

**CONVENTION ON
BIOLOGICAL
DIVERSITY**Distr.
GENERALUNEP/CBD/COP/8/10
6 February 2006

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

**CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES TO THE
CONVENTION ON BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY**

Eighth meeting

Curitiba, Brazil, 20-31 March 2006

Item 26.2 of the provisional agenda*

REPORT OF THE GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT FACILITY*Note by the Executive Secretary*

1. In accordance with the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the Conference of the Parties and the Council of the Global Environment Facility (GEF) contained in decision III/8, annex, the GEF Council prepares and submits a report for each ordinary meeting of the Conference of the Parties. Section 3 of the MOU provides a list of specific information, detailed information as well as other information to be included in the report.
2. In decision VII/20, paragraph 1, the Conference of the Parties decided that the report from the Council of the Global Environment Facility to the Conference of the Parties should be made available three months prior to an ordinary meeting of the Conference of the Parties as well as with updates as appropriate, and in accordance with rules 28 and 54 of the rules of procedure for meetings of the Conference of the Parties, the Executive Secretary should make it available in all six United Nations languages.
3. In its recommendation I/4, the Ad Hoc Open-ended Working Group on Review of Implementation of the Convention requested the Executive Secretary to invite the Chairman of the Global Environment Facility to provide details of the Resource Allocation Framework adopted by the special meeting of the Council of the Global Environment Facility on 1 September 2005 and its implications and potential impact on the implementation of the Convention at the eighth meeting of the Conference of the Parties. The Executive Secretary sent the requisite invitation to the Chairman of the Global Environment Facility on 7 October 2005 and received a reply dated 13 October 2005 indicating that the GEF Secretariat will be glad to provide details of the Resource Allocation Framework in preparation for the eighth meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity.
4. In light of the above, the Executive Secretary is circulating herewith the report of the Global Environment Facility to the eighth meeting of the Conference of the Parties.

* UNEP/CBD/COP/8/1.

5. The Conference of the Parties is invited to review and take note of the report of the GEF Council and to consider the information contained therein when deciding upon the need for further guidance to the financial mechanism and the effectiveness of the financial mechanism under agenda item 25 and other items of relevance of the present meeting.



Global Environment Facility

February 10, 2006

Revised

GEF REPORT TO THE EIGHTH MEETING
OF THE CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES
TO THE CONVENTION ON BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This document reports on the activities of the Global Environment Facility (GEF) in the area of biological diversity for the period July 1, 2003 to December 30, 2005. The GEF, as the operating entity of the financial mechanism of the Convention on Biological Diversity, provides financing to country driven projects based on guidance received from the Conference of Parties. The report describes the GEF's activities in response to guidance received from the Conference of Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity at its seventh session (COP VII) held in Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia in February 2004 and other relevant decisions of previous COPs. Of the decisions approved by COP VII, several have relevance to financial issues, and two in particular are directed towards the GEF. These are Decision VII/20, which provides further guidance to the financial mechanism; and Decision VII/22, which describes the arrangements for the third review of the effectiveness of the financial mechanism. Decision VII/21 addresses issues related to additional financial resources in which some paragraphs are addressed to the GEF.

During the reporting period, the GEF approved 113 full-size and medium-size projects and enabling activities in the area of biological diversity (including biosafety). The total GEF allocation during the reporting period was approximately US\$392.4 million. Almost US\$1.3 billion was leveraged in co-financing for the projects, from partners which included the Implementing Agencies, Executing Agencies, bilateral agencies, recipient countries, and the private sector. In addition, eighty-eight project preparation grants were approved in the reporting period amounting to approximately US\$18.5 million. The document describes GEF financed activities in its other focal areas, in particular projects and programs in the areas of international waters, integrated ecosystem management and sustainable land management, which also contributed directly or indirectly to the objectives and implementation of the Convention on Biological Diversity. The document reports on the activities of the Office of Monitoring and Evaluation (OME) in the area of biological diversity during the reporting period. Three major studies, one on the overall performance of the GEF and three in the area of biological diversity and biosafety were completed by the OME and will be available as information documents at this eighth session of the Conference of Parties.

Information on other relevant issues being addressed by the GEF, including the Resource Allocation Framework (RAF) and the GEF 4 replenishment process, is included.

Table of Contents

I.	Introduction.....	6
II.	Project Activities in the Area OF Biological Diversity	6
III.	Activities in Response to CoP VII Guidance.....	9
IV.	Activities in Other GEF Focal Areas of relevance to this report	25
V.	Monitoring & Evaluation Results.....	27
VI.	Emerging Issues Relevant to the area of Biological Diversity	31

Tables

Table 1: GEF Projects in the area of biological diversity, including biosafety approved between July 1, 2003 and June 30, 2005.	7
Table 2: Biosafety Projects approved during the reporting period.....	23

Annexes

Annex 1: Full-size projects in the biodiversity focal area approved during the reporting period.....	34
Annex 2: Medium-size projects in the biodiversity focal area approved during the reporting period.....	38
Annex 3: Enabling activities in the biodiversity focal area approved during the reporting period.....	41
Annex 4: Project Summaries	43
Annex 5: List of GEF documents available at the eighth session of the Conference of Parties	65

I. INTRODUCTION

1. This report has been prepared for the eighth meeting of the Conference of Parties (COP 8) to the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD). It reports on activities of the GEF in the area of biodiversity and biosafety during the period, July 1, 2003 to December 2005. The report describes the major GEF activities and issues during the reporting period in the areas covered by the Convention. Project related data covers fiscal years 2004 and 2005 (July 1, 2003 to June 30, 2005).

2. In addition to this report, supplemental information is presented in GEF publications and documents which the GEF will make available to the eighth meeting of the Conference of Parties. A list of the documents is provided in Annex 6. All documents are available on the GEF website, www.theGEF.org.

II. PROJECT ACTIVITIES IN THE AREA OF BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY

3. The GEF, as the operating entity of the financial mechanism of the Convention on Biological Diversity, provides financing to country driven projects based on guidance received from the Conference of Parties. GEF financed projects are managed primarily through three Implementing Agencies: the United Nations Development Program (UNDP), United Nations Environment Program (UNEP) and the World Bank Information on all GEF projects is available on the GEF website (www.theGEF.org) under Project Data and Documents.

4. As of June 2005, approximately US\$2.1 billion has been provided in grants in the area of biological diversity. At the time of approval, the biodiversity grants leveraged close to US\$4.4 billion of co-financing bringing a total value of the GEF biodiversity portfolio to approximately US\$6.5 billion.

5. Between July 1, 2003 and June 30, 2005 (FY 04 and 05), the GEF approved 113 projects addressing biological diversity and biosafety objectives. The total GEF allocation for these projects was approximately US\$392.4 million. Almost US\$1.3 billion was leveraged in co-financing for the projects from partners including the Implementing Agencies, Executing Agencies, bilateral agencies, recipient countries, and the private sector.

6. Projects approved by the GEF in the area of biological diversity focus on five Operational Programs (OPs). These operational programs are consistent with the policy, strategy and program priorities decided by the Conference of the Parties. At the country level, however, activities must be identified as priorities in the respective National Biodiversity and Action Plan of the country. The operational programs include dry land ecosystems (OP1), coastal, marine, and freshwater ecosystems (OP2), forest ecosystems (OP3), mountain ecosystems (OP4) and an operational program on conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity important to agriculture (OP13). The cross-cutting issues approved by the Conference of the Parties are addressed within GEF projects as prioritized by the recipient countries.

7. Within the umbrella framework of the operational programs,¹ strategic priorities define the major themes and approaches under which resources are programmed within the focal area. These priorities reflect a sharpening of the approach. Approximately fifty-two percent of projects approved in the GEF-3 replenishment period were allocated to strategic priority one (SP1)-catalyzing sustainability of protected areas. Thirty-three percent of projects approved in the GEF-3 replenishment period were allocated to

¹ Document GEF/C.21/Inf.11. *Strategic Business Planning: Direction and Targets*. April 2003.

strategic priority two (SP2)-mainstreaming biodiversity in production landscapes. The remaining fifteen percent was shared between strategic priorities three and four.²

8. Table 1 provides a breakdown of the approved projects by project type. Annexes 1-4 provide a list and summary information on the approved projects. Table 1 indicates that out of the projects approved during the reporting period fifty nine were full-size projects (i.e., projects above US\$1 million in GEF financing), thirty-four were medium-sized projects (i.e., projects up to US1 million in GEF financing), and twenty were enabling activities. In addition, GEF financed projects in its other focal areas, in particular projects and programs in the areas of international waters, integrated ecosystem management and sustainable land management, also contribute directly or indirectly to the objectives and implementation of the Convention on Biological Diversity.

Table 1: GEF Projects in the area of biological diversity, including biosafety approved between July 1, 2003 and June 30, 2005.

Type of Activity	Number of Activities	GEF Financing (US\$ millions)	Co-financing (US\$ millions)	Total Financing (US\$ millions)
Full-sized projects	59	\$356.76	\$1,233.61	\$1,590.37
Medium-sized projects ³	34	\$31.32	\$64.23	\$95.55
Enabling activities ⁴	20	\$4.32	\$0.88	\$5.2
Total	113 projects	\$392.41	\$1,298.73	\$1,691.13

Full-sized Projects

9. Annex 1 lists the fifty-nine full-size projects. Thirty-eight projects are for individual countries. Twelve regional and 4 global projects were approved as full-size projects. Among these, full-size projects, ten directly target or contain elements addressing arid and semi-arid zone biological diversity (OP 1); thirty-five directly target or contain elements addressing coastal, marine, and freshwater biological diversity (OP2); eighteen directly target or contain elements addressing forest biological diversity (OP3); eight directly target or contain elements addressing mountain biological diversity (OP4), and six directly target or contain elements addressing agricultural biological diversity (OP13). In addition four full-sized projects were approved as non-expedited enabling activities (EAs). These projects were approved for capacity building activities under the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety.

Medium-sized Projects

10. Annex 2 lists the thirty-four medium-size projects. Thirteen of the projects are individual countries. In addition four global and three regional projects were approved. Among the medium-size projects; nine directly target or contain elements addressing arid and semi-arid zone biological diversity (OP1); nine

² SP3: Capacity Building for the Implementation of the CBD Cartagena Protocol on Biodiversity and SP4: Generation and Dissemination of Best Practices for Addressing Current and Emerging Biodiversity Issues.

³ Includes expedited and non-expedited MSPs.

⁴ Does not include those EAs approved under non-expedited procedures.

directly target or contain elements addressing coastal, marine, and freshwater biological diversity (OP 2); twenty-one directly target or contain elements addressing forest biological diversity (OP3); six directly target or contain elements addressing mountain biological diversity and five directly target or contain elements addressing agricultural biological diversity (OP13).

Enabling Activities

11. Annex 3 lists the Enabling Activities (EAs) which were approved by the GEF during the reporting period. Twenty national Enabling Activities were approved. Among these, eight supported assessments of capacity needs for various activities under the Convention on Biological Diversity, of which three were add-on activities. The other twelve activities included support for national reporting and for biodiversity strategy and action plans (BSAP).

12. To date the GEF has invested a total of US\$92.4 million and leveraged nearly US\$22 million in co-financing to developing and countries in transition for 290 enabling activities.⁵ Enabling activities are those activities that assist countries in preparing the foundation for design and implementation of effective response measures to achieve the CBD objectives nationally. These assist eligible countries to develop National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans (NBSAPs), or programs referred to in Article 6 of the Convention. It also assists in carrying self assessments of capacity building needs, reporting to the Convention on Biological Diversity and participation in the clearing house mechanism (CHM) of the Convention.

13. Through FY2005, 102 GEF grants at country level were provided to support activities related to National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plans (NBSAPS) amounting to a total commitment of US\$23.6 million and leveraging approximately US\$3.6 million in co-financing from partners. During the reporting period four enabling activities in the Comoros, Bosnia –Herzegovina, Serbia- Montenegro and Turkey contain components that will support the preparation of an NBSAP in the respective countries. The GEF has committed US\$1.2 million in support of these activities.

Project Development Grants

14. Often, as a first step in project development, the GEF provides financing to assist recipient countries to develop a project concept into a project proposal. Most of the full-size projects and a number of medium-sized projects have been developed using GEF project preparation funds. Eighty-eight project preparation grants were approved in the reporting period amounting to US\$18.5 million in forty-two individual countries. In addition project preparation grants were approved for twelve global and twenty regional projects.

Small Grants Program

15. The GEF Small Grants Program (SGP) implemented by UNDP on behalf of the GEF was launched in 1992. The GEF-SGP supports the implementation of the Convention on Biological Diversity and based on request from the COP⁶ has been improved through the years to be a quick, flexible, and responsive mechanism to support Parties in national implementation of the Convention. The GEF SGP channels its support through civil society action by providing grants of up to \$50,000 to community based and non-governmental organizations, to build their capacity to undertake environmental projects

⁵ This includes expedited (up to US\$450,000) and non expedited EAs (above US\$450,000)

⁶ Refer to Decisions III/5, VI/17, and VII/20.

(governments at the local level can also benefit from SGP funds, but only through partnerships with recipient NGOs). Through FY 2005 the SGP, in the area of biological diversity, has supported 3,571 projects amounting to a total GEF contribution of US\$92 million in grants and US\$51 million (in-cash plus \$40 million in-kind) leveraged as co-financing. During the reporting period, the GEF-SGP supported 1,017 projects in fifty-five countries for biodiversity conservation and sustainable use. The total GEF allocation for these projects amounted to US\$23.2 million and leveraged a total of US\$27.4 million (in-cash and in-kind) co-financing from various partners around the world. Further information on the SGP can be found at: www.undp.org/sgp.

III. ACTIVITIES IN RESPONSE TO COP VII GUIDANCE

16. All COPs have provided guidance to the GEF on the policy, strategy, program priorities and eligibility criteria to be followed in providing financial assistance to developing country parties for purposes of the Convention. This guidance has been regularly incorporated in GEF policies and operational activities, and GEF responses to the guidance are reported on in each of its reports to the COP.

17. The Seventh Meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity provided further guidance to the GEF.⁷ Among the decisions adopted by COP VII (held in Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia February 2004), two decisions are directed to the GEF.⁸ In general, the guidance requested the GEF to address program priorities related to marine and coastal biological diversity, monitoring and indicators, ecosystem approach, biological diversity and climate change, Global Taxonomy Initiative, sustainable use, invasive alien species, protected areas, strategic plan, technology transfer and cooperation, Millennium Development Goals, national reporting, education and public awareness, access to genetic resources and fair and equitable sharing of benefits, and biosafety. These issues are being addressed by the GEF through its operational strategy and activities under the biodiversity focal area. The following highlights the GEF's initial response to the COP VII guidance. In each section, examples of relevant project activities are provided to illustrate the type of activities being implemented on-the-ground. It should be recalled that Annex 4 provides a summary of all projects approved during the reporting period and that examples given are not a comprehensive accounting of project activities in the area concerned.⁹

Marine and Coastal Biological Diversity

18. Recognizing the importance of marine and coastal biological diversity to the healthy functioning of global ecosystems¹⁰ and following the guidance of the Convention¹¹ the GEF has committed a significant portion of its resources to coastal and marine areas through operational program 2 in the biodiversity focal area and through the international waters focal area. During the reporting period, the GEF committed US\$77.58 million to seventeen projects that directly target or contain elements that address marine and coastal ecosystems. An additional US\$279.27 million was leveraged as co-financing from other partners. Sixteen of these projects were approved for individual countries and one regional project. The following

⁷ Decision VII/20, *Further Guidance to the Financial Mechanism*.

⁸ These are Decision VII/20, *Further guidance to the financial mechanism*, and Decision VII/22, *Arrangements for the third review of the effectiveness of the financial mechanism*. Decision VII/21 *Additional financial resources* includes some paragraphs of relevance to the GEF.

⁹ In addition, data on projects approved during the reporting period responding to guidance provided by earlier meetings of the Conference of the Parties appear in annexes 1-3 and will be further summarized in the draft publication "Catalyzing Sustainable Biodiversity Conservation: The GEF Biodiversity Portfolio 1991-2005" to be distributed at the eight meeting of the Conference of the Parties.

¹⁰ The oceans cover more than 71% of the Earth's surface and are home to 97% of all life on earth.

¹¹ See decisions I/2, V/13 and VI/17 VII/20.

projects provide examples of GEF supported activities during the reporting period that address the conservation and sustainable use of marine and coastal ecosystems:

- (a) The *South Africa Conservation and Sustainable Use of Biodiversity on the South African Wild Coast project* implemented by UNDP assists the government of South Africa to conserve and sustainably manage biodiversity of global significance in one of the most important coastal areas of the country in the Eastern Cape Province. It implements a strategy for the long-term management of the Wild Coast and provides for the management of a mosaic of land uses, focusing on a network of protected areas as nuclei for biodiversity conservation. The project pursues a biodiversity conservation program that is compatible with livelihoods, and will set aside development zones, managed to minimize negative environmental externalities. A significant proportion of the project activities address mangrove areas.
- (b) A regional project in Indonesia and the Philippines, *the Marine Aquarium Market Transformation Initiative (MAMTI)*, implemented by the International Finance Corporation (IFC), the private sector branch of the World Bank and involves the private sector and local communities in the sustainable management and use of aquarium fish species. The project carries out a range of activities to ensure that the industry is transformed to a principal driver of marine biodiversity conservation; sustainable use, sustainable livelihoods, poverty alleviation and food security for coastal communities in the countries involved and addresses issues on the demand side in developed countries.
- (c) In Mauritius, the *Partnerships for Marine Protected Areas*, a medium-sized project implemented by UNDP assists the Government of Mauritius to improve management and conservation practices for marine protected areas (MPAs) in the country, and the equitable sharing of benefits to local communities. It does so through the development and testing of a model for co-management between government, local communities and the private sector, and through building an enabling environment for its replication throughout the country.

19. The GEF-SGP has provided support in the amount of approximately \$3.27 million to 141 projects under OP2. An additional US\$3.18 million was leveraged in co-financing for coastal, marine and freshwater ecosystems. A current GEF SGP project: *Community-based integrated mangrove rehabilitation and economic recovery program in Tsunami effected villages in Pulau Weh, Aceh in Indonesia*, is providing support for post-tsunami recovery of coastal resources based on a sustainable livelihoods approach among affected communities. The project has targeted a number of strategies including coral reef transplantation, community-based reef monitoring, as well as eco-tourism. A learning exchange visit has also been planned to exchange good practices learned during another GEF-SGP supported community project in Bali working on coral reef ecosystem recovery through coral transplantation. Target indicators of impacts include enhanced community-based recovery efforts, healthy coral growth, income generation, and strengthened institutional capacity of the local coastal community. Rehabilitation activities for mangrove ecosystems are also being carried out with funding from other agencies.

Monitoring and Indicators

20. Decision VII/20, paragraph 4 "Recognizes that the development and use of indicators, particularly in the development phase, requires a financial and technical commitment from Parties, and therefore

/...

requests the financial mechanism and encourages bilateral and multilateral funding agencies to assist developing countries, in particular the least developed and small island developing States among them, and countries with economies in transition through the provision of financial assistance and training, as required and as appropriate, to develop and implement effective biodiversity indicators.”

21. In recognizing the importance of the development of comprehensive monitoring systems, GEF supported projects include a monitoring system as part of their implementation strategy. The GEF provides financial assistance at all stages during the project development cycle to assist least developed and small island states to develop and implement effective biodiversity indicators. In many cases, these systems become important vehicles for building the capacity of recipient countries to develop their own monitoring systems at the country level. During the reporting period, several projects have been recognized as having a particularly comprehensive monitoring systems as part of the project implementation plan:

- (a) The UNDP implemented project, *Demonstrating Sustainable Conservation of Biodiversity in Four Protected Areas in Russia's Kamchatka Oblast, Phase 2*, creates an integrated long-term monitoring program to follow biodiversity status, pollution and other threats both within and outside the protected area system.
- (b) Another project in Korea, *Conservation of Globally Significant Wetlands* implements a comprehensive monitoring system which tracks progress of biodiversity indicators relating to key environmental processes that will influence the health and productivity of wetlands.

