



# Global Environment Facility

GEF/C.22/12  
October 24, 2003

---

GEF Council  
November 19-21, 2003

Agenda Item 14

## REVIEW OF EXPERIENCE WITH EXECUTING AGENCIES UNDER EXPANDED OPPORTUNITIES

### **Recommended Council Decision**

The Council, having reviewed document GEF/C.22/12 *Review of Experience of Executing Agencies under Expanded Opportunities*, notes the progress that has been made and approves the following changes to the policy: (i) All executing agencies acting under the policy (Executing Agencies) and acting within their agreed scope for GEF operations may have *direct access* to GEF resources for the implementation of GEF projects (medium and full size projects); and (ii) on a case-by-case basis, the CEO may approve *PDF-A grants* for the development of eligible concepts by an Executing Agency.

The Council confirms the current scope of GEF operations for each agency as set out in the Business Plan, but requests the Secretariat to review this on the basis of a systematic review of institutional capacity in relation to GEF business needs (including capacity to mainstream GEF operations and to undertake the relevant sectoral dialogue) and to report to the Council in November 2004. The Council also requests the Secretariat to further enhance the integration of Executing Agencies into GEF operations, in the ways identified in this review.

## Table of Contents

<b>Executive Summary .....</b>	<b>1</b>
Scope of the Review .....	1
Organization of the Report.....	1
<b>Framework for Review of Executing Agency Experience .....</b>	<b>2</b>
Evolution of the Policy .....	2
Objectives .....	2
Expanded Opportunities for the Regional Development Banks .....	3
UNIDO and FAO .....	3
IA Accountability .....	4
Selection Criteria .....	4
IFAD .....	5
Comparative Advantages .....	5
Direct Access for ADB and IADB.....	5
Current Status .....	6
<b>Review of Executing Agency Experience .....</b>	<b>7</b>
Previous Progress Review.....	7
EA Contribution to the GEF .....	8
GEF Projects .....	8
Project Quality .....	9
Co-Financing .....	10
Other Contributions .....	10
Issues Affecting EA Performance.....	11
EA Internal Organization.....	12
Uncertainties, Transaction Costs, and Internal Incentives.....	12
Relationships with the Implementing Agencies.....	13
Project Implementation Agreements.....	13
PDF-A and Corporate Budgets .....	13
Comparative Advantage and Scope of Activity.....	14
Programming and Business Plan Development .....	14
Relationships with the GEF Secretariat .....	15
Upper Management Dialogue and Staff Training.....	15
Project Cycle Guidance .....	15
Focal Points.....	15
Proactive Role .....	15
<b>Recommendations for Enhancing the Role of the Executing Agencies.....</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Annex A: Executing Agency Projects in GEF Pipeline 1999-2003 .....</b>	<b>A1</b>
<b>Annex B: Executing Agency Projects under Implementation 1999-2003 .....</b>	<b>B1</b>

## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

### **Scope of the Review**

1. The GEF Council initiated the policy of Expanded Opportunities in May 1999 with the approval of the document *Expanded Opportunities for Executing Agencies* (GEF/C.13/3). The aim of the policy is to advance the operational objectives of the GEF by increasing its capacity to prepare, implement, and mobilize resources for global environmental projects. Over the past four years, seven new agencies have received Council approval to participate in GEF activities under the policy. At its meeting in May 2003, the Council requested the Secretariat to report on the experience that these new Executing Agencies (EAs) have had working with the GEF Secretariat and the Implementing Agencies (IAs) under the policy.

2. This review has been prepared in response to the Council's request. It is based on an examination of Council documents, the previous *Review of Progress under Expanded Opportunities for Executing Agencies* (GEF/C.15/4), materials provided by the Executing Agencies, the GEF Overall Performance Studies, and extensive interviews with representatives of the Implementing Agencies, the Executing Agencies, and the staff of the GEF Secretariat. Although the review is not intended as a detailed quantitative evaluation of the performance and impact of the policy of Expanded Opportunities, it provides a basis for improving the implementation of the policy.

### **Organization of the Report**

3. This report is organized in three main sections, following this introduction. The first establishes the framework for reviewing the experience of the Executing Agencies. Within the context of a brief history of the evolution and status of the policy of Expanded Opportunities, it outlines the objectives of the policy, the criteria for selecting EAs, the scope of the activities expected of the EAs, and the roles and responsibilities of the IA under the policy. It is in the light of these objectives and past experience that the performance of the EAs can be judged.

4. The second section is an assessment of the experience of the Executing Agencies within this framework. It briefly examines the last progress review before assessing the contribution the EAs have made to the GEF program and examines the factors that have had positive and negative effects on their performance. The issues that emerged in the course of the review include organizational matters that are internal to the EAs and issues derived from the interaction between the EAs and the Implementing Agencies and the functions of the GEF Secretariat. The review points to areas where work should either continue or be initiated to advance the contribution that EAs can make to the GEF under Expanded Opportunities.

5. The third and final section of the report makes recommendations for enhancing the potential of, and consolidating the gains achieved by, the policy of Expanded Opportunities. These concern:

- (a) Granting all EAs direct access to GEF project planning and implementation funds without involving IAs in the process beyond the initial due diligence reviews which are a precondition for their acceptance under the policy;
- (b) Making PDF-A funding available to EAs;
- (c) Engaging EAs more actively in the GEF programming and business planning process;
- (d) Reviewing the comparative advantages of the EAs , their capacity to meet broader GEF mainstreaming objectives, and their strategic match with GEF business needs; and
- (e) Encouraging the GEF Secretariat to actively engage in training, communications, and other actions to enhance the integration of the EAs into the GEF operations.

## **FRAMEWORK FOR REVIEW OF EXECUTING AGENCY EXPERIENCE**

### **Evolution of the Policy**

6. The Expanded Opportunities policy evolved through a series of Council deliberations which began in 1994 after the restructuring of the GEF and gained momentum following the First GEF Assembly in New Delhi in 1998. Among the recommendations that resulted from the Assembly was the statement that: “GEF should promote greater coordination and co-financing of its activities from other sources, including bilateral funding organizations and should expand opportunities for execution of activities to those entities referred to in Paragraph 28 of the Instrument, in particular Regional Development Banks and non-governmental organizations (NGOs).” Following the First GEF Assembly, the Council analyzed criteria and options for expanding opportunities, adopted the new policy in May 1999, and -- in successive meetings since then -- approved the admission of new Executing Agencies as the program needs of the GEF evolved.

7. Throughout this process the Council sought to balance a number of complex issues related to the objectives of the policy, the criteria for admitting EAs, and the evolving role of the Implementing Agencies. These concern the type of GEF resources to which EAs would have access; whether that access would be directly to the GEF Council and Secretariat or indirectly through an Implementing Agency; the accountability of the IAs for EA operational activities; the scope of an EA’s operational activities; the allocation of fees; and the roles and responsibilities of the GEF Secretariat, the IAs, and the EAs for programming, business planning, and general corporate activities. The following summary of the history highlights these key decisions.

