



Global Environment Facility

GEF/C.24/6/Rev.1

April 29, 2005

GEF Council
June 3-8, 2005

Agenda Item 9

SCOPE AND COHERENCE OF THE LAND DEGRADATION ACTIVITIES IN THE GEF

Recommended Council Decision

The Council, having reviewed document GEF/C.24/6/Rev.1, *Scope and Coherence of the Land Degradation Activities in the GEF*, endorses the policies and direction presented in the paper that the GEF Secretariat and Implementing and Executing Agencies are pursuing in developing the GEF portfolio in land degradation.

Table of Contents

I.	Background	1
II.	Introduction.....	2
III.	Clarifying Fundamental Issues	3
IV.	Portfolio Analysis	15
V	Future Directions: An Integrated Approach to Natural Resources Management.....	18
VI.	Conclusions.....	20
	Annex 1. List of documents prepared for the Council on Land Degradation.....	21
	Annex 2. Portfolio Description	22
	Annex 3. Implementation of GEF Country Pilot Partnership for Sustainable Land Management	29

I. BACKGROUND

1. Land degradation has become internationally recognized as a threat to the global environmental commons and is associated with desertification, deforestation, loss of biodiversity, its adverse effect on climate, sedimentation and pollution of international waters.
2. International responses to address land degradation have been incorporated in various conventions and agreements that recognized the threat it represents and the consequences of continued degradation. These include: United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD) which recognizes land degradation as the root cause of the desertification processes in arid, semi arid and sub-humid zones; United Nations Convention on Biological Diversity (UNCBD) which recognizes land degradation as a threat to biodiversity through changes in land use; and the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) which recognizes land degradation as it affects climate patterns through deforestation and loss of soil carbon. International waters agreements also recognize land degradation as it affects major catchments and waterways through sedimentation and pollution. The UN Forum on Forests (UNFF) has also recognized land degradation as a major factor in the loss of forest resources.
3. The long history of the issue of land degradation from 1977 (United Nations Conference on Desertification, Nairobi), to 1992 (UNCED, Rio de Janeiro) and 1994 (adoption of the restructured GEF), with close links to the above-mentioned conventions and agreements, has been difficult because of the range of diverging views, over the nature, causes, and effects of land degradation among governments, national and international institutions and other stakeholders involved in the international environmental system. However, the adoption of the UNCCD in 1994 indicated the willingness and the consensus of the international community to develop a common approach to respond to the challenge.
4. The GEF initially addressed land degradation by providing financing to assist developing countries and countries with economies in transition to prevent and control land degradation, primarily desertification and deforestation, as it relates to its focal areas (biodiversity, climate change, international waters, and ozone layer depletion). This linkage to the other focal areas, however, presented some operational difficulties to countries in developing projects to address land degradation prevention and control.
5. This situation was improved by the approval of GEF operational programs on integrated ecosystem management and conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity important to agriculture as these programs provided frameworks for GEF assistance to strengthen public policy and enabling environments for addressing land degradation. These operational programs strengthened cross-sectoral and integrated approaches to natural resources management within the GEF.
6. At the Second GEF Assembly in 2002, Participants agreed to designate land degradation, primarily desertification and deforestation, as a new focal area of the GEF. This designation made sustainable land management a primary focus of GEF assistance, seeking to optimize GEF assistance to address land degradation in arid, semi-arid, sub-humid and humid areas of the world in a more consistent, systematic and integrated way. Sustainable land management calls

for a new comprehensive approach (landscape approach) to address the land degradation issue in a holistic and integrated manner which represent a new step in the GEF vision to develop cross focal area synergies.

7. The Assembly also confirmed that the GEF would be available as a financial mechanism of the UNCCD pursuant to Article 21 of the Convention. In 2003, the GEF Council approved an operational program on sustainable land management (SLM).

II. INTRODUCTION

8. This note responds to the Council's decision at its May 2004 meeting requesting the "GEF Secretariat in collaboration with the Implementing Agencies, to prepare an analysis of the scope, implementation focus and coherence of land degradation activities". Council requested this clarification following a progress report on the implementation of the GEF activities in the land degradation area (covering a period of eighteen months), and discussion of projects in the focal area that were being considered by the Council.¹

9. While responding to the Council request, this document offers an opportunity to address the issue of "coherence" of the GEF strategies, programs, and procedures across all GEF focal areas and their integration. The establishment of the land degradation focal area has provided the GEF with the best opportunity to address the issue of integrated natural resources management as a holistic approach to achieve environmental sustainability.

10. This document seeks to:

- (a) clarify a number of fundamental and longstanding issues associated with the definition of land degradation, global benefits arising from the focal area, the rationale for incremental costs, and collaboration between the GEF and the UNCCD;
- (b) analyze the coherence of the land degradation portfolio; and
- (c) reflect on future directions towards more effective and sustainable adoption of integrated approaches to natural resources management within the GEF.

¹ This note takes into account previous work by the GEF Secretariat and the Implementing Agencies addressing land degradation. For example, *The GEF Framework for Activities concerning Land Degradation*, approved by the GEF Council in 1996, is a programming framework for GEF land degradation activities based on linkages between land degradation and three focal areas. It describes the operational framework, operational criteria and guidelines, country eligibility and criteria, programming strategy, programming process, financing policy and program priorities. Reports prepared for the Council on land degradation are listed in Annex I to this report.

III. CLARIFYING FUNDAMENTAL ISSUES

National vs. Global benefits

11. The global environment consists of a mosaic of natural and human use ecosystems, which are ecologically linked, irrespective of the scale of analysis. Ecosystem integrity (health, stability and connectivity) can be defined by its structural components (biotic and abiotic factors) and the interactive and synergetic processes between them that allow a sustained and steady delivery of goods and services. A key finding of the recently-concluded Millennium Ecosystem Assessment (MEA) is the unprecedented changes made to the world's ecosystems, during recent decades as a result of meeting growing demands for food, fiber, water and energy. These pressures have resulted in serious degradation or unsustainable uses of most of the ecosystem services. The MEA forecasts that increased pressure will be exerted in the near future on ecosystem goods and services in all terrestrial biomes, through continuous habitat changes (land conversion and use), water and fisheries resources overexploitation, biodiversity and groundwater mining and climate change. These direct drivers of change are often synergetic. The MEA has clearly demonstrated that the loss of services derived from ecosystems is a significant barrier to the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals to reduce poverty, hunger and diseases.

12. The MEA particularly emphasizes that drylands areas are among the regions of the world where ecosystem services are most threatened by human impacts. Land degradation, which is the underlying cause of the breakdown of ecosystems' integrity (along with fresh water degradation and scarcity), may be broadly defined as "any form of deterioration of the natural potential of land that affects ecosystem integrity either in terms of reducing its sustainable ecological productivity or in terms of its native biological richness and maintenance of resilience." Some aspects of land degradation may be more irreversible than others. Land degradation affects not only selected ecosystem components or functional cycles and regulating services (such as air quality regulation, climate regulation, water and erosion regulation, disease and pest regulation, natural hazard regulation), but because of the interconnectivity between ecosystems across scales, it also triggers destructive processes that can affect the entire biosphere.

