



Global Environment Facility

GEF/C.23/Inf.12

April 16, 2004

GEF Council
May 19-21, 2004

EVALUATION REPORT OF THE GEF COUNCIL MEMBER AND FOCAL POINT SUPPORT PROGRAM



Global Environment Facility

March 23, 2004

EVALUATION REPORT OF THE
GEF COUNCIL MEMBER AND FOCAL POINT
SUPPORT PROGRAM

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	1
Description of the Program	2
Background and Rationale	2
The Scope of an Action Plan	3
Survey of Focal Points	4
The Focal Point and Council Member Support Program.....	4
Objectives	4
Focal Point Responsibilities.....	5
Eligible Activities	5
Allocation of Funds.....	6
Program Administration.....	6
Current Status of the Program.....	7
Evaluation of the Council Member and Focal Point Support Program	7
Objective and Methodology of the Evaluation	7
Findings of the Evaluation	8
Scope of the Program.....	8
Coverage of the Program	9
Patterns of Activity	10
Assessment of the Scope of the Support Program	12
Impact of the Support Program.....	13
Assessment of the Impact	15
Coordination and Administration of the Program	15
Annual Plans	16
Administration of Funds	16
Program Reports	17
Conclusions and Recommendations	18
Principal Achievements	18
Critical Issues.....	19
Recommendations for the Future.....	21

INTRODUCTION

1. The GEF Council approved the program to support Council Members and Focal Points in May 1999. The program was designed to provide funds and services to help GEF Focal Points and Council Members in recipient countries carry out their consultation and coordination roles more effectively and raise awareness of the goals and opportunities offered by the GEF. Coordinated by the GEF Secretariat and administered by the UNDP in 108 countries and the World Bank in 11 countries through their field offices, the three-year program covers 164 eligible countries of which 101 have received support to date. As of January 2004, the program has expended \$1.4 of the \$1.8 million originally allocated for its implementation.
2. In May 2003, following a review of its annual progress report - GEF Support to National Focal Points and Council Members Representing Recipient Country Constituencies (GEF/C21/Inf.12)- the GEF Council extended the program through May 2004. In addition, it authorized an independent evaluation of the program in order to determine whether and how it should be extended in the future. An additional US\$350,000 was requested to continue the focal point support program for an additional year pending the review and a decision by the Council in May 2004 on actions to continue strengthening focal points. The evaluation was started in November 2003.
3. This report presents the findings and recommendations of the Independent Evaluation. Following this introduction, the report is organized in three main sections. The first describes the Focal Point and Council Member Support Program, its objectives, the scope of the activities eligible for financial and technical support, its administrative structure and procedures, and the status of the program. It also reviews the concerns that gave rise to the program and sets it in the context of other GEF capacity building initiatives. It is against this background that one can judge whether the program is an effective instrument for meeting its stated objectives.
4. The second section presents the results of the evaluation. It starts with an explanation of the evaluation's objectives and methodology which outlines the key questions asked about the program and describes the scope of the literature review, interviews and the survey of Focal Points, Council Members, and Implementing Agency staff which were used to address these questions. The remainder of the second section is devoted to the presentation of the analysis and findings of the evaluation. It examines the design of the program, the effectiveness of its implementation and its overall impact. Throughout, the assessment draws upon the results of the survey, which appears as Appendix I of the report.
5. The final section summarizes the critical issues, lessons and options for the future that are derived from the evaluation. Alternatives are examined for a) terminating the program altogether; b) making modifications to improve its performance; or c) streamlining and refocusing the program in a more fundamental way. The recommendations proposed are built on the conclusion that there is still a strong need to improve communication and coordination of GEF policies, projects and programs within recipient member countries, within the GEF's constituencies, and between the GEF and its member countries.

DESCRIPTION OF THE PROGRAM

Background and Rationale

6. The origins of the Focal Point and Council Member Support Programs lie in the GEF Council's response to the findings of the Study of the GEF's Overall Performance (February 1998). Following its review of this report and its consideration of the recommendations contained in the Report on the 2nd Replenishment of the GEF Trust Fund, the Council called for the preparation of an action plan to address the issues raised in the Performance Report. A survey focused on the needs of Focal Points was also undertaken. The elements of the action plan, which were set forth in the GEF paper entitled Country Ownership of GEF Projects: Elements for Strengthened Country Level Coordination and Ownership, and Greater Outreach and Coordination, (GEF/C.12/8, September 11, 1998) and the results of the survey were presented at the October 14-16, 1998 Council meeting, following the GEF Assembly in New Delhi, India. These studies laid the foundation for the Focal Point Support Program launched the following Spring.

7. The Study of GEF's Overall Performance (February 1998) reviewed GEF experience in ten countries. Among its findings, it underscored the need to enhance the capacity of countries to develop, manage and mainstream GEF projects on their own and identified a number of weaknesses with regard to Focal Points. These were a lack of clarity about mandates, functions and general terms of reference, and institutional weaknesses derived from the fact that Focal Points tended to be housed in Environment Ministries which generally did not have the authority to coordinate other ministries and were considered weak, especially in relation to ministries of finance. The inter-agency coordination mechanisms that had been created for GEF programs also were found wanting, as they were often ad hoc arrangements and did not coordinate well with Convention Focal Points. The study found that Focal Points did not have the budgetary resources to carry out GEF functions and did little to reach out to civil society stakeholders. Finally, in most cases, the availability of local language publications and information was very limited.

8. The Study called for the GEF to take actions to enable the GEF Focal Points to become more effective advocates for GEF programs and issues. Among other things, it recommended involving Focal Points more in GEF Project Development Workshops; focusing more on the coordination and information dissemination roles of the Focal Points; and providing more GEF resources for translation of GEF documents into local languages. In a parallel recommendation dealing with the GEF communication and outreach activities aimed at strengthening the GEF at the local country level, the report called for the GEF Secretariat to take a more vigorous approach to disseminating information about the GEF programs to the Focal Points.

9. The Study's findings regarding country capacity and ownership were underscored in the Report on the 2nd Replenishment of the GEF Trust Fund which identified the need for an action plan to address these broader issues, as well as the needs of Focal Points. The Report stated:

"Participants stress that GEF activities should be country-driven and that country ownership is key to the success of GEF projects. To achieve this, GEF activities should

be based on national priorities designed to support sustainable development and the global environment. Participants underscore the need for concerted efforts to advance recipient countries' knowledge of the global environment and the GEF, to facilitate country access to GEF financing and country ownership of GEF financed projects, to strengthen national focal points, and to facilitate coordination at the country level. Participants recommend that the Council requests the Secretariat, in consultation with the Implementing Agencies, to review country level relations, including capacity building, training, outreach and information sharing, and prepare for Council approval an action plan to strengthen country-level coordination and to promote genuine country ownership of GEF-financed activities, including active involvement of recipient countries and interested stakeholders. The action plan should also address: i) the need for the Implementing agencies to assist countries in identifying and implementing policies in support of the global environment; and ii) means through which the Secretariat may work with the Implementing and Executing agencies and other entities to strengthen the financial and institutional sustainability of GEF funded activities, and to better promote the use of local, national and regional expertise."

10. The GEF Council endorsed the policy recommendations of the Replenishment Report at its meeting on March 30-31, 1998 and requested that the Secretariat prepare an action plan for the October 1998 Council meeting which addressed the issues raised in the Study of the GEF's Overall Performance.

The Scope of an Action Plan

11. In a paper entitled Country Ownership of GEF Projects: Elements for Strengthening Country-level Coordination and Ownership, and Greater Outreach and Communications. (GEF/c.12/8) , the essential elements of an action plan were set forth for Council review. The scope of the action plan was to cover a range of issues including (i) capacity building to enhance country ownership and the country driven character of GEF operations; (ii) improved coordination, communications and information sharing; and relations with Conventions, as well as iii) support to Focal Points. The paper did not elaborate upon the details of proposals in each these areas, but instead laid out the broad elements of an overall plan and the basic principles to be followed in developing each of them. Following the Council's review of the paper, more specific proposals were then prepared for the Council's approval at the next meeting in May 1999.

12. The paper presented a number of objectives for the design of a program to support Focal Points and Council Members. It reviewed the findings of the Study of GEF's Overall Performance, acknowledging the weaknesses of Focal Point structures, and noting the need for more frequent constituency meetings and better communication and training regarding GEF policies and procedures. The specific objectives it suggested for a future program were: a) to provide information and lessons learned at a country level; b) promote awareness of GEF activities and stakeholders; and c) to address constraints to effective coordination.

13. In addition, the paper also set forth several general criteria for the design of the program that should be born in mind for this evaluation. Aside from indicating that the program should

build on existing experience and be cost effective, the paper stated that the delivery vehicle for the support should be easy to access, sustainable and cost effective, and suggested that the support be provided in the form of services through the field offices of the GEF Implementing Agencies. The paper also made clear that the support should not be provided indefinitely and that a longer-term solution to strengthening Focal Points might be funded through GEF project Funds.

Survey of Focal Points

14. Along with the preparation of the paper on Country Ownership of GEF Projects, the GEF carried out a survey of national Focal Points in August of 1998, which also was presented to the GEF Council Meeting in October 1998 (GEF/C.12Inf.17). The survey, which was sent to both Operational and Political Focal Points aimed to determine how Focal Points perceived their role and responsibilities. The survey identified a number of information needs and services that the GEF might provide the Focal Points, among them a) training on GEF objectives, policies procedures and project preparation; b) provision of improved communications technology (Internet) services; c) improved flow of information on the GEF; d) help on improving coordination and communications with stakeholders, Global Conventions, and national ministries. These formed the basis for the scope and details of the Focal Point and Council Member Support Program.

The Focal Point and Council Member Support Program

15. The GEF formally launched the Focal Point and Council Member Support Program in May 1999. The detailed plan for the program was laid out in Constituencies and Assistance for Country-level Coordination (GEF/C.13/13) which defined its scope and estimated costs. Funding for the first period of the program was approved in the GEF Corporate Budget for FY 2000. The formal objectives, range of eligible activities, administrative structure and procedures and the current status of the program are described below.

Objectives

16. The central objective of the Support Program is to enhance the capacity of the Operational and Political Focal Points and GEF Council Members to discharge their responsibilities more effectively. As noted in the GEF Guidelines for the program, the Political Focal Points in a GEF member country is responsible for issues having to do with GEF policies and governance while the Operational Focal Point is responsible for the coordination of GEF's operations within the country. Council Members are concerned with GEF governance and programs worldwide and for the most part, have multi-country constituencies. The different responsibilities of the Political and Operational Focal points are summarized below.