### *Objectives*

8. The new policy was formally adopted at the May meeting in 1999 with the approval of the document cited above, *Expanded Opportunities for Executing Agencies*. The document set forth three distinct advantages or objectives for the policy:

- (a) Increasing the capacity of the GEF to address strategic operational needs, including in new and emerging areas, and to respond to country driven priorities and the requirements of the conventions;
- (b) Increasing the diversity of experience from which the GEF can draw for innovative interventions in operational program areas; and
- (c) Leveraging additional resources for the protection of the global environment by expanding the GEF's capacity to mobilize financial and technical resources and co-financing for its projects.

#### *Expanded Opportunities for the Regional Development Banks*

9. The Council decision on the document also defined a new relationship between the GEF and four regional development banks (RDBs): ADB, EBRD, IADB and AfDB. In order to reduce the uncertainties involved in proposing projects to the GEF, the four RDBs were granted direct access to the GEF Secretariat for determinations on project eligibility and for approval of PDF-B grants, without having to pass through an Implementing Agency. Under that arrangement, it was still necessary to identify an Implementing Agency that agreed to remain fully accountable to the Council for the project's implementation. This accountability was exercised case by case by the EA and the IA drawing up memoranda of agreement setting forth the roles each would play in the implementation of the project in question. These agreements also covered procedures regarding the management and disbursement of project funds and the allocation of fees for the preparation and implementation of the project. These arrangements set the framework for the implementation of the policy and the scope of the IA's accountability until they were refined in subsequent Council decisions.

#### *UNIDO and FAO*

10. A year later at its May 9-11, 2000 meeting, the Council reviewed the document *Review of Progress in Expanded Opportunities for Executing Agencies* (GEF/C.15/4). This review covered the progress made by RDBs during the first year of expanded opportunities. It highlighted steps made to address a number of issues of particular concern to the RDBs and illustrated in matrix form the division of responsibilities among the GEF Secretariat, the IAs, and the EAs for project cycle management. The document also proposed to expand opportunities for other agencies which, having passed through a satisfactory due diligence review of the conformity of their policies and procedures with those of the GEF, were deemed to have comparative advantages to address fields in which the GEF needed to operate and in which the agency showed a clear commitment to mobilize resources to support GEF projects. The document recommended that the United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO) and the UN Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) be granted expanded

opportunities in recognition of their experience with persistent organic pollutants (POPs), which was an emerging business need of the GEF that could not be fully met by the IAs and current EAs. The Council accepted this recommendation, and also requested that the division of responsibilities for the project cycle and the accountability of the IAs for EA activities under implementation be revisited and simplified.

#### *IA Accountability*

The Council delineated the scope of IA accountability at its meeting of November 2000.

11. While reiterating that an IA remained directly accountable to the Council for its own GEF-financed activities, the Council limited the IA's accountability for EA activities under expanded opportunities to conducting the due diligence review to ensure compliance of the EAs with the policies and procedures of the GEF. Once such compliance was assured, the EA would be solely accountable for fulfilling the policies and procedures and assuring the quality, implementation, and financial integrity of their GEF projects. At this meeting the Council also confirmed that once admitted under expanded opportunities, the EAs would have direct access to PDF-B grants through the GEF Secretariat.

#### *Selection Criteria*

12. At its meeting in May, 2001, the Council formally approved criteria for selecting new Executing Agencies set forth in the document *Criteria for the Expansion of Opportunities for Executing Agencies* (GEF/C.17/13). The three main criteria are summarized below:

- (a) Strategic Match: The extent to which the agency's expertise and comparative advantage meets the strategic needs of the GEF as expressed in the Corporate Business Plan. The annual Program Status Reviews of GEF Operational Programs serve to identify portfolio gaps on a regular basis, which, in turn allows a review of the degree to which the expertise and capacity of the EAs match the needs of the program.
- (b) Capacity: The institutional capacity and effectiveness of the agency in GEF operational program areas. Three criteria are applied here: 1) Project and portfolio management experience; special technical expertise; record on environmental, social and sustainable development issues; and safeguard, public disclosure and fiduciary policies; 2) experience with GEF projects or with projects relevant to future GEF operations, and; 3) the strength, depth, and diversity of agencies contacts in member countries, including its field presence and assistance programs.
- (c) Complementarity: The size of the agency's regular work program in relevant fields and the extent to which future GEF projects could build upon that work program and the agency can leverage resources and commitments from other partners and co-financiers.

13. Working with the Implementing Agencies, the Secretariat applies these criteria in conducting a due diligence review of any prospective EA on behalf of the Council. Once the Council has approved an EA's participation and the legal and financial arrangements have been completed for its admission under the policy, the Secretariat and the agency would also develop a plan with the EA for its GEF operations in the area of the strategic match. The depth of each agency's commitment and its past performance according to the criteria would be reviewed periodically and reported to the Council.

#### *IFAD*

14. In keeping with these criteria, the Council then approved the inclusion of the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD) under expanded opportunities because of its expertise in land degradation, rural sustainable development, and integrated land management, and its critical role in the implementation of the UN Convention to Combat Desertification.

15. At this same meeting the Council also provided direct access to GEF resources to UNIDO and FAO for undertaking Enabling Activities on POPs with member countries.

16. During the Council discussion on that document, it was noted that while the executing agencies are primarily invited to participate in expanded opportunities due to their comparative advantage and expertise with regard to a specified focal area and that this should remain the primary focus of their activities, an agency would not be precluded from developing projects in other areas when there is a GEF business need and such agency possesses a comparative advantage and demonstrates core commitment to the area. This would be considered on a case by case basis.

17. Council also confirmed that the same fee system for implementing GEF projects that applies to IAs would also apply to EAs, and that there should be no additional fee when an IA is collaborating with an EA on a project.

#### *Comparative Advantages*

18. The GEF Business Plan FY03-05, presented to the Council at its May 2002 meeting, summarized the comparative advantages of each of the EAs in relation to specific GEF business needs. For the GEF, the comparative advantage of the RDBs lies in their carrying out investment projects at the country and multi-country level and mobilizing private sector resources within their regions; that of FAO and UNIDO is in the area of agricultural and industrial POPs, respectively; and that of IFAD is in addressing land degradation through community-based natural resources management and poverty alleviation, particularly in the smaller countries of Africa. The Business Plan noted that the comparative advantages of agencies might change over time and that they should be kept under review.

#### *Direct Access for ADB and IADB*



19. Following the Second GEF Assembly in Beijing in October 2002, the Council expanded the access of two RDBs in response to the policy recommendations of the Third Replenishment. This action provided direct access to project funding to the Asian Development Bank and the Inter-American Development Bank. The policy recommendation also stated, “ .... that Council review annually, beginning in May 2003, the experience of other executing agencies designated under expanded opportunities and consider whether additional agencies should benefit from such direct access based on having satisfactorily demonstrated to the Council their capacity and comparative advantage in the management of GEF project activities.”