Ecosystem Approach

22. The GEF's biodiversity strategy is currently designed to achieve biodiversity conservation within the framework of an integrated ecosystem approach. An integrated ecosystem approach was endorsed by the COP V (Nairobi Kenya) in 2000 and is “designed to balance conservation, sustainable use and equitable sharing of genetic resources, looking beyond protected area boundaries to the wider landscape whilst placing humans at the centre of conservation efforts.” In addition to embracing the ecosystem approach as an integral feature of project design in all GEF biodiversity projects, the GEF has also pursued this approach through demonstration projects under the operational program on integrated ecosystem management (OP12), funded through allocations from the GEF focal areas in which benefits are generated.

23. Further GEF programming, however, has shifted strategy towards a process of integration defined as the “joining of forces” across the GEF focal areas to help client countries most efficiently address their natural resource management priorities using an array of integrated approaches to conserve, sustainably use and manage natural resources, including biodiversity. Pursuing integration across focal areas, at the various levels, basin – landscape – ecosystem – country – region, will allow GEF to most effectively fulfill its role of catalyst and facilitator of global environmental sustainability and strengthen its role in helping countries meet their national commitments while enhancing the global environment.

24. Integrated approaches in the biodiversity portfolio, although *ad hoc* have been pursued through mainly the operational program on forests (OP3) which has integrated its activities with OP12 and the operational program on land degradation (OP15). The operational program on marine, coastal and freshwater ecosystems integrates its activities mainly with the operational program on integrated water management (OP 9) in the international waters focal area.

25. The GEF also supports integrated ecosystem management through projects that integrate activities from multiple focal areas. These projects include components from across the GEF focal areas, are approved under the multi focal area project window. During the reporting period, two projects of relevance to the biodiversity focal area were approved under the multi-focal area window. This amounts to a commitment of US\$7.5 million of GEF grants and an additional US\$20.7 million leveraged in co-financing from other partners. These include: *Community Agriculture and Watershed Management*, a global project implemented by the World Bank in Tajikistan, which uses a multi focal area and integrated ecosystem management approach to promote sustainable land use in mountain ecosystems and agricultural biodiversity, and the *International Assessment of Agricultural Science and Technology for Development (IAASTD)* project, implemented by the World Bank as a global project which will use a similar approach to address biodiversity conservation and sustainable land use in all the ecosystems within the biodiversity focal area and in OP 8 and OP 9 in the area of international waters.

26. During the reporting period, the GEF-SGP has also committed US\$377,609 to fourteen projects that were identified as “multi operational”. An additional US\$1.58 million was leveraged as co-financing for these projects.

Biological Diversity and Climate Change

27. The negative impacts of other global environmental changes, such as climate change, on the biodiversity of highly vulnerable ecosystems, such as mountains, coral reefs and forests, remain a challenge for biodiversity conservation globally. The GEF recognizes this challenge and is approaching this issue through financing projects for the conservation and sustainable use and benefit sharing of biological diversity threatened by climate change impacts. Two modalities of particular relevance financing projects through the multiple focal area and a new strategic priority on adaptation (SPA) are described below.

28. The GEF Operational Strategy states that “the overall strategic thrust of GEF-financed climate change activities is to support sustainable measures that minimize climate change damage by reducing the risk, or the adverse effects, of climate change.” It will finance agreed and eligible enabling, mitigation, and adaptation activities in eligible recipient countries” The GEF has provided support for Stage I and II adaptation activities (as defined by the UNFCCC COP) in the context of the formulation of National Communications to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC). In response to Convention guidance, funding for a strategic priority on adaptation was approved by the Council in November 2004. The strategic priority provides the opportunity to test integration and synergies among GEF focal areas and their relevant conventions through concrete demonstration projects responding to the impact of climate change.

29. Decision VII/20 paragraph 6 of the seventh session of the Conference of Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity, specifically addresses the link between climate change and biodiversity conservation. It calls for increasing the effectiveness in addressing environmental issues undertaken by multiple Conventions by applying the ecosystem approach. Ecosystems management, particularly in forests, has long been recognized as an important in maintaining “sinks” for greenhouse gases. Increasingly, the role of ecosystems in reducing a country’s vulnerability to the adverse impact of climate change is being emphasized. The GEF, through its development of adaptation guidelines has identified the potential global environmental benefits of addressing adaptation in each of its focal areas. In the biodiversity focal area, global environmental benefits include: the reduced risks of global biodiversity loss; the enhanced protection of ecosystems and the species they contain; and increased sustainability in the use of biodiversity components. GEF resources for adaptation could be utilized to address and implement measures to reduce vulnerability and increase adaptive capacity of natural ecosystems to climate change.

In addition, the GEF is developing tools to more systematically seek opportunities to address the effects of climate change on biodiversity in its regular portfolio, particularly in protected area design, and on coastal and marine ecosystems.

Global Taxonomy Initiative (GTI)

30. Several projects in the GEF biodiversity portfolio include components that address taxonomy as a means of achieving conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity. The GEF supports the Global Taxonomy Initiative (GTI) through enabling activities, which help countries to assess their national capacities. Many countries have used this financing modality to assess and identify the need for taxonomic work. The GEF also supports the National Capacity Needs Assessment Program, through which countries can identify needs to strengthen capacity for taxonomic work. In addition, taxonomic work is embedded within the biodiversity monitoring activities of GEF projects and in some self standing projects.

31. A few GEF supported programs and projects, such as the *Inventory, Evaluation and Monitoring of Botanical Diversity in Southern Africa: A Regional Capacity and Institution Building Network (SABONET)*, directly target taxonomic work. The project involves the computerization of plant specimens stored in national and regional herbaria and botanical gardens and identification of under-surveyed/poorly known taxa or areas. This project is being replicated in eastern Africa through the *Botanical and Zoological Taxonomic Networks in Eastern Africa (BOZONET)* project. The objective of BOZONET is to support the countries of East Africa to remove barriers to the flow of relevant taxonomic information, through supporting networked centers of expertise, expanding the range of end-users of such information, and assisting those end-users in the use of this information for the sustainable conservation of biodiversity, and establishing processes of inventory, description, monitoring and dissemination.

32. Some projects approved during the reporting period include activities that involve taxonomy. For example, a UNDP implemented project in Cambodia, *Establishing Conservation Areas Landscape Management (CALM) in the Northern Plains*, establishes a biological monitoring program to identify biodiversity trends including taxonomic activities. Other funding comes in many projects under biodiversity monitoring components. Another global project, *Implementing the Global Strategy for Plant Conservation: identification of threatened plant species and protection of important plant areas*, currently in the pipeline and being developed by UNEP, will also contribute to the objectives of the GTI. The project will undertake national plant conservation assessments using the IUCN Red List Categories and Criteria (IUCN, 2001) and Guidelines for Application of the IUCN Red List Criteria at Regional Level in six countries. These assessments are major prerequisites for identifying important plant areas, and a complimentary process in achieving the project goal. Indicators and procedures for monitoring conservation status both nationally and regionally will be developed.

Sustainable Use

33. The GEF supports sustainable use of biodiversity in protected areas and landscapes. GEF supported projects contain activities that address sustainable forestry management, agriculture and fisheries. The GEF has recently sharpened and focused its attention on sustainable use of biodiversity in landscapes through strategic priority two (SP2) which aims to catalyze biodiversity conservation by mainstreaming it into the productive sector focusing mainly on economic issues.

34. During the reporting period thirteen projects were approved under SP2. This amounted to approximately US\$160 million in GEF grants. For example, the *Recovery, Conservation, and Sustainable Use of Georgia's Agrobiodiversity* project focuses on conservation and sustainable utilization of threatened local plant genetic resources important to food and agriculture in Georgia. A global project *Improved Certification Schemes for Sustainable Tropical Forest Management*, in Brazil, Mexico and Cameroon, develops the tools and incentives to help small forest managers, communities and non-timber forest products (NTFP) collectors in the tropics to identify and protect biodiversity in the forests they manage (the 'Target Forests') through certification. The tools will then be disseminated internationally through a series of regional training courses for groups developing and promoting certification standards in at least 10 tropical countries.

Invasive Alien Species (IAS)¹²

35. Species introductions have been considered one of the most important threats to biological diversity,¹³ have resulted in the extirpation of many native species, and have caused major changes to the overall structure and processes of many ecosystems around the world. The GEF is now supporting fifty-one projects that address the threat of invasive alien species. This amounts to a total of about US\$311 million of GEF grants. These projects includes those that contain a component that addresses the threat of IAS and those that have national programs that aim to specifically control and eradicate invasive species. During the reporting period twelve projects approved by the GEF directly or indirectly addressed the threat of invasive alien species. This amounts to a commitment of approximately US\$53.7 million from the GEF to eleven individual countries and one regional project.

36. An example of a project in this area is the GEF supported regional project; *Removing Barriers to Invasive Plant Management in Africa* which protects ecosystems, species and genetic diversity from invasive alien species, for global, national and community benefit. The project contributes to this goal through its purpose of removing the barriers to effective prevention and management of IAS in four pilot countries; Ethiopia, Ghana, Uganda and Zambia. The focus is on invasive plants, as this group poses the greatest current threat, and because a number of invasive plant species have been identified in the four countries requiring immediate attention. Invasive plants in both terrestrial and aquatic ecosystems are addressed. Another project in Hungary: *Conservation and Restoration of the Globally Significant Biodiversity of the Tisza River Floodplain through Integrated Floodplain Management* develops a program for managing invasive species in a coordinated and systematic manner across this extensive floodplain.

¹² See Decision VII/20.

¹³ Figure 4.3 Millennium Ecosystem Assessment, 2005: General Synthesis: Ecosystems and Human Well-being. Island Press, Washington D.C. Other Millennium Assessment reports such as Living beyond our means: Statement of the Board of the MA. 2005. Washington D.C.

Protected Areas¹⁴

37. Guidance on protected areas has been provided by a number of previous COP decisions. The latest guidance is summarized by Decision VII/20, paragraph 10. In considering this guidance, the GEF has strengthened its first pillar of the GEF strategic priorities in its biodiversity focal area which seeks to catalyze the sustainability of protected areas, i.e. to conserve biodiversity through the expansion, consolidation, and rationalization of national protected area systems with a major emphasis in achieving long-term financial sustainability. Through FY2004, GEF has supported initiatives in nearly 1,432 protected areas covering close to 300 million hectares world-wide. During this period the GEF invested more than US\$1.2 billion in projects that support protected areas and leveraged an additional \$3.1 billion in co-financing from project partners. During the reporting period the GEF committed US\$225.8 million to projects under strategic priority one which focus on initiatives in protected areas.¹⁵ Projects were approved for twenty-seven individual countries and five regional projects. In addition, other GEF initiatives such as the GEF-SGP and the Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund, administered by Conservation International, also contributed significantly to protected areas. The GEF-SGP reports that through FY 2005, a total of approximately 904 of GEF-SGP supported projects target protected areas. The COMPACT approach being implemented by the GEF-SGP is a strategic clustering of GEF-SGP grants around internationally recognized protected areas (mainly World Heritage sites) which is entering a second 5-year phase of the pilot program which was initiated in 2000.¹⁶

38. To extend conservation efforts beyond protected areas, GEF-supported projects have worked to create linkages between protected areas and their surrounding context in a myriad of ways. Important components of these activities include buffer zones, corridors, cultural linkages, integrated coastal zone management, and transboundary protected areas. Buffer zones and corridors have proven that they can be effective in providing a means for improved management and increased biodiversity conservation, and GEF projects have made extensive use of these planning and management mechanisms in projects such as the *Second Rural Poverty, Natural Resources Management and Consolidation of the Mesoamerican Biological Corridor* Project in Panama, which supports the efforts of the Government of Panama to integrate environmental and social sustainability into development and poverty reduction strategies in the Pacific and Atlantic municipalities. The project achieves this through enabling decentralization of strengthening local governments, institutional strengthening and support to poor communities to adopt biodiversity friendly income generating activities. Another project; *Establishing Conservation Areas Landscape Management (CALM) in the Northern Plains of Cambodia* designs and implements a landscape level conservation program (CALM) through a "Living Landscapes" approach to conserve key components of biodiversity which are either unique to the landscape or for which the landscape acts as a critical range.

39. The GEF's approach to protected areas reflects the importance of mainstreaming by linking protected areas to other development priorities through an ongoing dialogue that engages different stakeholders at the international, national, local, and grassroots levels. One of the keys to mainstreaming is building awareness and support for protected areas, and increasing awareness of protected area values. Key challenges under this approach include the development of partnerships by identifying sectors not directly related to protected areas, and to attract new constituencies to expand the appreciation of protected area values. The process of mainstreaming, however, can be indistinct, and may occur in different ways depending on the context of implementation. These activities can include the incorporation

¹⁴ See Decision VII/20.

¹⁵ Projects that are SP1 only, do not include hybrid projects which include other Strategic Priorities.

¹⁶ The GEF-SGP has expanded the number of WH sites from 6 to 8 for the phase 2005 to the end of 2009.

of protected area considerations into policies governing non-protected area sector activities, and the simultaneous achievement of gains for protected areas and gains in economic sectors.

40. About twelve percent of the terrestrial land surface of the globe is in protected areas, and the GEF funding has substantively contributed to this milestone achievement since its inception as was noted in the Biodiversity Program Study 2004. However, the global network of protected areas still has substantial gaps particularly in the marine and freshwater environment. Decision VII/20, paragraph 3 “*invites the Global Environment Facility, other funding institutions, and development agencies to provide financial support for the implementation of the elaborated program of work on marine and coastal biodiversity.*” During the reporting period several approved GEF supported initiatives are supporting the establishment of marine protected areas. As mentioned earlier in this report, seventeen projects covering sixteen individual countries and one regional project will solely address the conservation and sustainable use of coastal and marine areas including marine protected areas.

41. The GEF-supported project: *Conserving Globally Significant Biodiversity along the Chilean Coast* implemented by UNDP, assists the Government of Chile to conserve and sustainable manage marine and coastal biodiversity through the establishment of Multiple Use Marine Coastal Protected Areas (MUMPAs) in critical areas of the Chilean coast. Through this, the government's goal is to remove barriers for the definition and implementation of an integrated management system for coastal/marine biodiversity and its biological resources. It does so through the creation of three MUMPAs in three demonstration sites of global importance and by developing tools and mechanisms to facilitate their replication in other parts of the country. It is expected that, by removing barriers, the successful demonstration of win-win approaches for private sector and community benefits linked to strong biodiversity conservation efforts, will permit the replication of these approaches and methodologies in Chile and elsewhere in the region.

42. The *Partnerships for Marine Protected Areas* project in Mauritius assists Mauritius to improve the management and conservation practice for Marine Protected Areas (MPAs) in the country, and the equitable sharing of benefits to the local communities. It does so through the development and testing of a model for co-management between government, local communities and the private sector, and through building an enabling environment for its replication throughout the country.

Strategic Plan of the Convention

43. COP VII developed a framework to enhance the evaluation of achievement and progress in the implementation of its Strategic Plan and, in particular, its mission to achieve a significant reduction in the current rate of biodiversity loss at global, regional and national levels. It also identified provisional indicators for assessing progress towards the 2010 biodiversity target. This plan contains four strategic goals and objectives addressed in the Annex of Decision VI/26 as follows:

- (a) The Convention is fulfilling its leadership role in international biodiversity issues;
- (b) Parties have improved financial, human, scientific, technical and technological capacity to implement the Convention;
- (c) National biodiversity strategies and action plans (NBSAPs) and the integration of biodiversity concerns into relevant sectors serve as an effective framework for the implementation of the objectives of the Convention; and

- (d) There is a better understanding of the importance of biodiversity and of the Convention, and this has led to broader engagement across society in implementation.

44. At COP VII, the GEF received guidance on this issue in Decision VII/20, paragraph 11. In responding to this guidance, UNEP-WCMC prepared a project, *Building the Partnership to Deliver the Global 2010 Indicators*, this project has been included in the pipeline and is expected to enter the work program during fiscal year 2006. It seeks to support the building of a partnership which will assist in achieving the 2010 indicators.

45. The GEF is linking the CBD 2010 targets with its proposed programming for the GEF-4 period (2006-2010) and will measure achievement of these targets through agreed indicators.

Technology Transfer and cooperation¹⁷

46. Technology transfer and cooperation is often a core element in GEF investment projects in the biodiversity focal area. It has been promoted through activities such as: (a) supporting information networks (e.g., the Inter-American Biodiversity Information Network and the Southern Africa Botanical Network); (b) strengthening national enabling environments through, for example, the support provided to develop the National Biosafety Frameworks; (c) increasing technical knowledge and capacity as in the Regional Central American Biological Corridor project; (d) development of good practice and its application to other projects and regions such as the Costa Rica Eco-markets project addressing environmental services; (e) the development and application of natural pest control for alien, invasive species such as in the Lake Victoria project; and (f) supporting the actual use of technology, as in the case of Geographic Information Systems (GIS) for land use planning, management and decision-making often requested and approved through many projects under implementation. Support for priority needs in the area of technology transfer will continue to be addressed through the development of country driven projects as is done today.

47. Through the development and implementation of its private sector strategy, the GEF will also encourage countries and national and global private companies¹⁸ to support and provide tools, practices and training necessary to strengthen technology transfer and cooperation. The GEF private sector strategy also calls for enhanced knowledge management and dissemination of experience with the private sector to benefit many sectors important to supporting the objectives of the Convention as much possible.

48. During the reporting period nineteen projects included technology transfer as a core element of implementation. For example, in Romania the project: *Strengthening Romania's Protected Area System by Demonstrating Government-NGO Partnership in Romania's Maramures Nature Park*, uses new technology to monitor the impact of biomass heat generation on wood waste disposal problems and facilitate the replication of this technology in other areas of Maramures, through peer-to-peer training. A project in Kenya, *Developing Incentives for Community Participation in Forest Conservation through the Use of Commercial Insects*, uses low-technology approaches for honey and silk production developed and tested at rural community level, and combined with social and market support to produce economically viable activities.

¹⁷ From Document GEF/C 27/4. *Relations with Conventions and other Institutions*. September 2005

¹⁸ Commercial technology, including biotechnology, development has already been substantial in areas such as natural resource management, agriculture and health, to name a few. The private sector has had more substantive development in technology, particularly in biotechnology, than the public sector due to the high cost of research and development.

Millennium Development Goals

49. The GEF has produced a publication (Achieving the Millennium Development Goals – A GEF Progress Report, September 2005), highlighting its support for the achievement of the MDGs which will be available for distribution at the COP. All GEF projects are set in the context of national development plans and support the sustainable development programs of Parties to the Convention. Therefore, they contribute substantively to reach proposed MDGs. One World Bank project, *the Global, Development Marketplace (DM)*, has as a primary objective to help the development community at large to meet the proposed MDGs by generating new approaches to poverty reduction from a variety of stakeholders outside the usual sources in the development agencies.

