



Global Environment Facility

November 25, 2003

JOINT SUMMARY OF THE CHAIRS GEF COUNCIL MEETING NOVEMBER 19-21, 2003

OPENING OF THE MEETING

1. The meeting was opened by Leonard Good, Chief Executive Officer/Chairperson of the Facility. The Council welcomed the proposal made by the CEO in his remarks that a discussion be held at the Council's next meeting on the future strategic directions of the GEF.

ELECTION OF A CHAIRPERSON

2. The Council elected Leander Treppel, the Member representing Austria, Belgium, Czech Republic, Hungary, Luxembourg, Slovak Republic, Slovenia and Turkey as its elected Co-Chair.

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

3. The Council approved the provisional agenda set forth in document GEF/C.21/1/Rev.2.

STAP

4. Ms. Julia Carabias Lillo, the Chair of STAP, reported on work that STAP III has been carrying out as well as the products that it intends to deliver by June 2004.

Decisions of the Council

5. The Council approved the following decisions with respect to the items on its agenda.

Decision on Agenda Item 5

Participation of Council Members in Council Meetings

6. The Council expresses its regret that the Council Member representing the Caribbean constituency was not able to participate in the meeting recognizing the paramount importance of participation of all constituency groupings in Council meetings. The Council recalls that the GEF has always operated in a spirit of inclusiveness and partnership for the purpose of managing the global environment, and it called for a practical and sustainable solution that would ensure that all constituencies can be fully represented in Council meetings.

7. The Council requests the GEF Secretariat to consult with the World Bank and the host government with a view to identifying a solution and to propose steps to ensure the representation of all constituencies at GEF Council meetings.

8. The Secretariat is requested to inform the Council by mail no later than March 15, 2004 of the progress that has been made in identifying a solution, including proposals for the organization of the next Council meeting in May 2004.

Decision on Agenda Item 6

Appointment of Independent Monitoring and Evaluation Coordinator

9. The Council takes note of the information that was provided by the CEO/Chairman on the progress that has been made in the selection of a candidate for appointment to the position of coordinator of the GEF independent monitoring and evaluation unit. The Council welcomes the proposal of the CEO/Chairman that he undertake further consultations with the other members of the selection committee with a view to making a proposal to the Council by mail in December on the next steps to be followed in the process.

Decision on Agenda Item 7

Relations with Conventions

10. The Council, having reviewed Document GEF/C.22/4/Rev.2, *Relations with Conventions*, takes note of the developments of relevance to the GEF within the various international agreements and welcomes the continuing collaboration between the GEF and the Conventions. More specifically, the Council:

- (a) welcomes efforts to coordinate the CBD's review process of the financial mechanism with the work to be undertaken for the third Study of GEF's Overall Performance;
- (b) requests the GEF Secretariat in collaboration with the Implementing Agencies and the Convention Secretariat of the CBD to inform the first Meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol on the experience and lessons learned through the GEF activities undertaken pursuant to the GEF Initial Strategy for assisting countries to prepare for the entry into force of the Protocol with a view to contributing to the formulation of guidance as to how developing countries may work with the financial mechanism to best build upon such experience;
- (c) requests the GEF Secretariat in collaboration with the Implementing Agencies to inform the ninth Session of the Conference of the Parties to the UNFCCC of the steps that have been undertaken to operationalize in an expeditious manner financing for the preparation of second national communications;
- (d) welcomes the decision of the sixth Session of the Conference of the Parties to the UNCCD to identify the GEF as a financial mechanism of the UNCCD pursuant to article 20, paragraph 2(b), and article 21 of the Convention and requests the CEO

to collaborate with the Executive Secretary of the Convention and the Managing Director of the Global Mechanism to prepare a Memorandum of Understanding on arrangements to facilitate collaboration between the GEF and the UNCCD. The CEO is requested to submit a draft MOU to the Council for its review and comment in sufficient time so that the views of the Council may be reflected in the draft MOU to be presented to the seventh session of the COP for its consideration in 2005;