## Current Status

20. In summary, the policy of Expanded Opportunities has evolved over time and several special features need to be understood in order to assess the experience of the EAs. The objectives of the policy and the criteria for selecting EAs determine which agencies have expanded opportunities and what is expected of them. The concept of comparative advantage not only underscores the specific contribution expected of the EA, but also helps distinguish the operational role of the EAs from the corporate responsibilities of the Implementing Agencies (which include participation in policy and programming, business planning, project review, the aforementioned due diligence activities, training, and outreach and communications). Comparative advantage also bears on the distinction between direct and indirect access to GEF resources. Direct access entails being able to present proposals to the GEF directly without going through an Implementing Agency. Given a certain comparative advantage, an EA then may have direct access to certain types of GEF resources for activities related to that comparative advantage. These resources include PDF-A funds, PDF-B grants, and funds for Enabling Activities, Medium-Sized Projects, and Full Projects. An EA may also accede to GEF resources indirectly through an IA to work with the IA in areas in which the EA has demonstrated competence, but which are not designated as a specific GEF business need for which that EA has been granted expanded opportunities. All these considerations come to play in a review of EA experience. The following table summarizes the status of access to GEF resources for the EAs participating under expanded opportunities as of October 2003.

Agency	ADB	IADB	EBRD	AfDB	IFAD	UNIDO	FAO
PDF-A	Direct	Direct	-	-	-	-	-
ENABLING ACTIVITIES	-	-	-	-	-	POPs	POPs
PDF-B	Direct	Direct	Direct	Direct	Direct	Direct	Direct
MSPs	Direct	Direct	IA	IA	IA	IA	IA
FULL-SIZE PROJECTS	Direct	Direct	IA	IA	IA	IA	IA

Notes:

*Direct:* Indicates direct access in area of designated comparative advantage to GEF Secretariat for Pipeline inclusion and PDF-B and to Council for project approval as part of a Work Program.

*IA:* Indirect access through IA for project implementation in area of designated comparative advantage

*IFAD:* Scope of expanded opportunities is land degradation/desertification. Direct access to PDF B.

*UNIDO:* Comparative advantage under expanded opportunities is industrial POPs. Direct access to PDF-B.

*FAO:* Comparative advantage under expanded opportunities is agricultural POPs. Direct access to PDF-B.

## REVIEW OF EXECUTING AGENCY EXPERIENCE

21. The experience of the seven EAs now working under expanded opportunities will address the central question of whether the EAs are making progress in fulfilling the promise of expanded opportunities. Have new issues emerged since the last progress review? What contributions have the EAs made to the GEF to date? What obstacles or issues have hindered their ability to work with the GEF?

### Previous Progress Review

22. The last review of progress under the policy of expanded opportunities was presented to the Council in May 2000. It focused on only the experience of the Regional Development Banks with regard to PDF-B funds because, at that time, RDBs were the only agencies formally accorded EA status with direct access to this type of funding. Nevertheless, the issues raised in that report bear revisiting here because they may apply to the newer EAs, as well as the RDBs. In summary, these issues were:

- (a) Operational Uncertainty: This factor inhibited RDB project preparation, as the RDBs were unsure about the roles of the IAs, whether IAs would accept proposals, and the level and timing of funding that might be received.

The progress report noted that much of this uncertainty diminished with : a) upstreaming RDB consultation with GEF staff on project concepts; b) direct submission of RDB concepts for pipeline approval to the GEF Secretariat, and c). the completion of Memorandums of Agreement (MOAs) and Financial Procedures Agreements between the IAs and the RDBs. In addition, efforts were initiated to streamline project documentation, and the policy regarding allocation of fees was clarified to emphasize that fees would be allocated according to work performed with no additional premiums given to an IA for its pass-through role.

- (b) Understanding of GEF Policies and Procedures: Within RDBs, upper management and operational staff lacked understanding of the requirements for preparing GEF projects, and how to fit those requirements into the existing RDB project cycle. Financial and legal staff also were unfamiliar with GEF/Trustee requirements.

Actions on the part of the GEF Secretariat to provide training and orientation through general and tailor-made GEF Familiarization Seminars for the RDBs addressed this issue, and the RDBs appointed in-house GEF coordinators to provide technical and policy advice to staff. In addition the Council subsequently limited the accountability of the IA, making it clear that the EAs were fully accountable for the quality, implementation, and financial integrity of their projects.

- (c) Perceived Lack of Commitment: Difficulties in collaboration with the IAs and a perceived lack of proactive engagement by the GEF staff led RDBs to doubt the commitment to expanded opportunities.

The GEF Secretariat's steps to actively engage in upstream consultation, secure direct access to pipeline approval, and discuss relevant Business Plan issues with RDB dispelled these concerns, as did gradual improvements in IA collaboration.

- (d) Credibility: Within countries, RDBs felt that local Focal Points did not regard them as active partners in developing GEF projects.

23. The GEF Secretariat addressed this issue by officially informing the GEF Focal Points of the role of the EAs and by encouraging countries to invite representatives of the EAs to participate in GEF Country Dialogue Workshops. In addition, RDBs took more vigorous steps to communicate their GEF role to GEF Focal Points through their country offices and counterparts.

24. As noted, many of the issues raised in the Progress Report either have been addressed or are being addressed by the GEF and the RDBs. However, in one form or another some of these issues are still in evidence among all Executing Agencies.

### **EA Contribution to the GEF**

25. The seven Executing Agencies have greatly expanded the capacity of the GEF to prepare and implement projects to address global environmental problems within their respective areas of comparative advantage. Having met the criteria for inclusion under Expanded Opportunities, the agencies clearly have the strategic mandates, the staff expertise, project management experience, country contacts, and capacity to mobilize resources to enable them to make a positive contribution to the meeting the GEF goals in these areas. That contribution can be seen in the number of projects they have added to the GEF portfolio in their capacity as EAs, the quality of their project proposals, the co-financing they have mobilized and other activities in which they are involved that are related to the GEF.

### *GEF Projects*

26. The following table summarizes the number of projects initiated by EAs since May 1999 that were formally in the GEF pipeline as of June 2003 or are currently under implementation. The numbers include projects prepared by Executing Agencies under expanded opportunities, as well as projects prepared by IAs with EA, in areas not under expanded opportunities. The only Enabling Activities carried out under expanded opportunities are for POPs. A more detailed description of these projects appears in Annex A and Annex B.

### **GEF Projects of Executing Agencies**

### 1999-2003

Agency	Enabling Activities	Pipeline	Implementation
ADB		6	7
AfDB		-	-
EBRD		1	1
IADB		6	1
FAO	0	4	2
UNIDO	36	4	3
IFAD		1	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>14</b>

27. The distribution of these projects by GEF focal area is shown below:

FOCAL AREA	ADB	AfDB	EBRD	IADB	FAO	UNIDO	IFAD
Biodiversity	OP 2,4,3			OP2,3	OP1,13		OP4
Climate Change	OP 6		OP6	OP5,6	OP6	OP6	
International Waters			OP8	OP10	OP9	OP9	
Ozone Layer Depletion							
Other FA/Crosscutting (POP, Integrated Eco-system Mgt & Sustainable Land Mgt.	OP12				OP12,13,14	OP14	OP12,14