FOCAL POINT RESPONSIBILITIES

Political Focal Point	Operational Focal Point
1. Receive and distribute documents on GEF policy and governance.	1. Ensure consistency of GEF proposals with country priorities and commitments under global environmental conventions.
2. Communicate Government views to GEF Secretariat.	2. Facilitate country consultations on GEF operational matters.
3. Constituency contact point w/GEF Secretariat, Council Member; other constituency members.	3. Identify project ideas to meet country priorities.
4. Contact point within country on GEF governance matters.	4. Endorse GEF project proposals
N/A	5. Provide feedback on GEF activities including project implementation.

17. The specific objectives of the Support Program aim to help improve:

- (a) The flow of communication, information and documentation;
- (b) Provide training and enhance awareness of the GEF;
- (c) Facilitate and enhance feedback on GEF proposals;
- (d) Improve country-level coordination of the focal point system; and
- (e) Enhance constituency related coordination and communications.

Eligible Activities

18. The Scope of Eligible (Operational and Political) activities/services set forth in the Guidelines for the program reflect these objectives. On behalf of the GEF, the field office of the Implementing Agency identified by the Operational Focal Point can assist the OFP with the following:

- (a) Retrieval of GEF documents from the GEF website and dissemination of the documents to National Focal Points and others as agreed with the Focal Points.
- (b) Providing a reference library of relevant information and publications in IA field Offices and access to electronic information networks, such as the SDNP, SIDnet or INFOTERRA. In consultation with the Implementing Agency Field Office, another entity could serve as a reference library, as long as the quality and continuity of such a reference source can be assured.
- (c) Organization of meetings for country level coordination as necessary.
- (d) Other activities such as seminars, training courses, field visits may be approved.
- (e) Translation of GEF documents into the local language.

- (f) One time expenditure on a modem for access to the Internet and training in its use.
19. The scope of activities undertaken by Council Members that are eligible for support are:
- (a) Assistance to the Council Member to communicate with members of the constituency in a cost effective manner (e.g. arranging telephone, faxes and mail);
 - (b) Ensuring that the Council Member receives GEF Council documents on GEF Council and policy matters;
 - (c) Organizing meetings and telephone conferences for Constituency level coordination, as necessary, including to coordinate with Constituency members in preparation of GEF Council meetings.
20. Ineligible expenditures for Operational and Political Focal Points were a) international travel and per diem for anything other than up to two Constituency meetings per year within the region; b) procurement of computer hardware; c) recurrent expenditures (staff, rent etc.) and d) support to Council Members. Ineligible expenditures for Council Members are computer hardware and recurring costs.

Allocation of Funds

21. Under the terms of the program, the IA Field Office is authorized to expend \$8500 for the first year and \$8000 each for the second and third years for Focal Point Support.¹ The annual ceiling for support to Council Members is \$2000.

Program Administration

22. The Support Program is administered through the country Field Office of an Implementing Agency based upon an agreement between the IA and the recipient country. Practice to date has been that the Focal Points and the Field Offices develop an annual plan or work program, which identifies priority activities with a corresponding budget and a schedule of implementation. Following approval of the plan, the IA Field Office either provides services to the Focal Points or covers the costs for activities undertaken to implement the plan. Most Field Offices either pay for services directly or reimburse the Focal Point for authorized expenditures. For instance, UNDP's approach has been to disburse funds in relation to the agreed upon work program, reimbursing the costs of the activities or providing services directly to carry out an activity, such as organizing a meeting. The guidelines state that no cash transfers between the Field Office and the OFP are foreseen. The Field Office, in consultation with the Focal Point or Council Member is responsible for providing Annual Reports to the GEF Secretariat on the activities and expenditures made under the program. The Implementing Agency Field Offices receive a fee for their services of 3% on the funds administered.

¹ The program covers the one time cost of \$500 for purchase of a modem for Internet access.

Current Status of the Program

23. After three and one half years of operation, the Support Program now reaches 101 countries in all four regions covered by the GEF. The original authorization for the program of US\$1,596,900 was increased by US\$350,000 when the GEF Council extended the program to the end of FY 2004. The original allocation for Council Member support was \$216,000, which combined with the figures above brings the total available funding to \$2,162,600. As stated earlier, the latest information shows that total disbursements have reached \$1,399,273, which leaves a balance of approximately \$763,327 as the program reaches its termination date. (Appendix II)

EVALUATION OF THE COUNCIL MEMBER AND FOCAL POINT SUPPORT PROGRAM

24. The GEF Council called for an independent evaluation of the Support Program at its meeting in May 2003 following its review of GEF Support to National Focal Points and Council Members Representing Recipient Country Constituencies (GEF/C.21/Inf.12). This report, which examined the program's progress to date and presented revised guidelines for its implementation, proposed the evaluation and recommended that it be completed by the May 2004 Council meeting. The specific objectives of the evaluation, its methodology, and its major findings are examined in this section of the report.

Objective and Methodology of the Evaluation

25. The fundamental objective of the evaluation is to determine whether the support provided to Focal Points and Council Members through the program has achieved the objectives of strengthening the national coordination activities of the GEF Focal Points and assisted the recipient country Council Members in fulfilling their responsibilities toward the members of their constituencies. The evaluation has addressed this central question by examining how the Focal Points and Council Members have used the program and what impact it has had in their minds and in the minds of the Implementing Agency staff responsible for administering it. The evaluation also assessed how well the program has been run by the Implementing Agencies responsible for administering the funds and providing technical assistance. The ultimate objective of this analysis was to identify the strengths and weaknesses of the program and draw out lessons learned upon which to base recommendations for the future of the program.

26. The evaluation used a number of sources in order to answer these questions. These included: a) a literature review which covered: the GEF Council documents cited earlier related to the purposes and design of the Support Program; program progress reports and a mid-term review; the first Study of the GEF's Overall Performance (1998) and, the more recent, First Decade of the GEF: Second Overall Performance Study (2002), and material on related GEF capacity building initiatives; b) extensive interviews with staff at the GEF Secretariat, the World Bank and UNDP, as well as with a select number of Focal Points and Council Members who attended the GEF Council Meeting in November 2003; and c) a widely distributed survey of Focal Points, Council Members and IA staff..

27. The survey was sent to 242 recipient country GEF Operational and Political Focal Points, Council Members and IA Country Office personnel managing the Support Program. The Survey was designed to gather information on: a) the types of activities being carried out under the Support Program; b) the management and administration of the program; c) the impact of the program, and; d) the recipients' assessment of the program. Recommendations were also solicited from the respondents for modifying and improving the program in the future.

28. As of January 5, 2004, 75 respondents had filled out the questionnaire. Forty nine percent (49%) of the respondents were Operational Focal Points, 11 % were Political Focal Points, and 26% were IA country office staff. Few Council Members responded to the survey, although some Political Focal points also may have been Council Members. The geographic distribution of the responses showed 26% from the Asia and Pacific Region; 23% from Central Europe and the Former Soviet Union; 16% from Africa and 16% from Latin America.

FINDINGS OF THE EVALUATION

29. The overall conclusion of the evaluation is that the GEF Focal Point and Council Member Support Program in its present form is having a positive but limited effect on the capacity of Council Members and Focal Points to carry out their responsibilities more effectively. The findings show a general consensus that the activities funded by the program are contributing to improved communication, increased awareness and better coordination with program stakeholders. However, the evaluation also shows that there is room for improvement in both the design and administration of the program, and a continuing need to support Focal Points and Council Members in the future.

30. The following review of the findings of the evaluation is organized in four main sections: a) the Scope of the Program; b) the Impact of the Program; c) Coordination and Administration of the Program; and d) Overall Assessment. The discussion in each of these sections is informed by the results of the survey and an analysis of the interviews and pertinent documents. The review applies primarily to Focal Point support, except where the explicit mention is made of Council Member experience.

SCOPE OF THE PROGRAM

31. In reviewing the scope of the program, the evaluation sought to determine how widespread it had become, what types of activities were being supported most often, and whether Focal Points and Council Members considered the types of activities supported by the program to be essential for carrying out their roles. Whether the funds provided were sufficient was a central concern, as well.

Coverage of the Program

32. Although the Support Program got off to a slow start as countries selected the Implementing Agencies with which they wished to work and the guidelines for the program were developed and distributed, it is now well known to eligible recipient countries. Responses to the questionnaire indicate that most Focal Points and Council Members are fully aware of the existence of the Support Program (74%) and that most of them had received some support from it (66%). Although a small number of respondents did say that they were not aware of the Program, their comments suggest that rather than be completely unaware of it, they were lacking certain information or had not received the technical help they needed to understand the program and prepare a proposal for the use of the funds. Others were unaware because they had only recently assumed Focal Point duties and had not been informed or made aware of the availability of the support funds. Responding to this situation, the GEF Secretariat now provides information about the Support Program to all newly appointed Focal Points.

33. Growth in the coverage of the program bears this out. The first Progress report on the program (GEF/C.15/Inf.8; April 7, 2000) showed that 82 countries signed up for the program; by the following year 110 countries had signed up (see GEF/C.17/Inf.10; April 12, 2001), and by January 2003, 128 had been incorporated in the program and 98 had received support. By early 2004, 101 countries were receiving support.

34. The geographic distribution of the disbursements made so far under the program is set forth in the chart below. Approximately 31% of the funding has gone to African countries, 21% to countries in the Asia and Pacific region, 05% to Near East/North Africa region, 22% to Eastern Europe, and the Newly Independent States, and 21% to Latin America and the Caribbean. This is a relatively even distribution of the funding, except in the case of the Near East/North Africa region, where the demand for the support funding has not been high.

Distribution of Disbursements by Region: FY2000-FY2004

Region	FY2000	FY2001	FY2002	FY2003	FY2004	TOTAL
Africa	96,600	134,730	110,889	55,864	33,229	431,312
Asia/Pacific	104,850	102,100	65,755	25,550	0	298,255
Near East	8240	35,200	15,980	8,800	8,250	76,470
E.Europe/NIS	115,054	58,722	73,042	40,853	18,167	305,838
LAC	78,950	85,190	49,280	24,750	49,228	287,398
TOTAL	403,694	415,942	314,946	155,817	108,874	1,399,273

1/ UNDP/WB Operational Focal Points Annual Disbursements (2004) (Appendix I)

35. The gradual decline in total year disbursements is understandable given the three-year life of the program. Nevertheless, there is still a gap between the number of countries currently signed up to receive support (120) and those that have received it (101), a fact that may argue for a more proactive effort to get funds to interested countries.

