



## Convention on Biological Diversity

Distr.  
GENERAL

UNEP/CBD/COP/10/6  
2 August 2010

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

### CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES TO THE CONVENTION ON BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY

Tenth meeting

Nagoya, Japan, 18-29 October 2010

Items 2.2 and 4.10 of the provisional agenda \*

#### REPORT OF THE GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT FACILITY

*Note by the Executive Secretary*

1. In accordance with the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the Conference of the Parties and the Council of the Global Environment Facility (GEF) contained in the annex to decision III/8, the GEF Council is to prepare and submit a report for each ordinary meeting of the Conference of the Parties. Section 3 of the Memorandum of Understanding provides a list of specific information, detailed information as well as other information to be included in the report.

2. In addition, the ninth meeting of the Conference of the Parties made several requests for reporting by the Global Environment Facility, as the institutional structure operating the financial mechanism of the Convention, to the tenth meeting:

(a) In decision IX/11 B, annex, paragraph 13, the Global Environment Facility, in collaboration with the Executive Secretary, was invited to consider how it can contribute to the implementation of the strategy for resource mobilization, and report back to the Conference of the Parties through the third meeting of the Working Group on Review of Implementation of the Convention, including consideration of a plan to address the strategy for resource mobilization, in consultation with the GEF implementing agencies;

(b) In decision IX/31 A, paragraph 3(b), the Conference of the Parties requested the Council of the Global Environment Facility to report on implementation of the four-year framework for programme priorities related to utilization of GEF resources for biodiversity to the tenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties;

(c) In decision IX/31 C, paragraph 5, the Conference of the Parties requested the Global Environment Facility, within its mandate, to consider the following guidance, submitted in its entirety in decision IV/5, paragraph 4, of the fourth meeting of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety, noting that subparagraph (f) should be considered in the context of the programme priorities in the annex to decision IX/31 B, and to report back to the Conference of the Parties at its tenth meeting.

2. In light of the above, the Executive Secretary is circulating herewith the report of the Global Environment Facility to the Conference of the Parties at its tenth meeting.

\* UNEP/CBD/COP/10/1.

/...





June 21, 2010

---

GEF REPORT TO THE TENTH MEETING  
OF THE CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES  
TO THE CONVENTION ON BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1. This document reports on the activities of the Global Environment Facility (GEF) in the area of biological diversity for the period January 1, 2008 to June 30, 2010, as such it includes the last 2.5 years of GEF-4.
2. The GEF, as the operating entity of the financial mechanism of the Convention on Biological Diversity, provides financing to country driven projects based on guidance received from the Conference of Parties. The report describes the GEF's activities in response to guidance received from the Conference of Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity at its ninth session (COP IX) held in Bonn, Germany 19-30 May, 2008, and other relevant decisions of previous COPs. One decision, COP/DEC/IX, 31 is directed towards the GEF and provides additional guidance to the financial mechanism.
3. Between January 1, 2008 and June 30, 2010, the GEF approved 222 projects (inclusive of enabling activities) that addressed biological diversity and biosafety objectives. The total GEF allocation for these projects was \$ 530,218,557. Approximately 1.7 billion was leveraged in co-financing for the projects from partners including the GEF Agencies, bilateral agencies, recipient countries, private foundations, and the private sector. This resulted in a cofinancing ratio of 1 (GEF): 3.3 (cofinancing).
4. Between January 1, 2008 and June 30, 2010, the GEF also approved 29 projects under the sustainable forest management program for a total GEF allocation of \$ 112,063,278, of which \$61,557,797 (about 55%) came from the biodiversity focal area, which leveraged an additional \$ 429,021,597. This resulted in a cofinancing ratio of 1 (GEF) to 4 (cofinancing).
5. Twenty-seven (27) multi-focal area projects were approved between January 1, 2008 and June 30, 2010, with significant contributions from the biodiversity focal area. Out of a total GEF allocation of \$131,948,322 to these integrated focal area projects, \$65,709,527 or 50% came from the biodiversity focal area. These 27 projects leveraged an additional \$ 896,097,281 for a cofinancing ratio of 1 (GEF) to 6.8 (cofinancing).
6. Technology transfer and cooperation and the participation of the private sector is often a significant element of most GEF biodiversity projects and has been exemplified during the reporting period through many projects. In addition, the Earth Fund was fully operational during the reporting period and brought enhanced engagement of the private sector in GEF biodiversity investments. Earth Fund Platforms (portfolios of individual activities) relevant to the implementation of the CBD and approved during the reporting period totaled \$ 40 million.
7. In addition, one-hundred and twenty-four (124) project preparation grants were approved in the biodiversity focal area during the reporting period amounting to \$ 11,291,738.
8. During the reporting period the GEF Small Grants Programme funded 1,613 new projects in more than 115 countries to support the GEF-4 strategic objectives of biodiversity conservation in and around protected areas, and the sustainable use of biodiversity in production landscapes and seascapes. The total GEF allocation for these new biodiversity projects amounted to \$43.21 million and leveraged a total of \$51.51 million (in-cash and in-kind) co-financing from various partners.

9. During the reporting period, the Critical Ecosystem Partnership fund (CEPF), a partnership of GEF, Conservation International, the Government of Japan, the French Development Agency, the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation and the World Bank, provided funding for 173 projects in nearly 50 countries enabling civil society to protect biodiversity in highly threatened areas. The total CEPF investment for biodiversity during the reporting period amounted to \$29.8 million.
10. Five projects under the Strategic Priority on Adaptation (SPA) were approved during the reporting period that have clear biodiversity benefits and received contributions of \$ 15,327,400 from the biodiversity focal area.
11. In sum, during the reporting period about \$ 846 million were programmed to directly advance the objectives of the convention. In total, this investment leveraged an additional \$ 3.0 billion, resulting in a cofinancing ratio of 1 (GEF) to 3.6 (cofinancing).
12. The document also describes GEF financed activities in the GEF focal areas of international waters and land degradation which also contributed directly or indirectly to the objectives and implementation of the Convention on Biological Diversity.
13. Through the international waters focal area, the GEF approved 33 projects for an amount of \$ 136.7 million that supported directly or indirectly the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity during the reporting period. An additional \$ 1.35 billion was leveraged as cofinancing for these international waters projects. Of particular note is the sub-portfolio of sustainable fisheries projects that were approved in the IW portfolio during the reporting period. Seven projects supporting sustainable fisheries management totaling \$28.14 million of GEF resources which leveraged \$175.93 million were approved to support sustainable fisheries management.
14. In the land degradation focal area, eight (8) projects amounting to a total GEF commitment of \$11.59 million have components that address biodiversity conservation and/or sustainable use. An additional \$41 million was leveraged as cofinancing for these land degradation projects.
15. Thus, the combination of direct biodiversity investment, and indirect investments in the international waters and land degradation focal area, contributing to the achievement of the objectives of the convention by the GEF during the reporting period totaled \$ 996 million, which leveraged \$ 4.4 billion, a total investment of \$ 5.39 billion.
16. The document also reports on the activities of the GEF Evaluation Office during the reporting period that are related to the area of biological diversity including syntheses of ten biodiversity-related studies. Four of them are impact evaluations: two are included in the Annual Impact Report (AIR) 2008 and two in the AIR 2009. Five other studies are Country Portfolio Evaluations (CPE): three of them are included in the Annual Country Portfolio Evaluation Report (ACPER) 2009 and the other two in the ACPER 2010.<sup>1</sup> The last study is the Fourth Overall Performance Study (OPS4) of the GEF.

---

<sup>1</sup> The ACPER 2010 synthesizes the findings and recommendations of the CPE in Moldova and Turkey and will be presented to the GEF Council in June 2010.

17. Other relevant issues discussed include the biodiversity strategy for GEF-5, progress in implementation of the GEF Sustainable Forest Management Program and plans for GEF-5, and a summary of the GEF-5 replenishment.

## Table of Contents

I.	Introduction.....	1
II.	Project Activities in the Area of Biological Diversity.....	1
A.	Summary.....	1
B.	GEF-4 Biodiversity Strategy.....	2
C.	GEF-5 Biodiversity Strategy.....	3
D.	Sustainable Forest Management during GEF-4 and GEF-5.....	9
E.	Summary of Project Activities in Biological Diversity.....	12
	Full-sized Projects.....	12
	Medium-sized Projects.....	13
	Enabling Activities.....	14
	Project Preparation Grants.....	14
	Small Grants Programme.....	15
	Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund.....	16
III.	Activities in Response to COP Guidance.....	16
A.	Summary.....	16
B.	Protected Areas: Systemic Approaches to Improving Protected Area Management.....	24
C.	Sustainably Using Biodiversity through Mainstreaming.....	27
D.	Biosafety.....	30
E.	Invasive Alien Species.....	36
F.	Access to genetic resources and fair and equitable sharing of benefits (ABS).....	37
G.	Marine/Coastal Biodiversity and Island Biodiversity.....	38
H.	Strategic Plan of the Convention.....	40
I.	Technology Transfer and Cooperation and the Private Sector.....	41
J.	National Reporting.....	45
K.	Communication, Education and Public Awareness.....	46
L.	Biological Diversity and Climate Change.....	46
IV.	Activities in Other GEF Focal Areas of relevance to this report.....	52
A.	International Waters.....	52
B.	Land Degradation Focal Area.....	53
V.	Monitoring & Evaluation Results.....	54
A.	Portfolio Monitoring Results.....	54
B.	Results from the GEF Evaluation Office.....	61
VI.	Other Relevant Issues to the Conference of the Parties.....	67
A.	Fifth Replenishment of the GEF Trust Fund.....	67
B.	GEF Collaboration with the CBD Secretariat to celebrate the International Year of Biodiversity (IYB).....	70

## Tables

Table 1: Long-term strategic objectives and strategic programs for biodiversity in GEF-4 (FY 2007-2010).....	3
Table 2: Coherence between the 2010-2014 four-year framework of program priorities agreed at COP-9, the GEF-4 and GEF-5 biodiversity strategy.....	4
Table 3: Coherence between the 2010-2014 four-year framework of program priorities agreed at COP-9 and its outcomes and the GEF-5 biodiversity strategy.....	6
Table 4: GEF Projects in the area of biological diversity, including biosafety approved between January 1, 2008 and June 30, 2010. ....	12
Table 5. Full-sized projects approved between January 1, 2008 and June 30, 2010 per GEF-4 strategy objectives.....	13
Table 6. Medium-sized projects approved between January 1, 2008 and June 30, 2010 per GEF-4 strategy objectives.....	14
Table 7. GEF response to COP-IX Guidance Decision IX/11 and IX/31.....	17
Table 8. Comparison of protected area and sustainable use/mainstreaming projects approved between January 1, 2008 and June 30, 2010.....	27
Table 9. Sustainable use/mainstreaming full-size projects approved between January 1, 2008 and June 30, 2010 by sectors.....	28
Table 10. Sustainable use/mainstreaming medium-size projects approved between January 1, 2008 and June 30, 2010 by sectors.....	29
Table 11. Biosafety projects approved between January 1, 2008 and June 30, 2010.....	32
Table 12. SPA projects approved between January 1, 2008 and June 30, 2010 with biodiversity financing.....	48
Table 13. SPA projects approved between January 1, 2008 and June 30, 2010 with no biodiversity financing but that contribute to biodiversity conservation.....	49
Table 14. FY 08 update on GEF-3 project cohort contributions to the biodiversity outcome targets in the GEF-3 business plan.....	56
Table 15. FY 09 update on GEF-3 project cohort contributions to the biodiversity outcome targets in the GEF-3 business plan.....	58



## **Annexes**

Annex 1. Biodiversity Strategy for GEF-5.....	72
Annex 2. Full-size projects in the biodiversity focal area approved during the reporting period.....	85
Annex 3. Medium-size projects in the biodiversity focal area approved during the reporting period.....	95
Annex 4. Enabling activities in the biodiversity focal area approved during the reporting period.....	102
Annex 5. Summaries of biodiversity projects approved during the reporting period.....	104
Annex 6. Summary of country grants of the GEF project “Supporting Country Action on the CBD Programme of Work on Protected Areas” under implementation .....	159
Annex 7. Multi-focal area projects approved during the reporting period including Sustainable Forest Management (SFM) program.....	162
Annex 8: List of GEF documents available at the Tenth Session of the Conference of the Parties.....	170
Annex 9: GEF-5 operational procedures for the System for a Transparent Allocation of Resources (STAR).....	171



## **INTRODUCTION**

1. This report has been prepared for the tenth meeting of the Conference of Parties (COP 10) to the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD). It reports on activities of the GEF in the area of biodiversity and biosafety during the period, January 1, 2008 to June 30, 2010<sup>1</sup>. The report describes the major GEF activities and issues during the reporting period in the areas covered by the Convention.
2. In addition to this report, supplemental information is presented in GEF publications and documents which the GEF will make available to the tenth meeting of the Conference of Parties. A list of the documents is provided in Annex 8.

## **PROJECT ACTIVITIES IN THE AREA OF BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY**

### **A. Summary**

3. The GEF, as the operating entity of the financial mechanism of the Convention on Biological Diversity, provides financing to country driven projects based on guidance received from the Conference of Parties. GEF financed projects are managed through ten agencies: the U.N. Development Programme (UNDP); the U.N. Environment Programme (UNEP); the World Bank; the U.N. Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO); the U.N. Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO); the African Development Bank (AfDB); the Asian Development Bank (ADB); the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EBRD); the Inter-American Development Bank (IDB); and the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD). The Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel (STAP) provides technical and scientific advice on GEF's policies and projects. Information on all GEF projects is available on the GEF website (<http://www.thegef.org>) under Projects.
4. Since 1991, the GEF has provided about \$ 2.9 billion in grants and leveraged about \$ 8.2 billion in co-financing in support of 990 biodiversity projects in 155 countries.
5. Between January 1, 2008 and June 30, 2010, the GEF approved 222 projects (inclusive of enabling activities) that directly addressed biological diversity and biosafety objectives. The total GEF allocation for these projects was \$530,218,557. Approximately 1.7 billion was leveraged in co-financing for the projects from partners including the GEF Agencies, bilateral agencies, recipient countries, private foundations, and the private sector. This resulted in a cofinancing ratio of 1 (GEF): 3.3 (cofinancing).

---

<sup>1</sup> The report is only entirely complete for the June 30, 2010 reporting period with regards to CEO and GEF Council approved PIFs. Given the reporting deadline for transmitting the report to the COP and allowing for translation of the document, the numbers provided herein may not include some CEO approval of project preparation grants that occurred between June 1 and June 30, 2010.

## **B. GEF-4 Biodiversity Strategy**

6. The reporting period covers the investments of the last 2.5 years of GEF-4; hence, the GEF-4 strategy guided this investment. The GEF revised its strategy for GEF-4 (FY 2007-2010) based on the implementation experience gained during GEF-3 and in response to evolving thinking in the conservation community about the drivers of biodiversity loss.

7. The GEF-funded Millennium Ecosystem Assessment identified the most important direct drivers of biodiversity loss and degradation of ecosystem goods and services as being habitat change, climate change, invasive alien species, overexploitation and pollution.<sup>2</sup> These drivers are influenced by a series of indirect drivers of change, including demographics, global economic trends, governance, institutions and legal frameworks, science and technology, and cultural and religious values. The biodiversity strategy in GEF-4 addressed a subset of the direct and indirect drivers of biodiversity loss and focused on the highest leverage opportunities for the GEF to contribute to biodiversity conservation and its sustainable use.

8. The goals of GEF's biodiversity program during GEF-4 were the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity, the maintenance of the ecosystem goods and services that biodiversity provides to society, and the fair and equitable sharing of the benefits arising from the utilization of genetic resources. To achieve these goals, the GEF-4 strategy encompassed four complementary and mutually reinforcing objectives: 1) improving the sustainability of protected area systems, the most predominant and dedicated land-use modality globally for biodiversity conservation; 2) mainstreaming biodiversity conservation and sustainable use into production sectors that impact biodiversity; 3) safeguarding biodiversity by: a) building country capacity to implement the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety (CPB); and b) the prevention, control and management of invasive alien species; and 4) capacity building to support the implementation of the Bonn Guidelines on Access to Genetic Resources and Benefit-sharing. Underpinning these responses, GEF supported institutional capacity building and the development of the appropriate policy frameworks necessary to ensure biodiversity conservation and its sustainable use.

9. The long-term objectives and strategic programs that were redefined for the GEF-4 replenishment period replaced the previous structure of operational programs and strategic priorities and balanced the need for continuity in the investment strategy, while focusing more explicitly on specific interventions for sustaining biodiversity over the long-term. The new structure balanced continuity and flexibility and supported an institutional emphasis on results (see Table One).

---

<sup>2</sup> Millennium Ecosystem Assessment 2005, *Ecosystems and Human Well-being: Synthesis*, Island Press, Washington, DC.

**Table 1: Long-term strategic objectives and strategic programs for biodiversity in GEF-4 (FY 2007-2010)**

Long-term Strategic Objectives	Strategic Programs for GEF-4
1: To catalyze sustainability of protected area systems	1. Sustainable financing of PA systems at the national level 2. Increasing representation of effectively managed marine PA areas in PA systems 3. Strengthening terrestrial PA networks
2: To mainstream biodiversity in production landscapes/seascapes and sectors	4. Strengthening the policy and regulatory framework for mainstreaming biodiversity 5. Fostering markets for biodiversity goods and services
3: To safeguard biodiversity	6. Building capacity for the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety 7. Prevention, control and management of invasive alien species
4: To build capacity on access and benefit sharing	8. Building capacity on access and benefit sharing

10. The strategy was consistent with the integrated approaches to biodiversity conservation and sustainable use promoted by the ecosystem approach, the primary framework for action under the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD).<sup>3</sup> Together, these strategic objectives made a substantial contribution to implementing most of the Millennium Development Goals, particularly environmental sustainability and poverty reduction, while meeting the priorities identified by the COP of the CBD.

11. The GEF’s biodiversity strategy was designed to achieve biodiversity conservation and sustainable use within the framework of the ecosystem approach. An integrated ecosystem approach was endorsed by COP V and is “designed to balance conservation, sustainable use and equitable sharing of genetic resources, looking beyond protected area boundaries to the wider landscape whilst placing humans at the centre of conservation efforts.”

### **C. GEF-5 Biodiversity Strategy**

12. The ninth meeting of the Conference of the Parties of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) acknowledged that the GEF-4 strategy served as a useful starting point for the GEF-5 strategy and requested GEF to build on it for the fifth replenishment based on the four year framework of program priorities developed by COP-IX.<sup>4</sup> Table Two below demonstrates the coherence between the GEF-4 strategy, the COP-IX programme priorities, and the GEF-5 strategy.

<sup>3</sup> Decision CBD COP V/6.

<sup>4</sup> Decision CBD COP IX/31.

**Table 2. Coherence between the 2010-2014 Four-Year Framework of Programme Priorities Agreed at COP-IX, the GEF-4 and GEF-5 Biodiversity Strategy**

<b>COP 2010-2014 Programme Priorities</b>	<b>Strategic Programs for GEF-4</b>	<b>GEF-5 Strategy Objectives</b>
<p><b>Priority area 1:</b> Promote conservation of biological diversity, including through catalyzing sustainability of protected area systems</p> <p><b>Program priority area 2:</b>  Promote sustainable use of biodiversity</p>	<p>1. Sustainable financing of protected area (PA) systems at the national level</p> <p>2. Increasing representation of effectively managed marine PA areas in PA systems</p> <p>3. Strengthening terrestrial PA networks</p>	<p>Objective One: Improve Sustainability of Protected Area Systems:</p> <p>a) Increase financing of PA systems; b) Expand ecosystem and threatened species representation within protected area systems; and c) Improve management effectiveness of existing protected areas.</p>
<p><b>Priority area 2:</b> Promote sustainable use of biodiversity</p> <p><b>Priority area 3:</b> Mainstream biological diversity into various national and sectoral policies and development strategies and programs</p>	<p>4. Strengthening the policy and regulatory framework for mainstreaming biodiversity</p> <p>5. Fostering markets for biodiversity goods and services</p>	<p>Objective Two: Mainstream Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Use into Production Landscapes/Seascapes and Sectors:</p> <p>1. Strengthen Policy and Regulatory Frameworks; 2. Implement Invasive Alien Species Management Frameworks; and 3. Strengthen Capacities to Produce Biodiversity-friendly Goods and Services.</p>
<p><b>Priority area 4:</b> Improve national capacity to implement the Convention <i>and</i> the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety</p>	<p>6. Building capacity for the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety</p>	<p>Objectives One and Two as above, Objective Four: Build Capacity on Access to Genetic Resources and Benefit Sharing, and Objective Five: Integrate CBD Obligations into National Planning Processes through Enabling Activities all contribute to the aim of program priority four (4) to improve national capacity to implement the Convention.</p> <p>Objective Three: Build Capacity for the Implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety</p>
<p><b>Priority area 5:</b> Promote the implementation of the Convention's third objective and support the implementation of the international regime on access to genetic resources and benefit-sharing</p>	<p>8. Building capacity in access and benefit sharing</p>	<p>Objective Four: Build Capacity on Access to Genetic Resources and Benefit Sharing</p>
<p><b>Priority area 6:</b> Safeguard biodiversity</p>	<p>7. Prevention, control, and management of invasive alien species (IAS)</p>	<p>Objective Two: Mainstream Biodiversity and Sustainable Use into Production Landscapes and Seascapes and Sectors</p> <p>Objective One: Improve Sustainability of Protected Area Systems: c) Improve management effectiveness of existing protected areas</p>

13. The GEF-5 strategy maintains coherence with the GEF-4 strategy while proposing refinements to the strategy's objectives based on COP-IX guidance, advances in conservation practice, and advice from the GEF's Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel.

14. In Decision IX/31, the GEF was requested to report on implementation of the Four-year Framework of Programme Priorities related to utilization of GEF resources for biodiversity to the tenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties. Given that this report from GEF is required to be submitted prior to the beginning of GEF-5 and the actual implementation of the Four-year Framework of Programme Priorities, within this report GEF is reporting on the plan for implementation of the four-year framework, that is, the GEF-5 biodiversity strategy itself. At subsequent COPs, the GEF will report on implementation of the Four-year Framework of Programme Priorities and the GEF-5 strategy as resources are programmed by countries.

15. Table Three below shows the relationship between the COP guidance and the GEF-5 strategy and the outcomes of the Four-Year Framework of Programme Priorities agreed at COP-IX, in Decision IX/31.

**Table 3. Coherence between the FY 2010-2014 four-year frame work of programme priorities agreed at COP-IX and the GEF-5 biodiversity strategy (FY 2011-2014)**

<b>COP 2010-2014 Programme Priorities</b>	<b>GEF-5 FY 2011-2014 Strategy Objectives</b>	<b>Programme Priority Outcomes that will be addressed through the objectives of the GEF 5 strategy</b>
<p><b>Priority area 1:</b> Promote conservation of biological diversity, including through catalyzing sustainability of protected area systems</p> <p><b>Priority area 2:</b> Promote sustainable use of biodiversity</p>	<p>Objective One: Improve Sustainability of Protected Area Systems: a) Increase financing of PA systems; b) Expand ecosystem and threatened species representation within protected area systems; and c) Improve management effectiveness of existing protected areas.</p>	<p>Outcomes 1.1-1.6</p> <p>Outcome 4.3-4.7</p>
<p><b>Priority area 2:</b> Promote sustainable use of biodiversity</p> <p><b>Priority area 3:</b> Mainstream biological diversity into various national and sectoral policies and development strategies and programs</p>	<p>Objective Two: Mainstream Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Use into Production Landscapes/Seascapes and Sectors: d) Strengthen Policy and Regulatory Frameworks; e) Implement Invasive Alien Species Management Frameworks; and f) Strengthen Capacities to Produce Biodiversity-friendly Goods and Services.</p>	<p>Outcomes 2.1-2.3</p> <p>Outcomes 3.1-3.7</p> <p>Outcome 4.3-4.7</p> <p>Outcome 6.1</p>

<b>COP 2010-2014 Programme Priorities</b>	<b>GEF-5 FY 2011-2014 Strategy Objectives</b>	<b>Programme Priority Outcomes that will be addressed through the objectives of the GEF 5 strategy</b>
<p><b>Priority area 4:</b> Improve national capacity to implement the Convention <i>and</i> the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety</p>	<p>Objectives One and Two as above, Objective Four: Build Capacity on Access to Genetic Resources and Benefit Sharing, and</p> <p>Objective Five: Integrate CBD Obligations into National Planning Processes through Enabling Activities all contribute to the aim of program priority four (4) to improve national capacity to implement the Convention.</p> <p>Objective Three: Build Capacity for the Implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety</p>	<p>Outcomes 4.1-4.7</p> <p>Outcome 6.2</p>
<p><b>Priority area 5:</b> Promote the implementation of the Convention's third objective and support the implementation of the international regime on access to genetic resources and benefit-sharing</p>	<p>Objective Four: Build Capacity on Access to Genetic Resources and Benefit Sharing</p>	<p>Outcomes 5.1-5.3</p> <p>Outcome 4.3</p> <p>Outcome 4.4</p> <p>Outcome 4.6</p> <p>Outcome 4.7</p>
<p><b>Priority area 6:</b> Safeguard biodiversity</p>	<p>Objective Two: Mainstream Biodiversity and Sustainable Use into Production Landscapes and Seascapes and Sectors</p> <p>Objective One: Improve Sustainability of Protected Area Systems: c) Improve management effectiveness of existing protected areas</p> <p>Objective Three: Build Capacity for the Implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety</p>	<p>Outcomes 2.2 and 2.3</p> <p>Outcomes 4.3-4.8</p> <p>Outcomes 6.1 and 6.2</p>

16. The goal of the GEF-5 biodiversity strategy is the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity and the maintenance of the ecosystem goods and services that biodiversity provides to society. To achieve this goal, the GEF-5 strategy encompasses five objectives:

- improve the sustainability of protected area systems;
- mainstream biodiversity conservation and sustainable use into production landscapes/seascapes and sectors;
- build capacity to implement the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety;
- build capacity on access to genetic resources and benefit-sharing; and
- integrate CBD obligations into national planning processes through enabling activities.

17. The GEF-5 strategy was developed with the full participation of the CBD Secretariat.



18. Given that the GEF-5 strategy is the road map for implementation for the four-year framework of program priorities, the GEF-5 strategy document agreed by GEF Council and the GEF Assembly is appended as Annex One to this document. As noted in Table Three (3) above, all response measures in the GEF-5 strategy, when taken as a whole, will allow Parties to respond to the COP 2010-2014 programme priorities in their entirety.

19. The GEF-5 biodiversity strategy will also be implemented amidst the backdrop of the voluntary national portfolio identification process being initiated as part of GEF-5. On a strictly voluntary basis, countries may undertake a national GEF portfolio identification process to develop a framework for programming GEF resources. Funding to support the portfolio identification process will be provided directly to countries by the GEF Secretariat. This support will facilitate country planning for the strategic use of each country's biodiversity allocation to achieve the priorities identified in their respective National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan.

20. Furthermore, a number of features in the GEF-5 strategy reflect COP-IX recommendations and the four-year framework of programme priorities, and, therefore, are highlighted below.

21. Under objective one, "Improve Sustainability of Protected Area Systems"<sup>5</sup>, a key refinement for GEF-5 is the explicit acknowledgement in the strategy that GEF will support expansion of threatened species representation alongside the ongoing support GEF has provided in GEF-4 to expanding ecosystem representation with an increasing emphasis on marine and inland water ecosystem representation (see paragraphs 12-13, Annex 1). This addition to the strategy responds to Outcome 1.6 of Priority One of the Four-Year Framework of Programme Priorities agreed at COP 9, in Decision IX/31.

22. Although this has been identified as a priority for the 2010-2014 period, a project implemented by UNEP and executed by local NGOs was already approved during the reporting period and will demonstrate in a suite of pilot sites of the Alliance for Zero Extinction (AZE) in Peru, Bolivia, Ecuador and Colombia, how community-based models benefit local societies by protecting species and ecosystem services (Communities of Conservation: Safeguarding the World's Most Threatened Species, (UNEP, GEF: \$ 1.775 M, Cofinance: \$ 1.775 M, Total: \$ 3.555 M). The concept of the AZE alliance, which is to protect the habitat of critically endangered and endangered species that depend on a single site for their survival, has been further reinforced by a Memorandum of Cooperation between AZE and the Convention Secretariat signed during a plenary session of the fourteenth meeting of the Convention's scientific advisory body (SBSTTA), held last month at the United Nations Office at Nairobi, with the participation of delegates and scientists from the 193 Parties to the treaty, as well as from the United States.

23. Developing climate-resilient protected area systems remains a challenge for most protected area managers because the scientific understanding and technical basis for informed decision-making on adaptation or resiliency measures is in its nascent stages. To help overcome these technical challenges, GEF will support the development and integration of adaptation and

---

<sup>5</sup> A protected area system could include a national system, a sub-system of a national system, a municipal-level system, or a local level system or a combination of these.

resilience management measures as part of protected area management projects (see paragraph 10 of Annex 1). This support is important to ensure that GEF's investments will continue to contribute to the sustainability of national protected area systems and responds to Outcome 1.5 of Priority One of the Four-Year Framework of Programme Priorities agreed at COP 9, in Decision IX/31.

24. Under Objective Two, "Mainstream Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Use into Production Landscapes/Seascapes and Sectors", GEF will continue to promote measures to help reduce the negative impacts that productive sectors exert on biodiversity, particularly outside of protected areas and those affecting landscape species, and highlight the contribution of all components of biodiversity to ecosystem functioning, economic development and human well being, – a set of actions often referred to as "mainstreaming".

25. A key refinement of the GEF's mainstreaming strategy in GEF-5 is the opportunity provided under strategy objectives two and five ("Integrate CBD Obligations into National Planning Processes through Enabling Activities") to support the integration of the objectives of the National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plans into sectoral planning documents (see paragraphs 22, 28 and 40 in Annex 1).

26. Enabling activity support will be provided from the focal area set-aside funds (FAS) for an amount up to \$500,000 per country for revising NBSAPs in line with the CBD's new strategic plan to be adopted at COP-10, national reporting, and implementation of guidance related to the CHM. This could help foster effective use of national biodiversity strategies and action plans (NBSAPs) as tools for mainstreaming biodiversity into national development strategies and programs which responds to Outcomes 4.1 and 4.2 Priority One of the Four-Year Framework of Programme Priorities agreed at COP 9, in Decision IX/31.

27. Implementation of the CBD's third objective on access to genetic resources and benefit sharing has been slowed by the lack of capacity of most key stakeholder groups. Of particular note is the difficulty in most countries to establish a common understanding between providers and users of genetic resources and the associated traditional knowledge of indigenous and local communities.

28. Prior to completion of negotiations of an international regime on ABS, under objective four of the biodiversity strategy, "Build Capacity on Access to Genetic Resources and Benefit Sharing", GEF will support capacity building of governments for meeting their obligations under Article 15 of the CBD, as well as building capacity within key stakeholder groups, including indigenous and local communities, and the scientific community. This would include support for the establishment of measures that promote concrete access and benefit-sharing agreements that recognize the core ABS principles of Prior Informed Consent (PIC) and Mutually Agreed Terms (MAT) including the fair and equitable sharing of benefits. Projects submitted prior to completion of the negotiations of the international regime should be consistent with the Bonn Guidelines on ABS and the related action plan on capacity building for ABS adopted under the Convention (Decision VII/19F). After completion of the negotiations of the international regime, the GEF will fully elucidate project support provided under this objective for approval by GEF council.

#### **D. Sustainable Forest Management during GEF-4 and GEF-5**

29. Forest ecosystems provide a variety of benefits which are realized at the global, subregional, national and local scales. Beyond their key role in climate change mitigation of land-based emissions, forests harbor a significant fraction of the world's biodiversity and are responsible for the provision of key ecosystem services, including functioning as carbon sinks and storehouses, as buffers against soil degradation and desertification, as well as sustaining the livelihoods of hundreds of millions of rural people everywhere.

30. In response to this opportunity, and as part of the strategy development process for GEF-4, the GEF developed a program approach to support sustainable forest management (SFM) that embodies the ecosystem approach at the landscape level and encourages interventions that bring together the GEF focal areas of biodiversity, climate change, and land degradation to achieve greater global environmental benefits. Thus, the GEF-4 SFM program supported interventions that seek to generate multiple benefits in biodiversity, climate change (via reduced emissions from deforestation) and sustainable land management (including sustaining rural livelihoods). As part of the replenishment decisions, the GEF-5 strategy will expand a financial incentive mechanism pioneered under GEF-4 dedicated to forests, which will include the latest developments in new and innovative financing opportunities for Sustainable Forest Management (SFM) and REDD-plus. Unlike in GEF-4, all types of forests will be eligible for funding under the SFM/REDD-plus program, ranging from tropical and sub-tropical forests to woodlands. The primary focus of this program will be implementation at the national level, including through programmatic approaches. The portfolio is expected to be made up of a wide spectrum of SFM management tools, such as protected area creation and management, integrated watershed management, certification of timber and non-timber forest products, payments for ecosystem services (PES) schemes, financial mechanisms related to carbon, development and testing of policy frameworks to slow the drivers of undesirable land-use changes, and work with local communities to develop alternative livelihood methods to reduce emissions and sequester carbon. In connection with these projects and programs, the GEF may also support activities that develop systems to measure and monitor carbon stocks and fluxes from forest and non-forest lands.

31. GEF-funded interventions will cover the spectrum of land-use categories as defined by the IPCC, including reducing deforestation and forest degradation and enhancing carbon stocks in non-forest lands, as well as management of peatlands. However, seeking to address potential trade-offs, the strategy does not support the substitution of native forests with plantations, regardless of whether benefits in carbon sequestration could be anticipated.

32. The renewed financial scheme for GEF-5 will be open to all forest countries and designed to provide incentives for the emergence of more impactful SFM/REDD-plus projects and programs. The incentives will only be provided if they leverage contributions and foster convergence of investments from GEF-5 STAR balances in the focal areas of biodiversity, climate change and land degradation directed towards forest activities, with the aim of achieving multiple benefits under more cost-effective strategies.

33. The GEF-5 SFM/REDD-plus program reflects the guidance coming from all three conventions dealing with forests, and for which the GEF is a financial mechanism (UNFCCC, CBD and UNCCD), including the program of work on forests of the CBD, and adopts the evolving consensus around the SFM concept, as embraced by the Collaborative Partnership on Forests (CPF) and stated in the non-legally binding instrument on all types of forests (NLBI) of the United Nations Forum on Forests (UNFF). The approach recognizes SFM as encompassing seven thematic elements: extent of forest resources, biological diversity, forest health and vitality, productive functions of forests, protective functions of forests, socioeconomic functions, and the legal, policy and institutional framework. This broadly defined approach can be applied from production forests, all the way to protected forests and to degraded forests in need of restoration.

34. The allocation of resources to projects and programs on SFM/REDD-plus will draw on a transparent and equitable investment algorithm that finances countries at a ratio of approximately 3:1. In other words, for every three units of investment from STAR resources allocated to a particular country, one unit will be released from the SFM/REDD plus incentive mechanism (the challenge account) to the project being proposed. For example, a country that decides to program \$30 million from combinations of resources from two or three of the eligible focal areas would be endowed with an additional \$9 million originating from the SFM/REDD plus challenge account. A country that decides to allocate \$5 million from its focal area allocations would leverage \$1.5 million from the challenge account. According to GEF projections, a funding envelope of \$250 million, set aside from the allocations of biodiversity, climate change and land degradation, and operating as a challenge account, will be able to mobilize up to \$800 million in country allocations, not considering the leveraging opportunities from other sources triggered by GEF direct investments.

35. Individual countries will be allowed to invest a maximum of \$30 million from their combined allocations. Large allocation countries may also choose to allocate additional resources for forest projects and programs beyond the ceiling used to trigger SFM/REDD plus challenge account investments, but these would not be eligible to be leveraged by the program beyond the \$30 million ceiling. To ensure that countries have access to sufficient funding to invest in SFM at an ecologically and operationally significant scale, each country will be required to invest a minimum of \$2 million from their combined allocations in order to qualify for incentive investments from the challenge account.

36. In sum, the challenge account will be used as an incentive to coalesce and augment multi-sectoral and multi-focal area investments in transformative initiatives in forests. The GEF has a significant comparative advantage in directing the investments that support measures to control and prevent deforestation and forest degradation as essential and cost-effective means to deliver multiple global environmental benefits, including the protection of forest habitats, forest ecosystem services, mitigation of climate change and protection of international waters, reflecting the transversal nature of forests globally. The GEF-5 strategy will better reflect these key synergies, working with and supporting the calls for international cooperation and national action to reduce deforestation, prevent forest degradation, promote sustainable livelihoods and reduce poverty for all forest-dependent peoples. Finally, because the SFM/REDD-plus incentive mechanism will leverage resources additional to those from the biodiversity focal area, this new

program will result in an increment of resources for biodiversity-related projects, a positive outcome for the program of work of CBD.

### E) Summary of Project Activities in Biological Diversity

37. Table Four (4) provides a breakdown of the approved projects by project type during the reporting period. Annexes 1-4 provide a list and summary information on the approved projects.

**Table Four: GEF Projects in the area of biological diversity, including biosafety, approved between January 1, 2008 and June 30, 2010.**

Type of Activity	Number of Activities	GEF Financing (US\$ millions)	Cofinancing (US\$ millions)	Total Financing (US\$ millions)
Enabling Activities <sup>6</sup>	17	4,615,610	1,497,991	6,113,401
Medium Size <sup>7</sup> Projects	89	75,143,489	157,634,035	232,777,524
Full Size Projects	116	450,459,458	1,522,885,814	1,973,345,272
Totals	222	530,218,557	1,682,017,840	2,212,236,197

#### Full-sized Projects

38. Annex Two lists the 116 full-size projects approved during the reporting period. Ninety-three projects are single-country projects, 17 projects are regional and 6 are global. Table Five (5) below summarizes the number of projects per the objectives of the GEF-4 biodiversity strategy.

<sup>6</sup> Enabling activities to support the fourth national report were funded through three MSPs to expedite approvals of the EAs through the project: "Support to GEF Eligible CBD Parties for Carrying out 2010 Biodiversity Targets National Assessments-Phases II and III" and these are reported under the MSP modality.

<sup>7</sup> Three medium-size projects were used as fast-disbursement mechanisms to support enabling activities.

**Table Five. Full-sized Projects Approved Between January 1, 2008 and June 30, 2010 per GEF-4 Biodiversity Strategy Objectives**

<b>Objectives of GEF-4 Biodiversity Strategy</b>	<b>Number of Projects<sup>8</sup></b>	<b>Total GEF budget \$</b>
To catalyze sustainability of protected area Systems (Sustainable financing of PA systems at the national level, Increasing representation of ecosystems, including marine areas, in PA systems, strengthening capacity)	51	220,753,852
To mainstream biodiversity in production landscapes/seascapes and sectors (strengthening the policy and regulatory framework for mainstreaming biodiversity and fostering markets for biodiversity goods and services)	52	202,789,611
To safeguard biodiversity (building capacity for the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety)	5	13,599,766
To safeguard biodiversity (prevention, control and management of invasive alien species)	6	16,730,929
To build capacity on access and benefit sharing	3	6,785,300
Totals	117	460,659,458

### **Medium-sized Projects**

39. Annex Three lists the 89 medium-size projects approved during the reporting period (three are technically enabling activities that used the MSP window to expedite fund disbursement). Seventy-seven (77) of the remaining 80 projects are single-country projects and seven are regional and two are global projects. Table Six (6) below summarizes the number of projects per the objectives of the GEF-4 biodiversity strategy.

---

<sup>8</sup> One project, due to the nature of the intervention strategy which focused on IAS and biosafety, overlapped with more than one objective resulting in the project being counted twice resulting in a total number of 118.

**Table Six. Medium-sized Projects Approved Between January 1, 2008 and June 30, 2010 per GEF-4 Biodiversity Strategy Objectives**

<b>Objectives of GEF-4 Biodiversity Strategy</b>	<b>Number of Projects<sup>9</sup></b>	<b>Total GEF budget \$</b>
To catalyze sustainability of protected area Systems (Sustainable financing of PA systems at the national level, Increasing representation of ecosystems, including marine areas, in PA systems, strengthening capacity)	25	24,202,737
To mainstream biodiversity in production landscapes/seascapes and sectors (strengthening the policy and regulatory framework for mainstreaming biodiversity and fostering markets for biodiversity goods and services)	26	23,168,757
To safeguard biodiversity (building capacity for the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety)	33	24,106,995
To safeguard biodiversity (prevention, control and management of invasive alien species)	0	0
To build capacity on access and benefit sharing	2	1,600,000
Totals	86	73,078,489

### **Enabling Activities**

40. Enabling activities are those activities that assist countries in preparing the foundation for design and implementation of effective response measures to achieve the CBD objectives nationally including the development of National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans (NBSAPs) and programs referred to in Article 6 of the Convention. Enabling activities also support self-assessments of capacity building needs, reporting to the Convention on Biological Diversity, and participation in the clearing house mechanism

41. Annex Four lists the 17 Enabling Activities (EAs) which were approved by the GEF during the reporting period. Three MSPs were approved as global medium-size projects during this reporting period to expedite fund disbursement in support of national reporting. The projects, “Support to GEF Eligible CBD Parties for carrying out 2010 Biodiversity Targets National Assessments –Phases II and III” received \$3.0 million from GEF which leveraged an additional amount of \$ 2.565 in cofinance.

### **Project Preparation Grants**

42. As a first step in project development, the GEF provides financing to assist recipient countries to develop a project concept (PIF) into a project proposal for CEO endorsement. Most of the full-size projects and a number of medium-sized projects have been developed using GEF project preparation grants (PPGs).

<sup>9</sup> One project, due to the nature of the intervention strategy, overlapped with more than one objective resulting in the total project number being higher than the actual number of projects supported.

43. One-hundred and twenty-four (124) project preparation grants were approved in the reporting period amounting to \$ 11,291,738; 107 project preparation grants supported single-country projects, twelve (12) supported regional project design, five (5) supported the development of global projects.

### **Small Grants Programme**

44. The GEF Small Grants Programme (SGP), implemented by UNDP on behalf of the GEF partnership, was launched in 1992. The GEF-SGP supports the implementation of the Convention on Biological Diversity and responds to the request from the COP for a quick, flexible, and responsive delivery modality to support Parties in national implementation of the objectives of the Convention. Through its decentralized governance mechanism, the SGP channels its support through civil society action by providing grants of up to \$50,000 to community based and non-governmental organizations to undertake environmental projects.

45. By the end of its 4th Operational Phase (OP4) in May 2010, SGP had supported a cumulative total of more than 12,760 projects and strengthened more than 9,000 civil society groups in 120 countries across all the GEF focal areas. In the biodiversity focal area, the SGP programming has supported more than 7,039 community-based biodiversity projects totaling \$164 million, which have leveraged a further \$120 million in cash co-financing, and \$112 million in in-kind contributions.

46. During the OP4 reporting period (January 2008 till June 2010)<sup>10</sup> the GEF-SGP funded at least 1,613 new projects in more than 115 countries to support the GEF-4 strategic objectives of biodiversity conservation in and around protected areas, and the sustainable use of biodiversity in production landscapes and seascapes. In relation to the Convention target to support the appropriate governance of protected areas, the SGP supported numerous projects towards the recognition of Indigenous and Community Conserved Areas (ICCAs), including through the launch of a pilot global registry on ICCAs in partnership with the UNEP-WCMC. (UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/14/L.5/10c).

47. The total GEF allocation for these new biodiversity projects amounted to \$43.21 million and leveraged a total of \$51.51 million (in-cash and in-kind) co-financing from various partners around the world. During OP4, over 1,000 SGP biodiversity projects from previous Operational phases were still under implementation. Twenty-two (22) new participating SGP countries were also incorporated into the programme during the period. According to the decision of the GEF Council in November 2009, 10 mature SGP countries with over 15 years of grant-making experience will be upgraded during the GEF-5 cycle through access to an increased level of STAR allocation resources for community-based actions. Further information on the SGP can be found at: [www.undp.org/sgp](http://www.undp.org/sgp)

---

<sup>10</sup> Data compiled on 19 May 2010



## **Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund (CEPF)**

48. During the reporting period, the Critical Ecosystem Partnership fund (CEPF), a partnership of GEF, Conservation International, the Government of Japan, the French Development Agency, the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation and the World Bank, provided funding for 173 projects in nearly 50 countries enabling civil society to protect biodiversity in highly threatened areas. CEPF's investments supported catalyzing sustainability of protected area systems and mainstreaming biodiversity in production landscapes. For example, through support to the Caucasus Protected Areas Fund, approximately \$9.5 million has been mobilized to help cover management costs for protected areas in Armenia, Azerbaijan and the Republic of Georgia and thus secure sustainability of these critical ecosystems in the long run. In South Africa, CEPF support helped potato farmers in the Cape Floristic Region devise agriculture guidelines that protect highly threatened Fynbos while improving farmers' income.

49. The total CEPF investment for biodiversity between January 2008 and March 2010 amounted to \$29.8 million, bringing the program's global investment portfolio since its inception to \$123.9 million and leveraging \$262 million from partners around the world for conserving some of the most biologically rich yet threatened areas of the world.

### **III. Activities in Response to COP Guidance**

#### **A. Summary**

50. All COPs have provided guidance to the GEF on the policy, strategy, program priorities and eligibility criteria to be followed in providing financial assistance to developing country parties for purposes of the Convention. This guidance has been regularly incorporated in GEF policies and operational activities, and GEF responses to the guidance are reported on in each of its reports to the COP.

51. The Ninth Meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity provided further guidance to the GEF.<sup>11</sup> Table Seven (7) below summarizes COP-IX guidance and provides a synopsis of GEF's progress to date in responding to that guidance.

---

<sup>11</sup> Decision IX/11 and IX/31.

