



**GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT FACILITY**  
INVESTING IN OUR PLANET



**WORLD BANK GROUP**  
Development Finance

GEF/R.08/30  
March 23, 2022

---

Fourth Meeting for the Eighth Replenishment of the GEF Trust Fund  
April 7-8, 2022  
Virtual Meeting

**GEF-8 PROGRAMMING SCENARIOS AND  
GLOBAL ENVIRONMENTAL BENEFITS TARGETS  
(PREPARED BY THE GEF SECRETARIAT)**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>Preamble to the GEF R.08/30 Programming Scenarios .....</b>	<b>ii</b>
<b>Introduction.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Updated GEF-8 Programming Scenarios .....</b>	<b>1</b>
Programming Scenarios .....	1
Financing the IPs.....	5
<b>Updated Results Targets for GEF-8.....</b>	<b>12</b>

## **PREAMBLE TO THE GEF R.08/30 PROGRAMMING SCENARIOS**

This final GEF-8 Programming Scenarios document has been revised and updated following the Third Replenishment Meeting as well as the Interim Replenishment Meeting held in March 2022, taking in consideration statements made during these meetings and written comments received from replenishment participants. This preamble note is intended to help the reader by identifying and highlighting key changes and additions made to the overall strategic direction.

All final allocations have been agreed during the Interim Replenishment Meeting with scenarios presented during the second day with participants.

The final agreed share of the overall replenishment directed to the Biodiversity Focal Area was 36%. Likewise, the final shares of the other focal areas were fixed as follows, depending on the scenario level: Climate Change between 13-16%, Land Degradation around 11%, Chemicals and Waste between 14-15%, and International Waters 11-12%.

The revised scenarios also include changes in allocations for the NGI, SGP and Innovation Window relative to what was presented in the Third Replenishment Meeting. The NGI and SGP allocations were reduced in the lower scenario, and proportion maintained for the higher scenarios. The Innovation Window was zeroed out in the lower scenario and restored in the higher scenarios.

The final programming scenario for GEF-8 will be calculated on a pro-rata basis using the parameters described above once the final overall replenishment figure is agreed upon.

The results targets for GEF-8 have also been revised based on these programming scenarios. While most targets have remained similar to those presented in the Third Replenishment Meeting, targets related to Biodiversity and International Waters have shown increases by virtue of their modified shares.

## **INTRODUCTION**

1. This paper describes the GEF-8 programming scenarios and results targets. The first section explains how GEF-8 programming scenarios will help the GEF support countries in achieving Global Environmental Benefits (GEBs). The second section articulates how Integrated Programs will be financed under the programming scenarios. The third section provides targets and estimates of the scale of lasting Global Environmental Benefits to be delivered in ten targeted results areas based on the programming scenarios

## **UPDATED GEF-8 PROGRAMMING SCENARIOS**

2. As a result of discussions and recommendations emerging from the Third Replenishment Meeting and the Interim 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.

3. 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.

4. 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**

5. 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 US\$5.8 and the US\$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.

6. 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.

7. Building on the original scenarios prepared for the Third Replenishment Meeting (February 2-4) and the follow-up Interim Meeting (March 8-9), 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 36% share of the total amount of the replenishment, a recommendation now endorsed by 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. Hence, the best option to accommodate these focal area specific requests by donors was to adjust the amounts for other GEF-8 priorities, specifically the NGI, SGP, and the Innovation Window.

8. Taking these into consideration, the GEF Secretariat made final adjustments to the four financial scenarios. Highlights of trends for each focal area under the revised scenarios are as follows:

- ***Biodiversity (BD)*** - The total envelope was fixed at 36% 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. Furthermore, and in response to requests by many participants, the amount for Enabling Activity was increased by US\$ 10 million. 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 extra amounts are allocated for Global and Regional Programs, making this line under the US\$7 Billion scenario considerably 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 (CCM)*** - The Climate Change Mitigation focal area envelope was maintained at 13-16% in the latest scenarios, with the absolute amounts being 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. At the request of participants, the focal area envelope was internally adjusted to increase the amount for Enabling Activities by US\$20 million.

