices for the climate change and biodiversity focal areas for GEF-5, and furthermore to present scenarios for possible expansion of the RAF, if feasible, to all focal areas for GEF-5 for consideration by the Council at the June 2009 GEF Council meeting.</p>	<p>Rating: Substantial</p>	<p>Progress Feb '08 – April '09:</p> <p>Following the recommendations of the GEFEO and the guidance of the Council, the GEF Secretariat has been improving the RAF. In March 2009, the GEF Secretariat presented a paper on RAF/STAR, taking into account all the six issues for future improvement. The Council members have read and discussed the paper, and given further guidance on improving RAF/STAR. The GEF Secretariat is currently developing a new version of the STAR paper for the Council Meeting in June 2009. Examples of the GEF Secretariat's actions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Working with STAP to improve CC indicator; 2. Using new indicator for CC and BD; 3. Planning to replace GPI; 4. Having abolished 50% rule and group allocations; 5. Expanding STAR in all the focal areas 	<p>Substantial</p>	<p>The Evaluation Office recognizes and appreciates the substantial efforts to prepare options for a new and improved system for allocations in GEF-5.</p>