



# Global Environment Facility

GEF/C.31/8  
May 14, 2007

---

GEF Council  
June 12-15, 2007

Agenda Item 14

## WORK PROGRAM SUBMITTED FOR COUNCIL APPROVAL

## **Recommended Council Decision**

The Council reviewed the proposed work program submitted to Council in document GEF/C.31/8 and approves the work program comprising the following \_\_\_\_ programs and project proposals, subject to comments made during the Council meeting and additional comments that may be submitted to the Secretariat by June 29, 2007.

[List of Proposals approved by Council]

With respect to the following \_\_\_\_ proposals approved as part of the work program, the Council requests the Secretariat to arrange for Council Members to receive draft final project documents submitted to the CEO for endorsement. Council Members may transmit to the CEO within four weeks any concerns they may have prior to the CEO endorsing a project document for final approval by the Implementing or Executing Agency. Such projects may be reviewed at a further Council meeting at the request of at least four Council Members.

[List of Proposals requested for circulation to Council prior to CEO endorsement]

With respect to the *Strategic Investment Program for Sustainable Land Management in Sub-Saharan Africa*, the Council requests the Secretariat to arrange for Council Members to receive draft final project documents for projects to be financed under the program submitted to the CEO for endorsement. Council Members may transmit to the CEO within four weeks any concerns they may have prior to the CEO endorsing a project document for final approval by the Implementing or Executing Agency. Such projects may be reviewed at a further Council meeting at the request of at least four Council Members.

With respect to the GEF Public Private Partnership Initiative, the Council:

- (a) requests the GEF Secretariat to collaborate with the Trustee in establishing the PPP Trust Fund;
- (b) allocates \$50 million for the PPP, drawing upon resources that have been identified through the Trustee's project data reconciliation and savings in the corporate budget resulting from the termination of the corporate budget for the Implementing Agencies;
- (c) requests the CEO in the coming months, to consult with the Council in constituting the PPP Board.

With respect to the remaining \_\_\_\_ proposals approved as part of the work program, the Council finds that each project proposal presented to it as part of the work program is, or would be, consistent with the Instrument and GEF policies and procedures and may be endorsed by the CEO for final approval by the Implementing or Executing Agency, provided that the CEO circulates to the Council Members, prior to endorsement, draft final project documents fully incorporating the Council's comments on the work program accompanied by a satisfactory explanation by the CEO of how such comments and comments of the STAP reviewer have been addressed and a confirmation by the CEO that the project continues to be consistent with the Instrument and GEF policies and procedures.

[List of proposals to be endorsed by CEO under delegated authority]

## Executive Summary

1. This is the first work program presented by the CEO for Council review and approval in GEF-4. It is also the first work program prepared after the GEF Resource Allocation Framework became applicable to the biodiversity and climate change focal areas. The work program is ambitious with three major initiatives, and requests \$561.82 million, nearly a fifth of the resources targeted for programming during GEF-4 and 75 percent of currently available resources in the GEF Trust Fund. Co-financing associated with these proposals amount to \$3,419.25 million – each dollar of GEF grant is matched by \$6.40 in co-financing, a dramatic increase from the historical average of \$4.
2. The proposed work program consists of 29 new full-sized project (FSP) proposals requesting GEF project grants totaling \$523.96 million (see Annex A for the financial details of proposals and Work Program Project Summaries in Annex C for details regarding project objectives). Associated with these projects are requests for fees totaling \$37.87 million for the Implementing and Executing Agencies to meet their project cycle management costs, resulting in a total GEF Trust Fund financing of \$561.82 million requested through this work program.
3. The work program includes requests for financing three major initiatives:
  - *The Strategic Investment Program for Sustainable Land Management in Sub-Saharan Africa (SIP)* (\$150 million requested) with the overall objective of advancing sustainable land management, improving governance for land management, and strengthening coalition development in Sub-Saharan Africa. The recently held African Ministerial Conference in Ouagadougou (April 24-25, 2007) issued a declaration requesting the GEF Council to approve this Strategic Investment Program.
  - *The Small Grants Program* (\$128.32 million requested) is a flagship program implemented through the UNDP. The program is currently active in 100 countries, and plans to expand to 121 countries during the next four years. The program includes for the first time a transparent system of allocation of resources, agreeing to graduate countries that have been receiving funding for more than eight years, thereby freeing up resources for including new countries, especially LDCs and SIDs.
  - *The GEF Public-Private Partnership Fund* (\$50 million requested) is to help the GEF realize its long-standing goal of attracting more private sector resources for the global environment. The partnership will support strategic investment programs in competitive environmental technological solutions as well as innovative financial solutions adapted to the developing countries needs, such as a capital mechanism for prizes' competitions encouraging breakthrough technical solutions to global environmental challenges.

## Table of Contents

Main features of the proposed work program.....	1
Status of the use of GEF-4 Resources.....	2
Distribution of GEF Project Grants by Region.....	3
Distribution of Proposals by GEF Agency .....	3
Co-financing .....	5
GEF Strategies and the Work Program.....	5
Project Proposals in the Work Program.....	11

### List of Annexes:

Annex A:	Project Proposals Submitted for Council Approval, June 2007
Annex B:	Historical Trend Analysis
Annex C:	Work Program Project Summaries

### List of Tables:

Table 1:	GEF Resources requested in the June 2007 Work Program by Focal Area
Table 2:	Status of Resources Programmed under GEF-4 by Focal Area and Corporate Program
Table 3:	Distribution of GEF Project Grants in the June 2007 Work Program by Region and Focal Area
Table 4:	Distribution of Proposals by Agency in the June 2007 Work Program
Table 5:	Analysis of Project Management Budget in the June 2007 Work Program
Table 6:	Distribution of Co-financing in the June 2007 Work Program by Co-financiers

Where to send technical comments:

*It is suggested that Council members send their technical comments electronically (in Word file) to the GEF Secretariat's program coordination registry at: [gcoordination@TheGEF.org](mailto:gcoordination@TheGEF.org)*

## Main features of the proposed work program

1. The work program presented by the Secretariat for Council review and approval is the first one since the GEF-4 replenishment. It is also the first since the GEF Resource Allocation Framework became applicable to the biodiversity and climate change focal areas. This work program is ambitious with three major initiatives and \$561.82 million requested, i.e. nearly a fifth of the resources targeted for programming during GEF-4.
2. The proposed work program includes requests for financing three major initiatives:
  - (a) Strategic Investment Program (SIP) for Sustainable Land Management in Sub-Saharan Africa requesting a total of \$150 million, including agency fees;
  - (b) Replenishment of the Small Grants Program, requesting a total of \$128.32 million, including agency fees; and
  - (c) Public-Private Partnership Fund, requesting \$50 million.
3. The proposed work program consists of 29 new full-sized project (FSP) proposals requesting GEF project grants totaling \$523.96 million (see Annex A for the financial details of proposals and Annex C for details regarding project objectives). Associated with these projects are requests for fees totaling \$37.87 million for the Implementing and Executing Agencies to meet their project cycle management costs, resulting in a total request of \$561.82 million from the GEF Trust Fund.
4. Table 1 shows the total GEF resources requested in this work program totaling \$561.82 million and its distribution by focal area.

**Table 1: GEF Resources requested in the June 2007 Work Program by Focal Area (\$ million)**

Focal Area	Number of Projects	GEF project Grant	Agency Fees	Total GEF Resources Requested in this WP
Biodiversity	8	37.31	3.73	41.04
Climate Change	6	75.80	7.03	82.83
International Waters	6	51.07	4.88	55.94
Land Degradation	1	137.30	12.70	150.00
Ozone Depletion	-	-	-	-
Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs)	4	25.21	2.60	27.81
Multi-focal Areas	4	197.27	6.93	204.20
<b>Total</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>523.96</b>	<b>37.87</b>	<b>561.82</b>

Note : The "Multi-focal areas" category in Table 1 is comprised of projects that operate in different focal areas of the GEF; it includes the core corporate programs, the corporate programs, and the proposed public-private partnership fund.

## Status of the use of GEF-4 Resources

5. The CEO, under delegated authority, has approved project preparation grants, medium-sized projects, and enabling activities amounting to \$7.20 million of GEF-4 resources until April 30, 2007. When added to the total resources requested in this work program of \$561.82 million, total resources programmed for GEF-4 to-date amount to \$569.03 million, including agency fees, as shown in Table 2.

**Table 2. Status of Resources Programmed under GEF-4 by Focal Area and Corporate Program (\$ million)**

GEF Focal Area and Corporate Program	Targeted Allocations in GEF-4		GEF-4 approvals until April 30, 2007		Resources requested through this work program, including agency fees		Total GEF-4 resources programmed			% of GEF-4 Resources used
	Amount	%	Grant	Fees	Grant	Fees	Grant	Fees	Total	
Biodiversity	950.00	31.6%	1.71	0.09	37.31	3.73	39.02	3.82	42.83	4.5%
Climate Change	950.00	31.6%	0.55	-	76.80	7.12	77.35	7.12	84.47	8.9%
International Waters	335.00	11.1%	0.57	-	70.79	6.79	71.35	6.79	78.14	23.3%
Ozone Depletion	40.00	1.3%	0.84	0.08	-	-	0.84	0.08	0.91	2.3%
Land Degradation	282.00	9.4%	0.95	0.09	137.30	12.70	138.25	12.79	151.04	53.6%
Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs)	282.00	9.4%	1.97	0.18	28.11	2.86	30.08	3.04	33.12	11.7%
Core Corporate Programs	15.00	0.5%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.0%
Corporate Programs	156.00	5.2%	-	-	123.65	4.67	123.65	4.67	128.31	82.3%
Public-Private Partnerships	-	0.0%	0.19	-	50.00	-	50.19	-	50.19	N/A
<b>Total: Resources Programmed</b>	<b>3,010.00</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>6.77</b>	<b>0.43</b>	<b>523.96</b>	<b>37.87</b>	<b>530.73</b>	<b>38.30</b>	<b>569.03</b>	<b>18.9%</b>

Note 1: The Small Grants Program, which is a corporate program, is programmed from resources directly made available to the program under the replenishment plus resources earmarked by countries under the RAF in the biodiversity and climate change focal areas.

Note 2: Multi-focal area projects were shared among the different focal areas

6. Overall, nearly a fifth of GEF 4 resources and 75 percent of currently available resources in the GEF Trust Fund have been programmed until now. However, the programming rate is uneven across the different focal areas/themes. Pending Council approval, nearly all the resources for corporate programs, particularly the Small Grants Program, and more than half the resources in the land degradation focal area will be used. Conversely, programming in the biodiversity and climate change focal areas is relatively less prominent, largely due to the transition to the Resource Allocation Framework. Over the next few work programs, resource programming in these areas will be ramped up to meet the GEF-4 programming targets.

7. The Secretariat will report every six months (period ending June 30, and period ending December 31) on all approvals and cancellations during the preceding six months. The reports will include: (i) proposals approved by the Council as part of work programs; (ii) project

preparation grants, medium-sized projects, and enabling activities approved by the CEO under delegated authority; (iii) CEO endorsements; (iv) resources utilized under country and group allocations in the RAF applicable to the biodiversity and climate change focal areas; and (v) proposals approved by the Council and cancelled from the pipeline.

### **Distribution of GEF Project Grants by Region**

8. Table 3 shows the regional distribution of project grants in the work program. The Africa region gets nearly a third of the resources, largely because of the Strategic Investment Program. Small Grants Program and the Public-Private Partnership Fund contribute to the large share of the “global” category.

**Table 3: Distribution of GEF Project Grants in the June 2007 Work Program by Region and Focal Area (\$ million)**

<b>Focal Area</b>	<b>Africa</b>	<b>Asia</b>	<b>Europe and Central Asia</b>	<b>Latin America and Caribbean</b>	<b>Global</b>	<b>Regional</b>	<b>Total</b>
Biodiversity	10.30	-	-	15.70	11.31	-	<b>37.31</b>
Climate Change	11.00	41.30	10.00	13.50	-	-	<b>75.80</b>
International Waters	-	20.88	4.55	5.00	5.64	15.00	<b>51.07</b>
Land Degradation	137.30	-	-	-	-	-	<b>137.30</b>
Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs)	-	20.30	-	-	-	4.91	<b>25.21</b>
Multi-focal Areas	-	-	-	10.73	173.65	12.89	<b>197.27</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>158.60</b>	<b>82.48</b>	<b>14.55</b>	<b>44.93</b>	<b>190.60</b>	<b>32.80</b>	<b>523.96</b>
<b>% resources programmed for Region</b>	<b>30%</b>	<b>16%</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>36%</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>100%</b>

### **Distribution of Proposals by GEF Agency**

9. Table 4 shows distribution of proposals by GEF agencies. Of the 29 project proposals in this work program, six proposals are submitted by the GEF Executing Agencies individually; in addition, Executing Agencies partner with other agencies in three proposals. About 15.4 percent of the resources requested in this work program will be implemented by the Executing Agencies, compared to a historical average of 3.6 percent in GEF-3 under the direct access policy.

**Table 4. Distribution of Proposals by Agency in the June 2007 Work Program**  
(\$ million)

Agency**	Number of Projects	GEF Project Grant	PDF/PPG Amount	Total GEF Project Grant	Agency Fees
FAO	1	3.50	0.73	4.23	0.42
IADB	2	9.10	0.95	10.05	1.01
UNDP	10	179.86	3.01	182.87	10.00
UNDP/IADB	1	13.50	0.25	13.75	1.34
UNEP	3	23.45	2.08	25.53	2.30
UNEP/UNIDO	1	12.89	0.70	13.59	1.23
UNIDO	3	20.30	0.67	20.97	2.10
World Bank Group	7	124.05	1.34	125.39	6.77
World Bank/UNDP/ UNEP/ AfDB/ IFAD/ FAO	1	137.30	0.70	138.00	12.70
<b>Total</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>523.96</b>	<b>10.42</b>	<b>534.38</b>	<b>37.87</b>

10. Total agency fees requested in this work program amount to \$37.87 million, based on the latest fee policy approved by the Council in December 2006. In addition to fees provided for agencies to manage the GEF project cycle, project management costs are included as part of the GEF project grants. Refer to Table 5 for an analysis of project management budgets in the project proposals in the work program. Project management costs using GEF grant range from 3 percent to 18 percent of the total GEF grant, with an average of 11.5 percent for all focal areas in the work program. With the agency fees at 10 percent, it means that total administrative costs (fees + project management budget) associated with projects could be as high as 28 percent for some projects. It is also worth noting that while the GEF grant accounts average about 13 percent of the total project cost, the GEF share of the project management budgets average around 67 percent. The Secretariat would like to cap the GEF project management budget at 10 percent of the GEF grant, thereby limiting the total GEF administrative costs to not more than 20 percent of the GEF grant.

**Table 5. Analysis of Project Management Budget in the June 2007 Work Program**

	Range: Share of GEF Project Management Budget to GEF Grant	Average: Share of GEF Project Management Budget to GEF Grant	Average: Share of GEF Management Budget to Total Project Management Budget	Average: Share of GEF Grant to Total Project Cost
Biodiversity	3.62% to 16.71 %	9.11%	32.04%	22.44%
Climate Change	2.96% to 13.24%	5.94%	53.43%	4.38%
International Waters	3.3% to 12.06%	8.03%	44.76%	23.18%
POPs	6.25% to 10.18 %	7.81%	39.08%	29.69%
Multi-focal Areas	6.71 % to 17.74%	16.20%	96.52%	22.39%
<b>All Focal Areas</b>	<b>3% to 18 %</b>	<b>11.49%</b>	<b>66.99%</b>	<b>12.62%</b>

Note: The shares in the table are calculated for 25 proposals in the work program that have complete project management budget information. The four projects that do not have project management budget information are investment fund and program projects. Detailed project management budget information will be available only when sub-projects are submitted for review for CEO endorsement.



## Co-financing

11. Co-financing associated with the proposed work program amounts to \$3,419.25 million, which brings the total project value to \$3,953.63 million. Each dollar of GEF grant is matched by \$6.40 in co-financing, a dramatic increase from the historical average of \$4.<sup>1</sup>

12. Table 6 shows the distribution of co-financing levels in projects proposed in this work program by co-financier and focal area. Multilateral agencies provide 45 percent of the co-financing, while local governments and beneficiaries respectively bring 30 percent and 12 percent. In terms of focal areas, co-financing is the highest for climate change (96 percent) and land degradation ( 88 percent), whereas it is expected to be lower for persistent organic pollutants ( 69 percent) and multi-focal areas ( 66 percent). On average, co-financing will provide 86 percent of total project costs in this work program.

**Table 6: Distribution of Co-financing in the June 2007 Work Program by Co-financiers (\$ million)**

Type	Biodiversity	Climate Change	International Waters	Land Degradation	Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs)	Multi-focal Areas	Total
GEF Project Grant	37.31	75.80	51.07	137.30	25.21	197.27	523.96
PDF/PPG	3.14	1.20	2.45	0.70	1.32	1.62	10.42
Total GEF Project Grant	40.45	77.00	53.52	138.00	26.53	198.88	534.38
<i>Co-Financier</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Beneficiaries	-	377.35	-	-	-	30.41	407.76
Bilateral	4.00	21.10	30.70	-	1.62	11.16	68.58
Foundation	6.32	0.60	-	-	-	3.69	10.61
Government	68.20	754.79	67.96	-	44.02	80.10	1,015.05
Multilateral	33.20	419.00	56.11	986.22	1.71	54.91	1,551.14
NGO	3.80	-	6.18	-	1.50	18.94	30.42
Others	0.28	0.51	45.35	-	-	27.62	73.75
Private Sector	9.64	78.48	3.13	-	9.56	160.34	261.15
Total Co-Financing	125.82	1,651.82	209.83	986.22	58.40	387.17	3,419.25
Total Project Cost	166.27	1,728.82	263.34	1,124.21	84.93	586.05	3,953.63
GEF:Co-Financing Ratio	3.11	21.45	3.92	7.15	2.20	1.95	6.40
Percentage Co-Financing	76%	96%	80%	88%	69%	66%	86%

## GEF Strategies and the Work Program

13. This work program represents an important step forward in implementing the GEF-4 programmatic framework submitted for Council discussion. While the proposals included in the work program were reviewed for conformity with the interim strategies submitted to the Council in December 2006, a majority of the proposals also conform to the GEF-4 strategic programming frameworks.

