

联合国

EP



联合国
环境规划署

Distr.
GENERAL

UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/68/13
5 November 2012

CHINESE
ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

执行蒙特利尔议定书
多边基金执行委员会
第六十八次会议
2012年12月3日至7日，蒙特利尔

评估 2015—2017 三年期行政费用制度（第 66/17(e) 号决定）

执行蒙特利尔议定书多边基金执行委员会的会前文件不妨碍文件印发后执行委员会可能作出的任何决定。

1. 自行政费用制度为每一个新的三年期受到审查以来，执行委员会在第六十二次会议上被问及是否希望进行一次独立的评估，或者由秘书处进行一次评估。委员会决定“2012-2014 三年期行政费用制度的范围要以基金秘书处在第六十五次会议前编制的 2012 年核心单位费用报告为基础”（第 62/25(c) 号决定）。
2. 在根据各执行机构作用和投资组合变更以及合理化报告规定的影响来评估现行制度的适当性时，秘书处请各执行机构提供资料说明各自的行政费用在什么范围内被用于报告规定、项目执行以及内部管理要求。尽管环境规划署提供了估计数，开发计划署和世界银行指出，它们必须进行详细分析才能评估各自行政费用中的各个费用部分；至今没有向基金秘书处提交任何资料。委员会无法在 2012-2014 三年期开始之前或者在三年期第一次会议之前商定行政费用制度。因此，行政费用制度适用于 2012-2014 年的第一次会议。
3. 秘书处第六十五次会议询问执行委员会，是否希望请各执行机构提供关于行政费用被用于报告、项目执行和内部要求的情况的费用分析以及与审查 2015-2017 三年期行政费用有关的行政费用评估。这项问题在第六十六次会议得到处理，执行委员会决定：“在第六十八次会议继续讨论评估 2015-2017 三年期行政费用制度可能需要的职权范围以及如何根据以前的职权范围修改这项职权范围”（第 66/17(e) 号决定）。
4. 这份文件对这项问题进行了讨论，审查了多边基金的行政费用的历史演变及其评估、以前的职权范围、意见和建议。

行政费用的历史及其评估

5. 多边基金自成立以来，已经有过四套行政费用制度。最初，开发计划署、环境规划署和工发组织接受统一的机构费用，费率为核准项目以及项目编制和国家方案编制活动的价值的 13%，而世界银行接受一项行政、法律和财务预算，即其包括项目编制和国家方案编制在内的年度工作方案的供资要素作为行政费用。它还接受每一个别项目的核准资金 3% 的支助费用，用于支付其负责项目执行的财务中介机构的费用。
6. 第一次独立的评估是由环境规划署前任副执行主任进行的，其结果使所有机构，包括世界银行接受了 13% 的费用（见 UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/12/6，第 41 段；UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/14/12，和第 18/10(b) 号决定）。第二次独立评估是由 Coopers 和 Lybrand 公司进行的，其结果给行政费用制度带来了第三个改变（见缔约方会议第 VIII/4 号决定，第 6 段；和 UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/26/67）。新的行政费用制度最初适用于所有机构，但是现今完全适用的只有双边机构，部分适用于环境规划署（第 26/41 号决定和第 67/15(a) 号决定）。第三十八次会议之前，执行委员会根据机构份额（世界银行 45%、开发计划署 30% 和工发组织 25%）分配投资项目资源。由于这一个改变，开发计划署、工发组织和世界银行接受了个别活动支助费用比率减少的核心项目预算（见第 37/68(c) 号决定和第 38/68 号决定）。目前这些机构的制度就是如此。
7. 另一项独立评估是根据第五十一次会议审议的职权范围（UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/51/44 和第 51/38 号决定）进行的。这项研究是由 Price Waterhouse Coopers 公司进行的，被呈交给第五十五次会议（UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/55/48 和第 55/44 号决定）；基金秘书处呈交的一份议题文件（UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/56/19）对此采取了后续行动。执行委员会同意在 2009-2011 三年期内维持现行的双边和执行机构行政费用制度，并

请各执行机构提供充分的实际数据用以监测行政费用收入和开支之间的差异（第 56/41(b) 和(c)号决定）。

8. 执行委员会第六十四次会议请基金秘书处在进度报告中在审查根据第“62/25(c)号决定将要提交第六十五次会议的行政成本时审议：a. 考虑到执行机构任务和一揽子项目的变化，现有行政成本计划是否继续适用；b. 确保总体行政成本所占比率保持在历史平均水平或更低水平的备选方案”（第 64/6(c) (三)号决定）。