**Table Seven. Status of GEF Response Decision IX/11 and IX/31**

COP Decision	GEF Secretariat Response
<p><b>IX/11. Review of implementation of Articles 20 and 21</b></p>	<p><b>A) In-depth review of the availability of financial resources</b></p>
<p><i>Urges</i> the Global Environment Facility to continue to mobilize co-financing and other modes of financing for its projects related to implementation of the Convention, and <i>requests</i> the Global Environment Facility to continue to leverage financial resources to support the Convention’s objectives.</p>	<p>GEF Agencies continue to mobilize co financing as part of all projects, consistent with the principle of incremental costs and the generation of global benefits. These are key requirements of the GEF project review criteria. During GEF-3, on average, each GEF dollar leveraged three other dollars for each biodiversity project.</p> <p>During the reporting period, \$831 million of GEF resources were programmed (inclusive of biodiversity, sustainable forest management, the Earth Fund, multiple focal area projects, the SGP, the CEPF), which leveraged an additional \$3.7 billion, a 1:3.6ratio.</p>
<p><i>Urges</i> Parties, the Global Environment Facility, and relevant organizations to include gender, indigenous peoples and local communities perspectives in the financing of biodiversity and its associated ecosystem services.</p>	<p>The GEF policy on public participation, initiated from the beginning of the GEF, outlines provisions and policies on stakeholder participation including consideration of gender issues and participation of local and indigenous communities at all steps of the GEF project cycle. The GEF has recently conducted studies on both indigenous peoples and gender involvement in GEF projects, which identify opportunities to strengthen GEF approaches and engagement on these issues. As a follow up, the GEF is currently undertaking a study to develop practical guidance to encourage the effective inclusion of socio-economic aspects in GEF projects, with a particular focus on gender. This exercise will help to incorporate appropriate measurement of these aspects in GEF projects and their contribution to the achievements of global environmental benefits. In addition, in collaboration with the civil society organizations (CSOs), including local and indigenous communities, the GEF is engaged in further strengthening its engagement with these partners and a strategy paper is being prepared by the CSOs for discussion at future GEF Council meeting.</p>
<p><b>IX/11. Review of implementation of Articles 20 and 21</b></p>	<p><b>B) Strategy for resource mobilization in support of the achievement of the Convention’s three objectives of the Convention and accompanying Annex I: “Strategy for Resource Mobilization in Support of the Achievement of the Convention’s Three Objectives for the period 2008-2015.”</b></p>
<p>The Global Environment Facility, in collaboration with the Executive Secretary, is invited to consider how it can contribute to the implementation of the strategy for resource mobilization, and report back to the Conference of the Parties through the third meeting of the Working Group on Review of Implementation of the Convention, including consideration of a plan to address the strategy for resource mobilization, in consultation with the GEF implementing agencies.</p>	<p>GEF Secretariat contributed to the WGRI-3 with the following view on this topic: The GEF itself has been an effective mechanism for resource mobilization. GEF has provided grants of about \$2.9 billion which has leveraged \$8.2 billion for biodiversity conservation and sustainable use since GEF’s inception, a total of more than \$11 billion.</p>

COP Decision	GEF Secretariat Response
	<p>With regards to the recently concluded replenishment, the pledged amount of \$1.2 billion should leverage an additional \$3.6 billion over the course of GEF-5, which will result in almost \$5 billion for biodiversity.</p> <p>In the GEF-5 strategy, the Focal Area Set Aside provide countries the opportunity and resources necessary for revising their NBSAPs in accordance with COP recommendations that will arise out of the new strategic plan to be adopted at COP-10. In addition, objective five encourages the integration of NBSAP objectives and targets into other development processes thereby potentially leveraging resources and greater impacts. In our view, the NBSAP should serve as the primary vehicle for prioritization of GEF investments and project interventions to help GEF-recipient countries to achieve the objectives of the CBD at national level. Therefore, the revision of the NBSAP should provide a substantive input to the country resource mobilization strategy as any financing strategy must focus on priorities and opportunities for resource mobilization. As such, support to NBSAPs is the most targeted, tangible and relevant role for the GEF to play in the implementation of a strategy for resource mobilization at the country level.</p> <p>In addition, as part of the recommendations of GEF-5 replenishment, recipient countries will be provided resources if they wish to undertake a <u>voluntary</u> national GEF portfolio identification process to provide a framework for programming GEF resources. This would also provide concrete national level opportunities for countries to leverage resources across GEF focal area to generate multiple environmental benefits, including benefits to biodiversity. In particular, the funding opportunities under GEF's Sustainable Forest Management program provide an excellent opportunity for national level resource mobilization across GEF focal areas along with sectoral financing to generate biodiversity benefits.</p>
<b>IX/31, Financial mechanism B) Input to the Fifth Replenishment</b>	
<p><i>Acknowledges</i> the GEF-4 strategy for biodiversity is a useful starting point for GEF-5 and <i>requests</i> GEF, for the fifth replenishment period, to build on the GEF-4 strategy based on the four-year framework of programme priorities in the annex to the present decision.</p>	<p>GEF took note of the four-year framework approved at COP-9 and used it, as well as the GEF-4 strategy, as the starting point for the GEF-5 strategy.</p> <p>Please see Tables Two and Three in the body of this report and Annex 1 appended to this report.</p>
<b>IX/31, Financial mechanism C) Additional Guidance to the Financial Mechanism</b>	
<p><i>a) Requests</i> the Global Environment Facility, within its mandate, to consider the following guidance, submitted in its entirety in decision IV/5, paragraph 4, of the Fourth Meeting of the Conference of the Parties serving as the Meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety, noting that subparagraph (f) should be considered in the context of the programme priorities in</p>	<p>a) The Evaluation Office conducted an assessment of the GEF support to Biosafety within at least three of its evaluations: Evaluation of GEF support to Biosafety (presented to GEF Council at its November 2005), Midterm review of the Resource Allocation Framework (presented to GEF Council at its November 2008 meeting) and the Fourth Overall Performance Study</p>

<b>COP Decision</b>	<b>GEF Secretariat Response</b>
<p>decision IX/31 of the present decision, and to report back to the Conference of the Parties at its tenth meeting;</p> <p><i>Requests</i> the Global Environment Facility Evaluation Office to assess the impact of the Resource Allocation Framework on the implementation of the Protocol, and propose measures that can minimize potential resource limitations that may affect the implementation of the Protocol including measures that facilitate consideration of regional and subregional projects developed by the countries of the region;</p> <p><i>b) Urges</i> the Global Environment Facility to make financial resources available with a view to enable eligible Parties to prepare their national report;</p> <p><i>c) Urges</i> the Global Environment Facility to extend the UNEP-GEF Biosafety Clearing-House project, in its current form as a global project with a view to ensuring sustainability of national Biosafety Clearing-House nodes and providing more capacity-building support, with special attention to targeted stakeholders (e.g., customs departments and phytosanitary inspectors), and to provide additional funding for these activities from sources other than the Resource Allocation Framework (RAF) taking into consideration the global nature of the project;</p> <p><i>d) Invites</i> the Global Environment Facility, at the request of developing country Governments, to provide financial and other support to enable universities and relevant institutions to develop and/or expand existing biosafety academic programmes and provide scholarships to students from developing country Parties, in particular the least developed and small island developing States among them, and countries with economies in transition;</p> <p><i>e) Requests</i> the Global Environment Facility, to cooperate with and support developing country Parties, in particular the least developed and small island developing States among them, and Parties with economies in transition, in their efforts to build their capacities in the area of sampling and detection of living modified organisms, including the setting up of laboratory facilities and training of local regulatory and scientific personnel;</p> <p><i>f) Requests</i> the Global Environment Facility to consider the following programme funding priority needs for biosafety during the period of its fifth replenishment (2010-2014), where appropriate, using the issue-specific approach and providing longer-term support for building, consolidating and enhancing sustainable human resource capacity: Implementation of legal and administrative systems for notification procedures;</p>	<p>(presented to GEF Council at its June 2009 meeting). Please refer to the GEF Evaluation Office section below for further explanation.</p> <p>b) This would be eligible under enabling activities funded under the focal area set-aside.</p> <p>c) The UNEP-GEF Project for Continued Enhancement of Building Capacity for Effective Participation in the BCH II (UNEP, GEF \$2.5M, co-financing \$2.5M, Total \$5.0M) was approved during the reporting period. Please see Annex 5 of this report for a summary project description.</p> <p>d) The GEF does not provide financial support for this kind of intervention under the Council-approved GEF Biosafety strategy. GEF has never provided this kind of support in the biodiversity focal area given that it is not consistent with the GEF mandate.</p> <p>e) This is currently eligible under the GEF biosafety strategy and is already a part of the ongoing National Biosafety Framework Implementation projects.</p> <p>f) The Council-approved GEF biosafety strategy remains the guiding document for GEF support to CPB implementation. Given that not all countries have finished the second stage of GEF support (implementation of the NBFs), GEF's focus during GEF-5 will be to ensure that all remaining countries will complete their NBF implementation projects.</p> <p>Of the 142 countries that have received financial</p>

COP Decision	GEF Secretariat Response
<p>Risk assessment and risk management; Implementation of enforcement measures including detection of living modified organisms; Implementation of liability and redress measures.</p>	<p>support to develop their NBFs, 71 have projects for its implementation, leaving significant opportunities to provide ongoing support for single country projects to accelerate implementation of the protocol. Within the GEF-5 biosafety strategy allowances are made for thematic and regional projects.</p> <p><b>Regional or sub-regional projects:</b> Providing support to eligible countries through regional or sub-regional projects will be pursued when there are opportunities for cost-effective sharing of limited resources and for coordination between biosafety frameworks. Regional and sub-regional approaches will be pursued where stock-taking assessments support the potential for: coordinating biosafety frameworks, interchange of regional expertise, and capacity building of common priority areas.</p> <p><b>Thematic projects:</b> A thematic approach can be an effective way to develop the capacities of groups of countries lacking competencies in relevant fields. This multi-country approach will be pursued where stock-taking assessments support the needs of eligible countries and where this approach would foster the pooling of resources, economies of scale and international coordination.</p>
<p><i>Requests</i> the Global Environment Facility to assist with the preparation of the Global Biodiversity Outlook, and <i>invites</i> Parties, other Governments and donors, to make timely financial contributions for the preparation and production of the third edition of the Global Biodiversity Outlook and ancillary products. These funds should be provided as early as possible so that the Global Biodiversity Outlook can be finalized in advance of the tenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties, in all United Nations languages, and with a draft available for review at the fourteenth meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice.</p>	<p>Information from the GEF portfolio can always serve as a source of information for the production of the Global Biodiversity Outlook with regards to response measures that GEF has funded in response to biodiversity loss, however, it should be noted that funding for production of these kinds of analyses is not explicitly part of the GEF mandate to fund incremental costs of achieving global environmental benefits.</p>
<p><i>Requests</i> the Global Environment Facility to: Provide support to developing country Parties in the preparation of national assessments of technology needs for implementation of the Convention; Continue to support ongoing national programmes for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity through improved access to and transfer of technology and innovation; Consider possibilities to provide funding under enabling activities for the provision of capacity-building, where needed, on, <i>inter alia</i>: Technologies for conservation and sustainable use; Governance and regulatory frameworks associated with access and transfer of technology and innovation.</p>	<p>The GEF biodiversity strategy provides a series of response measures to biodiversity loss. During the reporting period, and historically, GEF has provided support to project interventions that promote conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity making use of technology and innovation as appropriate.</p> <p>Please also refer to the section in this report on technology transfer and cooperation and the private sector.</p> <p>The GEF Earth Fund (pilot project) is another vehicle for enhancing GEF engagement with the private sector through a matching of GEF resources with private sector resources to catalyze the sustainable generation of global environmental benefits. Its primary role is to</p>

COP Decision	GEF Secretariat Response
	<p>mobilize private capital into projects, technologies and business models that will contribute to the protection of the global environment and to thereby promote environmentally sound and sustainable economic development.</p> <p>The Earth Fund is structured based on the concept of “Platforms” under which a portfolio of individual activities (hereinafter referred to as “projects”) will be managed. The overarching goals of each Platform have to be aligned with GEF focal area strategies, while projects within each Platform will seek to address specific environmental challenges or to leverage particular business models or financial instruments in service of these objectives. This is a delegated structure that allows projects to be approved by GEF Agencies that manage Platforms, once those Platforms have been approved by Council.<sup>12</sup></p> <p>The Earth Platforms relevant to the implementation of the CBD and approved during the reporting period are: (i) the IFC Earth Fund Platform (\$30 million, September 2008); (ii) the WB/Conservation International “Conservation Agreement Private Partnership Platform” (\$5 million, August 2009); (iii) the UNEP/Rainforest Alliance “Greening the Cocoa Industry” (\$5 million, April 2010); and (iv) the IDB/Nature Conservancy “Public-Private Funding Mechanisms for Watershed Protection” (\$5 million, April 2010).</p>
<p><i>Urges</i> the Global Environment Facility and other donors to continue to provide funding to developing country Parties, in particular the least developed countries and small island developing States among them, and countries with economies in transition, for the establishment and updating of their clearing-house mechanisms.</p>	<p>Under the resource allocation framework for GEF-4, and continuing for GEF-5, countries have the option to allocate resources to support the Clearing House Mechanism (CHM) as part of GEF support to enabling activities.</p> <p>In GEF-5, all countries will be able to access up to \$500,000 per country as part of the Focal-Area Set Aside (FAS) for enabling activities, including the CHM.</p>
<p><i>Requests</i> the Global Environment Facility, and <i>urges</i> Governments and other donors to provide funding to developing countries, in particular the least developed countries and small island developing States among them, as well as countries with economies in transition, for the revision and implementation, through projects, of national, and where appropriate, regional biodiversity strategies.</p>	<p>Enabling activity support will be provided from the focal area set-aside funds (FAS) for an amount up to \$500,000 per country for revising NBSAPs in line with the CBD’s new strategic plan to be adopted at COP-10. This could help foster effective use of national biodiversity strategies and action plans (NBSAPs) as tools for mainstreaming biodiversity into national development strategies and programs which responds to Outcomes 4.1 and 4.2 Priority One of the Four-Year Framework of Programme Priorities agreed at COP 9, in Decision IX/31.</p>

<sup>12</sup> Within each Platform, projects are approved through approved operational procedures (submitted to Council with each Platform proposal) which normally allow these projects to be approved consistent with the project cycle of the Agency itself.

COP Decision	GEF Secretariat Response
	All GEF projects have to identify how they are in support of the country's NBSAP. This is a key criterion when assessing GEF support for projects.
<i>Invites</i> the Global Environment Facility, in accordance with its mandate, and other funding institutions and development agencies to provide financial support for the implementation of the ecosystem approach by developing countries, particularly the least developed and small island developing States, and countries with economies in transition, and encourages bilateral and multilateral donor agencies to apply the ecosystem approach in providing aid assistance.	The vast majority of GEF-supported biodiversity projects employ the ecosystem approach.
<i>Requests</i> the Global Environment Facility, and <i>invites</i> Parties, other Governments, and relevant organizations to support capacity-building in developing countries, in particular the least developed and the small island developing States and Parties with economies in transition, for engaging the business community in the implementation of the Convention.	<p>The GEF welcomes engagement of the business community in the implementation of GEF biodiversity projects and GEF-4 has seen an increase of private sector engagement in both biodiversity mainstreaming projects and private sector support to generate increased revenue for protected area management.</p> <p>Please reference description above about GEF activities supported under the Earth Fund and see section in this report under technology transfer.</p>
<i>Reiterates</i> its invitation to the Global Environment Facility, Parties, other Governments and funding organizations to provide adequate and timely financial support to enable the Global Invasive Species Programme to fulfil the tasks outlined in many of its decisions.	<p>The GEF identified invasive alien species as a priority strategic program in GEF-4, Strategic Program 7: "Prevention, control, and management of invasive alien species (IAS)". During the reporting period five projects that addressed invasive alien species (IAS) were approved for a total of \$17,930,929 which leveraged and additional \$29,560,897 in cofinance. These projects addressed IAS in 19 island states.</p> <p>In GEF-5, under Objective Two, GEF will continue to offer support to country-driven projects that seek to respond to COP-guidance vis-à-vis Invasive Alien Species: GEF will support interventions that address the issue of invasive alien species systemically through developing the sectoral policy, regulations, and institutional arrangements for the prevention and management of invasions emphasizing a risk management approach by focusing on the highest risk invasion pathways. Priority will be given to establishing policy measures that reduce the impact of invasive species on the environment, including through prevention of new incursions, early detection and institutional frameworks to respond rapidly to new incursions.</p>
<i>Urges</i> Parties, in particular developed country Parties, and <i>invites</i> other Governments and international financial institutions including the Global Environment Facility, the regional development banks and other multilateral financial institutions to provide the adequate, predictable and timely financial support, to developing country Parties, in particular the least developed countries and small island developing states as well as countries with	The GEF defines a sustainable protected area system as one that: a) has sufficient and predictable financial resources available, including external funding, to support protected area management costs; b) effectively protects ecologically viable representative samples of the country's ecosystems and species at a sufficient scale to ensure their long term persistence; and c) retains adequate individual and institutional capacity to

<b>COP Decision</b>	<b>GEF Secretariat Response</b>
<p>economies in transition, to enable the full implementation of the programme of work on protected areas.</p>	<p>manage protected areas such that they achieve their conservation objectives. GEF support will strengthen these fundamental aspects of protected area systems to accelerate their current trajectory towards long-term sustainability. The GEF-5 strategy provides an array of opportunities for countries to move their protected area system towards sustainability and this is further explained in Annex 1 of this report.</p>
<p><i>Invites</i> the Global Environment Facility to:  Continue to provide, and facilitate easier access to financial resources for protected areas in its biodiversity focal area including projects such as the UNDP/GEF project “Supporting Country Action on the CBD programme of work on protected areas”, so as to extend support to developing countries, in particular the Small Island and Developing States (SIDS) and Least Developed Countries (LDC) among them, and countries with economies in transition, taking into account the goals and targets set in the programme of work;  To consider support for proposals that demonstrate the role-protected areas play in addressing climate change.  To ensure that protected areas remain a priority of the Global Environment Facility for the foreseeable future.</p>	<p>Upon completion of the GEF project, “Supporting Country Action on the CBD programme of work on protected areas”, an independent evaluation of its performance will be conducted, consistent with GEF practice. At this point an assessment will be made on the efficacy of said approaches to supporting PoWPA. During the reporting period, more than 50% of biodiversity resources were directed towards PA management through the GEF’s regular project modalities. Please see Tables 4 and 5 of this report.</p> <p>As noted in the GEF-5 strategy, developing climate-resilient protected area systems remains a challenge for most protected area managers because the scientific understanding and technical basis for informed decision-making on adaptation or resiliency measures is in its nascent stages. To help overcome these technical challenges, GEF will support the development and integration of adaptation and resilience management measures as part of protected area management projects (see paragraph 10 of Annex 1). This support is important to ensure that GEF’s investments will continue to contribute to the sustainability of national protected area systems and responds to Outcome 1.5 of Priority One of the Four-Year Framework of Programme Priorities agreed at COP 9, in Decision IX/31.</p> <p>In the GEF-5 strategy, protected areas remain a priority, and the nominal allocation of GEF-5 resources amount to \$700 million - or almost 60% of the total allocation for biodiversity - for the objective on protected areas in the strategy. Of course, this figure will, in the end, be a reflection of the GEF-5 programming as decided by GEF-recipient countries.</p>

52. The remainder of this section provides updates on past guidance provided to the GEF where there has been considerable and notable activity during the reporting period. In each section, examples of relevant project activities are provided, as appropriate, to illustrate the type of activities being implemented on-the-ground.



53. Annex Five provides a summary of all projects approved during the reporting period and the examples given below are an illustrative but not a comprehensive accounting of all project activities.

54. For further information on each country's GEF portfolio, please refer to the GEF country page on the GEF website: <http://www.gefonline.org/Country/CountryProfile.cfm>.

## **B. Protected Areas: Systemic Approaches to Improving Protected Area Management**

### **Response to Guidance**

55. The GEF is the largest funding mechanism for protected areas worldwide and has invested in over 2,302 protected areas, covering more than 634 million hectares. The GEF has provided more than \$1.89 billion to fund protected areas management, leveraging an additional \$5.95 billion in co-financing from project partners for a total of almost \$8 billion dollars.

56. Guidance on protected areas has been provided by a number of previous COP decisions. The latest guidance is summarized by Decision VIII/18, paragraphs 28-30 and IX/31, B) paragraphs 13 and 14. (Please see summary Table Seven (7) above for response to COP IX guidance).

57. In considering this guidance, the GEF has further strengthened its support to protected areas through the formulation of a more comprehensive strategy on protected areas in GEF-4 that focuses on catalyzing sustainable protected area systems.

58. The GEF defines a sustainable protected area system as one that possesses the following characteristics: a) sufficient and predictable revenue, including external funding, available to support protected area management costs; b) includes coverage of ecologically viable representative samples of ecosystems; and c) has adequate individual, institutional, and systemic capacity in place to manage protected areas such that they achieve their management objectives. Capacity building at the national and local levels to support effective management of individual protected areas and protected area systems will remain an ongoing priority and an integral part of project interventions.

59. Recognizing the important role that indigenous communities play in biodiversity conservation, and in response to COP guidance, the strategy acknowledges the importance of the participation of indigenous and local communities in the design, implementation, management and monitoring of projects to conserve and sustainably use biodiversity. Promoting capacity development of indigenous and local communities is recognized as being particularly relevant as part of GEF's support to catalyzing sustainability of protected areas systems. The strategy supports indigenous and community conserved areas (ICCAs) as part of national systems of protected areas, and as a way to strengthen sustainable management of protected areas systems.<sup>13</sup>

---

<sup>13</sup> Indigenous and Community Conserved Areas (ICCAs) are natural sites, resources and species' habitats conserved in voluntary and self-directed ways by indigenous peoples and local communities.

60. GEF is, therefore, supporting comprehensive interventions that address these three aspects of protected area management in order to catalyze the long-term sustainability of the system. GEF-4 support to catalyzing sustainable protected area systems was channeled through three strategic programs: a) sustainable financing of protected area systems at the national level; b) increasing representation of effectively managed national marine protected area networks in protected area systems; and c) strengthening terrestrial protected area networks.

61. During the reporting period the GEF committed \$ 245 million to 76 projects that supported the improved management of protected areas. These projects received an additional \$ 671 million in cofinancing with each GEF dollar leveraging about \$2.7 dollars of cofinancing.

### **Full-size Projects**

62. Of the 51 full-size protected area projects approved during the reporting period, 12 were dedicated to increasing coverage and improving management of marine protected areas for a total GEF investment of \$ 47,999,754 which leveraged an additional \$116,505,676 in cofinancing.

63. In addition, 17 full-size projects were dedicated to improving the financial sustainability of national protected area systems, for a total GEF investment of \$ 96,467,030 which leveraged an additional \$ 306,069,986 in cofinancing.

### **Medium-size Projects**

64. Of the 25 medium-size protected area projects approved during the reporting period, three (3) were dedicated to increasing coverage and improving management of marine protected areas for a total GEF investment of \$ 2,895,556 which leveraged an additional \$4,764,166 in cofinancing.

65. In addition, 7 medium-size projects were dedicated to improving the financial sustainability of national protected area systems, for a total GEF investment of \$ 6,765,000 which leveraged an additional \$ 23,921,000 in cofinancing.

### **Example of Systemic Approach to Protected Area Management**

66. GEF's strategy to support protected areas has evolved from solely focusing on improving the management effectiveness of single sites to more systemic interventions that make substantial contributions to the functioning of the entire protected area system. The project summarized below that was approved during the reporting period exemplifies this evolving approach.

67. The project, "Sustainable Financing of Ecuador's National System of Protected Areas (SNAP) and Associated Private and Community-managed PA Subsystems" (UNDP, GEF: \$6.4 million, Cofinance: \$ 9.0 million, total: \$15.4 million), has as its long term goal the improved sustainability of the National System of Protected Areas, so that it provides development results through a healthy and sustainable environment and guarantees the Rights of Nature, or

ecosystem rights, as established in the 2008 Constitution. The immediate objective of the project is to institutionalize a financial and operational framework for the expanded Ecuadorian National System of Protected Areas. The project's activities are fully in line with GEF's focus on building institutional and financial sustainability of protected area systems by providing technical assistance to a) design appropriate policies and laws to allow protected areas to manage the entire revenue stream from generation of income to investment; b) establish business plans that include multiple funding sources and have a long-term perspective that matches expenditure to revenue; c) consolidate agencies responsible for managing protected areas with sufficient capacity to manage protected areas based on sound principles of business planning as well as principles of conservation biology; and d) achieve full recognition of the support to protected area conservation and management provided by communities living in and near protected areas. The project's policy development and institutional strengthening actions at the systemic level will be complemented with demonstration of financial sustainability within 9 protected areas representing public (6), private (2), and communal (1) areas. The demonstration sites have been selected based on consultations and comprehensive technical and financial criteria to ensure that in the long term this experience can be strategically upscaled and/or replicated to the whole system.

### **Extending Support to SIDS and LDCs**

68. In the previous reporting period (COP-IX), a global project was approved: "Supporting Country Action on the CBD Programme of Work on Protected Areas (PoWPA)", which directly responded to a request made at COP-8. The GEF provided \$9.4 million, which leveraged co-financing of an additional \$4.04 million. The project considered applications for up to \$150,000 from countries to undertake one or more of 13 critical PoWPA activities. An implementation update follows below. Please also see Annex 6.

69. The entire grant was allocated over the course of five rounds and implementation has continued during this reporting period. The first round allocated funds to 39 projects in 12 countries. The second round allocated funds to 44 projects in 17 countries. The third round allocated funds to 13 projects in seven countries. The fourth round allocated funds to 18 projects in 11 countries. The fifth and final round allocated funds to 11 projects in nine countries. The total number of projects funded is 127 to 47 countries (some countries received more than 1 round of funding).

70. Of the 127 projects funded, 46 are in Least Developed Countries (LDCs) and 52 are from Small Island Developing States (SIDS). 17 of the 47 countries included in the project are LDCs and 19 are SIDS. This distribution was part of a conscious effort to focus on LDCs and SIDS, in direct response to a CoP-8 decision that specifically requested assistance to LDCs and SIDS in the implementation of the Programme of Work on Protected Areas.

## C. Sustainably Using Biodiversity through Mainstreaming

### Response to Guidance

71. GEF's biodiversity strategy in GEF-3 and GEF-4 has complemented support to the sustainable use of biodiversity through protected area management with targeted promotion of biodiversity mainstreaming. Over the long term, the viable conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity will require the sustainable management of a landscape and seascape mosaic that includes protected areas and a variety of other land uses, especially as human pressure on land continues to increase. As noted by the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment, the sustainable use of biodiversity will only be achieved once biodiversity is mainstreamed within production sectors.

72. Although there was no specific guidance with regards to sustainable use from COP IX, support to sustainable use is of increasing importance in GEF's biodiversity portfolio as evidenced by the investment during the reporting period noted in Table Eight (8) below.

**Table Eight. Comparison of Protected Area and Sustainable Use/Mainstreaming Projects Approved Between January 1, 2008 and June 30, 2010 per Number of Projects and Resources**

Objectives of GEF-4 Biodiversity Strategy	Number of Medium and Full-Size Projects	Total GEF budget for Medium and Full-size Projects \$
To catalyze sustainability of protected area Systems (Sustainable financing of PA systems at the national level, Increasing representation of ecosystems, including marine areas, in PA systems, strengthening capacity)	76	244,956,589
To mainstream biodiversity in production landscapes/seascapes and sectors (strengthening the policy and regulatory framework for mainstreaming biodiversity and fostering markets for biodiversity goods and services)	78	225,913,368

73. During the reporting period the GEF committed \$ 225.9 million to 78 projects that supported biodiversity mainstreaming, both figures being comparable to the investments in protected area management. These projects received an additional \$ 928,505,508 million in cofinancing with each GEF dollar leveraging about \$ 4.3 dollars of cofinancing, an expected higher leverage ratio than with the protected area project portfolio.

### Full-size Projects

74. The sectoral breakdown of 52 full-size sustainable-use/mainstreaming projects approved during the reporting period is provided in Table Nine (9) below. Payment for Ecosystem Service schemes are highlighted as a special category.

**Table Nine. Sustainable Use/Biodiversity Mainstreaming Full-size Projects Approved Between January 1, 2008 and June 30, 2010 by Sectors**

Sectors	Number Full-Size Projects	GEF budget for Full-size Projects \$	Cofinancing
Forestry <sup>14</sup>	14	57,305,542	172,912,500
Agriculture	11	33,227,245	71,289,920
Multi-sectoral	10	46,283,112	94,897,954
Marine/coastal resources <sup>15</sup>	6	18,957,075	52,126,000
Water management	4	18,085,000	397,266,000
Payment for Ecosystem Services	3	13,681,637	28,426,000
Fisheries	2	4,050,000	7,518,000
Tourism	1	4,000,000	8,500,000
Energy	1	7,200,000	33,700,000
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>202,789,611</b>	<b>866,636,374</b>

### Medium-Size Projects

75. The sectoral breakdown of 26 medium-size sustainable use/mainstreaming projects approved during the reporting period is provided in Table Ten (10) below. Payment for Ecosystem Service schemes are highlighted as a special category.

<sup>14</sup> These are forestry mainstreaming projects that only used biodiversity resources. SFM projects that received support from multiple GEF focal areas are addressed under the SFM section of the report.

<sup>15</sup> These projects often addressed issues outside of fisheries, per se, including tourism, land-use planning etc, hence are separated out from pure fisheries projects.

**Table Ten. Sustainable Use/Biodiversity Mainstreaming Projects Approved Between January 1, 2008 and June 30, 2010 by Sectors**

Sectors	Number Medium-size Projects	GEF budget for Medium-size Projects \$	Cofinancing
Forestry <sup>16</sup>	5	4,497,272	11,695,000
Agriculture	4	3,422,270	5,160,667
Multi-sectoral	9	8,210,000	18,780,076
Marine/coastal resources <sup>17</sup>	2	1,900,000	8,550,000
Payment for Ecosystem Services	2	1,834,676	2,274,373
Energy	2	1,900,000	5,500,000
Tourism	1	495,449	635,498
Infrastructure	1	909,090	9,273,520
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>23,168,757</b>	<b>61,869,134</b>

76. GEF’s mainstreaming portfolio illustrates that during the reporting period biodiversity mainstreaming in forestry and agriculture were the highest priority of GEF-recipient countries. Given the reliance of rural communities on forest and agricultural resources for sustaining their livelihoods this is not an unexpected result.

77. A particularly compelling project example that demonstrates this relationship is the project in the Philippines, “Partnerships for Biodiversity Conservation: Mainstreaming in Local Agricultural Landscapes” (UNDP, GEF: \$4.5 million, Confinance: \$9.1 million, Total: \$ 13.6 million). The project seeks to assist Local Government Units (LGUs) in critical eco-regions of the Philippines to better incorporate the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity in their development planning systems and economic growth strategies. The current National Integrated Protected Areas System (NIPAS) excludes other areas of critical connective habitat and other sites which are globally significant for biodiversity conservation (Key Biodiversity Areas). The result is a highly fragmented landscape, consisting of unsustainable agricultural and natural resources production systems and incompatible land uses which further expose the remaining natural habitats to threats. To arrest fragmentation and ensure that activities in the surrounding landscape conserve species assemblages and maintain ecosystem functions, three major capacity constraints will be addressed in this project: (i) inadequate policies, systems, tools and capacities by government agencies at the national level to support local government unit (LGU) landscape level biodiversity conservation efforts; (ii) weak capacities and lack of tools by LGUs for mainstreaming biodiversity in landscape level and local development planning; and (iii) failure to integrate biodiversity concerns into local development planning, leading to unsustainable management of the surrounding landscape. The proposed project will directly address these barriers through an integrated approach aimed at strengthening enabling policies at the national

<sup>16</sup> These are forestry mainstreaming projects that only used biodiversity resources. SFM projects that received support from multiple GEF focal areas are addressed under the SFM section of the report.

<sup>17</sup> These projects often addressed issues outside of fisheries, per se, including tourism, land-use planning etc, hence are separated out from pure fisheries projects.

level; enhancing capacities of LGUs, and mainstreaming demonstrations at eight pilot sites covering 700,000 hectares across five critical biogeographic regions (Luzon, Palawan, Negros-Panay, Mindoro and Mindanao).

## **D. Biosafety**

### **Response to Guidance**

78. At its third meeting, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety (COP-MOP) adopted decision BS-III/5 on matters related to the financial mechanism and resources. This decision included recommendations to the eighth meeting of the Conference of the Parties (COP) to the CBD regarding further guidance to the financial mechanism with respect to biosafety. The COP conveyed the recommendations to the GEF in paragraphs 9 to 13 of its Decision VIII/18 on guidance to the financial mechanism. This decision urged the GEF to support in-country, regional and sub-regional stock-taking studies to better plan future assistance; and requested the GEF to support long-term training in risk management, risk assessment and LMO detection techniques; awareness-raising, public participation and information sharing; coordination and harmonization of National Biosafety Frameworks (NBFs) at regional and sub-regional levels; sustainable participation in the Biosafety Clearance House; transfer and joint development of technology in risk assessment, risk management, monitoring and detection of LMOs; development and implementation of NBFs; development of technical, financial, and human capacity; implementation of the revised Action Plan for Building Capacities for the Effective Implementation of the CPB; and facilitation of the consultative information-gathering process leading to the preparation of national reports under the Protocol.

79. In Decision BS-III/5 the COP-MOP encouraged the GEF and the Executive Secretary of the Convention to continue their strong collaboration in advancing support to the implementation of the Protocol and to further develop its funding modalities for organizing its support to the Protocol in a systematic and flexible manner.

80. Pursuant to the above request the GEF Secretariat, in collaboration with the GEF agencies, prepared a biosafety strategy based on guidance received from the Conference of the Parties. It also took into account GEF's mandate, lessons emerging from the experience to date with the implementation of the projects funded under the GEF's Initial strategy for Assisting Countries to Prepare for the Entry into Force of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety (CPB), the results of the independent evaluation of GEF's support to the CPB, prepared by the GEF Evaluation Office, inputs received from the GEF Council, and inputs received at a consultative session held in conjunction with the COP/MOP-3 in Curitiba (Brazil).

81. The GEF Council, at its meeting in December 2006, reviewed and approved the Strategy for Financing Biosafety (GEF/C.30/8/Rev.1<sup>18</sup>) as an interim basis for the development of projects for implementation of the CPB until the Council approved the focal area strategies and invited the GEF agencies, under the coordination of the GEF Secretariat and based on their comparative

---

<sup>18</sup> [http://www.gefweb.org/documents/council\\_documents/GEF\\_30/documents/C.30.8.Rev.1StrategyforFinancingBiosafety.pdf](http://www.gefweb.org/documents/council_documents/GEF_30/documents/C.30.8.Rev.1StrategyforFinancingBiosafety.pdf)

advantages, to collaborate with the GEF to provide assistance to countries for the implementation of the Protocol.

82. In March 2007, the GEF CEO invited UNEP to take the lead role, in close collaboration with the GEF Secretariat, in the development of a strategic approach for programming resources for biosafety capacity-building during GEF-4. In September 2007, the GEF Council approved the biosafety strategy as part of the Biodiversity Focal Area Strategy and Strategic Programming for GEF-4.<sup>19</sup>

83. A Program Document for GEF Support to Biosafety in GEF-4 was approved by GEF Council at its April 2008 meeting. The Program shapes the GEF strategy for financing biosafety under GEF-4 and beyond, through which GEF Agencies with a comparative advantage in biosafety can provide support to countries.

84. Please see summary Table Seven above for response to COP IX, (C) guidance on biosafety.

### **Project Support During the Reporting Period**

85. During the reporting period, GEF approved 37 projects for the Implementation of National Biosafety Frameworks (NBF) and related obligations to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety which covered 46 countries totaling \$35.2 million while leveraging co-financing of \$43.0 million for a total of \$78.2 million. The GEF approved all biosafety proposals presented during the reporting period that met GEF's funding criteria.

86. The GEF also approved a project in support of the Biosafety Clearing House during the reporting period in response to guidance from COP/Decision/IX/31. This project will provide further assistance in strengthening the national capacities to effectively access and use of the Biosafety Clearing House (BCH) in up to 50 countries. This project will promote regional and sub-regional collaboration, networking and exchange of experience for national and regional BCH management. The GEF contributed \$2.5 million and leveraged an additional \$2.5 million in co-financing.

87. The GEF will continue supporting the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety during GEF-5 under objective three of the biodiversity strategy. The GEF will support single-country projects that implement National Biosafety Frameworks, regional or sub-regional projects and thematic projects that develop the capacities of groups of countries lacking competencies in relevant fields. Table 11 provides a list of biosafety projects approved during the reporting period.

---

<sup>19</sup> [http://www.gefweb.org/uploadedFiles/Focal\\_Areas/Biodiversity/GEF-4%20strategy%20BD%20Oct%202007.pdf](http://www.gefweb.org/uploadedFiles/Focal_Areas/Biodiversity/GEF-4%20strategy%20BD%20Oct%202007.pdf)



**Table 11: Biosafety Projects approved during the reporting period January 1, 2008 and June 30, 2010**

Agency	Country	Project Type	Project Title	GEF Grant (\$)	Cofinancing (\$)	Total (\$)
UNEP	Albania	MSP	Capacity Building for the Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework	558,000	306,600	864,600
UNEP	Bangladesh	MSP	Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework	884,090	533,300	1,417,390
UNEP	Bhutan	MSP	Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework of Bhutan	869,000	854,000	1,723,000
UNEP	Cambodia	MSP	BS Building Capacity for the Detection and Monitoring of LMOs in Cambodia Biosafety Program	656,528	1,000,000	1,656,528
UNEP	Cameroon	FSP	BS Development and Institution of A National Monitoring and Control System (Framework) for Living Modified Organisms (LMOs) and Invasive Alien Species (IAS)	2,400,000	8,400,000	10,800,000
UNEP	Costa Rica	MSP	BS Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework	718,873	750,102	1,468,975
UNEP	Cuba	MSP	Completion and Strengthening of the Cuban National Biosafety Framework for the Effective Implementation of the Cartagena Protocol	900,091	895,800	1,795,891
UNEP	Ecuador	MSP	Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework	665,818	660,824	1,326,642
UNEP	El Salvador	MSP	Contributing to the Safe use of Biotechnology	900,000	1,025,000	1,925,000
UNEP	Ethiopia	MSP	Implementation of Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety through Effective	600,000	700,000	1,300,000

Agency	Country	Project Type	Project Title	GEF Grant (\$)	Cofinancing (\$)	Total (\$)
			Implementation of National Biosafety Framework			
UNEP	Ghana	MSP	BS Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework for Ghana	636,364	800,000	1,436,364
UNEP	Global	FSP	Project for Continued Enhancement of Building Capacity for Effective Participation in the BCH II	2,500,000	2,515,000	5,015,000
UNEP	Guatemala	MSP	Development of Biosafety Mechanisms to Strengthen the Implementation of the Cartagena Protocol in Guatemala	616,364	490,020	1,106,384
UNEP	India	FSP	BS Capacity Building on Biosafety for Implementation of the Cartagena Protocol - Phase II under the Biosafety Program	2,727,273	6,000,000	8,727,273
UNEP	Indonesia	MSP	Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework	830,196	709,200	1,539,396
UNEP	Iran	MSP	Building National Capacity to Implement the National Biosafety Framework of Islamic Republic of Iran and the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety	749,000	851,000	1,600,000
UNEP	Jordan	MSP	Support for the Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework for Jordan	\$884,000	\$905,000	\$1,789,000
UNEP	Lao PDR	MSP	Support the Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework of LAO PDR	995,000	505,000	1,500,000

Agency	Country	Project Type	Project Title	GEF Grant (\$)	Cofinancing (\$)	Total (\$)
UNEP	Lesotho	MSP	Support the Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework of Lesotho	884,806	166,888	1,051,694
UNEP	Liberia	MSP	Support the Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework of Liberia	577,679	530,000	1,107,679
UNEP	Libya	MSP	Support the Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework for Libya	908,100	950,000	1,858,100
UNEP	Macedonia	MSP	Support to the Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework	407,000	236,000	643,000
UNEP	Madagascar	MSP	Support for Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework of Madagascar	613,850	290,000	903,850
UNEP	Mongolia	MSP	Capacity Building for Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework	381,800	335,000	716,800
UNEP	Mozambique	MSP	Support to the Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework of Mozambique	755,000	188,750	943,750
UNEP	Namibia	MSP	Institutional Capacity Building towards the implementation of the Biosafety Act 2006 and related obligations of the CPB	510,000	396,000	906,000
UNEP	Nigeria	MSP	Support for the Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework of Nigeria	965,000	1,046,000	2,011,000
UNEP	Panama	MSP	Consolidation of National Capacities for the Full Implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety	954,927	1,000,000	1,954,927

Agency	Country	Project Type	Project Title	GEF Grant (\$)	Cofinancing (\$)	Total (\$)
			in Panama			
UNEP	Peru	MSP	Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework	811,804	900,000	1,711,804
World Bank	Regional	MSP	Latin-America: Communication and Public Awareness Capacity-Building for Compliance with the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety	900,000	1,020,000	1,920,000
UNEP	Regional (Antigua And Barbuda, Barbados, Dominica, St. Kitts And Nevis, St. Lucia, Trinidad and Tobago, St. Vincent and Grenadines)	FSP	BS Regional Project for Implementing National Biosafety Frameworks in the Caribbean Sub-region - under the GEF Biosafety Program	3,344,043	3,767,950	7,111,993
UNEP	Regional (Bahamas, Belize, Grenada, Guyana, Suriname)	FSP	BS Implementation of National Biosafety Frameworks in Caribbean Sub Region Countries of Bahamas, Belize, Grenada, Guyana and Suriname in the Context of a Regional Project	2,628,450	3,150,674	5,779,124
UNEP	Rwanda	MSP	Support to the Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework for Rwanda	645,455	969,085	1,614,540
UNEP	Syria	MSP	Support to the Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework for Syria	875,000	953,000	1,828,000
UNEP	Tajikistan	MSP	Support to the Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework of Republic of	\$840,000	540,000	1,380,000

Agency	Country	Project Type	Project Title	GEF Grant (\$)	Cofinancing (\$)	Total (\$)
			Tajikistan			
UNEP	Turkey	MSP	Support to the Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework	542,650	750,000	1,292,650
UNEP	Turkmenistan	MSP	Capacity Building for the Development of the National Biosafety Framework	284,600	167,625	452,225
			Budget total	36,920,761	45,257,818	82,178,579

## E. Invasive Alien Species (IAS)

### Response to Guidance

88. The Millennium Ecosystem Assessment identified the spread of invasive alien species as one of the five major direct drivers of change in biodiversity and ecosystems, particularly in island ecosystems. In addition, invasive alien species can markedly decrease outputs in productive systems (e.g., agriculture, forestry, fisheries) when alien species become invasive weeds, pests, and diseases.<sup>20</sup>

89. Guidance on invasive alien species has been provided by a number of previous COP decisions. The latest guidance is summarized by Decision IX/31, C) paragraphs 12. (Please see summary Table Seven (7) above for response to COP IX guidance).

90. In recognition of the importance of addressing the threat IAS pose, since its inception the GEF has supported fifty-three projects that address the threat of invasive alien species amounting to about \$315 million in GEF grants.

91. Within the biodiversity strategy for GEF-4, Strategic Program 7: Prevention, Control, and Management of Invasive Alien Species” was developed to provide a specific funding window for projects that will support a) strengthening the enabling policy and institutional environment for cross-sectoral prevention and management of invasions; b) implementing communication and prevention strategies that emphasize a pathways and ecosystem approach to managing invasions; c) developing and implementing appropriate risk analysis procedures for non-native species importations; d) developing and implementing early detection and rapid response procedures for

<sup>20</sup> Figure 4.3 Millennium Ecosystem Assessment, 2005: General Synthesis: Ecosystems and Human Well-being. Island Press, Washington D.C. Other Millennium Assessment reports such as Living beyond our means: Statement of the Board of the MA. 2005. Washington D.C.

management of nascent infestations; and e) managing priority alien species invasions in pilot sites to ensure conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity.

### **Project Support During the Reporting Period**

92. During the reporting period five projects that addressed invasive alien species (IAS) were approved for a total of \$17,930,929 which leveraged and additional \$29,560,897 in cofinance. These projects addressed IAS in 19 island states. These projects addressed IAS in 19 island states.

93. A project in Sri Lanka will implement the integrated systemic approaches called for in COP guidance and embedded in GEF's IAS strategy. The project, "Strengthening Capacity to Control the Introduction and Spread of Alien Invasive Species" (UNDP, GEF: \$1.82 million, Cofinance: \$ 3.145 million, Total: \$ 4.695 million), will strengthen institutional and planning capacities in Sri Lanka to prevent the introduction, and enhance the detection of IAS at key entry points *and* implement effective controls against their further entry and spread, based on a multi-stakeholder approach which mainstreams instruments for their control across relevant sectors. The project aims to i) build capacity and foster enhanced communication among the multiple stakeholders whose actions impact on the introduction and spread of IAS; ii) foster an enabling policy, institutional and planning environment for effective and informed joint action; and iii) generate and share knowledge about the rationale, need and specific techniques and best practices to tackle IAS in Sri Lanka.

## **F. Access to genetic resources and fair and equitable sharing of benefits (ABS)**

### **Response to Guidance**

94. The GEF-4 strategy included a specific objective and strategic program on access and benefit sharing that incorporated previous COP guidance. In recognition of the incipient phase of ABS under the CBD during GEF-4, and before an international regime on ABS is adopted, GEF provided support capacity building of governments for meeting their obligations under Article 15 of the CBD, as well as building capacity within key stakeholder groups, including indigenous and local communities, and the scientific community. This strategic program sought to support the establishment of measures that promote concrete access and benefit sharing agreements that recognize the core ABS principles of Prior Informed Consent (PIC) and Mutually Agreed Terms (MAT) including the fair and equitable sharing of benefits. Projects in this strategic program were to be consistent with the Bonn Guidelines on Access to Genetic Resources and the Fair and Equitable Sharing of Benefits Arising out of their Utilization and the related action plan on capacity building for ABS adopted under the Convention.

95. Through regular project support since its inception and through the period of GEF-3 the GEF has funded more than fifty projects for a total of \$229 million in GEF grants to support ABS issues. The grants leveraged approximately \$580 million in co-financing from various partners, a total of \$ 809 million.

## **Project Support During the Reporting Period**

96. In response to the establishment of the objective for ABS during GEF-4, the GEF approved five projects during the reporting period for a total of \$8.4 million which leveraged \$10.4 million in co-financing.

97. Three regional projects (Africa, Latin American and the Caribbean, and Asia) assisting a total of 40 countries, and two country-based projects, one in India and the other in Ethiopia were approved. These projects are focusing on developing national ABS policies and regulations, strengthening the capacity of stakeholders and institutions on ABS, and building public awareness on ABS issues.

98. The GEF has also supported ABS through Enabling Activities in Morocco, Pakistan and Mozambique, with a total investment of \$0.7 million. Hence, total investment in ABS was \$9.1 million of GEF resources.

99. These were the only ABS projects presented for approval during the reporting period.

## **G. Marine/Coastal Biodiversity and Island Biodiversity**

### **Response to Guidance**

100. During GEF-4, GEF sought to play a catalytic role in increasing representation of marine ecosystems within national protected area systems through a specific strategic program, “Increasing Representation of Effectively Managed Marine Protected Areas in Protected Area Systems”. Under this strategic program, the GEF encouraged country-level efforts to address the marine ecosystem coverage gap within national level systems including the creation and management of national coastal and marine protected area networks (near shore), including no-take zones, to conserve marine biodiversity, enhance long-term fisheries management, contribute to local livelihoods, help hedge against natural disasters, and mitigate the effects of global climate change.

101. Although there was no specific guidance with regards to marine/coastal biodiversity or island biodiversity from COP IX, support to these thematic areas is of increasing importance in GEF’s biodiversity portfolio as evidenced by the investment during the reporting period noted below.

### **Project Support During the Reporting Period**

102. As noted above, GEF support during the reporting period to marine biodiversity conservation and sustainable use through improving the coverage and management of marine protected areas totaled about \$67.7 million of GEF resources through 21 projects which amounted to about 28% of the total GEF investment in protected areas during the reporting period. These 21 projects leveraged and additional \$ 171.8 million in cofinancing for a total investment of almost \$240 million in marine protected area management.

103. For example, in Colombia, the project, “Protecting Biodiversity in the Southwestern Caribbean Sea, (IADB, GEF: \$ 3.0M, Cofinance: \$ 4.15 M, Total: \$ 7.15 M), seeks to conserve and sustainably use important marine and coastal ecosystems and biodiversity in the Caribbean Sea through the effective implementation of the Integrated Management Plan of the Seaflower Marine Protected Area (San Andres Archipelago). Through the effective implementation of the Seaflower MPA’s integrated management plan, including a plan to cover 100% of the recurrent costs of the MPA thus assuring operational sustainability, the project will contribute to the protection of 65,000km<sup>2</sup> of marine and coastal habitat that contains globally important marine ecosystems and biodiversity, including vulnerable, threatened and endangered species. The MPA’s coral reefs, in particular, make up one of the most extensive and productive reef systems in the Western Hemisphere. The MPA is found within the Western Caribbean Coral Reef Hotspot, one of the world’s top ten regions exceptionally rich in marine species. The MPA will also serve as a model for MPAs managed by other regional development authorities, thus elevating the potential for additional global benefits.

104. At a MPA system level, for example, in Costa Rica, the GEF approved the project, Costa Rica, Consolidating Costa Rica’s Marine Protected Areas (MPAs). (UNDP, GEF: \$1.2 M, \$ 17.862 M, Total: \$ 19. 074 M), during the reporting period. This project will consolidate Costa Rica’s marine protected areas (MPAs) by increasing their ecological representation and ensuring their effective management and financial sustainability through the establishment of a trust fund for MPAs. In addition, the project will help to reduce threats to marine biodiversity by: (1) promoting sustainable fisheries and tourism and coordinating actions with these sectors as part of Costa Rica’s National Marine Strategy; (2) protecting key habitats to prevent their degradation; and (3) identifying MPAs that are most affected by climate change, incorporating climate change mitigation and adaptation into their management plans, and the preliminary monitoring of affected key species and ecosystems.

105. In addition, GEF support during the reporting period to sustainable use of marine biodiversity through biodiversity mainstreaming totaled \$ 28,907,075 through 11 projects which leveraged \$ 76,694,000 of cofinancing.

106. In sum, through the biodiversity focal area the total investment in marine biodiversity was about \$ 97 million – or about 21% of the total amount invested in protected areas and mainstreaming during the reporting period – which leveraged an additional \$ 316 million, a total of \$ 413 million. Please also see Section IV on the International Waters Focal Area portfolio.

107. In addition, please note support provided to 19 Island States to address the issue of invasive alien species, the primary driver of biodiversity loss in island ecosystems.

## **H. Strategic Plan of the Convention**



## **Response to Guidance**

108. COP VII developed a framework to enhance the evaluation of achievement and progress in the implementation of its Strategic Plan and, in particular, its mission to achieve a significant reduction in the current rate of biodiversity loss at global, regional and national levels. It also identified provisional indicators for assessing progress towards the 2010 biodiversity target. This plan contains four strategic goals and objectives addressed in the Annex of Decision VI/26 as follows: a) The Convention is fulfilling its leadership role in international biodiversity issues; b) Parties have improved financial, human, scientific, technical and technological capacity to implement the Convention; c) National biodiversity strategies and action plans (NBSAPs) and the integration of biodiversity concerns into relevant sectors serve as an effective framework for the implementation of the objectives of the Convention; and d) There is a better understanding of the importance of biodiversity and of the Convention, and this has led to broader engagement across society in implementation.

109. At COP VII, the GEF received guidance on this issue in Decision VII/20, paragraph 11. In responding to this guidance, the GEF supported the project “Building the Partnership to Track Progress at the Global Level in Achieving the 2010 Biodiversity Target” (UNEP, GEF: \$ 3.95 million, Cofinancing: \$ 1.38), which was approved during the previous reporting period for COP IX and is currently under implementation.

110. The GEF also linked its own portfolio output and outcome indicators for the GEF-3 and GEF-4 biodiversity strategy to the CBD 2010 global biodiversity indicators.

111. Although no specific guidance on the Strategic Plan was given to the GEF during COP IX, the GEF has clearly identified in the GEF-5 strategy support for the revision of the NBSAPs in order for countries to respond to the new strategic plan to be agreed at COP-10. Enabling activity support will be provided from the focal area set-aside funds (FAS) for an amount up to \$500,000 per country for revising NBSAPs in line with the CBD’s new strategic plan to be adopted at COP-10, national reporting, and implementation of guidance related to the CHM.

112. In addition, a key refinement of the GEF’s mainstreaming strategy in GEF-5 is the opportunity provided under strategy objectives two and five (“Integrate CBD Obligations into National Planning Processes through Enabling Activities”) to support the integration of the objectives of the National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plans into sectoral planning documents (see paragraphs 22, 28 and 40 in Annex 1). This could help foster effective use of national biodiversity strategies and action plans (NBSAPs) as tools for mainstreaming biodiversity into national development strategies and programs which responds to Outcomes 4.1, 4.2 Priority One of the Four-Year Framework of Programme Priorities agreed at COP 9, in Decision IX/31.

## **I. Technology Transfer and Cooperation and the Private Sector**

## Response to Guidance and Project Support During the Reporting Period

113. Guidance on technology transfer and cooperation has been provided by a number of previous COP decisions. The latest guidance was received in COP IX/31, C) paragraph 7. (Please see summary Table Seven (7) above for response to COP IX guidance).

114. The GEF biodiversity strategy provides a series of response measures to biodiversity loss. During the reporting period, and historically, GEF has provided support to project interventions that promote conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity making use of technology and innovation as appropriate and through engagement with the private sector.

115. Technology transfer and cooperation is often a significant element of most GEF biodiversity projects and has been exemplified during the reporting period through projects such as the following examples:

116. In the project, China, Integrated Ecosystem and Water Resources Management in the Baiyangdian Basin in China (ADB, GEF \$2.975M, Cofinancing \$276.11M, Total project \$279M) the project aims to integrate ecosystem and water management to conserve biodiversity and improve environmental conditions in the Baiyangdian Basin. A key activity of the conservation component of the project is the establishment of 12 pilot projects that demonstrate sustainable use through viable eco-tourism enterprises and sustainable harvesting, processing and marketing of natural products.

117. The objective of the project, Mainstreaming Agro-biodiversity Conservation in the Farming Systems of Ethiopia (UNDP, GEF \$3.8M, co-financing \$4.7M, Total \$8.5M) is to mainstream conservation of agro-biodiversity resources farming systems. Ethiopia, and the surrounding countries in the “Horn of Africa”, is recognized as one of the eight Vavilov Centers, the original centers of domesticated plants. The project will invest in the following activities: Enabling policy and institutional framework supporting in-situ conservation of agro-biodiversity and wild crop relatives in 4 sites totaling 750,000 ha., the identification and promotion of market incentives to increase trading in agro-biodiversity friendly products, and conserving Crop Wild Relatives *in-situ* gene bank or set aside areas to ensure that farming systems integrate CWR areas into overall landscape plans. Five in-situ gene banks covering a total of 500,000 ha will be established to protect the wild relatives of 5 important crops (wild coffee, ensette, teff, sesame, and nough seed).

118. The objective of the project, Biodiversity Conservation in Multiple-Use Forest Landscapes in Sabah, Malaysia (UNDP, GEF: 4,4M, Cofinancing: 8.8M, Total: 13.2M) is to demonstrate and begin to institutionalize a multiple-use forest landscape planning and management model which brings the management of critical protected areas and connecting landscapes under a common management umbrella, implementation of which is sustainably funded by revenues generated within the area. The project is expected to serve as a model where the forest can be managed viably by achieving an optimal balance across potentially competing uses – one which maximizes economic, social and environmental benefits to society. Lessons from the project will be used to develop guidelines and best practices to upscale the approach in other forest landscapes within the State and in other parts of Malaysia and the Heart of Borneo.

The project has three components: 1) State-level policies, regulations and institutional and human capacities provide an enabling environment for optimized multiple use zoning, planning, financing and management, 2) Demonstration of multiple-use forest landscape planning and management system, 3) Demonstration of innovative sustainable financing methods for multiple use forest landscape management.

119. The global project (Chile, Lesotho, Trinidad and Tobago, Vietnam, South Africa), Project for Ecosystem Services (ProEcoServ) (UNEP, GEF \$6.3M, co-financing \$14.0M, Total \$20.3M) aims to pilot the bundling of ecosystem services and the integration of ecosystem services approaches in natural resources management and decision making. The overall goal of the project is to better integrate ecosystem assessment, scenario development and economic valuation of ecosystem services into national sustainable development planning. Within this overall approach, each individual country will develop a specific set of activities that take into account the particularities of the national institutional and policy framework as well as its ecosystems.

120. In Costa Rica, the project, Integrated Management of Marine and Coastal Resources in Puntarenas, (IADB, GEF: \$ 3.0 M, Cofinance: \$ 8.813 M, Total: \$ 1.813 M), seeks to promote the integrated planning and management of marine and coastal ecosystems in the Multiple-Use Marine Areas (MUMAs) Golfo de Nicoya and Pacífico Sur (Puntarena Province), with the goal of conserving important biodiversity, maintaining the provision of crucial ecosystem services, and providing a basis for sustainable socioeconomic development through tourism, artisanal fishing and other income generating activities at the local scale. The project will achieve this by: strengthening key regulations of the fisheries sector, implementation of sustainable financial mechanisms (fees mainly) to support increased levels of management activities, improving the sustainability of productive activities within the two MUMAs, particularly those of the tourism and artisanal fishing sectors. With respect to tourism, the project will expand Costa Rica's existing Sustainable Tourism Certification (CTS) to marine and coastal resource-based activities and to train tourism entrepreneurs in the two MUMAs in the application of the newly developed sustainability standards within their own operations. The extensive continental shelf off the Pacific coast of Costa Rica and the coastal ecosystems of the Golfo de Nicoya, Golfo Dulce and the Térraba-Sierpe wetland system in Puntarenas Province provide for a particularly rich marine and coastal biodiversity and high level of productivity. Out of the seven marine ecoregions that extend from Mexico to Ecuador, the Nicoya Ecoregion where the project will be implemented is considered the most valuable in terms of its biodiversity.

### **Earth Fund of the GEF**

121. Of particular interest with regards to fostering technology transfer and cooperation, is the Earth Fund of the GEF which explicitly engages the business community in support of implementation of the Convention. The 2006 private sector strategy documents included an innovative proposal to establish a pilot public-private partnership (PPP) initiative to enhance GEF engagement with the private sector. Private sector engagement outside of the resource allocation system was proposed, given the increased difficulty in inducing countries to allocate resources to promote private sector engagement since the RAF was operationalized. A pilot PPP concept was approved by the GEF Council in June 2007 along with a funding allocation of \$50

million. After detailed negotiations with the IFC as a strategic partner, the concept was further developed as a pilot project, was renamed the GEF Earth Fund, and was approved by Council in May 2008.<sup>21</sup>

122. The GEF Earth Fund (pilot project) is a vehicle for enhancing GEF engagement with the private sector through a matching of GEF resources with private sector resources to catalyze the sustainable generation of global environmental benefits. Its primary role is to mobilize private capital into projects, technologies and business models that will contribute to the protection of the global environment and to thereby promote environmentally sound and sustainable economic development.

123. The Earth Fund allows the GEF to demonstrate ways to more systematically engage with the private sector outside of the constraints of the resource allocation system in order to reach beyond its traditional boundaries, foster innovation, open and develop new markets, and demonstrate the potential for strategic partnerships to achieve a greater scale of investment than generally achievable through the normal GEF project cycle. Private sector engagement will also continue outside of the Earth Fund through implementation of the GEF focal area strategies.

