

Management Action Record – January 2010
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.	New rating: Medium	Progress April '09 – Jan '10: For the GEF-5 strategic document, each focal area's technical advisory group has articulated the linkages between global and local benefit, and the strategies have highlighted and recognized the linkages, including poverty and gender issues, when relevant. The learning objectives of the focal area strategies have particular focus on the issue. It is on the agenda for GEFSEC to hire a consultant in 2010 to help integrate social impacts and benefits, including health, employment, gender, and livelihood support in Focal Area tracking tools, however; this has not gone into effect yet.	New Rating: Medium	GEF -5 focal area strategies have begun to address social and gender issues. It is also expected that the expert the secretariat plans to hire will provide an overall framework that can permit the development of social and gender standards for GEF operations.

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.	New rating: Medium	Progress April '09 – Jan '10: Based on the relevant studies conducted last year (on indigenous peoples and gender mainstreaming), the GEFSEC is currently working on a guidance paper on gender mainstreaming, building on gender strategies of the GEF Agencies and concerned Conventions, to more systematically address the issues in the GEF projects and project cycle.	New rating: Medium	The GEF secretariat has begun the process to produce guidance that sets standards on gender and social issues in GEF operations.
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.	New rating: Medium	Progress April '09 – Jan '10: All focal areas have analyzed the issue of trade-offs in the GEF-5 focal area strategies while carefully looking into the linkages between global and local benefits.	New rating: Medium	Tradeoffs have been considered in the development of GEF-5 strategies.

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.	New rating: Medium	Progress April '09 – Jan '10: Socio-economic and institutional assessments are an integral part of the project documents that are recently submitted by the GEF Agencies. GEF-5 Strategies better integrate social impacts and local benefits involving relevant experts at project level.	New rating: Medium	The Evaluation Office did not have opportunity to verify Socio-economic and institutional assessment of documents recently submitted. Nevertheless progress made on the topic on GEF-5 strategies and the background studies conducted indicate medium overall progress in addressing gender and social issues.

*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 – January 2010
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
5. 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;	New rating: Medium	Progress April '09 – Jan '10: The GEFSEC's new RBM has produced an evidence paper on GEB linkage to local benefits, which urges the hiring of a socioeconomic consultant to include adequate indicators in the PIRs.	New rating: Substantial	PIRs and TEs include an analysis of GEF and cofinancing.
6. 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.	New rating: Substantial.	Progress April '09 – Jan '10: The focal area strategies for GEF-5 describe 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. GEF has outlined a KM strategy for GEF-5.	New rating: Substantial	GEF-5 strategies are clearer and have a better identification of GEBs.
7. 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.	New rating: Substantial	Progress April '09 – Jan '10: A paper, "Operational Guidelines for the Application of the Incremental Cost Principle" was submitted to the June 2007 Council meeting; Council approved the paper and the guidelines as a basis for a simplified demonstration of the "business-as-usual" scenario, incremental reasoning, fit with the focal area strategies and co-funding. The Council requested the Secretariat, the GEF agencies and the Evaluation Office to ensure that the guidelines and information requirements are followed in project design and	New rating: High	Council paper prepared and discussed. New Council decision should be followed up in OPS5

Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Rating in Progress of Adoption *			
			Mgmt	Comments	GEF EO	Comments
				implementation, monitoring and evaluation.		

*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 – January 2010
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
8. 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;	New rating: Substantial	Progress April '09 – Jan '10: The PIF template continues to be used for determining eligibility of the project and for work program inclusion.	New rating: Substantial	Use of the PIF has resulted in the streamlining of the review process through the simplification of review criteria focusing only on the project eligibility, resources availability and agreed agency comparative advantage.
9. 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;	New rating: Substantial	Progress April '09 – Jan '10: There is an increase in the submission of programmatic approaches in the recent work programs. PIFs under the programmatic approaches also made up a substantial volume of the work program.	New rating: Substantial	Out of the 34 programmatic approaches identified by the GEF Sec, 62% were approved during GEF-4 while the rest were approved in previous GEF phases.
10. See all the above	See all the above	Dec. 2006 - Decision on Agenda Item 9 – d) Expedite the project cycle.	New rating: Substantial	Progress April '09 – Jan '10: In response to the evaluation of the project cycle, a new project cycle paper was submitted to Council in June 2007 which recommended to expedite the project cycle. There is progress on the shortening of project cycle submitted after June 2007. The GEF Secretariat continues to keep track and monitor the preparation time for all projects and provided alert to those that are in danger of exceeding the target preparation time.	New rating: Substantial	The new 22-month project cycle seems to be reducing approval time. Twenty-one months after the approval of the first work program in the new cycle, 77 percent of projects were presented to the GEF Chief Executive Officer (CEO) for endorsement. No data are available on the remaining 23 percent. In the new cycle, the 22-month period between project identification form (PIF) approval and CEO endorsement is mostly

Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Rating in Progress of Adoption *			
			Mgmt	Comments	GEF EO	Comments
						<p>within the responsibility of the GEF Agencies and focal points.</p> <p>Delays were noted in the period proceeding project proposal approval. PIFs tend to cycle back and forth between Agencies and the GEF Secretariat before they are submitted for Council approval, with some inefficiency in communication. The Secretariat has adopted a 10-business-day standard for replies, which it has met for 56 percent of PIFs received.</p>

Management Action Record – January 2010
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
11. 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.	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.	New rating: High	Progress April '09 – Jan '10: The PIF for the UNEP-GEF Project "Building Capacity for Effective Participation in the BCH-II" for \$2.5M was approved by Council as part of the November 2009 Work Program. This project would allow the enhancement of the BCH in 50 countries that have completed their National Biosafety Frameworks, and BCH-I. The project aims at delivering assistance by a series of training events, development of training materials, and direct assistance to countries by Regional Advisors. GEF is contributing \$2.5M and co-financing is \$2.5M. In addition to this FSP, GEF has funded a number of Enabling Activities during GEF-5 to assist countries enhancing their NBFs and BCHs.	New rating: High	Agreed

* 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
12. 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	New rating: Medium	<p>Progress April '09 – Jan '10:</p> <p>The GEFSEC participated in the Fifth Coordination Meeting for Governments and Organizations Implementing or Funding Biosafety Capacity-Building Activities held in San José, Costa Rica, 2009. As a result of this meeting, the CBD Secretariat agreed on compiling information on capacity-building needs and priorities on: i) handling socio-economic considerations, ii) risk assessment and post-release monitoring of LMOs, and iii) integrating biosafety into national development plans. The need for the identification or establishment of a national coordination mechanism for biosafety capacity development was also discussed. The GEF will use the results and recommendations of these reports during the implementation of the Biosafety Program during GEF-5.</p>	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.
13. 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	New rating: High	<p>Progress April '09 – Jan '10:</p> <p>STAP has participated in the formulation of the biodiversity strategy for GEF-4 and GEF-5 and STAP has concurred with the focus of the capacity building approach espoused in the strategies for GEF-4 and GEF-5, respectively. Regional- and country-focused biosafety projects regularly include specific components on mainstreaming biosafety considerations into broader development plans and processes. Activities include: i) seminars to sensitize policymakers and planners; ii) training workshops for relevant officials; and iii) guidance on how to integrate biosafety into relevant sectoral and cross-sectoral policies, and programmes. Thus, it is the capacity building projects themselves that are thought to be the best vehicle to integrate biosafety into other sectors, including sectors outside of the traditional environment</p>	New rating: High	Agreed

Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision *	Rating in Progress of Adoption *			
			Mgmt	Comments	GEF EO	Comments
				sectors. This makes for more strategic and sustained integration of the issue of biosafety into sectoral processes.		

*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 – January 2010
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
14. 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.	New rating: Substantial	<p>Progress April '09 – Jan '10:</p> <p>BD: The biodiversity focal area has developed a full suite of tracking tools, under the leadership of the GEF Secretariat with full participation of the GEF biodiversity task force which includes STAP. No corporate resources were required for this exercise.</p> <p>LD: The process for LD Focal Area Tracking Tool development is now well underway. The GEF Secretariat team is working closely with STAP and LD Interagency Task Force. Two developments during this period have helped to add-value to the process: decision by the UNCCD COP9 for all Parties to report on Land Cover Status as a key indicator effective 2012; and submission by the United Nations University (UNU) of draft report on indicators for the LD Focal Area by the GEF-UNDP project entitled "KM:Land".</p> <p>POPs: The POPs focal area has developed a full suite of tracking tools under the leadership of the GEF Secretariat and with full participation of the GEF POPs task force which includes STAP. A first version of the tracking tool was field tested through the 2008 PIR exercise. The tracking tool further developed and improved with a consultant's support and taking into account lessons learned, which fed back into the 2009 PIR exercise.</p> <p>CC: GEFSEC has been leading the development of indicators and</p>	New rating: Substantial	The GEF Secretariat has developed and updated tracking tools for most focal areas. They have shown progress in climate change where such tools are still being developed.

Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Rating in Progress of Adoption *			
			Mgmt	Comments	GEF EO	Comments
				<p>tracking tools for GHG accounting of GEF-funded projects. GEFSEC is currently working with STAP, GEF Agencies, and other experts to finalize methodology for estimating GHG emissions reduction from sustainable urban transport projects and is also updating and refining methodology for climate change mitigation projects in other sectors.</p> <p>IW: The International Waters Focal area has developed a full suite of Tracking Tools for GEF-4, in full cooperation with the IW Task Force. For the AMR/PIR 2009 the IW focal area received filled-in GEF- 4 Tracking Tools from the agencies, so the functionality of the GEF-4 TT has been demonstrated. International Waters focal area and Task Force developed in 2006 a Tracking Tool for GEF-3. For the AMR/PIR 2009, the IW focal area had full compliance from all agencies reporting on GEF-3 performances using the GEF-3 TT.</p>		

*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 – January 2010
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
15. UNDP and UNEP need to involve social and institutional expertise in project supervision.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 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. 	<p>Jun. 2007 – Decision on Agenda Item 6 - UNDP and UNEP should involve social and institutional expertise in project supervision where appropriate;</p>	<p>New rating: High</p>	<p>Progress April '09 – Jan '10:</p> <p>UNDP: UNDP involves social and institution expertise in project supervision where appropriate and will continue to examine how to further strengthen this. UNDP has recently instituted in the UNDP ATLAS ERP system, a 4 point rating of the gender relevance of each UNDP output.</p> <p>UNEP: -The updated UNEP Project Manual that will be online in early 2010, includes guidance on how to involve social and institutional expertise in project supervision</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Specific guidelines for applying social safeguards were developed by UNEP and are in the testing phase -All executing agencies are screened at the time of project appraisal to determine their social and institutional expertise -Staff are regularly trained to increase social and institutional capacity in project supervision. 	<p>New rating:</p> <p>UNDP: Substantial</p> <p>UNEP: Not possible to verify yet</p> <p>Overall: Substantial</p>	<p>UNDP addresses social and institutional issues through appropriate expertise as part of its human rights based approach to development and has put in place the instruments and tools to mainstream this approach into project preparation and supervision.</p> <p>The Direction of the GEF in UNEP (DGEF) has put in place a process to identify and track projects in which social issues and risks need to be addressed. However, it is yet not clear whether it has adopted a broader institutional policy framework that provides the basis for more specific and coherent programmatic guidance, processes or tool kits to address social issues and risks in GEF projects.</p>
16. Special attention is required to ensure continued and improved supervision in the new project cycle, through ensuring adequate funding in project fees.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 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 is directed 	<p>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;</p>	<p>New rating: Substantial</p>	<p>Progress April '09 – Jan '10:</p> <p>The secretariat believes the supervision budget is enough for Agencies and their compliance should be 100%. We do not get reporting on all projects that could be due for a PIR nor are the responses always full and the disbursement figures are not complete. It is not known if these shortcomings are due to lack of funding or lack of systems. However, we will review this costing and attribution in the new RBM policy paper and the M&E policy</p>	<p>New rating: Not possible to verify yet.</p>	<p>The project fees provided to agencies are based on a flat rate. While this rate may be sufficient (or more than sufficient) to support the supervision needs for full size projects, it may not be sufficient for the projects where GEF grant is smaller (MSPs/Enabling Activities). It puts agencies, such as UNEP, which have a GEF portfolio that is skewed towards smaller projects at a disadvantage. Progress made on RBM</p>

Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Rating in Progress of Adoption			
			Mgmt	Comments	GEF EO	Comments
	toward supervision of projects.			paper to ensure we have funding and compliance on all relevant issues,		clarifies supervision expectations but does not adequately address how resources will be provided for it. The final proposals for GEF-5 may provide further details.
17. UNEP should develop a structural approach to supervision of its GEF portfolio.	<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 establish project supervision tasks and their costs. A GEF Operations Manual is under development with an expected completion date of</p>	Jun. 2007 – Decision on Agenda Item 6 - UNEP should develop a systemic approach to supervision of its GEF portfolio;	New rating: Medium	<p>Progress April '09 – Jan '10:</p> <p>UNEP: UNEP is allocating 60% of the agency fee to project supervision. UNEP has analyzed the adequacy of fees for both corporate activities, and project cycle management. While the fees are adequate for project supervision, UNEP believes that they are not adequate to fully cover the supervision of the preparatory phase, nor for the GEF corporate activities. UNEP wonders whether the EO has studied the adequacy of funding for supervision (as stated in the EO comment on MAR 2009, and OPS-4). UNEP therefore suggests that the rating on this issue should be "Low"</p>	New rating: Substantial	<p>UNEP supervision performance has improved since 2006. This improvement is a result of a series of changes that UNEP has undertaken to meet Council request to develop a structured approach to supervision of GEF projects.</p> <p>A new risk tracking system has been developed and is functional. The system addresses risk identification during project preparation and tracking of risks and mitigating actions during project implementation. Oversight was also strengthened by requiring focal area team leaders to regularly monitor the support provided by the task managers to risky projects. A new database was also put in place, allowing better tracking of individual GEF projects and the portfolio. Despite the progress made, limited staffing and resources for field missions continue to constrain UNEP's project supervision.</p>

Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Rating in Progress of Adoption			
			Mgmt	Comments	GEF EO	Comments
18. 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.	<p>August 2007.</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>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>	<p>New rating: High</p>	<p>Progress April '09 – Jan '10:</p> <p>UNDP: The UNDP Evaluation Office has developed new GEF project terminal evaluation quality assurance procedures. The reviews are now fully consistent with GEF EO guidance for Terminal Evaluation Reviews and constitute a second tier independent review of each completed project and its terminal evaluation. The 24 completed projects during the GEF fiscal year 2009-2010 are now being assessed and the results will be synthesized and reported in March 2010. The Reviews and synthesis are designed to provide expected information on sustainability of outcomes, quality of M&E systems and co-finance reporting.</p> <p>UNEP: Progress has been achieved in line with the previous comments.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -UNEP DGEF has increased its human resource capacity and provided training to existing staff on project supervision. -The PIR system is in place and fully operational. -The Project at Risk System is in place and fully operational. -Project Supervision Plans are put into place at the time of CEO endorsement -A Quality of Supervision Review has been conducted by UNEP's EOU, applying the same methodology as GEF's EO. The results of both studies show a substantial increase in the quality of supervision of UNEP GEF projects compared to the 2007 GEF/EO review. 70% of projects achieved a "Satisfactory" supervision rating. 30 % "Moderately Satisfactory". There were no projects in the "Unsatisfactory" Range (for full details see www.unep.org/eou). -With the expected changes in the 	<p>New rating: Substantial</p>	<p>All Implementing agencies have taken steps towards harmonizing Terminal Evaluations with GEF Terminal Evaluations Guidelines. Overall the quality of information on project outcomes and risks to sustainability of outcomes has improved significantly. However, despite some gains, quality of financial information still remains concern. The Evaluation Office will include this issue through a consultative process.</p>

Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Rating in Progress of Adoption			
			Mgmt	Comments	GEF EO	Comments
				<p>project cycle in GEF-5, it has been decided to publish the GEF Operations Manual by the beginning of GEF-5.</p> <p>World Bank: The WBG IEG systematically provides an independent rating of the quality of Implementation Completion Reports of WBG GEF projects, with attention to the GEF criteria. As the GEF EO has stated its decision to accept IEG outcome ratings, this recommendation can be considered as resolved.</p>		

Management Action Record – January 2010
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
19. 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.	New rating: Substantial	<p>Progress April '09 – Jan '10:</p> <p>The GEF-5 Replenishment documents include the recommendation that recipient countries set up a national GEF Committee with broad representation to discuss GEF issues and the use of allocated resources. This recommendation is for those that do not have this kind of mechanism or a similar one.</p> <p>In addition it is suggested that countries may wish to undertake Project Identification Exercises (PIE) that would use the committee mentioned above or another mechanism to decide how the GEF-5 resources allocated under the STAR will be used. The GEF will provide up to 30,000 dollars per country to support these exercises. These PIEs are voluntary.</p> <p>It is expected that both these recommendations will lead to greater coordination and programming at the country level with participation of interested stakeholders.</p>	New rating: High	The request by Council of country assistance strategies has evolved to the PIEs. EO, during GEF-5, will most likely review the experience with development and implementation of PIEs.

