



## Convention on Biological Diversity

Distr.  
GENERAL

UNEP/CBD/COP/9/9  
2 May 2008

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

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

Ninth meeting

Bonn, 19–30 May 2008

Item 2.2 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 the annex to 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 addition, in decision VIII/18, paragraph 2, the Conference of the Parties requested the Global Environment Facility, as the institutional structure operating the financial mechanism of the Convention, to include in its regular report to the Conference of the Parties information on:

(a) The initial application of the Resource Allocation Framework to resources allocated in the fourth replenishment of the Global Environment Facility that is operational from July 2006, focusing on the biodiversity focal area;

(b) How the Resource Allocation Framework is likely to affect funding available to developing countries and countries with economies in transition for the implementation of their commitments under the Convention.

3. In light of the above, the Executive Secretary is circulating herewith the report of the Global Environment Facility to the Conference of the Parties at its ninth meeting.

---

\* UNEP/CBD/COP/9/1.





# Global Environment Facility

April 30, 2008

---

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

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1. This document reports on the activities of the Global Environment Facility (GEF) in the area of biological diversity for the period January 1, 2006 to December 31, 2007, as such it includes the end of the GEF-3 phase and the start of GEF-4.
2. 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 eighth session (COP VIII) held in Curitiba, Brazil, 20 - 31 March 2006, and other relevant decisions of previous COPs. One decision from COP VIII, Decision VIII/18, is directed towards the GEF and provides guidance to the financial mechanism.
3. During the reporting period, the GEF approved 54 full-size, 19 medium-size projects, and two enabling activities in the area of biological diversity (including biosafety). The total GEF allocation during the reporting period was approximately \$ 306 million.<sup>1</sup> An additional \$1.536 billion was leveraged in co-financing for the projects from partners that included the GEF Agencies, bilateral agencies, recipient countries, and the private sector. In addition to the biodiversity portfolio, fourteen multi-focal area projects were partially supported with \$ 42 million of biodiversity resources. In addition, 23 project preparation grants were approved in the reporting period amounting to approximately \$4.3 million.
4. The document also describes GEF financed activities in the GEF focal areas of international waters and land degradation which also contributed directly or indirectly to the objectives and implementation of the Convention on Biological Diversity. Through the international waters focal area, the GEF committed \$61.82 million to 11 projects that supported directly or indirectly the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity. An additional \$315.36 million was leveraged as cofinancing for these international waters projects. In the land degradation focal area, six projects amounting to a total GEF commitment of approximately \$30.14 million have components that address biodiversity conservation and/or sustainable use. An additional \$194 million was leveraged as cofinancing for these land degradation projects.
5. The document reports on the activities of the GEF Evaluation Office during the reporting period that are related to the area of biological diversity including the following reports: Joint Evaluation of the GEF Small Grants Programme, GEF Annual Report on Impact, Country Evaluations, and an update of the Mid-Term Evaluation of the Resource Allocation Framework. Initial results from the GEF-3 portfolio in terms of the coverage of the investment are also provided.
6. Other relevant issues discussed include the Biodiversity Strategy for GEF-4, the GEF Sustainable Forest Management Program, Collaboration with the CBD Secretariat on the formulation of a Strategy for Resource Mobilization for the CBD, and an update on the progress in implementing the GEF reforms.

---

<sup>1</sup> All figures in this report are in US dollars.

## Table of Contents

|      |   |    |
|------|---|----|
| I.   | Introduction.....   | 1  |
| II.  | Project Activities in the Area of Biological Diversity .....                      | 1  |
| A.   | GEF-3 Biodiversity Strategy .....   | 1  |
| B.   | GEF-4 Biodiversity Strategy.....  | 3  |
| C.   | Sustainable Forest Management during GEF-4.....                                   | 4  |
| D.   | Summary of Project Activities in Biological Diversity.....                        | 6  |
|      | Full-sized Projects.....  | 6  |
|      | Medium-sized Projects.....  | 7  |
|      | Enabling Activities.....  | 7  |
|      | Project Development Grants .....  | 8  |
|      | Small Grants Program.....   | 8  |
| III. | Activities in Response to COP Guidance .....                                      | 8  |
|      | Protected Areas: Systemic Approaches to Improving Protected Area Management ..... | 9  |
|      | Sustainably Using Biodiversity through Mainstreaming .....                        | 12 |
|      | Access to genetic resources and fair and equitable sharing of benefits (ABS)..... | 14 |
|      | Biosafety .....   | 15 |
|      | Biological Diversity and Climate Change.....                                      | 18 |
|      | Marine/Coastal Biodiversity and Island Biodiversity .....                         | 20 |
|      | Invasive Alien Species (IAS).....   | 22 |
|      | Global Taxonomy Initiative (GTI).....   | 23 |
|      | Taxonomy Support through Enabling Activities .....                                | 24 |
|      | Taxonomy Support through Full and Medium Sized Projects.....                      | 24 |
|      | Taxonomy Support through Small Grants Program .....                               | 24 |
|      | Strategic Plan of the Convention .....  | 24 |
|      | Technology Transfer and Cooperation.....  | 25 |
|      | National Reporting.....   | 26 |
|      | Communication, Education and Public Awareness .....                               | 27 |
| IV.  | Activities in Other GEF Focal Areas of relevance to this report .....             | 28 |
|      | International Waters.....   | 28 |
|      | Land Degradation Focal Area .....   | 29 |
| V.   | Monitoring & Evaluation Results .....   | 30 |
| A.   | GEF-3 Portfolio Monitoring Results .....  | 30 |
|      | Monitoring Results at the Portfolio Level.....                                    | 30 |
|      | Coverage Results from GEF-3.....  | 30 |
| B.   | Results from the GEF Evaluation Office .....                                      | 32 |
|      | Joint Evaluation of the GEF Small Grants Programme .....                          | 32 |
|      | GEF Annual Report on Impact .....   | 33 |