124. The Earth Fund is structured based on the concept of “Platforms” under which a portfolio of individual activities (hereinafter referred to as “projects”) will be managed. The overarching goals of each Platform have to be aligned with GEF focal area strategies, while projects within each Platform will seek to address specific environmental challenges or to leverage particular business models or financial instruments in service of these objectives. This is a delegated structure that allows projects to be approved by GEF Agencies that manage Platforms, once those Platforms have been approved by Council.<sup>22</sup>

125. The GEF Council has approved all of the existing \$50 million GEF funding allocation (excluding Agency fees) for five Earth Fund Platforms. The Earth Platforms relevant to the implementation of the CBD are: (i) the IFC Earth Fund Platform (\$30 million, September 2008); (ii) the WB/Conservation International “Conservation Agreement Private Partnership Platform” (\$5 million, August 2009); (iii) the UNEP/Rainforest Alliance “Greening the Cocoa Industry” (\$5 million, April 2010); and (iv) the IDB/Nature Conservancy “Public-Private Funding Mechanisms for Watershed Protection” (\$5 million, April 2010).

### **Save our Species**

126. The conservation of threatened species serves many purposes beyond preventing the extinction of species science knows are on the verge of disappearing forever. These include raising public awareness, coalescing local communities around the plight of biodiversity conservation and protecting the habitats of many other less known species. Also, when the tide

---

<sup>21</sup> The GEF Earth Fund was established as a result of two Council documents, “*The Public Private Partnership Initiative: Furthering the GEF Strategy to Enhance Engagement with the Private Sector*”, approved by the Council in June 2007, and “*The GEF Earth Fund: (formerly) The Public Private Partnership Initiative: Furthering the GEF Strategy to Enhance Engagement with the Private Sector*”, approved by circulation to Council in May 2008

<sup>22</sup> Within each Platform, projects are approved through approved operational procedures (submitted to Council with each Platform proposal) which normally allow these projects to be approved consistent with the project cycle of the Agency itself.

shifts for a particular species, it is often the case that natural resources management has taken a more sustainable path, and at various levels. This is also an indication that capable institutions are being established, that adequate governing mechanisms are beginning to be put in place, and that ecosystem services, such as clean water and soil fertility, are being provided by the local habitat.

127. The conservation community has made great strides in protecting globally relevant species, but there is a vital missing link that must be brought in for effective scaling up of these efforts - meaning the private sector. The Save Our Species is a program was established by the GEF (GEF \$4.9M, Cofinancing \$8.89M, Total project \$13.79M, the World Bank (WB) and the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) as a scalable response to a global natural emergency that is explicitly built around the notion that business and corporations that have built their logos and brands inspired by thousands of species worldwide have a vested interest in becoming involved in this immediate crisis. The World Bank and GEF have each contributed about \$5 million to initiate the project, with the objective of matching these funds through private sector engagement, with the vision of building a large species conservation fund by 2015. The SOS initiative will become operational in the second semester of 2010 with the disbursement of the first batch of grants.

## **J. National Reporting**

### **Response to Guidance**

128. The objective of national reporting, as specified in Article 26 of the Convention, is to provide information on measures taken for the implementation of the Convention and the effectiveness of these measures. The national reporting process is, therefore, key to enabling the Conference of the Parties to assess the overall status of implementation of the Convention.<sup>23</sup> The process of reporting also assists the individual country to monitor the status of implementation of the commitments it has taken on as a Contracting Party.

### **Project Support Provided During the Reporting Period**

129. As noted previously under the section on enabling activities, during the reporting period, the GEF approved three MSPs, “Support to GEF Eligible CBD Parties for carrying out 2010 Biodiversity Targets National Assessments –Phases II and III ”as part of a global umbrella Medium Size Project within the Enabling Activities window that is designed to provide funding and technical support to assist eligible countries to assess progress towards the 2010 Target through a national participatory assessment process, using the provisional framework for goals and targets adopted by the CBD COP decision VIII/15. The guidelines for the fourth national report of the CBD will be used in connection with this national assessment.

130. These projects provide an expedited mechanism for the development, submission and approval of countries’ proposals (individual funding requests of up to \$20,000) for their 2010 Biodiversity Targets National Assessments. The joint partnership and umbrella approach are aimed at reducing transaction costs of individual country requests, providing the GEF, UNDP

---

<sup>23</sup> CBD Website : <http://www.biodiv.org/world/intro.asp>.

and UNEP an opportunity for managing the biodiversity Enabling Activities more strategically in close partnership with the CBD and other key global actors. An update is provided on the last two Medium Size Projects that are currently under implementation.

131. Update on Support to GEF Eligible CBD Parties for carrying out 2010 Biodiversity Targets National Assessments – Phase I and II” (UNDP) during the reporting period (January 1, 2008-June 30, 2010). Enabling activity proposals from 90 countries were approved and funding has been released for 89 of these proposals. Hence, with the exception of one country, all other countries have had the funding and the conditions to produce their reports as of November 19, 2009. The total of 90 countries is also the total number of possible grant approvals under the project. Of the 89 countries that have received funding, a total of 70 countries as of June 7, 2010 have submitted their reports to the CBD Secretariat. The large majority of countries with pending report submissions to the CBD Secretariat are expected to complete the activity by no later than the end of July 2010.

132. Update on Support to GEF Eligible CBD Parties for carrying out 2010 Biodiversity Targets National Assessments – Phase III” (UNEP) during the reporting period (January 1, 2008-June 30, 2010). The Phase III National reporting project started in July 2009, and is designed to support up to 40 countries to draft their reports for carrying out 2010 Biodiversity Targets National Assessment and to develop fourth national reports. So far 32 countries have made requests for funding. Twenty-nine countries have either signed the legal grant agreement to receive the funds or are being processed, twenty countries have received funds and, of these, 16 have completed the Fourth National report and sent it either to UNEP or CBD Secretariat. The countries with pending report submissions to the CBD Secretariat are expected to complete the activity by October 2010.

133. During GEF-5, enabling activity support will be provided from the focal area set-aside funds (FAS) for an amount up to \$500,000 per country including support for national reporting.

## **K. Communication, Education and Public Awareness**

### **Response to Guidance and Project Support During the Reporting Period**

134. Although no specific guidance on the Strategic Plan was given to the GEF during COP IX, GEF supported projects often include components or activities on education and public awareness and communications strategies in their implementation plans. Most projects approved during the reporting period include activities that target biodiversity education and awareness-raising on the values of biodiversity, both ecological and economic.

135. These components have become increasingly more important for projects that address issues that are not well-understood or that are not yet perceived as a problem by key stakeholders. This is probably most evident in GEF’s biosafety and invasive alien species projects. All of the invasive alien species (IAS) projects referenced earlier include investments in raising awareness about IAS and their economic impacts given the paucity of awareness in most GEF-recipient countries. In addition, all biosafety projects include public awareness and education as critical components of national biosafety framework implementation.

## **L. Biological Diversity and Climate Change**

### **Response to Guidance: Overview**

136. The negative impacts of other global environmental changes, such as climate change, on the biodiversity of highly vulnerable ecosystems, such as mountains, coral reefs and forests, remain a challenge for biodiversity conservation globally. The GEF recognizes this challenge and is financing projects for the conservation and sustainable use and benefit sharing of biological diversity threatened by climate change impacts.

137. Decision VII/20 paragraph 6 of the seventh session of the Conference of Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity, specifically addresses the link between climate change and biodiversity conservation and calls for the development of synergies amongst the Conventions. The GEF, through its development of adaptation guidelines has identified the potential global environmental benefits of addressing adaptation in each of its focal areas. In the biodiversity focal area, global environmental benefits include: the reduced risks of global biodiversity loss; the enhanced protection of ecosystems and the species they contain; and increased sustainability in the use of biodiversity components. Priority areas of management concern vis a vis adaptation to climate change include coral reefs, forests, and protected area systems, particularly those found in highly vulnerable regions and ecosystems.

138. In the biodiversity strategy for GEF-5, the potential impact of climate change on biodiversity is noted specifically in GEF's protected area strategy. The strategy identifies capacity building opportunities to help design resilient protected area systems that can continue to achieve their conservation objectives in the face of anticipated climate change. This will provide a degree of insurance for GEF's investments and contribute to long-term protected area sustainability. However, although many protected area managers recognize the need to incorporate climate change scenarios within protected area system design, the scientific understanding and basis for doing so is largely undeveloped. The GEF will support adaptation components through the climate change focal area in all projects, when needed.

139. The GEF Operational Strategy states that "the overall strategic thrust of GEF-financed climate change activities is to support sustainable measures that minimize climate change damage by reducing the risk, or the adverse effects, of climate change. It will finance agreed and eligible enabling, mitigation, and adaptation activities in eligible recipient countries".

### **Response to Guidance: Adaptation**

140. The GEF has provided support for Stage I and II adaptation activities (as defined by the UNFCCC COP) in the context of the formulation of National Communications to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC). In response to Convention guidance, funding for a Strategic Priority on Adaptation (SPA) was approved by the Council in November 2004. The strategic priority provides the opportunity to test integration and synergies among GEF focal areas and their relevant conventions through concrete demonstration projects responding to the impact of climate change.

## Support Provided During the Reporting Period: Adaptation

141. Table Twelve below summarizes the SPA projects approved during the reporting period that have clear biodiversity benefits and Table Thirteen presents SPA projects that did not receive a biodiversity contribution but where biodiversity benefits were generated.

**Table 12. SPA projects approved during the reporting period with biodiversity financing**

Country	Agency	Project Title	Total GEF Grant	Biodiversity Contribution	Total Cofinancing
India	World Bank	Sustainable Land, Water and Biodiversity Conservation and Management for Improved Livelihoods in Uttarakhand Watershed Sector	7,000,000	2,860,000	83,000,000
India	UNDP	Integrated Land and Ecosystem Management to Combat Land Degradation and Deforestation in Madhya Pradesh	5,763,000	1,931,000	95,523,750
Regional (Indonesia, Malaysia, Philippines )	ADB	Coastal and Marine Resources Management in the Coral Triangle: Southeast Asia	10,310,000	6,000,000	76,000,000
Regional (Papua New Guinea, Solomon Islands, Palau, Federated States of Micronesia, Fiji, Timor Leste, Vanuatu)	ADB	Coastal and Marine Resources Management in the Coral Triangle of the Pacific	8,336,450	3,586,400	16,350,000
Tajikistan	UNDP	Sustaining Agricultural Biodiversity in the Face of Climate Change	1,900,000	950,000	4,000,000
		Totals	Total GEF Grant: 33,309,450	Total Biodiversity Contribution: 15,327,400 or about 45%	Total Cofinancing: 274,873,750

**Table Thirteen. SPA projects with no biodiversity financing but that contribute to biodiversity conservation and sustainable use indirectly**



Country	Agency	Project Title	Total GEF grant	Cofinancing
Albania	UNDP	Identification and Implementation of Adaptation Response Measures in the Drini-Mati River Deltas	975,000	984,525
Armenia	UNDP	Adaptation to Climate Change Impacts in the Mountain Forest Ecosystems of Armenia	900,000	900,000
India	World Bank	Sustainable Rural Livelihood Security through Innovations in Land and Ecosystem Management	2,690,000	88,000,000
India	FAO	Reversing Environmental Degradation and Rural Poverty through Adaptation to Climate Change in Drought Stricken Areas in Southern India: A Hydrological Unit Pilot Project Approach	909,091	2,577,270
Tunisia	World Bank	Second Natural Resource Management Project	636,000	58,380,000
Uruguay	UNDP	Implementing Pilot Climate Change Adaptation Measures in Coastal Areas of Uruguay	975,000	2,922,900
		Totals:	7,085,091	153,764,695

142. An excellent example of the use of SPA and Biodiversity funding is the project, “Sustaining Agricultural Biodiversity in the Face of Climate Change” (UNDP, GEF: \$ 1.9 million, 950,000 of biodiversity funding, Cofinance: 4,950,000).

143. Tajikistan is a major storehouse of globally important agrobiodiversity and represents one of the basic centers of origin for cultivated plants worldwide. At present, 1,880 plant varieties of global significance are cultivated in Tajikistan for food, forage, technical and medical use, and decorative purposes. The biodiversity of Tajikistan’s agroecosystems is significant, with nearly 50 percent of cultivated crops being of local variety, (including many common cereal and fruit crops). The richness of the agro-ecosystems is complemented by a large concentration of wild relatives of agricultural plants present in Tajikistan’s mountain ecosystems, (including barley, almond, pomegranate, grapes, apples, pear, cherry, and plum). Many of the locally adapted varieties and the wild relatives in Tajikistan are known to have natural resistance to diseases,

harsh climates, and pests and as such constitute a valuable source of genetic material. Tajikistan's agricultural biodiversity is thus not only of importance to the livelihoods of rural communities, to the local economy, and to local long-term food security in the country, but also to global food security, particularly in light of the global challenges of climate change.

144. These unique agricultural and natural ecosystems in Tajikistan are now facing numerous threats, including conversion of previously marginal land to agriculture leading to rapid land degradation, overharvesting of wild species, habitat destruction from overgrazing, and conversion of traditional land-use practices, based on locally adapted crop species, to a modern system dominated by alien species and heavy application of agrochemicals and irrigation. Climate change is now threatening to further exacerbate the stresses faced by these unique agroecosystems. Key climate change-related threats include an increasingly arid and warm climate and dwindling water resources in the summer period, caused by rapid glacial decline in the neighboring high mountains.

145. Through SPA and Biodiversity funding, the project will address both baseline and climate change threats to Tajikistan's agrobiodiversity. This will be done by providing farmers and local authorities with the knowledge and skills to address climate change and protect important agrobiodiversity. Farm-based adaptation practices will be piloted, including the demonstration of techniques for water harvesting, soil conservation, and flood protection; reintroduction of stress-resistant local varieties; and improved cutting practices in forestry. Also, a seed insurance scheme will be tested in selected communities to promote the advantages to local farmers of agrobiodiversity in relation to climate change.

### **Response to Guidance: Mitigation and Adaptation**

146. As discussed earlier, the Sustainable Forest Management Program was unveiled as part of GEF-4 Sustainable Forest Management Program to address the cross-cutting issues of climate change mitigation and adaptation, sustainable land management, biodiversity conservation and sustainable use within the context of the same project intervention. See Annex 7 for a list of the SFM projects approved under the SFM program during the reporting period. These include projects that used funds from multiple focal areas, but also projects that used funds only from the biodiversity focal area.

147. Between January 1, 2008 and June 30, 2010, the GEF also approved 29 projects under the sustainable forest management program for a total GEF allocation of \$ 112,063,278, of which \$61,557,797 (about 55%) came from the biodiversity focal area, which leveraged an additional \$ 429,021,597. This resulted in a cofinancing ratio of 1 (GEF) to 4 (cofinancing).

148. During all of GEF-4, \$161 million was invested by the GEF in 41 SFM projects which leveraged about \$552 million under this initiative. All types of forests have been made eligible for funding under the SFM program, ranging from tropical and sub-tropical forests to woodlands and trees in the wider landscape. The GEF SFM program has developed as a functioning, innovative leveraging mechanism providing incentives for countries to direct part of the resources allocated to them under the GEF allocation framework (now called the STAR-System for Transparent Allocation of Resources) and resources derived from the land degradation focal area to the sustainable management of forests. In addition to the investments under the SFM

Program, the GEF has also financed 66 other forest-related projects through its biodiversity, land degradation and climate change focal areas in GEF-4 with about \$250 million.

149. A particularly interesting example of GEF's new programmatic approaches implemented in GEF-4 was developed under the umbrella of the SFM program. The GEF Strategic Program for Sustainable Forest Management in the Congo Basin (CBSP) (World Bank, as Program Coordination Agency; Countries: Cameroun, Central African Republic, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Equatorial Guinea, Gabon, Republic of Congo; GEF grant: \$55 million; cofinancing: \$167 million) was launched after the UNFCCC conference in Bali in December 2007 and highlights the multiple benefits of forest conservation and sustainable management.

150. After a Ministerial meeting held in Libreville, Gabon, in February 2008, all Congo Basin countries and their partners worked together to build a GEF program based on national priorities. Eight months after, the World Bank, as the Program Coordination Agency, was able to submit a Program Framework Document for Council approval (November 2008). During the following year (and during this reporting period) all 13 PIFs were approved for a total GEF grant amount of \$55 million and cofinancing of \$167 million. The CBSP includes regional, transboundary, and national projects to: 1) reinforce the role of the African Forest Commission (COMIFAC) at regional level, 2) meet targets identified in the Convergence Plan which serves as the roadmap to implement the political vision for Congo Basin forests; and 3) reflect strong partnership arrangements between Central Africa countries, and their partners (GEF agencies, cooperation agencies, NGOs, the private sector, and the Civil Society).

151. The program is built on three strategic orientations. First, the program seeks to protect ecosystem functions and values within the regional protected area network by improving management effectiveness of protected areas in more than 20 sites covering nine (9) million hectares. At least five new protected areas will be created. On-the-ground investments will be made in key biodiversity hotspots as Maïko in DRC, Ngoyla Mintom in Cameroun, Monte Alen, Rio Muni, Rio Campo, and Bioko Island in Equatorial Guinea, or Basse-Lobaye Biosphere Reserve and the Mourou-Fadama-Ndanda multiple use area in Central African Republic. Second, the project seeks to foster sustainable management and use of natural resources in the productive landscape of the Congo Basin through biodiversity mainstreaming—including improving sustainable forest management certification standards, addressing the management challenges of illegal logging and hunting bushmeat. Third, the program will strengthen the institutional and sustainable financing framework for sustainable ecosystem management, through a \$13 million regional project on REDD+, the development of a regional mechanism to finance protected areas management, and a Payment for Environment Services pilot project in the Mbé river basin in Gabon.

#### **IV. Activities in Other GEF Focal Areas of relevance to this report<sup>24</sup>**

---

<sup>24</sup>The projects listed in this analysis in other focal areas within the GEF are projects whose main activities relate to achieving the objectives of the respective focal area strategy but which also generate global biodiversity benefits and complement the objectives of the biodiversity focal area.

152. Activities in other focal areas also contribute to the strategy and objectives of the Convention on Biological Diversity, in particular those activities in the international waters and land degradation focal areas.

### **A. International Waters**

153. The GEF International Waters program helps countries work together to secure a wide range of economic, political, and environmental benefits from shared surface water, groundwater, and marine systems under the guidance of following two objectives: 1) to foster international, multistate cooperation on priority transboundary water concerns; and 2) to catalyze transboundary action addressing water concerns. During GEF-4, one particular objective complemented the work of the biodiversity focal area: restoring and sustaining coastal and marine fish stocks and associated biological diversity.

154. Through the international waters focal area, the GEF approved 33 projects for an amount \$ 136.7 million that supported directly or indirectly the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity during the reporting period. An additional \$ 1.35 billion was leveraged as cofinancing for these international waters projects.

155. Of particular note is the sub-portfolio of sustainable fisheries projects that were approved in the IW portfolio during the reporting period. Eight projects supporting sustainable fisheries management totaling \$30.64 million of GEF resources which leveraged \$181.38 million were approved to support sustainable fisheries management.

156. For example, as part of the GEF-funded Coral Triangle Initiative Program<sup>25</sup> approved during the reporting period, two projects supporting sustainable fisheries management were supported and serve as a complement to investments in marine protected area management that are being funded through the biodiversity focal area under this program.

157. The Coral Triangle Initiative (CTI) Program (Indonesia, Malaysia, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Solomon Islands, Timor Leste; Federated States of Micronesia, Fiji, Palau and Vanuatu) involves the protection and sustainable use of a multi-country area of coasts and oceans in East Asia and the Pacific, hence sustainable fisheries management is paramount.

158. One regional CTI project clearly demonstrates the complementarity of the IW focal area's work to the achievement of marine biodiversity conservation. Three countries-Indonesia, Malaysia and the Philippines-are jointly implementing the Sulu-Celebes Sea Sustainable Fisheries Management project (GEF: \$2.89 million, cofinance: \$3.42 million) in the Sulu-Celebes Sea (SCS) a Large Marine Ecosystem in the tropical seas of Asia bounded by the three participating countries. Being at the heart of the most bio-diverse marine area in the world, the

---

<sup>25</sup> This 10-country initiative was coordinated by the ADB, with the participation of UNDP, FAO and the World Bank and was approved during the reporting period. The initiative involves three of GEF's focal areas: Biodiversity, International Waters, and the adaptation aspects of Climate Change. (GEF: \$72.545 million (BD: \$26.525 million; IW: \$24.02 million; Adaptation: \$22 million).

SCS is also a very rich fishing ground for large and small pelagic as well as bay and coral reef fishes, providing livelihoods to the coastal inhabitants and food for the entire region and beyond. The fishery resources, however, have declined due to various threats, including overexploitation, habitat and community modification and global climate change. The goal of the Project is a economically and ecologically sustainable marine fisheries in the SCS, for the benefit of communities who are dependent on these resources for their livelihoods and for the global community who benefit from the conservation of highly diverse marine ecosystems.

159. The three countries and other stakeholders, including NGOs, have worked together to develop the Sulu-Sulawesi Marine Ecoregion Conservation Plan and formally put in place a regional institutional mechanism to implement the plan. The Project activities, outcomes and outputs will build on these strong regional and national initiatives. The project will seek to secure regional consensus on trans-boundary priorities and their immediate and root causes by updating an earlier Trans-boundary Diagnostic Analysis for the SCS and focusing on unsustainable exploitation of fisheries. The second outcome is agreement on regional and national legal, policy and institutional reforms for improved fisheries management through the formulation of a Strategic Action Program, which will build on the existing Ecoregion Conservation Plan. The third outcome is the strengthening of institutions and introduction of reforms to catalyze implementation of policies on reducing overfishing and improving fisheries management. The primary target for institutional strengthening is the Sulu-Sulawesi Marine Ecoregion Tri-National Committee and its Sub-Committees, in particular the Sub-Committee on Sustainable Fisheries. The fourth outcome is increased fish stocks of small pelagic through the implementation of best fisheries management practices in demonstration sites.

## **B. Land Degradation Focal Area**

160. The land degradation focal area supports initiatives that address land degradation within a framework of an integrated approach to sustainable land management that contributes to sustainable development.<sup>26</sup> In the land degradation focal area, 8 projects amounting to a total GEF commitment of \$11.59 million have components that address biodiversity conservation and/or sustainable use. An additional \$41 million was leveraged as cofinancing for these land degradation projects.

161. For example, the project, Sustainable Rangeland Management for Rural Livelihood and Environmental Integrity (UNDP, GEF: \$0.95 million, Cofinancing: \$ 2.183 million) being implemented in Kazakhstan, will demonstrate good practice in livestock management that promotes both the ecological integrity of natural grasslands and supports rural livelihoods; thereby generating additional biodiversity benefits. Kazakhstan is the sixth largest country worldwide in terms of extension of its grasslands. The project's strategy is to generate from the vast rangelands a stable supply of products from livestock for consumption, processing and for export. This will contribute to ecosystem integrity and will ensure sustainable incomes and support the reduction of poverty among the most affected population. Degradation caused by overgrazing of areas close to villages and farms and underutilisation of remote rangelands will be stopped and reversed, resulting in a balanced use of rangelands with positive impacts on the

---

<sup>26</sup> See UNCCD, Article 2, paragraph 1.

global environment. The project envisages reviving mobile grazing systems, including a supportive legal and institutional environment, technical assistance, facilitation of organisational agreements and support for investments into the local infrastructure.

162. In terms of additional global environmental benefits the project will achieve in other focal areas, the project will be supportive of mitigating climate change through stabilising and rehabilitating carbon pools in soil and above-ground vegetation. It will further help conserve globally significant biodiversity including typical steppe formations (25 physiognomic steppe formations have been identified in the region) with rich communities of turf graminoids. The pilot areas have a very high diversity of feathergrasses and are rich in sagebrush formations comprising many species.

## **V. MONITORING & EVALUATION RESULTS**

### **A. Portfolio Monitoring Results**

163. The GEF Evaluation Office develops the policy, related guidelines and administrative procedures for monitoring and evaluation in the GEF. The policy and guidelines help project managers and Agency and GEF Secretariat staff plan and conduct monitoring and evaluation. The GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy provides norms and standards for the GEF Secretariat and the GEF Evaluation Office.<sup>27</sup> The Policy explains the concept, role and use of monitoring and evaluation within the GEF; establishes minimum requirements for how projects should be monitored and evaluated in line with international standards; and assigns roles and responsibilities for these tasks. The GEF Agencies plan and implement their project monitoring and evaluation, in line with their own systems and procedures and based on these minimum requirements.

164. The biodiversity tracking tools were introduced in GEF-3 to measure progress in achieving the outputs and outcomes established at the portfolio level for GEF-3 in the biodiversity focal area.<sup>28</sup> Given slight changes in the GEF's biodiversity strategy in GEF-4, modified Tracking Tools for GEF-4 projects are being applied. These will be slightly adjusted for GEF-5 to reflect experience in applying the tools.

165. The tracking tools are applied three times: at CEO endorsement, at project mid-term and at project completion. Project outcomes from the GEF-3 and GEF-4 project cohort are aggregated for analysis of directional trends and patterns at a portfolio-wide level to inform the development of future GEF strategies and to report to the GEF Council on portfolio-level performance in the biodiversity focal area as the projects are completed and evaluations conducted. The last two reports provided to the GEF Council during the reporting period (FY 2008 and FY 2009) are summarized below.

---

<sup>27</sup> [http://gefweb.org/uploadedFiles/Policies\\_and\\_Guidelines-me\\_policy-english.pdf](http://gefweb.org/uploadedFiles/Policies_and_Guidelines-me_policy-english.pdf)

<sup>28</sup> The biodiversity tracking tools for GEF-3 and GEF-4 projects, respectively, can be found on the GEF website under Biodiversity-Tracking Tools.

**Progress in Achieving Portfolio-level Outcomes from the PIR (Project Implementation Review) FY 2008 Project Cohort**

166. As part of the FY2008 PIR process the GEF Secretariat requested that GEF agencies submit the completed tracking tools for all projects undergoing a mid-term or final evaluation in FY2008. As part of the ongoing reporting to Council on the portfolio level results from GEF-3 for the FY2008 cohort are provided in Table 14 below.

**Table 14. FY 08 Update on GEF-3 Project Cohort Contributions to Biodiversity Outcomes in the Business Plan for GEF-3**

<p><b>Strategic Priority One For GEF-3: Catalyzing Sustainability of Protected Area Systems at National Levels.</b></p>
<p><b>Expected Impact:</b> Improved management effectiveness of national PA system, and individual PAs which receive direct support over the long-term.</p>
<p><b>Selected Performance indicators (outcomes) to be assessed at mid-term and final evaluation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• X (Y %) PAs supported show improved management effectiveness against baseline scenarios</li> </ul>
<p><b>Tracking Tool Results from Projects Submitting Mid-Term and Final Evaluations during FY 2008 PIR Exercise</b></p> <p><u>Mid-Term Evaluation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• At the time of the FY 2008 PIR, 24 protected areas---or 4 % of the GEF-3 cohort total covering an area of 1,591,340 hectares, or only 1.2 % of the GEF-3 cohort total---were part of protected area projects that underwent a mid-term evaluation as reported by the GEF agencies.</li> <li>• 75 % of these protected areas demonstrated improved management effectiveness as measured by Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool, 12.5% showed no improvement, and 12.5% regressed and demonstrated a negative trend.</li> <li>• The 18 sites that demonstrated improved management effectiveness covered an area of 1,164,941 hectares or 73 % of total coverage of the evaluated protected areas.</li> </ul> <p><u>Final Evaluation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• At the time of the FY 2008 PIR, 8 (eight) protected areas---or slightly more than 1 % of the number of protected areas being managed in the GEF-3 project cohort covering an area of 183,243 hectares, or slightly less than 1% of the GEF-3 cohort in terms of hectares covered-- were part of protected area projects that underwent a final evaluation as reported by the GEF agencies.</li> <li>• Seven (7) (or 88%) of these protected areas demonstrated improved management effectiveness as measured by Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool. One protected area dropped slightly in management effectiveness.</li> <li>• The 7 (seven) sites that demonstrated improved management effectiveness covered an area of 141,483 hectares or 77% of total coverage of the evaluated protected areas.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Strategic Priority Two For GEF-3: Mainstreaming Biodiversity Conservation in Production Landscapes and Sectors</b></p>
<p><b>Expected Impact:</b> (i) Produce BD gains in production systems and buffer zones of protected areas and (ii) BD mainstreamed into sector programs of the IAs.</p>

<b>Strategic Priority One For GEF-3: Catalyzing Sustainability of Protected Area Systems at National Levels.</b>
<b>Expected Impact:</b> Improved management effectiveness of national PA system, and individual PAs which receive direct support over the long-term.
<b>Selected Performance indicators (outcomes) to be assessed at mid-term and final evaluation:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• X (Y %) PAs supported show improved management effectiveness against baseline scenarios</li> </ul>
<b>Tracking Tool Results from Projects Submitting Mid-Term and Final Evaluations during FY 2008 PIR Exercise</b> <p><u>Mid-Term Evaluation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• At the time of the FY 2008 PIR, 24 protected areas---or 4 % of the GEF-3 cohort total covering an area of 1,591,340 hectares, or only 1.2 % of the GEF-3 cohort total---were part of protected area projects that underwent a mid-term evaluation as reported by the GEF agencies.</li> <li>• 75 % of these protected areas demonstrated improved management effectiveness as measured by Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool, 12.5% showed no improvement, and 12.5% regressed and demonstrated a negative trend.</li> <li>• The 18 sites that demonstrated improved management effectiveness covered an area of 1,164,941 hectares or 73 % of total coverage of the evaluated protected areas.</li> </ul> <p><u>Final Evaluation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• At the time of the FY 2008 PIR, 8 (eight) protected areas---or slightly more than 1 % of the number of protected areas being managed in the GEF-3 project cohort covering an area of 183,243 hectares, or slightly less than 1% of the GEF-3 cohort in terms of hectares covered-- were part of protected area projects that underwent a final evaluation as reported by the GEF agencies.</li> <li>• Seven (7) (or 88%) of these protected areas demonstrated improved management effectiveness as measured by Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool. One protected area dropped slightly in management effectiveness.</li> <li>• The 7 (seven) sites that demonstrated improved management effectiveness covered an area of 141,483 hectares or 77% of total coverage of the evaluated protected areas.</li> </ul>
<b>Selected Performance indicators (outcomes) to be assessed at mid-term and final evaluation:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• X (Y %) projects supported in each sector have included incorporated biodiversity aspects into sector policies and plans at national and sub-national levels, adapted appropriate regulations and implement plans accordingly.</li> <li>• X ha of production systems that contribute to biodiversity conservation or the sustainable use of its components against the baseline scenarios.</li> </ul>
<b>Tracking Tool Results from Projects Submitting Mid-Term and Final Evaluations during FY 2008 PIR Exercise</b> <p>At the time of the FY 2008 PIR, only four mainstreaming projects underwent a mid-term evaluation as reported by the agencies in the fiscal year. No projects underwent a final evaluation.</p> <p>Three projects sought to influence the policy and regulatory framework.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>--One project, starting from a zero baseline, had achieved BD considerations mentioned in sector policy through specific legislation and regulations are under implementation.</li> <li>--One project had made no progress in advancing BD considerations into the policy and regulatory frameworks that they targeted.</li> <li>--One project had successfully incorporated BD into agriculture and tourism policy.</li> </ul>



<b>Strategic Priority One For GEF-3: Catalyzing Sustainability of Protected Area Systems at National Levels.</b>
<b>Expected Impact:</b> Improved management effectiveness of national PA system, and individual PAs which receive direct support over the long-term.
<b>Selected Performance indicators (outcomes) to be assessed at mid-term and final evaluation:</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• X (Y %) PAs supported show improved management effectiveness against baseline scenarios</li> </ul>
<b>Tracking Tool Results from Projects Submitting Mid-Term and Final Evaluations during FY 2008 PIR Exercise</b>
<p><u>Mid-Term Evaluation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• At the time of the FY 2008 PIR, 24 protected areas---or 4 % of the GEF-3 cohort total covering an area of 1,591,340 hectares, or only 1.2 % of the GEF-3 cohort total---were part of protected area projects that underwent a mid-term evaluation as reported by the GEF agencies.</li> <li>• 75 % of these protected areas demonstrated improved management effectiveness as measured by Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool, 12.5% showed no improvement, and 12.5% regressed and demonstrated a negative trend.</li> <li>• The 18 sites that demonstrated improved management effectiveness covered an area of 1,164,941 hectares or 73 % of total coverage of the evaluated protected areas.</li> </ul> <p><u>Final Evaluation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• At the time of the FY 2008 PIR, 8 (eight) protected areas---or slightly more than 1 % of the number of protected areas being managed in the GEF-3 project cohort covering an area of 183,243 hectares, or slightly less than 1% of the GEF-3 cohort in terms of hectares covered-- were part of protected area projects that underwent a final evaluation as reported by the GEF agencies.</li> <li>• Seven (7) (or 88%) of these protected areas demonstrated improved management effectiveness as measured by Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool. One protected area dropped slightly in management effectiveness.</li> <li>• The 7 (seven) sites that demonstrated improved management effectiveness covered an area of 141,483 hectares or 77% of total coverage of the evaluated protected areas.</li> </ul>
<p>--All four projects sought to change production systems with the following results at the mid-term evaluation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 730 hectares out of a project goal of 3,000 hectares were under certified organic agricultural production. Production included four wild species and eleven landraces .</li> <li>• 170,000 hectares out of a project goal of 228,000 hectares semi-arid woodlands was under more sustainable management (not certified).</li> <li>• One project covered more than 1.5 million hectares, within which the following the sustainable use outputs were achieved by the project mid-term: 1) Four forestry units managed under FSC Guidelines; 2) Seven farmers engaging in organic farming (certified); 3) Sixty farmers utilizing indigenous breed of cattle or sheep for grazing and milk production; 4) Eight Municipalities integrating BD concerns into planning,( i.e. .municipality environment plans, spatial plans, action plans, project plans, tendering procedures etc.)</li> </ul>

### **Progress in Achieving Portfolio-level Outcomes from the PIR (Project Implementation Review) FY 2009 Project Cohort**

167. As part of the FY2009 PIR process the GEF Secretariat requested that GEF agencies submit the completed tracking tools for all projects undergoing a mid-term or final evaluation in

FY2009. As part of the ongoing reporting to Council on the portfolio level results from GEF-3 for the FY2009 cohort are provided in Table 15 below.

**Table 15: FY2009 Update on GEF-3 Project Cohort Contributions to the Biodiversity Outcomes in the Business Plan for GEF-3**

Strategic Priority One For GEF-3: Catalyzing Sustainability of Protected Area Systems at National Levels	
<p><b>Expected Impact:</b> Improved management effectiveness of national PA system, and individual PAs which receive direct support over the long-term.</p>	
<p><b>Selected Performance indicators (outcomes) to be assessed at mid-term and final evaluation:</b> X (Y %) of the PAs supported show improved management effectiveness against baseline scenarios</p>	
<p><b>Tracking Tool Results From Projects Submitting Mid-Term or Final Evaluations during FY2009 PIR Exercise</b></p>	
<p><u>Mid-Term Evaluation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• At the time of the FY2009 PIR, 57 protected areas were part of protected area projects that underwent a mid-term evaluation as reported by the GEF Agencies. This is 10 % of the number of protected areas supported in the GEF-3 cohort covering an area of 11,491,132 hectares, (8% of the GEF-3 cohort total in terms hectares covered).</li> <li>• 50 (or 88%) of these protected areas demonstrated improved management effectiveness<sup>29</sup>, two (or 4 %) showed no improvement, and 5 (or 8 %) regressed and demonstrated a negative trend.</li> <li>• The 50 sites that demonstrated improved management effectiveness covered an area of 11,199,815 hectares or 97 % of total coverage of the evaluated protected areas.</li> </ul>	<p><u>Final Evaluation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• At the time of the FY2009 PIR, 8 protected areas were part of protected area projects that underwent a final evaluation as reported by the GEF Agencies. This is slightly more than 1% of the number of protected areas being managed in the GEF-3 project cohort covering an area of 971,674 hectares, (slightly less than 1 % of the GEF-3 cohort in terms of hectares covered).</li> <li>• Seven of these protected areas demonstrated improved management effectiveness.<sup>30</sup> One protected area did not establish an appropriate baseline value, and thus could not be judged.</li> <li>• The seven sites that demonstrated improved management effectiveness covered an area of 811,674 hectares or 84% of total coverage of the evaluated protected areas.</li> </ul>

Strategic Priority Two For GEF-3: Mainstreaming Biodiversity Conservation in Production Landscapes and Sectors
<p><b>Expected Impact:</b> (i) Produce biodiversity gains in production systems and buffer zones of protected areas and (ii) Biodiversity mainstreamed into sector programs of the IAs.</p>

<sup>29</sup> A measured by Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool

<sup>30</sup> Ibid.

<p><b>Selected Performance indicators (outcomes) to be assessed at mid-term and final evaluation:</b> (i) X (Y %) projects supported in each sector have included incorporated biodiversity aspects into sector policies and plans at national and sub-national levels, adapted appropriate regulations and implement plans accordingly. (ii) X ha of production systems that contribute to biodiversity conservation or the sustainable use of its components against the baseline scenarios.</p>	
<p><b>Tracking Tool Results From Projects Submitting Mid-Term or Final Evaluations during FY2009 PIR Exercise</b></p>	
<p><u>Mid-Term Evaluation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• At the time of the FY2009 PIR, four mainstreaming projects underwent a mid-term evaluation as reported by the Agencies in the fiscal year.</li> <li>• These four projects sought to mainstream BD into 20 production sector policies in 10 countries. The projects' progress on policy mainstreaming was assessed with the GEF tracking tool.<sup>31</sup></li> <li>• The projects have achieved a 75% success rate in supporting the development and implementation of regulations that incorporate biodiversity considerations into sectoral policy. In addition, the projects have achieved a success rate of 40% in having the enforcement of the regulations monitored independently.</li> <li>• All four projects sought to change production systems with the following results thus far: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>--Sustainable management of 222,300 hectares in Central Asia of agro-biodiversity (fruit and nut varieties and landraces, wild relatives of fruit and nuts).</li> <li>--Okavango Delta Management Plan developed and approved as overarching planning tool covering 1.5 million hectares. In addition, 25,000 hectares of wet lands under improved fisheries management.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p><u>Final Evaluation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• At the time of the FY2009 PIR, one mainstreaming project underwent a final evaluation as reported by the Agencies in the fiscal year.</li> <li>• The project sought to mainstream BD into fisheries policy and as a result BD is mentioned in sector policy through specific legislation, regulations are in place to implement the legislation. In addition, 6,000 hectares of Siberian taimen habitat conserved (Mongolia)</li> </ul>

168. GEF reporting on portfolio-level outcomes is done each year as part of the Annual Monitoring Review (AMR) process. These reports will give Council small snapshots of implementation progress with the GEF-3 cohort and in the future, for the GEF-4 and GEF-5 project cohort. The GEF will continue to provide these portfolio level summaries as part of the AMR process.

169. Once 50% and 100% of the GEF-3 biodiversity project cohort has undergone a mid-term review, portfolio outcomes will be summarized and presented to Council in order to provide a more substantial view of portfolio-level progress. This will be repeated once 50 and 100% of the

<sup>31</sup> The tracking tool assesses progress on a scale from one to six. The progress that projects achieved in improving the 20 policies is: BD mentioned in sector policy-1 (two policies); BD mentioned in sector policy through specific legislation—2 (one policy); Regulations in place to implement the legislation—3 (two policies); Regulations under implementation—4 (six policies); Implementation of regulations enforced—5 (one policy); Enforcement of regulations is monitored independently—6 (eight policies).

GEF-3 project cohort has undergone a final evaluation. The same policy will be applied for the GEF-4 project cohort currently under implementation.

170. Given changes in the GEF's biodiversity strategy for GEF-4, the GEF tracking tools for strategic objectives one and two were revised. Additions to the tracking tool for Strategic Objective One: "Catalyzing Sustainability of Protected Area Systems" include a scorecard to measure improvements in financial sustainability of a protected area system. The tracking tool for strategic objective two on biodiversity mainstreaming has been streamlined to concentrate on key data collection relevant to the portfolio level outcomes. In addition, the GEF developed a new tracking tool to measure progress in "Building Capacity to Implement the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety" and for "Prevention, Control and Management of Invasive Alien Species", both of which were part of Strategic Objective Three: Safeguarding Biodiversity in the GEF-4 strategy.

171. A tracking tool for GEF investments in capacity building in Access and Benefit Sharing will be developed to reflect outcomes of COP-10 and guidance provided to the GEF in terms of the request for GEF support to ABS implementation. This tool will then be applied in GEF-5.

## **B. Results from the GEF Evaluation Office**

172. During the reporting period the GEF Evaluation Office was involved in ten studies that were of relevance to the biodiversity focal area. Four of them are impact evaluations: two are included in the Annual Impact Report (AIR) 2008 and two in the AIR 2009. Five other studies are Country Portfolio Evaluations (CPE): three of them are included in the Annual Country Portfolio Evaluation Report (ACPER) 2009 and the other two in the ACPER 2010.<sup>32</sup> The last study is the Fourth Overall Performance Study (OPS4) of the GEF.

173. The results of these evaluations and the related management responses were formally presented to the GEF Council at its June 2009 and November 2009 sessions. The full reports are available at the GEF Evaluation Office website ([www.gefeo.org](http://www.gefeo.org)). Council documents can be found at the GEF website ([thegef.org/gef/council\\_meetings](http://thegef.org/gef/council_meetings)). The Office is ready to provide any additional information to the COP in the framework of the next review of the GEF. The main messages emerged from these evaluations have been summarized by the Office and are reported here below.

### **Impact Evaluations**

174. The AIR 2008 brings together the results of two quasi-experimental impact evaluations that explored the value of using quasi-experimental methods to construct accurate counterfactuals for project intervention areas. These are *Evaluating the Local Socioeconomic*

---

<sup>32</sup> The ACPER 2010 synthesizes the findings and recommendations of the CPE in Moldova and Turkey and will be presented to the GEF Council in June 2010.

*Impacts of Protected Areas*, a study that focused on the protected area system of Thailand,<sup>33</sup> and *Measuring the Social Impacts of Protected Areas*, a study that focused on the Costa Rica protected area system (which received GEF support) and enabled a comparison with the Evaluation Office 2007 study of avoided deforestation of the same protected area system. These two impact evaluations found that:

- a) Districts surrounding protected areas in Costa Rica and Thailand experienced less poverty than carefully controlled counterfactual districts not adjacent to protected areas with similar geographic and physical characteristics.
- b) When these districts were compared with counterfactual districts in similar locations but not adjacent to protected areas, the latter were even poorer. Thus, proximity to a protected area in fact emerged as having a positive effect on income. In Costa Rica, for example, protection led to better outcomes in terms of condition of housing and access to water supply.
- c) Income inequality increased near protected areas in Thailand (data on this factor were not available for Costa Rica), so an aggregate income improvement may disguise pockets of worsening poverty.

175. The AIR 2009, although mainly focused on ozone depleting substances in countries with economies in transition, included two impact evaluations relevant to biodiversity. The first was a review of the *Regional Integrated Silvo-pastoral Approaches to Ecosystem Management Project (RISEMP)*. This GEF project, implemented by the World Bank in Colombia, Costa Rica and Nicaragua, was specifically designed to enable experimental impact evaluation by comparing featured participant and control groups of farmers. The study concluded that:

- a) An experimental design that is implemented without the necessary knowledge and institutional support in the field can lose its utility, as happened in Nicaragua. The experimental framework failed on two of the three group comparisons that were to support rigorous claims on the effects of payment incentives for environmental services and technical assistance on land use change and corresponding environmental effects.
- b) Implementing such a design involves substantial costs related to implementation, ethical dilemmas from possible resistance from stakeholders, and forgone benefits to farmers.

176. The second study, undertaken by the Evaluation Office in collaboration with the Independent Evaluation Group (IEG) of the World Bank, was an impact evaluation of a set of GEF biodiversity projects in Peru, all of which with a local community component. Specifically, this study analyzed the impacts in biodiversity conservation and sustainable use given local communities and indigenous groups' approaches, and the impact on the socioeconomic development of local communities and indigenous groups. The study also assessed the sustainability of GEF biodiversity investments in Peru, including any replication and scaling-up opportunities that took place. Finally, the study tested the application to a cluster of projects of a

---

<sup>33</sup> Catalyzing Sustainability of Thailand's Protected Area System (GEF ID 3517).

new methodology developed by the Office to assess progress towards impact, the Review of Outcomes to Impacts (ROtI).<sup>34</sup>The study concluded that:

- a) The GEF has been a key contributor to biodiversity conservation in and around protected areas in Peru. The GEF has contributed to the establishment and sustainability of the long-term financing mechanism for the National System of Natural Protected Areas in Peru (SINANPE in Spanish); the replication, scale-up, and scale-out of the participatory model for protected area management; and increasing understanding of how local communities can benefit from biodiversity conservation activities to improve their livelihoods.
- b) GEF-funded projects in Peru are partially equipped to attain sustained improved livelihoods for local communities. The replication of the sustainable alternative economic activities model developed and applied in the GEF projects at the national level has been met and is likely to continue. Although the general perception of communities is that of improved livelihoods compared to the last decade, sustainability and replication of the model have been only partially met at the local level. Progress is likely to continue.
- c) There is limited evidence regarding the delivering of intended impacts and global environmental benefits.

### **Country Portfolio Evaluations**

177. During the reporting period, the Evaluation Office conducted CPEs in Cameroon, Egypt, Syria, Moldova and Turkey. These evaluations independently assess: (i) the relevance of GEF support to the sustainable development agenda and environmental priorities of a country as well as the relevance to the GEF global mandate; (ii) the efficiency of the implementation of GEF projects in the country; and (iii) the results of the GEF support. The scope of these evaluations includes all GEF supported projects across all focal areas and GEF Agencies in each country and a selection of relevant regional and global projects. Progress toward impact of a full-size project and an enabling activity was analyzed using the ROtI methodology in both CPEs conducted in fiscal year 2010 in Turkey and Moldova.

178. With regards to the biodiversity focal area, these evaluations concluded that:

- a) In all five countries, GEF support to biodiversity has been relevant to the countries development of biodiversity policies and strategies.
- b) In Syria and Egypt, GEF support contributed to developing the institutional capacity within national and local authorities, raising awareness on biodiversity issues of decision makers outside the environmental circles, the awareness of local administration, the media and the public at large. This brought biodiversity higher on the political agenda and allowed some biodiversity projects to generate considerable co financing from line ministries, NGOs and the private sector.

---

<sup>34</sup> The ROtI Handbook, GEF Evaluation Office (2009). <http://www.thegef.org/gef/node/2096>.

- c) In Cameroon, GEF support provided the foundation for an enhanced recognition of biodiversity conservation and the creation of protected areas with a surface area of 24,300 km<sup>2</sup>. This approach has been replicated at national and regional levels and could enhance the conservation status of a 300,000 km<sup>2</sup> area.
- d) In Turkey and Moldova, GEF support in biodiversity built robust foundations for the achievement of significant results. In Turkey the proportion of land under some form of protection for nature conservation has increased from 4% to about 6% since 2000. The *In-situ Conservation of Genetic Diversity Project* implemented in Turkey during the '90s made important contributions, with impacts still relevant 12 years after the project closure. However, further progress toward impact in these two countries is limited by unresolved institutional barriers and socio-economic factors.

#### **Fourth Overall Performance Study of the GEF**

179. Overall performance studies are undertaken every four years by the GEF Evaluation Office to provide inputs to the discussions and negotiations on GEF replenishments. OPS4, completed in 2009 to serve as an input to the fifth replenishment of the GEF, assessed the extent to which the GEF is achieving its objectives and identified potential improvements. The scope of OPS4 was defined by a number of clusters and specific key evaluation questions, ranging from the full history of the GEF to a snapshot of the situation at a certain moment in time, from a few representative interventions to the full GEF portfolio. Impact analysis played a fundamental role in the delivery of the results sections of OPS4. Central to OPS4 methodological approach was the implementation of the ROI methodology at desk and field level to the full GEF portfolio of projects.

180. According to OPS4, during GEF-4 (as of June 30, 2009) the GEF Council approved in the biodiversity focal area 157 projects (\$455 million), 62 Project Identification Forms (PIF) (\$112.6 million), and 50 multifocal area projects (\$89.4 million). Support to protected area systems continued to be the largest allocation within the biodiversity focal area, with about 90 % of the funding going to protected area projects. About 40 % of the GEF funding was allocated to projects dealing with mainstreaming biodiversity, on two priorities: (i) strengthening the policy and regulatory frameworks, and (ii) fostering markets for biodiversity goods and services. Support to the Cartagena Protocol totaled about \$28 million, while almost \$20 million has gone to invasive species projects and \$20 million to projects dealing with access and benefit sharing.

181. With respect to responding to the Convention on Biodiversity (CBD) guidance, OPS4 concluded that:

- a) The GEF is the world's main financial entity for biodiversity conservation projects. The GEF has also been essential to global implementation of the Cartagena Protocol through support to the development of National Biodiversity Frameworks (NFBs) in 123 countries and for their subsequent implementation in pilot cases.

- b) The GEF has been responsive to CBD guidance particularly on issues related to biodiversity conservation and sustainable use. Access to biosafety funding, however, has not kept up with potential demand, given the number of NBFs completed so far (110) and based on consultations with the CBD Secretariat and GEF focal points.

182. On results, OPS4 found that biodiversity projects which are highly likely to contribute to global environmental benefits have met three main impact drivers:<sup>35</sup>

- a) *Stakeholder ownership and support*. To carry forward project results after completion, stakeholders must have ownership of the process, i.e. they must be transformed from “stakeholders” to “results owners”.
- b) *Effective financial mechanisms*. These include a range of approaches, such as trust funds, markets for sustainable livelihoods, small grants programs, and incentives from and markets for certified products.
- c) *Adequate information flows*. These include research, monitoring and evaluation, and public communications programs. High quality data in sufficient quantities facilitate efficient resource allocation and lead to improved decision making. Effective information sharing also contributes to building awareness and disseminating experiences.

183. What makes biodiversity conservation so difficult is the ever changing nature of any given set of environmental, sociopolitical, and economic circumstances in a geographic area. According to OPS4 findings, commonly unmet impact drivers in biodiversity include:

- a) Insufficient technical and institutional capacity.
- b) Ineffective or inappropriate policy frameworks, for example, related to land tenure issues.
- c) Lack of mechanisms for replication/scaling up, such as dissemination strategies.
- d) Insufficient financial sustainability, including reliance on markets that are not adequately developed or dependence on government funding, but with a low priority to receive such funds.
- e) Insufficient stakeholder ownership.
- f) Insufficient information/data to assess whether intended progress is actually being achieved.

184. GEF projects often achieve outcomes such as building protected area management capacity or assisting in the establishment of institutional frameworks. However, in many cases, a

---

<sup>35</sup> Impact drivers are the significant factors that, if present, are expected to contribute to the ultimate realization of project impacts and that are within the ability of the project to influence.



protected area must be effectively managed (and monitored) for an extended period of time before it can be determined that the targeted globally significant biodiversity has been effectively conserved.

185. With regards to tracking tools for protected areas, the GEF makes use the Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool (METT), which records scores to questions that measure the progress of protected areas in achieving management effectiveness as defined by the World Commission on Protected Areas Framework.<sup>36</sup> According to OPS4, the METT has been widely adopted and is one of the indicators that track global progress to the CBD 2010 biodiversity target. At the level of individual protected areas, the tool provides data that could be useful as background information for impacts. The tool, however, is too limited to allow a detailed evaluation of outcomes and is really aimed at providing a quick overview of the steps in the management framework up to and including outputs. All the data derived from the tracking tools for GEF's strategic objectives would require a very substantial effort to collate, provide quality assurance to, and analyze; this would require specific resources in the GEF Secretariat if it is to be done properly. The challenge is now to ensure sufficient resources during GEF-5 and to integrate indicators that derive from the progress from outcome to impact review into the tracking tools.

186. OPS4 made specific recommendations for biodiversity:

- a) Projects need to be designed and implemented as much as possible to ensure local ownership, continued government support, and ongoing availability of funding after project closure to support the biodiversity strategy's focus on sustainable biodiversity conservation.
- b) There should be a portfolio approach on the national level. Such an approach would include national GEF programming and follow-up, including continuing institutional support, monitoring, supervision, and evaluation, and would help recipient countries maximize progress toward global environmental benefits.
- c) The GEF Secretariat should ensure that its tracking tools fully encompass this longer term perspective.
- d) The GEF Council should approve and finance what could be a substantial exercise: developing and monitoring indicators for progress toward impact, integrated into the results based management system of GEF-5. This would be particularly useful in the context of the more systemic approaches, which have emerged in later GEF biodiversity strategies, the results of which will only begin to emerge in the OPS5 cohort of projects. Furthermore, harmonization between the tracking tools and the ROI methodology could provide a powerful system of indicators, enabling more effective management of portfolio wide progress toward impacts.

