



# Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity

22 May 2007  
International Day for Biological Diversity



Biodiversity and Climate Change

Ref.: SCBD/ITS/YX/60872

22 November 2007

## NOTIFICATION

### **Outcomes of the thirty-second meeting of the Council of the Global Environment Facility Washington DC, USA, 14-16 November 2007**

Dear Madam/Sir,

The purpose of this notification is to convey, for your information, the outcomes of the thirty-second meeting of the Council of the Global Environment Facility (GEF) - the designated institutional structure operating the financial mechanism of the Convention.

In this meeting, the GEF Council has taken decisions on the following matters, among others:

- Relations with conventions and other institutions
- Adaptation Fund of the Kyoto Protocol
- Evaluation Office progress report
- Evaluation of the Small Grants Programme and management response
- GEF annual report on impact 2007
- Terms of reference for the mid-term review of the Resource Mobilization Framework (RAF)
- Work program, including three programmatic approaches
- Operational policies and guidelines for the use of non-grant instruments in the GEF
- GEF communications and outreach strategy

The full text of the above decisions and highlights of the Council's discussions are enclosed hereto. The statement delivered by the Executive Secretary is available at the CBD website.

It must be noted that the Chairperson of the Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel of the GEF commended the convening of the chairs of the scientific bodies of the biodiversity related conventions held in Paris on 1 July 2007 in conjunction with SBSTTA 12.

Please accept, Madam/Sir, the assurances of my highest consideration.

Ahmed Djoghlaif  
Executive Secretary

### **Enclosures**

To: CBD National Focal Points





# Global Environment Facility

November 19, 2007

---

## JOINT SUMMARY OF THE CHAIRS GEF COUNCIL MEETING NOVEMBER 14-16, 2007

### OPENING OF THE MEETING

1. The meeting was opened by Ms. Monique Barbut, Chief Executive Officer/Chairperson of the Facility.

### ELECTION OF A CHAIRPERSON

2. The Council elected Mr. Gerben de Jong, the Council Member representing the Netherlands as its elected Co-Chair.

### ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

3. The Council approved the provisional agenda set forth in document GEF/C.32/1/Rev.3.

### REPORT BY THE CHAIR OF STAP

4. Ms. Yolanda Kakabadse, Chair of STAP, reported on the restructuring of STAP and the activities of STAP.

### STATEMENTS BY THE REPRESENTATIVES OF THE SECRETARIATS OF THE UNITED NATIONS CONVENTION ON BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY, UNITED NATIONS CONVENTION TO COMBAT DESERTIFICATION, AND THE OZONE SECRETARIAT OF THE MONTREAL PROTOCOL

5. The Council heard statements from Mr. Yibin Xiang, presenting a message on behalf of Mr. Ahmed Djoghlaflaf, the Executive Secretary of the Convention, Mr. Luc Gnacadja, the new Executive Secretary of the UN Convention to Combat Desertification, and Mr. Paul Horwitz, Deputy Executive Secretary of the Ozone Secretariat of the Montreal Protocol. Printed versions of the statements of Mr. Djoghlaflaf and Mr. Gnacadja were made available at the Council meeting.

### DECISIONS

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

#### *Decision on Agenda Item 6 Relations with Conventions and other Institutions*

7. The Council considered document GEF/C.32/4, *Relations with the Conventions and Other International Institutions*, and welcomes the proposed guidance and decisions that have been approved by the Conferences of the Parties to the global environmental conventions.

The Council requests the Secretariat and the GEF Agencies to continue to work with recipient countries to reflect the guidance and national priorities in their GEF programming and activities.

*Decision on Agenda Item 7 Adaptation Fund of the Kyoto Protocol*

8. The Council, having reviewed document GEF/C.32/5/Rev.1, *Note on the Adaptation Fund*, takes note of the information included in it and endorses the recommendation that the GEF continue to adopt a flexible approach to the establishment and operationalization of the Adaptation Fund in response to decisions by the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol (COP/MOP).

