



GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT FACILITY
INVESTING IN OUR PLANET



WORLD BANK GROUP
Development Finance

GEF/R.08/21/Rev.01

March 2, 2022

Interim Meeting for the Eighth Replenishment of the GEF Trust Fund
March 8-9, 2022
Virtual Meeting

REVISED PROGRAMMING SCENARIOS AND GLOBAL ENVIRONMENTAL BENEFITS TARGETS

(PREPARED BY THE GEF SECRETARIAT)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Revised GEF-8 Programming Scenarios	1
Programming Scenarios	1
Financing the IPs.....	5
Revised GEF-8 Results Targets	12

REVISED GEF-8 PROGRAMMING SCENARIOS

1. As a result of discussions and recommendations emerging from the Third Replenishment Meeting, the GEF Secretariat has revised and updated the GEF-8 Programming Scenarios taking into consideration the views of participants. This chapter presents the revised scenarios for consideration by participants and includes two main sections.

2. The first section provides a detailed summary of revisions of indicative amounts for the original three scenarios of *US\$5 Billion*, *US\$6.5 Billion*, and *US\$7 Billion*. In addition, a new **US\$5.8 Billion** scenario has been included as an intermediate option between the previous two lower scenarios. It should be noted that the proposed Corporate Budget line is held constant for all the scenarios and kept at the same level as the scenarios presented in the Third Meeting.

3. The second section focuses on changes made to the notional financing for the Integrated Programs (IPs). With the suggested adjustments made to focal area percentages across all scenarios, the notional breakdowns for IPs were directly affected. The total indicative amount for IPs stands at just around 31% of the total replenishment amount across all scenarios. A detailed description of the new projections for IPs is presented along with key priorities related to programming by countries, including the STAR to matching incentive ratio, STAR threshold to trigger matching incentive, and plans to impose a ceiling on use of the matching incentive by countries.

Programming Scenarios

4. The programming scenarios presented continue to represent a major shift in financing for the GEF relative to previous cycles (Table 1). The US\$5 Billion scenario represents an approximate 25% increase over the GEF-7 replenishment of US\$4.068 Billion, with the \$5.8 and the \$6.5 Billion scenarios corresponding to an increase of about 35% and 60%, respectively. Finally, the highest-level scenario represents an increase of approximately 75%. The US\$5 Billion scenario is considered the minimum scenario needed to achieve the GEF mandates across the conventions to which it is accountable, and as reflected in the GEF-8 programming directions, together with the growing levels of ambition in delivery and impact being expected by the global community.

5. The new US\$5.8 Billion scenario provides another option for accommodating several key recommendations by replenishment participants. Specifically, this scenario allows for suggested increases in the amounts allocated to the Non-Grants window and to the Small Grants Programme, while maintaining the relative proportions for focal areas relatively constant. While the two highest scenarios provide for an impactful GEF value-for-money proposition across all mandates of the GEF, this new scenario may help participants to better understand how the evolution from the baseline scenario to progressively higher ones reflect the ambition expressed in the Programming Directions to deliver greater outcomes for the entire strategy.

6. Building on the original scenarios prepared for the Third Replenishment Meeting (Feb 2-4), several key revisions and adjustments were made following recommendations from participants. The most consequential change, as it affects the delivery of other GEF convention mandates, is the increase in the share of the biodiversity focal area resources to 35% share of the total amount of the replenishment, a recommendation endorsed by virtually all participants. Given that other priorities were also expressed by many donors regarding higher shares for certain focal areas, in particular for the Chemicals and Waste focal area, together with calls for Climate Change-related financing to remain at GEF-7 levels, there are certain numerical boundaries that cannot be crossed without compromising these recommendations.

7. Highlights of trends for each focal area under the revised scenarios are as follows:

- **Biodiversity** - The total envelope was fixed at 35% of total replenishment amount across all scenarios, except for the US\$7 Billion where it is nominally same as in US\$6.5 Billion. As a result of this increase, absolute amounts for all components increased proportionally across progressively higher scenarios, except for Enabling Activities which remain constant for all scenarios. The amount for the CBD Cartagena and ABS Protocols as particular windows in the Biodiversity set-aside is only reflected in the US\$7 Billion scenario. Because the amount for STAR is kept at the same level in the US\$7 Billion scenario as the US\$6.5 Billion scenario, the set-aside amounts are significantly higher in the US\$7 Billion scenario. Hence, the amounts for Cartagena and ABS, and also for Global and Regional Programs, are higher. There is a case to be made that the higher amounts would position the GEF as being able to more fully implement the post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework.
- **Climate Change Mitigation** - The Climate Change Mitigation focal area envelope was reduced from 17-20% in the original scenarios to 13-16% in the latest scenarios. On the other hand, with the increase in the total volume of the replenishment, the absolute amounts would be higher than those in GEF-7. The analyses conducted indicate that reducing this share any further from these amounts would compromise GEF's many mandates in the financial mechanism of the Paris Agreement. Perhaps more important, lower shares would compromise the delivery of climate-related financing at the recommended levels achieved in GEF-7. It should be noted that all components under the focal area have been proportionally reduced, and more so for the amounts allocated to STAR. This also means that indicative amounts for Integrated Programs were consequently significantly reduced. Given their priority, the amounts for CBIT and Enabling Activities are kept nominally higher and maintained at same level across all scenarios.
- **Land Degradation** – The focal area accounts for just over 11% of the total replenishment, but the total envelope is higher in absolute terms than in GEF-7 - from the US\$5 Billion scenario all the way up to the highest. All components increase proportionally from the lower to higher scenarios, but the amount for Enabling Activities is maintained at the same level.