13. Land degradation in drylands for example, such as de-vegetation and desiccation of soils that lead to formation of aerosols and increased incidence of dust storms (like the "Harmattan" in the Sahel and the dust storms in Northeast Asia commonly called "Yellow Sands") and lowering of soil moisture over vast expanses of land (e.g., Sahel, China and the Southwestern US, etc.), have important effects on cloud formation and rainfall patterns at national, regional and global scales. Air borne sediments, pathogen germs, pesticides and nutrients from degraded landscapes (often agricultural systems) can have negative off-site impacts on both terrestrial and marine ecosystems as well as on human health. Land degradation leads to a decrease in soil and above-ground carbon and net primary productivity, which impacts on the global carbon cycle. It also leads to changes in plant and animal biodiversity, which impacts on the provisioning of ecosystem goods and regulation functions and cultural services. High runoff volumes and high erosion rates from degraded lands lead to negative effects on flow regimes (destructive floods downstream such as in Bangladesh or Haiti), excessive clay and silt loads in river deltas, river

mouths and coastal zones and interference with groundwater recharges. Over-pumping of aquifers in degraded areas has negative consequences for the quality of freshwater through increased salinity and minerals. Deforestation has been clearly linked to biodiversity loss, increased carbon emissions, decreased carbon sequestration potential and global climate change. The results of prevention and control of land degradation, therefore, can go well beyond national boundaries and isolated effects on climate, biodiversity and international waters.

14. The objective of the operational program on SLM is therefore to mitigate the causes and negative impacts of land degradation on the structural and functional integrity of ecosystems through sustainable land management practices as a contribution to enhancing ecosystem functions and services and improving peoples' livelihoods and economic well being.

15. The objective of the focal area is to assist countries to remove critical barriers to sustainable land management. In doing so, environmental, social and economic barriers to good policy, planning and management, which negatively influence individual and collective behaviors and change the economic background to decision-making, are fully taken into account.

16. The barriers to SLM can be grouped into four clusters:

- (a) institutional and governance barriers;
- (b) economic and financial barriers;
- (c) social and behavioral barriers; and
- (d) technology and knowledge barriers.

17. Global environmental benefits from prevention and control of land degradation are linked to the removal of the above-mentioned barriers. The removal of these barriers will enable countries to stabilize and enhance the structural and functional integrity of the ecosystems within their sustainable development strategies as they relate to:

- (a) state (static): status of ecosystem components (or natural resources); and
- (b) functions and services (dynamic): supporting (e.g., nutrient cycling, soil formation, primary production), provisioning (e.g., food, fresh water, wood and fiber, fuel), regulating (e.g., climate regulation, flood regulation, water purification) and cultural (e.g., educational) services.

18. Global environmental benefits resulting from the removal of the barriers to SLM include:

Ecosystem Structure:	Ecosystem Services:
Stabilization of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) soil resources (ii) biological resources (iii) water resources (iv) micro-climate (and related qualities of those resources) 	Stabilization and enhancement of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>Supporting Service: e.g.,</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) nutrient cycle (ii) soil formation <u>Regulating Service: e.g.,</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) climate regulation (ii) flood regulation (iii) water purification (provisioning service) (cultural service)

19. The outcomes of the stabilization and enhancement of the ecosystem structure and services can be translated into:

- (a) restored degraded ecosystems in the wider landscape;
- (b) increased carbon stocks;
- (c) increased diversity of biological resources in restored ecosystems and habitats;
- (d) reduced frequency of dust storms;
- (e) reduced stress on trans-boundary water bodies from sedimentation and pollution from land management; and
- (f) reduced methane and carbon emissions.

20. Since SLM is linked to the use of ecosystem goods and services by people for their well-being, there are also significant local or national benefits that include:

- (a) livelihood resilience (including food security, poverty reduction and land-use based conflict mitigation); and
- (b) reduced human migration (both regional and international).

21. This progressive model from local to national to global levels holds true for the other GEF focal areas as well (POPs is a good example) and is supported by recent GEF portfolio reviews which have concluded that the GEF has most impact at the global level when its programs are based on national priorities and the interests of local land users.

Incremental Costs

22. GEF adheres to the principle of incrementality in financing projects in the land degradation focal area although it recognizes that since poverty and degraded environments are closely intertwined addressing sustainable global benefits of SLM inevitability calls for activities that also address local benefits. There is continuum in environmental values and benefits from the local through national to global. Land degradation in this context results in benefit losses at both the local and global levels. SLM projects usually produce both global environmental benefits related to ecosystem integrity (enhanced services and functions) and national/local

benefits associated with improved livelihoods. SLM projects are either win-win situations, or they minimize trade offs between local and global benefits for the greater good of ensuring sustainable environment management and livelihoods.

Baseline

23. The baseline of countries as it relates to land degradation is the current enabling frameworks of institutions and human capacities and land-use practices (which include unsustainable practices) which contribute directly or indirectly to the degradation of soil and biological resources, pollution and sedimentation of water bodies, diminishing of carbon stocks and the erosion of broader ecological services.

24. In designing projects and programs, funding by the government, local communities, multilateral organizations and other international donors which are related to improving peoples' livelihoods will be taken into account in the baseline.

GEF alternative to business-as-usual

25. The alternative will reflect improved /sustainable land-use practices at the landscape level that seek to prevent and control land degradation in order to retain and restore ecosystem structural and functional integrity through the removal of critical barriers so that land degradation can be arrested and addressed adequately.

26. Three concepts will be applied when determining incremental costs:

- (a) lifting barriers;
- (b) cost sharing; and
- (c) sliding scale.

Lifting barriers

27. GEF's assistance in the focal area focuses on financing the agreed incremental costs of activities associated with the removal of barriers to sustainable land management as a contribution to the protection, restoration and maintenance of ecosystem integrity (health, stability and connectivity). Barriers that are addressed are *inter alia* institution, policy and regulations, technology, technical, capacity, and knowledge base of best practice.

28. The removal of these barriers builds on the baseline, and in some cases include activities which are "additional" and in other cases "substitutional". Additional activities which complement the baseline include those which are innovative but not yet within the range of the country's available tools, but which are critical to achieving the OP#15 objectives. Substitutional activities are those that seek to replace unsustainable practices. The increment will be reflected accordingly. The impact of GEF funded activities on the ecosystem integrity is monitored by a set of indicators related to structural ecosystem components (e.g., soil quality, biodiversity, carbon stocks) and services (e.g., land productivity, water quality, quality of

habitats, carbon sequestration), or indirectly through process indicators (e.g., policy and institutional reforms and innovative knowledge disseminated).

29. Incrementality also includes activities and processes that project proponents have to undertake to design and implement an “integrated ecosystem approach” to land management. GEF financing is used to bring together various sector ministries and departments and local communities to ensure coordinated approaches to sustainable ecosystem management that is responsive to developmental needs of the country and beyond. It is also used to finance diagnostics activities for problem within the broader landscape

Cost sharing

30. The land degradation focal area is the most recent addition to the GEF system and the application of the incremental cost principle will be partly based on experience and lessons learnt from the other GEF focal areas related to natural resources management. These include OP#1, 4 and 13 in the biodiversity focal area and OP#9 in the international water focal area and OP#12 in the multi focal area. Experience shows that in applying the incremental cost principle, practical considerations of reasonable cost sharing can often assist in reaching agreement on the incremental costs for a specific project. When working with relevant stakeholder groups of LDC/SIDS countries facing severe problems of land degradation that impact negatively on the ecosystem integrity at various scales (e.g., local, regional) and the livelihood of the people, full account should be taken of the baseline funding available from national resources and other development partners to determine an increment which reflects the country’s ability to pay.

Sliding scale

31. A sliding scale for co-financing based on the notion of incrementality and leveraging can provide a simplified approach to approximating incremental costs.² A sliding proportional scale of co-financing would require a greater co-financing ratio for larger projects. The ratio gradually increases as the project size increases. The October 2002 document paper on co-financing (GEF/C.20/6 paragraph 25) does imply at the principle that larger projects should have a relatively larger share of co-financing. When project activities are “additional”, a major part of the baseline will be assumed to be co-financing, and hence more co-financing is expected. Lower co-financing will be often associated with “substitutional” projects. For example, in a diagnostic landscape project which identifies the need to build capacities of farmers to move away from irrigation to drought tolerant crops, the baseline will remain the same while the GEF will finance the cost of promoting substitution activities (policy change in the baseline, training, and technology transformation.) The adoption of such a scale-based methodology rationalizes and simplifies the process of determining GEF incremental financing as it allows agencies and project proponents to focus on incremental reasoning at the objective and outcome levels, without having to negotiate individual activities. Applying this methodology to an analysis of the existing GEF land degradation portfolio has revealed that the GEF has funded a larger share

² A similar approach has been adopted for use in the special climate change funds.

of smaller projects (up to US\$ 1 million) than the share it finances of projects with larger funding requirements (greater than US\$1million).(Table 1).