National Reporting

50. The objective of national reporting, as specified in Article 26 of the Convention, is to provide information on measures taken for the implementation of the Convention and the effectiveness of these measures. The national reporting process is, therefore, key to enabling the Conference of the Parties to assess the overall status of implementation of the Convention.¹⁹ The process of reporting will also assist the individual country to monitor the status of implementation of the commitments it has taken on as a Contracting Party. As of October 6, 2005, the Convention Secretariat received 140 first national reports, 118 second national reports, and 29 third national reports, as well as 116 national biodiversity strategies and action plans (includes 2 reports posted as “version 2”). In addition, the Convention Secretariat received 60 thematic reports on alien invasive species, 17 on access and benefit-sharing as related to genetic resources, 47 on forest ecosystems, 40 on mountain ecosystems, 28 on technology transfer and cooperation, 56 on protected areas, and 49 on global taxonomy initiative. 6. The Convention Secretariat has received 63 reports from governments since March 2005. Almost all of the reports from developing countries have been prepared with GEF assistance provided through enabling activities.

51. During the reporting period,

- (a) four enabling activities in Rwanda, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Serbia-Montenegro and Turkey are supporting, among other aspects, the preparation of national reports. The enabling activity in Rwanda will specifically target the preparation of the second national report to the Convention on Biological Diversity;
- (b) Forty grants are supporting the development of first national reports to the Convention on Biological Diversity;
- (c) Nineteen grants are supporting the development of second national reports to the Convention on Biological Diversity; and
- (d) Three Medium-sized grants for global projects are supporting 150 countries to prepare third national reports to the Convention on Biological Diversity based on COP guidelines. To the date of this report, approximately 100 countries have accessed such support.

Education and Public Awareness

52. The majority of GEF supported projects include a component or activities on education and public awareness. During the last four years, projects have included a communications strategy in their implementation plans. Ninety-nine percent of the projects approved during the reporting period include a component or activities that target education and awareness. For example, a project in Liberia, *Establishing the Basis for Biodiversity Conservation on Sapo National Park and in South-East Liberia*, includes a major component on education and awareness campaigns for protected area management and biodiversity conservation. In Malaysia, the project, *Conserving Marine Biodiversity through Enhanced Marine Park Management and Inclusive Sustainable Island Development*, will implement a comprehensive environmental education and out reach program targeted at those having the greatest impact on marine biodiversity.

Access to genetic resources and fair and equitable sharing of benefits (ABS)

¹⁹ CBD Website : <http://www.biodiv.org/world/intro.asp>.

53. The seventh meeting of the Conference of the Parties provided guidance to the GEF on assistance for the implementation of the Action Plan in support of the implementation on the Bonn Guidelines on Access to Genetic Resources and Fair and Equitable Sharing of Benefits Arising out of their Utilization, and support for capacity building regarding the transfer of technologies which enable providers to fully appreciate and actively participate in benefit-sharing arrangements at the stage of granting access permits (Decision VII/20, paragraph 19).

54. For the reporting period, more than 30 countries were in the process of assessing their capacity with regard to ABS issues with GEF support through existing enabling activities. This support allows eligible Parties to prepare the foundation for design and implementation of effective response measures required to achieve ABS objectives. They normally involve the stocktaking through the review and assessment of information to gain a better understanding of the nature and scope of issue, identify options, establishing priorities and preparing and developing planning exercises to link biodiversity issues to the broader national development frameworks. A few of the countries supported have also assessed their legislative framework and implementation modalities.

55. Through regular project support, and since its inception, the GEF has funded over fifty projects for a total of US\$229 million in GEF grants to support ABS issues. The grants leveraged approximately US\$580.1 million in co-financing from various partners.

56. Examples of projects with ABS components on agro-biodiversity include:

- (a) in situ conservation of crop wild relatives through enhanced information management and field application;
- (b) in-situ on farm conservation of agricultural biodiversity (horticultural crops and wild fruit species) in Central Asia;
- (c) development and application of decision-support tools to conserve and sustainably use genetic diversity in indigenous livestock and wild relatives;
- (d) conservation and sustainable use of cultivated and wild tropical fruit diversity: promoting sustainable livelihoods, food security and ecosystem services; and
- (e) conservation and use of crop genetic diversity to control pests and diseases in support of sustainable agriculture.

57. There are also examples of projects the primary objectives of which are ABS issues under development. Examples of these projects are:

- (a) *piloting implementation of policies on ABS at the domestic level in developing countries.* This project aims at assisting 15 pilot countries, as Parties to the Convention, to build capacity for drafting, finalizing and/or revising their national regulatory framework on ABS;
- (b) supporting the development and implementation of Access and Benefit Sharing policies in Africa; and

- (c) a regionally harmonized national consultation process for implementation of the Bonn Guidelines in ASEAN Member States.

Biosafety

58. Decision VII/20 urged the Global Environment Facility to “ensure a rapid implementation of its initial strategy for assisting countries to prepare for the ratification and implementation of the Protocol, and to support capacity-building for the establishment of national components of the Biosafety Clearing-House in a flexible manner, and to provide additional support for the development and/or strengthening of existing national and regional centers for training; regulatory institutions; risk assessment and risk management; infrastructure for the detection, testing, identification and long-term monitoring of living modified organisms; legal advice, decision-making; handling of socio-economic considerations; awareness-raising and technology transfer for biosafety.” It also provided further guidance to the GEF, particularly in paragraphs 24-26.

59. The GEF Council, at its meeting in May 2004, welcomed the guidance of the Conference of the Parties to the CBD inviting the GEF to extend support for demonstration projects on implementation of the national biosafety frameworks to other eligible countries.

60. At the November 2004 Council meeting, the GEF Council requested the Office of Monitoring and Evaluation (OME) to undertake an evaluation of the activities financed under the Initial Strategy. The evaluation, to be finished by November 2005, was expected to provide valuable information and lessons for future GEF support aimed at building capacity to implement national biosafety frameworks at the country level.

61. The Council, at its June 2005 meeting, approved an interim approach to the financing of biosafety capacity building activities, pending the completion of the evaluation. The Council also requested the Secretariat to prepare, in consultation with the Implementing Agencies and having into account the results of the evaluation, a proposed strategy on the most efficient and effective means to provide additional support to countries to strengthen their capacity to implement national biosafety frameworks, as called for in the guidance of the Convention.

62. The approved interim approach seeks to support countries with urgent needs to move forward in implementing their NBFs through 10 to 15 medium sized projects, similar in scope, activities and financing to the demonstration projects implemented under the initial strategy. In addition, it was agreed that support would be provided through one to two projects aimed at strengthening developing country regional centers of excellence to enable those centers to assist countries in the region in implementing their NBFs.

63. The Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the CPB, at its second meeting held in May-June 2005, approved Decision BS-II/5, encouraging the GEF and the Executive Secretary of the Convention to continue their strong collaboration in advancing support to the implementation of the Protocol and to further develop its funding modalities for organizing its support to the Protocol in a systematic and flexible manner. This decision will be submitted to the next meeting of the Conference of the Parties for consideration and possible transmittal to the GEF.

Office of Monitoring and Evaluation (OME) evaluation of the GEF initial strategy in biosafety.

64. The evaluation focused on four key questions:

- (a) Is the GEF support consistent with the Cartagena Protocol, conducted in a way that takes into account the needs of the recipient countries and is it of sufficient professional quality?
- (b) Is the GEF support to capacity development efforts, including stakeholder involvement and regional collaboration, relevant and effective?
- (c) What progress has been made in countries on building the requisite capacities towards their ratification and implementation of the Cartagena Protocol? And
- (d) Are the modalities and approaches of the GEF support effective and efficient compared with similar projects?

65. The evaluation carried out by the OME provides valuable information and lessons for future GEF support aimed at building capacity to implement national biosafety frameworks, as requested by the Conference of the Parties. Currently, the project “Development of NBFs” is being implemented in more than 120 countries, aimed at building up the necessary basis for the Parties to initiate a more in-depth and comprehensive implementation of the Cartagena Protocol. At the same time, the project “Building Capacity for the effective participation of Parties in the Biosafety Clearing House (BCH)” complements this effort by providing useful tools for the full participation in the Cartagena Protocol Clearing House to the participating countries.

66. The evaluation finds that the implementation of these two projects has had a positive effect at different levels, building up a momentum that would facilitate further advances in the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol. Some of the most significant achievements, highlighted by the evaluators, are the following:

- (a) Activities directed towards drafting new legislation and regulations for the implementation of the Protocol have started, providing a basis of the national regulatory frameworks;
- (b) increase in awareness of biosafety issues has been created among key project participants, such as government, private sector and civil society;
- (c) dialogue and interaction have been facilitated among government entities and academia, frequently including industry and civil society too; and
- (d) at regional and sub-regional levels, meetings have been held, providing opportunities for discussion, information sharing and exchange of views among participating countries.

67. The evaluation also uncovered areas where there is room for improvement and/or need for change of approach in GEF support to countries for the implementation of the CPB:

- (a) clear and realistic targets need to be identified based on an analysis and evaluation of the stock taking study;
- (b) financial support has to be estimated based on country needs and should cover adequately the fields where support is needed according with the findings of the stocktaking study in the country. Funding needs vary depending on the number of issues addressed by the proposed project and their complexity, as well as by the national or regional approach recommended;

- (c) regional cooperation and harmonization needs more attention;
- (d) adequate support to countries requires a “hands-on” approach by people with adequate and substantial experience in implementing national biosafety frameworks;
- (e) need for in-country coordination and “ownership” of the projects by all involved ministries, to ensure synergy and continuity; and
- (f) there is a broad range of differences among countries interested in receiving support in terms of approaches, degree of implementation, needs and concerns about different issues addressed by the Protocol and therefore a “one-size-fits-all” approach does not work.

Elements for the GEF Biosafety Strategy for the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol.

68. Based on: (a) CBD COP Guidance, (b) GEF’s mandate, operational strategy, Council decisions, and procedures, (c) the findings of the OME Evaluation, and (d) the GEF-4 Programming Document, the Secretariat proposed a draft elements that would form the foundations of a GEF Biosafety Strategy for the Implementation of the Protocol. This document is at the GEF web site as document GEF/C.27/12.

69. The GEF Council, at its meeting in November 05, reviewed the proposed draft elements document, approved the elements as a basis for the development of a strategy to guide the provision of GEF assistance to support the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety, subject to the comments made by the Council. The GEF Secretariat was invited to prepare, in consultation with the Implementing and Executing Agencies, a proposed biosafety strategy for Council review and approval by mail in early 2006.

70. Operationally, during the reporting period, five projects listed in table # 2 were approved to continue funding biosafety activities under the agreed interim strategy.

71. Table 2 indicates that between July 1st 2003 to June 30th 2005, five (5) projects addressing biosafety were approved for a total of US\$26.3 million.

Table 2: Biosafety Projects approved during the reporting period.

Country	Project name	IA	GEF contribution (US\$ millions)
Global	Add-on to the Development of National Biosafety Frameworks Project for 20 additional countries	UNEP	5.218
Global	Add-on to the Development of National Biosafety Frameworks Project for 10 countries	UNEP	2.609
Global	Building Capacity for the Effective Participation in the Biosafety Clearing House (BCH)	UNEP	4.615
Global	Add-on to the Building Capacity for the Effective Participation in the BCH Project for 89 countries	UNEP	8.906
Regional	Biosafety in Centers of Biodiversity: Building Technical Capacity in Latin America for Safe Deployment of Transgenic Crops	WB	5.000
	Total		26.348

IV. ACTIVITIES IN OTHER GEF FOCAL AREAS OF RELEVANCE TO THIS REPORT²⁰

72. As noted earlier in this report, activities in other focal areas also contribute to the strategy and objectives of the Convention on Biological Diversity, in particular those activities in the international waters, land degradation and integrated ecosystem management focal areas (Operational program 9, Operational Program 15, and Operational Program 12 respectively).

International Waters

73. During the reporting period, fourteen projects under the international waters focal area were identified as containing biodiversity elements. This amounts to a total commitment of US\$174.76 million within the area of international waters. These projects range from policy related interventions in national and trans boundary waters that are also expected to produce global biodiversity benefits, such as protection of fisheries and wetlands, knowledge management initiatives and the conservation of marine protected areas. Some projects target research in specific ecosystems such as coral reefs. Half of these projects have been approved under Operational program 9.²¹

74. A global project implemented by the World Bank, *Coral Reef Targeted research and Capacity building for management*, is expected to generate enormous biodiversity benefits by conducting specific, targeted research to fill critically important information gaps in the fundamental understanding of coral reef ecosystems so that management and policy interventions can be strengthened globally. The purpose of the targeted research is to test specific hypotheses related to major human and natural factors threatening coral reef health.

75. A medium-sized project, *Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis and strategic Action program Development for the Lake Victoria basin*, in east and central Africa will undertake a Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis (TDA) of the Lake Victoria Basin, will identify a Strategic Action/Investment Program (SAP) addressing key environmental issues and poverty alleviation by promoting sustainable economic growth. The SAP will be endorsed by the Regional Policy Steering Committee (RPSC) and the Ministerial Committee on Lake Victoria Development Program (CLVDP) and with appropriate involvement of Rwanda and Burundi. This PROJECT FOLLOWS GEF earlier investment on Lake Victoria that addressed issues related to over-fishing, eutrophication, pollution and invasive, alien species such as the water hyacinth. Many of the project components were very successful in controlling pollution and invasive species, bringing community-development action and activities supporting livelihoods of local communities.

76. The *Marine and Coastal Environment Management Project (MACEMP)*, an integrated project in Tanzania under OP 2(biodiversity) and OP 8(International Waters),²² improves the lives and livelihoods of coastal communities of mainland Tanzania and Zanzibar, through implementing participatory and integrated coastal development/economic activities while sustaining coastal resources. It uses an integrated, holistic approach comprising integrated coastal zone management planning, supporting

²⁰The projects listed in this analysis in other focal areas within the GEF are projects whose main activities relate to the operational program within that particular focal area. Some projects that are in under the biodiversity focal area may contain some multi focal area components but they are not included in this analysis, but are included as projects under the section II in this document.

²¹ OP 9: Integrated Land and Water Multiple Focal Area Operational Program.

²² OP 8: Waterbody-based Operational Program..

alternative income generation activities supporting biodiversity conservation objectives, and improving market access and enhancing economic potential of coastal resources.

Land Degradation

77. The land degradation focal area supports initiatives that address land degradation within a framework of an integrated approach that can contribute to sustainable development.²³ Thus, projects in the land degradation focal area may focus on combating forest degradation and other types of issues that have relevance to the area of biological diversity. During the reporting period, ten projects amounting to a total commitment of approximately US\$45 million in the land degradation focal area were reported to have components that address biodiversity concerns particularly in forest ecosystems.

78. The Bhutan *Multi-Sectoral Mechanism and Incentives for Sustainable Land Management* project, implemented by the World Bank, promotes innovative mechanisms to enhance sustainable land management practices with local, regional and global environmental benefits. By so doing, the project enhances synergies between the Convention to Combat Desertification, the Framework Convention on Climate Change, and the Convention on Biological Diversity nationally.

79. A medium-sized project, *Development and Implementation of a Sustainable Resource Management Plan for Marsabit Mountain and its associated Watersheds*, implemented by UNEP in Kenya, ensures the long-term conservation and sustainable use of the unique mountain ecosystems in Marsabit by developing and implementing a management plan that could be replicated in similar environments in the Horn of Africa.

Integrated Ecosystem Management

80. Projects under the Operational Program (OP 12) *Integrated Ecosystem Management* are also approved under the multi focal area window. The objective of this operational program is to optimize global benefits while addressing the objectives of multiple international conventions and treaties in accordance with national priorities. It thus provides opportunities to enhance the capture of global environmental benefits across the focal areas of the GEF, namely biodiversity, climate change, international waters, and land degradation (desertification and deforestation). During the reporting period eight projects approved under OP 12 were reported to have elements that would generate global biodiversity benefits. This amounts to approximately US\$24 million committed under OP 12.

81. A full-sized project implemented by UNEP, the *Nature Conservation and Flood Control in Yangtze River Basin*, in China, mitigates flood events through rehabilitation and conservation of ecosystem functions, while simultaneously enhancing conservation and sustainable use of biological resources of global importance and strengthening sequestration of greenhouse gases. The project also strengthens capacity of the central and local government bodies to enable them to apply developed methodologies to the region as a whole in a flexible and sustainable manner.

82. In Belarus, the project, *Denaturalization and sustainable management of peat lands in Belarus to combat land degradation, ensure conservation of globally valuable biodiversity, and mitigate climate change*, mitigates climate change, prevent land degradation, ensure biodiversity conservation, and prevent radioactive pollution by rehabilitating and securing long-term conservation and sustainable use of degraded peat lands in the country.

²³ See UNCCD, Article 2, paragraph 1.

V. MONITORING & EVALUATION RESULTS

83. During the period, July 2003 – June 2005, the GEF Office of Monitoring and Evaluation conducted three studies that are relevant to the Convention on Biological Diversity: the Third Overall Performance Study of the GEF (2005), the second Study on the GEF Biodiversity Program (2004) and a study on the role of local benefits in global environmental programs. The three reports are summarized below. Copies of the documents are currently available in the GEF web site and will be available at the meeting of the COP.

Third Overall Performance Study (OPS3) of the GEF

84. The OPS3 report was completed on June, 2005. The study was conducted by the international firm, ICF Consulting and managed by the GEF Office of Monitoring and Evaluation. The draft report was presented to the GEF Council on June 3, 2005 for their review and comments and for information to the GEF replenishment process on June 9, 2005. The purpose OPS3, commissioned by the GEF Council, was “to assess the extent to which GEF has achieved, or is on its way towards achieving its main objectives, as laid down in the GEF Instrument and subsequent decisions by the GEF Council and the Assembly, including key documents such as the Operational Strategy and the Policy Recommendations agreed as part of the Third Replenishment of the GEF Trust Fund.”¹ The scope of the OPS3 study is defined by its Terms of Reference, approved by the GEF Council on 21 May 2004, and covers five main themes: (a) Results of GEF activities; (b) Sustainability of results at the country level; (c) GEF as a catalytic institution; (d) GEF policies, institutional structure, and partnerships; and (e) GEF implementation processes.

85. The major findings and recommendations include:

- (a) *Focal Areas Results.* The GEF has achieved significant results, particularly at the outcome level, in the focal areas of Biodiversity, Climate Change, International Waters, and Ozone Depletion, and is well placed to deliver important results in the newer focal areas of Land Degradation and Persistent Organic Pollutants. The report includes a presentation of the major achievements in each of them;
- (b) *Strategic Programming for Results - Focal Area Level.* While OPS3 observed good steps in GEF's attempt to shift from an approval focus to a results and quality orientation, and significant results have been achieved much remains to be done to focus on and manage results. This could be done by clarifying and improving the coherence of strategic direction in each of the focal areas to improve effective programming and to be able to meaningfully track indicators for results;
- (c) *Strategic Programming for Results - Country Level.* GEF projects are often developed in a more ad hoc and sometimes opportunistic manner, rather than systematically developed to contribute to an overall country strategy. As a result, because coherent portfolios are not always developed for countries, results may not always be maximized or achieved in the most cost effective manner. OPS3 recommends that the GEF needs a programmatic approach that (a) targets cross-focal area synergies; (b) prioritizes country projects; (c) explicitly considers global environmental benefits; and (d) sharpens the focus on sustainability and catalytic effects;

- (d) *Responsiveness to Conventions.* OPS3 finds that the GEF has been responsive to guidance from the conventions it serves. OPS3 recommends that there is a strengthening of communications between the GEF Secretariat and the secretariats of the Conventions it serves;
- (e) *Information Management within the GEF Network.* The GEF systems for information management, which encompass knowledge management, management information systems and infrastructure are inadequate and should be improved; and
- (f) *Network Responsibilities and Administration.* The GEF, based on its organization, structure, and division of roles and responsibilities, is a network organization with independent or at least semi-autonomous entities working together to achieve a common result. This structure is an appropriate institutional form to enable the GEF to meet its mandate and operations. OPS3 recommends that (i) the GEF Secretariat's role as the network administrative office be strengthened; (ii) there be more clarity in the roles and responsibilities for all GEF partners, especially IAs, EAs and STAP; (iii) the GEF foster M&E at all levels; and, (iv) launch a private sector initiative.
- (g) *Small Grants Program.* The SGP is well-received by recipient countries and increases the visibility of the GEF. The flexibility of the SGP has allowed for innovative thinking and design of activities to meet country needs and capacities in SIDS and LDCs. OPS3 recommends that there should be an increase in this program's funding allocation.