- (e) invites Council Members to submit to the Secretariat any comments that they may have on the draft Memorandum of Understanding between the COP to the Stockholm Convention and the GEF Council by December 31, 2003, so that the GEF Secretariat can reflect Members' views in its collaboration with the Convention Secretariat to revise the draft MOU;
- (f) also invites Council Members to submit to the Secretariat by December 31, 2003, any comments that they may have on the elements of the terms of reference for the review of the financial mechanism by the COP to the Stockholm Convention (see document UNEP/POPS/INC.7/24 on the website www.pops.int) so that the GEF Secretariat can reflect Members' views in its consultations with the Convention Secretariat on the preparation of draft terms of reference for the review of the financial mechanism;
- (g) agrees that eligibility for POPs enabling activities should be extended to developing countries and countries with economies in transition that are in the process of becoming Parties to the Stockholm Convention; and
- (h) requests the GEF Secretariat to seek further information and justification from the Secretariat of the Vienna Convention and its Montreal Protocol as to why South Africa, as a developing country, cannot seek financing from the Multilateral Fund of the Montreal Protocol for the phase out of methyl bromide. In presenting this information to the Council, the Secretariat is also requested to provide information on the needs of South Africa, including the types of activities and technology that would need to be financed, the cost of those activities, and information on how such resources might be accommodated within the resource targets for GEF 3 presented in the business plan.

Decision on Agenda Item 8

Work Program

11. The Council reviewed the proposed Work Program submitted to Council in document GEF/C.22/5 and approves it¹ subject to comments made during the Council meeting and

¹ One Council Member, in light of national legislation regarding its country's voting position for development projects financed by certain development institutions, opposed the following project proposals: *Cuba: Generation and Delivery of Renewable Energy Based Modern Energy Services in Cuba; the Case of Isla de la Juventud; Regional: Towards a Convention and Action Program for the Protection of the Caspian Sea Environment, Phase II*

additional comments that may be submitted to the Secretariat by close of business December 5, 2003.

12. The Council also reviewed the project, *Global: Building Capacity for Effective Participation in the Biosafety Clearing House (BCH) of the Cartagena Protocol*, that was originally included in the Intersessional Work Program circulated to the Council on July 25, 2003.

13. The Council finds that, with the exception of:

- (a) Chile: Conserving Globally Significant Biodiversity along the Chilean Coast (UNDP)
- (b) China: Hai River Basin Integrated Water Resources Management (World Bank);
- (c) Vietnam: Forest Sector Development Project (World Bank)
- (d) Global: Building Capacity for Effective Participation in the Biosafety Clearing House of the Cartagena Protocol (UNEP)
- (e) Global: Fuel Cells Financing Initiative for Distributed Generation Applications (World Bank/IFC);

projects presented to it as part of the work program (i) are or would be consistent with the Instrument and GEF policies and procedures and (ii) may be endorsed by the CEO for final approval by the Implementing Agency, provided that the CEO circulates to the Council Members, prior to endorsement, draft final project documents fully incorporating the Council's comments on the work program accompanied by a satisfactory explanation by the CEO of how such comments and comments of the STAP reviewer have been addressed and a confirmation by the CEO that the project continues to be consistent with the Instrument and GEF policies and procedures.

14. With respect to the projects specified above, the Council requests the Secretariat to arrange for Council Members to receive the draft final project document for each project and to transmit to the CEO within four weeks any concerns they may have prior to the CEO endorsing the project document for final approval by the Implementing Agency. Such projects may be reviewed at a subsequent Council meeting at the request of at least four Council Members.

Decision on Agenda Item 9

GEF Business Plan FY05-07

15. The Council, having reviewed document GEF/C.22/6, *GEF Business Plan FY05-07*, takes note of the business plan, without approving it, and of comments made by the Council at the meeting, as a provisional basis for programming of GEF resources, taking into account other

(due to financing for Iran); and *Global: Add-on for Development of National Biosafety Frameworks Project* (due to financing for Libya).

related decisions of the Council. The Council requests the GEF Secretariat to prepare a proposed GEF Business Plan FY06-08 for Council review at its meeting in November 2004.