Patterns of Activity

36. Drawing from evidence contained in Annual Progress Reports, the aforementioned Mid-Term Review and the Survey; one can describe the pattern of activity supported by the program. The review shows which types of activities the program tends to support over others. There is no evidence that the program has supported any activities other than those defined as eligible by the guidelines.

37. In the January 2000, Mid Term Review, 15 countries responded to the GEF's requests for comment on the program. Comments showed appreciation for the support and there was a strong consensus that the Support Program was effective and very important to the recipients. At the time, the 15 countries involved were using the funds for the following types of activities:

- (a) Access to internet;
- (b) Access to GEF documents and translations into local languages;
- (c) Establishment of a GEF unit and local level coordination meetings, including NGOs;
- (d) Use CDW materials to organize workshops and awareness activities;
- (e) Workshops on biodiversity and climate change with the aim of implementing the Conventions;
- (f) Travel to Constituency meeting.
- (g) Countries requested more information in hardcopy and on the WEB from the GEF Secretariat.

38. In 2002, the UNDP did an analysis of the pattern of spending under the program which showed that the largest share of expenditures were directed at distribution of GEF Documents and financing Meetings and Field Visits:

<u>Activity</u>	<u>\$ Amount</u>	<u>Proportion of Total</u>
Purchase of Modem	4,400	.08%
WEB Site	16,100	.03%
Internet Connection	15,090	2.8%
GEF Documents	166,575	32%
Meetings & Field Visits	199,190	38%
Training workshops	60,595	12%
Miscellaneous	22,100	.04%
Total	521,000	100%

39. The pattern is quite compatible from the listing of activities and rankings of their importance provided by the respondents to the Evaluation Questionnaire. When asked what types of activities they have undertaken with the funds, respondents most often cited 1) organizing stakeholder consultation and 2) downloading and disseminating GEF documents. Accessing GEF information through the electronic network or a Field Office reference library and organizing country-level governmental coordination were also cited repeatedly. (See Question 7 of Survey Questionnaire, Appendix II)

40. As the chart below indicates, the type of support that Field Offices provide most frequently to Focal Points and Council Members has to do with 1) advice of eligibility of GEF proposals, 2) distribution of GEF materials, 3) accessing GEF information, 4) support for the GEF review process, and 5) assisting with Organizing Consultations in this order. However, as the chart indicates, Field Offices provide support in all eligible activity categories on an occasional basis.

Implementing Agency
Field Office Support to Focal Points and Council Members

Agency Support	Frequently	Occasionally	Not at All	N/A
1.0 Accessing GEF Information	20 27%	33 45%	2 3%	18 25%
2.0 Disseminating GEF Documents	22 30%	28 38%	7 10%	16 22%
3.0 Assist with Organizing Consultations	15 20%	35 48%	5 7%	20 25%
4.0 Design/Deliver Training & Seminars	7 10%	28 38%	22 30%	16 22%
5.0 Advise on Eligibility/Design GEF Proposals	24 33%	29 40%	4 5%	16 22%
6.0 Support Focal Point Review Process	16 22%	29 39%	13 18%	15 21%
7.0 Other Support	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

41. The responses regarding activities related to the Design/Delivery Training and Seminars reflect a moderate demand for these types of capacity building services. Although 48% of the responses about this activity said the Field Offices performed it “Frequently” or “Occasionally”, 30% said that no resources were dedicated to support this activity at all. This does not imply that the Field Offices do not offer these services, but rather that the Focal Points had not programmed them. This fact may appear to contradict the oft-repeated comments from Focal Points that more capacity building is needed. However, in most cases, focal points do not have the capacity or the knowledge to do the training and the funds available for support would not be enough to do the other activities (which they consider very important) as well as the capacity building. Discussions

with IA staff and focal points indicate that in a world of scarce resources, focal points make a trade off between using support funds to access and disseminate GEF information and training.

42. In summary, the Support Program is assisting Focal Points to one degree or another with all the eligible activities, but the ones most often supported are those dealing with organizing stakeholder consultations and accessing and disseminating GEF information. As the Survey indicates (Question 7b) these are also the activities that the respondents' regard as most important to carrying out their responsibilities, particularly those involved in organizing consultations and inter-governmental coordination.

Assessment of the Scope of the Support Program

43. When asked whether the scope of the existing program covers the types of activities that are essential to Council Member or Focal Point effectiveness the responses are affirmative, but not markedly so: 37% said it was the correct scope; but 25% said it was not. (Some respondents (38%) did not answer the question). If one discounts those who did not answer the question, only a small majority believe the scope of the program is well focused.

44. The questions raised by respondents about the scope of the program mainly focused on two activities. The first was training and capacity building for Focal Points. Although there has been some support given to this type of activity, it has been relatively low compared to the levels given to accessing and disseminating information and organizing stakeholder awareness raising and consultation meetings. In interviews and written comments, a number of respondents said there was a need for increased training on GEF policies and procedures, design requirements, and methodologies for monitoring and evaluation. Providing additional training and information on matters such as GEF procedures and policies is essential for Focal Points to discharge their coordination and communications functions. But adding capacity building for monitoring and evaluation runs the risk of assigning technical responsibilities to a Focal Point that are more properly carried out by line ministries of government in charge of implementing specific projects.

45. Focal Point travel to constituency meetings was the second activity that respondents' felt should be more explicitly included within the program. Although the guidelines for the Support Program permit travel to constituency meetings, they often have been interpreted narrowly to cover Political rather than Operational Focal Points. There is a strong feeling that Operational Focal Points would benefit from participating routinely in Constituency meetings in their regions, and that these meetings should be held more regularly and explicitly designed to cover GEF Council business, as well as regional constituency information and training needs.

46. Views on the level of funding for the Support Program reflect opinions about the limitations of its scope. When asked whether the funds available to the Focal Points and Council Members were sufficient for them to carry out their responsibilities, 32% of the respondents said they were, while 34%(10) said they were not and another 34% didn't answer. Some of the people who responded in the negative to this question had not yet received any funds under the program. Others felt that more funds were needed for Constituency meetings and capacity building, views that reflected the opinions expressed above about the scope of the program.

47. Despite the fact that most respondents did not feel that the funds were sufficient, few of them had leveraged Support Program funds from other sources to cover their needs. When asked if they had been able to raise other funds, 51% said they had not; 22% said they had; and 27% gave no reply. While there is no single explanation for this, it suggests that Focal Points and recipient governments, while content to receive the GEF support, give no pressing priority to securing additional funding for these GEF activities.

48. In summary, one can conclude from this review that while the scope and funding of the program are adequate, there may be something to be gained from reexamining both before extending the Support Program in the future. The repeated calls for more funding for capacity building suggests that there may be some tension between the program's basic objective of providing Focal Points with the means to improve information dissemination, stakeholder coordination, and communication about the GEF and the conception that Focal Points have of their own roles. Some Focal Points may see themselves as overall managers of GEF programs in the country rather than as coordinators and facilitators of an inter-governmental process and, accordingly are asking for capacity building in areas that fall outside the scope of the Support Program. This potential confusion raises questions about the focus of the program and its relationship to other GEF capacity building initiatives.

49. The adequacy of the funding provided for the program should also be examined carefully. Relatively speaking, opinions about this matter were evenly split. This may reflect the fact that the program's modest sums are appreciated by those countries that don't actually need them, and seen as absolutely essential but insufficient by those who actually do. In the case of those who call for more funds, it may also be surmised that they may have greater ambitions for the program than it was designed to bear. Moreover, the call for making OFP travel to constituency meetings explicitly eligible will certainly have cost implications that need to be taken into account. In either event, it would be useful to analyze the actual costs of eligible program activities in order to determine what levels of funding should be allowed in any future program,

IMPACT OF THE SUPPORT PROGRAM

50. The evaluation asked respondents to rank the program's impact of different activities as High, Medium, Low, or None. The following chart shows the respondents' general assessment of the effect of the funding on the direct objectives of the program (Items #1-5), as well as their views on it more indirect effects (Items #6-8). The results do not show a ranking among activities, although this can be inferred from the responses.

Program Objectives	High	Medium	Low	None
1.0 Improved National Multiple stakeholder Coordination for GEF Matters	20 27%	14 19%	7 10%	32 44%
2.0 Increased Access to GEF Documents and Related Information	22 30%	15 21%	5 7%	31 42%
3.0 Increased the Number and Quality of Stakeholder Consultation Meetings	18 25%	17 23%	5 7%	33 45%

4.0 Improved Council Member Communications With Constituency Members	5 7%	17 23%	8 11%	43 59%
5.0 Increased the Flow of GEF Information to Focal Point Offices and Interested National Agencies and Institutions	29 33%	14 14%	5 7%	25 34%
6.0 Reduced the Amount of Time Involved in Focal Point Review and Approval Process for GEF Projects	13 18%	21 29%	6 8%	33 45%
7.0 Produced Proactive support from IA Offices to Council Members and Focal Points	18 25%	20 27%	8 11%	27 37%
8.0 Introduced Innovative Project Concepts for Country/GEF Consideration	14 19%	19 26%	11 15%	29 40%

51. Before examining the results, a number of caveats are in order. First of all, it is important to note that the responses are based on the opinions of the respondents and not on measurable indicators. Accordingly, they can only be taken as qualitative judgments about the impact of the program. Secondly, the first five objectives are directly related to the eligible activities of the program, while the remaining three are only indirectly linked to these activities. Factors other than the OFP Support Program contribute to these results so a direct link cannot be made between them. The third thing to bear in mind is that the results shown in the column labeled NONE should be discounted. Because NONE was the default answer on the survey, it is impossible to determine whether this answer appeared because the respondent skipped this section of the survey entirely or because they actually responded that the Support Program had no impact on a particular objective.

52. Reviewing the results, it appears that respondents believe that the two areas in which the Support Program has had the highest impact have been in 1) Increasing the flow of GEF information to Focal Point offices and interested national agencies and institutions (#5) and, 2) increasing access to GEF documents and related information. (#2). Both of these activities aimed to raise awareness of the GEF, which is a central objective of the Support Program.

53. Respondents also concluded that the Support Program also has had a relatively high effect on increasing the number of stakeholder meetings. Some 48% ranked the effect of the program either HIGH or MEDIUM in this area.

54. Respondents also indicated that the program has contributed to improving national stakeholder coordination for GEF matters. Twenty-seven (27%) marked this as HIGH and 19% as MEDIUM. This is a broad objective of the Support Program, which is furthered by increasing information flow and the number of stakeholder meetings, although the results of the survey do not show a direct causal link between these objectives.