9. The Council notes the progress achieved by the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol in negotiating an agreement on the Adaptation Fund.

10. The Council authorizes the GEF CEO and Chair to communicate to the Conference of the Parties, serving as the meeting of the Parties of the Kyoto Protocol at its Third session to be held in Bali in December 2007, based on the principles in the decision 5/CMP.2, the GEF's flexibility, including as to the governance of the Adaptation Fund, and the GEF's willingness to support a COP/MOP decision, should one be made, requesting the GEF Secretariat to function as the Secretariat of the Adaptation Fund.

*Decision on Agenda Item 8 Evaluation Office Progress Report*

11. The Council, having reviewed document GEF/ME/C.32/1, *GEF Evaluation Office: Progress Report of the Evaluation Director*, takes note of the on-going work on the evaluation of Capacity Development and requests the Office to incorporate appropriate methodology in the upcoming focal area evaluations. On the International Workshop on Evaluating Climate Change and Development, the Council requests the Office to take into account the comments of the Council in its further preparations of the Workshop.

*Agenda Item 9 Evaluation of the Small Grants Programme and Management Response*

12. The Council, having reviewed Document GEF/ME/C.32/2, *Joint Evaluation of the Small Grants Programme – Executive Version*, as well as Document GEF/ME/C.32/3, *Management Response to the Joint Evaluation of the Small Grants Programme*, takes note of the conclusions and recommendations and requests the SGP Steering Committee to implement the recommendations by:

- (a) Proposing a level of management costs on the basis of services rendered and cost-efficiency rather than on the basis of a stated percentage.
- (b) Starting a process to change SGP's central management system suitable for the new phase of growth and to address the risks of growing complexity.
- (c) Strengthening country programme oversight.
- (d) Further strengthening Monitoring and Evaluation.

- (e) Proposing a revision of the current criteria for access to SGP resources to maintain cost efficiency.
- (f) Further developing a graduation policy for the SGP country programmes which takes into account the identified risks to GEF achievements and cost effectiveness, especially in SIDS and LDCs.

13. Council requests the SGP Steering Committee to report for decision of the Council on the actions taken to implement the recommendations at the April 2008 Council Meeting.

*Decision on Agenda Item 10 GEF Annual Report on Impact 2007 – Executive Version*

14. The Council, having reviewed Document GEF/ME/C.32/4, *GEF Annual Report on Impact 2007 – Executive Version*, as well as GEF/ME/C.32/5 *Management Response to the GEF Annual Report on Impact 2007*, takes note of the Annual Report's conclusions and requests the GEF Secretariat to incorporate its recommendations into project preparation and to ensure adequate monitoring of progress towards institutional continuity, and requests the Evaluation Office to continue its program of Impact Evaluation as proposed.

*Decision on Agenda Item 11 Terms of Reference for the mid-term review of RAF*

15. The Council having reviewed Document GEF/ME/C.32/6, *Terms of Reference for the Mid-term Review of the RAF*, approves the terms of reference, subject to comments made at the Council meeting, which will be reflected in revised Terms of Reference to be circulated by the GEF Evaluation Office. The Council also approves US\$ 500,000.00 as “special initiative” fund for the GEF Evaluation Office to cover the expenses for the mid-term review.

*Decision on Agenda Item 12 Work Program*

16. The Council reviewed the proposed work program submitted to Council in document GEF/C.32/6/Rev.1 and approves it (with a total in GEF financing of \$237.46 million), subject to comments made during the Council meeting and additional comments that may be submitted to the Secretariat by November 30, 2007.