#### **Office of Evaluation Response to IX/31 guidance (C) (a)**

---

<sup>36</sup> World Commission on Protected Areas [http://www.iucn.org/about/union/commissions/wcpa/wcpa\\_overview](http://www.iucn.org/about/union/commissions/wcpa/wcpa_overview).

187. MOP4 requested the Evaluation Office to assess the impacts of the Resource Allocation Framework in the implementation of the Protocol. According to the evaluation of the GEF support to the Cartagena Protocol (2006), the GEF had contributed to the speeding up of the ratification of the protocol and had promoted the implementation processes. Furthermore, the evaluation found that the GEF support had been consistent with the protocol, although awareness raising and participation efforts by different stakeholders have not been as broad as required. As presented above, the GEF Council approved the GEF strategy for Biosafety in 2007 incorporating conclusions and recommendations from this evaluation.

188. In 2008, the Evaluation Office conducted a mid-term review of the Resource Allocation Framework, “the RAF Midterm Review.” Regarding biosafety, this evaluation concluded that the introduction of the RAF appeared at that time to have slowed the momentum created by the global project supporting national biosafety frameworks. Finally, the Evaluation Office conducted the Fourth Overall Performance Study (OPS4) in 2009 and early 2010 and had a similar conclusion regarding the implementation of the RAF. As of the end of June 2009, the GEF had supported the preparation of 123 National Biosafety Frameworks (NBFs). On the other hand, only 50 national level projects to implement the NBFs had been approved by the GEF or were under preparation at that time. The evaluation concluded that lower funding and implementation levels of biosafety NBFs may have been affected by the RAF, given that countries had to decide how to invest their RAF allocation provided by the GEF among the strategic objectives of the GEF biodiversity strategy and their numerous obligations as parties to the CBD. Furthermore, the evaluation concluded that although the demand for biosafety may exist several international national issues may have diminished the presentation of proposals to the GEF: many biosafety focal points do not fully participate in the national level GEF decision-making process, biosafety may not be a recognized national priority; and there is limited national capacity to identify biosafety as a priority or to develop and implement projects.

## **VI. OTHER RELEVANT ISSUES TO THE CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES**

### **A. Fifth Replenishment of the GEF Trust Fund**

189. The GEF has been replenished four times since its inception in 1991: \$2.02 billion in 1994, \$2.75 billion in 1998, \$2.92 billion in 2002, and \$3.13 billion in 2006.

190. The fifth GEF replenishment process began in November 2008 when the Trustee and the Secretariat, acting under the direction of the GEF Council, invited prospective Participants to a planning meeting in Washington D.C.

191. Replenishment discussions progressed through six meetings convened during 2009 and 2010, when participants discussed the Fourth Overall Performance Study of the GEF, the programming approach for GEF-5, the policy recommendations to support further evolution of the institution, and financial arrangements and burden-sharing.

192. The replenishment process was also more inclusive with the participation of non-donor recipient country representatives representing one representative from each of the regional

groupings of Africa, Asia, Eastern Europe, Latin America and Caribbean; two NGO representatives were also invited as observers.

193. Negotiations for the Fifth Replenishment came to a successful conclusion on May 12, 2010. Thirty five donors have generously pledged \$4.256 billion for programming in the next four years. The Russia Federation became a new donor to the GEF, and Brazil re-engaged as a donor with a significant contribution. The total contributions resulted in a 52.5% increase in new resources available to the GEF.

194. The GEF-5 programming strategy is set within the context of a results-based management framework that establishes an overall corporate results framework. The strategies and results frameworks, with indicators and targets, in the different GEF focal areas -- biodiversity, climate change, international waters, chemicals, and land degradation, and a new program in sustainable forest management – and in thematic areas such as corporate programs, and activities in the private sector are all linked to the corporate results framework.

195. At the special GEF Council meeting on Monday, May 24, in Punta del Este, Uruguay, the Council took note of the Summary and endorsed the entire Replenishment Package, including the Programming Document, the Policy Document, and the Replenishment Resolution.

196. In the case of biodiversity, funding will increase from \$941 million in GEF-4 to \$1.21 billion in GEF-5, an increase of about 29% for biodiversity. Although this robust replenishment will maintain GEF's position as the largest donor advancing globally biodiversity conservation, leveraging this investment will continue to be a focus of the GEF through programming these resources creatively, leveraging partnerships, and continuing to support innovations in conservation finance.

197. The policy recommendations for the fifth replenishment followed two main themes: (i) enhancing country ownership; and (ii) improving the effectiveness and efficiency of the GEF Network and are briefly summarized below.

### **i) Enhancing Country Ownership**

#### **a) Reforming the Corporate Programs**

Country Support Program (CSP) will be implemented by a central corporate entity (GEF Secretariat), and comprised of following elements:

- Multi-stakeholder dialogues along the lines of the current National Dialogue Initiative;
- Constituency-level workshops to keep GEF national focal points, convention focal points and other key stakeholders, including civil society abreast of GEF strategies, policies and procedures;
- Council Member support;
- Direct support to operational focal points;
- Knowledge management tool; and
- Familiarization seminars.

#### **b) Voluntary National Portfolio Identification Process**

On a strictly voluntary basis, countries may undertake a national GEF portfolio identification process to develop a framework for programming GEF resources. Resources will be provided directly by the GEF Secretariat.

c) Funding of Convention Reports

Resources for funding of convention reports, including for national communications required under the UNFCCC, to be provided outside the country allocations of the System for Transparent Allocation of Resources (STAR). Further, resources will be provided directly by the GEF Secretariat.

d) Flexibility in the STAR

The GEF System for Transparent Allocation of Resources (STAR) provides for flexibility for countries with a sum total allocation of \$7 million or lower in the three focal areas of biodiversity, climate change and land degradation, in that they have flexibility in programming projects in any one or more of the three focal areas. Please see Annex 9 for a description of GEF-5 operational procedures for the STAR.

e) Higher Value for Marine Biodiversity

The biodiversity index used to calculate the allocation for the biodiversity focal area gives more value to marine biodiversity than was provided previously during GEF-4 with a weighting increase from 20 to 25% for marine biodiversity in the index.

f) Broadening the GEF Partnership

Implementation of paragraph 28 of the GEF Instrument to include more entities – international entities, regional entities, NGOs, and national entities – in the GEF partnership with direct access to GEF resources.

**ii) Improving the Effectiveness and Efficiency of the GEF Network**

a) Enhancing Accountability to the Conventions

More engagement will occur between the GEF and convention secretariats, including participation of the convention secretariat in GEF Council discussions on focal area strategies and programming.

b) Streamlining the Project Cycle and Refining the Programmatic Approach

Further streamlining of the project cycle to reduce the elapsed times in processing will be implemented. Programmatic approach will be clarified so that GEF programs with a strategic focus can be designed and implemented.

c) Enhancing Engagement with the Private Sector

Council has requested the GEF Evaluation Office for an assessment of the performance of the Earth Fund established in GEF-4. Following the evaluation, a private sector strategy will be presented to the Council for implementation in GEF-5.

- d) Implementing the Results-based Management Framework  
The entire GEF-5 Programming Strategy is set within a results based management framework, with the focal results frameworks (containing clearly objectives and targets) aligned with a GEF corporate results framework. A GEF-wide knowledge management initiative will be implemented in GEF-5.
- e) Clarifying Roles and Responsibilities of GEF Entities  
The roles and responsibilities of GEF entities will be clarified in the context of the proposed reforms.
- f) Cooperation with Civil Society Organizations  
A strategy for enhancing engagement with civil society organization (CSOs) will be discussed by the Council in November 2010.

### **B) GEF Collaboration with the CBD Secretariat to Celebrate the International Year of Biodiversity (IYB)**

198. During the IYB, the GEF is raising global awareness on the importance of biodiversity through various fora using different communication tools in collaboration with key partners, including the CBD Secretariat.

199. GEF Secretariat participated in the Kobe Biodiversity Dialogue, held from Thursday, 15 October 2009 through Friday, 16 October 2009 in Kobe, Japan. GEF Secretariat presented a synthesis of GEF project experience in achieving sustainable biodiversity conservation as part of a panel discussion that identified ways and means to implement the new strategic plan of the CBD and the post-2010 biodiversity target.

200. The GEF Secretariat attended the High-level Event (21-22 January 2010) and the Science-Policy Conference (25-29 January 2010) to celebrate the IYB at the UNESCO Headquarters in Paris, France. The GEF CEO made an opening speech at the event which highlighted the importance of biodiversity to society and the role of the GEF in addressing the challenges to conserve and ensure sustainable use of biodiversity. The GEF CEO also chaired a session on "Development and Biodiversity" at the Science-Policy Conference. The panelists included representatives from UNDP, The Economics of Ecosystems and Biodiversity study team, and indigenous communities. They highlighted the contribution of biodiversity to development and the pressures that development can place on biodiversity. The recommendations from the Conference will be presented in a number of relevant meetings during the IYB.

201. The Global Workshop on the Satoyama Initiative: Ecosystem Services and Human Well-being, was organized by the Ministry of Environment of Japan and the UN University and co-organized by the CBD Secretariat, UNESCO, and UNEP in Paris, France on 29-30 January 2010. The GEF Secretariat participated in the workshop which was attended by more than 80 experts and CBD focal points. The GEF Secretariat presented the GEF biodiversity strategy on biodiversity mainstreaming and highlighted relevant ongoing projects to the Satoyama Initiative.

202. In Washington DC, the IYB was launched on April 13, together with an event that celebrated the work of President Arroyo of the Philippines and her leadership in the Coral Triangle Initiative, which has received considerable GEF support during GEF-4.

203. In addition, on the International Day for Biodiversity celebration in Kenya along the margins of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice (SBSTTA) and WGRI meetings, GEF Secretariat hosted a project site visit to a WB-GEF project at Nairobi National Park (Kenya, Wildlife Conservation Leasing Demonstration (WB; GEF \$0.7M; co-financing: \$0.5M, Total project: \$1.2M) in collaboration with CBD Secretariat.

## **ANNEX 1: BIODIVERSITY FOCAL AREA STRATEGY FOR GEF-5**

### **I. BACKGROUND**

#### **A) The Status of Biodiversity**

1. Biodiversity is defined as “the variability among living organisms from all sources including, *inter alia*, terrestrial, marine and other aquatic ecosystems and the ecological complexes of which they are part; this includes diversity within species, between species, and of ecosystems<sup>37</sup>.” As such, biodiversity is life itself, but it also supports all life on the planet, and its functions are responsible for maintaining the ecosystem processes that provide food, water, and materials to human societies. Thus the interventions identified in this document are integral components of any effective strategy for human adaptation to climate change.

2. Biodiversity is under heavy threat and its loss is considered one of the most critical challenges to humankind. Current rates of extinction exceed those in the fossil record by a factor of up to 1000 times. The interim report of the global study, “The Economics of Ecosystems & Biodiversity (TEEB)” reinforces the conclusion of the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment that ecosystem services are being degraded or used unsustainably with severe socio-economic consequences for human societies and for the future of all life on the planet<sup>38</sup>.

### **B) Evolution of the Biodiversity Focal Area at the GEF**

3. During GEF-1 and GEF-2, strategic direction for the biodiversity focal area was provided by the GEF operational strategy, the GEF operational programs and guidance provided to the GEF from the Conference of the Parties (COP) of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD).

4. The GEF developed its first targeted biodiversity strategy in GEF-3 to complement and further focus its operational programs and to respond to evaluation findings<sup>39</sup>. The GEF-3 strategy incorporated principles to achieve lasting biodiversity conservation and sustainable use and thereby: a) placed greater emphasis on sustainability of results and the potential for replication; b) moved beyond a projects-based emphasis to strategic approaches that strengthened country enabling environments (policy and regulatory frameworks, institutional capacity building, science and information, awareness); c) mainstreamed biodiversity conservation and sustainable use in the wider economic development context; and (d) increased support for sustainable use and benefit sharing. The changes implemented in the GEF-3 strategy formed the foundation upon which subsequent GEF strategies have been built. The strategy for each new phase has maintained continuity with these basic tenets of sustainability while incorporating new findings on good practice in biodiversity conservation and sustainable use.

## **II. BIODIVERSITY STRATEGY GOALS AND OBJECTIVES**

5. The Millennium Ecosystem Assessment identified the most important direct drivers of biodiversity loss and degradation of ecosystem goods and services as habitat change, climate

---

<sup>37</sup> Convention on Biological Diversity.

<sup>38</sup> Millennium Ecosystem Assessment 2005, Ecosystems and Human Well-being: Synthesis, Island Press, Washington DC.

<sup>39</sup> Biodiversity Program Study, 2004.

change, invasive alien species, overexploitation, and pollution. These drivers are influenced by a series of indirect drivers of change including demographics, global economic trends, governance, institutions and legal frameworks, science and technology, and cultural and religious values. The biodiversity strategy in GEF-4 addressed a subset of the direct and indirect drivers of biodiversity loss and focused on the highest leverage opportunities for the GEF to contribute to sustainable biodiversity conservation.<sup>40</sup>

6. The GEF-5 strategy will maintain coherence with the GEF-4 strategy while proposing refinements to the strategy's objectives based on COP-9 guidance, advances in conservation practice, and advice from the GEF's Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel. The ninth meeting of the Conference of the Parties of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) acknowledged that the GEF-4 strategy served as a useful starting point for the GEF-5 strategy and requested GEF to build on it for the fifth replenishment based on the four year framework of program priorities developed by COP-9.<sup>41</sup> Annex One shows the relationship between the COP guidance and the GEF strategy.

7. The goal of the biodiversity focal area is the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity and the maintenance of ecosystem goods and services. To achieve this goal, the strategy encompasses five objectives:

- a. improve the sustainability of protected area systems;
- b. mainstream biodiversity conservation and sustainable use into production landscapes/seascapes and sectors;
- c. build capacity to implement the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety;
- d. build capacity on access to genetic resources and benefit-sharing; and
- e. integrate CBD obligations into national planning processes through enabling activities.

#### **A) Objective One: Improve Sustainability of Protected Area Systems<sup>42</sup>**

##### **Rationale**

8. The GEF defines a sustainable protected area system as one that: a) has sufficient and predictable financial resources available, including external funding, to support protected area management costs; b) effectively protects ecologically viable representative samples of the country's ecosystems and species at a sufficient scale to ensure their long term persistence; and c) retains adequate individual and institutional capacity to manage protected areas such that they achieve their conservation objectives. GEF support will strengthen these fundamental aspects of protected area systems to accelerate their current trajectory towards long-term sustainability.

9. Capacity building at the national and local levels to support effective management of individual protected areas and protected area systems will remain an ongoing priority and an integral part of project interventions. GEF will continue to promote the participation and capacity building of indigenous and local communities in the design, implementation, and

---

<sup>40</sup> [http://gefweb.org/uploadedFiles/Focal\\_Areas/Biodiversity/GEF-4%20strategy%20BD%20Oct%202007.pdf](http://gefweb.org/uploadedFiles/Focal_Areas/Biodiversity/GEF-4%20strategy%20BD%20Oct%202007.pdf)

<sup>41</sup> Decision CBD COP IX/31.

<sup>42</sup> A protected area system could include a national system, a sub-system of a national system, a municipal-level system, or a local level system or a combination of these.



management of protected area projects through established frameworks such as indigenous and community conserved areas (ICCAs).<sup>43</sup> GEF will also promote protected area co-management between government and indigenous and local communities where such management models are appropriate.

10. Developing climate-resilient protected area systems remains a challenge for most protected area managers because the scientific understanding and technical basis for informed decision-making on adaptation or resiliency measures is in its nascent stages. To help overcome these technical challenges, GEF will support the development and integration of adaptation and resilience management measures as part of protected area management projects. This support is important to ensure that GEF's investments will continue to contribute to the sustainability of national protected area systems.

### ***Increase Financing of Protected Area Systems***

11. Restricted government budgets in many countries have reduced the financial support for protected area management. Thus new financing strategies for protected area systems are critical to reduce existing funding gaps. Furthermore, protected area agencies and administrations are often ill-equipped to respond to the commercial opportunities that protected areas provide through the sustainable use of biodiversity. Hence targeted capacity building is also required. GEF-supported interventions will use tools and revenue mechanisms that are responsive to specific country situations (e.g., conservation trust funds, systems of payments for environmental services, debt-for-nature swaps) and draw on accepted good practices developed by GEF and others.<sup>44</sup> GEF will also encourage national policy reform and incentives to engage the private sector and other stakeholders to improve protected area financial sustainability.

### ***Expand Ecosystem and Threatened Species Representation within Protected Area Systems***

12. GEF has been recognized for its substantive contribution to the global achievement of the 10-percent target of the world's land area under protection.<sup>45</sup> However, the marine area under protection remains low. In GEF-4, the GEF sought to redress this disparity through investments to increase the representation of marine ecosystems in protected area systems. The GEF will continue this focus in GEF-5.

13. While not all countries have marine ecosystems under their national jurisdiction, many countries have identified gaps at the national level in the coverage of terrestrial ecosystems and threatened species, which coincide with existing global level representation gaps. Both of these gaps will be addressed in GEF-5.

### ***Improve Management Effectiveness of Existing Protected Areas***<sup>46</sup>

---

<sup>43</sup> Indigenous and Community Conserved Areas (ICCAs) are natural sites, resources and species' habitats conserved in voluntary and self-directed ways by indigenous peoples and local communities.

<sup>44</sup> GEF Experience with Conservation Trust Funds (GEF Evaluation Report # 1-99).

<sup>45</sup> OPS3: Progressing Toward Environmental Results, Third Overall Performance Study of the GEF.

<sup>46</sup> The GEF has been tracking protected area management effectiveness since GEF-3 and has applied the Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool (METT) to qualitatively assess how well a protected area is being managed to achieve its conservation objectives.

14. The sustainability of a protected area system requires that each protected area site is effectively managed according to its specific demands.<sup>47</sup> Some areas will require a low level of management activity while others may require a greater management effort to achieve their conservation objectives. In some instances the most efficient way to improve the system's sustainability will be to focus on improved site level management for each protected area within the system.

### **Project Support**

15. **Improve Sustainable Financing of Protected Area Systems:** GEF will support the development and implementation of comprehensive, system-level financing solutions and help build the capacity required to achieve financial sustainability.

16. **Expand Marine and Terrestrial Ecosystem Representation:** GEF will support efforts to address the marine ecosystem coverage gap within national level systems through the creation and effective management of coastal and near shore protected area networks, including no-take zones, to conserve and sustainably use marine biodiversity. GEF will also support the creation and effective management of new protected areas to expand terrestrial and inland water ecosystem representation within protected area systems. Conserving habitat for landraces and wild crop relatives of species of economic importance may also be included as part of this effort to reduce representation gaps.

17. **Expand Threatened Species Representation:** GEF will support the creation and effective management of new protected areas that extends the coverage of threatened species in protected area systems and improves the coverage of their spatial range.

18. **Improve Management Effectiveness of Existing Protected Areas:** GEF will support projects that aim to improve the management effectiveness of existing protected areas. This could include support to transboundary protected areas.

### **B) Objective Two: Mainstream Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Use into Production Landscapes/Seascapes and Sectors**

### **Rationale**

19. The persistence of biodiversity requires the sustainable management of landscape and seascape mosaics that include protected areas and a variety of other land and resource uses outside of these protected areas. Thus, in order to complement its investments to strengthen the sustainability of protected area systems, GEF will promote sustainability measures to help reduce the negative impacts that productive sectors exert on biodiversity, particularly outside of protected areas, and highlight the contribution of biodiversity to economic development and human well being, – a set of actions often referred to as “mainstreaming”. Biodiversity-dependent production sectors and those with large ecological footprints will be targeted: agriculture, fisheries, forestry, tourism, and the major extractive industries of oil and gas, and mining.

---

<sup>47</sup> This would include actions to manage threats to biodiversity including invasive alien species, but given the high cost of eradication and the low success rates, projects will prioritize prevention approaches.

20. GEF's strategy to support biodiversity mainstreaming focuses on the role and potential contributions of both the public and private sector. The strategy aims to strengthen the capacity of the public sector to manage and regulate the use of biological diversity in the productive landscape and seascape while also exploiting opportunities to support the production of biodiversity-friendly goods and services by resource managers and users including the private sector.

### ***Strengthen the Policy and Regulatory Framework for Mainstreaming Biodiversity***

21. The incorporation of biodiversity conservation, sustainable use, and benefit-sharing into broader policy, legal, and regulatory frameworks is not taking place in many GEF-eligible countries because of a number of factors. These factors include poor governance, weak capacity, conflicting policies (e.g., tenure regimes biased against "idle" lands), and the lack of scientific knowledge and incentives.

22. Mainstreaming may yield substantial social and economic benefits to public or private actors. However, these actors may be unaware of these benefits. In these circumstances, providing information on the economic valuation of biodiversity and its contribution to national development and corporate interests is a key task. The Millennium Ecosystem Assessment advanced valuable information on biodiversity and ecosystem services on a global scale, but similar efforts are required at the national and local scales where most policy and production decisions regarding land- and ocean-use are made. This could also involve more effective use of national biodiversity strategies and action plans (NBSAPs) to foster mainstreaming of biodiversity into national development strategies and programs.

23. Even when public and private actors are aware of the benefits from effecting policy and resource management changes, they may not have the capacity to act. In these cases, capacity building becomes paramount.

24. In some cases, public and private actors may not have the incentive to act even if they have the capacity to do so. Incentives can often be created by changing policies and programs that encourage economically inefficient uses of ecosystems and species (e.g., strengthening property rights systems; removing "perverse" subsidies). In other cases, incentives can be created through the evolving mainstreaming tool of Payment for Ecosystem Services (PES).<sup>48</sup>

25. In recognition of the importance that the COP places on the threat that invasive alien species pose to biodiversity, particularly in islands and island states, and most often in productive lands and oceans, GEF will continue to support the development of regulatory and management frameworks to prevent, control and manage these species.

### ***Strengthen Capacities to Produce Biodiversity-friendly Goods and Services***

26. Environmental certification systems exploit the willingness of the market to pay a premium for goods and services whose production, distribution and consumption meets an

---

<sup>48</sup> Also called Payments for Environmental Services.

environmental standard. This willingness creates market incentives for producers to improve their environmental and/or social practices to receive the price premium. GEF will help remove the barriers to enhancing, scaling up, replicating, and extending environmental certification systems in productive landscapes and seascapes.

## **Project Support**

27. **Strengthen Policy and Regulatory Frameworks:** GEF will support the development and implementation of policy and regulatory frameworks that provide incentives for private actors to align their practices and behavior with the principles of sustainable use and management. To this end, GEF interventions will remove critical knowledge barriers and develop requisite institutional capacities. This will include support for sub-national and local-level applications--where implementation can be more effective--of spatial land-use planning that incorporates biodiversity and ecosystem service valuation.

28. GEF will continue to support national, sub-national and local PES schemes. Recent STAP guidance will be applied, as appropriate, in the review of PES projects.<sup>49</sup>

29. **Implement Invasive Alien Species Management Frameworks:** GEF will support interventions that address the issue of invasive alien species systemically through developing the sectoral policy, regulations, and institutional arrangements for the prevention and management of invasions emphasizing a risk management approach by focusing on the highest risk invasion pathways. Priority will be given to establishing policy measures that reduce the impact of invasive species on the environment, including through prevention of new incursions, early detection and institutional frameworks to respond rapidly to new incursions.

30. **Produce Biodiversity-friendly Goods and Services:** To increase production of biodiversity-friendly goods, GEF will focus its support on: a) improving product certification standards to capture global biodiversity benefits; b) establishing training systems for farmers and resource managers on how to improve management practices to meet certification standards; and c) facilitating access to financing for producers, cooperatives, and companies working towards producing certified goods and services.

### **C) Objective Three: Build Capacity for the Implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety (CPB)<sup>50</sup>**

## **Rationale**

31. The Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety seeks to protect biological diversity from the potential risks posed by living modified organisms resulting from modern biotechnology. GEF's strategy to build capacity to implement the CPB prioritizes the implementation of activities that are identified in country stock-taking analyses and in the COP guidance to the GEF, in particular the key elements in the *Updated Action Plan for Building Capacities for the Effective*

---

<sup>49</sup> Payment for Environmental Services and the Global Environment Facility: A STAP Guideline Document, 2008.

<sup>50</sup> A *Strategy for Financing Biosafety* (Doc GEF/C.30/8/Rev.1) was approved by the GEF Council at its December 2006 meeting. The full list of activities to be supported under this objective can be found in the full strategy document at: [http://gefweb.org/Documents/Council\\_Documents/GEF\\_30/documents/C.30.8.Rev.1StrategyforFinancingBiosafety.pdf](http://gefweb.org/Documents/Council_Documents/GEF_30/documents/C.30.8.Rev.1StrategyforFinancingBiosafety.pdf)

*Implementation of the CPB*, agreed to at the third COP serving as the Meeting of the Parties to the CPB (COP-MOP-3).

### **Project Support**

32. **Single-country projects:** These projects will be implemented when the characteristics of the eligible country, as assessed in the stock-taking analysis – and the design of existing or planned future regional or sub-regional efforts in the area – recommend a national approach for the implementation of the CPB in that country.<sup>51</sup>

33. **Regional or sub-regional projects:** Providing support to eligible countries through regional or sub-regional projects will be pursued when there are opportunities for cost-effective sharing of limited resources and for coordination between biosafety frameworks. Regional and sub-regional approaches will be pursued where stock-taking assessments support the potential for: coordinating biosafety frameworks, interchange of regional expertise, and capacity building of common priority areas.

34. **Thematic projects:** A thematic approach can be an effective way to develop the capacities of groups of countries lacking competences in relevant fields. This multi-country approach will be pursued where stock-taking assessments support the needs of eligible countries and where this approach would foster the pooling of resources, economies of scale and international coordination.

## **D) Objective Four: Build Capacity on Access to Genetic Resources and Benefit Sharing (ABS)**

### **Rationale**

35. Implementation of the CBD's third objective on access to genetic resources and benefit sharing has been slowed by the lack of capacity of most key stakeholder groups. Of particular note is the difficulty in most countries to establish a common understanding between providers and users of genetic resources and the associated traditional knowledge of indigenous and local communities.

### **Project Support**

36. Prior to completion of negotiations of an international regime on ABS before the COP's tenth meeting in Nagoya, Japan, GEF will support capacity building of governments for meeting their obligations under Article 15 of the CBD, as well as building capacity within key stakeholder groups, including indigenous and local communities, and the scientific community. This would include support for the establishment of measures that promote concrete access and benefit-sharing agreements that recognize the core ABS principles of Prior Informed Consent (PIC) and Mutually Agreed Terms (MAT) including the fair and equitable sharing of benefits. Projects submitted prior to completion of the negotiations of the international regime should be

---

<sup>51</sup> By the end of GEF-4, as many as 50 countries will have received support for implementation of their National Biosafety Frameworks. If that target is achieved, 75 eligible countries are remaining to implement their NBFs leaving significant opportunities to provide ongoing support for single country projects to accelerate implementation of the protocol.

consistent with the Bonn Guidelines on ABS and the related action plan on capacity building for ABS adopted under the Convention (Decision VII/19F).

37. After completion of the negotiations of the international regime, the GEF will fully elucidate project support provided under this objective in consultation with the CBD Secretariat and COP Bureau for approval by GEF council.

**E) Objective Five: Integrate CBD Obligations into National Planning Processes through Enabling Activities**

**Rationale**

38. Enabling activities continue to play an important role in assisting national government institutions to meet their immediate obligations under the CBD, notably the development and revision of National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plans (NBSAPs), national reporting, and clearing house information functions. Enabling activities help national executing agencies to integrate CBD obligations, strategies and work programs into the national planning process and hence can make critical contributions to the successful mainstreaming of biodiversity into national development planning frameworks and sector planning processes. In addition, increased understanding about the role intact habitat and biodiversity play to help humans adapt to climate change and advances in ecosystem service valuation provide an opportunity to incorporate this knowledge into the revision of NBSAPs. This should increase the potential of NBSAPs to serve as effective vehicles for mainstreaming biodiversity in sustainable development policy and planning.

**Project Support**

39. Enabling activity support could be provided for revising NBSAPs in line with the CBD's new strategic plan to be adopted at COP-10 and integrating biodiversity into sectoral planning, national reporting, and implementation of guidance related to the Clearing House Mechanism (CHM).

**III) Focal Area Set Aside (FAS)**

40. Countries will be able to access the global and regional set-aside funds (GRS) to implement enabling activities for an amount up to \$500,000 on an expedited basis for activities identified under Objective Five above. Amounts greater than that will be provided from a country's national allocation.

41. The remaining funds in FAS will be used to address supra-national strategic priorities or to incentivize countries to make substantive changes in the state of biodiversity at the national level through participation in global, regional or multi-country projects. Projects supported with FAS funds will meet some or all of the following criteria: (i) relevant to the objectives of GEF's biodiversity strategy; (ii) support priorities identified by the COP of the CBD; (iii) high likelihood that the project will have a broad and positive impact on biodiversity; (iv) potential for replication; (v) global demonstration value; and (vi) contribute to global conservation knowledge through formal experimental or quasi-experimental designs that test and evaluate the hypotheses

embedded in project interventions. An incentive system would operate for all regional projects whereby participating countries would receive resources from the FAS proportionate with the amount of resources dedicated to a project from their national allocation.

42. Consistent with the criteria identified above for special initiatives to be funded by FAS, the biodiversity focal area will partner with the international waters focal and set aside \$25 million from the FAS to initiate a global pilot program focused on the protection of marine biodiversity in “Areas Beyond National Jurisdiction” (ABNJ). This investment will complement GEF’s continued focus on increasing marine protected area coverage under national jurisdiction given that about 50% of the Earth’s surface is considered the high seas, or marine areas beyond national jurisdiction. These offshore areas harbor about 90% of the Earth’s biomass and host a diversity of species and ecosystems, many of which are yet to be discovered. As a result, protection of the high seas has become an emerging priority in biodiversity conservation. Although conservation and management of high seas marine protected areas pose a number governance challenges and legal issues, the GEF believes that it is important to begin learning how to implement and manage marine protected areas in the waters beyond national jurisdiction. The proposed pilot is consistent with CBD COP Decision IX/20.

43. The IPCC has been responsible for both the resolution of important scientific questions related to the nature and extent of the global warming problem, as well as making those contributions effectively permeate the policy debate at the highest levels. However, the science-policy interface for biodiversity and ecosystem services is fragmented inside and outside of the CBD impeding a similar incremental process occurring for the important problem of biodiversity loss and ecosystem degradation like the world has witnessed with the IPCC. Policy making in biodiversity conservation and ecosystem management at all levels can be further strengthened if they are supported by credible, legitimate and salient scientific findings and recommendations which are provided by an intergovernmental science-policy platform, while building on the GEF-funded Millennium Ecosystem Assessment findings. To address this need, CBD COP IX agreed to explore the establishment of an Intergovernmental Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES). The twenty-fifth session of the UNEP Governing Council/Global Ministerial Environmental Forum adopted Decision 25/10 on the intergovernmental science-policy platform on biodiversity and ecosystem services, which accords UNEP the mandate to continue to facilitate discussions on strengthening the science-policy interface on biodiversity and ecosystem services. Supporting this emerging initiative could be undertaken with a contribution from the FAS.







**Table 1: Biodiversity Results Framework**<sup>10</sup>

**Goal:** Conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity and the maintenance of ecosystem goods and services.

**Impacts:**

Biodiversity conserved and habitat maintained in national protected area systems.

Conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity integrated into production landscapes and seascapes.

**Indicators:**

Intact vegetative cover and degree of fragmentation in national protected area systems measured in hectares as recorded by remote sensing.

Intact vegetative cover and degree of fragmentation in production landscapes measured in hectares as recorded by remote sensing.

Coastal zone habitat (coral reef, mangroves, etc) intact in marine protected areas and productive seascapes measured in hectares as recorded by remote sensing and, where possible, supported by visual or other verification methods.

Objectives	Expected Outcomes and Indicators	Outcome targets for \$4.2 billion Target	Core Outputs
Total Focal Area Allocation		\$1.20 billion	
Sustainable Forest Management/REDD-plus		\$130 million	
Objective 1: Improve Sustainability of Protected Area Systems	<p>Outcome 1.1: Improved management effectiveness of existing and new protected areas. <i>Indicator 1.1: Protected area management effectiveness score as recorded by Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool.</i></p> <p>Outcome 1.2: Increased revenue for protected area systems to meet total expenditures required for management. <i>Indicator 1.2: Funding gap for</i></p>	<p>\$ 700 million</p> <p>Eighty-percent (80%) of projects meet or exceed their protected area management effectiveness targets covering 170 million hectares of existing or new protected areas.</p> <p>Eighty-percent (80%) of projects meet or exceed their target for reducing the protected area management funding gap in protected area systems that develop and</p>	<p>Output 1. New protected areas (number) and coverage (hectares) of unprotected ecosystems.</p> <p>Output 2. New protected areas (number) and coverage (hectares) of unprotected threatened species (number).</p> <p>Output 3. Sustainable financing plans (number).</p>

<sup>10</sup> Biodiversity tracking tools have been developed and are now in use for GEF projects in protected areas (objective one), biodiversity mainstreaming including invasive alien species management frameworks (objective two), and biosafety (objective three) and can be found at: <http://gefweb.org/interior.aspx?id=230>. A tracking tool for objective four on Access to Genetic Resources and Benefit Sharing will be developed as the activities of the objective are finalized in response to the outcome of the current negotiations of the international regime on ABS.

Objectives	Expected Outcomes and Indicators	Outcome targets for \$4.2 billion Target	Core Outputs
	<i>management of protected area systems as recorded by protected area financing scorecards.</i>	implement sustainable financing plans.	
Objective 2: Mainstream Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Use into Production Landscapes, Seascapes and Sectors	<p>Outcome 2.1: Increase in sustainably managed landscapes and seascapes that integrate biodiversity conservation. <i>Indicator 2.1: Landscapes and seascapes certified by internationally or nationally recognized environmental standards that incorporate biodiversity considerations (e.g. FSC, MSC) measured in hectares and recorded by GEF tracking tool.</i></p> <p>Outcome 2.2: Measures to conserve and sustainably use biodiversity incorporated in policy and regulatory frameworks. <i>Indicator 2.2: Policies and regulations governing sectoral activities that integrate biodiversity conservation as recorded by the GEF tracking tool as a score.</i></p> <p>Outcome 2.3: Improved management frameworks to prevent, control and manage invasive alien species <i>Indicator 2.3: IAS management framework operational score as recorded by the GEF tracking tool.</i></p>	<p>\$250 million</p> <p>Sustainable use and management of biodiversity in 60 million hectares of production landscapes and seascapes.</p> <p>Fifty-percent (50%) of projects achieve a score of six (6) (i.e., biodiversity conservation and sustainable use is mentioned in sector policy through specific legislation, regulations are in place to implement the legislation, regulations are under implementation, implementation of regulations is enforced, and enforcement of regulations is monitored)</p> <p>Eighty-percent (80%) of projects meet or exceed their target for a fully operational and effective IAS management framework.</p>	<p>Output 1. Policies and regulatory frameworks (number) for production sectors.</p> <p>Output 2. National and sub-national land-use plans (number) that incorporate biodiversity and ecosystem services valuation.</p> <p>Output 3. Certified production landscapes and seascapes (hectares).</p>

Objectives	Expected Outcomes and Indicators	Outcome targets for \$4.2 billion Target	Core Outputs
Objective 3: Build Capacity for the Implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety (CPB)	Outcome 3.1 Potential risks of living modified organisms to biodiversity are identified and evaluated in a scientifically sound and transparent manner <i>Indicator 3.1: National biosafety decision-making systems operational score as recorded by the GEF tracking tool</i>	\$40 million  Eighty-percent (80%) of projects meet or exceed their target for a fully operational and effective biosafety framework.	All remaining eligible countries (about 60-70 depending on programming for rest of GEF-4) have national biosafety decision-making systems in place.
Objective 4: Build Capacity on Access to Genetic Resources and Benefit Sharing	Outcome 4.1: Legal and regulatory frameworks, and administrative procedures established that enable access to genetic resources and benefit sharing in accordance with the CBD provisions <i>Indicator 4.1: National ABS frameworks operational score as recorded by the GEF tracking tool (to be developed)</i>	\$ 40 million  Eighty-percent (80%) of projects meet or exceed their target for a fully operational and effective ABS framework.	Access and benefit-sharing agreements (number) that recognize the core ABS principles of Prior Informed Consent (PIC) and Mutually Agreed Terms (MAT) including the fair and equitable sharing of benefits.
Objective Five: Integrate CBD Obligations into National Planning Processes through Enabling Activities	Outcome 5.1 Development and sectoral planning frameworks at country level integrate measurable biodiversity conservation and sustainable use targets. <i>Indicator 5.1: Percentage of development and sectoral frameworks that integrate measurable biodiversity conservation and sustainable use targets.</i>	\$ 40 million  50% of parties that revise NBSAPs successfully integrate measurable biodiversity conservation and sustainable use targets into development and sectoral planning frameworks.	Number and type of development and sectoral planning frameworks that include measurable biodiversity conservation and sustainable use targets.

**ANNEX 2: FULL-SIZE PROJECTS IN THE BIODIVERSITY FOCAL AREA  
APPROVED DURING THE REPORTING PERIOD**

<b>Country</b>	<b>Agency</b>	<b>Project Title</b>	<b>GEF Amount (\$)</b>	<b>Cofinancing Amount (\$)</b>	<b>Total (\$)</b>
Angola	World Bank	National Biodiversity Project	2,000,000	6,000,000	8,000,000
Argentina	UNDP	Strengthening Fisheries Governance to Protect Freshwater and Wetland Biodiversity	2,355,000	4,843,000	7,198,000
Argentina	UNDP	Inter-jurisdictional System of Coastal-Marine Protected Areas (ISCOMPA)	2,177,727	10,730,000	12,907,727
Bahamas	UNEP	Building a Sustainable National Marine Protected Area Network	2,200,000	6,760,000	8,960,000
Benin	World Bank	SPWA-BD Support to Protected Areas Management	1,900,500	9,675,000	11,575,500
Bolivia	UNDP	SFM Biodiversity Conservation through Sustainable Forest Management by Local Communities	5,500,000	10,500,000	16,000,000
Brazil	UNEP	Improving Brazilian Capacity to Conserve and Use Biodiversity through Information Management and Use	8,172,727	20,100,000	28,272,727
Brazil	FAO	Integrated Management of the Ilha Grande Bay Ecosystem	2,400,000	7,400,000	9,800,000
Brazil	World Bank	Amazon Region Protected Areas Program Phase 2	15,890,000	70,000,000	85,890,000
Cameroon	UNEP	BS Development and Institution of A National Monitoring and Control System (Framework) for Living Modified Organisms (LMOs) and Invasive Alien Species (IAS)	2,400,000	8,400,000	10,800,000
Cameroon	FAO	CBSP Sustainable Community Based Management and Conservation of Mangrove Ecosystem in Cameroon	1,733,182	3,700,000	5,433,182
Cameroon	World Bank	CBSP Conservation and Sustainable Use of the Ngoyla Mintom Forest	3,500,000	6,500,000	10,000,000
Cape Verde	UNDP	SPWA-BD Consolidation of Cape Verde's Protected Areas System	3,287,000	14,245,000	17,532,000

Country	Agency	Project Title	GEF Amount (\$)	Cofinancing Amount (\$)	Total (\$)
Central African Republic	UNDP	CBSP Strengthened management of the national protected areas system through involvement of local communities	1,768,182	2,350,000	4,118,182
China	ADB	CBPF Jiangsu Yancheng Wetlands System Protection Project	2,500,000	100,000,000	102,500,000
China	ADB	CBPF Integrated Ecosystem and Water Resources Management in the Baiyangdian Basin	2,975,000	276,116,000	279,091,000
China	UNDP	CBPF: Strengthening Globally Important Biodiversity Conservation Through Protected Area Strengthening in Gansu Province	1,738,000	7,280,000	9,018,000
China	UNDP	CBPF: Strengthening the Effectiveness of the Protected Area System in Qinghai Province	5,354,545	18,500,000	23,854,545
China	FAO	CBPF: Demonstration of Estuarine Biodiversity Conservation Restoration and Protected Area Networking	3,636,400	11,863,500	15,499,900
Colombia	UNDP	Mainstreaming Biodiversity in the Coffee Sector in Colombia	2,000,000	5,270,000	7,270,000
Colombia	UNDP	Mainstreaming Traditional Knowledge Associated with Agrobiodiversity in Colombian Agroecosystems	2,500,000	5,130,000	7,630,000
Colombia	IADB	Protecting Biodiversity in the Southwestern Caribbean Sea	3,000,000	4,150,000	7,150,000
Colombia	UNDP	Designing and Implementing a National Sub-System of Marine Protected Areas (SMPA)	4,850,000	7,500,000	12,350,000
Colombia	World Bank	Colombian National Protected Areas Conservation Trust Fund – Additional financing for the Sustainability of the Macizo Regional Protected Area System (SIRAPM)	4,000,000	13,800,000	17,800,000
Colombia	IADB	Mainstreaming Biodiversity in Palm Cropping in Colombia with an Ecosystem Approach	4,250,000	14,130,000	18,380,000
Congo DR	World Bank	CBSP Forest and Nature Conservation Project	6,000,000	62,000,000	68,000,000
Costa Rica	IADB	Integrated Management of Marine and Coastal Resources in Puntarenas	3,000,000	8,813,000	11,813,000

Country	Agency	Project Title	GEF Amount (\$)	Cofinancing Amount (\$)	Total (\$)
Costa Rica	UNDP	Consolidating Costa Rica's Marine Protected Areas (MPAs)	1,212,027	17,862,676	19,074,703
Cote d'Ivoire	World Bank	Protected Area Project (Projet d'Appui a la Relance de la Conservation des Parcs et Reserves, PARC-CI)	2,540,000	19,543,596	22,083,596
Cuba	UNDP	Application of a Regional Approach to the Management of Marine and Coastal Protected Areas in Cuba's Southern Archipelagos	5,710,000	14,150,000	19,860,000
Cuba	UNDP	Enhancing the Prevention, Control and Management of Invasive Alien Species in Vulnerable Ecosystems	5,018,182	10,000,000	15,018,182
Cuba	UNEP	Agricultural Biodiversity Conservation and Man and Biosphere Reserves in Cuba: Bridging Managed and Natural Landscapes	1,368,182	2,181,887	3,550,069
Dominican Republic	UNDP	Re-engineering National Protected Area System in Order to Achieve Financial Sustainability	3,200,000	8,128,000	11,328,000
Ecuador	IADB	Marine and Coastal Biodiversity Conservation	4,000,000	6,000,000	10,000,000
Ecuador	UNDP	Sustainable Financing of Ecuador's National System of Protected Areas (SNAP) and Associated Private and Community-managed PA Subsystems	6,400,000	9,000,000	15,400,000
Egypt	UNDP	Strengthening Protected Area Financing and Management Systems	3,616,000	13,800,000	17,416,000
El Salvador	UNDP	Mainstreaming Biodiversity Management into Fisheries and Tourism Activities carried out in Coastal /Marine Ecosystems	2,354,545	6,053,000	8,407,545
Equatorial Guinea	UNDP	CBSP – Strengthening the National System of protected areas in Equatorial Guinea for the effective conservation of representative ecosystems and globally significant biodiversity	1,768,182	4,450,000	6,218,182
Ethiopia	UNDP	Mainstreaming Agro-biodiversity Conservation in the Farming Systems of Ethiopia	3,863,600	4,700,000	8,563,600

Country	Agency	Project Title	GEF Amount (\$)	Cofinancing Amount (\$)	Total (\$)
Ethiopia	UNEP	Capacity Building for Access and Benefit Sharing and Conservation and Sustainable Use of Medicinal Plants	2,047,000	2,025,000	4,072,000
Global	UNEP	BS:UNEP-GEF Project for Continued Enhancement of Building Capacity for Effective Participation in the BCH II	2,500,000	2,515,000	5,015,000
Global	World Bank	Save Our Species	4,900,000	8,890,000	13,790,000
Global (Bolivia, Colombia, Ecuador, Peru, Venezuela)	UNEP	Communities of Conservation: Safeguarding the World's Most Threatened Species	1,775,000	1,775,000	3,550,000
Global (Brazil, Kenya, Sri Lanka, Turkey)	UNEP/FAO	Mainstreaming Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Use for Improved Human Nutrition and Well-being	5,517,618	8,410,000	13,927,618
Global (Chile, Indonesia, Nepal, Vietnam)	UNEP	Expanding FSC Certification at Landscape-level through Incorporating Additional Ecosystem Services.	2,880,000	2,880,000	5,760,000
Global (Chile, Lesotho, Trinidad and Tobago, Vietnam, South Africa)	UNEP	Project for Ecosystem Services (ProEcoServ)	6,296,637	14,045,000	20,341,637
Guatemala	UNDP	Promoting Ecotourism to Strengthen the Financial Sustainability of the Guatemalan Protected Areas System (SIGAP)	1,295,455	1,955,310	3,250,765
Haiti	UNDP	Establishing a Financially Sustainable National Protected Areas System	2,627,273	6,450,000	9,077,273
Honduras	UNDP	Conservation of Biodiversity in the Indigenous Productive Landscapes of the Moskitia	2,018,300	5,455,000	7,473,300
India	UNEP	BS Capacity Building on Biosafety for Implementation of the Cartagena Protocol - Phase II under the Biosafety Program	2,727,273	6,000,000	8,727,273
India	UNEP	Strengthening the Implementation of the Biological Diversity Act and Rules with Focus on its Access and Benefit Sharing Provisions	3,561,000	6,228,000	9,789,000



Country	Agency	Project Title	GEF Amount (\$)	Cofinancing Amount (\$)	Total (\$)
India	UNDP	IND-BD Mainstreaming Coastal and Marine Biodiversity Conservation into Production Sectors in the Godavari River Estuary in Andhra Pradesh State	6,023,636	17,700,000	23,723,636
India	UNDP	IND-BD Mainstreaming Coastal and Marine Biodiversity Conservation into Production Sectors in the Malvan Coast, Maharashtra State	3,438,294	10,200,000	13,638,294
Indonesia	World Bank	Promoting Sustainable Production Forest Management to Secure Globally Important Biodiversity	3,300,000	8,000,000	11,300,000
Jamaica	UNDP	Strengthening the Operational and Financial Sustainability of the National Protected Area System	2,770,585	7,610,000	10,380,585
Kazakhstan	UNDP	Steppe Conservation and Management	2,215,000	5,702,400	7,917,400
Kenya	UNDP	Strengthening the Protected Area Network within the Eastern Montane Forest Hotspot of Kenya	4,500,000	11,000,000	15,500,000
Lao PDR	UNDP/FAO	Mainstreaming Biodiversity In Lao PDR's Agricultural and Land Management Policies, Plans and Programmes	2,265,000	4,813,000	7,078,000
Madagascar	UNDP	Network of Managed Resource Protected Areas	6,000,000	9,075,000	15,075,000
Madagascar	World Bank	Support to the Madagascar Foundation for Protected Areas and Biodiversity	10,000,000	34,300,000	44,300,000
Malaysia	UNDP	Enhancing Effectiveness and Financial Sustainability of Protected Areas	5,600,000	9,800,000	15,400,000
Malaysia	UNDP	Biodiversity Conservation in Multiple-Use Forest Landscapes in Sabah	4,400,000	8,800,000	13,200,000
Mali	UNDP	SPWA-BD Expansion and Strengthening of Mali's PA System	1,768,000	3,950,000	5,718,000
Mauritius	UNDP	Expanding Coverage and Strengthening Management Effectiveness of the Terrestrial Protected Area Network	4,000,000	6,000,000	10,000,000

Country	Agency	Project Title	GEF Amount (\$)	Cofinancing Amount (\$)	Total (\$)
Mexico	UNDP	SFM Transforming Management of Biodiversity-rich Community Production Forests through Building National Capacities for Market-based Instruments - under the Sustainable Forest Management Program	6,900,000	17,371,500	24,271,500
Mexico	World Bank	Consolidation of the Protected Area System (SINAP II) - Fourth Tranche	5,440,000	5,440,000	10,880,000
Mexico	UNEP	Integrating Trade offs between Supply of Ecosystem Services and Land use Options into Poverty Alleviation Efforts and Development Planning	5,900,000	9,531,000	15,431,000
Mexico	UNEP	Mainstreaming the Conservation of Ecosystem Services and Biodiversity at the Micro-watershed Scale in Chiapas	1,485,000	4,850,000	6,335,000
Mexico	World Bank	Fostering Sustainable and Competitive Production Systems Consistent with the Conservation of Biodiversity	11,688,182	19,200,000	30,888,182
Mongolia	UNDP	Strengthening of the Protected Area Networking System in Mongolia (SPAN)	1,363,630	4,800,000	6,163,630
Morocco	IFAD	MENARID - A Circular Economy Approach to Agro-Biodiversity Conservation in the Souss Massa Draa Region of Morocco	2,647,272	5,500,000	8,147,272
Mozambique	UNDP	Sustainable Financing of the Protected Area System in Mozambique	4,850,000	15,000,000	19,850,000
Namibia	UNDP	Protected Landscape Conservation Areas Initiative (NAM PLACE)	4,500,000	13,100,000	17,600,000
Niger	UNDP	SPWA-BD Integrating the Sustainable Management of Faunal Corridors into Niger's Protected Area System	1,768,182	5,200,000	6,968,182
Nigeria	UNDP	SPWA-BD Niger Delta Conservation Project	3,610,000	6,150,000	9,760,000
Pakistan	UNDP	Mountains and Markets: Biodiversity and Business in Northern Pakistan	1,793,182	6,185,000	7,978,182
Panama	UNDP	Mainstreaming Biodiversity Conservation into the Operation of the Tourism and Fisheries Sectors in the Archipelagos of Panama	1,695,000	2,675,000	4,370,000

Country	Agency	Project Title	GEF Amount (\$)	Cofinancing Amount (\$)	Total (\$)
Panama	IADB	Mainstreaming biodiversity conservation through low-impact ecotourism in the SINAP	4,000,000	8,500,000	12,500,000
Papua New Guinea	UNDP	PAS Community-Based Forest and Coastal Conservation and Resource Management in PNG	6,900,000	12,000,000	18,900,000
Peru	IFAD	SFM Sustainable Management of Protected Areas and Forests of the Northern Highlands of Peru	1,720,000	13,481,000	15,201,000
Philippines	UNDP	Expanding and Diversifying the National System of Terrestrial Protected Areas	3,500,000	3,860,000	7,360,000
Philippines	UNDP	Partnerships for Biodiversity Conservation: Mainstreaming in Local Agricultural Landscapes	4,500,000	9,100,000	13,600,000
Regional (Antigua And Barbuda, Barbados, Dominica, St. Kitts And Nevis, St. Lucia, Trinidad and Tobago, St. Vincent and Grenadines)	UNEP	BS Regional Project for Implementing National Biosafety Frameworks in the Caribbean Sub-region - under the GEF Biosafety Program	3,344,043	3,767,950	7,111,993
Regional (Antigua And Barbuda, Grenada, St. Kitts And Nevis, St. Lucia, St. Vincent and Grenadines)	World Bank	Sustainable Financing and Management of Eastern Caribbean Marine Ecosystems	8,750,000	14,800,000	23,550,000
Regional (Bahamas, Belize, Grenada, Guyana, Suriname)	UNEP	BS Implementation of National Biosafety Frameworks in Caribbean Sub Region Countries of Bahamas, Belize, Grenada, Guyana and Suriname in the Context of a Regional Project	2,628,450	3,150,674	5,779,124
Regional (Bahamas, Dominican Republic, Jamaica, St. Lucia, Trinidad and Tobago)	UNEP	Mitigating the Threats of Invasive Alien Species in the Insular Caribbean	2,574,887	3,084,247	5,659,134

Country	Agency	Project Title	GEF Amount (\$)	Cofinancing Amount (\$)	Total (\$)
Regional (Cameroon, Kenya, Madagascar, Mozambique, Senegal, South Africa)	UNEP	Supporting the Development and Implementation of Access and Benefit Sharing Policies in Africa	1,177,300	795,950	1,973,250
Regional (Central African Republic, Congo, Cameroon, Gabon, Congo DR)	UNDP	CBSP Sustainable Financing of Protected Area Systems in the Congo Basin	8,181,818	50,600,000	58,781,818
Regional (Central African Republic, Congo, Gabon, Congo DR)	FAO	CBSP Sustainable Management of the Wildlife and Bushmeat Sector in Central Africa	4,245,452	6,000,000	10,245,452
Regional (Colombia, Ecuador, Peru)	UNEP	Facilitation of Financing for Biodiversity-based Businesses and Support of Market Development Activities in the Andean Region	6,414,021	7,897,954	14,311,975
Regional (Congo, Congo DR)	UNDP	CBSP Catalyzing Sustainable Forest Management in the Lake Tele-Lake Tumba (LTLT) Transboundary Wetland Landscape	2,172,726	6,600,000	8,772,726
Regional (Cook Islands, Micronesia, Kiribati, Marshall Islands, Niue, Papua New Guinea, Palau, Tonga, Vanuatu, Samoa)	UNEP	PAS Prevention, Control and Management of Invasive Alien Species in the Pacific Islands	3,031,815	4,430,000	7,461,815
Regional (Cook Islands, Nauru, Tonga, Tuvalu)	UNEP	PAS Implementing the Island Biodiversity Programme of Work by Integrating the Conservation Management of Island Biodiversity	1,740,600	1,960,000	3,700,600
Regional (Fiji, Niue, Vanuatu, Samoa)	FAO	PAS Forestry and Protected Area Management	6,286,000	9,880,000	16,166,000

Country	Agency	Project Title	GEF Amount (\$)	Cofinancing Amount (\$)	Total (\$)
Regional (Gambia, Mali, Sierra Leone, Chad, Togo)	UNEP	SPWA Evolution of PA Systems with regard to Climatic, Institutional, Social, and Economic Conditions in the West Africa Region	3,636,364	10,000,000	13,636,364
Regional (Indonesia, Cambodia, Philippines, Vietnam)	UNEP	Removing Barriers to Invasive Species Management in Production and Protection Forests in SE Asia	3,081,045	3,646,650	6,727,695
Regional (Kyrgyzstan, Kazakhstan)	World Bank	Tien Shan Ecosystem Development Project	3,300,000	11,200,000	14,500,000
Regional (Malawi, Zambia)	World Bank	Sustainable Management of Nyika Transfrontier Conservation Area	4,817,000	8,300,000	13,117,000
Regional (Micronesia, Marshall Islands, Palau)	UNEP	PAS The Micronesia Challenge : Sustainable Finance Systems for Island Protected Area Management - under the GEF Pacific Alliance for Sustainability	5,454,545	10,884,000	16,338,545
Russian Federation	UNDP	Strengthening the Marine and Coastal Protected Areas of Russia	4,000,000	8,500,000	12,500,000
Russian Federation	UNDP	Improving the Coverage and Management Efficiency of Protected Areas in the Steppe Biome of Russia	5,304,545	15,300,000	20,604,545
Russian Federation	UNDP	Mainstreaming Biodiversity Conservation into Russia's Energy Sector Policies and Operations	7,200,000	33,700,000	40,900,000
Seychelles	UNDP	Strengthening Seychelles' Protected Area System through NGO Management modalities	2,100,000	3,527,000	5,627,000
Sierra Leone	World Bank	SPWA-BD Integrated Ecosystems Management Project	1,800,000	2,000,000	3,800,000
South Africa	World Bank	Development, Empowerment and Conservation in the Greater St Lucia Wetland Park and Surrounding Region	9,000,000	15,000,000	24,000,000
Sri Lanka	UNDP	Strengthening Capacity to Control the Introduction and Spread of Alien Invasive Species	1,825,000	3,415,000	5,240,000
Sri Lanka	UNEP	Maintreaming Agrobiodiversity Conservation and Use in Sri Lankan Agro-ecosystems for Livelihoods and Adaptation to Climate Change	1,450,455	3,079,520	4,529,975

Country	Agency	Project Title	GEF Amount (\$)	Cofinancing Amount (\$)	Total (\$)
Sudan	UNDP	Launching Protected Area Network Management and Building Capacity in Post-conflict Southern Sudan	3,820,000	4,400,000	8,220,000
Tanzania	UNDP	Strengthening the Protected Area Network in Southern Tanzania: Improving the Effectiveness of National Parks in Addressing Threats to Biodiversity	5,304,550	11,500,000	16,804,550
Thailand	UNDP	Catalyzing Sustainability of Thailand's Protected Area System	3,370,000	8,980,000	12,350,000
Thailand	UNDP	Sustainable Management of Biodiversity in Thailand's Production Landscape	1,940,000	4,550,000	6,490,000
Togo	UNDP	SPWA-BD: Strengthening the Conservation Role of Togo's National System of Protected Areas (PA)	1,222,200	3,000,000	4,222,200
Turkey	UNDP	Strengthening Protected Area Network of Turkey - Catalyzing Sustainability of Marine and Coastal Protected Areas	2,300,000	4,000,000	6,300,000
Venezuela	UNDP	Strengthening the Financial Sustainability and Operational Effectiveness of the Venezuelan National Parks System	7,179,327	16,640,000	23,819,327
Venezuela	UNDP	Strengthening the Marine and Coastal Protected Areas System	7,445,455	16,000,000	23,445,455
Vietnam	UNDP	Removing Barriers Hindering PA Management Effectiveness in Vietnam	3,536,360	15,150,000	18,686,360
		<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>GEF FINANCE: 450,459,458</b>	<b>COFINANCE LEVERAGED: 1,522,885,814</b>	<b>TOTAL: 1,973,345,272</b>

**ANNEX 3: MEDIUM-SIZE PROJECTS IN THE BIODIVERSITY FOCAL AREA  
APPROVED DURING THE REPORTING PERIOD**

<b>Country</b>	<b>GEF Agency</b>	<b>Project Title</b>	<b>GEF Amount (\$)</b>	<b>Cofinancing Amount (\$)</b>	<b>Total (\$)</b>
Albania	UNDP	Improving Coverage and Management Effectiveness of Marine and Coastal Protected Areas	950,000	1,927,500	2,877,500
Albania	UNEP	Capacity Building for the Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework	558,000	306,600	864,600
Argentina	World Bank	Grasslands and Savannas of the Southern Cone of South America: Initiatives for their Conservation in Argentina	900,000	1,910,667	2,810,667
Armenia	UNDP	Catalyzing Financial Sustainability of Armenia's Protected Areas System	990,000	4,535,000	5,525,000
Armenia	UNDP	Developing the Protected Area System	950,000	2,000,000	2,950,000
Bangladesh	UNEP	BS Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework	884,090	533,300	1,417,390
Belarus	UNDP	Mainstreaming Biodiversity Conservation into Territorial Planning Policies and Practices	971,000	2,860,000	3,831,000
Belize	UNDP	Strengthening National Capacities for the Consolidation, Operationalization and Sustainability of Belize's Protected Areas System	975,000	1,031,000	2,006,000
Benin	UNDP	SPWA Incorporation of Sacred Forests into the Protected Areas System of Benin	950,000	4,070,000	5,020,000
Bhutan	UNEP	Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework of Bhutan	869,000	854,000	1,723,000
Burkina Faso	UNDP	SPWA-Protected Area Buffer Zone Management in Burkina Faso	860,000	3,090,000	3,950,000
Burundi	UNDP	Improving Effectiveness of Protected Areas to Conserve Biodiversity in Burundi	859,090	2,325,571	3,184,661
Cambodia	UNEP	BS Building Capacity for the Detection and Monitoring of LMOs in Cambodia Biosafety Program	656,528	1,000,000	1,656,528
Chad	UNDP	SPWA-Strengthening the national protected area network in Chad	859,091	3,360,000	4,219,091
Chile	World Bank	Design and Implementation of a Biodiversity Management System in the Ministry of Public Works	909,090	9,273,520	10,182,610

/...

