MID-TERM REVIEW OF
THE GEF
RESOURCE ALLOCATION FRAMEWORK

Effects of the Resource Allocation Framework on the Small Grants Programme

Technical Paper #6
30th October 2008

Not edited
Not for citation or distribution

Draft 2

Contents

Contacts:
Neeraj Kumar Negi, Evaluation Officer, GEF Evaluation Office
Task Manager: Siv Tokle, Sr. Evaluation Officer, GEF Evaluation Office

1. Summary of Key Findings

This paper presents an assessment of the effects of the Resource Allocation Framework (RAF) on the Small Grants Programme (SGP) of the Global Environment facility (GEF). It is an input to the mid-term review of the RAF being conducted by the GEF Evaluation Office. The findings and conclusions presented in this paper are based on literature review, an analysis of the SGP databases, survey of the RAF stakeholders, and interviews of the relevant SGP and GEF Secretariat staff.

During the third phase of its operation (OP3) the SGP received almost all of its GEF support through core funds. In comparison, during OP4 the SGP needs to access a substantial proportion of potential GEF support through RAF country allocations. Rules framed by the SGP steering committee regulate the manner in which GEF resources can be accessed through core funds and RAF country allocations and utilized. This review found that:

- The rules regulating access and utilization of RAF resource have constrained SGP from accessing GEF resources through RAF country allocations. As a result, it is likely that during GEF-4 SGP will be able to access only about US $ 62-68 million from RAF country allocations. This is substantially lower than the US $ 90 million that was expected as per the 'Programming Document for the Fourth Replenishment of the GEF Trust Fund.'

- Overall the proportion of SGP investment in projects pertaining to the climate change focal area has increased significantly whereas there has been a moderate increase in the investments in the biodiversity focal area. Investments in other focal areas have declined. The project portfolios of 'RAF funds only' country programs have been the most affected. Project portfolios of 'RAF/Core funds' country programs were moderately affected whereas those of the 'Core funds only' country programs remained unaffected.

- Generally speaking at the global program level the predictability of funding, especially for management activities, has improved. However, a significant proportion of the SGP national coordinators from of 'RAF/Core funds' country programs – that need to access GEF resources through both Core funds and RAF country allocations – report that predictability of funding allocation for their respective country programs has declined. An overwhelming majority of national coordinators also felt that after RAF transparency in allocation of funding to country programs has improved.

- The country program expenditure caps introduced by the SGP steering committee for GEF-4 have affected at least 11 country programs. Compared to the OP3, the per annum expenditure on project grants by these programs declined by 33 percent during the first year of OP4. Due to lower levels of operation, management costs of these country programs increased from 13.5 percent during OP3 to 14.8 percent during the first year of OP4.

- The need to access resources from the RAF country allocations has encouraged the SGP to seek greater involvement and engagement with the GEF operational focal points and relevant government departments of the participating countries in RAF funds only and RAF/Core funds country programs. Although this has provided SGP opportunities to mainstream and upscale its experience through government agencies, it has also made SGP vulnerable to government influences.

- Implementation of RAF has increased the workload of the SGP staff both at the country program and global program level. Although some of the work load will reduce when SGP operations have transitioned to the new allocation system, work load due to additional reporting requirement and need to interact more intensively with the government agencies to gain access to RAF country allocation funds is likely to persist. The transaction cost of negotiating and finalizing the RAF endorsement process, including the related paperwork, has also increased for other stakeholders such as the GEF Secretariat and governments of participating countries.

Some of the effects of the constraints introduced due to implementation of RAF could be mitigated. Increase in program expenditure caps for countries such as India, Philippines and Mexico that have considerable capacity to absorb GEF resources through small scale interventions will help these programs to produce global environmental benefits through such activities in a cost efficient manner.

Another measure that could be useful is to provide RAF-funds-only country programs some support to allow them to take up projects in GEF focal areas for which the respective participating country has not contributed from its indicative RAF allocation. This would mitigate the imbalances in the project portfolios of these country programs. However, when developing a modality for providing support for care needs to be taken that it does not reduce the resources available for other country programs and program management activities.

The efficacy of the strategy requiring SGP to access GEF funds through two different sources – core funds and RAF country allocations – needs to be reconsidered. While accessing resources through the RAF country allocations has benefited SGP in terms of increased ownership of the host governments, it has also increased workload for the SGP staff and has reduced the time available to them for other activities.

2. Background and Methodology

Background

The Global Environment Facility (GEF) is a mechanism for international cooperation to provide new and additional funding to meet the agreed incremental costs of securing global environmental benefits. The GEF activities are funded through contributions from donor countries that replenish GEF resources every four years. These resources are primarily used to make grants to the eligible participating countries to undertake projects that generate global environmental benefits. Prior to GEF-4, resources were disbursed for eligible projects on a first-come, first-serve basis. Thus, as long as a participating country submitted eligible project proposals through implementing agencies and GEF resources had not been exhausted, there was no restriction on GEF resources that it could access.

This, however, changed in July 2006 when a new Resource Allocation Framework (RAF) was implemented to "allocate resources to countries in a transparent and consistent manner based on global environmental priorities and country capacity, policies and practices relevant to successful implementation of GEF projects." Underlying objectives of the RAF are to:

- Increase impact of GEF funding on the global environment;
- Improve on the existing GEF country-driven approach and partnerships; and
- Increase the predictability and transparency of GEF funding allocations.

About 60 percent of the total GEF resources (US $ 3.1 billion) for GEF-4 (2006-2010) are being allocated using the RAF formula for country allocations in biodiversity and climate change.[1] Under this framework each eligible participating country is given an individual indicative[2] allocation for biodiversity and climate change focal areas based on its potential to generate global environmental benefits and its performance in terms of national policies and enabling environment that facilitate successful implementation of GEF projects. Separate indicative country allocations are made for biodiversity and climate change focal areas. For participating countries whose allocation for a focal area is not sufficiently large, the country allocation for that focal area is pooled together with that of other countries. Such pooled allocations are referred to as group allocations.

Any eligible participating country can access GEF RAF resources only up to its indicative country allocation or the maximum level established for the group allocation. Further, a country may access only up to 50 percent of its indicative RAF allocations for biodiversity and climate change focal areas during the first half of the GEF-4. The key difference from the earlier practice is that for a major proportion of GEF resources a participating country that has an indicative country allocation knows in advance the upper bound of the resources that it may access during a GEF funding cycle.

Countries can receive GEF financing through resources available outside RAF for projects in the other focal areas (international waters, land degradation, ozone layer depletion, and persistent organic pollutants). About 10 percent of the RAF resources are set aside for supporting cross-cutting capacity building projects and regional and global projects. The Small Grants Programme (SGP) accesses GEF resources through core funds and RAF country allocations. The allocation for core funds is comprised of the funds from the RAF set aside and of the contributions from the focal areas that not covered under RAF during GEF4.

The GEF created the SGP in 1992. The SGP functions as a means of directly financing NGO and CBO initiatives that generate global environmental benefits in ways that address a country's sustainable development priorities (Joint Evaluation of the SGP Program, 2008). The maximum size of individual grants is US$ 50,000 and most grants range between US $ 20,000 and 35,000. The United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) implements SGP on behalf of the GEF partnership. The United Nations Office for Project Services (UNOPS) is the executing agency

[1] Its figure is 67 percent if all the programmable resources, including contributions made from the Biodiversity and Climate Change focal areas allocations to corporate programs and regional/global projects.
[2] Indicative means individual allocation for one country. It term indicates the allocations are not entitlements and that actual commitments may be differ.

for this program. Since 1999 the SGP has been operating as a corporate program of the GEF. A multiagency steering committee provides overall strategic guidance to SGP[3].