Biodiversity Program Study 2004

86. One of the key tasks of the GEF Office of Monitoring and Evaluation is to review the progress and results of the focal areas of the GEF every four years, coinciding with the GEF replenishment process. Independent studies of the GEF biodiversity, climate change and international waters focal areas were conducted during 2003-2004. There are available in the GEF web site, including the management responses prepared by the GEF Secretariat and the Implementing Agencies. These three studies serve as the major inputs to the OPS3. The evaluation of the GEF biodiversity program was completed in June 2004 and presented to GEF Council in November 2004.

87. The evaluation reviewed the GEF biodiversity portfolio (all projects approved by GEF Council, ongoing and completed) plus the GEF biodiversity operational programs and strategies as well as the GEF guiding principles and the GEFM&E policies and procedures in the context of the GEF biodiversity focal area, as of June 30, 2003. The objective of the study was to assess how the GEF biodiversity program is performing and recommended how to continue its development. The evaluation highlighted the following results achieved by the GEF biodiversity program:

- (a) the GEF biodiversity program has made notable contributions to conservation and sustainability use, supporting and enabling positive changes in the behavior or activities of people and their subsequent affects on biodiversity;
- (b) the GEF is likely the world's largest government-funded mechanism for biodiversity conservation for developing countries. From its inception in 1991 to 2003, the GEF has provided \$1.7 billion in direct funding support to 605 projects and accessed approximately \$3.3 billion in co-financing. As of July 2003, the GEF Small Grants Program had awarded 3076 biodiversity related grants for a total of \$63 million in GEF funding and \$64.6 million

in cash and in-kind co-financing in about 83 countries. Approximately 75% of GEF biodiversity projects (FY91-FY03) have involved sometime of support to protected areas and about 50% are working in areas outside formal protected areas. GEF projects have addressed sites of global significance. Approximately 55% of World Heritage sites eligible for inclusion in GEF projects have received GEF funding. 65 GEF projects have provided funding for about 40% of eligible Man and Biosphere Reserves (MABs; 106 sites). 65 GEF projects have included Ramsar sites (90 sites);

- (c) the top 10 countries receiving GEF funding for biodiversity (about 1/3 of the total GEF funding for biodiversity) are all megadiverse countries (countries estimated to contain 70% of the global biodiversity);
- (d) there is a strong correlation between GEF supported activities and the notable increase in protected area coverage over the past decade. The GEF is credited with helping achieve the global goal of 10% of the world's land area under protection. By the end of FY03, the GEF had supported investments in 1,232 protected areas, covering nearly 257 million hectares, about 15% of the total terrestrial land area protected globally. Many of the GEF biodiversity projects have secured legal status of some of these protected areas;
- (e) the GEF appears to have been responsive to most areas of CBD/COP guidance, providing financing for biodiversity initiatives in many sectors and countries around the world. Support for guidance on forest ecosystems and capacity building in biosafety has been particularly strong;
- (f) many projects have documented a wide range of achievements in influencing policy and legislation, such as working on targeted legislation to deliver stronger protected areas systems; and furthering legislation relating to land use, land tenure, and natural resource management. Projects have also contributed to policy and legislative issues in sectors related to the sustainable use of biodiversity, including hunting, fishing, forestry, agriculture and tourism. While the majority of projects have focused on public awareness at local or national levels, experts agree that the GEF has played a major role in raising the level of global awareness regarding biodiversity conservation;
- (g) Many successful partnerships have been created with local and national governments, local, national and international NGOs, academia, private sector entities, donors, and other projects and international initiatives. The GEF has been able to bring different stakeholders together, creating linkages between communities, NGOs and governments, encouraging cooperation and improving understanding and dialogue between local and national levels;

88. On the other hand, the study revealed several shortcomings and remaining challenges of the Program, which the GEF Secretariat and Implementing Agencies have discussed in their management response to GEF Council and addressed in the programming of GEF resources for the fourth phase of the GEF (GEF4):

- (a) the absence of a single, unifying program strategy against which to objectively assess performance to date was found to be one of the fundamental weakness of the GEF's current Biodiversity Program, and without due attention may well remain its "Achilles heel." The GEF must become far more strategic and deliberate in the use of its

significant, albeit limited, funds. The program still has not adopted a rationale or an objective system with clear criteria for prioritizing or balancing the portfolio, for example, addressing the most promising approaches, the most pressing threats, and the world's most important areas;

- (b) more than 50% of completion reports or terminal evaluations did not include any assessment or conclusions on the final impact of the project on biodiversity status, although very often they were able to report on strong proxies, such as the extent of protected habitat. These findings point to problems in project design, implementation, and overall evaluation and reporting standards. Measuring biodiversity impacts presents a challenge to the entire conservation community;
- (c) increased responsiveness to CBD is needed to implement effective incentive measures and national action plans and strategies, to develop indicators and baselines to monitor changes in the status of biodiversity, and to establish mechanisms for promoting the sustainability of project outcomes. Further challenges for GEF to implement CBD: (1) poorly focused and prioritized COP guidance, which has resulted in one or two projects for every decision; (2) lack of participatory collaboration approach between GEF, the Parties, Implementing Agencies and other key stakeholders to clarify and prioritize COP guidance; and (3) apparent expectation that all COP guidance will be supported by the GEF, at the same level and in perpetuity;
- (d) the GEF project approval process (pipeline to implementation) is still too long (between 4 and 5 years for FSPs and 2 years for MSPs) and complex, highly confusing to the average applicant and heavily laden with transaction cost. Furthermore, with the current project design approach (4-5 year project) it is most likely that while many outputs, along with some outcomes, will be achieved, most projects will fall short of making the longer term project level impacts they seek;
- (e) notably outstanding is the problem of developing and selecting appropriate indicators for assessing both biological and socioeconomic trends at all levels (project through program), making it difficult to measure achievement or impact over time. Moreover, there is still a need to establish the qualitative link between better or more effective management and conservation impacts in the protected areas portfolio;
- (f) opportunities for more and closer collaboration with the private sector partners working in industries that may negatively affect the status of biodiversity should be sought more proactively; and
- (g) The high costs involved in biodiversity conservation and the fact that the components of biodiversity are often common access resources present challenges for the financial sustainability of GEF supported outcomes.

Study on the Role of Local Benefits in Global Environmental Programs

89. This study analyzed the inter-relationship between local benefits and global environment benefits in the GEF strategy and projects. In several GEF focal areas, local benefits, or recompense for costs incurred locally to protect the environment, are an essential means of generating and sustaining intended global benefits.

90. The study design was based on three distinct, but inter-related approaches: firstly, a series of case studies, including both field-based and non-field studies; secondly a review of assessments provided by previous evaluative studies at the project, program and thematic level; thirdly, an examination of relevant donor agency, NGO and research community experiences.

91. The study drew four main conclusions. Firstly, in many areas in which the GEF is active, local and global benefits are strongly interlinked. Secondly, in some GEF projects there were considerable achievements in developing local incentives to ensure environmental gains. Thirdly, in many projects where local-global linkages were intended to be addressed, they were not sufficiently taken into account, resulting in less local and global benefits than anticipated. Fourthly, “win-win” situations for global and local benefits proved in many cases to be unattainable.

92. On the basis of its findings, the study made four recommendations, as follows:

- (a) where local benefits are an essential means to achieve and sustain global benefits, the GEF portfolio should integrate them more strongly into its programming;
- (b) integration of local benefits should be more systematically carried forward into all stages of the project cycle ;
- (c) GEF activities should include processes for dealing with trade-offs between global and local benefits in situations where win-win results do not materialize; and
- (d) In order to strengthen generation of linkages between local and global benefits, the GEF should ensure adequate involvement of expertise on social and institutional issues at all levels of the portfolio.

93. The study also noted that the GEF needs to better articulate the relationship between environment and development in its mandate. The study has shown that in many situations, the GEF’s environmental objectives cannot be achieved and sustained independently of broader development processes. The failure to address this relationship fully has reduced the effectiveness of the GEF portfolio in meeting its global environmental goals. It is important to re-assess the GEF practices of incremental cost calculations and the associated interpretations of what is “GEF-able”, without undermining the principle that all GEF funding needs to be spent on achieving global environmental benefits. The Office of Monitoring and Evaluation will undertake an evaluation of incremental cost analysis which will make use of the material gathered in this study and bring this to the Council for further discussion.

VI. EMERGING ISSUES RELEVANT TO THE AREA OF BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY

94. During the reporting period, the GEF has undertaken other activities which are of relevance to its biodiversity portfolio and of interest to the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on biological Diversity. The GEF continues its efforts to streamline its project cycle, and the Council has under

discussion an action plan to respond to the recommendations of medium-sized projects evaluation. Negotiations for the replenishment of the Facility continue. A decision has been reached on a GEF resource allocation framework.

Further Streamlining Project Cycle – Operations Manual

95. The GEF is currently finalizing an operations manual to provide Parties with basic knowledge about the mission of the Global Environment Facility (GEF), the policies and procedures in carrying out its mission, i.e., to protect the global environment through technical advice and funding support to countries to undertake environment projects, and the GEF project operations process. The manual is divided into two parts. Part I of the manual provides the background of the GEF structure, the principles, strategies, and policies which provide guidance in the implementation of the projects. Part II provides the detailed processes and procedures in undertaking the projects, as well as the approval process and documentations needed in each stage of the project cycle. The Operations Manual puts together all the information needed by Parties to access the GEF resources using the various modalities in a user-friendly format. The Operations Manual will be made available to all Parties through the GEF web site.

Fourth Replenishment of the GEF Trust Fund

96. At its November 2004 meeting, the Council requested the Trustee of the Global Environment Facility, in cooperation with the Chief Executive Officer and Chairman of the Facility, to initiate discussions on the fourth replenishment of the GEF Trust Fund (“GEF-4”) with the convening of a planning meeting in early March 2005. At the meeting on March 3, 2005, the GEF-4 replenishment process, was reviewed and agreed by donors.

97. GEF-3 resources fund Council work programs and administrative budgets for the period from July 1, 2002 to June 30, 2006. Discussions on the GEF-4 were initiated in 2005 to ensure that GEF operations can continue uninterrupted after the end of the GEF-3 period and that GEF-4 resources are available to cover GEF operations from July 1, 2006 through June 30, 2010. The timing of the GEF-4 discussions also takes into consideration the need to conclude replenishment discussions in early 2006 to give donor governments sufficient time to obtain the necessary parliamentary approvals to maintain continuity in their annual contributions to the GEF Trust Fund.

98. All countries that have indicated their intention to contribute the equivalent of at least SDR 4 million for that replenishment are invited to participate in the replenishment discussions. Potential donors that do not intend to provide this minimum contribution are also invited to attend replenishment negotiations as observers.

99. Five meetings have been held on this issue in June 9-10, 2005, September 2, 2005, October 5-7, 2005, November 11, 2005 and November 21-22 2005. They addressed the results of the Third Overall Performance Evaluation (OPS-3), negotiating text for policy recommendations under GEF-4, programming document for GEF-4 and the draft GEF-4 replenishment resolution. A final meeting is expected in early 2006.

GEF Resource Allocation Framework

100. The policy recommendations of the third replenishment of the GEF Trust Fund, endorsed by the Council in October 2002, requested “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. Furthermore, the policy recommendations stated that, “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 could be informed as to how allocation decisions are made.”

101. At a special meeting held on August 31 – September 1, 2005, the GEF Council approved a resource allocation framework (RAF) to allocate GEF resources to countries in a transparent and consistent manner based on global environmental priorities and country capacity, policies and practices relevant to successful implementation of GEF projects. (See Joint Summary of the Chairs, Special Meeting of the Council, available on the GEF website).

102. The RAF will initially apply to resources allocated in GEF-4 (beginning in July 2006) under the GEF focal areas of biodiversity and climate change. The Council will review the RAF after two years of implementation. The review will examine the operational experience with the RAF. The GEF Secretariat and Implementing and Executing Agencies are working to elaborate the procedures to ensure operationalization of the RAF in GEF-4.

103. At its meeting in November 2005, Council expressed appreciation for the work that has been initiated by the GEF Secretariat and the Implementing Agencies to operationalize the September RAF decision and requested the Secretariat to report on progress in June 2006, to continue to consult with countries to assist them with the transition to the RAF, and to involve the Executing Agencies, especially the regional development banks, in the planning process.

ANNEX 1: FULL-SIZE PROJECTS IN THE BIODIVERSITY FOCAL AREA APPROVED DURING THE REPORTING PERIOD

Country Name	IA	Project Name	Type	GEF Amount	Co-fin Amount	Total
Azerbaijan	World Bank	Rural Environment Project	FP	\$5.00	\$11.88	\$16.88
Benin	World Bank	Community-based Coastal and Marine Biodiversity Management Project	FP	\$4.30	\$9.80	\$14.10
Brazil	World Bank	Integrated Management of Aquatic Resources in the Amazon (AquaBio)	FP	\$7.18	\$9.97	\$17.15
Bulgaria	World Bank	Forest Development Project	FP	\$7.75	\$46.71	\$54.46
Cambodia	UNDP	Establishing Conservation Areas Landscape Management (CALM) in the Northern Plains	FP	\$2.30	\$2.67	\$4.97
Cameroon	World Bank	Forestry and Environmental Sector Adjustment Credit (FESAC)	FP	\$10.00	\$116.53	\$126.53
Chile	UNDP	Conserving Globally Significant Biodiversity along the Chilean Coast	FP	\$3.87	\$7.91	\$11.79
China	ADB	Sanjiang Plain Wetlands Protection Project	FP	\$12.14	\$42.25	\$54.39
El Salvador	World Bank	Environmental Services Project	FP	\$5.00	\$9.50	\$14.50
Gabon	World Bank	Support to Gabon's Forest and Environment Sector Program (PSFE)	FP	\$10.00	\$21.30	\$31.30
Global	UNEP	Building Capacity for Effective Participation in the Biosafety Clearing House (BCH) of the Cartagena Protocol	FP	\$4.62	\$0.35	\$4.97
Global	UNEP	Development of National Biosafety Frameworks Project (Add-on)	FP	\$5.22	\$0.00	\$5.22
Global	UNEP	Building Capacity for Effective Participation in the Biosafety Clearing House (BCH) -- (add-on to include 89 additional countries)	FP	\$8.91	\$1.05	\$9.96
Global	UNEP	Development of National Biosafety Frameworks Project (10 additional countries) - Add On	FP	\$2.61	\$0.75	\$3.36
Guinea	World Bank	Coastal Marine and Biodiversity Management	FP	\$5.00	\$13.05	\$18.05
Honduras	IADB	Consolidation of Ecosystem Management and Biodiversity Conservation of the Bay Islands	FP	\$2.50	\$13.80	\$16.30
India	UNDP	Andaman and Nicobar Islands: Ecologically - Sustainable Island Development	FP	\$3.39	\$6.00	\$9.39
Iran	UNDP	Conservation of Iranian Wetlands	FP	\$2.92	\$10.32	\$13.24
Iran	UNDP	Conservation of Biodiversity in the Central Zagros Landscape Conservation Zone	FP	\$3.80	\$6.04	\$9.84
Latvia	UNDP	Biodiversity Protection in North Vidzeme Biosphere Reserve	FP	\$2.66	\$10.74	\$13.40
Madagascar	World Bank/UNDP	Third Environment Program	FP	\$13.50	\$135.35	\$148.85
Malaysia	UNDP	Conservation of Biological Diversity through Improved Forest Planning Tools	FP	\$2.26	\$3.44	\$5.70
Malaysia	UNDP	Conserving Marine Biodiversity through Enhanced Marine Park Management and Inclusive Sustainable Island Development	FP	\$1.95	\$2.01	\$3.97

Country Name	IA	Project Name	Type	GEF Amount	Co-fin Amount	Total
Mali	World Bank/IFAD	Biodiversity Conservation and Participatory Sustainable Management of Natural Resources in the Inner Niger Delta and its Transition Areas, Mopti Region	FP	\$6.00	\$13.59	\$19.59
Mongolia	UNDP	Community-based Conservation of Biological Diversity in the Mountain Landscapes of Mongolia's Altai Sayan Ecoregion	FP	\$2.72	\$7.70	\$10.42
Mozambique	World Bank	Transfrontier Conservation Areas and Sustainable Tourism Development Project	FP	\$10.00	\$24.00	\$34.00
Namibia	World Bank	Namib Coast Biodiversity Conservation and Management (NACOMA)	FP	\$4.90	\$55.79	\$60.69
Namibia	UNDP	Strengthening the Protected Area Network (SPAN)	FP	\$8.20	\$33.68	\$41.88
Nepal	UNDP	Conservation and Sustainable Use of Wetlands	FP	\$1.96	\$2.10	\$4.06
Pakistan	UNDP	Protection and Management of Pakistan Wetlands	FP	\$2.99	\$8.79	\$11.78
Panama	World Bank	Second Rural Poverty, Natural Resources Management and Consolidation of the Mesoamerican Biological Corridor Project	FP	\$6.00	\$44.00	\$50.00
Philippines	ADB	Integrated Coastal Resources Management Project	FP	\$9.00	\$54.00	\$63.00
Regional (Antigua And Barbuda, Dominica, Grenada, St. Kitts And Nevis, St. Vincent and Grenadines, St. Lucia)	World Bank	OECS Protected Areas and Associated Sustainable Livelihoods	FP	\$3.70	\$3.87	\$7.57
Regional (Cameroon, Congo, Gabon)	UNDP	Conservation of Transboundary Biodiversity in the Minkebe-Odzala-Dja Interzone in Gabon, Congo, and Cameroon	FP	\$10.12	\$34.62	\$44.74
Regional (Colombia, Ecuador, Venezuela, Perú)	UNEP	Conservation of the Biodiversity of the Paramo in the Northern and Central Andes	FP	\$8.19	\$10.53	\$18.72
Regional (Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua)	UNDP	Central American Markets for Biodiversity (CAMBio): Mainstreaming Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable use within Micro, Small and Medium-sized Enterprise Development and Financing	FP	\$10.23	\$17.75	\$27.98
Regional (Estonia, Hungary, Lithuania, Mauritania, Niger, Nigeria, Senegal, Gambia, South Africa, Tanzania, Yemen, Turkey)	UNEP	Enhancing Conservation of the Critical Network of Sites of Wetlands Required by Migratory Water birds on the African/Eurasian Flyways.	FP	\$6.00	\$6.77	\$12.77