- **Land Degradation (LD)** – 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 (CW)** - 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 the reinstatement of the IP on Elimination of Hazardous Chemicals from Supply Chains.
- **International Waters (IW)** - This focal area now accounts for between 10.6 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.

9. The revised scenarios also include changes in allocations for the NGI, SGP and Innovation Window relative to what was presented in the Third Replenishment Meeting. The NGI amount was reduced nominally from US\$215 million to US\$180 million in the lower US\$5 Billion Scenario, and proportion maintained for the higher scenarios. Similarly, the SGP amount was reduced from US\$160 Million to US\$145 million in the lower US\$5 Billion Scenario, and proportion maintained for the higher scenarios. The Innovation Window was zeroed out in the lower US\$5 Billion Scenario and restored at US\$30 million in the US\$5.8 Billion Scenario, then increased proportionally in the higher scenarios.

**Table 1 - Programming Scenarios for GEF-8**

FOCAL AREA	US\$5 Billion		US\$5.8 Billion		US\$6.5 Billion		US\$7 Billion	
	US\$	% of total	US\$	% of total	US\$	% of total	\$	% of total
<b>Total Biodiversity</b>	<b>1800</b>	<b>36%</b>	<b>2088</b>	<b>36%</b>	<b>2340</b>	<b>36%</b>	<b>2489</b>	<b>35.6%</b>
<b>BD STAR Country Allocations</b>	<b>1360</b>	<b>27.2%</b>	<b>1585</b>	<b>27.3%</b>	<b>1783</b>	<b>27.4%</b>	<b>1783</b>	<b>25.5%</b>
BD-1: Integrated Landscape/Seascape Management	528	10.6%	616	10.6%	693	10.7%	693	9.9%
BD-2: Cartagena Protocol/Nagoya Protocol	77	1.5%	90	1.5%	101	1.6%	101	1.4%
BD-3: Domestic Resource Mobilization	155	3.1%	181	3.1%	203	3.1%	203	2.9%
Integrated Programs	600	12.0%	699	12.0%	785	12.1%	785	11.2%
<b>BD STAR Set Aside</b>	<b>440</b>	<b>8.8%</b>	<b>503</b>	<b>8.7%</b>	<b>557</b>	<b>8.6%</b>	<b>707</b>	<b>10.1%</b>
EAs	60	1.2%	60	1.0%	60	0.9%	60	0.9%
Global and Regional Programs	115	2.3%	134	2.3%	151	2.3%	300	4.3%
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%
<b>Total Climate Change Mitigation</b>	<b>802</b>	<b>16.0%</b>	<b>900</b>	<b>15.5%</b>	<b>920</b>	<b>14.2%</b>	<b>920</b>	<b>13.1%</b>
<b>CCM STAR Country Allocations</b>	<b>480</b>	<b>9.6%</b>	<b>564</b>	<b>9.7%</b>	<b>581</b>	<b>8.9%</b>	<b>581</b>	<b>8.3%</b>
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%
<b>CCM STAR Set Aside</b>	<b>322</b>	<b>6.4%</b>	<b>336</b>	<b>5.8%</b>	<b>339</b>	<b>5.2%</b>	<b>339</b>	<b>4.8%</b>
CBIT	75	1.5%	75	1.3%	75	1.2%	75	1.1%
EAs	145	2.9%	145	2.5%	145	2.2%	145	2.1%
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%
<b>Total Land Degradation</b>	<b>580</b>	<b>11.6%</b>	<b>650</b>	<b>11.2%</b>	<b>731</b>	<b>11.2%</b>	<b>731</b>	<b>10.4%</b>
<b>LD STAR Country Allocations</b>	<b>428</b>	<b>8.6%</b>	<b>482</b>	<b>8.3%</b>	<b>544</b>	<b>8.4%</b>	<b>544</b>	<b>7.8%</b>
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%
<b>LD STAR Set Aside</b>	<b>152</b>	<b>3.0%</b>	<b>168</b>	<b>2.9%</b>	<b>187</b>	<b>2.9%</b>	<b>187</b>	<b>2.7%</b>
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%