17. The approved work program is comprised of 26 free-standing Project Identification Forms (PIFs) and three programmatic approaches, which contain 14 PIFs as follows:

**Free-Standing PIFs**

*Biodiversity*

- **Regional (Pakistan, Sri Lanka, Vietnam)** : Development and Application of Decision-support Tools to Conserve and Sustainably use Genetic Diversity in Indigenous Livestock and Wild Relatives (UNEP) (GEF Grant : \$ 1.98 m)
- **Brazil** : Rio Grande Do Sul Biodiversity Conservation (World Bank) (GEF Grant : \$ 5.00 m)
- **Brazil** : Espirito Santo Biodiversity and Watershed Conservation and Restoration Project (World Bank) (GEF Grant : \$ 4.00 m)

- **Chile** : Building a Comprehensive National Protected Areas System: A Financial and Operational Framework (UNDP) (GEF Grant : \$ 5.00 m)
- **Ecuador** : Management of Chimborazo's Natural Resources (World Bank) (GEF Grant : \$ 3.90 m)
- **Indonesia** : Citarum Watershed Management and Biodiversity Conservation Project (ADB) (GEF Grant : \$ 3.75 m)
- **Peru** : Strengthening Biodiversity Conservation through the National Protected Areas Program (World Bank) (GEF Grant : \$ 8.89 m)
- **Ukraine** : Strengthening Governance and Financial Sustainability of the National Protected Area System (UNDP) (GEF Grant : \$ 1.80 m)

### *Climate Change*

- **Global** : Global Market Transformation for Efficient Lighting (UNEP/UNDP) (GEF Grant : \$ 5.00 m)
- **China** : Enabling China to Prepare Its Second National Communications to UNFCCC (UNDP) (GEF Grant : \$ 5.00 m)
- **China** : Market Transformation of Energy-Efficient Bricks and Rural Buildings (MTEBRB) (UNDP) (GEF Grant : \$ 7.00 m)
- **China** : Thermal Power Efficiency (World Bank) (GEF Grant : \$ 19.70 m)
- **India** : Sustainable Urban Transport Project (World Bank/UNDP) (GEF Grant : \$ 22.50 m)
- **Indonesia** : Geothermal Power Generation Development Program (World Bank) (GEF Grant : \$ 4.00 m)
- **Indonesia** : Micro-turbine Cogeneration Technology Application Project (MCTAP) (UNDP) (GEF Grant : \$ 2.59 m)
- **Thailand** : Promoting Renewable Energy in Mae Hong Son Province (UNDP) (GEF Grant : \$ 2.99 m)
- **Global (Yemen)** : Adaptation to Climate Change Using Agrobiodiversity Resources in the Rainfed Highlands of Yemen (World Bank) (GEF Grant : \$ 4.00 m)

### *International Waters*

- **Regional (Angola, Namibia, South Africa)** : Implementation of the Benguela Current LME Action Program for Restoring Depleted Fisheries and Reducing Coastal Resources Degradation (UNDP) (GEF Grant : \$ 5.14 m)
- **Regional (Antigua And Barbuda, Bahamas, Barbados, Belize, Brazil, Colombia, Costa Rica, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Guatemala, Grenada, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Jamaica, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, St. Kitts And Nevis, St. Lucia, St. Vincent and Grenadines, Suriname, Trinidad and Tobago)** : Sustainable Management of the Shared Marine Resources of the Caribbean Large Marine Ecosystem (CLME) and Adjacent Regions (UNDP) (GEF Grant : \$ 7.08 m)
- **Regional (Bolivia, Brazil, Colombia, Ecuador, Guyana, Peru, Suriname, Venezuela)**: Integrated and Sustainable Management of Transboundary Water Resources in the Amazon River Basin Considering Climate Variability and Change (UNEP) (GEF Grant : \$ 7.00 m)