Country Name	IA	Project Name	Type	GEF Amount	Co-fin Amount	Total
Regional (Ethiopia, Uganda, Zambia, Ghana)	UNEP	Removing Barriers to Invasive Plant Management in Africa	FP	\$5.00	\$6.17	\$11.17
Regional (Gambia, Guinea, Mali, Senegal)	UNDP	In-situ Conservation of Endemic Ruminant Livestock in West Africa	FP	\$10.00	\$19.59	\$29.59
Regional (Guatemala, Belize, Honduras, El Salvador, Nicaragua, Costa Rica, Panama)	World Bank/IADB	Integrated Ecosystem Management in Indigenous Communities	FP	\$9.00	\$39.89	\$48.89
Regional (Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan)	UNEP	In Situ/On Farm Conservation and Use of Agricultural Biodiversity (Horticultural Crops and Wild Fruit Species) in Central Asia	FP	\$5.72	\$6.15	\$11.86
Regional (Latin America and Caribbean)	World Bank	Building the Inter-American Biodiversity Information Network (IABIN)	FP	\$6.00	\$30.29	\$36.29
Regional (Nicaragua, Honduras)	World Bank	Corazon Transboundary Biosphere Project	FP	\$12.00	\$21.00	\$33.00
Regional (Philippines, Indonesia)	World Bank/IFC	Marine Aquarium Market Transformation Initiative (MAMTI)	FP	\$6.62	\$15.37	\$21.99
Republic Of Korea	UNDP	Conservation of Globally Significant Wetlands	FP	\$2.12	\$11.02	\$13.15
Russian Federation	UNDP	Conservation of Wetland Biodiversity in the Lower Volga Region	FP	\$6.67	\$9.03	\$15.70
Russian Federation	UNDP	Biodiversity Conservation in the Russian Portion of the Altai-Sayan Ecoregion	FP	\$3.52	\$12.16	\$15.68
Russian Federation	World Bank	Fire Management in High Biodiversity Value Forests of Amur-Sikhote-Alin Ecoregion	FP	\$7.90	\$36.24	\$44.14
Russian Federation	UNDP	Demonstrating Sustainable Conservation of Biodiversity in Four Protected Areas in Russia's Kamchatka Oblast, Phase 2	FP	\$5.50	\$9.93	\$15.43
Rwanda	UNDP	Strengthening Biodiversity Conservation Capacity in the Forest Protected Area System of Rwanda	FP	\$5.45	\$7.98	\$13.43
Senegal	World Bank	Integrated Marine and Coastal Resource Management	FP	\$5.00	\$12.00	\$17.00
South Africa	UNDP	Conservation and Sustainable Use of Biodiversity on the South African Wild Coast	FP	\$6.50	\$24.32	\$30.82
Tanzania	World Bank	Marine and Coastal Environment Management Project (MACEMP)	FP	\$10.00	\$48.13	\$58.13
Tunisia	World Bank	Gulf of Gabes Marine and Coastal Resources Protection	FP	\$6.06	\$2.74	\$8.80

Country Name	IA	Project Name	Type	GEF Amount	Co-fin Amount	Total
Turkmenistan	UNDP	Conservation and Sustainable Use of Globally Significant Biological Diversity in Khazar Nature Reserve on the Caspian Sea Coast (Resubmission)	FP	\$1.43	\$1.60	\$3.03
Uganda	UNDP	Conservation of Biodiversity in the Albertine Rift Forest Protected Areas	FP	\$3.40	\$7.80	\$11.20
Uruguay	World Bank	Integrated Natural Resources and Biodiversity Management	FP	\$7.00	\$12.00	\$19.00
Vietnam	World Bank	Forest Sector Development Project	FP	\$9.00	\$65.59	\$74.59
Zambia	UNDP	Effective Management of the National Protected Areas System	FP	\$6.00	\$36.01	\$42.01

ANNEX 2: MEDIUM-SIZE PROJECTS IN THE BIODIVERSITY FOCAL AREA APPROVED DURING THE REPORTING PERIOD

Country	IA	Project Name	Type	GEF Amount	Co-fin Amount	Total
Afghanistan	ADB	Natural Resources and Poverty Alleviation Project	MSP	\$0.98	\$0.75	\$1.73
Argentina	UNDP	In-Situ Conservation of Andean Crops and their Wild Relatives in the Humahuaca Valley, the Southernmost Extension of the Central Andes	MSP	\$0.94	\$0.91	\$1.85
Bulgaria	World Bank	Lake Pomorie Conservation, Restoration and Sustainable Management Project	MSP	\$0.86	\$1.12	\$1.98
Chile	UNDP	Biodiversity Conservation in Altos de Cantillana	MSP	\$0.96	\$1.14	\$2.09
Czech Republic	UNDP	Conservation of Biological Diversity of Carpathian Mountain Grasslands in the Czech Republic through Targeted Application of New EU Funding Mechanisms	MSP	\$0.97	\$9.38	\$10.35
Georgia	UNDP	Recovery, Conservation, and Sustainable Use of Georgia's Agro biodiversity	MSP	\$0.96	\$1.72	\$2.68
Global	UNEP	UNEP Support to CBD Parties for Preparation of Third National Reports to the COP of CBD	MSP	\$1.00	\$0.00	\$1.00
Global	UNDP	National Reporting to the CBD: Supporting Countries to Prepare the Third National Report on Biodiversity	MSP	\$1.00	\$0.00	\$1.00
Global	World Bank	Development Marketplace	MSP	\$1.00	\$2.34	\$3.34
Global (Brazil, Mexico, Cameroon)	UNEP	Improved Certification Schemes for Sustainable Tropical Forest Management	MSP	\$0.96	\$0.47	\$1.43
Guatemala	UNDP	Consolidating a System of Municipal Regional Parks (MRPs) in Guatemala's Western Plateau	MSP	\$0.97	\$1.26	\$2.23
Hungary	UNDP	Conservation and Restoration of the Globally Significant Biodiversity of the Tisza River Floodplain through Integrated Floodplain Management	MSP	\$0.94	\$1.75	\$2.69
Indonesia	World Bank	Lambusango Forest Conservation, Sulawesi	MSP	\$0.98	\$3.49	\$4.47
Kenya	UNDP	Developing Incentives for Community Participation in Forest Conservation through the Use of Commercial Insects in Kenya	MSP	\$1.00	\$2.25	\$3.25

Country	IA	Project Name	Type	GEF Amount	Co-fin Amount	Total
Lao PDR	World Bank	Integrated Ecosystem and Wildlife Management Project in Bolikhamxay Province	MSP	\$0.97	\$0.61	\$1.59
Liberia	World Bank	Establishing the Basis for Biodiversity Conservation on Sapo National Park and in South-East Liberia	MSP	\$0.98	\$1.44	\$2.41
Mauritius	UNDP	Partnerships for Marine Protected Areas in Mauritius	MSP	\$0.98	\$3.37	\$4.34
Nicaragua	UNDP	Conservation of Dry Forest and Coastal Biodiversity of the Pacific Coast of Southern Nicaragua: Building Private-Public Partnerships	MSP	\$0.96	\$3.89	\$4.86
Peru	World Bank/IFC	Inka Terra: An Innovative Partnership for Self-Financing Biodiversity Conservation & Community Development	MSP	\$0.73	\$11.37	\$12.09
Peru	UNDP	Conservation and Sustainable Use of Biodiversity in the Peruvian Amazon by the Indigenous Ashaninka Population	MSP	\$0.98	\$0.56	\$1.53
Regional (Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland)	UNEP	Conservation and Sustainable Use of Biodiversity through Sound Tourism Development in Biosphere Reserves in Central and Eastern Europe	MSP	\$0.94	\$1.18	\$2.12
Regional (Kenya, Burkina Faso)	UNEP	Dryland Livestock Wildlife Environment Interface Project (DLWEIP)	MSP	\$0.98	\$2.36	\$3.33
Regional (Russian Federation, Ukraine, Belarus, Kazakhstan)	UNEP	Strengthening the Network of Training Centers for Protected Area Management through Demonstration of a Tested Approach	MSP	\$0.98	\$1.37	\$2.34
Romania	UNDP	Strengthening Romania's Protected Area System by Demonstrating Government-NGO Partnership in Romania's Maramures Nature Park	MSP	\$0.98	\$1.33	\$2.31
Russian Federation	UNDP	Conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity in Russia's Taymir Peninsula: Maintaining connectivity across the landscape	MSP	\$0.97	\$2.04	\$3.01
Tajikistan	World Bank	Dashtidzhum Biodiversity Conservation	MSP	\$0.75	\$0.20	\$0.95
Tanzania	World Bank/IFC	Lalkisale Biodiversity Conservation Support Project	MSP	\$0.45	\$0.41	\$0.86
Tanzania	UNDP	The Development and Management of the Selous-Niassa Wildlife Corridor	MSP	\$0.99	\$1.06	\$2.05

Country	IA	Project Name	Type	GEF Amount	Co-fin Amount	Total
Tanzania	World Bank	Novel Forms of Livestock & Wildlife Integration Adjacent to Protected Areas in Africa	MSP	\$0.88	\$1.33	\$2.21
Uzbekistan	UNDP	Conservation of "Tugai Forest" and Strengthening Protected Areas System in the Amu Darya Delta of Karakalpakstan	MSP	\$0.97	\$1.14	\$2.11
Vanuatu	UNDP	Facilitating and Strengthening the Conservation Initiatives of Traditional Landholders and their Communities to Achieve Biodiversity Conservation Objectives	MSP	\$0.75	\$0.71	\$1.46
Venezuela	World Bank	DHEKUANA NONODOO: Sustainable Use and Conservation of Biodiversity Resources of Dhekuana Indigenous Lands	MSP	\$0.75	\$0.35	\$1.10
Vietnam	UNDP	Making the Link: The Connection and Sustainable Management of Kon Ka Kinh and Kon Cha Rang Nature Reserves	MSP	\$0.88	\$2.09	\$2.96
Vietnam	UNDP	Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Use of the Marine Resources at Con Dao National Park	MSP	\$0.97	\$0.88	\$1.85

ANNEX 3: ENABLING ACTIVITIES IN THE BIODIVERSITY FOCAL AREA APPROVED DURING THE REPORTING PERIOD

Country	IA	Project Name	Type	GEF Amount	Co-fin Amount	Total
Barbados	UNEP	Assessment of Capacity Building Needs and Country Specific Priorities in the Conservation of Biodiversity and Participation in the National Clearing House Mechanism	EA	\$0.29	\$0.06	\$0.34
Rwanda	UNDP	Elaboration of the Second National Report on the Implementation of Biodiversity by Rwanda for the Sixth Conference of Parties in 2002	EA	\$0.03	\$0.01	\$0.04
Chad	UNDP	Identification of Capacity-building Needs for the Implementation of the National BSAP - Add on	EA	\$0.20	\$0.00	\$0.20
Turkmenistan	UNDP	Assessment of Capacity Building Needs and Enhancement of Biodiversity Information Management (Add On)	EA	\$0.13	\$0.01	\$0.14
Czech Republic	UNEP	Assessment of Capacity-building Needs: Access to Genetic Resources and Benefit-sharing, Conservation and Sustainable Use of Biodiversity Important for Agriculture, Forestry and Research	EA	\$0.20	\$0.04	\$0.24
Paraguay	UNDP	Assessment of Capacity Building Needs & Country Specific Priorities (Add On)	EA	\$0.24	\$0.08	\$0.32
Serbia and Montenegro	UNDP	Biodiversity Strategy, Action Plan and National Report (BSAP)	EA	\$0.29	\$0.02	\$0.32
Comoros	UNDP	Capacity Needs Assessment for the implementation of the National Biodiversity Strategy and support to the Clearing House Mechanism	EA	\$0.27	\$0.00	\$0.27
Fiji	UNDP	Additional Funding of Biodiversity Enabling Activity	EA	\$0.24	\$0.16	\$0.40
Honduras	UNDP	Assessment of Capacity Building Needs and Country Specific Priorities for the Implementation of the Action Plan for the National Strategy on Biodiversity (Add on)	EA	\$0.19	\$0.04	\$0.23
Tajikistan	UNDP	Additional Financing for Capacity Assessment in Biodiversity Priority Areas	EA	\$0.22	\$0.03	\$0.25
Uzbekistan	UNDP	Assessment of Priority National Capacity Development Needs for Implementation of the BSAP and Establishment of CHM Structures	EA	\$0.21	\$0.02	\$0.23

Country	IA	Project Name	Type	GEF Amount	Co-fin Amount	Total
Albania	World Bank	Assessment of Capacity Building Needs to Address the Priorities of the BSAP - Phase II	EA	\$0.32	\$0.07	\$0.39
Madagascar	UNEP	Biodiversity Enabling Activities Add-on: Assessment of Capacity Building Needs and Establishment of a National Clearing House Mechanism	EA	\$0.19	\$0.05	\$0.24
Bosnia-Herzegovina	UNEP	Biodiversity EA Preparation of National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan, National Reports and Establishment of a National Clearing House Mechanism	EA	\$0.29	\$0.04	\$0.33
Tunisia	UNEP	Assessment of Capacity-building Needs for Biodiversity and Participation in the Establishment of a Clearing House Mechanism (CHM) - ADD ON	EA	\$0.19	\$0.08	\$0.26
Botswana	UNDP	Botswana Biological Diversity (ADD-ON)	EA	\$0.11	\$0.02	\$0.13
Turkey	UNEP	Consultation for National Reporting, Participation in the National Clearing House Mechanism and Further Development of the National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (NBSAP)	EA	\$0.37	\$0.10	\$0.46
Nauru	UNDP	National Biodiversity Conservation Strategy and Action Plan and Report to the COP including Clearing House Mechanism	EA	\$0.14	\$0.01	\$0.15
Namibia	UNEP	Assessment of Capacity Building Needs to Conserve Biological Diversity - Add on	EA	\$0.21	\$0.06	\$0.27

ANNEX 4: PROJECT SUMMARIES***Full size projects***

Azerbaijan: *Rural Environment Project*, the project introduces a new multiple-use protected areas model to conserve global biodiversity resources in Azerbaijan, which is new to the country. The project's development objective is to introduce improved natural resource management and related economic activities in two mountainous areas of Azerbaijan, in order to enhance the ecological quality and the sustainable productivity of high elevation forests and pastures. The project's global objective is to protect biodiversity in two globally significant biodiversity areas within the Caucasus and Zangezur mountains, and introduce and pilot an inclusive model of protected area management in Azerbaijan. (World Bank, GEF \$5m, total project \$16.88m).

Benin: *Community-based Coastal and Marine Biodiversity Management Project*, the main objective of the project is to contribute to a sustainable management of the coastal zone and biological diversity of national and global interest, with the view to a sustainable development of the country. Project activities consist of four inter-related component aimed at creating the technical, institutional, organizational, socio-economic, and governance conditions to ensure conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity and its resources. These components are: (a) institution and capacity-building in integrated coastal zone management, (b) community-based biodiversity conservation; (c) monitoring and evaluation of coastal wetlands and marine environment, and project management and coordination. (World Bank, GEF \$4.3m, total \$14.1m).

Brazil: *Integrated Management of Aquatic Resources in the Amazon (AquaBio) Project*, its development objective is to support the mainstreaming of a multi-stakeholder, integrated management approach to the conservation and sustainable use of freshwater biodiversity in public policies and programs in the Brazilian Amazon River Basin. This would in part be achieved through the generation and dissemination of sub-regional experiences that promote and facilitate its implementation in the Amazon Basin. (World Bank, GEF \$7.18m, total project \$17.15m).

Bulgaria: *Forest Development Project*, the development objective of the project is to increase the contribution of forest to the national economy and to the benefit of rural populations through sustainable management of state, private and communal forests. Its global objective is to strengthen conservation of forest ecosystems through mainstreaming biodiversity conservation into forest management, and through improved conservation of critical ecosystems. (World Bank, GEF \$7.74m, total project \$54.45m).

Cambodia: *Establishing Conservation Areas Landscape Management (CALM) in the Northern Plains*, the project designs and implements a landscape level conservation program through a "Living Landscapes" approach to conserve key components of biodiversity which are either unique to the landscape or for which the landscape acts as a critical range. (UNDP, GEF \$2.3m, total project \$4.96m).

Cameroon: *Forestry and Environmental Sector Adjustment Credit (FESAC)*, the project development objective is to strengthen public and private efforts to achieve socio-economically and ecologically sustainable use of national forest and wildlife resources. Within this objective, the project seeks to: (a) promote the sustainable management of rainforests and savanna lands; (b) increase local community involvement in and benefits from sustainable management of natural resources; (c) improve the institutional and organizational capacity to implement new policies and regulations for forest management and timber industry development; and (d) enhance conservation of biodiversity and supply

/...

environmental services of national and global relevance. The project's global objective is to improve the long-term prospects for globally important biodiversity within Cameroon's network of ecosystem units. (World Bank, GEF\$10m, total project \$126.53m).

Chile: *Conserving Globally Significant Biodiversity along the Chilean Coast*, the project assists the Government of Chile to conserve and sustainably manage marine and coastal biodiversity through the establishment of Multiple Use Marine Coastal Protected Areas (MUMPAs) in critical areas of the Chilean coast. Through this, the government's goal will be to remove barriers for the definition and implementation of an integrated management system for coastal/marine biodiversity and its biological resources. It will do so through the creation of three MUMPAs in three demonstration sites of global importance and by developing tools and mechanisms to facilitate their replication in other parts of the country. It is expected that, by removing barriers, the successful demonstration of win-win approaches for private sector and community benefits linked to strong biodiversity conservation efforts, will permit the replication of these approaches and methodologies in Chile and elsewhere in the region. (UNDP, GEF \$3.87m, total project \$11.79m).

China: *Sanjiang Plain Wetlands Protection Project*, the project would assist the Government of China and the Heilongjiang Province to establish mechanisms for restoring and protecting biodiversity and natural resources at the watershed scale while integrating the needs of all key stakeholders. Project objectives are 1) Enhancement flood mitigation role of the wetland, and 2) Conservation of the globally unique environment and biodiversity of Sanjiang plain. The project will (a) increase tree cover in fragile uplands to protect soil, slopes and watersheds, while providing profitable crops and alternative employment opportunities to low-income farmers; (b) promote increased ecosystem and economic productivity through better land use, enabling local, national, regional and global stakeholders to derive benefits from the recovery of lost ecosystem functions; (c) provide models for wetland restoration (including maintaining local livelihoods), watershed level water resources management, and species and habitat recovery and management; and (d) enhance knowledge and awareness of conservation issues and a significant human and institutional capacity for sustainable management wetlands. (ADB, GEF \$12.14m, total project \$54.39m).

El Salvador: *Environmental Services Project*, the objectives of the project are to protect El Salvador's natural ecosystems and conserve the globally significant biodiversity through the development of a system of payments for environmental services and consolidation, expansion, and restoration of natural protected areas. (World Bank, GEF \$5m, total project \$14.5m).

Gabon: *Support to Gabon's Forest and Environment Sector Program (PSFE)*, the objective of the program is to protect and manage biodiversity in a sustainable way and contribute to the diversification of national economy through strengthened capacities of parks and wildlife authorities. It is designed to complement the Gabon's Forest and Environment Sector Program (PSFE), a sector wide, multi donor program led by the Ministry of Forests. The program is consisted of five components: (a) sustainable forest management including wildlife in production landscapes; (b) Fisheries and coastal zone management; (c) development of the national parks network; (d) valorization of other environmental goods and services; and (e) institutional strengthening research and training. (World Bank, GEF \$10m, total project \$31.3m).

Global: *Building Capacity for Effective Participation in the Biosafety Clearing House (BCH) of the Cartagena Protocol*, the overall objective of this project is to assist eligible countries in building and strengthening national capacity needed to enable access and use of the BCH in order to implement their

obligations under the Protocol once it enters into force. This will also ensure that the Biosafety Clearing-House is operational upon entry into force of the Protocol. (UNEP, GEF \$4.62m, total project \$4.97m).

Global: *Development of National Biosafety Frameworks Project (Add-on)*, this project aims to assist all GEF eligible countries to prepare for the entry into force of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety in accordance with the GEF Initial Biosafety Strategy as endorsed by the 16th Council meeting, taking into account other bilateral and multilateral initiatives. The project aims at assisting all GEF eligible countries that have signed the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety to prepare national biosafety frameworks and promote regional and sub-regional cooperation through the convening of regional and sub-regional workshops. Project implementation is guided by the "Indicative framework for capacity building under the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety" (UNEP/CBD/ICCP/1/4) as well as the guidance of the Intergovernmental Committee of the Cartagena Protocol. The initial GEF commitment extended support to all eligible countries, with a clear understanding that the original figure of 100 countries was a planning figure. The current additional request is a continuation of the original project, based on the same standards and project structure. This add-on project extends support to a further 20 countries to fulfill their obligations to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety. (UNEP, GEF \$5.22M, total project \$5.22m).