<b>Total Chemicals and Waste</b>	<b>750</b>	<b>15.0%</b>	<b>820</b>	<b>14.1%</b>	<b>917</b>	<b>14.1%</b>	<b>917</b>	<b>13.1%</b>
<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%
<i>Contribution to IP Global Platforms</i>	13	0.3%	13	0.2%	13	0.2%	13	0.2%
<i>Contribution to IP Country Projects</i>	25	0.5%	28	0.5%	34	0.5%	34	0.5%
<b>Total International Waters</b>	<b>530</b>	<b>10.6%</b>	<b>690</b>	<b>11.9%</b>	<b>768</b>	<b>11.8%</b>	<b>768</b>	<b>11.0%</b>
<i>Blue Economy</i>	175	3.5%	228	3.9%	253	3.9%	253	3.6%
<i>ABNJ</i>	32	0.6%	41	0.7%	46	0.7%	46	0.7%
<i>Enhancing Freshwater Security</i>	175	3.5%	228	3.9%	253	3.9%	253	3.6%
<i>Contribution to IP Global Platforms</i>	32	0.6%	41	0.7%	46	0.7%	46	0.7%
<i>Contribution to IP Country Projects</i>	117	2.3%	152	2.6%	169	2.6%	169	2.4%
<b>TOTAL FOCAL AREA RESOURCES</b>	<b>4462</b>	<b>89.2%</b>	<b>5148</b>	<b>88.8%</b>	<b>5676</b>	<b>87.3%</b>	<b>5825</b>	<b>83.2%</b>
<i>Non-Grant Instruments Window</i>	180	3.6%	205	3.5%	304	4.7%	473	6.8%
<i>Innovations Window</i>	0	0.0%	30	0.5%	43	0.7%	62	0.9%
<i>Small Grants Program</i>	145	2.9%	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%
<b>TOTAL PROGRAMMING</b>	<b>4813</b>	<b>96.3%</b>	<b>5613</b>	<b>96.8%</b>	<b>6313</b>	<b>97.1%</b>	<b>6813</b>	<b>97.3%</b>
<i>Corporate Budgets</i>	187	3.7%	187	3.2%	187	2.9%	187	2.7%
<i>GEFSEC</i>	127	2.5%	127	2.2%	127	2.0%	127	1.8%
<i>IEO</i>	30	0.6%	30	0.5%	30	0.5%	30	0.4%
<i>Trustee</i>	15	0.3%	15	0.3%	15	0.2%	15	0.2%
<i>STAP</i>	14	0.3%	14	0.2%	14	0.2%	14	0.2%
<b>GRAND TOTAL</b>	<b>5000</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>5800</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>6500</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>7000</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

## 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.*

10. 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.

11. 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.

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

13. 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.

14. 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	<b>1384</b>	180	<b>1564</b>
5.8 Billion	1085	362	180	<b>1627</b>	212	<b>1839</b>
6.5 Billion	1205	402	203	<b>1810</b>	233	<b>2043</b>

### *Notional IP Envelopes for Countries*

15. 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.

16. 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.

17. 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**

<b>GEF-8 Integrated Programs</b>	<b>5B</b>	<b>5.8B</b>	<b>6.5B</b>
<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
<b><i>Totals Amounts to Countries</i></b>	<b><i>1384</i></b>	<b><i>1627</i></b>	<b><i>1810</i></b>

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

<b>GEF-8 Integrated Programs</b>	<b>BD</b>	<b>CCM</b>	<b>LD</b>	<b>IW</b>	<b>CW</b>	<b>TOTALS</b>
<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
<b><i>Focal Area Totals to Countries</i></b>	<b>800</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>249</b>	<b>110</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>1384</b>

18. 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.