Table 1: Funding Statistics of Approved and Endorsed Projects in the Land Degradation Portfolio (as of April 2005)

Total financing in mio US\$	Number of Projects	Range GEF Funding in mio US\$	Average GEF Funding in mio US\$	Range Baseline Funding in mio US\$	Average Baseline funding in mio US\$	Range Ratio GEF: Cofunding	GEF-3 Average Ratio GEF: Cofunding
up to 2mio	4*	min: 0.72 max: 0.94	0.86	min: 0.25 max: 0.9	0.65	min: 1 to 0.34 max: 1 to 1	1 to 0.76
2- less than 5	3	min: 0.95 max: 1	0.98	min: 1.21 max: 1.82	1.51	min: 1 to 1.21 max: 1 to 1.84	1 to 1.54
more than 5 mio	7	min: 0.98 max: 10.31	5.41	min: 9.06 max: 44.32	19.2	min: 1 to 1.68 max: 1 to 12.48	1 to 3.5

* This includes the LDC/SIDS Portfolio project that will support up to 49 MSPs for Capacity Building for SLM

32. The analysis indicates that for smaller projects the GEF proportion of project financing is larger than its proportion of project financing for larger projects. Smaller projects are often primarily concerned with capacity building while the larger projects are often related to investments.

Looking forward

33. Lessons drawn from the above pilot, as well as application of the three tools for calculating incremental costs, provide a good basis for guiding GEF future efforts in refining its guidelines and methodologies for calculating incremental cost ratios. Based on the above, the following it is proposed that the following guidelines be followed for land degradation projects:

- (a) For projects requiring funding not exceeding \$1 million of GEF funding, GEF will finance up to 75% of the total project cost;
- (b) for project requiring funding not exceeding \$2m of GEF funding, GEF will finance up to 50 percent of the total project cost;
- (c) for projects requiring funding ranging between \$2 and \$5m of GEF funding , the GEF will finance up to one third of the costs of the project, and;
- (d) for projects requesting funding exceeding \$5m, the GEF will finance up to one fifth of the total project costs.

34. This scale will be kept under review and adjusted as need arises. Any project proponent that believes that the incremental costs should exceed these ratios may submit an incremental cost analysis to support its request for additional financing.

Scope of Activities eligible for GEF funding as agreed in OP 15

35. Paragraphs 36 to 47 below are extracted from OP15 and describe the agreed scope of activities to be financed under the operational program on sustainable land management.

Sustainable agriculture

36. Sustainable agricultural practices can help to improve and sustain the productivity of rainfed agriculture. This may involve crop diversification to reduce the risk of failure; introduction of high-yielding and drought resistant crop varieties; adoption of mixed cropping systems; livestock and crop integration; crop rotation to recycle soil nutrients; water harvesting; and improved access to credit, extension, and marketing services (baseline actions).

37. For irrigated cropland, sustainable agriculture may involve a shift from large-scale irrigation schemes to small-scale systems that can be more easily managed by user groups; improved drainage to prevent water logging and salinization; improved water use efficiency; and judicious use of fertilizers and other agrochemicals, including the use of integrated pest management (baseline actions).

38. The GEF may provide incremental funds for complementary pilot or demonstration activities, such as adoption of improved tillage methods that do not adversely affect the stability of soil structure; establishment of windbreaks, buffer strips, and filter strips to reduce water or wind erosion; protection from farming or rehabilitation of riverine or coastal wetlands to stabilize hydrological flows; introduction of indigenous crop varieties to reduce the risk of crop losses because of their adaptation to variations in local climatic and soil conditions; and improved management of agricultural waste to improve soil and water conservation. These interventions would have additional benefits related to the conservation of biological diversity; sequestration of soil carbon; and reduction in carbon dioxide emissions.”

Sustainable rangeland/pasture management

39. Baseline activities to improve and sustain the economic productivity of rangeland and pasture may include reducing livestock stocking density to ensure that the carrying capacity of a range or pasture is not exceeded; distribution of water points to prevent high concentration of livestock in one area; adoption of rotational grazing systems; and improved access to credit, veterinary, and marketing services.

40. “The GEF may complement these measures with incremental pilot or demonstration activities such as strengthening of viable traditional rangeland management systems; establishment of mechanisms to help resolve wildlife-livestock-agriculture conflicts; enhancement of range management systems; introduction of indigenous plants for rehabilitation of rangeland; development of community-based rangeland fire management programs;

introduction of indigenous livestock varieties to minimize losses because of their natural adaptation to extreme climatic events and environmental conditions; establishment of windbreaks to reduce water and wind erosion; protection and/or rehabilitation of riparian forest or woodland; and protection and/or rehabilitation of the natural vegetation of groundwater recharge areas. These above measures would improve soil and water conservation and they would also help to protect biodiversity, including agro biodiversity; increase carbon sequestration; and reduce carbon dioxide emission.”

Sustainable forest and woodland management

41. Baseline activities to improve and sustain the economic productivity of forest or woodland management may include development of community-based management arrangements for multiple uses of forest/woodland resources; establishment of forests or tree crop farms; and minimizing agricultural expansion, especially shifting cultivation, to forest/woodlands by improving soil fertility through crop rotation using nitrogen fixing crops and crop residue.

42. Complementary incremental actions for GEF financing may include pilot or demonstration activities aimed at strengthening viable indigenous forest/woodland management systems; use of indigenous multiple use tree species to rehabilitate degraded area; rehabilitation and protection of degraded ecologically sensitive areas; protection and/or rehabilitation of riparian forest and wetlands, and groundwater recharge areas; improvement of forest health, controlling damaging invasive alien species, strengthening forest inventory, monitoring, assessment and sustainable harvesting practices, establishment of community woodlots to provide fuel wood as an alternative source to natural forests and woodland; and piloting of mechanisms to compensate local communities that protect ecosystem stability, functions and services in watersheds to ensure stable flow of high quality water for downstream users. These interventions would have additional global environment benefits such as conservation of biodiversity, carbon sequestration, and reduction in carbon dioxide emission.

Capacity Building

43. Capacity building at the local, national, and regional levels would initially focus on country-driven activities aimed at creating the appropriate enabling environment and institutional capacity to support sustainable land management.

44. Mainstreaming sustainable land management into national development priorities. Baseline actions would include activities related to the formulation of a national development plan, poverty reduction strategy paper (PRSP), or Comprehensive Development Framework (CDF).

45. GEF incremental assistance may specifically focus on providing coordination support for the following baseline actions to facilitate the implementation of country-driven priorities:

- (i) Harmonization, if necessary, of sustainable land management priorities identified in action programs such as national environment action

programs, National/Sub-Regional/Regional Action Programs (NAPs/SRAPs/RAPs) to combat desertification, national biodiversity strategies and action plans, national communication for UNFCCC, and National Adaptation Programmes of Action, and forest action programs.