55. Although 23% of those who ranked the impact of the Support Program on Council Member communications with constituency members (#4) said it has had a MEDIUM effect, only 7% believed it was HIGH. While one cannot draw definitive conclusions from the information at hand, these results suggest that Focal Points do not view the nature of their communication with Council members as being effected very much by the Support Program. In

fact, the Focal Points' call for greater participation in constituency meetings suggests that communications between Focal Points and Council Members may not be all that frequent.

56. In the minds of the respondents, the Support Program has also contributed somewhat to reducing the time involved in the review and approval of GEF projects (#6); producing proactive support from IA Field Offices (#7); and introducing innovative concepts for GEF consideration (#8). Except in the case of #6, it is hard to attribute too great an effect to the Support Program itself. These were not regarded as specific objectives of the program and other factors influence whether they are met. Producing proactive support from the IA Offices was not an aim of the program either, but giving the IA Offices responsibility for implementing the program obviously obliges them to be more proactive with regard to its administration. This may be an ancillary benefit, drawing the IA field offices more closely into the GEF program in each of the member countries.

Assessment of the Impact

57. While it is difficult to draw incontrovertible conclusions from this information, it does appear that the Support Program has definitely helped Operational Focal Points meet the objectives of spreading the word about GEF and engaging with stakeholders. Written comments from respondents reflect the observations made with regard to increasing the awareness of the GEF within government. They also point to the role the Support Program has played in raising the profile of Focal Points within government which in turn has enhanced their capacity to coordinate GEF activities in the country. Whether this has had a lasting institutional effect is not clear, however. According to the survey, few countries had created formal GEF Coordinating Units (44%), which suggests that most FPs must operate without an inter-governmental institutional mechanism to give authority and continuity to the task of coordinating GEF activities in the country. Moreover, the fact that the written comments of respondents emphatically call for more training and capacity building, suggests that FP still feel the need to sharpen their ability to carryout their coordination roles.

COORDINATION AND ADMINISTRATION OF THE PROGRAM

58. On the face of it, the organization and administration of the Focal Point and Council Member Support Program is relatively straightforward. On behalf of the GEF, UNDP and the World Bank administer the program through their country offices, which, in turn work with the Council Member and the Focal Point to identify the activities to be carried out in a given year and then cover the cost of carrying out those activities. Country offices provide technical support to the Focal Points, as well and report annually to UNDP and World Bank program managers, who work with the GEF Secretariat to coordinate their activities and report to the GEF Council.

59. But any enterprise that involves so many countries and so many layers of personal and bureaucratic relationships is bound to produce a variety of issues large and small. The Support Program is no exception, and the evaluation gathered both positive and negative evidence about how well the program was run.

60. On the positive side of the ledger, the evaluation found that Council Members, Focal Points and IA Country Staff generally characterized their relationships as “ excellent, strong good, very cooperative, regular, reliable and successful “. Only 11% of the respondents to the survey said that they were not able to get the information they need on GEF matters from the IAs Field Offices. And when asked if the Field Offices responded effectively to Focal Point and Council Member requests for technical and logistical support, the majority (64%) said “yes”. In addition to these comments, others underscored two vital, though quite different, services provided by the Field Offices. The first was purely administrative: providing offices space and assisting with funds management and accounting. The second had to do with the mainstreaming goals of the GEF. The comments recognized that the IA Field Offices and staff play a critical role advising Focal Points on GEF priorities and helping coordinate GEF activities with other development actors in the country.

61. On the less positive side, the bureaucratic nature of some of the transactions involved in the program proved to be potential irritants. This was less true with processes such as the development and approval of Annual Plans but much more so with regard to financial procedures for reimbursements. Each of these will be discussed below.

Annual Plans

62. As noted earlier, in order to receive funds under the Support Program, Focal Points prepare Annual Work Plans, which identify the activities to be carried out, and the funds required. The IA Country Office approves these plans and covers the costs of the activities carried out under the plan. According to the survey responses, the Country Office staff generally participates to some degree in the preparation of these plans providing general guidance or direct technical support.

63. Approval of the Plan can take anywhere from a few weeks to one or two months depending upon the relationship between the OFP and the Field Office and the workload of the IA Staff. Approval of a specific activity generally takes a matter of a few days or a week or two, although some respondents said it could take over a month.

64. Although all respondents felt that basing the Support Program on an agreed upon Annual Plan was a good approach, in some cases the approval process had taken too long. Sometimes this is attributable to bureaucratic delays within the recipient government and sometimes to the IA Country Office ensuring that the proposals were in line with the GEF guidelines for the implementation of the program. Another reason for delays is that Country Offices are not allowed to approve new plans or disburse new funds pending the receipt of reports on the past use of funds.

Administration of Funds

65. In discussions with UNDP and World Bank staff, as well as from commentary received from Focal Points and Country Office staff, the burdens posed by the administration of the program were mentioned repeatedly. People pointed to a number of problems: policies and

procedures for handling financial transactions that were unnecessarily complicated given the relatively small sums involved; lack of flexibility of interpretation in the guidelines in relation to eligible expenditures (i.e. exclusion of computer hardware and certain types of travel); overburdened local staff. and, occasionally tensions between Focal Points and IA Country Office staff derived from the fact that some Focal Points believe the Support Program is an “entitlement” they are due regardless of the fiduciary concerns of the responsible Country Office.

66. At least, in part, the roots of these problems lie in the fact that the guidelines and procedures for administering the program are out of scale with the relatively small sums involved in each country. In the original design of the program, no cash transfers to Focal Points were envisioned. This has meant that IA Country Offices have to carry out financial transactions (reimbursements, payments for services, logistical arrangements etc) which otherwise would have been done by the recipient government under a more standard grant program. On top of this, the staff is responsible for complying with UNDP or World Bank financial and accounting procedures, which in most cases are designed for more complex, larger-scale transactions. There is no doubt that these requirements are essential for the IA’s to exercise its’ fiduciary responsibilities correctly however small the sums involved. But they do complicate the administration of the program and require staff with the time to devote to carrying them out. Unless the Country Office has staff exclusively assigned to GEF programs, it is time that is in the shortest supply for many staff members. These bureaucratic issues can be overcome and most Country Offices have managed to find ways to expedite matters when necessary. But they can become persistent irritants that may produce unnecessary tensions between the IA Field Offices and host country government officials.

67. Other problems concerning the administration of the program were also mentioned by the people consulted for the evaluation. Operational Focal Points may have a variety of other responsibilities along with those involving the GEF, leaving them with little time to devote to the program. Similarly, when Focal Points are removed to be replaced by others, it takes time and effort to bring the new appointee up-to date on GEF policies, programs and procedures. IA Country Office staff members are not always GEF specialists either, and they sometimes are not up-to date with their own knowledge of the programs despite the support they may receive from their headquarters. It was evident, that communication and information flow between the Country Offices and the Focal Points needed to be improved. These issues underscore the importance of routinely providing Focal Points, as well as IA Country staff with the information and training they need to stay on top of their jobs.

Program Reports

68. In general, the evaluation found that reporting on the program was adequate but could be improved. As required, the GEF Secretariat has reported to the Council on an annual basis drawing on information provided by the World Bank and the UNDP, but the reports do not have a standardized format for gathering and describing information about the activities and lessons gained from each of the participating countries and the funds allocated to different activities. The have no common criteria or indicators for weighing and evaluating information. And as a result, they are not useful for comparing information across countries or measuring the outputs and

potential impacts of the program. A more standardized format is needed if the program were to be extended to provide the information that is essential for effective monitoring and evaluating in the future.

69. For both UNDP and the World Bank, it is clear that the effort required to administer the Support Program, far exceeds the financial compensation (a 3% administration fee) received for taking on the task. For both agencies, the benefits derived from their roles are tied to the opportunities afforded their institutions and environmental staff to strengthen their relationships with recipient country officials and stakeholders. Enhancing the performance of Country Office staff by simplifying the administrative requirements for the Support Program should bring benefits to the entire GEF program in member countries.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

70. The overall conclusion of the evaluation is that the GEF Focal Point and Council Member Support Program is having a positive but limited effect on the capacity of Council Members and Focal Points to carry out their responsibilities more effectively. The program is achieving most of its objectives to some degree and it is being managed relatively well. But there is room for improvement, and the GEF should address a number of critical issues effecting the program's design and administration before extending it into the future.

Principal Achievements

71. The main achievements of the Support Program have been in increasing the flow of GEF information to Focal Points and Council members and in enhancing their capacity to communicate with stakeholders and GEF constituency members. The program has helped raise awareness of the GEF program in the participating countries by increasing access to GEF information and helping distribute that information more widely. It has heightened the profile of Focal Points and has also facilitated more interaction with governmental and private stakeholders by supporting meetings and workshops on GEF priorities and programs in the countries.

72. In general, these results have contributed to improving coordination of GEF programs, but it is hard to say to what extent. Some Operational Focal Points believe that the existence of the program has strengthened their influence within their governments, and this appears to be the case in those countries where GEF Coordinating Units have been established. Moreover, IA Country Offices often have helped organize coordinating meetings and have been credited with helping Focal Points advance the goal of mainstreaming GEF concerns in national policies and programs. Nevertheless, successful coordination may depend on the power and influence of the ministry or official involved more than upon the modest support provided by the GEF's program. The direct causal connection between the Support Program and improved inter-governmental coordination on GEF matters is difficult to determine, except in the cases where the program has been directed explicitly at the creation and strengthening of an inter-governmental unit for that purpose.

73. One other achievement should be noted before addressing some of the critical issues affecting the program. Although not one of its explicit objectives, the Support Program has had the effect of providing a useful vehicle for collaboration between the GEF Secretariat, the Implementing Agencies and the Focal Points and Council Members it supports. Some respondents indicated that the GEF Secretariat should take a stronger, more direct role in the program in order to facilitate a more direct exchange of information and simplify lines of responsibility. All agreed, however, that the benefits to the GEF that this collaboration produces generally outweigh the occasional bureaucratic tensions it may engender.

Critical Issues

74. A number of critical issues emerged from this evaluation, but four warrant special attention when considering the future of the Support Program. They have to do with the focus and rationale for the program, its relationship to other GEF capacity building initiatives, GEF support for constituency meetings, and improvements to the Support Programs administration.