<sup>1</sup> For details on co-financing, please refer to Table 6 and Table B.1 in Annex B

### *Private Sector*

14. In June 2006, the Council, having reviewed document GEF/C.28/14, *GEF Strategy to Enhance Engagement with the Private Sector* supported the further development of its proposal to enhance financing through a public/private sector partnership, including clear information on its management, decision making and rules to avoid conflicts of interest. Building on this recommendation and upon the changing dynamics of the private sector, an operational road map for implementation of the *GEF Public Private Partnership Initiative (PPP)* is proposed.

15. The proposed PPP will support a Public/Private Sector strategic investment program in competitive environmental technological and financial solutions, and the scaling-up of the use of pilot instruments. Sectoral platforms related to GEF focal areas and priorities will be developed and implemented.

16. A minimum 1-to-1 matching contribution from the private sector and other donors will trigger the launch of PPP activities. The use of GEF resources for the PPP will only be approved once a 1-to-1 match from the private sector and other donors is guaranteed. The PPP intends to attract a target level of funding at three times the initial GEF contribution.

### *Small Grants Program*

17. The GEF Small Grants Program has funded 8200 projects in the past 15 years and is currently active in nearly 100 countries. In the next 4 years, it is proposed to expand its operations to 121 countries. The program includes for the first time a transparent system of allocation of resources, agreeing to graduate countries that have been receiving funding for more than eight years, thereby freeing up resources for including new countries, especially LDCs and SIDS. The program will also provide an enhanced monitoring and evaluation system with indicators to track the impact on relevant global environmental issues. SGP is requesting a funding of \$110 million including fees, for 4 years with additional amounts authorized by countries from allocations under the Resource Allocation Framework. Based on endorsements from the GEF national operational focal points, the total grant requested in this work program is approximately \$128.32 million, including agency fees. The program has a steering committee including all the GEF agencies and chaired by the GEF CEO which provides strategic guidance and oversight. The committee is expected to meet at least two times a year.

### *Biodiversity (BD)*

18. The eight proposals in the work program reflect the evolving focus of the biodiversity strategy and are clustered around three key program areas: (i) increasing the sustainability of protected area systems; (ii) maintaining the goods and services that biodiversity provides to the society through biodiversity mainstreaming; and (iii) safeguarding biodiversity through integrated approaches to the management of invasive alien species.

19. Of particular note is the Costa Rica project, *Overcoming Barriers to Sustainability of Costa Rica's Protected Areas System*. The project is unique in its comprehensive approach to barrier removal which includes policy and institutional reforms such as the enforcement of a new

national policy for protected areas, the development of a system business plan and financing strategy, and the implementation of new partnerships with communities and the tourism industry.

20. The South African *National Grasslands Biodiversity Program* applies a variety of innovative approaches such as forestry certification, biodiversity offsets, and conservation stewardship agreements to mainstream biodiversity conservation objectives into the major production sectors that impact this important biome: agriculture, forestry, urban development and coal mining.

21. The Millennium Ecosystem Assessment identified invasive alien species (IAS) as the most important driver of biodiversity loss on island ecosystems. The Seychelles addresses this threat to biodiversity through the *Mainstreaming Prevention and Control Measures for Invasive Alien Species into Trade, Transport and Travel Across the Production Landscape* project. The integrated approach being employed by the project addresses the prevention, control and management of IAS through the development of appropriate policy and legislative frameworks required, while building the technical capacity to manage invasions that remain today undetected. Raising public awareness of the importance of IAS management to the island's economy will also be part of the intervention strategy.

#### *Climate Change (CC)*

22. In the climate change focal area, the work program contains six proposals. In terms of their distribution by programming area, three focus on energy efficiency, either through improving the efficiency of the built environment or improving the efficiency of industry; two deal with sustainable transport; and one focuses on the promotion of on-grid renewable energy. Consistent with the revised programming strategy, this work program places greater emphasis on energy efficiency than renewable energy. This is also one of the indirect results of the RAF—by allocating resources according to national GHG emissions, the projects that come forward will naturally be more focused on energy efficiency, as energy efficiency holds greater potential to reduce GHG emissions than does renewable energy.

23. With respect to the three energy efficiency projects, the BRESL project attempts to create shared standards and labels for cold appliances through Southeast Asia. It will target six products (air conditioners, refrigerators, rice cookers, electric fans, FTL ballasts, and CFLs) in that region. This project, together with others in the pipeline, should enable the GEF to have supported projects to transform refrigerator markets in virtually every part of the developing world. The Brazil Market Transformation for Energy Efficiency in Buildings project focuses on improving the energy efficiency of the buildings sector and will attempt to set up a performance guarantee mechanism to enable ESCOs to borrow from commercial banks. It should be noted that it also includes co-financing from the Multilateral Fund of the Montreal Protocol to phase out chillers that make use of HCFC's. This is an interesting and innovative example of cross-cutting support between the GEF and the financing mechanism of other international multilateral agreements. The China Energy Efficiency project targets energy-efficient investments in key industries by developing sustainable energy efficient lending business in Chinese banks.

24. The two transport proposals aim at stimulating sustainable transport initiatives in more than one urban area. The South African proposal will ensure that the transport systems put place for the 2010 World Cup reduces overall GHG emissions. The China transport proposal will support the creation of a national urban transport strategy and facilitate investments to improve public transport and mobility in more than a dozen cities. This project demonstrates an interesting case of country-drivenness as project activities will bring together the national government and the local authorities to address urban transport challenges.

25. The Russia Renewable Energy Development Program seeks to establish the regulatory conditions and a favorable investment climate for the generation of renewable electricity and heat in smaller urban areas and provinces in Russia. It also involves not just the national government, but also several regional authorities who are eager to tap their renewable energy potential.

#### *International Waters (IW)*

26. This work program includes the first major attempt in the international waters focal area to integrate planning for climate change adaptation and groundwater considerations into large basin management. The La Plata basin project proposal, in many ways innovative, addresses the need to balance water uses with the impacts of increased frequency of extreme climatic events causing huge economic and environmental losses in this large trans-boundary water basin.

27. This work program also reflects the call for integration among GEF focal areas in the draft IW strategy with two significant cases: the Mediterranean Sea Large Marine Ecosystem (LME), where IW will join forces with the POPs focal area, and the Plata Basin, a first attempt to cooperate with the climate change focal area within the context of the SPA.

28. Three of the four Strategic Programs identified in the Draft Strategy are targeted in the proposed work program:

- (a) *Depletion of coastal and marine fish stocks and associated biological diversity*, with actions at the global level (alien species), at the regional level for habitat restoration (the Central American Gulf of Fonseca), and the Mediterranean Sea Large Marine Ecosystem;
- (b) *Nutrient over-enrichment and oxygen depletion from land-based pollution of coastal waters in Large Marine Ecosystems*; with focus on two high priority areas, the Mediterranean Sea Large Marine Ecosystems (LME), and the LME of East Asia;
- (c) *Overuse and conflicting uses of water resources in surface and groundwater basins*, with an innovative effort in one of the great basins of South America, the Plata, and again with actions in groundwater basins linked with the Mediterranean Sea LME.

29. The two Partnership Investment Funds (East Asian LMEs and Mediterranean Sea LME) are progressing in implementation and completing the Council-approved partial first tranche

allocations with sub-projects in the pipeline and two under implementation.<sup>2</sup> Due to the lack of available funding in GEF 3, requests for these two funds were not made for the amount needed to complete the first tranche. This work program includes the remaining funding installments for the first GEF action. Both Funds are accompanied by complementary Regional Projects being submitted for Council approval. These regional projects complete the architecture of these two “GEF IW Partnership” interventions<sup>3</sup> and are intended to ensure harmonization of national reforms, coordination and coherence among sub-projects and partners/donors, replication of new and innovative approaches, and the establishment of long term monitoring of results.

30. Finally, six GEF Agencies are involved in the implementation/execution of the seven IW projects (five in the IW focal area and two partnered with other focal areas) submitted for approval, all of them participating according to their comparative advantages and roles.

#### *Land Degradation (LD)*

31. The *Strategic Investment Program for Sustainable Land Management (SLM) in Sub-Saharan Africa (SIP)* is the first strategic program supported under the GEF focal area Land Degradation in GEF-4. The program has been identified as high priority in the focal area, and more than half of the overall GEF-4 resources allocated to the focal area are proposed for Council approval through this program. The overall objective of the program is to advance SLM mainstreaming, improve governance for SLM, and strengthen coalition development in the sub-Saharan region of Africa. The SIP fits the emerging GEF-4 strategy for the land degradation focal area and will contribute to the strategic program “Sustainable Agriculture and Rangeland Management”. Individual projects under the SIP will address primarily Strategic Objective 1 creating an enabling environment that will place SLM in the main stream of development policy and practice at regional, national and local levels. A limited number of projects will address Strategic Objective 2 which strives for mutual benefits for the global environment and local livelihoods through catalyzing SLM investments for large-scale impact.

#### *Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs)*

32. The work program contains five proposals in this focal area that are all consistent with the interim strategy being applied for GEF-4. The projects cover all areas of programming: National Implementation Plan (NIP) development, capacity building for NIP implementation, investments for NIP implementation, and demonstrations.

33. The India NIP project represents a major step forward for the Stockholm Convention with the support to India for its implementation. The China capacity building project builds on existing work – China has recently adopted its NIP – and will ensure that capacities for its implementation exist at all levels in the country. The hospital waste management project will

---

<sup>2</sup> While the East Asian one is regional and focuses on one theme - land based pollution reduction (Strategic Program 2), the Mediterranean one implements an ecosystem approach, and addresses all main transboundary concerns of the LME - living resources, coastal habitats, land based pollution and coastal water use conflicts, thus involving three Strategic Programs (1,2,3).

<sup>3</sup> Also called Strategic Partnerships, since they involve a large number of partners (donors, countries, agencies...). They follow the Danube/Black Sea Basin approach first approved by Council in 2001.

contribute to addressing a significant source of dioxins and furans in the country, and most importantly will influence in a timely manner a major plan for hospital waste disposal facilities that is being implemented in China.

34. The project addressing DDT alternatives in the Middle East and North Africa region, in partnership and with the strong support from WHO, will contribute to the body of knowledge that is being generated with GEF support on alternatives to DDT in various ecological and socio-economic settings.

35. Finally, the POPs component to the Strategic Partnership for the Mediterranean is an example for cross focal area integration and will support NIP implementation with regards to PCBs in the five participating countries, whilst building on and strengthening the work accomplished over the past decade under the aegis of the Mediterranean Action Plan.

## Project Proposals in the Work Program<sup>4</sup>

### Biodiversity

1. **Global (Ghana, Kenya, South Africa, India, Nepal, Pakistan, Brazil) :** Conservation & Management of Pollinators for Sustainable Agriculture through an Ecosystem Approach (UNEP) (GEF Grant : \$ 7.81 m)
2. **Global (Peru, Chile, China, Tunisia, Philippines, Algeria) :** Conservation and Adaptive Management of Globally Important Agricultural Heritage Systems (GIAHS) (FAO) (GEF Grant : \$ 3.50 m)
3. **Brazil :** Effective Conservation and Sustainable Use of Mangrove Ecosystems in Brazil (UNDP) (GEF Grant : \$ 5.00 m)
4. **Costa Rica :** Overcoming Barriers to Sustainability of Costa Rica's Protected Areas System (UNDP) (GEF Grant : \$ 4.80 m)
5. **Guatemala :** Improvement of Management Effectiveness in the Maya Biosphere Reserve (MBR) (IADB) (GEF Grant : \$ 4.10 m)
6. **Nicaragua :** Strengthening and Catalyzing the Sustainability of Nicaragua's System of Protected Areas System (UNDP) (GEF Grant : \$ 1.80 m)
7. **Seychelles :** Mainstreaming Prevention and Control Measures for Invasive Alien Species into Trade, Transport and Travel Across the Production Landscape (UNDP) (GEF Grant : \$ 2.00 m)
8. **South Africa :** National Grasslands Biodiversity Program (UNDP) (GEF Grant : \$ 8.30 m)

### Climate Change

9. **Regional (Bangladesh, China, Indonesia, Thailand, Vietnam) :** Barrier Removal to the Cost-Effective Development and Implementation of Energy Efficiency Standards and Labeling Project (BRESL) (UNDP) (GEF Grant : \$ 6.80 m)
10. **Brazil :** Market Transformation for Energy Efficiency in Buildings (UNDP/IADB) (GEF Grant : \$ 13.50 m)
11. **China :** China/GEF/World Bank Urban Transport Partnership Program (World Bank) (GEF Grant : \$ 21.00 m)
12. **China :** Energy Efficiency Financing (World Bank) (GEF Grant : \$ 13.50 m)
13. **Russian Federation :** Renewable Energy Project (RREP) (World Bank) (GEF Grant : \$ 10.00 m)
14. **South Africa :** Sustainable Public Transport and Sport: A 2010 Opportunity (UNDP) (GEF Grant : \$ 11.00 m)

### International Waters

15. **Global (China, Brazil, India, Mexico, Turkey, South Africa, Iran, Argentina, Venezuela, Chile, Algeria, Egypt, Ukraine, Peru, Morocco, Libya, Croatia, Ecuador,**

---

<sup>4</sup> The GEF grant is the funding request for the project and does not include PDFs previously approved.

**Guatemala, Angola, Sudan, Costa Rica, Cote d'Ivoire, Panama, Trinidad and Tobago, Yemen, Jordan, Ghana) :** Building Partnerships to Assist Developing Countries to Reduce the Transfer of Harmful Aquatic Organisms in Ships' Ballast Water (GloBallast Partnerships) (UNDP) (GEF Grant : \$ 5.64 m)

16. **Regional (Cambodia, China, East Timor, Indonesia, Malaysia, Philippines, Lao PDR, Thailand, Vietnam, Brunei) :** Implementation of Sustainable Development Strategy for the Seas of East Asia (SDS-SEA) (UNDP) (GEF Grant : \$ 10.88 m)
17. **Regional (El Salvador, Honduras, Nicaragua) :** Integrated Ecosystem Management of the Gulf of Fonseca (IADB) (GEF Grant : \$ 5.00 m)
18. **Regional (Albania, Montenegro) :** Lake Skadar-Shkodra Integrated Ecosystem Management (World Bank) (GEF Grant : \$ 4.55 m)
19. **Regional (Cambodia, China, Indonesia, Lao PDR, Malaysia, Philippines, Thailand, Vietnam) :** World Bank/GEF Partnership Investment Fund for Pollution Reduction in the Large Marine Ecosystems of East Asia (Tranche 1, 2nd Installment) (World Bank) (GEF Grant : \$ 10.00 m)
20. **Regional (Albania, Algeria, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, Egypt, Macedonia, Lebanon, Libya, Morocco, Serbia, Syria, Tunisia, Turkey) :** World Bank-GEF Investment Fund for the Mediterranean Sea Large Marine Ecosystem Partnership, Tranche 1, 2nd Installment (World Bank) (GEF Grant : \$ 15.00 m)

#### **Land Degradation**

21. **Regional (Benin, Botswana, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Ghana, Kenya, Lesotho, Madagascar, Malawi, Mali, Mauritania, Mozambique, Namibia, Niger, Nigeria, Rwanda, Senegal, South Africa, Sudan, Tanzania, Togo, Uganda, Gambia, Zambia) :** Strategic Investment Program for SLM in Sub-Saharan Africa (SIP) (phased project) (World Bank/UNDP/ UNEP/ AfDB/ IFAD/ FAO) (GEF Grant : \$ 137.30 m)

#### **Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs)**

22. **Regional (Sudan, Morocco, Yemen, Djibouti, Egypt, Syria, Jordan, Iran) :** Demonstration of Sustainable Alternatives to DDT and Strengthening of National Vector Control Capabilities in Middle East and North Africa (UNEP) (GEF Grant : \$ 4.91 m)
23. **China :** Environmentally Sustainable Management of Medical Waste in China (UNIDO) (GEF Grant : \$ 11.65 m)
24. **China :** Strengthening Institutions, Regulations and Enforcement Capacities for Effective and Efficient Implementation of the National Implementation Plan (NIP) in China (UNIDO) (GEF Grant : \$ 5.41 m)
25. **India :** Development of a National Implementation Plan in India as a First Step to Implement the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs). (UNIDO) (GEF Grant : \$ 3.24 m)



### **Multi-focal Areas**

26. **Global** : GEF Public-Private Partnership Initiative (Lead agency: World Bank/IFC; other agencies: UNEP, FAO, UNIDO) (GEF Grant : \$ 50.00 m)
27. **Global** : Small Grants Programme, 4th Operational Phase (UNDP) (GEF Grant : \$ 123.65 m)
28. **Regional (Albania, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Croatia, Egypt, Lebanon, Libya, Morocco, Serbia, Syria, Tunisia, Turkey, Algeria)** : Strategic Partnership for the Mediterranean Large Marine Ecosystem--Regional Component: Implementation of Agreed Actions for the Protection of the Environmental Resources of the Mediterranean Sea and Its Coastal Areas (UNEP/UNIDO) (GEF Grant : \$ 12.89 m)
29. **Regional (Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Paraguay, Uruguay)** : Sustainable Management of the Water Resources of the la Plata Basin with Respect to the Effects of Climate Variability and Change (UNEP) (GEF Grant : \$ 10.73 m)

## PROJECT PROPOSALS SUBMITTED FOR COUNCIL APPROVAL

June 2007

All amounts in US\$ million.

