



Global Environment Facility

GEF/C.24/3
October 19, 2004

GEF Council
November 17-19, 2004

Agenda Item 7

REPORTING ON PERFORMANCE TARGETS TO BE ACHIEVED BY FALL 2004

Recommended Council Decision

The Council, having reviewed document GEF/C.24/3, *Reporting on Performance Targets to be Achieved by Fall 2004*, and taking into account the verification provided by the Office of Monitoring and Evaluation, determines that the GEF [has]/[has not] achieved the performance measures as noted in footnote to Attachment 1 of the Agreement to the third replenishment of the GEF Trust Fund.

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	1
Reporting on Achievements.....	1
The Choice of Indicators.....	2

Annexes

Annex 1	Performance Based Allocation Framework	3
Annex 2	Persistent Organic Pollutants	5
Annex 3	Biodiversity	7
Annex 4	Climate Change.....	20
Annex 5	International Waters.....	29
Annex 6	Ozone Depletion	33
Annex 7	Land Degradation.....	34

Introduction

1. In making its contribution to the third replenishment of the GEF Trust Fund, the United States made a contingent pledge of \$70 million. As noted in footnote f to Attachment 1 of the Replenishment Agreement, the pledge is contingent on the following:

“In addition to four annual installments of USD 107.5 million, the United States will provide USD 70 million in the final year of the replenishment upon achievement of the performance measures outlined in Schedule 1 to this Table. The achievement of such measures will be determined by the Council on the basis of verification by the Independent Monitoring and Evaluation Unit, and taking into account any unforeseen events or circumstance that may prevent their achievement.”

2. The Council is invited to review this paper with a view to determining whether the GEF has achieved the performance measures.

Reporting on Achievements

Table 1. Performance Measures & Achievements by the GEF in Fall 2004

Focal Area/Theme	Performance Measure	Achievement (FY03-04)
Performance-based Allocation System	The GEF will have in place an operational performance-based allocation system, as agreed in the GEF-3 replenishment report.	During FY03 and FY04, the Secretariat has presented the Council with various options to develop a resource allocation framework for the GEF. No consensus has emerged from these meetings regarding a framework, and Council will continue its review of options for an operational GEF Resource Allocation Framework at its meeting in November 2004.
Persistent Organic Pollutants	No less than 50 countries will be provided assistance to prepare national implementation plans that include an inventory of POPs stockpiles and set out an action plan for their reduction.	59 proposals for development of National Implementation Plan approved from FY03 to present.
Biodiversity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Projects projected to place at least 17 million additional hectares of land under improved management for conservation or protection will be approved. Projects will be approved to place under conservation no less than 7 million additional hectares of “productive” landscapes, including land around protected areas that are under productive use, but support habitats and ecosystems. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Projects projected to place 46 million additional hectares of land under improved management for conservation or protection have been approved. Projects have been approved to place under conservation 38 million hectares of “productive” landscapes, including land around protected areas that are under productive use, but support habitats and ecosystems.
Climate Change	Projects projected to avoid or sequester at least 200 million tons of greenhouse gas emission will be approved.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Projects approved in FY03 and FY04 are estimated to have direct GHG emission reductions of 181 million tons over their

Focal Area/Theme	Performance Measure	Achievement (FY03-04)
		investment lifetimes. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The same projects are conservatively estimated to have indirect GHG emission reductions of 409 million tons over the lifetime of the investments
International Waters	Projects will be approved to establish management frameworks in riparian countries for no fewer than two new transboundary waterbodies.	Projects approved to establish management frameworks in riparian countries in six new transboundary water bodies.
Ozone Depletion	Projects projected to phase out no fewer than 50 tons of methyl bromide and HCFCs will be approved.	Projects approved to phase-out 167 tons of methyl bromide approved.
Land Degradation	Projects will be approved to protect no less than 3 million additional hectares of land area from degradation.	Projects approved to place 17.06 million additional hectares of land under a sustainable land management regime

Details regarding each item in the above table can be found in the attached annexes.

The Choice of Indicators

3. The Secretariat and the Implementing Agencies have spent considerable time and resources developing methodologies, generating and collating information to report against the performance measures and to measure coverage and impact of the respective portfolios. It is recognized that these performance measures were derived from the programming paper that was prepared for purposes of the third replenishment of the GEF. Some focal areas have been relatively successful in tracking the targets. However, in others, the indicators, while seemingly appropriate at the macro-level, neither provide useful assessment of outcomes resulting from GEF projects nor serve as an incentive to achieve the strategic results towards which the GEF should be striving. The indicators and associated tools of assessment require ongoing refinement. The Secretariat will continue to improve both the means to measure achievement and impact at the portfolio level and the indicators themselves.

Annex 1: Performance Based Allocation System

Performance Based Allocation System

1. The policy recommendations agreed as part of the third replenishment of the GEF Trust fund provided with respect to a performance based allocation system for the following:

“Participants request the GEF Secretariat to work with the Council to establish a system for allocating scarce GEF resources within and among focal areas with a view towards maximizing the impact of these resources on global environmental improvements and promoting sound environmental policies and practices worldwide.

In this connection, Participants request the GEF Secretariat to prepare, in consultation with the Council, a paper for Council review and decision at its meeting in May 2003. A draft paper that can be used as a basis of consultation should be circulated to Council Members by February 1, 2003. The paper should propose an allocation system, for which implementation should be initiated immediately after a Council decision in May 2003, based on the core principles of selectivity, accountability, and results.

The system should establish a framework for allocation to global environmental priorities and to countries based on performance. Such a system would provide for varied levels and types of support to countries based on transparent assessments of those elements of country capacity, policies and practices most applicable to successful implementation of GEF projects. This system should ensure that all member countries can be informed as to how allocation decisions are made.”

2. In response to these recommendations, the GEF Secretariat has worked with the Council to establish a system for allocating GEF resources consistent with the policy recommendations. Although this work is not completed at this time, the following steps have been taken by the Secretariat and the Council to develop a performance based allocation system that generates consensus support from the Council.

3. The GEF Council has discussed the development of a resource allocation framework at its various meetings. The Council discussed GEF/C.21/8, *Issues Note: A Framework for Programming Resources for Enhanced Performance and Results at the Country Level* at the May 2003 meeting, and requested “the GEF Secretariat to establish and chair a working group of technical experts to prepare elements of a framework for GEF performance-based allocations for Council review and approval.”¹

¹ Joint Summary of the Chairs, GEF Council Meeting, May 14-16, 2003, para.18.

4. Based on nominations received from Council members, and other experts identified by the Secretariat, the CEO constituted a Technical Working Group that worked during August-October 2003 towards developing a resource allocation framework. The Group presented its final report GEF/C.22/11, *Performance-based Framework for Allocation of GEF Resources*, at the November 2003 meeting. The Council reviewed the report and requested the Secretariat to develop a GEF-wide system based on global environmental priorities and country-level performance relevant to those priorities. Further, the Council requested the Secretariat to present to the May 2004 Council meeting a study of options to strengthen the current system of allocating GEF resources with a view to coming to a conclusion in November 2004.²

5. At the May 2004 meeting, Council reviewed GEF/C.23/7, *Performance-based Framework for Allocation of GEF Resources*, and agreed that the GEF Secretariat convene a seminar in September 2004 with a view to advancing the Council's work. The Secretariat was requested to prepare a more elaborated document for the seminar, taking into full account the decision of the GEF Council at its Nov 2003 meeting.

6. A seminar was held in Paris during September 27-28, 2004, for which the Secretariat tabled a discussion paper, *GEF Resource Allocation Framework*. No consensus emerged on any of the three models for resource allocation that were presented in the paper. The seminar participants requested that the Secretariat present a paper to the Council for its review in November 2004 that will include options for a resource allocation framework reflecting the views presented at the seminar and at earlier Council meetings.

7. The Secretariat has submitted a document, GEF/C.24/8, *GEF Resource Allocation Framework*, for discussion at the November 2004 meeting.

² Joint Summary of the Chairs, GEF Council Meeting, November 2003.

Annex 2: Persistent Organic Pollutants

1. The performance target to be achieved for Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs) is that “no less than 50 countries will be provided assistance to prepare national implementation plans that include an inventory of POPs stockpiles and set out an action plan for their reduction.”
2. GEF’s initial support for implementation of the Stockholm Convention is focussing on enabling activities, assisting countries with preparation of National Implementation Plans (NIPs) required under Article 7 of the Stockholm Convention. A NIP will provide a framework for a country to develop and implement, in a systematic and participatory way, priority policy and regulatory reforms, capacity building, and investment programs on POPs. National implementation Plans include an assessment of the infrastructure to manage POPs, a preliminary inventory of the POPs imported, produced, emitted, used, exported or stockpiled in the country, as well as specific action plans for their minimisation or elimination.
3. In addition to the NIP program, a number of projects are under preparation or have been approved to support policy reforms and investments, as well as to demonstrate and promote the replication of alternative technologies and practices.
4. During GEF -3 so far, from Fiscal Year 03 to present, 59 proposals have been approved under expedited processing for POPs enabling activities. In addition, funding has been granted to two countries under the full project cycle. See Table 2.1 for list of approved enabling activities proposals from the GEF project database.

