



**GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT FACILITY**  
INVESTING IN OUR PLANET

GEF/R.7/11  
December 22, 2017

---

Third Meeting for the Seventh Replenishment of the GEF Trust Fund  
January 23-25, 2018  
Brasilia, Brazil

## **GEF-7 REPLENISHMENT**

### **OVERVIEW:**

#### **GEF-7--GLOBAL CONTEXT AND STRATEGIC PRIORITIES**

**(PREPARED BY THE SECRETARIAT)**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

TACKLING AN INCREASINGLY URGENT AGENDA .....	3
STRATEGIC PRIORITIES .....	4
GEF-7 FUNDING .....	5
ACHIEVING HIGHER RESULTS.....	6
MORE INTEGRATED PROGRAMMING .....	7

## TABLES

TABLE 1. COMPARING GEF-7 AND GEF-6 TARGETS .....	7
TABLE 2. GEF-7 PROGRAMMING STRUCTURE .....	8
ANNEX TABLE A1 NATIONAL CURRENCY”, “STATUS QUO”, “INCREASED SUPPORT” PROGRAMMING SCENARIOS FOR GEF-7.....	10
ANNEX TABLE A2. NOTIONAL IMPACT PROGRAM BREAKDOWN.....	11
ANNEX TABLE A3. NOTIONAL FOCAL AREA BREAKDOWNS.....	12

## BOXES

Box 1. GEF-7 FOCAL AREA ALIGNMENT WITH COP GUIDANCE .....	9
---	---

## Tackling an increasingly urgent agenda

1. **GEF-7 comes at a vital moment for the future of the planet and for human well-being.** Global ecosystems, biomes and processes that regulate the stability and resilience of the Earth system are being stretched to a breaking point. According to science, several “Planetary Boundaries” have been breached, namely (i) biodiversity, which is being lost at a rate not seen in the past 65 million years, (ii) land-use change, where—largely driven by agricultural expansion<sup>1</sup>—global forest cover continues to decline, and (iii) climate, where atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> concentrations now exceed 400 ppm, making it increasingly urgent to reverse global emissions trends.

2. **A radical transformation of key economic systems will be required to reduce our environmental footprint.** Looking ahead, four systems are of particular importance for the prospects of the future of the planet and its peoples: (i) the food system, as population growth and dietary changes are projected to increase global demand for food by 70% by 2050, (ii) the energy system, which represents 68% of GHG emissions today and will see a 30% increase in electricity demand by 2040, (iii) cities, which are projected to be home to two-thirds of the global population by 2050, up from slightly more than half today, and (iv) the global production/consumption system, where the current “take-make-waste” model has nearly quadrupled global waste creation since 1970.

3. **Nations of the world have recognized the seriousness and urgency of the situation.** In the past two years, significant global agreements have been reached. First, in September 2015, Agenda 2030 with its Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) was universally agreed by all UN member states setting ambitious targets for the world. Implicit in the SDGs is the recognition that social and economic development will not be achievable in the absence of a stable and healthy Earth system. Moreover, the climate agreement adopted in Paris in 2015 brings countries together under a common global framework to reduce emissions and build resilience to climate impacts.

4. **The private sector, sub-national governments, international finance, and other actors are increasingly focused on sustainability.** The formal, multilateral processes are being underpinned by a number of multi-stakeholder initiatives focused on delivering concrete progress in specific areas, from tropical forest protection, to renewable energy expansion, to local government action. Environmental issues dominate the global risk landscape as perceived by businesses, while the drive to sustainability is opening up significant global business opportunities—in the order of US\$12 trillion annually for the SDGs as a whole. In parallel, a rapidly increasing number of cities are moving aggressively forward to strengthen their sustainability and resilience. In parallel, the international landscape for environmental finance is evolving rapidly. The Green Climate Fund has become fully operational and will be an increasingly important channel for multilateral climate finance going forward. In addition, private

---

<sup>1</sup> The related Planetary Boundary for biogeochemical cycles has also been transgressed, as agricultural fertilizer use has dramatically altered the global phosphorous (P) and nitrogen (N) balance.

conservation finance is gradually emerging as an important source of funding for investments in conservation of ecosystem system services, and could reach US\$200 billion in the medium term.

