

ANNEX V

INCORPORATION OF STAP REVIEWER'S COMMENTS

1. The GEF/SGP responds to the GEF Strategy and Operational Programs. These in turn respond to the conventions. While the reviewer's recommendation on building closer links to the relevant conventions is an important one, the programme cannot build direct links with the relevant conventions and will do so through the GEF Strategy and Operational Programs.
2. We take note of the reviewer's emphasis on ensuring that essential guidance documents and procedures are in place prior to entertaining expansion to new countries. Our sense is that these critical elements can be consolidated within the first year of the programme. There is clearly a significant and rising demand for the programme and its unique approach. The programme strategy therefore includes expansion to five new countries, subject to the achievement of benchmarks relating to programme consolidation during the first year (see paragraph 10).
3. Efforts to intensify links with other UNDP programmes are an integral part of the GEF/SGP strategy for the next phase. Functional links will be established not only with other UNDP in-country activities, but also with activities of other GEF Implementing Agencies, government agencies, and national environmental funds (see Output 3). By providing valuable advisory and operational services in its area of comparative advantage, this operational collaboration will serve to enhance the impact of GEF/SGP experiences with community-based initiatives. In addition, targeted efforts will be made to seek co-financing from UNDP programmes and other sources, providing yet another means for building links (see Output 6).
4. The reviewer's comment on pioneering "... the identification of projects that can support the global environmental benefits from international water bodies, and land degradation issues, primarily desertification and deforestation, as they relate to the three focal areas" reflects the general concern over the skewed balance of the project portfolio towards biodiversity and climate change projects. One of the special features of the GEF/SGP has been the democratic and transparent procedure for inviting project proposals at the country-level. The result is a portfolio that is demand driven and responds to the needs and priorities in each participating country. It is unrealistic to set *ex ante* targets for the balance of projects between the three focal areas. It is possible, however, to provide additional guidance and recommendations to country programmes (as part of the Operational Guidelines) for taking a proactive approach to addressing global environmental issues in the international waters focal area by implementing community based components of existing GEF international waters projects (see Output 1).
5. The issue of insufficient resource allocation for the communications and outreach strategy, monitoring and evaluation, and resource mobilization has been addressed by revisiting the share of key resources allocated to these outputs (see indicative budget allocation by outputs on page 14).
6. The useful suggestion to develop a system for recognizing good performers within the programme will be incorporated into the programmes monitoring and evaluation system (see Output 7).

7. UNOPS serves an extremely useful role and takes on administrative functions such as personnel recruitment and contract administration for national project staff and national/international consultants, subcontracts, budget administration, among others. Given its experience it is best placed to fulfill these tasks. Nevertheless, the issue of efficient and effective service delivery is an important one that will be addressed through prior agreement on specific measures (see paragraph 45 under *Analysis of Alternative Institutional Arrangements*). We have already started a dialogue with UNOPS and as part of the final implementation and execution arrangements specific steps to improve the situation will be discussed and agreed on.

ANNEX VI

ALLOCATION OF KEY AND OTHER RESOURCES ACROSS PROGRAMME OUTPUTS

The budget in Table 2 is designed to provide a notion of how key resources and efforts are to be allocated across programme outputs. This exercise can also provide a useful indicator for on going and *ex post* evaluation, not only in terms of whether programme outputs are being achieved, but also in terms of whether the desired allocation of resources towards realizing these outputs is taking place. The following details are relevant to the distribution:

- UNOPS support costs for Grants, Country-level programme management and Audits are included in the total for these line items when they are allocated across outputs.
- The Communications Officer line item has been separated out from the Global programme management line item in allocating across outputs.

The following are included in the financial allocation for outputs but are not highlighted in column 3 of table 2.

- The Visits to country programmes line item is allocated across outputs along with (and therefore in the same ratio as) global programme management.
- The Contingency line item (US\$ 150,000) has been allocated as follows:

Output 1:	27,500
Output 2:	6,667
Output 3:	9,167
Output 4:	22,500
Output 5:	19,167
Output 6:	32,500
Output 7:	32,500