#### *Project Quality*

28. According to GEF Secretariat and IA staff, the quality at entry of the projects has also been good. Understandably, EA project teams initially sometimes need orientation on such matters as eligibility criteria, the documentation needed to meet different requirements at different stages of the project cycle, and the treatment of issues such as additionality and incremental costs. Once oriented however EA teams have produced projects that have been as good as those presented by IAs. For instance, the IDB's Project proposal for the *Consolidation of Biodiversity and Ecosystems Management for the Bay Islands of Honduras* was mentioned for its high quality. The EBRD program for providing credit for pollution reduction technology innovation to small and medium enterprise in Slovenia opened up new ground with the private sector. And, even though the World Bank and IDB are still working on its development, the project *Indigenous Community Integrated Ecosystems Management in Central America* is considered a promising approach to addressing the inclusion of indigenous communities in biodiversity conservation. In the interviews, mention was made of work undertaken by UNIDO and FAO, as well, although the projects cited were not developed when these agencies were acting as EAs under Expanded Opportunities but rather as project executing agencies working under the overall direction and supervision of an IA. These projects were: UNIDO's work with UNDP on the *Integrated Management of the Humboldt Current Large Marine Ecosystem (HCLME)*; and two projects, which FAO's Investment Center helped prepare under its cooperative program with the World Bank (*Argentina: Small Farmers Integrated Eco-Systems Management Project- PDF-B* and *Brazil: Northwestern Fulminense State of Rio de Janeiro- Monitoring and Evaluation*). A more detailed, quantitative assessment of the quality at entry

of EA projects (compared to IA projects) can only be conducted once the EAs have gained more experience.

29. Only a few projects prepared by EAs under the policy are under implementation and none are near the stage where they might be submitted to ex-post evaluation. Interim reviews of two projects developed prior to expanded opportunities – the World Bank/ADB *Sundarbans* project in Bangladesh and the World/IADB *Tejona Wind* project in Costa Rica -- have shown evidence of the need for improved supervision on the part of the EAs to keep the projects on track. However, supervision issues are not uniquely tied to EA projects, and no concrete conclusions can be drawn about the quality of project execution for projects implemented by EAs until more experience accumulates.

### *Co-Financing*

30. Projects in which EAs have been involved have generated a substantial amount of co-financing for the GEF program. Without considering EA in-kind contributions and the cost of self-financed project preparation, the co-financing associated with the projects in execution listed above (see Annex B) amounts to \$306,230,000. The total GEF grants for these projects was \$109,980,000. The amount of this co-financing attributable to the EAs involved was \$162,140,000 or 53% of the total co-financing. The major share of this amount (over 95%) was attributable to the RDBs. For EA projects approved to date, the GEF is leveraging funding at a level of approximately three to one. With relatively little EA experience built up so far, it is not useful at this point to compare the leveraging achieved by IAs with that of the EAs. These co-financing figures, which exclude investment loans associated with GEF grants, reflect the Council's decision to refine the definition and accounting of co-financing.

### *Other Contributions*

31. The EAs have also brought other benefits to the GEF in the past few years that are not exclusively tied to the preparation or implementation of projects. For instance, both the EBRD and the IADB (though the Multilateral Investment Fund) have enhanced the GEF's capacity to deal with the potential of the private sector. UNIDO's energetic commitment of expertise has helped lay the foundation for more countries to address the critical issue of persistent organic pollutants. The GEF/ IFAD relationship has enhanced the role of the Global Mechanism for the UNCCD. For its part, FAO assisted the GEF with the development of three operational programs (OP13, OP14 and OP15), through its Inter-Departmental Working Group on Biodiversity(OP13), the GEF POPs Task Force (OP14), and the GEF Land degradation Task Force and the FAO Inter-departmental Working Group on Desertification (OP15). Also, in June 2002, the GEF Secretariat and FAO co-hosted a workshop in Rome on *Productive Uses of Renewable Energy: Experience, Strategies, and Project Development*. All these contributions go beyond the mere preparation of projects , and could be greatly expanded by closer collaboration on the strategic level between the EAs, the IAs, and the GEF Secretariat.

32. In addition, EAs such as FAO, UNIDO and IFAD have provided technical assistance for project preparation and project execution services to IAs long before they became formal EAs. For instance, FAO reports that under the World Bank/FAO Cooperative Programme, the FAO Investment Centre had assisted the World Bank on some 30 project preparation missions and another 25 supervision missions for GEF projects. Similarly, FAO and UNIDO have each acted as an executing agency for a number of UNEP, UNDP, and World Bank projects. In some of these cases the agencies have been proactive in developing project concepts and proposals, but ultimately, they have worked through an IA that has been fully accountable for project preparation and implementation.

33. In summary, one can draw several conclusions from this brief review of the contributions that the EAs have made so far under the policy of expanded opportunities. The first is that they most definitely have the technical and managerial capacity to produce projects for the GEF and meet the needs of its Business Plan. Generally speaking, the quality of their work also has been very good. Though the learning curve for some may have been steep, with the help of GEF Secretariat and IA staff, the EAs have been more than capable of meeting GEF requirements. As a group, the EAs also represent an invaluable source of additional regional geographic and technical expertise to help shape and refine GEF operations.

34. However, the one question that does stand out is that the number of EA projects approved for the GEF pipeline seems somewhat modest. During the period from July 1999 through June 2003, the Council approved 266 PBF/Bs for the IAs compared to only 27 for the new EAs. Making this comparison is not entirely fair. It does not take into account the pronounced advantage held by the IAs in terms of experience and funding and it fails to differentiate between RDBs who gained access nearly four years ago and the more recent UN agency partners. Moreover, there is no question that the ADB and UNIDO have generated considerable GEF activity, and IFAD and FAO have been actively engaged with IAs on GEF projects for some time. Overall, however, it does appear that the EAs, particularly the RDBs have been slow to get started. Some of the reasons for this can be attributed to differences among the agencies in the length of their experience with GEF or the sheer bureaucratic difficulties involved in adapting large institutions to new situations. Others concern critical issues within the EAs and with the relationships among the EAs, the IAs, and the GEF. These issues are discussed below.

### **Issues Affecting EA Performance**

35. Progress has been made since the last review of EA experience under the policy of expanded opportunities. Little doubt remains about the commitment of the GEF Council and Secretariat to the policy, the IAs have accepted their new role, and the GEF Secretariat has continued its programs to orient and train EA staff about GEF policies, procedures and technical requirements and to improve the project cycle. The EAs also have made progress in consolidating arrangements to participate in the GEF. However, there are still a number of critical issues to overcome that go beyond the customary problems of launching a new program.

### *EA Internal Organization*

36. With one exception, all of the EAs are well on their way to completing the process of gearing up to participate fully in GEF. The top leadership of the agencies has clearly endorsed the GEF relationship, GEF units and designated staff have been assigned GEF responsibilities, and the sometimes trying process of negotiating MOAs and Financial Procedures Agreements with the GEF Secretariat and the Trustee has been completed or is nearing completion for most of the EAs. Coupled with the experience gained to date on GEF project preparation, the training programs offered by the GEF and the IAs have helped the EAs move forward on GEF projects. Due to a period of institutional relocation and staff turnover, the African Development Bank has not yet begun this process of incorporation but is now seeking to do so.

