



United Nations Development Programme
GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT FACILITY



Summary of Replies from GEF/SGP National Coordinators

COOPERATIVE ACTIVITIES WITH “REGULAR” GEF PROJECTS

This summarizes responses from 34 GEF/SGP national coordinators to a query about cooperative activities between the Small Grants Programme and “regular” GEF projects in their country. Eleven SGP country programmes report operational links to regular GEF projects. Two of these programmes and four additional programmes provide advisory services to GEF projects. Conversely, in some countries, the “regular” GEF provides useful assistance to the Small Grants Programme.

A. Project Services Provided by the Small Grants Programme

- The SGP national coordinator in **Ghana** helped to develop the proposal for Renewable Energy-based Electricity for Rural, Social and Economic Development, a Full Project, especially the components relating to NGOs and community groups. When project implementation starts, the SGP will harmonize its grant-making activities with support provided to communities under the Full Project.
- The SGP in **Egypt** has welcomed project proposals from NGOs in the Red Sea Governorate, the site of the Egyptian Red Sea Coastal and marine Resource Management Project, a UNDP/UNEP/World Bank project; it also invited these NGOs to participate in the GEF/SGP stakeholders workshop held in May 1997.
- In **Jordan**, the SGP has funded two community-based projects within the Dana Nature Reserves, the site of a UNDP/World Bank GEF project. It granted \$18,000 to The Friends of Dana, which used the grant to generate more than \$150,000 to improve the village of Dana and integrate it effectively into the Full Project. The SGP also granted \$45,000 to the Wadi Faynan Project-Intermediate Technology Work Group, which obtained co-financing of \$113,500 to transform an old mining camp within the reserve into a research, educational and eco-tourism center. It also co-financed a SGP stakeholders workshop in the Dana National Reserve.

Prepared by: Joan Shapiro
 Resource Strategy Adviser

Submitted: A

Commissioned by the GEF/SGP Coordination Unit of the
 United Nations Development Programme

The SGP in Jordan also helped to establish a community-based NGO (Friends of Azraq) which has helped to protect a Ramsar site wetland area targeted by the Conservation of Azraq Oasis project, a UNDP/GEF Full Project. Also in Jordan, the SGP helped to form, and made a grant to, the Recycling Coalition (RC). RC is assisting the Greater Amman Municipality to carry out a UNDP/GEF biogas project.

- In the **Philippines**, the Small Grants Programme works very closely with NIPA (NGOs for Integrated Protected Areas, Inc.), the consortium of NGOs responsible for providing technical assistance to communities participating in the World Bank/GEF project “Conservation of Priority Protected areas in the Philippines.” The SGP is represented on NIPA’s board and several NIPA NGOs have been SPG beneficiaries.
- In **Sri Lanka**, the SGP will help ensure ongoing community services to the Development of Wild Life Conservation and Protected Area Management project when project activities are extended by ADB beyond the GEF funding period.
- In **Poland**, the GEF SGP has provided complete descriptions of NGOs working on nature conservation for a UNEP Biodiversity Data Management Enabling Activity.
- The national coordinator in **Turkey** is actively involved in most regional and national activities related to the Black Sea Environmental Programme (BSEP). The SGP also supports the NGO component of the BSEP, mainly by sharing SGP experience.
- The SGP coordinator in **Barbados** provides liaison services among four projects (in Antigua/Barbados, Dominica, St. Kitts/Nevis and St. Vincent/Grenadine), the UNDP Country Office and UNDP/GEF in preparations for the design of an Enabling Activity project to implement the Biodiversity Convention. She provides similar liaison services to an Enabling Activity in Climate Change and the Caribbean Renewable Energy Development Programme, a PDGB project.
- The GEF/SGP in **Ecuador** has furnished information on community/projects in protected areas to the GEF-INEFAN project. The information provided has been taken into account in formulating a national strategy for protected areas.
- The GEF/SGP in **Guatemala** has provided information needed by a UNDP/GEF Full Project, Resources Conservation of the Sarstun-Motagua Region (RECOSMO), to establish a small grants programme for local communities and NGOs, including the SGP’s project evaluation guidelines. It has also helped RECOSMO to develop a project monitoring system.

- The GEF/SGP in **Trinidad and Tobago** has worked with community groups in or near protected areas covered by a PRIF project (Enhancing the Capacity of Suriname to Conserve Biodiversity) to strengthen their capacities to present project proposals.

B. SGP Advisory Services

- In **Burkina Faso**, the SGP Coordinator has cooperative relationships not only with GEF project personnel but also with officials responsible for local implementation of the Biodiversity and Climate Change Convention. The SGP and all regular GEF projects are considering the establishment of a formal framework for cooperation and exchanges of experience.
- In **Kenya**, the SGP coordinator serves on the National Liaison Committee for the UNDP/GEF project "Important Bird Areas (IBA) Programme for Kenya - - African NGO-government Partnerships for Sustainable Biodiversity Action." She also helped to develop the proposal for the UNDP Full Project "Reducing Biodiversity Loss at Cross Border Sites in East Africa."
- In **Mali**, the SGP participated in the meeting which approved a UNDP/GEF Enabling Activity: RAF-93-G51. The SGP coordinator is also working on a proposal for a World Bank/GEF regional project to save elephants in Gourma.
- The coordinator in **Senegal** continuously shares SGP experiences with the government GEF focal point and the GEF focal point in the UNDP Country Office. He has also provided specific advice to "regular" GEF projects (in biodiversity and climate change) on participatory methodologies and other techniques for working at the community level.
- In **Egypt** the SGP has helped to involve Egyptian NGOs and communities in formulating the project document for the "Manzela Lake" project.
- The Ministry of Foreign affairs in **Poland** has now assumed responsibility for organizing meetings of representatives from "regular" GEF projects, an initiative that was originated by the GEF/SGP and the UNDP Country Office. A national GEF Steering Committee is now in place. The coordinator often participates in seminars on GEF projects, e.g., the Polish Efficiency Lighting Project, an IFC project.
- The SGP national coordinator in **Costa Rica** serves on an ad hoc committee which advises UNDP and the GEF Focal Point regarding "regular" and medium-sized projects.

C. Assistance Received from "Regular" GEF

- Cooperative relationships between SGP country programmes and “regular” GEF projects are not all “one way.” In at least six countries, staff associated with the larger GEF projects have been helpful to the Small Grants Programme.
- Coordinators in Africa report that:
 - ❖ Staff from a UNDP/GEF project in **Burkina Faso** to train populations in wildlife management participated in the formulation of the national strategy for the SGP in the operational phase.
 - ❖ NGOs funded by the SGP in **Mauritius** were invited to participate in a Biodiversity Training Workshop organized by the University of Mauritius in connection with the UNDP/GEF project “Restoration of Highly Degraded and Threatened Native Forest in Mauritius.” Consultants to this project also provide expert advice to the Small Grants Programme.
 - ❖ The government GEF focal point and GEF focal point at UNDP participated in the workshop that defined the GEF/SGP country strategy in **Senegal**.
- The UNDP/GEF project “Maintaining Biodiversity in Pakistan with Rural Community Development” is represented on the GEF/SGP National Selection Committee in **Pakistan**, and project staff provide backstopping services to SGP grantees in the project area.
- The National Project Adviser of the UNDP Coastal Zone Management Project in **Belize**, a GEF/UNDP Full Project, serves on the GEF/SGP National Steering Committee. Project personnel also help to screen marine projects submitted for GEF/SGP funding and participate in relevant project site visits.
- A GEF-INEFAN project staff member serves on the GEF/SGP National Steering Committee in **Ecuador**.

D. No Significant Relationships

Fifteen national coordinators reported that there were no contacts, or only informal contacts, between the Small Grants Programme and regular GEF projects in their country. The countries are Albania, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Côte d’Ivoire, Dominican Republic, India, Indonesia, Mexico, Morocco, Papua New Guinea, Thailand, Tunisia, Uganda and Zimbabwe.



Summary of Replies from GEF/SGP National Coordinators

RELATIONS BETWEEN GEF/SGP AND UNDP PROGRAMMES AND PROJECTS

Twenty four national coordinators commented on relationships between the GEF Small Grants Programme Country Programme and UNDP projects and programmes. These comments suggest that:

- The GEF Small Grants Programme benefits from its location in most countries at the UNDP Country Office. In many cases, UNDP has provided valuable contacts and outreach, assistance with media coverage and programme support.
- The SGP has also received substantial funding from UNDP resources for its grant-making activities, administrative costs and project co-financing in some countries.
- The SGP cooperates closely with many UNDP projects, not only other small grants programmes like the Africa 2000 Network and LIFE but also projects relating to poverty alleviation, indigenous peoples, gender, and other initiatives involving work at the community level.
- In several countries, the SGP is responsible for coordinating a UNDP project or implementing a project component in these areas.
- The SGP provides advisory services to UNDP, and/or government and other agencies through UNDP, in virtually every country. Sometimes policy issues are involved, e.g., formulation of the Country Advisory Note and Country Cooperation Framework or the National Environmental Action Plan. In other cases, the SGP has been consulted about project design and implementation, especially projects involving NGOs and CBOs, capacity building, participatory methodologies and community mobilization. Technical advice, drawn from innovative SGP-funded projects, has also been provided.
- Visits to SGP-funded projects, the dissemination of SGP materials and other strategies have increased UNDP awareness of GEF and of GEF/SGP approaches to

issues affecting the global environment. In some countries, exposure to SGP has had significant impact on UNDP project and programme planning.