Table 2.1. POPs NIP proposals approved during GEF III to date (FY03-FY05)

Country	Project Status	Agency	FY approval	Country	Project Status	Agency	FY approval
Albania	expedited	UNDP	2004	Malawi	expedited	UNIDO	2003
Antigua & Barb	expedited	UNEP	2003	Marshall Islands	expedited	UNEP	2003
Argentina	expedited	UNEP	2003	Mauritius	expedited	UNDP	2003
Azerbaijan	expedited	UNIDO	2005	Mexico	expedited	World Bank	2004
Belarus	expedited	World Bank	2004	Monqolia	expedited	UNIDO	2003
Benin	expedited	UNEP	2003	Nauru	expedited	UNEP	2004
Botswana	expedited	UNIDO	2004	Nicaragua	expedited	UNDP	2004
Brazil	PDF-B	UNEP	2003	Niue	expedited	UNDP	2003
Burkina Faso	expedited	UNDP	2003	Oman	expedited	UNEP	2004
Burundi	expedited	UNIDO	2003	Pakistan	expedited	UNDP	2003
Cambodia	expedited	UNEP	2003	Palau	expedited	UNEP	2003
Cameroon	expedited	UNEP	2003	Paraguay	expedited	UNEP	2004
China	full project	UNIDO	2003	Peru	expedited	UNEP	2004
Comoros	expedited	UNDP	2004	Rwanda	expedited	UNIDO	2003
Cuba	expedited	UNEP	2004	Sao Tome & Prin	expedited	UNIDO	2003
Djibouti	expedited	UNIDO	2003	Senegal	expedited	UNEP	2003
Egypt	expedited	UNIDO	2003	Serbia & Monten	expedited	UNEP	2003
Ethiopia	expedited	UNIDO	2003	Seychelles	expedited	UNIDO	2003
Gabon	expedited	UNIDO	2003	South Africa	expedited	UNEP	2003
Georgia	expedited	UNDP	2003	St. Lucia	expedited	UNEP	2004
Guinea-Bissau	expedited	UNEP	2005	Sudan	expedited	UNDP	2003
Haiti	expedited	UNEP	2003	Syria	expedited	UNEP	2003
Honduras	expedited	UNDP	2004	Tajikistan	expedited	UNEP	2004
Jamaica	expedited	UNDP	2003	Thailand	expedited	UNEP	2003
Kiribati	expedited	UNEP	2003	Tonqa	expedited	UNEP	2003
Korea DPR	expedited	UNDP	2004	Turkey	expedited	UNIDO	2003
Kyrqyzstan	expedited	UNEP	2004	Ukraine	expedited	UNEP	2003
Latvia	expedited	UNDP	2003	Vanuatu	expedited	UNEP	2003
Liberia	expedited	UNIDO	2003	Venezuela	expedited	UNIDO	2003
Lithuania	expedited	UNDP	2003	Zimbabwe	expedited	UNEP	2003
Madaqascar	expedited	UNEP	2003				

Annex 3: Biodiversity

Introduction

1. The following biodiversity performance measures were identified in the replenishment agreement, Schedule 1 to Attachment 1, as targets to be achieved by Fall 2004: “Projects projected to place at least 17 million additional hectares of land under improved management for conservation or protection will be approved. In addition, projects will be approved to place under conservation no less than 7 million additional hectares of “productive” landscapes, including land around protected areas that are under productive use, but support habitats and ecosystems.”

2. This report places the targets within the context of the strategic priorities of the biodiversity focal area and describes the tools developed to track progress in achieving the targets both for Fall 2004 and for the entirety of GEF-3. Results are presented for FY 03 and FY 04 and a brief analysis discusses the application of the tools to track progress in achieving the performance measures at the portfolio level.

Strategic Priorities of the GEF Biodiversity Focal Area

3. The Strategic Priorities for the biodiversity focal area during GEF-3 were first fully articulated in the Business Plan that was approved at May Council 2003.³ The Strategic Priorities incorporate and respond to operational and technical recommendations from the Overall Performance Study Two (OPS2), project- and program-level monitoring and evaluation, issue-specific monitoring and evaluation studies, the guidance received from the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), and the targets identified in the replenishment agreement. When taken as a whole, the Strategic Priorities complement existing GEF policies, procedures and Operational Programs and build upon existing eligibility requirements while emphasizing specific areas where outcomes are actively sought.

4. The Strategic Priorities are comprised of:

- (a) Strategic Priority One: Catalyzing Sustainability of Protected Areas
- (b) Strategic Priority Two: Mainstreaming Biodiversity in Production Landscapes and Sectors
- (c) Strategic Priority Three: Capacity Building for the Implementation of the UN Convention on Biological Diversity Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety
- (d) Strategic Priority Four: Generation and Dissemination of Best Practices for Addressing Current and Emerging Biodiversity Issues.

³ http://www.gefweb.org/Documents/Council_Documents/GEF_C21/C21.Inf.11- Strategic_Business_Planning.pdf. (pp. 3-13).

5. In order for the GEF biodiversity portfolio to make the most effective contribution to the objectives of the CBD, the strategic emphasis of the portfolio is directed towards conserving and sustainably using biodiversity within protected areas and mainstreaming biodiversity in production landscapes and sectors (Strategic Priority One and Two, respectively). These two strategic priorities provide a flexible window to support the Work Programs of the CBD and reflect current thinking in the conservation community of the imperative to both secure the global protected area estate while integrating biodiversity considerations into those sectors that provide an opportunity for biodiversity conservation and sustainable use to develop and persist within more far-reaching socio-economic processes. In order to support these two main areas of investment, lessons learned from successes and failures in conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity are identified, disseminated and incorporated into future project design and implementation and this objective is supported through Strategic Priority Four. Strategic Priority Three responds to the recognition of the potential risks posed to biodiversity by living modified organisms and the high priority that recipient countries place on biosafety. This priority also responds to the guidance from the CBD and the Intergovernmental Committee for the Cartagena Protocol.

Tracking Performance of the GEF Biodiversity Focal Area

6. The GEF Secretariat has adopted standardized “tracking tools” and a systematic process to allow for portfolio level monitoring of progress against the coverage and impact indicators for Strategic Priority One and Two. The tracking tools have been developed through a consultative process that was led by the GEF Biodiversity Task Force and the Office of M&E and included external monitoring and evaluation experts who had experience in developing program and portfolio monitoring mechanisms.

7. The contributions of each project approved under GEF-3 to achieving the coverage and impact indicator targets is recorded through the use of the “tracking tools”. These tools were primarily developed to be used by the GEF Secretariat at the portfolio level as a monitoring tool. The tools are designed to be applied at three times during the project cycle: work program inclusion, and shortly after the mid-term and final evaluations. For Strategic Priority 1, the Tracking Tool, “Reporting Progress in Protected Areas”, as developed by World Bank/WWF Alliance for Forest Conservation and Sustainable Use, is used in conjunction with a section which provides GEF relevant background information. This tool provides useful information at the project level and the portfolio level given that it tracks trends towards improvement in protected area management that are easily rolled-up to the portfolio level. For Strategic Priority 2, the Tracking Tool, “Reporting Progress on Mainstreaming Biodiversity in Production Environments”, as developed by the GEF Secretariat, the GEF Biodiversity Task Force and the Office of M&E, is applied. This tool provides portfolio level information, however, the Task Force is still working on improving its applicability at the project level.

8. The replenishment targets are a sub-set of the targets established for the biodiversity focal area for GEF-3 as part of the Strategic Business Plan. Broader and more comprehensive coverage and impact indicators with targets were developed for the entire duration of the GEF-3 cycle and the biodiversity program is also tracking progress towards these broader targets. A full

report on the progress made in meeting this targets will be included as part of the programming document for GEF-4.

9. The application of the tracking tools represents the first time that the GEF has collected portfolio level data of this type in the biodiversity focal area. The results provided in Table 2.1 and Table 2.2 were derived from recording coverage data reported in the project documents when they entered into the work program. A number of operating assumptions were applied when recording the coverage data and, as a result, we expect that over the course of GEF-3 there will be some variance in the data on coverage as the tools are applied during the lifespan of the project.

10. For Strategic Priority One, (Catalyzing Sustainability of Protected Areas), the total number of hectares within the protected areas that are the focus of the project is the coverage number. No attempt has been made to amend this number based on the nature of the intervention in the protected area or in the protected area system, even though a project may include components and activities (public awareness, national policy development, site identification, etc.) that could be perceived as not being directly related to improved management of a specific site, per se, or that may be directed at systemic changes within a national system of protected areas. Our assumption is that all project activities included in an integrated project design are contributing--directly or indirectly-- to more effective protected area management within these projects. Only at the project final evaluation when the tracking tool is applied to measure trends in effective protected area management could a complete analysis be conducted.

11. Under Strategic Priority Two (Mainstreaming Biodiversity in Production Landscapes and Sectors), estimating coverage of hectares for projects in the production landscape can be difficult given that clear and neat boundaries of the production landscape may not exist, unlike with projects in Strategic Priority One (Catalyzing Sustainability of Protected Areas) where demarcated boundaries for protected areas are most often the norm. In addition, projects that focus on the conservation of land races or crop wild relatives, for example, may have as their first entry point target species and accurate coverage data may not be known until the final evaluation. Furthermore, some projects under Strategic Priority Two emphasize strengthening the capacity of institutions to mainstream biodiversity into their land management practices and policies. These management authorities may have responsibility for very large areas which may increase the coverage number in a way that is disproportionate to the impact that will be achieved during the actual lifespan of the project.

12. In recording data for coverage for Strategic Priority Two Projects, as was done under Strategic Priority One, the total number of hectares covered under the intervention as reported in the project documents and the tracking tool was recorded. In addition, for capacity building and institutional strengthening projects that involved land management entities responsible for areas that were the focus of the project, coverage numbers reflect the land and resources under their management responsibility. However, we acknowledge that the situations described above may be a source of variance in the final coverage number reported by projects and that this variance will not be resolved until after the final evaluation is conducted.

13. Virtually all projects that were analyzed have implicit or explicit replication strategies. The vast majority of projects did not assume successful replication when reporting coverage numbers, thus, only at the final evaluation will the tracking tools be able to report accurate coverage data that reflects the success (or failure) of replication. In addition, replication may occur after a project formally closes and mechanisms do not yet exist to capture this coverage information that could result in under-reporting.