19. 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. For CW, the focus is on reducing mercury and POPs.

20. 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 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***

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 ratio will enable the GEF Secretariat to have a more predictable envelope to be used by countries for programming the IPs. 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.

### ***Minimum STAR Threshold***

22. 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***

23. 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.

24. 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*

25. The indicative amount for IP Global Platforms is drawn from all five focal areas as presented in *Table 5*. 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 5. Indicative Focal Amounts allocated for IP Global Platforms in the Proposed Programming Scenarios**

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

26. The notional breakdown of this total envelope for Global Platforms across the IPs is shown in *Table 6* 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 6. Notional IP Envelopes for Global Platforms under the Proposed Programming Scenarios**

<b>GEF-8 Integrated Programs</b>	<b>5B</b>	<b>5.8B</b>	<b>6.5B</b>
<i>Food Systems</i>	20	26	26
<i>Ecosystem Restoration</i>	13	15	15
<i>Sustainable Cities</i>	20	26	26
<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	15
<i>Clean and Healthy Ocean</i>	15	15	20
<i>Greening Transportation Infrastructure Development</i>	10	15	17
<i>Net-Zero Nature-Positive Accelerator</i>	10	15	20
<i>Wildlife Conservation for Development</i>	15	15	19
<i>Elimination of Hazardous Chemicals from Supply Chains</i>	10	10	10
<b>Totals Amounts to Countries</b>	<b>180</b>	<b>212</b>	<b>233</b>

27. 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. Ecosystem Restoration and Blue and Green Islands have smaller amounts because these IPs only require platforms that will focus primarily on coordination and leveraging existing systems for south-south exchange.

28. 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.

29. 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.

## UPDATED RESULTS TARGETS FOR GEF-8

30. Changes made to the programming scenarios since the Third Replenishment Meeting have implications on the scale of Global Environmental Benefits expected to be delivered in GEF-8. This section provides updated results targets reflecting the latest distribution of allocated resources for the US\$5 billion, US\$5.8 billion and US\$6.5 billion programming scenarios under consideration, noting that the US\$7 billion scenario will deliver even higher results mainly through the larger Non-Grant Instrument window. Updated targets have been set as per the mixed method approach described in the related paper prepared for the Third Replenishment Meeting.

31. Results areas linked to Biodiversity, Climate Change and International Waters have seen the largest changes in target levels, reflecting latest resources allocation planned in related Focal Areas and for Non-Grant Instrument. These lead for example to higher impact in targets related to terrestrial and marine protected areas. At the same time, a minor decline is observed for landscapes under improved practices, as reduced allocations for Non-Grant Instrument offset increases in Biodiversity focal area allocations. Likewise, targets for CO<sub>2</sub> emission mitigation decrease slightly given lower envelopes for Non-Grant Instrument. Targets linked to strengthening transboundary water management decrease under the lower scenario and increase under the higher one, consistent with related changes in allocation.

32. All GEF-8 scenarios under consideration will deliver higher impact across Core Indicators. Specifically, the US\$6.5 billion will allow the GEF to provide resources to meet the rising needs of countries and urgency to achieve environmental benefits under the Healthy Planet, Healthy People framework on a larger scale (see *Table 7*):

- 185 million hectares of terrestrial protected areas created or under improved management;
- 140 million hectares of marine protected areas created or under improved management;
- 12 million hectares of area of land restored and 250 million hectares of landscapes under improved practices, including 130 million hectares under sustainable land management;
- 95 million hectares of marine habitat under improved practices;
- 2.3 billion metric tons of greenhouse gas emissions mitigated;
- 58 shared water ecosystems under improved management;
- 3 million metric tons of globally over-exploited marine fisheries moved to more sustainable levels;
- 460 thousand metric tons of toxic chemicals reduced; and
- 7,800 grams of toxic equivalent of unintentionally produced persistent organic pollutants to air from point and nonpoint sources to be reduced or avoided.