Country	GEF Agency	Project Title	GEF Amount (\$)	Cofinancing Amount (\$)	Total (\$)
China	UNDP	CBPF: Emergency Biodiversity Conservation Measures for the Recovery and Reconstruction of Wenchuan Earthquake Hit Regions in Sichuan Province	909,000	1,926,200	2,835,200
Colombia	UNDP	Institutional and Policy Strengthening to Increase Biodiversity Conservation on Production Lands (PL)	975,000	3,000,000	3,975,000
Congo	FAO	CBSP- Integrated management of mangrove and associated wetlands and coastal forests ecosystems of the Republic of Congo	950,000	1,150,000	2,100,000
Costa Rica	UNEP	BS Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework	718,873	750,102	1,468,975
Cuba	UNEP	BS Completion and Strengthening of the Cuban National Biosafety Framework for the Effective Implementation of the Cartagena Protocol	900,091	895,800	1,795,891
Djibouti	UNDP	Establishing Effectively Managed Marine Protected Areas in Djibouti	980,000	1,170,000	2,150,000
Ecuador	UNEP	BS Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework	665,818	660,824	1,326,642
El Salvador	UNEP	BS Contributing to the Safe use of Biotechnology	900,000	1,025,000	1,925,000
Ethiopia	UNEP	BS Implementation of Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety through Effective Implementation of National Biosafety Framework	616,000	700,000	1,316,000
Gabon	UNDP	CBSP: Sustainable Management of the Mbe River Forested Watershed through the Development of a Payments for Ecosystem Services (PES) Mechanism	859,091	2,950,000	3,809,091
Gambia	World Bank	SPWA-The Gambia Biodiversity Management and Institutional Strengthening Project	945,000	1,258,876	2,203,876
Georgia	UNDP	Ensuring Sufficiency and Predictability of Revenues for the Protected Areas Systems	1,000,000	4,635,000	5,635,000
Ghana	World Bank	SPWA BD: Landscape Management and Biodiversity	1,000,000	5,100,000	6,100,000
Ghana	UNEP	BS Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework	636,364	800,000	1,436,364



Country	GEF Agency	Project Title	GEF Amount (\$)	Cofinancing Amount (\$)	Total (\$)
		for Ghana			
Global	UNEP	Support to GEF Eligible CBD Parties for carrying out 2010 Biodiversity Targets National Assessments - Phase III	1,000,000	1,100,000	2,100,000
Global	UNEP	International Commission on Land Use Change and Ecosystems	1,000,000	1,000,000	2,000,000
Global	UNDP/UNEP	Support to GEF Eligible CBD Parties for Carrying out 2010 Biodiversity Targets National Assessments- Phase II	1,000,000	712,050	1,712,050
Global	UNDP/UNEP	Support to GEF Eligible CBD Parties for Carrying out 2010 Biodiversity Targets National Assessments- Phase II	1,000,000	752,950	1,752,950
Global	World Bank	Tiger Futures: Mainstreaming Conservation in Large Landscapes	950,000	1,850,000	2,800,000
Guatemala	UNEP	BS Development of Biosafety Mechanisms to Strengthen the Implementation of the Cartagena Protocol in Guatemala	616,364	490,020	1,106,384
Guinea-Bissau	World Bank	SPWA BD: Guinea Bissau Biodiversity Conservation Trust Fund Project	950,000	2,900,000	3,850,000
Guinea-Bissau	UNDP	SPWA: Support for the Consolidation of a Protected Area System in Guinea-Bissau's Forest Belt	950,000	3,500,000	4,450,000
Honduras	UNDP	SFM: Mainstreaming Biodiversity Conservation into the Management of Pine-Oak Forests	829,091	3,295,000	4,124,091
Indonesia	UNEP	BS Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework	830,196	709,200	1,539,396
Iran	UNEP	Building National Capacity to Implement the National Biosafety Framework of Islamic Republic of Iran and the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety	749,000	851,000	1,600,000
Jordan	UNEP	Support for the Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework for Jordan	884,000	905,000	1,789,000
Jordan	IFAD	Mainstreaming Biodiversity in Silvo-Pastoral and Rangeland Landscapes in the Pockets of Poverty of Jordan	1,000,000	3,100,000	4,100,000

Country	GEF Agency	Project Title	GEF Amount (\$)	Cofinancing Amount (\$)	Total (\$)
Jordan	UNDP	Mainstreaming Marine Biodiversity Conservation into Coastal Management in the Aqaba Special Economic Zone	950,000	7,300,000	8,250,000
Kenya	World Bank	Wildlife Conservation Leasing Demonstration	727,270	505,000	1,232,270
Kiribati	UNEP	PAS:Phoenix Islands Protected Area (PIPA)	890,000	945,000	1,835,000
Lao PDR	World Bank	Protected Area Management Models for Lao PDR: Learning and Disseminating Lessons from Nam Et-Phou Louey	879,000	1,423,400	2,302,400
Lao PDR	UNEP	BS Support the Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework of LAO PDR	995,000	505,000	1,500,000
Lebanon	UNEP	Sustainable Management of Marine and Coastal Biodiversity and Habitats through Policy and Legislative Development and Mainstreaming in Lebanon.	950,000	1,250,000	2,200,000
Lesotho	UNEP	BS Support the Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework of Lesotho	884,806	166,888	1,051,694
Liberia	World Bank	SPWA BD: Biodiversity Conservation through Expanding the Protected Area Network in Liberia (EXPAN)	950,000	9,168,000	10,118,000
Liberia	UNEP	Support the Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework of Liberia	577,679	530,000	1,107,679
Libya	UNEP	Support for the Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework for Libya	908,100	950,000	1,858,100
Macedonia	UNEP	Support the Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework	407,000	236,000	643,000
Madagascar	UNEP	BS Support for Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework of Madagascar	613,850	290,000	903,850
Malawi	World Bank	Participatory Development and Management of Nkhotakota Wildlife Reserve (PDMNWR)	845,000	1,545,000	2,390,000
Mauritania	UNDP	Partnership to Mainstream Marine and Coastal Biodiversity into Oil and Gas Sector Development in Mauritania	950,000	3,500,000	4,450,000

Country	GEF Agency	Project Title	GEF Amount (\$)	Cofinancing Amount (\$)	Total (\$)
Moldova	UNDP	Improving Coverage and Management Effectiveness of the Protected Area System in Moldova	950,000	1,042,820	1,992,820
Mongolia	UNEP	BS Capacity Building for Biosafety Implementation	381,800	335,000	716,800
Montenegro	UNDP	Catalyzing Financial Sustainability of the PA System	950,000	3,100,000	4,050,000
Montenegro	UNDP	Strengthening the Sustainability of the Protected Areas System of the Republic of Montenegro	950,000	3,017,000	3,967,000
Morocco	UNDP	Mainstreaming Biodiversity into Value Chains for Mediterranean Medicinal and Aromatic Plants	950,000	1,200,000	2,150,000
Mozambique	UNEP	Support to the Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework of Mozambique	755,000	188,750	943,750
Namibia	UNEP	BS Institutional Capacity Building Towards the Implementation of the Biosafety Act 2006 and related Obligations to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety	510,000	396,000	906,000
Nigeria	UNEP	BS Support for the Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework of Nigeria	965,000	1,046,000	2,011,000
Panama	UNEP	BS Consolidation of National Capacities for the Full Implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety in Panama.	954,927	1,000,000	1,954,927
Peru	UNEP	BS Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework	811,804	900,000	1,711,804
Regional	World Bank	Latin-America: Communication and Public Awareness Capacity-Building for Compliance with the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety	900,000	1,020,000	1,920,000
Regional (Africa)	World Bank	SPWA-BD Scaling up the impacts of goods practices in linking poverty alleviation and biodiversity conservation	900,000	1,100,000	2,000,000
Regional (Bolivia, Colombia, Costa Rica)	UNEP	Strengthening the Implementation of Access to Genetic Resources and Benefit-Sharing Regimes in Latin America and the Caribbean	850,000	600,000	1,450,000

Country	GEF Agency	Project Title	GEF Amount (\$)	Cofinancing Amount (\$)	Total (\$)
Regional (Bulgaria, Romania)	UNEP	Promoting Payments for Environmental Services (PES) and Related Sustainable Financing Schemes in the Danube Basin	964,676	1,374,373	2,339,049
Regional (Cambodia, Indonesia, Lao PDR, Malaysia, Myanmar, Philippines, Thailand, Vietnam, Timor Leste, Brunei, Singapore)	UNEP	Building Capacity for Regionally Harmonized National Processes for Implementing CBD Provisions on Access to Genetic Resources and Sharing of Benefits	750,000	750,000	1,500,000
Regional (Cote d'Ivoire, Ghana)	FAO	SPWA-Development of a trans-frontier conservation area linking forest reserves and protected areas in Ghana and Cote d'Ivoire	859,090	1,200,000	2,059,090
Regional (Namibia, Zambia)	World Bank	Open Africa North South Tourism Corridor (OANSTC)	495,449	635,498	1,130,947
Romania	UNDP	Improving the Financial Sustainability of the Carpathian System of Protected Areas	950,000	4,750,000	5,700,000
Russian Federation	World Bank	Support to the Global Tiger Summit Hosted by the Russian Federation	560,000	685,000	1,245,000
Rwanda	UNEP	BS Support to the Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework for Rwanda	645,455	969,085	1,614,540
Serbia	UNDP	Ensuring Financial Sustainability of the Protected Area System	950,000	2,970,000	3,920,000
Suriname	UNDP	Coastal Protected Area Management	965,556	1,666,666	2,632,222
Swaziland	UNEP	Capacity Building for the Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework of Swaziland	770,000	352,500	1,122,500
Syria	UNEP	Support for the Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework for Syria	875,000	953,000	1,828,000
Tajikistan	UNEP	BS Support the Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework of Republic of Tajikistan	840,000	540,000	1,380,000
Turkey	UNEP	BS Support for the Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework	542,650	750,000	1,292,650

Country	GEF Agency	Project Title	GEF Amount (\$)	Cofinancing Amount (\$)	Total (\$)
Turkmenistan	UNEP	BS Capacity Building for the Development of the National Biosafety Framework	284,600	167,625	452,225
Turkmenistan	UNDP	Strengthening the Turkmenistan Protected Areas System	950,000	2,100,000	3,050,000
Uganda	UNDP	Extending Wetland protected Areas through Community Based Conservation Initiatives	800,000	3,033,250	3,833,250
Uganda	UNEP	Developing an Experimental Methodology for Testing the Effectiveness of Payments for Ecosystem Services to Enhance Conservation in Productive Landscapes in Uganda	870,000	900,000	1,770,000
Uzbekistan	UNDP	Mainstreaming biodiversity into Uzbekistan's oil-and-gas sector policies and operations	950,000	2,000,000	2,950,000
Uzbekistan	UNDP	Strengthening Sustainability of the National Protected Area System by Focusing on Strictly Protected Areas	975,000	1,240,000	2,215,000
Zambia	World Bank	Extension of Kasanka Management System to Lavushi Manda National Park	835,000	1,073,000	1,908,000
		<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>GEF FINANCE:</b> <b>75,143,489</b>	<b>COFINANCE LEVERAGED:</b> <b>157,634,035</b>	<b>TOTAL:</b> <b>232,777,524</b>

**ANNEX 4: ENABLING ACTIVITIES IN THE BIODIVERSITY FOCAL AREA  
APPROVED DURING THE REPORTING PERIOD**

<b>Country</b>	<b>GEF Agency</b>	<b>Project Title</b>	<b>GEF grant (\$)</b>	<b>Cofinance (\$)</b>	<b>Total (\$)</b>
Afghanistan	UNEP	Development of National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (NBSAP)	394,000	70,000	464,000
Ghana	UNEP	Review of the National Biodiversity Strategy, Development of the Action Plan and Participation in the National Clearing House Mechanism	430,000	80,000	510,000
Guyana	UNDP	Assessment of Capacity Building Needs, Preparation of Second and Third National Report (CBD) and the Clearing House Mechanism - ADD ON	272,000	53,000	325,000
Jamaica	UNDP	Assessment of Capacity Building Needs, Preparation of the Third National Report (CBD) and the Clearing House Mechanism	218,620	179,670	398,290
Liberia	UNDP	Capacity Needs Assessment for the Implementation of Liberia's National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan and Country Driven CHM Support	194,000	19,000	213,000
Malawi	UNEP	Development of a National Clearing House Mechanism and Assessment of Capacity Building Needs - Add on	130,000	10,000	140,000
Mexico	UNDP	Needs Assessment and Priority Setting for the Conservation and Sustainable Use of Biodiversity EA Add On	252,000	350,321	602,321
Morocco	UNEP	Development of the National Clearing House Mechanism, capacity assessment for ABS and Taxonomy in Morocco, and updating of the NBSAP	187,500	20,000	207,500
Mozambique	UNEP	Development of the National Clearing House Mechanism and Capacity Assessment for ABS and Taxonomy	175,200	20,000	195,000
Myanmar	UNEP	Development of the National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (NBSAP)	200,000	50,000	250,000
Pakistan	UNEP	Development of a National Clearing House Mechanism, Capacity assessment for ABS, Preservation of Traditional Knowledge and In situ/Ex situ conservation in Pakistan	380,000	35,000	415,000

Country	GEF Agency	Project Title	GEF grant (\$)	Cofinance (\$)	Total (\$)
Romania	UNDP	Support to Alignment of NBSAP with CBD Obligations and Development of CHM	439,000	21,000	460,000
St. Kitts And Nevis	UNDP	Assessment of Capacity Building Needs and Country Specific Priorities (add on)	175,000		175,000
Thailand	UNDP	Support to Alignment of NBSAP with CBD Obligations and to Development of CHM	359,090	520,000	879,090
Timor Leste	UNDP	National Biodiversity Strategy Action Plan, the First & Third National Report to CBD, Establishment of Clearing House Mechanism	277,200	18,000	295,200
Tuvalu	UNDP	National Biodiversity Strategy Action Plan, First and Third National Reports to the COP and CHM	232,000	10,000	242,000
Uganda	UNEP	Development of a National Clearing House Mechanism and Capacity Assessment	300,000	42,000	342,000
		<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>4,615,610</b>	<b>1,497,991</b>	<b>6,113,401</b>

Please note that three MSPs were used to expedite disbursement of grants for the Fourth National Report as part of Enabling Activity support and these three projects are reported under the Table for MSPs:

Country	GEF Agency	Project Title	GEF grant (\$)	Cofinance (\$)	Total (\$)
Global	UNEP	Support to GEF Eligible CBD Parties for carrying out 2010 Biodiversity Targets National Assessments - Phase III	1,000,000	1,100,000	2,100,000
Global	UNDP/UNEP	Support to GEF Eligible CBD Parties for Carrying out 2010 Biodiversity Targets National Assessments - Phase II	1,000,000	712,050	1,712,050
Global	UNDP/UNEP	Support to GEF Eligible CBD Parties for Carrying out 2010 Biodiversity Targets National Assessments - Phase II	1,000,000	752,950	1,752,950
		<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>3,000,000</b>	<b>2,565,000</b>	<b>5,565,00</b>

## ANNEX 5: PROJECT SUMMARIES

### Summary of Full-Sized Projects Approved Between January 1, 2008-June 30, 2010

#### **Angola, National Biodiversity Project (WB, GEF \$2.0M, co-financing \$6.0M, Total \$8.0M).**

The objective of this project is to strengthen the Institutional Capacity to manage the Protected Areas Network, and to rehabilitate Iona National Park along the border with the "Skeleton Coast Park in Namibia. Namibia. The project is focusing on 1) the rehabilitation of Iona National Park (i.e. core Park infrastructure rehabilitated, Park management plan formulated and under implementation, Park staff recruited, trained and equipped to efficiently apply Park management plan, Participatory community consultations, and a trans-boundary pilot project developed and implemented with rural communities engaged in conservation activities in Skeleton Coast Park in Namibia), and 2) strengthening institutional capacity to manage the Protected Areas Network (i.e. capacity building plan formulated and implemented for the Ministry of Environment, provincial governments and staff in rehabilitated National Parks, sustainability strategy for PA Network, biodiversity conservation awareness campaigns formulated and delivered at the national level and in select provinces, lessons from Iona NP rehabilitation process and results documented, disseminated and replication initiated).

#### **Argentina, Strengthening Fisheries Governance to Protect Freshwater and Wetland**

**Biodiversity (UNDP, GEF: \$2.355M , Cofinance: \$5.264 M Total: \$7.619 M).** The objective of the project is a strengthened governance framework developed across the provinces ensures effective protection of freshwater fisheries and wetland biodiversity of the Parana and Paraguay river wetlands in Argentina. The vast corridor of wetlands and flood plains which make up the ecosystem of the Paraguay-Paraná Rivers, del Plata Basin, contains the most important biodiversity of inland waters in Argentina and one of the most diverse worldwide. The ecological value of the Basin lies in the size of the wetlands which operate as high-quality freshwater reserves, with an important diversity of fish, including economically important migratory species, some of which have seen significant reductions in their stocks. The project will support Argentina to implement a long-term solution to manage these fisheries under a harmonized, planned governance system across the whole of the Basin, backed by a territorial zoning process that will reduce the threats from different sectors of society to vital freshwater habitats. The project will work to achieve the following four Outcomes: 1) Policy and regulatory framework for freshwater fisheries harmonized and based on an ecosystem approach; 2) Institutional capacities for fisheries and wetland management strengthened; 3) Impacts on biodiversity reduced through the implementation of pilot initiatives on alternatives to fishing and through the optimization of the use of fish resources; and 4) Pilot spatial and inter-sectoral ecosystem-based planning process implemented in the Paraná Delta, to be replicated throughout the basin.

#### **Argentina, Inter-jurisdictional System of Coastal-Marine Protected Areas (ISCMPA),**

**(UNDP, GEF: \$ 2.177M, Cofinance: 10.730 M, Total: \$12.907 M).** The objective of the project is the framework for an effectively managed and financially sustainable Inter-jurisdictional System of Coastal-Marine Protected Areas (ISCMPA) is developed for the conservation and sustainable use of Argentina's coastal marine biodiversity. The proposed project will seek to overcome the barriers mentioned above by promoting the development of a system of CMPAs that addresses the conservation of biodiversity at the level of the whole coastal-marine ecosystem. Specifically, the project will: 1) catalyze the creation of an Inter-jurisdictional System of Coastal-Marine Protected Areas (ISCMPA) that brings together national and provincial authorities to coordinate CMPAs' management and establishes links with sectoral



practices; 2) expand the number and size of pilot CMPAs based on their ecological linkages to deliver immediate biodiversity benefits and provide ground-tested operational and financial approaches that will feed into the systemic framework as it emerges, and 3) develop a coordinated strategy with private and civil sectors to make the ISCMPA sustainable and the CMPAs' management more efficient.

**Bahamas, Building a Sustainable National Marine Protected Area Network, (UNEP, GEF: \$2.2 M, Cofinance: \$ 6.76 M, Total: \$ 8.96M).** The objective of the project is to expand protected area coverage of globally significant marine biodiversity and increase the management effectiveness of the national marine protected area network across the Bahamian archipelago. The project will expand coverage of the National Marine Protected Area Network to protect important ecosystems, pilot demonstration projects that address specific threats to MPAs (invasive species, unsustainable exploitation of fishery resources, tourism-related conversion and tourism planning processes that negatively impact ecologically valuable sites) and improve overall financing for protected area management through a trust fund.

**Benin: SPWA-BD Support to Protected Areas Management. (World Bank, GEF: \$1.900M, GEF cofinancing: \$9.675M, Total project: \$11.575 M)**

The project aims to strengthen sustainable management of the Northern Benin Savannah Ecosystems areas through enhanced management capacity and the establishment and operation of a conservation trust fund for a long-term funding.

**Bolivia, SFM Biodiversity Conservation through Sustainable Forest Management by Local Communities (UNDP, GEF: \$5.5 M, Cofinance: \$10.5 M, Total: \$ 16.0M).** The objective of the project is enhanced protection and conservation of biodiversity (BD) in the Amboro-Madidi Corridor through sustainable forest management (SFM) practices enabled by fostering markets for certified forest products and increased local incomes. The project will implement the following set of strategic activities to achieve the following outcomes: 1) Institutional support mechanisms are built to assist BD conservation through certified community forest management; 2) Community capacity is strengthened to achieve and maintain certification, and to manage forests in a sustainable and BD-friendly manner, and; 3) Economic incentives are in place to attract and keep community forestry operations committed to sustainable forestry and BD management practices.

**Brazil, Amazon Region Protected Areas (ARPA) Program Phase 2, (WB, GEF: \$ 15.89 M, Cofinance: \$ 70 M, Total \$ 85.89 M).** The objective of the project is to expand and consolidate the protected areas system in the Brazilian Amazon and implement mechanisms for its financial sustainability. This is the second phase of the ARPA program. It will make a major contribution to protecting Amazon forest biodiversity through the definition of priority areas for protection followed by the creation, establishment, consolidation and long-term maintenance of protected areas including financial sustainability.

**Brazil, Improving Brazilian Capacity to Conserve and Use Biodiversity through Information Management and Use (UNEP, GEF: \$ 8.172M, Cofinance: \$ 20.1 M, Total: \$ 28.272 M).** The objective of the project is to ensure better policy design and implementation by facilitating and mainstreaming biodiversity information into decision making and policy development processes. Brazil is arguably one of the two top megadiverse countries in the world, at the same time undergoing rapid economic development and, with that, experiencing the associated changes in the state of natural ecosystems. The country has also developed a solid

legal framework addressing the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity and native ecosystems, perhaps unprecedented in the developing world. Finally, a wealth of data has been accumulated during the last 2-3 decades pertaining to the biological diversity of the country. On the other hand, the full implementation of the enacted legislation and associated policies has been severely hindered by the inadequacy of the existing systems for accessing current and systematized biodiversity data, and at various levels, together with making it widely available to key decision makers in the public and private sectors. These knowledge barriers will be removed by the interventions promoted by this project, thereby making accessible credible data to support policy instruments, court decisions, and law enforcement. Over time, reliable information systems will reinforce the credibility and public acceptance of environmental provisions. Finally, these systems will help pinpoint areas of major biological knowledge gaps in the country, increasing the efficiency of the needed inventories required to orient conservation prioritization blueprints and action on the ground that also reflect global biodiversity priorities.

**Brazil, Integrated Management of the Ilha Grande Bay Ecosystem, (FAO, GEF: \$ 2.4 M, Cofinance: \$ 8.4 M, Total: \$ 10.8 M).** The goal of the project is to achieve the long-term conservation and sustainable use of the Ilha Grande Bay Ecosystem (BIG) and its associated terrestrial and marine biodiversity of global importance on the south coast of Rio de Janeiro State in Brazil. Progress towards meeting this goal would be achieved through: (i) the development and implementation of a pilot integrated ecosystem management approach, (ii) preparation and implementation of a biodiversity conservation mosaic management and action plan designed to promote greater coordination and coherency among existing protected areas (PAs) in BIG; (iii) the identification and mitigation of one or more critical threats affecting the “health” of the BIG Ecosystem and its ability to provide critical environmental “goods and services” including the conservation of biodiversity; (iv) increased public awareness and support for efforts to conserve the BIG Ecosystem; and (v) increased institutional capacity at the regional and municipal levels.

**Cameroon: CBSP Conservation and Sustainable Use of the Ngoyla Mintom Forest. (World Bank, GEF: \$3.5M, GEF cofinancing: \$6.5M, Total project: \$10M)**

The project aims to establish a core protected area within the Ngoyla-Mintom forest through an integrated approach of land use planning, fostering public-private partnerships. The project is based on three components aiming to 1) promote Sustainable Forest Management in the entire Ngoyla-Mintom forest block with a Master Plan on 988,000 ha, 2) make operational the core protected area on 160,000 ha, and 3) experiment a sustainable financing mechanism for the core area.

**Cameroon, BS Development and Institution of A National Monitoring and Control System (Frame work) for Living Modified Organisms (LMOs) and Invasive Alien Species (IAS) (UNEP, GEF \$2.4M, co-financing \$8.4M, Total \$10.8M).**

This project aims at strengthening the institutional capacity in the prevention and control of the introduction, establishment and spread of Invasive Alien Species (IAS) and management of LMOs. This objective will be achieved by developing the policy, regulatory and institutional framework for effective prevention and control of the introduction, establishment and spread of LMOs and biological invaders (separate legal frameworks for LMOs and IAS), implementation of a sustainable strategies for the risk-based management of priority pathways and species for IAS and LMOs, building the capacity to enable the control of the entry, establishment and spread of IAS and LMOs, and raising awareness of key stakeholder groups on risks, impacts and management of IAS and LMOs.

**Cameroon: CBSP Sustainable Community Based Management and Conservation of Mangrove Ecosystem in Cameroon. (FAO, GEF: \$1.73M, GEF cofinancing: \$3.7M, Total project: \$5.43M)**

This project aims to achieve the conservation of Cameroon's Atlantic mangroves, their associated coastal ecosystems, and biodiversity, contributing also to the improvement of livelihoods in local communities. A significant part of the project is devoted to field interventions to protect, restore, and monitor mangrove ecosystems with a particular attention to local and indigenous communities (Bagyeli pygmies and Bantus). For long term sustainability, institutional frameworks, consultative mechanisms, and local agreements will be legally installed and implemented. Management planning through collaborative process will be held for the conservation of mangroves and their integration in the local development. The project will facilitate the extension of the national protected area network to wetland ecosystems linking conservation to development and local community participation.

**Cape Verde: SPWA-BD Consolidation of Cape Verde's Protected Areas System. (UNDP, GEF: \$3.287M, GEF cofinancing: \$14.245M, Total project: \$17.532M)** The project aims to consolidate and strengthen Cape Verde's protected areas system through the establishment of new terrestrial and marine PA units, and the promotion of participatory approaches to conservation.

**Central African Republic: CBSP Strengthened management of the national protected areas system through involvement of local communities. (UNDP, GEF: \$1.768M, GEF cofinancing: \$2.35M, Total project: \$4.118M )**

The Project aims to conserve globally important biodiversity through strengthened co-management of a consolidated protected area network in Central African Republic. This will be achieved through 1) an effective involvement of local communities in the management of the Protected Area system and 2) the implementation of effective, sustainable, and replicable models of community-based protected area management. The two pilot sites are the Basse-Lobaye Biosphere Reserve and the Mourou-Fadama-Ndanda multiple use area.

**China, CBPF Jiangsu Yancheng Wetlands System Protection Project (ADB, GEF \$2.5M, Cofinancing \$100M, Total project \$102.5M).**

The project is part of the China Biodiversity Partnership Framework (CBPF) and it focuses on wetland system conservation in Jiangsu. The project will result in the restoration of the hydrological and ecological processes in an approx area of 362000ha, representing about 80 percent of the total coastal wetland area in Jiangsu. The sites are recognized by UNESCO and Ramsar as globally significant and one of the most important wetland sites in China. Globally threatened species that will be protected will include several flagship species, including Milu deer and red-crowned cranes. The site-based management interventions will be complemented by improving environmental governance at the municipal and provincial levels. Significant cofinance is also provided by the Government of China (\$50 million) and ADB (\$50 million) to the project.

**China, CBPF Integrated Ecosystem and Water Resources Management in the Baiyangdian Basin (ADB, GEF \$2.975M, Cofinancing \$276.11M, Total project \$279M)**

The project aims to integrate ecosystem and water management to conserve biodiversity and improve environmental conditions in the Baiyangdian Basin. The project includes two key components: 1. Biodiversity Conservation: i) Justification prepared and submitted for recognition of the Baiyangdian wetland system under the Ramsar Convention, ii) Approximately

45,000 ha gazetted and effectively managed for biodiversity conservation; iii) Improved survival of globally-important threatened and endangered species (the brown-eared pheasant, other threatened forest birds, and at least 7 globally-significant species of migratory waterfowl), iii) Habitat enhancement activities undertaken on approximately 5% of the core conservation zone areas in the two Provincial Nature Reserve; iv) About 12 pilot projects implemented and supported through extension training to demonstrate improved sustainable livelihoods through eco-tourism, and sustainable harvesting, processing and marketing of natural products; 2. Institutional strengthening: i) Detailed plan prepared for capacity building and institutional strengthening, ii) 12 staff training programs designed by 2010, ii) 6 study tours carried out by 2012, iii) 8 fellowships awarded by 2010, iv) on-the-job training program conducted throughout the project implementation.

**China, CBPF: Strengthening Globally Important Biodiversity Conservation Through Protected Area Strengthening in Gansu Province (UNDP, GEF \$1.74M, Cofinancing \$7.28M, Total project \$9.02M)**

This project is a sub-project under the CBPF (China Biodiversity Partnership and Framework for Action). The project is expected to deliver tangible global environment benefit by improving PA management effectiveness in Gansu province in more than 9.88 million ha and expansion of PA estate in up to 600000 ha. The province is recognised with rich biodiversity resources, ranked 4th in China, including being a habitat of the Giant Panda.

**China, CBPF: Strengthening the Effectiveness of the Protected Area System in Qinghai Province (UNDP, GEF \$5.35M, Cofinancing \$18.5M, Total project \$23.85M)**

This project will catalyze management effectiveness of Qinghai's PA system to fulfill its purpose of conserving globally important biodiversity. Three proposed project components: 1) mainstreaming PA management objectives in development plans and policies; 2) increased PA management effectiveness at the provincial level; and 3) demonstration of effective PA management at the Sanjiangyuan National Nature Reserve are addressing the key barriers to achieve the long term solution for effective management of Qinghai's PAs, which is considered to strengthen effective policies, capacities and co-management in place for PA management in Qinghai.

**China, CBPF: Demonstration of Estuarine Biodiversity Conservation Restoration and Protected Area Networking (FAO, GEF \$ 3.63M, Cofinancing \$11.86M, Total project \$15.49M)**

The project is part of the China Biodiversity Partnership Framework (CBPF) and it focuses on coastal and marine PA system management at the national and provincial levels. The project plans to set up and strengthen policy and institution for coastal and marine PA conservation at the provincial level by testing its approach in Pearl and Yellow river estuaries, which are two major estuaries in China and of global importance. The project is expected to contribute for the conservation of total of approx 9270km<sup>2</sup> of estuarine wetlands through: strengthening of management effectiveness of marine protected areas (MPAs); creation of new MPAs; promotion of the establishment of MPA network; restoration of degraded wetlands habitats; development and strengthening of related policy and institutional framework; and identifying and disseminating best practices for MPA management.

**Colombia, Mainstreaming Biodiversity in the Coffee Sector in Colombia, (UNDP, GEF; \$2.0M, Cofinance: \$5.27 M, Total: \$ 7.27 M).** The objective of the project is to create an enabling environment for conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity in coffee productive

landscapes that contribute to both the livelihoods of the local populations and global environmental benefits. The project will: 1) provide technical assistance to coffee growers to produce biodiversity-friendly certified coffee for established markets, 2) help develop PES schemes (water and pilot carbon sequestration projects) to augment coffee income; and 3) strengthen the capacity of municipalities to implement landscape-based planning in the coffee-producing region to support the economic and ecological long-term viability of biodiversity-friendly coffee farms. By project end, global, national, and local benefits will include: a) improved habitat for threatened plants and endemic animals and migratory birds species through the promotion and establishment of biodiversity-friendly production practices in 27,000 hectares of the coffee landscapes; b) improved water quality using improved production practices and clean technologies that minimize agro-chemical use and production waste through the implementation of water-related PES models; c) soil conservation and stabilization through the adoption of improved production practices; and d) climate change mitigation through pilot PES projects for carbon sequestration.

**Colombia, Mainstreaming Traditional Knowledge Associated with Agrobiodiversity in Colombian Agroecosystems, (UNDP, GEF: \$ 2.5 M, Cofinance: \$ 5.13 M, Total: \$ 7.63 M).**

The project objective is to promote the sustainable management agro-ecosystems in Colombia through the protection and management of agrobiodiversity and associated traditional knowledge. The principal focus of the project is to strengthen national policies and regulations to mainstream the conservation and sustainable use of agrobiodiversity in the agricultural sector and to market agrobiodiversity products. The GEF's support will play an important role in: (i) harmonizing current policies to remove perverse incentives that motivate economic sectors to unsustainably manage biodiversity; (ii) developing demonstration projects that create economic benefits powerful enough to drive innovation and certification processes of agrobiodiversity in the Chocó, Andean, and Amazonian regions; and (iii) development of partnerships with private sector stakeholders, small and medium-scale enterprises to develop innovative processes and activities that improve productivity and market efficiency.

**Colombia, Protecting Biodiversity in the Southwestern Caribbean Sea, (IADB, GEF: \$ 3.0M, Cofinance: \$ 4.15 M, Total: \$ 7.15 M).** The objective of this project is the protection, conservation, and sustainable use of important marine and coastal ecosystems and biodiversity in the Caribbean Sea, through the effective implementation of the Integrated Management Plan of the Seaflower Marine Protected Area (San Andres Archipelago). Through the effective implementation of the Seaflower MPA's integrated management plan, including a plan to cover 100% of the recurrent costs of the MPA thus assuring operational sustainability, the project will contribute to the protection of 65,000km<sup>2</sup> of marine and coastal habitat that contains globally important marine ecosystems and biodiversity, including vulnerable, threatened and endangered species. The MPA's coral reefs, in particular, make up one of the most extensive and productive reef systems in the Western Hemisphere. The MPA is found within the Western Caribbean Coral Reef Hotspot, one of the world's top ten regions exceptionally rich in marine species. The MPA will also serve as a model for other MPAs managed by regional development authorities, thus elevating the potential for additional global benefits. Thus, the project also fills a key gap in the GEF's marine protected area portfolio.

**Colombia, Designing and Implementing a National Sub-System of Marine Protected Areas (SMPA), (UNDP, GEF: \$ 4.85 M, Cofinance: \$ 7.5 M, Total: \$ 12.35 M).** The objective of the project is to promote the conservation and sustainable use of coastal and marine biodiversity in the Caribbean and Pacific regions through the design and implementation of a financially

sustainable and well-managed National Subsystem of Marine Protected Areas – SMPA. Building on SINAP’s current structure, the project will seek the development of a legal, institutional, and operational framework in order to facilitate the effectiveness and efficiency of regional- and local-level MPA management objectives. Through the SMPA the project will secure increased revenue and diversification of funding streams for regional- and local-level MPAs to meet biodiversity conservation and sustainable use goals. The project will increase MPA management capacity by means of a training program for key staff.

**Colombia, Colombian National Protected Areas Conservation Trust Fund – Additional financing for the Sustainability of the Macizo Regional Protected Area System (SIRAPM), (WB, GEF: \$4.0M, Cofinance: \$ 13.8 M, Total \$ 17.8 M).** The objective of the project is to support the conservation of globally significant biodiversity in and the financial sustainability of the *Macizo* Regional Protected Area System (SIRAPM) by integrating it into the conservation mosaic approach promoted under the National Protected Area Conservation Trust Fund for the consolidation of the Colombian National Protected Area system. Building upon the gains and final recommendations of the previous GEF Biomacizo project, the project proposes to integrate the SIRAPM into its expanded strategic conservation framework through an additional financing grant from the GEF. As such, project activities will address the main outstanding issues from the Biomacizo project while extending to the Massif region innovative components of the NPACTF conservation mosaic approach including: i) its integration of productive landscapes and protected area buffer zones into sustainable development activities; ii) its incorporation of vulnerable populations in rural areas and indigenous groups in territorial planning processes; iii) its application of sustainable financing mechanisms, including payment for environmental services; and iv) its general monitoring framework and tailored indicators.

**Colombia, Mainstreaming Biodiversity in Palm Cropping in Colombia with an Ecosystem Approach, (IADB, GEF: \$ 4.25 M, Cofinance: \$ 14.130 M, Total: \$ 18.38 M).** The objective of the project is to induce the adoption of biodiversity-friendly production systems in palm-growing farms in Colombia contributing to protect and restore high value conservation areas in palm-growing regions, enhance their natural assets in the framework of regional conservation schemes, and improve local livelihoods with participation from social actors present in palm agro-ecosystems. The project will result in: i) enhanced connectivity between natural ecosystems present in African palm plantations and local conservation schemes; ii) the protection, restoration and conservation of high value conservation areas in each region with participation from social actors present in palm agroecosystems; iii) the recovery and maintenance of agro-biodiversity related to palm productive systems; iv) increased awareness and adoption of best practices for the conversion of productive systems with a landscape approach in a regional context, all of which will result improved biodiversity conservation and sustainable use and enhanced provision of ecosystem goods and services.

**Congo DR: CBSP Forest and Nature Conservation Project. (World Bank, GEF: \$6.0M, GEF cofinancing: \$62.0M, Total project: \$68.0M)**

This project aims to promote the protection and sustainable management of forest resources in DRC, by helping public institutions, civil society and local communities to implement new forest and nature conservation policies on the field. The project will aim to provide a support to a critical area (Maiko) and innovative field operations (conservation concessions, REDD).

**Costa Rica, Integrated Management of Marine and Coastal Resources in Puntarenas, (IADB, GEF: \$ 3.0 M, Cofinance: \$ 8.813 M, Total: \$ 1.813 M).** The extensive continental shelf off the Pacific coast of Costa Rica and the coastal ecosystems of the Golfo de Nicoya, Golfo Dulce and the Térraba-Sierpe wetland system in Puntarenas Province provide for a particularly rich marine and coastal biodiversity and high level of productivity. Out of the seven marine ecoregions that extend from Mexico to Ecuador, the Nicoya Ecoregion where the project will be implemented is considered the most valuable in terms of its biodiversity. The objective of the project is to promote the integrated planning and management of marine and coastal ecosystems in the Multiple-Use Marine Areas (MUMAs) Golfo de Nicoya and Pacífico Sur (Puntarena Province), with the goal of conserving important biodiversity, maintaining the provision of crucial ecosystem services, and providing a basis for sustainable socioeconomic development through tourism, artisanal fishing and other income generating activities at the local scale. The project will achieve this by: strengthening key regulations of the fisheries sector, implementation of sustainable financial mechanisms (fees mainly) to support increased levels of management activities, improving the sustainability of productive activities within the two MUMAs, particularly those of the tourism and artisanal fishing sectors. With respect to tourism, the project will expand Costa Rica's existing Sustainable Tourism Certification (CTS) to marine and coastal resource-based activities and to train tourism entrepreneurs in the two MUMAs in the application of the newly developed sustainability standards within their own operations.

**Costa Rica, Consolidating Costa Rica's Marine Protected Areas (MPAs). (UNDP, GEF: \$1.2 M, \$ 17.862 M, Total: \$ 19. 074 M).** The objective of the project is to consolidate Costa Rica's marine protected areas (MPAs) by increasing their ecological representation and ensuring their effective management and financial sustainability by creating a PA Trust Fund with an initial investment of \$25 million under the Forever Costa Rica initiative. In addition, the project will help to reduce threats to marine biodiversity by: (1) promoting sustainable fisheries and tourism and coordinating actions with these sectors as part of Costa Rica's NMS; (2) protecting key habitats to prevent their degradation; and (3) identifying MPAs that are most affected by climate change, incorporating climate change mitigation and adaptation into their management plans, and the preliminary monitoring of affected key species and ecosystems.

**Cote d'Ivoire: Protected Area Project (Projet d'Appui a la Relance de la Conservation des Parcs et Reserves, PARC-CI). (WB, GEF: \$2.54 M, GEF cofinancing: \$19.5M , Total project: \$22.08 M)**

The PARC-CI project aims to stabilize Protected Area institutions in the immediate post-conflict period. The project will build capacity in the two institutions that have been created to manage the park and reserve system in Côte d'Ivoire (the Office of Parks and Reserves OIPR and the Foundation) and then will specifically invest in one pilot park, the Comoé National Park, and its surrounding fringe communities.

**Cuba, Application of a Regional Approach to the Management of Marine and Coastal Protected Areas in Cuba's Southern Archipelagos, (UNDP, GEF: \$ 5.71M, Cofinance: \$ 14.15 M, Total: \$ 19.86 M).** This project will contribute to the conservation of marine biodiversity in Cuba, including fisheries resources of major regional importance, by creating capacities for the application of a regional approach to the management of marine and coastal protected areas in the Southern Archipelagos Region (which covers almost 6,000,000ha) as part of the country's National Protected Areas System (SNAP). The project will result in the expansion of the protected area estate in order to fill cover key gaps in ecosystem coverage and

promote connectivity and management efficiency. The resulting PA estate would be embedded in a series of Zones Under Integrated Coastal Management Regimes which would serve to buffer impacts from productive activities and strengthen the integration between conservation and production sectors.

**Cuba, Enhancing the Prevention, Control and Management of Invasive Alien Species in Vulnerable Ecosystems, (UNDP, GEF: \$ 5.018 M, Cofinance: \$ 10.0 M, Total: \$ 15.018).**

The objective of the project is to safeguard globally-significant biodiversity in vulnerable ecosystems, by building capacity at the systemic level to prevent, detect, control, and manage the spread of Invasive Alien Species (IAS) in Cuba. Despite numerous initiatives in Cuba to manage IAS, systems for prevention, control, management and removal are not yet fully effective. The long-term solution to address these shortcomings is to strengthen the institutional policies and technical capacities needed to manage IAS, while stimulating multi-stakeholder, cross-sectoral cooperation for effective implementation in the field. Reaching this goal will require pursuing the following broad operational strategies that the project will support: (i) strengthen the policy and legal framework on IAS; (ii) build sound and effective coordination mechanisms across concerned sectors, between relevant institutions and in partnership with key actors; (iii) enhance scientific knowledge on IAS introduction, spread, impacts and management options among key stakeholders charged with control; (iv) build general public awareness on IAS and their impacts, and; (v) improve management effectiveness in the field to ensure safeguarding of biodiversity.

**Cuba, Agricultural Biodiversity Conservation and Man and Biosphere Reserves in Cuba: Bridging Managed and Natural Landscapes, (UNEP, GEF: \$ 1.36 M, Cofinance: \$ 2.181 M, Total: \$ 3.55 M).**

The objective of the project is to mainstream agricultural biodiversity into the management of Cuban Man and Biosphere (MAB) Reserve system. The project will take hitherto ignored agricultural biodiversity management practices into account to produce more effective management plans that can be applied to other MAB reserves in Cuba. By securing the conservation of the endemic agricultural biodiversity in a range of ecosystems, the project will provide essential biological resources, and knowledge for more diversified and sustainable agricultural production systems in Cuba. Achievement of the project objective will contribute to the conservation of the diversity within and around protected areas in ways that improve the livelihoods of rural communities and sustain ecosystem functions in MAB buffer zones and horticultural and agroforestry systems.

**Dominican Republic, Re-engineering the National Protected Area System in Order to Achieve Financial Sustainability, (UNDP, GEF: \$ 3.2 M, Cofinance: \$ 8.128, Total: \$ 11.328).**

The project goal is to safeguard globally significant biodiversity of the Dominican Republic by improving the financial sustainability of the National Protected Areas System (NPAS). The project has two primary outcomes: 1) Increased and diversified NPAS funding and 2) Improved protected management and efficiency in 18 priority PAs with highest revenue generation potential. The project will develop a system-wide Financing Strategy and a related Business Plan to increase revenue capture at the system level. The project will operationalize the Protected Area Trust Fund, which will become a permanent source of funding to cover recurrent costs of the NPAS. To complement the capitalization the Trust Fund, the PA system's existing visitors fee structure and collection will be optimized. In addition, the project will also support the establishment of a permanent system for valuation of Ecosystem Benefits and Services, mainly from water resources. The goal is to develop a steady, reliable, sufficient flow of annual resources from a diverse base of local recurrent income, trust fund yields, national budget contributions, and other sources.



**Ecuador, Marine and Coastal Biodiversity Conservation, (IADB, GEF: \$ 4.0 M, Cofinance: \$ 6.0 M, Total: \$ 10.M).** The objective of the project is to improve the conservation of marine and coastal biodiversity in Ecuador through improving marine and coastal protected area management and targeted actions for the protection of key threatened marine species. The project will implement two components aimed at: (i) supporting the consolidation and expansion of a network of representative and well managed MPAs that provides for both ecological and socioeconomic benefits (e.g., fisheries recovery) and (ii) support the implementation of the National Plan of Action for the Conservation and Management of Sharks (PAT-Ec) by means of strengthening cooperation and enforcement and promoting science-based decision making on management of shark populations.

**Ecuador, Sustainable Financing of Ecuador's National System of Protected Areas (SNAP) and Associated Private and Community-managed PA Subsystems, (UNDP, GEF: \$ 6.4 M, Cofinance: \$ 9.0 M, Total: \$ 15.4 M).** The long term goal of the project is the improved sustainability of the National System of Protected Areas, so that it provides development results through a healthy and sustainable environment and guarantees the Rights of Nature, or ecosystem rights, as established in the 2008 Constitution. The immediate objective of the project is to institutionalize a financial and operational framework for the expanded Ecuadorian National System of Protected Areas. The project's activities are fully in line with GEF's focus on building institutional and financial sustainability of protected area systems by providing technical assistance to a) design appropriate policies and laws to allow protected areas to manage the entire revenue stream from generation of income to investment; b) establish business plans that include multiple funding sources and have a long-term perspective that matches expenditure to revenue; c) consolidate agencies responsible for managing protected areas with sufficient capacity to manage protected areas based on sound principles of business planning as well as principles of conservation biology; and d) achieve full recognition of the support to protected area conservation and management provided by communities living in and near protected areas.