A. Nature of In-Country Relationships

Africa

Burkina Faso: The Small Grants Programme cooperates closely with the Africa 2000 Network, both in strategic planning and operationally; administrative costs are shared. The national coordinator also shares SGP experiences with relevant UNDP staff.

Cote d'Ivoire: No operational relationships at present but possible collaboration between SGP and UNDP poverty alleviation activities is being discussed.

Ghana: The Country Office has supported the development of operational links between the SGP and UNDP's Poverty Reduction Programme.

Kenya: SGP collaborates closely with the Africa 2000 Network, another UNDP small grants programme. (The coordinators serve on each other's National Selection Committee.) It has also helped with start-up of the Sub-Programme for Poverty Alleviation Kenya. The SGP coordinator also serves as a member of the Trickle-Up Programme Monitoring and Advisory Committee and provides advice to the United Nations Volunteers programme.

Mali: SGP works closely with the units responsible for developing the National Environment Action Plan and implementation of the Desertification convention.

Mauritius: The coordinator may also serve as coordinator for the LIFE programme, another UNDP small grants programme now being introduced to Mauritius. She has also helped to formulate the National Environmental Strategies for the Next Decade for Mauritius. The SGP shares information and experience with several projects and institutions funded by UNDP.

Senegal: The SGP and Africa 2000 Network have had integrated mechanisms and very close operational contacts. The SGP has also shared experiences with LIFE, another UNDP small grants programme.

Zimbabwe: the SGP has shared experiences with, and given advice to, various UNDP activities, including projects to implement the Desertification Convention and District Environmental Action Programmes, the Africa 2000 Network, the Poverty Alleviation Programme and activities supporting the Biodiversity and Climate Change Conventions.

Arab States

Egypt: SGP has very close operational relationships with LIFE, an advisory relationship to the GEF Medium-Sized Projects initiative and a policy relationship to the Sustainable Livelihoods Action Plan in Egypt. The coordinator and UNDP's Resident Representative are seeking to use SGP mechanisms to carry out other UNDP and government projects.

Jordan: The SGP national coordinator has been asked by the UNDP Country Office to help prepare the UNDP Country Note, to represent UNDP at meetings to prepare the National Environmental Action Plan and to help formulate Capacity 21, Climate Change and Biodiversity enabling activities. Joint meetings involve the SGP coordinator and the managers of all UNDP funded projects. UNDP staff are regularly briefed on SGP and also participate in project site visits. UNDP supports SGP outreach activities.

Tunisia: SGP has collaborated with other UNDP projects to strengthen NGOs' capacities.

Asia-Pacific

India: UNDP and the government of India have committed \$700,000 for the GEF/SGP national programme over the next five years.

Pakistan: The UNDP Country Office has provided an operational budget under the Programme Implementation Support Project (PISP) for two SGP provincial offices in Lahore and Quetta. SGP experience has been "mainstreamed" through publication of a source book on environment.

Sri Lanka: The SGP works closely with the United Nations Volunteers (UNV) programme, inasmuch as UNV volunteers are very active in forming community-based organizations and initiating community development activities. It also shares information and experience with other UNDP programmes.

Thailand: SGP cooperates closely with the Thai-UNCAP Facility, a UNDP project, which has provided co-financing for four SGP projects. It also cooperates with the Highland People Programme and Poverty Alleviation Programme, mainly by exchanging information and experience. The coordinator has also participated in the Interna Gender Mainstreaming Consultative meeting of the UNDP Gender Mainstreaming Facility, using two SGP projects as case studies.

Europe

Poland: SGP has close contacts with the Umbrella Project, a joint venture of the Polish Government, UNDP and the European Union which is a leading institution in implementing Agenda 21. SGP has tapped Umbrella resources to provide consultant

assistance to various institutions, mainly on the preparation of grant proposals. The SGP has also supported the UNDP HIV/AIDS programme by granting funds for biomass fuel heating at EcoSchool Life.

Turkey: The SGP is considered “part and parcel” of UNDP’s overall environmental strategy and portfolio. This will enable SGP to achieve a broader impact than what it accomplishes at the community level; it will also help to ensure longer-term sustainability. The SGP’s National Steering Committee supports efforts to mainstream SGP experience in UNDP and has demonstrated this by selecting projects for SGP awards - - 80% of the SGP portfolio - - that can be linked to two main UNDP programmes: the “Local Agenda 21” initiative and the Sustainable Energy and Desertification programme. The “Local agenda 21” project (TUR/97/005), budgeted at \$1,600,000, works in 22 cities in participatory ways to achieve the goals of Agenda 21 at the municipal level. It was developed from an SGP pilot phase project, “Urla Local Agenda 21,” which received only \$30,000 in GEF/SGP support. City consultations under the national UNDP project are, in turn, leading to new SGP projects, including “An Option for Sustainable Livelihood – gum production in Cesme” and “Sustainable Livelihood Opportunities in Devzak through Cornel Trees.” Another new SGP project will rely on a network created for the UNDP Local Agenda 21 programme to carry out training and demonstration activities. The SGP is benefiting from and contributing to the National Programme on Sustainable Energy and Combating Desertification (TUR/98/003) by funding two related smaller projects on the use of renewable energy in rural areas and the promotion of sustainable energy. The SGP also coordinates the small grants component (METAP Small Grants Facility) of the Mediterranean Environmental Technical Assistance Programme (METAP), a project to address environmental degradation in the region funded by UNDP, the World Bank, the European Union and EIB. The World Bank has allocated \$75,000 for grants in 1998 and will provide \$7,500 for administrative costs.

Latin America and the Caribbean

Belize: The SGP has provided advisory services to at least four UNDP projects and programmes, as follows:

- ❖ It recommended community leaders to assist the Programme to Promote Sustainable Human Development with capacity building and project design. Field visits to funded projects were coordinated.
- ❖ The Support to Sustainable Human Development programme was also assisted with advice on community leaders and by coordination of field visits.
- ❖ The national coordinator serves on the technical advisory committee for The MesoAmerican Biological Corridor Project (MBCP).

- ❖ He also helped to prepare the project proposal for the National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan and serves on the technical advisory subcommittee on biodiversity.

Several GEF Medium-Sized Project proposals have also benefited from advice by the SGP coordinator.

Brazil: Possible future cooperation between SGP and LIFE (Local Initiative Facility for Urban Environment), a UNDP small grants programme, has been discussed recently with the LIFE programme manager and national coordinator. Cooperation would involve operational collaboration and exchanges of experience. In another area, UNDP/ Brazil has taken up an SGP proposal for a study of how to market and sell the products of sustainable biodiversity, agro-extractivism and peasant agriculture and is developing a larger study on this issue involving all relevant UNDP projects and programmes in Brazil.

Chile: The SGP coordinator has served as the coordinator of a UNDP project (CHI/94/006) for regeneration and environmental management in indigenous territories for Corporacion Nacional de Desarrollo Indigena (CONADI). SGP has also provided services to a second CONADI-UNDP project to train indigenous communities in ethnotourism, including the dissemination of experiences to other organizations and communities.

Costa Rica: The SGP is part of UNDP's overall programme; conversely, the Resident Representative or Deputy RR participates in most SGP functions. Close operational ties exist between SGP and the Trust Fund for Integration and Development (FID). Both programmes work together to support poor groups and communities. If funds are not available to SGP, it often helps communities obtain a soft loan or grant and loan from FID.

Ecuador: The SGP provides ongoing support to UNDP, especially in the areas of environmental conservation, poverty alleviation in rural areas and community development.

Guatemala: SGP has provided advisory services to PROFED, a project for strengthening the judicial power of civil society. Its experience with communities enables SGP to contribute in various areas central to the UNDP mission in Guatemala, i.e., strengthening civil society, poverty alleviation, promotion of sustainable development and conservation of the environment.

Mexico: The SGP in Mexico has cooperated with the UNDP Country Programme by:

- ❖ Providing advisory services to a project for Natural Resources management and social change in Costa Chica, Guerrero (MEX/93/022).
- ❖ Introducing the micro-region approach to BAASOY a project for technical cooperation for social, indigenous and nongovernmental organizations (MEX/93/027).
- ❖ Helping to establish a common data base for five ~~ND~~ projects.
- ❖ Coordinating a project to provide technical assistance to micro projects in the Yucatan Peninsula.

Trinidad and Tobago: SGP has contributed to preparation of the Country Advisory Note and Country Cooperation Framework.

B. SGP Impacts

Africa

Burkina Faso: Sharing SGP experiences with other UNDP programmes has led to a better understanding of the GEF/SGP, increased visibility, strengthened partnerships and improved programme implementation.

Ghana: UNDP is increasingly adopting strategies initiated by the Small Grants Programme, including decentralized approaches which involve a National Steering Committee and the use of participatory methodologies for identifying, implementing and evaluating community-based projects. UNDP is encouraging the SGP to work in geographic areas where UNDP poverty alleviation projects are located so that both kinds of initiatives will benefit the rural poor.

Kenya: By arranging UNDP staff visits to SGP-funded projects and taking part in the Country Office's workshops on participation, the SGP coordinator has created awareness of SGP projects, developed good working relationships with some key stakeholders and opened up the possibility of access to UNDP core resources for some SGP projects.

Mali: Participation in UNDP activities benefits the SGP and helps to assure its durability. Conversely, SGP contributes its experience in mobilizing people and its knowledge of participatory methodologies to other UNDP programmes and projects. This has proved very useful.