14. Finally, for both Strategic Priorities, there are also a few data gaps that must be filled during project implementation and these are identified in Table 2.2.

15. Thus, it is likely that over the course of the remaining years of GEF-3 the coverage numbers will vary as new data is collected and initial data is verified during the mid-term and final evaluations to ensure the best possible accuracy. Regardless of this potential variance which may marginally increase or decrease coverage numbers, we are confident that the two coverage indicators reported on in this document for Strategic Priority One and Two in GEF-3 (per the business plan) will be met.

16. In closing, the tracking tools are best thought of as a work in progress that will require refinement through an iterative process of application, reflection and analysis throughout GEF-3. In addition, experience is still being gained in applying these tools in an integrated way with other M&E reporting exercises to maximize efficiency while adding value at the project level.

Results

17. The GEF Biodiversity Portfolio has **exceeded** the biodiversity performance measures to be achieved by Fall 2004 as specified in the replenishment agreement.

- (a) Projects projected to place 46,080,334 additional hectares of land under improved management for conservation or protection have been approved. Given that the replenishment target was set at 17 million hectares the achievement percentage of the portfolio is 271% for this target.
- (b) Projects have been approved to place under conservation 38,968,527 hectares of “productive” landscapes, including land around protected areas that are under productive use, but support habitats and ecosystems. Given that the replenishment target was set at 7 million hectares the achievement percentage is 557% for this target.

18. Table 3.1 presents results on achievement of the two biodiversity performance measures that were to be met by Fall 2004 (replenishment targets) and includes data from FY 03 and FY 04. Table 3.2 presents a summary of the data collected on a per-project basis.

Table 3.1. Report on Biodiversity Performance Measures for Fall 2004

Strategic Priority	Biodiversity Performance Measures to be Achieved by Fall 2004 (per replenishment agreement)	Cumulative Results for FY 03 and 04	Achievement Percentage
Strategic Priority One: Catalyzing Sustainability of Protected Areas	Projects projected to place at least 17 million additional hectares of land under improved management for conservation or protection will be approved.	46,080,334 hectares	271%
Strategic Priority Two: Mainstreaming Biodiversity in Production Landscapes and Sectors	Projects will be approved to place under conservation no less than 7 million additional hectares of “productive” landscapes, including land around protected areas that are under productive use, but support habitats and ecosystems.	38,968,527 hectares	557%

Table 3.2 Per Project Coverage for Strategic Priority One (Protected Areas) and Strategic Priority Two (Production Environment) for FY 03 and FY 04

GEF_ID	Country	Project Title	Type	FY	OP	SP	Target for Strategic Priority One - Protected Areas (hectares)	Target for Strategic Priority Two - Production Environment (hectares)
1312	Argentina	Management and Conservation of Wetland Biodiversity in the Esteros del Ibera	MSP	2003		2 1	1,300,000	⁴ N/A
1852	Bhutan	Linking and Enhancing Protected Areas in the Temperate Broadleaf Forest Ecoregion of Bhutan (LINKPA)	MSP	2003		3, 4 1,2	351,000	38,500
1794	Bolivia	Removing Obstacles to Direct Private-Sector Participation in In-situ Biodiversity Conservation	MSP	2003		3, 4 1,2	7,500	2,000
1642	Brazil	Formoso River -- Integrated Watershed Management and Protection	MSP	2003		3, 2 2	N/A	Information not available
1042	Bulgaria	Conservation of Globally Significant Biodiversity in the Landscape of Bulgaria's Rhodope Mountains	FP	2003		4 1,2	650,000	N/A
1183	Cambodia	Tonle Sap Conservation Project	FP	2003		2 1,2	282,742	220,360
1124	Cape Verde	Integrated Participatory Ecosystem Management In and Around Protected Areas, Phase I	FP	2003		1 1,2	17,388	Information not available
1125	Chad	Conservation and Sustainable Use of Biodiversity in the Moyen-Chari	FP	2003		1 1	114,000	N/A
1128	China	Biodiversity Management in the Coastal Area of China's South Sea	FP	2003		2 1	535,659	N/A
1750	China	Lake Dianchi Freshwater Biodiversity Restoration Project	MSP	2003		2 1,2	300	30,000

⁴ N/A means not applicable. An SP 1 project will not report coverage in hectares for the Production Environment and an SP 2 project will not report coverage in hectares for Protected Areas.

GEF_ID	Country	Project Title	Type	FY	OP	SP	Target for Strategic Priority One - Protected Areas (hectares)	Target for Strategic Priority Two - Production Environment (hectares)
1876	Colombia	Naya Biological Corridor in the Munchique-Pinche Sector	MSP	2003	3, 4	1,2	224,329	140,788
1713	Costa Rica	Improved Management and Conservation Practices for the Cocos Island Marine Conservation Area	MSP	2003	2	1	12,120	N/A
1024	Global	Ecosystems, Protected Areas and People	MSP	2003	1, 2, 3, 4	4	N/A	N/A
1139	Guinea	Conservation of the Biodiversity of the Nimba Mountains through Integrated and Participatory Management	FP	2003	4	1,2	21,780	123,420
1221	Guinea-Bissau	Coastal and Biodiversity Management Project	FP	2003	2	1,2	185,398	101,230
1628	India	Capacity Building for Implementation of the Cartagena Protocol	FP	2003	EA	3	N/A	N/A
1438	Jordan	Conservation and Sustainable Use of Biodiversity in Dibeen Nature Reserve	MSP	2003	1, 3	1	6,000	N/A
1184	Jordan	Conservation of Medicinal and Herbal Plants	FP	2003	1, 13	2	N/A	21,500
1148	Kazakhstan	In-Situ Conservation of Kazakhstan's Mountain Agrobiodiversity	FP	2003	13	1,2	2,100,000	5,100
1707	Lebanon	Integrated Management of Cedar Forests in Lebanon in Cooperation with other Mediterranean Countries	MSP	2003	3	1,2	150	450
1200	Lithuania	Conservation of Inland Wetland Biodiversity	FP	2003	2	2	N/A	38,366
1929	Madagascar	Participatory Community-based Conservation in the Anjozorobe Forest Corridor	MSP	2003	4	2	N/A	20,000
1099	Maldives	Atoll Ecosystem-based Conservation of Globally Significant Biological Diversity in the Maldives' Baa Atoll	FP	2003	2	1,2	Information not available	120,000

GEF_ID	Country	Project Title	Type	FY	OP	SP	Target for Strategic Priority One - Protected Areas (hectares)	Target for Strategic Priority Two - Production Environment (hectares)
2078	Mexico	Consolidation of the Protected Area System (SINAP II) - Second Tranche	FP	2003	1, 2, 3, 4	1	3,313,417	N/A
1611	Mongolia	Developing a Model Conservation Programme-Conservation of the Gobi Desert Using Wild Bactrian Camels as an "Umbrella Species".	MSP	2003		1 1,2	4,420,000	1,800,000
1859	Mongolia	Conservation of the Eg-Uur Watershed	MSP	2003		2 2	N/A	3,480,000
1107	Nepal	Landscape Level Biodiversity Conservation in Nepal's Western Terai Complex	FP	2003		3, 13 1,2	173,300	173,300
1721	Pakistan	Conservation of habitats and species of global significance in Arid and Semi-arid Ecosystems in Balochistan	MSP	2003		1 1	360,000	Information not available
1489	Paraguay	Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Use in the Mbaracayu Natural Reserve	MSP	2003		3 1,2	64,400	Information not available
957	Peru	Conservation and Sustainable Use of Biodiversity in the Amaraeri Communal Reserve and Adjoining Indigenous Lands	MSP	2003		3 1	577,014	N/A
1101	Peru	Participatory Management of Protected Areas	FP	2003		2, 3, 4 1	2,071,814	N/A
1485	Peru	Poison Dart Frog Ranching to Protect Rainforest and Alleviate Poverty	MSP	2003		3 1,2	12,000	3,000
1259	Regional (Armenia, Bolivia, Madagascar, Sri Lanka, Uzbekistan)	In-situ Conservation of Crop Wild Relatives through Enhanced Information Management and Field Application	FP	2003		13, 4 2	N/A	N/A
1604	Regional (Bahamas, Dominican Republic, Jamaica)	Sustainable Conservation of Globally Important Caribbean Bird Habitats: Strengthening a Regional Network for a Shared Resource	MSP	2003		2, 1, 3, 4 1,2	N/A	N/A
1216	Regional (Benin, Burkina Faso, Cote d'Ivoire, Mali, Niger)	Building Scientific & Technical Capacity for Effective Management & Sustainable Use of Dryland Biodiversity in West African Biosphere Reserves	FP	2003		1 1,2	3,159,037	2,940,963

GEF_ID	Country	Project Title	Type	FY	OP	SP	Target for Strategic Priority One - Protected Areas (hectares)	Target for Strategic Priority Two - Production Environment (hectares)
1097	Regional (China, Iran, Kazakhstan, Russian Federation)	Development of a Wetland Site and Flyway Network for Conservation of the Siberian Crane and Other Migratory Waterbirds in Asia	FP	2003		2 2	4,379,633	N/A
1694	Regional (Kazakhstan, Uzbekistan, Turkmenistan, Tajikistan, Kyrgyzstan)	Development of the Econet for Long-term Conservation of Biodiversity in the Central Asia Ecoregions	MSP	2003		1, 4 4	N/A	N/A
1589	Regional (Mozambique, Zambia, Zimbabwe)	Integrated Management of Dryland Biodiversity through Land Rehabilitation in the Arid and Semi-Arid Regions of Mozambique, Zambia and Zimbabwe	FP	2003		1, 12 1,2	700,000	5,350,000
1161	Russian Federation	Conservation and Sustainable Use of Wild Salmonid Biological Diversity in Russia's Kamchatka Peninsula, Phase I	FP	2003		13, 2 2	N/A	Information not available
1163	Russian Federation	An Integrated Ecosystem Management Approach to Conserve Biodiversity and Minimize Habitat Fragmentation in Three Selected Model Areas in the Russian Arctic (ECORA)	FP	2003		3, 2, 12 1,2,4	3,905,296	6,972,136
1471	Seychelles	Improving Management of NGO and Privately Owned Nature Reserves and High Biodiversity Islands in Seychelles	MSP	2003		2 2	N/A	123
1681	Slovak Republic	Conservation, Restoration and Wise Use of Calcareous Fens	MSP	2003		4, 2 1	659	N/A
1055	South Africa	Agulhas Biodiversity Initiative (ABI)	FP	2003		1 1,2	84,000	28,000
1782	South Africa	Richtersveld Community Biodiversity Conservation Project	MSP	2003		1 1,2	162,962	Information not available
1516	South Africa	C.A.P.E. Biodiversity and Sustainable Development Project	FP	2003		1, 2, 4, 3 1,2	108,000	400,000
1168	Swaziland	Biodiversity Conservation and Participatory Development Project	FP	2003		1, 3 1,2	Information not available	480,000