Up to June 2007 (up to the end of SGP OP3), the SGP accessed GEF resources primarily through direct allocations from the GEF core funds. The GEF Council approved release of a tranche for SGP after it received such a request from the GEF CEO. The Central Program Management Team (CPMT) of SGP determined allocations to individual country programs based on the total resources available, and needs and absorbing capacity of the country programs. For OP4 (which became operational in July 2008 a year after the start of GEF-4) this mode of accessing GEF resources has been changed. Although SGP continues to access a major proportion of its GEF support through the core funds, it needs to access the remainder through the indicative RAF allocations of eligible participating countries. [4]

This paper forms part of the mid-term review of the RAF, requested by the GEF Council, which will be presented to the Council in November 2008. It responds to the terms of reference for the review regarding the observable changes in GEF programming from GEF-3 to GEF-4. Specifically, the Council wanted to know how the RAF has affected the funding of the Small Grants Programme.

Methodology

The findings and conclusions presented in this paper are based on literature review, a portfolio analysis of the SGP and RAF databases, survey of the RAF stakeholders including SGP national coordinators, and interviews of the relevant SGP, GEF Secretariat and Agency staff, as well as GEF operational focal points and country stakeholders.

The literature review was conducted to gather background information for this paper. The databases used for this analysis include the SGP project database, which provides information on the SGP project portfolio, and the SGP country program expenditure database, which provides information on the actual expenditures incurred by the SGP in the participating countries. These databases facilitated analysis of the changes in the project portfolios and expenditure patterns of the participating countries. An online survey was conducted as part of this RAF mid term review to know the perceptions of RAF stakeholders, especially on effects of RAF on SGP. Interviews of the relevant SGP and GEF Secretariat staff facilitated a better understanding of the SGP and RAF processes. Since SGP is still under transition from the old allocation system, it is difficult to assess a fuller range of effects at this point.

[3] The SGP Steering Committee was constituted in December 2006. It is chaired by the CEO of the GEF and its members include representatives from the GEF Secretariat, the GEF Agencies, the GEF NGO Network, and the Central Program Management Team (CPMT) of SGP. Prior to this committee, an operation consultations group provided strategic guidance to SGP.

[4] The SGP also accesses a small proportion of GEF resources by implementing the small grant components of some of the medium and full size GEF projects. To avoid double counting the small grant components implemented by the SGP for the medium and full size GEF project are reported by the parent projects and not SGP. There have been no changes in this modality for OP4.

3. Access to GEF resources for SGP during GEF-4

Coverage under RAF and SGP

The GEF provides assistance to 161 countries through RAF allocations (see Annex 3 for complete list). Based on whether the countries have individual allocation for the focal areas covered under RAF the beneficiary countries may be divided into five different groups:

a. Countries (31, 19% of 161) with individual allocation in both focal areas.

b. The **biodiversity countries** (26, 16% of 161) - with individual allocations in biodiversity and group allocation in climate change.

c. The **climate change countries** (15, 9% of 161) - with individual allocations in climate change and group allocation in biodiversity

d. The **group allocation countries** in both focal areas are the largest category (78, 48% of all eligible countries).

e. Countries with **only climate change group allocation**, and no biodiversity allocation (11 countries, mainly new to the GEF, mainly in the Arab States (7))[5].

At the start of OP4, among the countries which may access GEF resources through RAF, SGP was operational or had been operational in 100. It is expected that during OP4 the SGP will start its operation in 23 more countries (Table 1). Thus, a majority – but not all – of the countries eligible to receive GEF funding through RAF are covered by SGP.

Table 1: Frequency distribution of SGP Country Programs

Country program type	At the start of OP4 (2007)	Expected at the end of OP4 (2010)
RAF funds only	14	17
RAF/Core funds	38	47
Core funds only	48	59
All programs	100	123

SGP Programming for GEF-4

'The Programming Document for the Fourth Replenishment of the GEF Trust Fund' enunciates the financial plan for SGP during GEF-4[6]. As per this plan the total allocation for SGP during GEF-4 is US $ 200 million. According to this plan, SGP may receive GEF resources through two sources.

- **Core funds:** SGP may receive up to US $ 110 million from the direct allocations from the GEF focal areas. Of this amount a total of US $ 80 million was to be contributed by setting aside resources from RAF allocations of the biodiversity and climate change focal areas at the global program level, and US $ 30 million was to be contributed from the program budgets of land degradation, international waters and persistent pollutant focal areas (US $ 10 million each).

[5] Only climate change group allocation: Bahrain, Cyprus, Kuwait, Malta, Oman, Qatar, San Marino, Singapore, United Arab Emirates, Israel, and Saudi Arabia.

[6] This document is attached as an annex (Annex II) to the "Summary of Negotiations on the Fourth Replenishment Agreement of the GEF Trust Fund (October 19, 2006, revised)."
http://thegef.org/Replenishment/Reple_Documents/SummaryofNegotiations_Revised_October2006.pdf.pdf

- **RAF Country Allocations:** SGP could access up to US $ 90 million from the RAF country allocations of participating countries.

The access and utilization of GEF-4 resources by SGP for OP4 are primarily governed by the rules framed by the SGP Steering Committee. Most of the rules that are currently applicable were framed by the Steering Committee in its first meeting in December 2006. These rules are listed in annex 1 of this paper. There is an overall expenditure cap of US $ 600,000 per annum for each participating country during the GEF-4 period. Based on the sources through which the SGP country programs may access GEF funding, the SGP country programs could be broadly classified as:

1. **RAF funds only programs**: Country programs may access GEF funding (for grant making) only through the indicative RAF allocations for their respective country. To be included in this group the respective countries should have a RAF allocation of more than US $ 15 million for Biodiversity and/or Climate Change focal area. During GEF-4 each of the participating country in this group may cumulatively contribute up to US $ 2,400,000 to their respective SGP country program. The resources committed from a RAF country allocation of a focal area to the respective SGP country program may be used to fund projects only in that focal area.
2. **RAF/Core funds programs**: Country programs in this group access GEF funding through both RAF and core funds. For the first half of GEF-4, the participating countries whose indicative RAF country allocations for GEF-4 in both biodiversity and climate change focal areas is lower than US $ 15 million were able to contribute up to US $ 300,000 per annum from their RAF allocation for a matching investment from core funds. This rule was amended in November 2007 for the second half of the GEF-4 to allow contributions of up to US $ 400,000 per annum from RAF and of US $ 200,000 from the core funds. The program may use core funds to support projects from any GEF focal area. However, from the funds accessed through RAF it may support only those projects that pertain to the respective RAF allocation focal area.
3. **Core funds only programs**: These programs pertain to countries that do not have an individual allocation for either biodiversity or climate change focal areas, i.e. those with access to the group allocation. They may access GEF funding only from core funds, which may then be used to support projects from any focal area. For GEF-4 the average annual expenditure of LDC and SIDS countries is capped at US $ 600,000. However, for countries that are neither LDC nor SIDS the average annual expenditure for GEF-4 is capped at US $ 400,000.
4. **New SGP country programs**: The rules treat each country program that is in its first year of operation as a new country program. Regardless of their RAF country allocation status, as an exception the new country programs are allowed preferential access of up to US $ 150,000 from core funds during the first year of their operations for establishing the program. In case a country program is otherwise eligible for accessing GEF funds through RAF, it may do so after following the rules for accessing RAF resources. After being operational for a year, the new country programs have to follow the rules that are applicable to the old country programs as described above in three first bullets. During OP4, SGP will make 23 new country programs operational (table 1).