Mauritius: Some SGP projects, e.g., an organic compost-making project, may serve as a pilot for larger projects to be funded by UNDP.

Senegal: Cooperation with the Africa 2000 Network has benefited both programmes including in the areas of capacity building and project monitoring and evaluation. Experience has been shared in some technical areas, e.g., latrines and improved cookstoves.

Zimbabwe: The SGP has helped to change UNDP approaches to people and communities. The adoption of participatory methodologies has become policy. It has enabled UNDP to share experiences with other sectors using examples from SGP. SGP has also affected government programmes. It has had significant impacts on beneficiary communities.

Arab States

Egypt: Closely integrated operations with LIFE assures the sharing of lessons learned and allows each programme to benefit from the other's experiences.

Asia Pacific

Sri Lanka: The coordinator reports that the SGP is well received within UNDP and that it is a visible part of UNDP's Country Programme.

Europe

Poland: SGP is having an impact in Poland through media coverage of funded projects. Seven films on SGP projects were shown on channel TVP between October 1997 and March 1998, and at least 15 films will be produced by the regional channel beginning in January 1999.

Latin America and the Caribbean

Guatemala: PROFED, a UNDP project to strengthen the judicial power for civil society, has adopted SGP's project evaluation criteria and guidelines.

Trinidad and Tobago: The SGP has helped UNDP to focus on NGOs, CBOs and communities in its various programming areas. It has contributed to the formation of partnerships between UNDP and NGO/CBO projects. It has also helped to assure community representation at UNDP programme-related conferences and workshops.

C. Country Programmes Reporting No Links to UNDP

Only six countries reported that there were no operational or advisory ties to UNDP projects and programmes: Albania, Dominican Republic, Indonesia, Morocco, Papua New Guinea and Uganda. Of these, three (Albania, Morocco and Uganda) are new to the SGP programme.



United Nations Development Programme

GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT FACILITY

Annex VII 1~

Summary of Replies from GEF/SGP National Coordinators

COOPERATION WITH NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL FUNDS

More than 100 national environmental funds (NEFs) are currently operating or in the process of establishment in approximately 80 countries, including many countries which also offer the GEF Small Grants Programme.

Environmental funds are innovative financing mechanisms to cover the recurrent costs of parks and protected areas, support the overall goal of conserving biological diversity, reduce air and water pollution, strengthen local environmental institutions and/or promote sustainable development. They can take different forms: a trust fund established by special legislation, a foundation, a common law trust or a non-profit corporation. Funds also receive financing from different sources, including the national government of the country in which the fund is located, debt-for-nature swaps through governments or an international NGO, bilateral debt conversion or direct grant assistance, in-country bequests or grants from individuals or corporations, fees for visits to parks or levies for the use of natural resources, contributions from philanthropic foundations and/or grants from multi-lateral institutions, including the Global Environment Facility (GEF).

Most environmental funds are independent of government. Most include representatives of non-governmental organizations (NGOs) on their governing board. Many NEFs support projects that are designed and implemented by NGOs, community-based organizations and other organizations of the civil society. The large majority of funds are “green” funds, designed to conserve biodiversity and/or promote sustainable development, but some funds, mainly in Eastern Europe, are “brown” funds, intended to combat pollution.

Although (a few) NEFs have been operating for seven or eight years, many are very new or not yet operational.

The GEF Coordination Unit at UNDP has encouraged in-country cooperation between the SGP and national environmental fund(s), not only to leverage SGP resources but also to maximize the effectiveness of each programme’s operations.

The SGP coordinators in 22 countries have reported working with 27 environmental funds in various ways.

A. Co-financing Projects

- As a founding member of the new national environmental fund in **Senegal**, the SGP is well placed to propose projects for co-financing. The SGP is also represented on the fund's scientific and technical committee charged with reviewing the environmental components of projects proposed for fund support.
- The Foundation for the Philippine Environment (FPE) has provided multiyear financing for a number of projects supported by SGP in the **Philippines**.
- The NEF in **Thailand** is examining ways of co-financing and scaling up SGP-supported projects but the issue is complicated by the fact that the NEF's grants are normally 10 times larger than an SGP grant. The director of the Office for the National Environmental Fund serves on the SGP's National Steering Committee.
- In **Poland**, the SGP has developed close working relations with the National Environmental Fund for Environmental Protection and Water Management, 49 independent voivodship environmental funds in 49 administrative units, and EcoFund, the government fund established to administer resources from debt swaps with the governments of France, Italy, Sweden, Switzerland and the United States. Project co-financing is an important aspect of these relationships, e.g., EcoFund is estimated to have allocated \$1.6 million to SGP-sponsored projects or as follow up to SGP activities.
- The national environmental fund in **Bolivia**, FONAMA, is represented on the SGP national steering committee. The SGP also refers good project proposals which it cannot support to FONAMA.
- In Brazil, the PPG 7-PD/A, part of a pilot programme for conservation of the Brazilian Rain Forest, may finance projects in the legal Amazon which SGP lacks resources to support. The SGP also cooperates with the National Plan to combat Desertification in co-financing projects in sem-arid areas.
- In **Costa Rica**, project support to indigenous organizations by the Small Grants Programme may enable these groups to access environmental payments from the National Fund for Forest Activities (FONAFIFO) for forest conservation. In one case, the SGP awarded \$20,000 for a project by an indigenous organization which then received \$100,000 from FONAFIFO for a five-year period. This arrangement will almost certainly continue and may be scaled up.
- The SGP in **Guatemala** collaborates closely with the Guatemalan Environmental Conservation Trust (FCG). Until now FCG has administered a project to provide grants for SGP stakeholders. The two programmes are preparing a joint request to the

MacArthur Foundation for a grant that would establish an endowment to support the SGP's grant-making activities and small loans by the FCG for productive sustainable development activities. Possible future project co-financing is also being explored with the Guatemalan Environment Fund (FOGUAMA), which is not yet fully operational.

- The SGP in **Mexico** also works closely with the national environmental fund, Fondo Mexicano para la Conservacion de la Naturaliza (FMCN). Two SGP projects have been co-financed by FMCN, for a total of \$20,650, and co-financing totaling \$81,369 has been requested from FMCN for five additional projects.
- ISPN, the host institution for the Small Grants Programme in Brazil, has close contacts with four conservation funds: FNMA, the government's national environmental fund; FUNBIO, the Brazilian Fund for Biodiversity, supported in part by GEF; PPG7-PD/A, a subprogram of demonstration projects of the pilot programme for conservation of the Brazilian Rain Forest, and the National Plan to Combat Desertification. It also participates in the network of Brazilian financial mechanisms for the environment. The SGP exchanges information and experience with these groups.

B. Sharing Information and Experience

- The SGP in **Ghana** has close relationships with the secretariat for the National Desertification Fund, e.g., the NDF secretariat is represented on the SGP national steering committee. The SGP has also offered to develop and launch the NDF inasmuch as it has decided to use participatory approaches in its grant-making activities.
- **Mali:** SGP has contributed to the design of FONADES, the national desertification fund in the process of establishment.
- **Mauritius:** The SGP will seek to exchange information and experience with the NEF to be established by Ministry of Local Government and Environment as part of Agenda 21 programming.
- **Senegal:** The coordinator met with the Minister of Environment about setting up a national environmental fund. The SGP has also participated in a workshop to launch the NEF, shared experience on grant-making from the Small Grants Programme with technical committees preparing materials for the new fund, and participated in a workshop to approve the fund.
- The USAID unit responsible for establishing an Independent Fund for the Environment in **Uganda** is represented on the SGP National Steering Committee.

Currently, the programmes share information on NGOs and CBOs but SGP is exploring other opportunities for cooperation when the fund is formally established.

- In **Indonesia**, the SGP has shared information and experience with KEHATI, the principal environmental fund, and other programmes which support the environment. It is exploring the possibilities of organizing joint workshops and co-financing projects.
- The SGP and IUCN in **Pakistan** have published guidelines on the establishment of national environmental funds. The SGP coordinator has also shared information and experiences with the Joint Secretary of the Ministry of Environment, Local government and Rural Development who manages a small grants programme under the National Conservation Strategy.
- The SGP in **Sri Lanka** shares information and experience with the two government-supported NEFs: the Conservation of Forest Trust and the Wildlife Trust of Sri Lanka. Co-financing of relevant projects will be explored.

C. Programme Implementation

- The SGP (and Africa 2000 Network) in **Zimbabwe** have collaborated with the National Desertification Fund in training activities.
- The two responsible ministries in **Egypt** have been approached about using SPG as a mechanism to award grants to NGOs from the National Environmental Fund. Projects funded by SGP (and LIFE, another UNDP small grants programme) have been submitted to the fund.
- In the **Philippines**, a memorandum of agreement has been prepared between SGP and the Foundation for the Philippine Environment (FPE) whereby SGP will screen and select biodiversity projects for FPE funding initially totaling \$78,000.
- The Small Grants Programme in **Belize** works closely with the Protected Areas Conservation Trust (PACT), the national environmental fund. The executive director of PACT serves on the GEF/SGP National Steering Committee. The GEF/SGP national coordinator and PACT projects officer collaborate on project identification, screening and site visits. The possibility of merging the SGP and PACT in the medium- to long-term, i.e., after about five years, has been suggested.
- In **Chile**, SGP cooperates with the Fondo de las Américas. If the fund cannot support an NGO project for one reason or another, it may recommend it to the SGP for financing.