75. Rationale for the Program: A series of critical questions emerged regarding the primary rationale for the Support Program. Overall the central objective of the GEF is to enhance mainstreaming of global environmental aims in the policies and programs of recipient member countries. The FP Support Program is one means through which the GEF seeks to advance these objectives by providing modest funding to increase awareness and improve inter-governmental coordination. However, the evaluation suggests that there may be a need to focus more sharply on what the basic aim of the program should be. Is it a modest, interim program designed to help Focal Points and Council Members do their jobs more effectively or is it a longer-term, more open ended arrangement reflecting, in some way, the incremental costs of global environmental inter-governmental cooperation with the GEF? If it is the former (as the GEF Council affirms), then the program does not have the benchmarks and criteria to determine when its objectives have been achieved. As things stand now, there are no criteria or indicators to determine when a given country no longer needs the program. In addition, the activities funded by the program, while essential, are not aimed directly at building the Focal Point's capacity to carry on without the support. In fact, one might ask if focusing on strengthening the capacity of the Focal Point is indeed the best way to achieve more permanent inter-governmental coordination and mainstreaming. Would the objectives of the program be better served by having it focus explicitly on creating and strengthening a mechanism for inter-agency coordination, subordinating the role of the Focal Point to the aim of strengthening that coordinating body? The evaluation shows that improved communications, information dissemination, and interaction with stakeholders have raised the understanding of the GEF and the stature of the Focal Points. But the program may run the risk of becoming a subsidy to the Focal Point rather than an instrument for institutionalizing more effective inter-governmental coordination and mainstreaming. The future design of the program must explicitly address how to establish more permanent capacity to undertake these coordinating functions in the recipient countries.

76. Role of the Focal Point Another issue related to the focus of the Program has to do with the very role of the Focal Point. Should the role of Focal Point concentrate on matters of GEF program coordination, ensuring the effective functioning of an inter-governmental process

involving global conventions, as well as the endorsement of GEF activities? Or should it extend also to project supervision, monitoring and evaluation? Are these two roles compatible? Shouldn't the Focal Point concentrate mostly on inter-ministerial coordination involving global GEF policy and governance and leave specific GEF project management functions to the appropriate operational line agencies responsible for a given project? These are not easily resolved issues, but the evaluation found that the Support Program could benefit from seeking a more precise definition of exactly which FP roles it aims to strengthen.

77. Relationship to Other GEF Capacity Building Programs: The GEF has a number of initiatives designed to promote understanding of the GEF and enhance the capacity of countries to deal with global environmental issues. For instance, these include the Country Dialogue Initiative; National Capacity Self Assessments (NCSA); Enabling Activities for the CBD, the UNFCCC, and the Stockholm Convention; capacity building programs for LDCs and SIDS (as foreseen in the Strategic Approach to capacity building); the GEF's Strategic Approach to Enhancing Capacity Building, and the capacity development activities that are often included in components of specific GEF country projects. The evaluation found that there is still an on-going need to provide training and capacity building to Focal Points, but whether this training is best provided through the Support Program or through another one of these initiatives will depend upon how one defines the specific focus of the Focal Point's role and the objectives chosen for the Support Program itself. In either event, there is a clear need to develop a strategy for developing capacity in each country that rationally integrates the aims of all these programs.

78. Constituency Meetings: The evaluation indicates that constituency meetings can provide a useful forum for Operational Focal Points, Political Focal Points and Council Members to meet on GEF matters. Operational Focal Points sometimes find it difficult to attend these meetings not only because funds may be lacking, but also because the guidelines do not make it clear that they are available to Operational Focal Points, as well as Political Focal Points. Resolving this issue, and taking steps to support routine, annual or semi-annual constituency meetings could provide a mechanism for routine communication among regional Focal Points and the GEF Secretariat and IA/EA staff.

79. Administrative Improvements: Although the administrative issues discussed earlier have not affected significantly the Support Program, they do constitute a drag on its potential that should be resolved in any future design. The fundamental issues have to do with the trade-offs between the fiduciary responsibility of IAs, the lack of flexibility in the expenditure of funds, the complexity in documenting transactions, and the related high costs to the Country Offices of administering the program. A new approach may be needed to handling the financial arrangements for the program that places greater responsibility on the recipient countries without diminishing the fiduciary control of the Implementing Agencies or the discipline represented by the requirement to agree upon and follow an annual work plan. Implementing a more flexible financial arrangement makes it especially important to establish more uniform and useful reporting procedures as well.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE FUTURE

80. It is recommended that the GEF Focal Point and Council Member Support Program be extended for another three-year period, with some redesign. The results of the evaluation made it clear that there is a continuing need, particularly among less developed recipient countries to strengthen GEF coordination at the country level, raise awareness of GEF priorities, policies and programs, and strengthen stakeholder involvement in global environmental programs, and enhance the capacity of those countries to develop and implement GEF projects. The Support Program can contribute to these ends and should not be terminated.

81. What shape the program takes will depend upon the focus the GEF chooses to give it in the future. One option is to modify it only slightly, making necessary improvements without altering the basic design. A second is to carry out a more strategic overhaul, sharpening the focus of the program and fitting it more squarely into an overall strategy for developing the global environmental management capacity of the country. And, another is to combine elements of both, moving gradually from the first to the second over time.

82. Under the first option the fundamental objectives of the program would remain the same. The central objective would be for the GEF to transfer funds to the recipient member country to cover the incremental costs of coordinating and raising awareness of global environmental programs in that country. The funds would continue to be directed to the Focal Points to cover their costs for carrying out eligible activities, and the funds would continue to be provided until the recipient country chose to cover these costs from its national budget. Under this option, however, the guidelines on eligible activities could be modified and improvements made to the administration of the program. These changes could include:

83. The GEF Secretariat should take a more central role to ensure all Focal Points get GEF information, guidelines, newsletters, and seek to increase communications between GEF secretariat, IA's, IA country Offices and Focal Points and Council Members;

- (a) Eligible activities could include necessary computer/communications hardware up to a specified limit and temporary staff for specific events or finite activities;
- (b) Improve administration of the program, simplifying procedures, developing a method for disbursing cash advances against approved work plan activities where feasible;
- (c) GEF Secretariat and IAs should develop standardized program reporting to lay a foundation for regular monitoring and evaluation of program expenditures, activities, outputs, and impacts; and
- (d) Increase program funding to allow for a) two annual constituency meetings and Operational Focal Point travel b) participation in capacity building activities provided outside program, c) adjust for actual costs of Council Member and Focal Point activities based on review of past expenditures.

84. Under the second option, the Support Program would be more sharply focused on strengthening the institutional capacity for inter-governmental coordination on global environmental issues. While Focal Points might play an important role in the program, the program's funds would be aimed at strengthening the mechanisms for coordination, rather than the role of a particular FP. Funding would be contingent upon the prior creation of an inter-governmental coordination mechanism, and funds would be dispersed against an action plan aimed at creating permanent capacity that was part of the GEF's overall integrated capacity building program for the country. The program would have the following main characteristics:

- (a) The focus would be on structuring and supporting an inter-governmental coordinating process for global environmental programs and for the review and endorsement of GEF programs and projects.
- (b) The program would support coordination and communication and training on Convention issues and GEF wide matters.
- (c) The role of the Operational and Political Focal Points would focus on the issues and activities identified above, with Operational Focal Points acting in support of an inter-governmental coordinating body, which would, in turn be chaired by an appropriate ministerial level official.
- (d) The program would not support project-related supervision, monitoring or evaluation, leaving these activities to be funded and carried out through projects and the operating budgets of line ministries.
- (e) The program could be either a component of a larger capacity development strategy or a stand-alone operation. Accordingly, the program could be funded as part of a larger grant to the country and administered as such, thus reducing the transaction costs experienced under the current arrangement for the Support Program.
- (f) The program would be designed with appropriate indicators to determine when a desired level of capacity had been built so that the country no longer required or remained eligible for the support.

85. Choosing this second option will require a careful examination of how it could fit within the broader capacity development strategies being developed by the GEF and how best to integrate it into the GEF's country programming process. As this process may require some time, it may be advisable to adopt the first option and gradually transform it into the second over time. In this case, the first option could be viewed as a necessary foundation and transitional subsidy for moving toward the creation of a permanent global environmental coordination capacity in GEF member countries. The primary difference between the two options is a shift to strengthening institutional capacity for coordination rather than the current emphasis on budget support to focal points. It is expected that this type of support will end when countries show that

GEF activities are linked to the overall development activities of the country. In both options, it will be important to have performance benchmarks for the focal points' functions.

APPENDIX I

**QUESTIONNAIRE FOR INDEPENDENT EVALUATION
OF
GEF FOCAL POINT AND COUNCIL MEMBER SUPPORT**

INTRODUCTION AND RATIONALE

The purpose of this questionnaire is to gather information to permit a comprehensive review and evaluation of the GEF Focal Point and Council Member Support Program. The questionnaire presented below is distributed to Council Members, National Focal Points and the staff of the Field Offices of UNDP and the World Bank who have been involved in implementing the Focal Point Support Program. Responses to the questionnaire will be the basis for determining the scope of the Support Program in the future.

The fundamental objective of the evaluation is to determine whether the support provided to Focal Points and Council Members through the program has achieved the objectives of strengthening the national coordination activities of the GEF Focal Points and assisted recipient country Council Members in fulfilling their responsibilities toward the members of their constituencies. The evaluation will review the performance of the program, assessing the effectiveness of the mechanisms for delivering resources and support, identifying its strengths and weaknesses, and drawing out lessons learned and good practices. It will assess whether there is a need to continue to provide support to Focal Points and Council Members and, if so, how best to improve the support provided. Accordingly, it is essential to have your views.

QUESTIONNAIRE INSTRUCTIONS

The questionnaire is organized in four main sections. **Section A** requests general background information; **Section B** focuses on questions having to do with the scope and funding of activities carried out under the program; **Section C** seeks to determine the impact of the program; **Section D** covers the administration and coordination of the program, and; the **Section E** seeks to obtain objective assessments of the program from the recipients of support as well as GEF staff responsible for its implementation.

Council Members, Focal Points, and Implementing Agency Field Office respondents are urged to answer all questions which pertain to their experience either as recipients of support or administrators/coordinators of the program. Please provide specific details in your responses and comments so that concrete examples of experience can be gained from the survey. However, please do not reply to questions that do not apply to your role in the program (i.e. as a Focal Point, Council Member, or Field Office staff).