**Egypt, Strengthening Protected Area Financing and Management Systems (UNDP, GEF \$3.6M, co-financing \$13.8M, Total \$17.4M).**

The objective of this project is to establish a sustainable protected area financing system to ensure the effective use of generated revenues for biodiversity conservation. If successful, this project will benefit eight protected areas covering 1.84M ha. This project aims at reaching this objective by having a legal, policy-, regulatory- and institutional framework in place, by generating at least \$20M in the protected areas, by re-injecting 4 times as much as the baseline of 2005-2008, by increasing the revenues by 25% using sources other than user-fees, and by having business planning and cost-effective management systems established at the site level in eight priority protected areas. Community partnership system will be tested in at least one protected area, and system and site-level safeguards and monitoring systems in place to secure ecosystem and species integrity.

**Equatorial Guinea: CBSP – Strengthening the National System of protected areas in Equatorial Guinea for the effective conservation of representative ecosystems and globally significant biodiversity. (UNDP, GEF: \$1.768M GEF cofinancing : \$4.45M, Total project: \$6.218M)**

The aim of this project is to establish an ecologically representative, effectively managed and self sustained Protected Area Network by 1) developing a strategic and legal framework, 2) strengthening capacities at national level and on the field with local communities, and 3)

implementing field actions on three pilot sites (Bioko Island Landscape Corridor, the Monte ALEN/Río Muni ecological landscape, and Río Campo). Different participatory Protected Area management mechanisms will be undertaken to empower local communities, reduce the pressures on the Park, and promote economic alternatives.

**El Salvador, Mainstreaming Biodiversity Management into Fisheries and Tourism Activities carried out in Coastal /Marine Ecosystems (GEF: \$ 2.35 M, Confinance: \$ 6.053 M, Total: 8.407 M).** El Salvador's coastal zone includes extensive areas of mangroves, three Ramsar sites and one Marine Protected Area (Los Cobanos PA), all of which provide habitat to globally important marine biodiversity while supporting important artisanal fisheries and a small but growing ecotourism industry. The project seeks to improve management of fisheries and the tourism sector as a way to reduce pressures on marine biodiversity through targeted interventions to 1) strengthen policies and regulations and their enforcement in these two sectors; 2) improve fishing practices of artisanal fishers aiming at sustainable catch and focusing on local markets; 3) strengthen the operations of local ecotourism operators including hotels to incorporate environmental management principles; and 4) strengthen the capacity of municipal government staff to enforce environmental regulations.

**Ethiopia, Mainstreaming Agro-biodiversity Conservation in the Farming Systems of Ethiopia (UNDP, GEF \$3.8M, co-financing \$4.7M, Total \$8.5M).**

The objective of this project is to mainstream conservation of agro-biodiversity resources into their farming systems. Ethiopia, and the surrounding countries in the “Horn of Africa”, is recognized as one of the eight Vavilov Centers, the original centers of domesticated plants. The country harbors important gene pools of Wild Crop Relatives (CWR) for at least 197 species of crops, including grains, pulses, oil seeds, vegetables, tubers, fruits, spices, stimulants, fibers, dyes and medicinal plants. In addition, several crops that were domesticated outside of East Africa, exhibit high secondary diversification in Ethiopia, evidenced in farmer varieties (FV) of wheat, barley, and several pulses. The project will invest in the following activities: Enabling policy and institutional framework supporting in-situ conservation of agro-biodiversity and wild crop relatives in 4 sites totaling 750,000 ha., the identification and promotion of emerging market incentives to increase trading in agro-biodiversity friendly products, and conserving Crop Wild Relatives *in-situ* gene bank or set aside areas to ensure that farming systems integrate CWR areas into overall landscape plans. Five in-situ gene banks covering a total of 500,000 ha will be established to protect the wild relatives of 5 important crops (wild coffee, ensette, teff, sesame, and nough seed).

**Ethiopia, Capacity Building for Access and Benefit Sharing and Conservation and Sustainable Use of Medicinal Plants (UNEP, GEF \$2.0M, co-financing \$2.0M, Total \$4.0M).**

The objective of this project is to contribute to the conservation of biodiversity through the sustainable use of medicinal plants, and the effective implementation of a revised national access and benefit sharing (ABS) regime. This is a very important project for Ethiopia, a country that contains an outstanding number of plant species, including more than 1000 medicinal plants. In Ethiopia, about 70% of the human population and 90% of the livestock population are dependent on traditional medicine. In all, 48 million consumers use some 56,000 tones of medicinal plants per annum, with consumers obtaining their plant material from healers, traders and by direct harvesting. Globally, this is a very important project, as Ethiopia continues leading the efforts in building the national capacity for a wider application of Access and Benefit Sharing of genetic resources (ABS). This project includes in-situ and ex-situ conservation and sustainable use of

medicinal plants in selected conservation and production sites (pilot areas covering 200,000 ha.), and capacity building for wider application of ABS measures in Ethiopia.

**Guatemala, Promoting Ecotourism to Strengthen the Financial Sustainability of the Guatemalan Protected Areas System (SIGAP), (UNDP, GEF: \$ 1.295M, Cofinance: \$ 1.955M, Total: \$ 3.250 M).** The objective of the project is to strengthen the financial sustainability of Guatemala's Protected Areas System (SIGAP) by developing new financing vehicles within the developing ecotourism sector, while ensuring the alignment of ecotourism activities with biodiversity conservation objectives. The project will take enhance the financial sustainability of the SIGAP through tourism practices that integrate biodiversity conservation objectives in PAs. This will be achieved through a revised national tourism legislative/policy framework and training strategy that will allow the strengthening of institutional capacity, provide mechanisms for financial investment in PAs from the tourism sector, reinvest gate and concession fees in the PAs, and manage pressures on biodiversity that are imposed by the growth of tourism. Policy reforms will be made operational through a tourism pilot program in the PAs of the Western Highlands that integrates biodiversity conservation objectives and complies with environmental and social safeguards.

**Haiti, Establishing a Financially Sustainable National Protected Areas System (GEF: \$ 2.62 M, Cofinance: \$ 6.45 M, Total: \$ 9.077 M).** The objective of the project is by June 2014 (end of project), Haiti has put in place an integrated operational and financial framework to ensure long-term sustainability of the national protected areas (PA) system. The project will address the continued erosion of biodiversity in Haiti, and the limited effectiveness of protected areas for ensuring biodiversity conservation due to their limited access to reliable funding. This project will promote increased investment in protected areas by the Government in recognition of their importance for national development and vulnerability reduction; increase the efficiency and effectiveness of the use of the funds available; and diversify the sources of income available to PAs. The project's intervention is particularly opportune given the recent government declaration of the National Protected Area System and establishment of the National Agency for Protected Areas, under the General Decree of Environmental Management.

**Honduras, Conservation of Biodiversity in the Indigenous Productive Landscapes of the Moskitia, (UNDP, GEF: \$ 2.018 M, Cofinance: \$ 5.455 M, Total: \$ 7.473 M).** The objective of the project is biodiversity conservation and sustainable use in production landscapes effectively managed by indigenous people in the Moskitia. The project will develop capacities within indigenous natural resource users to apply sustainable forms of production (modifying existing practices or adopting new ones as appropriate) that are compatible to the sustainable use of the region's biodiversity; assist Government and outside agencies to improve the effectiveness of their interventions; and strengthen the capacities of central Government, municipal Governments, NGOs, indigenous organizations and community-based organizations to plan and regulate resource use in an effective and coordinated manner, building where possible on traditional norms and mechanisms. GEF project resources would be accompanied by major co-financing from development projects aimed at supporting small rural businesses. The promotion of biologically and productively sustainable forest management (for both timber and non-timber products), that is at the same time socially and economically viable, will have a particularly important role to play in enabling indigenous communities to assert their occupancy and use rights over their traditional lands, in the face of the threat of encroachment and deforestation by outsiders. In the fisheries sector, the emphasis will be more on the application of regulation, particularly through community-based norms, and the spatial planning and definition of fishing

and set-aside areas to allow reproduction and population recovery. Activities in the tourism sector would focus on supporting the spatial planning and compatibility of co-financed investments with biodiversity conservation and sustainable use.

**India, IND-BD Mainstreaming Coastal and Marine Biodiversity Conservation into Production Sectors in the Godavari River Estuary in Andhra Pradesh State (UNDP, GEF \$6.023M, Cofinancing \$17.7M, Total Project \$23.7M)**

This project is one of the two sub-projects that are developed under the India GEF Coastal and Marine Program (IGCMP) to mainstream biodiversity conservation in productive landscapes and sectors in India. The project site is in the eastern coast of India in Godavari River Estuary in Andhra Pradesh State, as one of the most critical marine and coastal ecoregions of India. Consistent with the overall program, the project will focus its initiatives in the Godavari River Basin on the following three components: sectoral mainstreaming; institutional capacity building; and community based coastal and marine natural resources management initiatives. The project also includes a coordination and knowledge management component to coordinate the overall program at the national level. This project will have direct GEB in more than 44000 ha of coastal land in the Godavari River Estuary, which is recognized as one of the most globally significant coastal and marine biodiversity regions in India. The Godavari mangrove ecosystem is the second largest area of mangroves in India.

**India, IND-BD Mainstreaming Coastal and Marine Biodiversity Conservation into Production Sectors in the Malvan Coast, Maharashtra State (UNDP, GEF \$3.43M, Cofinancing \$ 10.2M, Total project \$13.63M)**

This project is one of the two sub-projects that are developed under the India GEF Coastal and Marine Program (IGCMP) to mainstream biodiversity conservation in productive landscapes and sectors in India. This project site is in the western coast of India at the Malvan marine sanctuary area as one of the most critical marine and coastal ecoregions of India. Consistent with the overall program, this project will have direct global environmental benefit in more than 18000 ha of coastal landscape and seascale area in Malvan by mainstreaming biodiversity in key sector development plans and policies, including fisheries sector policies. While replicating the initiatives in other areas in western India, there could be larger impact on the global environmental benefit.

**Indonesia, Promoting Sustainable Production Forest Management to Secure Globally Important Biodiversity (WB, GEF: 3.3M, Cofinancing: 8.0M, Total:11.3M)**

The project will take advantage of recent opportunities provided through changes in national forest policy to enhance the sustainability of production forest management through development of alternative non-timber income sources. The project will consist of three main steps: (a) evaluation of existing restoration and NTFP/environmental services programs and establishment of learning sites/models; (b) dissemination of information to stakeholders and support for feasibility assessments for potential businesses/restoration forest concessions; (c) forming partnerships and facilitating investment to set-up new restoration concessions and enhance the management of existing natural forest concessions. The project will be implemented in production forest concessions in natural forest. The project will contribute to solving the problem of degradation of production forest and loss of global environmental values by demonstrating and promoting an alternative model of management which emphasizes preservation of ecosystem services and functions in some of the world's biologically-richest lowland rainforests rather than just exploiting them for timber.

**Jamaica, Strengthening the Operational and Financial Sustainability of the National Protected Area System, (UNDP, GEF: \$ 2.77 M, Cofinance: \$ 7.61 M, Total: \$ 10.38 M).**

The objective of the project is to consolidate the operational and financial sustainability of Jamaica's National System of Protected Areas. The long-term solution to the ongoing loss of biodiversity in Jamaica's protected areas is a consolidated NSPA supported by a unified institutional framework equipped with the legislative mandate, management capacity and financial support required to ensure protected area conservation. The project's objective will be achieved through three components: (1) Strengthening of planning and revenue generation; (2) Rationalizing and integrating the national system of protected areas; and, (3) Increasing the effectiveness of protected area management.

**Kazakhstan, Steppe Conservation and Management (UNDP, GEF 2.2M, Cofinancing \$5.7M, Total project \$7.9M)**

This project will expand the protected area system of Kazakhstan to ensure an improved coverage of steppe ecosystems. It will develop and implement an ecologically representative landscape level conservation management system for the Kazakh steppe which will facilitate the establishment of a network of different categories of protected areas and the best possible connectivity within a functional landscape and will take into account both patterns and processes. The protected areas will be designated as nodes within a network of continental corridors where a range of conservation compatible land-uses are employed. Mechanisms and instruments will be developed to improve conservation management in steppe protected areas, buffer zones and in corridors between PAs and to better link protected areas with the wider productive landscape. The project is expected to have three outcomes: (i) Protected area system of Kazakhstan contains representative samples of steppe ecosystem under various conservation management regimes; (ii) The systemic, institutional and individual capacity for steppe protected area conservation and management in a wide productive landscape is strengthened; and (iii) Tools for landscape-level steppe conservation planning and management are developed and implemented by key stakeholders.

**Kenya, Strengthening the Protected Area Network within the Eastern Montane Forest Hotspot of Kenya (UNDP, GEF \$4.5M, co-financing \$11M, Total \$15.5M).**

The objective of this project is to increase the representation and management of the biodiversity of the Eastern Montane Forests by means of creating new protected areas (20,000 ha.), upgrading Nature Reserves (25,000 ha) and National Reserves (20,000 ha), improving management capacities in Joint Forest Management systems established in the buffer areas (200,000 ha) and in Community Conservation Areas (10,000 ha), and improving management capacity in additional 79,000 ha). Activities will take place in two different conservation landscapes: The Western Non-Volcanic Mountains (Cherangani Hills and Mau Summit) and the Guinea-Congolian Forest Block (Kakamega Forest, South & North Nandi). The Cherangani Hills has 5 distinct forest types plus heath. Mau Summit has a variety of forest communities with grass and swamp areas, with more than 70 forest dependent bird species. Kakamega Forest is described as one of Kenya's richest forests, with 194 forest dependent bird species, 16 globally significant.

**Lao PDR, Mainstreaming Biodiversity In Lao PDR's Agricultural and Land Management Policies, Plans and Programmes (UNDP/FAO, GEF \$2.268M, Cofinancing \$4.813M, Total project 7.08M)**

The project aims to provide Lao farmers with necessary incentives, capabilities, and supporting insitutional framework to conserve agro-biodiversity within the farming systems in Lao PDR. Laos is recognized to have the greatest diversity of rice of any of the Mekong nations and largest

collection of indigenous rice accessions. The project brings direct global benefits through in-situ conservation of wild rice diversity and others. Additionally, it will also help conserve globally important biodiversity in production landscapes of 500000 hectares where agro-diversity conservation is comprehensively mainstreamed into farming systems.

**Madagascar, Network of Managed Resource Protected Areas (UNDP, GEF \$6.0M, co-financing \$9.0M, Total \$15.0M).**

The objective of this project is to strengthen the network of Managed Resource Protected areas. This will be achieved by creating new protected areas under IUCN Categories V and VI, build the institutional capacity for decentralized MRPAs governance, and strengthen the financial sustainability of MRPAs. Five new MRPS will be added to the system covering 1,527,151 ha. and management effectiveness will increase in selected. As the result of this, loss of natural forest within in target MRPAs will be less than half of the national average for unprotected areas. The systemic, institutional, and individual capacity development scores will increase. There will be an increase in the communities' perception of their livelihood stake in the good stewardship of biological resources in MRPAs, and a 10% increase in the financial sustainability scores.

**Madagascar, Support to the Madagascar Foundation for Protected Areas and Biodiversity (WB, GEF \$10.0M, co-financing \$34.3M, Total \$44.3M).**

The objective of this project is to improve the sustainability of the protected area system in Madagascar (6 million hectares in 2012). The GEF will contribute US\$10 million to the endowment capital of the of the Madagascar Foundation for Protected Areas and Biodiversity (FAPBM). This would be an important milestone towards achieving the Foundation's self-imposed target of securing at least US\$50 million by 2012. With a total capital of US\$50 million, the Foundation expects to generate approximately \$3 million annually which will provide approximately a third of the 2012 protected area system's recurrent costs. This would reduce the reliance on traditional donors' assistance to effectively protect the conservation areas in Madagascar. The GEF grant would also leverage funds for the preparation or revision of several Administrative and Grant Making instruments for the appropriate allocation and use of the financial resources including an internal administrative, accounting and financial manual, an Strategic Plan containing a prioritization policy based on scientific data, a Grant Administration Manual, and a Fundraising Plan.

**Malaysia, Enhancing Effectiveness and Financial Sustainability of Protected Areas (UNDP, GEF: 5.6M, Cofinancing: 9.8M, Total: 15.4 M)**

The project proposes to create a national structure to support and financially sustain a Protected Area system in Malaysia. In order to ensure cost-effectiveness, and to promote improvements in management and conservation status, the system will link the provision of financial support to the quality of management and conservation value of each site. By linking Federal government support to the achievement of specific conservation indices rather than the jurisdictional authority to designate and manage PAs, this approach will allow the Federal Government to meet its global responsibilities for PA systems management and conservation, without infringing on State Governments' constitutional authority over natural resources. The system will be piloted in terrestrial wildlife PAs in Peninsular Malaysia, encompassing an area of at least 500,000ha. However, the system will be designed to be extensible to Marine PAs, forest reserves, community-managed lands (including private reserves or easements), and all other forms of protected area in the country. The ultimate aim of the project would be to ensure that Protected Areas in Malaysia are underpinned by adequate financial and technical resources, within an overall system that ensures representativeness and nation-wide coherence. To help move towards

this goal, the project's objective will be to establish a performance-based financing structure to support effective PA systems management.

**Mali: SPWA-BD Expansion and Strengthening of Mali's PA System. (UNDP, GEF: \$1.768M, GEF cofinancing: \$3.95M, Total project: \$5.718M)**

The objective of the project is to establish three new protected areas in the Southwestern region in the Malian side of the Bafing-Faleme Transboundary reserve and define Buffer and Transition zones of both the Bafing-Famele and the Baoule Biosphere Reserves. An innovative landscape approach, involving local communities for the conservation and sustainable use of natural resources will be implemented. This zone is a transition area of very vulnerable ecosystems, with the last intact blocks of Western Sudanian Savannah, with one of the last colonies of Western Chimpanzees in West Africa, as well as the Western Eland.

**Malaysia, Biodiversity Conservation in Multiple-Use Forest Landscapes in Sabah, (UNDP, GEF: 4,4M, Cofinancing: 8.8M, Total: 13.2M)**

The project's objective is to demonstrate and begin to institutionalize a multiple-use forest landscape planning and management model which brings the management of critical protected areas and connecting landscapes under a common management umbrella, implementation of which is sustainably funded by revenues generated within the area. The project is expected to serve as a model where the forest can be managed viably by achieving an optimal balance across potentially competing uses – one which maximizes economic, social and environmental benefits to society. Lessons from the project will be used to develop guidelines and best practices to upscale the approach in other forest landscapes within the State and in other parts of Malaysia and the Heart of Borneo. The project has three components: 1) State-level policies, regulations and institutional and human capacities provide an enabling environment for optimized multiple use zoning, planning, financing and management, 2) Demonstration of multiple-use forest landscape planning and management system, 3) Demonstration of innovative sustainable financing methods for multiple use forest landscape management.

**Mexico, SFM Transforming Management of Biodiversity-rich Community Production Forests through Building National Capacities for Market-based Instruments - under the Sustainable Forest Management Program, (UNDP, GEF; \$ 6.9 M, Cofinance: \$ 17.371M, Total: \$ 24.271 M).** The objective of the project is biodiversity management is integrated into forestry practices on community lands through market-based instruments. The project will spearhead forest biodiversity conservation in Mexico by improving management of biodiversity-rich community production forests. This will be achieved by building strong national and international markets for timber products from sustainably managed forests and enhancing the capacity of forestry stakeholders to participate in this market and thus garner the economic benefits and incentives associated with sustainable forest management and biodiversity conservation.

**Mexico, Consolidation of the Protected Area System (SINAP II) - Fourth Tranche, (WB, GEF; \$ 5.44 M, Cofinance: \$ 5.44 M, Total: \$ 10.88 M).** The Project's objective is to promote the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity in Mexico through the consolidation of the National System Protected Areas (SINAP) by: (a) conserving globally important biodiversity in selected areas of SINAP through an endowment fund; (b) promoting the economic, social and environmental sustainability of productive activities in selected protected areas; (c) promoting social co-responsibility for conservation; and (d) in general, promoting the inclusion of biodiversity conservation and sustainable criteria in development projects and other practices

affecting selected protected areas. This project extends the protected areas program initiated with GEF funding in 1992 and restructured as an endowment fund for 10 protected areas in 1997 (Project SINAP I), by adding 12 new protected areas to the program. The protected areas included in the SINAP II project were selected because of their global biodiversity value, as well as the degree of threat they face. The fourth tranche of SINAP II will provide long-term financing to three additional Biosphere Reserves, each of which shelters unique and endangered biodiversity. Benefits generated by the protection of these areas will include the long-term preservation of globally important biodiversity.

**Mexico, Integrating Trade offs between Supply of Ecosystem Services and Land use Options into Poverty Alleviation Efforts and Development Planning (UNEP, GEF: \$ 5.9 M, Cofinance: \$ 9.531 M, Total: \$ 15.431 M).** The objective of the project is to mainstream biodiversity conservation into natural resource use and development planning in the Mixteca Region integrating ES tools and sustainable livelihood options. The project will fill critical information gaps, design a program tailored to mainstream ecosystem services considerations into poverty alleviation, farming and infrastructure programs, and assist in the pilot application of these adjusted programs into selected areas, which will be those with the highest biological value and that comprise corridors among reserve areas.

**Mexico, Mainstreaming the Conservation of Ecosystem Services and Biodiversity at the Micro-watershed Scale in Chiapas, (UNEP, GEF: \$ 1.485 M, Cofinance: \$ 4.85 M, Total: \$ 6.335 M).** In the Sierra-Costa region of Chiapas, land use change is a critical driver responsible for the loss of biodiversity and the degradation of ecosystem services. In order to design and implement appropriate land use policies and management, more knowledge about land use/ecosystem services and biodiversity linkages under varying conditions, crops and land use practices is needed. The objective of the project is to mainstream biodiversity into natural resources management at the sub-watershed level through the integration of ecosystem services considerations in future decision-making in the Sierra-Costa region of Chiapas. The project will increase the knowledge base and understanding about the relationship between land uses and the provision of environmental services in the Sierra-Costa region. Subsequently, the project will develop and implement methodologies and protocols that watershed committees and other governmental and non-governmental actors in the region can apply in environmental and land-management decision-making so that they can make fully-informed decisions at the watershed level that balance trade-offs among biodiversity conservation, agricultural productivity, and the provisioning of ecosystem services. The project will also seek to increase access by land users to environmental service payments from both government programs and private sector markets in return for adopting sustainable production practices and making land use decisions that benefit biodiversity and maintain environmental services at levels that ensure sustainable livelihoods and a healthy environment.

**Mexico, Fostering Sustainable and Competitive Production Systems Consistent with the Conservation of Biodiversity, (WB, GEF: \$ 11.68 M, Cofinance: \$ 19.2 M, Total: \$ 30.88 M).** The objective of the project is to conserve and protect nationally and globally significant biodiversity in Mexico through improving and mainstreaming sustainable management practices in the productive landscape in priority ecological corridors. Building on the foundation and corridor context of the Mexico MBC project, the proposed project focuses on green product and market development in biological corridors through socially and environmentally responsible production and marketing of goods and services, with a specific focus on the protection of biodiversity. Project activities will be carried out in corridors in the states of Chiapas, Campeche,



Tabasco, Veracruz, Guerrero, Oaxaca, Michoacan, Quintana Roo and Yucatan. Productive sectors targeted by the project are those that: (i) are well established in the corridors and represent opportunities to take advantage of significant market demand (including opportunities for diversification of products within sectors and on a given land holding); and (ii) can contribute to greater socio-environmental benefits through fostering their green production, including: cacao, coffee, cattle raising, forestry, honey, tourism, and chicle/gum, among others.

**Mongolia, Strengthening of the Protected Area Networking System in Mongolia (SPAN) (UNDP, GEF \$1.63M, Cofinancing \$4.8M, Total project \$6.43M)**

The project aims to strengthen financial laws and regulations and PA financial planning laws, regulations and current practices, and recommend required changes to streamline and enhance the business/financial management of the protected area network. It plans to improve the financial situation of the PA system, and allowing it to more cost effectively mitigate human induced pressures. This will in turn unlock the potential of PAs to protect biodiversity, using new management models tested and adapted under the projects. The project envisions two components: 1) strengthen policy, legal and institutional arrangement for sustainable PA financing; and 2) business planning and cost effective management tools demonstrated at three PA sites.

**Mauritius, Expanding Coverage and Strengthening Management Effectiveness of the Terrestrial Protected Area Network on the Island of Mauritius (UNDP, GEF \$4.0M, co-financing \$6.0M, Total \$10.0M).**

The objective of this project is to expand and ensure effective management of the protected area network. The project aims at adding 6,893 ha of terrestrial landscapes to the PA network, and increasing the protection of the biodiversity of the existing areas by improving management effectiveness and the overall institutional capacity of the PA system. In the long-term, threats such as the spread of invasive alien species, unsustainable deer farming practices, and uncontrolled wildfires will be contained. The Global Environmental Benefits that this project will deliver, include improving the conservation status of all rare and threaten plant- and animal-species, including within the Protected Area System, un-represented and under-represented habitats, and the plants and animal species associated with climatic gradients and isolated mountain ranges

**Mozambique, Sustainable Financing of the Protected Area System in Mozambique (UNDP, GEF \$4.8M, co-financing \$15.0M, Total \$19.8M).**

The objective of this project is to re-structure the Protected Area System to improve its effectiveness and financial sustainability. The project will invest financial resources in three fronts: First, strengthening the sustainability elements of the PA system at institutional level by analyzing, rationalizing and strengthening capacities, supporting the legal and policy framework for the country's maturing PA system, as well as fostering intersectorial coordination. Second, demonstrating at the site-level that a decentralized, co-management and revenue-sharing models can significantly strengthen the overall effectiveness and sustainability of the PA system in a demonstrative way, and Third introducing and expanding business planning, revenue-generation and revenue-sharing models for PAs, while also establishing a trust fund for conservation. Overall, this project has the potential to benefits to up to 17.7 million hectares in 47 conservation areas, and local communities that up to now, have not been allowed to participate in the co-management and revenue-sharing of the PAs.

**Namibia, NAMIBIA Protected Landscape Conservation Areas Initiative (NAM-PLACE) (UNDP, GEF \$4.5M, co-financing \$13.1M, Total \$17.6M).**

The objective of this project is to establish Protected Landscape Conservation Areas (PLCAs) and ensure that land uses in areas adjacent to existing Protected Areas are compatible with biodiversity conservation objectives. Corridors will be established to sustain the viability of wildlife populations. Protected Landscape Conservation Areas (PLCA) established in 5 sites constituting additional 15,550 KM2 of PA, and adaptive collaborative management frameworks for 5 PLCAs will be operational and in line with agreed national framework for PLCAs. The project also aims at ensuring that production practices on community and private lands within 5 PLCAs are compatible with best practices in biodiversity and that PLCA management costs are underwritten by stakeholders through an agreed financial management system with appropriate revenue/ benefit sharing mechanisms in place.

**Niger: SPWA-BD Integrating the Sustainable Management of Faunal Corridors into Niger's Protected Area System. (UNDP, GEF: \$1.76M, GEF cofinancing: \$5.2, Total project: \$6.968M)**

The project objective is to significantly expand the existing protected area system and to improve its management effectiveness. The project will strengthen the policy, legal and institutional framework for improving protected area management and testing pilot public-private mechanisms that will lower costs and create incentives for conservation. The project will support the development of an interconnected protected area complex in northern Niger focused on the Aïr-Ténéré, Termit Tin Toumma (to be created) and the Gadabedji protected areas, all to be interconnected by strategically defined wildlife corridors under participatory and sustainable use management.

**Nigeria: SPWA-BD Niger Delta Conservation Project. (UNDP, GEF: \$3.61M, GEF cofinancing: 6.15M, Total project: \$9.76M)**

The project is based on three components to mainstream biodiversity management priorities into the Niger Delta Oil and gas Sector by 1) implementing a governance framework to reduce threats and risks linked to Oil and Gas operation in priority ecosystems on 4,6 million ha, 2) managing directly key biodiversity areas in the Niger delta on 46,000 ha, and 3) developing a financial mechanism to support biodiversity conservation and community based management activities in the Niger delta.

**Pakistan, Mountains and Markets: Biodiversity and Business in Northern Pakistan (UNDP, GEF \$1.79M. Cofinancing \$6.18M, Total project \$7.97M)**

The project will promote sustainable production of biodiversity goods and services, including non-bimber forest products such as chilgoza pine numts, morel mushrooms, and goji berry through community ecosystem enterprises, which in turn improve sustainable management biodiversity in at least 300000 ha of land within the broader mountain landscape in Northern Pakistan.

**Panama, Mainstreaming biodiversity conservation through low-impact ecotourism in the SINAP, (IADB, GEF: \$ 4.0 M, Cofinance: \$ 8.5 M, Total: \$ 12.5 M).** The objective of the project is to generate a model of low environmental impact ecotourism in the National Protected Areas System (SINAP) that contributes to biodiversity conservation and sustainability of Protected Areas, in a framework of innovation, entrepreneurial integration, and sustainable social development. The project seeks the sectoral integration of biodiversity conservation through: (i) the promotion of an approach to ecotourism that enhances the value of the natural wealth of the

PAs; (ii) strengthening inter-institutional coordination with a view to a new system for managing tourism; (iii) the review and improvement of instruments for tourism planning, management, and monitoring in priority PAs; (iv) and the expansion of the role of the private sector and civil society in offering quality ecotourism services that contribute to biodiversity conservation in the PAs, financial sustainability of the PAs through increased generation of revenues, and local development. This local development should draw on the sustainable use of resources, the internalization of environmental and social costs, and market preferences formed by users and consumers asking for and rewarding good environmental practices associated with production and ecotourism services, in keeping with the principles enshrined in the General Law on the Environment.

**Panama, Mainstreaming Biodiversity Conservation into the Operation of the Tourism and Fisheries Sectors in the Archipelagos of Panama, (UNDP, GEF: \$ 1.695 M, Cofinance: \$ 2.675 M, Total: \$ 4.37 M).** The objective of the project is to integrate biodiversity conservation into the fisheries, tourism, and property development sectors operating in the archipelagos of Panama. Panama's four major archipelagos – Las Perlas and Coiba on the Pacific coast, and Bocas del Toro and Kuna Yala on the Caribbean side – represent areas critical for the conservation of marine and terrestrial biodiversity, harboring a significant number of vital ecosystems that include primary and secondary forest (particularly tropical moist forest), mangroves and coral reefs. Tourism-related coastal developments and overfishing represent the most important current and future threats to the biodiversity of Panama's archipelagos and the pressures to exploit natural resources for these industries are extremely high. At the same time these sectors are of immense economic importance to Panama but their sustainability in the long term depends on the sustainable use of the natural assets on which they depend. The project will support three main areas of action: 1) implementation of biodiversity-friendly investments in the fisheries, tourism and property development sectors, 2) development of a policy and legal framework that rewards biodiversity-friendly natural resource management and deters unsustainable practices, and 3) strengthening governance structure at the local levels to implement biodiversity conservation plans and enforce related policies and regulations.

**Papua New Guinea, Community-Based Forest and Coastal Conservation and Resource Management in PNG, (UNDP: 6.9M, GEF: 12.0M, Total: 18.9M)**

The objective of the project will be to establish a system of terrestrial and marine protection which builds upon existing community-based resource management structures in PNG. The key impact indicator associated with this objective will be the extent of high conservation value terrestrial and marine area which is brought under community-based conservation at targeted sites. To achieve this objective, three components will be required: 1) Strengthen national and local policies and capacities to support community managed PAs. Key Outcomes under this component will include; 2) Community Conservation Areas strengthened or established in West New Britain Province and the Owen Stanley Range; 3) Promote conservation-compatible livelihood generation opportunities.

**Peru, SFM Sustainable Management of Protected Areas and Forests of the Northern Highlands of Peru (IFAD, GEF: \$ 1.72 M, Cofinance: \$ 13.481 M, Total: \$ 15.201).** The objective of the project is to promote the sustainable and participative management of protected areas and communal forested lands in the Northern Andean Highlands region of Peru. The project will catalyze the growth of investments, activities and participation of poor rural households. This proposed project will be incremental to, but fully blended with, the IFAD-funded Sierra Norte project. The GEF intervention will cover the same geographical areas as the

IFAD-supported Sierra Norte project in the regions of Lambayeque and Cajamarca, and will include communal forested lands in the highlands of Ferreñafe and Reque provinces, where rural poverty, biodiversity loss and environmental degradation are inter-linked. The project area will also include the buffer zones of three PAs in Rio La Leche watershed (Forest of Cañaris and Laquipampa Wildlife Reserve) and in the Rio Reque watershed (Chaparrí Private Conservation Area). The project will be organized into two main components: (i) supporting the regional system of PAs in Lambayeque and Cajamarca, and (ii) promoting sustainable forest management in PA buffer zones within the project area.

**Philippines, Expanding and Diversifying the National System of Terrestrial Protected Areas (UNDP, GEF: 3.5M, Cofinancing: 3.8M, Total:7.3 M )**

This project aims to expand and diversify the system of terrestrial protected areas in Philippines by supporting new protected area models and building capacities for effective management of the system. The expanded protected area system will improve ecological coverage of protected areas in Philippines with an additional 400,000 ha of Key Biodiversity Areas (KBAs). A total of nine sites will be added. The project will also seek to improve the sustainable financing of the protected area system in the Philippines, with demonstration activities at three pilot sites.

**Philippines, Partnerships for Biodiversity Conservation: Mainstreaming in Local Agricultural Landscapes (UNDP, GEF: 4.5M, Cofinancing: 9.1M, Total: 13.6M)**

The project seeks to assist Local Government Units (LGUs) in critical eco-regions of the Philippines to better incorporate the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity resources in their development planning systems and economic growth strategies. The current National Integrated Protected Areas System (NIPAS) excludes other areas of critical connective habitat and other sites which are globally significant for biodiversity conservation. These are the Key Biodiversity Areas (KBAs) and the surrounding production landscapes of PAs and KBAs which are important for connectivity of key biodiversity corridors. The result is a highly fragmented landscape, consisting of unsustainable agricultural and natural resources production systems and incompatible land uses which further expose the remaining natural habitats to threats. To arrest fragmentation and ensure that activities in the surrounding landscape conserve species assemblages and maintain ecosystem functions, three major capacity constraints will be addressed in this project: (i) inadequate policies, systems, tools and capacities by government agencies at the national level to encourage local government unit (LGU) landscape level biodiversity conservation efforts; (ii) weak capacities and lack of tools by LGUs for mainstreaming biodiversity in landscape level and local development planning; and (iii) failure to integrate biodiversity concerns into local development planning, leading to unsustainable management of the surrounding landscape. The proposed project will directly address these barriers through an integrated approach aimed at strengthening enabling policies at the national level; enhancing capacities of LGUs, and demonstration at eight pilot sites covering 700,000 hectares across five critical biogeographic regions (Luzon, Palawan, Negros-Panay, Mindoro and Mindanao).

**Russian Federation, Strengthening the Marine and Coastal Protected Areas of Russia (UNDP, GEF \$4M, Cofinancing \$8.5M, Total project \$12.5M)**

The project objective is to facilitate the expansion of the national system of marine and coastal protected areas and improve its management effectiveness. This project will address systemic issues needed to effectively manage MPA such as capacity development, management effectiveness and linking individual MPAs through a learning network that goes beyond Russia.

It is an interesting project that has its risks but if successful, we can gain useful knowledge how effective MPA are for marine habitat and species conservation.

**Russian Federation, Improving the Coverage and Management Efficiency of Protected Areas in the Steppe Biome of Russia (UNDP, GEF \$5.3M, Cofinancing \$15.3M, Total project \$20.8M)**

The objective of the project is to develop the capacity and ecologically based enabling, tools and mechanisms for the consolidation, expansion and disturbance based integrated management of a system of protected natural areas at the landscape level within the steppe biome. Russia is home to the largest area of Steppe Biome in the world, with a rich plant and animal biodiversity, including several globally important species such as the Saiga antelope and Mongolian Gazelle. The Russian Steppe is, however, facing major threats from habitat conversion, and the pace of conservation action by the government has been slow to catch-up with these threats. This is due mainly to legal, institutional, and capacity barriers, which also hamper collaborative action by sectors and agencies. In addition, existing protected areas in Russia cover nearly 7 million hectares, but do not adequately represent Steppe ecosystem within their boundaries. This project is designed to tackle these barriers by building on existing frameworks and investment opportunities already put in place by the government. The project will result in at least 1.8 million hectares of additional Steppe habitat under protection, which represents a significant global benefit in this important ecosystem.

**Russian Federation, Mainstreaming Biodiversity Conservation into Russia's Energy Sector Policies and Operations (UNDP, GEF \$7.2M, Cofinancing \$33.7M, Total project \$40.9M)**

This ambitious project will mainstream biodiversity considerations in Russia's four main energy sectors: oil, gas, coal and hydro-power. If successful, the outcomes and impacts on the environment will be profound. The GEF project fulfills a truly incremental and catalytic role by not only making a difference to the business-as-usual but also by bringing together government and private sector resources and NGOs.

**Seychelles, Strengthening Seychelles' Protected Area System through NGO Management modalities (UNDP, GEF \$2.1M, co-financing \$3.5M, Total \$5.6M).**

The objective of this project is to expand and strengthen the protected area system in the outer- and inner islands. This project aims at establishing seven (7) new areas under new PA categories, and strengthening the management in five (5) new or existing areas. A variety of ownership/management structures for multiple-use protected area will be applied on the ground with active participation of the various stakeholders. By establishing a system that allows for multiple uses, the project aims at developing and using new financing strategies and mechanisms to contribute supporting the system and these protected areas in particular. The project will invest resources in strengthened the management Framework for the PAs, impacting a potential of 45,000 ha. , expand and strengthened of PAs Management in the Inner islands (six conservation-management areas and three areas with improved management) and Outer Islands (one new conservation-management area and two areas).

**Sierra Leone: SPWA-BD Integrated Ecosystems Management Project. (World Bank, GEF: \$1.8M, GEF cofinancing: \$2.0M, Total project: \$3.8M)**

The aim of this project is to improve management of two priority wetland ecosystems as part of the national framework of conservation in Sierra Leone (the River Estuary and the Mamunta Mayosso are Ramsar and Important Bird Area sites). The project will entail establishing co-

management plans, and aligning rural development initiatives with long term resource management providing sustainable, conservation-linked benefits for local communities.

**South Africa, Development, Empowerment and Conservation in the Greater St Lucia Wetland Park and Surrounding Region (WB,GEF \$9.0M, co-financing \$15.0M, Total \$24M).**

This project will allow the selection and implementation of the best feasible option for maintaining the availability of fresh water to the Greater St Lucia Wetland Park estuary, and to increase access among local communities to conservation compatible economic opportunities. The project aims at achieving this objective by means of management plans for coastal dunes, invasive alien species, encroachment of grasslands, and re-establish indigenous wildlife, study on options for the restoration of the Umfolozi swamp and its impact on the St Lucia estuary, follow-up actions to implement selected options, promoting conservation-compatible local economic and cultural development by means of a Small and Medium Enterprise (SME) Program, a Youth Educational Program, a Capacity building program, and a Cultural Heritage Management Plan, improved capacity of the iSimangaliso Authority and other relevant stakeholders for biodiversity conservation by means of training and mentoring activities, GIS and databases, M&E system, Website improved and stakeholder's coordination mechanisms in place.

**Sri Lanka, Strengthening Capacity to Control the Introduction and Spread of Alien Invasive Species (UNDP, \$1.82M, Cofinancing \$3.145M, Total project \$ 4.965)**

By building capacity to control the introduction and spread of the IAS in Sri Lanka, the project will make a major contribution to global environment benefit by safeguarding globally important biodiversity, including reducing the risks to endemic species, unique and threatened ecosystems and protected area which are international recognized to be critical to biodiversity conservation. The long-term solutions that the project seeks to promote are: 1) strengthened institutional and planning capacities in Sri Lanka to prevent the introduction, and enhance the detection of IAS at key entry points, and 2) implement effective controls against their further entry and spread, based on a multi-stakeholder approach which mainstreams a concern with invasives and instruments for their control across relevant sectors. The project aims to build capacity and communications among the multiple stakeholders whose actions impact on the introduction and spread of IAS; foster an enabling policy, institutional and planning environment for effective and informed joint action; and take steps to generate and share knowledge about the rationale, need and specific techniques and best practices to tackle IAS in Sri Lanka.

**Sri Lanka, Maintreaming Agrobiodiversity Conservation and Use in Sri Lankan Agro-ecosystems for Livelihoods and Adaptation to Climate Change (UNEP, GEF \$1.45M, Cofinancing \$3.079M, Total project \$ 4.52M)**

The project is expected to ensure that agrobiodiversity in Sri Lanka is optimally conserved and used to also meet the challenges of climate change and improve rural livelihoods. The initiative will be supported through development and strengthening of institutional framework, capacity and networks for sustainable food production and ecosystem management, as well as introducing improved sustainable management practices that support traditional crop and livestock species and genetic diversity. Sri Lanka has a strong commitment to conservation of biodiversity, particularly on agrobiodiversity, and the GEF investment will bring necessary support for integration, coordination and collaboration between the stakeholders to link the actions at the community level to wider policy framework and actions.

**Tanzania, Strengthening the Protected Area Network in Southern Tanzania: Improving the Effectiveness of National Parks in Addressing Threats to Biodiversity (UNDP, GEF \$5.3M, co-financing \$11.5M, Total \$16.8M).**

The objective of this project is better protect the biodiversity in the southern part of the country by expanding the PA system to include ecologically sensitive areas, and by buffering these and other areas from poaching and fires. This will be achieved by 1) integrating management of NPs and broader landscapes, including 7 Districts in Southern Tanzania covering over 30,000 km<sup>2</sup> in the Ruaha–Usangu–Kipengere and Kitulo–Livingstone ecological landscapes, 2) expanding the PA system to encompass ecologically sensitive areas adjacent to Kitulo NP (Mt Rungwe) and Ruaha NP (Usangu Game Reserve), totaling over 10,712 km<sup>2</sup>, and 2) providing operations support for NP Management in Southern Tanzania covering an area of over 33,000 km<sup>2</sup>. The project aims at having no net loss of natural habitat in major habitat blocks, and reducing at least 40% hunting pressures, and stable populations of indicator species including predators (lion, wild dog) and ungulates (Elephant, Buffalo and Sable antelope). The Integrated landscape management approach is replicated in at least 1 (one) additional ecological landscape in southern Tanzania.

**Thailand, Catalyzing Sustainability of Thailand's Protected Area System (UNDP, GEF \$3.37M, Cofinancing \$8.98M, Total project \$12.35M)**

The country has more than 400 protected areas covering approximately 18% of its total land area and 8% of its territorial seas. However, weak policies and institutional capacities for effective PA management and financial planning together with heavy human pressure (about five million people living within the boundaries of these protected areas) have led to a rapid decline of biodiversity in Thailand's protected areas. The present project intends to reverse this trend by overcoming barriers to effective management and sustained financing of Thailand's protected area system. This project is highly ambitious and has the potential to substantially increase the long-term sustainability of protected areas in Thailand. This project will address PA financing primarily by 1) identifying new avenues for revenue generation and 2) improving the cost efficiency of management through operational reforms. The project will also support development of appropriate incentives, establishment of an effective monitoring system, and use of traditional knowledge in conservation efforts.

**Thailand, Sustainable Management of Biodiversity in Thailand's Production Landscape (UNDP, GEF \$1.94M, Cofinancing \$4.55M, Total project \$5.49M)**

Much of the globally significant biodiversity in Thailand is found in “production landscapes” outside PAs – in agricultural areas and production forests and wetlands, only 18% of Thailand's total land area is under PAs. Increasing population pressures and rapid economic development are adding pressure to biodiversity both inside and outside PAs. The total economic values of NTFPs and wetland products in Thailand are unknown. Many economically attractive biological resources are under threat from unsustainable extraction with possible extirpation in the wild. This project will address the key barriers (unsustainable harvesting systems, lack of BD conservation in local economic decision making and low market potential of native bioresources based products) to support biological conservation in the target areas. The project will assist in establishing and maintaining sustainable biological resource based development and the generation of new income earning opportunities at the community level. Also the results of several pilot plots (coastal shrimp harvest and bamboo) will be up-scaled to other geographic locations and other products to reduce the adverse impacts to areas of high conservation values. This will lead to the potential development of other biodiversity based products, which is a novel approach to biodiversity conservation; local communities will be empowered to practice

sustainable management techniques and given direct economic incentives to conserve natural resources through the medium of market forces.

**Togo: SPWA-BD: Strengthening the Conservation Role of Togo's National System of Protected Areas (PA). (UNDP, GEF: \$1.2M, GEF cofinancing: \$3M, Total project: \$4.2M)**

This project aims at reestablishing the Togo's protected area estate by 1) redefining and rationalizing the protected area estate, 2) reinforcing capacities of staff and protected area adjacent communities, and 3) developing an effective management on the Oti-Keran & Oti-Mandouri Complex in view to reconnect to the W-Arly-Pendjari (WAP) Complex.

**Turkey, Strengthening Protected Area Network of Turkey - Catalyzing Sustainability of Marine and Coastal Protected Areas (UNDP, GEF \$2.3M, co-financing \$4.0M, Total \$6.3M).**

The objective of this project is to expand the national system of marine and coastal protected areas, improve the management effectiveness of new and existing protected areas, and zoning of marine portions of five marine areas. In addition, the project will strengthen the capacity for local coordination and increase the capacity to financially sustain the protected area system. To reach these goals, the project will build the institutional capacity for planning and management of MPAs and this will result in the extended the coverage of marine protected areas by 100,000 ha. and the improvement of management in 5 existing SEPAS covering 335,906 ha of which 146,871 ha. are marine. The expansion and strengthening of the Marine protected Area System of Turkey will be guided by a 10-year action plan. Sustainable financing options for funding marine protected areas will be included in the project. For instance the self-funded revenue would increase from 10% to 25%.

**Vietnam, Removing Barriers Hindering PA Management Effectiveness in Vietnam (UNDP, GEF \$3.53M, Cofinancing, \$15.15M, Total project \$15.18M)**

The project is expected to have significant positive impacts on Vietnam's system of protected areas through strengthened systemic, insititutional, and individual capacities, supported by sustainable financing. The project is expected secure global environmental benefit through protection of over 330000ha of demonstration sites. This project will assist Vietnam to overcome the national policy, legal and institutional barriers to ensure PA systems effectiveness by strengthen the management and financing of the protected area systems. It will assist PA authorities to test innovative PA management and financing schemes through a two-pronged approach 1) improving the cost effective and targeted use of existing resources 2) identifying sustainable and innovative avenues for sustainable revenue generation.

**Regional (Came roon, Kenya, Madagascar, Mozambique, Senegal, South Africa), Supporting the Development and Implementation of Access and Benefit Sharing Policies in Africa (UNEP, GEF \$1.1M, co-financing \$0.8M, Total \$1.9M).**

This project would allow the development, implementation, and review the framework for Access and Benefit Sharing to Genetic Resources in Six African countries. This project focuses on the development national capacity in the participating countries. The project complements the Regional and Sub-regional activities sponsored by the ABS Capacity Development Initiative for Africa, a multi-donor effort lead by the Dutch, German, French and Norwegian governments. This project is particularly important because it is in support of one of the three objectives of the CBD, in a continent where building the capacity for ABs has been highlighted by all as the top priority for investments. The project has the following components and outputs: 1. Revision of existing national ABS policies and regulations, 2. Development of national ABS policies and



regulations, 3. Implementation of national ABS policies and regulations, 4. Regional and sub-regional cooperation and capacity-development. The Deutsche Gesellschaft für Technische Zusammenarbeit GmbH (GTZ) is the Lead Executing Agency for this project. This would greatly facilitate the coordination with the ABS Capacity Development Initiative for Africa currently underway

**Regional (Malawi, Zambia), Sustainable Management of Nyika Transfrontier Conservation Area (WB ,GEF \$4.8M, co-financing \$8.3M, Total \$13.1M).**

This project will assist the two governments and their stakeholders in implementing the existing joint management plan that links five protected areas with a total of 5,701 km<sup>2</sup> (Nyika National Park and Vwaza Marsh Wildlife Reserve in Malawi and Nyika National Park, Lundazi, Mitengi, Mikuti Forest Reserves in Zambia). The work will be carried out by building the capacity to control resource uses and to monitor trends in biodiversity and ecosystem functions through an effective joint law enforcement system and a public-private partnership for park management as well as an implementation of a cost-effective monitoring system. The expected outcomes of the project are: Governance, planning and management mechanisms of the Nyika TFCA established and effective, The formal protected areas in the TFCA are managed more efficiently, Better stewardship of natural resources by local communities, Revenues and funds support biodiversity conservation and livelihoods in the TFCA.

**Regional (Micronesia, Marshall Islands, Palau) The Micronesia Challenge : Sustainable Finance Systems for Island Protected Area Management (UNEP, GEF: 5.4M Cofinancing: 10.88M, Total: 16.28M)**

This GEF project will directly support the development and adoption of sustainable finance mechanisms for protected area system in each participating country. The objective of this project, therefore, is to establish sustainable finance systems and policies in FSM, RMI, and RP by 2014 that ensure sufficient resources to support the activities required to abate threats to their marine and terrestrial biodiversity and effectively manage each of their Protected Areas Networks, their primary strategy for achieving the goals of the Micronesia Challenge. The Project will provide comprehensive support to the existing Micronesia Conservation Trust (MCT) to develop and resource the Micronesia Challenge financial architecture. The project will catalyze, capitalize and implement a strategic financing program for protected area conservation efforts across the MC sub-region. It will build incremental GEF finance with matching partner commitments beyond the lifetime of the Project to leverage financial resource flows that will enable global environmental benefits whilst achieving the 2020 conservation target of the Micronesia Challenge. Furthermore, to gather momentum with the Micronesia Challenge at the site-level, the Project will provide specific on-the-ground preparatory activities and testing of approaches and incentives in protected area sites across the three countries, as well as simultaneously developing the financial architecture and capital of the Micronesia Challenge endowment. The project will assist the initial implementation of the Challenge in designating areas for biodiversity conservation as well as employing strategies that provide tangible resilience and adaptive capacity for climate change.

**Regional (Cook Islands, Micronesia, Kiribati, Marshall Islands, Niue, Papua New Guinea, Palau, Tonga, Vanuatu, Samoa) Prevention, Control and Management of Invasive Alien Species in the Pacific Islands (UNEP, GEF: 3.0M, Cofinancing: 4.43M, Total:7.43M )**

The objective of the project is to reduce the environmental and economic impacts of invasive alien species in both terrestrial and marine habitats in the Pacific. The project objective will be realized through four components: 1) Strengthening national enabling policy and institutional

environment for cross-sectoral prevention and management of IAS, 2) Facilitating regional harmonization and support through the Regional Invasive Species Strategy (RISS) for the Pacific, 3) Strengthening the Institutional, Capacity and Knowledge Base, and 4) National & Regional Pilots of the prevention, control and management of priority invasive alien species. **Regional (Kyrgyzstan, Kazakhstan), Tien Shan Ecosystem Development Project (WB, GEF \$3.3M, Cofinancing \$11.2M, Total funding \$14.5M)**

The objective of the project is to contribute to improving ecosystem management and sustainable forestry resulting in an improvement of biodiversity and reduced GHG emissions by sequestering carbon dioxide. This project will generate multiple global environmental benefits offered by the Tien Shan forest ecosystem. The project will be implemented by the State EPFA (Kyrgyzstan) and the MoA (Kazakhstan) which also will provide substantial co-financing to the project. In addition, during the preparation of the project a \$8million grant contribution by IFAD was secured. This project is highly innovative and unique.

**Regional (Central African Republic, Congo, Cameroon, Gabon, Congo DR): CBSP Sustainable Financing of Protected Area Systems in the Congo Basin. (UNDP, GEF: \$8.2M, GEF cofinancing: \$50.6M, total project: \$58.8M)**

The goal of the project is to achieve long-term financial sustainability of national protected area systems in the Congo Basin. For that, the project aims to have in place capacity, institutional frameworks and model mechanisms for the long-term financial sustainability of PA systems and associated ecosystems within the Congo Basin. Pilot mechanisms will be tested at national, transboundary, and regional levels.

**Regional (Congo, Congo DR): CBSP Catalyzing Sustainable Forest Management in the Lake Tele-Lake Tumba (LTLT) Transboundary Wetland Landscape. (UNDP, GEF: \$2.17M, GEF cofinancing: \$6.6, Total project : \$8.77M)**

The project aims to implement a strategy for the conservation and sustainable management of one of the world's largest swamp forest and the world's largest Ramsar site established in DRC in July 2008 with: 1. the adoption of a transboundary strategy for cooperation, 2. the implementation of community based management projects, and 3. the reinforcement of capacity of national agencies.