Management Action Record – January 2010
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
20. 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.	<p>- 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.</p> <p>- 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.</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>New rating: High</p>	<p>Progress April '09 – Jan '10:</p> <p>SGP Steering Committee have organized consultations with national Coordinators from ten countries and have recommended that management costs would be established by the Council based on survey conducted by two external consultants.</p> <p>The Council during its 36th meeting (C.36/4) agreed that management costs will be determined based on services provided but not on the basis of stated percentage.</p>	<p>New rating: substantial</p>	<p>Council agreed that management costs will be determined on the basis of services provided. Full implementation of this decision is still pending as the process of upgrading national programs is still on its way.</p>
21. 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.	<p>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.</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>New rating: Substantial</p>	<p>Progress April '09 – Jan '10:</p> <p>The Council during its 36th meeting (C.36/4) agreed that ten country programs will be upgraded to FSP and will be managed separately. CPMT role will be only coordination and more emphasis on regional management approaches will be explored by UNDP during GEF-5.</p>	<p>New rating: Medium</p>	<p>Process of upgrading country programs has started but it has been slow. Unless a solution is found there are risks that there will be a funding gap for the operation of the ten country programs that are in line for upgrading. Overall programmatic document which defines the role of CPMT vis a vis upgraded country programs has not been</p>

Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Rating in Progress of Adoption			
			Mgmt	Comments	GEF EO	Comments
22. Country programme oversight needs to be strengthened.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 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 be appropriately announced on the SGP and GEF websites. 	Nov. 2007 – Decision on Agenda Item 9 - ... (c) strengthening country programme oversight.	New rating: Substantial	<p>Progress April '09 – Jan '10:</p> <p>Country oversight will be increased by involving UNDP regional advisors into technical oversight issues of SGP.</p>	New rating: Not possible to verify yet.	<p>prepared.</p> <p>Involvement of UNDP regional advisors in technical oversight is likely a sound approach. UNDP regional teams have also expressed willingness to provide this support. It is not clear the extent to which this has taken place.</p>
23. 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.	New rating: Substantial	<p>Progress April '09 – Jan '10:</p> <p>Evaluation and monitoring of the program will be enhanced by exploring opportunities to increase staff resources and clearly defining objectives, frequency and methodologies for SGP M&E. New approach is already implemented through RAF-2 allocation.</p>	New rating: substantial.	The SGP has made some structural and procedural improvements in its database and is providing more attention to monitoring at the global program level. It has improved its oversight of the country programs through audits. Some of the potential improvements are yet to be explored and put in place.
24. 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.	New rating: Medium	<p>Progress April '09 – Jan '10:</p> <p>Access to SGP criteria will be proposed and considered during SGP Steering Committee meeting in March 2010.</p>	New rating: Negligible	Specific proposals have not yet been submitted to Council. The process of by which criteria are being defined has been slow.
25. 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	- 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	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	New rating: High	<p>Progress April '09 – Jan '10:</p> <p>SGP policy for upgrading country programs was approved by the Council in its 36th meeting and it will have no negative impact on SIDS</p>	New rating: Medium	A policy for upgrading was presented and approved by Council and care has been taken to prevent negative impacts to LDCs and SIDS. Implementation

Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Rating in Progress of Adoption			
			Mgmt	Comments	GEF EO	Comments
SIDS and LDCs.	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.	GEF achievements and cost effectiveness, especially in SIDS and LDCs.		and LDCs. Cost effectiveness also was considered and further improvement of the program is planned to upgrade ten SGP country programs.		of upgrading has been slow and there are risks that country programs that will be upgraded will have a funding gap that will affect operations and fulfillment of comments.