### *Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs)*

- **Ghana** : Capacity Building for PCB Elimination (UNDP) (GEF Grant : \$ 3.50 m)
- **Mexico** : Environmentally Sound Management and Destruction of PCBs (UNDP) (GEF Grant : \$ 4.63 m)
- **Morocco** : Safe Management and Disposal of PCBs (UNDP/UNIDO) (GEF Grant : \$ 4.76 m)
- **Russian Federation** : Building the Capacity of the Russian Federation to Implement the Stockholm Convention on POPs and Develop a National Implementation Plan (UNEP) (GEF Grant : \$ 1.44 m)<sup>1</sup>
- **Tunisia** : Demonstrating and Promoting Best Techniques and Practices for Managing Healthcare Waste and PCBs (World Bank) (GEF Grant : \$ 5.50 m)
- **Vietnam** : Building Capacity to Eliminate POPs Pesticides Stockpiles (UNDP) (GEF Grant : \$ 4.30 m)

### **Programmatic Approaches**

18. The Council, having reviewed the three Programmatic Approaches, identified below, endorses the overall objectives and scope of the Approaches and approves the associated PIFs presented in this work program as follows:

#### *China Biodiversity Partnership Framework for Action*

- **China** : CBPF Conservation and Sustainable Use of Biodiversity in the Headwaters of the Huaihe River Basin (UNDP) (GEF Grant : \$ 2.73 m)
- **China** : CBPF Priority Institutional Strengthening and Capacity Development to Implement the China Biodiversity Partnership and Framework for Action (UNDP) (GEF Grant : \$ 4.54 m)
- **China** : CBPF Shaanxi Qinling Mountains Integrated Ecosystem Development (ADB) (GEF Grant : \$ 4.27 m)

#### *Sustainable Forest Management (SFM)*

- **Brazil** : SFM Catalyzing the Contribution of Indigenous Lands to the Conservation of Brazil's Forest Ecosystems (UNDP) (GEF Grant: \$ 6.00 m)
- **Mongolia**: SFM Forest Landscapes Development and Conservation (World Bank) (GEF Grant: \$ 1.73 m)
- **Russian Federation** : SFM - Strengthening Protected Area System of the Komi Republic to Conserve Virgin Forest Biodiversity in the Pechora River Headwaters Region (UNDP) (GEF Grant: \$ 4.50 m)
- **Tanzania**: SFM Extending the Coastal Forest Protected Area Subsystem (UNDP) (GEF Grant: \$ 3.55 m)

---

<sup>1</sup> This project will not be CEO endorsed until Russia deposits its Instrument of Ratification to the Stockholm Convention with the United Nations in New York.

- **Global** : SFM Carbon Benefits Project (CBP): Modeling, Measurement, and Monitoring (UNEP/World Bank) (GEF Grant: \$ 5.00 m)
- **Regional (Indonesia, Malaysia, Philippines, Thailand, Vietnam, Singapore, Brunei)** : SFM Rehabilitation and Sustainable Use of Peatland Forests in South-East Asia (IFAD) (GEF Grant: \$ 4.51 m)
- **Indonesia** : SFM Strengthening Community Based Forest and Watershed Management (SCBFWM) (UNDP) (GEF Grant: \$ 7.00 m)
- **Iran** : SFM Rehabilitation of Forest Landscapes and Degraded Land with Particular Attention to Saline Soils and Areas Prone to Wind Erosion (FAO) (GEF Grant : \$ 2.67 m)<sup>2</sup>
- **Paraguay**: SFM Improving the Conservation of Biodiversity in Atlantic Forest of Eastern Paraguay (World Bank) (GEF Grant: \$ 4.50 m)

*India Country Partnership Program: Sustainable Land and Ecosystem Management (SLEM)*

- **India**: SLEM/PPP-Sustainable Land Management in Shifting Cultivation Areas of Nagaland for Ecological and Livelihood Security (UNDP) (GEF Grant: \$3.6 m)
- **India**: SLEM/PPP-Sustainable Rural Livelihood Security through Innovations in Land and Ecosystem Management (World Bank) (GEF Grant: \$10 m)

19. For all programmatic approaches, the Council requests that future PIFs financed under these programmatic approaches be included in work programs submitted to the Council for approval.