- **Chemicals and Waste** - The focal area accounts for between 14 and 15% of the total replenishment of the total replenishment, depending on the scenario. All components increase proportionally across the scenarios, but the amount for Enabling Activities is maintained at the same level. An important change from the original scenario is the modest increase in the amount allocated for IPs across all scenarios. This was necessitated by recommendations from replenishment participants to reinstate the IP on Elimination of Hazardous Chemicals from Supply Chains.
- **International Waters** - This focal area accounts for between 10 and 12% of the total replenishment, but with absolute amounts higher in the US\$5 Billion scenario than in GEF-7, increasing further in the higher scenarios. All components increase proportionally from the lower to higher scenarios.

8. The revised scenarios also include changes in allocations for the NGI, SGP and Country Engagement relative to what was presented in the Third Replenishment Meeting. The NGI amount was increased nominally from US\$160 Million to US\$215 million in the lower US\$5 Billion Scenario, and proportion maintained for the higher scenarios. Similarly, the SGP amount was increased from US\$150 Million to US\$160 million in the lower US\$5 Billion Scenario, and proportion maintained for the higher scenarios.

Table 1 - Programming Scenarios for GEF-8

FOCAL AREA	\$5 Billion		\$5.8 Billion		\$6.5 Billion		\$7 Billion	
	\$	% of total	\$	% of total	\$	% of total	\$	% of total
Total BD	1750	35.0%	2030	35.0%	2275	35.0%	2424	34.6%
BD STAR Country Allocations	1320	26.4%	1537	26.5%	1728	26.6%	1728	24.7%
BD-1: Integrated Landscape/Seascape Management	500	10.0%	583	10.0%	655	10.1%	655	9.4%
BD-2: Cartagena Protocol/Nagoya Protocol	73	1.5%	85	1.5%	95	1.5%	95	1.4%
BD-3: Domestic Resource Mobilization	147	2.9%	171	2.9%	192	3.0%	192	2.7%
Integrated Programs	600	12.0%	699	12.0%	785	12.1%	785	11.2%
BD STAR Set Aside	430	8.6%	493	8.5%	547	8.4%	697	10.0%
EAs	50	1.0%	50	0.9%	50	0.8%	50	0.7%
Cartagena and ABS	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	100	1.4%
Global and Regional Programs	115	2.3%	134	2.3%	151	2.3%	200	2.9%
IP Global Platforms	65	1.3%	76	1.3%	85	1.3%	85	1.2%
IP Country Project Incentive	200	4.0%	233	4.0%	262	4.0%	262	3.7%
Total CCM	802	16.0%	900	15.5%	920	14.2%	920	13.1%
CCM STAR Country Allocations	480	9.6%	564	9.7%	581	8.9%	581	8.3%
Efficient use of energy and materials	95	1.9%	111	1.9%	115	1.8%	115	1.6%
Decarbonized power systems	87	1.7%	102	1.8%	105	1.6%	105	1.5%
Zero-emission mobility	87	1.7%	102	1.8%	105	1.6%	105	1.5%
Nature-based solutions	62	1.2%	73	1.3%	75	1.2%	75	1.1%
Integrated Programs	150	3.0%	176	3.0%	182	2.8%	182	2.6%