Decision on Agenda Item 10

Action Plan

16. The Council reviewed the *Action Plan to Respond to Recommendations for Improving GEF's Performance*, document GEF/C.22/7, and invites Council Members to submit written comments on the plan to the Secretariat by December 19, 2003. The Council requests the Secretariat to revise the Action Plan on the basis of the comments received and to circulate the revised Action Plan to the Council for approval by mail.

Decision on Agenda Item 11

Strategic Approach to Enhance Capacity Building

17. The Council, having reviewed document GEF/C.22/8, *Strategic Approach to Enhancing Capacity Building*, approves the strategic approach and requests the GEF Secretariat, in collaboration with the Implementing Agencies and the monitoring and evaluation unit, to undertake further work to operationalize it. This will include the development of:

- (a) targets and indicators for measuring results and impacts of capacity building activities;
- (b) operational modalities and project criteria for the implementation of the strategic approach, including for the enhancement of capacity building components within GEF projects and for country capacity building programs for LDCs and SIDS; and
- (c) proposals for Council consideration for a technical support program.

18. The GEF Secretariat is requested to report to the Council at its meeting in May 2004, and regularly thereafter, on the development and implementation of the strategic approach.

Decision on Agenda Item 12

Progress of the Monitoring and Evaluation Unit

19. The Council, having reviewed document GEF/C.22/9, *Progress Report on the Monitoring and Evaluation Unit*, takes note of the progress made under the Monitoring and Evaluation work program since the last meeting. The Council requests the independent GEF M&E Director to prepare for consideration at its meeting in May 2004 a four year rolling M&E work plan together with an annual work program and budget, taking into account the terms of reference for the monitoring and evaluation unit approved in July 2003. The Director is requested to include in the work plan steps to develop procedures to clarify how the monitoring and evaluation unit relates to the Council and the GEF family, including a process for management responses to its reports, and proposals addressing how monitoring and evaluation products are to be applied within the GEF. The work plan should also include steps to ensure implementation of the policy decisions related to monitoring and evaluation from the third replenishment of the GEF Trust Fund.

20. The Council having reviewed document GEF/C.22/10, *Third Study of GEF's Overall Performance (OPS 3) – Evaluative Framework*, agrees that the study should be prepared by an independent team of evaluators as was done for OPS1 and OPS2. The Council also agrees that the terms of reference for OPS3 should be concluded as early as possible in 2004 and should include information on the process for selecting the independent team of evaluators and on how the study should be conducted. The Council welcomes the offer of the Council Member from Canada to take a lead in preparing the terms of reference. The Canadian Council Member is requested to consult with the other Council Members, the GEF monitoring and evaluation unit, and the GEF Secretariat in carrying out this task. The Council requests the Secretariat to circulate the proposed terms of reference to all Council Members for approval by mail by February 1, 2004.

21. The Council, having reviewed document GEF/C.22/11, *Performance-Based Framework for Allocation of GEF Resources*, expresses its appreciation for the work carried out by the Technical Working Group to prepare the paper, which is a good step towards improving the performance of the system. The Council agrees that the Secretariat should work to develop a GEF-wide system based on global environmental priorities and country-level performance relevant to those priorities. In this regard, the Council requests the Secretariat to present to the May 2004 Council meeting a study of options to strengthen the current system of allocating GEF resources with a view to coming to a conclusion in November 2004. The system should be consistent with the GEF Instrument, the environmental conventions for which the GEF is a financial mechanism, the Policy Recommendations of the Third Replenishment, Council decisions at the October 2002 meeting, and the Beijing Assembly Declaration.