SECTION A. GENERAL BACKGROUND INFORMATION

1. Number of respondents: 73

2. Region

REGION	COUNT	PERCENTAGE
	13	19%
Africa	12	16%
Asia and Pacific	19	26%
Central Europe and Former Soviet Union	17	23%
Latin America and Caribbean	12	16%

3. Role of Respondent

ROLE	COUNT	PERCENTAGE
	10	14%
Focal Point (Operational)	36	49%
Focal Point (Political)	8	11%
Implementing Agency CO	19	26%

4. Are you aware of the GEF Support Program for Council Members and Focal Points?

AWARENESS OF FOCAL POINT SUPPORT	COUNT	PERCENTAGE
..	10	14%
No	9	12%
Yes	54	74%

5. Have you received support from the GEF Support Program?

RECEIVED SUPPORT FROM GEF SUPPORT PROGRAM	COUNT	PERCENTAGE
	12	16%
No	13	18%
Yes	48	66%

SECTION B . SCOPE AND FUNDING OF THE GEF COUNCIL MEMBER/FOCAL POINT SUPPORT PROGRAM

6. How much total funding have you received/provided for each of the last 4 years from the GEF Support Program?

2000	2001	2002	2003
n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

Note: Incomplete data; answers not applicable

7. Activities:

a. What types of activities have you undertaken/supported with the support you have received?

Activity	Count	Percentage
Downloading and Disseminating GEF Documents	24	33%
Accessing GEF Information Reference Library in Field Office	18	25%
Accessing Electronic Information Network	21	29%
Organizing stakeholder Consultations	30	41%
Organizing Country-level Governmental Coordination	22	30%
Purchase of Modem for Internet Access	14	19%
Conducting Activities to Strengthen Focal Point	20	27%

Note: Percentages calculated on total number of responses (73) as respondents receive more than one type of support.

- b. Which of these activities is the most important for Council members and Focal Points to carry out their roles most effectively?**

Activity RANK	Count		
	1	2	3
Downloading and Disseminating GEF Documents	18	7	4
Accessing GEF Information Reference Library in Field Office	12	11	2
Accessing Electronic Information Network	19	11	2
Organizing stakeholder Consultations	30	6	3
Organizing Country-level Governmental Coordination	23	5	2
Purchase of Modem for Internet Access	9	7	5
Conducting Activities to Strengthen Focal Point	21	5	4

- c. What is the Total (\$) amount of Focal Point Support Funding that has been spent on each of these activities by the Council Member of Focal Point during the last 4 years?**

Activity	Amount
Downloading and Disseminating GEF Documents	n/a
Accessing GEF Information Reference Library in Field Office	n/a
Accessing Electronic Information Network	n/a
Organizing Stakeholder Consultations	n/a
Organizing Country-level Governmental Coordination	n/a
Purchase of Modem for Internet Access	n/a
Conducting Activities to Strengthen Focal Point	n/a

Note: Data incomplete; responses not applicable.

- 8. Does the Current Scope of the Council Member/Focal Point Support Program cover the types of activities that are essential to effectively carrying out the responsibilities of a Council Member or Focal Point?**

	Count	Percentage
	28	38%
Yes	27	37%
No	18	25%

9. Have the funds provided through the Focal Point and Council Member Support Program been sufficient to carry out these activities effectively?

	Count	Percentage
	25	34%
Yes	23	32%
No	25	34%

10. Have you been able to raise/leverage funds from other sources to supplement Focal Support Funds?

	Count	Percentage
	20	27%
Yes	16	22%
No	37	51%

11. What types of sources have provided these funds?

Source	Amount	Percentage
State/Government	n/a	
Bilateral Donors	n/a	
Private Sector/ Business	n/a	
Foundation	n/a	
Multilateral Banks	n/a	

Note: Data Incomplete; responses not applicable.

12. What types of activities have you been able to carry out with these supplemental funds?

- Constituency meetings (Council meetings)
- Regional Meetings
- Meetings for endorsement of projects for GEF financing
- In-house consultations
- Stakeholder meetings
- Institutional strengthening of the ministry of Environmental Protection through consultancy, advisory, expertise in field of inter-sectoral coordination, regional cooperation, environmental legislation, NCSD establishment, etc.
- Capacity building and training
- Providing offices, furniture and equipment (computers, printer, phone, fax)
- Administrative support (transmitting docs, copies)

- Providing support staff

13. How important were these activities to your role as a Council Member/Focal Point?

- Very important: 6
- Integral part of operational level support
- Essential
- Facilitated success of our third constituency meeting
- Complementary to main funded activities
- Attending Council Meetings for non-council members get closer the national focal points to the GEF and makes better understand its mechanisms and structures

14. Could you carry out your Council Member/Focal Point responsibilities without these additional funds?

YES: 9

NO: 18

SECTION C. IMPACT OF SUPPORT PROGRAM

Note: Percentages that appear below are based on total respondents (73), although count only shows numbers for those respondents who answered the question. Number for those who did not answer is not shown.

15. What has been the impact of the current Council Member/Focal Support Program?

Improved national multiple stakeholder coordination/consultation for GEF matters?

	Count	Percentage
High	20	27%
Low	7	10%
Medium	14	19%

Increased access to GEF documents and related information?

	Count	Percentage
High	22	30%
Low	5	7%
Medium	15	21%

Increased the number and quality of stakeholder consultation meetings?

	Count	Percentage
High	18	25%
Low	5	7%
Medium	17	23%

Improved Council Member communications with constituency members?

	Count	Percentage
High	5	7%
Low	8	11%
Medium	17	23%

Increased the flow of GEF Information to Focal Point Offices and interested national agencies and institutions?

	Count	Percentage
High	29	33
Low	5	7
Medium	14	14

Reduced the amount of time involved in the Focal Point Review and approval for GEF projects?

	Count	Percentage
High	13	18
Low	6	8
Medium	21	22

Produced proactive support from IA Field Offices to Council Members and Focal Points?

	Count	Percentage
High	18	25
Low	8	11
Medium	20	27

Introduced innovative projects concepts for country/GEF consideration

	Count	Percentage
High	14	19
Low	11	15
Medium	19	26

SECTION D. COORDINATION AND ADMINISTRATION OF THE PROGRAM

Note: Percentages that appear below are based on total respondents (73), although count only shows numbers for those respondents who answered the question. Number for those who did not answer is not shown.

- 16. Does the Country/Government have a GEF Coordination Unit responsible for GEF Member/Focal Point support?**

	Count	Percentage
Yes	32	44
No	27	37

Total Number of Staff:

- 17. Which GEF Implementing Agency is responsible for coordinating and administering the Council Member/Focal Point Support Program?**

GEF Implementing Agency	No. of staff assigned to Support Program
UNDP	53
UNEP	3
World Bank	7
IFC	

- 18. How would you characterize relationships/interaction between the country focal points and the IA field office?**

Majority of Respondents:

- Excellent. Full cooperation
- Strong relationship
- Well-tuned, efficient, constructive, synergic
- Effective
- Very close and consultative
- Close relationship
- Good coordination between IA/UNDP and OF
- Very cooperative relationship that is also improving
- Successful
- Good and reliable
- Good, but could be better
- Regular

Minority of Respondents:

- Satisfactory
- Adequate
- A much more responsive relationship is needed
- Non-existent
- Country-focal point operates independently

19. Does the Field Office maintain a GEF Reference Library (or World Bank PIC) with focal point support funds and provide access to GEF and other electronic information networks for the use of Focal Points and Council Members and other stakeholders?

	Count	Percentage
No	30	41
Yes	24	33

20. Are you able to obtain the information you need on GEF matters from the IA Field Office?

	Count	Percentage
Yes	39	53
No	8	11

21. What type of staff support is provided to the Council Member/Focal Point and how frequently?

Accessing GEF information

	Count	Percentage
Frequently	20	27
Not at all	2	3
Occasionally	33	45

Disseminating GEF documents

	Count	Percentage
Frequently	22	30
Not at all	7	10
Occasionally	28	38

Assist with organizing consultations

	Count	Percentage
Frequently	15	20
Not at all	5	7
Occasionally	35	48

Design/deliver training & seminars

	Count	Percentage
Frequently	7	10
Not at all	22	30
Occasionally	28	38

Advise eligibility/design GEF proposals

	Count	Percentage
Frequently	24	33
Not at all	4	5
Occasionally	29	40

Support Focal Point Review Process

	Count	Percentage
Frequently	16	33
Not at all	13	5
Occasionally	29	40

- 22. Has the designated Field Office staff responded effectively to Council Member and/or Focal Point requests for technical and logistical support in the context of the GEF support program?**

	Count	Percentage
Yes	47	64
No	8	11

- 23. What type of work program is the basis for the Focal Point Support Program?**

Annual Plan: 26

Activity-by-activity approval: 14

24. Was the Field Office staff involved in the development of the plan?

	Count	Percentage
Yes	44	60
No	8	11

25. On average, how long does it take for the Annual Plan to be approved?

Days: 1

Weeks: 23

1 Month: 4

More than 1 month: 5

More than 2 months: 2

26. On average, how long does it take for a specific activity to be approved?

Days: 11

Weeks: 15

1 Month: 3

More than 1 month: 2

More than 2 months: 2

27. On average, how long does it take to disburse funds once a plan or activity is approved?

Days: 14

Weeks: 14

Months: 5

More than 1 month: 1

More than 2 months: 3

**28. Does the field office regard this process as simple and straightforward or complex?
How could it be simplified?**

Simple: 18

Complex: 6

Simple:

- Once annual Plan is approved there is no need to approve specific activities so the process is very simple.

- The approval of annual plan is simple as discussion are held during the development of the plan.
- Disbursement of funds is simple- the time needed depends on the workload of finance section of country office.

Complex:

- Complex as procedural requirements have been tightened.
- It is complicated because the funding is on a reimbursed basis. Where the country office looks after more than one country it is impossible to do it this way. It is best to advance funds to the countries and let them implement the activities without the hassle of sending invoices or receipts to the IAs, etc. The current arrangement also delays implementation of activities.

Bureaucracy/Work Overload/Lack of Resources:

- Bureaucratic barriers in the administrative system of the host country as well as the GEF are other important aspects which should be taken into account.
- Sometimes it takes awhile because of the work overload of the regional support representatives
- It depends on the number of domestic stakeholders particularly the relevant ministries. The more stakeholders, the more difficult and lengthier process.
- In some specific areas there is not adequate national expertise or required capacities available. In other cases national consultants are not on hand in a full time manner.

Process could be simplified:

- The Support Fund should be disbursed to OFP on cash modality to be subsequently liquidated by the OFP to the IA in accordance with GEF guidelines. The disbursement process for small activities is a tedious process and even the OFP office and the IA finds this modality taxing
- Process could be simplified by allowing more flexibility on the criteria for funds use. GEF OFP has been using other sources for some of the GEF related activities.
- Transfer of funds from one fiscal year to the following appears to be difficult
- Software for the administration and reporting on the program could be very useful.