### *Uncertainties, Transaction Costs, and Internal Incentives*

37. In all of the EAs, however, a fundamental transformation is needed in the attitudes and perceptions of mainstream operational staff before the full potential of the EAs can be fulfilled. Within all these agencies, the drive to participate in GEF through expanded opportunities has been by the leaders and staff of environmental divisions. While they have had the support of upper management, they seldom had the authority or incentives to easily convince operational staff that incorporating GEF projects in their regular operations was well worth the added costs and uncertainties of meeting GEF technical and procedural requirements. Mainstream operations staff view these as high transaction costs, when added to the routine complexities of working through the project cycles of their own agencies. If the perceived transaction costs involved with working through an IA is added to the equation, as would be the case for EAs that do not have direct access to GEF project funding, the disincentives to working with the GEF increase for the mainstream operations staff.

38. This situation is particularly pronounced in the RDBs, but it was also mentioned by representatives of FAO and IFAD. At the EBRD, which deals with private sector lending, project /loan officers are especially wary of the difficulties of matching GEF requirements with profit-oriented private sector financial objectives and with the mismatch between the relatively short and rapid approval processes within the EBRD for their regular projects and the longer approval process due to additional approvals needed for GEF projects. For them, as with project team leaders at the ADB or IADB, the internal incentive structure rewards preparing and expediting sizable loans as quickly as possible. This tends to make these officers somewhat risk averse when it comes to taking on complex procedures beyond their control. The ADB addressed this problem early on, by setting aside funds to assist project officers with preparing GEF components and by getting top management to include the preparation of GEF projects as an indicator of performance in personnel evaluations. At the UN agencies where the core activities are more directly and easily incorporated into GEF objectives- say UNIDO or FAO this issue is much less severe.

39. As suggested by the example of the ADB, resolving this issue internally involves a number of actions. The leadership of the EA must clearly and emphatically endorse the EAs role in GEF, and management should establish internal incentives, such as performance indicators in

personnel reviews and funds to identify and initiate GEF projects, to give priority to the GEF. GEF staff within the agency must also play a continuously active role promoting GEF operations, providing training and guidance, and coordinating with the GEF Secretariat.

#### *Relationships with the Implementing Agencies*

40. The role of the Implementing Agencies with regard to EAs has been spelled out in GEF Council decision on GEF/C.15/4 *Review of Progress in Expanded Opportunities for Executing Agencies* and GEF/C.19/8 *Clarifying the Roles and Responsibilities of the GEF Entities*. The guidance in these papers has helped considerably to define and differentiate IA/EA roles, and in general terms, it can be said that the relationships between IAs and EAs has improved since the policy of expanded opportunities went into effect. In cases where internal IA priorities do not conflict with those of the EA, joint activities have proven highly constructive. IAs can provide invaluable policy and technical guidance to EAs on project eligibility, GEF priorities, operational and budgetary constraints, and technical knowledge about specific focal areas. However, there are still some irritants and obstacles that EAs believe put them at a disadvantage in the GEF.

#### *Project Implementation Agreements*

41. The definition and negotiation of the MOAs are a case in point for EAs whose direct access is limited to PDF-B funds. Unlike the single umbrella agreements that were negotiated by the GEF Secretariat and the Trustee with ADB and IADB (who were granted direct access for full project funding) the agreements required of the EAs with more limited access generally have been negotiated on a project-by-project basis with IAs. This means that any IA that had agreed to act as the accountable conduit for EA projects negotiates repeatedly with EAs even though the issues involved may not vary very much from case to case. According to some EAs, the negotiations have often become unduly lengthy and detailed, and in some cases have revolved more around the sharing of fees than on project design. From the point of view of an IA, no value is added by entering into the MOAs since the IA has no accountability for project quality, receives no fee for the pass-through function, and is essentially acting on behalf of the Trustee. Many of the issues involved in these negotiations are especially germane to the Trustee, and might best be resolved through single umbrella agreements. All in all, the transaction costs of such project-by-project negotiations are unnecessary, and for all concerned, greater benefits might come from eliminating this pass-through role of the IAs and treating all EAs equally with regard to direct access to GEF funds.

#### *PDF-A and Corporate Budgets*

42. EAs also feel that their capacity to deliver projects to the GEF has been restrained by the fact that, unlike the IAs, they do not have access to PDF-A funds and do not benefit from the stability afforded by corporate budget allocations. Even though PDF-A funds are small amounts, they give the IAs flexibility in identifying project concepts which the EAs do not have, because the EA must often compete internally for planning funds that are not only scarce but subject to other institutional priorities that may be more compelling to the EA's management than a GEF



project. Having access PDF-A funding would provide the EAs with an instrument, however small, to pursue GEF objectives more vigorously within their institutions.

43. Several EAs view the corporate budget allocations that the GEF provides only to the IAs as the means by which the IAs maintain stable GEF coordination units, rather than as the source of funding for the IA to provide corporate services, such as policy and program development, support to the conventions, outreach, communications, or monitoring and evaluation. Accordingly, the EAs see these allocations as budget support that gives the IAs a staffing advantage that they lack and could certainly use, at least until the returns from GEF project preparation fees were sufficient to cover the EA's internal staffing costs. As the EAs have expressed little interest in providing corporate services themselves, there is little concrete justification for including them in corporate budget allocations. Nevertheless, the rationale behind these allocations should be explained more thoroughly in order to dispel any misconceptions that may persist.

#### *Comparative Advantage and Scope of Activity*

44. Even though the GEF has defined quite clearly the rationale for expanded opportunities in terms of business needs and comparative advantage, EAs often feel that this rationale is unduly constraining and acts as a drag on their productive potential within GEF. For instance, FAO and UNIDO -- whose access under the policy is currently limited to the POPs focal area despite their technical expertise in other areas -- find it contradictory to be constrained from doing some types of projects directly that they nevertheless are entirely free to do under the aegis of an IA. FAO emphasizes that it has experience and staff expertise in Sustainable Land Management and Integrated Ecosystems Management, and in critical areas such as agricultural biodiversity, productive uses of renewable energy, biosafety, and fisheries. Similarly, UNIDO stated its expertise covers renewable energy and energy efficiency, land degradation, and international waters. This is a matter that could be addressed in the Business Plan.

#### *Programming and Business Plan Development*

45. In the minds of most EAs, there is a need to improve coordination between their own country strategy and programming processes and those of the GEF. The RDBs have wide-ranging policy-dialogue and programming interactions with their member countries, which produce project ideas and opportunities that could be useful to the GEF. In turn, the GEF has strategic priorities that should inform these RDB processes. Currently, some EAs feel that they come to the GEF process too late in the game to contribute to priority-setting. A GEF forum for regularly coordinating annual planning processes, reviewing EA country strategies and pipelines, and mutually identifying potentially fruitful priorities would be very beneficial. Given the resources constraints that currently affect GEF programming, it is imperative that the agencies feel that they are being treated equitably in the programming and business planning process. This is a critical issue that goes beyond the relationship of the EAs to the IAs and affects the EA relationship to the GEF as a whole.

### *Relationships with the GEF Secretariat*

46. Over the years of expanded opportunities, the GEF Secretariat has played a vital role in explicating the policy to the EAs and guiding them with regard to GEF policies and procedures. A number of positive steps were taken as a result of the earlier review of progress which have deepened the EAs' understanding of the GEF and reduced the uncertainties surrounding the project approval process. In this review, the general views of both the EAs and the GEF Secretariat staff was that the relationship between the Secretariat and the EAs was quite good. The review did identify a several issues which should be addressed in the future.