<i>CCM STAR Set Aside</i>	322	6.4%	336	5.8%	339	5.2%	339	4.8%
CBIT	75	1.5%	75	1.3%	75	1.2%	75	1.1%
EAs	125	2.5%	125	2.2%	125	1.9%	125	1.8%
Support for carbon pricing schemes	20	0.4%	20	0.3%	20	0.3%	20	0.3%
Global and Regional Programs	22	0.4%	22	0.4%	22	0.3%	22	0.3%
IP Global Platforms	30	0.6%	35	0.6%	36	0.6%	36	0.5%
IP Country Project Incentive	50	1.0%	59	1.0%	61	0.9%	61	0.9%
Total LD	580	11.6%	650	11.2%	731	11.2%	731	10.4%
<i>LD STAR Country Allocations</i>	428	8.6%	482	8.3%	544	8.4%	544	7.8%
LD-1: Sustainable land management	71	1.4%	80	1.4%	91	1.4%	91	1.3%
LD-2: Restoration of production landscapes	41	0.8%	46	0.8%	52	0.8%	52	0.7%
LD-3: Address land degradation, desertification and drought	71	1.4%	80	1.4%	91	1.4%	91	1.3%
LD-4: Improve enabling framework for LDN	58	1.2%	65	1.1%	74	1.1%	74	1.1%
Integrated Programs	187	3.7%	210	3.6%	238	3.7%	238	3.4%
<i>LD STAR Set Aside</i>	152	3.0%	168	2.9%	187	2.9%	187	2.7%
EAs	23	0.5%	23	0.4%	23	0.4%	23	0.3%
Global/Regional Programs	25	0.5%	28	0.5%	32	0.5%	32	0.5%
IP Global Platforms	42	0.8%	47	0.8%	53	0.8%	53	0.8%
IP Country Project Incentive	62	1.2%	70	1.2%	79	1.2%	79	1.1%
Total CW	750	15.0%	820	14.1%	917	14.1%	917	13.1%
<i>Stockholm Convention</i>	387	7.7%	423	7.3%	473	7.3%	473	6.8%
EAs	28	0.6%	28	0.5%	28	0.4%	28	0.4%
Other Programming	359	7.2%	395	6.8%	445	6.8%	445	6.4%
<i>Minamata Convention</i>	252	5.0%	276	4.8%	308	4.7%	308	4.4%
EAs	20	0.4%	20	0.3%	20	0.3%	20	0.3%
Other Programming	232	4.6%	256	4.4%	288	4.4%	288	4.1%
<i>Montreal</i>	12	0.2%	13	0.2%	15	0.2%	15	0.2%
<i>SAICM</i>	61	1.2%	67	1.2%	75	1.2%	75	1.1%
Contribution to IP Global Platforms	13	0.3%	13	0.2%	13	0.2%	13	0.2%
Contribution to IP Projects	25	0.5%	28	0.5%	34	0.5%	34	0.5%
Total IW	500	10.0%	690	11.9%	768	11.8%	768	11.0%
<i>Blue Economy</i>	165	3.3%	228	3.9%	253	3.9%	253	3.6%
<i>ABNJ</i>	30	0.6%	41	0.7%	46	0.7%	46	0.7%
<i>Enhancing Freshwater Security</i>	165	3.3%	228	3.9%	253	3.9%	253	3.6%
Contribution to IP Global Platforms	30	0.6%	41	0.7%	46	0.7%	46	0.7%
Contribution to IP Projects	110	2.2%	152	2.6%	169	2.6%	169	2.4%
TOTAL FOCAL AREA RESOURCES	4382	87.6%	5090	87.8%	5611	86.3%	5760	82.3%
<i>Non-Grant Instruments Window</i>	215	4.3%	250	4.3%	350	5.4%	500	7.1%
<i>Innovations Window</i>	30	0.6%	43	0.7%	62	1.0%	100	1.4%
<i>Small Grants Programme</i>	160	3.2%	200	3.4%	256	3.9%	400	5.7%
<i>Country Engagement</i>	26	0.5%	30	0.5%	34	0.5%	53	0.8%
TOTAL PROGRAMMING	4813	96.3%	5613	96.8%	6313	97.1%	6813	97.3%

Corporate Budgets	187	3.7%	187	3.2%	187	2.9%	187	2.7%
GEFSEC	127	2.5%	127	2.2%	127	2.0%	127	1.8%
IEO	30	0.6%	30	0.5%	30	0.5%	30	0.4%
Trustee	15	0.3%	15	0.3%	15	0.2%	15	0.2%
STAP	14	0.3%	14	0.2%	14	0.2%	14	0.2%
GRAND TOTAL	5000	100.0%	5800	100.0%	6500	100.0%	7000	100.0%

Financing the IPs

Note: The financing envelopes presented here are notional/indicative only. They are not reflective of a separate envelope but rather embedded within focal area resources proposed in the GEF-8 Programming Scenarios (Table 1). The actual amounts that will eventually be directed to the IPs as GEF-8 progresses can vary depending on country choice of IPs. The progress will be reported when technically cleared Program Framework Documents for IPs are presented as part of Work Programs for Council approval.

9. Financing for the IPs is drawn from all five focal areas in four categories: STAR, STAR Matching Incentives, Non-STAR Focal Area Contributions, and Global Platforms.

- **STAR** represents the total amounts within each focal area that will be allocated to countries through the STAR allocation systems;
- **STAR Matching Incentives** refers to the country project incentive windows that are a part of the focal area set asides, which will be matched to the STAR resources put towards IPs by countries;
- **Non-STAR Focal Area Contributions** represent the amounts from Non-STAR focal areas that will be invested in the IPs; and
- **Global Platforms** refer to the knowledge platforms that support each IP and are not country specific.

10. The indicative amounts under STAR focal areas (BD, CCM, and LD) includes three of these categories: STAR, STAR Matching incentives, and Global Platforms. Amounts under the two Non-STAR focal areas (IW and CW) include only Non-STAR Focal Area Contributions and global platforms.

11. The total indicative amounts for IPs under each of the proposed programming scenarios is presented in Table 2. For each scenario, the total includes amount for Country Programming (comprised of STAR, Matching Incentive, and Non-STAR Focal Area Contribution), and amount for Global Platforms.

12. Based on the experience with the past three replenishment cycles that applied different incentive ratios, for all scenarios the total Indicative IP amount for countries in STAR focal areas is based on the 3:1 ratio of STAR to matching incentive. With the ratio remaining the same, this

total indicative amount increases from US\$5 Billion to US\$ 6.5 Billion of the GEF-8 Programming Scenarios and kept at same level as US\$ 6.5 billion Scenario in the US\$ 7 Billion. The amount for non-STAR focal areas increases modestly from the lower to higher scenario and is kept same for the US\$6.5 and US\$7 Billion scenarios.

13. The amount for Global Platforms increases only modestly from the lower to higher scenario and kept same for the US\$6.5 and US\$7 Billion Scenarios.