- The SGP host organization in the **Dominican Republic** is PRONATURA, the national environmental fund. It provides full support needed to assure good performance by the SGP.
- Legislation adopted in **Trinidad and Tobago** in 1995 calls for the establishment of an environmental trust fund. The SGP is expected to assist with its establishment, especially the “window” that provides funding for NGO and CBO projects to conserve the environment.

D. Institutional Arrangements

NEF officials are represented on the SGP’s National Steering Committee in at least three countries: Belize, Thailand and Uganda.

Formal arrangements have been developed or proposed to ensure collaboration between the SGP programme and the national environmental fund in Dominican Republic, Guatemala and the Philippines.

The possibility of merging the SGP and the national environmental fund at some future date has been considered in at least one country (Belize).

E. No Current Relationships

Ten country programmes report that they are not cooperating with an environmental fund: Albania, Cote d’Ivoire, Ecuador, India, Jordan, Kenya, Mauritius, Papua New Guinea, Tunisia and Turkey. In Turkey, the SGP national coordinator is exploring cooperation with the fund managed by the ministry of the Environment but there is little basis for collaboration inasmuch as it does not support NGO activities. In most cases, this is because no fund has been established in the country to date.



United Nations Development Programme
GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT FACILITY



Summary of Replies from GEF/SGP National Coordinators

IN-COUNTRY RESOURCE MOBILIZATION

GEF Small Grants Programme national mechanisms have mobilized more than \$16.6 million from in-country sources, including \$13,523,000 in co-financing for community projects supported by the SGP; \$490,000 for country programme implementation costs, and \$2,617,000 for country programme grant allocations. Details follow.

C. Project Co-Financing

1. Respondents

The national coordinators in 38 countries¹ were asked to report on total funds raised to date (since their country joined the GEF Small Grants Programme) for project co-financing, i.e., to support projects, mainly community-based activities, funded under the GEF/SGP. Twenty-six coordinators reported having mobilized co-financing for GEF/SGP projects. Countries with co-financing activities include Burkina Faso, Cote d'Ivoire, Ghana, Kenya, Mali, Mauritius, Senegal and Zimbabwe in Africa; Egypt, Jordan and Tunisia in North Africa and the Middle East; Indonesia, Pakistan, Philippines and Thailand in Asia and the Pacific; Poland in Europe, and Barbados, Belize, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Guatemala, Mexico, and Trinidad and Tobago in Latin America and the Caribbean.

The coordinators in eight countries responded that they had not been involved in project co-financing activities: Albania, Dominican Republic, India, Morocco, Papua New Guinea, Sri Lanka, Turkey and Uganda.

Four country programmes had not replied by the deadline: Botswana, Cameroon, Kazakhstan and Tanzania. Information on these countries can be added as replies are received.

2. Co-financing Totals

¹ Seven countries were not queried, either because they had just joined the programme, no coordinator was in place or for other reasons: Bhutan, Lao PDR, Malaysia, Nepal, Palestinian Authority, Peru and Vietnam.

- At least \$13,523,000 has been raised in co-financing for approximately 415 GEF/SGP projects since the beginning of the pilot phase².
- Five countries reported total project co-financing of under \$50,000: Bolivia, Côte d'Ivoire, Kenya, Mali and Zimbabwe.
- Seven country programmes have raised between \$50,000 and \$200,000 in project co-financing: Barbados, Belize, Guatemala, Mauritius, Senegal, Thailand, and Trinidad and Tobago.
- Nine countries have raised between \$200,000 and \$1 million:
 - ❖ Egypt \$247,267
 - ❖ Mexico 271,882
 - ❖ Philippines 280,845
 - ❖ Burkina Faso 283,848
 - ❖ Ghana 350,775
 - ❖ Chile 644,000
 - ❖ Pakistan 733,000
 - ❖ Jordan 733,000
 - ❖ Ecuador 936,000
- The SGP has raised more than \$1 million in project co-financing in four countries:
 - ❖ Poland \$1,234,835
 - ❖ Brazil 1,523,073
 - ❖ Costa Rica 2,138,901
 - ❖ Tunisia 2,867,000

3. Sources of Co-financing

- Sources of project co-financing identified by the SGP coordinators include:
 - a. One or more agencies of the host government: 20 countries.
 - b. Bilateral aid agencies or other donor government agencies: 19 countries.
 - c. Non-governmental organizations, including international and national NGOs: 19 countries.

² One coordinator reported that a project had been co-financed but did not give the amount.

- d. Private sector entities: eight countries.
 - e. Local “support NGOs” and/or the beneficiary communities: seven countries.
 - f. Multilaterals (other than UNDP): seven countries.
 - g. UNDP projects or programmes: five countries.
 - h. National environmental funds: four countries.
- **Host governments:** Government co-financing has come not only from national ministries and agencies but also from municipal and other local governments. Countries with project co-financing from government sources in excess of \$100,000 include Brazil, Chile, Ghana, Jordan, Mexico, Poland and Tunisia.
 - **Donor governments:** Donor governments are also a principal source of SGP project co-financing. Donor countries supporting SGP projects include:
 - ❖ Canada (Costa Rica, Kenya, Thailand, Tunisia)
 - ❖ Denmark (Philippines)
 - ❖ European Union (Burkina Faso, Chile, Ghana, Mauritius)
 - ❖ France (Barbados)
 - ❖ Germany (Brazil, Costa Rica, Egypt, Jordan)
 - ❖ Japan (Jordan, Philippines)
 - ❖ Netherlands (Brazil, Burkina Faso, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Ghana, Guatemala, Trinidad and Tobago, Zimbabwe)
 - ❖ Spain (Costa Rica)
 - ❖ Switzerland (Ecuador, Jordan)
 - ❖ Sweden (Tunisia)
 - ❖ United Kingdom (Chile, Costa Rica, Jordan, Trinidad and Tobago)
 - ❖ United States (Belize, Costa Rica, Mauritius, Pakistan and Tunisia)

- Notable examples of cooperation between national SGP programmes and donor governments can be found in:
 - ❖ **Chile**, where the European Economic Community has contributed \$90,000 for a project on vicuna raising.
 - ❖ **Costa Rica**, where co-financing has been mobilized from Canada, Germany, Netherlands, Spain, United Kingdom and the United States.
 - ❖ **Ecuador**, where the Embassy of the Netherlands has supported 33 projects through the SGP for a total of \$765,000 and FOES (Ecuadorian-Swiss Counter-Value Fund) has co-financed six SGP projects for \$116,000.
 - ❖ **Ghana**, where the European Union has contributed \$80,000 to the Beng – Fiema Monkey Sanctuary community-based Conservation Project and discussions have been initiated with USAID for co-financing of \$75,000 for a TECHNOSERVE micro-enterprise best practice programme to reduce human-elephant conflicts.
 - ❖ **Jordan**, where SGP has obtained co-funding for projects from the embassies of Germany, Japan, Switzerland and the United Kingdom.
 - ❖ **Philippines**, where the coordinator works closely with the Grants Assistance for Grassroots Projects programme of Japan, which has contributed \$118,264 to four SGP projects, and DANIDA (Danish International Development Assistance), which has provided \$55,471 for two projects.
 - ❖ **Tunisia**, where USAID (United States Agency for International Development) has contributed \$200,000 to two projects.
- **NGOs:** Large numbers of national and international and national NGOs also provide co-financing for SGP projects. Major NGOs supporting projects financed by the SGP include:
 - ❖ Association Francaise des Volontaires du Progres (AFVP) (Burkina Faso, Cote d'Ivoire)
 - ❖ Biomass Users Network (Costa Rica)
 - ❖ Bread for the World (Brazil)
 - ❖ CARE (Costa Rica)

- ❖ Development and Peace (Brazil)
 - ❖ IUCN (Costa Rica, Pakistan, Philippines, Senegal)
 - ❖ Misereor (Brazil)
 - ❖ NOVIB (Pakistan)
 - ❖ Nuova Frontiera (Brazil)
 - ❖ Oxfam (Pakistan)
 - ❖ Save the Children (Pakistan)
 - ❖ Terre des Hommes (Thailand)
 - ❖ The Nature Conservancy (Belize)
 - ❖ World Wildlife Fund (WWF) (Brazil, Guatemala, Pakistan, Tunisia)
- **Private Sector:** Several coordinators have succeeded in mobilizing project co-financing from the private sector (Barbados, Brazil, Costa Rica, Guatemala, Jordan, Mauritius, Pakistan and Zimbabwe) but the grants have been small except for the Jordan Cement Company, which contributed \$110,000 to the Jordan Environment Society's Rhus Forest project and Shell y Castrol, Industria Nacional de Ciminto in Costa Rica, which gave \$277,583 to a waste disposal project.
 - **Beneficiaries³:** Two national programmes have given high priority to project cost-sharing by beneficiaries and/or local NGOs:
 - ❖ In Pakistan, 35 SGP -funded projects have also been supported by the beneficiary organization or community, with contributions totaling \$338,770, and/or a local "support NGO" (\$148,376).
 - ❖ In Poland, NGO/CBO contributions to projects partly financed by the SGP have totaled \$391,910.
 - **UNDP and other multilateral sources:** Mali, Mexico, Poland and Senegal report project co-financing arrangements with UNIFEM and UNDP. The programmes in Barbados, Belize, Brazil, Guatemala, Jordan and Mexico have co-financed projects

³ Only five countries specified project co-financing by beneficiary communities and local organizations but this occurs more widely than was reported.

with the Organization of Eastern Caribbean States and OAS; UNHCR; PPG-7 and the World Bank; the Inter American Development Bank (IDB); UNFPA, and FAO respectively.