5. **Despite these efforts, and many success stories, the global drivers of environmental degradation remain strong, underscoring the magnitude and urgency of the challenge.** New data show that almost 30 million hectares of tree cover was lost 2016. This is the highest tree cover loss since 2011, and equivalent to an increase of about 50% compared to 2015. The loss was caused by widespread forest fires, in particular, fueled by the extraordinary warm and dry climate in many high-forest countries. Deforestation also remains high, although there are indications that the deforestation rate in tropical forests has declined recently, in particular in the Amazon. Global GHG emissions are projected to have increased in 2017 by about 2%. This is in contrast with the previous three years, when global emissions were practically constant despite robust growth in the global economy during the same period, which had raised the prospect of a global-level “decoupling” of economic growth and GHG emissions. New studies of chemical contamination provide another illustration of the full extent of our global environmental footprint: earlier this year, scientists reported extreme concentrations of persistent organic pollutants in organisms living in the deepest depths of the oceans.

### Strategic Priorities

6. **Given the significant challenges facing the global environment, the evolving context, and the timing of GEF-7, a range of strategic priorities for GEF-7 emerges:**

- ***Leverage the GEF's unique position.*** As emphasized by OPS6, the GEF occupies a unique space in the global environmental financing architecture derived from its formal mandate as a financing mechanism under several multilateral environmental agreements: CBD, UNCCD, UNFCCC, the Minamata Convention, the Stockholm Convention, and the Montreal Protocol (where the GEF supports countries with economies in transition). In addition, the GEF provides targeted support for transboundary freshwater and marine issues. As noted by OPS6, this positioning enables the GEF to take an integrated and system approach to tackling interconnected issues and generating multiple benefits. OPS-6 also highlights the GEF's proven record in funding demonstration and pilot activities with a potential for being an incubator to test and refine approaches that can subsequently be funded at larger scale from other sources. Finally, the GEF is well-positioned to provide support for institutional strengthening to help lay the foundation for enhanced action. Going forward, it will be important for the GEF to leverage these unique characteristics.
- ***Enhance GEF value-for-money through integrated programming.*** The GEF is well-positioned to create synergies across a range of environmental domains to generate multiple benefits, and—as noted by OPS6—to design and implement its interventions to drive transformational change. For example, it is increasingly being recognized that to achieve the Paris Agreement's objectives, net negative emissions would be needed in the future, and that better stewardship of land and forests can be a cost-effective, although not sufficient, way of achieving this. A stronger focus on integration would require the

GEF to more strategically deploy resources where the GEF can support the transformation of key systems that drive environmental degradation, flexibly aligned with country priorities, and best utilize the capacities of its various Implementing Agencies, so that impacts can be maximized.

- ***Strengthen GEF institutional effectiveness and efficiency.*** OPS-6 confirms the GEF’s good project performance record, which provides a strong basis for further improvements in GEF effectiveness and efficiency. GEF-7 provides an opportunity to move forward on a range of issue, including: (i) improving the GEF’s resource allocation system by increasing the flexibility given to countries to program their STAR allocations; (ii) enhancing the GEF’s focus on the poorest and most vulnerable countries; (iii) seeking ways to optimize the use of GEF funding by increasing its leveraging investments from other sources (iv) further improve the GEF’s results architecture to enhance accountability and transparency; (v) strengthen the GEF’s gender responsiveness building on the newly-adopted Gender Equality Policy; (vi) further strengthen operational processes and enhance efficiency and transparency, including through upgrading the GEF’s project management information system; (vii) reviewing processes and procedures to ensure project sustainability; and (viii) further leverage the GEF’s knowledge assets.
- ***Improve GEF’s ability to catalyze private sector action.*** The GEF-6 “NGI Pilot” illustrated the GEF’s relevance in contributing to blended finance operations—where scarce public resources are used to unlock significant private finance—especially outside “traditional” renewable energy and energy efficiency projects. These experiences provide the GEF with a solid basis for expanding its focus on blended finance. Moreover, as emphasized in OPS-6, it is important to view the private sector more broadly than just a source of financing. To achieve transformation and market change, the GEF can play a role in influencing sustainable industry practices, for example by supporting standards setting, supporting early-adoption, and promoting sustainable sourcing and production practices. This calls for GEF support to strengthen the enabling environments for private sector activity and facilitating multi-stakeholder partnerships around particular environmental challenges.
- ***Align GEF support with SDG implementation.*** The GEF’s mission to safeguard the global environment by supporting countries in meeting their commitments under multilateral environmental conventions through national, regional and global partnerships is closely aligned with the SDGs and consistent with convention guidance to seek synergies with the implementation of the 2030 Agenda, in particular SDG 13, 14 and 15. In addition, GEF interventions provide important co-benefits that can help countries achieve other SDGs in areas like clean water, gender equality, energy, sustainable cities and responsible consumption and production.