9. 执行委员会第六十七次会议通过了一项新的行政费用制度，并决定在执行委员会第七十四次会议，即 2012—2014 三年期最后一次会议，审查行政费用制度及其核心项目供资预算（第 67/15(b) (c)号决定）。

10. 在解决根据可能的开支额而不是核准额评估行政费用的议题过程中，秘书处提出，可以审议在年度预先核准预算的基础上建立行政费用制度，并从 2015-2017 三年期开始执行，因为这将意味着可以避免资金余额待开支的状况以及提供对行政费用的机构费用部分使用情况的清晰认识。机构费用部分占联合国机构执行项目费用的一定百分比费用，因此，超支或者开支不足都有可能发生，除非制度改变。秘书处还提到，如果委员会希望就 2015-2017 三年期制定一种不同的行政费用制度，那么它应当在该三年期之前进行，使氟氯烃淘汰管理计划第二阶段可将这种新制度列入考虑。

以前的职权范围

11. 附件一至三载列了用于独立评价的以前职权范围。其中还包括了全球环境基金进行的用于上次行政费用研究的职权范围。全球环境基金的职权范围确定了有待处理的目标、具体问题和议题、工作方法以及进行评价的时限和进度指标。

评论

12. 根据执行委员会第 67/15(c)号决定，对行政费用制度及其核心项目供资预算的审查应提交其第七十四次会议。各执行机构也表示希望在下一个三年期维持目前使用的制度。不过，在下一个三年期中将有许多氟氯烃淘汰管理计划第二阶段的长期协定，其执行时间可能超过一个三年期期间，因此，机构费用应根据对氟氯烃淘汰管理计划第二阶段的编制指导进行考虑。

13. 审查工作可由独立顾问、基金秘书处或专家进行，一如已往审查的情况。使用独立专家的经验是他们费用高昂和进行分析的顾问团队需要长时间了解情况。执行机构并不提供成本分析，说明用于报告、项目执行和内部要求以及基金秘书处要能评估提供给行政费用的经费要求提交的其他评估所需的行政费用。此外，除了考虑达到行政费用历史平均费率的选项外，并无已经核准的职权范围。

14. 不论职权范围的形式为何，有执行委员会提供意见和有执行机构提供意见的职权范围要比没有职权范围好，能够说明何种费用应列入评估。执行委员会不妨提出它对职权范围的看法，并请秘书处与执行机构合作，按第 67/15(c)号决定授权进行的评估，提出职权范围、有待讨论的问题、工作方法、进度指标和费用。

15. 预计 2012—2014 三年期的行政费用制度不会达到 11.54%的历史行政费用比率，原来预期这个三年期会达到 11.55%的平均比率。行政费用制度至今没有达到缔约方第八

次会议所确定的实现费用比率低于 10% 的目标（第 VIII/4 号决定）。职权范围应探索在 2015 年至 2017 年的三年期中实现这些目标的方法。

建议

16. 谨建议执行委员会：

- (a) 提出其对评估 2015—2017 三年期行政费用的职权范围内容的意见；
- (b) 请秘书处与各执行机构合作，按第 67/15(c) 号决定授权进行的评估，提出职权范围、有待讨论的问题、工作方法、进度指标和费用以及包括但不限于实现执行委员会第 67/15(c) 号决定和缔约方会议第 VIII/4 号决定所确定目标的建议。

Annex I

TERMS OF REFERENCE OF PROPOSED ENQUIRY FOR THE ADMINISTRATIVE COST ANALYSIS PRESENTED TO THE 14TH MEETING OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

1. Define what should be regarded as admissible administrative costs of operating the Multilateral Fund, taking into account different practices amongst the implementing agencies and as far as practical comparable practices in other aid agencies.
2. On basis of figures reported to the Treasurer and such other supplementary figures as may be provided by the implementing agencies, calculate the administrative costs that fell within the definition of such costs and were charged to the Financial Mechanism by each implementing agency and by the Secretariat separately in the years 1991-1993.
3. Relate the calculated administrative costs over the period 1991-1993 in each implementing agency with the actual programme of activities implemented by each agency in those years, and relate the aggregate of all identified administrative costs, including the Secretariat administrative costs, to the programme of the Multilateral Fund overall in each year.
4. Establish how far a comparison of administrative costs can be made with the administrative cost ratios of the Global Environment Facility and other aid programmes.
5. Endeavour to define norms for admissible administrative costs involved in implementing the Multilateral Fund's approved programme of activities.
6. Advise how administrative costs of the implementing agencies might be made more transparent in future within the proposed norms.