20. With respect to any PIF approved in this work program, either under one of the programmatic approaches or as a stand alone PIF, the Council requests the Secretariat to arrange for Council Members to receive a copy of the draft final project document that is submitted to the CEO for endorsement. Council Members may transmit to the CEO within four weeks any concern they may have prior to the CEO endorsing a project document for final approval by a GEF Agency.

21. With respect to the **Regional (Botswana, Lesotho, Namibia, South Africa)** : *Development and Adoption of a Strategic Action Program for Balancing Water Uses and Sustainable Natural Resource Management in the Orange-Senqu River Transboundary Basin* project, the Council withholds its approval of the project pending resolution of the project financing issues. When the issues are resolved, the project may be resubmitted.

*Decision on Agenda Item 13*

*Operational Policies and Guidelines for the Use of Non-Grant Instruments in the GEF*

22. The Council, having reviewed document GEF/C.32/7, *The Use of Non-Grant Instruments in GEF Projects: Update*, requests the Agencies to track by type of financing all projects that provide non-grant financing, and to notify the Secretariat and the Trustee about any project that may generate reflows of funds to them and/or to the GEF Trust Fund.

---

<sup>2</sup> The Council Member representing the United States of America, in light of its national legislation regarding its country's voting position for development projects financed by certain development institutions, opposed this project.

23. The Council requests the Secretariat, in collaboration with the Trustee, the World Bank and the Regional Development Banks, and in consultation with the other Agencies, (a) to determine where the use of non-grant instruments would enhance the function of the GEF, with reference to the focal area strategies, and (b) to develop operational policies and guidance for the use of non-grant instruments, and to report to the next Council meeting in April 2008 for decision. Emphasis should be put in particular on (a) the use of GEF grants to provide concessional loans through blending, (b) the listing of non-grant instruments other than loans that can be used with GEF resources and (c) the list of Agencies authorized to use the different kinds of non-grant instruments.

24. The Council endorses the two ground rules specified in paragraphs 23 and 25 regarding the concessionality of non-grant instruments and the requirements for the approval of new projects that include such instruments.

*Decision on Agenda Item 14                      GEF Communications Strategy*

25. The Council, having reviewed document GEF/C.32/8, *Communications and Outreach Strategy*, approves the strategy presented in the document.

26. The Council, taking note of the indicative deliverables and budget as a suggested approach for implementation, requests the Secretariat to proceed with implementation of the strategy in full consultation with GEF partners, and asks that the Secretariat report back to the Council on outcomes in November 2009.

*Decisions on Agenda Item 15                      Other Business*

27. The Council adopts the following revision to paragraph 11 of the project cycle paper GEF/C.31/7/Rev.1 – as approved in June 2007.

28. The revised paragraph 11 will read as follows:

11. Council Approval of Umbrella Programmes. Beginning in FY08, umbrella programmes for GEF funding will only be submitted to Council at its meetings, not inter-sessionally. Documentation for an umbrella program presented to the Council in a work programme will identify all the projects to be financed under the program and will present the PIFs for the concepts. If a PIF for a project is not ready for presentation as part of the programmatic framework, then: (i) the amount requested for the program will be reduced by the amount of the project; and (ii) when the PIF is ready, and cleared by the CEO, it will be presented for approval, in future work programs. All approved PIFs will be posted on the GEF web site.

29. As proposed in the document GEF/C.32/9/Rev.1, *Confirmation of Participants Joining Constituencies*, the Council confirms the following constituency groupings: (i) Comoros, Djibouti, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Kenya, Madagascar, Mauritius, Rwanda, Seychelles, Somalia, Tanzania, and Uganda

**CLOSURE OF THE MEETING**

30. The meeting closed on November 16, 2007.





# Global Environment Facility

November 20, 2007

---

## HIGHLIGHTS OF THE COUNCIL'S DISCUSSIONS GEF COUNCIL MEETING NOVEMBER 14-17, 2007

1. The following is a record prepared by the GEF Secretariat of comments, understandings and clarifications of certain points made by Council Members during discussions of the agenda items and related decisions. The joint summary of the Council meeting records the decisions agreed by the Council. These points are supplemental to the joint summary.