## **GEF-7 Funding**

7. **The urgency and severity of the global environmental challenges calls for a robust response.** The previous GEF replenishment—GEF-6—that was concluded in 2014 raised US\$4.4 billion. Arguably, the urgency and severity of the global environmental challenges today are even

bigger, as is the global commitment to addressing them. This, combined with a stronger GEF value-for-money proposition than in the past, provide a compelling rationale for aiming even higher in GEF-7. Tempering this ambition, however, is adverse exchange rate movements, which lowers the measured \$-value of most contributor's commitments. Therefore, the following scenarios are presented:

- A “*Status Quo*” scenario of US\$4.4 billion is presented that illustrates how the GEF can help tackle global environmental problems with at least the same financial resources as in the past.
- An “*Increased Support*” scenario of US\$5.0 billion, equivalent to an increase over GEF-6 of about 13% illustrates a possible financing structure under a stronger replenishment result.
- Finally, a “*National Currency*” scenario of US\$4.1 billion is presented. The available funding under the National Currency scenario illustrates the impact of the fact that the US dollar has strengthened vis-à-vis most currencies. The National Currency scenario reflects, all else in GEF-6 equal, the revalued GEF-6 envelope based on the agreed GEF-7 reference exchange rates.

### **Achieving higher results**

8. **GEF-7 seeks to achieve substantially more ambitious results than in the past.** Based on lessons from independent evaluations, scientific evidence, and the GEF's past implementation experience there are several reasons why the proposed GEF-7 strategy can be expected to yield greater results than in the past. First, GEF-7 investments will focus more explicitly on achieving multiple benefits, and hence yield more “results per \$”, than in the past. Second, GEF-7 programming will draw on key features of past transformational engagements, such as *a priori* focus on systems change, and on addressing market barriers and enhancing the role of the private sector. Third, a stronger reporting framework in GEF-7 will help the GEF better capture both environmental benefits and socio-economic co-benefits, which have often been underreported in the past

9. **Larger results are expected across all GEF areas of engagement.** Even in the case of an unchanged overall funding envelope, preliminary estimates suggest potential for significantly higher results in GEF-7 compared to what was projected for the previous GEF-6 replenishment. For example the targets for (i) total area of land under improved management is increased by 43% in the Status Quo scenario; carbon mitigation would increase by 120%, and the GEF's contribution to the global reduction in toxic chemicals would increase by 35%. Significant results can also be achieved in terms of support to the global protected areas estate, and in terms of improving sustainable fisheries and other oceans improvements.

10. **An increase in GEF-7 funding would enable a more-than-proportional increase in targets.** Conversely, a decline in the size of the replenishment would disproportionately affect the GEF's ability to achieve global environmental benefits. For example, under the Status Quo

financing scenario, the target replenishment is 8% larger than under the National Currency scenario, yet for most core indicators GEF-7 targets would be set 13–17% higher. In the Increased Support scenario, the difference is even larger. This is mainly because a larger replenishment would enable an increasing share of funding to be directed towards Impact Programs and other programming areas that stand to deliver significant global environmental benefits.