Source: "The administrative costs of the financial mechanism", UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/14/12, Annex A.

Annex II

TERMS OF REFERENCE OF THE CONSULTANCY ON THE ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS OF THE IMPLEMENTING AGENCIES

1. Decision VIII/4 of the Eighth Meeting of the Parties requested:

“That the Executive Committee should, over the next three years, work toward the goal of reducing agency support costs from their current level of 13 per cent to an average of below 10 per cent to make more funds available for other activities. The Executive Committee should report to the Parties annually on their progress, and the Parties may adjust the goal accordingly;”
2. In accordance with this decision, the consultant will work with the Secretariat and the implementing agencies to identify options and approaches for reducing the overall level of administrative costs focusing on revising the current uniform, fee-based approach.
3. Options to be considered could include:
 - (a) Establishment of different rates of support costs for different types of projects and projects in different sectors;
 - (b) Establishment of a sliding scale of support costs for different sized investment projects.
4. The option of deciding support costs on a project-by-project basis is excluded.
5. In undertaking this work, the consultant should take account of the previous reports prepared on this subject.
6. The consultant should also take account of experience in similar multilateral funding mechanisms.
7. The consultant will provide a report on progress to the Executive Committee at its Twenty-second Meeting.

Annex III

DRAFT TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR A COMPREHENSIVE INDEPENDENT ASSESSMENT OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS REQUIRED FOR THE 2009-2011 TRIENNIUM (FOLLOW-UP TO DECISION 50/27)

Items to be considered by the Consultant

10. At its 50th Meeting, during its review of proposed 2007 core unit costs, the Executive Committee was informed that there was a substantial balance in support costs amounting to between US \$30.8 and US \$40.8 million. Although this amount could have been used as it represented balances as at 31 December 2005 (in the first case) and only approved amounts for 2006 (in the second case), implementing agencies would continue to receive support costs on approvals and core unit costs at least until the end of the current triennium. Moreover, this amount could have theoretically covered support costs for an additional two to three years of overall administrative costs.

11. During the 2009-2011 triennium, CFCs, halons and CTC will be phased out by 2010. After 2010, only 20 per cent of the baseline for methyl bromide and 30 per cent of the baseline for TCA remain to be phased-out, along with the HCFC phase-out that is currently scheduled to occur by 2040. The assessment of administrative costs should take into account the costs associated with closing activities for the 2010 phase-outs.

12. Support costs are provided to enable the implementing agencies to complete the supervision, technical assistance and monitoring obligations at the programme level through 2010 and beyond until projects are completed, completion reports and assessments have been conducted, and accounts have been reconciled and closed and all commitments in multi-year agreements have been fulfilled. They would also be used to monitor any projects with activities following 2010.

13. Support cost funds associated with projects cannot be used by the United Nations' implementing agencies until there is a project-related disbursement freeing the funds for use for administrative purposes. There may therefore be a cash flow issue to consider in determining whether funds are sufficient for the agencies to administer their existing and approved-in-principle portfolios to achieve the 2010 compliance targets. The assessment of the balance of support costs should take into account any such concerns with cash flow that might arise for the implementing agencies.

14. At its 49th Meeting, the Executive Committee agreed to consider the capacity of UNDP, UNIDO and the World Bank to complete projects on time in the context of its review of administrative costs at its 50th Meeting (decision 49/7(c)). The assessment should include a review of the administrative cost regimes of these agencies for Article 5 countries to achieve their compliance efforts during the next triennium, and meet their fiduciary responsibilities, and provide reporting to the Executive Committee. This should take into account current plans for the use of the balance of support costs and any related cash flow issues.

15. Although UNEP does not receive core unit costs, previous independent assessments also considered UNEP's administrative costs. As indicated above, decision 26/41 is the basis for administrative costs for UNEP and bilateral agencies. In determining the level of administrative costs in decision 26/41, Coopers and Lybrand considered historical costs for UNEP and the other agencies. Similarly, a review of UNEP administrative costs along the categories identified by Coopers and Lybrand should be undertaken. Since bilateral agencies have not been included in any assessment of administrative costs to-date, a similar review should be undertaken for existing agencies engaged in ongoing bilateral activities.