Table 2. Total Indicative Amounts (US\$ Millions) for IPs under the Proposed Programming Scenarios

GEF-8 Programming Scenario	Amount for Country Programming				(d) Amount for Global Platforms	TOTAL for Scenario (c) + (d)
	(a) STAR Focal Areas (3:1 ratio)		(b) Non-STAR Focal Area Contributions	(c) TOTAL (a) + (b)		
	STAR	Incentive				
5 Billion	937	312	135	1384	180	1564
5.8 Billion	1085	362	180	1627	212	1839
6.5 Billion	1205	402	203	1810	233	2043

Notional IP Envelopes for Countries

14. The notional breakdown of resources for Country Programming under the three Programming Scenarios is presented in Table 3. Building on programming experience in GEF-6 and GEF-7, the projected total envelope for IPs that is realized through actual GEF-8 programming will be ultimately based on their relative global coverage, relative importance for the focal areas as determined by amounts contributed, and potential for contributing multiple GEBs relative to GEF-8 ambitions.

15. Across all scenarios, three IPs account for the highest amounts to be programmed by countries: Amazon, Congo, and Critical Forest Biomes; Food Systems; and Sustainable Cities. However, the notional amounts for all other IPs are sufficiently large to allow for robust programming.

16. The notional IP envelope for countries draw on multiple focal areas under each of the proposed Programming Scenarios. Table 4 shows how the IP amounts are distributed across the focal areas, based on explicit linkages as outlined in the GEF-8 Programming Directions document. For the three STAR focal areas, the highest contribution is from BD, followed by LD and CCM.

Table 3. Notional IP Envelopes for Country Programming under the Proposed Programming Scenarios

GEF-8 Integrated Programs	5B	5.8B	6.5B
<i>Food Systems</i>	215	252	282
<i>Ecosystem Restoration</i>	96	113	127
<i>Sustainable Cities</i>	158	184	208
<i>Amazon, Congo, and Critical Forest Biomes</i>	292	347	390
<i>Circular Solutions to Plastic Pollution</i>	67	82	87
<i>Blue and Green Islands</i>	83	97	110
<i>Clean and Healthy Ocean</i>	89	107	116
<i>Greening Transportation Infrastructure Development</i>	111	127	138
<i>Net-Zero Nature-Positive Accelerator</i>	110	129	137
<i>Wildlife Conservation for Development</i>	110	127	143
<i>Elimination of Hazardous Chemicals from Supply Chains</i>	53	62	72
Totals Amounts to Countries	1384	1627	1810

Table 4. Indicative breakdown of IP resources by focal area under US\$5 billion scenario

GEF-8 Integrated Programs	BD	CCM	LD	IW	CW	TOTALS
<i>Food Systems</i>	115	5	85	10	0	215
<i>Ecosystem Restoration</i>	5	6	85	0	0	96
<i>Sustainable Cities</i>	55	50	53	0	0	158
<i>Amazon, Congo, and Critical Forest Biomes</i>	271	15	0	6	0	292
<i>Circular Solutions to Plastic Pollution</i>	10	15	0	42	0	67
<i>Blue and Green Islands</i>	70	7	6	0	0	83
<i>Clean and Healthy Ocean</i>	40	7	0	42	0	89
<i>Greening Transportation Infrastructure Development</i>	100	11	0	0	0	111
<i>Net-Zero Nature-Positive Accelerator</i>	24	76	10	0	0	110
<i>Wildlife Conservation for Development</i>	105	0	5	0	0	110
<i>Elimination of Hazardous Chemicals from Supply Chains</i>	5	8	5	10	25	53
Focal Area Totals to Countries	800	200	249	110	25	1384

17. The indicative breakdown takes into consideration IPs with greatest potential to address each focal area priority. In the US\$ 5 Billion scenario for example (Table 4), notional focal area resources to IPs shows the following trends:

- for BD, the highest proportions are targeted toward Amazon, Congo Basin, and Critical Forest Biomes, Food Systems, Wildlife Conservation for Development, and Greening Transportation Infrastructure Development;

- for CCM, Net-Zero Nature-Positive Accelerator and Sustainable Cities account for the largest share;
- for LD, Ecosystem Restoration and Food Systems account for the largest shares;
- for IW, Clean and Healthy Ocean and Circular Solutions to Plastic Pollution; and
- for CW, all the resources are allocated to Elimination of Hazardous Chemicals from Supply Chains.

18. Contributions from the non-STAR focal areas are targeted towards IPs that will specifically address IW and CW focal area priorities as part of the overall programming approach to achieve transformational change. For IW this includes focus on transboundary systems such as under the Amazon, Congo Basin and Critical Forest Biomes, and on aquaculture linked to freshwater or coastal marine systems such as under Food Systems IP. For CW, the focus is on reducing mercury and POPs.

19. The projected trends for use of focal area resources in the US\$5 Billion scenario are maintained for the US\$5.8 and US\$ 6.5 Billion scenarios, with slightly higher amounts for each IP. However, some slight adjustments were made in the scenario for some IPs to accommodate differences between the focal area amounts. For example, in the US\$5.8 billion scenario, the IW amount was increased significantly for the Clean and Healthy Ocean IP to compensate for a lower BD amount. For the US\$6.5 Billion scenario, CW resources were added to the envelope for Sustainable Cities to further reinforce focus on reducing POPs.

STAR to Matching Incentive Ratio

20. The GEF has accumulated experience with different incentive ratios for programs that sought integration and higher impact, starting with the Sustainable Forest Management Program in GEF-5 that used a 4:1 ratio. In GEF-6, a 2:1 ratio to program STAR and Matching incentives was applied in the Integrated Approach Pilots and later in GEF-7's Impact Programs. Additionally for the GEF-7 Impact Programs, a minimum threshold of US\$4 million from STAR was established for participating countries to trigger the incentive amount. Experience has shown that both the ratio and threshold were found to be appropriate for ensuring robust and impactful portfolios under each program. Nearly all countries participating in the programs committed more than the minimum amount, resulting in total project grant amounts of US\$ 6 million or more on average (Table 5). The downside, however, was that demand from countries interested in the programs far exceeded the amount available as matching incentive. Hence, many countries could not participate in the programs, as reported in the OPS7 evaluation.