### *Agenda Item 4: Report by the Chair of the Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel (STAP)*

2. Ms. Kakabadse reported on the preparation of a policy note on sustainable forest management for the guidance of the GEF Secretariat. This note was made available at the meeting, and future reports and lessons learned will be disseminated to all GEF stakeholders.

3. STAP will present to the GEF Secretariat and Council a report providing conclusions from an expert workshop held on Carbon Capture and Storage (CCS). This workshop was convened at the request of the GEF Secretariat in response to guidance received from the UNFCCC.

4. In response to questions from a number of Council Members regarding STAP's process for selecting issues on which to work, Ms. Kakabadse and the GEF CEO explained that STAP responds to requests for technical and scientific guidance from GEF Focal Points and Convention Secretariats.

5. The GEF Secretariat will post STAP comments on Project Identification Forms (PIFs) on the GEF website.

### *Agenda Item 5: Statements by the Representatives of the Secretariats of the United Nations Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD), and Ozone Secretariat of the Montreal Protocol.*

6. The Council heard statements from Mr. Yibin Xiang, presenting a message on behalf of Mr. Ahmed Djoghlaflaf, the Executive Secretary of the Convention, Mr. Luc Gnacadja, the new Executive Secretary of the UN Convention to Combat Desertification, and Mr. Paul Horwitz, Deputy Executive Secretary of the Ozone Secretariat of the Montreal Protocol.

7. Many Council Members congratulated the new Executive Secretary of the UN Convention to Combat Desertification, Mr. Luc Gnacadja on his appointment as the new

Executive Secretary of the UNCCD, and a number of Council Members noted the importance of the work of this convention to developing countries.

8. A number of Council Members stressed the importance of fully exploiting the potential synergies between the various conventions, particularly on the issue of climate change.

9. Copies of the statements of Mr. Djoghlafl and Mr. Gnacadja were made available at the Council meeting.

*Agenda Item 6 Relations with Conventions and other Institutions*

10. Council Members and Alternate members representing South and Central American countries expressed interest in a regional sustainable land management program.

11. In response to a query, the GEF Secretariat indicated that the countries' second national communications to the UNFCCC were funded outside the RAF allocations, using GEF 3 resources, but the third and subsequent national communications need to be funded out of country RAF allocations, as this is the only available source in GEF 4.

12. Some Council Members asked for details on the criteria for funding projects under the GEF sustainable forest management program.

*Agenda Item 7 Adaptation Fund of the Kyoto Protocol*

13. The GEF CEO made clear that the UNFCCC had already agreed to principles for the functioning of the Adaptation Fund, as articulated in Decision 5/CMP.2, of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties (COP/MOP) to the Kyoto Protocol, in Nairobi, Kenya, November 17, 2006. These principles ensure that the integrity of the GEF will be respected. The CEO explained further that if the GEF were to be the host of this Fund, it would apply the approved COP/MOP principles, noted above.

14. Many Council Members noted that it would be inefficient and expensive to create a new entity to manage the Adaptation Fund. Additional reasons cited for support by many Council Members included the GEF's comparative advantage, knowledge and experience in managing existing adaptation funds and its well established role as the major financial instrument for global environmental issues.

15. A number of Council Members expressed the desire that the new Adaptation Fund be more efficient and less bureaucratic in its processes for reviewing and approving projects.

16. Many Council Members stressed the importance of sending a clear, positive message to the COP on the Council's willingness for the GEF to manage the Adaptation Fund.

*Agenda Item 8 Progress Report of the Evaluation Director*

17. One Council Member requested the Evaluation Office to publish and disseminate the conclusions of the workshop in Egypt.

18. Another Council Member asked that methods of evaluating capacity development be the focus of the workshop and follow up.