**Table 7. The Expected Global Environment Benefits of GEF-8 along Core Indicators**

CORE INDICATOR (CI)	GEF-7		GEF-8 TARGETS BY SCENARIO		
	Target	Approved	US\$5b	US\$5.8b	US\$6.5b
<b>CONSERVING &amp; SUSTAINABLY USING BIODIVERSITY</b>					
CI 1. Terrestrial protected areas created or under improved management for conservation and sustainable use (million ha)	200	102	140	165	185
CI 2. Marine protected areas created or under improved management for conservation and sustainable use (million ha)	8	1328	100	130	140
CI 4. Area of landscapes under improved practices (million ha; excluding protected areas)*	320	167	185	220	250
CI 5. Area of marine habitat under improved practices to benefit biodiversity (million ha; excluding protected areas)	28	87	70	80	95
<b>SUSTAINABLY MANAGING AND RESTORING LAND</b>					
CI 3. Area of land under restoration (million ha)	6	8	10	11	12
<b>REDUCING GHG EMISSIONS</b>					
CI 6. Greenhouse Gas Emissions Mitigated (million metric tons of CO2e)	1500	1445	1750	2050	2300
<b>STRENGTHENING TRANSBOUNDARY WATER MANAGEMENT</b>					
CI 7. Number of shared water ecosystems (fresh or marine) under new or improved cooperative management	32	54	39	53	58
CI 8. Globally over-exploited marine fisheries moved to more sustainable levels (million metric tons)	3.5	2.4	2.0	2.7	3.0
<b>REDUCING CHEMICALS AND WASTE</b>					
CI 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	360	400	460
CI 10. Reduction, avoidance of emissions of persistent organic pollutants to air from point and non-point sources (grams of toxic equivalent)	1300	2862	5900	7000	7800

\* This Core Indicator also includes a target for its sub-indicator ‘Area of landscapes under sustainable land management in production systems’ shared with the grouping of indicators ‘Sustainably Managing and Restoring Land’ under the GEF-8 Results Measurement Framework. Associated targets are 85 Mha, 105 Mha and 130 Mha in ascending order of scenarios’ volume.



### ***Updated targets for GEF-8***

33. Across virtually all areas, the GEF sets ambitious, yet achievable targets for GEF-8 that exceed those agreed for GEF-7. *Table 7* provides complete GEF-8 targets across the ten core indicators focused on global environmental benefits, presented side-by-side with GEF-7 targets and Council approvals as per the December 2021 edition of the GEF Corporate Scorecard for context. In setting targets and measuring progress, the GEF strikes a careful balance between ambition and realism, in the context of higher goals for the world's environment and climate. The following paragraphs provide details on targets for the US\$6.5 billion scenario by key results areas:

- **Conserving and sustainably using biodiversity.** Learning from GEF-7 experience and leveraging new opportunities, 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 185 million hectares, up from 170 million hectares identified at the Third Replenishment Meeting. Altogether, this heightened support to protected areas contributes to the goal to protect 30 percent of the planet by 2030. The level of ambition for terrestrial protected areas reflects in part the higher cost to transform land into protected areas as productive agricultural land expands. This is also reflected in the targeted 250 million hectares of areas of landscapes under improved practices, of which 130 million hectares under sustainable land management. Taken together, the targets for marine and terrestrial areas are 160 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, 12 million hectares of land will be placed under restoration in GEF-8, almost 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 commitment is translated into the Bonn Challenge, which aims to reach 350 million hectares of land restored by 2030.
- **Reducing GHG emissions.** The target for CO2 emissions mitigated continues to be over 150% the GEF-7 target, even with adjustments to the Climate Change focal area allocations. This highlights 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 target for globally overexploited marine fisheries moved to more sustainable levels reaches 3 million metric tons. This level is higher than in GEF-7 and reflects 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.** 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 will account for a large share of the expected global environmental benefits in GEF-8 – significantly larger than their relative share in GEF-7. *Table 8* provides the distribution of targets for each integrated program and illustrates the following:

- 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 under the US\$ billion scenario. This share is higher than the relative share of financing supporting Integrated Programs across all scenarios. Using the example of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions mitigated, integrated programs target to mitigate 1,200 million metric tons of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions, or 51 percent of the total GEF-8 target under the \$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. In fact, nearly all Integrated Programs aim to mitigate CO<sub>2</sub> emissions, showing how integrated programming generate benefits in multiple areas. Likewise, nine out of ten integrated programs will aim to improve practices in landscapes.
- 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 8* point to the relative contribution of each integrated program to different indicators. For example, the Net-Zero Nature-Positive Accelerator will be a major contributor to mitigating GHG emissions, but its contribution to improve practices in marine habitat will be limited.

**Table 8. Expected results from integrated programs in GEF-8**

	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
<b>TARGETS ACROSS INTEGRATED PROGRAMS</b>											
<b>Cumulative targets across IPs</b>	US\$5b	71	51	6	95	50	914	7	0	65	2030
	US\$5.8b	82	54	7	112	55	1074	9	0	80	2789
	US\$6.5b	86	57	7	121	65	1197	10	0	94	3097
<b>TARGETS BY INTEGRATED PROGRAMS</b>											
<b>Food Systems</b>	US\$5b			0.4	20		222	1		20	
	US\$5.8b			0.5	25		260	1		30	
	US\$6.5b			0.6	27		291	1		33	
<b>Ecosystem Restoration</b>	US\$5b			4.2	9		77	1			
	US\$5.8b			4.5	10		90	1			
	US\$6.5b			4.7	10		102	1			
<b>Sustainable Cities</b>	US\$5b			0.2	2.5		195				450
	US\$5.8b			0.2	2.9		227				500
	US\$6.5b			0.3	3.3		256				600
<b>Amazon, Congo, and Critical Forest Biomes</b>	US\$5b	51		1.0	40		196	1		0.01	
	US\$5.8b	59		1.2	47		233	1		0.01	
	US\$6.5b	60		1.3	50		262	1		0.01	
<b>Circular Solutions to Plastic Pollution</b>	US\$5b						14	1		10	1091
	US\$5.8b						18	2		10	1696
	US\$6.5b						19	2		10	1800
<b>Blue and Green Islands</b>	US\$5b	0.4	50	0.3	3.0	36	42	1	0.01	10	243
	US\$5.8b	0.5	53	0.3	3.5	40	49	2	0.02	12	310
	US\$6.5b	0.6	56	0.3	4.0	46	56	2	0.02	15	362
<b>Net-Zero Nature-Positive Accelerator</b>	US\$5b			0.1	4.4		98				
	US\$5.8b			0.1	4.9		115				
	US\$6.5b			0.2	5.4		122				

	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
<b>Blue and Healthy Ocean</b>	US\$5b				0.2	13	5	2			
	US\$5.8b				0.2	14	5	2			
	US\$6.5b				0.3	18	7	3			
<b>Wildlife Conservation for Development</b>	US\$5b	17		0.1	13		42				
	US\$5.8b	20		0.1	15		49				
	US\$6.5b	22		0.1	17		55				
<b>Greening Transportation Infrastructure Development</b>	US\$5b	2.5	0.5		2.5	0.5	17				
	US\$5.8b	2.9	0.6		2.0	0.6	19				
	US\$6.5b	3.1	0.6		3.1	0.6	21				
<b>Eliminating Hazardous Chemicals from Supply Chains</b>	US\$5b				1.0		6			25	246
	US\$5.8b				1.2		7			28	283
	US\$6.5b				1.4		8			36	335