- (ii) Integration of country-driven desertification and deforestation prevention and control priorities outlined in national environmental action programs, NAPs/SRAPs/RAPs, national biodiversity strategies and action plans, national communication for UNFCCC, and forest management action plans into national development plans, PRSPs, and/or CDF. Such integration would facilitate coordinated financial resource mobilization, from both in-country and external sources, and the successful implementation of priority activities.
- (a) Integration of land use planning systems. Baseline activities may include the establishment of development planning systems and the development of systems for drought preparedness and for other extreme climatic events at the national and local levels. GEF incremental activities may include the following:
- (i) Strengthening of participatory institutional mechanisms and capacity for integrated land use planning and implementation, including land suitability analysis, at the national and local levels and across sectors as a contribution to improving livelihoods and protecting ecosystem stability, functions, and services.
 - (ii) Incorporation of sustainable land management practices into systems developed for drought preparedness and for other extreme climatic events.
 - (iii) Development of policies, regulations, and incentive structures such as improved land tenure systems and pricing systems to appropriately value renewable natural resources, including water, to encourage efficient and sustainable use and management.
 - (iv) Strengthening of information management systems to support decision-making at the national and local levels on integrated land use planning and management.
 - (v) Dissemination and replication of good management practices, technologies, and lessons learned.

46. Agreements and mechanisms for management of transboundary resources. Building on appropriate national policies (baseline actions) to develop agreements and modalities for management of transboundary natural resources through sustainable land management (GEF incremental actions). For example, countries may collaborate at the sub-regional level to protect transboundary grazing corridors for nomadic pastoralists from overgrazing. They may also

collaborate to jointly adopt sustainable land use management programs to reduce sedimentation of shared waterbodies

Knowledge Management through Targeted Research

47. GEF-supported targeted research is aimed at providing information, knowledge, and tools to improve the quality and effectiveness of GEF projects and programs. “Targeted research may initially focus on partnerships with small farmers, pastoralists, and other natural resource users and stakeholders to demonstrate under field conditions cost-effective agronomic practices to improve soil fertility management as alternatives to shifting agriculture; methodologies for valuing environmental services; tillage methods that have minimal impacts on soil structure and improve soil and water conservation; and systems to improve livestock production in areas with limited rangeland/pasture. Targeted research may also focus on the development of analytical tools and frameworks to assist countries to assess the environmental and economic costs of land degradation and the benefits of early intervention to prevent or control degradation, as well as the status and trends in their forests, rangelands and other land types.”

GEF and the UNCCD

Second GEF Assembly

48. At the Second GEF Assembly held in Beijing in 2002, Participants in the GEF agreed to include land degradation, primarily desertification and deforestation, as a new focal area of the GEF. The Assembly also confirmed “that the GEF shall be available as a financial mechanism of the UN Convention to Combat Desertification in those Countries Experiencing Serious Drought and/or Desertification, particularly in Africa, pursuant to paragraph 21 of the Convention, if the Conference of the Parties should so decide. In this regard, the Assembly requests the Council to consider any such decision of the Conference of the Parties with a view to making the necessary arrangements.”

49. In order to give effect to these decisions, the Second GEF Assembly amended the *Instrument for the Establishment of the Restructured GEF* to include land degradation, primarily desertification and deforestation, as a new focal area and to provide in paragraph 21(f) of the Instrument that “the Secretariat shall, on behalf of the Council, exercise the following functions: (f) coordinate with the Secretariats of other relevant international bodies, in particular the Secretariats of the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification in Countries Experiencing Serious Drought and/or Desertification, Particularly in Africa”

Operational Program on Sustainable Land Management

50. At its first meeting after the Assembly in May 2003, the GEF Council approved a new operational program on sustainable land management as a framework to operationalize the land degradation focal area. The operational program provides “a framework for the development of activities eligible for GEF incremental financing to address the root causes and negative impacts of land degradation on ecosystem stability, functions and services as well as on people’s

livelihoods and economic well-being through sustainable land management practices. The document outlines, among other things, program objectives, expected outcomes, and activities eligible for GEF support.”

51. At its sixth meeting in 2003, the Conference of the Parties to the UNCCD welcomed the GEF Operational Program on Sustainable Land Management (see section below.)

52. The operational program specifically notes that GEF support under the operational program will be consistent with the work program priorities of the UNCCD as well as the program priorities on sustainable land management of the Convention on Biological Diversity and the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change.

53. The operational program also elaborates upon the relationship between the Global Mechanism of the CCD and the GEF as follows:

“The GEF’s Implementing and Executing Agencies can assist countries to mobilize co-financing from external sources. In addition, the UNCCD has established the Global Mechanism to “... promote actions leading to mobilization and channeling of financial resources, including the transfer of technology, on a grant basis, and/or concessional or other terms, to affected developing country parties ...”. The Global Mechanism, therefore, has a major role to play in assisting countries to mobilize co-financing (i.e. non-GEF funds) to cover the cost of baseline activities.

“The Global Mechanism is expected to coordinate with the GEF Implementing and Executing Agencies and other donors in financial resource mobilization. The Facilitation Committee of the Global Mechanism could assist in supporting such coordination. The committee was established to provide support and advice to the Global Mechanism as well as for institutional collaboration. Members of the committee include the following GEF Implementing and Executing Agencies -- UNDP, UNEP, World Bank, IFAD, FAO, Asian Development Bank, African Development Bank, Inter-American Development Bank, and the GEF Secretariat.”

54. GEF support for activities under the land degradation focal area will therefore serve to assist recipient countries to meet the objectives of the UNCCD taking into consideration the policies, strategies and priorities agreed by the Conference of the Parties of the UNCCD. In so doing, consistent with the strategic priorities for the land degradation focal area, GEF financing will be targeted for (a) capacity building, and (b) implementation of innovative and indigenous sustainable land management practices.

55. In providing assistance for capacity building, the GEF will focus on assisting countries to implement national and regional programs, in particular national action programs and sub-regional and regional action programs called for in the UNCCD and may provide support within the framework of capacity building projects for the elaboration of such programs. The GEF Council, in approving the operational program for sustainable land management, specifically “recognized that in the framework of capacity building projects to be funded under the

operational program, the elaboration of national action programs, sub-regional action programs, regional action programs and national reports are considered as components.”³

Conference of the Parties to the UNCCD

56. At its sixth Conference of the Parties, the UNCCD approved the following decision designating the GEF as a financial mechanism of the Convention and calling for the preparation of arrangements for establishing a working relationship with the GEF.

The Conference of the Parties

Taking note of the report by the secretariat as contained in document ICCD/CRIC(2)/6.

Taking into consideration the report of the first session of the Committee for the Review of the Implementation of the Convention in referring to issues Parties would wish to see addressed in the implementation of the Global Environment Facility (GEF) Operational Program on Sustainable Land Management.

Designation of a financial mechanism

- (i) *Welcomes* the decision by the World Summit on Sustainable Development in Johannesburg, South Africa, in August-September 2002, which, inter alia, recognized the complementary roles of the GEF and the Global Mechanism of the Convention in providing and mobilizing resources, and called on the Second GEF Assembly to consider making the GEF a financial mechanism of the Convention;
- (ii) *Welcomes* also the decision of the Second GEF Assembly in October 2002, in Beijing, China, declaring that the GEF should be available as a financial mechanism of the UNCCD in those countries experiencing serious drought and/or desertification, particularly in Africa, pursuant to article 21 of the Convention, if the Conference of the Parties should so decide;
- (iii) *Further welcomes* the decision of the GEF Council in May 2003 in Washington D.C., United States of America, establishing a new operational program on sustainable land management;
- (iv) *Decides* to accept the GEF as a financial mechanism of the UNCCD pursuant to article 20, paragraph 2(b), and article 21 of the Convention and in accordance with the GEF Instrument as amended;

Arrangements for establishing a working relationship with the Global Environment Facility

³ Joint Summary of the Chairs, May 2003, paragraphs 12-13.