**11. The Impact Programs contribute disproportionately to global environmental benefits across the biodiversity, climate change and land degradation focal areas.** Under the “status quo” financing scenario, the Impact Programs account for about 22% of all funding, but are expected to bring 36% of the total GEF-7 target for area of land under improved management (214 million hectares of a total target of 601). In terms of climate change mitigation, under the Status Quo scenario the Impact Programs would account for 58% of the GEF-7 target.

**Table 1. Comparing GEF-7 and GEF-6 targets**

	GEF-6 targets	GEF-7 targets across scenarios				Change from GEF-6		
		National currency	Status Quo		Increased support	National Currency	Status Quo	Increased Support
			Total	o/w Impact Programs				
Protected Areas (m ha)	n.a.	182	210	53	248	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Land under improved management (m ha)	420	516	601	215	659	23%	43%	57%
Greenhouse Gas Emissions Mitigated (m tons CO <sub>2</sub> eq)	750	1,410	1,650	954	1,810	88%	120%	141%
Sustainable fisheries (m tons)	n.a.	3,340	3,900	n.a.	3,900	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Toxic chemicals reductions (thousand tons)	81	92	108	4.1	109	14%	33%	35%

Note: Precise definitions of each GEF-7 target indicator can be found in the note “*GEF-7 Programming Scenarios and Aggregated Results*”.

“n.a.” indicates that no individual target was established.

### More integrated programming

**12. The GEF-7 Programming Directions is seeking maximum impact across its focal areas through integrated programming, aligned with MEA guidance (Box 1).** The GEF2020 strategy argues that achieving the objectives of multilateral environmental agreements requires the GEF to support country priorities that are ultimately aimed at tackling the drivers of environmental degradation. For this reason, the focal areas, which remain the central organizing feature in the *GEF-7 Programming Directions*, provide countries with the opportunity to participate in selected “Impact Programs” focusing on (i) Food systems, Land Use and Restoration; (ii) Sustainable Cities; and (iii) Sustainable Forest Management. The Impact Programs are designed to help countries pursue holistic and integrated approaches for transformational change in these key systems in

line with countries’ national development priorities. The Impact Programs hold the potential to enhance synergies and integration across GEF focal areas, as illustrated in table 2 below. Impact programs will also allow the GEF to better crowd-in other stakeholders, including the private sector, enhance knowledge sharing and learning, and ensure a more effective use of GEF resources. They will help ensure that each of the GEF’s focal areas provides maximum contribution to the goals of their respective conventions as described in the GEF focal areas.

**Table 2. GEF-7 Programming Structure**

Focal Areas	Biodiversity	Climate Change	Land Degradation	International Waters	Chemicals and Waste
<b>Programming Areas to be addressed through Focal Areas Investments</b>					
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Biodiversity mainstreaming</li> <li>Global Wildlife Program</li> <li>Natural capital</li> <li>Agrobiodiversity</li> <li>Inclusive conservation</li> <li>Invasive species</li> <li>Protected areas</li> <li>Biosafety</li> <li>ABS</li> <li>Enabling Activities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Innovation and technology transfer for sustainable energy breakthroughs</li> <li>NDC preparation and implementation</li> <li>Capacity Building Initiative for Transparency</li> <li>Enabling Activities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Creating Enabling Environments for LDN</li> <li>LDN Target setting</li> <li>Enabling Activities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Strengthening Blue Economy Opportunities</li> <li>Improve Management in ABNJs</li> <li>Enhancing Water Security in Freshwater Ecosystems</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industrial Chemicals</li> <li>Agricultural Chemicals</li> <li>LDC/SIDS support</li> <li>Enabling Activities</li> </ul>
<b>Objectives to be addressed through Impact Programs that promote convention priorities</b>					
Food, Land Use, and Restoration Impact Program	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Manage biodiversity in production landscapes</li> <li>Harnessing biodiversity for sustainable agriculture</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Land-based and value chain GHG mitigation (<i>sequestration and avoidance</i>)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sustainable land management</li> <li>Diversification of crop and livestock systems</li> <li>Restoration of degraded production landscapes</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Replacement of POPs and relevant HHP’s used in the global food supply chain</li> <li>Disposal of obsolete agricultural chemicals that are POPs.</li> </ul>
Sustainable Cities Impact Program	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Integrating biodiversity and ecosystem values in urban planning</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Urban-related GHG emissions avoidance</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sustainable management of production systems in urban and per-urban areas</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Shared water ecosystems (fresh or marine) under new or improved cooperative management</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reduction of POPs, ODS, and Mercury in built infrastructure, industry and products and materials used in cities.</li> </ul>
Sustainable Forest Management Impact Program	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Protection of HCV forests</li> <li>Manage biodiversity in forest landscapes</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Protection of carbon-rich stocks</li> <li>Forest related GHG emissions avoidance</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sustainable management of dryland landscapes</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Shared water ecosystems (fresh or marine) under new or improved cooperative management</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Eliminate mercury in forests where ASGM that uses mercury occurs</li> </ul>