|  |    |
|--|----|
| Country Evaluations.....   | 34 |
| Mid-Term Evaluation of the Resource Allocation Framework .....   | 35 |
| VI. Other Relevant Issues to the Conference of the Parties ..... | 35 |
| Fourth Replenishment of the GEF Trust Fund.....                  | 36 |
| Financial Resources .....  | 36 |
| GEF Sustainability Compact.....                                  | 36 |

## Tables

|   |    |
|---|----|
| Table 1: Long-term strategic objectives and strategic programs for biodiversity in GEF-4 (FY 2007-2010).....                                | 4  |
| Table 2: Long term objectives and strategic programs for Sustainable Forest Management in GEF-4.....  | 5  |
| Table 3: GEF Projects in the area of biological diversity, including biosafety approved between January 1, 2006 and December 31, 2007. .... | 6  |
| Table 4. Full-sized Projects Approved Between January 1, 2006 and December 31, 2007 per GEF's Strategic Objectives .....                    | 6  |
| Table 5. Medium-sized Projects Approved Between January 1, 2006 and December 31, 2007 per GEF's Strategic Objectives.....                   | 7  |
| Table 6: Biosafety Projects approved during the reporting period January 1, 2006 and December 31, 2007 .....                                | 17 |
| Table 7: FY 2003-06 Project Contributions to the Targets in the Business Plan for GEF-3.....  | 31 |
| Table 8. Progress in Implementing the GEF Sustainability Compact.....   | 36 |

## Annexes

|   |    |
|---|----|
| Annex 1: Full-size projects in the biodiversity focal area approved during the reporting period.....    | 38 |
| Annex 2: Medium-size projects in the biodiversity focal area approved during the reporting period ..... | 42 |
| Annex 3: Enabling activities in the biodiversity focal area approved during the reporting period.....   | 43 |
| Annex 4: Project Summaries .....  | 44 |

|  |    |
|--|----|
| Annex 5: Summary of country grants of the GEF project “Supporting Country Action on the CBD Programme of Work on Protected Areas” under implementation ..... | 70 |
| Annex 6: GEF Support to Taxonomy .....   | 72 |
| Annex 6 Table 2 Project Details .....  | 80 |
| Annex 6.....   | 88 |
| Annex 7. Multi Focal Area Projects .....   | 89 |
| Annex 8: List of GEF documents available at the .....  | 90 |

## **I. INTRODUCTION**

1. This report has been prepared for the ninth meeting of the Conference of Parties (COP 9) to the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD). It reports on activities of the GEF in the area of biodiversity and biosafety during the period, January 1, 2006 to December 31 2007. The report describes the major GEF activities and issues during the reporting period in the areas covered by the Convention.

2. In addition to this report, supplemental information is presented in GEF publications and documents which the GEF will make available to the ninth meeting of the Conference of Parties. A list of the documents is provided in Annex 8.

## **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 through ten agencies: the U.N. Development Programme (UNDP); the U.N. Environment Programme (UNEP); the World Bank; the U.N. Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO); the U.N. Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO); the African Development Bank (AfDB); the Asian Development Bank (ADB); the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EBRD); the Inter-American Development Bank (IDB); and the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD). The Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel (STAP) provides technical and scientific advice on GEF's policies and projects. Information on all GEF projects is available on the GEF website (<http://gefweb.org>) under Projects.

4. Since 1991, the GEF has provided about \$2.3 billion in grants and leveraged about \$5.36 billion in co-financing in support of about 790 biodiversity projects in more than 155 countries.

5. Between January 1, 2006 and December 31, 2007, the GEF approved 75 projects addressing biological diversity and biosafety objectives. The total GEF allocation for these projects was approximately \$306 million. Approximately \$1.536 billion was leveraged in co-financing for the projects from partners including the GEF Agencies, bilateral agencies, recipient countries, and the private sector. In addition to the biodiversity portfolio, fourteen multi-focal area projects were partially supported with \$42 million of biodiversity resources.<sup>2</sup> The reporting period covers the end of GEF-3 and the start of GEF-4, thus it is worthwhile to briefly discuss the strategies for each of these phases of the GEF which guided this investment.