Actual expenditure caps are higher due to shorter duration of SGP OP4 vis-à-vis GEF-4. Compared to GEF-4, which is of four-year duration, the corresponding operational cycle of SGP (OP4) is three years long. While the rules do not clarify the implications of this disconnect on country program expenditure caps, the practice has been that the resources allocated for a country program for GEF-4 may be used within the three years that SGP OP4 is under implementation. There is, therefore a resultant increase in the effective average annual expenditure caps for the country programs.[7] The de-facto caps are presented in table 2.

Table 2: De facto average annual country program expenditure caps during GEF-4 (in US $)

Type of country programs	Number of Country Programs	Core Funds	RAF Funds	Total GEF Resources
RAF funds only	17	0	800,000	800,000
RAF/Core funds	47	266,667 (400,000*)	533,333 (400,000*)	800,000
Core funds only programs in LDC/SIDS countries	44	800,000	0	800,000
Core funds only programs in countries that are neither LDC nor SIDS	16	533,333	0	533,333

*The figures given in parentheses correspond to caps that were applicable from July 2007 to June 2008. In November 2007 the SGP Steering Committee amended these caps to the figures given without parentheses for the remaining period of GEF 4 beginning July 2008. .

For the "Core funds only programs" all the expenditure on management costs, and for "RAF/Core funds" and "RAF funds only" programs a substantial portion of the expenditure on management costs, is excluded from expenditure that is considered for calculating country program expenditure. Management costs of the SGP include agency fees of UNDP, UNOPS support fee, and other management expenses incurred at the global and country program level. The project document for OP4 of SGP commits SGP to keep the managements costs of the program, including agency fees for UNDP, at a ceiling of 28 percent of the total GEF support (excluding agency fee this expenditure is capped at 24 percent). As discussed earlier in this paper, the rules framed by the SGP Steering Committee have prescribed the expenditure caps for different types of country programs. However, these rules do not clarify whether management costs incurred at the country program level will be included as part of the country program expenditure. The Steering Committee has allowed the CPMT to exclude expenditure on management costs by the "Core funds only programs" from the country program expenditure caps. For such programs the country program expenditure is calculated by taking into account only the expenditure on project grants. For the "RAF/Core funds programs" and "RAF funds only programs" the contributions from the RAF country allocations, including the 10 percent for meeting the UNDP agency and UNOPS support fees, are included for calculating the country program expenditure. However, the management expenditure met through core funds is excluded for calculating the country program expenditure.

[7] Up to 2007 the Operational Phases of SGP were not aligned with the funding cycle of GEF. In its December 2006 meeting the SGP steering committee also took a decision to align the former with the latter. To facilitate alignment, OP3 – which was to end in March 2008 – was terminated in June 2007. SGP OP4 was designed to be of three-year duration and to terminate in June 2010, when the GEF4 also ends.

SGP has faced several constraints in accessing RAF resources. Key constraints include:

- the rules for accessing RAF country allocations put a limit on the amount that could be raised from individual country programs;
- indicative RAF allocations of some RAF/Core funds program countries are small;
- the 50 percent rule restricts the timing of resource utilization;
- the rule requiring matching contributions from core funds for the RAF/Core fund programs;
- the confusion created due to lack of clarity in communications between GEF Secretariat and SGP country programs and changes in rules to access RAF resources; and,
- competition with other agencies for GEF resources.

The overall expenditure cap for individual country programs limits the extent to which GEF resources can be accessed by SGP. Some of the participating countries such as Mexico and India wanted to contribute a larger amount to SGP but were not able to do so because of the limit prescribed by the rules. In contrast, for other countries such as Afghanistan, Cape Verde, Cambodia, Cote d'Ivoire, Haiti, Mongolia and Nicaragua, whose indicative RAF country allocations for GEF4 are in the range of US $ 3.3 to 4.1 million, the relatively small size of the indicative RAF allocations constrains them from committing funds to SGP. The 50 percent rule, that restricted the participating countries from committing more than half of their indicative RAF allocations during the first two years of the GEF4, was another constraint. The governments of Mongolia and Nicaragua, even through they wanted to commit funds to their SGP country programs, were not able to do so for the first year of OP4 because they had already committed 50 percent of the RAF country allocations to full size and medium size projects.

The rules requiring matching of funds from RAF and core funds in a 1:1 ratio for the RAF/Core funds programs constrained the ability of SGP to access resources from RAF. To match the funds accessed through RAF, CPMT had to allocate significant resources from the core funds. Since a major part of the core funds is dedicated to meeting the management costs of running all the country programs and management costs of the global program team, and to making grants in the group allocation country programs, dedicating adequate core funds to RAF/Core funds country programs was difficult. This rule was changed in November 2007 for the second half of the GEF-4 to allow SGP to contribute up to US $ 200,000 per annum from core funds to a participating country and access up to US $ 400,000 from its RAF country allocation. As a result, during the second half of GEF-4 SGP is likely to have greater access to RAF resources for the RAF/Core funds country programs.

The GEF Secretariat issued the first set of "Guidelines for Country Operational Focal Points to Manage GEF Resources" in April 2006. These guidelines informed the focal points that contributions from RAF allocations to SGP will be tracked. It, however, did not specify a limit on these contributions[8]. On June 18th 2006 the Global Manager of SGP wrote to the operational focal points alerting them about the need for SGP to access GEF resources through RAF country allocations. In his letter the Global Manager laid out a prospective plan suggesting the minimum amounts that participating countries should contribute to the SGP. From October 2006 to April 2007, the GEF Secretariat conducted teleconferences with the focal points regarding programming for GEF-4. During these teleconferences, among other issues, the focal points

[8] Six letters were sent by the GEF CEO to GEF Operational Focal Points in March 2006, April-May 2006, August 2006, October 2006 and two separate letters in December 2006.

sought advice from GEF Secretariat on the resources they could contribute to the SGP. The follow-up letters sent by the Secretariat during October and November 2006 after these conferences did advise the respective operational focal points on the amounts that they could commit from their RAF country allocations to SGP. The basis on which specific amounts were suggested was not clear. In December 2006 the SGP Steering Committee issued a new set of guidelines that regulated access to GEF resources through RAF country allocations. These guidelines did not clarify issues related to effect of shortened duration of OP4 vis-à-vis GEF-4 and treatment of management costs. This lack of clarity was also reflected in the teleconference follow-up letters sent after the issuance of the new guidance as these letters do not address the effect of the shortened time period of SGP OP4 on the country program expenditure caps. Some country programs such as Indonesia where the respective operational focal points had been earlier advised that for the resources contributed to SGP country program from the RAF country allocations the country program will also receive matching resources from SGP core funds, later came to know that they are no more eligible to receive resources from Core funds (because of their status as a “RAF funds only” program). Changes in the guidelines for accessing GEF resources through RAF country allocations, disconnect in the advice received from CPMT and GEF Secretariat, and lack of clarity in the December 2006 guidelines on certain aspects of SGP programming, together created considerable confusion. Consequently, Operational Focal Points were reluctant to commit resources to SGP.