Global: *Building Capacity for Effective Participation in the Biosafety Clearing House (BCH) -- (add-on to include 89 additional countries)*, the overall objective of this project is to assist eligible countries in building and strengthening national capacity needed to enable access and use of the BCH in order to implement their obligations under the Cartagena Protocol, once it enters into force. This project is proposed as an add-hoc project, to include 89 additional countries, to the current project entitled Building Capacity for Effective Participation in the Biosafety Clearing House (BCH) of the Cartagena Protocol, approved by the GEF Council in November, 2003. (UNEP, GEF \$8.90m, total project \$9.96m).

Global: *Development of National Biosafety Frameworks Project (10 additional countries) - Add On*, This project is an extension of the original project on "Development of National Biosafety Frameworks Project" and aims to assist remaining GEF eligible countries to prepare for the entry into force of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety in accordance with the Initial Biosafety Strategy. A further request for additional funds for 20 countries was approved at the GEF November 2003 Council through an add-on project. (UNEP, GEF \$2.61m, total project \$3.36m).

Guinea Coastal Marine and Biodiversity Management Project, it promotes management of Guinea's coastal biodiversity for both conservation of biodiversity and sustainable development ends, with a particular emphasis on assisting local communities in and around key priority sites to plan, implement, and maintain environmentally sustainable and socially inclusive alternative livelihoods options. It does so through: (a) the establishment of one protected areas in collaboration with stakeholders and international NGOs; (b) improved collaboration between stakeholders at national and sub regional levels; (c) environmentally sustainable and socially inclusive alternative livelihoods; (d) local stakeholders enabled to plan, implement and monitor their own sustainable development plans; and (e) efficient management of project resources. (World Bank, GEF \$5m, total project \$18.05m).

Honduras: *Consolidation of Ecosystem Management and Biodiversity Conservation of the Bay Islands*, the project assists the Government of Honduras to conserve and sustainably manage key coastal/marine ecosystems in the archipelago of the Bay Islands (islands of Utila, Roatan, Guanaja, and over 60 smaller keys). The archipelago includes a complex marine system exceeding 500 km² with barrier and fringing corals reef formations juxtaposed with extensive sea grass beds and coastal lagoons. The region is of great biological diversity and the project would complement existing GEF investments in

the Mesoamerican Barrier reef and the Belize coastal zone management projects. Key project objectives are: (a) defining and implementing the sub-regional (Bay Islands-wide) institutional arrangements needed to integrate biodiversity conservation into broader environmental management functions of local and central government agencies; (b) establishing the operational basis and capacity for co-management of the system of coastal and marine protected areas spanning the entire archipelago; (c) introducing economic incentives for maintenance and recovery of natural resources under threat; and (d) designing and implementing financing mechanisms for biodiversity conservation. (IADB, GEF \$2.5m, total project \$16.3m).

India: *Andaman and Nicobar Islands: Ecologically-Sustainable Island Development Project*, it supports the implementation of activities directed to coastal conservation, management and sustainable use of coral resources and sustainable economic activities of the coastal communities in these globally important island ecosystems. (UNDP, GEF \$ 3.39m, total project \$9.3872).

Iran: *Conservation of Iranian Wetlands*, the project's goal is to catalyze the sustainability of Iran's system of wetland protected areas, thereby enhancing its effectiveness as a tool for conserving globally significant biodiversity. The project's objective is to systematically remove or substantially mitigate threats facing globally significant biodiversity and sustainability at two demonstration sites, while ensuring that lessons learned through these demonstrations are applied within protected area management systems throughout Iran and most particularly at a set of target replication sites. These target replication sites have been defined as the remaining nationally and internationally protected (Ramsar) sites in Iran. (UNDP, GEF \$2.91m, total project \$13.24m).

Iran: *Conservation of Biodiversity in the Central Zagros Landscape Conservation Zone*, the project objective is the conservation of the biodiversity and the landscape within the Central Zagros Landscape Conservation Zone. In order to achieve this objective, the project will stimulate changes in village-level practices, at the provincial level, and in national agencies. Hence, project outcomes and activities focus into these three levels. (UNDP, GEF \$3.8m, total project \$9.84m).

Latvia: *Biodiversity Protection in North Vidzeme Biosphere Reserve*, the project assists the Government of Latvia in addressing the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity in a biosphere reserve that covers approximately six percent of the country's territory. It will do so through the strengthening of the institutional, managerial, and financial sustainability of this protected area through legislation, policy analysis, strengthening institutional and stakeholder capacities to improve all aspects of the protected area management. It will also integrate biodiversity conservation into the planning, management and sustainable use of the protected area. Given its representativeness among Latvia ecosystems, lessons learned could be replicated elsewhere within national system of protected areas. (UNDP, GEF \$2.66m, total project \$13.4m).

Madagascar: *Third Environment Program*, the program's development objective is setting natural resources management and biodiversity protection in critical ecological regions on an effective and sustainable footing with active participation from local populations and other relevant stakeholders, while incorporating environmental dimensions in public policy making and investment decisions. The proposed UNDP/GEF and IDA/GEF funding supports the third five-year phase of the Environmental Action Plan (PAE). The PAE was adopted by the Government of Madagascar in 1989, while implementation started in 1991 with the support of a broad coalition of bilateral donors (Germany, France, Switzerland, and USA), international agencies (GEF, IDA, UNDP) and NGOs (WWF, Conservation International). The PAE was

designed, from its inception, as a fifteen-year investment program divided into three five-year phases. The third phase aims to achieve the mainstreaming of environment into macroeconomic management and sector programs, mainstreaming into local governance and community initiatives, and putting into place sustainable financing mechanisms for the environment. The third phase of PAE incorporates an “exit strategy”, progressively reducing dependence on donor funds and a move towards internally managed funds for PAE operating and investment cost. However, it also provides opportunities for continued donor assistance to a country-led programmatic approach to environmental management. (World Bank/UNDP, GEF \$13.5m, total project \$148.85m).

Malaysia: *Conservation of Biological Diversity through Improved Forest Planning Tools*, This project develops tools and generates knowledge needed to ensure that forestry production systems are planned and managed in a manner which will contribute to biodiversity conservation or the sustainable use of its components as compared to baseline scenarios. It fits under the GEF Strategic Priority four on the Generation and Dissemination of Best Practices for Addressing Current and Emerging Biodiversity Issues. Tools developed under the project will be disseminated for broader application to GEF Strategic Priority two on Mainstreaming Biodiversity in Production Landscapes and Sectors. (UNDP, GEF \$2.26m, total project \$5.70m).

Malaysia: *Conserving Marine Biodiversity through Enhanced Marine Park Management and Inclusive Sustainable Island Development*, the project builds upon significant investments and proposals by the Malaysian Federal and State authorities to ensure improved marine resource conservation and management in the Malaysian east coast and inclusive sustainable island development. The conservation objective is addressed through the improvement of existing management of marine protected areas at three sites: Pulau Tioman, Pulau Redang, and Pulau Sibut-Tinggi. The project will target approximately 165,000 ha of coastal marine ecosystems under improved management. It also strengthens activities at the national and systemic levels ensuring replicability of new initiatives demonstrated in the three project sites. This replicability process could eventually reach up to approximately 570,000 ha of coastal marine environments in Peninsular Malaysia. Its sustainable development objective is addressed through diminishing negative impacts arising from island-based development through the implementation of effective, broad scale mechanisms for multi-sectoral coordination and sustainable development planning. (UNDP, GEF \$1.95m, total project \$3.97m).

Mali: *Biodiversity Conservation and Participatory Sustainable Management of Natural Resources in the Inner Niger Delta and its Transition Areas, Mopti Region*, the project objectives are (a) to promote the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity resources of global value in Mali’s Sahel region, specifically in the Interior Delta of the Niger (Mopti); (b) to promote positive impacts and mitigate negative ones of agricultural practices on biological diversity in agro-ecosystems and their interface with other ecosystems; (c) the conservation and sustainable use of genetic resources of actual or potential value for food and agriculture; (d) to prevent deforestation and promote sustainable use and sustainable management of forests or forested areas in order to conserve their biodiversity; (e) to prevent and control land degradation through development of sustainable use methods for biodiversity conservation, including the management of freshwater systems and (f) to ensure the conservation of representative natural habitats and ecosystems through effective systems of conservation areas, including protected areas, and strategic interventions to rehabilitate degraded areas. (World Bank/IFAD, GEF\$6m, total project \$19.59m).

Mongolia: *Community-based Conservation of Biological Diversity in the Mountain Landscapes of Mongolia's Altai Sayan Ecoregion*, The project is designed to modify land and resource use trends and

address the inadequacies of the protected area system within the landscape of Altai-Sayan. It includes Approx. 2000km² of Mongolia's Altai-Sayan brought under improved management, where biodiversity conservation will be mainstreamed into productive sectors (grazing, pastureland, forestry and tourism). About 10% of the land area will be under strict protection and 90% will comprise production landscapes. (UNDP, GEF \$2.72m, total project \$10.42m).

Mozambique: *Transfrontier Conservation Areas and Sustainable Tourism Development Project*, its global objective is to ensure the sustainable management and conservation of Mozambique's global biodiversity assets and critically important transboundary ecosystems through an integrated ecosystem management approach. It builds upon the experience of earlier GEF-funded pilot project aimed at assisting Mozambique to capitalize on unique opportunities in biodiversity conservation as a basis for tourism and rural development. The project institutionalizes a fully participatory, multi-sectoral planning and implementation process for transfrontier conservation areas and integrates environmental and social values with economic development. The project reinforces enabling conditions for community-oriented, private sector investment in environmentally and socially sustainable tourism. (World Bank, GEF \$10m, total project \$33.99m).

Namibia: *Namib Coast Biodiversity Conservation and Management (NACOMA) Project*, its overall goal is the prudent and effective conservation, management and utilization of the vast and diverse biodiversity found within the Namib coast of Namibia. The program objective is to put in place a coastal zone management system that leads to the sustainable use of resources and the protection of Namibia's biodiversity. (World Bank, GEF \$4.9m, total project \$60.69m).

Namibia: *Strengthening the Protected Area Network (SPAN) Project*, the project long term goal is the sustainable management of natural resources, to protect biodiversity and contribute to equitable economic and social development. Its immediate objective is to improve management effectiveness of the National System of Protected Areas. (UNDP, GEF \$8.2m, total project \$41.88m).

Nepal: *Conservation and Sustainable Use of Wetlands*, the overall project goal is to ensure the maintenance and enhancement of wetland biodiversity and environmental goods and services for improved local livelihoods. Its immediate objective is to strengthen national and local capacity in ecosystem management and sustainable uses of wetland biodiversity in Nepal. Two demonstration sites were selected from among four wetland sites identified and represent two different types of tenure: one is a protected area and its buffer zone and the other is a national forest area. (UNDP, GEF \$1.96m, total project \$4.06m).

Pakistan: *Protection and Management of Pakistan Wetlands*, the project strengthens government and local capacity to protect and manage the selected representative and globally significant wetland ecosystems, to ensure sustainable human development maximizing ecological and economic benefits for the present and future generations. (UNDP, GEF \$2.99m, total project \$11.78m).

Panama: *Second Rural Poverty, Natural Resources Management and Consolidation of the Mesoamerican Biological Corridor Project*, its global objective supports Government efforts to integrate environmental and social sustainability into development and poverty reduction strategies in the Pacific and Atlantic municipalities. It does so through: (a) enabling decentralization of environmental management by strengthening local governments; (b) strengthening and training local government authorities in environmental management; and (c) supporting poor communities to adopt biodiversity friendly income generating activities. (World Bank, GEF \$6m, total project \$50m).

Philippines: *Integrated Coastal Resources Management Project*, it seeks to improve coastal and marine resource management enhancing biodiversity conservation, and to reduce poverty in coastal communities. Through a participatory approach it supports: (a) policy and institutional strengthening and development; (b) reducing the extensive poverty prevalent among coastal communities through provision of alternative livelihood and enterprise development, social services and infrastructure, (c) promoting sustainable management and use of coastal resources and related ecosystems, and conserve coastal resources and globally significant biodiversity; (d) controlling coastal environmental pollution and erosion; and (e) strengthening capabilities of Government agencies, NGOs and local communities on coastal resource management and social development.(ADB, GEF \$9m, total project \$63m).

Regional(Antigua And Barbuda, Dominica, Grenada, St. Kitts And Nevis, St. Vincent and Grenadines, St. Lucia): *OECS Protected Areas and Associated Sustainable Livelihoods Project*, its development objective is to contribute to the economic development of Small Island Development States (SIDS) of the Organization of Eastern Caribbean States (OECS) region through the strengthening of existing and the creation of new protected areas; and providing environmentally sustainable economic opportunities for communities living in the surrounding areas. This will be accomplished by: (a) improving relevant, policy regulatory and institutional arrangements in the participating countries; (b) establishing or strengthening a number of demonstration protected areas, including providing support for the development of new and alternative livelihoods for communities living in the proximity of these sites; and (c) improving institutional capacity to manage protected areas in the region. (World Bank, GEF \$3.7m, total project \$7.57m).

Regional (Cameroon, Congo, Gabon): *Conservation of Transboundary Biodiversity in the Minkebe-Odzala-Dja Interzone in Gabon, Congo, and Cameroon Project*, its development objective is to conserve globally significant biodiversity in the Congo Basin through integration of conservation objectives into the national and regional sustainable development plans. The specific objective is to maintain the ecological functions and connectivity of the region, and ensure long-term conservation of its protected area system through integrated, sustainable and participatory management in the inter-zone between the protected areas. The project promotes a matrix of land uses, which, when integrated across the area, both conserve globally significant biodiversity through sustainable use and safeguards it through set-asides in production forests. It makes a substantial contribution towards strengthening the system of protected areas both at national and regional levels, by designing and implementing a cost-effective model for the management of a mosaic of different uses which will increase landscape resilience and consolidate the overall protected area system. Collectively, activities undertaken demonstrate cost-effective and replicable ways and means for facilitating broad-based participation of local and indigenous communities, the private sector and other key actors in the project area, and reconcile protected area management with sustainable use objectives and production systems and, ultimately, significantly improve prospects for sustainability of the protected area systems at the regional level. (UNDP, GEF \$10.12m, total project \$44.74).

Regional (Colombia, Ecuador, Venezuela, and Peru): *Conservation of the Biodiversity of the Paramo in the Northern and Central Andes*, the project development objective is to ensure conservation of globally significant biodiversity in the Andean Páramo. This will be achieved by implementing a series of initiatives necessary to create an enabling environment for the improved livelihoods of páramo stakeholders based on the conservation and sustainable use of the ecosystem's natural resources. (UNEP, GEF\$8.19m, total project \$18.72m).

Regional (Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua): *Central American Markets for Biodiversity (CAMBio): Mainstreaming Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable use within Micro, Small and Medium-sized Enterprise Development and Financing*, the project supports the mainstreaming of biodiversity conservation and sustainable use within small, micro, and medium sized enterprise development and financing in five Central American countries. Its goal is to ensure that micro-, small- and medium-sized enterprises in Central America increasingly contribute to sustainable development and environmental protection by incorporating biodiversity concerns in their products and services. It removes barriers in banking, business, and enabling environment to catalyze biodiversity-friendly investments in micro-, small-, and medium-sized enterprises in the region: (UNDP, GEF \$10.22m, total project \$27.97m).

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 Water birds on the African/Eurasian Flyways*, this project aims to improve, on a sustainable basis, the conservation status of African/Eurasian migratory water birds, by enhancing and coordinating measures taken by GEF-eligible countries to conserve key critical wetland areas that these birds require to complete their annual cycle, including stop-over sites during migration and their "wintering grounds". It is a catalyst for integrating best practices into conservation efforts throughout the flyway, using existing coordinating mechanisms and commitments, particularly those of the Ramsar Convention and the Agreement on the Conservation of the African-Eurasian Migratory Water bird Accord of the Convention on Migratory Species, and a number of international and local NGOs. The project area covers the entire African/Eurasian region as defined in the Agreement. This includes all of Africa, all of Europe, south-west Asia (including the Middle East and the Central Asian states), Greenland and the Canadian Archipelago. (UNEP, GEF \$6m, total project \$12.76m).

Regional (Ethiopia, Uganda, Zambia, and Ghana): *Removing Barriers to Invasive Plant Management in Africa*, the project goal is to protect ecosystem, species and genetic diversity from invasive alien species, for global, national and community benefit. It does so through removing barriers to effective prevention and management of invasive, alien species in four pilot countries; Ethiopia, Ghana, Uganda and Zambia. Its focus is on terrestrial and aquatic invasive plants, as these groups pose the greatest current threat, and because a number of invasive plant species have been identified in the four countries requiring immediate attention. (UNEP, GEF \$5m, total project \$11.17m).

Regional (Gambia, Guinea, Mali, Senegal): *In-situ Conservation of Endemic Ruminant Livestock in West Africa*, the project goal is to ensure sustainable populations of targeted endemic ruminant livestock breeds in four West African countries, in order to improve rural economies and to ensure the conservation of these breeds and their globally unique genetic traits. Its objectives are: (a) establishing effective models for community based management of endemic ruminant livestock and their habitat at project pilot sites; (b) enhancing productivity of purebred species through selective breeding and production improvements; (c) implementing incentive schemes to foster optimal valorization of endemic livestock, improved marketing and distribution channels for dairy products and crafts, and increased off take and exports of endemic purebreds to neighboring countries; (d) harmonizing sub-regional policies for livestock management, including transhumance (herd movements); and (e) a system of regional information sharing, cooperation and exchanges relevant to endemic ruminant livestock. (UNDP, GEF\$10m, total project \$29.59m).

Regional (Guatemala, Belize, Honduras, El Salvador, Nicaragua, Costa Rica, Panama): *Integrated Ecosystem Management(IEM) in Indigenous Communities*, the project goal is to support an emerging network of indigenous communities engaged in integrated ecosystem management in Central America. This would enhance the sustainability of human-managed systems that have been evolving for centuries in the region, conserving high levels of biodiversity, but that are under increasing threat. The project builds or strengthens community networks across the region, create links between communities with established best practice IEM examples and those with comparable environmental characteristics and similar potential. Its long-term outcome would be that successful and proven regional models are effectively adopted in local and national initiatives, including World Bank and IDB-assisted projects, and that a common vision emerges among indigenous communities on how best to manage their traditional resources.(World Bank/IADB, GEF \$9m, total project \$48.88m).

Regional (Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan): *In Situ/On Farm Conservation and Use of Agricultural Biodiversity (Horticultural Crops and Wild Fruit Species) in Central Asia*, the project purpose is to provide farmers, institutes and local communities with knowledge, methodology and policies to conserve globally significant in-situ/on-farm horticultural crops and wild fruit species in Central Asia. This is expected to contribute to achieving sustainable agricultural development, food security and environmental stability. Its particular focus is on traditional, local varieties of fruit crops maintained by farmers and their wild relatives growing in forests, and on the enhancement of farmers' and community capacities to conserve in-situ horticulture diversity. (UNEP, GEF \$5.72m, total project \$11.86m).

