



Global Environment Facility

GEF/C.12/Inf.17
October 9, 1998

GEF Council
October 14 – 16, 1998

SURVEY OF NATIONAL FOCAL POINTS

INTRODUCTION

1. Effective coordination should assist countries to utilize GEF resources more effectively, to participate better in decision-making on GEF matters and to strengthen country-ownership of GEF-financed activities. It should also serve to bring together the mutually complementary process of the GEF, its Implementing Agencies and the Conventions that the GEF serves. The importance of country-level coordination was recognized as a fundamental policy of the GEF in the *Instrument for the Establishment of the Restructured GEF* and the project cycle approved by Council.
2. Recognizing that country-level coordination is the primary responsibility of the GEF country focal points, the GEF concluded that it would be useful to obtain information from the focal points as to how they perceived their roles and responsibilities. It was expected that through a survey of focal points a number of models and ideas for strengthening country coordination would emerge that would be of benefit to other countries. It was also anticipated that the survey would lead to ideas that would assist the Council, the GEF Secretariat and the Implementing Agencies in assessing needs and identifying services that might be provided to assist the focal points to fulfill their responsibilities and functions.
3. A survey was sent to both the political and operational focal points of all GEF Participants in August 1998. A copy of the survey is attached to this report. The report summarizes the responses and main ideas emerging from the replies to the survey.

BACKGROUND OF THE FOCAL POINT SYSTEM

4. The GEF mandate covers four focal areas that, at the country-level, may require interaction with a number of governmental ministries, departments or agencies. Therefore, the GEF requested that participating countries designate a focal point to receive GEF-related information and correspondence and serve, with each constituency, as the point of contact for Council Members.¹
5. To further improve coordination and communication between GEF and the recipient countries on operational matters, the GEF Council tasked the Secretariat with requesting recipient countries to identify operational focal points to "act as the principal contact point for all Implementing Agency activity in the country, provide feedback on GEF activities, review project ideas and concepts, facilitate broad-based as well as project related consultation, and facilitate national interagency discussion on issues of substantive interest to the GEF."²

¹ "Political and Operational Focal Points of the GEF," page 2.

² "The Project Preparation and Development Facility," Doc. GEF/C.3/6, February 1995.

6. The originally designated focal points are referred to as Political Focal Points, and the subsequently designated focal points are referred to as Operational Focal Points. The different responsibilities of the political and operational focal points are summarized below:

GEF Political Focal Points	GEF Operational Focal Points
To receive from the GEF Secretariat all documents and correspondence related to the governance of the GEF and to distribute that information to appropriate officials and interested parties in the country.	To ensure that GEF proposals and activities in the country are consistent with country priorities and the country commitments under global environmental conventions.
To communicate its government's views, comments, suggestions on these matters to the Secretariat.	To identify project ideas to meet country priorities.
To serve as the contact point for other members of its constituency, particularly its Council Member.	To endorse project proposals.
To serve as the contact point within the country on GEF governance matters, to inform interested parties, including country's focal points for the two conventions, about GEF activities, and to facilitate in-country consultations on GEF governance matters.	To facilitate broad-based in-country consultation on GEF operational matters.
	To provide feedback on GEF activities, including implementation of projects.
Source: "Political and Operational Focal Points of the GEF," pages 2-3.	

7. As indicated above, the political and operational focal points were intended to fill distinctly different areas of responsibility regarding interaction with the GEF. These differences had to be accommodated in the design of the focal point survey.

DESIGN AND DISTRIBUTION OF THE FOCAL POINT SURVEY

8. A survey was developed for distribution to all GEF political and operational focal points. Although the political and operational focal points are intended to fill different functions in their interactions with the GEF and in-country stakeholders, it was decided that the survey would not be targeted to the intended functions of either political or operational focal points. Rather it would be designed to allow the focal points to present information about all their relevant activities.

9. The survey was designed to use both multiple-choice and open-ended questions to elicit the following information about the focal points.

- a. Political and institutional context and function within the host country
- b. Organizational structure (including administration)
- c. Interaction with their counterparts (political or operational)
- d. Stakeholders
- e. Examples of success
- f. Constraints and barriers to success
- g. Ideas for improving the focal point system
- h. Areas of needed assistance

10. As appropriate, the survey was distributed in English, French, or Spanish. Two hundred thirty-two surveys were sent to three hundred thirty-three countries, of which one hundred twenty-nine are political focal points, seventy-one are operational focal points, and thirty-two have both functions.