The requirement that SGP also needs to access GEF resources through RAF makes it a competitor of other agencies for such resources. This implies that the SGP now needs to coordinate and reconcile its relationships with other GEF agencies at the country level. While SGP has been able prevent a mutually harmful competition with other GEF agencies, this remains an additional constraint under which it now operates.

During the first year of SGP OP4, the eligible participating countries contributed a total of about US $ 18 million from their respective RAF country allocations[9]. Once the rules for accessing these resources were established and the issues on which there was little clarity were further clarified CPMT and country program teams were able secure the operational focal points’ endorsements for commitments from the respective RAF country allocations. Although the confusion pertaining to rules applicable for accessing GEF resources from RAF country allocations and other constraints provided challenges, in most instances SGP country program teams were able to seek support of the GEF operational focal point of their country and other relevant government departments in committing RAF country allocation funds to SGP. What also helped was the fact that in most of the countries – such as Mexico, India and Brazil – where SGP was required to access funds exclusively through country RAF allocations, the program had been in operation for considerable period of time and had relatively good standing. Due to change in the rules of raising funds from RAF allocations and anticipated increase in number of countries where SGP will be operational, the SGP may be able to access about US$ 22 to US $ 25 million per annum from RAF country allocations. This would bring the overall GEF support to SGP through RAF country allocations during GEF-4 to about US $ 62 to 68 million. The amount raised through RAF will still be lower than the US $ 90 million estimated in the programming document for the fourth replenishment of the GEF trust fund.

[9] This also includes the agency fees for UNDP.

4. Effect of the RAF on SGP

4.1 SGP Project Portfolio

The source through which SGP accesses GEF funds seems to affect the nature of the projects that are funded. Based on the available information[10] it could be said that from OP3 to OP4 the proportion of SGP investment in climate change focal area projects has increased significantly (from 15 percent for OP3 to 24 percent during the first year of OP4). There has also been a slight increase in investments in the biodiversity focal area (increased from 46 to 51 percent). The proportion of investment in other focal areas, especially land degradation and multi focal area projects, has declined. When the effect on project portfolios of different types of country programs is assessed, it was found that these programs were affected differently (table 3).

Table 3: SGP project portfolio: Proportions invested in different focal areas during OP4 (figures for OP3 given in parentheses)

Country program type	BD	CC	IW	LD	MF	PP
RAF funds only programs	75% (57%)	23% (9%)	0% (1%)	0% (11%)	2% (18%)	0% (5%)
Both RAF and core funds programs	46% (44%)	31% (18%)	1% (7%)	15% (17%)	7% (11%)	1% (3%)
Core funds only programs	41% (43%)	14% (13%)	10% (6%)	21% (22%)	10% (12%)	4% (3%)
All country programs	51% (46%)	24% (15%)	4% (6%)	13% (18%)	7% (13%)	2% (3%)

Figures for OP4 are based on 984 projects for which data was available. The figures for OP3 are based on data for 1933 projects.

The project portfolio of SGP country programs with 'RAF funds only' were the most affected. The GEF resources accessed through RAF country allocations a focal area may be invested only in projects pertaining to that focal area. Of the GEF resources accessed for such country programs, 85 percent was from the allocations for the biodiversity focal area and remainder from the climate change focal area. An analysis of the available data shows that for such country programs from OP3 to OP4 the proportion of investment in biodiversity focal area increased from about 57 percent to 75 percent and for climate change from 9 percent to 23 percent.[11] During OP3 for these country programs the investments in other focal areas were about 34 percent; during the first year of OP4 investment in other focal areas was 2 percent of the total. As more complete data becomes available the figures for OP4 are expected to closely track the proportion of the resources accessed from the RAF allocations of the respective focal areas.

[10] The figures presented in this analysis are provisional The details pertaining to focal area of the grants made during the first year of OP4 and the amount committed to them is available for about 85 percent of the anticipated grants - the figures for the remainder are still being uploaded.

[11] About two percent of investments have been in projects that are from the multi focal area. It is not know whether these is due to misclassification of projects or whether these projects simultaneously focused on biodiversity and climate change focal areas.

At the country program level the changes in project portfolio were starker. Among the 14 RAF only country programs that were operational at the beginning of OP4, eight programs accessed RAF funds from the allocation for only the biodiversity focal area and five programs accessed it from RAF allocations for both the biodiversity and the climate change focal areas.

- Among the country programs that accessed RAF country allocations only from biodiversity focal area during the first year of OP4, during OP3 Ecuador and Philippines had substantial investment in climate change, land degradation and persistent organic pollutants focal areas. The fact that these SGP programs got RAF funds exclusively from the biodiversity focal area has forced them to stop their activities in other focal areas.
- The five country programs that accessed RAF funds from allocations in both focal areas include Chile, India, Iran, Malaysia and Turkey. For the first year of OP4 these programs received 59 percent of the funds for biodiversity and the remaining 41 percent for climate change focal area. In comparison, during the OP3 for these country programs biodiversity focal area had accounted for 39 percent and climate change 15 percent of the investment, whereas the remainder (46 percent) was split among the other focal areas. Broadly speaking, within these country programs, investment in biodiversity and climate change focal areas have increased significantly at the cost of investments in other focal areas. The impact of this dramatic shift in project portfolio on program effectiveness is still early to ascertain.

In some instances, however, changes in the project portfolios of RAF funds only programs may be more nominal than actual. The GEF focal areas such as biodiversity, climate change, international waters, land degradation and multifocal area have many cross cutting themes. Consequently, based on the project feature that has been emphasized a project may be eligible for funding from more than one focal area. The SGP staff confirmed that given the restrictions on usage of the funds accessed through RAF allocations, in some instances for RAF funds only country programs projects with cross cutting themes were approved to also address other focal areas. The extent to which such adjustments were made is very difficult to determine. Moreover, the persistent organic pollutants (PoPs) focal area has very few crosscutting linkages with climate change and biodiversity focal areas, limiting the extent to which issues pertaining to this focal area could be addressed. As a result, in countries that have RAF funds only programs NGOs such as Toxic Links (India), Red de Acción en Alternativas la uso de Agroquímicos (PERU) and other NGOs associated with the International POPs Elimination Network, which focus on PoPs, are no longer eligible to receive GEF funding through SGP.