Table 5. Financing Trends for the GEF-6 and GEF-7 Integrated Programs (US\$ millions)

Replenishment Phase	Program	Average STAR Amount	Average Incentive Amount	Average Total Grant
GEF-6 IAP Programs	Resilient Food Systems	4.8	1.19	5.89
	Sustainable Cities	8.4	2.1	10.5
GEF-7 Impact Programs	Food Systems, Land Use and Restoration	7.4	1.9	9.3
	SFM Amazon Sustainable Landscapes	8.7	2.3	11
	SFM Congo Basin Sustainable Landscapes	7.2	1.9	9.9
	SFM Drylands Sustainable Landscapes	6	2	8
	Sustainable Cities	10.1	2.1	12.2

21. For the GEF-8 STAR focal areas, the total indicative IP amounts of STAR and matching incentives for programming by countries has been fixed with a 3:1 ratio in all the proposed scenarios. This total window will not change even if a different ratio is ultimately used by countries for programming the IPs. Furthermore, regardless of the ratio used, the indicative amounts for matching incentives will not increase. Hence any change in this ratio will affect how much STAR or matching incentive is programmed by countries. This implication and ultimate trade-offs of the alternative ratios proposed by participants are explained below.

- **2:1 ratio** – With this ratio, less of the STAR amount for IPs will be needed to use up the matching incentive. This implies that matching incentives will be exhausted with a STAR amount that is less than what was notionally allocated in these scenarios, and upon which the core indicator targets are also predicted. With this ratio, therefore, more incentive amounts would be needed to accommodate more countries. There is also the additional risk of potentially ending up with too many small projects that would not be attractive to certain agencies, in particular the MDBs.
- **4:1 or 5:1 ratio** – With these higher ratios, the amount of STAR allocated for IPs would risk being diverted from other country priorities, including the ability to join in more than one IP. Moreover, this ratio would also disincentivise LDCs, SIDS and smaller allocation countries from participating in the IPs.

22. Building on previous experience in programming, as indicated in OPS7, a 3:1 ratio for STAR to matching incentive provides the best opportunity for increasing efficiency in the delivery of impact and inclusiveness in providing access to all countries. This ratio will ensure that the matching incentive available for each program will accommodate as many eligible countries as possible, including LDCs and SIDS, while at the same achieving the robust portfolio needed for influencing transformative change. Finally, having a dual structure for incentive ratios would present serious challenges in managing and accounting for resources, and servicing interested countries.

Minimum STAR Threshold

23. In GEF-7 the minimum threshold was set at \$4 million. In order to expand opportunities for countries to participate in more than one IP, while keeping a volume of resources compatible with the achievement of impacts on the ground, the proposals is to introduce minimum threshold for STAR be set at the MSP level, meaning US\$2 Million. With the STAR to Matching Incentive ratio of 3:1, a country selected to participate in an IP that uses only this minimum threshold will have US\$2.67 Million for its project under the program.

Ceilings to the Matching Incentive

24. A final aspect for increasing efficiency and fairness in programming is the imposition of a ceiling on incentive amounts that can be captured by any one country under the IPs. The ceiling is intended to ensure equal access to matching incentives by all countries selected for an IP, so that eligible LDCs and SIDS or countries with smaller STAR allocations are not overwhelmed by those with higher allocations.

25. The actual amount for a ceiling will be determined at the time when countries have been selected and the IP portfolio is being decided. For each IP, LDCs and SIDs that meet the minimum threshold requirement will be prioritized first for the incentive amounts. All countries affected by imposition of a ceiling will be notified and consulted by the GEF Secretariat, so they can decide on amount of STAR resources they choose to allocate.

Notional Amounts for IP Global Platforms

26. The indicative amount for IP Global Platforms is drawn from all five focal areas as presented in Table 6. The amounts increase modestly for each focal area from the lower US\$5 Billion Scenario to the higher US\$6.5 Billion scenario, except for CW which is held constant across all scenarios. This is in recognition of the fact that priorities of this focal area are anchored only within a few IPs.

Table 6. Indicative Focal Amounts allocated for IP Global Platforms in the Proposed Programming Scenarios

GEF-8 Programming Scenario	BD	CCM	LD	IW	CW	Totals
5 Billion	65	30	42	30	13	<i>180</i>
5.8 Billion	76	35	47	41	13	<i>212</i>
6.5 Billion	85	36	53	46	13	<i>233</i>

27. The notional breakdown of this total envelope for Global Platforms across the IPs is shown in Table 7 for the proposed replenishment scenarios. The breakdown is based on projected size of

the IP portfolio, including likely number of countries, geographical scale of operation (global, regional, or sub-regional), and potential for leveraging diverse initiatives and stakeholders. Based on this, the three IPs with the largest notional amounts for country programming are allocated higher amounts for the platforms: Amazon, Congo, and Critical Forest Biomes; Food Systems; and Sustainable Cities. All other IPs are allocated proportionally similar amounts.