11. Sixty-seven responses to the survey from sixty-one countries were received. In most cases, it appears that the political and operational focal points submitted a joint response. The section below summarizes the survey information received. It is organized by the sections of the survey: National Coordination, Communication with the GEF, the Project Cycle, and Vision.

SUMMARY AND ANALYSIS OF SURVEY RESPONSES

NATIONAL COORDINATION

12. The National Coordination section of the survey was designed to find out what activities the focal points are involved in to facilitate communication and information exchange among each other, the focal points for the conventions on the global environment, and local stakeholders. In addition to activities they are engaged in, the section was intended to elicit information regarding what the focal points saw as their primary responsibilities.

13. The basic functions of the focal points described in the survey have been very much the same across all countries that responded. All focal points describe themselves as being responsible for:

- a. Information dissemination
- b. Coordination between stakeholders
- c. Organization of seminars, workshops, meetings and study groups
- d. Project appraisal, approval and monitoring
- e. Communication with locally active environmental entities
- f. Information sharing with relevant government agencies.

14. Particular aspects of these functions that emerged from the responses are summarized below:

- a. Information dissemination. Focal points felt one of their main duties is to disseminate information regarding GEF objectives and activities.
- b. Coordination between stakeholders and organization of seminars, workshops, meetings and study groups. Focal points see themselves as facilitators of organization and cooperation. By organizing activities where stakeholders can participate and contribute, focal points can increase the amount of cooperation and communication between stakeholders.
- c. Project monitoring, appraisal and approval. Focal points see their involvement as helping to provide guidance, arrange technical assistance and educate stakeholders about project funding protocol.
- d. Communication with locally active environmental entities. Keeping in communication with environmental groups in their country is a key role identified by GEF focal points.
- e. Information sharing with relevant government agencies. Survey responses indicate that focal points are communicating and sometimes advising relevant ministries regarding global environmental issues and activities that help to address them.

15. While the preceding list captures those functions most frequently identified by the focal points in each country, it should be noted that not all responses listed each of these items.

16. Coordination between GEF focal points. Communication between GEF political and operational focal points within the same country varied from little or no communication, to

informal communication based largely on personal relationships, to formal meetings. Some countries have coordinated focal point activities around discussions on “decision-making, implementation strategies and monitoring of project efficiency.” It was noted that in countries where the focal points were separated by large geographic spaces, these types of activities were much more infrequent and difficult. An important point made in the surveys is the importance of personal contacts for coordinating and communicating activities. Countries that noted the use of informal communication activities generally were engaging in more activities involving stakeholders and other focal points.

17. In many countries, the GEF focal points are housed within government agencies that interact on a regular basis for reasons separate from GEF activities. When this is the case, coordination between focal points is much better. Although this arrangement may work well, it is entirely dependent on a very specific set of circumstances that may not be replicable in other GEF countries, because the GEF cannot determine which individuals, in which parts of government, may be focal point representatives.

18. Coordination between GEF focal points and focal points for the conventions on the global environment. This function was identified by the GEF focal points in 30 countries as a high priority, although, conversely, several GEF focal points indicated they do not have contact with the convention focal points.

19. The following are a few examples of the communication taking place between GEF focal points and the focal points for the various conventions on the global environment: review panels of related activities in-country; national steering committees for environmental activities; task forces to deal with more complex projects; inclusion of convention focal points in monitoring tasks; consultations with convention focal points regarding projects relevant to their activities; study groups concerned with global environmental.

- a. Review panels and national steering committees: A review panel may be comprised of local stakeholders for the purpose of sharing information on ongoing projects within the country. National steering committees are more formalized, and have the official responsibilities of guiding environmental projects within a country, to correspond to that country’s needs and policies. Both types of communication organization were cited by focal points as approaches used.

National Steering Committee in Poland

Poland reports the establishment of a National Steering Committee which "... has been set up in order to provide advice to the Political Focal Point on matters related to GEF. The Committee is advising the Political Focal Point on the priorities for the submission of project proposals to the Implementing Agencies, as well as on the endorsements for projects to be submitted to the Council. The Committee monitors the projects which are already in process of being implemented. The Steering Committee is composed of, Political Focal Point (representative of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs), representative of the Minister for the Environmental Protection, Natural Resources and Forestry, Focal Points of the Climate, Biodiversity and Ozone conventions, Government's plenipotentiary for international waters, representative of the National Fund for Environmental Protection and Water Management and the Ecofund (whose President serves as the GEF Operational Focal Point), and a representative of the NGO community."