13. **Certain GEF focal area objectives are best pursued through discrete, single-focus interventions.** GEF support plays a critical role in supporting countries to translate MEA commitments into action. Consequently, each focal area also provides countries with the opportunity to pursue such interventions as best aligned with their priorities. The GEF will examine possibilities for also achieving multiple, cross-focal area benefits from these investments. For example, many interventions focusing on mainstreaming biodiversity would have climate-related benefits, as would many interventions in support of land degradation neutrality.



### **Box 1. GEF Programming Alignment with COP Guidance**

**Biodiversity.** The programming options included in the proposed Biodiversity Focal Area strategy respond directly to the GEF-7 Four-year Framework of Program Priorities agreed by countries at CBD COP-13, as well as the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity, 2011-2020. Specifically, the proposed Biodiversity Focal Area is built around achieving the Four-year Programs three objectives: (i) Mainstream Biodiversity Across sectors as Well as Within Production Landscapes and Seascapes, (ii) Reduce Direct Drivers of Biodiversity Loss, and (iii) Strengthen Biodiversity Policy and Institutional Frameworks. COP-13 explicitly recognized “the opportunities for synergy, inherent in the unique institutional design of the Global Environment Facility, with related multilateral environmental agreements”.

**Climate Change.** Participants at UNCCC COP22 encouraged alignment of GEF-7 programming with priorities identified in nationally determined contributions (NDCs) to the Paris Agreement. The GEF was also encouraged to continue to promote synergies across focal areas. The COP further requested the GEF to integrate the CBIT in GEF-7. In view of the GEF’s comparative advantage to foster innovative project designs, proven track record of support for technology transfer, and ability to attract private sector co-financing, the proposed GEF-7 Climate Change Focal Area is organized around the following objectives: (i) Promote Innovation and Technology Transfer for Sustainable Energy Breakthroughs, (ii) Demonstrate Mitigation Options with Systemic Impacts, and (iii) Foster Enabling Conditions for Mainstreaming Mitigation Concerns into Sustainable Development Strategies.

**Land Degradation.** Participants at UNCCD COP12 encouraged the GEF to provide support in line with the Convention’s Land Degradation Neutrality (LDN) concept, with a view to maintain or improve ecosystem services, land productivity, food security, and to increase the resilience of the land and the populations dependent on it. Moreover, the recent UNCCD COP 13 in Ordos encouraged “the GEF to continue and further enhance means to harness opportunities for leveraging synergies among the Rio Conventions and other relevant multilateral environmental agreements”. The proposed GEF-7 Land Degradation Focal Area seeks to achieve the following objectives: (i) Enhance on-the-ground Implementation of LDN, and (ii) Create an Enabling Environment to Support LDN Implementation Globally.