### **A. GEF-3 Biodiversity Strategy**

6. Until the formulation of strategic priorities for implementation during GEF-3 (FY 2003-2006), the GEF biodiversity portfolio was built on the GEF Operational Strategy and Operational Programs, as well as the guidance provided to GEF from the COP. The GEF Operational

---

<sup>2</sup> See Annex 7 for a list of these projects.



Strategy defines the ten operational principles for development and implementation of the GEF's work program. The GEF Operational Programs in biodiversity were built on the general Operational Strategy and define, by ecosystem type, specific criteria by which GEF projects were further characterized and evaluated. Earlier implementation of the GEF biodiversity program emphasized eligibility based on fit with one or more of the five biodiversity operational programs.<sup>3</sup>

7. In response to two external evaluations undertaken of the biodiversity program, the Second Program Study of the GEF Biodiversity Program and the Second Overall Performance Study, the GEF developed a strategy for GEF-3 to focus the GEF's investment strategy on four strategic priorities:

- (a) Strategic Priority One (SP1): Catalyzing the Sustainability of Protected Area
- (b) Strategic Priority Two (SP2): Mainstreaming Biodiversity in Production Landscapes/Seascapes and Sectors
- (c) Strategic Priority Three (SP3): Capacity Building for the Implementation of the UN Convention on Biological Diversity Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety
- (d) Strategic Priority Four (SP4): Generation and Dissemination of Best Practices for Addressing Current and Emerging Biodiversity Issues.

8. A main purpose for sharpening the investment focus of GEF resources was to apply scarce GEF resources in a manner that most effectively catalyzes actions to maximize global environmental benefits. The strategic priorities for GEF-3 internalized the most pertinent recommendations that had emerged from the evaluation exercises and provided a framework for the entire portfolio that:

- (a) Placed greater emphasis on sustainability of results and the potential for replication;
- (b) Moved beyond the current projects-based emphasis, where appropriate, to more strategic approaches that systematically target country enabling environments to address biodiversity conservation over the long term;
- (c) Inserted biodiversity within other sectors by mainstreaming it in the wider sustainable development context and economic sectors;
- (d) Engaged with the private sector more effectively;
- (e) Increased support for CBD objectives on sustainable use and benefit sharing;

---

<sup>3</sup> Arid and semi-arid ecosystems, coastal-marine and freshwater ecosystems, forest ecosystems, mountain ecosystems, and agro-biodiversity.

- (f) Addressed stakeholder participation more systematically;
- (g) Continued to strengthen the Implementing Agency's (IA) role as brokers in the development agenda within the context of country-driven Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSPs), Country Assistance Strategies (CAS) and other such tools; and
- (h) Improved dissemination of tools, lessons learned and best practices among broader audiences.

## **B. GEF-4 Biodiversity Strategy**

9. The GEF revised its strategy for GEF-4 (FY 2007-2010)<sup>4</sup> based on the implementation experience gained during GEF-3 and in response to evolving thinking in the conservation community about the drivers of biodiversity loss. The GEF-funded Millennium Ecosystem Assessment identified the most important direct drivers of biodiversity loss and degradation of ecosystem goods and services as being habitat change, climate change, invasive alien species, overexploitation and pollution.<sup>5</sup> These drivers are influenced by a series of indirect drivers of change, including demographics, global economic trends, governance, institutions and legal frameworks, science and technology, and cultural and religious values. The biodiversity strategy in GEF-4 addresses a subset of the direct and indirect drivers of biodiversity loss and focuses on the highest leverage opportunities for the GEF to contribute to sustainable biodiversity conservation.

10. The goals of GEF's biodiversity program during GEF-4 are the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity, the maintenance of the ecosystem goods and services that biodiversity provides to society, and the fair and equitable sharing of the benefits arising from the utilization of genetic resources. To achieve these goals, the GEF-4 strategy encompasses four complementary and mutually reinforcing objectives: 1) improving the sustainability of protected area systems, the most predominant and dedicated land-use globally for biodiversity conservation; 2) mainstreaming biodiversity conservation and sustainable use into production sectors that impact biodiversity; 3) safeguarding biodiversity by: a) building country capacity to implement the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety (CPB); and b) the prevention, control and management of invasive alien species; and 4) capacity building to support the implementation of the Bonn Guidelines on Access to Genetic Resources and Benefit-sharing. Underpinning these responses, GEF will support institutional capacity building and the development of the appropriate policy frameworks to ensure sustainable biodiversity conservation.