22. In developing these options, the Secretariat shall consult with the Implementing and Executing Agencies, and member countries, and should consider the principles of simplicity, transparency, pragmatism, cost-effectiveness, comprehensiveness, country-drivenness, and equal opportunity for all recipient countries to have access to GEF resources. The Secretariat should include in the next document estimates of cost associated with each option.

23. The Council approves an addition to the GEF Secretariat Corporate budget of \$360,000 for expenses to be incurred over FY04. These resources will be used to finance consultants and to commission external studies. The Council requests the Secretariat to make provision for developing and maintaining the performance-based system in future budget requests, as necessary.

24. The Council, having reviewed document GEF/C.22/12, *Review of Experience of Executing Agencies under Expanded Opportunities*, notes the progress that has been made and

approves the following changes to the policy: (i) all executing agencies acting under the policy (Executing Agencies) and acting within their agreed scope for GEF operations will be given *direct access* to GEF resources for the implementation of GEF projects (medium and full size projects); and (ii) on a case-by-case basis, the CEO may approve *PDF-A grants* for the development of eligible concepts by an Executing Agency.

25. The Council requests the Secretariat and the Trustee to take immediate steps to negotiate with the Executing Agencies the agreements necessary to ensure their direct access to GEF resources. The Secretariat, Trustee and Executing Agencies are requested to aim to complete these agreements by May 2004.

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

Decision on Agenda Item 16

Note on Collaboration with the Commission on Sustainable Development

27. The Council, having reviewed the *Note on Collaboration with the Commission on Sustainable Development*, GEF/C.22/13, approves the proposals contained therein for GEF activities related to the CSD meeting to be held in New York, April 2004. The Council requests the Secretariat to consult with the Secretariat of the CSD on strengthening the collaboration between the GEF and the CSD, taking into account the CSD future program and organization of work, and to report back to the Council at its meeting in May 2004 on the outcomes of those discussions and follow-up proposals.

Decision on Agenda Item 17

Initial Proposals for the Process of Selecting CEO/Chairman of the Facility

28. The Council, having reviewed document GEF/C.22/14, *Initial Proposals concerning the Process for Selection of the CEO/Chairman of the Facility*, underscores that the process should be built upon the principles of transparency of information throughout the process, objectivity in applying clear selection criteria approved by all and independence of the selection process. The Council requests the Secretariat to prepare a revised proposal on the basis of the discussions during the Council meeting. The revised proposal should be submitted to the Council for its review and approval in May 2004.

29. The Council confirms the following constituency groupings:

- (a) Azerbaijan, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyz Republic, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, and Uzbekistan;
- (b) Afghanistan, Jordan, Lebanon, Pakistan, Syria and Yemen;
- (c) Botswana, Lesotho, Malawi, Mozambique, Namibia, South Africa, Swaziland, Zambia, and Zimbabwe;
- (d) Comoros, Djibouti, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Kenya, Madagascar, Mauritius, Rwanda, Seychelles, Sudan, Tanzania, and Uganda.

HIGHLIGHTS OF COUNCIL'S DISCUSSIONS

30. The following comments, understandings and clarification were made during the Council's discussions of its agenda items and related decision.

Agenda Item 6 Appointment of Independent Monitoring and Evaluation Coordinator

31. The Council underscored the importance that it attaches to this position and stressed that its priority concern was to ensure that the right candidate is appointed to the position. The Council also emphasized that transparency of the process continues to be essential, and it requested the CEO/Chairman to keep it informed of the steps he plans to follow and the status of the process.

Agenda Item 7 Relations with Conventions

32. The Council emphasized the importance of interlinkages and synergies among the conventions, and requested the GEF Secretariat, in collaboration with the Implementing Agencies and the Convention Secretariats, to facilitate the implementation of projects and programs based on a synergistic approach among the conventions.

33. It was noted that the types of projects highlighted by the UN Forum on Forests for possible GEF consideration were examples of projects that would address synergies among the conventions.

34. The Council noted the importance of capacity building for the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety, particularly with respect to the Biosafety Clearing House.