**Regional (Central African Republic, Congo, Gabon, Congo DR): CBSP Sustainable Management of the Wildlife and Bushmeat Sector in Central Africa. (FAO, GEF: \$4.2M, GEF cofinancing: \$6.0, Total project: \$10.2M)**

The objective is to develop an approach for the sustainable management of the wildlife and bushmeat sector in three pilot countries of the Congo Basin (Democratic Republic of Congo, Republic of Congo, Central Africa Republic). The project is based on three main components with 1) the implementation of pilot actions on the field based on community wildlife management approaches and the development of alternative livelihoods, 2) the awareness of the population and key stakeholders through information dissemination and training, 3) a better understanding of the status of wildlife populations and the impact of bushmeat management strategies by building efficient mechanisms for monitoring and regulation of bushmeat trade at national and local level. The sub-regional level will be a key to harmonizing strategies and activities, and involve other Congo Basin countries.

**Regional (Gambia, Mali, Sierra Leone, Chad, Togo): SPWA Evolution of PA Systems with regard to Climatic, Institutional, Social, and Economic Conditions in the West Africa Region. (UNEP, GEF: \$3.6M, GEF cofinancing: 10.0M, Total project: \$13.6M)**

The Governments of Chad, the Gambia, Mali, Sierra Leone and Togo, will work collaboratively in leading a regional project addressing the links between Climate Change and protected areas. The proposed project will build capacity for understanding and managing Protected Areas (PAs) for the threat of Climate Change (CC) by: 1) combining and distilling existing information from disparate sources, 2) undertaking new research to contribute to the body of knowledge, 3) borrowing from other fields and innovating to develop new management approaches, and 4) ensuring that training and learning are taking place to support a strong community of PA managers in the region. Three other countries- Burkina Faso, Cote d'Ivoire, Ghana, will be involved in trans-boundary aspects. During initial consultations, five other countries, namely, Guinea, Liberia, Niger, Nigeria, and Senegal have expressed interest to participate in the regional consultations.

**Regional, (Bahamas, Dominican Republic, Jamaica, St. Lucia, Trinidad and Tobago), Mitigating the Threats of Invasive Alien Species in the Insular Caribbean, (UNEP, GEF: \$ 2,547, Cofinance: \$ 3.094, Total: \$ 5.659).** The objective of the project is globally significant ecosystems, species and genetic diversity preserved in the Caribbean region through reduction of risk from invasive alien species. Invasive Alien Species (IAS) are a major threat to the vulnerable marine, freshwater and terrestrial biodiversity of Caribbean islands and to the people depending on this biodiversity for their livelihoods. The project will broaden the approach to dealing with IAS, both by strengthening existing national measures and by fostering regional cooperation frameworks through which Caribbean-wide strategies can be developed. In parallel with participation in the development of national and regional strategies, each country will also address its own most pressing IAS problems through a total of twelve pilot projects, relating to prevention, early detection and rapid response, management and eradication of the most problematic IAS. In all the pilots there is a strong emphasis on capacity building among Government staff and other practitioners, as well as raising awareness of IAS issues among a wider stakeholder group including the general public. The pilots are designed so that their findings and lessons learned will be readily applicable to other sites, including other Caribbean states, enabling replication of the methodologies. Through this combination of approaches, the project will provide the participating countries and others in the Caribbean region with the necessary tools and capacity to address existing and future biological invasions.

**Regional, (Colombia, Ecuador, Peru), Facilitation of Financing for Biodiversity-based Businesses and Support of Market Development Activities in the Andean Region (UNEP, GEF: \$ 6.41 M, Cofinance: \$ 7.89, Total: \$ 14.311 M).** Colombia, Ecuador and Peru provide habitat to globally significant biodiversity that has contributed important benefits for humanity through new sources of food and raw materials for medicines, cosmetics and dyes. The objective of the project is to protect and sustainably use biodiversity in the Andean region through support to the Biotrade Sector. At present, these countries have taken steps to achieve this goal by strengthening protected area systems, improving systems of land zoning, promoting low impact extraction technologies and engaging in discussion with specific sectors to agree on sustainable rates of resource use. This project will complement these efforts by consolidating and supporting the growth of biotrade activities through strengthening tools, norms and methods as well as capacity development that result in robust value chains. Specifically, the project will (i) strengthen norms and standards favorable to biotrade; (ii) facilitate the access of biotrade products to markets that reward sustainable extraction and production; (iii) build business

capabilities within the scope of value chains of products based on biodiversity; (iv) improve access to information on key biotrade products and markets; (v) facilitate the access to financial resources to biotrade initiatives; (vi) support pilot biotrade projects in key sectors for demonstration purposes; and (vii) implement information and replication strategies at the national and regional Andean level.

**Regional, (Antigua and Barbuda, Grenada, St. Kitts and Nevis, St. Lucia, St Vincent and the Grenadines), Sustainable Financing and Management of Eastern Caribbean Marine Ecosystems.** (UNEP, GEF: \$ 8.75 M, Cofinance: \$ 14. 8 M, Total: \$ 23.55) The objective of the project to improve the management effectiveness of existing and expanded Protected Area networks across the Eastern Caribbean through the establishment of sustainable financing mechanisms. To address the OECS region's marine and coastal resource degradation threats and management challenges, especially the lack of sustainable conservation funding, the proposed project aims to: (i) establish a system of long-term financing mechanisms to sustainably fund PAs in the OECS region; (ii) promote collaboration among governments, communities, NGOs and the private sector of the six OECS member countries in order to facilitate marine and coastal conservation; and (iii) support efforts to harmonize policy, legal and institutional frameworks among the six Eastern Caribbean states.

**Global (Chile, Lesotho, Trinidad and Tobago, Vietnam, South Africa), Project for Ecosystem Services (ProEcoServ) (UNEP, GEF \$6.3M, co-financing \$14.0M, Total \$20.3M).**

The objective of this project is to pilot the bundling of ecosystem services and the integration of ecosystem services approaches in resource management and decision making to promote innovative solutions that bear potential for scaling-up and replication. The overall goal of the project is to better integrate ecosystem assessment, scenario development and economic valuation of ecosystem services into national sustainable development planning. Within this overall project approach, each individual country will develop its specific set of activities that take into account the particularities of the national institutional and policy framework as well as its ecosystems. The project provides an opportunity to generate targeted national and global benefits at significant levels, among these: a) Long-term conservation of species and habitat diversity, linked to reduced direct impacts and congruence with relevant development processes; b) Enhanced conservation of ecosystems, such as mangrove wetlands, drylands and coastal and marine ecosystems; c) Enhanced complicity and convergence of policy frameworks with ecosystem services approaches; and d) Development of and access to innovative biodiversity conservation financing instruments. As such, this is an innovative project that builds on the outputs and outcomes of the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment and consistent with GEF's biodiversity mainstreaming strategy.

**Global, BS: UNEP-GEF Project for Continued Enhancement of Building Capacity for Effective Participation in the BCH II (UNEP, GEF \$2.5M, co-financing \$2.5M, Total \$5.0M).**

The objective of this project is the enhancement of the Biosafety Clearing House Mechanism in 50 countries. The participating countries are parties of the CPB and have completed their National Biosafety Framework and/or BCH-I. This project is above and beyond the objectives of BCH-I. The project aims at delivering assistance to interested parties by a series of training events (i.e. Global Meeting, Sub-regional Meetings, and National Workshops), development of training materials, and direct assistance to countries by Regional Advisors. This new BCH project is in line with the recommendations of the Terminal Evaluation of BCH-I, mainly: 1.

"Continuing the Regional Advisor network" (i.e. Global, sub-regional meetings), and 2. "Training and technical support need to be adjusted to different levels of national capacity and need", (i.e. Workshops and Training and Consulting by Regional Advisors at the National level). The BCH-II will select only countries that would have completed the NBF and the BCH-I.

**Global, Save Our Species (WB, GEF \$4.9M, Cofinancing \$8.89M, Total project \$13.79M)**

Save Our Species is intended to be a long-term global program to improve the conservation status of globally threatened species. Save Our Species will provide grants for conservation of threatened species globally. The project will provide the private sector and other donors with a mechanism to contribute to and support efficient, credible, and coordinated conservation action. SOS activities and investments to support on-the-ground action will be guided by species conservation priorities identified through the IUCN Red List and SSC Species Profiles and Action Plans, which are science-based, global in scope, and current. By strategically focusing on species conservation priorities identified by the SSC and by providing rapid action funding that can be mobilized quickly during crises, SOS would provide critically-needed resources where and when they matter most. At least 60 threatened species grants are expected to be made over the 5-year SOS program with the majority being made as medium-sized grants from \$25,000 to \$150,000.

**Global, (Peru, Bolivia, Ecuador and Colombia) Communities of Conservation: Safeguarding the World's Most Threatened Species, (UNEP, GEF: \$ 1.775 M, Cofinance: \$ 1.775 M, Total: \$ 3.555 M).** The objective of the project is to strengthen effective protection of habitats populated by species that are globally critically endangered and endangered within the terrestrial protected area networks of the Tropical Andean countries of Peru, Bolivia, Ecuador and Colombia. The project seeks to turn the tide of habitat loss and species extinction at a "pilot" suite of sites that provide habitat to globally important and critically threatened endemic species in the Tropical Andes of Peru, Bolivia, Ecuador, Venezuela and Colombia. The project's methodology combines the social marketing expertise of the project proponents, Rare, with the action of local organizations to engage rural communities in the design and implementation of more sustainable resource management practices to relieve deforestation, decrease species loss, and safeguard the provision of water as a crucial ecosystem service in the project sites.

**Global, (Brazil, Kenya, Turkey, Sri Lanka), Mainstreaming Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Use for Improved Human Nutrition and Well-being (UNEP/FAO, GEF: \$ 5.517 M, Cofinance: \$ 8.410 M, Total: \$ 13.927).** The objective of the project is to strengthen the conservation and sustainable management of agricultural biodiversity through mainstreaming into national and global nutrition, food, and livelihood security strategies and programmes. This project aims to contribute to creating globally applicable policy lessons and models that recognize the nutritional value of agricultural biodiversity in order to create additional incentives for its conservation and sustainable use. By focusing on a strategic set of countries with important biodiversity, encompassing a range of ecosystems, local agricultural species and food systems but common nutrition problems, a globally relevant portfolio of interventions will be created to serve as models for application in a wide range of countries and ecosystems. It is expected that this project will establish cross-sectoral policy models to promote the mainstreaming of biodiversity into health, agriculture and environment sectors in the four project countries that have global applicability. Successful models, experiences and lessons learned leading to specific policies and policy actions will be shared across countries to jump-start and accelerate mainstreaming biodiversity conservation in sectors responsible for food and nutrition policies. These models will allow synergies among global initiatives and create additional

incentives to promote the conservation of biodiversity and its sustainable use for improved nutrition and health.

**Global, (Chile, Indonesia, Nepal, Vietnam), Expanding FSC Certification at Landscape-level through Incorporating Additional Eco-system Services. (GEF: \$ 2.88 M, Cofinance: \$ 2.88 M, Total: \$ 5.76 M).** The objective of the project is to pilot test expanded and enhanced global and national environmental standards applied to emerging markets for biodiversity conservation and eco-system services as an initial step for upgrading of successful models of FSC certification. The project will develop scientifically derived verifiable indicators for forest management for ES. At the same time the project would work on (i) global FSC policies and business model(s) to support the relevance of expanded FSC certification related to its (ii) financial feasibility as well as social- and environmental costs. This project will also analyze the potential demand for FSC certification in these fast-growing ecosystem service markets. The testing of the FSC ES model will also take place in the national context through national pilots in each of the participating countries. For this reason, the national organizations will be at the forefront, producing through consensus locally adapted indicators based on the adapted FSC international standards. The project will apply pilot site selection criteria, based on global BD significance and potential benefits to communities as well as nationally important ES. Finally, the project will raise awareness of the experiences in using the FSC certification system for BD conservation and other ES and promoting its successful application.

## **Summary of Medium Size Projects Approved Between January 1, 2008-June 30, 2010**

### **Albania, Improving Coverage and Management Effectiveness of Marine and Coastal Protected Areas (UNDP, GEF \$0.95M, Cofinancing \$1.92M, Total project \$2.87M)**

The objective of the project is to improve coverage and management effectiveness of Albania's marine and coastal protected areas. The project aims at (i) improving the biogeographical representation of marine and coastal protected areas and (ii) improving management capacity and arrangements for marine and coastal protected areas. A central component of the project is the creation of a new marine protected area aiming at the protection of some of the rare and heavily endangered marine species along the Albanian coastlines. The project aims to create the countries' first marine protected area covering 13,000 ha.

### **Albania, Capacity Building for the Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework (UNEP, GEF: \$0.5M , co-financing: \$0.3M, Total project:\$0.8M)**

The objective of this project is to assist the Government of Albania with the implementation the National Biosafety Framework in line with national priorities and obligations to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety. The project will be executed through the Ministry of Environment, Forestry and Water Administration, which for long has served as a National Executing Agency for biosafety activities. The implementation project will help Albania to put in place a standalone biosafety policy, a regulatory regime on biosafety including the approved draft law, the mechanisms for risk assessment and management by putting in place a competent national authority and respective institutions, and to create a sustainable mechanism to fulfill obligations of the CPB regarding public awareness and information, specifically through the use of the BCH. The setting up of a laboratory on LMO detection, as well as training of key experts on LMO expertise, is one of the activities that will have the most impact on the setting up of a functional infrastructure to deal with LMOs.

### **Armenia, Catalyzing Financial Sustainability of Armenia's Protected Areas System(UNDP, GEF \$0.95M, Cofinancing \$4.53M, Total project \$5.48M)**

Armenia and the Caucasus region are considered as being a biodiversity hotspot of global importance with high degrees of endemism. The project indicates that financial sustainability cannot be reached for most of Armenia's PAs under the current baseline scenario. However, to change this situation, only relatively modest additional funding might be necessary. The proposed project has the potential to reduce the gap between the need and supply of financial resources for the protected area system in the short term and catalyze close-to-optimal financing in the long term.

### **Armenia, Developing the Protected Area System (UNDP, GEF \$0.95M, Cofinancing \$2M, Total project \$2.95M)**

The project aims to catalyse the expansion of the nature reserves to provide better representation of ecosystems within Armenia's current protected area system and enable active conservation of biodiversity. The project would allow the expansion of the Protected Area system in Armenia with 48,000 ha, and setting foundations for long-term operational sustainability of sanctuaries totaling 137,000 ha. Through this, the sanctuary estate is increased by 53% corresponding to a 16% increase in the overall country PA estate. These Sanctuaries will increase the habitat for threatened species like the Caucasian leopard Armenian mouflon, and Bezoar goat, and of un-represented ecosystems like low Mountain dry steppes, mountain meadow steppes, high

mountain alpine and subalpine-ecosystems. The three new sanctuaries are used as model for the formal designation and establishment of responsible administration bodies for all sanctuaries in Armenia.

**Bangladesh, Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework (UNEP, GEF: \$0.9M, co-financing: \$0.5M, Total project:\$1.4M).** The objective of this project is to allow the Government of Bangladesh and the Agency to implement the National Biosafety Strategy in compliance with the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety through enhancing the existing capacity on Biosafety at the Institutional, Individual and Systemic levels. This project will invest in Biosafety policy, rules and regulations, the administrative system for handling application for use or release of LMOs, the monitoring and evaluation systems for LMOs, increasing public awareness and harmonization of BS standards. Implementation of the NBF is a must to ensure conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity of endemic species and unique ecosystems in Bangladesh. The country with more than 5000 plant species subspecies, of which a least 160 species are used as crops (rice, wheat, jute, pulses, oilseed plants, minor cereals, sugar crops, fruit plants, vegetables, root tuber crops, spices, forest trees, beverage crops, flowers, medicinal and aromatic plants). Rice alone has more than 4000 indigenous varieties.

**Belarus, Mainstreaming Biodiversity Conservation into Territorial Planning Policies and Practices (UNDP, GEF \$0.97M, Cofinancing \$2.86M, Total project \$3.83M)**

This MSP is part of an important national level effort by the Government of Belarus to mainstream biodiversity conservation into development planning process within its territories. The focus on mainstreaming is intended to complement existing conservation achievements through a representative protected area system. The project is designed to address enabling policy, regulatory, and institutional needs for ensuring maintenance of biodiversity in land uses outside of the protected area system. As a result, emphasis is placed on management of important target species and unique habitats as an integral part of landscape scale planning, including considerations for private lands. GEF financing will play an important role in capacity building, knowledge management, and cross-sector coordination at local and district level.

**Benin: SPWA Incorporation of Sacred Forests into the Protected Areas System of Benin. (UNDP, GEF: \$0.95M, GEF cofinancing: \$4.07M, Total project: \$5.02M)**

This project aims to promote the conservation and sustainable use of Benin's Sacred Forests as a network of community-managed areas incorporated into the national system of protected areas. The logical framework is based on three components with 1) the institutionalization of Sacred Forests, 2) Piloting participatory community management plans for Sacred Forests, and 3) Engineering sustainable uses of wild resources.

**Bhutan, Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework of Bhutan (GEF \$ 0.869M, co-financing \$ 0.854 M, Total \$ 1.723M).**

The objective of this project is to make the National Biosafety Framework operational and consistent with the provisions of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety. Specifically, the project will help to operationalise the policy, legislative, administrative, monitoring and enforcement systems set up in the draft NBF of 2006, and help to ensure that these are fully integrated into the country's development plans and decision-making processes. The implementation of the NBF is urgently needed, because there is increasing pressure both for the importation of LMOs into the country and for application of biotechnology in order to increase agricultural production and promote food security. By the completion of the project Bhutan will be able to monitor imports of foods and seeds to control any illegal trans-boundary movement of LMOs, monitor illegal



planting of LMOs from seeds smuggled across its borders from neighboring countries, evaluate dossiers for applications to import LMOs, and carry out and monitor field trials for LMOs introduced by CGIAR centres in conjunction with the research Centres of the Ministry of Agriculture.

**Burkina Faso: SPWA-Protected Area Buffer Zone Management in Burkina Faso. (UNDP, GEF: \$0.86M, GEF cofinancing: \$3.09M, Total project: \$3.95M)**

This pilot project aims to incorporate protected areas into Burkina Faso's decentralization process, making community managed protected areas operational. The effective management of community protected areas will be demonstrated on pilot sites in the Upper Mouhoun river plains, covering 100,000 ha. Lessons will be taken to extend the approach to the other community managed areas included in the national protected area network (600,000 ha).

**Cambodia, Building Capacity for the Detection and Monitoring of LMOs in Cambodia Biosafety Program (UNEP, GEF \$06M, co-financing \$1.0M, Total \$1.6M).**

The objective of this project is to build the human and infrastructure capacities for LMO detection and monitoring. The National Capacity Self-Assessment (NCSA) showed the urgent need to create a critical mass of scientific personnel to maintain and sustain the national reference laboratory as well as to improve its existing laboratory infrastructure. The project focus on the identification, analysis and quantification of LMO detection and monitoring needs with reference to the results from the 'needs evaluation' carried out at the mid-2006, training staff for LMO detection, operation and maintenance of LMO equipment, staff training on public communication to promote public understanding on the potential consequences of unapproved or unintentional releases of LMOs to their health, biodiversity and the environment, improve the infrastructure for LMOs detection and monitoring, and establish a system to store, retrieve and disseminate LMO information.

**Chad: SPWA-Strengthening the national protected area network in Chad. (UNDP, GEF: \$0.859M, GEF cofinancing: \$3.36M, Total project: \$4.219M)**

The project aims to support the establishment of an effectively managed Protected Area network in Chad by (1) strengthening PA policy and planning framework; (2) reinforcing capacities for PA management, and (3) testing new governance approaches. The project is focused on three sites covering 100,000 ha (Ouadi-Rime-Ouadi Achim Faunal Reserve, Fada Archei Faunal Reserve, and a transboundary protected area between Chad and Cameroon, Sena Oura National Parks).

**China, CBPF: Emergency Biodiversity Conservation Measures for the Recovery and Reconstruction of Wenchuan Earthquake Hit Regions in Sichuan Province (UNDP, GEF \$0.909M, Cofinancing \$1.926M, Total project \$2.835M)**

This project is a Short-term Response Measure (STRM) to respond to the urgent biodiversity needs and threats associated with the recent Wenchuan Earthquake in China. The earthquake affected areas involve several protected areas of global biodiversity significance covering an area of 35000 km<sup>2</sup>, supporting a wide array of habitats with nearly 50 extremely endangered species and hundreds of rare species, including the giant panda. The overall project objective is to conserve critical ecosystems and their associated threatened and endangered species in the earthquake hit region and mitigate the loss of biodiversity occurring as a result of the earthquake.

**Congo: CBSP- Integrated management of mangrove and associated wetlands and coastal forests ecosystems of the Republic of Congo. (FAO, GEF: \$0.95M, GEF cofinancing: \$1.15M, Total project: \$2.1M)**

The project aims to support the direct conservation of 20% of Congo's remaining mangroves and the rehabilitation of 1,000ha, by strengthening national and local capacities. The project is built on three components to 1) design appropriate policies and regulations, 2) rehabilitate and manage mangrove forests involving local knowledge and skills, 3) develop a collaborative management and sustainable use of mangrove forests and wetland resources in pilot sites. The intervention strategy is based on a co-management approach to ensure synergy among stakeholders and an integrated territorial land and ecosystem approach taking into account different land uses and their regulation around the mangroves.

**Costa Rica, Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework (UNEP, GEF \$0.7M, co-financing \$0.7M, Total \$1.4M).**

The objective of this project is to implement Costa Rica's National Biosafety Framework and to fulfill the country's obligations as a Party to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety (CPB). The project is strongly focused on operational issues, and on building technical capacity and leveling this capacity among the different National Competent Authorities (NCAs). Costa Rica first began working towards this goal through the UNEP-GEF Project "Development of a National Biosafety Framework" (NBF), as a result of which a draft biosafety law and regulatory proposals were approved. Costa Rica also finalized the establishment of its Biosafety Clearing House mechanism. The project will carry out activities leading to achieving having functional operational and administrative system to fulfill obligations to the CPB, build the technical capacity for comprehensive biosafety management, and improved communication, education, and public participation in biosafety decisions.

**Cuba, Completion and Strengthening of the Cuban National Biosafety Framework for the Effective Implementation of the Cartagena Protocol (UNEP, GEF \$0.9M, co-financing \$0.8M, Total \$1.7M).**

The objective of this project is to address the technical, legal, infrastructural and managerial gaps in biosafety found in the National Competent Authorities to attain the successful and sustainable implementation of the Cartagena Protocol. Notwithstanding Cuba's outstanding progress on BioSafety, the country is witnessing an increasing need for institutional coordination and capacity-building because of the rapidly evolving technology and ongoing diversification of LMO and because of need for harmonization trade-related issues that come into play with Cuba being a member of the WTO and the CPB. By tackling specific administrative and scientific items, the project will contribute to the robustness of the complete biosafety framework and will serve to consolidate Cuba as a biosafety reference in the region. The current project therefore seeks to address all the above issues by structuring a project around institutional coordination for regulatory, BCH and decision-making purposes, imports, exports and transit of LMOs for food, feed and processing, human resources training, and scientific and technological capacities of the National Competent Authorities.

**Djibouti, Establishing Effectively Managed Marine Protected Areas in Djibouti (UNDP, GEF \$0.9M, co-financing \$1.2M, Total \$2.1M).**

The objective of this project is to prepare the legal framework for the establishment of a system of Marine Protected Areas (MPAs), build the institutional capacities to run the system, and secure new financial resources to cover the recurrent costs of the system. The project will invest

funding in the legal, and policy frameworks (including the regulatory basis for MPA revenue generation in place, and norms and standards for nature tourism established), building institutional capacity for planning, regulation, and validation of management of MPAs (including a cadre of MPA managers and local community rangers trained, and the development planning mechanism tested at 3 newly gazette MPAs -4300 ha), and developing and implementing a plan for sustainable financing of the PAs in the network. This component will include the development of MPA system and site-based business and conservation plans, the identification of the financial incentives and regulatory drivers, the negotiation and implementation of the certification system for MPA tour operators, business sponsorship negotiated for investment in MPA management and conservation, and PA investment and recurrent costs underwritten by budget appropriations and user fee systems.

**Ecuador, Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework (UNEP, GEF \$0.6M, co-financing \$0.6M, Total \$1.3M).**

The objective of this project is to put in place a workable and transparent national biosafety framework, to fulfill its obligations as a Party to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety. The project aims at achieving this objective by establishing a policy and regulatory framework for GMOs, by setting up a system for decision making and control, by building the human and institutional capacity to carry out the duties necessary to comply with the CPB, and by increasing the public participation, awareness and understating of biosafety issues. Various mechanisms for public access to and sharing of information on biosafety will be created and maintained.

**El Salvador, Contributing to the Safe use of Biotechnology (UNEP, GEF \$0.9M, co-financing \$1.0M, Total \$1.9M).**

The objective of this project is to consolidate and implement an operable biosafety framework for the safe use of biotechnology in El Salvador, in accordance with national priorities and international obligations. This project will achieve this objective by the political integration of biosafety in national policies, plans and programs, by putting into effect a fully functional legal framework in accordance with the CPB, by setting up a systems for handling requests and decision-making system, by setting up a system for monitoring, inspection and vigilance in biosafety, and by ensuring public awareness and participation processes in biosafety.

**Ethiopia, Implementation of Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety through Effective Implementation of National Biosafety Framework (UNEP, GEF \$0.6M, co-financing \$0.7M, Total \$1.3M).**

The objective of this project is to implement the National Biosafety Strategy. Ethiopia took part in the UNEP/GEF Project on "Development of National Biosafety Frameworks and the BCH project. This project will focus on ensuring the approval of the "Draft Biosafety Proclamation" and guidelines, as well as building on and implementing the instruments developed during the previous projects. The project will invest developing the Biosafety and biotechnology policy, and the regulatory framework, building the institutional capacity to handle biosafety issues, and enhancing public awareness, education and participation. This project is important for Ethiopia is the center of origin and diversity of a number of crops including wheat, barley, sorghum, finger millet, and their wild relatives, and these may be at risk of trans-boundary border movements of LMO via trade, mobility of people or physical means.

**Gabon: CBSP: Sustainable Management of the Mbe River Forested Watershed through the Development of a Payments for Ecosystem Services (PES) Mechanism. (UNDP, GEF: \$0.855M, GEF cofinancing: \$2.95M, Total project: \$3.809M)**

The Mbe River watershed is one of the most biologically diverse sites in Central Africa and is of global conservation significance. The catchment area provides functions and services which are economically and ecologically important (source of fresh water, electricity, soil fixation, silt filtration, flooding regulation). The project aims to develop a sustainable funding mechanism to secure the long-term protection of this crucial forested and high-value biodiversity conservation watershed.

**Gabon, CBSP: Sustainable Management of the Mbe River Forested Watershed through the Development of Payments for Ecosystem Services (PES) Mechanism (UNDP, GEF \$0.8M, co-financing \$2.9M, Total \$3.8M).**

The objective of this project is to develop a Payment for Ecosystem Services (PES) mechanisms in the Mbe watershed of Gabon. This scheme should turn into a sustainable financing mechanism to ensure long term protection of this forested watershed with high conservation value. The Mbé River watershed is one of the most biologically diverse sites in Central Africa and is of global conservation significance. As a result of its long period of isolation and stability, the Mbé watershed is one of the oldest forests in all of Africa harboring a unique assemblage of species with extremely high endemism. Surveys over the last four years rank the area as having exceptional regional and global significance for plant species and highlight its potential to resist on-going and future climate change. The project will invest in the policy, legal and institutional framework to support PES scheme for the Mbé watershed, the pilot PES scheme in the Mbé watershed, a monitoring plan to evaluate the PES scheme, and in the dissemination of lessons learned from the PES scheme design.

**Gambia: SPWA-The Gambia Biodiversity Management and Institutional Strengthening Project. (World Bank, GEF: \$0.945M, GEF cofinancing: \$1.25M, Total project: \$2.203M)**

This project will focus on 1) strengthening field effectiveness of biodiversity and Protected Area Management with a effort on the Tanji Bird Reserve and the Kiang West National Park, 2) developing a long term sustainable financing vision, and 3) developing capacities for management of Protected Areas and Biodiversity implementing recommendations of the Institutional Assessment completed in 2007.

**Georgia, Ensuring Sufficiency and Predictability of Revenues for the Protected Areas Systems (UNDP, GEF \$1M, Cofinancing \$4.63M, Total project \$5.63M)**

Georgia is located in the Caucasus region, which is considered as being a biodiversity hotspot of global importance. Financial sustainability cannot be reached for most of Georgia's PAs under the current baseline scenario. The proposed project consists mainly of investments to establish a sinking fund that has the potential to reduce the gap between the need and supply of financial resources for the protected area system in the short term and catalyze close-to-optimal financing in the long term.

**Ghana: SPWA BD: Landscape Management and Biodiversity. (World Bank, GEF: \$1.0M, GEF cofinancing: \$5.1M, Total project: \$6.1M)**

The area is located in the northern region of Ghana, in the Upper West region which is a reasonably undisturbed sample of Guinea Savanna ecosystems. The project will support the implementation of management plans of the Gbele Resource Reserve and the wildlife corridors between Mole Park, Gbele park and Burkina Faso with the establishment of Community Resource Management Areas (CREMAs).

**Ghana, Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework for Ghana (UNEP, GEF \$0.6M, co-financing \$0.8M, Total \$1.4M).**

This project will allow the Government of Ghana to implement the National Biosafety Framework (NBF), previously developed with GEF funding. This project will strengthen and reinforce the institutional and human capacity needed to meet the critical challenges in the operationalisation of the NBF and the obligations under the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety. The project will carry out by preparing a stocktaking report, drafting a biosafety/biotechnology policy and get it endorsed by cabinet for parliament approval, an approved regulatory regime, the development and implementation of regulations and guidelines, the nomination of the National BS Authority and Technical Advisory Committee, training staff, and handling of applications, monitoring and enforcement of laws and regulations.

**Guatemala, Development of Biosafety Mechanisms to Strengthen the Implementation of the Cartagena Protocol in Guatemala (UNEP, GEF \$0.6M, co-financing \$0.5M, Total \$1.1M).**

The objective of this project is to put in place a transparent national biosafety system in compliance with the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety. The project will strengthen the legal, regulatory and policy framework on biosafety, establish a national system for risk assessment and risk management, establish the capacity for decision making and regulatory compliance, generate and manage biosafety information and public awareness. This project is supported by a wealth of national institution including the Ministry of Agriculture, the National System of Protected Areas, the University of San Carlos, The University of El Valle, the National System for Science and Technology, and the Institute of Agricultural Sciences and Technology.

**Guinea-Bissau: SPWA: Support for the Consolidation of a Protected Area System in Guinea-Bissau's Forest Belt. (UNDP, GEF: \$0.95M, GEF cofinancing: \$3.5M, Total project: \$4.45M)**

This project proposes to support Guinea-Bissau's initial steps to expand its terrestrial protected area system in the Dulombi-Boé-Cheché complex in the southeastern part of the country. This will be the first purely terrestrial protected area units in Guinea-Bissau, while simultaneously increasing the effectiveness and sustainability of the national Protected Area system. The project is based on 3 main components to 1) develop the institutional and legal framework for the effective expansion and management of protected areas in the forest belt region, 2) improve capacities of key protected area management stakeholders for establishing and managing a more representative protected area network, and 3) implement participatory conservation management approaches in the DBT Complex (Dulombi National Park - 98,951 ha; Boe National Park - 95,280 ha; Cuntabane-Quebo Wildlife Corridor - 55,003 ha; Salifo Wildlife Corridor - 36,162 ha; Tchetché Wildlife Corridor - 33,604 ha).

**Guinea-Bissau: SPWA BD: Guinea Bissau Biodiversity Conservation Trust Fund Project. (World Bank, GEF: \$0.95M, GEF cofinancing: \$2.9M, Total project: \$3.85M)**

The project aims to strengthen the ongoing management and conservation of the network of parks and protected areas in Guinea Bissau by 1) consolidating capacities for the management of coastal and marine protected areas, 2) implementing four plans for endangered species implemented (chimpanzee, mangrove, hippo, and marine turtle), and 3) strengthening the Foundation for Biodiversity.

**Indonesia, Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework (UNEP, GEF \$0.8M, co-financing \$0.7M, Total \$1.5M).**

The objective of this project is to implement the National Biosafety Framework in Indonesia in accordance with the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety and national standards. This project will achieve this objective by carrying out a stocktaking, implementing a Regulatory System, establishing a national system for handling request, perform risk assessment, and decision making, by establishing a National System for monitoring environmental effects, and enhancing public awareness and education on GMOs.

**Iran, Building National Capacity to Implement the National Biosafety Framework of Islamic Republic of Iran and the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety (UNEP, GEF \$0.8M, co-financing \$0.8M, Total \$1.6M).**

The objective of this project is to build the national capacity to implement the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety. The project aims at achieving this goal by integrating biosafety into relevant national development plans, biodiversity strategies and biotechnology strategy/policy/action plans, and strengthening and making operational the National Biosafety Law, building a system for handling requests (i.e. health safety assessment, decision-making and risk management), and for “follow-up” activities (e.g. monitoring for environmental impacts, inspections and enforcement to ensure compliance). The project will also invest in a system for increasing public awareness, education, access to information and participation in decision-making and increasing knowledge and information for scientists, policy makers, and staff involved in biosafety especially in the area of risk assessment and risk management.

**Jordan, Mainstreaming Biodiversity in Silvo-Pastoral and Rangeland Landscapes in the Pockets of Poverty of Jordan (IFAD, GEF \$ 1M, Cofinancing \$3.1M, Total project \$4.1M)**

This project will address the barriers to mainstreaming biodiversity within silvo-pastoral and rangeland landscapes at both the national level, and at the local level in the pockets of poverty in Jordan. The project will work at two levels: at a national scale to ensure that it contributes to the establishment of an enabling environment for mainstreaming biodiversity in key production landscapes and at local level, focusing on investment that targets linkages between development efforts and community-based conservation and support to protected areas in pockets of rural poverty in Jordan. Additional investment opportunities will be leveraged through pilot PES schemes in rangelands and silvo-pastoral ecosystems, and income generating activities that contribute to conservation. Global environmental benefits will be generated through protection of biodiversity, improving habitat connectivity for protected areas in wider landscape context, reducing pressure on biodiversity and natural resources within the protected areas, and maintenance of ecosystem functions and services across silvo-pastoral and rangeland ecosystems. GEF financing will enable improved land use practices in the buffer zones to reduce pressure on two protected areas, financial sustainability of the protected areas, and ecotourism infrastructure in the two protected areas.

**Jordan, Mainstreaming Marine Biodiversity Conservation into Coastal Management in the Aqaba Special Economic Zone (ASEZ) (UNDP, GEF \$0.95M, Cofinancing \$7.3M, Total project \$8.25M)**

This project aims to ensure the long-term survival of coral reefs in Jordan and equitable sharing of the benefits of the ecosystem services they provide, by developing mechanisms to ensure that biodiversity protection is addressed within the development framework of the ASEZ, and in particular into sectors of economy that strongly impact it, notably tourism. The project will address an important interface for biodiversity conservation - coastal zone management and marine biodiversity protection. The project will directly deal with threats to coral reefs by translocating species and modifying policies related to tourism.

**Jordan, Support for the Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework for Jordan (UNEP, GEF: \$0.8M , co-financing: \$0.9M, Total project:\$1.7M).**

The objective of this project is to allow Jordan to implement its National Biosafety Framework. The NBF was completed with a National workshop held in Amman in June 2004, and now, the country is committing to have the system in place by 2013. This project should bring Jordan in line with its national development priorities and international obligations. The project will; i) integrate and incorporate Biosafety and the safe use of biotechnology into national sectoral action plans and strategies, ii) establish a sound and effective legal regime in line with national legislation, national needs and priorities, and the requirements of the CPB, iii) establish a fully functional system for handling requests, performing risk assessment, decision-making, performing administrative tasks, handling, storing and exchanging information, iv) establish a workable and effective national system for follow-up and for public awareness, education, participation, and access to information on LMOs.

**Kenya, Wildlife Conservation Leasing Demonstration (WB; GEF \$0.7M; co-financing: \$0.5M, Total project: \$1.2M).**

The objective of this project is to protect important conservation areas in the savannas of the Kitengela. By “leasing lands”, the project will engage local communities in conservation practices, including no-fencing. This practice alone, should allow seasonal migrations of wildlife between the Nairobi National Park and the Kitengela Plains in the south. The project aims at achieving the following conservation outcomes: Increasing Conservation land to 60,000 acres through wildlife leases, Institutional strengthening and information dissemination, efficient and transparent administration of Wildlife Conservation Leases, monitoring system for tracking lease compliance, wildlife movements, and related habitat condition. The project also aims at adding two additional sites for implementation of Wildlife Conservation Leases, and leverage additional financing resources at minimum level of \$60,000/yr. In the long term conservation leases, should be incorporated into Government wildlife and land use policies

**Kiribati, Phoenix Islands Protected Area (PIPA) (UNEP, GEF: 0.89M, Cofinancing: 0.945M, Total: 1.835M)**

The project seeks to develop and implement the PIPA Management Plan through a twin focus on: (i) Core Operational (capacity, infrastructure, zonation, enforcement, monitoring, evaluation) and Strategic Outcomes (atoll restoration, reverse fishing license, World Heritage listing, tourism initiatives, climate change adaptation), and (ii) to design and operationalise PIPA's Sustainable Financing System.

**Lao PDR, Protected Area Management Models for Lao PDR: Learning and Disseminating Lessons from Nam Et-Phou Louey (WB, GEF \$0.879M, Cofinancing \$1.423M, Total project \$2.3M)**

The project will enhance conservation of a number of threatened species, including the protection of tigers and their prey in a global priority landscape for tiger conservation. The project will do so by strengthening the terrestrial protected area network of Lao PDR by demonstrating and disseminating replicable innovative working models for sustainable natural resource use and sustainable PA financing through ecotourism and REDD.

**Lao PDR, Support the Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework of LAO PDR (UNEP, GEF \$1.0M, co-financing \$0.5M, Total \$1.5M).**

The objective of this project is to have a workable and transparent National Biosafety Framework. The project will carry out a stocktaking analysis, consolidate a National plan for Biosafety, establish an adequate legal and regulatory regime for LMOs, and the systems for the proper handling of requests, establishing a system for monitoring, enforcement and inspection of LMOs, enhance the public education, awareness and participation in LMO decision. In addition, the project will work to enhance regional coordination.

**Lesotho, Support the Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework of Lesotho (UNEP, GEF \$0.9M, co-financing \$0.1M, Total \$1.0M).**

The objective of this project is to develop a National Biosafety Framework, in line with its national development priorities and the obligations to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety. The project will carry out a stocktaking, integrate biosafety and biotechnology into national development plans, establish a functional and responsive regulatory regime in line with CP and national needs on biosafety, establish a national system for handling requests including risk assessment and decision making, establish a system for monitoring and enforcement, establishing a systems for public awareness, education and participation in decision-making on LMOs

**Liberia, Support the Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework of Liberia (UNEP, GEF \$0.5M, co-financing \$0.5M, Total \$1.1M).**

The objective of this project is to work on the Biosafety Framework and build the institutional and human capacity to comply with the obligations of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety. This project will allow The Environmental Protection Agency of Liberia (EPA-Liberia) to continue positioning environmental issues at the top of the Government's agenda. The project has six components, including stocktaking, development of National Biosafety and Biotechnology Policy, strengthening the administrative system for handling requests, update the regulatory regime to meet the obligations of the CPB, building the institutional capacity to monitor environmental impacts and enforcements, and raising Public awareness and participation.

**Liberia: SPWA BD: Biodiversity Conservation through Expanding the Protected Area Network in Liberia (EXPAN). (WB, GEF: \$0.95M, GEF cofinancing: \$9.168M, Total project: \$10.011M)**

The project aims to contribute to the conservation of Liberia's globally significant biodiversity providing better representation of ecosystems within Liberia's current protected area network, and enabling active conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity with local communities. This project is conceived as a pilot activity in complement of a REDD initiative in Liberia with the FCPF. The first component will strengthen the capacity of decentralized Forest Development Authority offices. The second component will develop a community mapping approach to create



two new protected areas with the Grand Kru protected area ( 135,100 ha) and the Grebo protected area, close to the Cote d'Ivoire border (97,140 ha). The third component will provide a support to develop a Community Livelihood Programme around the new protected areas. Technical partnerships will reinforce the whole approach (US Fisheries and Wildlife Service, Conservation International, and Fauna & Flora International, for instance).

**Lybia, Support for the Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework for Libya (UNEP, GEF: \$0.9M , co-financing: \$0.9M, Total project:\$1.8M).**

The GEF should support this project, as it would enable the Government of Libya to have a national biosafety framework in line with its obligations to the CPB. The project is structured around i) a biosafety law and accompanying Regulations on use, handling, release and placing on the market of locally produced or imported LMOs and products into the market, ii) developing the procedures for Administrative processing, risk assessment and decision-making of LMOs are defined and made operational, iii) developing the procedures for monitoring of environmental effects and enforcement actions are defined and in place. Technical measures for monitoring and inspections are in place, and iv) increased public education and participation.

**Macedonia, Support the Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework (UNEP, GEF: \$0.4M , co-financing: \$0.2M, Total project:\$0.6M).**

The objective of this project is to allow the implementation of the National Biosafety Framework in Macedonia. This project will invest in: i) a stocktaking on biosafety, ii) a regulatory regime, iii) the system for handling requests for authorization, including guidelines, methodologies and manuals on risk assessment and risk management, iv) reference laboratories equipped, v) monitoring and inspection system for LMOs established, vi) human resources for monitoring, inspections, border controls, compliance to Biosafety Law and the Protocol and emergency response, vii) guidelines, methodologies and manuals on monitoring, inspections and emergency response prepared, and viii) Public participation.

**Madagascar: Support for Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework of Madagascar (UNEP, GEF \$0.6M, co-financing \$0.3M, Total \$0.9M).**

The objective of this project is to put in place a functional and transparent national biosafety framework, in accordance with national development priorities, and to fulfill its obligations as a Party to the Cartagena Protocol. The specific objectives of this project are to assist Madagascar to integrate and incorporate biosafety issues in national programmes and/or strategies on sustainable development, to assist Madagascar to establish and consolidate a regulatory Biosafety regime, in line with the CPB, to establish and consolidate a system for the administration of requests (including risk assessment and decision-making in the management of biosafety), to establish and consolidate a coordinated and collaborative monitoring and enforcement system, and to establish and consolidate a national system for public awareness, education, participation, and access to information.

**Malawi, Participatory Development and Management of Nkhotakota Wildlife Reserve (PDMNWR) (WB, GEF \$0.8M, co-financing \$1.5M, Total \$2.3M).**

The objective of this project is to improve the management of Nkhotakota Wildlife Reserve (the oldest -1938, and largest in the country -1802 Km<sup>2</sup>) by creating conditions for sustainable management and successful tourism investments in its Bua watershed area. It is considered to be one of the most important and pristine wildlife areas and acknowledged for its diverse habitats. The Reserve is an important bird, and contains two key bird species of global conservation concern: the Taita Falcon and the Black Stork. In spite of highly populated adjacent areas, large

African mammals still roam the area, though at low density. The Bua is one of the few rivers around Lake Malawi where lake salmon continues to spawn. The project will invest in the following activities: resource protection, infrastructure development and monitoring, business development for revenue generation, conservation based Community-Livelihoods, institutional and financial framework for Nkhotakota Wildlife Reserve Development Trust.

**Mongolia, Capacity Building for Biosafety Implementation (UNEP, GEF: \$0.4M , co-financing: \$0.3M, Total project:\$0.7M).**

The objective of this project is to build the capacity and comply with the obligations of Mongolia as Party to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety. The draft NBF formed the basis of a new Biosafety law which was enacted as "The Law on Living Modified Organisms (LMOs)" in November 2007. In order to implement this Law, it is essential to develop the appropriate rules and regulations. This project will invest in this activity, as well as in increasing human capacity, institutional capacity (i.e. infrastructure & Equipment) for the implementation of the BS program, and public awareness and participation in Biosafety issues.

**Mauritania: Partnership to Mainstream Marine and Coastal Biodiversity into Oil and Gas Sector Development in Mauritania. (UNDP, GEF: \$0.95M, GEF cofinancing: \$3.5M, Total project: \$4.45M)**

The project aims to protect and conserve marine and coastal biodiversity, by strengthening the policy, legislative and financial instruments, as well as the capacity of government and civil society stakeholders in partnership with nascent offshore oil and gas industry in Mauritania,. The project is structured around 3 components to 1) mainstream marine and coastal biodiversity conservation into the governance frameworks for the oil and gas sector and into the industry's operations, 2) strengthen financial flows to promote biodiversity conservation through partnerships between the public sector and the oil and gas sector, and 3) reinforce capacities of key stakeholders in public sector and civil society for monitoring marine and coastal biodiversity and environmentally sound decision-making related to the development of the oil and gas sector.

**Moldova, Improving Coverage and Management Effectiveness of the Protected Area System in Moldova (UNDP, GEF \$0.95M, Cofinancing \$1.04M, Total project \$1.99M)**

The project seeks to pilot an approach to PA expansion in Moldova that enables the consolidation and expansion of a number of existing, but currently spatially and institutionally fragmented, protected areas into a single protected area – a National Park - under a single management authority. Preliminary feasibility studies for the possible establishment of five large National Parks - Codrii Centrali, Padurea Domneasca, Orheiul Vechi, Prutul de Jos and Plaiul Fagului – across the country have already been completed, and demonstrate the efficacy of this approach. Two of these areas - Prutul de Jos and Padurea Domneasca – also have the potential to be incorporated into larger trans-boundary protected areas with Romania.

**Montenegro, Catalyzing Financial Sustainability of the PA System (UNDP, GEF \$0.95M, Cofinancing \$3.1M, Total project \$4M)**

The national protected area system (PAS) in Montenegro currently covers 9.7% of its territory with plans underway to increase this area to 25%. This solution requires that protected area agencies have adequate capacities to identify and resource cost-effective management efforts across an expanded protected area system. The project has the objective of improving the financial sustainability of Montenegro's protected area system and the proposed components and

outcomes will address three key barriers to improving the financial sustainability of an expanded PAS in Montenegro (i) under-developed policy instruments and regulatory framework, (ii) insufficient revenue-streams, and (iii) low cost-effectiveness of business and financial management systems.

**Montenegro, Strengthening the Sustainability of the Protected Areas System of the Republic of Montenegro (UNDP, GEF \$0.95M, Cofinancing \$3.01M, Total project \$3.96M)**

The objective of the project is to enhance the coverage and management effectiveness of the protected area system of Montenegro by developing the capacity in protected area institutions to design, plan and manage a more representative system of protected areas. This project would allow the Government of Montenegro to enlarge and manage the PA system. Specifically, the project aims at: 1) Expanding and rationalizing the PA system to ensure better habitat representation and more secure conservation status; and 2) Strengthening capacity of PA institutions to more effectively manage a representative system of protected areas.

**Mozambique, Support to the Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework of Mozambique (UNEP, GEF \$0.70M, co-financing \$0.2M, Total \$0.9M).**

The objective of this project is to strengthen the existing institutional and technical structures needed to meet the obligations of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety. The project will carry out stocktaking, establish a regulatory regime for LMOs, a system for handling requests for permits, a system for monitoring and enforcement, and enhance public education, awareness and participation.

**Namibia, Institutional capacity building towards the implementation of the Biosafety Act 2006 and related obligations to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety (UNEP, GEF: \$0.5M , co-financing: \$0.4M, Total project:\$0.9M).**

The objective of this project is to upgrade and strengthen the biosafety capacity in Namibia for decision making and management of potential risks associated with the application of modern biotechnology in conformity with the CPB and the Biosafety Act of 2006. This project aims at: i) upgrading Facilities (to improve on the already existing facility and capacity to screen for LMOs in order to enable the monitoring and managing of risks associated with handling , transport, use, transfer and release), ii) upgrading the Administrative Structures (to monitor safe development, use and handling of LMOs in Namibia and the SADC region), iii) enhancing public participation in decision making by stakeholders through educating them and creating awareness on modern biotechnology, and iv) strengthening information generation, flow and sharing with relevant stakeholders.

**Nigeria, Support for the Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework of Nigeria (UNEP, GEF \$1.0M, co-financing \$1.0M, Total \$2.0M).**

The objective of this project is to address the identified gaps in legal, technical and administrative measures to ensure compliance with the CPB. The project will carry out a stocktaking analysis to better determine the gaps and areas of intervention in the National Biosafety, establish a functional system for handling request and decision-making as well as performing risk assessment and management associated to LMOs, establish a fully functional and responsive regulatory regime in line with CPB and national needs, strengthening the systems for “follow-up” activities, namely monitoring of environmental effects and enforcement, and having a national system for public awareness, education, participation and access to information established.

**Panama, Consolidation of National Capacities for the Full Implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety in Panama (UNEP, GEF \$0.9M, co-financing \$1.0M, Total \$1.9M).**

The objective of this project is to implement the National Biosafety Strategy and develop national capacities to properly handle Living Genetically Modified Organisms (LMO) for the safeguard of biodiversity. The project will complete the regulatory and institutional arrangements in support of decision-making and compliance processes, addresses the need for greater capacity in risk assessment and risk management, establish the necessary monitoring, inspection and response system including customs surveillance and emergency responses, generate up-to-date national biosafety information in a manner that will promote transparency and accountability, and will stimulate of public participation through awareness-raising and increasing opportunities for acquiring biosafety expertise.

**Peru, Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework (UNEP, GEF \$0.8M, co-financing \$0.9M, Total \$1.7M).**

The objective of this project is to have an operational and transparent national biosafety framework. This project is the next step following the development of a National Biosafety Framework (NBF), and the creation of a Biosafety Clearing House (BCH). The project will complete the regulatory framework on biosafety and its integration into national policies for sustainable development, increase the capacity for handling requests, carrying out assessments, and taking enforcing decisions. The project will also work at raising the levels of public awareness, education and participation in decision-making for LMOs.

**Romania, Improving the Financial Sustainability of the Carpathian System of Protected Areas (UNDP, GEF \$0.95M, Cofinancing \$4.75M, Total project \$5.9M)**

This project will secure the financial sustainability of Romania's Carpathian network of PAs, as a model for replication to the entire Carpathian Network of Protected Areas (CNPA). With adequate financial resources the financial sustainability of Romanian Carpathian PAs and the CNPAs will be increased. The project objective will be realized through two components: i) Strengthening the supportive legislative framework and Sustainable Finance Strategy, and ii) Strengthening the institutional and individual capacities of management authorities and other local stakeholders to implement the sustainable finance plan. The project is expected to generate significant new revenues to the CNPAs. The GEF investment of approximately USD 1 million is projected to generate additional revenue of USD 5 million per year.

**Russian Federation, Support to the Global Tiger Summit Hosted by the Russian Federation (WB, GEF \$0.56M, Cofinancing \$0.685M, Total project 1.245M)**

The project will provide support for the Year-of-the-Tiger Summit hosted by the Russian Federation to bring together Heads of Governments in order to launch the Global Tiger Conservation and Recovery Program. The project is designed to: (a) provide expertise and analytical support for the Summit preparation; (b) provide organisational and logistic support for the Summit preparation; (c) deliver an information campaign to highlight the Summit, promote its goals and commitments. The project is expected to mobilise and confirm political will of the global community to take effective transformational joint measures to prevent extinction of tigers and restore their population in the wild to sustainable levels.

**Rwanda, Support to the Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework for Rwanda (UNEP, GEF \$0.6M, co-financing \$1.0M, Total \$1.6M).**

The objective of this project is to implement its National Biosafety Framework (NBF) and strengthen its institutions and human resource through capacity building in line with its obligations to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety. The proposed project will assist Rwanda in strengthening Biosafety capacity at national level for decision making and management of potential risks associated with the application of modern biotechnology. The establishment of a workable and cost effective system, through which each intentional trans-boundary movement or domestic use of LMO is properly assessed, will help to achieve the global environmental goals of the CPB and the protection of national biodiversity of global importance. The project will carry out stocktaking, establish an administrative and institutional Framework on Biosafety, build the institutional and human capacities to effectively run the Biosafety framework, and enhance public participation, education and awareness on LMOs.

**Serbia, Ensuring Financial Sustainability of the Protected Area System (UNDP, GEF \$0.95M, Cofinancing \$2.97M, Total project \$3.92M)**

This project is aiming at improvement of the financial sustainability of Serbia's protected area system. Serbia has a status as a centre of biodiversity in Europe, its Balkan and Pannonian regions harbor numerous endemic-relict floral elements from previous geological ages. Serbia has recently started to reinforce its biodiversity conservation framework, the three key main barriers to ensuring financial sustainability of the Serbian PA system are regulatory and policy gaps, low diversity of funding sources, and inadequate cost-effectiveness of site management. The project has therefore three components: (i) Enabling legal and policy environment for improved PA financial sustainability; (ii) Increasing revenue-streams for the PA system; and (iii) Institutional and individual capacity of PA institutions to raise PA management cost-effectiveness. One of the key activities of the third component is the development of a business planning process for the PAs of Serbia with 21 pilot sites included and the capacity to extend the process to all PAs of Serbia that require strategic planning. Together these activities and outcomes will greatly increase the financial sustainability and cost-effectiveness of Serbia's protected areas.