- **National environmental funds (NEFs):** In several SGP countries, cooperative relationships with the national environmental fund have involved project co-financing:
 - ❖ In Guatemala, the Trust Fund for Conservation in Guatemala (FCG) has co-financed one project for \$3,000.
 - ❖ In Mexico, Fondo Mexicano para la Conservación de la Naturaleza (FMCN) has co-funded two SGP projects for \$51,650.
 - ❖ The Foundation for the Philippine Environment (FPE) has provided \$94,154 for two projects also funded by SGP.
 - ❖ In Poland, a total of \$548,940 has been made available to SGP projects by the National Environmental Fund for Environmental Protection and Water Management, the Voivodship Funds for Environmental Protection, and Eco Fund.

4. Co-financing Mechanisms; Administrative Cost Sharing

- With two main exceptions (Bolivia and Ecuador), project co-financing has gone directly from the donor to the beneficiary organization.
- In Bolivia, LIDEMA, the NGO which serves as host to the Small Grants Programme, obtained \$283,000 from the Netherlands in the pilot phase to co-finance projects funded by the SGP. SGP coordinated this programme. More recently, LIDEMA created a fund for the environment with \$300,000 from the MacArthur Foundation to co-finance SGP projects.
- In Ecuador, significant grants from FOES (Ecuadorian-Swiss Counter Value Fund (\$116,000), the government's Indigenous People Development Fund (\$55,000) and the Embassy of the Netherlands (\$765,000) have been transmitted to grantees through the SGP/UNDP Country Office.
- Although no co-financing to date has covered any SGP programme implementation costs, UNIFEM and the SGP programme have shared programme implementation responsibilities for a co-financed project in Mali and the Department for International Development (DFID) of the British Government is considering a grant of up to

£1.500.000 for activities in the Carrado Biome of Brazil which would include provision for extra costs incurred by ISPN, the SGP host institution.

D. Co-Financing for the National Programme

1. Support for the GEF/SGP National Programme

- Six countries have mobilized significant resources for the SGP country programme (as distinct from co-financing for individual projects supported by the SGP): Costa Rica, Cote d'Ivoire, Guatemala, India, Mexico and Pakistan.
- In four countries, support for the national programme has involved UNDP payments for GEF/SGP operating costs:
 - ❖ **Costa Rica:** UNDP is paying the salary of the GEF SGP National Coordinator for six months so that he will also continue to function as an adviser to the Country Office on environment. UNDP is also providing \$3,000 for the part-time services of a marketing consultant.
 - ❖ In **Côte d'Ivoire**, the UNDP Country Office has funded a secretary and some SGP programme implementation costs for a total of \$145,520.
 - ❖ In **Guatemala**, the UNDP Country Office is covering UNOPS support costs and GEF/SGP administrative costs in 1998-1999, for a total of \$200,000.
 - ❖ UNDP in **Pakistan** has committed \$95,500 for one year to cover the costs of two GEF/SGP outposts in Lahore and Quetta, including the costs of two provincial coordinators and support costs.
- Major funding commitments to support grant-making activities at the country level have also been made by UNDP and others in India and Mexico:
 - ❖ In **India**, UNDP has committed \$500,000 in TRAC resources to the SGP for 1998-2003. (This may include some provision for administrative costs.)
 - ❖ In **Mexico**, the SGP has mobilized \$2,116,835 for activities to be carried out by the SGP country programme. These include:
 - a. A one-year UNDP grant of \$383,000 for MEX/97/009, a training fund.
 - b. A three-year grant of \$538,835 from the Mexican government (INSOL) for the same project.

- c. A three-year grant of \$100,000 from The Rockefeller Foundation for this project.
- d. Two two-year grants from the Interamerican Foundation of the U.S. Government of \$150,000 and \$350,000 for Fondo Pensular's technical assistance fund and credit fund in the Yucatan Peninsula.
- e. Three grants from the Mexican government (FONAES) and UNIFEM of \$375,000, \$200,000 and \$20,000 respectively for the Fondo Pensular's credit and technical assistance funds.

2. Joint Programming Arrangements

- Five countries report innovative arrangements at country level for joint programming activities involving SPG and other donor organizations: Egypt, Jordan, Mali, Senegal and Thailand.
- Arrangements include:⁴
 - ❖ **Egypt:** The ministries of the Environment and Social Affairs are establishing a fund of \$600,000 to support NGO activities to protect the environment, with co-financing to come from the SGP and LIFE, a UNDP small grants programme.
 - ❖ **Jordan:** GEF/SGP will manage \$75,000 from the World Bank as part of the METAP pilot phase small grants programme. Five percent will be allocated for SGP administrative costs.
 - ❖ In **Mali**, the SGP has an unlimited agreement with a ILO women's support programme to co-finance community-based projects on a 50:50 basis.
 - ❖ In **Senegal**, the SGP participates in a programme with Centre Canadien d'Etude et de Cooperation International (CECI), a Canadian NGO, and the Africa 2000 Network, a UNDP small grants programme, for co-financing community projects. CECI is contributing \$30,750 and the GEF/SGP and Africa 2000 Network are providing \$15,000 each.
 - ❖ In **Thailand**, the Thai-UNCAP Facility, supported by the UN and the Thai government, is co-financing projects with the SGP in four target areas. The facility has committed over \$100,000 for this work.

⁴ Either already formally agreed or in the final stages of negotiation.

**RESOURCE MOBILIZATION & FINANCIAL SUSTAINABILITY:
GOALS AND STRATEGY
for
GLOBAL ENVIRONMENTAL FACILITY SMALL GRANTS
PROGRAMME (GEF/SGP)**

Summary Report of Findings

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This document reports the findings of a consultancy whose goal is to develop a strategy for the Global Environmental Facility Small Grants Programme, or GEF/SGP (hereafter SGP), to mobilize financial resources and work toward long-term sustainability. The development, implementation and evaluation of the resource mobilization and fundraising strategy at both global and country levels focuses on tapping into a largely new category of prospects for SGP, i.e., private sector sources. In this report, private sector sources are defined as corporations, foundations, large NGOs and high net-worth individuals. Principal deliverables of the strategy are the two-year budget and corresponding activities for global and country programs. A detailed timeline will be developed with Operational Phase II to coordinate activities and maximize prospects for success.

The Report is based on face-to-face and phone interviews; a review of program documents and reports; two country missions that included site visits and meetings with over a dozen SGP grantees and environmental experts; working sessions with the New York Coordination Unit (hereafter NYCU); analysis of the SGP product and a survey created for National Coordinators (hereafter NCs) to assess the program's value, visibility, impact and prospects for co-financing; and observations within and outside the GEF/SGP about the fundraising enterprise in general. The findings represent the work of one consultant with two decades of experience generating financial resources from the private sector for a public purpose business.

Critical to this assignment is developing a realistic framework for achieving the goal--gauging opportunities both for instituting an effective fundraising strategy and building an entrepreneurial, co-funding program based on SGP's first six years of experience and its revised operations. The initial focus is on creating a foundation for success: resource mobilization from private sources has not figured prominently in the daily operations of most SGP countries, and results to date, while impressive overall, diverge widely. The challenge is to recommend a methodology that provides a more systematic approach for successful country programs while at the same time providing the tools for sustained and diversified funding for those less experienced. The Report includes Objectives & Methodology; Product Definition & Positioning; Resource Mobilization: Goals & Strategy; Proposed Activities; Budget; Recommendations & Conclusions; and Attachments.

Several overriding considerations inform this Report and will influence the outcome over the long-term. Chief among them is recognizing that developing an organization's capacity and the professionalism of its stakeholders takes time, financial and talent resources, and that budget allocations and priorities reflect a commitment to goals. NGOs and CBOs face particular challenges in this regard due to their fundamental public purpose. Within this context, SGP will continually be challenged to:

- 1) Find the balance between its current institutional, organizational structure and the new, inherently entrepreneurial activity it is introducing.
- 2) Seek to incorporate techniques which have achieved material results in business, e.g., reasonable risk-taking, openness to new approaches, performance-based incentives that accrue to the program.
- 3) Recognize that institutionalization will take different forms in different countries, that achieving self-sufficiency may prove impractical in some locales, and that creative maintenance strategies will need to be developed.
- 4) Periodically review and revise fundraising guidelines to balance equal and legitimate needs of global and country programs both for coordination with implementing agencies as well as independence of action.
- 5) Nurture new relationships and work to change traditional public/private sector roles as a means to building a fundraising culture and achieving sustainability.

Two more realities inform this Report: SGP is an impressive environmental initiative that is eminently "fundable" if the foundation is laid with resources adequate to the scale of the task; and since interest in both the global environment and grassroots, community-based solutions is high, SGP's embarking on a long-term resource mobilization enterprise is timely.

I OBJECTIVES & METHODOLOGY

The findings presented in this Report are based on a set of quantitative and qualitative deliverables developed in conjunction with NYCU. As a means of exploring co-funding opportunities for SGP at the global program and country program levels, the adviser agreed to:

- develop goals, a corresponding financial strategy and timetable to help make SGP more self-sustaining;
- examine the guidelines that currently govern the gathering of co-financing resources in order to recommend new and less traditional approaches to tapping private sector resources;
- review “best practices” for co-financing, particularly among multi-laterals and within the international development community;
- understand and articulate SGP’s purpose and impact in non-technical terms as a prerequisite to approaching the marketplace for monetary and in-kind support;
- conduct one or more fact-finding missions;
- advise NYCU on new, core promotional materials based on the two preceding activities;
- lay the foundation for beginning to research the new, target markets; and
- make preliminary introductions about SGP’s work and innovative approach to practitioners in these markets.