The project portfolio of the RAF/Core funds country programs was moderately affected. During the first year of OP4, for 38 country programs SGP could access GEF resources for grant making both from RAF country allocations and from core funds. For such country programs of the GEF resources accessed through RAF (US$ 8.2 million), 58 percent (US $ 4.8 million) was from the biodiversity focal area allocation and 42 percent (US $ 3.4 million) from the climate change allocation. A matching US $ 8.2 million was provided to the country programs through core funds. While the usage of resources accessed through RAF allocations is constrained, the matching resources from the core funds may be invested in any of the eligible GEF focal areas[12]. This flexibility may allow the country programs to mitigate imbalances in their portfolio introduced due to restrictions on usage of funds accessed through RAF country allocations. The available evidence suggests that the SGP country programs are indeed compensating for the

[12] SGP does not work in the ozone depletion focal area of GEF.

usage restriction on resources accessed through RAF country allocations of biodiversity and climate change focal areas by increasing their investments in other focal areas through core funds. For example, 58 percent of the investments in grants from the resources accessed through RAF country allocations were in biodiversity focal area whereas only 34 percent of investments from core fund resources were in this focal area. Similarly, the proportion of investment through grants in climate change focal area was 42 percent for the RAF country allocation resources and 20 percent for the core fund resources. In contrast, other focal areas that received negligible investments from the RAF country allocation resources comprised about 54 percent of the investments made through core fund resources.

When compared to OP3, for the RAF/Core funds country programs the actual proportion of overall investments during the first year of OP4 remains more or less the same for the biodiversity, land degradation and multi focal area. However, investments in the climate change focal area increased significantly from 18 percent during OP3 to 31 percent (table 3). This difference in investment patterns between biodiversity and climate change focal areas is primarily related to the baseline level of investments. During OP3 the investment in biodiversity for such country programs was 44 percent, which is only 14 percent lower than the 58 percent of the RAF allocations accessed through the biodiversity focal area. In comparison, during the OP3 the baseline investment in the climate change focal area was 18 percent, 24 percent lower than the 42 percent of the RAF allocations accessed through the climate change focal area. As a result, country programs had greater flexibility in maintaining the proportion of investment in biodiversity than they had for climate change focal area.

The project portfolios of Core funds only country programs were unaffected. For these country programs the terms of operation regarding investment in various focal areas have not changed. Therefore, significant changes in the project portfolio of these country programs were not expected. This was confirmed through analysis of the projects of OP4 for which data is available (table 3).

Allowing RAF funds only country programs access to some support from Core funds will mitigate the imbalances in the project portfolios of these country programs. The experience gained so far shows that RAF/Core funds programs were able to mitigate effects on their project portfolio due to restrictions on usage of RAF resources by strategically using a higher proportion of core funds to support activities in the focal areas not supported through RAF country allocations. There is therefore a potential for correcting imbalances in the project portfolios of RAF funds only country programs by allowing them some access to core funds resources.

4.2 Predictability and transparency

One of the major objectives for introducing the new resource allocation framework was to increase predictability and transparency in allocation of resources. Assessment of the effect of RAF on predictability and transparency of allocation of GEF resources shows that it has affected different constituents and stakeholders of SGP differently.

The upfront disbursement of all the approved core funds (US $ 110 million) to SGP for OP4 provides considerable operational flexibility at the global program level. The SGP is now assured of adequate support for its management operations during the entire duration of OP4. It also has flexibility of using the core funds for making grants in the Core funds only and RAF/Core funds country programs. Core funds may also be leveraged to access resources from the RAF country allocations of the RAF/Core funds country programs. During the first year of OP4 SGP could have accessed RAF resources from a pool of 52 participating countries (64 by the end of OP4). While support from RAF allocations of each of these countries individually is uncertain, since SGP draws RAF resources from large pool of countries its inability to assess RAF resources from some countries is mitigated by it being able to access RAF resources of other countries.[13] Thus, overall predictability in availability of resources at the global program level has increased allowing CPMT to plan allocation of management resources better. Similarly, it is able to plan grant making activities through the Core funds only and the RAF/Core funds country programs better than during OP3.

Box 1: Effects of Rules for Accessing Contributions from RAF Country Allocations on Resources available to Core Funds only programs

The fixed management expenditure, such as staff salaries and rent of premises, of SGP country programs in the participating countries with indicative RAF allocation is met through Core funds. Of the contributions made from the RAF country allocations to the respective SGP country programs, SGP is allowed to apportion 10 percent for meeting the UNDP agency fee (about 4 percent) and UNOPS fee (about 6 percent). However, SGP is not allowed to use a part of the contributions from the RAF country allocations to meet other incremental management costs, such as expenses on traveling and capacity building of NGOs/CBOs, etc., of the respective country programs. The data collected for the Joint Evaluation of SGP indicates that such incremental management costs generally range between 7 to 14 percent of the total country program expenditure.

To meet these incremental expenditures, CPMT has to allocate additional resources from its core funds to country programs of the contributing countries. This reduces the total amount that could be made available to the “Core Funds only” country programs for making grants.

At the country level, the respective operational focal points of the eligible participating countries are aware of their RAF focal area allocations for GEF-4 and the rules that need to be followed to commit from these resources to SGP. This allows them to commit resources to SGP after assessing available resources and country priorities. Among the 14 “RAF funds only” country programs 13 have contributed to their respective SGP country programs. Only Colombia did not to contribute to the program because there was no agreement between UNDP and the proposed SGP host institution on operational issues such as channeling of funds and hosting arrangements. For the “RAF funds only” countries the predictability of resources that could be committed is high because within the constraints laid by the SGP steering committee, the decision on quantum of RAF resources to be committed to SGP is internal to the participating country. However, at the SGP country program level there remains an element of uncertainty as the operational focal point may decide not to commit resources to the program. For RAF/Core funds supported countries an additional element of uncertainty was introduced by the requirement to match funds generated through RAF with core funds. Thus, the participating countries were not able to take a decision on their

[13] For example, of the 52 countries eligible to contribute to SGP from their RAF country allocations, 44 countries (85%) contributed for the first year of GEF OP4. Based on the operational focal point endorsements obtained by the SGP by July 2008, for the second half of GEF4 47 (90%) countries have contributed from their RAF country allocations to SGP. The CPMT informs that the remaining countries are now in the process of committing funds to the SGP for the second half of GEF4.

commitment to SGP independently. The SGP Steering Committee in its November 2007 meeting decided to eliminate the matching requirement for the RAF/Core funds programs for the second half of GEF-4. This amendment has addressed the additional unpredictability associated with the earlier requirement. For the Core funds only countries, the process of resource allocation remains similar to followed in OP3. However, due to rules related to use of RAF country allocations for meeting country program management costs when the amount contributed from RAF country allocations of "RAF funds only" and "RAF/Core funds" program countries increases the amount available for grant making to the "Core Funds only" program decreases by about 10 percent of the contributed amount (see box 1).

Findings of the survey of national coordinators of SGP suggest that overall RAF may have enhanced predictability of GEF funding to the respective country programs. However, based on the type of country program the responses of the national coordinators seem to vary. The national coordinators from countries that have a "RAF funds only" or a "Core funds only" program are more likely to have a positive opinion on RAF enhancing predictability of GEF funding than those that were required to access matching resources from both core funds and from RAF country allocations. An underlying reason for this could also be that in most of the countries that had 'RAF funds only' program, SGP has been under operation for long and, therefore, it has been able to establish better linkages with the relevant government departments and the GEF operational focal point. For the 'Core funds only' programs, on the other hand, the source through which they access GEF funds – core funds – has remained the same. In addition, there is additional stability in funding for them because core funds for the entire duration of GEF-4 have been provided to SGP upfront. Although the funds available to these programs for grant making are affected by the funds contributed by the "RAF funds only" and "RAF/Core funds" program countries, the net effect is spread over a large number of country programs and funds available for grant making are generally known well in advance. In comparison, many of the RAF/Core funds programs are still young and are yet to have strong working relationship with the government agencies and the GEF operational focal point. The need for RAF/Core funds programs to simultaneously access resources from RAF country allocations and core funds introduces an additional element of uncertainty. This was confirmed by the responses of the National Coordinators of SGP that led the "RAF/Core funds" programs (table 4).