**Swaziland, Capacity Building for the Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework of Swaziland, (UNEP, GEF: \$0.8M , co-financing: \$0.3M, Total project:\$1.1M).**

The objective of this project is to assist the Kingdom of Swaziland to implement its National Biosafety Framework (NBF) and to fulfill its obligations as a Party to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety. The GEF grant to develop a NBF resulted in a Policy on Biotechnology and Biosafety as well as a Biosafety Bill 2008. This new grant for the Implementation of the NBF will assist the country in developing the appropriate regulations, the systems for detecting & monitoring LMOs, and increase public awareness. Consistent with these needs, the project is structured around: i) establishing a functional and effective regulatory regime, ii) developing a system for detecting & monitoring the presence of LMOs, iii) establishing a system for public awareness and participation in decision making, iv) integrating and incorporate biosafety issues in the National programmes, and v) establishing an effective system for handling applications for the introduction of LMOs, including risk assessment and risk management.

**Syria, Support for the Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework for Syria (UNEP, GEF: \$0.8M , co-financing: \$0.9M, Total project:\$1.7M).** The objective of this project is to allow Syria to put in place the National Biosafety Framework in line with its national development priorities and the CPB. The project aims at: i) having a fully functional

biosafety legislative system in place and working by 2014, ii) a system for risk assessment, risk management and decision making on LMOs and their products in place, iii) a system for monitoring, enforcement and emergency measures, including establishing the role, responsibilities and procedures for monitoring, enforcement and emergency measures, and technical means for monitoring and inspections are in place, and iv) a system for public information, education and participation in decision making process.

**Tajikistan, Support the Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework of Republic of Tajikistan (UNEP, GEF \$0.8M, co-financing \$0.5M, Total \$1.4M).**

The project objective is to assist Republic of Tajikistan to implement its National Biosafety Framework (NBF) to comply with the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety (CPB). This project will assist in the integration of biosafety issues into national plans and programs will consolidate and strengthen a fully functional regulatory regime consistent with the CPB and national needs will consolidate and strengthen a system for handling requests, carrying out risk assessments and decision-making on GMOs. In addition, this project will establish and strengthen enforcement and monitoring system, and enhance public awareness, education and participation in decision-making on LMOs.

**Turkey, Support for the Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework (UNEP, GEF: \$0.5M , co-financing: \$0.7M, Total project:\$1.2M).**

The objective of this project is to further develop and implement the Biosafety Framework of the country. The elements of the NBF established as a result of the GEF funded NBF are still in place with some in need of further development. Specifically, this project aims at: i) having a stocktaking and identifying the gaps to be filled, ii) a regulatory biosafety regime, as well as a Biosafety Committee, and Competent Authorities & Advisory Committee in place, iii) a system for handling requests, risk assessment, risk management and decision making: Guidelines, Internet Portal, Human Resources, iv) a system for monitoring and inspection for LMOs (Ankara Control Laboratory, Laboratory and Research Institute Network) and v) strengthening the BCH as public awareness and participation.

**Turkmenistan, Capacity Building for the Development of the National Biosafety Framework (UNEP, GEF: \$0.3M, co-financing: \$0.1M, Total project: \$0.4M).**

The objective of this project is to build the capacity to develop a National Biosafety Framework. Specifically, this project will help develop of a National Biosafety Policy and a National Regulatory Regime, design of National Administrative system (including monitoring and follow-up activities), and improve public awareness, education and participation. Since Turkmenistan joined the Cartagena Protocol only very recently (2008), the approach of this project is to build the key technical elements of a Biosafety Framework and to raise the awareness on biosafety in the government before committing to a larger project. The project includes a component to develop and put in motion the national BCH.

**Turkmenistan, Strengthening the Turkmenistan Protected Areas System (UNDP, GEF \$0.95M, Cofinancing \$2.1M, Total project \$3M)**

The project will create the enabling environment for the establishment of a functional, effective and ecologically coherent system of protected area. The project has two components with one component focusing on the increased coverage of PAs in Turkmenistan and the second

component on establishing an adequate institutional framework for the management of PAs. The project is executed by the Ministry of Nature Protection.

**Uganda, Developing an Experimental Methodology for Testing the Effectiveness of Payments for Ecosystem Services to Enhance Conservation in Productive Landscapes in Uganda (UNEP ,GEF \$0.8M, co-financing \$0.9M, Total \$1.7M).**

The objective of this project is to develop an experimental methodology for testing the effectiveness of Payments for Ecosystem Services (PES) to enhance conservation in productive landscapes. The project includes setting a field experiment, and at the same time financing PES scheme start-up costs, and the actual Ecosystems Services during the implementation of the project. The project will focus on an area of private and communal land between the Budongo and Bugoma forest reserves in Hoima District, Uganda. This area forms the home to some of Uganda's largest chimpanzee populations living outside the protected areas. Clearing of forests for cash crops such as tobacco and rice is threatening the survival of these chimpanzee populations, and risks isolating the populations in the Budongo and Bugoma reserves. The loss of these forest habitats is also threatening other ecosystem services in particular carbon storage and access to clean water. The project will pilot a PES scheme using experimental methodologies, strengthening the technical and institutional capacity to design, implement and monitor PES schemes, generate, develop and disseminate replicable PES models based on lessons learned and best practices.

**Uganda, Extending Wetland protected Areas through Community Based Conservation Initiatives. (UNDP, GEF: \$0.8M , co-financing: \$3.0M, Total project:\$3.9M).**

The objective of this project is to strengthen the Ugandan National Protected Area network by expanding the coverage of the Protected Area network to include two representative wetland systems adjacent to two terrestrial protected areas. The project will allow the development of protection and sustainable management strategies implemented by rural communities. This project targets Uganda's wetlands, the storehouse of globally significant biodiversity with 11 RAMSAR sites. In spite of their large area (estimated at 30,000 km<sup>2</sup>), importance for biodiversity, and the livelihoods of local communities - with whom this project is going to be implemented, these ecosystems remain largely under-represented in the Protected Area System. The objective of the project will be achieved through effective establishment and strengthening of community-based regulation and sustainable wetlands resource use, and by integrating community conservation models into the Protected Area and national planning.

**Uzbekistan, Mainstreaming biodiversity into Uzbekistan's oil-and-gas sector policies and operations(UNDP, GEF \$0.95M, Cofinancing \$2M, Total project \$2.95M)**

This project is innovative and challenging since it targets two major production sectors that are known for their destructive practices in the wider landscape: the oil and gas industry. As of now, no biodiversity considerations are part of their strategy and implementation processes resulting in a high loss of biodiversity. The project will have two main components: one working on the enabling environment and the second one working at the local level on demonstration activities. The project is co-financed by the private sector involved in the oil and gas industry as well as the GoU, which is a positive sign of tandem work between the government and the PS to make these changes effective and long-term.

**Uzbekistan, Strengthening Sustainability of the National Protected Area System by Focusing on Strictly Protected Areas (UNDP, GEF \$0.975M, Cofinancing \$1.24M, Total project \$2.21M)**

This project aims to demonstrate new management approaches for the expansion of protected area system in Uzbekistan. It will provide a test ground for the buffer zone provisions of the new Protected Area Law, by adjusting reserves' boundaries, rezoning and working with local communities for the establishment of the first community – owned and managed protected areas in Uzbekistan. The project will demonstrate these new conservation management approaches at Surkhan Strict Nature Reserve. The project will also build the management capacity of all strict nature reserves across the country, to effectively utilize opportunities that have been opened up by the adoption of the new law. The project has the three following outcomes: (i) Master Plan for Protected Area System of Uzbekistan is guiding the expansion; (ii) Strengthened institutional and individual capacity to enable expansion and improved management effectiveness; (iii) Demonstration of new conservation management approaches (new governance approaches) in buffer areas of strictly nature reserves in Uzbekistan.

**Zambia, Extension of Kasanka Management System to Lavushi Manda National Park (WB, GEF \$0.8M, co-financing \$1.0M, Total \$1.9M).**

The objective of this project is to improve the conservation management of Lavushi Manda (LMNP) and Kasanka National Parks (KNP). The project will achieve this objective by developing park management plans are developed for KNP (2011), and for LMNP (2013), by having an operational management team from Kasanka Trust, and law enforcement staff from Zambia Wildlife Authority (ZAWA) operating in LMNP, and by carrying out basic fire and hydrological management, mammal road counts, and anti-poaching patrols. Stakeholders and community representatives of LMNP will be engaged through a Park Management Committee and Kasanka Trust will implement recommendations to improve management at LMNP and KNP, established minimal infrastructure and equipment necessary for management at LMNP, and additional partnerships with donors and/or tourism operators to generate revenues for both parks.

**Regional, SPWA-Development of a trans-frontier conservation area linking forest reserves and protected areas in Ghana and Cote d'Ivoire (FAO, GEF: \$ 0.859, Cofinance: \$ 1.2M, Total: \$ 2.059).** The objective of the project is to establish a viable and sustainable trans-frontier conservation area that links forest reserves and protected areas in Bia, Goaso and Djambarakoru (in Ghana and Côte d'Ivoire). The proposed Bia-Goaso-Djambarakoru Trans-frontier Conservation Area has been identified by government stakeholders and conservation partners as a viable wildlife corridor (see map below). It currently contains some of the highest concentrations of endemic but threatened plant and animal species of the Upper Guinea Forest Ecosystem and it has been identified as one of the priority conservation landscapes in that ecosystem. The main threats to sustainable land and forest management and biodiversity conservation in this area are: agricultural expansion; hunting pressure; over-harvesting of forest products; and human-wildlife conflicts. These threats are exacerbated by current forest management and development policies in both countries that are national in orientation and do not reflect the conservation benefits that could be achieved from managing the area as one contiguous unit. The project proposed to overcome these threats through: 1) the establishment of a functional bilateral framework for collaborative management of the conservation area; 2) developing, testing and promoting best practices in cocoa agroforestry for the rehabilitation of degraded forest landscapes that will also provide connectivity between the fragmented forest



blocks and enhance ecosystem services (e.g. watershed protection, carbon sequestration), and 3) strengthening management effectiveness in the 3 PAs (with, in particular, a focus on financial sustainability) and measures to mainstream conservation (e.g. improved control of hunting activities) in the HCVF identified in the production landscape.

**Regional (Namibia, Zambia), Open Africa North South Tourism Corridor (OANSTC) (WB, GEF \$0.5M, co-financing \$0.6M, Total \$1.1M).**

The objective of this project is the conservation of biodiversity along the Open Africa North South Tourism Corridor by improving the economic opportunities of the local communities living along the route connecting Zambia and Namibia. This project will allow the local communities in Zambia and Namibia to receive direct economic benefits for conservation along biodiversity-rich tourism routes. This corridor will become part of Africa's largest conservation area, the emerging Kavango-Zambezi trans-frontier conservation area initiative, comprised of a network of 36 national parks, game reserves, community conservancies and game management areas containing the largest contiguous population of the African elephant (approx. 250,000) in the continent. The objectives of the project will be achieved by better biodiversity management through mainstreamed biodiversity in tourism planning, management and marketing along 8 new and 3 up-graded biodiversity-rich tourism "routes", promotion of biodiversity-rich tourism routes contributes to increased interest in the Open Africa network and income for tourism route members, and individual and institutional capacity-building measures improve local and national decision-making processes & facilitating replication.

**Regional (Cambodia, Indonesia, Lao PDR, Malaysia, Myanmar, Philippines, Thailand, Vietnam, Timor Leste, Brunei, Singapore), Building Capacity for Regionally Harmonized National Processes for Implementing CBD Provisions on Access to Genetic Resources and Sharing of Benefits (UNEP, GEF \$0.7M, co-financing \$0.7M, Total \$1.5M).**

The objective of this project is to give the opportunity to the seven (7) participating countries to build their capacity to implement the Bonn Guidelines in accordance with the Action Plan on Capacity-building for Access to Genetic Resources and Benefit-sharing adopted by the COP and with the draft ASEAN ABS Framework Agreement. In addition, this project will give these countries the opportunity to more effectively participate in the negotiation of the international ABS regime. This project will invest in providing each country with a roadmap for developing and implementing its national ABS regime, in ensuring that stakeholders in each country effectively participate in the development and implementation of the national ABS regime, in the establishment of a Regional ABS network, and countries negotiators have full understanding of issues being discussed during the negotiations of the International Regime.

**Regional (Bolivia, Colombia, Costa Rica), Strengthening the Implementation of Access to Genetic Resources and Benefit-Sharing Regimes in Latin America and the Caribbean. (UNEP, GEF \$0.8M, co-financing \$0.6M, Total \$1.4M).**

This project will allow the participating Countries to carry out the necessary activities to strengthen the national regimes on access and benefit sharing to genetic resources. By means of this project, the participating countries would increase their capacity to put into place the provisions of the CBD regarding access and equitable sharing of benefits of genetic resources, and at the same time, gain the necessary knowledge and skills to actively and successfully participate in the international negotiations on ABS. The project has three components: Building capacities of stakeholders to address challenges and opportunities on ABS. Promote ABS agreements that integrate legal, technical and social aspects. Build the national capacities to participate in the international ABS arena.

**Regional. Latin-America, Communication and Public Awareness Capacity-Building for Compliance with the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety (WB, GEF \$0.9M, co-financing \$1.0M, Total \$1.9M).**

The objective of the proposed Regional Capacity-Building for Compliance with the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety project is to strengthen communication and public awareness capacity on biosafety in Latin America in general and in Brazil, Colombia, Costa Rica and Peru in particular. The objective will be achieved through piloting communication and public awareness strategies and sharing the results widely across the region. These activities will culminate in a regional conference to take stock of biosafety management systems in the region. The project will be building on the development and implementation of pilot communication strategies, and regional technical knowledge sharing including a regional conference on Biosafety.

**Regional (Africa): SPWA-BD Scaling up the impacts of good practices in linking poverty alleviation and biodiversity conservation. (World Bank, GEF: \$0.9M, GEF cofinancing: 1.1M, Total project: \$2.0M)**

The project will bring a critical support to reinforce a regional network of Protected Area managers, developing a regional training programme, and including innovative distance training by internet. The network will be extended to key partners involved in different issues (NGOs, universities, private sector). The project will propose a knowledge management process to identify and share best practices through different tools (guidelines, toolkits, e-platform, and publications).

**Regional (Bulgaria, Romania), Promoting Payments for Environmental Services (PES) and Related Sustainable Financing Schemes in the Danube Basin (UNEP, GEF \$0.9M, co-financing \$1.3M, Total \$2.3M).**

The project represents an innovative idea of introducing PES as a market instrument for BD conservation in the Danube region. If successful, the PES systems will generate a sustainable financing flow that can be reinvested in the better management of watersheds draining into the Danube. There is considerable potential to link this project with the GEF Black-Sea-Danube IW program which will allow for the up scaling of PES in the basin. This project has the potential to provide Global Environmental Benefits by means of establishing the following: 1) Three to five local water and/or biodiversity PES schemes set up to support conservation-friendly land use on 500,000 ha., 2) two national biodiversity and or water related PES schemes developed in Bulgaria and Romania, 3) these schemes have the potential to catalyze support for Integrated River Basin Management on up to 7 million ha. in the Danube.

**Global, Tiger Futures: Mainstreaming Conservation in Large Landscapes (WB, GEF \$0.95, Cofinancing \$1.85M, Total project \$2.8M)**

As Asia's largest top predator, the tiger is the region's most important and charismatic umbrella species. As such the health of tiger populations is a useful indicator of the health, effectiveness and sustainability of the region's protected area networks. Moreover since tigers are wide-ranging species which require large landscapes to maintain viable populations, effective conservation measures are required both within, and beyond, protected area boundaries to maintain biological corridors and tiger habitats within the broader production landscape and to strengthen policy and regulatory frameworks to protect tigers from national and international trade. The objective of the project is to mainstream conservation in large landscapes through enhanced protection of tigers and their habitats across the range states. The project has identified three components: 1) building national and regional commitments; 2) gap analysis of financing

needs for effective tiger conservation; and 3) building regional capacity and transnational cooperation to address wildlife trade. The project will complement a new high-profile partnership and cross-regional initiative led by the World Bank, to address conservation of tigers and the large landscapes on which they depend.

## **Summary of Enabling Activities Approved Between January 1, 2008-June 30, 2010**

### **Afghanistan, Development of the National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan, (UNEP, GEF: \$ 394,000, Cofinance: \$ 70,000, Total: \$ 464,000).**

Development of National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (NBSAP), Assessment of Capacity Building Needs for In-situ and Ex-situ Biodiversity Conservation

The objective of the project is to enable Afghanistan to better meet its immediate obligations under the Convention on Biological Diversity, especially in relation to Article 6 by developing a National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan, which incorporates the decisions and work programmes of the Conference of the Parties of the Convention on Biological Diversity. The project will assess capacity needs for in-situ and ex-situ biodiversity conservation and will develop National Biodiversity Strategy and Action plan that is required for implementation of the Convention.

### **Ghana: Review of the National Biodiversity Strategy, Development of the Action Plan and Participation in the National Clearing House Mechanism. (UNEP, GEF: \$0.43 M, GEF cofinancing: \$0.08 M, Total project: \$0.51 M)**

The overall goal of this project is to enable Ghana better meet its immediate obligations under the Convention on Biological Diversity, especially in relation to Article 6 (General Measures for Conservation and Sustainable Use), Article 13 (Public Education and Awareness), and Article 18 (Technical and Scientific Cooperation). The project is built on the 3 following components to: 1) revise and better incorporate the decisions and work programmes of the Conference of the Parties of the CBD into the existing National Biodiversity Strategy (NBS), 2) develop a home grown Clearing House Mechanism, and 3) to undertake capacity and needs assessment for biodiversity conservation activities in Ghana in 7 areas (ex situ and in situ conservation, taxonomy, agricultural biodiversity, invasive species, Access to Benefit Sharing, preservation and maintenance of biodiversity related to indigenous and local communities).

### **Liberia: Capacity Needs Assessment for the Implementation of Liberia's National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan and Country Driven CHM Support. (UNDP, GEF: \$0.194 M, GEF cofinancing: 0.019 M, Total project: \$0.213 M)**

The aim of the project is to contribute to a more strategic and measurable implementation of the CBD at the country level. The project is based on the evaluation of existing needs and a program to build institutional and human capacity for conservation and sustainable use of Liberia's biodiversity (Biodiversity Clearing House Mechanism, 2010 Target, implementation of the CBD Strategic Plan).

### **Morocco, Development of the National Clearing House Mechanism, Capacity Assessment for ABS, and Taxonomy and updating of the NBSAP, (UNEP, GEF: \$ 187,500, Cofinance: \$ 20,000, Total: \$ 207,500).**

The project has three main objectives: 1) Capacity assessment for Taxonomy. 2) Capacity assessment for ABS: To undertake in depth consultations on Access to Benefit Sharing (ABS); 3) Development of a national CHM.

**Mozambique, Development of the National Clearing House Mechanism, Capacity Assessment for ABS, and Taxonomy(UNEP, GEF: \$ 175,200 Cofinance: \$ 20,000, Total: \$ 195,200).**

The GEF biodiversity add-on project contains three main objectives: 1) To make recommendations on how a future NBSAP should be developed according to new information already collected by the NCSA process and other processes; 2) To carry out any additional assessment of capacity development needs required for the effective and efficient implementation of the priority objectives of the NBSAP; and 3) To further develop the capacity of the CHM and to improve the availability and dissemination of biodiversity-relevant information at national level.

**Pakistan, Development of the National Clearing House Mechanism, Capacity Assessment for ABS, and Preservation of Traditional Knowledge and in-situ/ex-situ conservation in Pakistan (UNEP, GEF: \$ 380,000, Cofinance: \$ 35,000, Total: \$ 415,000).**

The objectives of the project are to 1) undertake in depth consultations on the complex issues of Access to Genetic Resources and Benefit Sharing (ABS) and capacity need assessment on Traditional knowledge by local and indigenous communities; 2) develop the capacity for the Clearing House Mechanism to improve the availability and dissemination of biodiversity-relevant information at both national and regional levels; and 3) assess capacity needs in the areas of Ex-situ and In-situ conservation.

**Timor Leste, National Biodiversity Strategy Action Plan, the First & Third National Report to CBD, Establishment of Clearing House Mechanism (UNDP, GEF: \$ 0.027M Cofinancing: \$0.018M, Total: \$0.045M)**

This project will help to prepare the foundation to design and implement effective response measures to achieve the objectives of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) in Timor-Leste. The project will assess and address capacity gaps for biodiversity planning and management in the country and produce a participatory, strategic plan and priorities for action in protecting Timor-Leste's biodiversity culminating in a NBSAP; and preparation for the first and third National Report.

**Tuvalu, National Biodiversity Strategy Action Plan, First and Third National Reports to the COP and CHM (UNDP, GEF: \$0.232 M, Cofinancing:\$0.010 M, Total: \$0.242 M)**

This project will support the production of a BSAP and a first and third national report to the Conference of Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity. The activities proposed will help the Government of Tuvalu to protect and sustainably use its marine and terrestrial biodiversity, as well as to meet its obligations under the CBD.

**Uganda, Development of a National Clearing House Mechanism and Capacity Assessment, (UNEP, GEF: 300,000, Cofinance: \$42,000, Total: \$ 342,000).**

The objectives of the project are to: 1) establish and operationalize a CHM to improve information sharing and management and to enhance implementation of Article 18; 2) carry out an Assessment on capacity for several biodiversity issues; and 3) carry out any additional assessment of capacity development needs required for effective implementation of the NBSAP.

**Global, Support to GEF Eligible CBD Parties for Carrying out 2010 Biodiversity Targets National Assessments- Phase II** (UNDP/UNEP, GEF: \$1.0 M, Cofinancing: 0.712 M, Total: 1,712 M). Enable GEF eligible CBD parties to assess progress towards the achievement of the 2010 Biodiversity Targets at national level through a country-wide, stakeholder consultation process and to appropriately report and communicate on it.

**Global, Support to GEF Eligible CBD Parties for Carrying out 2010 Biodiversity Targets National Assessments- Phase II** (UNDP/UNEP, GEF: \$ 1.0M, Cofinancing: 0.752M, Total: \$ 1,752M). Enable GEF eligible CBD parties to assess progress towards the achievement of the 2010 Biodiversity Targets at national level through a country-wide, stakeholder consultation process and to appropriately report and communicate on it.

**Global, Support to GEF Eligible CBD Parties for Carrying out 2010 Biodiversity Targets National Assessments- Phase III (UNDP/UNEP, GEF: \$ 1.0M, Cofinancing: 1.1M, Total: \$ 2.1M)**. Enable GEF eligible CBD Parties to assess progress towards the achievement of the 2010 Biodiversity Targets at the national level and to develop the Fourth National Report to the CBD.

**Global, International Commission on Land Use Change and Ecosystems, UNEP, GEF: \$ 1.0M, Cofinancing: 1.0M, Total: \$ 2.0M**). The objective of the project is to assist legislators and parliamentarians in a global discourse on developing regulatory tools and applied public policy to address land use change and ecosystem degradation. The project will 1) strengthen the science-policy interface, by utilizing existing clearing-house and knowledge management systems to identify policy and legislative tools for parliamentarians to address the loss of ecosystem services, and provide fora to bridge the gap between science and policy in developing countries. 2) The project will work with the scientific and public policy community to ensure that legislators have the latest information on land use change and understand future trends, contribution to climate change and potential impacts on ecosystem services. 3) It will develop policy and regulatory proposals, in the context of land use change and climate change impacts, to address the development of sustainable biofuels (with reference to the previous work of the GLOBE Biofuels Commission), and other key land use changes and ecosystem degradation (e.g. sustainable irrigation, nutrient over-enrichment, desertification, organic agriculture, GMOs, livestock production, etc.) . 4) The project will identify legislative and public policy measures that would encourage a scaling up of the most promising developments in expanding the role of markets for ecosystem services, including creation of tools and approaches for the incorporation of ecosystem services and their valuation into environmental and particularly into non-policy. 5) It will identify key steps that legislators can take, at both international and national levels, to encourage and promote the role of markets for forest ecosystem services.

**ANNEX 6: SUMMARY OF COUNTRY GRANTS OF THE GEF PROJECT “SUPPORTING COUNTRY ACTION ON THE CBD PROGRAMME OF WORK ON PROTECTED AREAS” UNDER IMPLEMENTATION**<sup>54</sup>

**Afghanistan:** The project is supporting the development of a protected area system plan, an assessment of ecological gaps, a revenue-sharing mechanism to support protected areas, and a capacity-strengthening component (PoWPA Activities 1.1.1, 1.1.5, 2.1.2, 3.2.1, and 4.1.2)

**Albania:** The project is supporting an assessment of marine gaps, the formulation of regulations to improve protected area management and establishment, and an assessment of marine threats (PoWPA Activities 1.1.5 and 3.1.1).

**Antigua and Barbuda:** The project is supporting a protected area gap assessment, the development of a legal framework, a sustainable finance plan, and a project to strengthen protected area capacity (PoWPA Activities 1.1.1, 1.1.4, 1.1.5, 1.2.1, 3.1.1, 3.2.1, and 3.4.1).

**Armenia:** The project includes an assessment of ecological gaps, an assessment to evaluate governance types and promote innovative forms of protected area governance, and an assessment of capacity needs (PoWPA Activities 1.1.5, 2.1.2, 3.2.1).

**Bahamas:** The project is supporting an assessment of protected areas contribution to the national economy; training for government and protected area staff in the application of economic tools; launching vocational training courses for park officers; developing a database and software to measure protected areas' management effectiveness and designing a system to monitor the country's progress in the implementation of PoWPA (PoWPA Activities 3.1.2, 3.2.1, 4.1.2 and 4.2.1).

**Belize:** The project focuses on assessing protected area values to the national economy, and developing a sustainable finance plan (PoWPA Activities 3.1.2, 3.4.1).

**Benin:** The project focuses on assessing governance and promoting innovative forms of governance, developing appropriate protected area policies, and developing a plan for sustainable finance (PoWPA Activities 1.1.1, 2.1.2, 3.1.1 and 3.4.1).

**Bosnia and Herzegovina:** The project focuses on assessing ecological gaps within the country (PoWPA Activities 1.1.5).

**Burundi:** The project includes an assessment of governance types and the promotion of innovative forms of protected area governance, along with an assessment of appropriate incentives to promote protected areas (PoWPA Activities 1.1.14, 2.1.2, 3.1.1, and 3.1.6).

**Cambodia:** The project includes an assessment of management effectiveness, a capacity needs assessment and the development of appropriate legislation for protected areas (PoWPA Activities 2.1.2, 3.2.1 and 4.2.1).

**Colombia:** The project is supporting training on protected area issues, and the development of a comprehensive capacity-building program (PoWPA Activity 3.2.1).

**Comoros:** The project includes plans to establish protected areas and develop a training program (PoWPA Activities 1.1.4, 1.1.5, 2.1.2 and 3.2.1).

**Congo DR:** The project includes an assessment of existing governance types, and the promotion of innovative types of protected area governance (PoWPA Activities 1.1.4, 2.1.2, 3.1.1).

**Djibouti:** The project supports an assessment of protected area governance, a gap assessment, the development of legislation and a sustainable finance plan (PoWPA Activities 1.1.4, 1.1.5, 3.1.1, 3.4.1).

---

<sup>54</sup> Full approved project applications, and progress to date can be downloaded at <http://www.protectedareas.org>.

**Dominican Republic:** The project is helping to formulate a protected area system master plan for the national protected area network; undertaking a comprehensive protected area gap analysis; developing a national capacity building plan and conducting a series of thematic workshops; helping identify innovative financing mechanisms and design a monitoring system to track country's progress in PoWPA implementation (PoWPA Activities 1.1.5, 3.2.1, 3.4.1, and 4.1.2).

**Fiji:** The project is supporting an ecological gap assessment, and the development of a legal framework (PoWPA Activities 1.1.5, 3.1.1).

**Grenada:** The project is supporting an assessment of protected area values, a study on willingness to pay, and a process to integrate protected areas into the wider landscape, seascape and sectoral plans and strategies (PoWPA Activities 1.2.1, 3.1.2).

**Guatemala:** Under the auspices of a multi-sectoral advisory committee, and in collaboration with international NGOs, funding will facilitate establishment of locally managed conservation areas; launch a capacity building action plan for the protected area system; test payment-for-ecosystem services mechanism in at least two protected areas and introduce a scorecard to measure the financial sustainability of the whole protected area system (PoWPA Activities 2.1.2, 3.1.6, 3.2.1).

**Guinea:** The project includes an assessment of governance types, a management effectiveness assessment, a capacity needs assessment and development of legislation (PoWPA Activities 1.1.4, 2.1.2, 3.1.1, 3.2.1 and 4.2.1).

**Honduras:** The project is supporting a capacity needs assessment plan, a governance assessment, an assessment of the value of protected areas and their contribution to the national economy, and a training on key protected area needs (PoWPA Activities 2.1.2, 3.1.2, 3.4.1).

**Jamaica:** This project supports an assessment of protected area values, the integration of protected areas into surrounding landscapes and seascapes and sectoral plans, and the development of protected area standards (PoWPA Activities 3.1.2, 4.2.1).

**Kiribati:** This project includes an ecological gap assessment, and an assessment of existing and innovative governance types (PoWPA Activities 1.1.5, 2.1.2, 3.1.1).

**Lao PDR:** This project includes the development of a sustainable finance plan and a legal framework (PoWPA Activities 3.1.1, 3.1.2, 3.4.1).

**Liberia:** This project focuses on the integration of protected areas into the wider landscape and seascape, and into sectoral plans and strategies (PoWPA Activity 1.2.1).

**Madagascar:** The project supports the development of a capacity plan, and monitoring of biodiversity within protected areas (PoWPA Activities 3.2.1, 4.1.2).

**Maldives:** The project supports the development of a protected area system master plan, and the assessment of innovative forms of governance (PoWPA Activities 1.1.4, 1.1.5, 2.1.2, and 3.1.6).

**Mauritania:** The project includes an assessment of ecological gaps and of governance types (PoWPA Activities 1.1.5, 2.1.2, 3.1.1).

**Micronesia:** The project is very ambitious, and includes the development of protected area standards and best practices, an ecological gap assessment, a capacity needs assessment and project to strengthen capacity, a sustainable finance plan and a monitoring program (PoWPA Activities 1.1.5, 1.2.1, 2.1.2, 3.2.1, 3.4.1, 4.1.2 and 4.2.1).

**Mongolia:** The project includes an assessment of ecological gaps, a capacity needs assessment and capacity-building component, a sustainable finance plan, and the development of protected area targets and indicators (1.1.1, 1.1.5, 3.2.1 and 3.4.1).

**Nepal:** The project supports the development of a capacity training program (PoWPA Activity 3.2.1).

**Nicaragua:** The project includes an assessment of marine gaps, and the development of a protected area system master plan (PoWPA Activity 1.1.5).



**Panama:** The project includes an assessment of ecological gaps (PoWPA Activity 1.1.5).

**Papua New Guinea:** The project includes an ecological gap assessment, a process to integrate protected areas into the wider landscape and seascape, and the development of a legal framework (1.1.5, 1.2.1, 3.1.1).

**Paraguay:** The project includes an assessment of protected area management effectiveness, and an assessment of protected area values (PoWPA Activities 3.1.2, 4.2.1).

**Samoa:** The project includes an assessment of ecological gaps, the development of a training program, and the integration of protected areas into the wider landscape, seascape and sectoral plans and strategies (PoWPA Activities 1.1.5, 2.1.2, 3.1.6, and 3.2.1).

**Sierra Leone:** The project includes the development of a legal framework, and a capacity needs assessment (PoWPA Activities 1.1.5, 3.1.5, and 3.2.1).

**Solomon Islands:** The project includes the development of a legal framework for protected area establishment and management, and an ecological gap assessment (PoWPA Activities 1.1.5, 3.1.1).

**St. Vincent and Grenadines:** The project includes an assessment of protected area values, a willingness to pay study, and a process to integrate protected areas into the wider landscape, seascape and sectoral plans and strategies (PoWPA Activity 3.1.2).

**Tajikistan:** The project includes an assessment of protected area values, the development of protected area incentives, a capacity needs assessment and the development of a monitoring plan (PoWPA Activities 3.1.2, 3.1.5, 3.2.1, and 4.1.2).

**Thailand:** The project includes the development of a protected area system master plan (PoWPA Activity 3.1.1).

**The Gambia:** The project includes the formation of a multi-sectoral advisory committee for protected areas, a governance assessment, the development of a plan for ecotourism, and the development of standards and best practices for protected areas (PoWPA Activities 1.1.4, 2.1.2, 3.2.1 and 4.2.1).

**Timor Leste:** The project includes an ecological gap assessment, the development of specific targets and indicators for protected areas, and the development of a capacity needs assessment and plan (PoWPA Activities 1.1.1, 1.1.4, 1.1.5 and 3.2.1).

**Tonga:** The project includes an ecological gap assessment and the development of a legal framework (PoWPA Activities 1.1.5 and 3.1.2).

**Turkmenistan:** The project includes the development of an ecotourism plan for protected areas, to provide benefits to local communities (PoWPA Activities 3.1.2, 3.1.6).

**Uganda:** The project includes an assessment of the value of protected areas to the national economy, and an assessment of protected area governance (PoWPA Activities 1.1.4, 2.1.2, and 3.1.2).

**Vanuatu:** The project includes the development of a protected area strategic master plan (PoWPA Activity 3.1.1).

**ANNEX 7. MULTI FOCAL AREA PROJECTS INCLUDING SUSTAINABLE FOREST MANAGEMENT APPROVED DURING THE REPORTING PERIOD**

A) Sustainable Forest Management Projects<sup>55</sup>

<b>Country</b>	<b>Agency</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>GEF Grant (\$)</b>	<b>Biodiversity contribution (\$)</b>	<b>Cofinancing (\$)</b>
Bolivia	UNDP	SFM Biodiversity Conservation through Sustainable Forest Management by Local Communities	5,500,000	5,500,000	10,500,000
Brazil	FAO	SFM Strengthening National Policy and Knowledge Frameworks in Support of Sustainable Management of Brazil's Forest Resources	8,850,000	5,400,000	33,900,000
Cambodia	UNDP	SFM Strengthening Sustainable Forest Management and the Development of Bio-energy Markets to Promote Environmental Sustainability and to Reduce Green House Gas Emissions in Cambodia	2,363,635	1,000,000	5,400,000
Ecuador	IFAD	SFM Sustainable Management of Biodiversity and Water Resources in the Ibarra-San Lorenzo Corridor	2,700,000	2,160,000	10,984,000
Global	World Bank	SFM Capacity Development for Climate Change Mitigation through Sustainable Forest Management in non-Annex I Countries	1,000,000	333,000	2,400,000
Global	UNEP	SFM Facilitating financing for Sustainable Forest Management in SIDS	950,000	475,000	1,000,000

<sup>55</sup> Most SFM projects have availed themselves of funding from multiple focal areas; however, a few projects that were approved during the reporting period have only used resources from the biodiversity focal area. Regardless of the focal area funding source, these projects have also aimed at generating multiple benefits across focal areas, which has been one of the key aims of the SFM program in GEF-4.

Country	Agency	Title	GEF Grant (\$)	Biodiversity contribution (\$)	Cofinancing (\$)
		and LFCCs			
Haiti	IADB	SFM Sustainable Land Management of the Upper Watersheds of South Western Haiti	3,436,364	1,718,182	18,100,000
Honduras	UNDP	SFM: Mainstreaming Biodiversity Conservation into the Management of Pine-Oak Forests	829,091	829,091	3,295,000
Indonesia	ADB	SFM Sustainable Forest and Biodiversity Management in Borneo	2,527,273	1,668,182	10,000,000
Mexico	IFAD	SFM Mitigating Climate Change through Sustainable Forest Management and Capacity Building in the Southern States of Mexico (States of Campeche, Chiapas and Oaxaca)	5,000,000	-	13,525,000
Mexico	UNDP	SFM Transforming Management of Biodiversity-rich Community Production Forests through Building National Capacities for Market-based Instruments - under the Sustainable Forest Management Program	6,900,000	6,900,000	17,371,500
Peru	IFAD	SFM Sustainable Management of Protected Areas and Forests of the Northern Highlands of Peru	1,720,000	1,720,000	13,481,000
Regional (Cameroon, Central African Republic, Republic of Congo, Democratic Republic of	WB, UNDP, UNEP, FAO	SFM Program for Sustainable Forest Management in the Congo Basin (this Program consists of 13 complementary projects)	54,725,097	28,923,797	200,705,097

Country	Agency	Title	GEF Grant (\$)	Biodiversity contribution (\$)	Cofinancing (\$)
Congo, Equatorial Guinea, Gabon)					
Regional (Argentina, Bolivia, Paraguay)	UNEP/UNDP	SFM Sustainable Forest Management in the Transboundary Gran Chaco American Ecosystem	6,863,636	1,000,000	18,600,000
Tanzania	UNDP/World Bank	SFM Sustainable Woodland Management in the Miombo Areas of Western Tanzania	2,745,000	1,890,000	9,000,000
Thailand	UNDP	SFM: Integrated Community-based Forest and Catchment Management through an Ecosystem Service Approach (CBFCM)	1,758,182	1,323,636	10,760,000
Vietnam	World Bank	SFM Sustainable Forest Land Management - under the Country Program Framework for Sustainable Forest Land Management	4,195,000	3,286,000	50,000,000
		<b>Totals</b>	<b>Total GEF Grant Amount: 112,063,278</b>	<b>Total Biodiversity Contribution: 61,577,797, or about 55%</b>	<b>Total Confinance Leveraged: 429,021,597</b>

B) Multi-focal area projects (not SFM program)

<b>Country</b>	<b>Agency</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Total GEF Grant (\$)</b>	<b>Biodiversity Contribution (\$)</b>	<b>Cofinancing (\$)</b>
Algeria	UNDP	MENARID Conservation of Globally Significant Biodiversity and Sustainable Use of Ecosystem Services in Algeria's Cultural Parks	5,387,142	3,387,142	10,022,858
Argentina	UNDP/UNEP	Establishment of Incentives for the Conservation of Ecosystem Services of Global Significance	2,905,000	2,905,000	6,900,000
Argentina	World Bank	Rural Corridors and Biodiversity Conservation	6,289,030	4,477,352	15,310,196
Bolivia	IADB	Conservation and Sustainable use of Biodiversity and Land in Andean Vertical Ecosystems	6,000,000	3,000,000	8,050,000
Chile	World Bank	Sustainable Land Management	5,863,636	1,363,636	77,610,000
China	IFAD	PRC-GEF An IEM Approach to the Conservation of Biodiversity in Dryland Ecosystems - under the PRC-GEF Partnership on Land Degradation in	4,545,000	2,727,000	25,023,580

Country	Agency	Title	Total GEF Grant (\$)	Biodiversity Contribution (\$)	Cofinancing (\$)
		Dryland Ecosystem Program			
China	World Bank	PRC-GEF Partnership: Mainstreaming Biodiversity Protection within the Production Landscapes and Protected Areas of the Lake Aibi Basin	2,976,000	1,488,000	8,935,000
Colombia	World Bank	Mainstreaming Biodiversity in Sustainable Cattle Ranching	7,000,000	5,000,000	33,000,000
Global	World Bank	Development Market Place 2009: Adaptation to Climate Change (DM 2009)	2,000,000	500,000	4,300,000
India	World Bank	SLEM - Sustainable Land Water and Biodiversity Conservation and Management for Improved Livelihoods in Uttarakhand Watershed Sector	7,000,000	2,860,000	83,000,000
India	UNDP	SLEM-CPP-Integrated Land Use Management to Combat Land Degradation in Madja Pradesh	5,763,000	1,931,000	95,523,750

<b>Country</b>	<b>Agency</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Total GEF Grant (\$)</b>	<b>Biodiversity Contribution (\$)</b>	<b>Cofinancing (\$)</b>
Iran	UNDP	MENARID Institutional Strengthening and Coherence for Integrated Natural Resources Management	4,320,000	400,000	14,946,000
Nicaragua	IADB	Integrated Mangement in Lakes Apanas and Asturias Watershed	4,040,900	1,440,900	4,900,000
Philippines	World Bank	Mindanao Rural Development Program Phase II - Natural Resource Management Project	6,486,363	3,243,181	123,828,000
Philippines	ADB	Agusan River Basin Integrated Water Resources Management	2,932,000	1,264,000	75,000,000
Philippines	ADB	CTI Integrated Natural Resources and Environmental Management Sector	3,530,000	1,264,000	102,000,000
Regional (Belize, Guatemala, Honduras, Mexico)	World Bank	Meso-American Barrier Reef System II	6,340,000	4,354,570	17,500,000
Regional (Central African Republic, Congo, Cameroon, Gabon, Equatorial Guinea, Congo DR)	UNEP	CBSP - A Regional Focus on Sustainable Timber Management in the Congo Basin	3,075,681	1,282,500	6,280,000

<b>Country</b>	<b>Agency</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Total GEF Grant (\$)</b>	<b>Biodiversity Contribution (\$)</b>	<b>Cofinancing (\$)</b>
Regional (Chile, Peru)	UNDP	Towards Ecosystem Management of the Humboldt Current Large Marine Ecosystem	6,925,000	3,820,000	25,190,000
Regional (Fiji, Micronesia, Papua New Guinea, Palau, Solomon Islands, Timor Leste, Vanuatu)	ADB	PAS Coastal and Marine Resources Management in the Coral Triangle of the Pacific - under the Pacific Alliance for Sustainability Program	8,336,450	3,586,400	16,350,000
Regional (Indonesia, Malaysia, Philippines)	ADB	CTI Coastal and Marine Resources Management in the Coral Triangle: Southeast Asia under Coral Triangle Initiative	10,310,000	7,500,000	76,000,000
Regional (Mongolia, Russian Federation)	UNDP	Integrated Natural Resource Management in the Baikal Basin Transboundary Ecosystem	3,898,000	1,268,000	10,670,000
Senegal	UNDP	SPWA-BD Participatory Conservation of Biodiversity and Low Carbon Development of Pilot Ecovillages at the Vicinity of Protected Areas in Senegal	2,880,000	1,920,000	12,700,000



Country	Agency	Title	Total GEF Grant (\$)	Biodiversity Contribution (\$)	Cofinancing (\$)
Swaziland	IFAD	SIP-Lower Usuthu Smallholder Irrigation Project (LUSIP)	1,972,820	454,546	12,273,897
Tajikistan	UNDP	Sustaining Agricultural Biodiversity in the Face of Climate Change	1,900,000	950,000	4,800,000
Tunisia	IFAD	MENARID Support to Sustainable Land Management in the Siliana Governorate	5,000,000	400,000	22,684,000
Tunisia	World Bank	MENARID Ecotourism and Conservation of Desert Biodiversity	4,272,300	2,922,300	3,300,000
		<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>TOTAL GEF GRANT AMOUNT: 131,948,322</b>	<b>TOTAL BD CONTRIBUTION: 65,709,527, or 50%</b>	<b>TOTAL COFINANCE LEVERAGED: 896,097,281</b>

**ANNEX 8: LIST OF GEF DOCUMENTS AVAILABLE AT THE  
TENTH SESSION OF THE CONFERENCE OF PARTIES**

Documents for general information

- Financing the Stewardship of Global Biodiversity
- GEF: Indigenous Communities and Biodiversity Conservation
- Mainstreaming Biodiversity in Production Landscapes and Sectors
- GEF Global Support for Biodiversity Conservation: Fact Sheets
- GEF Support to Wilderness Area
- GEF Action on Sustainable Forest Management
- GEF Biodiversity Highlights in West Africa
- GEF Annual Report 2009
- REDD+ Brochure
- System For Transparent Allocation of Resources (STAR) Brochure
- Payment for Ecosystem Services at GEF
- Celebrating the International Year of Biodiversity: Success Stories from the Field

Reports of the GEF Evaluation Office

- Fourth Overall Performance Study of the GEF: Progress Toward Impact: 2010
- Annual Country Portfolio Evaluation Report: 2010
- Country Portfolio Evaluation: Turkey: 2010
- Country Portfolio Evaluation: Moldova: 2010
- Annual Impact Report 2009, 2010
- Annual Impact Report 2008, 2009
- Annual Country Portfolio Evaluation Report: 2009
- GEF Country Portfolio Evaluation: Cameroon, 2008
- Country Portfolio Evaluation: Syria, 2009
- Country Portfolio Evaluation: Egypt, 2009
- Annual Country Portfolio Evaluation Report: 2008
- GEF Country Portfolio Evaluation: South Africa, 2008
- GEF Country Portfolio Evaluation: Madagascar, 2008
- GEF Country Portfolio Evaluation: Benin, 2008
- Joint Evaluation of the Small Grants Programme: 2008

## ANNEX 9: GEF-5 OPERATIONAL PROCEDURES FOR THE SYSTEM FOR A TRANSPARENT ALLOCATION OF RESOURCES (STAR)<sup>56</sup>

### *Introduction and Background*

1. The GEF Council at its November 2009 meeting adopted all the main elements of a new System for Transparent Allocation of Resources (STAR). The STAR was designed to replace the Resource Allocation Framework that was used during the fourth replenishment of the GEF.
2. The present note further clarifies some operational rules and procedures related to the practical application of the STAR under GEF-5 which starts on July 1, 2010. This paper is coherent with, and complementary to, the other documents that address various related elements of GEF-5 policies and procedures, including the project cycle and programmatic approaches, focal area strategies and sustainable forest management, and portfolio identification exercises.

### *Allocations of GEF-5 resources under the STAR*

3. **Initial Allocations.** The initial allocations for GEF-5 are determined according to the STAR model. The model is run for the total GEF-5 replenishment level. Based on the GEF-4 experience, this is likely to reduce the need for upward or downward adjustments to the national allocations during the replenishment period.
4. **Additional Allocations.** If, and as soon as, additional cumulative resources greater than \$300 million become available to the GEF Trust Fund (from donors, exchange rate gains, investment income, etc.) above the GEF-5 replenishment figures, the STAR model will be run within one month after these resources become available and up until June 2013, at the end of the third year of the replenishment period. The allocation system will maintain the original global benefits and global performance indices adopted for GEF-5. In such cases, countries will be informed of revised allocations.

### *Managing shortfall of resources and cancellations*

5. **Funding Shortfall.** In the case of a funding shortfall where the actual level of resources is reduced from the initial programmed amount during the course of GEF-5, no changes will be made to the current country allocations. The current country allocation will always be considered as a maximum target that may be achieved, only if donors and the prevailing economic environment allow the initial estimates of funding to be realized. Projects will be approved on a first-come first-served basis until resources are fully utilized.

---

<sup>56</sup> This Annex is Document GEF/C.38/9/Rev 1 from the June 29-July 1, 2010 GEF Council Meeting. The Council Decision on this paper was “The Council, having reviewed document GEF/C.38/9/Rev.1, *GEF-5 Operational Procedures for the System for a Transparent Allocation of Resources (STAR)*, approved the procedures described in the document, and requested the GEF Secretariat to implement the STAR accordingly and to comply with the timeline described in paragraph 21 of the document.

6. **Cancellations.** During GEF-5, the cancellation of any project prior to the last six months of the replenishment (December 31, 2013) will lead to those resources becoming available again to that same country (or focal area set aside) and focal area. In the last six months, the cancellation of any project will lead to those resources becoming available to the same focal area, subject to the terms of paras. 8 and 9.

#### *Maximizing utilization of STAR envelopes*

7. **A formal notification** will be sent by December 31, 2012 by the GEF Secretariat to all countries reminding them that they have twelve months (through December 31, 2013) to formally submit all their project concepts for consideration and potential funding under GEF-5. Countries are expected to present project concepts to the full value of their focal area allocations (or full value of the total country envelope for “flexible” countries) by December, 31, 2013.

8. **Re-allocation of additional or unused resources within focal areas.** For the final work programs of the GEF-5 replenishment in 2014, the CEO will make available any additional or unused resources to eligible projects from any countries within that focal area, should that be necessary.

9. **Re-allocation of additional or unused resources across focal areas.** The CEO can also propose for Council approval to shift resources between focal areas. This will allow a maximum usage of all available resources within the framework of STAR allocations and ensure proper management of allocations by country and by focal area. As in the past, such re-allocation across focal areas is to be kept to a minimum.

#### *Flexibility rules for resource allocations across focal areas*

10. **Allocations for “flexible countries”.** Countries with a total indicative allocation of up to the flexibility threshold<sup>57</sup> can allocate the sum total of their allocation for projects across any, or all, of the three focal areas of biodiversity, climate change, and land degradation under the STAR. For these countries, tracking of the utilization of GEF resources will be carried out at the level of the total sum of the three focal area allocations, rather than at the level of individual<sup>58</sup> focal area allocations.

11. Any increased allocation resulting from the distribution of additional resources that become available during the course of GEF-5 will have no impact on the number of flexible countries identified at the beginning of the replenishment period.

12. **Marginal adjustments.** Marginal adjustments between focal areas will be allowed for countries with a total allocation higher than the flexibility threshold. Such adjustments will only

---

<sup>57</sup> The flexibility threshold for GEF-5 is set at \$7m based on the replenishment figures as of May 2010 and on the STAR policy to “protect” 90% of biodiversity and climate change resources. 63 “flexible” countries are under this threshold.

<sup>58</sup> Resources utilized will be counted against the relevant specific focal area(s) so that the GEF can report to the Conventions.

be allowed for countries that would exhaust their allocation for a focal area with the submission of a particular project and would need to top it up by using part of an allocation from a different focal area. The maximum “marginal adjustment” that will be allowed is set as follows:

- For sum total country allocations of \$7-20 million: \$0.2 million
- For sum total country allocations of \$20-100 million: \$1 million
- For sum total country allocations greater than \$100 million: \$2 million

13. This “marginal adjustment” can be applied from one or two focal areas, to one or more other focal areas during the replenishment period. This will be possible in more than one instance; as long as the maximum is not reached. For example a country with a total allocation of \$80m could allocate \$0.5m from climate change to biodiversity, and later \$0.5m from climate change to land degradation. Or one land degradation project that requires more than is available in that country’s land degradation envelope could be increased by drawing \$0.5m from climate change and \$0.5m from biodiversity. This provision is different from, and irrespective of, the possibility to develop multi-focal area projects, from focal areas under the STAR, and outside the STAR.

#### ***Country endorsement of proposals for GEF funding***

14. **Project Prioritization.** Prioritization of PIF proposals for submission to the GEF for funding and utilization of STAR resource envelopes is managed at the country level – ultimately by the GEF Operational Focal Point. For a given country, the GEF Secretariat will therefore process projects for approval on a first-come, first-served basis, unless a communication from the country states otherwise. Countries will be supported in their prioritization and portfolio management effort by operational focal points having access to real time information on GEF approvals and on the availability of focal area resources from the GEF Project Management Information System (PMIS).

15. **Project Endorsements.** Endorsement letters from Operational Focal Points for GEF-5 projects or programs shall refer to the current national STAR allocations for each relevant focal area. Such endorsements should include all project costs, including explicit reference to preparation costs (PPG) and Agency fees. Each endorsement letter will be made publicly available for consultation on the GEF web-based database.

16. A revised endorsement letter is required if the overall total project amount requested is higher than stated in the original endorsement letter by more than 5% at PIF or CEO endorsement stage.

17. The endorsement letter for each project for the “flexible” STAR countries should refer to the actual amount to be endorsed for that project out of the sum total GEF-5 indicative allocations for the three focal areas, and indicate the amount contributed from each focal area(s) to which the project contributes. It will also include explicit reference to any project preparation costs (PPG) and Agency fees.

18. The endorsement for each project that makes use of the “marginal adjustment” provision should also explicitly indicate what amount is “taken” from which focal area(s). The PMIS will be used to reflect these changes to the resources available to a country under each focal area envelope.

19. **Informing the conventions about utilization of resources.** A country that makes use of the “flexible countries” or “marginal adjustment” provisions will need to inform the secretariats of the relevant conventions of the use of funds for each focal areas by copying the relevant convention secretariats on each endorsement letter.

*Next steps and timeline for implementation*

20. As per the November 2009 Council decision, the STAR is to be implemented from the point of GEF-5 effectiveness.

21. The Secretariat will prepare papers for the June 2011 and June 2012 Council meetings that describe the experience with implementation of the STAR. For the June 2013 Council meeting, the Secretariat will prepare a paper on progress in the development of indicators for all GEF focal areas. At the June 2013 meeting, the Council will also have, before it, a review of the STAR design and its implementation, which will be carried out by the Office of Evaluation to inform the Council’s decisions with respect to developing a GEF-wide STAR in the future, if feasible.