**Chemicals and Waste.** The Chemicals and Waste Focal area directly responds to the needs expressed by Participants at the 2017 BRS COP relating to the Stockholm Convention and by participants to Minamata Convention negotiations (the latter entered into force on August 16, 2017; COP-1 was held in end-September 2017), and responds to certain requests from Strategic Approach to International Chemicals Management (SAICM). Finally, it supports the compliance needs of countries with economies in transition to meet their obligations under the Montreal Protocol. The Chemicals and Waste Focal area focuses on eliminating chemicals covered by the above conventions that are used in or emitted from industrial and agricultural sectors.

**International Waters.** While not responding directly to a convention, the GEF International Focal Area fills a critical gap in the global management of transboundary water resources, both marine and freshwater. GEF IW interventions are built on initial assessment of threats and opportunities, through the so-called Transboundary Diagnostic Analyses, which are followed up by the development of regionally agreed Strategic Action Programs (SAPs). Aligned with SAPs, the objectives of the International Waters Focal Area are (i) strengthening Blue Economy Opportunities, (ii) Improving Governance in Areas Beyond National Jurisdiction (ABNJ), and (iii) Enhance Water Security in Freshwater Ecosystems

**Annex Table A1 National Currency, Status Quo, Increased Support Programming scenarios for GEF-7.**

	Scenarios								Change from Status Quo	
	National Currency				Status Quo		Increased Support		National Currency	Increased Support
	GEF-5	GEF-6	GEF-7	% Change From GEF-6	GEF-7	% Change From GEF-6	GEF-7	% Change From GEF-6		
<b>Biodiversity</b>	<b>1,210</b>	<b>1,296</b>	<b>1,234</b>	<b>-4.8%</b>	<b>1,412</b>	<b>9.0%</b>	<b>1,586</b>	<b>22.3%</b>	<b>-12.6%</b>	<b>12.3%</b>
STAR country allocations	968	1,051	968	-7.9%	1,123	6.8%	1,234	17.4%	-13.8%	10.0%
STAR set-aside	242	245	266	8.6%	290	18.2%	351	43.4%	-8.2%	21.3%
- <i>Enabling Activities</i>	60	13	50	284.6%	50	284.6%	50	284.6%	0.0%	0.0%
- <i>Integrated programming</i>	130	195	161	-17.4%	180	-7.9%	226	16.0%	-10.4%	25.9%
- <i>Global and regional programs</i>	52	37	55	48.6%	60	62.2%	75	102.7%	-8.3%	25.0%
<b>Climate Change</b>	<b>1,360</b>	<b>1,260</b>	<b>807</b>	<b>-36.0%</b>	<b>842</b>	<b>-33.2%</b>	<b>1,006</b>	<b>-20.2%</b>	<b>-4.2%</b>	<b>19.5%</b>
STAR country allocations	1,088	941	498	-47.1%	515	-45.3%	635	-32.5%	-3.3%	23.3%
STAR set-aside	272	319	309	-3.3%	327	2.6%	371	16.4%	-5.7%	13.5%
- <i>Enabling activities and CBIT</i>	80	130	180	38.5%	180	38.5%	180	38.5%	0.0%	0.0%
- <i>Integrated Programming</i>	100	130	109	-16.4%	127	-2.2%	171	31.8%	-14.6%	34.7%
- <i>Global and regional programs</i>	92	59	20	-66.1%	20	-66.1%	20	-66.1%	0.0%	0.0%
<b>Land Degradation</b>	<b>405</b>	<b>431</b>	<b>453</b>	<b>5.2%</b>	<b>532</b>	<b>23.4%</b>	<b>602</b>	<b>39.8%</b>	<b>-14.8%</b>	<b>13.3%</b>
STAR country allocations	324	346	338	-2.3%	394	13.8%	430	24.3%	-14.1%	9.2%
STAR set-aside	81	85	115	35.7%	138	62.5%	172	102.8%	-16.5%	24.8%
- <i>Enabling Activities</i>	15	15	25	66.7%	25	66.7%	25	66.7%	0.0%	0.0%
- <i>Integrated Programming</i>	20	60	65	8.9%	78	30.3%	112	87.4%	-16.4%	43.8%
- <i>Global and regional programs</i>	46	10	25	150.0%	35	250.0%	35	250.0%	-28.6%	0.0%
<b>Chemicals and Waste</b>	<b>425</b>	<b>554</b>	<b>669</b>	<b>20.8%</b>	<b>689</b>	<b>24.4%</b>	<b>745</b>	<b>34.5%</b>	<b>-2.9%</b>	<b>8.1%</b>
<b>International Waters</b>	<b>440</b>	<b>456</b>	<b>456</b>	<b>0.0%</b>	<b>456</b>	<b>0.0%</b>	<b>510</b>	<b>11.8%</b>	<b>0.0%</b>	<b>11.8%</b>
<b>Non-Grant Instruments Window</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>115</b>	<b>176</b>	<b>53.0%</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>73.9%</b>	<b>240</b>	<b>108.7%</b>	<b>-12.0%</b>	<b>20.0%</b>
<b>Corporate Programs</b>	<b>210</b>	<b>197</b>	<b>183</b>	<b>-7.1%</b>	<b>183</b>	<b>-7.1%</b>	<b>193</b>	<b>-2.0%</b>	<b>0.0%</b>	<b>5.5%</b>
- <i>Small Grants Program</i>	140	140	140	0.0%	140	0.0%	150	7.1%	0.0%	7.1%
- <i>Country Support Program</i>	26	23	23	0.0%	23	0.0%	23	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
- <i>Cross-Cutting Capacity Development</i>	44	34	20	-41.2%	20	-41.2%	20	-41.2%	0.0%	0.0%
<b>Corporate budgets: Secretariat, IEO, STAP and Trustees</b>	<b>120</b>	<b>125</b>	<b>153</b>	<b>22.4%</b>	<b>153</b>	<b>22.4%</b>	<b>153</b>	<b>22.4%</b>	<b>0.0%</b>	<b>0.0%</b>
- <i>Secretariat, STAP, Trustee</i>		106	128.5	21.2%	128.5	21.2%	128.5	21.2%	0.0%	0.0%
- <i>IEO</i>		19	24.5	28.9%	24.5	28.9%	24.5	28.9%	0.0%	0.0%
- <i>Forex Management</i>			n/a		n/a		n/a			
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>4,250</b>	<b>4,433</b>	<b>4,131</b>	<b>-6.8%</b>	<b>4,467</b>	<b>0.8%</b>	<b>5,035</b>	<b>13.6%</b>	<b>-7.5%</b>	<b>12.7%</b>