Table 7. Notional IP Envelopes for Country Programming under the Proposed Programming Scenarios

GEF-8 Integrated Programs	5B	5.8B	6.5B
<i>Food Systems</i>	20	26	25
<i>Ecosystem Restoration</i>	13	15	15
<i>Sustainable Cities</i>	20	26	25
<i>Amazon, Congo, and Critical Forest Biomes</i>	41	45	45
<i>Circular Solutions to Plastic Pollution</i>	15	15	20
<i>Blue and Green Islands</i>	11	15	13
<i>Clean and Healthy Ocean</i>	15	15	20
<i>Greening Transportation Infrastructure Development</i>	10	15	20
<i>Net-Zero Nature-Positive Accelerator</i>	10	15	20
<i>Wildlife Conservation for Development</i>	15	15	20
<i>Elimination of Hazardous Chemicals from Supply Chains</i>	10	10	10
Totals Amounts to Countries	180	212	233

28. The higher amount for Amazon, Congo Basin, and Critical Forest Biomes IP is necessary because the IP covers multiple “distinct” geographies that warrant separate platforms to ensure coherence and alignment. The Ecosystem Restoration and Blue and Green Island IPs have smaller amounts because these IPs only require platforms that will focus primarily on coordination and leveraging existing systems for south-south exchange.

29. The IW amount for platforms is allocated to only four IPs that are likely to target conjunctive or transboundary water resources: Clean and Healthy Ocean, Circular Solutions to Plastic Pollution, Food Systems, and Amazon, Congo, and Critical Forest Biomes.

30. The CW amount for global platforms is allocated mainly to the IP on Elimination of Hazardous Chemicals from Supply Chains. A small amount was allocated to the Amazon, Congo, and Critical Forest Biomes to leverage the platform for opportunities to tackle mercury in artisanal gold mining.

REVISED GEF-8 RESULTS TARGETS

31. This chapter presents Core Indicator (CI) targets aligned with the three programming scenarios under consideration by Participants in preparation for the Fourth Meeting of the GEF-8 Replenishment: US\$ 5 billion as a baseline, US\$6.5 billion and a mid-range scenario of US\$5.8 billion. The US\$ 7 billion scenario will deliver even higher results through a larger Non-Grant Instrument window.

32. Table 8 presents the targets under the previously considered scenarios, together with the alternative scenarios currently under consideration. Updated targets have been set by relying on the same mixed method approach used to identify targets for the Third Replenishment Meeting and described in the related paper. This involves relying on evidence from GEF-6 and GEF-7, as well as statistical analysis, expert judgement and, engagement with countries, to identify the right level of ambition and realism.

Table 8. The Expected Global Environment Benefits of GEF-8, by Core Indicator
'Previous' and 'Revised' relate to scenarios presented at the Third and Interim Replenishment Meeting

CORE INDICATOR	GEF-7		US\$5 billion			US\$6.5 billion			US\$5.8 billion
	Target	Approved	Previous	Revised	Change	Previous	Revised	Change	
CONSERVING & SUSTAINABLY USING BIODIVERSITY									
Core Indicator 1 — Terrestrial protected areas created or under improved management for conservation and sustainable use (million hectares)	200	102	125	135	108%	170	180	106%	160
Core Indicator 2 — Marine protected areas created or under improved management for conservation and sustainable use (million hectares)	8	1328	90	95	106%	140	140	100%	125
Core Indicator 4 — Area of landscapes under improved practices (million hectares; excluding protected areas)	320	167	180	185	103%	245	260	106%	220
Core Indicator 5 — Area of marine habitat under improved practices to benefit biodiversity (million hectares; excluding protected areas)	28	87	65	65	100%	100	90	90%	75
SUSTAINABLY MANAGING AND RESTORING LAND									
Core Indicator 3 — Area of land under restoration (million hectares)	6	8	10	10	100%	12	12.5	104%	11
REDUCING GHG EMISSIONS									
Core Indicator 6 — Greenhouse Gas Emissions Mitigated (million metric tons of CO ₂ e)	1500	1445	1840	1,800	98%	2320	2,350	101%	2,100
STRENGTHENING TRANSBOUNDARY WATER MANAGEMENT									
Core Indicator 7 — Number of shared water ecosystems (fresh or marine) under new or improved cooperative management	32	54	46	37	80%	54	58	107%	53
Core Indicator 8 — Globally over-exploited marine fisheries moved to more sustainable levels (million metric tons)	3.5	2.4	2.4	1.9	81%	2.7	3	112%	2.7

CORE INDICATOR	GEF-7		US\$5 billion			US\$6.5 billion			US\$5.8 billion
	Target	Approved	Previous	Revised	Change	Previous	Revised	Change	
REDUCING CHEMICALS AND WASTE									
Core Indicator 9 — Reduction, disposal/destruction, phase out, elimination, and avoidance of chemicals of global concern and their waste in the environment and in processes, materials, and products (thousand metric tons of toxic chemicals reduced)	100	88	335	365 ¹	109%	455	465	102%	410
Core Indicator 10 — Reduction, avoidance of emissions of persistent organic pollutants to air from point and non-point sources (grams of toxic equivalent)	1300	2862	5815	5,900	101%	8630	7800	90%	7,000