11. The long-term objectives and strategic programs that were redefined for the GEF-4 replenishment period replaced the previous structure of operational programs and strategic priorities and balance the need for continuity in the investment strategy, while focusing more

---

<sup>4</sup> The full version of the GEF Biodiversity Strategy for GEF-4 can be found at: [http://gefweb.org/uploadedFiles/Focal\\_Areas/Biodiversity/GEF4%20strategy%20BD%20Oct%202007.pdf](http://gefweb.org/uploadedFiles/Focal_Areas/Biodiversity/GEF4%20strategy%20BD%20Oct%202007.pdf)

<sup>5</sup> Millennium Ecosystem Assessment 2005, Ecosystems and Human Well-being: Synthesis, Island Press, Washington, DC.

explicitly on specific interventions for sustaining conservation over the long-term. The new structure balances continuity and flexibility and supports the emphasis on results (see Table 1).

**Table 1: Long-term strategic objectives and strategic programs for biodiversity in GEF-4 (FY 2007-2010)**

| Long-term Strategic Objectives   | Strategic Programs for GEF-4  |
|--|---|
| 1: To catalyze sustainability of protected area systems                      | 1. Sustainable financing of PA systems at the national level<br>2. Increasing representation of effectively managed marine PA areas in PA systems<br>3. Strengthening terrestrial PA networks |
| 2: To mainstream biodiversity in production landscapes/seascapes and sectors | 4. Strengthening the policy and regulatory framework for mainstreaming biodiversity<br>5. Fostering markets for biodiversity goods and services   |
| 3: To safeguard biodiversity   | 6. Building capacity for the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety<br>7. Prevention, control and management of invasive alien species   |
| 4: To build capacity on access and benefit sharing                           | 8. Building capacity on access and benefit sharing  |

12. The strategy is consistent with the integrated approaches to biodiversity conservation and sustainable use promoted by the ecosystem approach, the primary framework for action under the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD).<sup>6</sup> Together, these strategic objectives will make a substantial contribution to implementing most of the Millennium Development Goals, particularly environmental sustainability and poverty reduction, while meeting the priorities identified by the COP of the CBD.

13. The GEF’s biodiversity strategy in GEF-3 and GEF-4 has been designed to achieve biodiversity conservation within the framework of the ecosystem approach. An integrated ecosystem approach was endorsed by COP V 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.”

**C. Sustainable Forest Management during GEF-4**

14. In addition to supporting the ecosystem approach as a guiding framework for individual project interventions, and as part of the strategy development process for GEF-4, the GEF has developed a program approach to support sustainable forest management that embodies the ecosystem approach at the landscape level and encourages interventions that bring together the GEF focal areas of biodiversity, climate change, and land degradation to achieve greater global environmental benefits.

---

<sup>6</sup> Decision CBD COP V/6.

15. The Sustainable Forest Management (SFM) program is one of a number of programmatic approaches that will run through the course of GEF-4, and hopefully beyond the current replenishment cycle, depending on resource availability. As one of the evolving programmatic approaches to the delivery of higher impact results by the GEF, the SFM program is allowing resources from multiple thematic (focal) areas to be invested in a more structured and focused way, by addressing threats to forest ecosystems arising from a variety of sources. Thus, the SFM program supports interventions that generate multiple benefits in biodiversity, climate change (via reduced emissions from deforestation) and sustainable land management (including sustaining rural livelihoods) simultaneously.

16. The goal of GEF investment in sustainable forest management (SFM) is to maintain and enhance the economic, social and environmental values of all types of forests, for the benefit of present and future generations. SFM is a broad concept, referring to the conservation and appropriate use of forests and trees to sustain livelihoods, including; conservation of biological diversity; prevention, control and reversal of land degradation; using trees and forest cover to combat desertification and mitigate or adapt to climate change; and the sustainable production of wood and non-wood forest products and services. As a step towards a more programmatic approach to support SFM, strategic programs have been developed in support of the long term objectives as summarized in Table Two below.

**Table 2: Long term objectives and strategic programs for Sustainable Forest Management in GEF-4**

| Long-term Objectives  | Strategic Programs for GEF-4  |
|---|---|
| <p><b>1:</b> To conserve and sustainably use forest biodiversity</p> <p><b>2:</b> To promote sustainable management and use of forest resources</p> | <p>1. Sustainable financing of protected area systems at national level</p> <p>2. Strengthening terrestrial protected area networks</p> <p>3. Management of LULUCF as a means to protect carbon stocks and reduce GHG emissions</p> <p>4. Strengthening the policy and regulatory framework for mainstreaming biodiversity</p> <p>5. Fostering markets for biodiversity goods and services</p> <p>6. Promoting sustainable energy production from biomass</p> <p>7. Supporting sustainable forest management in productive landscapes</p> |

17. The purpose of a SFM program framework is to identify priority areas for GEF investment that are consistent with the GEF mandate to generate global environmental benefits and that are in alignment with the strategic programs already identified in biodiversity, climate change and land degradation. It aims to identify thematic areas where progress towards SFM would make the greatest contribution to achieving the objectives in the three focal areas.