#	GEF ID	OP Country	IA	Project Title	PDF A	PDF + PPG	GEF Project Grant	Total GEF Grant*	Cofin.	Agency Fees	Total Project Cost **
Biodiversity											
1	2123	13	Global (Ghana, Kenya, South Africa, India, Nepal, Pakistan, Brazil)	UNEP		0.700	7.811	8.511	18.647	0.766	27.158
2	2127	13	Global (Peru, Chile, China, Tunisia, Philippines, Algeria)	FAO	0.025	0.700	3.500	4.225	14.500	0.423	18.725
3	2703	2	Brazil	UNDP		0.330	5.000	5.330	15.346	0.480	20.676
4	2773	2	Costa Rica	UNDP		0.335	4.800	5.135	20.310	0.462	25.445
5	2687	3	Guatemala	IADB		0.350	4.100	4.450	11.330	0.445	15.780
6	2702	1	Nicaragua	UNDP		0.350	1.800	2.150	3.820	0.194	5.970
7	3254	2	Seychelles	UNDP			2.000	2.000	4.605	0.180	6.605
8	2615	4	South Africa	UNDP		0.350	8.300	8.650	37.262	0.779	45.912
Sub total for Biodiversity					0.025	3.115	37.311	40.451	125.820	3.727	166.270

\* "Total GEF Grant" is the GEF Project Grant plus previously approved project preparation grant(PDF A, PDF B, PDF C and PPG).

\*\* "Total Project Cost" includes Total GEF Grant and cofinancing.

						All amounts in US\$ million.						
#	GEF ID	OP	Country	IA	Project Title	PDF A	PDF + PPG	GEF Project Grant	Total GEF Grant*	Cofin.	Agency Fees	Total Project Cost **
Climate Change												
9	2777	5	Regional (Bangladesh, China, Indonesia, Thailand, Vietnam)	UNDP	Barrier Removal to the Cost-Effective Development and Implementation of Energy Efficiency Standards and Labeling Project (BRESL)	0.050		6.800	6.850	27.355	0.617	34.205
10	2941	5	Brazil	UNDP/LADB	Market Transformation for Energy Efficiency in Buildings		0.250	13.500	13.750	64.825	1.339	78.575
11	2609	11	China	World Bank	China/GEF/World Bank Urban Transport Partnership Program		0.350	21.000	21.350	585.750	1.922	607.100
12	2951	5	China	World Bank	Energy Efficiency Financing			13.500	13.500	583.150	1.215	596.650
13	2376	6	Russian Federation	World Bank	Renewable Energy Project (RREP)		0.350	10.000	10.350	66.800	0.932	77.150
14	2604	11	South Africa	UNDP	Sustainable Public Transport and Sport: A 2010 Opportunity		0.197	10.999	11.197	323.942	1.008	335.139
Sub total for Climate Change						0.050	1.147	75.799	76.997	1,651.822	7.032	1,728.811

\* "Total GEF Grant" is the GEF Project Grant plus previously approved project preparation grant(PDF A, PDF B, PDF C and PPG).

\*\* "Total Project Cost" includes Total GEF Grant and cofinancing.

All amounts in US\$ million.

GEF		OP	Country	IA	Project Title	Per amount in US\$ million					Agency Fees	Total Project Cost **
#	ID					PDF A	PDF + PPG	GEF Project Grant	Total GEF Grant*	Cofin.		
<b>International Waters</b>												
15	2261	10	Global (China, Brazil, India, Mexico, Turkey, South Africa, Iran, Argentina, Venezuela, Chile, Algeria, Egypt, Ukraine, Peru, Morocco, Libya, Croatia, Ecuador, Guatemala, Angola, Sudan, Costa Rica, Cote d'Ivoire, Panama, Trinidad and Tobago, Yemen, Jordan, Ghana)	UNDP	Building Partnerships to Assist Developing Countries to Reduce the Transfer of Harmful Aquatic Organisms in Ships' Ballast Water (GloBallast Partnerships)		0.700	5.640	6.340	17.702	0.575	24.042
16	2700	9	Regional (Cambodia, China, East Timor, Indonesia, Malaysia, Philippines, Lao PDR, Thailand, Vietnam, Brunei)	UNDP	Implementation of Sustainable Development Strategy for the Seas of East Asia (SDS-SEA)		0.700	10.876	11.576	33.374	1.042	44.951
17	2688	9	Regional (El Salvador, Honduras, Nicaragua)	IADB	Integrated Ecosystem Management of the Gulf of Fonseca		0.600	5.000	5.600	21.716	0.560	27.316
18	2133	9	Regional (Albania, Montenegro)	World Bank	Lake Skadar-Shkoder Integrated Ecosystem Management		0.450	4.550	5.000	11.163	0.450	16.163
19	3025	10	Regional (Cambodia, China, Indonesia, Lao PDR, Malaysia, Philippines, Thailand, Vietnam)	World Bank	World Bank/GEF Partnership Investment Fund for Pollution Reduction in the Large Marine Ecosystems of East Asia (Tranche 1, 2nd Installment)			10.000	10.000	80.870	0.900	90.870
20	3229	9	Regional (Albania, Algeria, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, Egypt, Macedonia, Lebanon, Libya, Morocco, Serbia, Syria, Tunisia, Turkey)	World Bank	World Bank-GEF Investment Fund for the Mediterranean Sea Large Marine Ecosystem Partnership, Tranche 1, 2nd Installment			15.000	15.000	45.000	1.350	60.000
<b>Sub total for International Waters</b>							2.450	51.066	53.516	209.825	4.877	263.342

Page 3 of 5

\* "Total GEF Grant" is the GEF Project Grant plus previously approved project preparation grant(PDF A, PDF B, PDF C and PPG).

\*\* "Total Project Cost" includes Total GEF Grant and cofinancing.

**Annex A**

						All amounts in US\$ million.						
GEF												
#	ID	OP	Country	LA	Project Title	PDF A	PDF + PPG	GEF Project Grant	Total GEF Grant*	Cofin.	Agency Fees	Total Project Cost **
<b>Land Degradation</b>												
21	2757	15	Regional (Benin, Botswana, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Ghana, Kenya, Lesotho, Madagascar, Malawi, Mali, Mauritania, Mozambique, Namibia, Niger, Nigeria, Rwanda, Senegal, South Africa, Sudan, Tanzania, Togo, Uganda, Zambia, Zimbabwe)	World Bank/UNDP/ UNEP/ AfDB/ IFAD/ FAO	Strategic Investment Program for SLM in Sub-Saharan Africa (SIP)		0.700	137.298	137.998	986.215	12.702	1,124.213
Sub total for Land Degradation							0.700	137.298	137.998	986.215	12.702	1,124.213
<b>Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs)</b>												
22	2546	14	Regional (Sudan, Morocco, Yemen, Djibouti, Egypt, Syria, Jordan, Iran)	UNEP	Demonstration of Sustainable Alternatives to DDT and Strengthening of National Vector Control Capabilities in Middle East and North Africa		0.650	4.913	5.563	8.416	0.501	13.980
23	2927	14	China	UNIDO	Environmentally Sustainable Management of Medical Waste in China		0.350	11.650	12.000	33.077	1.200	45.077
24	3263	14	China	UNIDO	Strengthening Institutions, Regulations and Enforcement Capacities for Effective and Efficient Implementation of the National Implementation Plan (NIP) in China			5.410	5.410	9.825	0.541	15.235
25	1520	14	India	UNIDO	Development of a National Implementation Plan in India as a First Step to Implement the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs).		0.317	3.241	3.558	7.080	0.356	10.638
Sub total for Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs)							1.317	25.214	26.531	58.399	2.597	84.930

\* "Total GEF Grant" is the GEF Project Grant plus previously approved project preparation grant(PDF A, PDF B, PDF C and PPG).

\*\* "Total Project Cost" includes Total GEF Grant and cofinancing.

						All amounts in US\$ million.								
GEF		#	ID	OP	Country	IA	Project Title	PDF A	PDF + PPG	GEF Project Grant	Total GEF Grant*	Cofin.	Agency Fees	Total Project Cost **
Multi-Focal Area/Corporate Programs														
26	3357	M <sup>a</sup>	Global		World Bank/IFC	GEF Public-Private Partnership Fund		0.190		50.000	50.190	160.000	0.000	210.190
27	3228	M <sup>a</sup>	Global		UNDP	Small Grants Programme, 4th Operational Phase				123.647	123.647	147.000	4.666	270.647
28	2600	M <sup>a</sup>	Regional (Albania, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Croatia, Egypt, Lebanon, Libya, Morocco, Serbia, Syria, Tunisia, Turkey, Algeria)		UNEP/UNIDO	Strategic Partnership for the Mediterranean Large Marine Ecosystem--Regional Component: Implementation of Agreed Actions for the Protection of the Environmental Resources of the Mediterranean Sea and Its Coastal Areas ***		0.700		12.891	13.591	29.607	1.233	43.198
29	2095	M <sup>a</sup>	Regional (Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Paraguay, Uruguay)		UNEP	Sustainable Management of the Water Resources of the La Plata Basin with Respect to the Effects of Climate Variability and Change ****	0.025	0.700		10.730	11.455	50.562	1.031	62.017
Sub total for Multi-Focal Area/Corporate Programs								0.025	1.590	197.268	198.883	387.170	6.930	586.052
Total for Work Program								0.100	10.319	523.956	534.375	3,419.250	37.865	3,953.625

\* "Total GEF Grant" is the GEF Project Grant plus previously approved project preparation grants(PDF A, PDF B, PDF C and PPG).

\*\* "Total Project Cost" includes Total GEF Grant and cofinancing.

\*\*\*US\$2.5M of this amount comes from the allocations for POPs and the rest from IW; \*\*\*\*US\$1M of this amount will come from Climate Change allocations for SPA and the rest from IW.

## ANNEX B. HISTORICAL TREND ANALYSIS

### Historical Cofinancing Trends

1. Table B.1 shows the historical trend in total co-financing amounts and ratios. Co-financing performance has steadily increased over the history of the GEF. The co-financing ratio average for GEF-4 to date is 6.35 compared to the overall historical average of 3.83.

**Table B.1: Trends in Co-financing Amounts and Ratios (GEF Pilot Phase - GEF 4)\***  
(\$ million)

GEF Phase	GEF Grant (\$m)	Co-financing Amount (\$m)							Total Project Cost (\$m)	Co-Financing Ratio
		BD	CC	IW	LD	MFA	ODS	POPs		
Pilot Phase	739.55	189.05	2,402.89	144.26	-	4.35	1.85	-	3,481.95	3.71
GEF - 1	1,254.85	966.03	2,322.10	217.40	-	55.21	95.24	-	4,910.83	2.91
GEF - 2	1,912.41	1,852.22	3,403.40	568.67	-	345.29	78.11	5.49	8,165.59	3.27
GEF - 3	2,897.72	2,996.94	4,609.69	2,448.74	977.43	894.52	11.49	143.33	14,979.85	4.17
GEF - 4	539.05	125.82	1,651.82	209.83	986.22	390.52	0.41	59.53	3,963.19	6.35
2007	539.05	125.82	1,651.82	209.83	986.22	390.52	0.41	59.53	3,963.19	6.35
<b>Total</b>	<b>7,343.59</b>	<b>6,130.05</b>	<b>14,389.91</b>	<b>3,588.89</b>	<b>1,963.64</b>	<b>1,689.88</b>	<b>187.10</b>	<b>208.34</b>	<b>35,501.41</b>	<b>3.83</b>

*Legend:* BD – Biodiversity; CC – Climate Change; IW – International Waters; LD – Land Degradation; MFA – Multi-focal Area; ODS – Ozone Depleting Substances; POPs – Persistent Organic Pollutants

\* Table associates project preparation grants with the project grants for those periods when the project grants are approved

(b) Note: Cofinancing ratio = Cofinancing/GEF Grant

### Project Grants

1. Table B.2 contains the cumulative GEF project grants approved by the Council through work programs as well as project preparation grants, medium-sized projects, and enabling activities approved by the CEO.

**Table B.2: Project Grant Trends (GEF Pilot Phase - GEF 4) by Focal Area \* (\$ million)**

GEF Phase	Biodiversity		Climate Change		International Waters		Land Degradation		Multi-Focal Area		Ozone Depletion		Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs)		Total
	Grant	%													
Pilot Phase	331.72	43%	284.80	37%	125.46	16%	-	0%	15.70	2%	5.54	1%	-	0%	763.22
GEF - 1	459.75	36%	509.89	40%	120.89	10%	-	0%	50.59	4%	121.10	10%	-	0%	1,262.23
GEF - 2	746.44	38%	680.73	35%	301.31	15%	1.47	0%	148.09	8%	43.47	2%	29.06	1%	1,950.58
GEF - 3	880.94	30%	877.68	30%	343.90	12%	219.27	8%	412.18	14%	12.15	0%	163.74	6%	2,909.86
GEF - 4	38.05	7%	76.35	14%	51.63	10%	138.25	26%	198.43	37%	0.84	0%	27.18	5%	530.73
2007	38.05	7%	76.35	14%	51.63	10%	138.25	26%	198.43	37%	0.84	0%	27.18	5%	530.73
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,456.90</b>	<b>33%</b>	<b>2,429.45</b>	<b>33%</b>	<b>943.19</b>	<b>13%</b>	<b>358.99</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>824.99</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>183.10</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>219.99</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>7,416.61</b>
Total %	33%		33%		13%		5%		11%		2%		3%		100%

\* Table includes all projects approved by the Council as well as those expedited MSPs and EAs that were approved by the CEO with delegated authority.



## ANNEX C. WORK PROGRAM PROJECT SUMMARIES

### Biodiversity

**1. Global (Ghana, Kenya, South Africa, India, Nepal, Pakistan, Brazil):** Conservation & Management of Pollinators for Sustainable Agriculture through an Ecosystem Approach (UNEP)

Focal Area/OP/Strategic Priority: Biodiversity/OP13 on Agrobiodiversity/ Mainstreaming Biodiversity in Production Landscapes/Seascapes and Sectors

Local executing agency: **Brazil:** Brazilian Ministry of the Environment;  
**Ghana:** University of Cape Coast;  
**India:** G.B. Pant Institute of Himalayan Environment and Development;  
**Kenya:** National Museums of Kenya;  
**Nepal:** Ministry of Agriculture and Cooperatives, Gender Equity and Environment Division;  
**Pakistan:** National Agricultural Research Centre;  
**South Africa:** South African National Biodiversity Institute;

Total Cost of the Project: \$27.158 million

GEF Funding Request: \$7.811 million (+ \$700,000 of PDF previously approved)

Key Indicators:

- At least 495,000 ha of land under target cropping systems in the area surrounding Study, Training, Evaluation and Promotion (STEP) sites is managed with good agricultural practices for pollinator conservation and sustainable use by project end.
- 20% of farmers in more than 430 local communities in the area surrounding STEP sites improve crop production by 10% and crop quality through better conservation and management of pollination services by project end.

Rationale & Objective:

Pollination is a keystone process in both human-managed and natural terrestrial ecosystems. It is critical for food production and human livelihoods. In agro-ecosystems, pollinators are essential for orchard, horticultural and forage production, as well as the production of seed for many root and fibre crops. Pollinators such as bees, birds and bats affect 35 percent of the world's crop production, increasing outputs of 87 of the leading food crops worldwide, plus many plant-derived medicines in our pharmacies. Food security, food diversity, human nutrition and food prices all rely strongly on animal pollinators. This is particularly the case of horticultural crops. Diversification into horticultural crops is becoming an avenue to poverty alleviation amongst many farmers around the world.

With the threat of increased impacts on pollination services as agricultural systems are intensified, it is critical to identify, in multiple agro-ecosystems and ecologies, the practices that will prevent the loss of pollination services provided by wild indigenous pollinators. Because restoration is far more difficult than conservation of existing interactions, there are strong argument rationales to conserve wild and indigenous pollination services before they are lost.

The project's *immediate objective* is to harness the benefits of pollination services provided by wild biodiversity for human livelihoods and sustainable agriculture, through an ecosystem approach in selected countries. The project seeks to promote awareness that not just species, but also the interactions between species merit conservation and careful management, as a way to strengthen key ecosystem linkages.

Project Outcomes:

- An integrated and accessible knowledge base for management of wild pollination services, for farmers, land managers and policy makers.
- Enhanced conservation and sustainable use of pollinators for sustainable agriculture.
- Increased capacity for conservation and sustainable use of pollinators by farmers and land managers.
- Mainstreaming of pollinator conservation and sustainable use.