29. From the viewpoint of Council Members/Focal Points is this process clear and simple or complex? How could it be improved?

Simple: 15

Complex: 6

Could be simplified:

- It is probably clear but it is not acknowledged. Some explanation, instructions should be forwarded by a seminar or a consultation meeting.
- Clear activity list should be given to the FP to be able to prepare the related program as mechanically as possible and to request formalities
- Field Offices should ensure that funds are used- sometimes a country does not use the Council Members support funds because it does not learn about it until it is too late.

30. Are the systems/data bases in place within the Field Office and the office of the Focal Point to facilitate reporting on an annual basis on the Support Program?

	Count	Percentage
Yes	28	38
No	23	32

31. Do the Annual Reports offer useful information on the scope and operation of the Support Program that can be used to assess and improve it?

	Count	Percentage
Yes	31	42
No	14	19

32. What improvements to the reporting procedures would you recommend?

More Information/ Raise Awareness:

- Develop a database comprising reports of all eligible countries for all years.
- Procedure Manual publication
- The amount of funds to be disbursed
- Additional funds which could be made available if FP funds have been used
- Council's decision regarding the Support Program

Reporting:

- There should be a reporting unit consisting of the representatives of the Country focal points and the IA field office with regular meetings as well as a secretariat with a specific mandate for this purpose, located either in AI or Focal Point office.

- OFP Report to UNDP semi-annually or semi-quarterly
- Report to GEF Secretariat after one year
- Standard reporting form

33. Additional Comments on Section D.

- In order to get involved in GEF Support funds we think that capacity building is of prime need
- GEF Secretariat should process the fund approval for GEF-OFP support more rapidly
- In the EU Accession Countries there is no strong need for a FP Support Program
- Project support budget of a Focal Point should be restored even if it could be necessary to reduce its amount
- Information on annual reports is not available
- Member meeting

SECTION E. OVERALL ASSESSMENT

34. What have been the main benefits and achievements of the Council Member/Focal Point Support Program?

- GEF Constituency Meeting
- Increased awareness of global environmental concerns and MEAs
- Increased inter-agency coordination in the country about GEF policies and procedures
- Increased country level stakeholder awareness, involvement in decision making, and coordination on GEF activities.
- Increased awareness of OFP and its office on GEF Procedures making the review process a bit faster
- Increased access to GEF / faster review of proposals
- Document dissemination (particularly to national organizations and NGOs)
- Better recognition of domestic capabilities and building the capacities required for designing and implementation of more projects in the future.
- Assured funding
- Sharing of experience and information between the diverse teams implementing GEF funded projects in the country
- Field meetings in project region

35. What have been the main deficiencies in the Program?

Lack of Awareness/Information:

- Lack of information on the Support Program
- More information is needed about the roles of the IAs- the increase in GEF operational programs and the increase in the number of GEF executing agencies and IAs has resulted in some confusion and requires better information dissemination and clarification
- Many countries unaware of the Support Program

Lack of Resources:

- Limited finance/resources
- Lack of support staff to maintain GEF program on a regular basis
- Greater need for capacity building and education, training, activities on elaboration of GEF projects (for NGOs, Science Managers and Government officials)
- Program does not fund the recruitment of staff and procurement of computer hardware and printer

Difficulty with Disbursement Process:

- Model of disbursement should be cash advance system
- Relatively long process in getting the funds from GEF, lack of information about the rules and procedures of GEF activities- particularly the conditions and limitations of GEF in providing necessary funds.
- Lack of flexibility in fund utilization- not a preferred window for conducting GEF related activities-other sources are used more frequently.
- No financial support for following up the project implementation
- Complexity in itemizing and disbursing fund
- Terms of Reference very strict

No participation:

- Different treatment of small developing country members
- Limited support to OFP participation in constituency meetings
- Exclusion of international travel

No benefit:

- No real benefit is achieved in some countries, the FP was able to carry out its work using its own resources

36. What are the principle lessons that can be learned from the experience of the program with regard to:

- a. in-country inter-agency coordination**
 - b. stakeholder coordination**
 - c. GEF communication and outreach**
 - d. Relationships between the IA Field Offices and GEF focal points and GEF Secretariat**
-
- a.**
 - Inter-agency coordination at the country level improve GEF project processing/review
 - Close cooperation between national executing agency and implementing agencies
 - More project development activities should be shifted to units operating within the country
 - b.**
 - Stakeholder consultations provides opportunities for new approaches in partnership and coordination including fund leveraging for GEF priorities
 - Regional and global initiatives information should be provided to OFP and national stakeholders in order to link to country initiatives and priorities
 - Communication with national stakeholder has been increased.
 - Coordination among regional constituency members has improved
 - Having key GEF documents translated into the native language is very important for improving stakeholder awareness, strengthening GEF outreach, etc
 - More frequent meetings with stakeholders
 - c.**
 - The FP Support Program's success depended solely on the need from and willingness by the FP to take advantage of FP Support
 - There should be a country specific strategy to use the GEF funds
 - The Program was not fully utilized. Over the years the Funds were not utilized and it was only this year that a minimal amount was utilized
 - Awareness of GEF opportunities is so weak among potential beneficiaries that improved dissemination of information does not translate into tangible increase of the project proposals' flow in the short run
 - Having a number of on-going GEF funded projects implemented in public sector makes generation of the new project proposals easier in the same sector, whereas it seems very difficult for the private sector to "break the ice" apply for assistance from the GEF
 - d.**
 - The OFP need to more clearly understand their role and responsibilities. It is more efficient to appoint a working level rather than a political person who is more

interested in facilitation of a coordination and partnership among relevant national agencies.

- IA Headquarters should update field offices on new GEF policies as well as those emanating from COPs of various conventions
- Role of IA is sometimes too great- it translates into unnecessary wait for potential applicants
- GEF grant recipient teams are not well informed on each other's activities (essential for increasing efficiency through cross-fertilization and for developing synergy)
- IA field offices could share more information on their activities and ways of working in relation to GEF focal points, projects, and proposals under development.

37. How would you recommend improving Focal Point/Council Member support program?

Clarity/Awareness:

- Clear reporting requirements
- Providing field offices with updates on new GEF policies including MEA/COP decisions
- Assistance programs should be more transparent
- More backstopping and guidance from GEF is needed and more publications disseminated to all to ensure the GEF Reference libraries are sustained.
- By making it easier to apply for
- Each new focal point should receive a short package outlining the program by e-mail
- Regular updating through newsletters
- More orientation workshops are needed to bring stakeholders on the same level of understanding of the operation of the program

Coordination:

- The OFP must ensure proper coordination and partnership among all GEF funded projects to avoid duplication/confusion- Since the NCSA and Enabling Activities Projects cover dissemination of GEF docs, Internet access and study tours/travel, OFP does not really need additional support for these purposes.
- To have the possibility to contract personnel to download and prepare GEF docs into a suitable form to better disseminate the information in the local media and to organize meetings and workshops
- Regular information exchange between GEF Secretariat, GEF Council, IAs and GEF-OFP
- Tie Commencement of the program in a country with (preferably) the beginning of the Bank's fiscal year or (at least) with the beginning of a calendar year. This can make progress reporting more logical and accounting much easier

Resources:

- Ensure that GEF FP is assisted and supported by staff to promote preparation of GEF fundable project concepts, to assess and monitor and evaluate GEF projects.
- Train staff in the FP or other institution in GEF project preparation, project review, and monitoring and evaluation.
- Continued financial and technical support for GEF-OPF
- Incorporate national technicians and consultants
- To fund some more activities that were not eligible for funding (staff, procurement of computer hardware, printer.)

Disbursements:

- Improved disbursement procedure (cash advance system)
- Funding disbursements should not restrict the ability of countries to implement activities.

Impact:

- A more strategic approach should be considered. This involves designing the program to have specific phases or components to follow rather than expecting countries to implement activities under the same generic requirements right through out.
- Further engagement in designing the projects with specific attention to the social and economic priorities of the host countries.
- Regular meetings to assess progress in implementation of a country's strategy to utilize GEF funds.
- Project Field Visits
- Post implementation monitoring of funds
- There should be some indicators to measure success or failure of the program at country level.

38. Additional comments on Section E.

- A Work Program should be developed for utilization of the Support Program
- A special program to enable Focal Points to mobilize environmental management support and awareness within countries may be useful, especially if there are funds to involve the media.

GEF CEO should visit developing countries

Appendix II: UNDP Operational Focal Point and Council Member Annual Disbursements (FY 2000-2004)

	BRX	Country	UNDP	UNE P	WB	FY 2000	FY 2001 (1 July 00- 30 June 01)	FY 2002 (1 July 01- 30 June 02)	FY 2003 (1 July 02- 30 June 03)
						1st Support Period \$\$\$	1st Support Period \$\$\$ 2nd Support Period \$\$\$	1st Support Period \$\$\$ 2nd Support Period \$\$\$	1st Support Period \$\$\$ 2nd Support Period \$\$\$
1	RBA	ANGOLA							
2	RBA	BENIN	X			13-Dec-00	8.5		
3	RBA	BOTSWANA				13-Dec-00	8.5		
4	RBA	BURUNDI	X			1-Mar-01	8.25	15-May-02	8.25
5	RBA	BURKINA FASO	X						
6	RBA	CAMEROON	X			17-Apr-01	7.725		30-Aug-02
7	RBA	CAPE VERDE	X						
8	RBA	CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC							
9	RBA	CHAD	X			1-Mar-00	8.601		
10	RBA	COMOROS	X			24-Aug-00	8.8	15-May-02	8.25
11	RBA	CONGO (BRAZZAVILLE)	X			12-Mar-01	8.5	14-Jun-02	8.25
12	RBA	CONGO, DR	X			23-Oct-01	8.25		
13	RBA	COTE D'IVOIRE	X			8-Jan-01	8.8	15-May-02	8.0
14	RBA	EQUATORIAL GUINEA							
15	RBA	ERITREA		X		27-Jun-01	8.755		
16	RBA	ETHIOPIA	X					5-Jun-02	8.25
17	RBA	GABON	X			13-Apr-00	8.8		
18	RBA	GAMBIA	X			22-Feb-00	8.8		
19	RBA	GHANA	X			16-May-00	8.8		
20	RBA	Guinea	X					7-May-02	8.8
21	RBA	GUINEA-BISSAU							
22	RBA	KENYA	X			7-Mar-00	8.8	30-Mar-02	8.25
23	RBA	LESOTHO	X						
24	RBA	LIBERIA							
25	RBA	MADAGASCAR	X			24-Aug-00	8.8		
26	RBA	MALAWI	X			13-Dec-00	8.5		
27	RBA	MALI	X					14-May-02	8.755
28	RBA	Mauritania		X					
29	RBA	MAURITIUS	X			27-Apr-00	8.8		
30	RBA	MOZAMBIQUE	UNDP						
31	RBA	NAMIBIA							
32	RBA	NIGER	X			19-Apr-00	8.8		12-Nov-02
33	RBA	Nigeria		x					
34	RBA	RWANDA				18-Feb-00	8.8	16-Aug-02	8.8
35	RBA	SAO TOME & PRINCIPE	X						14-May-03
36	RBA	SENEGAL	X			16-May-01	8.25		
37	RBA	Seychelles		X					
38	RBA	SIERRA LEONE							
39	RBA	South Africa		x					
40	RBA	SWAZILAND	X			21-Feb-01	8.8		
41	RBA	TANZANIA	X			31-AUG-00	8.8	15-Apr-02	8.25
42	RBA	TOGO	I						
43	RBA	UGANDA	X			30-Mar-01	8.8	14-Jun-02	8.25
44	RBA	ZAMBIA	X						
45	RBA	ZIMBABWE				26-Jan-00	8.8		
	RBA	ZZ- TOTAL				12	96.60	15	128.03
								1	6.70
	ASP	AFGHANISTAN							
46	ASP	BANGLADESH	X			23-Feb-00	8.8		
47	ASP	BHUTAN							
48	ASP	CAMBODIA	X			28-Sep-01	8.8		23-Dec-02
49	ASP	CHINA		X					
50	ASP	COOK ISLANDS	X					10-Aug-01	8.25
51	ASP	DPRK	X					6-Feb-02	8.25