18. The SFM program is evolving as a multi-disciplinary initiative, drawing on knowledge, experiences and funding from the GEF focal areas of biodiversity, climate change and land degradation. More than \$44 million has already been invested during the first six months of the

program. Thus, the GEF SFM program is a functioning, innovative leveraging mechanism that provides incentives for countries to direct part of the resources allocated to them under the GEF Resource Allocation Framework to SFM.

#### D) Summary of Project Activities in Biological Diversity

19. Table 3 provides a breakdown of the approved projects by project type during the reporting period. Annexes 1-4 provide a list and summary information on the approved projects.

**Table 3: GEF Projects in the area of biological diversity, including biosafety approved between January 1, 2006 and December 31, 2007.**

| Type of Activity                 | Number of Activities | GEF Financing (US\$ millions) | Cofinancing (US\$ millions) | Total Financing (US\$ millions) |
|----------------------------------|----------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Enabling Activities <sup>7</sup> | 2                    | 1.272186                      | 0.76295                     | 2.035136                        |
| Medium Size Projects             | 19                   | 14.10076                      | 20.11249                    | 34.21325                        |
| Full Size Projects               | 54                   | 290.524                       | 1,515.288                   | 1805.8137                       |
| Totals                           | 75                   | 305.896496                    | 1536.16344                  | 1842.062086                     |

#### Full-sized Projects

20. Annex One lists the 55 full-size projects approved during the reporting period. Forty-four projects are single-country projects, five projects are regional and six global. Table 4 below summarizes the number of projects per the strategic objectives of the GEF Biodiversity Program.

**Table 4. Full-sized Projects Approved Between January 1, 2006 and December 31, 2007 per GEF's Strategic Objectives**

| Long-term Strategic Objectives of GEF's Biodiversity Program   | Number of Projects <sup>8</sup> |
|--|---------------------------------|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To catalyze sustainability of protected area Systems (Sustainable financing of PA systems at the national level, Increasing representation of ecosystems, including marine areas, in PA systems, strengthening capacity)</li> </ul> | 26                              |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To mainstream biodiversity in production landscapes/seascapes and sectors (strengthening the policy and regulatory framework for mainstreaming biodiversity and fostering markets for biodiversity goods and services)</li> </ul>   | 31                              |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To safeguard biodiversity (building capacity for the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety)</li> </ul>  | 2                               |

<sup>7</sup> One "enabling activity" was funded through an MSP to expedite approvals of the EAs through the project: "Support to GEF Eligible CBD Parties for Carrying out 2010 Biodiversity Targets National Assessments-Phase 1".

<sup>8</sup> A number of projects, due to the nature of their intervention strategy, overlap with more than one strategic objective resulting in the total project number being higher than the actual number of projects supported.

|  |   |
|--|---|
| • To safeguard biodiversity (prevention, control and management of invasive alien species) | 1 |
| • To build capacity on access and benefit sharing  | 0 |

## Medium-sized Projects

21. Annex Two lists the 19 medium-size projects approved during the reporting period (one was an enabling activity that used the MSP window to facilitate access). Seventeen of the projects are single-country projects and two are global projects. Table 5 below summarizes the number of projects per the strategic objectives of the GEF Biodiversity Program

**Table 5. Medium-sized Projects Approved Between January 1, 2006 and December 31, 2007 per GEF’s Strategic Objectives**

| Long-term Strategic Objectives of GEF’s Biodiversity Program   | Number of Projects <sup>9</sup> |
|--|---------------------------------|
| • To catalyze sustainability of protected area Systems (Sustainable financing of PA systems at the national level, Increasing representation of ecosystems, including marine areas, in PA systems, strengthening capacity) | 6                               |
| • To mainstream biodiversity in production landscapes/seascapes and sectors (strengthening the policy and regulatory framework for mainstreaming biodiversity and fostering markets for biodiversity goods and services)   | 5                               |
| • To safeguard biodiversity (building capacity for the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety)  | 11                              |
| • To safeguard biodiversity (prevention, control and management of invasive alien species)   | 0                               |
| • To build capacity on access and benefit sharing  | 0                               |

## Enabling Activities

22. To date the GEF has invested a total of \$93.7.million and leveraged nearly \$23 million in co-financing to developing and countries in transition for 292 enabling activities.<sup>10</sup> 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 including the development of National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans (NBSAPs) and programs referred to in Article 6 of the Convention. Enabling activities also support self-assessments of capacity building needs, reporting to the Convention on Biological Diversity, and participation in the clearing house mechanism (CHM) of the Convention.

23. Annex 3 lists the two Enabling Activities (EAs) which were approved by the GEF during the reporting period. One single-country project supported assessments of capacity building needs for various activities under the Convention on Biological Diversity and the preparation of the second and third national report. A global project, “Support to GEF Eligible CBD Parties for

<sup>9</sup> See footnote 10.

<sup>10</sup> This includes expedited and non expedited EAs.

carrying out 2010 Biodiversity Targets National Assessments –Phase I’ (GEF: \$1.0 million, Cofinancing: \$ 0.75 million) was also approved and this project is described later in the section on National Reporting.