Project Outputs:

- An expanded knowledge base and tools accessible to pollination practitioners
- Guidelines and publications on plant pollination limitations, agroecosystem management of pollination services, and socio-economic valuation of pollination.
- User-friendly tools for pollinator identification.
- Development and testing of pollinator-friendly management plans
- Documentation of practices and tools for evaluation and development of management plans
- Enhanced capacity of farmers and multipliers to conserve and use wild pollination services
- Enhanced research capacity for management of pollination services
- Tools for building capacity in management of pollination services
- Campaign for increased public awareness of the role of pollinators
- National dialogue on pro-pollinator policy
- Information portals on national and global levels

## 2. Global (Peru, Chile, China, Algeria, Tunisia, Philippines) : Conservation and Adaptive Management of Globally Important Agricultural Heritage Systems (GIAHS) (FAO)

Focal Area/OP/Strategic Priority: Biodiversity/OP13 on Agrobiodiversity/ Mainstreaming Biodiversity in Production Landscapes/Seascapes and Sectors

Local executing agency: **Algeria:** Ministère de l'aménagement du territoire et de l'environnement

**Chile:** Centro de Tecnología y Educación /CET

**China:** Ministry of Agriculture/MOA

**Peru:** National Environmental Council /CONAMA

**Philippines:** Department of Environment and Natural Resources /DENR

**Tunisia:** Ministère de l'environnement et du développement durable

Total Cost of the Project: \$18.725 million

GEF Funding Request: \$3.50 million (+ \$725,000 of PDFs previously approved)

### Key Indicators:

The project will contribute to mainstreaming the conservation and sustainable use of globally important agro-biodiversity harbored in 112000 ha of productive landscape of traditional agricultural systems in seven countries through policy and regulatory reforms, innovative market mechanisms and incentive schemes and support systemic and institutional capacity building of seven countries demonstrating "local livelihood improvements – global environmental benefits linkages", by applying an ecosystem approach in the agricultural landscape.

### Rationale & Objective:

Worldwide, specific agricultural systems and landscapes have been created, shaped and maintained by generations of farmers and herders based on diverse natural resources, using locally adapted management practices. These ingenious agricultural systems reflect the evolution of humankind, the diversity of its knowledge, and its profound relationship with nature and have resulted not only in outstanding landscapes, maintenance and adaptation of globally significant agricultural biodiversity but, above all, in the sustained provision of multiple goods and services, food and livelihood security and quality of life. The continued survival of these globally important agricultural heritage systems (GIAHS) is threatened by several factors such as the loss of customary institutions and forms of social organization that underpin management of these systems; abandonment of the traditional cultivation and farming systems; conversion of land and habitat in and around traditionally managed fields to alternative uses such as unsustainable intensive farming, plantations, housing; and the displacement and dilution of traditional varieties cultivated in these systems.

The project **objective** is to promote conservation and adaptive management of globally significant agricultural biodiversity harbored in globally important agricultural heritage systems.

### Project Outcomes:

- An internationally accepted system for recognition of GIAHS is in place.

- The conservation and adaptive management of globally significant agricultural biodiversity harbored in GIAHS is mainstreamed in sectoral and inter-sectoral plans and policies in pilot countries.
- Globally significant agricultural biodiversity in pilot GIAHS is being managed and sustainably used by empowering local communities and harnessing evolving economic, social, and policy processes and by adaptation of appropriate new technologies that allow interaction between ecological and cultural processes.
- Lessons learned and best practices from promoting effective management of pilot GIAHS are widely disseminated to support expansion and upscaling of the GIAHS in other areas/countries and creation of the GIAHS network

Project Outputs:

- GIAHS concept, definition and criteria
- Interim GIAHS Secretariat with a statutory mandate and Scientific Advisory Committee
- Sustainable financing mechanism and institutional support for consolidating and expanding the GIAHS approach
- Improved sectoral and inter-sectoral policies and regulations
- Training programs for national-level institutions to mainstream GIAHS in sectoral and inter-sectoral plans and policies
- Stakeholder collaboration mechanisms
- Monitoring system for political and socio-economic processes that impact biodiversity and cultural values in GIAHS
- Environmentally friendly technologies and practices for GIAHS
- Programs for alternative and/or supplementary livelihoods
- Documentation and published information

### 3. **Brazil** : Effective Conservation and Sustainable Use of Mangrove Ecosystems in Brazil (UNDP)

<u>Focal Area/OP/Strategic Priority:</u>	Biodiversity: Primarily OP2 Coastal, Marine, and Freshwater Ecosystems; SP1: Catalyzing Sustainability of Protected Area Systems at National Levels
<u>Local executing agency:</u>	Ministry of the Environment (MMA)
<u>Total Cost of the Project:</u>	\$20.676 million
<u>GEF Funding Request:</u>	\$5.0 million (+ \$330,000 of PDF previously approved)

#### Key Indicators:

568,000 Hectares of globally important mangroves will be under improved management effectiveness in Brazilian Conservation Units. The enabling framework, dissemination and outreach components of the project will lay the foundation for long term improvement to the conservation and sustainable use of 13,400km<sup>2</sup> of mangroves corresponding to 9% of the world mangrove ecosystems. The subset of mangrove protected areas, improved institutional capacities and tested finance strategies will advance the sustainability of the Brazilian National System of Conservation Units with indirect biodiversity benefits to other ecosystems.

#### Rationale & Objective:

Mangrove ecosystems are among the most productive on earth, supporting globally significant biodiversity and providing resources and environmental services that underpin economic activities and ensure the environmental integrity of coastal areas. Moreover, their role in increasing the resilience of coastal ecosystems, communities and economic activities to climate change is increasingly recognized. While Brazil has put in place a comprehensive framework for ensuring that mangrove ecosystems are conserved, there are a number of weaknesses in the systems which undermine the delivery of effective protection. The result is the loss of mangrove habitats and the provision of resources on which many communities and sectors depend. This project will directly address this problem by tailoring existing protected area management tools in the National System of Conservation Units (SNUC) to address the specific characteristics of mangrove ecosystems and increase capacities for their implementation, thus establishing minimum standards and improved approaches to mangrove conservation and sustainable use across the country. The result would be direct conservation benefits to 568,000 ha of globally significant mangroves, positive impacts on the livelihoods of some of the poorest segments of Brazilian society and a framework through which lessons learnt could be replicated to all of Brazil's mangrove ecosystems and others globally.

The *Development Objective* is the conservation and sustainable use of mangrove ecosystems in Brazil to conserve globally significant biodiversity and key environmental services and functions important for national development and the well-being of traditional and marginalized coastal communities.

#### Project Outcomes:

- The enabling environment for a sub-system of mangrove ecosystem protected areas is in place, including policy, regulatory, and financial mechanisms
- Replicable models are in place for the management of mangrove resources in SNUC sustainable-use protected areas
- Conservation of mangroves is improved by piloting the alignment of UC management with sectoral and spatial planning
- Mangrove-related outreach, dissemination and adaptive management increased

#### Project Outputs:

- Economic and environmental sustainability assessed for Conservation Units (UC) containing mangroves.
- A specific policy and regulatory framework for the conservation, sustainable use and management of mangrove ecosystems developed and validated
- A representative and effective network of PAs that contain mangroves developed as part of the SNUC
- Inter-institutional coordination and overall capacity within SNUC improved for the effective protection of mangrove biodiversity
- Capacity development of communities-based and other local grass-roots organisations linked to the direct management of mangrove resources in selected PAs.
- Strategic partnerships forged with the private sector for the sustainability for Conservation Units containing mangroves.
- Improved technical guidelines developed and tested for the development of Management Plans for Conservation Units containing mangroves.
- Management Plans developed for PA containing mangroves within selected mosaics to test guidelines tailored for mangrove conservation.
- Conservation and sustainable use approaches defined for addressing specific issues and threats in selected mosaics.
- Management models defined for the Mosaic-approach in selected Mosaics.
- Monitoring and Evaluation Plan.

#### 4. **Costa Rica** : Overcoming Barriers to Sustainability of Costa Rica's Protected Areas System (UNDP)

<u>Focal Area/OP/Strategic Priority:</u>	Biodiversity/OP1-4/ Strategic Objective 1: Catalyzing sustainability of protected area systems
<u>Local executing agency:</u>	National System of Conservation Areas (SINAC)
<u>Total Cost of the Project:</u>	\$25.445 million
<u>GEF Funding Request:</u>	\$4.80 million (+ \$335,000 of PDF previously approved)
<u>Key Indicators:</u>	1,840,448 hectares of protected areas under improved management effectiveness

##### Rationale & Objective:

Whilst Costa Rica has promoted itself as one of the world's foremost eco-tourism destination its national Protected Areas System is not equipped to manage the growth in national territory under protection and the threats to already protected habitats. Various *pressures* - both within the protected areas and outside in the surrounding landscapes - are currently undermining the long-term sustainability not only of the individual protected area units, but of the overall protected area system. These pressures can be grouped into three clusters of threats, which bear directly or indirectly on the long-term viability of the protected area system: (i) habitat degradation; (ii) habitat conversion; and (iii) over-exploitation. The *underlying causes* of these threats include: (i) a legislative framework which impedes effective protected area management, (ii) absence or inadequacy of management plans and bio-regional scale conservation strategies; (iii) uncoordinated land development planning; (iv) insufficient financial and human resource for effective management and threat reduction to protected areas and (v) under estimation of the economic value of the ecosystem services provided within and outside the protected areas.

The long-term national Goal of the full GEF project is: Consolidating the Protected Areas System as a key component of sustainable development in Costa Rica.

The Project Objective is: To overcome the major systemic and institutional barriers to sustainability of the Costa Rican Protected Area System. There are five planned outcomes in support of the project's stated objective.

##### Project Outcomes and Outputs:

The proposed project will support Costa Rica's efforts to strengthen its Protected Areas System administered by the National System of Conservation Areas (SINAC). The aim is to have a System that effectively conserves a representative sample of Costa Rica's biodiversity, advance national goals and captures global benefits in a range of ecosystems. This will be achieved through five interrelated Outcomes with the associated outputs listed below.

Outcome 1: Costa Rica's legal and policy framework is reformed and enhanced to ensure effective management and long-term financial and ecological sustainability of the Protected Area System.

Output 1.1: A National Policy for a consolidated terrestrial and marine Protected Area System is approved and in force.

Output 1.2: Prerequisite legal reforms and a re-categorization of Protected Areas defined and applied through local and regional planning instruments.

Output 1.3: A SINAC Strategic Plan officially approved and operational.

Output 1.4: A Protected Area System Strategic Action Plan officially approved and operational.

Outcome 2: SINAC's institutional Protected Area System framework and capacity is enhanced for eco-regional planning and optimal management effectiveness.

Output 2.1: SINAC's institutional and administrative structure and organization re-aligned and enhanced.

Output 2.2: SINAC's intra-institutional coordination mechanisms for effective Protected Area System management developed and operational.

Output 2.3: Staff profiles, responsibilities and occupational standards for enhanced Protected Area System management defined, clarified or re-aligned.

Output 2.4: Training Program for practitioners at all levels on administrative, technical and practical skills necessary for optimal Protected Area management effectiveness.

Outcome 3: SINAC has the financial sustainability to effectively attain its strategic objectives and provide resources for long-term Protected Area System management needs.

Output 3.1: A Protected Area Financing Strategy adopted and operational.

Output 3.2: A Protected Area System Financing Business Plan prepared and operational

Output 3.3: The creation and retention of new revenue sources for Protected Areas enabled by national policies.

Output 3.4: System-wide funding mechanisms developed and implemented in the Protected Area System and its constituent Protected Area units.

Output 3.5: An online Protected Area System financial information system and fee collection mechanisms designed and established within SINAC.

Output 3.6: Training Program for SINAC financial administrators at all levels to set up, consolidate and operate financial planning, management and other business systems.

Outcome 4: SINAC tests new and innovative conservation approaches at the Conservation Area and Protected Area levels.

Output 4.1: Protected Area boundaries legally registered and demarcated for a representative sample of Protected Area units within the Protected Area System.

Output 4.2: Infrastructure and accessibility of 10 most visited Protected Areas within Protected Area System improved.

Output 4.3: Protected Area management authority support to community-based businesses tested and institutionalized.

Output 4.4: Partnerships between a Conservation Area and the tourism industry for financing PA management tested.

Output 4.5: New management approaches and local land use planning tools compatible with eco-regional conservation goals tested with local municipal governments and community-based organizations.

Output 4.6: New approaches to eco-regional planning and Protected Area management tested through TNC-Osa Conservation Area Partnership.



Outcome 5: Successful Protected Area System management models are scaled-up and replicated at the systemic level through strategic partnerships with key stakeholders.

- Output 5.1: Local and regional Protected Area Management Councils function with an integrated and inter-sectoral vision through flexible and inclusive management arrangements.
- Output 5.2: SINAC has institutional capacity for engaging with indigenous communities and for providing alternative livelihood support to communities located in and around Protected Areas.
- Output 5.3: Institutional mechanisms are put in place through clear rules for the tendering and bidding of concessions, other use permits and opportunities to local entrepreneurs.
- Output 5.4: Models for multi-stakeholder Protected Area management boards are institutionalized and replicated in a variety of ecological and socio-economic contexts.
- Output 5.5: SINAC Protected Area system is connected through biological corridors which operate under innovative public–private partnership models.
- Output 5.6: Marketing and communication strategy on Protected Area values, vulnerabilities and revenue mechanisms formulated and implemented at the national level.

## 5. **Guatemala:** Improvement of Management Effectiveness in the Maya Biosphere Reserve (MBR) (IADB)

<u>Focal Area/OP/Strategic Priority:</u>	Biodiversity/OP3/SP1
<u>Local executing agency:</u>	Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources
<u>Total Cost of the Project:</u>	\$15.780 million
<u>GEF Funding Request:</u>	\$4.100 million (+ \$350,000 of PDF previously approved)
<u>Key Indicators:</u>	

- Approximately 75% of Guatemala's protected area system will be strengthened by improving and expanding co-management arrangements to areas of high biodiversity value within the Maya Biosphere Reserve, the largest protected area in Central America;
- 2,112,949 ha of the Biosphere Reserve will be protected, of which 814,324 ha is designated for strict protection and includes two Ramsar sites (Laguna del Tigre National Park and Yaxha-Nakum-Naranjo National Park);
- Approximately 23% of the Project funding will be directed towards capacity building with special attention to local communities
- Overall management effectiveness of the Maya Biosphere Reserve is expected to increase 20% against a baseline scenario by the end of the project.

### Rationale & Objective:

The Maya Biosphere Reserve (MBR) is the largest protected area in Central America, spanning 2,112,940 ha of the northern part of the department of Petén in Guatemala. The reserve encompasses approx. 75% of the Guatemalan system of PAs managed by the National Council for Protected Areas (CONAP). As an internationally renowned culturally and ecologically significant area, the reserve includes a World Heritage Site and a UNESCO Biosphere Reserve. While threats to the biodiversity resources are increasing, including due to increased unsustainable human activities with lack of land use planning and capacity, the GEF project is suggested to support conservation management and the sustainable use of biodiversity with an emphasis on areas of high biological importance in the MBR, by strengthening institutional, national and local capacities to optimize management, thus guaranteeing the effective participation of various stakeholders as partners in conservation.

### Project Outcomes:

The project aims to have the following four key results:

- Institutional arrangements and overall capacity for diversity conservation are strengthened.
- Productive practices that mainstream biodiversity conservation in strategic parts of the MBR are adopted
- Policy framework compatible with biodiversity conservation is endorsed and implemented and barriers to its sustainable use are removed.
- Overall management of the MBR shifts towards and adaptive management approach guided by a regional vision of the Reserve.

### Project Outputs:

Component 1:

- Strengthened institutional capabilities for governance of the MBR

- Improved and developed new mechanisms for co-management in core zones, biological corridors, community polygons, and other special use areas
- Strengthened the operational capacity of the SECONAP in the MBR
- Partnerships developed with the formal education sector in the region for environmental education and skills training

Component 2:

- Innovative investments made in the use of biodiversity and environmental goods and services of the MBR
- Diversified of forestry products and entrepreneurial training for the administration of concessions
- Low-impact nature-based tourism activities and tourism circuits developed in the CZ, biological corridors and MUZ
- Incentives for sustainable agricultural activities in appropriate areas

Component 3:

- Supported the resolution of land and resource use conflicts<sup>5</sup> in the MBR, particularly the biological corridors and core zones to the west of the 90° meridian
- Improved policies, norms and regulations for controlling threats in the MBR
- Supported the environmental audit and expert assessment functions performed by judicial officers in the MBR
- Revenue-generating mechanisms as part of a fully-endorsed Business Plan for the MBR are put in place and operating.

Component 4:

- Consolidated and improved the exchange of information for the management of the MBR
- Established the monitoring and evaluation system of the performance and impact of managing the MBR
- Developed a research agenda for biodiversity conservation

---

<sup>5</sup> Understanding as land conflicts those disputes over possessions and use right over lands, due to overlapping boundaries and boundary markers, inconsistency between areas registered and area occupied, invasions, all of which create uncertainties in land ownership. CONTIERRA reports as of 2005 a total of 302 cases of land conflicts throughout the department, and 127 conflicts inventoried by the Office at San Benito, which serves the municipalities that correspond to the MBR.