- b. Task forces: Some focal points indicated that task forces were used to deal with coordination and communication related to more complex projects.
- c. Inclusion of convention focal points regarding projects relevant to their activities: Cooperation on projects relevant to individual conventions between focal points was indicated in a minority of responses.
- d. Working groups/study groups concerned with global environmental issues: As was pointed out by China, Gambia, Ukraine, Uruguay and others, working/study groups allow individuals from government, academia, NGOs, and international organizations to exchange ideas, experiences and information about global environmental issues.

Use of Working Groups in Belize

Belize has established working groups for both the Convention on Biological Diversity and the U.N. Framework Convention on Climate Change. The focal point wrote, "We have seen the establishment of these working groups as the most effective for coordination between the GEF operational focal points ... because they play an important and effective role in the technical and developmental process through their shared experiences and technical expertise." In terms of coordination with stakeholders, Belize reports, "Workshops and community consultations have been most successful in enhancing stakeholders understanding of the GEF's purpose and programs in Belize."

20. These activities are examples of coordination that increase the institutional capacity of the GEF focal points as well as the convention focal points. The most successful activities related to coordination between GEF focal points and convention focal points was indicated to be task

groups and a sharing of responsibilities regarding project monitoring and implementation. These activities were successful because of "appropriate information exchange and joint decision-making."

21. Several countries either did not provide descriptions of successful coordination/communication techniques, or had not participated in enough coordinated activities to date to feel they could provide a useful suggestion.

22. Coordination with other stakeholders. Coordination with stakeholders is an important part of GEF focal point operation. The focal points were asked to identify who the stakeholders are in their respective countries and what types of activities they are engaged in to increase participation and cooperation. The stakeholders most frequently identified include:

- a. various government departments and ministries
- b. environmental NGOs
- c. private sector entities (energy, natural resources)
- d. community-based organizations

23. These groups are of obvious importance when trying to implement GEF projects and ensuring their success. To maintain open channels of communication with these stakeholders, many countries have conducted the following activities:

- a. study groups with relevant organizations
- b. coordination meeting between NGOs, government offices, other focal points
- c. informal consultations between organizations
- d. training seminars regarding project preparation and implementation
- e. national steering committees composed of government and private stakeholders

24. Though many GEF focal points are involved in these activities (see above section on focal point responsibilities), the frequency and institutionalization of them seem to be inconsistent. Responses indicate these activities are irregular occurrences, and at the time of the survey, many focal points could not state when the next activity would be taking place. This is representative of a system that contains many good ideas regarding stakeholder participation, but is lacking in organizational resources to use the ideas effectively.

25. Responses show that informal consultations and training seminars have been the most effective means of disseminating information about the GEF to other stakeholders.

26. Informal consultations. Through personal relationships and informal channels of communication, GEF focal points give advice to stakeholders about project design and implementation. As noted by one focal point, "Informal consultations have worked best, because of the importance of personal contact and its fluidity."

27. Training seminars. Some focal points are engaging in training seminars for project proposals, project implementation and project monitoring.

China's Approach to Stakeholder Participation and Training

Coordination between stakeholders is a key role of GEF focal points. In China, the GEF focal points consult with stakeholders regarding what they see as important needs and objectives. China has also implemented a system of training stakeholders in project preparation through direct involvement. China's survey response states that, "Providing training for the key stakeholders, especially those trainers who work in key government agencies and major academic institutions, has been very successful in enhancing their understanding of the GEF's purpose and programs. In addition, gaining practical experience through project preparation—learning by doing—has been very helpful." Those that have received training are expected to provide training (in Chinese) to a larger audience from line ministries, local governments and project entities.

To achieve coordination between the GEF focal point and convention focal points, China has established procedures for consulting convention focal points on all GEF projects related to their activities. Twice a year, all agencies concerned with global environmental issues are invited to discuss major policy issues related to GEF operations in China. In addition, the GEF focal points attend meetings organized by other agencies.