### **Project Development Grants**

24. 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. Twenty-three project preparation grants were approved in the reporting period amounting to \$4.3 million; 15 project preparation grants supported single-country projects, seven supported regional project design, one supported the development of a global project.

### **Small Grants Program**

25. The GEF Small Grants Programme (SGP), implemented by UNDP on behalf of the GEF partnership was launched in 1992. The GEF-SGP supports the implementation of the Convention on Biological Diversity and based on request from the COP<sup>11</sup> 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 undertake environmental projects.

26. By the end of its Third Operational Phase in 2007, SGP had supported more than 9,500 projects and strengthened more than 7,000 civil society groups in 101 countries across all the GEF focal areas. In the biodiversity focal area, the SGP programming has supported more than 5,230 community based biodiversity projects, totaling \$117 million which have leveraged an additional \$81 million in cash co-financing and \$85 million in in-kind contributions.

27. During the reporting period (January 1, 2006 through December 31, 2007), the GEF-SGP funded 444 new projects in more than 90 countries to support biodiversity conservation and sustainable use. An additional 1,636 SGP biodiversity projects are still under implementation.

28. The total GEF allocation for these projects amounted to \$7,321,277 million and leveraged a total of \$9,715,340 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](http://www.undp.org/sgp).

### **III. ACTIVITIES IN RESPONSE TO COP GUIDANCE**

29. 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

---

<sup>11</sup> Refer to Decisions III/5, VI/17, and VII/20.

policies and operational activities, and GEF responses to the guidance are reported on in each of its reports to the COP.

30. The Eighth Meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity provided further guidance to the GEF.<sup>12</sup> The guidance from COP-8 requested GEF to provide information on the progress in implementation of the RAF, the streamlining of procedures, contributions to the strategic plan, and resource mobilization to reduce the rate of biodiversity loss. Guidance on program priorities and activities are related to biosafety, island biodiversity, communication and public awareness, technology transfer, national reporting, the global taxonomy initiative, invasive alien species, and protected areas.

31. This section highlights the GEF's initial response to the COP VIII guidance, in addition to providing updates on past guidance provided to the GEF where there has been considerable and notable activity during the reporting period. In each section, examples of relevant project activities are provided to illustrate the type of activities being implemented on-the-ground. Annex 4 provides a summary of all projects approved during the reporting period and the examples given below are an illustrative but not a comprehensive accounting of all project activities. For further information on each country's GEF portfolio, please refer to the GEF country page on the GEF website: <http://www.gefonline.org/Country/CountryProfile.cfm>.

### **Protected Areas: Systemic Approaches to Improving Protected Area Management**

32. The GEF is the largest funding mechanism for protected areas worldwide. GEF has invested in more than 1,600 protected areas, covering more than 360 million hectares, an area equivalent to Greenland and Mongolia put together. The GEF has provided more than \$1.56 billion to fund protected areas, leveraging an additional \$4.15 billion in co-financing from project partners.

33. Guidance on protected areas has been provided by a number of previous COP decisions. The latest guidance is summarized by Decision VIII/18, paragraphs 28-30. In considering this guidance, the GEF has further strengthened its support to protected areas through the formulation of a more comprehensive strategy on protected areas in GEF-4 that focuses on catalyzing sustainable protected area systems. The GEF defines a sustainable protected area system as one that possesses the following characteristics: a) sufficient and predictable revenue, including external funding, available to support protected area management costs; b) includes coverage of ecologically viable representative samples of ecosystems; and c) has adequate individual, institutional, and systemic capacity in place to manage protected areas such that they achieve their management objectives. GEF is supporting comprehensive interventions that address these three aspects of protected area management in order to catalyze the long-term sustainability of the system. GEF-4 support to catalyzing sustainable protected area systems will be channeled through three strategic programs: a) sustainable financing of protected area systems at the national level; b) increasing representation of effectively managed national marine protected area networks in protected area systems; and c) strengthening terrestrial protected area networks.

---

<sup>12</sup> Decision VIII/18, *Guidance to the Financial Mechanism*.



34. Recognizing the important role that indigenous communities play in biodiversity conservation, and in response to COP guidance, the strategy acknowledges the importance of the participation of indigenous and local communities in the design, implementation, management and monitoring of projects to conserve and sustainably use biodiversity. Promoting capacity development of indigenous and local communities is recognized as being particularly relevant as part of GEF's support to catalyzing sustainability of protected areas systems. The strategy supports community- and indigenous- conserved areas as part of national systems of protected areas, and as a way to strengthen sustainable management of protected areas systems. This approach is best exemplified in a project approved during the reporting period: "Catalyzing the Contribution of Indigenous Lands to the Conservation of Brazil's Forest Ecosystems" (GEF: \$6 million, Cofinancing: \$31.7 million). Given their crucial role in forest conservation and to help fill gaps in ecosystem representation in the PA estate, Brazil is seeking to complement the protection provided by the National System of Conservation Units with that potentially afforded by Indigenous Lands. The project's objective is to consolidate Indigenous Lands as protected areas that are critical to the conservation of Brazil's forest ecosystems and as an integral part of the National Protected Area Plan.