Appendix II: UNDP Operational Focal Point and Council Member Annual Disbursements (FY 2000-2004)

BRX		Country	UNDP UNE WB P		FY 2000		FY 2001 (1 July 00- 30 June 01)			FY 2002 (1 July 01- 30 June 02)			FY 2003 (1 July 02- 30 June 03)							
					1st Support Period	\$\$\$	1st Support Period	\$\$\$	2nd Support Period	\$\$\$	1st Support Period	\$\$\$	2nd Support Period	\$\$\$	1st Support Period	\$\$\$	2nd Support Period	\$\$\$	3rd Support Period	\$\$\$
52	ASP	FUJI			12-Apr-00	8.8														
53	ASP	INDIA		X	22-Mar-00	8.8			12-Apr-01	8.25										
54	ASP	INDONESIA		X																
55	ASP	IRAN					20-Feb-01	8.8												
56	ASP	KIRIBATI		X	27-Apr-00	8.65														
57	ASP	LAOS		X																
58	ASP	MALAYSIA		X	1-Mar-00	8.8					15-Oct-01	8.65								
59	ASP	MALDIVES		X			18-Jul-00	8.8												
60	ASP	MARSHALL ISLANDS		X			21-May-01	8.755												
61	ASP	MICRONESIA, FS		W																
62	ASP	MONGOLIA																		
63	ASP	NAURU		I																
64	ASP	NEPAL		X	26-Jan-00	8.8			16-May-01	8.25										
65	ASP	NIUE		X			10-Jul-00	8.8												
66	ASP	PAKISTAN		X	22-Aug-00	8.59														
67	ASP	PALAU		X																
68	ASP	PAPUA NEW GUINEA																		
69	ASP	PHILIPPINES		X	26-Jan-00	8.8														
70	ASP	REPUBLIC OF KOREA		I																
71	ASP	SAMOA		X			10-Jul-00	8.25			10-Aug-01	8.25								
72	ASP	SOLOMON ISLANDS		X	18-Apr-00	8.8					23-Jul-01	8.25								
73	ASP	SRI LANKA		X	2-Mar-00	8.8														
74	ASP	THAILAND		X	29-Jun-00	8.8														
75	ASP	TOKELAU																		
76	ASP	TONGA		X																
77	ASP	TUVALU		X	3-Dec-00	8.55														
78	ASP	VANUATU																		
79	ASP	VIETNAM		X	26-Jan-00	8.5			21-Feb-01	8.25					0.00					
	ASP	ZZ- TOTAL			11	96.35	8	69.35	3	24.75	3	25.15	2	16.50	0.00	8.25	1.00	8.25	2.00	16.50
80	ARB	ALGERIA		I																
81	ARB	DIBOUTI																		
82	ARB	EGYPT		X			5-Jul-00	8.8			25-Jul-01	7.725								
83	ARB	IRAQ																		
84	ARB	JERUSALEM PAPP																		
85	ARB	JORDAN		I											20-Aug-02					
86	ARB	LEBANON		X	3-Feb-00	8.24						8.8								
87	ARB	MOROCCO																		
88	ARB	SOMALIA																		
89	ARB	SUDAN		X	12-Mar-00	8.8														
90	ARB	SYRIA		X	10-Aug-00	8.8														
91	ARB	TUNISIA																		
92	ARB	YEMEN		X	12-Jul-00	8.8					10-Aug-01	8.25								
	ARB	ZZ- TOTAL			1.00	8.24	4.00	35.20	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.00	15.98	0.00	8.8	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
93	EIS	ALBANIA																		
94	EIS	ARMENIA		X			12-Jul-00	8.8												
95	EIS	AZERBAIJAN		X	12-Apr-00	8.8														
96	EIS	BELARUS		X	1-Mar-00	8.8					19-Jul-01	8							6-Nov-02	8.25
97	EIS	BOSNIA & HERZEGOVINA																		
98	EIS	BULGARIA		X	15-Feb-00	8.5					24-Aug-01	6.95								
99	EIS	CROATIA																		
100	EIS	CZECH REPUBLIC		X			1-Aug-00	8.8			24-Aug-01	8.25							2-Dec-02	8.25
101	EIS	ESTONIA		X	7-Mar-00	8.24														
102	EIS	GEORGIA																		
103	EIS	HUNGARY		X			24-Oct-00	8.8												
104	EIS	KAZAKHSTAN		X	22-Feb-00	8.8					6-Nov-01	8.25								

Appendix II: UNDP Operational Focal Point and Council Member Annual Disbursements (FY 2000-2004)

	BRX	Country	UNDP UNE P	FY 2000		FY 2001 (1 July 00- 30 June 01)		FY 2002 (1 July 01- 30 June 02)		FY 2003 (1 July 02- 30 June 03)	
				1st Support Period	\$\$\$	1st Support Period	\$\$\$	1st Support Period	\$\$\$	1st Support Period	\$\$\$
105	EIS	KOSOVO									
106	EIS	KRYGYZSTAN	X	9-Mar-00	8.8						
107	EIS	LATVIA	X	15-Feb-00	8.8	8-Jan-01	8.24				
108	EIS	LITHUANIA	X	28-Jun-00	8.8						
109	EIS	MACEDONIA	I								
110	EIS	MALTA									
111	EIS	MOLDOVA	X	1-Mar-00	8.8						
112	EIS	POLAND	X	22-Mar-00	8.8	8-Jan-01	8.24				
113	EIS	ROMANIA	I								
114	EIS	RUSSIAN FEDERATION	I								
115	EIS	SLOVAKIA	X	13-Apr-00	8.8						
116	EIS	SLOVENIA	X	14-Jun-00	8.8						
117	EIS	St. HELENA									
118	EIS	TAJKISTAN	X	17-Feb-00	8.8	21-Feb-01	8.25				
119	EIS	TURKMENISTAN	X								
120	EIS	UKRAINE									
121	EIS	UZBEKISTAN									
122	EIS	YUGOSLAVIA									
		ZZ- TOTAL		13.00	113.54	3.00	26.40	1.00	8.80	0.00	0.00
123	LAC	ANGUILLA									
124	LAC	ANTIGUA & BARBUDA	X								
125	LAC	ARGENTINA	X	26-Jan-00	8.8	29-May-01	8.8				
126	LAC	ARUBA									
127	LAC	BAHAMAS	X			9-Apr-01	8.755				
128	LAC	BARBADOS	X	8-Jun-00	8.55	15-May-01	6.7				
129	LAC	BELIZE	I								
130	LAC	BERMUDA									
131	LAC	BOLIVIA	X			26-Jul-00	8.8				
132	LAC	BRAZIL									
133	LAC	BRITISH VIRGIN ISLANDS									
134	LAC	CAYMAN ISLANDS									
135	LAC	CHILE	X			25-Jul-00	8.24				
136	LAC	COLOMBIA	X	10-May-00	8.8						
137	LAC	COSTA RICA	X	22-Mar-00	8.8						
138	LAC	CUBA	X								
139	LAC	DOMINICA	X			15-May-01	5.15				
140	LAC	DOMINICAN REPUBLIC	I								
141	LAC	ECUADOR									
142	LAC	EL SALVADOR	I								
143	LAC	GRENADA									
144	LAC	GUATEMALA									
145	LAC	GUYANA	X			2-Oct-00	8.8				
146	LAC	HAITI	X	26-Jan-00	8.8						
147	LAC	HONDURAS	X			8-Aug-00	4.635				
148	LAC	JAMAICA	X	26-Apr-00	8.8						
149	LAC	MEXICO									
150	LAC	MONTSERRAT									
151	LAC	NETHERLANDS									
152	LAC	ANTILLES									
153	LAC	NICARAGUA	I								
		PANAMA	X	1-Mar-00	8.8						

Appendix II: UNDP Operational Focal Point and Council Member Annual Disbursements (FY 2000-2004)

[illegible]

Appendix II: World Bank Operational Focal Point Annual Disbursements (FY2000-2004)

OUI	FY00	FY01	FY02	FY03	FY04	Total	Allocation	Balance
ECA	Ukraine Georgia Croatia	- 1,514 -	880 6,712 -	1,068 6,974 -	1,625 6,228 -	984 2,660 6,273	31,235 25,235 25,235	26,679 1,147 18,962
AFR	Namibia South Africa Nigeria Mauritania Eritrea	- - - - -	- - - - -	- 2,279 - - -	- - - - 5,264	10,194 - - - 35	25,235 25,235 25,235 25,235 25,235	15,041 22,956 25,235 25,235 19,936
EAP	China Mongolia Indonesia	8,500 - -	8,000 - -	7,993 7,862 -	- 800 -	- - -	25,235 25,235 25,235	742 16,574 25,235
		10,014	15,592	26,174	12,292	19,162	83,234	200,351

Countries in bold represent FPs approved in the FY