**Annex Table A2. Notional Impact Program Breakdown<sup>1</sup>**

	National Currency			Status Quo				Increased Support				
	STAR	Set-aside		STAR	Set-aside		Total	STAR	Set-aside		Total	
		Matching Incentives	Global / Regional		Matching Incentives	Global / Regional			Matching Incentives	Global / Regional		
<b>Impact Programs and Frontier Investments</b>												
<i>Food, Land Use and Restoration</i>	<b>280</b>	<b>140</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>455</b>	<b>310</b>	<b>155</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>500</b>	<b>350</b>	<b>175</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>560</b>
<i>Sustainable Cities</i>	<b>110</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>175</b>	<b>120</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>130</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>220</b>
<i>SFM for Major Biomes</i>	<b>130</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>225</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>255</b>	<b>180</b>	<b>90</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>300</b>
Amazon	50	25	10	85	60	30	10	100	70	35	10	115
Congo	30	15	10	55	30	15	10	55	40	20	10	70
Drylands	50	25	10	85	60	30	10	100	70	35	10	115
<b>Frontier Investments</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>170</b>
Green Finance	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	10	20	50
MEA/SDG Integration	0	0	0	0	20	10	0	30	20	10	0	30
Circular Economy	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40	20	30	90
<b>Total</b>	<b>520</b>	<b>260</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>855</b>	<b>600</b>	<b>300</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>985</b>	<b>740</b>	<b>370</b>	<b>140</b>	<b>1250</b>

1/ Final allocations for each Impact Program will be determined by country demand, and the line-item projections are therefore only indicative.