Table 4: Effect of RAF on predictability of funding

Country program type	RAF enhances predictability of funding			Total Number of respondents
	Positive opinion	Negative opinion	Don't know	
RAF funds only	5	0	1	6
RAF/Core funds	17	7	1	25
Core funds only	9	1	0	10
All programs	31	8	2	41

Transparency in funding allocation also needs to be assessed at various levels. At the steering committee level, the basis for rules for access and utilization of GEF resources by SGP is not clear. The minutes of the SGP steering committee meetings do not clarify why annual expenditures of SGP programs in large countries such as India and Mexico have been capped at the same level as for SIDS. There is variance in how different types of country programs perceive RAF to have affected transparency in resource allocation. Fifty-two national coordinators of SGP participated in the online survey on RAF MTR. Of the 41 that responded to the question whether RAF had led to greater transparency in resource allocation, 56 percent expressed a positive opinion, 32 percent a negative opinion, and 12 percent did not express an opinion. When the responses are classified based on the type of country programs, despite small sample sizes, contrasting perceptions are notable. National coordinators of country programs in Core funds only countries are more likely to feel that RAF may enhance transparency in resource allocation than coordinators of the RAF funds only programs (table 5).

Table 5: Effect of RAF on transparency in resource allocation

Country program type	**RAF enhances transparency in resource allocation**			**Total Number of respondents**
	Positive opinion	Negative opinion	Don't know	
RAF funds only	1	5	0	6
RAF/Core funds	14	7	4	25
Core funds only	8	1	1	10
All programs	23	13	5	41

4.3 Effect on management costs

During OP3 the level of grant making of at least 12 country programs was higher than the limits imposed during OP4. One of these countries (Palestinian Authority) is not eligible for direct participation in the program during GEF4[14]. Thus, in broad terms the expenditure caps have affected at least 11 country programs. The Joint Evaluation of the Small Grants Programme (2008) predicted that curtailing the size of the country programs by establishing caps will increase the management costs of such programs (as a proportion of total costs). The preliminary data for OP4 shows that for the affected programs, average country program management costs increased from 13.5 percent during OP3 to 14.8 percent during the first year of OP4. In comparison, for the other country programs that were unaffected by the caps the management costs marginally declined from 16.2 percent to 15.8 percent during this period.[15] Thus, caps may have led to increase in management costs of country programs affected by the caps. Therefore, there is a case for having higher program expenditure caps for countries such as India, Philippines and Mexico that are likely to have considerable capacity to absorb GEF resources through small scale interventions in a cost effective manner.

4.4 Effect on relationship with the host government

For country programs that receive GEF support only through Core funds there has been little change in the relationship of SGP with the host government. However, for other programs that are required to access GEF resources through RAF country allocations there is a need to seek greater involvement of and cooperation from the GEF operational focal point. This need has encouraged SGP to establish closer linkages with the government agencies in such countries. There is anecdotal evidence that during the first year of OP4 SGP country programs in some of these countries have provided greater representation to government agencies in the national

[14] Palestinian Authority may access GEF funds if it part of a regional approach.
[15] This is based on data for 68 countries that are not affected by the caps and that made grants during both the years of OP3.

steering committees of the SGP. The national coordinators report they have been devoting considerable time and attention to negotiating with the operational focal point for commitments from RAF and to developing and maintaining good relationships with them and the relevant government departments.

Enhanced engagement of government agencies in SGP activities provides SGP an opportunity to seek up-scaling and mainstreaming of the SGP experience in government programs. However, this also exposes SGP country programs to greater pressure for aligning its activities to government priorities. This implies that such pressures may make it difficult for the country programs to concentrate the program on themes and in geographical areas that are more appropriate for SGP interventions but have been left out from government plans and priorities. Similarly, in some instances government agencies may exert pressure on the SGP country program to give preference to project proposals by government agencies or government supported organizations. The findings of the online survey of SGP national coordinators reflect this undercurrent. Although 78 percent of the respondents felt that RAF has led to increased interaction between SGP and government, 68 percent believed that it had weakened the neutral role of SGP. There is little difference in the responses of the national coordinators based on the type of country program.

4.5 Effect on work load of SGP staff

Interviews with the SGP staff, including those at the headquarters and in country offices, suggest that implementation of the RAF has increased their work load. While some of the increase in the work load could be attributed to SGP being in the state of transition to the new funding framework, the remainder is likely to persist even after the transition.

For the country programs that access GEF resources only through core funds there has been no change in the modality of grant making. NGOs, CBOs, and other eligible organizations access SGP grants through the procedures applicable during OP3. Reporting requirements for such programs have remained the same so there has been little change in the work load of staff in these programs.

For the country programs that need to access GEF resources through country RAF allocations there has been an increase in the work load. Need to access resources through RAF has meant that the staff in these countries spent substantial time in engaging the operational focal point and the relevant government agencies, preparing documents that facilitate approval by the GEF Council to RAF commitments to SGP, and reporting separately for grants made from RAF and core funds. In countries such as Pakistan, Thailand and Iran the national coordinators faced difficulties in getting endorsements from the operational focal points for commitments from the RAF country allocations and getting the RAF utilization strategy for SGP approved. Consequently, they had to spend a lot of time and effort in getting the endorsement.

At the global program level, UNOPS separately records, maintains and reports information on funds utilized through RAF country allocations and Core funds. Thus, it has to spend more time and resources on maintaining accounts.

The efficacy of the strategy requiring SGP to access GEF funds through two different sources – core funds and RAF country allocations – needs to assessed. While accessing resources through the RAF country allocations has benefited SGP in terms of increased ownership of the host governments, it has also increased workload for the SGP staff and has reduced the time available to them for other activities. The transaction cost of negotiating and finalizing the RAF endorsement process, including the related paperwork, has also increased for other stakeholders such as the GEF Secretariat and governments of participating countries.

References

GEF (Global Environment Facility). 2008. Joint Evaluation of the GEF Small Grants Programme, 2008. Washington, DC: GEF.
http://www.gefweb.org/uploadedFiles/Publications_SGP_Report.pdf

GEF. 2006. Summary of Negotiations on the Fourth Replenishment Agreement of the GEF Trust Fund, October 19, 2006, revised.
http://thegef.org/Replenishment/Reple_Documents/SummaryofNegotiations_Revised_October2006.pdf.pdf

Annex 1: Rules from the SGP Steering Committee in its December 2006 meeting

"2. Financial Allocations

a. Country participants in the Small Grants Programme will have access to the SGP within the GEF-4 cycle as follows:

i. The maximum amount of the GEF contribution to the SGP per country should be a cumulative total of $2.4 million for GEF-4 at an average of $600,000 per year – regardless of whether it comes as a RAF allocation of a core SGP grant allocation.

ii. Countries which belong to the group in the RAF have preferential access to SGP core funding. The allocation cap [maximum limit] for LDC/SIDS is $600,000 per year and for non-LDC/SIDS is $400,000 per year;

iii. Countries which have indicative RAF country allocations up to $15 million in either the climate change or biodiversity focal area in GEF-4 can draw up to $300,000 from SGP's core budget each year with a matching amount expected from their RAF allocations[16];

iv. Countries which have indicative RAF country allocations of more than $15 million in either the climate change or biodiversity focal area in GEF-4 will no longer be able to access SGP's core funding and will need to finance their small grants program from their RAF allocations in order to sustain SGP operations in their countries;

v. A new country entering the SGP will be entitled to $150,000 in core SGP funds for its first year in the program as an exception to the above rules. In this first year a country with an indicative country allocation can program a matching amount for its small grants program. For the second year of its program and thereafter, a country will follow the standard guidelines listed above."