## 6. **Nicaragua** : Strengthening and Catalyzing the Sustainability of Nicaragua's System of Protected Areas System (UNDP)

<u>Focal Area/OP/Strategic Priority:</u>	BD/OP1-4
<u>Local executing agency:</u>	Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment (MARENA)
<u>Total Cost of the Project:</u>	\$5.97 million
<u>GEF Funding Request:</u>	\$1.80 million (+ \$350,000 of PDF previously approved)
<u>Key Indicators:</u>	50 additional PAs (319,326 Ha.) under improved conservation management by 2010

### Rationale & Objective:

The current baseline efforts are not sufficient to reduce the threats to biodiversity within Nicaragua's PAs, leading to habitat decline, fragmentation of ecosystems, and loss of species diversity. Most donor efforts have focused on site level activities to circumvent the systemic weaknesses of SINAP's management capacity. This has led to improvements at a few important PAs but has failed to bring sustained improvements to the PA system and SINAP remains technically and financially weak. Furthermore, SINAP is confronted with a particularly difficult situation where most land within its PAs is privately owned and under unsustainable production. Past efforts have been unable to support compatible land use within the context of this challenge. The current situation is hence unsustainable and does not afford adequate protection for biodiversity:

The project will seek to improve system-level capacity through overcoming existing institutional and systemic barriers to effective PA management. Strengthened capacity of SINAP at the system level will be complemented by engaging key stakeholders such as sectoral Ministries, municipalities, co-managers as well as the private landowners and labourers. This strategy will promote, over the long term, improved PA site-level management and financing and catalyze future donor assistance.

The project goal is, "Nicaraguan society conserves biodiversity in-situ through a sustainable National Protected Areas System. This is based on the goal of SINAP's Development Strategy and responds to the nexus between Nicaragua's large constituency of private property owners and their need for economic growth that must be balanced with the need for conservation of biodiversity.

The project objective is, "The Nicaraguan Protected Areas System is effectively managed through legal reforms, strengthened institutions, sustainable financing and partnerships." The objective will be achieved through the realisation of 4 outcomes that have been developed through a participatory process involving both stakeholders and co-financiers.

### Project Outcomes:

The project has been designed to achieve the following outcomes:

- (a) Improve the national enabling environment so that the legal, policy and strategic frameworks are in place to allow SINAP to function more effectively. This will include key legal reforms and adoption of an updated master strategy for SINAP detailing its process for decentralization, coverage and management.
- (b) Share the responsibilities of PA management across all relevant stakeholders including Ministries, regional government bodies, municipalities, private landowners and

concessionaires and NGO co-managers. The project will support establishing and strengthening multi-stakeholder institutional structures so that they are operational and have capacity to engage stakeholders in PA management. This component will also develop the capacities of stakeholders, primarily landowners within PAs, to work with the PA authorities on biodiversity friendly economic activities.

- (c) Improve SINAP's financial situation through transforming its financing system to generate, retain and account for funds and more effectively invest them at the site level. Reforms will also improve financing possibilities and create incentives (and reduce disincentives) for private producers within PAs to develop production in harmony with biodiversity conservation.
- (d) Institutionalize the learning within the project and MARENA for broader uptake, sustainability and replication.

#### Project Outputs:

##### Outcome 1: Enhanced Policy and legal framework enables improved SINAP management and finances.

- Output 1.1. The quantitative economic contribution of Nicaragua's protected areas to the national and regional economy is widely known.
- Output 1.2: Legislation is in place to formalize the agreements SINAP management.
- Output 1.3: Legislation in force to enable increased revenues to SINAP and PAs.
- Output 1.4: SINAP has an improved strategic and management framework.

##### Outcome 2: PA management responsibilities are shared by key stakeholders.

- Output 2.1: A participatory and integrated stakeholder governance and communication structure is functioning.
- Output 2.2: Integrated stakeholder support for mitigating the impacts of economic development and integrating economic development with PA management objectives. the conversion of production systems to models of environmentally sound production in line with conservation objectives established.
- Output 2.3: Protocols, standards, and indicators for co-manager performance established.

##### Outcome 3: Capacities for Sustainable Financing of SINAP and PAs developed.

- Output 3.1 A long-range financing strategy and plan for SINAP in force.
- Output 3.2: Increased annual government financing for SINAP.
- Output 3.3: Concession payment mechanisms established and functioning
- Output 3.4: Model PA site business plans developed and implemented.
- Output 3.5: A cost and revenue accounting system for SINAP is implemented the system level.

##### Outcome 4: Institutionalizing management and learning within project and MARENA

- Output 4.1: Effective project management.
- Output 4.2 Project monitoring and evaluation system.

## 7. **Seychelles** : Mainstreaming Prevention and Control Measures for Invasive Alien Species into Trade, Transport and Travel Across the Production Landscape (UNDP)

<u>Focal Area/OP/Strategic Priority:</u>	Primary SP2: Mainstream Biodiversity in Production Landscapes, Seascapes and Sectors; Secondary SP4: Generation, Dissemination, and Uptake of Good Practices for Addressing Current and Emerging Biodiversity Issues; OP2 (Coastal, Marine and Freshwater Ecosystems); OP 3 (Forest Ecosystems)
<u>Local executing agency:</u>	Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources
<u>Total Cost of the Project:</u>	\$6.605 million
<u>GEF Funding Request:</u>	\$2.0 million
<u>Key Indicators:</u>	Increase in production area under effective conservation management: EOP Target: 1,374,000km <sup>2</sup> (Seychelles Exclusive Economic Zone).

### Rationale & Objective:

The Seychelles islands are a repository of globally significant biodiversity that has evolved in isolation to the biota of the Continental landmasses. The islands are part of a Global Conservation Hotspot: Madagascar and the Indian Ocean Islands. Biodiversity is threatened by Invasive alien species (IAS) brought into the country through the trade, travel and transportation sectors. IAS comprise the single greatest singular threat to native species and habitats. Invasive plants out-compete and smother the native flora, while invasive animals similarly out-compete and prey on the fauna. The Seychelles currently has an inadequate internal framework for controlling the entry of IAS into, and their spread within, the archipelago. The country has taken impressive steps to eradicate invasive alien species from small islands and to restore small island ecosystems. It is taking a number of actions to eradicate invasive fauna and control weeds on larger islands, where technology permits. However, such investments make little sense as long as the door is left open to the arrival of new IAS and there is a risk of re-invasion.

The project complements a second initiative under the IEM Programme, the UNDP-GEF Mainstreaming Biodiversity Management into Production Sector Activities Project, which addresses the direct threats to biodiversity associated with the two main production sectors, namely tourism and artisanal fisheries. However, it differs from that initiative by focusing on the entire production landscape of the country, and sectors across the economic spectrum, rather than vertically within specific sectors.

The Project Objective is to increase capacities to prevent and control the introduction and spread of Invasive Alien Species through Trade, Travel and Transport across the Production landscape

### Project Outcomes:

- Enabling conditions for effective control of the introduction and spread of IAS in place
- Strengthened Institutional capacity to prevent and control the introduction and spread of IAS
- Improved knowledge and learning capacities to control the introduction, establishment and spread of IAS.

### Project Outputs:

- Overarching and comprehensive IAS policy
- National legislative framework dealing with IAS amended and brought in line with international standards.
- Cost Recovery System for Bio-security Service is in place.
- National Communication Plan / Public Awareness Strategy on IAS management developed and Implemented.
- Biosecurity Service created.
- Biosecurity Service equipped and staffed with capacitated human resources.
- IAS baseline established.

- Lessons learned and best practices on IAS eradication & control, and habitat restoration established and disseminated.

## 8. **South Africa** : National Grasslands Biodiversity Program (UNDP)

<u>Focal Area/OP/Strategic Priority:</u>	Biodiversity/OP4 and OP2/ Mainstreaming Biodiversity in Production Landscapes/Seascapes and Sectors
<u>Local executing agency:</u>	South African National Biodiversity Institute (SANBI)
<u>Total Cost of the Project:</u>	\$45.912 million
<u>GEF Funding Request:</u>	\$8.30 million (+ \$350,000 of PDF previously approved)
<u>Key Indicators:</u>	Increase in production area under effective conservation management. EOP target: 1,396,900 ha

### Rationale & Objective:

The South Africa Grasslands biome is a repository of globally significant biodiversity. However, 30% of the total area has been irreversibly transformed by anthropogenic activities and only 2.8% is formally conserved through a protected area system that is not wholly representative of biodiversity patterns. Much of the grasslands ecosystem presently lies in production landscapes allocated to livestock production, agriculture (mainly cereals), afforestation with exotic tree species, and coal mining. There is an unmet need to mainstream biodiversity management objectives into the practices of the production sectors that provide the stimulus for land use changes that threaten biodiversity.

The National Grasslands Biodiversity Program (NGBP) aims to mainstream conservation objectives into the major production sectors: agriculture, forestry, urban development and coal mining. The programme will lift a number of barriers to conservation, namely, market failure, systemic and institutional capacity weaknesses and limited know-how for conservation management within production sector institutions. Although the enabling environment for “mainstreaming” is largely in place with a supportive policy and legal framework, there is a gap between policy and implementation. The project is designed as a catalytic initiative which will coordinate existing conservation efforts in the biome and improve their efficacy by expanding the management “tool box”.

The project seeks to promote contribution of major production sectors to the achievement of biodiversity conservation priorities within the grasslands biome.

### Project Outcomes:

- Enabling environment for biodiversity conservation in production landscapes is strengthened
- Grassland biodiversity conservation objectives mainstreamed into agriculture
- The forestry sector directly contributes to biodiversity conservation objectives in the grasslands biome
- Grassland biodiversity management objectives mainstreamed into urban economy in Gauteng

### Project Outputs:

- The enabling policy and regulatory framework is deepened
- Knowledge management system for the umbrella NGBP is developed
- Increased capacity of stakeholder institutions to engage effectively in mainstreaming biodiversity management into production practices



- Improved rangeland management systems piloted that incorporate biodiversity management objectives
- Biodiversity-friendly livestock/game production systems promoted through certification scheme
- Land use allocation decision making processes reflect biodiversity conservation priorities
- Improved management of existing unplanted forestry owned land
- Conservation Stewardship Arrangements operationalised
- Forestry certification systems strengthened
- Appropriate expansion of new forestry plantations in terms of location
- Biodiversity toolkit (policy, guidelines, decision-support tools) developed for use by province and municipalities within urban areas
- Strengthening capacity through targeted awareness, communication and training
- Secure priorities areas as biodiversity refugia in the Gauteng
- A biodiversity offset scheme is developed for the coal mining sector
- Coal mine expansion planned using biodiversity information

## Climate Change

### **9. Regional (Bangladesh, China, Indonesia, Thailand, and Vietnam): Barrier Removal to the Cost-Effective Development and Implementation of Energy Efficiency Standards and Labeling Project (BRESL) (UNDP)**

<u>Focal Area/OP/Strategic Priority:</u>	CC/OP5/Building Energy Efficiency
<u>Local executing agency:</u>	China Standard Certification Center (lead agency)
<u>Total Cost of the Project:</u>	\$34.205 million
<u>GEF Funding Request:</u>	\$6.80 million (+ \$50,000 of PDF-A approved by UNDP)
<u>Key Indicators:</u>	

- GHG emissions reduction from utilization of energy efficient appliances/equipment in the region by Year 5 (2011) = 22.0 million tons/year CO<sub>2</sub>
- Energy savings from the use of energy efficient appliances/equipment by Year 5 (2011) = 24,021 GWh/year
- Increase in market share of efficient products by Year 5 (2011) = 25%

#### Rationale & Objective:

The proposed project will focus on building capabilities and interest to pursue energy-efficient standards and labeling (ES&L) efforts in each of the participating countries. The project will focus on six products: (1) refrigerators; (2) room air conditioners; (3) electric motors; (4) ballasts for fluorescent tubes; (5) electric fans; and (6) compact fluorescent lamps. The harmonization objective of the project will encourage regional trade in energy-efficient products.

#### Project Outcomes:

The project is comprised of 5 major components consisting of complementary activities designed to remove barriers to ES&L and focusing on: (1) ES&L policy making; (2) ES&L capacity building; (3) ES&L manufacturer support; (4) ES&L regional cooperation; and, (5) ES&L pilot projects.

Among the expected outcomes resulting from BRESL include: (1) new minimum efficiency standards for the target products adopted in at least 4 countries, reducing unitary energy use for these products by at least 10% relative to business as usual (4% for motors); (2) at least 4 countries adopt new or improved appliance and equipment energy efficiency labeling schemes; (3) ES&L programs are operating in at least 5 countries; (4) regional cooperation on ES&L efforts; (5) majority of appliance/equipment manufacturers in the region recognize the benefits of, and opportunities for, ES&L efforts to increase their profits; (6) mutual recognition agreements and product certification and posting procedures in place; (7) increased market share of EE equipment/appliances in the different countries and in the region as a result of the ES&L programs; and, (8) energy savings from the utilization of energy efficient appliances/equipment in the end use sectors in each of the participating countries.

## 10. **Brazil** : Market Transformation for Energy Efficiency in Buildings (UNDP/IADB)

Focal Area/OP/Strategic Priority: CC/OP5/Building Energy Efficiency

Local executing agency:

Total Cost of the Project: \$78.575 million

GEF Funding Request: \$13.50 million (+ \$250,000 of PDF previously approved)

Key Indicators:

- 5.617 million MWh of energy savings and cumulative GHG emissions reduction of 9.588 Mt CO<sub>2</sub> eq over 20 years (2.820 Mt CO<sub>2</sub> eq from direct and direct post project emissions reductions)

Rationale & Objective:

The project is aimed to help remove financial, capacity, technology and policy barriers that currently limit the widespread adoption of energy-efficient measures and technologies in buildings in Brazil. To contribute to the removal of barriers to EE investment in the buildings sector, and to maintain compliance with the Montreal Protocol, the GOB has asked UNDP-GEF and UNDP-Montreal Protocol/Chemicals to join efforts to initiate a program that encourages cross-convention synergies to promote market transformation in EE in buildings and chiller replacement.

Project Outcomes:

- Enhanced energy efficiency investments through capacity building in private and public sector buildings
- Access to energy efficiency services and commercial financing for public sector buildings enhanced with a Public Building Initiative
- Interest enhanced in the replacement of energy-inefficient CFC free-using chillers
- A Partial Performance Guarantee Mechanism made available to stimulate energy efficiency investment through ESCOs

## **11. China : China/GEF/World Bank Urban Transport Partnership Program (World Bank)**

<u>Focal Area/OP/Strategic Priority:</u>	Climate Change/OP11/SO7 (Facilitating Sustainable Mobility in Urban Transport)
<u>Local executing agency:</u>	China's Ministry of Finance
<u>Total Cost of the Project:</u>	\$607.10 million
<u>GEF Funding Request:</u>	\$21.00 million (+ \$PDF of \$350,000 previously approved)
<u>Key Indicators:</u>	

- Reduction in forecast CO<sub>2</sub> emissions: an estimated 9-22 MT over 20 yrs.
- Adoption and implementation of a national urban transport strategy: at least 35 Chinese cities

### Rationale & Objective:

Greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions from China's urban transport sector are rising very fast, because of explosive growth in car ownership and use. China's national and municipal leaders recognize, a nation-wide paradigm shift in city transport and land use strategies to promote public transport is urgently required. The objective of the proposed project is to assist China to develop and implement strategies for sustainable urban transport planning, and to develop an institutional and legal framework for planning and implementing sustainable urban transport systems. It also includes a technical training and capacity building program, to achieve paradigm shifts from intensive investments in road infrastructure to encouraging modal shifts to the environment-friendly modes: public transport and NMT. It also aims to assist 14 cities and one province in developing long term strategies for sustainable transport. This planning and policy exercise is supplemented by a series of demonstration projects, emphasizing public transport and sustainable transport policies together with technical training and capacity building.

### Project Outcomes:

The project is designed to produce the following key outcomes:

- A paradigm shift in China's urban transport and land-use policies, plans and investments towards the promotion of public and non-motorized transport modes which are less energy intensive and polluting than those fostered by current urban land-use and urban transport strategies and planning systems.
- Significantly lower urban transport GHG emissions from China's cities than the business-as-usual scenario.

### Project Outputs:

- The project is designed to produce the following key outputs:
- National Sustainable Urban Transport Development Strategy
- Urban Transport Planning Guidelines for Municipalities
- Recommendations for Urban Transport Legislation Institutional arrangements for promoting sustainable urban transport in China
- Trained experts and increased technical capacity Dissemination and public awareness-raising tools
- Fifteen large-scale sustainable urban transport demonstration projects, featuring four key initiatives.

## 12. China: Energy Efficiency Financing (World Bank)

Focal Area/OP/Strategic Priority: CC/OP5/Industrial Energy Efficiency  
Local executing agency: National Development and Reform Commission  
Total Cost of the Project: \$596.65 million  
GEF Funding Request: \$13.50 million

Key Indicators:

- Reduction of 3.9 million tons of CO<sub>2</sub> over the five-year project period, and avoidance of 78 million tons of CO<sub>2</sub> over the twenty-year life span of renovations financed by the project; and
- Industrial energy conservation investment lending business line established and sustained in the banking sector.

Rationale & Objective:

The development objective of the proposed project is to improve the energy efficiency of medium and large-sized manufacturing facilities in China's industrial sector. Its global environmental objective is to reduce China's GHG emissions by medium and large-sized energy consumers in energy-intensive industries. These objectives will be achieved by (a) developing sustainable energy conservation lending businesses in selected banks to support medium and large-scale energy conservation investments in these industries; and (b) strengthening government capability to enforce related laws, regulations and standards, and to supervise and monitor industrial energy conservation activities.

Project Outcomes include:

- improve energy efficiency of medium and large-sized energy-intensive industrial enterprises; and
- reduce greenhouse gas emissions of such industries.