### *Upper Management Dialogue and Staff Training*

47. First, there is a broad consensus that the GEF and the EAs should intensify their efforts to more actively engage the leadership of the EAs in order to deepen their commitment to the GEF mission within their agencies. In addition, training for operations staff should be intensified and should go beyond GEF Familiarization Workshops and focus on tailor-made exercises for the types of projects under consideration by the EA. More guidance materials would be useful to support this training, as well.

### *Project Cycle Guidance*

48. Second, the on-going efforts to clarify and simplify the project cycle and project documentation should continue. A number of EA representatives observed that the guidance on technical requirements and procedures from the Secretariat, as well as the IAs keeps changing. The GEF Project Review Criteria and decision points need to be communicated more clearly, and the proposed revisions to the GEF Project Cycle would offer the opportunity to further clarify GEF requirements.

### *Focal Points*

49. Third, among the EAs there is widespread agreement that the Secretariat should make a greater effort to help the GEF Focal Points understand the resources that EAs can bring and that the EAs themselves need to participate more actively in the GEF Country Dialogue Workshops.

### *Proactive Role*

50. Finally, EAs felt that the GEF Secretariat should take an even more proactive role in promoting greater integration of the EAs in the GEF. Along with increased guidance provided by GEF staff during project review and the availability of training exercises, EAs felt that they would benefit internally from more visible GEF support at upper management levels.

## **RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ENHANCING THE ROLE OF THE EXECUTING AGENCIES**

51. For the GEF to become a dynamic partnership fostering cooperative action to address global environmental issues, it must make a concerted effort to consolidate the gains achieved by the policy of expanded opportunities. At this point, the challenge is not to expand the number of Executing Agencies further but to make the policy of Expanded Opportunities work more effectively. The combined capacity and expertise of the ten agencies now operating under Expanded Opportunities responds fully to the strategic priorities and needs of the GEF Business Plan, and there is no compelling need to add any more agencies. In fact, the greatest needs are to reduce the complexities of the present IA/EA arrangement and to unleash the constraints that have impeded more active participation on the part of the current EAs.

52. With this in mind, the GEF should seek to disentangle and simplify the relationships between the IAs and the EA. Upon granting them access under expanded opportunities, it was determined that the EAs have well established track records in their fields of expertise. Accordingly, having been invited to join, they should have direct access from the outset to the full range of GEF funding to carry out projects in the fields of their comparative advantage. Their success within the GEF should be determined by the quality of the projects they prepare and their contributions to the overall goals of the GEF.

53. The critical step for achieving this is to grant all EAs direct access to GEF project planning and implementation funds without involving the IAs in the process beyond the initial due diligence reviews which are a precondition for acceptance into the GEF. First, this would mean that the GEF and the Trustee would only have to develop one MOA and Financial Procedures Agreement with the EA and it would relieve both the IA and the EAs of the burden of developing these agreements on a project-by-project basis. Second, it would make PDF-A funds available to EAs and thereby enhance their ability to bring project concepts to the table. The GEF Secretariat could be responsible for responding to requests for PDF-A funds from the EAs.

54. In order to capitalize on the full potential of the EAs, the GEF should establish mechanisms to coordinate GEF programming and business planning processes more effectively with the processes of the EAs. This not only would help the EAs include GEF priorities more vigorously in their own processes, but it would inform the GEF about issues and priorities affecting the EAs in their member countries. In sum, improving communication and coordination between these processes will enhance each agency's sense of the constraints and opportunities they might face. Coordinating such a broader, more inclusive planning process may require more resources for the GEF Secretariat, but it would produce a clearer picture of what each partner can be expected to bring to the program.

55. In the context of the programming and business planning process, it will also be important to examine the potential contributions EAs make in their areas of comparative advantage. Comparative advantage is defined in terms of an agency's broad capacity to mainstream GEF objectives in country policy and programs, as well as its expertise and capacity in specialized areas of GEF priority and its ability to mobilize additional resources. Agencies

such as UNIDO and FAO were granted expanded opportunities because their clear comparative advantages in the area of persistent organic pollutants (POPs) would contribute to achieving GEF's objectives. In the context of the annual review of EA experience, an assessment of the role of these EAs would help determine if they meet the GEF Selection Criteria in their other fields of expertise and if the GEF has a business need for broadening the scope of their participation. Such a review should focus not only on the additional technical capacity the agency would bring to the GEF and its ability to mobilize financial resources, but also on its ability to integrate or mainstream global environmental objectives into its own programs and operations, as well as into the overall social and economic development strategies and programs of the countries in which it is working.

56. Drawing out the full potential of the EAs and making the policy work more effectively will also require aggressive engagement from the GEF Secretariat on a number of fronts mentioned earlier. Efforts should be made with the leadership of the EAs to refresh and enhance the understanding and commitment to the GEF in their agencies; more specialized training and guidance should be provided for operations staff; the EAs should be more engaged in country-based dialogue; and the GEF Secretariat should take the lead in developing a common communications and outreach strategy that integrates the efforts of the agencies. Achieving this may well require more resources, but it should also produce valuable benefits for the members of the GEF.

# ANNEX A: EXECUTING AGENCY PROJECTS IN GEF PIPELINE 1999-2003

GEF ID	IA	Country	Title	Type	OP	FA	Status	PDF A	PDF B	Pipeline	PDF B
<b>Expanded Opportunity</b>											
1126	ADB	China	Songhua River Flood and Wetland Management Project	FP	2	Biodiversity	PDFB		0.330	9/1/1999	21-Dec-99
1185	ADB	Philippines	Integrated Coastal Resources Management Project	FP	2	Biodiversity	PDFB		0.330	2/9/2000	28-Feb-00
1357	ADB	India	Conservation and Sustainable Livelihoods in the Indian Sundarbans	FP	12	Multiple Focal Areas	Pipeline			2/27/2002	
1419	ADB	Maldives	Outer Islands Electrification	FP	6	Climate Change	Pipeline			3/15/2001	
1127	ADB	China	Yunnan Comprehensive Agricultural Development and Biodiversity Conservation Project	FP	4	Biodiversity	PDFB		0.350	10/1/1999	27-Oct-99
1238	ADB	Solomon Islands	Marine Resources Management and Conservation Project	FP	2	Biodiversity	PDFB		0.150	9/30/1999	27-Oct-99
			<b>Sub Total ADB</b>					-	<b>1.160</b>		
963	IADB	Regional (Honduras, Guatemala, Belize)	Environmental Protection and Maritime Transport Pollution Control of the Gulf of Honduras	FP	10	International Waters	PDFB		0.550	9/10/1999	01-Mar-01
1092	IADB	Regional (Guatemala, Belize, Honduras, El Salvador, Nicaragua, Costa Rica, Panama)	Integrated Ecosystem Management in Indigenous Communities	FP	3	Biodiversity	PDFB		0.700	5/14/2001	15-Apr-02