16. In undertaking this work, the consultant should take account of the previous reports prepared on this subject both by independent consultants and by the Secretariat. The information should be used to establish norms of the costs of administration of Fund projects. The categories of administrative costs employed in previous studies may also be used as a basis for the analysis but may be added to, or revised, as necessary. The extent to which existing resources could be used to address future administrative cost requirements should also be considered. The consultant should identify the services provided with administrative costs taking into account the different administrative cost regimes for UNEP and the other multilateral and bilateral implementing agencies.

17. The consultant should also take into account different implementation modalities used by the multilateral and bilateral implementing agencies. In some cases, administrative costs are used to administer programmes through other agencies while some agencies use their own staff to execute projects approved by the Executive Committee. In some cases, agency fees are transferred to the executing agency (for example, some agencies transfer funds to national executing agencies and/or financial intermediaries) and in other cases the fees are maintained to varying degrees by the agency administering the project.

18. The offices of implementing agencies dealing with Multilateral Fund matters are also involved in implementing activities funded for other multilateral environmental agreements (MEAs). At its 50th Meeting, the Executive Committee decided that the UNEP's compliance "CAP budget should only be spent in accordance with the terms of reference for the financial mechanism contained in Article 10 of the Montreal Protocol and should not be spent on inter-multilateral environmental agreement coordination activities" (decision 50/26, para. a (iii)). The consultant should ascertain how this is being achieved for all agencies since the offices involved in activities for the Multilateral Fund are, for the most part, also involved in activities funded for other MEAs.

19. The consultant should also take into account the experience of the implementing agencies with similar multilateral funding mechanisms. In this respect, the administrative costs used for the Global Environmental Facility and other global and regional funds as applicable should be reviewed to inform a recommendation for future administrative costs of the Fund.

20. The consultant should propose any changes to the existing administrative cost regimes that would enable the implementing agencies to provide sufficient administrative support to Article 5 countries to help them achieve compliance during the next triennium with a view to providing sufficient capacity to complete all activities necessary for Article 5 countries to achieve their compliance efforts during the next triennium, enable implementing agencies to exercise their fiduciary responsibilities, and to provide sufficient oversight and reporting for the Executive Committee. In this respect, challenges for the next triennium (2009-2011) should be taken into account as mentioned above, in particular with respect to future control measures as well as the need to ensure that all commitments and financial accounts are closed. Any possible additional costs after 2011 would also have to be assessed taking into account any project activities expected to occur after 2010.

21. Any changes to the existing administrative cost regimes should also take into account current plans for the use of the balance of support costs and any related cash flow issues mentioned above. To do this, the consultant should consider project implementation trends for the existing portfolio of approved projects, earned versus unearned support costs, and fixed versus variable costs.

Deliverables

22. The consultant will provide a report on progress to the Executive Committee at its 53rd Meeting in the context of the annual assessment of core unit costs. A draft report should be submitted by 15 January 2008. The final report would be submitted by 15 February 2008 for consideration of the Executive Committee at its 54th Meeting.

UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/51/44, paragraphs 10 to 22

Annex IV

Terms of reference

**FORMAT FOR REPORTING ON RESOURCES PROVIDED TO THE
AGENCIES FOR ADMINISTRATIVE PURPOSES**



GEF/C.40/Inf.11
April, 26, 2011

GEF Council Meeting
May 24-26, 2011
Washington, D.C.

**FORMAT FOR REPORTING ON RESOURCES PROVIDED TO THE
AGENCIES FOR ADMINISTRATIVE PURPOSES**

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION.....	1
DEFINITIONS.....	1
Corporate Activities	1
Project Cycle Management.....	2
ANNEX 1: AGENCY ADMINISTRATIVE FEE REPORTING MATRIX PER FISCAL YEAR	5

ANNEX 1 – TERMS OF REFERENCE

In 2007, the GEF Secretariat, in response to a request from the GEF Council, contracted an external consulting firm to review administrative costs at the three GEF Agencies (UNDP, UNEP, and the World Bank) in order to estimate the costs of undertaking GEF-financed projects and engaging with the GEF partnership. Despite cooperation from the Agencies, the Consultant encountered difficulties in acquiring and assembling comparable data on administrative costs across the three agencies. The report from the consultant will be provided as background to the selected consultant undertaking this review of GEF Administrative Expenses.