Outputs include:

- \$400 million of energy efficiency financing provided by the participating financial institutions to medium and large-sized energy-intensive industries for energy efficiency investments;
- additional \$150 million of energy efficiency investment financing requests in the pipeline of Chinese banks participating in the project;
- energy efficiency financing preparation procedures and modalities adopted by Chinese banks participating in the project; and
- the establishment of a fully-functioning National Energy Conservation Center.

### 13. **Russian Federation : Renewable Energy Project (RREP) (World Bank)**

Focal Area/OP/Strategic Priority: Climate Change Strategic Priority: CC4 On-Grid Renewable

Energy

Local executing agency: Ministry of Economic Development and Trade (MEDT)

Total Cost of the Project: \$77.15 million

GEF Funding Request: \$10.00 million (+ \$350,000 of PDF previously approved)

Key Indicators:

Project will reduce 4.89m tonnes of CO2 emissions by increasing renewable energy production in three markets: 1) on-grid electricity from small hydro and wind; 2) district heating from waste biomass; and 3) residential heat and hot water systems from solar and biomass resources. Other indicators include Adoption of Enabling Regulatory and incentive framework for heat and power; Number of RE projects reaching financial closure; RE Power Generation Capacity Installed (MWe); RE Heat generation capacity installed (MWt); and Total electricity and heat generated from new RE installations (MWh).

Rationale & Objective: The projects global objective is to reduce emission of greenhouse gases (GHG's) for the purpose of climate change mitigation through implementation of renewable energy projects in the Russian Federation. The development objective of the project is to facilitate a sustainable market for Renewable Energy Resources (RER's) in the Russian Federation by supporting the development of enabling policies, institutional capacity, and self-sustaining, market-oriented financing mechanisms.

Project Outcomes: The program outcome is the design and implementation of enabling regulatory and incentive framework for renewable energy resource-based power and heat production, including tariff design, licensing and permitting procedures, and training of stakeholders and the establishment of a Renewable Energy Financing Facility.

Project Outputs: The primary program outputs are the increased in-country knowledge and an improved framework and market for renewable energy development and increased investments in renewable energy projects.

#### 14. South Africa: Sustainable Public Transport and Sport: a 2010 Opportunity (UNDP)

<u>Focal Area/OP/Strategic Priority:</u>	Climate Change/OP11/SO7 (Facilitating Sustainable Mobility in Urban Transport)
<u>Local executing agency:</u>	The Department of Transport
<u>Total Cost of the Project:</u>	\$335.14 million
<u>GEF Funding Request:</u>	\$10.999 million (+ \$197,000 of PDF previously approved )

##### Key Indicators:

- Direct avoided greenhouse gas emissions; approximately 423,000 tons of CO<sub>2</sub>-equivalent over the next 10 years; indirect CO<sub>2</sub> emission reduction due to replication is an estimated 2 million tCO<sub>2</sub>-equivalent over a ten-year period
- The annual number of person trips on sustainable transport modes promoted under the project will be increased by 20%

##### Rationale & Objective:

In South Africa the public transport system provides low levels of service, and is mainly used by lower-income groups. The rail transit and scheduled bus services (both government and privately owned) have declined rapidly since the early 1980s. As incomes amongst all races rise in South Africa, private car ownership and use has increased significantly over the last decade and is anticipated to continue to rise in the future. The objective of the proposed project is to provide an effective, sustainable and environment-friendly urban public transport system, planned and regulated at local levels of government, taking advantage of the 2010 FIFA World Cup, in a two-pronged way; Giving targeted technical assistance to specific transport system improvement projects in selected venue cities; Capacity building and institutional strengthening, in particular at the local level of government.

##### Project Outcomes:

The project is designed to produce the following key outcomes:

- Implementation of transport system improvements in seven 2010 venue cities
- Increased information and knowledge about sustainable transportation options and implementation amongst local and national decision-makers and transport and urban planners

##### Project Outputs:

The project is designed to produce the following key outputs:

- Restructured public transport systems (high-impact mode-shift projects) have been supported and are implemented in two venue cities
- Road management and transport system efficiency improvements have been supported and are implemented in one venue city
- Non-motorized transport (NMT) projects have been supported and are implemented in three venue cities
- Travel Demand Management (TDM) projects have been supported and are implemented in one venue city
- Increased number of post-graduate professionals with training and relevant work experience in the field of sustainable transport by means of study and training grants
- Increased information and knowledge about sustainable transportation options and implementation amongst local and national decision-makers and transport and urban planners

## International Waters

**15. Global (China, Brazil, India, Mexico, Turkey, South Africa, Iran, Argentina, Venezuela, Chile, Algeria, Egypt, Ukraine, Peru, Morocco, Libya, Croatia, Ecuador, Guatemala, Angola, Sudan, Costa Rica, Cote d'Ivoire, Panama, Trinidad and Tobago, Yemen, Jordan, Ghana) : Building Partnerships to Assist Developing Countries to Reduce the Transfer of Harmful Aquatic Organisms in Ships' Ballast Water (GloBallast Partnerships) (UNDP)**

Focal Area/OP/Strategic Priority: IW/SP1  
Project executing agency: International Maritime Organization  
Total Cost of the Project: \$24.042 million  
GEF Funding Request: \$5.640 million (+ \$700,000 of PDF previously approved)

Key Indicators:

- Each country will have a National Task Force (NTF) operating
- At least two thirds of the LPCs (e.g. 9 countries), will have ratified the Ballast Water Management Convention during the course of the project.
- Partnering Countries, using the expertise developed and with the support of LPCs will, at the minimum, develop a draft NBWMS during the course of the project.
- Member states of the participating Regional Seas conventions and Large Marine Ecosystem (LME) programs will indicate their collective support, by approving regional strategies and protocols on ballast water management.
- Cost effective technology solutions and standards will be developed, tested and promoted through a successful partnership with industry, evidenced by testing facility standards developed, sediment facility options piloted, R&D symposiums held, and a ballast water management innovation fund launched.
- Each LPC will be able to identify the significant environmental and economic impacts and threats to biodiversity in their major port areas, verified through port baseline surveys and economic impact assessments conducted, as well as training provided for more than 250 experts on surveys and taxonomy.
- Sufficient information will be made available for countries to implement risk-based ballast water management programs. Verification will be through evidence that a web portal is operating as intended, a global database has been established, and the public awareness program is in place.
- By the end of the project, the backbone for a GloBallast Marine Electronic Information Systems (GMEIS) will be functional.

Rationale & Objective:

The objective of GBP is to assist vulnerable developing states and regions to implement sustainable, risk-based mechanisms for the management and control of ships' ballast water and sediments in order to minimize the adverse impacts of aquatic invasive species transferred by ships.

Project Outcomes:

Expected outcomes of the project would be:

- Learning, evaluation and adaptive management increased;



- Ballast Water Management Strategies in place, with legal, policy and institutional reforms developed, implemented and sustained at national level;
- Knowledge management tools and marine monitoring systems are effectively utilised to expand global public awareness and stakeholder support, improve understanding of ballast water impacts on marine ecology, and enhance maritime sector communications;
- Public-private partnerships developed to spur the development of cost-effective ballast water technology solutions.

**16. Regional (Cambodia, China, East Timor, Indonesia, Malaysia, Philippines, Lao PDR, Thailand, Vietnam, Brunei):** Implementation of Sustainable Development Strategy for the Seas of East Asia (SDS-SEA) (UNDP)

Focal Area/OP/Strategic Priority: IW/OP9/SP1  
Local executing agency: UNOPS & Governments  
Total Cost of the Project: \$44.951 million  
GEF Funding Request: \$10.876 million (+ \$700,000 of PDF previously approved)  
Key Indicators:

- Improvements in fish stock and coastal habitat achieved;
- Community livelihoods sustained and access to fish for artisanal fishers secured;
- Multi-agency partnerships for action developed;
- quantifiable pollution reduction through institutional reforms, increased enforcement, and demonstration investments;
- Multi-agency partnerships developed and catalyzing replication of reforms and investments;
- Reduction of risks to human health from untreated sewage and community livelihoods improved in demonstration areas.
- Six-year partnership programs formulated, adopted and initiated at the regional and national levels during this three-year project.
- Land based pollution reduction approaches and technologies promoted by the Partnership Investment Fund for Pollution Reduction in the LMEs of East Asia (World Bank – GEF), disseminated and replicated.

Rationale & Objective

Growing populations, dynamic economic growth, and rising global demands for fishery and aquaculture products, largely met by export products from the East Asian Seas, have combined to exert tremendous pressure on East Asia's marine environment and coastal resources. The recent tsunami on 26 December 2004, sharpened the concern of the world on the devastating effects brought about by the loss of natural defenses that are afforded by mangroves and coral reefs, with the loss of more than 150,000 lives. On 12 December 2003, largely as a result of GEF foundational projects (PEMSEA), the 12 coastal nations of the Seas of East Asia for the first time in the region decided to take concerted action and adopted a common strategy for sustainable coastal and marine development: the Sustainable Development Strategy for the Seas of East Asia (SDS-SEA). The SDS-SEA addresses priority concerns in several sectors including land-based and sea-based pollution, overfishing, health and safety, loss of biodiversity, habitat preservation, sustainable water use and water resource management, natural and man-made hazards, and other challenges of sustainable coastal management. A major objective of the project is finally to complement the Partnership Investment Fund for Pollution Reduction in the LME of East Asia (World Bank – GEF) by promoting the dissemination and regional replication of the new approaches tested and demonstrated by the Investment Fund sub-projects.

Expected Outcomes

- (a) Operationalization of a country-owned regional mechanism, consisting of a PEMSEA Partnership Council, a PEMSEA Resource Facility, the regional Partnership Investment Fund for Pollution Reduction in the LME of East Asia (World Bank – GEF), and a tri-

annual East Asian Seas Congress to oversee, guide, coordinate and monitor the full implementation of the SDS-SEA;

- (b) Development and implementation of national policies and action plans for sustainable coastal and ocean development in at least 70% of PEMSEA countries by 2015;
- (c) Scaling up ICM programmes at the national and sub-national levels, targeting coverage of at least 20% of the region's coastlines by 2015, including reduction of vulnerability from natural hazards and improved health of human beings, ecosystems and the natural resource base;
- (d) Twinning and networking arrangements involving South-South and North-South collaboration to share knowledge and experience in innovative approaches to ecosystem-based management of watersheds, estuaries and the adjacent coastal seas.
- (e) Building up and making the best use of regional intellectual capital and resources for integrated management and sustainable use of the environment and resources, through stakeholder participation and networking, as well as scientific, technical and information support; and
- (f) Innovative financing mechanisms established, to help countries achieve time-bound wastewater emission targets, including a revolving fund to leverage private sector investment and public-private partnerships for pollution control in secondary cities and in industrial and agricultural enterprises in regional pollution hotspots, in collaboration with World Bank, participating national governments and the private sector.

**17. Regional (El Salvador, Honduras, Nicaragua): Integrated Ecosystem Management of the Gulf of Fonseca (IADB)**

Focal Area/OP/Strategic Priority: IW/OP9/SP2  
Local executing agency: CCAD, Governments  
Total Cost of the Project: \$27.316 million  
GEF Funding Request: \$5.00 million (+ \$600,000 of PDF previously approved)

Key Indicators

- The Gulf of Fonseca, the only multi-national maritime body along Central America's Pacific coast (3,200km<sup>2</sup>) and its tributary watersheds (21,000km<sup>2</sup>) will have a trilateral pollution and sediment control strategy agreed upon by governments and stakeholders in El Salvador, Honduras and Nicaragua and measurable results in its implementation;
- strategic partnerships between the three countries, including a Trilateral Commission for the integrated management of the Gulf's ecosystems, and financing institutions will be in operation;
- 22% of the entire area of mangroves and six major estuaries and deltas, including two Ramsar sites contributing to the productivity of the Pacific Central-American Coastal Large Marine Ecosystem (LME) under a locally-driven and nationally endorsed action plan contributing towards the targets of the World Summit on Sustainable Development; and
- El Salvador, Honduras and Nicaragua with innovative demonstration projects in fisheries and mangrove co-management, cleaner production (including from shrimp aquaculture) and sediment control.

Rationale & Objective

Encompassing approximately 3,200 km<sup>2</sup>, the Gulf of Fonseca is a complex of marine and inter-tidal waters shared by El Salvador, Honduras and Nicaragua. The ecological significance of the Gulf of Fonseca estuary has been confirmed by several global and regional priority-setting initiatives. As one of only two tri-national maritime bodies in Central America, it requires sustained regional coordination to address trans-boundary concerns such as water pollution, habitat loss, excess sedimentation and over-exploitation of fisheries. The objective of the Project is to foster the sustainable use of the Gulf of Fonseca's marine and coastal resources and the integrated management of its ecosystems through the support of a trilateral framework for cooperation. The specific objectives are to: (i) establish and strengthen institutional arrangements for an effective and participatory management of the Gulf's ecosystems; (ii) foster integrated planning and regulatory management of coastal and marine resources in the Gulf of Fonseca; (iii) establish decision-making systems for pollution and sediment monitoring, prevention, and control; and (iv) support the promotion of livelihoods compatible with the sustainable use of the Gulf's resources.

Expected Outcomes

- The regional capacity and institutional mechanisms for integrated management of the Gulf of Fonseca are expanded and strengthened.
- The foundation for a permanent, self-sustaining, regional cooperation mechanism for environmental protection of the Gulf will be established.
- A plan for trilateral coastal resource management (CRM) endorsed by all three countries and implemented under local leadership.

- A specific policy for fisheries and aquaculture in the Gulf endorsed and implemented by all three countries and artisanal fisheries co-management in place with at least three cooperatives including voluntary by-catch reduction
- Sustainable financing mechanisms designed.
- Pollution and sediment control regional strategy designed and executed, with national and local investments in wastewater treatment, clean production and watershed management aligned with agreed upon priorities.
- Sustainable livelihoods promoted, including alternative income sources for local communities based on sustainable use of natural resources and environmental services, enhanced knowledge in local communities on natural resource conservation and sustainable production methods; increased awareness among the target industries of the competitive advantages of clean production and sound environmental management.
- Targeted sectors and industries adopt clean productive practices.

**18. Regional (Albania, Montenegro): Lake Skadar-Shkodra Integrated Ecosystem Management (World Bank)**

Focal Area/OP/Strategic Priority: IW/OP8/Waterbody-based Operational Program with preparation completed during GEF 3.

Local executing agency:

Total Cost of the Project: \$16.163 million

GEF Funding Request: \$4.55 million (+ \$450,000 of PDF previously approved)

Key Indicators:

- A lake-wide zoning and management plan is prepared and approved by both governments
- A coordinated monitoring program and common database are established and operating, providing information which is publicly accessible and is used in implementation of the Strategic Action Program
- At least 50 percent reduction in the number of fishermen using the lake that is unlicensed and/or using illegal methods such as dynamite and electrical shock
- At least three ecological restoration pilot projects successfully completed (sites and total areas to be determined)
- At least a 20% increase in the number of project area residents earning \$1000/year from tourism or other activities associated with sustainable use of the lake and its natural resources.
- Successful completion of the urgent environmental investment activities (specific indicators of successful completion to be identified at Appraisal, based on the activities selected)

Rationale & Objective:

The objective of the project is to put in place effective transboundary cooperation, at local, national and multi-country levels, for the preservation, management and sustainable economic development of Lake Skadar-Shkoder basin and its natural resources. In so doing, the project will support and improve local livelihoods and contribute to national economies, while preserving an internationally important natural freshwater habitat and bird sanctuary.

Project Outcomes:

The outcomes and results of the capacity building aspects of the project will mainly be evaluated on the basis of success in putting in place institutional structures and programs which are effective in improving transboundary cooperation and on-the-ground management in the short term, and likely to be sustainable in the long term. Indicators include formal agreements, establishment of institutional arrangements. The bilateral Secretariat (an initial step towards a permanent transboundary Joint Management Commission or similar body) will be responsible for reporting on progress in these areas. Approval of a lake-wide zoning and management plan by both governments will be a strong indication of improved cooperation

**19. Regional (Cambodia, China, Indonesia, Lao PDR, Malaysia, Philippines, Thailand, Vietnam):** World Bank/GEF Partnership Investment Fund for Pollution Reduction in the Large Marine Ecosystems of East Asia (Tranche 1, Installment 2) (World Bank)

Focal Area/OP/Strategic Priority: IW/SP1&2  
Local executing agency: National agencies in the project countries  
Total Cost of the Project: \$90.87 million  
GEF Funding Request: \$10.00 million

Key Indicators:

Increased investment in technological, technical, and institutional mechanisms

- Increased investment in pollution reduction (\$ million)
- Number of cost-effective technologies/ techniques demonstrated in specific country contexts
- Number of institutional and/or regulatory reforms approved and implemented

Key parameters to be finalized with Strategic Partnership; are expected to include BOD, N and P

- Reduction in discharge of BOD to seas of East Asia (tons/yr)

Rationale & Objective (for the Investment Fund in its entirety):

The seas of East Asia comprise six interconnected large marine ecosystems (LMEs) - the Yellow Sea, the East China Sea, the South China Sea, the Gulf of Thailand, the Sulu-Celebes (Sulawesi) Sea, and the Indonesian Seas. All these marine ecosystems are under increasing pressure from land-based human activities. Billions of tons of untreated wastewater are in fact discharged annually from coastal cities and from industries, including major livestock concentrations.