*Agenda Item 9 Evaluation of the Small Grants Programme (SGP) and Management Response*

19. Some Council Members raised questions on how to increase the number of countries served by SGP while minimizing management costs. The GEF Secretariat informed that the SGP Steering Committee at its meeting on November 12, 2007, set up a group consisting of GEF Agencies, GEF Secretariat and a member of the GEF-NGO Network. This group will review all the information and identify options related to the program's management and cost-efficiency for submission to the Council at its next meeting in April 2008. Answering concerns of some Council Members, the EO also pointed out that levels of co-financing were slightly below Council required co-financing for the SGP, but were in general in line with the level of co-funding available for activities at the community level.

20. One Council Member questioned the application of a ceiling for using RAF resources, and some expressed concern about the graduation policy. The GEF Secretariat indicated that the funding ceiling and the graduation policy were part of the SGP project document approved by the Council at its December 2006 Council meeting. The GEF CEO stated that there would be no graduation policy within the next three years, and that she will come back to the Council with proposals, which will have first been discussed in the SGP Steering Committee. The CEO stressed that even if there is a graduation, there are still many options on the table for how the GEF can support SGP graduating countries. A few Council Members asked for a flexible graduation strategy, recognizing national circumstances and available funding for maintaining the involvement of civil society in global environmental management.

21. Some Council Members acknowledged the need to ensure that special treatment is provided to LDCs and SIDS.

*Agenda Item 10 GEF Annual Report on Impact 2007 – Executive Version*

22. Most Council Members welcomed the proposed report on impact and indicated that there is still room for improvement in the methodology.

23. Some Council Members suggested that future reports on impact address other focal areas, using a sector approach. It was also proposed that the current report be presented at the Second meeting of the Ad Hoc Open-Ended Working Group on Protected Areas in Rome.

24. Several Council Members highlighted the importance of sustainability of protected area management programs and suggested investments for achieving political commitment, supporting alternative livelihoods for affected people and identifying ways for economic sustainability of the activities as critical in ensuring institutional continuity.

25. Some Council Members asked the GEF Secretariat to address institutional sustainability attributes within the PIF review process and extend it to all focal areas.

26. A few Council Members asked to consider expanding the impact analysis to a thematic sector that would allow larger sampling of projects for identifying barriers to success as well as good practices that can be shared with the international community and the Parties to the CBD.

27. A few Council Members also wanted to see more quantitative information in the impact analysis.

*Agenda Item 11 Terms of Reference (TOR) for the mid-term review of RAF*

28. Following presentation of the proposed TOR by the Evaluation Office Director, several Council Members requested more detailed questions, sub-questions and issues be added to add to the Terms of Reference, particularly comparison to previous arrangements, the effect of exclusions and the RAF on GEF partners and stakeholders; considerations of other GEF changes; delivery and resource utilization; cost-effectiveness; and incentives for good project design and policies. The Evaluation Office Director clarified that the issues raised are already included in the TOR and will be covered in the evaluation.

29. The methodology was discussed and clarified, including the competitive sourcing of institutions to manage the Delphi study, which would include a representative selection of experts. The RAF progress as reported by the GEF Secretariat will be used as source material.

30. Many members raised concerns about the size of the budget and stressed the importance of the end product of the review. The budget line for country field visits was discussed. Given the low level of implementation thus far of projects under the RAF, activities under this budget line will be omitted from the review. Concerns that were to be covered by the country field visits will be addressed through surveys and sub-regional consultations, as well as through interactions with country representatives at the GEF Country Support Programme sub-regional workshops, National Dialogues, Constituency Meetings and other international meetings in the coming year.

31. Many Council Members asked that the study focus on impacts, but given the recent implementation of the RAF, the Evaluation Office indicated that it would be very difficult to evaluate impacts at this point.

32. Several Council Members questioned the timing of the mid-term evaluation given that RAF Implementation commenced in April 2007. The GEF Evaluation Office noted that Council could choose to delay the review.