Annex 2: Estimation of amount that SGP will raise through RAF country allocations

During the first year of SGP OP4 there were 14 RAF-only countries and US $ 9.4 million was raised from these countries. In 2010 the number of RAF-only countries will increase to 17. The amount raised from RAF for these countries is likely to increase proportionately to about US $ 11 to 12 million dollars.

Similarly, during the first year of SGP OP4 there were 38 RAF/Core countries that could raise US $ 400,000 per annum from RAF. The respective programs together raised US $ 8.2 million during the first year. In 2010 the number of RAF/Core countries is likely to increase to 47. Further, due to rule changes during the second half of GEF-4 SGP will be able to raise up to US $ 533,333 per annum from the RAF allocations of such countries. Assuming that SGP is able to raise 10 to 25 percent more resources per country program due to change in this rule, by the last

[16] In the November 2007 the GEF Steering Committee of SGP decided that the RAF utilization guidelines for SGP will be revised for the second half of GEF4 so that countries with indicative RAF allocations of less than $15 million can draw up to $200,000 in core funds per year but will be allowed to get up to $400,000 in RAF contributions annually to SGP.

year of GEF-4 SGP will be able to raise about US $ 11 to 13 million dollars from RAF country allocations for the RAF/Core country programs.

Thus, in all the SGP may be able to raise about 22 to 25 million dollars during the last year of SGP OP4.

Annex 3: List of Countries Covered by RAF and SGP

S. No.	Country	RAF Allocation for GEF-4		SGP Status	SGP Program Type	LDC	SIDS
		Biodiversity	Climate Change				
1	Afghanistan	3.5	group*	New	Core/RAF	Yes	No
2	Albania	group*	group*	OLD	Core Only	No	No
3	Algeria	3.7	7.6	New	Core/RAF	No	No
4	Angola	group*	group*	Not Covered	Not Covered	Yes	No
5	Antigua and Barbuda	group*	group*	OLD	Core Only	No	Yes
6	Argentina	14.5	13.3	OLD	Core/RAF	No	No
7	Armenia	group*	group*	New	Core Only	No	No
8	Azerbaijan	group*	4.1	Not Covered	Not Covered	No	No
9	Bahamas	group*	group*	New	Core Only	No	Yes
10	Bahrain		group*	Not Covered	Not Covered	No	Yes
11	Bangladesh	group*	6.7	New	Core/RAF	Yes	No
12	Barbados	group*	group*	OLD	Core Only	No	Yes
13	Belarus	group*	7.9	OLD	Core/RAF	No	No
14	Belize	group*	group*	OLD	Core Only	No	Yes
15	Benin	group*	group*	OLD	Core Only	Yes	No
16	Bhutan	group*	group*	OLD	Core Only	Yes	No
17	Bolivia	11.4	3.1	OLD	Core/RAF	No	No
18	Bosnia-Herzegovina	group*	group*	Not Covered	Not Covered	No	No
19	Botswana	group*	group*	OLD	Core Only	No	No
20	Brazil	63.2	38.1	OLD	RAF only	No	No
21	Bulgaria	group*	8.5	OLD	Core/RAF	No	No
22	Burkina Faso	group*	group*	OLD	Core Only	Yes	No
23	Burundi	group*	group*	New	Core Only	Yes	No
24	Cambodia	group*	3.3	OLD	Core/RAF	Yes	No
25	Cameroon	11.9	group*	OLD	Core/RAF	No	No
26	Cape Verde	4.1	group*	New	Core/RAF	Yes	Yes
27	Central African Republic	group*	group*	New	Core Only	Yes	No
28	Chad	group*	group*	OLD	Core Only	Yes	No
29	Chile	15.7	6.1	OLD	RAF only	No	No
30	China	44.3	150.0	New	RAF only	No	No
31	Colombia	36.6	8.9	OLD	RAF only	No	No
32	Comoros	group*	group*	OLD	Core Only	Yes	Yes
33	Congo, Dem. Rep. (Zaire)	9.6	group*	New	Core/RAF	Yes	No
34	Congo, Republic of	group*	group*	Not Covered	Not Covered	No	No
35	Cook Islands	group*	group*	OLD	Core Only	No	No
36	Costa Rica	12.0	group*	OLD	Core/RAF	No	No
37	Côte d'ivoire	3.6	group*	OLD	Core/RAF	No	No
38	Croatia	group*	group*	Not Covered	Not Covered	No	No
39	Cuba	14.7	4.2	OLD	Core/RAF	No	Yes
40	Cyprus		group*	Not Covered	Not Covered	No	No
41	Djibouti	group*	group*	Not Covered	Not Covered	Yes	No
42	Dominica	group*	group*	OLD	Core Only	No	Yes
43	Dominican republic	5.8	group*	OLD	Core/RAF	No	Yes
44	Ecuador	23.2	group*	OLD	RAF only	No	No

S. No.	Country	RAF Allocation for GEF-4		SGP Status	SGP Program Type	LDC	SIDS
		Biodiversity	Climate Change				
45	Egypt	4.3	11.5	OLD	Core/RAF	No	No
46	El Salvador	group*	group*	OLD	Core Only	No	No
47	Equatorial Guinea	group*	group*	Not Covered	Not Covered	Yes	No
48	Eritrea	group*	group*	New	Core Only	Yes	No
49	Estonia	group*	group*	Not Covered	Not Covered	No	No
50	Ethiopia	7.7	4.9	OLD	Core/RAF	Yes	No
51	Fiji	5.1	group*	OLD	Core/RAF	No	Yes
52	Gabon	group*	group*	Not Covered	Not Covered	No	No
53	Gambia	group*	group*	OLD	Core Only	Yes	No
54	Georgia	group*	group*	Not Covered	Not Covered	No	No
55	Ghana	group*	group*	OLD	Core Only	No	No
56	Grenada	group*	group*	OLD	Core Only	No	Yes
57	Guatemala	8.2	group*	OLD	Core/RAF	No	No
58	Guinea	group*	group*	OLD	Core Only	Yes	No
59	Guinea-Bissau	group*	group*	New	Core Only	Yes	Yes
60	Guyana	group*	group*	Not Covered	Not Covered	No	No
61	Haiti	4.1	group*	OLD	Core/RAF	Yes	Yes
62	Honduras	6.8	group*	OLD	Core/RAF	No	No
63	Hungary	group*	8.2	Not Covered	Not Covered	No	No
64	India	29.6	74.9	OLD	RAF only	No	No
65	Indonesia	41.4	16.3	OLD	RAF only	No	No
66	Iran	6.7	16.5	OLD	RAF only	No	No
67	Israel		group*	Not Covered	Not Covered	No	No
68	Jamaica	5.1	group*	OLD	Core/RAF	No	Yes
69	Jordan	group*	group*	OLD	Core Only	No	No
70	Kazakhstan	5.5	13.5	OLD	Core/RAF	No	No
71	Kenya	7.9	3.4	OLD	Core/RAF	No	No
72	Kiribati	group*	group*	OLD	Core Only	Yes	Yes
73	Korea, North (DPRK)	group*	6.4	Not Covered	Not Covered	No	No
74	Korea, south (ROK)	group*	group*	Not Covered	Not Covered	No	No
75	Kuwait		group*	Not Covered	Not Covered	No	No
76	Kyrgyz republic	group*	group*	OLD	Core Only	No	No
77	Laos	5.2	group*	New	Core/RAF	Yes	No
78	Latvia	group*	3.2	Not Covered	Not Covered	No	No
79	Lebanon	group*	group*	OLD	Core Only	No	No
80	Lesotho	group*	group*	OLD	Core Only	Yes	No
81	Liberia	group*	group*	New	Core Only	Yes	No
82	Libya	group*	group*	Not Covered	Not Covered	No	No
83	Lithuania	group*	3.4	OLD	Core/RAF	No	No
84	Macedonia	group*	group*	OLD	Core Only	No	No
85	Madagascar	24.2	group*	OLD	RAF only	Yes	No
86	Malawi	4.2	group*	OLD	Core/RAF	Yes	No
87	Malaysia	15.2	11.3	OLD	RAF only	No	No
88	Maldives	group*	group*	New	Core Only	Yes	Yes
89	Mali	group*	group*	OLD	Core Only	Yes	No