The work involved document review, meetings and frequent consultation with NYCU, phone and face-to-face interviews, and research. The Scope of Work (see Attachment I) would be revised and prioritized after submission of an Interim Report of Findings; key elements would be incorporated into the GEF Small Grants Programme (Second Operational Phase) Project Brief, others would be discussed in this report, and a few would be undertaken in a next phase due to this assignment’s limited duration. In addition to a detailed timeline, more work is projected in the following areas:

1. Best practices for co-financing: Fundraising experience at the country level has been analyzed and the results, in many instances, are impressive. Since countries routinely learn from each other, examples of effective resource mobilization strategies will be broadly disseminated. Such co-financing involves primarily other agencies--multi-laterals, large environmental NGOs and the international development community in general, including national environmental funds. Which of these programs are effective? How do they work? What can SGP learn that is replicable and appropriate for its operations? Where are the opportunities for collaboration and partnership? What are the current mechanisms for co-financing? How can or should they be revised to facilitate innovation and creativity in fundraising?
2. Development of core promotional materials: SGP needs a new brochure, available in three languages, that tells the SGP story in accessible, motivating and human terms. It also needs to have on hand a prototype funding proposal, updated no less than annually, that can be adapted at the country level. Core communications will be consistent while, at the same time, reflecting SGP’s remarkable diversity.
3. Market analysis and research on co-financing prospects: Foundations, corporations, large NGOs and individuals represent potential sources of financial support and referral for SGP global and country programs. There are many ways to identify and approach these prospects. An understanding of which approaches are appropriate will depend on such factors as country conditions, the culture of giving, the experience of the NC, contacts among NSCs, resources allocated to the enterprise, opportunities to partner in the fundraising enterprise with other organizations. Research will be implemented, different approaches tested, and results evaluated on an ongoing basis once the effort begins.

II PRODUCT DEFINITION & POSITIONING

What is the organization known as the GEF Small Grants Programme? Why does it matter? Who cares about it and what would be lost if it were to shut down? People involved with SGP might be concerned with the prospect of its ceasing operations. However, precisely the fact that the Small Grants Programme has not had the need to define its role within the environmental and conservation community has contributed to its being such a well-kept secret. (The traditional marketing adage that “if you haven’t talked about it, you haven’t done it” would appear to apply here.) It now has such a need.

Effective fundraising begins and ends with a commitment to a program’s purpose and goals. Successful grassroots programs, just as successful businesses, communicate that commitment up and down the organization. At this stage in its development, SGP shares the problem of many NGOs: its work is important and unusual, even remarkable, it is making a measurable impact on people and communities, but it is for all purposes invisible outside the immediate circle of practitioners, beneficiaries, agency managers, and the few organizations with which it regularly interacts. SGP will fall short of achieving the impact or long-term sustainability it seeks unless its purpose, value, approach and results in the dual arenas of environmental conservation and sustainable livelihoods are articulated and celebrated to a broader group of stakeholders and prospective supporters.

Strategic resource mobilization

- starts by defining the product--the SGP program--that it wants to sell;
- defines it, not in the language of the specialist, but in words readily accessible to the woman and man on the street;
- articulates SGP’s impact in non-technical, human and motivating terms;
- and describes how and why the program occupies a special niche in the market.

A product definition survey, completed by over six dozen NCs, selected GEF management and staff, and NYCU now serves as the basis for approaching the marketplace of private resources for monetary and in-kind support. (The questionnaire appears as Attachment I and the Compilation of Survey Responses is available on request.) Survey results were encouraging, confirming the belief that SGP is an extraordinary, first-of-its-kind initiative within the international environmental community. For example, some of the words used to describe SGP were “flexible, nimble, participatory, low-cost, effective, non-bureaucratic, innovative, intelligent, practical.” Similarly, its contributions in connecting individuals and grassroots communities to complex, global environmental issues was a repeated theme. With an eminently saleable product in hand, one has the raw material to plan and implement a resource mobilization strategy. The work that needs to be done going forward to develop clear and compelling promotional materials could also include changing the program’s name. (As it stands, Small Grant Programme could describe any of hundreds of NGOs.) Minimally, it is recommended that the new marketing pieces incorporate a tagline that captures some of SGP’s distinguishing characteristics, such as “Smart, Global, Pragmatic.”

III RESOURCE MOBILIZATION: GOALS & STRATEGIES

A. Financial Goals & Timetable

SGP will seek to raise \$15 million in cash contributions at the country and global level over a two-year period. Of this amount, the year-one goal is \$3.75 million, or 25%, and the year-two goal is \$11.25 million, or 75%.

These amounts are based on the following assumptions:

1. There will be three pools of funds: a) approximately \$15 million per year from GEF, totaling \$30 million for two years; b) \$15 million in non-GEF cash contributions over two years generated through a scaled-up and more systematic resource mobilization effort; and c) \$15 million of in-kind (non-cash) contributions over two years,

primarily from local communities in which SGP grantees operate. Of this two-year total of \$60 million projected in Operational Phase II, funds raised from private sources represent 25%.

- In terms of total financial support (versus in-kind contributions), the resource mobilization target of \$3.75 million equals 20% of \$18.75 million in financial support for year one. The second-year goal of \$11.25 million equals 43% of the \$26.25 million in financial support that SGP anticipates. The chart below reflects these relationships.

| | Monies Raised (\$ in millions) | % of Total Cash Support | % of Total Support |
|-----------------|---|------------------------------------|---------------------------|
| Year One | \$ 3.75 | 20% | 17% |
| Year Two | 11.25 | 43% | 30% |
| Total | \$15.00 | | |

- The resource mobilization Budget (see Section V) totaling \$289,000 for two years reflects the importance of investing at an adequate level in year one to lay the foundation for achieving the aggressive year two fundraising target of over \$11 million, three times the first year’s goal. However, resource mobilization expense as a percentage of funds raised declines from 3.9% in year one to 1.3% in year two (or \$147,000 of \$3.75 million vs. \$142,000 of \$11.25 million), even though the net amount in year two remains almost the same. This level of expenditure realistically reflects the requirements of a start-up operation.

Two other assumptions are expected for subsequent years (2001 and following): (i) Resource mobilization expenses at global level will decline as the fundraising enterprise shifts to the country level. (ii) There will be a more gradual increase (versus the sharp increase years one and two) in fundraising results at both the global and country levels. Going forward, it is anticipated that SGP global will raise 10-15% of new money and country programs, 85-90% until and as the latter become independent or partner with other country entities.

Resource mobilization results during the entire period will be evaluated and changes in these assumptions will be made in light of both global and country level experience and performance.

B. Non-Financial Goals & Strategies

Creating the foundation for financial security and long-term sustainability, i.e., raising the monetary resources adequate to support the scale of SGP’s work, means building a culture of fundraising within SGP itself, at both global and country levels. Instituting and sustaining this new culture over the long term requires that SGP engage in a multiple series of initiatives and practices, many if not most of which are new to the overall SGP. This section and the one that follows focus on the non-financial and qualitative challenges inherent in this resource mobilization enterprise. They are described both in the list below and in the Chart of Activities (Section IV):

- Build and instill an entrepreneurial enterprise--the practice of fundraising--within an institution traditionally guided by policies and procedures in many of its daily operations.
- Learn how to fundraise: how to contact, make effective presentations to, be persistent in pursuing, and ultimately “closing” on a prospect. This includes ongoing research and prospect identification. Once the fundraising enterprise begins, it effectively does not end.
- Learn how to nurture and maintain donor relationships once funds have been received. This is especially important since the best source of “new business” is the current customer base; satisfied clients are the best referral sources to other qualified prospects.
- Create internal communications tools to support fundraising and resource mobilization efforts at global and country levels, maximizing the use of computers and electronic mail to make informal weekly reports, as well as quarterly compilations, of lessons learned and successes.

- Develop a new language for SGP outside the office. This means learning to describe SGP in non-technical, human and motivating terms that will interest and excite a diverse marketplace.
- Develop a small portfolio of accessible sales and communications tools, with items such as a short brochure, referral cards and news briefs readily available for presentations and/or public relations opportunities. Developments from the world of SGP are periodically updated.
- Review, revise and evaluate these and other resource mobilization tools and strategies no less than annually.

These concepts and practices are fundamental to effective resource mobilization in any organization, for-profit or not-for-profit. In addition, SGP should explore other potentially productive approaches to becoming financially more self-sufficient. For example, as it gains confidence and expertise in its fundraising efforts, SGP will want to

- become familiar with financial tools and structures other than grants, e.g., grant capital, endowment funds, community foundations, program-related investments.
- Learn about a growing field among non-profits--creating for-profit affiliates to generate income that support the programmatic activities of the non-profit parent organization.
- Explore building collaborations and partnerships with new sectors and markets as a way to broaden its reach and mainstream its important work.

C. Some Caveats

In analyzing the potential for implementing a successful resource mobilization strategy, it is also important to keep in mind factors that may influence well-laid plans but are beyond SGP's control. (Such factors are the "Threats" of a traditional SWOT Analysis, i.e., Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, Threats; and they tend to be external, rather than internal, to an enterprise.) There has been no attempt here to research such issues. A couple of obvious examples, however, include guidelines on co-financing issued by an implementing agency that could constrain some of the activities herein envisaged; new regulations from other multi-laterals about funding from the private sector about which SGP is not now aware; changes in the tax code; or a trend by prospective funders away from interest in the environment. Changing programmatic interests and priorities among foundations can present serious challenges to long-term sustainability for NGOs that have organized themselves around a particular philanthropic focus.