- (v) *Welcomes* the decision by the GEF Council at its meeting in May 2003, requesting the GEF secretariat to discuss with the UNCCD secretariat the arrangements to facilitate collaboration between the GEF and the UNCCD;
- (vi) *Requests* the Executive Secretary, in collaboration with the Managing Director of the Global Mechanism, to consult with the Chief Executive Officer and Chairman of the GEF with a view to preparing and agreeing upon a Memorandum of Understanding on the arrangements called for in paragraph 5 above for consideration and adoption by the seventh session of the Conference of the Parties and Requests that such arrangements should be concluded between the secretariat and the GEF and elaborate on how the GEF should take into consideration policies, strategies and priorities agreed upon by the COP.”

Arrangements to facilitate collaboration between the GEF and the CCD.

57. As called for by the GEF Assembly and Council and the Conference of the Parties to the UNCCD, the Executive Secretary of the UNCCD and the CEO of the GEF, in collaboration with the Managing Director of the Global Mechanism, have prepared a draft memorandum of understanding (MOU) on arrangements to facilitate and enhance collaboration between the GEF and the CCD.

58. As provided for in paragraph 21 of the Instrument, the Secretariat is to coordinate with the Secretariat of the UNCCD on behalf of the Council. Furthermore, the decision of the Parties to the UNCCD calls for a memorandum of understanding on arrangements to facilitate collaboration between the GEF and the UNCCD to be prepared and agreed by the Convention Secretariat and adopted by the Parties. It is therefore proposed that the MOU be concluded between the Executive Secretary of the UNCCD and the CEO/Chairman of the GEF and that it become effective upon adoption by both the UNCCD COP and the GEF Council. Although the decision of the COP does not call for adoption by the GEF Council, in the interest of reciprocity it is proposed that the Council should do so.

59. The Council is invited to consider and adopt the proposed MOU (GEF/C.25/5) prior to its submission for consideration and adoption at the seventh session of the Conference of the Parties to the UNCCD.

IV. PORTFOLIO ANALYSIS

Challenges

60. It is important to recall that the operational program on sustainable land management was only approved by the GEF Council in May 2003, with the assumption that the program will take time to develop and mature. Therefore, funding was provided on the expectation that the program would slowly grow during the remaining period under GEF-3 and continue expanding during GEF-4 and onward. However, eighteen months into implementation, responses to

developing GEF activities in OP # 15 have been overwhelming. Resource supply is not able to meet the demand.

61. The challenges managing this OP since inception can be summarized as follows:
- (a) managing an unanticipated flow of demand for project support with limited available resources; and
 - (b) striking the right balance among:
 - (i) land degradation strategic priorities
 - (ii) “traditional” project approach modalities and piloting of innovative cross-sectoral and programmatic approaches; and
 - (iii) land use systems (agriculture, rangeland and livestock, forestry).

Analysis of Portfolio coherence

62. The sustainable land management program that is being developed seeks to promote a programmatic approach and enhance sector integration in addressing various trade-offs in managing natural resources through integrated land use planning and community driven development. All activities are based on priorities identified in the national planning frameworks.

63. This objective has been achieved in most of the land degradation projects. Approximately half of the projects have been designed to take into consideration the landscape approach which assures resilience and stability of the ecosystem. All the projects were developed to appropriately ensure their coherence with other ongoing GEF activities. The appropriate incorporation of the human dimensions in environmental management in these projects have provided useful linkages and coherence with biodiversity conservation, international waters and climate change adaptation activities.

64. Capacity building, the first priority, is being addressed through:
- (a) four medium sized projects targeting institutional capacity building for sustainable land management in individual countries,
 - (b) one region-wide medium size project targeting African countries and
 - (c) one portfolio project for forty-eight countries having weak institutional capacity and lacking an enabling environment for sustainable land management (all LDCs and SIDS).

65. These capacity building activities were developed taking into account other GEF capacity building initiatives to ensure coherence and cost effectiveness. Although there is some amount of geographical overlap in some projects, there is no duplication of their objectives and focus of the

projects. Particular attention has been given to ensuring that these projects are consistent and build upon the national capacity self assessments which have also identified priorities for land degradation in countries.

66. There is a reasonable balance between traditional and innovative approaches which respond to the second strategic priority of the land degradation focal area. The GEF Country Pilot Partnerships in Sustainable Land Management (CPP) provide a holistic framework for country programming of land degradation activities. The program seeks to address all environmental constraints to SLM through development and execution of well coordinated interventions that are coherent with other GEF and donor activities in the countries. For a more complete description of the CPP, see annex 3.

67. Land degradation problems in a broad array of diverse land use systems are adequately addressed in the portfolio. Most of the projects and partnerships do not only focus on single production systems, such as agriculture, livestock or forest management, but rather embrace the integrated management of those systems in the total landscape. Examples include the Asian Development Bank's Partnership Program "Central Asian Countries Initiative for Land Management" or the UNDP project "Land Degradation in Upper Sabana Yegua".

68. There are also projects that will reform an entire production sector, such as the World Bank project on "Agricultural Productivity and Sustainable Land Management" in Kenya or the Kazakhstan proposal on "Forest Production and Reforestation Project". It is expected that as the program grows, there will be a better balance between project and programmatic approaches. Recent experience with the CPP in Namibia gives seems to indicate that this approach is particularly responsive to country needs.

69. Approximately 84% of the projects in the portfolio address both strategic priorities in the land degradation focal area: capacity building and on-the-ground investments. Projects with investments on the ground address issues at the community level and include interventions that aim at improving both livelihoods and economic well-being of local people as baseline actions while also preserving or restoring ecosystem stability, functions, and services. These projects are particularly important in introducing innovations, demonstration, and replication of good practices which include sustainable indigenous land management systems.

Land degradation activities in the other GEF focal areas

70. Since land degradation in GEF-3 was partly undertaken as a cross cutting issue within the other GEF focal area, a parallel study was undertaken to determine the magnitude of resources devoted to land degradation activities within the other focal areas. Report of this study is before the Council as GEF/C.24/Inf.6, *Status of Land Degradation as a Cross cutting Issue under GEF-3*. This study included the following:

- (a) an inventory of all projects which have tangible linkages to land degradation under biodiversity, climate change, international waters, persistent organic pollutants, multi-focal area programs, and integrated ecosystem management;

- (b) an analysis of their consistency and systematic contribution to prevention and control of land degradation; and
- (c) a presentation of trends in resource flows for land degradation activities since the GEF Pilot Phase.

71. The review examined a total of 158 GEF 3 projects with a total GEF allocation of US\$ 643.9 million. The specific allocation for activities related to land degradation in these 158 projects was estimated at US\$155 million.

72. Thirty seven projects (23.4%) were categorized as having a strong land degradation component, 48 projects (30.4%) as projects with potential and indirect land degradation effects while 73 projects (46.2%) as projects with little apparent effects on land degradation. 32% of the GEF funds allocated to projects with a strong land degradation component went to prevention or rehabilitation activities while for projects with potential and indirect effects on land degradation and those with little apparent land degradation effect, the proportion was 28% and 12% respectively. The bulk of projects were in the biodiversity focal area, followed by projects in integrated ecosystem management and international waters.

73. The analysis shows a sharp increase in the number of projects addressing land degradation as a cross-cutting issue since land degradation is increasingly seen as a threat to the sustainable use and/or protection of biodiversity, water and climate. Most of the projects in the operational programs Integrated Ecosystems Management and Integrated Land and Water Management addressed land degradation with about 30% of the GEF resources.

Managing resources

74. 23 months into the implementation of GEF 3, resources of US \$ 250 million allocated for land degradation activities have been fully committed for projects under preparation and those already approved by Council. The challenge now is how to maintain optimism for an ever growing demand for GEF support in this focal area while adequately responding to related short and long-term expectations. Most projects now entering the pipeline will mature during GEF-4, and it can be expected that the demands for this focal area in GEF-4 will be much greater than the current resources allocated in GEF-3.