Subsequently, a working group comprised of staff from the GEF Secretariat and all ten GEF Agencies convened in 2008 and agreed on common definitions of project cycle activities and a reporting format that would allow for an assessment of GEF administrative costs across Agencies. However, this agreed reporting format was insufficient to allow a comparison among agencies, and a recent paper presented to the GEF Council in November 2010⁸⁷ once again highlighted the commonality issues among Agencies and the difficulty to compile comparable information with regard to administrative expenses. The GEF Secretariat and all ten Agencies are now engaged through another inter-agency working group to develop an agreed common format to report on expenditures related to administrative resources provided by the GEF. This exercise is expected to be completed by mid-April 2011.

The term "administrative costs/expenses" is utilized in these terms of reference to refer to the costs incurred by all ten Agencies in the delivery of results using GEF resources towards project activities in recipient countries. For the purposes of this exercise, "administrative costs/expenses" capture two categories of expenses. The first category of administrative costs is met from the fees that are provided to Agencies. The fees are provided to the Agencies to cover their costs for two purposes: (a) to fulfill corporate responsibilities related to institutional relations, policy and program development/ management/ coordination, outreach/knowledge management/external relations, management and finance and monitoring and evaluation; and (b) to provide project cycle management services, including due diligence management, quality assurance and oversight of a project through the entire project cycle – development, preparation, supervision, and evaluation.⁸⁸

A second category relates to project management costs included in the GEF project grant. It is recognized that resources to finance these costs are not always provided to the Agency and that they often flow directly to the executing entity of the project. Nevertheless, the review is expected, through a review of a sample of projects, to provide information on the level and use of project management resources.

Objectives of the Review

The overall objective of the Review was to examine the current level of fees paid by the GEF to Agencies to cover project cycle management costs and corporate costs, and project management

⁸⁷ *Rules and Guidelines for Agency Fees and Project Management Costs*: October 20, 2010, GEF/C.39/09

⁸⁸ *Proposal for A Fee-Based System for Funding GEF Project Implementation*, April 7, 1999, GEF/C.13/11.

Table 7-1: Summary of Recommendations and Other Options

Cost Area	Recommendation	Other Options
(4) Corporate costs	On the assumption the GEF wishes to pay only those "corporate costs" strictly required of each GEF Agency in regard to its direct engagement with the GEF on administrative and policy matters, and the assumption that these core corporate tasks and their costs are very similar across Agencies, a standard annual payment per Agency is an appropriate instrument. GEFSEC has made an estimate of average corporate costs under these assumptions. However the complexities and uncertainties are sufficient in our opinion to justify further study and discussion of the approach and the amount of the subvention.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The status quo of a notional one tenth of the fee allocated to corporate cost or some variant of that approach such as a higher or lower notional percentage within a 10% fee, or within a 9% fee. • Customized subventions that have been tried before and found less satisfactory than a fixed fee approach. • An additional supplement provided to GEF Agencies in a replenishment year, either a standard amount for all Agencies or a variable amount linked to their individual plans to participate.
(5) Project oversight (management and technical oversight of the EA by the IA)	Fee of 9% on top of each project budget available to the GEF Agency upon project endorsement by the GEF CEO.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supplementary "Development Grants" to Agencies that propose to upgrade their portfolio in a particular GEF Focal Area, and propose a detailed work plan to do so in the coming year. Activities and outputs could include thematic evaluations or reviews, producing strategy documents, general programming plans, or "Country Investment Plans" in a GEF Focal Area. • Lower fee for program-based approaches involving a series or cluster of projects. • Lower fee for a project where the IA is also the executing agency. • Lower fee when the GEF grant is fully blended with a larger loan. (not as a strict rule but open to GEFSEC or Agencies to negotiate on a case-by-case basis). • An additional fee, similar to the CIF fee of 0.25% of the project budget paid to the IA by the recipient country out of its own resources.
(6) Project management by the executing agency.	A ceiling of 5% of the project budget above which the financial proposal to the GEF would be subject to additional scrutiny.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A somewhat higher ceiling, in the range of 5% to 10%, not to signal that a higher PMC can be routinely applied but to limit the demand on GEFSEC resources for review time. • Over time, the development by GEFSEC of a risk-based approach to identifying grant proposals that require higher levels of budget scrutiny prior to approval, including but not limited to scrutiny of PMCs.

costs; and to determine whether those administrative costs are reasonable relative to the services provided.