28. Direct involvement with stakeholders seems to be seen by focal points as the most effective mode of communication.

COMMUNICATIONS WITH THE GEF

29. This section of the survey was designed to elicit information regarding how and for what purposes the focal points are in contact with the GEF and vice versa. In addition, there are several questions in this section focusing on how communications can be improved and what the GEF can do to enhance the focal point system.

Level of Communication

30. Most of the countries' focal points claim that communications between the GEF Secretariat and the focal point and between the Implementing Agencies and the focal point are

sufficient, as shown in the table below. However, it appears that communication between the local level offices of the Implementing Agencies and the focal points could be improved.³

Provision of Information

	Sufficient	Insufficient	No Response
GEF Secretariat	47	12	
Implementing Agencies	33	27	
Local Offices of the Implementing Agencies	29	29	1

Communication Needs

31. The more subjective questions regarding what type of support the focal points need from the GEF elicited a wide array of responses. The focal points responses can be grouped into five basic categories of communication needs:

- a. Training on GEF objectives
- b. Education on proposal preparation
- c. Feedback on submitted proposals
- d. Communication technologies and logistics
- e. Coordination of the focal point system

32. Training on GEF objectives. The focal points also feel that communications would be enhanced by training on GEF objectives. One country noted, "National Focal Points in LDCs are somewhat disadvantaged because, unlike our counterparts from the developed countries, we were not involved in the preparation of GEF in anticipation of the Earth Summit. We were rather just informed about GEF without really understanding its agenda, purpose and history. In this context, our request for support should be seen."

³ The GEF Secretariat is responsible for communicating with the national focal points on policy matters, while the Implementing Agencies are the main channel of communication with the national focal points with regard to specific projects. Each Implementing Agency has its own procedures and practices for working with the focal points on specific projects.

33. The training that the focal points are requesting is really two-fold. First, they need basic information about the GEF including its history, objectives, and role within their countries. Secondly, the focal points need training programs for support and technical staff that are in direct contact with the key stakeholders. It has been suggested that arrangements be made for training workshops to be held at Headquarters of the GEF Secretariat and Implementing Agencies.

34. Education on proposal preparation. The focal points expressed a strong desire to have a broader understanding of the proposal approval process. The focal points want faster responses on evaluations of proposed projects, as many note problems such as shortage of technical personnel and significant lag time in receiving documents and other necessary communications. Several focal points discussed the benefits of making a local review body or an officer available to the country before each round of funding to assist in the review process.

35. Feedback on submitted proposals. In addition to this support to facilitate and speed the proposal review process, the focal points also want to be more informed during and after the decision process. A common request from the focal points is for an update on the status of project proposals. One country writes, "the focal point is often unaware of what stage or what decisions have been made concerning project proposals and are then unable to update/inform the proposers, decision makers, or other interested parties when asked about their status." Other focal points request that more information be provided on ongoing projects within their countries. It was suggested that the use of periodical reports and lists of projects' status be made available to the focal points.

36. Communication technologies and logistics. Focal points have also requested that documents, including educational and reference materials, be translated into the native language of their country. In terms of communications equipment, many focal points note that Internet access and email capability are essential. Funding for Internet access would be a tremendous asset in terms of facilitating communications between the GEF and the focal points and among the focal points themselves. Internet access would speed the entire proposal process and make administration more efficient as documents could be made available via the Web. Of the 67 focal points responding, 25 have access to the Internet, and 37 do not (5 did not respond to this question).

37. Coordination of the focal point system. Coordination of the focal point system is another area that was discussed often in the responses. Many of the focal points favor coordination meetings and regional workshops. One country wrote, "The most useful type of support is considered the active cooperation with the competent representatives from Implementing Agencies." The focal points believe that local-level workshops and staff visits from the Implementing Agencies will serve to boost stakeholder involvement. These meetings and workshops would serve as venues for networking as well as the sharing of experiences, both successful and inefficient case studies. The focal points also expressed the need for funding to cover the costs of these GEF coordination events. One focal point suggested this funding for workshops and participation in other coordination events be made available through the small grants program.

38. The following table summarizes the information that the focal points indicated that they would like to receive from the GEF Secretariat.

Type of Information Needed	Yes	No Response
Technical Information (for example data, assessments, analyses, etc.)	30	4
GEF Policy Information (for example, eligibility, strategies, etc.)	55	4
GEF Process Information (for example, the project cycle, etc.)	46	4

PROJECT CYCLE

39. The project cycle is an important part of the focal points' involvement with GEF projects. The purpose of this section of the survey was to identify ideas from the focal points about how the cycle might be modified to better fit the needs and resources of the GEF focal points.