V FUTURE DIRECTIONS: AN INTEGRATED APPROACH TO NATURAL RESOURCES MANAGEMENT

75. The fragmented and partial responses to what is recognized as a highly complex and integrated global environment system is clearly the problem with previous attempts to find lasting solutions to the problems associated natural resource degradation.

76. Lessons drawn from all our interventions over the past decade show that most strategies and decisions which are based on uncoordinated approaches (often advocated for institutional, organizational, management and/or conceptual simplification reasons) have so far not yielded results nor met expectations raised by the Rio process. The MEA has provided solid scientific

evidences and documentation of the nature and consequences of adverse ecosystems changes. This important assessment called the attention of all those concerned to pay special attention to the issue of linkages and synergy among identified components of the global environment complex.

77. Since the approval of the GEF Operational Strategy in 1995, the GEF Council has recognized the need for integration across focal areas. However, the focal area structure of the GEF has not been conducive to fully addressing the issue, although important initial steps have been taken. For example under the international waters operational program on integrated land and water multiple focal area, the integration of land use and biodiversity considerations in the design of water protection and rehabilitation was indispensable. GEF projects have also recognized that freshwater basins and coastal areas and seas constitute an environmental continuum.

78. In order to address ecological and socio-economic interactions across ecosystems, linking local benefits to global environmental benefits, the GEF focal area on land degradation has adopted a landscape approach. Landscapes are defined in the widest sense, referring to the delineable area of the earth's terrestrial surface, encompassing all attributes of ecosystems immediately above or below this surface, including those of :

- (a) soil and terrain forms,
- (b) surface hydrology (including shallow lakes, rivers, marshes and swamps),
- (c) near-surface sedimentary layers and associated groundwater and geo-hydrological reserve,
- (d) plant and animal populations (including its biodiversity),
- (e) near-surface climate, and
- (f) human settlement pattern and physical results of past and present human activity (terracing, water storage or drainage structures, roads, buildings etc.).

79. A landscape unit is defined by the dominant goods and services that it can provide. A landscape unit can contain different ecosystems and watersheds, but they are linked within the unit through economic, social, and ecological drivers. The ultimate goal of all GEF's activities in environmental management is to contribute to maintaining the integrity of ecological systems in a manner that is supportive of socially and economically sustainable development. The main objective is to restore ecological integrity (health and stability) and maintain ecosystem structure and functions for sustainable goods and services to improve people's livelihoods and economic well-being.

80. Being able to facilitate coordinated actions in water management, land management, protection of biological resources, promotion of sustainable energy resources, and sound management of hazardous synthetic chemicals, the GEF is uniquely placed to play a leadership

role in the global effort to achieve integrated management of natural resources and thus contribute to the implementation of the recommendations made by WSSD and now reaffirmed by the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment.

VI. CONCLUSIONS

81. GEF activities in the area of land degradation clearly produce global benefits through promoting ecosystem integrity even though the challenges being addressed most often have their origin in local and national activities. The GEF role is to finance the incremental costs of additional activities that project proponents have to undertake to design and implement an “integrated ecosystem based” approach to land management.

82. GEF’s role in support of the UNCCD is to finance the incremental costs of capacity building and investment projects designed to implement the national action programs approved by the eligible countries. A draft MOU on arrangements to facilitate and enhance collaboration between the GEF and the CCD has been prepared by the UNCCD Executive Secretary and the GEF CEO for consideration by the GEF Council and the UNCCD COP.

83. The land degradation portfolio coherently meets the objectives of the operational program and the strategic priorities established for the focal area. Within the portfolio there is a good balance between project approaches, diverse land use systems and geographic coverage. Land degradation continues to be addressed in the other focal areas of the GEF, and there is a sharp increase in the number of projects addressing land degradation as a cross-cutting issue. The major challenge facing the operational program is how to meet the ever growing demand for GEF support under this focal area, with the limited available resources.

84. As the GEF moves forward in its programming for GEF-4, there should be a clear move towards identifying synergies among the focal areas and to programming within the broader context of integrated natural resource management. With integration, GEF will better link its incremental role as steward of the global environment with the growing international call for sustainable development.

ANNEX 1. LIST OF DOCUMENTS PREPARED FOR THE COUNCIL ON LAND DEGRADATION

GEF/C.3/8, A framework of GEF Activities Concerning Land Degradation, February 1998.

GEF/C.14/4, Clarifying Linkages Between Land Degradation and the GEF Focal Areas: An Action Plan for Enhancing GEF Support, December 1999

GEF/C/17/Inf.7, GEF M&E Independent Study on Land Degradation, March 2001

GEF/C.17/15, Options to Enhance GEF Support for the Implementation of the UNCCD, April 2001.

GEF/C.18/4.Rev 1, A note on the proposed designation of Land Degradation as a GEF Focal Area, November 2001

GEF/C.20/8, 7, Elements of a GEF Operational Program for Prevention and Control of Desertification and Deforestation through Sustainable Land Management, September 2002

GEF/C.21/6, GEF Operational Program on Sustainable Land Management, May 2003

STAP – Opportunities for global gain: exploiting the linkages between the focal areas of the GEF, May 2004.

ANNEX 2. PORTFOLIO DESCRIPTION

Three programming approaches have been developed under the operational program for sustainable land management:

- (a) a “classic” project approach to address requests by countries to accelerate the development of activities which respond to their land degradation concerns;
- (b) an umbrella project providing medium sized projects to assist countries build the basic institutional and human and capacities required not only to develop GEF eligible projects, but also create the enabling environment for a cohesive country programming and implementation of sustainable land management approaches; and
- (c) a country programming approach to implement the concept of integrated natural resources management at the national level through a holistic process that bring together all resources users to agree on a set of common objectives that maintain the integrity of the natural resource base: land, water, and biodiversity.

The land degradation portfolio, comprising a pipeline of project concepts being developed and a work program of approved project proposals, currently contains mainly project concepts. Only a few projects are under implementation. Therefore, any conclusion drawn from the analysis of the current portfolio is very preliminary.

There are currently 46 projects of different nature, thematic coverage and stages of development (Attachment 1 provides an overview of the projects). The statistical break down is as follows:

Approaches

41 classic projects
2 portfolio programs
3 country programs

Stages of development

9 projects are approved/endorsed. Of these:

4 are full-sized projects approved by the GEF Council 4
5 medium-sized projects⁵

⁴ 3 country projects: Burundi (sustainable agriculture), Nigeria (sustainable agriculture, grazing and forestry), and Brazil (sustainable forestry), and one umbrella project for LDC/SIDS (capacity building)

⁵ 4 are community-based projects and 1 portfolio approach (National Reports)

37 projects are in the pipeline. Of these:

25 are full-sized projects. For most of these PDF-B resources have been approved for the development of the full project proposal

3 projects are of a programmatic type (Namibia, Cuba and Central Asia), and

9 are medium sized project proposals for which PDF-A resources have been allocated

Coverage by land use type

6 projects have a single production system focus⁶

17 projects cover two production systems⁷

23 projects cover the three production systems

Geographic coverage

The majority of the projects in the portfolio target African countries (23), followed by the countries in the Latin American region (10), Asia (8) and multiple regions (5). 11 out of the 46 projects target more than one country.