As far as possible within its constraints the External Review provides an assessment of whether GEF resources are being used effectively and efficiently, and makes recommendations, as appropriate, on ways to improve the management of administrative costs.

The consultant is required to prepare a brief report (about 50 pages + annexes) focusing on the following:

- a) Establish the current usage of fees (including provisions for corporate activities) and project management costs provided to Agencies;
- b) Estimate the core corporate activity costs required of all Agencies, based on GEF specifications of requirements.⁸⁹ (Requested by GEFSEC.)
- c) Assess whether deliverables in each category are in-line with the expenditures;
- d) Determine options and measures needed to rationalize Agency fees as appropriate;
- e) In carrying out this exercise, a sample of projects will be examined. This sample should be extracted from GEF-4 projects approved between fiscal years 2007 and 2010. The GEF Secretariat shall provide access to project information from the project database to facilitate the exercise.
- f) Review and apply the lessons learned from a previously conducted study by an independent consultant for the Multilateral Fund for the Implementation of the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer.
- g) Compare the GEF's fee system to other similar institutions to be selected by the consultant based on past experience.

Specific Questions and Issues to be Addressed

As the contractor develops the specific recommendations, the following questions and issues need to be considered:

Are the resources provided through fees and project management costs (in the projects sampled) in compliance with the GEF Secretariat's rules and guidelines? (See Annex 1) If not, identify the specific issues where the use of GEF administrative funds (fees and project management costs) are not properly used or applied.

Are the ten GEF Agencies using GEF project management costs to pay part of their own administrative expenses for non-GEF activities (in particular staff time)?⁹⁰

⁸⁹ Corporate activities would include *inter alia* participation in Council meetings, task force meetings, network meetings, and review of documents.

What expenses are included in the project management costs, and which are integrated with other components of the project financing request?

Are the ten Agencies delivering expected services for the level of resources they receive? *For example: Some project level funds may be used by the Agency's GEF coordinating unit. By the time the funds are received by the task manager of the project, is the level of funds adequate to perform proper supervision?*

Is the 1% corporate fee levied on the overall project amount used for corporate activities only?

Are there overlaps among the different resources provided by the GEF? Are there alternative ways to manage these resources?

Can there be a cost-neutral systematic tracking and reporting of usage of resources at a project level? Clarify why this may or may not be desirable, at what stage would it be most informative? Clarify how benefits compare to costs of introducing additional reporting and transaction costs of receiving a GEF grant.

How are other similar institutions tracking the proper use and management of administrative resources provided to implementing and executing entities?

Methodology

Meet with GEF Secretariat, all ten GEF Agencies and GEF Trustee to gather information and further refine the review approach.

In coordination with stakeholders, determine an appropriate methodology and sampling size of projects and obtain specific information on fees and project management costs provided for each of the sampled project. Assess how the resources provided by the GEF to cover Agencies' costs for project management and corporate activities are used.

The project samples should include projects from all Agencies and for all project types (full-sized, medium-sized and enabling activities) including SGP (Small Grant Program) projects. The samples should cover projects endorsed between FY2008 and FY2010. A relevant sampling size should be taken for each fiscal year to properly capture corporate expenditures related to the GEF-5 replenishment, more specifically in FY2009 and FY2010.

For each fiscal year, the 1% corporate fee should be computed for all CEO endorsed projects. Subsequently, the consultant should obtain the actual expenditures on corporate activities incurred by all GEF Agencies and provide an analysis on how the resources were used.

Similarly, for project cycle activities, the consultant should determine the activities that were undertaken for each project by the Agencies and analyze how they were delivered.

⁹⁰ See Appendix 12 of GEF Operations Manual: "The treatment of any projects that are to be implemented and internally executed by GEF Agencies", November 3, 2009.

The review should look at the resources allocated for project management costs and analyze how they were expended.

Conduct a comparative study with one or two similar institutions selected by the consultant to help assess the adequacy of the fee level.

Review the commonalities and differences in the data across Agencies to allow a more uniform reporting matrix and the ability to compare data across Agencies.