GEF_ID	Country	Project Title	Type	FY	OP	SP	Target for Strategic Priority One - Protected Areas (hectares)	Target for Strategic Priority Two - Production Environment (hectares)
1169	Syria	Biodiversity Conservation and Protected Area Management	FP	2003		1 1	60,000	N/A
1296	Vietnam	The Green Corridor	MSP	2003		3 2	N/A	134,000
1943	Vietnam	Integrating Watershed and Biodiversity Management in Chu Yang Sin National Park	MSP	2003		3 1	59,278	N/A
969	Zambia	Securing the Environment for Economic Development (SEED)	FP	2003		1, 3 1,2	2,246,600	3,530,400
1907	Afghanistan	Natural Resources and Poverty Alleviation Project	MSP	2004		1, 2, 3, 4 1,2	183,629	Information not available
1234	Benin	Community-based Coastal and Marine Biodiversity Management Project	FP	2004		2 1,2	139,100	550,000
1888	Bulgaria	Forest Development Project	FP	2004		3 1,2	192,000	1,308,000
1043	Cambodia	Establishing Conservation Areas Landscape Management (CALM) in the Northern Plains	FP	2004		3 2	N/A	300,000
1063	Cameroon	Forestry and Environmental Sector Adjustment Credit (FESAC)	FP	2004		1, 2, 3, 4 1,2,4	1,860,000	176,000
1236	Chile	Conserving Globally Significant Biodiversity along the Chilean Coast	FP	2004		2 1	130,031	N/A
1458	Georgia	Recovery, Conservation and Sustainable Use of Georgia's Agrobiodiversity	MSP	2004		13 2	N/A	N/A
1733	Guatemala	Consolidating a System of Municipal Regional Parks (MRPs) in Guatemala's Western Plateau	MSP	2004		3, 4 1,2	9,315	5,944
1273	Guinea	Coastal Marine and Biodiversity Management	FP	2004		2 1,2	86,001	30,000

GEF_ID	Country	Project Title	Type	FY	OP	SP	Target for Strategic Priority One - Protected Areas (hectares)	Target for Strategic Priority Two - Production Environment (hectares)
1515	Honduras	Consolidation of Ecosystem Management and Biodiversity Conservation of the Bay Islands	FP	2004		2 1	26,280	N/A
1145	Iran	Conservation of Iranian Wetlands	FP	2004		2 1	515,800	N/A
1045	Latvia	Biodiversity Protection in North Vidzeme Biosphere Reserve	FP	2004		2 1,2	18,440	322,560
1884	Madagascar	Third Environment Programme (EPIII)	FP	2004		1, 2, 3 1,2	2,080,000	1,000,000
1176	Malaysia	Conservation of Biological Diversity through Improved Forest Planning Tools	FP	2004		3 4	N/A	N/A
1201	Malaysia	Conserving Marine Biodiversity through Enhanced Marine Park Management and Inclusive Sustainable Island Development	FP	2004		2 1	164,534	N/A
1152	Mali	Biodiversity Conservation and Participatory Sustainable Management of Natural Resources in the Inner Niger Delta and its Transition Areas, Mopti Region	FP	2004		1, 2, 12, 13, 15 1,2	162,000	2,500,000
1246	Mauritius	Partnerships for Marine Protected Areas in Mauritius	MSP	2004		2 1	3,000	N/A
1100	Mongolia	Community-based Conservation of Biological Diversity in the Mountain Landscapes of Mongolia's Altai Sayan Ecoregion	FP	2004		4 2	N/A	200,000
1257	Pakistan	Protection and Management of Pakistan Wetlands	FP	2004		2 2	N/A	Information not available
1446	Peru	Conservation and Sustainable Use of Biodiversity in the Peruvian Amazon by the Indigenous Ashaninka Population	MSP	2004		3 1,2	300,000	360,000
1061	Peru	Inka Terra: An Innovative Partnership for Self-Financing Biodiversity Conservation & Community Development	MSP	2004		3 2	N/A	10,000

GEF_ID	Country	Project Title	Type	FY	OP	SP	Target for Strategic Priority One - Protected Areas (hectares)	Target for Strategic Priority Two - Production Environment (hectares)
1204	Regional (Antigua And Barbuda, Dominica, Grenada, St. Kitts And Nevis, St. Vincent and Grenadines, St. Lucia)	OECS Protected Areas and Associated Sustainable Livelihoods	FP	2004		2,1,2,4	4,750	715
1095	Regional (Cameroon, Congo, Gabon)	Conservation of Transboundary Biodiversity in the Minkebe-Odzala-Dja Interzone in Gabon, Congo, and Cameroon	FP	2004		3, 1,2	3,596,800	Information not available
1258	Regional (Estonia, Hungary, Lithuania, Mauritania, Niger, Nigeria, Senegal, Gambia, South Africa, Tanzania, Yemen, Turkey)	Enhancing Conservation of the Critical Network of Sites of Wetlands Required by Migratory Waterbirds on the African/Eurasian Flyways.	FP	2004		2, 1,4	1,431,358	469,671
1092	Regional (Guatemala, Belize, Honduras, El Salvador, Nicaragua, Costa Rica, Panama)	Integrated Ecosystem Management in Indigenous Communities	FP	2004		3, 4, 2	N/A	1,790,000
1091	Regional (Latin America and Caribbean)	Building the Inter-American Biodiversity Information Network (IABIN)	FP	2004		1, 2, 3, 4, 4	N/A	N/A
1916	Regional (Philippines, Indonesia)	Marine Aquarium Market Transformation Initiative (MAMTI)	FP	2004		2, 2	7,800	39,000
1098	Republic Of Korea	Conservation of Globally Significant Wetlands	FP	2004		2, 2	N/A	Information not available
1068	Russian Federation	Conservation of Wetland Biodiversity in the Lower Volga Region	FP	2004		2, 1	448,000	N/A
1177	Russian Federation	Biodiversity Conservation in the Altai-Sayan Mountain Ecoregion	FP	2004		4, 1	900,000	N/A
1189	Senegal	Integrated Marine and Coastal Resource Management	FP	2004		2, 1,2	388,720	77,700

GEF_ID	Country	Project Title	Type	FY	OP	SP	Target for Strategic Priority One - Protected Areas (hectares)	Target for Strategic Priority Two - Production Environment (hectares)
1734	Tanzania	The Development and Management of the Selous-Niassa Wildlife Corridor	MSP	2004		3 1	15,000	N/A
2151	Tanzania	Novel Forms of Livestock & Wildlife Integration Adjacent to Protected Areas in Africa	MSP	2004		1 2	N/A	3,500,000
1491	Tanzania	Lalkisale Biodiversity Conservation Support Project	MSP	2004		1 2	N/A	59,609
1174	Tunisia	Gulf of Gabes Marine and Coastal Resources Protection	FP	2004		2 1,2	Information not available	Information not available
1538	Uruguay	Integrated Natural Resources and Biodiversity Management	FP	2004		13 2	N/A	Information not available
1682	Vanuatu	Facilitating and Strengthening the Conservation Initiatives of Traditional Landholders and their Communities to Achieve Biodiversity Conservation Objectives	MSP	2004		2 1	Information not available	N/A
1030	Vietnam	Making the Link: The Connection and Sustainable Management of Kon Ka Kinh and Kon Cha Rang Nature Reserves	MSP	2004		3, 12 1,2	102,000	95,192
1031	Vietnam	Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Use of the Marine Resources at Con Dao National Park	MSP	2004		2 1,2	20,000	20,500
1356	Vietnam	Forest Sector Development Project	FP	2004		3, 4 1	1,630,000	N/A
						Total	46,080,334	38,968,527

Annex 4: Climate Change

Introduction

1. As part of the GEF Replenishment Agreement, performance targets (Schedule 1, Attachment 1) were established for the Climate Change focal area that requires that “Projects projected to avoid or sequester at least 200 million tons of greenhouse gas (carbon dioxide equivalents) emissions will be approved.”

2. In order to assess this indicator in a robust, consistent and transparent manner, a methodology was developed to estimate the greenhouse gas (GHG) emission reductions from the various projects approved in the GEF climate change focal area. Through an iterative process of collaboration with the Implementing Agencies, a methodology for estimating GHG savings that is particularly appropriate to the unique nature of GEF projects was developed. The methodology is summarized below, followed by a brief discussion of the results. The table in Annex I summarizes the results for each project. In addition, a separate note detailing the specific information, assumptions, and calculations used for each project has been prepared and submitted to the GEF Office of Monitoring and Evaluation for the validation exercise.

Scope of the exercise

3. The analysis includes all full and medium size projects approved in the climate change focal area during the period including fiscal years 2003 and 2004. The projects included in the analysis were approved under Operational Programs 5, 6, and 7 or as STRM. Annex 1 lists all projects included in the estimation.