(a) ⁶ 4 in forestry, 2 in rangeland/pasture;

⁷ 14 in agriculture/rangeland, 2 in agriculture/forestry and 1 in forestry/rangeland

No	GEF PMIS	Agency	Status	Country	Project Title	Agriculture	Forestry	Rangeland/ Pasture	Desertificati on	Deforestation	SP 1	SP-2
Pipeline for future Full-size Projects												
1	2354	WB	Pipeline entry	Kazakhstan	Forest Protection and Reforestation Project		X			X	X	X
2	2358	WB	Pipeline entry and PDF B	Bhutan	Multi-Sectoral Mechanism and Incentives for Sustainable Land Management	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
3	2355	WB	Pipeline entry	Kenya	Agricultural Productivity and Sustainable Land Management	X		X	X		X	X
4	2373	IFAD	Pipeline entry and PDF B	Brazil	Sustainable Land Management in the Semi-Arid Sertao Project	X	(X)	X	X	(X)	X	X
5	2369	IFAD	Pipeline entry	China	Drylands Ecological Conservation and Rehabilitation	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
6	2377	UNEP	Pipeline Entry and PDF B	Regional (Tajikistan, Kyrgyz Republic)	Sustainable Management of Natural Resources in the High Pamir-Alai Mountains - an Integrated and Transboundary Initiative for Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Mountain Development in Central Asia	X		X	X		X	X
7	2379	UNDP	Pipeline Entry and PDF B	Argentina	Sustainable Management of Arid and Semiarid Ecosystems to Combat Desertification in Patagonia			X	X		X	X
8	2380	UNDP	Pipeline Entry and PDF B	Niger	Sustainable co-management of the natural resources of the Air-Tenere complex	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
9	2437	UNDP/FAO	Pipeline entry	Cuba	Integrated Land and Soil Conservation	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
10	2438	UNDP/IFAD	Pipeline entry	Venezuela	Combating Land Degradation in the Arid and Semi-Arid Zones for Falcon and Lara States	X	(X)	X	X	(X)	X	X

No	GEF PMIS	Agency Status	Country	Project Title	Agriculture	Forestry	Rangeland/ Pasture	Desertificati on	Deforestation	SP 1		
11	2440	UNDP	Pipeline entry and PDF B	Nicaragua	Sustainable Land Management in Drought-prone Degraded Areas	X		X	X		X	X
12	2439	UNDP	Pipeline entry	Namibia	Country Partnership Programme	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
13	2449	UNEP	Pipeline entry	Regional	Conserving Biodiversity and Preventing Land Degradation in Small Island Ecosystems in the Caribbean		X			X		X
14	2455	ADB	Pipeline entry	Indonesia	Community-based Land Rehabilitation and Management Project	X	X		X	X	X	X
15	2459	WB	Pipeline entry and PDF B	Mauritania	Community-based Watershed Management	X		X	X		X	X
16	2505	UNEP	Pipeline entry	Regional (Argentina, Bolivia, Paraguay)	Transboundary Land Management in the Transboundary Gran Chaco Ecosystem in South America	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
17	2512	UNDP	Pipeline entry and PDF-B	Dominican Republic	Land Degradation in Upper Sabana Yegua	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
18	2509	UNDP	Pipeline entry and PDF B	Pakistan	Sustainable Land Management to Combat Desertification	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
19	2511	UNDP	Pipeline entry and PDF B	Senegal	Groundnut Basin Soil Management and Regeneration	X		X	X		X	X
20	2504	ADB	Pipeline entry	Regional (Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan)	Central Asian Countries Initiative for Land Management	X	X	X	X	X	X	X

No	GEF PMIS	Agency	Status	Country	Project Title	Agriculture	Forestry	Rangeland/ Pasture	Desertifi- cation	Defores- tation	SP 1	SP-2
21	2518	IFAD/ FAO	Pipeline entry and PDF B	Ethiopia	Community-based Integrated Natural Resources Management: Improving Ecosystem Integrity and Rural Livelihoods	X		X	X		X	X
22	2507	UNEP	Pipeline entry	Regional (Botswana, Namibia, S- Africa)	Kalahari-Namib - Enhancing Decision-making through interactive Environmental Learning- an action in Molopo-Nossob River Basin	X		X	X		X	
23	2548	WB	Pipeline entry	Madagascar	Sustainable Land Management under the Madagascar Watershed and Irrigation and Improvement Project	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
24	1431	UNEP/ FAO	Pipeline entry and PDF B	Regional (Gambia, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Mali, Mauritania, Niger, Senegal, Sierra Leone)	Integrated Management of the Fouta Djallon Highlands	X		X	X		X	X
25	1877	WB	Pipeline entry and PDF B	Guinea	Community Ecosystem Management Program (CEMP)	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
26	2139	UNEP/ FAO	Pipeline entry and PDF B	Regional (Rwanda, Uganda, Tanzania)	Transboundary Agro-Ecosystem Management Programme for the Lower Kagera River Basin (EP/RAF/102/GEF)	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
27	1329	UNEP/ FAO	Pipeline entry and PDF B	Global	LADA - Land Degradation Assessment	X	X	X	X	X	X	

PDF-A Proposals for future Medium and Full-size Projects

No	GEF PMIS	Agency	Status	Country	Project Title	Agriculture	Forestry	Rangeland/ Pasture	Desertifi- cation	Defores- tation	SP 1	SP-2
28	2180	UNEP	PDFA	Regional (Djibouti, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Kenya, Sudan, Uganda)	Sustainable Management of Transboundary Natural Resources and Biodiversity in the IGAD Region through Building Capacity in Environment Assessment and Monitoring	X	X	X	X	X	X	
29	2184	UNEP	PDFA	Regional (Ghana, Morocco, South Africa, Uganda)	Stimulating Community Initiatives in Sustainable Land Management	X	X	X	X	X	X	
30	2193	UNDP	PDFA	Global	Enabling Sustainable Dryland Management Through Mobile Pastoral Custodianship			X	X		X	(X)
31	2297	UNDP	PDFA	Madagascar	Stabilizing Rural Populations through the Identification of Systems for Sustainable Management and Local Governance of Lands in Southern Madagascar	X	X	X	X	X		X
32	2338	UNDP	PDFA	Botswana	Botswana Sustainable Land Management Project - Land Care Policy	X	X	X	X	X	X	
33	2394	WB	PDFA	Regional	Investing in Sustainable Land Management Through Mainstreaming and Partnership Building - A Pilot Approach in Sub- Saharan Africa	X	X	X	X	X	X	
34	2403	UNDP	PDFA	Mauritius	Capacity Building for Sustainable Land Management in Mauritius	X		X	X	X	X	
35	2170	UNDP	PDFA	Sierra Leone	Capacity Building for Sustainable Coastal Land Management in Sierra Leone	X	X		X	X	X	X
36	2175	UNEP	PDFA	Regional (Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan)	Capacity Building to Support the Implementation of Regional Environmental Action Plan in Central Asia	X	X	X	X	X	X	
37	2182	WB	PDF-A (FSP)	Chile	Land Management Project		X	X	X	X	X	X

No	GEF PMIS	Agency	Status	Country	Project Title	Agriculture	Forestry	Rangeland/Pasture	Desertification	Deforestation	SP 1	SP-2
----	----------	--------	--------	---------	---------------	-------------	----------	-------------------	-----------------	---------------	------	------