S. No.	Country	RAF Allocation for GEF-4		SGP Status	SGP Program Type	LDC	SIDS
		Biodiversity	Climate Change				
90	Malta		group*	Not Covered	Not Covered	No	No
91	Marshall islands	group*	group*	OLD	Core Only	No	Yes
92	Mauritania	group*	group*	OLD	Core Only	Yes	No
93	Mauritius	5.6	group*	OLD	Core/RAF	No	Yes
94	Mexico	54.6	28.3	OLD	RAF only	No	No
95	Micronesia	group*	group*	OLD	Core Only	No	Yes
96	Moldova	group*	group*	Not Covered	Not Covered	No	No
97	Mongolia	3.8	group*	OLD	Core/RAF	No	No
98	Morocco	4.3	3.8	OLD	Core/RAF	No	No
99	Mozambique	6.8	group*	OLD	Core/RAF	Yes	No
100	Myanmar	group*	group*	Not Covered	Not Covered	Yes	No
101	Namibia	6.5	group*	OLD	Core/RAF	No	No
102	Nauru	group*	group*	OLD	Core Only	No	Yes
103	Nepal	group*	group*	OLD	Core Only	Yes	No
104	Nicaragua	4.0	group*	OLD	Core/RAF	No	No
105	Niger	group*	group*	OLD	Core Only	Yes	No
106	Nigeria	5.6	9.3	New	Core/RAF	No	No
107	Niue	group*	group*	OLD	Core Only	No	Yes
108	Oman		group*	Not Covered	Not Covered	No	No
109	Pakistan	5.1	13.2	OLD	Core/RAF	No	No
110	Palau, Republic of	group*	group*	OLD	Core Only	No	Yes
111	Panama	11.2	group*	OLD	Core/RAF	No	No
112	Papua New Guinea	12.5	group*	OLD	Core/RAF	No	Yes
113	Paraguay	group*	group*	New	Core Only	No	No
114	Peru	25.3	4.6	OLD	RAF only	No	No
115	Philippines	21.3	6.6	OLD	RAF only	No	No
116	Poland	group*	38.1		Graduated	No	No
117	Qatar		group*	Not Covered	Not Covered	No	No
118	Romania	group*	13.9	OLD	Core/RAF	No	No
119	Russia	25.3	72.5	Not Covered	Not Covered	No	No
120	Rwanda	group*	group*	OLD	Core Only	Yes	No
121	Samoa	group*	group*	OLD	Core Only	Yes	Yes
122	San Marino		group*	Not Covered	Not Covered	No	No
123	Sao Tome and Principe	group*	group*	Not Covered	Not Covered	Yes	Yes
124	Saudi Arabia		group*	Not Covered	Not Covered	No	No
125	Senegal	group*	group*	OLD	Core Only	Yes	No
126	Serbia and Montenegro	group*	group*	Not Covered	Not Covered	No	No
127	Seychelles	5.3	group*	New	Core/RAF	No	No
128	Sierra Leone	group*	group*	Not Covered	Not Covered	Yes	No
129	Singapore		group*	Not Covered	Not Covered	No	Yes
130	Slovak Republic	group*	5.7	Not Covered	Not Covered	No	No
131	Solomon islands	group*	group*	OLD	Core Only	Yes	Yes
132	South Africa	22.5	23.9	OLD	RAF only	No	No
133	Sri Lanka	6.4	group*	OLD	Core/RAF	No	No
134	St. Kitts and Nevis	group*	group*	OLD	Core Only	No	Yes

S. No.	Country	RAF Allocation for GEF-4		SGP Status	SGP Program Type	LDC	SIDS
		Biodiversity	Climate Change				
135	St. Lucia	group*	group*	OLD	Core Only	No	Yes
136	St. Vincent and the Grenadines	group*	group*	OLD	Core Only	No	Yes
137	Sudan	4.3	5.7	Not Covered	Not Covered	Yes	No
138	Suriname	group*	group*	OLD	Core Only	No	Yes
139	Swaziland	group*	group*	Not Covered	Not Covered	No	No
140	Syria	group*	4.9	OLD	Core/RAF	No	No
141	Tajikistan	group*	group*	New	Core Only	No	No
142	Tanzania	12.8	4.8	OLD	Core/RAF	Yes	No
143	Thailand	9.2	14.7	OLD	Core/RAF	No	No
144	Togo	group*	group*	New	Core Only	Yes	No
145	Tonga	group*	group*	OLD	Core Only	No	Yes
146	Trinidad and Tobago	group*	group*	OLD	Core Only	No	Yes
147	Tunisia	group*	group*	OLD	Core Only	No	No
148	Turkey	6.1	17.5	OLD	RAF only	No	No
149	Turkmenistan	group*	group*	Not Covered	Not Covered	No	No
150	Tuvalu	group*	group*	OLD	Core Only	Yes	Yes
151	Uganda	4.0	3.1	OLD	Core/RAF	Yes	No
152	Ukraine	group*	18.9	New	RAF only	No	No
153	United Arab Emirates		group*	Not Covered	Not Covered	No	No
154	Uruguay	group*	group*	OLD	Core Only	No	No
155	Uzbekistan	group*	9.3	New	Core/RAF	No	No
156	Vanuatu	group*	group*	OLD	Core Only	Yes	Yes
157	Venezuela	16.7	8.8	New	RAF only	No	No
158	Vietnam	10.2	8.5	OLD	Core/RAF	No	No
159	Yemen	group*	group*	OLD	Core Only	Yes	No
160	Zambia	5.1	group*	OLD	Core/RAF	Yes	No
161	Zimbabwe	group*	group*	OLD	Core Only	No	No