35. A Council Member highlighted the importance of the target set by WSSD and the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity for a significant reduction in the current rate of loss of biological diversity.

36. Another Council member highlighted the importance of national systems of protected areas and the sustainable use of biological resources within the context of reducing poverty and increasing conservation of biodiversity.
37. The Council urged the Implementing and Executing Agencies to collaborate with countries in formulating projects under the operational program on sustainable land management.
38. The Council recommended that the MOU to be developed with the Secretariat of the UNCCD should seek to clarify the role of the Convention's Global Mechanism and that of the GEF as a financial mechanism of the Convention.
39. The Council noted that it recognized that South Africa, as a developing country, should be eligible for assistance to phase out the use of methyl bromide consistent with the Montreal Protocol. The Council, however, did not fully understand why such financing should be provided by the GEF, and it requested that the Council be provided with a fuller explanation as to why the Multilateral Fund could not finance South Africa's request.

Agenda Item 8 Work Program

40. The Council remarked on a number of trends in the work program. The Council welcomed the encouraging trend of a lower fee ratio and requested that efforts be made to maintain this trend. One Council Member expressed concern over the increasing number of global projects in the work program and requested the Secretariat to keep a more reasonable balance between country level projects and global projects. Another Council Member voiced concern over the decreasing trend in cofinancing and asked that more attention be given to encouraging cofinancing.
41. The Council welcomed the executive summaries of the projects as a tool for expediting its review of the projects, and it requested the Secretariat to work with the Implementing and Executing Agencies to improve the quality and consistency of the summaries.
42. While the Council welcomed the improvement in incorporating result measurements in the design of projects, it was requested that the project review criteria be adjusted to ensure that adequate monitoring and evaluation frameworks and indicators were in place by the time of Council approval of a project proposal.
43. The Council requested the Secretariat to make available more accessible information on the GEF project cycle and how to access GEF resources.
44. The Council requested the Secretariat to submit to the Council in November 2004 a first annual report on projects that had been cancelled or terminated before completion. The report should include information on the status of the funds and fees approved for such projects.
45. Another Council Member requested that OP7 be reviewed to determine whether GEF should be supporting large projects under this OP.

46. The GEF Secretariat and the Implementing Agencies were requested to give more attention to the private sector and local community involvement in the projects. They were also encouraged to look more closely at outcomes and impacts and to make better use of the STAP reviews.

47. It was requested that, in light of limited resources and the GEF's expanded mandate, the concepts of incremental costs and global environmental effectiveness be given priority.

Agenda Item 9 GEF Business Plan FY05-07

48. The Council welcomed the resources included in the Business Plan for capacity building and adaptation although it recognized that it was not possible on the basis of current experience to predetermine an overall, static target for resources to be allocated to capacity building.

49. Several Council Members commented on the need for a review of the Secretariat's staffing situation and requested that the review address efficiency, critical needs, potential savings, current constraints, prioritization of tasks, staffing levels, and the division of work between the Secretariat and the Implementing and Executing Agencies.

50. With regard to the proposed reviews of agency performance, one Council Member suggested adding criteria on disbursements and on the agency's ability to incorporate lessons learned in the regular work program, the use of monitoring and evaluation frameworks and the adequacy of project oversight and management.

51. Several Council Members noted the strong link between the Action Plan and the Business Plan.

52. The importance of a centralized and strengthened communication strategy and knowledge management was emphasized.

53. One Council Member noted that the strategic priorities should always be checked against their contribution to achieving global environmental benefits and financing of incremental costs.

54. One Council Member emphasized the need to strengthen adaptation activities and suggested that the amount allocated under the business plan for piloting adaptation projects should be increased. Operationalization of the new strategic priority should be expedited.

55. It was requested that Table 2 of the business plan include information on the resources already approved under each priority in previous fiscal years and how and if the targets of the previous business plan have been met. It was also requested that explanations be provided in the business plan if allocations among the strategic priorities are changed.

56. Several Council Members highlighted the need to continue work on streamlining and simplifying the project cycle and clarifying procedures for project approval.