Regional (Latin America and Caribbean): *Building the Inter-American Biodiversity Information Network (IABIN)*, the project assists countries in the region to define and establish IABIN, an important tool to assist in decision-making related to the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity and its biological resources. It develops an internet-based platform to provide access to scientifically credible biodiversity information currently existing in individual institutions and agencies in the American continent. IABIN helps to fulfill the mandate of the CBD Clearing-house Mechanism (CHM) in the region by providing the mechanism in the Americas to promote and facilitate technical and scientific cooperation (World Bank, GEF \$6m, total project \$36.29m).

Regional (Nicaragua, Honduras): *Corazon Transboundary Biosphere Project*, the project global objective is to consolidate the management and protection of Nicaragua's and Honduras' proposed transfrontier Biosphere Reserve "Corazón de Corredor Biológico Mesoamericano" (henceforth "Corazón Reserve"), simultaneously strengthening the PA systems as a whole of the two countries. The Corazón Reserve extends in Honduras from the Plátano Biosphere Reserve through the Tawakha Indigenous Reserve and Patuca National Park, to the Bosawas Reserve in Nicaragua and includes adjacent areas of natural habitat in the Mosquitia. This is an area of approximately 5 million ha and is the largest single block of unaltered tropical forest north of Colombia – it truly represents the "heart" of the Mesoamerican Biological Corridor. (World Bank, GEF \$12m, total project \$33m).

Regional (Philippines, Indonesia): *Marine Aquarium Market Transformation Initiative (MAMTI)*, The project carries out a range of activities to ensure that the marine aquarium industry is transformed to a principal driver of marine biodiversity conservation, sustainable use, sustainable livelihoods, poverty alleviation and food security for coastal communities in Indonesia and the Philippines.(World Bank/IFC, GEF \$6.62m, total project \$21.99m).

Republic Of Korea: *Conservation of Globally Significant Wetlands*, the project assists the Government of Korea to strengthen maintenance and enhancement of wetland biodiversity and the sustainable use of their goods and services. It will do so through strengthening national and local planning and management systems to reduce and eventually reverse their degradation. It strengthens cooperation efforts between government and local communities to protect and manage selected wetlands through multi-sectoral and multi-stakeholder partnerships. Nationally-based activities seek to influence decision-makers by increasing cooperation and coordination between stakeholders and strengthening their capacity to address wetland issues using systematic ecosystem-based approaches. Demonstration sites include the Lower Nakdong River Basin (including Woopo Ramsar Site) on the south-east coast, Lower Geum River Basin on the west coast, and Cheorwon Basin in the Demilitarized Zone. (UNDP, GEF \$2.12m, total project \$13.15m).

Russian Federation: *Conservation of Wetland Biodiversity in the Lower Volga Region*, the project assists the Russian Federation to secure the Lower Volga's global biodiversity by: (a) strengthening existing planning and management capacity for wetland management and biodiversity conservation; (b) assessing options and develop alternatives to current land, water, and resource management to foster more adaptive and biodiversity friendly management policies and practices; (c) strengthening existing legal and regulatory base and enforcement capability to combat local natural resource over-exploitation; (d) improving awareness of wetland conservation issues and biodiversity values among all sectors, including decision makers, industry, NGOs, and the general public; (e) developing alternative livelihoods for segments of local populations to relieve pressure on natural resources; and (f) establishing a sustainable financing mechanism for biodiversity conservation. (UNDP, GEF6.67m, total project \$15.69m).

Russian Federation: *Biodiversity Conservation in the Russian Portion of the Altai-Sayan Ecoregion (ASE)*, the project objective is to conserve the globally significant biodiversity of the Altai-Sayan Ecoregion through the expansion, consolidation, and operationalization of an effective PA system in the Russian portion of the ASE in close coordination with similar efforts in other countries there. It contributes to the conservation of globally significant biodiversity through the addition of 900,000 hectares of protected areas (national and regional PAs). Additionally, globally important rare and endangered species will either have halted or reversed their decline as a result of this project in the ASE. The project is phased, this being the first phase of a longer term initiative. The focus of this phase is on safeguarding identified key territories for biodiversity conservation in the ecoregion, stabilizing the currently deteriorating situation, and building institutional capacity to provide for biodiversity conservation and sustainable development over the long-term. The aim of the second phase would be to scale up and replicate lessons and best practices derived from the successful demonstration projects and other activities of this first phase. (UNDP, GEF \$3.52m, total project \$15.67m).

Russian Federation: *Fire Management in High Biodiversity Value Forests of Amur-Sikhote-Alin Ecoregion*, the objective of the project is to strengthen conservation of the high biodiversity value forests of the Amur-Sikhote-Alin ecoregion through improved forest fire management, reducing frequency, size and intensity of catastrophic fires in the areas of the global conservation importance. It develops and implements policies and practices for the integrated management, monitoring and prevention of forest fires within and outside of protected areas. It is additional to the fire management component of the on-going Russia Sustainable Forestry Pilot Project (World Bank loan) and has three specific outcomes: (a) establishment of an ecoregion-wide integrated forest fire management system to include high biodiversity value forests currently without proper fire management regime; (a) increased effectiveness of fire management in high biodiversity value forests through strengthened regulatory framework and interdepartmental coordination, integrated ecosystem management, and increased capacities to address

catastrophic fires and their consequences; and (c) raised public awareness and support from the local population and communities to fire prevention and mitigation through promotion of community-based fire management and alternative land/ecosystem management programs.(World Bank, GEF \$7.9m, total project \$44.14m).

Russian Federation: *Demonstrating Sustainable Conservation of Biodiversity in Four Protected Areas in Russia's Kamchatka Oblast, Phase 2*, the project goal is to secure the globally significant biodiversity values of the Kamchatka Peninsula. Its immediate objective is to demonstrate approaches for sustainable and replicable conservation of biodiversity in four different existing protected areas as a model for a sustainable system of protected areas in Kamchatka. (UNDP, GEF \$5.5m, total project \$15.42m).

Rwanda: *Strengthening Biodiversity Conservation Capacity in the Forest Protected Area System*, the project seeks to ensure the conservation of Rwanda's in-situ biological diversity through holistic support to the strengthening of the national protected area system, its technical and financial sustainability, and its cooperative link to local, national and regional constituents. It lays the groundwork for a long-term effective system of protected areas. The project builds constituencies at the local and national levels through participation of local communities to develop systems and techniques for sustainable use of biodiversity values. . Main components include: (a) restoration and rehabilitation of PAs; (b) Strengthening PA management and policy; (c) building constituencies and partnerships at local and national levels; and (d) establishing coordinating mechanisms at national, sub-national and regional levels. (UNDP, GEF \$5.45m, total project \$13.43m).

Senegal: *Integrated Marine and Coastal Resource Management*, the project strengthens the conservation and management of globally significant marine and coastal biodiversity in Senegal. Consequently, it responds to priorities identified in the National Biodiversity Strategy and the National Environment Action Plan. Its specific objectives are to: (a) strengthen the management of existing coastal and marine protected areas; (b) develop and implement participatory systems for managing biodiversity in a sustainable manner. and (c.) improve capacity to protect and conserve coastal and marine biodiversity by: (i) establishing a coherent institutional framework involving all stakeholders, (ii) developing and nurturing required scientific, technical and managerial skills, and (iii) improving the regulatory framework for coastal zone management. (World Bank, GEF \$5m, total project \$17m).

South Africa: *Conservation and Sustainable Use of Biodiversity on the South African Wild Coast*, the project seeks to develop a representative PA estate on communally owned land along the Wild Coast of the Eastern Cape Province. These protected areas will be managed under a range of co-management agreements between provincial, local and national authorities, local communities, and the private sector as suited to the management challenges facing different sites. There are three main intervention areas: (a) strengthening the institutional framework for co-management; (b) enhancing management effectiveness within a rationalized and more representative system of protected areas; and (c) developing a functioning network of effectively managed multiple resource use protected areas in active collaboration with local communities. This intervention will be nested in a land use plan for the Wild Coast that integrates the management of PAs with the regional sustainable development framework. (UNDP, GEF \$6.5m, total project \$30.818m).

Tanzania: *Marine and Coastal Environment Management Project*, the project development objective is to improve lives and livelihoods of coastal communities of mainland Tanzania and Zanzibar, through implementing participatory and integrated coastal development/economic activities while sustaining coastal resources. It uses an integrated, holistic approach comprising integrated coastal zone management

planning, supporting alternative income generation activities supporting biodiversity conservation objectives, and improving market access and enhancing economic potential of coastal resources. (World Bank, GEF \$10m, total project \$58.13m).

Tunisia: *Gulf of Gabes Marine and Coastal Resources Protection*, this project develops sustainable use and management plans for the Gulf of Gabes marine and coastal regions in Tunisia. It seeks to: (a) develop mechanisms for the integrated biodiversity management of the Gulf of Gabes at six pilot sites and implement three of them; and (b) identify the long-term institutional and technical resources required to reverse the current trend of biodiversity degradation through involvement of the communities concerned within a framework of promoting sustainable participatory development. These objectives are accomplished through institutional strengthening, training, capacity building and dissemination, baseline data acquisition and applied biodiversity monitoring; and participatory biodiversity management plans and mainstreaming of biodiversity protection. (World Bank, GEF\$6.06m, total project \$8.8m).

Turkmenistan: *Conservation and Sustainable Use of Globally Significant Biological Diversity in Khazar Nature Reserve on the Caspian Sea Coast (Resubmission)*, this project seeks to strengthen Turkmenistan's national system of protected areas by demonstrating effective biodiversity conservation in Turkmenistan's Khazar Nature Reserve (Khazar) on the Caspian Sea coast. Proposed project strategy is intended to demonstrate state-of-the-art methods and practices aimed at addressing these issues at the country's largest protected area Khazar Natures Reserve, assess the effectiveness of their application and identify best practices, and then replicate these practices and methods at other sites within the National System of Protected Areas. (UNDP, GEF \$1.43m, total project \$3.03m).

Uganda: *Conservation of Biodiversity in the Albertine Rift Forest Protected Areas*, the project develops a strategy program of action which will directly reduce deforestation of critical un-gazetted forest patches, strengthens implementation of the national Forest Conservation Master Plan in the Albertine Rift, and links to other donor funded forest conservation activities in the national parks. (UNDP, \$3.395m, total project \$11.19m).

Uruguay: *Integrated Natural Resources and Biodiversity Management*, the project objective is to promote the adoption of integrated production systems in agricultural and livestock landscapes to increase productivity within a context of holistic ecosystem and natural resources management while conserving soils, water, grasslands, and biodiversity. Bank funding finances the productive and competitive components related to agriculture and livestock. GEF funds finance the incremental costs required to restore or improve the capacity of the productive rural landscape to maintain ecological processes and conserve biodiversity. As such, the project will promote multiple-land use practices for biodiversity conservation outside protected areas. (World Bank, GEF \$7m, total project \$19m).

Vietnam: *Forest Sector Development Project*, the development objective of the overall World Bank Forest Sector Development Project is poverty alleviation through sustainable forest management, which is achieved through expansion and better management of Vietnam's plantation forests and the stimulation of small-scale production forestry, particularly by poor, small-holder farmers. The GEF project global environmental objective is to conserve biodiversity of global significance in Vietnam's Special Use Forests. This is achieved by: (a) establishing a pilot national SUF financing mechanism (a Conservation Fund) that will provide start-up support, on a competitive basis, to up to 50 poorly-managed SUFs of high biodiversity value to help them design and implement their first conservation management plans; and (b) providing technical assistance support on SUF conservation and management. (World Bank, GEF \$9m, total project \$74.59m).

Zambia: *Effective Management of the National Protected Areas System*, the project provides core strategic support to strengthen the system of national protected areas. Interventions have been strategically designed, taking into account the afore-mentioned country context and strategies and identified barriers, to accelerate and fortify efforts in support of this objective. GEF funding supports capacity building activities focused at the systemic and institutional levels, PA system reclassification, and demonstration of new management partnership models at two field demonstration sites. (UNDP, GEF \$6m, total project \$42.01m).

Medium-size projects

Afghanistan: *Natural Resources and Poverty Alleviation Project*, it aims at preventing further deterioration of the country's natural resource base (soil, water, forest, rangeland, and biodiversity) and improving the development profiles of local communities within nature reserves and their buffer zones, and the ability of families and individuals to secure sustainable incomes through self-identified livelihood programs. It also provides for environmental management capacity and reduces poverty by developing rural energy. (ADB, GEF \$0.97m, total project \$1.72m).

Argentina: *In-Situ Conservation of Andean Crops and their Wild Relatives in the Humahuaca Valley, the Southernmost Extension of the Central Andes*, the project objective is to ensure that indigenous farmers in the Humahuaca Valley of Argentina adopt improved on-farm conservation and management, based on traditional production practices that contribute to in-situ conservation of selected globally significant Andean crop varieties and their wild relatives. (UNDP, GEF \$0.94m, total project \$1.85m).

Bulgaria: *Lake Pomorie Conservation, Restoration and Sustainable Management Project*, it aims at promoting the sustainable management of the Pomoriisko Lake and wetland ecosystem by fostering a combination of restoration, conservation and sustainable production activities. Through a partnership comprised of an NGO, the local municipality and the private sector, it integrates the conservation of globally important bird habitat and unique hyper-saline plant and animal communities with the sustainable management of tourism and the area's natural resources. (World Bank, GEF \$0.86m, total project \$1.98m).

Chile: *Biodiversity Conservation in Altos de Cantillana*, the project contributes to the conservation of globally significant biodiversity of the Altos de Cantillana massif and the Aculeo lagoon basin, by developing a public-private partnership for the conservation and co management of private lands as a replicable model for the National System of Protected Areas. (UNDP, GEF \$0.96m, total project \$2.09m).

Czech Republic: *Conservation of Biological Diversity of Carpathian Mountain Grasslands in the Czech Republic through Targeted Application of New EU Funding Mechanisms*, the project overall objective is the protection and maintenance of globally significant biodiversity in protected landscape areas located in the Carpathian Mountain region. It does so by strengthening the conservation management of globally significant biodiversity in species-rich mountain grassland habitats (grasslands and pastures), in two areas in the Carpathian Mountains, of the Czech Republic. It addresses the objective chiefly by drawing in, on a demonstration basis, targeted support from newly available EU funding opportunities for integrated rural development (principally CAP support payments and Natura 2000/LIFE program grants) and making lessons learned widely available for replication throughout the Czech PLA system and the Carpathian ecoregion as a whole. (UNDP, GEF \$0.97m, total project \$10.35m).

Georgia: *Recovery, Conservation, and Sustainable Use of Georgia's Agro biodiversity*, the project goal is the conservation and sustainable utilization of threatened local plant genetic resources important to food and agriculture. It is implemented by Association ELKANA, an established NGO that provides technical, distribution and marketing support to organic farmers. ELKANA has its own distribution network, marketing unit and provides its own credit lines to member farmers. ELKANA also has established contacts with distributors and organic associations in Europe. GEF-financed activities are incremental to ELKANA's regular technical, distribution and marketing services to farmers who use the threatened and globally important varieties targeted by this project. (UNDP, GEF \$0.96m, total project \$2.68m).

Global: *UNEP Support to CBD Parties for Preparation of Third National Reports to the COP of CBD*, the project objective is to enable country Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity to prepare their national reports. (UNEP, GEF \$1m, total project \$1m).

Global: *National Reporting to the CBD: Supporting Countries to Prepare the Third National Report on Biodiversity*, this project is designed to assist at least 49 countries in the preparation of their third national reports on biodiversity in order to meet their national reporting requirements under the Convention on Biological Diversity. It provides expedited assistance to countries and reduces transaction costs of individual requests. Its benefits include enabling country Parties to improve the quality and timeliness of their reporting as called for under Decision VII/25 of the Seventh meeting of the Conference of Parties. (UNDP, GEF \$1m, total project \$1m).

Global: *Development Marketplace (DM)*, the primary objective of the DM program is to help the development community at large to meet the Millennium Development Goals by generating new approaches to poverty reduction from a variety of stakeholders outside the usual sources in the development agencies. (World Bank, GEF\$1m, total project \$3.34m).

Global (Brazil, Mexico, Cameroon): *Improved Certification Schemes for Sustainable Tropical Forest Management*, the project objective is to develop tools and incentives to help small forest managers, communities and NTFP collectors in the tropics to identify and protect biodiversity in the forests they manage (the 'target forests') through certification, whilst continuing to meet their own management objectives. It takes place in three contrasted tropical countries in order to develop and test the tools in a range of situations. Then, tools will be disseminated internationally through a series of regional training courses for groups developing and promoting certification standards in at least 10 tropical countries. (UNEP, GEF \$0.96m, total project \$1.43m).

Guatemala: *Consolidating a System of Municipal Regional Parks (MRPs) in Guatemala's Western Plateau*, this project enhances decentralized and participatory conservation management, by expanding and consolidating a network of globally important municipal regional parks (MRPs) in the Western Plateau region. (UNDP, GEF \$0.97m, total project \$2.22m).

Hungary: *Conservation and Restoration of the Globally Significant Biodiversity of the Tisza River Floodplain through Integrated Floodplain Management*, the objective of this project is biodiversity friendly, sustainable development of the Tisza floodplain. It establishes a biodiversity friendly, holistic floodplain management as the dominant development paradigm in the Upper Tisza floodplain. (UNDP, GEF \$0.94m, total project \$2.69m).

Indonesia: *Lambusango Forest Conservation, Sulawesi*, the goal of the project is to conserve globally-significant biodiversity in Sulawesi through an innovative local management regime and to utilize the lessons learned from this approach to establish similar national/local conservation partnerships in other parts of Indonesia. (World Bank, GEF \$0.97m, total project \$4.47m).

Kenya: *Developing Incentives for Community Participation in Forest Conservation through the Use of Commercial Insects in Kenya*, the overall goal of the project is to strengthen the national protected area system of forest reserves through improved incentives for real collaborative forest management with communities and to demonstrate in three different forest sites that the biodiversity of Kenya's forest

protected area system can be maintained through collaborative management systems using incentives based on income from commercial insects.(UNDP, GEF \$1m, total project \$3.25m).

Lao PDR: *Integrated Ecosystem and Wildlife Management Project in Bolikhamxay Province*, the overall goal of the project is to conserve internationally significant biodiversity found in Bolikhamxay Province. This goal is reached via three objectives: (a) increase the capacity of national and provincial staff to design, implement, and monitor the effectiveness of wildlife conservation activities; (b) increase the extent of implementation and monitoring of conservation activities by national, provincial, district staff and villagers in Bolikhamxay Province protected areas; and (c) increase the local constituency around the Nam Kading NPA and the PPAs that practice sustainable natural resource use. (World Bank, GEF \$0.97m, total project \$1.59m).

Liberia: *Establishing the Basis for Biodiversity Conservation on Sapo National Park in South-East Liberia*, project objective is to consolidate the management and development of Sapo National Park, and peripheral communal forests as part of landscape-level development. The GEF funds activities that brings Sapo National Park and biodiversity from its current low level to a situation where the park is reasonably protected over the long term, and it plays a keystone role in training Liberian conservationists and in linking the Cestos-Senkwehn-Gbi forests (part of which is proposed as a national park), to the Grebo National Forest (proposed as a national park) which itself is adjacent to the Taï forest complex of Côte d'Ivoire. (World Bank, GEF \$0.97m, total project \$2.41m).

Mauritius: *Partnerships for Marine Protected Areas in Mauritius*, the objective of this project is to assist the Government of Mauritius to improve the management and conservation practice for marine protected areas (MPAs) in the country, including Rodriguez, and the equitable sharing of benefits to the local communities. It will do so through the development and testing of a model for co-management between government, local communities and the private sector, and through building an enabling environment for its replication throughout the country. (UNDP, GEF \$0.98m, total project \$4.34m).