4. Multi-focal area projects—in which carbon mitigation plays a minor role—like the Small Grants Program (UNDP), the Technology Transfer Networks (UNEP), or the Environmental Business Finance Program (World Bank/IFC) have not been included due to the lack of clarity of their project design with respect to the achievement of GHG savings. Although two transportation projects were approved under OP 11 during the two years under review, the limited experience with consistent methodologies made it impossible to obtain results that were consistent and credible. As a result, these projects were not included in the final presentation of results. A greater number of transportation projects will have to be developed and used to test the methodology for consistency before they can be included in any such evaluations. Projects approved under other focal areas, including biodiversity, international waters, and land degradation were excluded from the analysis even though they may also have significant GHG benefits. As estimating GHG benefits from LULUCF-related activities remains controversial because of global assumptions about permanence, no definitive methodology for these projects has been developed. If the methodological questions would be resolved and the estimates included, the inclusion of carbon benefits from the projects in these other areas would have increased dramatically the final estimates obtained.

Methodology

5. The methodology developed for this exercise provides—for the first time—a consistent and transparent framework for the analysis of GHG emission reductions from GEF interventions. Because GEF projects place a heavy emphasis on capacity building, innovation and catalytic action for replication, the methodology was designed to distinguish between the direct GHG savings of a project (ie., those caused by outputs of the projects in the form of investments) and the indirect GHG savings (ie., those caused by the long-term outcomes of the barrier removal activities of the GEF interventions). Investments under GEF projects have direct impacts on the CO₂ emissions of a country, and these can clearly be attributed to the project's and the portfolio's performance. But, given the GEF's unique mission focusing on long-term, strategic and catalytic interventions, including only these direct effects is insufficient. It is also necessary to estimate the likely impacts of those strategic GEF activities that build capacity, improve the enabling environment for future investments, and stimulate replication. These impacts are referred to as the “indirect” GHG savings. As these two measures have vastly different levels of uncertainty and accuracy, it is not considered appropriate to view a project's overall performance measure as a sum of the two types of savings. The direct GHG reductions are monitored under a projects' M&E plans, but the indirect GHG reductions are projections into the medium-term future. Their estimation relies heavily upon expert judgement. Therefore, for the sake of clarity and transparency, it seems appropriate to report separately on the two figures and not aggregate them formally in this exercise, as has been standing practice in the past. Furthermore, to reduce the impact of the assessment uncertainties, the methodology uses two different approaches to estimating indirect effects with the result that a range of likely indirect effects rather than a single number is estimated.

Estimation of Direct Effects

6. Direct emission reductions are calculated by assessing the fuel savings attributable to the investments made during the project's supervised implementation period. Annual average fuel savings are summed over the respective lifetime of the investments. All CO₂ savings resulting from investments made within the boundaries of a project—either using GEF resources or the resources contributed by co-financiers and tracked through M&E systems—will be counted toward a project's direct effects. In order to avoid problems with shifting baselines and penalizing countries with significant pre-existing power generation based on renewable energies, the marginal power-generation technology and its emission factor are used to determine what fuel is saved, and to convert energy services into CO₂ equivalents. Projects are expected to explore the characteristics of the power sector, the emission factors, the markets to be transformed, and the lifetime of the investments during their PDF-B phase so that the project briefs should contain the necessary documentation. In a few cases where data on the marginal technology were unavailable, the average emission factors were utilized to calculate the CO₂ savings.

7. GEF projects frequently put in place mechanisms that will still be operational after the supervised lifetime of the project, such as revolving funds, partial credit guarantee facilities, or other risk mitigation mechanisms. Such mechanisms facilitate investments yielding CO₂

reductions, which can, in turn, be quantified using the same methodology as was used for the direct investments. However, these effects fall outside the framework of normal project monitoring systems, which end when the project terminates. To account for these savings, the methodology has been developed to calculate them separately as “direct post-project” emission reductions. Although the same assumptions on investment lifetimes and emission factors are used as in the case of direct emission reductions, the nature of the direct post-project emissions dictates that conservative assumptions are used for leakage rates and effectiveness of the financial instruments.

Estimation of Indirect Effects

8. The methodology used to account for indirect GHG benefits of a project limits the scope of the calculations to include only impacts within the same country or region, and to an “influence period” limited to ten years following the project’s completion. Again, projects must document the estimated market development and long-term impacts of their intervention during project preparations. Project briefs are therefore expected to contain the data required to complete the estimation. For the assessment of the indirect effects, two different paths were followed yielding two different estimates of indirect project effects.⁵ The first one—referred to as “bottom-up”—requires an expert judgment on the likely effectiveness of a project’s demonstration and triggering effects in order to assess how many times a successful investments under the project might be replicated. Most implementing agency proponents demonstrate a reasonable understanding of the opportunities for replication within a country, and can give a well-informed assessment of this effect. In order to minimize the risk of exaggerated project expectations, the methodology suggests conservative default proxies for the replication effects. As used to date, this “bottom-up” assessment has resulted mostly in a low estimate of the value for indirect CO₂ emission reductions.

9. The second—or “top-down” approach—can be used to achieve a higher limit for the range of likely indirect GHG benefits from a project. This figure is assessed by estimating the technical and economic market potential for the technology within the 10 years after the project’s lifetime. In reality, additional market barriers may emerge to prevent the achievement of the total potential, or proponents may use a estimation period of longer than 10 years. In such cases, conservative expert judgement was used to correct these potentials downward to a more realistic level. However, including the maximum realizable market size into the assessment of GEF GHG impacts implies that there would be no baseline changes over considerable periods of time without the GEF intervention, and that all emission reductions in that sector can be attributed entirely to the GEF project. Clearly, both of these assumptions are unlikely to hold. Therefore, the assessment contains a second correction factor, the “GEF causality factor,” that expresses the degree to which the GEF intervention can take credit for these improvements. This causality factor is used to finalize the “top-down” estimate for the indirect benefits, which can be viewed as typically providing the upper limit of the range of indirect GHG benefits.

⁵ This approach of using “top-down” and “bottom-up” approaches to estimating indirect GHG benefits of a project is analogous to the “top-down” and “bottom-up” approaches used in estimating national GHG inventories.

Data and documentation

10. Table 4.1 summarizes the assessments of direct impacts, the range of indirect impacts, and the most important assumptions for each project included in this analysis. As this is the first time that guidelines are given for the assessment of CO₂ emission reduction effects of GEF interventions, some of the results included in project documentation have been adjusted in order to maintain strict adherence to the methodological guidelines. In particular, the assessment of indirect impacts and the accounting for the lifetime of the investments have not been handled in a consistent and comparable manner across the portfolio. A separate note is available from the GEF Secretariat that explains the methodology, the assumptions, and the calculations in more detail for each of the projects included in this analysis. Due to data limitations, both indirect methodologies could not always be calculated for all projects. In such cases, the indirect estimate is drawn from that measure that could be calculated. In cases where two similar projects were approved in the same country, efforts were made to avoid possible double-counting by excluding either the direct or indirect or both the direct and indirect effects of one of the projects. Notes in the table indicate where this has been done. For future assessments, the methodology will be reviewed, clarified and published as a guide for project proponents in order to ensure consistency and comparability between all future assessments.

Summary of results

11. The performance measure for the Climate Change portfolio in Fiscal Years 2003 and 2004 was established such that projects should be approved that are expected to avoid or sequester at least 200 million tons of greenhouse gases (measured in tons of CO₂ equivalent). While the basis for this number was a rapid approximation of past direct and indirect GHG impacts of the GEF portfolio, the methodology used here refines this approach and distinguishes between different types of emission reduction that can be attributable to a given GEF project. Using this methodology, the projects approved in FY03 and FY04 are estimated to have **direct** GHG emission reductions of **181 million tons** over their investment lifetimes. Those same projects are conservatively estimated to have **indirect** GHG emission reductions of **409 million tons** over the lifetime of the investments, using the “bottom-up” approach. Using the less conservative “top-down” approach, the projects are estimated to lead to indirect GHG emission reductions of up to **1.86 billion tons**, making the range for indirect effects anywhere **between 409 million and 1.86 billion tons of CO₂ equivalent**. Based upon the more conservative, lower end of the estimate, the GEF Secretariat considers that the performance target established in the replenishment agreement has been met.

12. A quick reading of the attached table reveals that over 100 of the 180 million direct tons of CO₂ equivalent avoided through these projects are jointly attributable to two projects in China: the China EUEEP Phase 1 project of UNDP and the Heat Reform and Building Energy Efficiency Project of the World Bank. These two GEF projects together comprehensively address the two of the sectors with the largest GHG emissions within the country —industry and buildings—using an extremely cost-effective approach relying upon sector reform and capacity building to create a policy framework establishing standards for energy efficiency in buildings, heating systems, and industry. Both the direct and indirect savings were estimated in the most

conservative manner possible, in keeping with the established methodology. To avoid any possibility of double-counting within the current exercise, all of the benefits attributable to the complementary World Bank Heat Reform and Building Energy Efficiency project have not been counted towards the total. A separate annex addressing the details of this estimation can be made available on request.

13. Some observations are in order to put this high figure achieved within this set of projects into proper context. China is home to one sixth of the world's population; it has experienced rapid economic growth; and it has also demonstrated further growth in its energy consumption. China is currently the second largest emitter of greenhouse gases on the planet. All of these factors serve to highlight that these two interventions are unique in scope and scale. It is unlikely that other opportunities for projects of this magnitude could be found to exist anywhere else in GEF eligible countries.