Time Frame/Milestones

- Initial meetings with GEF Secretariat, GEF Evaluation Office, GEF Agencies and GEF Trustee. Include meetings with other institutions as necessary.
- Assessment of existing usage of fees.⁹¹
- Interim report with initial findings and possible options to rationalize fees as appropriate.
- Circulate interim report to the working group on GEF Fees for comments and feedback.
- Further meetings with GEF Secretariat and GEF Agencies.
- Final report. Report should include all findings identified in c) above and an Executive summary of the findings Due by October 14, 2011. (Changed to October 1 during the Inception Phase.)

⁹¹ The report should include but is not limited to the following: identification of existing usage of fee, assessment of appropriation of fees and project management costs in line with established rules and guidelines, analysis of existing overlap issues among agency fee and project management costs, assessment of deliverable of expected services by GEF Agencies, draft findings and recommendations regarding management of administrative resources at the GEF Agencies, draft findings and recommendations regarding the fee-based system of the GEF. a sample tool to track and report uses of resources at a project level.

ANNEX 2 – AGENCY REPRESENTATIVES FOR THE ADMINISTRATIVE COST REVIEW

Agency	Contact Name(s)	Contact email	Contact telephone	Contact address
Asian Development Bank	Bruce Dunn	bdunn@adb.org	Tel: +632 632 4444	6 ADB Avenue, Mandaluyong City 1550, Philippines
African Development Bank	Mr. A. Ayodabo	A.Ayodabo.afdb.org	Tel: (+216) 71 10 26 31	BP 323 Tunis-Belvedere 1002 Tunisia
	Ignacio Tourino Soto	I.Tourinosoto@AfDB.org	Tel: (+216) 71 10 25 33	
EBRD	Marta Simonetti	simonetm@ebrd.com	Tel: 0044 (0) 20 7338 7259. Mobile: 0044 (0) 7921 039815	One Exchange Square - London EC2A 2JN - United Kingdom
	Stefania Del Monte	delMontS@ebrd.com	Tel: 0044 (0) 20 7338 7259	
FAO	Barbara Cooney	Barbara.Cooney@fao.org	Tel: +3906 5705 5478 Fax: +3906 5705 4657	Viale dell Terme di Caracalla 00153 Rome, Italy
	Chris Dirkmaat	Chris.Dirkmaat@fao.org		
	Rikke Olivera	Rikke.Olivera@fao.org		
Inter-American Development Bank	Alexandra Ortega	alexandrao@iadb.org	Tel: (202) 623-3079	Inter-America Bank. 1300 New York Ave. NW W0502. Washington, DC 20577
	Ines Angulo	iangulo@iadb.org	Tel: (202) 623-3307	
	Michael Collins	mcollins@iadb.org	Tel: (202) 623-2158	
IFAD	Aisha Nazario	a.nazario@ifad.org	+39 06 5459 2151	Via Paolo di Dono, 44 00142 Rome, Italy
	Francesca Tarabella	f.tarabella@ifad.org		
	Elwyn Grainger-Jones	e.grainger-jones@ifad.org		
UNDP	Xiumei Zhang	xiumei.zhang@undp.org	212-906-6162	UNDP, 304 East 45th Street, Room 920, New York, NY 10017
UNEP	Maryam Niamir-Fuller	maryam.niamir-fuller@unep.org	Tel: (254 20) 762-4166 Cell: (254 0728) 608-470 Fax: (254 20) 762-4041	Block 2, North Wing, Ground Floor UNEP PO Box 30552 Nairobi, Kenya
UNIDO	Georgios Anestis	G.Anestis@unido.org	+43 1 26026 4565	Vienna International Centre P.O. Box 300 A-1400 Vienna, Austria
	Anyia Omysko	g.omysko@unido.org		
	Awuor Ajwala			
	Sherif Mohammed			
World Bank	Siv Tokde	stokde@worldbank.org	Tel: (202) 473 6476	1818 H Street NW Washington DC
	Karin Shepardson	Kshepardson@worldbank.org	(202) 458-1398	
	Brenda Manuel	bmanuel@worldbank.org	(202) 458-1415	
Trustee	Praveen Desabatla	pdesabatla@worldbank.org	Tel: (202) 458 2099	H3-240, H Building
Rideau Consultants	Kenneth Watson	ken.watson@sympatico.ca	Tel: (202) 232 0454	1750 P Street NW, Ph6 Washington DC 20036
	Allen Barry	barry@idmaq.ca		
	Joan Barclay	joanbarclay@gmail.com		