35. During the reporting period the GEF committed \$ 155 million to 30 projects that supported the improved management of protected areas. These projects received an additional \$ 658 million in cofinancing with each GEF dollar leveraging more than four dollars of cofinancing. Twenty-seven projects supported individual countries, one project was regional and two projects were global. Of the 27 single-country projects that were focused on specific protected area systems, nine projects were primarily focused on improving the financial sustainability of the system.

36. During GEF-3 and continuing on in GEF-4, GEF's strategy to support protected areas has evolved from solely focusing on improving the management effectiveness of single sites to more systemic interventions that make substantial contributions to the functioning of the entire protected area system. This approach is now embodied in the protected area projects that GEF is supporting. The two projects summarized below exemplify this evolving approach.

37. During the reporting period, GEF provide support to a project that aims to strengthen the protected area system in Chile; a large country (756,000 km<sup>2</sup>) with a huge latitudinal range, major altitudinal diversity, and natural barriers that isolate it from other landmasses. As a result it has high levels of globally significant biodiversity, including high beta biodiversity and outstanding levels of endemism that are among the highest in Latin America and the Caribbean. The main threats to this biodiversity are elimination and fragmentation of habitat for biodiversity; and degradation of biodiversity habitat and ecosystem functions.

38. In response to these threats, Chile has developed a set of institutions and norms that protect natural resources and govern sector impacts. Central to this is the National System of State Wildlife Protected Areas (SNASPE), which is managed by the National Forest Service (CONAF) with 95 protected areas (PAs) encompassing ca. 14.3 million ha (19% of Chile's territory excluding the Chilean Antarctic). However, funding levels are inadequate to assure management effectiveness and to abate threats particularly in PAs in more populated areas.

39. The GEF project, “Building a comprehensive National Protected Area System for Chile: a financial and operational framework” (GEF: \$5 million, Cofinancing: \$21.95 million) will put in place a consolidated framework to improve the financial and operational efficiency and coherency of the current assemblage of PAs, and to design an integrated National Protected Area System with aligned management standards and efficiencies across its constituent PAs to ensure sustainable financing in the short-term and to provide the basis for the expansion of Chile’s PA estate in the future. The project will pursue 3 main approaches: (i) increasing revenue generation by lifting legal and regulatory barriers that impede different revenue mechanisms or that act as disincentives for on-site revenue generation; and by testing resource generation mechanisms; ii) reducing National Protected Area System cost burdens by unleashing resources from development entities and productive sectors to buffer zones and communities to reduce threats at source, potentially reducing management costs and sharing the financial burden of PA costs; (iii) improving operational effectiveness and thereby cost effectiveness of PA management through the definition of operational standards, resource allocation and reporting systems, management and business planning and capacity building to ensure that investment in PAs is better spent and thus maximizes conservation benefits.

40. In Central America, a GEF project is helping improve the management of a protected area that is critical for the effective management of the entire system as well as for the larger Mesoamerican Biological Corridor. The Maya Biosphere Reserve (MBR), established in 1990 by the Government of Guatemala, was created to: (i) conserve the biodiversity and maintain the ecological integrity of the Selva Maya; (ii) conserve and sustainably use the reserve’s cultural and archeological heritage; and (iii) ensure broad public participation in the management and use of the reserve’s natural resources and cultural heritage. Spanning 2,112,940 ha of the northern part of the department of Petén, the MBR is Central America’s largest protected area and the core of the most extensive broadleaf tropical forest reserve in Mesoamerica (the Selva Maya). As such, it plays an important function in the connectivity of the other natural areas that constitute it, and thus allows for the functioning of unique ecological processes that determine the survival of species that need extensive areas as habitat. The Reserve encompasses approximately 75% of the Guatemalan System of Protected Areas (SIGAP) managed by the National Council for Protected Areas (Consejo Nacional de Areas Protegidas –CONAP), thus, substantial improvement of this protected area will make a significant contribution to the national system.

41. The GEF project, “Improvement of Management Effectiveness in the Maya Biosphere Reserve (MBR)” (GEF: \$4.1 million, Cofinancing \$10.9 million) recognizes that maintaining the ecological integrity of the MBR as a critical part of the Selva Maya will depend on a substantial improvement of the management of the reserve. To this end, the project strategy has several distinctive and innovative features including: (i) a regional approach that places the MBR within the broader development context of the Department of Peten in order to better addresses the root causes of biodiversity loss; (ii) a focus on participatory conservation with the communities settled in the MBR; (iii) enhanced involvement of municipalities within the MBR in conservation activities; (iv) horizontal transfer of knowledge and experience among communities and user groups so that they can manage their territories and resources while also reducing conflicts and improving their quality of life; (v) consolidating and expanding the network of co-administrator organizations in specific parts of the MBR; (vi) capacity building and the promotion of

institutional leadership for the administrators of the MBR; (vii) land use management to ensure a balance between the activities for fostering sustainable production and those associated with protection for the zones of high biological importance; and (viii) a regional monitoring and evaluation system linked to the national monitoring system of SIGAP. These features coincide with the strategic vision of the Government of Guatemala for the MBR as presented in the Strategy for Participatory and Inclusive Conservation.