Table 4.1: Projects included in this analysis and their emission savings

46 energy-related FSPs and MSPs approved in FY03-04					Direct Effects (lifetime + post-project)	Range of total indirect reductions projected over the 10-yr influence period		Remarks
					Total Direct Effects	Lower limit	Upper limit	
IA	GEF ID	Type	Country	Brief title				
UNDP	1116	FSP	Armenia	Energy Efficiency	700,000	2,100,000	3,560,000	
UNDP	1198	FSP	Belarus	Biomass	2,160,000	6,480,000	7,160,000	
UNDP	1235	FSP	Botswana	Rural electrification	26,000	52,000	117,200	
WB	2117	FSP	Bulgaria	Energy Efficiency Financing (BEEF)	14,700,000	10,290,000	16,520,000	
UNDP	1892	FSP	China	EUEEP Phase 1	111,300,000	223,000,000	1,512,000,000	Overlap with World Bank Heat Reform investment project. CO2 impact from Heat Reform project is subsumed here.
WB	966	FSP	China	Heat reform & Bldg EE	25,000,000 (included in EUEEP)	75,000,000 (included in EUEEP)	175,000,000 (included in EUEEP)	Overlap with EUEEP project above. CO2 impact from Heat Reform project is assumed to be captured in the overlapping EUEEP project above. Figures from this project are not counted towards the totals.
UNDP	1132	FSP	Costa Rica	Off-Grid	10,200	51,000	840,000	
UNEP	1361	FSP	Cuba	Renewables on Isla de la Juventud	390,000	1,170,000	1,170,000	Top-down methodology not applied due to lack of data
WB	1040	FSP	Egypt	Solar Thermal Hybrid	1,100,000	3,300,000	18,400,000	
UNDP	1136	FSP	Eritrea	Wind Energy	37,500	112,500	615,000	
WB	1686	FSP	Ethiopia	Rural Energy	362,000	724,000	1,810,000	Higher RF was used to form the upper indirect estimate.
UNDP	1137	FSP	Georgia	Ren. Energy (geo and microhydro)	1,000,000	3,000,000	5,750,000	
UNEP	1599	MSP	Global	EMPower	0	0	0	No quantifiable GHG effects; project builds capacity for global market aggregation.
WB/IFC	1685	FSP	Global	Fuel Cells Financing Initiative	179,361	1,793,610	4,000,000	
UNDP	1413	MSP	Honduras	EE Financing	26,400	105,600	176,000	
WB	1702	MSP	Hungary	Small Hydro	159,400	478,200	478,200	Not enough information available to conduct

46 energy-related FSPs and MSPs approved in FY03-04					Direct Effects (lifetime + post-project)	Range of total indirect reductions projected over the 10-yr influence period		Remarks
IA	GEF ID	Type	Country	Brief title	Total Direct Effects	Lower limit	Upper limit	
								top-down analysis.
UNDP	1199	FSP	India	Biomass Power Generation Phase 1	4,100,000	12,300,000	30,240,000	
UNDP	2140	FSP	India	EE in Steel Rerolling	6,364,000	19,092,000	23,074,400	
UNDP	2395	MSP	India	Electric Three-wheelers	17,400	52,200	4,614,000	
UNEP	1780	MSP	Kenya	Joint Geophysical Imaging	0	0	0	No quantifiable GHG effects - all project work lays the groundwork for future drilling.
UNDP	1245	FSP	Lesotho	Rural electrification	17,380	52,140	68,800	
UNDP	1897	FSP	Malaysia	BIPV	65,000	801,667	801,677	Indirect impact based on follow-up within govt. planning framework
UNDP	1029	MSP	Maldives	RETDAP	39,900	159,600	185,497	
WB/UNDP	1274	FSP	Mali	Household (HEURA)	127,000	254,000	508,000	Due to lack of data to carry out the top-down methodology, slightly higher replication factor was used for upper limit of range.
WB	1900	FSP	Mexico	Large-scale Renewables	2,800,000	8,400,000	25,200,000	Indirect estimate assumed to include reductions from the UNDP Mexico Wind project.
UNDP	1284	FSP	Mexico	Wind Power	120,000	0	0	All indirect effects are subsumed under the related WB Mexico RET project to avoid double-counting.
WB	1838	MSP	Morocco	Energy & Environment Upgrading	1,999,556	5,998,668	20,000,000	
WB	1079	FSP	Nicaragua	Rural Electrification	315,075	13,800	105,800	Due to overlap with UNDP project, indirect was only included for solar component
UNDP	1079	FSP	Nicaragua	Small Hydro	76,500	1,197,100	1,331,200	Due to overlap with UNDP project, indirect was only included for hydro component
UNDP	1260	FSP	Pakistan	Wind Energy, phase 1	0	1,770,000	5,400,000	No RF used. Reductions accrue from phase 2 of the GEF project.
WB	1103	FSP	Philippines	Distribution Loss Reduction	778,000	2,334,000	15,560,000	
UNDP	1532	FSP	Philippines	PELMATP	2,500,000	7,500,000	9,600,000	
WB	1445	MSP	Poland	Demand-side EE in	3,900,000	0	0	No coherent replication strategy.

46 energy-related FSPs and MSPs approved in FY03-04					Direct Effects (lifetime + post-project)	Range of total indirect reductions projected over the 10-yr influence period		Remarks
					Total Direct Effects	Lower limit	Upper limit	
IA	GEF ID	Type	Country	Brief title				
				Public Bldgs				
WB	1615	FSP	Regional	ECA Geothermal Fund tranche 1	6,857,000	13,714,000	27,428,000	Due to lack of data to carry out the top-down methodology, slightly higher replication factor was used for upper limit of range.
UNEP	1096	FSP	Regional (Czech Rep. & Slovakia)	EMPRESS	750,000	2,500,000	12,000,000	
UNDP	1162	FSP	Russian Federation	Coal Mine Methane	5,870,000	29,350,000	51,275,784	
WB/IFC	2111	MSP	Russian Federation	FEER	4,450,000	17,800,000	17,800,000	
WB/IFC	2194	MSP	Russian Federation	Framework for Wind Power	0	9,575,000	9,600,000	No direct investments, so lifetime of investment is not listed.
WB	2004	FSP	Swaziland	Energy for Rural Transformation	7,677	4,780,000	4,800,000	Direct does not include carbon-financed investments
UNDP	1196	FSP	Tanzania	Rural PV	10,000	20,000	33,900	
WB	1905	FSP	Tunisia	Industrial EE	636,422	1,909,266	2,036,550	
UNDP	967	FSP	Tunisia	Wind Power	3,680,000	7,360,000	8,832,000	
WB	1179	FSP	Uruguay	Energy Efficiency	2,212,000	4,424,000	5,920,000	
WB	1083	FSP	Vietnam	DSM/EE	362,252	1,449,008	1,745,569	
UNDP	1106	FSP	Vietnam	Public lighting (VEEPL)	211,000	3,421,000	7,600,000	Lower limit of indirect according to expectations formulated in the document, not using RF.
UNEP	1358	FSP	Zambia	RE for minigrids	220,000	660,000	2,000,000	
					180,637,023	409,544,359	1,858,357,577	

* All estimates are in metric tons of CO2 equivalent

Annex 5: International Waters

1. With reference to the GEF International Waters Focal Area, Schedule 1 to Attachment 1 of the Instrument for the Establishment of the Restructured Global Environment Facility states that by Fall 2004: "**Projects will be approved to establish management frameworks (focused on environmental priorities) in riparian countries in no fewer than 2 new transboundary waterbodies**".

Methodology for Reporting on Target

2. The target for the International Waters Focal Area is simply the number of projects (2) that would be developed by Implementing Agencies and approved by Council that include establishment of management frameworks (focused on environmental priorities) for transboundary waterbodies not earlier addressed by GEF. The methodology used is to compare the number of approved projects that include establishment of management frameworks with the target established in Replenishment---2 new transboundary waterbodies.

3. Management frameworks (focused on environmental priorities) are in this context considered to be based on the following elements:

- (a) Agreement upon set of transboundary priority concerns or risks based on sound science and consultation with stakeholders
- (b) Agreement for a Strategic Action Program to address the transboundary priorities and / or risks
- (c) Agreement on establishment/revitalization of a management institution to address the priority concerns/risks.

4. Projects that have been included in the analysis include among them establishment of management institutions at several different levels (agreement on a binding convention, establishing or re-vitalizing basin commissions, facilitating agreements on transboundary problems and priority actions through national policy, legal, and institutional reforms). Hence, projects building on previous International Waters basin wide efforts in a specific water body are not included, neither are projects that do not focus on a specific water body but concentrate on demonstration activities, capacity building or targeted research.

Results

5. The International Waters Focal Area has been successful in achieving its target. In fact it has been possible to go well beyond the initial target, with 6 new transboundary waterbodies where projects approved in FY 03 and 04 will facilitate the establishment of a variety of management frameworks, with priority focus on transboundary environmental concerns (Table 1). This represents a significant expansion of the geographic coverage of "foundational" projects, defined by the focal area as projects aiming at creating the enabling environment for stress reduction investments and reforms. In fact, stress reduction measures addressing transboundary

environmental issues can only be designed and implemented once the proper "processes" are in place, i.e., management frameworks focusing on problems and their causes with commitments to undertake action on identified transboundary priorities. The six approved projects contributing to the target are intended to establish these processes, and they are all concentrated in Africa. All of them include pilot on the ground demonstrations, an effective tool to leverage country commitments and experiment solutions.

6. It should be noted that three of the projects have an exclusive focus on transboundary aquifers. Action on groundwater has been slow to materialize globally and it must be included as part of integrated water resources management. With these new additions to the previously approved "Guarani Aquifer Project", and thanks to a close and effective cooperation among GEFSEC, the Implementing Agencies and Executing Agencies, the GEF is clearly taking the lead in fostering on the ground the sustainable management of transboundary groundwater systems and the protection of groundwater dependent ecosystems. It should also be noted that a number of these transboundary systems have been included in the EU Water Initiative as well that was announced at WSSD. Collaboration on these waterbody systems between the EU and GEF offer the potential for meaningful reforms and appropriate management institutions to have a good chance for success.