1147	IADB	Jamaica	Coastal Zone Management in Portland Bight: Demonstration Project	FP	2	Biodiversity	PDFB		0.330	9/19/1999	20-Jun-00
1219	IADB	Regional (Brazil, Mexico, Argentina, Chile)	Clean Tech Fund	FP	5	Climate Change	Pipeline			2/15/2001	
1515	IADB	Honduras	Consolidation of Ecosystem Management and Biodiversity Conservation of the Bay Islands	FP	2	Biodiversity	PDFB		0.320	2/4/2002	22-Feb-02
1547	IADB	Guatemala	Exploitation of the Geothermal Resources of Guatemala for Electricity Generation Projects	FP	6	Climate Change	PDFB		0.350	2/5/2002	16-Sep-02
			<b>Sub Total IADB</b>					-	<b>2.250</b>		
1160	EBRD	Russian Federation	Mutnovsky Geothermal Power Plant	FP	6	Climate Change	PDFB		<b>0.223</b>	9/10/1999	19-Jun-00
1520	UNIDO	India	Development of a National Implementation Plan in India as a First Step to Implement the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs).	FP	14	Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs)	PDFB		<b>0.317</b>	9/20/2002	20-Sep-02
			<b>Grand Total Expanded Opportunity</b>					-	<b>3.950</b>		

### Non-Expanded Opportunity

1891	UNEP/FAO	Regional (Bangladesh, Bhutan, Nepal, Sri Lanka)	Reducing Greenhouse Gas Emissions by Promoting Bioenergy Technologies for Heat Applications	FP	6	Climate Change	PDFB	0.025	0.329	6/23/2003	23-Jun- 03
2127	UNDP/FAO	Global (China, Papua New Guinea, India, Indonesia, Iran, Tunisia, Kenya, Cameroon, Madagascar, Mexico, Peru)	Conservation and Sustainable Management of Globally Important Ingenious Agricultural Heritage Systems (GIAHS)	FP	13	Biodiversity	Pipeline			6/13/2003	
1329	UNEP/FAO	Global	Land Degradation Assessment in Drylands (LADA)	FP	1, 12	Multiple Focal Areas	PDFB	0.025	0.700	8/27/2001	27-Aug- 01
2151	World Bank/FAO	Tanzania	Novel Forms of Livestock & Wildlife Integration Adjacent to Protected Areas in Africa	MSP	1	Biodiversity	PDFA	0.025			
			<b>Sub Total FAO</b>					<b>0.075</b>	<b>1.029</b>		

1848	UNEP/IFAD	Kenya	Mount Kenya Pilot Project for Land and Water Management	FP	12, 4	Multiple Focal Areas	PDFB		<b>0.350</b>	6/12/2003	12-Jun- 03
------	-----------	-------	--	----	-------	-------------------------	------	--	--------------	-----------	---------------

1443	UNDP/UNIDO	Regional (Chile, Peru)	Integrated Management of the Humboldt Current Large Marine Ecosystem (HCLME)	FP	9	International Waters	PDFB		0.344	12/11/2001	14-Dec- 01
1361	UNEP/UNIDO	Cuba	Generation and Delivery of Renewable Energy Based Modern Energy Services in Cuba; the case of Isla de la Juventud	FP	6	Climate Change	PDFB		0.325	8/1/2001	01-Aug- 01

1358	UNIDO	Zambia	Renewable Energy Based Electricity Generation for Isolated Mini-grids in Zambia	FP	6	Climate Change	PDFB		0.325	8/1/2001	01-Aug- 01
			<b>Sub Total UNIDO</b>					-	<b>0.994</b>		
			<b>Grand Total Non-Expanded Opportunity</b>					<b>0.075</b>	<b>2.373</b>		



## ANNEX B: EXECUTING AGENCY PROJECTS UNDER IMPLEMENTATION 1999-2003

### Expanded Opportunity

ID	IIA	Country	Project Title	Type	Op	Focal	GEF Amount	Cofnanciar Name	Cofinancing Amount	Project Approval Date
956	ADB	China	PRC/GEF Partnership on Land Degradation in Dryland Ecosystems: Project I on Strengthening the Enabling Environment and Building Institutional Capacity	FP	12	Land Degradation/Multiple Focal Areas	8.05	ADB	1.00	10/15/02
								Government	6.30	
									<b>7.30</b>	
1684	ADB	Regional (Cambodia, Lao PDR, China, Thailand, Vietnam)	National Performance Assessment and Subregional Strategic Environment Framework in the Greater Mekong Subregion (GMS)	MSP	12	Multiple Focal Areas	0.80	IGES/NES	0.30	12/18/02
								UNEP	0.20	
								ADB	0.80	
								GMS Countries	0.30	
									<b>1.60</b>	
1870	ADB	Regional (China, Mongolia)	Prevention and Control of Dust and Sandstorms in Northeast Asia	MSP	12	Multiple Focal Areas	0.50	ADB	0.50	12/18/02
								Government (in kind)	0.22	
									<b>0.72</b>	

881	ADB/UNDP	China	Wind Power Development Project	FP	6	Climate Change	12.00	ADB	58.00	11/01/00
								Provincial Power Companies	18.60	
								Domestic Banks	9.40	
									<b>86.00</b>	
878	ADB/World Bank	Sri Lanka	Protected Areas and Wildlife Conservation Project	FP	3	Biodiversity	10.53	ADB	12.00	11/01/00
								Netherlands	4.00	
								Government	7.70	
								Beneficiaries	0.90	
									<b>24.60</b>	
1105	ADB/World Bank	China	Efficient Utilization of Agricultural Wastes	FP	6	Climate Change	6.40	ADB	33.12	12/07/01
								Government/Beneficiaries	37.79	
									<b>70.91</b>	
1183	ADB/UNDP	Cambodia	Tonle Sap Conservation Project	FP	2	Biodiversity	3.60	Government	3.90	10/15/02
								Government (ADB Loan)	10.42	
								UNDP-Capacity 21	0.63	
								ADB Nonlending Assistant	0.39	

								Other International	0.20	
									<b>15.54</b>	
1348	FAO/World Bank	Regional (Botswana, Cameroon, Cote d'Ivoire, Lesotho, Mali, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Niger, Nigeria, South Africa, Swaziland, Tanzania, Tunisia, Ethiopia)	African Stockpiles Program - First phase	FP	14	Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs)	25.30	IDA, EU, Canada, Italy, Finland, Netherlands, Norway, UK, FA	31.00	10/15/02
								Beneficiary Governments	4.00	
									<b>35.00</b>	
1229	EBRD/ World Bank	Slovenia	EBRD/GEF Environmental Credit Facility (formerly entitled Slovenia: National Pollution Reduction Project)	FP	8	International Waters	9.99	EBRD loan	45.00	10/15/02
								Private Companies	0.42	
								Multi-donor BAS Programme	0.42	
									<b>45.84</b>	

1692	UNIDO/ UNDP	Slovak Republic	Global Programme to Demonstrate the Viability and Removal of Barriers that Impede Adoption and Successful Implementation of Available, Non-Combustion Technologies for Destroying Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs)	FP	14	Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs)	10.61	Government	4.49	05/16/03
								Private Industry	4.41	
								NGO Community	0.27	
								UNDP	0.24	
								UNIDO	0.67	
									<b>10.07</b>	
1512	UNIDO/ UNEP	Tunisia	Development of a National Plan for the Implementation of the Stockholm Convention on POPs	EA	14	Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs)	0.43	Government	<b>0.93</b>	11/14/01
2067	UNIDO/ UNEP	Global	Fostering Active and Effective Civil Society Participation in Preparations for Implementation of the Stockholm Convention. (NGO-POPs Elimination Project).	MSP	14	Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs)	1.00	IPEN	0.35	05/27/03
								To be identified from foundations and other donors	0.65	
									<b>1.00</b>	
1332	UNIDO	Czech Republic	Enabling activities to facilitate early action on the implementation of the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs) in the	EA	14	Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs)	0.44			07/31/01