40. The following table summarizes the responses to the question of whether information received by the focal points for project preparation and implementation is sufficient or not. As indicated by the table above, the distribution of sufficient to not sufficient responses is fairly even.

	Sufficient	Not Sufficient
GEF Secretariat	34	27
Implementing Agencies	30	30
Local offices of implementing agencies	28	31

41. When asked about the modification of the project cycle to make it more effective and streamlined while ensuring the high quality of projects, most countries declined to answer the question. Those that did, however, had several suggestions:

- a. GEF officer on hand to help with training and proposal evaluation
- b. GEF experts on hand to assist with analysis of incremental costs
- c. better information from GEF on monitoring project and project ideas

- d. better communication between focal points and GEF regarding project concept modification, to avoid inappropriate distortions in the original project
- e. shortening of the funding cycle to create a faster dispersal of funds
- f. reduce the number of approval points for a project proposal
- g. give more latitude to local authorities regarding the appropriateness of a project to each country
- h. better information for stakeholders regarding project proposal requirements

42. Respondents indicated that these modifications and guidance can enhance the ability of the GEF focal points to identify, assist and implement projects relevant to GEF objectives. As the above recommendations suggest, the focal points do not have enough information regarding the intricacies of the project funding cycle and feel that a more proactive role by the GEF would help them to be more effective.

VISION

43. This section was included in the survey to provide a broader perspective on the focal point system. This section allowed the focal points to present their own interpretation of how the system should function, what has been successful for their individual countries thus far, and what direction should be taken in the future to enhance the GEF focal point system. According to this section of the survey, the focal points feel that their most important roles as GEF representatives include:

- a. Screening of potential projects
- b. National decision-making and promotion of GEF objectives
- c. Coordination
- d. Encouraging dialogue with stakeholders

44. Screening of potential projects. The GEF focal point is often in a position to prioritize projects for their submission to the GEF. Other important functions discussed by the respondents include promotion and presentation of possibilities and GEF operations to all interested parties, both individuals and institutions. One country's focal point wrote, "Focal points can be effective in providing information about the GEF to sectoral ministries, NGOs, etc." Other focal points noted that another important role includes providing documents on the conventions and the sharing of information, including personal consultations with foreign experts.

45. National decision-making and promotion of GEF objectives. The focal points are also responsible for ensuring that projects are country-driven and in line with national strategies and priorities. In general, the responses regarding the major accomplishments of the focal points are very limited. Very few focal points cited anything, but those that did emphasized the formulation of National Action Plans and the promotion of inter-agency coordination. One focal point wrote, "... We managed to transfer the concept of GEF to many stakeholders in spite of the limited resources and time constraint."

46. Coordination. The final two questions from this section elicited a variety of responses concerning what type of GEF support would be most helpful at the country level. There seems to be some disagreement over whether the political and operational focal point should be one and the same. One country wrote, "... [The] political focal point should be separate from the operational focal point so as to ensure a balance of responsibilities ... and national coordination with full information on all GEF-related activities." Other focal points asserted that the political and operational functions of the focal points should be combined to minimize time and expense in communication.

47. Once again, several focal points emphasized the importance of being able to communicate with one another via e-mail, while the focal points also acknowledge the need for funding to support this communications expense. One focal point suggested the establishment of a mechanism for coordination and resolution of concerns related to the participation of the country in the GEF. It was suggested that the focal point system could be made more effective by setting up a work plan and common strategy of action.

48. Other suggestions included the promotion of training activities and exchange of experiences as a means of constant feedback. One country wrote, "In October 1997, I took part in a UNDP-GEF workshop for focal points which I found very helpful. I believe that such a training would be very welcome for many other GEF focal points too." Others feel that the focal points system can be made more effective by getting the focal points more involved when GEF personnel or missions visit so that they can address questions. This would also serve to enhance the transparency of operations

49. Encouraging dialogue with stakeholders. Focal points also emphasize their importance at the local level. One country stated that the focal point system can be made more effective "only by giving more importance to local approaches and priorities." Several focal points asserted that local offices of the GEF Implementing Agencies should be given more responsibility and authority in project evaluation. Others noted that there should exist local offices for executing agents and there should be a GEF representative in the local offices.