IV PROPOSED ACTIVITIES

A. Discussion

As discussed earlier in this report, prerequisites to successful implementation of a resource mobilization strategy involve instituting a culture of fundraising throughout SGP; and supporting and even taking a leadership role in creating a culture of philanthropy at the country level. Both are ambitious goals that require patience, long-term vision and a commitment to become involved in the mainstream of public, private, civic and philanthropic sectors. Not the least of these is being sensitive to the fact that philanthropy will take different forms in different countries, that a culture of giving may exist but in less obvious form, and that innovative or customized approaches to entry may have to be devised.

The resource mobilization Chart of Activities below lists a range of actions, from market analysis to training, donor cultivation, promotional materials, to fundraising manual that comprise the basic tools for launching this strategy. While indicating which level is more appropriate for an activity--global, country or both--there has been no attempt here to proscribe exactly how these activities should be conducted. For example, depending on the place, conditions and personnel, researching prospects may best be achieved by an NC, or a small team assembled for the process, or an independent country consultant. At the same time, keys to effective fundraising are similar regardless of the context: telling a story people can relate to, convincing a prospect of the value of what you are doing, writing a clear and persuasive proposal, planning activities for the year, never-ending prospecting, and believing in SGP's purpose.

As this enterprise unfolds, it will be important to define the universe of prospects, develop an understanding of how each operates, and identify areas of mutual interest and value. For example, a foundation with an environmental program is not, a priori, a prospect unless SGP can convince it that its work in climate change, for example, adds value the foundation could not otherwise achieve through its current approach. Or, however intrigued a corporation might be about an SGP project or grantee, if it is confronted with a protracted or excessively complex and bureaucratic funding process, its contributions will go elsewhere.

By the same token, researching corporate prospects should begin with their business self-interest insofar as that interest coincides with SGP goals and GEF priorities. Rather than take a scattershop approach, market research on companies could begin by identifying the industries that have an impact on or are affected by each of the three GEF focal areas; one then selects corporations within each of those industries and researches where they currently do business or plan to expand. This method of organizing and visualizing the research can be further broken down by region or micro-region. A "highly qualified prospect" would be the shipping company interested in improving its public image after having been fined for polluting a stretch of ocean that borders an SGP country (or countries) working on international waters. That is the easy part. The challenge is then finding the right person to approach. In general, the best place to start is at the top, and spending the time to gain access to that individual is often worth the effort.

In addition to these and many other considerations to be explored, this report strongly recommends that the entire resource mobilization strategy incorporate, from the beginning, modest but carefully articulated and communicated performance-based incentives. Thus, for example, if a country and its NC not just meet but exceed their annual co-financing target by some agreed upon amount or percentage, they have access to a scale of rewards, ranging from recognition by colleagues, to broader visibility within the entire system or, most importantly, to a special pool of grant funds set aside and available for this specific purpose each year. These are the kinds of indicators that communicate to NCs, NSCs and grantees that SGP is serious about instituting a resource mobilization program for achieving sustainability over the long term.

B. Chart of Activities

| Activities | Global Level | Country Level |
|--|--------------|---------------|
| Market analysis on funding prospects | | |
| Focus groups (share key findings with NCs) | X | |
| Focus groups (optional for country level) | | X |
| Informal meetings to research market potential | X | X |
| Define each market segment | X | X |
| Identify source materials for researching prospects | X | X |
| Purchase/share core resource materials | X | X |
| Compile & prioritize prospect list | X | X |
| Continual updating of prospect lists | X | X |
| Fundraising mechanics | | |
| Establish mechanism for accepting funds at global | X | |
| Clarify criteria for raising money internationally | X | |
| Communicate innovative strategies | X | X |
| Fundraising resource materials | | |
| Acquire <i>Foundation Directory</i> (book or CD-ROM) | X | |
| Subscribe to <i>Chronicle of Philanthropy</i> (countries via Internet) | X | X |
| Membership in Council on Foundations | X | X |
| Assemble library of core books on fundraising ¹ | X | |
| Acquire Foundation Center's list of publications | | |
| Resource mobilization training | | |
| All NCs attend one regional workshop in 1999 | | X |
| Advanced Resource Mobilization training for 8-12 NCs | X | |
| Industry conference on fundraising for NYCU | X | |
| Fundraising manual & guidelines | | |
| Write the manual (year one) ² | X | |
| Distribute the manual (NCs selectively distribute to NGOs) | X | X |
| Year two update with attachments ³ | X | |
| Year three revise & redistribute | | |
| Internal weekly communications update on fundraising (e-mail) | X | X |
| Marketing & promotion | | |
| Brochure (produce, translate & distribute) ⁴ | X | |
| Newsletter (produce & distribute; also create regional template) | X | X |
| Newsletter supplement (sent as insert to global newsletter) | X | X |
| Slide presentation | X | |
| Slide presentation (supplement global with local stories) | X | X |
| Annual report (produce & distribute) | X | X |
| Website ⁵ | X | X |
| Periodic promotional pieces ⁶ | X | X |
| Presentations at industries, trade shows, conferences | X | |

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| Feature articles | X | |
| Public service appearances | | X |
| Video | X | |
| Direct mail (create core sales letters) | | X |
| Direct mail (use core material and adapt) | | |
| Advertising (create core messages and graphics) | | |
| Advertising (adapt core materials within guidelines) | | |
| Donor cultivation & relations | | |
| Letters and phone calls | X | X |
| Face-to-face sales calls | X | X |
| Proposal writing | X | X |
| Site visits to projects | | X |
| Receptions/special events | X | X |
| Cultivate SGP Advisory Council | X | |

Assumptions:

1. Source materials will vary by country. In addition, there may be regional fundraising guides and lists.
2. Resource Strategy Adviser or comparable specialist oversees development of fundraising manual.
3. Support staff maintains and updates fundraising manual with input from NYCU.
4. Resource Strategy Adviser oversees creation and production of core SGP brochure.
5. NCs will be encouraged to send reports and stories regularly to Communications Officer so that the Website is continually updated and kept fresh and interesting.
6. Within broad guidelines and criteria, these occasional pieces should reflect the style and character of the country, region or micro-region.

V BUDGET

| | Year 1 | Year 2 | Total |
|---|--------------------|--------------------|---------------------|
| 1. Resource Strategy Adviser | \$75,000.00 | \$35,000.00 | \$110,000.00 |
| 2. Support staff for Resource Mobilization | 25,000.00 | 15,000.00 | 40,000.00 |
| 3. Legal advice on fundraising mechanisms/mechanics (global) | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 4. Market analysis on corporations, foundations, individuals & NGOs | 3,500.00 | 1,500.00 | 5,000.00 |
| 5. Fundraising resource materials | 5,000.00 | 3,000.00 | 8,000.00 |
| 6. Resource Mobilization training: | | | |
| Regional Resource Mobilization workshops for all NCs (3) | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Resource Mobilization training for 8-12 NCs (1, in New York) | 0.00 | 20,000.00 | 20,000.00 |
| Industry conference on fundraising for NYCU (in New York) | 4,000.00 | 0.00 | 4,000.00 |
| 7. Fundraising Manual & Guidelines | 500.00 | 0.00 | 500.00 |
| 8. Marketing & Promotion: | | | |
| Brochure (design, production, printing, translation) | 10,000.00 | 0.00 | 10,000.00 |
| Newsletter (produce in-house, distribute broadly) & mailing | 3,000.00 | 5,000.00 | 8,000.00 |
| Slide presentation (35mm & computer) | 2,000.00 | 500.00 | 2,500.00 |
| Annual Report | 10,000.00 | 20,000.00 | 30,000.00 |
| Website | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Periodic promotional pieces | 0.00 | 3,000.00 | 3,000.00 |
| Presentations at industry meetings, trade shows, conferences | 3,000.00 | 3,000.00 | 6,000.00 |
| Place feature articles in newspapers and local publications | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Public service appearances on TV, radio | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Video | 0.00 | 15,000.00 | 15,000.00 |
| Direct mail | 0.00 | 5,000.00 | 5,000.00 |
| Advertising (visibility) | 0.00 | 3,000.00 | 3,000.00 |
| 9. Donor cultivation & relations | 5,000.00 | 12,000.00 | 17,000.00 |
| 10. Sundry | 1,000.00 | 1,000.00 | 2,000.00 |
| Total: | \$147,000.0 | \$142,000.0 | \$289,000.00 |
| | 0 | 0 | |

VI RECOMMENDATIONS & CONCLUSIONS

The financial strategy recommended in this report and the concepts and activities from which it is derived incorporate the goals of continuity, flexibility and accountability highlighted in SGP's Project Brief for Operational Phase II. They are reflected in a variety of ways:

1. Institutional and financial sustainability are unattainable unless a solid foundation for success is laid when a new program is introduced; key program elements are then continually reinforced. Sustainability in a development context implies a time horizon of at least 10 to 20 years. Thus, a serious resource mobilization strategy goes well beyond fundraising training and guidelines manual. It starts with an appreciation of the culture of fundraising and builds from there. SGP already has a co-financing track record, so the strategy is in concert with a focus on continuity--reinforcing the considerable progress made to date and supportive of more predictable and program-wide results going forward.
2. As stressed time and again, resource mobilization is inherently entrepreneurial. Flexibility of action and customization of approaches are critical. The approach then moves from rhetoric to action: within the parameters of a set of basic activities, through trial and error and, eventually, through a continual stream of ideas and suggestions coming from colleagues in 46 countries, NCs and NYCU find the techniques and mechanisms for raising money and forging financial partnerships that respond to locale conditions and traditions. The global program has a responsibility to make the appropriate changes in its mode of operations to embrace and encourage this flexibility.
3. Finally, accountability in the context of resource mobilization goes well beyond submitting reports on fundraising activities, numbers of calls and presentations made, and growing prospect lists. Results speak for themselves, and both global and country programs will be accountable for meeting co-financing targets. But the global SGP should also be prepared to reward fundraising performance that exceeds goals. Creating an equitable incentive system that rewards achievement in a particularly entrepreneurial aspect of its program--resource mobilization--could also set useful precedent for other selected activities in the current institutional framework. Although establishing such a system represents a significant challenge, it may prove to be well worth the effort.