(i) *Reversing Land and Water Degradation Trends in the Niger River Basin* project (UNDP-World Bank) - The project will revitalize the existing Niger Basin Authority (NBA) by establishing a permanent collaboration and dialogue between the NBA and the nine riparian countries, and also by helping expand its mandate into a more integrated vision, including the protection of globally significant freshwater ecosystems (e.g.: the Niger Inner Delta) now threatened by excessive abstractions for agriculture and hydropower schemes. In the preparatory phase of the project, priorities based on sound science in a preliminary Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis (TDA) were prepared for five of the basin countries. In the project implementation the TDA will be further developed to include all nine riparian countries. An action program to address priorities will be developed in the form of a Strategic Action Program (SAP), and adopted by the countries. The project will assist riparian countries in reaching a consensus on a more balanced utilization of the vital freshwater resources of the Niger, that would preserve ecosystem functions and services.

(ii) *Addressing Transboundary Concerns in the Volta River Basin and its Downstream Coastal Area* project (UNEP) - This project completes the GEF International Waters coverage of Sahelian transboundary basins (Senegal, Volta, Niger, Chad, Nile). It is intended to create a joint management structure, and to test ways to address the major water scarcity problems which affect the upstream basin countries. A full science based diagnostic analysis (TDA) will be produced during project implementation and will be the basis for identifying strategies in a regionally agreed action program (SAP) to maintain the functioning of key ecosystems in land and at the coast, while providing for growing human needs. Furthermore, the project will develop a Volta Basin Commission/Authority by drafting its framework, obtaining national endorsements and generating national endorsements to ensure its establishment. Pilot demonstrations will be a key feature of the project to leverage country commitments and experiment solutions throughout the project's implementation.

(iii) *Protection of the North West Sahara Aquifer System and Related Humid Zones and Ecosystems* project (UNEP), and (iv) *Managing Hydrogeological Risk in the Iullemeden Aquifer System* project (UNEP) - Both these Medium Size Projects are specifically aimed at establishing initial joint management frameworks and at providing the needed basic knowledge on the aquifers extent and characteristics. Both the Northwest Sahara Aquifer and the Iullemeden Aquifer are very large renewable resources, and play a key role in sustaining human life and ecosystems (such as alluvial plain savannahs, humid zones and oasis). The Northwest Sahara Aquifer project will conduct analyses of environmental, legal and institutional issues in the area. These analyses will be the basis for a management model that, e.g., will aim at producing the best possible scenario for sustainable exploitation of the water resources. The project will establish an institution, Observatory for the Aquifer Basin, that will ensure continued sustainable management of the aquifer after the GEF funding has ceased. The Iullemeden Aquifer project will focus on identifying transboundary risks, including a TDA development, and then formulate and adopt a joint development strategy for the aquifer based on the risk identification and identified priorities. The project will establish a joint legal and institutional cooperative framework that will draft a basin agreement and schedules for a basin organization. This organization's structure will be approved and committed for support by the countries and their development partners. The Iullemeden project will work together with the Niger River Basin project described above for synergies and to facilitate inclusion of the Iullemeden results in the revised Niger Basin TDA and SAP.

(v) *Groundwater and Drought Management in the SADC Region* - The Limpopo Basin (World Bank) - This project responds to the water initiative of SADC, and addresses the strategic role of groundwater in coping with the extended droughts that have affected the region throughout the last decades. The project is designed to help implement one of the priorities already identified in SADC's Regional Strategic Action Plan for Integrated Water Resources Development and Management. This will be done by establishing a Groundwater Management Institute of Southern Africa that will promote the concept of regional management of groundwater resources, build understanding about the benefits of regional management, developing capacity and furthering the use of the tools developed during the project. In addition to regional capacity building components, the project will focus on the Limpopo Transboundary Basin as a pilot case where multi-country management schemes will be introduced to evaluate and implement groundwater exploitation options that would preserve the role of shallow aquifers in sustaining alluvial plain ecosystems, and support livelihoods during drought periods. Managed aquifer recharge will be among the measures considered to enhance the strategic use of groundwater.

Marine Environment

(vi) *Combating Living Resources Depletion and Coastal Area Degradation in the Guinea Current Large Marine Ecosystem through Ecosystem-based Regional Actions* (UNDP-UNEP) - This project embraces 16 West African countries sharing the LME, and represents a major capacity building effort to bring all the countries to a common level of commitment to preserve their coastal and offshore fisheries resources and straddling stocks, and to maintain or restore the functioning of coastal habitats of transboundary significance, such as mangroves and sea grasses,

threatened by aggressive coastal developments and erosion. The project will assist the countries to establish a joint management scheme in the form of an agreement on a set of priorities based on sound science and consultation with stakeholders, and subsequently on an agreed action program to address the identified priorities (TDA/SAP). The countries are to endorse a Guinea Current Commission during the completion of the SAP. This will be preceded by the establishment of an Interim Guinea Current Commission at the beginning of project implementation. Furthermore, the project will build capacity throughout the time frame of the project through a number of pilot demonstrations.

Table 5.1. Projects approved during fiscal year 03 and 04 contributing to the International Waters target “Projects will be approved to establish management frameworks (focused on environmental priorities) in riparian countries in no fewer than 2 new transboundary water-bodies.”

No. in text above	GEF ID	Project Name	Implementing Agency	Approval Date	Project Type*	Participating Countries	GEF Amount (\$ million)	Cofin Amount (\$ million)
i	1093	Reversing Land and Water Degradation Trends in the Niger River Basin	UNDP / World Bank	5/16/2003 by Council	FP	Benin, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Chad, Cote d'Ivoire, Guinea, Mali, Niger, Nigeria	13.4	29.6
ii	1111	Addressing Transboundary Concerns in the Volta River Basin and its Downstream Coastal Area	UNEP	5/16/2003 by Council	FP	Benin, Burkina Faso, Cote d'Ivoire, Ghana, Mali, Togo	5.7	10.4
iii	1851	Protection of the North West Sahara Aquifer System (NWSAS) and related humid zones and ecosystems	UNEP	12/18/2002 by the CEO	MSP	Algeria, Libya, Tunisia	0.6	0.8
iv	2041	Managing Hydrogeological Risk in the Iullemeden Aquifer System	UNEP	6/24/2003 by the CEO	MSP	Mali, Niger, Nigeria	1.0	0.8
v	970	Groundwater and Drought Management in SADC	World Bank	3/22/2004 by Council	FP	Botswana, Mozambique, South Africa, Zimbabwe	7.4	6.9
vi	1188	Combating Living Resource Depletion and Coastal Area Degradation in the Guinea Current LME through Ecosystem-based Regional Actions	UNDP / UNEP	11/21/2003 by Council	FP	Angola, Benin, Cameroon, Congo, Congo DR, Cote d'Ivoire, Equatorial Guinea, Gabon, Ghana, Guinea-Bissau, Liberia, Nigeria, Sao Tome and Principe, Sierra Leone, Togo	21.4	33.9

* FP = Full-sized project; MSP =Medium-sized project.

Annex 6: Ozone Layer Depletion

1. The performance target to be achieved for Ozone Layer Depletion is that “projects projected to phase out no fewer than 50 tons of methyl bromide and Hydrochlorofluorocarbons (HCFCs) will be approved”.

2. During GEF III so far, a project was approved to phase-out the use of 167 metric tons of methyl bromide annually, thereby ensuring that the seven participating countries in Central and Eastern Europe and Newly Independent States are in compliance with the Copenhagen amendment of the Montreal Protocol. No projects to address HCFCs were developed as all GEF eligible countries are – to the knowledge of the Secretariat - in compliance with the HCFC schedule. See Table 6.1 for list of approved ozone layer depletion proposals from the GEF project database.

Table 6.1: Ozone Layer Depletion proposals approved during GEF III to date (FY03-FY05)

Country	Project Status	Project Title	Agency	Total Gef Amount \$million	Cofinancing	FY approval
Armenia	Council approved	Programme for Phasing Out Ozone Depleting Substances	UNDP/UNEP	2.1	0	2003
Regional: Azerbaijan, Bulgaria, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, and Uzbekistan	Council approved	Total Sector Methyl Bromide Phase Out in Countries with Economies in Transition	UNEP/UNDP	5.2	6.7	2004

Annex 7: Land Degradation (Desertification and Deforestation)

Methodology For Reporting on Target

1. The GEF-3 target for the Focal Area (FA) Land Degradation (Desertification and Deforestation) is “to protect no less than 3 million additional hectares of land area from degradation”. Since operational program under this Focal Area was approved only in May 2003, the majority of the projects in the portfolio are at a very early stage of the preparation. There are currently 46 projects of different nature, thematic coverage and stages of development in the FA portfolio. 9 projects have already been approved/endorsed, of which 4 are full-sized projects (FSP) and 5 are medium-sized projects (MSP). 37 projects are currently in the pipeline, of which 28 will develop into FSPs and for most of which the designated implementing agencies have requested PDF-B resources. 9 proposal will develop into MSP proposals, for which PDF-A resources have been allocated by the implementing agencies to conduct preparatory meetings and studies before finalization of the project document for approval.

2. Only projects that have matured for work program inclusion (for FSP) or CEO approval (for MSP) can give a quantifiable information on how many ha the projects intends protect from degrading through the introduction of a sustainable management regime. Out of the 9 approved projects 3 of them are targeting the improvement of the institutional capacity for SLM. While these projects will not directly contribute to the achievement of the target, capacity building activities supported by them are prerequisites for many countries to achieve quantifiable impacts and targets in GEF-4 and beyond. The 6 projects addressing the strategic priority 2 of the FA, on-the ground-investments, are the projects that will fully contribute to the target.