*Agenda Item 12 Work Program*

33. A number of Council Members praised the work program that was prepared under the new project cycle. The Project Identification Form (PIF) included in the work program was generally viewed as very solid, providing a great deal of information; although a suggestion was made that the PIF should also include short sections to address sustainability and replicability at the outset at project level.

34. Some Council Members commented that the quality of the PIFs in the work program was uneven; since some contain comprehensive information, while others contain very little

information. Suggestions were made to further harmonize the format and provide a standardized approach.

35. Council Members requested that a new program document be designed specifically for the programmatic approach, and used in the place of PIFs.

36. A few Council Members also expressed satisfaction on STAP's upstream project review and welcomed the news that the comments of STAP would be published on the web.

37. One Council Member expressed interest in receiving more information on co-financing for the work program. In response, the CEO suggested that in the next work program, information regarding co-financing details, such as how much governments, bilateral agencies, private sector, and NGOs, are contributing, will be provided.

38. A section in the Project Cycle paper that was approved by Council in June 2007 impeded the speed of processing PIFs linked to programmatic approaches. It was proposed that an amendment on the project cycle paper be made to improve the processing of projects submitted under the programmatic approach. The amendment would allow subsequent projects (PIFs) financed under the program to be submitted to the GEF Secretariat on a rolling basis for inclusion in the first work program available, whether for a Council meeting or through an intercessional work program. The GEF Secretariat will respond to demand to expedite the project cycle by increasing the number of intercessional work programs on a trial basis for review by Council in April.

39. The Council Member representing India provided a presentation on the India Sustainable Land Management Program.

40. The Council Member representing China also provided a presentation of its Biodiversity Partnership Framework for Action (CBPF) included in this work program. China has decided to use its full RAF allocation in biodiversity for this program.

*Agenda Item 13      Operational policies and guidelines for the use of non-grant instruments*

41. Several Council Members expressed their support for a policy on the use of non-grant instruments by the GEF to stimulate investments in technology transfer and greening of infrastructure. Council Members requested the GEF, in consultation with the Trustee, to develop such a policy and report back to Council by April 2008.

42. One Council Member requested further clarification on the status of non-grant instruments currently being used, as a necessary first step in analyzing possible expanded use of these instruments.

43. Another Council Member requested clarification on the reflows from the use of non-grant instruments and asked that the possible implications of reflows be explored.

44. A number of Council Members stressed the importance of countries being able to choose what type of funding they receive from the GEF.

45. Other Council Members requested clarification on rules and procedure for use, eligibility of countries to access, global environmental effectiveness of, blending of, and time span, rate of interest and potential risks associated with, these instruments.

46. Council Members questioned how the use of non-grant instruments would work under the RAF.

47. The CEO clarified that the GEF will not duplicate the work of other institutions, as it is not a Bank. The CEO also confirmed that the projects using non-grant instruments will follow the same project cycle and endorsement process as the grant projects, and that a clear policy will be developed for reflows.

*Agenda Item 14      Communications Strategy*

48. One Council Member emphasized the role of the focal points in the communications plan, and requested that the communications plan take into account the languages of GEF countries.

49. Some Council Members stressed the importance of measuring the results and impact of the Communications strategy.

*Agenda Item 15      Other Business*

*Development of country strategies for GEF programming*

50. In response to a query, the CEO explained that the GEF had increased its direct dialogue with countries, but had not felt it appropriate to move beyond that stage. She also noted the existing instruments in the country support program and encouraged countries to use them. Those who spoke agreed that the issue was a sensitive one that would be premature to address at present, but that it should be kept in mind.

*Amendment to the Project Cycle Document*

51. As highlighted in paragraph 38 above, Council approved a revision to paragraph 11 of *GEF Project Cycle*, GEF/C.31/7/Rev.1 of June 2007.

**CLOSURE OF THE MEETING**

52. The meeting closed on November 16, 2007.