These principals in mind, the Report concludes with recommendations on ways to institutionalize a resource mobilization culture within SGP and obtain optimal results during this initial stage. They are based a) on an appreciation of SGP's many strengths and achievements as well as areas for improvement; and b) endorse a key finding of the Second Independent Evaluation: "...the idea of country program sustainability remains unclear to most, if not all, NCs and NSC members in terms of goals, timeframe, options and procedures. Most country programs will require several years or more before they can expect to become financially and/or institutionally independent from the GEF, and they will require significantly more guidance on how to achieve this."

A number of options considered to meet the strategic financial goals were deemed to be unworkable or inappropriate at this time because they could result in achieving sub-optimal performance. For example,

- centralizing all fundraising activities would be unwieldy as well as contrary to the goals just discussed;
- maintaining the current system is unlikely to facilitate meeting the ambitious co-financing targets being established; or

- instituting a fully decentralized system at this stage is unrealistic and inappropriate, for reasons that go well beyond reputation risk.

The options and recommendations that follow are deemed fundamental to the long-term resource mobilization enterprise, appear to be doable under current operating conditions, and represent essential building blocks for mounting a serious financial strategy. It is worth noting that the budget for these activities represents the threshold of expenditures to reach a point where there is an opportunity to begin institutionalizing a fundraising culture and achieving the quantifiable results that come with it. A budget does not guarantee results. Reducing the risk of non-performance will require management commitment, continued diligence and ongoing resource allocation:

1. Effective communications are central to this effort. While they will take many forms and will become the responsibility of new, full-time staff at NYCU, fundraising needs to be reinforced through a stream of frequent, informal messages and information designed to reach widely dispersed NCs no less than weekly, encourage them to participate in the process, and provide tips on what is working and what is not. The result is at least two-fold: practitioners receive valuable information, and a new communications culture is introduced into the entire organization. A hallmark of most effective organizations is open, clear and continual communications.
2. SGP will be challenged to incorporate techniques which have achieved material results in business--reasonable risk-taking, openness to new approaches, performance-based incentives. Gradually introducing the latter is strongly recommended. A benchmarking and incentive system should be developed in a consultative way, involving NCs and NYCU. Since this may be a novel, even unprecedented approach, it has a better chance of succeeding if practitioners help design it. The system could also vary by region. Incentives would be financial and non-financial (e.g., public recognition for meeting and exceeding annual cash or in-kind goals; being asked to join a prestigious Steering Committee on Fundraising; receiving advanced fundraising training). The highest reward would be financial--receiving additional grant funds in the following cycle, but no later than three months after reaching the goal. A pool of such funds would be set aside by NYCU for this purpose.
3. Periodically reviewing fundraising guidelines within implementing agencies and multi-laterals is necessary to balance equal and legitimate needs of global and country programs for coordination as well as independence of action. Raising significant grants from large national or international foundations is a case in point. There is a disincentive to seizing timely opportunities for financial support if an application to a prospect outside of one's country is, a priori, precluded. Solutions to this dilemma could be submission of joint proposals; contributing a portion of funds raised from international sources to a special pool, managed at global and earmarked for capacity building in fundraising; development of regional proposals.
4. Explore collaborations within and outside of the UNDP system. If within, work to ensure that the process is streamlined to facilitate progress. Current opportunities for this kind of partnership should be pursued, as well as prospects with selected national environmental funds and other large NGOs.
5. Regarding the two prior recommendations and in view of the proliferation of private sector initiatives within SGP implementing agencies and other multi-laterals, it may be necessary to create a manageable clearinghouse apparatus. Thus, while steering clear of a cumbersome

centralized structure, programs seeking private resources, especially large corporate contributions, should be generally informed of major initiatives underway by colleagues. This is part and parcel of SGP's communicating an institutional presence of competence and professionalism as it prepares to launch a major resource mobilization effort.

6. In addition to instilling a culture of fundraising within SGP, NCs and NYCU will be challenged to help build a culture of philanthropy in many if not most of its operating countries. This will require nurturing new relationships with individuals and organizations in sectors where there has been little or no prior experience, particularly private enterprise. Overall, SGP professionals will be working with many others in government, academia, politics, corporations, and civil society to change traditional public/private sector roles as they become increasingly skillful in raising resources and achieving sustainability.

ATTACHMENTS

- I Scope of Work
- II Product Definition Questionnaire

Attachment I

SCOPE OF WORK

The consultant will assist the GEF/SGP coordination unit in exploring co-funding opportunities for SGP both at the overall program and selected country levels. Specifically, the consultant will concentrate on the following activities:

1. Develop initial goals and a corresponding financial strategy and timeline to help make the program more self-sustaining. This includes recommendations on grants, grant capital and fee-generating activities. (7)
2. Understand current conditions and developments so that the strategy reflects the prevailing constraints and guidelines that govern private sector and other non-traditional funding mechanisms for SGP at both overall program and country levels. (1/2)
3. Examine “best practices” for co-financing within the international development community, environmental and other, and among SGP country programs. (5)
4. Go on at least one fact-finding mission to understand the impact and uniqueness of SGP’s work. (10)
5. Participate in one teleconference with selected National Coordinators to review their successful fundraising strategies and to begin identifying new funding prospects and approaches at the country level. (1/2)
6. Define the product: Examine and articulate SGP’s competitive position and advantages in the marketplace through conversations and interviews with selected experts in the field. What makes SGP unique and how can it best be sold? (5)
7. Initiate the process of assembling a list of co-funding prospects from different market segments, i.e., corporations, foundations, high net-worth individuals, and other donor organizations and institutions. (3)
8. Advise staff on updating sales and marketing materials and review the production of one internally-developed, new core piece. (This will later include a new, prototype funding proposal written by staff and adaptable to different prospects.) (2)
9. Test the market: Introduce SGP and its innovative approach--linking global environment issues to community-based activities--to potential new sources of support, both grant and grant capital; explore opportunities and timeline for funding. This activity, limited by time constraints in the initial period, would start in the U.S. but target selectively (e.g., beginning in Europe, Mexico, South America) in the next round. (6)
10. Revise the goals, financial strategy and timeline based on the activities above and submit a Summary Report of Findings for incorporation into the Project Brief. (3)

METHODOLOGY

After a detailed, two-day briefing on the GEF/SGP’s mission through document review and meetings with senior headquarters staff, the consultant will commence work on the activities above. Work will be done through a combination of research, phone and face-to-face interviews, fact-finding missions and frequent communications and consultation with SGP staff.

TIME FRAME

The consultant will begin to work June 1, 1998, and continue through the middle of August for a total of 42 days.

May 14, 1998

Attachment II GEF/SGP Project: Product Definition Survey

1. What is the Small Grants Programme (hereafter SGP) of GEF?
2. Why does it matter?
3. In general, what do people say about SGP?
 - a) What are the three words they use to describe SGP today?
 - b) What three words do we want people to use three to five years from now?
4. List SGP's main accomplishments using short phrases (no more than 6 words). These contributions can be outcomes (what happened), benefits (why it mattered), or beneficiaries (who was affected).
5. What kind of organization is SGP? What does it look like now?
6. What do we want SGP to look like in 3yrs., in 5yrs.?
7. What does SGP have to do to get there?
8. Who cares about SGP? What would be lost if SGP ceased operations?
9. What will it take to make people care about SGP?
10. Best co-financing practices in SGP and the larger GEF:
 - a) What is the best current example of co-financing within SGP?
 - b) What is the best example of co-financing operating today within GEF?
 - c) If you could design the ideal co-financing arrangement for SGP, what would it be?
 - d) How should SGP recognize and acknowledge its partners? What will they get for their support?
 - e) What measurable outcomes and benefits might attract such outside participation?
11. Please complete these sentences:
 - c) SGP is the only NGO initiative that _____ .
 - d) Without SGP, there would be no _____ .
 - e) Because of SGP, GEF is able to _____ .
 - f) Because of SGP, UNDP now understands _____ .
12. You have just received a short brochure in the mail telling you about SGP. What would you need to see or read in that brochure to attract your interest? List some of the elements.
13. What would you need to see or read in the brochure to get you to act, that is, to make a financial contribution to SGP?
14. If you were in charge, what changes would you recommend at the implementing organizations to make SGP even more effective?
15. Who are your role models in the environment? Distinguish between NGOs, corporates, governments. Which individuals in the field do you most admire, your "heroes or heroines"?

Prepared by: Joan Shapiro,
Resource Strategy
Adviser to GEF/SGP
June 22, 1998