Nicaragua: *Conservation of Dry Forest and Coastal Biodiversity of the Pacific Coast of Southern Nicaragua: Building Private-Public Partnerships*, the goal of the project is to demonstrate effective public-private partnerships in co-management of a protected area for the conservation and sustainable use of dry forest biodiversity and a turtle nesting area in the south Pacific coast of Nicaragua. The project will also provide the GoN with a general framework for the replication of the co-management model. (UNDP, GEF \$0.96m, total project \$4.86m).

Peru: *Inka Terra: An Innovative Partnership for Self-Financing Biodiversity Conservation & Community Development*, the project catalyzes self-financing uses of the 10,000 hectare Inka Terra Ecological Reserve (IER) that achieve biodiversity conservation and sustainable development for local communities. This is expected to provide a replicable model for engaging the private sector in achieving financial sustainability for protected areas. This project (a) eliminates deforestation and poaching within the IER; (b) reduces hunting to sustainable levels; (c) provides conservation-compatible livelihoods for a significant portion of the four local communities; (d) increases awareness of and support for conservation among local and regional stakeholders; and (e) generates long-term revenues to help ensure sustainability of the conservation and community development measures. (World Bank/IFC, GEF \$0.72m, total project \$12.09m).

Peru: *Conservation and Sustainable Use of Biodiversity in the Peruvian Amazon by the Indigenous Ashaninka Population*, globally significant biodiversity within Asháninka territories and surrounding state

forestlands is conserved under community management, and alternative livelihood opportunities benefit local inhabitants and reduce pressure on natural resources.(UNDP, GEF \$0.97m, Total project \$1.53m).

Regional (Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland): *Conservation and Sustainable Use of Biodiversity through Sound Tourism Development in Biosphere Reserves in Central and Eastern Europe*, the overall goal of this project is to promote the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity through the development and implementation of sustainable tourism practices in the 3 participating Biosphere Reserves. (UNEP, GEF \$0.94m, total project \$2.12m).

Regional (Kenya, Burkina Faso): *Dryland Livestock Wildlife Environment Interface Project (DLWEIP)*, the overall DLWEIP goal is to mainstream biodiversity and livestock resources at the interface between mixed production ecosystems and protected areas through the promotion and support of sustainable land use management systems for improved community livelihoods, biodiversity conservation and reduction of land degradation. The objective of the project is to promote the mainstreaming biodiversity and livestock resources at the interface between mixed production ecosystems and protected areas in Africa. (UNEP, GEF \$0.97m, total project \$3.33m).

Regional (Russian Federation, Ukraine, Belarus, Kazakhstan): *Strengthening the Network of Training Centers for Protected Area Management through Demonstration of a Tested Approach*, this project aims to strengthen the sustainability of protected area management through building capacity and disseminating best practices. The goal of the project is to improve biodiversity conservation in Northern Eurasia by strengthening the network of training centers for biodiversity conservation in protected areas and adjacent lands. The training centers will serve as catalysts for more effective management of the large protected area (PA) networks in this region. (UNEP, GEF \$0.97m, total project \$2.34m).

Romania: *Strengthening Romania's Protected Area System by Demonstrating Government-NGO Partnership in Romania's Maramures Nature Park*, the project strengthen Romania's national system of protected areas by disseminating lessons and good practices extracted from the Maramures demonstration of an effective protected area model. The main objective is to ensure that the biodiversity of Maramures Mountains Natural Park in Romania's Northern Carpathian Mountains is effectively conserved by adopting an effective protected area management model. (UNDP, GEF \$0.97m, total project \$2.31m).

Russian Federation: *Conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity in Russia's Taymir Peninsula: Maintaining connectivity across the landscape*, the project objective is the conservation and sustainable use of globally significant biodiversity across the tundra landscape of the Central Taymir Landscape Corridor (CTLC). Its implementation will result in stakeholders devising innovative and adaptive practices to mitigate and prevent threats to biological diversity by applying new partnerships, conservation tools, information, and sustainable livelihoods to conserve biological diversity. (UNDP, GEF \$0.97m, total project \$3.01m).

Tajikistan: *Dashtidzhum Biodiversity Conservation*, the objectives of the proposed project are: (a) reduce human risks and secure long term protection of the Zakaznik regionally and globally important flora and fauna species and ecosystems; (b) ensure the sustainability of natural resource use by local population in the Zakaznik surroundings, providing new incomes, finding alternative livelihoods and thus reduce the pressure on the overall Zakaznik's ecosystem; and (c) pilot community-based forestry management; (d)

/...

raise public awareness on conservation issues and involving local communities, NGOs in decision making and conservation activities. (World Bank, GEF \$0.75m, total project \$0.95m).

Tanzania: *Lalkisale Biodiversity Conservation Support Project*, its goals are (a) to conserve biodiversity of the Lolkisale area as a habitat for migratory wildlife species; (b) to use sustainably the natural resources of its ecosystems; and (c) to share equitably the benefits with local stakeholders, through a joint venture between the local community represented by the Lolkisale Village Council (LVC) and a private sector tourism development company, the Tarangire Conservation Company Ltd. (World Bank/IFC, GEF \$0.45m, total project \$0.86m).

Tanzania: *The Development and Management of the Selous-Niassa Wildlife Corridor*, the Selous – Niassa Wildlife corridor is classified as a threatened miombo woodland ecosystem linking the Selous and Niassa Game Reserves, two of the largest protected areas in Tanzania and Mozambique. If the predicted development pressures on this Corridor are not addressed this corridor and associated conservation benefits could lose its ecological integrity and so conservation role in the next six - seven years. The immediate objectives of the project are to ensure that Selous-Niassa Wildlife Corridor is effectively conserved, with the establishment of a network of village wildlife management areas that are protected, managed and utilized sustainably by the local communities with the assistance of local government and wildlife division and that the benefits from wildlife management enhance the livelihood security of villages with WMAs, and promote the long-term conservation of the corridor. (UNDP, GEF \$0.99m, total project \$2.05m).

Tanzania: *Novel Forms of Livestock & Wildlife Integration Adjacent to Protected Areas in Africa*, the project aims to achieve sustainable biodiversity conservation by alleviating and controlling conflicts over land use between pastoralism, cropping, and conservation. It explores and understands the dynamics of land use in Tanzania using this improved knowledge to generate greater returns to key stakeholders from both wildlife and livestock simultaneously. This is achieved by developing and implementing land use plans, establishing benefit sharing mechanisms from wildlife such as community-managed business ventures and by improving livestock production by pastoralists such as access to health, marketing and water. (World Bank, GEF \$0.88m, total project \$2.21m).

Uzbekistan: *Conservation of "Tugai Forest" and Strengthening Protected Areas System in the Amu Darya Delta of Karakalpakstan*, it strengthens the Karakalpakstan system of protected areas through the enhanced enabling environment and establishment of a multi-zoned national park. It demonstrates the collaborative conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity in Amu Darya Delta, and provides lessons and best practices replicable throughout the national protected areas system. (UNDP, GEF \$0.97m, total project \$2.11m)

Vanuatu: *Facilitating and Strengthening the Conservation Initiatives of Traditional Landholders and their Communities to Achieve Biodiversity Conservation Objectives*, The project assists the government of Vanuatu to facilitate and strengthen traditional approaches to conservation of biodiversity and the sustainable use of its components to enable locally governed and managed protected areas to be more effective conservation tools. (UNDP, GEF \$0.74m, total project \$1.45m).

Venezuela: *DHEKUANA NONOODO: Sustainable Use and Conservation of Biodiversity Resources of Dhekuana Indigenous Lands*, the overall objective of the project is to establish the basis for community driven natural resource management, co-management of protected areas, and fair and equitable sharing of benefits through development and implementation of natural resource management

plans for Dhekuana lands, including alternative food production and income-generating activities to help address increased needs of a fast growing community. (World Bank, GEF \$0.75m, total project \$1.1m).

Vietnam: *Making the Link: The Connection and Sustainable Management of Kon Ka Kinh and Kon Cha Rang Nature Reserves*, it establishes a foundation of support and management to maintain the biological integrity and connectivity of Kon Ka Kinh (KKK) and Kon Cha Rang (KCR) Nature Reserves (NRs). The goal of the project is the long-term conservation of the unique biological attributes of the Central Annamites Priority Landscape. While the establishment of KKK and KCR NRs was an important contribution to this goal, individually they are too small to maintain viable populations of all species, particularly wide-ranging species that occur at naturally low densities, such as tiger *Panthera tigris*. Therefore, in order for the goal to be realized, it is essential that KKK and KCR NRs and the intervening SFEs be managed in a way that is consistent with the maintenance of their integrity as a single biological unit. (UNDP, GEF \$0.87m, total project \$2.96m).

Vietnam: *Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Use of the Marine Resources at Con Dao National Park*, the project (a) implements the management plan for marine areas of Con Dao National Park by developing programs of planning, zoning, boundary demarcation, park infrastructure and human resource development; (b) monitors biodiversity and marine resources, and to rehabilitate the ecosystem degraded by natural catastrophes and human impacts; (c) encourages community participation in biodiversity conservation through education, awareness and joint development of livelihood support programs; (d) develops communications strategy, education and awareness programs for use with fishing and other coastal communities as well as local officials, and implement programs; and (e) implements a livelihood support program in the communities in Con Dao district. (UNDP, GEF \$0.97m, total project \$1.85m).

Enabling Activities

Albania: *Assessment of Capacity Building Needs to Address the Priorities of the BSAP - Phase II*, the objective is to assist Albania in reviewing the progress on the priorities identified in the BSAP; identifying the gaps, bottlenecks, options and future priority needs; evaluating its further capacity building needs; analyzing functional capabilities and determining mechanisms necessary to protect national biodiversity in accordance with the BSAP recommendations, and the GEF and COP/CBD guidelines. It also supports the establishment of a CHM and preparation of the second National Report to the COP. (World Bank, GEF \$0.32m, total project \$0.39m).

Barbados: *Assessment of Capacity Building Needs and Country Specific Priorities in the Conservation of Biodiversity and Participation in the National Clearing House Mechanism*, the overall goal and objectives of the Strategy and Action Plan attempt to address the range of issues relevant to the management of biodiversity in Barbados. (UNEP, GEF \$0.29m, total project \$0.34m).

Bosnia-Herzegovina: *Biodiversity EA Preparation of National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan, National Reports and Establishment of a National Clearing House Mechanism (CHM)*, this project seeks to (a) develop and approve at government level a National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (NBSAP), as required by CBD Article 6a and in accordance with COP Decisions II/7, III/9 and III/21; (b) to establish and operate an information network through the National Biodiversity Clearinghouse Mechanism (CHM), in accordance with CBD Article 18 and COP Decisions I/3, II/3, III/4, IV/2, V/14, and VI/18; (c) to prepare and submit to the CBD 1st and 2nd National Reports, in accordance with CBD Article 26 and COP Decisions II/17, III/9, IV/14 and V/19; and (d) assess priority capacity building needs for managing the use and conservation of biodiversity in B-H. (UNEP, GEF \$0.29m, total project \$0.32m).

Botswana: *Botswana Biological Diversity - Add-On*, it aims to assist the Government of Botswana and its appropriate institutions in the assessment of national capacity building needs for implementing the NBSAP. It assesses and nationally identifies the strengths, weaknesses, gaps, and capacity needs of the various institutions pertaining to biodiversity to meet its implementation objectives. (UNDP, GEF \$0.111m, total project \$0.13m).

Chad: *Identification of Capacity-building Needs for the Implementation of the National BSAP - Add On*, it assesses national capacity-building needs for the implementation of the national strategy; supports networking at the national, regional and international levels of the Clearing-House Mechanism of the Convention on Biological Diversity in Chad. (UNDP, GEF \$0.20m, total project \$0.20m).

Comoros: *Capacity Needs Assessment for the implementation of the National Biodiversity Strategy and support to the Clearing House Mechanism (CHM)*, the national objective aims to enable the elaboration and efficient implementation of appropriate measures to ensure biological diversity conservation and sustainable use, which will contribute to meeting the country's commitments in compliance with the international conventions relative to biological diversity. It identifies and assess human and institutional capacity needs to implement and improve the efficiency of measures for the conservation of biodiversity that the country has adopted in the National Biodiversity Strategy and its Law on the Environment, and to reinforce the biodiversity CHM in the country. It is intimately linked to the National Capacity Self-Assessment for the global environment (NCSA) project. The objective of the NCSA project is to conduct a thorough and systemic assessment and analysis of the country's capacity needs and of the constraints that the Union of the Comoros is facing in its efforts to fulfill its commitments towards the global environment as stated in the Rio conventions and their international instruments. The scope of the

NCSA is not simply biodiversity but environmental in a sustainable development context. (UNDP, GEF \$0.27m, total \$0.27m).

Czech Republic: *Assessment of Capacity-building Needs: Access to Genetic Resources and Benefit-sharing, Conservation and Sustainable Use of Biodiversity Important for Agriculture, Forestry and Research*, its main objectives are : (a) to assess capacity building needs in priority areas for access to genetic resources and benefit sharing, and for conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity important for agriculture and forestry; (b) to assess capacity building needs; (c) to define country priorities in developing strategies and adopting measures for ex-situ conservation (specialized collections); and (d) sustainable use. (UNEP, GEF \$0.2m, total project \$0.24m).

Fiji: *Additional Funding of Biodiversity Enabling Activity*, The overall objective of the Clearing House Mechanism (CHM) is to increase public awareness of biodiversity issues, which ultimately leads to effective and sound decision-makings of the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity at all levels. From the time Fiji became a party to the CBD, information dissemination was carried out on an ad hoc basis with no formal mechanism in place to ensure all relevant stakeholders receive this information through a centralized CHM, filtering this information right down to the grassroots levels promoting a better understanding of biodiversity and in particular the programs and obligations set out under the CBD. (UNDP, GEF \$0.24m, total project \$0.39m).

Honduras: *Assessment of Capacity Building Needs and Country Specific Priorities for the Implementation of the Action Plan for the National Strategy on Biodiversity (Add on)*, the project undertakes an assessment of capacity building needs and defines the country specific priorities regarding the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity and the development of a country-driven CHM project. (UNDP, GEF \$0.18m, total project \$0.23m).

Madagascar: *Biodiversity Enabling Activities Add-on: Assessment of Capacity Building Needs and Establishment of a National Clearing House Mechanism*, (UNEP, GEF \$0.19m, total project \$0.24m).

Namibia: *Assessment of Capacity Building Needs to Conserve Biological Diversity - Add on*, the project objective is to obtain national consensus on the specific mechanisms needed for ongoing capacity building related to the conservation and use of biodiversity in line with the NBSAP, an internal biodiversity training framework analysis, and to coordinate with the National Capacity Needs Self-Assessment for global environmental management (NCSA) currently being implemented in collaboration with UNDP. (UNEP, GEF \$0.21m, total project \$0.27m).

Nauru: *National Biodiversity Conservation Strategy and Action Plan and Report to the COP including Clearing House Mechanism*, this project allows Nauru to formulate strategies and actions to protect and sustainably use its marine and terrestrial biodiversity. Its outputs are a BSAP, the establishment of the Clearing House Mechanism, as well as submission of the first and third national reports to the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity. The BSAP complements the Nauru-Australia Cooperation, rehabilitation and Development Feasibility Study (NACRDFS) as well as the NEMS and other cross-sectoral plans. (UNDP, GEF \$0.14m, total project \$0.15m).

Paraguay: *Assessment of Capacity Building Needs & Country Specific Priorities (Add On)*, (UNDP, GEF \$0.24m, total project \$0.32m).

Rwanda: *Elaboration of the Second National Report on the Implementation of Biodiversity by Rwanda for the Sixth Conference of Parties in 2002*, the main objective of the project is to assist the Government of Rwanda in the consultation process associated with the preparation of its second national report to be presented to the CBD COP, in accordance with decision V/19. (UNDP, GEF \$0.02m, total project 0.03m).

Serbia and Montenegro: *Biodiversity Strategy, Action Plan and National Report (BSAP)*, the project enables the State Union of Serbia and Montenegro to prepare the first Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan, through two Republic Strategies, and the first National Report as the initial step to follow up on the national commitments to the Convention of Biodiversity ratified in 2002. Project components are: (a) stocktaking, inventory and analysis of existing information and preparation of the country study; (b) identification and analysis of available options; (c) preparation of a Strategy and Action Plan; (d) submission of First National Report and launching of BSAP. The project is implemented through a broad consultative process involving different stakeholder groups and expects to enhance public awareness and knowledge on biodiversity-related issues and to strengthen the dialogue, information exchange and cooperation among all relevant stakeholders including government, non-governmental, academic and private sectors. (UNDP, GEF \$0.29m, total project \$0.31m).

Tajikistan: *Additional Financing for Capacity Assessment in Biodiversity Priority Areas*, the goal is to assist the Republic of Tajikistan in further evaluating its capacity building needs, defining country specific priorities, analyzing functional capabilities and determining mechanisms necessary to protect national biodiversity in accordance with the BSAP recommendations, and the GEF and COP/CBD guidelines. (UNDP, GEF \$0.22m, total project \$0.25m).

Tunisia: *Assessment of Capacity-building Needs for Biodiversity and Participation in the Establishment of a Clearing House Mechanism (CHM) - Add On*, key objectives include (a) assessment of training and capacity building specific priority components of the National Biodiversity Action Plan and (b) the establishment and operation of an information network through the National Biodiversity Clearinghouse Mechanism (CHM), in accordance with CBD Article 18 and COP Decisions I/3, II/3, III/4, IV/2, V/14, and VI/18. (UNEP, GEF \$0.19m, total project \$0.26m).

Turkey: *Consultation for National Reporting, Participation in the National Clearing House Mechanism and Further Development of the National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (NBSAP)*, it undertakes consultations necessary for the preparation of second and third national reports to the Conference of the Parties of the Convention on Biological Diversity. It further develops the national Clearing House Mechanism (CHM) in order to provide more and improved information on Turkey's biodiversity, for public awareness, plus technical and scientific cooperation both within Turkey and with partner countries. It incorporates better the decisions and work programs of the Conference of the Parties of the Convention on Biological Diversity into the National Biodiversity Action Plan prior to its official submission to the CBD Secretariat. (UNEP, GEF \$0.36m, total project \$0.46m).

Turkmenistan: *Assessment of Capacity Building Needs and Enhancement of Biodiversity Information Management (Add On)*, (UNDP, GEF \$0.13m, total project \$0.14m).

Uzbekistan: *Assessment of Priority National Capacity Development Needs for Implementation of the BSAP and Establishment of CHM Structures*, (UNDP, GEF \$0.21m, total project \$0.23m).

ANNEX 5: LIST OF GEF DOCUMENTS AVAILABLE AT THE EIGHTH SESSION OF THE CONFERENCE OF PARTIES

A. Reports of the GEF Office of Monitoring and Evaluation (OME)

- (a) Biodiversity Program Study 2004;
- (b) Third Overall Performance Study of the Global Environment Facility (August 2005);
- (c) Study on The Role of Local Benefits in Global Environmental Programs.
- (d) Evaluation on GEF's support to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety

B. Documents for general information

- (a) GEF Annual Report 2004(available in English, French and Spanish);
- (b) Achieving the Millennium Development Goals – A GEF Progress Report (September 2005);
- (c) GEF and Small Island Developing States (January 2005);
- (d) The GEF and Wilderness Areas (2005);
- (e) Mainstreaming Biodiversity in productive Sector (STAP 2005);
- (f) GEF and Island Biodiversity, under preparation at the time of this report;
- (g) Catalyzing Sustainable Biodiversity Conservation: The GEF Biodiversity Portfolio 1991-2005., under preparation at the time of this report;

ⁱ “Terms of Reference for the Third Overall Performance Study of the GEF.” May 21, 2004.