CONCLUSION

50. The preceding summarizes the information provided by the focal points regarding their efforts to foster stakeholder participation, improve GEF coordination and increase awareness of global environmental issues. Of the activities named above, such basic practices as information dissemination, coordination between stakeholders and organization of seminars, workshops or an

equivalent activity are being implemented by nearly all GEF focal points in one form or another. This listing of activities is, however, basically a "best practices" list encompassing the general universe of activities that define the functions of an efficient, effective and proactive GEF focal point. Determining the extent to which all these practices are actually taking place in different countries is beyond the scope of this survey and would require a much more rigorous and detailed examination of focal point operation.



GEF Focal Point Survey

General Information

1. Is your role that of a GEF

☐ political focal point ☐ operational focal point ☐ both

2. Please identify the focal points in your country for the following

a) Convention on Biological Diversity

b) Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer

Name: _____

Position: _____

Institution: _____

Name: _____

Position: _____

Institution: _____

c) U.N. Convention to Combat Desertification in Those Countries Experiencing Serious Drought and/or Desertification, Particularly in Africa

d) U.N. Framework Convention on Climate Change

Name: _____

Position: _____

Institution: _____

Name: _____

Position: _____

Institution: _____

National Coordination

Institutional Coordination

1. In relation to your role as a GEF focal point, what are the institutional responsibilities of your office?

2. Please describe the functional relationship between your office and that of the other GEF focal point in your country.¹

3. What procedures (for example, task forces) have been established in your country for coordination between the GEF focal points and the focal points for the conventions on the global environment listed above?

¹ "Functional relationship" may encompass communications, allocation of responsibilities, lines of authority, decision-making processes, procedures for coordination, etc.

4. Which of these procedures have worked best, and why have they been so effective?

Coordination with other Stakeholders

5. In addition to your office, who are the key stakeholders (i.e., parties with significant interest) in activities funded by the GEF in your country?
6. Please describe the ways your office has brought about the participation of the other key stakeholders in your country.
7. What activities have been most successful in your country for enhancing stakeholders' understanding of the GEF's purpose and programs?

Communication with the GEF

1. For coordination purposes, is the information you receive from each of the following entities

	Sufficient	Not sufficient
The GEF Secretariat	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The GEF implementing agencies (the World Bank, UNDP, UNEP)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The local offices of the implementing agencies	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

2. Based on your experience, are there examples of particularly successful communication between the GEF, the focal points, and local stakeholders (i.e., parties with significant interest), that would be beneficial to share with other countries?

3. What types of information do primarily require from the GEF?

- ☐ Technical information (for example, data, assessments, analyses, etc.)
- ☐ GEF policy information (for example, on eligibility, strategies, etc.)
- ☐ GEF process information (for example, the project cycle, etc.)

4. What modes do you primarily use to obtain information from the GEF?

☐ Internet ☐ Email ☐ Fax ☐ Telephone ☐ Mail

5. Do you use the Internet to access the GEF web site (www.gefweb.org)?

☐ Yes ☐ No

6. If the GEF were able to provide any additional support to the focal points, what would be the most important type of support they could provide?

7. What support can the GEF provide to enhance the linkages in your country between the GEF focal points, the convention focal points, and the GEF implementing agencies (UNDP, UNEP, and the World Bank)?

8. In what ways has your office received support from the local offices of the implementing agencies, in relation to GEF activities?

9. What types of support from the implementing agencies do you consider most beneficial, in relation to GEF activities? Why has this support been of particular help?

The Project Cycle

1. For project preparation and implementation purposes, is the information you receive from each of the following entities

	Sufficient	Not sufficient
The GEF Secretariat	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The GEF implementing agencies (the World Bank, UNDP, UNEP)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The local offices of the implementing agencies	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

2. How might the GEF project cycle be modified to most effectively meet the needs of your office, the government, and the nongovernmental organizations in your country, while ensuring the high quality of projects?

3. What can the GEF do to help streamline the aspects of the project cycle that are completed by the host country?

Your Vision

1. In your experience, what are the most important functions of a GEF focal point? What have you found to be most effective for successfully fulfilling those functions?

2. What do you consider your major accomplishments in your role as a GEF focal point?

3. For purposes of improving country-level coordination, what steps should the GEF consider to help you meet your objectives?

4. In general, based on your experience, how can the system of focal points be made more effective?