33. These alternative updated scenarios lead to an overall increase in target levels for biodiversity-related Core Indicators, reflecting the increased allocation for Biodiversity reaching 35% of the total GEF-8 envelope. In light of the reduction in climate change allocation, it is noteworthy that the target for greenhouse gas emissions mitigated mostly stays unchanged under the latest scenarios, highlighting climate co-benefits emanating from integrated programming and each focal area. Targets for International Waters are lower under the US\$5 billion scenario, but higher under both the mid-range and higher scenarios, in alignment with updated programming scenarios. Key observations arising from targets updated along the revised scenarios can be summarized as follows:

- **Conserving and Sustainably Using Biodiversity.** Under the alternative \$6.5 billion scenario, an estimated 140 million hectares of marine areas are expected to be protected or sustainably managed with GEF-8 financing. This is seventeen times the GEF-7 target, reflecting higher demand to expand marine protected areas. The target for terrestrial protected area reaches 180 million hectares, contributing with marine areas to the goal to protect 30 percent of the planet by 2030. The level of ambition for terrestrial protected areas, as well as for the targeted 260 million hectares of areas of landscapes under improved practices, reflects in part the higher cost to transform land into protected areas as productive agricultural land expands. Taken together, the targets for marine and terrestrial areas are 154 percent higher than the GEF-7 equivalent, highlighting a collectively higher level of ambition for the planet.
- **Sustainably Managing and Restoring Land.** Restored landscapes translate into protected reserves, ecological corridors, regenerated forests, well-managed plantations, agroforestry systems and plantings along waterways. In this context, nearly 12.5 million hectares of land will be placed under restoration in GEF-8 under the new \$6.5 billion scenario, twice the high amount achieved in GEF-7. It will also help meet the global commitment to reach Land Degradation Neutrality under the UN Convention to Combat Desertification. This

¹ This revised version includes corrections to one typo of the CI 9 under the Sustainable Cities IP.

commitment is translated into the Bonn Challenge, which aims to reach 350 million hectares of land restored by 2030.

- **Reducing GHG Emissions.** Despite a significant reduction in funding for Climate Change Mitigation, the targets remain largely unchanged. The target for CO₂ emissions mitigated decreases only slightly by 2% in the alternative \$5 billion and increases by 1% in the revised \$6.5 billion scenarios. At a target of 2,350 million metric tons of CO₂e under the alternative \$6.5 billion scenario, it is over 150% the GEF-7 target, highlighting that the integrated approach promoted through GEF financing can achieve more results in support of the high goals set in the Paris Agreement under the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change.
- **Strengthening Transboundary Water Management.** The targets for CI 7 and 8 both decrease under the alternative \$5 billion scenario, reflecting the reduced share of IW funding from 12% to 10% of the total replenishment envelope; but increase in the new \$6.5 billion with the same level of funding as in the previous scenario. Under the alternative \$6.5 billion, the target for globally over-exploited marine fisheries moved to more sustainable levels stand at 3 million metric tons, reflecting the experience in GEF-7 and increased country demand. It also supports the fact that heightened ambitions for marine protected areas will provide a refuge for species. Ambitions around fisheries will also support the Agreement on Port State Measures (PSMA), the first binding international agreement to specifically target illegal, unreported, and unregulated fishing.
- **Reducing Chemicals & Waste.** Targets for CI 9 and 10 mostly increase under the new \$5 billion and \$6.5 billion scenarios. GEF-8 will continue to build on its past achievements, with a target to directly reduce or avoid 7,800 grams of toxic equivalent of unintentionally produced persistent organic pollutants emissions to air from point and non-point sources. This is in line with the GEF's responsibility to eliminate the most harmful chemicals, as it serves the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants, the Minamata Convention on Mercury, and the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer.

34. The proposed Integrated Programs (IPs), including the reinstated Eliminating Hazardous Chemicals from Supply Chains IP, will account for a large share of the expected global environmental benefits in GEF-8 – significantly larger than their relative share of financing. Table 9 provides a summary of changes across IPs comparing the scenarios presented at the Third Meeting with those prepared for the Interim Meeting. It also indicates targets for each IP, along the scenarios prepared for the Interim Meeting. Changes in target levels are aligned to overall changes in the financing of Integrated Programs. This leads to an overall steady level of targets in terms of terrestrial and marine protected areas under both scenarios, as compared to previous scenarios. Meanwhile, a moderate decrease is observed in the areas of land under restoration,

landscapes under improved practices and marine habitat under improved practices, as well as for greenhouse gas emissions mitigated.

Table 9. The Expected Results from Integrated Programs in GEF-8
Targets presented for each IP relate to the updated scenarios presented for the Interim Meeting