			Czech Republic							
1388	UNIDO	Hungary	Enabling Activities to Facilitate Early Action on the Implementation of the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs)	EA	14	Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs)	0.49			08/01/01
1389	UNIDO	Poland	Enabling Activities to Facilitate Early Action on the Implementation of the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs Convention) in Poland	EA	14	Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs)	0.50			08/01/01
1465	UNIDO	Mongolia	Enabling Activities to Facilitate Early Action on the Implementation of the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs)	EA	14	Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs)	0.49			07/30/02
1466	UNIDO	Ghana	Enabling Activities to Facilitate Early Action on the Implementation of the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs) in Ghana	EA	14	Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs)	0.50			10/29/01
1470	UNIDO	Romania	Enabling Activities to Facilitate Early Action on the Implementation of the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs) in Romania	EA	14	Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs)	0.50			10/04/01
1479	UNIDO	Armenia	Enabling activities to facilitate early action on the implementation of the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs) in the Republic of Armenia	EA	14	Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs)	0.48			11/14/01
1480	UNIDO	Chad	Enabling Activities to Facilitate Early Action on the Implementation of the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs) in Chad	EA	14	Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs)	0.49			06/13/02
1481	UNIDO	Algeria	Enabling Activities to Facilitate Early Action on the Implementation of the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs) in Algeria	EA	14	Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs)	0.49			11/14/01

1487	UNIDO	Central African Republic	Enabling Activity to Facilitate Early Action on the Implementation of the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants in Central African Republic	EA	14	Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs)	0.48			05/22/02
1488	UNIDO	Guatemala	EA to facilitate early action on the implementation of the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants in the Republic of Guatemala	EA	14	Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs)	0.50			04/19/02
1497	UNIDO	Egypt	Enabling Activities to Facilitate Early Action on the Implementation of the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs) in Egypt	EA	14	Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs)	0.50			09/03/02
1498	UNIDO	Togo	Enabling Activities to Facilitate Early Action on the Implementation of the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs) in Togo	EA	14	Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs)	0.50			11/14/01
1499	UNIDO	Niger	Enabling Activities to Facilitate Early Action on the Implementation of the Stockholm Convention on POPs	EA	14	Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs)	0.48			05/06/02
1500	UNIDO	Indonesia	Enabling Activities to Facilitate Early Action on the Implementation of the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs) in Indonesia	EA	14	Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs)	0.50			11/14/01
1508	UNIDO	Nigeria	Enabling Activities to Facilitate Early Action on the Implementation of the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs) in Nigeria	EA	14	Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs)	0.50			11/14/01
1509	UNIDO	Ethiopia	Enabling Activities to Facilitate Early Action on the Implementation of the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs)	EA	14	Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs)	0.50			07/29/02
1510	UNIDO	Tanzania	Enabling Activities to Facilitate Early Action on the Implementation of the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs) in the United Republic of Tanzania.	EA	14	Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs)	0.50			11/14/01

1518	UNIDO	Macedonia	Enabling Activities to Facilitate Early Action on the Implementation of the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs) in the Republic of Macedonia	EA	14	Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs)	0.50			11/14/01
1519	UNIDO	Croatia	Enabling Activities to Facilitate Early Action on the Implementation of the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs) in the Republic of Croatia.	EA	14	Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs)	0.47			11/14/01
1622	UNIDO	Bolivia	Enabling Activities to Facilitate Early Action on the Implementation of the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs) in the Republic of Bolivia	EA	14	Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs)	0.48			02/22/02
1652	UNIDO	Lao PDR	Enabling activities to facilitate early action on the implementation of the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs) in Lao People's Democratic Republic	EA	14	Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs)	0.50			04/19/02
1654	UNIDO	Lesotho	Enabling activities to facilitate early action on the implementation of the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs) in Lesotho	EA	14	Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs)	0.49			04/19/02
1674	UNIDO	Congo	Enabling activities to facilitate early action on the implementation of the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants in Congo	EA	14	Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs)	0.50	UNEP	<b>0.02</b>	04/19/02
1697	UNIDO	Nepal	Enabling Activities to Facilitate Early Action on the Implementation of the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants	EA	14	Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs)	0.47			05/22/02
1790	UNIDO	Gabon	Enabling Activities to Facilitate Early Action on the Implementation of the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants in Gabon	EA	14	Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs)	0.42			11/20/02

1791	UNIDO	Seychelles	Enabling activities to facilitate early action on the implementation of the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs) in Seychelles	EA	14	Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs)	0.38			11/20/02
1793	UNIDO	Sao Tome and Principe	Enabling Activities to Facilitate Early Action on the Implementation of the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs)	EA	14	Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs)	0.37			11/20/02
1798	UNIDO	Burundi	Enabling Activities to Facilitate Early Action on the Implementation of the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs)	EA	14	Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs)	0.40			11/20/02
1799	UNIDO	Malawi	Enabling Activities to Facilitate Early Action on the Implementation of the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs)	EA	14	Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs)	0.50			09/03/02
1800	UNIDO	Djibouti	Enabling Activities to Facilitate Early Action on the Implementation of the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs)	EA	14	Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs)	0.38			11/22/02
1873	UNIDO	Turkey	Enabling activities to facilitate early action on the implementation of the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs) in the Republic of Turkey	EA	14	Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs)	0.47			12/17/02
1922	UNIDO	Venezuela	Enabling activities to facilitate early action on the implementation of the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs) in the Republic of Venezuela	EA	14	Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs)	0.47			11/20/02
1923	UNIDO	Liberia	Enabling activities to facilitate early action on the implementation of the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs) in Liberia	EA	14	Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs)	0.37			01/27/03
1974	UNIDO	Rwanda	Enabling activities to facilitate early action on the implementation of the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs) in Rwanda	EA	14	Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs)	0.37			01/08/03



1412	UNIDO/ World Bank	China	Building the Capacity of the People's Republic of China to Implement the Stockholm Convention on POPs and Develop a National Implementation Plan	FP	14	Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs)	4.41	Canada	1.06	05/16/03
								UNIDO in kind	0.24	
								Italy	4.48	
								Government (in-kind)	0.92	
									<b>6.70</b>	
<b>Totals</b>									<b>306.23</b>	

**109.98**

**Cofinancing from Eas**

**162.14**

**%age cofinancing from Eas**

**53%**

**Non Expanded Opportunity**

884	UNEP/FAO	Global (Cameroon, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Indonesia, Iran, Mexico, Nigeria, Philippines, Trinidad and Tobago, Venezuela)	Reduction of Environmental Impact from Tropical Shrimp Trawling through Introduction of By-catch Technologies and Change of Management	FP	9	International Waters	4.78	UNEP (in-kind)	0.11	11/01/00
								FAO (in-kind)	1.01	
								Government	3.25	
									<b>4.37</b>	