In the last decade, significant steps have been taken towards establishing collaboration between the governments of the region to address the threats faced by the seas of East Asia. In 1995, with GEF catalytic support, twelve East Asian countries created the *Partnerships in Environmental Management for the Seas of East Asia* (PEMSEA) through which they developed a *Sustainable Development Strategy for the Seas of East Asia* (SDS-SEA). The SDS-SEA is a call to action. It is equivalent to a GEF-IW Strategic Action Program as it provides a strategic vision and a 34 specific commitment by the countries to work together. This Strategy was adopted by the countries in December 2003 (Putrajaya Declaration). Following the Putrajaya Declaration, the littoral countries have identified cooperative ways to accelerate the implementation of the SDS-SEA within the context of PEMSEA, thus creating an enabling environment for on the ground investments addressing land based point sources of marine pollution. The countries have moreover requested the assistance of GEF and of the World Bank in the implementation of the Strategy. The present proposal is the response to this request, and is aimed at catalyzing investments, both public and private, directed to reduce the stress on coastal and marine ecosystems and living resources in the seas of East Asia. The Fund will focus on demonstrating the viability of innovative waste water treatment facilities, and on the introduction of financial tools aimed at leveraging private sector investments and replication.

Since the initial submission (Nov 2005), the Fund has achieved considerable progress in pursuing its overarching aim, which is to reduce land-based marine pollution, by cofinancing World Bank projects that demonstrate innovative approaches, disseminate lessons learned, and promote replication of best practice. The projects under the Fund have developed rapidly, and fully account for the first instalment of the first tranche (US\$ 25 million). All in all two projects

(Ningbo and Shandong) have so far been CEO endorsed, two (Manila and Liaoning) are awaiting Council comments and CEO endorsement and the last project (Vietnam) has started preparation early in 2007, and is programmed for Board approval and implementation early in 2008. So far the first installment on \$ 25 Mio has mobilised more than \$ 700 Mio in co-financing.

For the second installment of the first tranche, for which this submission is made, two projects are in the pipeline for preparation (Shanghai and East Java) which will be ready for Board approval medio 2008. The second installment of \$10 Mio will mobilise \$79.54 Mio.

The total GEF investment in the Fund is proposed to be \$80 million over 10 years, with the second and third tranches expected to be requested in FY08 and FY10. The GEF Council will be asked to approve them subject to the Fund's fulfillment of reporting and sub-project processing requirements.

The Fund, conceptually modelled on the WB/GEF Nutrient Reduction Investment Fund for the Black Sea/Danube Strategic Partnership, consists of two complementary components:

- a Regional Component: "Implementation of the Sustainable Development Strategy for the Seas of East Asia - SDS-SEA" led by UNDP – being submitted for approval to this Council meeting;
- a "Partnership Investment Fund for the Large Marine Ecosystems of East Asia" led by the World Bank.

The objective of the proposed Fund is to reduce land-based pollution discharges that have an impact on the seas of East Asia by leveraging investments in land-based pollution reduction through the removal of technical, institutional, and financial barriers.

Project Outcomes (for the Investment Fund in its entirety):

Expected outcomes of the Fund would be:

- increased investment in activities that reduce land-based pollution;
- removal of technical, institutional and financial barriers that currently limit investment in pollution reduction;
- Replication of cost-effective pollution reduction technologies and techniques demonstrated by the Fund.



**20. Regional (Albania, Algeria, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, Egypt, Macedonia, Lebanon, Libya, Morocco, Serbia, Syria, Tunisia, Turkey):** World Bank-GEF Investment Fund for the Mediterranean Sea Large Marine Ecosystem Partnership, Tranche 1, 2nd Installment (World Bank)

Focal Area/OP/Strategic Priority: IW/SP1 & 2  
Local executing agency: National agencies in the project countries  
Total Cost of the Project: \$60.00 million  
GEF Funding Request: \$15.00 million  
Key Indicators:

- 15% of major hotspots/sensitive areas identified in the TDA are addressed
- Replication strategy is adopted and initiated in at least 3 countries
- US\$ 100 million replication investments are leveraged
- US\$250 million of project co-financing is secured
- Measures to address SAP targets are incorporated in at least 7 CASs
- At least 5 innovative low-cost techniques (such as managed aquifer recharge, engineered wetlands, treated wastewater reuse, etc) are demonstrated
- 1,000,000 population equivalent of wastewater is treated
- 5-7 sensitive areas are under effective management
- Bank IF Coordination team participates in all (100%) SP and Regional Project consultations
- Bank IF Coordination team organizes and/or participates in at least 5 regional conferences and/or technical workshops in support of the SP objectives.

**Rationale & Objective (for the Investment Fund in its entirety):**

Through the years, the GEF has supported the preparation and adoption of the two Strategic Action Programmes (one reducing land-based pollution and another for marine biodiversity conservation) by all Mediterranean riparian countries. The Strategic Partnership for the Mediterranean Sea Large Marine Ecosystem – with its regional component and investment fund pillars – is the most effective financing modality available to catalyze critical investments from public and private sector for pollution reduction, coastal management and biodiversity conservation. It promotes the institutional, technical and financial innovations needed to accelerate implementation and is the logical next step for GEF intervention. Without the catalytic effect of the GEF Investment Fund financing, investments would likely be limited, scattered and not targeted to reduction of transboundary pollution. Moreover, governments would likely give only marginal attention to the implementation of the SAPs within their financially constrained development programs. The Strategic Partnership, following the model of the GEF Black Sea Basin Strategic Partnership for Nutrient Reduction, consists of two complementary components:

- a Regional Component: “Implementation of agreed actions for the protection of the environmental resources of the Mediterranean Sea and its coastal areas” led by UNEP – being submitted for approval to this Council meeting;
- a “Partnership Investment Fund for the Mediterranean Sea Large Marine Ecosystem” led by the World Bank.
- The Fund, for an anticipated total of \$85 mil (\$70 from IW, and \$15 from BD) in GEF resources, and structured in three tranches, was approved by the GEF Council in August 2006, together with a first installment of \$10 mil. The current request of \$ 15 Mil would

complete the first Tranche. The following two tranches will be submitted to Council within 2010. The GEF Council will be asked to approve them subject to the Fund's fulfillment of reporting and sub-project processing requirements. The projects under the Fund are developing steadily. Under the First installment of First Tranche two projects (Egypt and Bosnia-Herzegovina/Croatia) are in the project preparation phase while several others are being identified (Montenegro, Morocco, etc.).

To sum up, the total GEF investment in the Fund is proposed to be \$80 million over 10 years, with the second and third tranches expected to be requested in FY08 and FY10.

The objective of the proposed World Bank-GEF Investment Fund for Pollution Reduction in the Mediterranean Sea is to accelerate the implementation of transboundary pollution reduction and habitat conservation measures in priority hotspots and sensitive areas of selected countries of the Mediterranean basin that would help achieve the SAP MED and SAP BIO targets. The four main transboundary concerns identified in the Mediterranean Sea LME include:, pollution hotspots, coastal degradation and habitat loss, fisheries depletion and related biodiversity loss.

Project Outcomes (for the Investment Fund in its entirety):

- Transboundary pollution reduction and biodiversity conservation in priority hotspots and sensitive areas of the Mediterranean Sea identified through the TDA-SAP process are achieved
- In-country replication of pollution reduction and biodiversity conservation investments is initiated
- Investments for pollution reduction and biodiversity conservation in selected countries are catalyzed
- SAPs implementation is addressed in World Bank country dialogues
- Innovative, cost-effective investments in specific country contexts are promoted
- Measurable pollution reduction and biodiversity conservation in support of the SAP targets are achieved
- Knowledge-sharing and cross-fertilization of project achievements among SP partners are facilitated.

## Land Degradation

**21. Regional (Benin, Botswana, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Ghana, Kenya, Lesotho, Madagascar, Malawi, Mali, Mauritania, Mozambique, Namibia, Niger, Nigeria, Rwanda, Senegal, South Africa, Sudan, Tanzania, Togo, Uganda, Gambia, Zambia) :**  
Strategic Investment Program for SLM in Sub-Saharan Africa (SIP) (phased project) (World Bank/UNDP/ UNEP/ AfDB/ IFAD/ FAO)

Focal Area/OP/Strategic Priority: LD/Desertification and Deforestation/**OP15**  
Local executing agency: Implementation responsibilities are shared between (i) NEPAD and the Regional Economic Communities (RECs), (ii) the GEF implementing and executing agencies and (iii)

a

SIP Steering Committee that acts as a strategic advisory group linked to the TerrAfrica partnership.

Total Cost of the Project: \$1,124.213 million  
GEF Funding Request: \$137.298 million (+ \$700,000 of PDF previously approved)

Key Indicators:

- positive trend in score on Composite Index for the SLM Enabling Environment among investment countries
- 90% of the GEF resources invested in the portfolio meet the leveraging ratio
- number of countries elaborating or implementing a Country SLM Investment Framework (CSIF).
- % productivity in SIP investment areas, reported by cropland, rangeland and forests, against baseline data.
- 80% of operations achieve satisfactory implementation performance reviews.
- % in hectares under SLM annually disaggregated by country, land-use type, and target area, against baseline data.
- total % change in soil quality (including carbon) in investment areas, against baseline data
- % change in Net Primary Productivity (vegetation cover enhanced with rain-use efficiency), against baseline data

Rationale & Objective:

Ecosystem goods and services are critical for the global and local environment as well as peoples livelihoods in sub-Saharan Africa, yet underproductive and unsustainable land management is common threatening integrity of those ecosystems. Roughly two-thirds of the region's 700 million people live in rural areas. They depend directly on hunting, fishing, forestry, or rainfed agriculture. Also urban residents rely heavily on rural production. Crop and livestock yields in sub-Saharan Africa are the lowest in the world, and deforestation proceeds at the highest rate in the world. In no other region are services provided by terrestrial ecosystems so fundamental to sustained livelihoods, while at the same time, the renewable resource base is being eroded rapidly. Countries are under-equipped to respond to both, increased climate variability and the estimated 0.5% - 9% drag that land degradation places on the agricultural gross domestic product in sub-Saharan Africa.

Business as usual in addressing the problem has delivered mixed results and a shift is urgently required to make progress. Joint diagnostic reviews and a comprehensive process of consultations have identified a number of key interconnected barriers and bottlenecks in the enabling environment that have led to the past shortcomings of investments in Africa that addressed land degradation. Many of these barriers cannot be addressed in a sustainable way by isolated single projects, many of which have been relatively short-term and overly reliant on technology. Nor can it be effectively supported by approaches focusing on individual sectors and donors acting alone.

In response, a regional programmatic approach, underpinned by partnerships and strong support from countries will have a number of strategic advantages over the business-as-usual approach in Sub-Saharan Africa. NEPAD's Comprehensive African Agriculture Development Program and Action Plan for the Environment, the implementation action plans of the African Regional Economic Communities, the UNCCD, and a growing number of national and sector strategies, all aim to address land degradation and increase the area of African cropland, rangeland, and woodland under sustainable management.

The program proposes to simplify GEF mobilization and amplify its impact and cost-effectiveness through the inter-agency Strategic Investment Program for SLM in Sub-Saharan Africa (SIP). The SIP will contribute to address the barriers to SLM in the region by facilitating donor alignment and country engagement, supported by the TerrAfrica platform, over the medium to long-term. The SIP is meant to provide an operational partnership framework for delivering on the objectives and related results of the emerging GEF-4 Land Degradation Focal Area Strategy.

The **overall goal** of the SIP is to improve natural resource-based livelihoods by preventing and reversing land degradation.

The **global environmental objective** is to prevent and reduce the impact of land degradation on ecosystem goods and services in country-defined priority ecosystems in SSA.

The **development objective** is to support sub-Saharan efforts to design and manage programs of activities that advance SLM mainstreaming, improve governance for SLM, and strengthen coalition development.

#### Program Outcomes:

- SLM applications on the ground are scaled up in country-defined priority agro-ecological zones
- Effective and inclusive dialogue and advocacy on SLM strategic priorities, enabling conditions, and delivery mechanisms established and ongoing.
- Commercial and advisory services for SLM are strengthened and readily available to land users.
- Targeted knowledge generated and disseminated; monitoring and evaluation systems established and strengthened at all levels

Program Outputs:

- % change in SLM applications adopted by land users in SIP investment areas, against baseline data
- # of new or existing national coalitions and one sub-regional or trans-boundary coalition established/strengthened
- Regional, sub-regional, national and sub-national organizations demonstrate increased capacity for SLM advocacy and demonstrate the capacity and political will to align their respective programs under agreed upon strategic priorities
- # of extensionists trained (agriculture, forestry and livestock) and fully functional
- # of farm trials conducted
- # of persons receiving SLM services (from extensionists, commercial or NGO providers) in targeted communities, compared to baseline
- # of knowledge products identified, developed, and disseminated, disaggregated by country, sub-region, and regional applications
- SIP program-level M&E system established and pilot data collection and analysis procedures operational by end of PY1
- All SIP operations have established M&E systems within second year of operation; these systems are reporting with verifiable and reliable data on programmatic indicators
- All M&E reports from SIP financed investment operations meet regional program standards
- All M&E reports are reporting on progress against strategic objectives at national, sub-regional, and regional levels
- M&E system reports yearly on evidence of alignment in policies and programs at national and regional levels

## **Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs)**

### **22. Regional (Sudan, Morocco, Yemen, Djibouti, Egypt, Syria, Jordan, Iran) :**

Demonstration of Sustainable Alternatives to DDT and Strengthening of National Vector Control Capabilities in Middle East and North Africa (UNEP)

<u>Focal Area/OP/Strategic Priority:</u>	POPs/OP3
<u>Local executing agency:</u>	WHO (Regional Office for the Eastern Mediterranean) and Departments of Health in the participating countries
<u>Total Cost of the Project:</u>	\$13.98 million
<u>GEF Funding Request:</u>	\$4.913 million (+ \$650,000 of PDF previously approved)
<u>Key Indicators:</u>	
<u>Key indicators:</u>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Cost-effective and sustainable alternative interventions to DDT introduced in 8 countries;</li><li>• Collection, repackaging and disposal of at least 100 tons of obsolete POPs pesticides.</li></ul>

#### Rationale and objective

The burden of vector-borne diseases and subsequent social and economic development in the population of Middle East and North African countries participating in the project is substantial. Chemical insecticides including DDT are the mainstay of vector control interventions in order to reduce the transmission of vector borne diseases by insect vectors.

The project aims to reduce reliance on DDT and minimize the potential to revert to DDT for the prevention and control of vector-borne diseases through the use of sustainable, cost-effective and environmentally friendly alternative interventions through establishing an Integrated Vector Management (IVM) framework and building national capacities for IVM and for the sound management of pesticides. Inter-sectoral collaboration, partnerships and community involvement will be crucial for the planning and implementation of vector control activities.

#### Project outcomes

- Demonstration of the viability, availability, sustainability and cost-effectiveness of vector control alternatives to DDT, based on principles of IVM;
- Strengthened national capacities for the planning, implementation and evaluation of the application of alternatives to DDT based on the principles of integrated vector management;
- Collection, repackaging and disposal of obsolete public health and agricultural POPs; and
- Dissemination of good practices and of demonstrated alternatives and lessons learned in the participating countries.

## 23. **China** : Environmentally Sustainable Management of Medical Waste in China (UNIDO)

<u>Focal Area/OP/Strategic Priority:</u>	POPs/SP/2/3
<u>Local executing agency:</u>	State Environmental Protection Administration (SEPA), in cooperation with the Ministry of Health (MOH)
<u>Total Cost of the Project:</u>	\$45.077 million
<u>GEF Funding Request:</u>	\$11.650 million (+ \$350,000 of PDF previously approved)
<u>Key Indicators:</u>	

- Reduction in releases of by-products by means of BAT/BEP demonstration in existing incineration facilities: 1.94g TEQs per year;
- Avoided releases of by-products by means of BAT/BEP demonstration and adoption through alternative treatment processes within the project areas and time frame: 2.59g TEQs per year;
- Demonstration of practices and technologies for POPs reduction.

### Rationale & Objective:

In the National Implementation Plan (NIP) of China for the implementation of the Stockholm Convention on POPs, medical waste incineration is listed as a key PCDD/PCDF release source, to which priority should be given to the application of best available techniques and best environmental practices (BAT/BEP) pursuant to the “Action Plan for Reduction and Elimination of PCDD/PCDF Releases”.

The project comes at a time when China is making a significant infrastructural investment in a nationwide program, which proposed that China would construct 332 dedicated medical waste disposal facilities in cities at municipal level and above across the country to ensure the safe disposal of medical waste.

The project is to interact with the nationwide program and promote the widespread adoption of BAT/BEP in the evolving medical waste management infrastructure and industry in a manner that sustainably reduces adverse environmental impacts from un-intentionally produced POPs and protects the human health. The project approach seeks to alter the current investment pattern that is overwhelmingly predominated by incineration technologies towards non-incineration alternatives; and ensure that where incineration technologies are adopted that optimal operating standards are achieved. By promoting BAT/BEP across the medical waste sector, the project seeks to decrease waste generation and alter the characterisation of medical waste by reducing the presence of materials that can potentially generate PCDD/PCDF emissions.

### Project Outcomes:

- Strengthened national, provincial and local regulatory framework for medical waste management;
- Strengthened nationwide institutional capacity for integrated medical waste management at national and local levels;
- Demonstration of systems management and application of best environmental practices in 20 medical institutions;
- Demonstration of best available techniques for medical waste disposal using thermal combustion;

- Demonstration of best available techniques/best environmental practices for medical waste thermal non-combustion, chemical treatment or other appropriate non-combustion treatments that may also be suitable for remote rural areas;
- Demonstration of spatially integrated and coordinated medical waste management and disposal systems in pilot provinces; and
- Development of a national strategy and action plan for medical waste management and disposal based on the experience gained through the demonstration activities.