Annex Table A3. Notional Focal Area Breakdowns<sup>1</sup>

	Scenario			Change from Status Quo	
	National Currency	Status Quo	Increased Support	National Currency	Increased Support
<b>Biodiversity Focal Area</b>	<b>1234</b>	<b>1412</b>	<b>1586</b>	<b>-13%</b>	<b>12%</b>
<b>STAR Country Allocations</b>	<b>968</b>	<b>1123</b>	<b>1234</b>	<b>-14%</b>	<b>10%</b>
- Biodiversity Mainstreaming in Priority Sectors	240	275	310	-13%	13%
- Global Wildlife Program	112	155	160	-28%	3%
- Natural Capital Assessment and Accounting	30	30	40	0%	33%
- Sustainable Use of Genetic Resources	42	47	47	-11%	0%
- Prevention, Control and Management of Invasive and Alien Species	35	40	40	-13%	0%
- Strengthen the Global Protected Area Estate	220	247	250	-11%	1%
- Implement the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety	6	8	8	-25%	0%
- Implement the Nagoya Protocol on Access and Benefit Sharing	35	40	40	-13%	0%
- Impact Programs	248	281	339	-12%	21%
<b>STAR Set-aside</b>	<b>266</b>	<b>290</b>	<b>351</b>	<b>-8%</b>	<b>21%</b>
- Enabling Activities	50	50	50	0%	0%
- Integrated programming	161	180	226	-10%	26%
- Other global and regional programs	55	60	75	-8%	25%
<b>Climate Change Focal Area</b>	<b>807</b>	<b>842</b>	<b>1006</b>	<b>-4%</b>	<b>19%</b>
<b>STAR Country Allocations</b>	<b>498</b>	<b>515</b>	<b>635</b>	<b>-3%</b>	<b>23%</b>
- De-centralized Power With Energy Storage	101	100	140	1%	40%
- Electric Drive Technologies and Electric Mobility	110	88	100	25%	14%
- Accelerating Energy Efficiency Adoption	85	95	104	-11%	9%
- Cleantech Innovation	28	36	50	-22%	39%
- Impact Programs	174	196	241	-11%	23%
<b>STAR Set-aside</b>	<b>309</b>	<b>327</b>	<b>371</b>	<b>-6%</b>	<b>13%</b>
- Enabling Activities	120	120	120	0%	0%
- CBIT	60	60	60	0%	0%
- Integrated Programming	109	127	171	-15%	35%
- Other Global and Regional Programs	20	20	20	0%	0%
<b>Land Degradation Focal Area</b>	<b>453</b>	<b>532</b>	<b>602</b>	<b>-15%</b>	<b>13%</b>
<b>STAR Country Allocations</b>	<b>338</b>	<b>394</b>	<b>430</b>	<b>-14%</b>	<b>9%</b>
- Support on the Ground Implementation of LDN	168	180	180	-7%	0%
- Creating an enabling environment to support LDN	72	90	90	-20%	0%
- Impact Programs	98	124	160	-21%	29%
<b>STAR Set-aside</b>	<b>115</b>	<b>138</b>	<b>172</b>	<b>-17%</b>	<b>25%</b>
- Enabling Activities	25	25	25	0%	0%
- Integrated Programming	65	78	112	-16%	44%
- Other Global and Regional Programs	25	35	35	-29%	0%
<b>Chemicals and Waste Focal Area</b>	<b>669</b>	<b>689</b>	<b>745</b>	<b>-3%</b>	<b>8%</b>
- Stockholm	375	375	375	0%	0%
- Minamata	221	241	285	-8%	18%
- Montreal	25	25	25	0%	0%
- SAICM	13	13	25	0%	92%
- Enabling Activities Stockholm and Minamata	35	35	35	0%	0%
<b>International Waters</b>	<b>456</b>	<b>456</b>	<b>510</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>12%</b>
- Blue Economy Opportunities	231	231	245	0%	6%
- ABNJ	25	25	50	0%	100%
- Enhancing Water Security	200	200	215	0%	8%

1/ Final allocations within each focal area will be determined by country demand, and the line-item projections are therefore only indicative.