3. Despite the designation of Land Degradation (Desertification and Deforestation) as a GEF Focal Area, land degradation continues to be addressed as a cross-cutting issue in the other GEF Focal Areas, namely Biodiversity, Climate Change and International Waters to promote synergies among focal area benefits. A recently conducted study on land degradation as a cross-cutting issue (GEF C.24/#Inf.) and synergies in those focal areas provides the basis for reporting on the cross-cutting contribution to the target. The study ranks projects into initiatives with *Indirect LD effect*, *Potential LD effect* and *Strong LD component*. For the counting of hectares of land protected from degrading towards the target, only those projects that have a strong LD component were considered and counted towards the target. 7 BD projects and 12 MFA/OP#12 were considered. Projects in the FA International Waters identified with a strong land degradation linkage could not be considered since the size of the demonstration sites could not be verified.

Project Selection

4. All projects under the FA Land Degradation (Desertification and Deforestation) were considered since its primary focus is land degradation control and prevention through the promotion of sustainable land management.

5. The principal means used to identify a project as addressing land degradation as a strong cross cutting issue in the FAs Biodiversity, International Waters, Climate Change and MFA/OP#12, was to find an explicit indication in that project's brief/document, or any other available project materials, that any of the threats and activities cited below were addressed.

Threats

- Soil erosion due to wind or water factors; sand dune mobilization and movement; sedimentation and siltation of riparian areas and coastal zones; soil compaction through surface crusting or deeper structural damage; declining soil fertility; and loss of soil organic matter or carbon.
- Salinization due to improperly managed irrigation practices; chemical and organic pollution of soils related to agriculture, industry, and urban activities; and GHG emissions (such as landfills, methane generation); lowering or loss of aquifer potential resulting from overuse or lack of recharge.
- Deforestation due to excessive logging, fuel wood extraction, or habitat conversion; loss of other vegetation, such as grasslands and savannas, due to overgrazing, over-harvesting, and habitat conversion; uncontrolled and excessive fires that can damage ecosystems.
- Over-harvesting of vegetation products in general, such as for medicinal use and gathering of food, which leads to ecosystem instability; over-cultivation leading to reduced fallows and regenerative ability of the ecosystem.
- Invasive species when they lead to ecosystem damage and instability.
- Overgrazing around settlements or in extensive rangelands.
- Habitat conversion in general, such as for cropland and improved pastures.
- Agricultural expansion into pastureland, thus forcing over-grazing in remaining pastures.
- Land use conflicts and curtailment of access rights, leading to destructive land uses and war.
- Land degradation when it is aggravated by droughts and desiccation.

Activities

A. Sustainable Land Use Practices

- Improvement of cropping and herding practices to prevent or mitigate land degradation.
- Soil and water conservation.
- Watershed catchment management.
- Habitat restoration.
- Integrated land use planning including land zonation protected areas and buffer zones.

B. Forestry/Trees Related Activities

- Sustainable use of biomass for energy , sustainable forest harvesting and fuel wood use conservation practices (incl. fuel wood pricing), and fire control measures.
- Regeneration of forestry and grasslands, including tree planting by communities for biodiversity conservation, watershed management for carbon sequestration.

C. Project Approaches

- Generation of alternative livelihood income and community participation activities.
- Land degradation capacity building efforts and mobilization of resources to address land degradation.
- Information collection, such as land cover or land degradation variables.
- Target research and indigenous knowledge for mitigating land degradation as cross cutting theme.
- Activities that address the underlying causes of degradation and policies that reduce land tenure insecurities.

D. Environmental Quality Issues

- Reducing dust in the atmosphere.
- Promoting carbon sequestration in soils.

Results

6. The contributions to the target have been derived from approved initiatives supported under the LD Focal Area and projects that address land degradation as a strong cross-cutting issue in the focal areas biodiversity and MFA/OP#12. These contributions would amount to **17.06 million ha of land protected from degrading through the promotion of a sustainable land management regime**. The contribution from the FA Land Degradation (Desertification and Deforestation) would be only 2.7% (460,310ha) since the operational program has been approved only recently (May 2003) and therefore, most of the initiatives are still in preparation. The major contribution 97.3% (16,603,320ha) would come from projects supported in the GEF FAs Biodiversity and MFA/OP#12 and that have been identified to have a strong linkage to land degradation.

7. The GEF portfolio addressing land degradation through the Focal Area Land Degradation (Desertification and Deforestation), Biodiversity and MFA/OP#12 has **exceeded** the performance measure to be achieved by Fall 2004 as specified in the replenishment agreement. Given that the replenishment target was set at 3 million hectares the achievement percentage of the portfolio is 567% for this target.

Table 7.1. Contribution to GEF-3 Target: Projects under FA Land Degradation – Operational Program 15 “Sustainable Land Management”

No	GEF PMIS	Agency	Status	Country	Project Title	Ha under SLM	related to agriculture and grazing	related reforestation	Erosion Reduction
1	2356	WB	Approved (Sept.2004)\ FSP	Brazil	Ecosystem Restoration of Riparian Forests in Sao Paolo	30000	28500	1500	
2	2373	IFAD	Approved (Nov.2004) FSP	Brazil	Sustainable Land Management in the Semi-Arid Sertao Project	311000	311000		
3	2052	UNEP	Approved (July2004) MSP	Regional (Lesotho, Malawi, Mozambique, South Africa, Swaziland, Tanzania, Zambia, Zimbabwe)	Sustainable Management of Inland Wetlands in Southern Africa: a Livelihoods and Ecosystem Approach	1000	1000		
4	1503	World Bank	Approved (Sept.2004) FSP	Nigeria	National Fadama Development Program II	100000	100000		
5	2357	WB	Endorsed (July2004) FSP	Burundi	Agricultural Rehabilitation and Support Project (PRASAB) - Support for Sustainable Land Management	18000	18000		
6	2402	UNDP	Approved (April2004) MSP	Ghana	Sustainable Land Management for Mitigating Land Degradation, Enhancing Agricultural Biodiversity and Reducing Poverty (SLaM)	310	310		
TOTAL HA						460310			

Table 7.2. Contribution to GEF-3 Target: Land Degradation as strong cross-cutting issue in the FA Biodiversity, Climate Change, and MFA/OP#12

No.	PMIS ID	Country	Focal Area	OP	Project Type	Project Status (approval date)	Project Title	Agency	Ha of land prevented from degrading (desertification and deforestation)	Remark
1	1063	Cameroon	Biodiversity	1, 2, 3, 4	FP	Approved (May2004)	Forestry and Environmental Sector Adjustment Credit (FESAC)	World Bank	176000	
2	1107	Nepal	Biodiversity	3	FP	CEO End. (March2004)	Landscape Level Biodiversity Conservation in Nepal's Western Terai Complex	UNDP	173300	
3	1139	Guinea	Biodiversity	4	FP	Approved (May2003)	Conservation of the Biodiversity of the Nimba Mountains through Integrated and Participatory Management	UNDP	123420	
4	1152	Mali	Biodiversity	1, 2, 12, 13, 15	FP	Approved (Aug.2003)	Biodiversity Conservation and Participatory Sustainable Management of Natural Resources in the Inner Niger Delta and its Transition Areas, Mopti Region	World Bank/IFAD	2500000	
5	1589	Regional (Mozambique, Zambia, Zimbabwe)	Biodiversity	1, 12	FP	Approved (Oct.2003)	Integrated Management of Dryland Biodiversity through Land Rehabilitation in the Arid and Semi-Arid Regions of Mozambique, Zambia and Zimbabwe	UNEP/ UNDP	5350000	
6	1611	Mongolia	Biodiversity	1	MSP	Approved (Oct.2002)	Developing a Model Conservation Programme-Conservation of the Gobi Desert Using Wild Bactrian Camels as an "Umbrella Species".	UNDP	1800000	
7	1888	Bulgaria	Biodiversity	3	FP	Approved (March2004)	Forest Development Project	World Bank	1308000	
8	956	China	MFA	12	FP	Approved (Nov.2002)	PRC/GEF Partnership on Land Degradation in Dryland Ecosystems: Project I on Strengthening the Enabling Environment and Building Institutional Capacity	ADB	?	

No.	PMIS ID	Country	Focal Area	OP	Project Type	Project Status (approval date)	Project Title	Agency	Ha of land prevented from degrading (desertification and deforestation)	Remark
9	1035	Peru	MFA	12	MSP	Approved (Aug.2004)	Integrated Ecosystem Management in the Cotahuasi Basin	UNDP	474600	
10	1178	Burkina Faso	MFA	12,13	FP	Endorsed (May2004)	Sahel Integrated Lowland Ecosystem Management (SILEM), Phase I	World Bank	1000000	Phase 1
11	1244	Kazakhstan	MFA	12,1, 8	FP	Endorsed (May2003)	Drylands Management Project	World Bank	80000	
12	1330	Zambia	MFA	12	MSP	Approved (Sept.2001)	Sustainable Land Management in the Zambian Miombo Woodland Ecosystem	World Bank	170000	
13	1362	Kenya	MFA	12	FP	Approved (May2004)	Western Kenya Integrated Ecosystem Management Project	World Bank	5000000	
14	1544	Brazil	MFA	12	FP	Approved (Nov.2003)	Rio de Janeiro Integrated Ecosystem Management in Production Landscapes of the North-Northwestern Fluminense	World Bank	657000	Reforestation
15	1848	Kenya	MFA	12,4	FP	Approved (Nov.2004)	Mount Kenya Pilot Project for Land and Water Management	UNEP/IFAD	213000	
16	1872	Tajikistan	MFA	12,4, 15, 13	FP	Endorsed (May2004)	Community Agriculture and Watershed Management	World Bank	78000	
								TOTAL	16,603,320	