57. Proposals to undertake further work on strengthening of national focal points and constituency relations were welcomed.

Agenda Item 10

Action Plan

58. It was recommended that actions to improve country performance be linked to national environmental action plans and PRSPs. It was also recommended that the GEF work with other donors at the country level to integrate environmental priorities into national development programs and budgets.

59. The Secretariat was requested to prioritize the proposed actions. It was also requested to include in the action plan an identification of the entity with a lead role for the action, required financial resources, and a proposed date for completion.

Agenda Item 11

Strategic Approach to Enhance Capacity Building

60. The Council requested the GEF Secretariat and the Implementing Agencies to facilitate assistance to all eligible countries for the preparation of national capacity needs self assessments (NCSA) given their importance in assisting countries to identify priority capacity building activities.

61. The Council agreed that whenever possible capacity building should be integrated with other GEF project activities.

62. The Council stressed the need for the development of indicators to measure results and impacts, including the sustainability of the capacity built.

63. The Council underlined the importance of capacity building across focal areas as a means of promoting synergies among the conventions. It was also noted that capacity building should be provided to strengthen policy planning and project cycle management.

64. It was agreed that the level of support for capacity building should not be preset or anticipated in the strategy but rather should be determined on the basis of country needs and the evolving approach to country-based allocations.

65. Several Council Members noted the importance of capacity building in implementing the environmental initiative of NEPAD and urged the GEF to be a partner in these efforts.

66. One Council Member requested the GEF to provide clear guidance to assist countries to develop and implement free standing capacity building projects.

67. It was noted that cofinancing of capacity building projects by governments and Implementing and Executing Agencies would increase ownership of the project, and it was recommended that minimum cofinancing ratios for capacity building projects be defined.

68. The capacity building strategy should include a participatory approach to ensure that the priorities and capacity building needs of civil society are addressed.

Agenda Item 12

Progress of the Monitoring and Evaluation Unit

69. The Council noted that the regular report of the monitoring and evaluation unit to the Council should be more analytical, should identify the main findings of the monitoring and evaluation unit and how this knowledge has been used in the GEF family, and should include concrete recommendations.

70. One Council Member suggested that consideration be given to a systematic “cleaning” of the GEF portfolio on the basis of agreed criteria to identify projects that should be closed or proposals that should be terminated so as to prevent GEF resources from being frozen for non-performing projects or proposals.

71. One Council Member requested more information from the Implementing Agencies on their systems for identifying at risk projects and requested the monitoring and evaluation unit to assess those systems. It was also noted that the Council should be able to propose directly to the monitoring and evaluation unit certain projects for evaluation by the unit.

72. It was suggested that the monitoring and evaluation unit consolidate its work, and it was recommended that the Council discuss matters related to monitoring and evaluation earlier in the agenda, before consideration of the work program and business plan.

Agenda Item 13

Third Study of GEF’s Overall Performance

73. The Council supported the objectives and scope of work proposed in document GEF/C.22/10 and agreed that OPS3 should be focused on the performance, impacts, efficiency and sustainability of GEF activities.

74. The team should include experts with knowledge and experience in carrying out evaluations as well as technical specialists. In formulating the team, consideration should be given to geographical and gender balance.

75. The process for preparing OPS3 should provide for regional consultations and the involvement of local and regional consultants.

76. In carrying out the evaluation, the team should consult with member countries, including organized civil society and indigenous people in the countries, so that their views may be taken into account in the evaluation.

Agenda Item 14

Performance Based Framework for Allocating GEF Resources

77. The Council supported the goal of improving performance and efficiency in order to enhance the results and impacts achieved by GEF resources.

78. The Council recalled that a performance based allocation system should reflect the unique nature of the GEF, its mandate to provide financing for incremental costs of achieving global environmental benefits, and its role as a financial mechanism of the global environmental conventions.

79. Concern was expressed that the system not be exclusive nor a barrier to assisting less developed countries to improve their performance through capacity building.