Management Action Record – January 2010
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
26. 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.	New rating: High	Progress April ‘09 – Jan ‘10: In GEF-4, the vast majority of projects under strategic objective one on protected areas are aimed at enhancing the sustainability of protected area systems, through interventions that 1) secure financial sustainability; 2) improve coverage of under-represented ecosystems, thus enhancing ecological sustainability; and 3) increase individual and institutional capacity. These three pillars of sustainability, particularly one and three, are fundamental for the institutional continuity of the protected area system and its sustainability. Hence, the issue of institutional continuity is embedded in the project intervention strategies themselves and has been indicated at PIF stage and CEO endorsement.	New rating: Substantial	As indicated in the Secretariat’s comments, two of the three pillars adopted under strategic objective one directly contribute to institutional continuity. Yet it is still not clear how risks to institutional continuity are monitored during project implementation.

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 – January 2010
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
27. 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,	New rating: Substantial	Progress April '09 – Jan '10: There has been a significant increase in the number of MFA and trans-boundary projects in GEF-4 compared to GEF-3.	New rating: Substantial	GEF-5 strategies have incorporated the concept of transboundary and integration across focal areas. A new strategy has been developed on adaptation. EO will evaluate the implementation of GEF-5 strategies during its GEF-5 work program and OPS5.
28. 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, 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	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.	New rating: High	Progress April '09 – Jan '10: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The GEF Secretariat has had a proactive role with countries and agencies to facilitate the implementation of three programs for West and Central Africa. By January 2010, 53 PIFs have been cleared under these three programs, setting aside more than 112 millions of GEF grants (3 of them waiting for next work program). The countries were in the driver seat: both programs were decided on orientations decided by countries. All projects were developed from national priorities and project ideas proposed by countries (in general through GEF national committees). 	New rating: Substantial	GEFSEC has been more proactive with LDCs, particularly by developing programmatic approaches. Country ownership has also been extensively considered in the GEF-5 policy and programmatic papers. EO should consider these issues during GEF-5 work program and OPS5.

* 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
	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.					

Management Action Record – January 2010

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
29. 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 inter-agency 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 countries where possible.	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, for a decision by mail by March 2009.	New rating: High	Progress April '09 – Jan '10: The Council eventually approved by mail the document, <i>Reallocation of Remaining GEF-4 Resources (revised version dated May 19, 2009)</i> , and agreed with the principles for allocating the remaining GEF-4 resources outlined in the paper. The Council mandated the Secretariat to implement the allocation of the remaining GEF-4 resources in accordance with these principles. The paper on reallocation of resources was posted to the web, and made widely available to OFPs and was used in briefings to the countries in regional and national consultations by GEF and Agencies. The use of the remaining resources has been maintained according to the mid-term reallocation of July 2008. By end of GEF-4, all resources will have been allocated according to these rules with CEO having final decision on the composition of the work program. GEFSEC will also make PMIS available to all OFPs in March 2010 giving them access to view and provide comments to Council, etc.	New Rating: Substantial	There has been an improvement in the GEF performance on parameters such as transparency and disclosure during implementation of the last phase of GEF-4. However, PMIS - a key instrument to for information management, disclosure, and transparency - still remains a work in progress in terms of quality of information and easy access to stakeholders across the GEF partnership. As per the Council decision, the Secretariat presented a proposal on rules for reallocation of unutilized funds. The procedures adopted for reallocation of the RAF funds were transparent and were shared across the GEF partnership.

[†] 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
<p>30. Steps to improve RAF design and indices for GEF-5 should be taken as of now. 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 - 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>New rating: High</p>	<p>Progress April '09 – Jan '10: The GEF Council at its November 2009 meeting adopted a decision on the System for Transparent Allocation of Resources (STAR) that replaces the RAF, with improved design and indices and expanded to the land degradation focal area.</p>	<p>New rating: High</p>	<p>Agreed</p>

Management Action Record – January 2010

Annual Country Portfolio Evaluation Report-2009, (GEF/ME/C.35/1, June 2009)

Management Response to the Annual Country Portfolio Evaluation Report-2009 (GEF/ME/C.35/2, June 2009)

Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Rating in Progress of Adoption [‡]			
			Mgmt	Comments	GEF EO	Comments
31. The GEF should address the significant gap of available resources for combating land degradation to support key challenges facing countries like Egypt, Syria, and Cameroon.	We find the comment regarding land degradation to be slightly contradictory. Underfunding is an issue that applies across the whole GEF portfolio, and we note that land degradation is not the only area where a higher resource level would help countries to better meet their environmental priorities.	<i>June 2009. Decision on Agenda Item 7: Explore within the GEF partnership modalities to address the significant gap of available resources for combating land degradation to support key challenges facing countries like Egypt, Syria, and Cameroon</i>	Rating: Medium	With GEF Council decision to include the LD FA in the STAR for GEF-5, all three of these countries now have an opportunity to harness GEF resources for combating LD. The GEF Secretariat is working closely with the World Bank MENA Region to ensure that both Egypt and Syria take full advantage of GEF resources in the LD FA.	Medium	Agreed. EO should review these issues during it GEF-5 work program or OPS5
32. The GEF should focus attention on countries in exceptional situations concerning limited access to International Financial Institutions, like Syria.	- - -	<i>June 2009. Decision on Agenda Item 7: Conduct a survey of countries in exceptional situations concerning limited access to GEF partner International Financial Institutions, like Syria.</i>	Rating: Negligible	Action on this matter has been delayed until resources are made available after Assembly and Replenishment.	Negligible	Agreed.

[‡] 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 – January 2010

GEF Annual Report on Impact –2009, (GEF/ME/C.36/2, Nov 2009)

Management Response to the GEF Annual Report on Impact –2009 (GEF/ME/C.36/3, Nov 2009)

Recommendation	Management Response	Council Decision	Rating in Progress of Adoption [§]			
			Mgmt	Comments	GEF EO	Comments
33. The GEF should consider further investment and capacity development to assist countries with economies in transition to address the remaining threats to the ozone layer.	We fully agree with this recommendation. Continuing support to eligible CEITs to meet Montreal Protocol obligations should continue to be a cornerstone of GEF programs, and it is one of the three objectives proposed for the GEF-5 chemicals strategy. Regarding destruction specifically, we would note that this is not an obligation under the Protocol, and that the policy discussions under the Protocol have only recently progressed. In view of the costs and uncertainties involved, we believe support should be provided on a pilot basis and in coordination with other GEF programs dealing with hazardous waste, notably POPs and International Waters.	<i>Nov 2009. Decision on Agenda Item 8:</i> GEF-5 strategy proposals, prepared by the Secretariat, should include further investment and capacity development to assist countries with economies in transition to address the remaining threats to the ozone layer.	Rating: High	The draft GEF-5 strategy for chemicals and associated programming document include provisions for further investment and capacity development to assist countries with economies in transition to address the remaining threats to the ozone layer.	Rating Substantial	The draft GEF-5 strategy for chemicals includes provisions for further investment in economies in transition to address remaining threats to the ozone layer. The extent of funding will depend on the negotiations of the 5 th replenishment.
34. The GEF should learn from the positive private sector engagement in the reduction of Ozone Layer Depletion focal area and incorporate similar approaches into its efforts to engage the private sector in other focal areas.	We fully agree with this recommendation, although again some context is necessary. There is strong engagement with the private sector because this is where the majority of the ODS consumption/production lies; there is no parallel in any other GEF focal area to this situation. We also agree in general with most of the “lessons for consideration” that are proposed, although their actual applicability would have to be assessed in detail.	<i>Nov 2009. Decision on Agenda Item 8:</i> The Secretariat should incorporate lessons from the positive private sector engagement in the Ozone Layer Depletion focal area into its efforts to engage the private sector, where possible and as appropriate, in other focal areas.	Rating: Substantial	All the proposed GEF focal area strategies for GEF-5, in addition to the proposed strengthening of the “Earth Fund”, call for enhanced engagement with the private sector. This takes many forms, including for example, supporting incentives for private sector investment in protected areas, catalysing private sector investment in environmentally sound climate-friendly technologies, supporting market and industry approaches for management and protection of pelagic and deep-sea environments, introduction of market-based financing mechanisms for investment in sustainable forestry management, and promoting private sector investment in best	Rating Substantial	Draft GEF-5 Focal area strategies have included activities with the private sector using different approaches. Strategies are now in a draft form and will be approved as part of the 5th replenishment of the GEF. Some focal areas such as international waters and climate change already have operations engaging the private sector.

[§] 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
				environmental practices and best available techniques for POPs release reduction.		