	Scenarios	Core Indicator 1	Core Indicator 2	Core Indicator 3	Core Indicator 4	Core Indicator 5	Core Indicator 6	Core Indicator 7	Core Indicator 8	Core Indicator 9	Core Indicator 10
TARGETS ACROSS INTEGRATED PROGRAMS											
US\$5 billion	Previous	70.9	50.5	6.6	104.8	50.1	1,102.7	7.0	0.01	45.0	1,943
	Revised	70.9	50.5	6.3	95.3	49.7	914.0	7.0	0.01	64.6	2,030
	Change	100%	100%	95%	91%	99%	83%	100%	100%	144%	104%
US\$6.5 billion	Previous	85.8	58.5	7.8	129.0	74.5	1,319.4	10.0	0.02	60.0	3,698
	Revised	85.8	56.6	7.5	121.4	64.7	1,198.8	10.0	0.02	93.5	3,097
	Change	100%	97%	96%	94%	87%	91%	100%	75%	156%	84%
US\$5.8 billion	New	82.0	53.6	6.9	111.9	54.9	1,072.1	9.0	0.02	80.3	2,789
TARGETS BY INTEGRATED PROGRAM											
Food Systems	US\$5b			0.4	20.1		222.0	1.0		20.0	
	US\$6.5b			0.6	27.4		291.0	1.0		33.0	
	US\$5.8b			0.5	25.0		260.0	1.0		30.0	
Ecosystem Restoration	US\$5b			4.2	8.9		77.0	1.0			
	US\$6.5b			4.7	10.0		102.0	1.0			
	US\$5.8b			4.5	9.6		90.0	1.0			
Sustainable Cities	US\$5b			0.2	2.5		195.0				450
	US\$6.5b			0.3	3.3		256.0				600
	US\$5.8b			0.2	2.9		227.0				500
Amazon, Congo, and Critical Forest Biomes	US\$5b	51.0		1.0	40.0		196.0	1.0		0.01	
	US\$6.5b	60.0		1.3	50.0		262.0	1.0		0.01	
	US\$5.8b	59.0		1.2	47.0		233.0	1.0		0.01	
Circular Solutions to Plastic Pollution	US\$5b						14.0	1.0		10.0	1,091
	US\$6.5b						19.0	2.0		10.0	1,800
	US\$5.8b						18.0	2.0		10.0	1,696
Blue and Green Islands	US\$5b	0.4	50.0	0.3	3.0	36.0	42.0	1.0	0.01	10.0	243
	US\$6.5b	0.6	56.0	0.3	4.0	46.0	56.0	2.0	0.02	15.0	362
	US\$5.8b	0.5	53.0	0.3	3.5	40.0	49.0	2.0	0.02	12.0	310
Net-Zero Nature-Positive Accelerator IP	US\$5b			0.1	4.4		98.0				
	US\$6.5b			0.2	5.4		122.0				

	Scenarios	Core Indicator 1	Core Indicator 2	Core Indicator 3	Core Indicator 4	Core Indicator 5	Core Indicator 6	Core Indicator 7	Core Indicator 8	Core Indicator 9	Core Indicator 10
	US\$5.8b			0.1	4.9		115.0				
Blue and Healthy Ocean	US\$5b				0.2	13.2	5.0	2.0			
	US\$6.5b				0.3	18.1	7.2	3.0			
	US\$5.8b				0.2	14.3	5.0	2.0			
Wildlife Conservation for Development	US\$5b	17.0		0.1	12.7		42.0				
	US\$6.5b	22.1		0.1	16.5		54.6				
	US\$5.8b	19.7		0.1	14.7		48.7				
Greening Transportation Infrastructure Development	US\$5b	2.5	0.5		2.5	0.5	17.0				
	US\$6.5b	3.1	0.6		3.1	0.6	21.0				
	US\$5.8b	2.9	0.6		2.9	0.6	19.4				
Eliminating Hazardous Chemicals from Supply Chains	US\$5b				1.0		6.0			24.6	246
	US\$6.5b				1.4		8.0			35.5	335
	US\$5.8b				1.2		7.0			28.3	283

35. Under the revised Programming Scenarios, estimates for most Core Indicators targets by Integrated Programs are overall at similar levels as presented during the third Replenishment Meeting. Key observations continue to include:

- Integrated programs are expected to achieve over half of the targeted results for the six core indicators contributing to biodiversity, land degradation and climate change results in GEF-8; a share of results higher than their relative financing of approximately 31% of the GEF-8 replenishment envelope. Using the example of CO₂ emissions mitigated, integrated programs target to mitigate 1,198.8 million metric tons of CO₂ emissions, or 51 percent of the total GEF-8 target under the alternative US\$6.5 billion scenario. This highlights the increased convergence between different focal areas, such as biodiversity with climate change, as demonstrated in many GEF-financed activities that protect areas, while achieving climate benefits. The contribution to combatting climate change is in fact tracked across nearly all integrated programs, showing how integrated programming generate benefits in multiple areas. Likewise, nine out of ten integrated programs will aim to improve practices in landscapes. Collectively, they contribute to 51 percent of GEF-8 targets for this indicator on landscapes under improved practices.
- Integrated programs contribute on average to five core indicators, cutting across focal areas of investment and attesting to the integrated nature of their design and related outcomes. Building on the GEF-7 experience where integrated programs contributed primarily to three focal areas, the scope and depth of interventions will expand to achieve high results in all five

focal areas. The learning that occurred through GEF-7 and earlier with the Integrated Approach Pilot programs now translates into a deeper understanding of how to address system change by tackling the drivers of environmental degradation across focal areas. This is how the Sustainable Cities integrated program in GEF-8 is expected to reduce pollutants, chemicals and waste in cities through a better management of waste, the sourcing of sustainable building materials and clean transportation. Conversely, new integrated programs targeting oceans will also yield benefits across multiple results areas, including reduced GHG emissions.

- The intensity of expected results across different Core Indicators varies by integrated program, highlighting careful considerations to achieving higher impact in program design. The conceptual thinking around the design of the integrated programs makes clear that integration facilitates the achievement of multiple benefits. Targets identified in Table 9 point to the relative contribution of each integrated program to different indicators. For example, the Net-Zero Nature-Positive Accelerator IP will be a major contributor to mitigating GHG emissions, but its contribution to improve practices in marine habitat will be limited.