80. The system should be simple and should not increase the bureaucracy and complexity of the GEF.

81. A number of Council Members requested that the Secretariat include in its work consideration of how to accommodate in the system regional and global projects, the private sector and civil society.

82. The Council noted that the system is not the same as eligibility criteria. A basic principle of the system should be equal opportunity for all recipient countries to have access to GEF resources.

83. Several Council Members expressed their support for the letter from the Chairman of the Group of 77, circulated as document GEF/C.22/Misc.1, presenting the group's serious concern about any system that might fundamentally change the nature and objectives of the GEF.

Agenda Item 15

Review of Experience with Executing Agencies under Expanded Opportunities

84. The Council noted its expectation that the inclusion of more Executing Agencies with direct access should result in higher quality projects, lower fees, a more efficient use of GEF resources and enhanced coherence and coordination of the GEF mechanism.

85. The Council requested the Secretariat and the Executing Agencies to make efforts at the country level to inform governments and other stakeholders of the opportunities to work with the GEF. In this regard, the Secretariat was requested to encourage national focal points to invite the Executing Agencies to country workshops and consultations

86. The Council called upon the Executing Agencies to ensure that GEF resources are used efficiently and effectively.

87. The Secretariat was requested to apply to the Executing Agencies the targets to be established for Implementing Agency commitment and mainstreaming described in the business plan. It was suggested that reporting on the achievement of the proposed targets may be in the form of a score card of performance indicators.

88. One Council Member requested the Secretariat to examine options for restructuring the corporate budget for May 2004.

Agenda Item 16

Note on Collaboration with the Commission on Sustainable Development

89. The Council strongly supported strengthened collaboration between the GEF and the CSD. Several Council Members suggested that this collaboration should also be reflected at the country level and called upon the national focal points for CSD and the GEF focal points to seek ways to share information and knowledge with a view to illustrating what results are being achieved through projects at the country level.

90. It was noted that the GEF's comparative advantage is in contributing lessons learned and knowledge from its successes and failures in implementing on-the-ground activities relevant to the policy work of the CSD.

Agenda Item 17

Initial Proposals for the Process of Selecting CEO/Chairman of the Facility

91. One Council Member thought the proposed timeframe to consult on the appointment/reappointment of the CEO was too long. The more important issue was to deepen consultations.

92. Many Council Members supported the proposal to amend the Instrument to provide for a four year term for the CEO that would be renewable only once. It was noted that this would require an amendment to the Instrument.

93. One Council Member requested more clarity on the appointment and role of an outside firm, and underlined the principle of casting the net widely for applicants.

94. Several Council Members proposed that the period in which the selection committee could add outside names should be concurrent with the period for advertising the position. Once a short list was established, it should not be changed.

95. Several Council Members invited the Secretariat to be more expansive in proposing options for the selection process, including options that would assign a greater role to the Council.

Agenda Item 19

Other Business

96. A number of Council Members indicated that they will be submitting written comments on document GEF/C.22/Inf.4, *Operational Program on Persistent Organic Pollutants*. The Secretariat was requested to take these comments fully into account in revising the operational program.

97. The Council Member from Germany announced her country's contribution of 15 million Euro to the Least Developed Countries Trust Fund for Climate Change.

98. A number of Council Members addressed the difficulties for national focal points and constituencies to be fully involved in the GEF and requested that consideration be given to strengthening GEF support for focal points and constituency consultations.

99. One Council Member suggested that the Secretariat explore ways beyond documents to display projects, good practices and lessons learned at Council meetings.

100. The Secretariat was requested to explore the issue of wider translation of Council documentation and to report back to the Council. The Secretariat was also requested to ensure that all documentation for Council meetings is circulated in advance of the meetings as provided for in the Council's rules of procedure.

Agenda Item 20 Joint Summary of the Chairs

CLOSURE OF THE MEETING

101. The meeting was closed by the Chairs on November 21, 2003.