Approved and Endorsed Projects

38	2357	WB	CEO Endorsed (FSP)	Burundi	Agricultural Rehabilitation and Support Project (PRASAB) - Support for Sustainable Land Management	X		X	X		X	X
39	2441	UNDP	CEO Endorsed (FSP)	Global	LDC-SIDS Targeted Umbrella Project for Sustainable Land Management	X	X	X	X	X	X	
40	2356	WB	Council Approved (FSP)	Brazil	Ecosystem Restoration of Riparian Forests in Sao Paolo			X		X	X	X
41	1503	WB	Council Approved (FSP)	Nigeria	National Fadama Development Program II	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
42	1666	UNEP	Approved MSP	Kenya	Development and Implementation of a Sustainable Resource Management Plan for Marsabit Mountain and its associated Watersheds	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
43	2167	UNEP	Approved MSP	Global	Global Support to Facilitate the Early Development & Implementation of Land Degradation Programs & Project Under the GEF Operational Programme N 15	X		X	X		X	
44	2052	UNEP	Approved MSP	Regional (Lesotho, Malawi, Mozambique, South Africa, Swaziland, Tanzania, Zambia, Zimbabwe)	Sustainable Management of Inland Wetlands in Southern Africa: a Livelihoods and Ecosystem Approach	X		X	X		X	X
45	2402	UNDP	Approved MSP	Ghana	Sustainable Land Management for Mitigating Land Degradation, Enhancing Agricultural Biodiversity and Reducing Poverty (SLaM)	X	X	X	X	X		X
46	2173	UNEP	Approved MSP	Regional (South Africa, Mozambique, Zimbabwe)	Sustainable Land Use Planning for Integrated Land and Water Management for Disaster Preparedness and Vulnerability	(X)		X		X	X	

ANNEX 3. IMPLEMENTATION OF GEF COUNTRY PILOT PARTNERSHIP FOR SUSTAINABLE LAND MANAGEMENT

Background

The GEF Council at its meeting in May 2004 noted the launch of the GEF Country Pilot Partnership for Sustainable Land Management being implemented on a pilot basis in some ten countries. It was noted that, the adoption of the GEF operational program on sustainable land management presented an excellent opportunity for the GEF to demonstrate integrated land and water management at the national level since sustainable land management can only be achieved through a holistic approach where different resource users come together to agree on a set of common objectives that maintain the ecological integrity of the resource base – land. There were several compelling reasons why country partnerships offered the best opportunities to achieve sustainable land management.

First, sustainable land management does require a coordinated approach with a longer time frame than most conventional projects which rely on three to five year implementation cycles. This longer term framework requires the partnership approach as it goes beyond the capacity and planning frameworks of individual organizations and institutions both at the national and international level. Second, the implementation of such a long term program would need to be supported by sizeable commitments of financial resources which would need to be made in a predictable manner over the implementation period of the program. Such a level of commitment would go beyond the capacity of individual countries or development partners. Third, since many GEF developing country partners are at different levels of development, the availability of such sizeable financial resource packages in a predictable manner would allow each individual country to design and pursue a sustainable land management program suitable to its needs and capacity. A country would not be compelled to adjust to varying time tables of different, which has largely contributed to project failure in the past.

Implementation Progress

Six identified pilots for Ethiopia, Burkina Faso, Vietnam, Central Asia, Cuba and Namibia are at different stages of implementation. The Central Asia Pilot is a regional initiative covering five countries – Tajikistan, Kyrgyzstan, Uzbekistan, Turkmenistan and Kazakhstan with Asian Development Bank as the lead GEF implementing agency. This was launched in Kazakhstan in February 2004 and the PDF B document is being finalized. This has taken longer because of the regional nature of the partnership. The World Bank is taking the lead for Ethiopia and Vietnam and is in the process of developing the concepts for pipeline entry. UNDP is taking the lead for Namibia and Cuba. IFAD and UNDP are co-leading the process in Burkina Faso. Namibia and Cuba have made the most progress so far with countries taking ownership and leadership in developing the concept and providing both political and financial commitment. The partnership frameworks for these countries will be coming for work program entry at the May 2005 GEF council. The initiation workshop of the Namibia gave a good insight into the process of developing the CPP.

Development of Namibia CPP

The CPP process is being directed by a senior team from government, appointed at the level of permanent secretaries, with the involvement of all concerned sectors and institutions. The Government is seeking to involve all local, national and international stakeholders in the preparatory process, including representatives of the civil society. The CPP concept prepared at the central government level with the involvement of key national stakeholders was approved by the GEF in July 2004. The CPP preparatory phase (including preparation of the program framework) is being implemented in partnership with an NGO, the partner-implementing organizations.

Namibia CPP Initiation Workshop

In September 2004, national stakeholders, international partners and donor communities gathered in Ondangwa, in the north central region of the country and engaged in a comprehensive dialogue about national priority issues in the arena of sustainable land management. The meeting, which was co-organized by the government and UNDP (on behalf of the GEF Family) was well attended, driven by government with the ministries of agriculture, environment, lands and planning represented by the accounting officers in addition to technical staff. The civil society was represented by the NANGOF, the NGO umbrella organization, the farmers union as well as the recently established communal land boards. A fair number of Namibian development partners and UN Agencies were in attendance, as were representatives of the GEF Secretariat, the GEF Implementing Agencies (UNDP, UNEP, World Bank) and Executing Agencies (FAO, African Development Bank).

The participants attained a better understanding of national goals, policies and programs relating to the development aspirations of the country. Participants also had an exceptional opportunity to experience first hand (through a number of targeted field excursions) various environmental challenges that are facing rural communities in Namibia, and which exemplify the causes and effects of land degradation.

Preliminary Lessons Learned

The process for CPP formulation, planning and implementation should be nationally driven with demonstrable government commitment and ownership. Hence, it is crucial to obtain government dedication from the start, when CPPs are being pre-screened for GEF funding support.

Consultation and participation of the major role players should be pursued throughout the development stage. While it is necessary to involve stakeholders at all levels, i.e. national, regional and international; it is more important for the national stakeholders (NGOs, CBOs and government) to commence some planning on their own and align the CPP objectives to the national development aspirations.

The CPP requires diverse inputs from many role players, and negotiated inputs and outcomes; however the government has made a strategic appeal to all partners that one thing that is not

negotiable is that the CPP should make visible impacts on the ground thus achieving meaningful impacts on the livelihoods of communities.

There are capacity constraints at many levels creating gaps which require targeted interventions from development partners. For e.g., the GRN of Namibia has strongly indicated the need to integrate their sectoral planning and implementation functions so as to limit transactional costs and avoid duplication of activities. This will maximize the overall achievements of programs. The government has very good plans and programs; as such the major gap is the capacity to implement the initiatives in a cross-sectoral, synergistic and integrated manner. The CPP is being designed to address this gap, taking advantage of the numerous sector specific policies in place.

The CPP aims to integrate land management initiatives in the country, i.e. from different partners and offers an opportunity to pilot this partnership with other development partners in Namibia in addition to GEF. A key message from the Namibia CPP is that it should not take a process-oriented approach, but should focus on impact-oriented outcomes.

For the GEF family, the CPP offers a unique opportunity to exercise the integration process across the GEF focal areas. This integration can demonstrate to the UN family that GEF interventions in a given country can have bigger impacts. The CPP will serve as a tool to test the overall GEF programmatic outcomes at national level.

It is fundamental for the CPP pilot countries to share lessons across the globe. A website platform whereby partners communicate success stories and challenges pertaining to formulation and implementation issues should be established. This must be accessible to GEF agencies, governments and implementing partner organizations.

Several constraints still remain in implementing the CPP. These include limited capacities at the lower levels of government, how to reconcile conflicts between sectors, high transaction costs for lead agencies and linking CPP to ongoing or planned activities. The CPP seems to have laid a foundation on which to build The Bank's proposed program on TerrAfrica and Ethiopia and Burkina Faso offer an excellent opportunity to demonstrate this approach.

Future Directions

The CPP is a bold undertaking by the GEF which will go along way in realizing the need for holistic approaches to environmental management at the national level. The GEF as a link between various conventions and government environmental programs is in the best position to assist in realizing integrated natural resources management at the national level. The initiative will require continued and persistent commitment from all partners involved and implementation of realistic demonstrations on the ground. The CPP is laying the groundwork for programmatic investments in SLM which could be supported through larger multi-partner initiative, such as TerrAfrica in Sub Saharan Africa.