**24. China : Strengthening Institutions, Regulations and Enforcement Capacities for Effective and Efficient Implementation of the National Implementation Plan (NIP) in China (UNIDO)**

<u>Focal Area/OP/Strategic Priority:</u>	POPs/SP1
<u>Local executing agency:</u>	State Environmental Protection Administration (SEPA)
<u>Total Cost of the Project:</u>	\$15.235 million
<u>GEF Funding Request:</u>	\$5.410 million
<u>Key Indicators:</u>	Strengthened regulatory framework and capacity for enforcement

Rationale & Objective:

China ratified the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants in June 2004. With GEF support, China has developed its National Implementation Plan (NIP) which was approved by the State Council in April 2007 following intensive consultations among national stakeholders. In parallel to NIP development, several technical assistance projects were developed in order to initiate work on urgent reduction and elimination of intentionally produced POPs. However, the effective and efficient implementation of the NIP requires the creation of an overall enabling environment that addresses cross-cutting and overarching regulatory and institutional issues in a systematic manner. This project will carry out cross-cutting activities to support regulatory and institutional strengthening, which can not be effectively undertaken through sectoral projects.

The project's objective is to create an enabling regulatory and policy environment in China by establishing/amending laws, regulations and standards; strengthening institutions for monitoring, R&D, technology transfer promotion; facilitating data and information collection; enhancing supervision, enforcement, and evaluation capabilities so as to allow for continuous improvement; and raising stakeholder awareness of POPs issues.

Project Outcomes:

Based on a comprehensive analysis of sectoral action plans and priorities for capacity building, this project will target institutional strengthening activities at the systemic, institutional, and individual levels. The project will be coordinated with other POPs projects, and will provide guidance and information mechanism/s to harmonize and integrate capacity building related activities.

Expected outcomes include i) strengthened policy and regulatory framework for more effective implementation of the Stockholm Convention and NIP; ii) strengthened institutions for more efficient implementation of the Stockholm Convention and NIP; and iii) changed attitudes and behaviors to promote environmental protection.

**25. India :** Development of a National Implementation Plan in India as a First Step to Implement the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs). (UNIDO)

<u>Focal Area/OP/Strategic Priority:</u>	POPs/SP1
<u>Local executing agency:</u>	Ministry of Environment and Forests
<u>Total Cost of the Project:</u>	\$10.638 million
<u>GEF Funding Request:</u>	\$3.241 million (+ \$317,000 of PDF previously approved)
<u>Key Indicators:</u>	National Implementation Plan submitted to the Stockholm Convention

Rationale & Objective:

The Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs), which was adopted in May 2001 with the objective of protecting human health and the environment from POPs, came into force on 17<sup>th</sup> May 2004. Parties to the Stockholm Convention are required to develop National Implementation Plans (NIPs) to demonstrate how their obligations to the Convention will be implemented. Each Party is to submit their NIP to the Conference of the Parties (COP) within two years of the date on which the Convention enters into force for the Party. India signed the Convention on 14 May 2002 and ratified it on 13 January 2006.

The overall objective of the full project is to develop the NIP for India to meet its obligation with the Convention.

Project Outcomes:

- Inventories on the production, use, trade, stockpiles and wastes of, and sites contaminated by, the chemicals listed in the Annexes of the Convention and existing in India;
- Development of strategies and action plans for the reduction and elimination of the chemicals listed in Annexes of the Convention, which exist in India;
- Assessment of infrastructure capacity and proposal for management options, including institutional arrangements, regulatory frameworks, and requirements for capacity building, raising stakeholder awareness and research and development, to ensure the effective and sustainable implementation of the proposed strategies and action plans and thus facilitate India's preparedness for compliance with the Convention;
- Formulation and stakeholder endorsement for a NIP, including priorities and objectives with the aim of estimating the costs likely to be incurred for introduction into development and assistance planning;
- Sustainable capacity build to prepare the NIP and its component inventories, strategies and action plans, and to fulfill ongoing reporting requirements of the Convention; and
- Development and demonstration of methodologies representing practical and feasible approaches to priority actions required by India in meetings its Convention obligations.

## Multi-focal Areas/Corporate Program

**26. Global:** GEF Public-Private Partnership Initiative (Lead agency: World Bank/IFC; other agencies: UNEP, FAO, UNIDO)

Focal Area/OP/Strategic Priority: Multi-focal, supported by all focal areas  
Total Cost of the Project: \$210.19 million  
GEF Funding Request: \$50.00 million (+ \$190,000 of PPG previously approved)  
Key Indicators:

- Number and quality of partnerships initiated
- Amount of project co-financing by private sector
- Impact of each platform in addressing the specific environmental challenge
- Replicability/ scalability
- Local environmental impact, acceptance and reform

### Rationale and objectives:

- The objective of the PPP is to facilitate strategic engagement of the private sector in the GEF's efforts to address global environmental challenges in developing countries. Partnership with the private sector will contribute to the achievement of results on a larger scale than would be obtainable by the GEF on its own.
- The PPP will support a strategic investment program in competitive environmental technological solutions, development of financial instruments for directed environmental investment, and scaling-up of the use of pilot instruments.
- The PPP will have a separate governance structure, parallel to the GEF's governance, that will include a PPP Board and Platform Steering Committees consisting of GEF Council members, private sector, foundation and NGO representatives, and will be chaired by the GEF CEO with the following objectives:
  - produce programmatic platforms based on mutual contributions by GEF and private sector partners;
  - ensure the private sector has a voice in the governance;
  - ensure flexibility and responsiveness to market developments; and
  - nurture and sustain the partnership.
- The main principles for the use of the GEF contribution to the proposed fund include the application of the incremental cost principle and all GEF eligibility criteria, as well as substantial co-funding from the private sector.

### Project Outputs:

The PPP will produce a series of platforms that will have significant benefits. For example:

- The *Biofuels platform* will provide much needed small-scale second generation biofuels technology that will encourage agricultural market growth and diversification, increase on-farm labor use, create rural jobs and access to energy, decrease pressures on ecosystems and competition for food crops, and reduce the energy vulnerability of energy-importing developing countries.
- The *Coastal Water Treatment platform* will reduce incidence of disease due to lack of clean water sources and contamination from untreated wastewater, improving human and ecosystem health.
- *Alternatives to DDT for Malaria* will use the capital for prizes tool to stimulate research for alternatives to this Stockholm Convention and WHO priority.

## 27. **Global** : Small Grants Programme, 4<sup>th</sup> Operational Phase (UNDP)

<u>Focal Area/OP/Strategic Priority:</u>	Multi-focal area
<u>Local executing agency:</u>	multiple
<u>Total Cost of the Project:</u>	\$270.65 million
<u>GEF Funding Request:</u>	\$123.65 million

The GEF Small Grants Program (GEF SGP) is a global corporate program implemented by UNDP on behalf of Implementing Agencies (IAs) and Executing Agencies (ExAs) of the GEF. Launched in 1992, GEF SGP is rooted in the belief that local solutions to global environmental problems work best when driven by local people.

GEF SGP is a decentralized and country-driven program of the GEF. SGP National Coordinators (NCs) facilitate its implementation in participating countries. Projects are reviewed and approved in line with national strategies developed by national steering committees composed of government representatives, including GEF Operational Focal Points, and civil society members representing non-governmental organizations (NGOs), community based organizations (CBOs), academia and the private sector.

There are currently 101 participating countries in GEF SGP in Africa, Asia/Pacific, Arab States, Europe/CIS and Latin America/Caribbean.

GEF SGP has funded more than 8,190 projects worldwide (as of March 2007). These projects have paid special attention to meeting GEF's environmental objectives while at the same time achieving poverty reduction and local empowerment objectives. Special concern is also given to local and indigenous communities as well as gender concerns. GEF SGP supports the larger sustainable development goals and the achievement of key components of the Millennium Development Goals.

The current proposal aligns the GEF SGP to the strategic priorities of GEF-4. The GEF SGP, will specifically focus on supporting local communities initiate new action for co-managing their natural resources, exemplifying the implementation of GEF's strategic priorities such as sustainable use activities both within protected areas and their buffer zones; conservation in productive landscapes and seascapes; productive uses of renewable energy; innovative demonstrations and capacity building foundational work in international waters; implementation of innovative and indigenous sustainable land management practices, and targeted capacity building and demonstration of innovative and cost-effective technologies in the POPs focal area.

In line with GEF's five-point sustainability compact from the 5 December 2006 GEF Council meeting, the GEF SGP will be more focused by identifying select GEF-4 strategic priorities in all focal areas in which GEF SGP has a comparative advantage. It will continue its goal of helping the most vulnerable by making sure that even small grant has concrete results, not only for the global environment, but also for sustainable development. In taking a programmatic approach, GEF SGP country programs will be leading in particular thematic priorities. Furthermore, in mature countries, projects and activities should now strive for higher level outcomes and stronger

links to supporting global environmental benefits – thus the scaling up, replication, and mainstreaming efforts we had identified for GEF SGP OP4.

In support of financing innovative efforts, GEF SGP is guiding ‘mature’ country programs to utilize new support mechanisms (i.e., market instruments) and initiate new partnerships with the business and finance sectors. One of GEF SGP’s priorities in this period will be to develop a strong global knowledge management platform that would be part of GEF’s knowledge network. In the activities section, identification of opportunities where IAs and ExAs can best participate has been made.

GEF SGP will continue to generate high levels of grassroots awareness of global environmental issues. Direct implementation of projects by communities and NGOs, together with decision-making on grants by National Steering Committees is designed to produce a very high degree of national ownership of the GEF SGP. There will also be increasing utilization of the GEF SGP mechanisms and procedures in the micro-grants components of other full-sized projects of the GEF as well as other donors.

**28. Regional (Albania, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Croatia, Egypt, Lebanon, Libya, Morocco, Serbia, Syria, Tunisia, Turkey, Algeria):** Strategic Partnership for the Mediterranean Large Marine Ecosystem--Regional Component: Implementation of Agreed Actions for the Protection of the Environmental Resources of the Mediterranean Sea and Its Coastal Areas (UNEP/UNIDO)

Focal Area/OP/Strategic Priority: MFA/ IW – OP9/SP1-2, POPs – OP14/SP2  
Local executing agency: Mediterranean Action Plan (lead)  
Total Cost of the Project: \$43.198 million  
GEF Funding Request: \$12.891 million (+ \$700,000 of PDF previously approved)  
Key Indicators:

- Adoption/sustainable implementation of regional and national policy/legal/institutional reforms for pollution reduction in all countries
- Regional and National institutions strengthened in all countries
- Sustainable financing mechanisms in place to support Resource mobilization strategy/financing mechanism for SAPs and NAPs
- Surface area covered by MPA's will be increased by 10% (from 9,732,600 to 10,705,860 hectares)
- Pollution reduction of min. 50% at demonstration sites
- Unsustainable fishing practices reduced by 90% at priority sites (covering 30,000 ha)
- 45,000 ha coastal zone managed through application of ICZM and IWRM
- 20,000 ha of land with appropriate aquifer and groundwater management in place
- Five countries with strengthened regulatory framework for POPs reduction
- Five countries with strengthened capacity for enforcement for POPs reduction
- Five countries with increased awareness of POPs

#### Rationale & Objective

In 1997 UNEP-MAP with the financial support of GEF, initiated a comprehensive regional effort aimed at identifying and accelerating the key reforms and investments necessary to reverse negative trends threatening the Mediterranean Sea Ecosystem, and move towards sustainability. In little over 6 years, a full Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis for the Mediterranean Sea (TDA-MED) was prepared and agreed upon by the Contracting Parties to the Barcelona Convention, followed by the adoption of two Strategic Action Programs (SAPs) to address main transboundary concerns: land based pollution (SAP MED), and loss of biodiversity (SAP BIO). As a consequence, the Mediterranean countries (Trieste, Oct. 2004) agreed on a collective effort for the protection of the environmental resources of the Mediterranean, the Strategic Partnership for the Mediterranean Sea Large Marine Ecosystem, led by UNEP and the World Bank, co-funded by the GEF and involving other relevant agencies, IFIs and bilateral and multilateral donors. The Partnership will serve as a catalyst in leveraging policy/legal/institutional reforms as well as additional investments for reversing degradation of the Mediterranean Sea Basin, with its coastal habitats and marine living resources. The Strategic Partnership, following the model of the GEF Black Sea Basin Strategic Partnership for Nutrient Reduction, consists of two complementary components:

- a Regional Component: "Implementation of agreed actions for the protection of the environmental resources of the Mediterranean Sea and its coastal areas" led by UNEP, and the object of the present proposal, and

- a “Partnership Investment Fund for the Mediterranean Sea Large Marine Ecosystem” led by the World Bank and already approved by the GEF Council in August 2006.

#### Expected Outcomes

- (a) the overall coordination of the Strategic Partnership ensured in concert with the World Bank;
- (b) harmonized policy, legal and institutional reforms aimed at reversing degradation trends with focus on land based pollution – PCBs, nutrients, fisheries and coastal habitats, in accordance with priorities agreed by the countries in the SAP MED and SAP BIO, established;
- (c) the future implementation of the ICZM Protocol facilitated;
- (d) the new approaches implemented/demonstrated under the Partnership Investment Fund Component (World Bank) disseminated and replicated;
- (e) monitoring of the progress of the Strategic Partnership as a whole, of the effectiveness of the stress reduction measures being promoted, and of the “environmental status indicators” agreed upon by the countries for the Mediterranean Sea, in place.

The proposed project shows several aspects that deserve particular mention: the full participation of northern littoral countries (Spain, France, Italy) to project activities, and funding, as reflected in the high co-financing ratio; the well defined set of results indicators (Process and Stress Reduction - Annex E); the innovative and comprehensive Replication Strategy, linked with strong Communication and Coordination components (Annex F); the integrated nature of the proposed approach (interlinked basin, coastal, and marine ecosystem management and interventions) and the joining of forces of focal areas (IW and POPs) around common priorities.



**29. Regional (Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Paraguay, Uruguay) : Sustainable Management of the Water Resources of the La Plata Basin with Respect to the Effects of Climate Variability and Change (UNEP)**

Focal Area/OP/Strategic Priority: MFA/IW – OP9/SP2 & SPA  
Local executing agency: OAS & CIC  
Total Cost of the Project: \$62.017 million  
GEF Funding Request: \$10.73 million (+ \$725,000 of PDFs previously approved)  
Key Indicators:

- An efficiently operating basin committee created through the strengthening of the CIC;
- strengthened national capacities for the conduct of integrated water resources management and climate change adaptation;
- an agreed strategy (SAP) for the resolution of water use conflicts and inter-sectoral conflicts;
- inter-ministerial committees within the Basin countries formed from the foundation created by the NPUs proposed to be created in each Basin country; and enhanced sustainable access to water within local communities in the la Plata River Basin.

Rationale & Objective

The proposed project responds to a decision taken by the Plata Treaty countries in 2001 during the IV Inter-American Water Management Dialogue. In that occasion the countries agreed on the need to develop, with the assistance of the GEF, a Framework Program for the la Plata Basin in order to: “i) coordinate projects of common interest for the la Plata Basin countries; ii) carry out projects in water resources management and select concrete prioritized actions; iii) highlight the importance of flood and drought phenomena in the Basin, among others; iv) define sustainable hydrology; and v) promote regional initiatives identified as priorities by two or more countries within the framework of the la Plata Treaty....”. The present proposal builds upon the experience gained through several GEF projects addressing specific sub-basins and groundwater systems part of the larger Plata Basin, and is the result of extensive preparation work (PDF-A, PDF-B) carried out by the CIC (Intergovernmental Coordinating Committee for the Plata Basin) with the assistance of UNEP and the OAS.

Expected Outcomes

- a. Joint multi-country integrated management of the Basin’s surface and groundwater resources taking into consideration the need to reach a sustainable balance among water uses, and to adapt and mitigate the impacts of climatic fluctuations and change, established. This will be achieved through the formulation and adoption by the countries of a Strategic Action Program, addressing the transboundary aspects of the joint integrated management of the Plata Basin, and including agreement on key institutional, legal, policy reforms and investments. The SAP will build upon a science based transboundary diagnostic analysis (TDA), and will be strengthened and informed by several demonstration sub-projects testing innovative approaches and including climate change adaptation aspects.
- b. Strengthened and harmonized multi-country institutional and legal frameworks and technical capacity (enabling conditions) necessary for the long-term implementation of the SAP, taking into account the implementation plans and financing strategies agreed by the Basin countries. This will include, amongst others, the development of predictive and decision support tools for climate induced alterations, such as an Integrated Hydro-meteorological-climatic

Forecasting System at the Basin level to generate meteorological, hydrological and climatic forecasts and scenarios to enhance the capacity within the Basin to anticipate floods, droughts, and extreme events (related to El Nino and La Nina periodicities), inform regional land use and economic development programs, and permit the Basin countries to anticipate and adapt to climate change and variability related impacts.

The project has leveraged a very high co-financing (1:4), including substantial cash contributions, and was very successful in engaging the private sector (Hydropower companies) which will actively participate to key and innovative components the project (testing of revolving funds using revenues from water charges) and provide substantial co-financing. The projects will also promote several innovative approaches, in particular the full integration of groundwater into basin-wide water resources management for the first time in the region. Once fully operational, the project will provide the forum and mechanisms for multi-country dialogue and water use conflict resolution in this highly sensitive transboundary water context.