42. The only global project approved during the reporting period, “Supporting Country Action on the CBD Programme of Work on Protected Areas (PoWPA)”, specifically responds to a COP request. The GEF provided \$9.4 million which leveraged co-financing of an additional \$4.04 million. The project considers applications for up to \$150,000 from countries in need of assistance to undertake one or more of the critical 13 PoWPA activities. At least half of the grant pool will be disbursed to Least Developed Countries (LDCs) and Small Island Developing State (SIDS). The project was officially launched in July 2007. To date, the project has had two rounds of applications and the current 3<sup>rd</sup> round will close in May 2008.

43. In the first round, 12 country applications for specific PoWPA Activities were approved. Average grant size was \$150,000 from GEF. A further 17 applications are under consideration by the International Technical Review Committee in the 2<sup>nd</sup> round. Fifty-eight percent (58%) of the approved grants to date support the implementation of the PoWPA in LDCs and/or SIDS. The GEF resources of \$1.6 million have leveraged \$1.5 million in co-financing from government and non-government agencies. A summary description of county grants under implementation can be found in Annex 5.

44. Furthermore, 19 countries (including 11 LDCs from Africa) are in the project pipeline, and these are to be submitted in the remaining two application rounds in 2008. Thus, on-going projects and projects in the pipeline total 48 PoWPA grants. The most popular activities that countries are implementing are activities with early PoWPA deadlines in 2007 and 2008 including ecological gap analysis, protected area (PA) training curriculum, analysis of existing and elaboration of new PA funding mechanisms, economic and social valuation of PAs, and diversification of PA governance forms.

45. GEF initiatives such as the GEF-SGP and the Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund also contribute significantly to protected areas. Of the 444 new SGP biodiversity projects approved in reporting period, at least 52 are dealing directly with the GEF strategic priority on protected areas (\$1.029 in grants, plus \$1.149 in total co-financing).

### **Sustainably Using Biodiversity through Mainstreaming**

46. Over the long term, the viable conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity will require the sustainable management of a landscape and seascape mosaic that includes protected areas and a variety of other land uses, especially as human pressure on land continues to increase. As noted by the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment, the sustainable use of biodiversity will only be achieved once biodiversity is mainstreamed within production sectors.

47. During the reporting period the GEF approved 27 projects and provided \$125 million to projects that supported the sustainable use of biodiversity within the production landscape and seascape through biodiversity mainstreaming. These projects received an additional \$811 million in cofinancing with each GEF dollar leveraging more than \$6.5 dollars of cofinancing. Twenty projects supported individual countries, two projects were regional and five global projects were supported. Of the 27 projects supported, 11 projects focused on agriculture and agrobiodiversity, eight projects addressed the forest sector. The remaining projects addressed a myriad of mainstreaming opportunities including fisheries management, payment for ecosystem services, production of non-timber forest products as well as comprehensive interventions that remove critical knowledge barriers, develop institutional capacities, and establish the policies, legislative, and regulatory frameworks required to integrate biodiversity conservation and sustainable use objectives into the actions of production sectors.

48. For example, in the field of agrobiodiversity conservation, the project, “Conservation and Sustainable Use of Cultivated and Wild Tropical Fruit Diversity: Promoting Sustainable Livelihood, Food Security and Ecosystem Services” being implemented in India, Indonesia, Malaysia, and Thailand (GEF: \$3.6 million, Cofinancing: \$ 6.7 million) will bring together local and scientific knowledge about the diversity of key tropical fruit trees to identify, develop and test good practices that will contribute to the conservation of this diversity and associated ecosystems services while improving the livelihoods of farmers and user groups. In addition, the methods and good practices resulting from the project will provide the scientific and practical foundations necessary for the development of environmental certification schemes to promote the marketability of tropical fruit diversity. The project focuses on four commercially important tropical fruit species with high diversity levels in the region, both at intraspecific level as well as at species level: citrus (*Citrus* spp.), mango (*Mangifera indica*), mangosteen (*Garcinia mangostana*), and rambutan (*Nephelium lappaceum*) as well as their wild relatives. The four countries participating in this project are located in the centers of diversity of these species. The project will strengthen capacity of farmers, user groups, local communities and institutions to conserve tropical fruit tree genetic resources and sustainably use the genetic resources of target crops and their wild relatives.

49. A project intervention strategy that complements sustainable forest production with protected area management is exemplified in the project “Guangxi Integrated Forestry Development and Biodiversity Conservation Project” being implemented in China (GEF: \$5.6 million, Cofinancing: \$199.3 million). The goal of this project is to better conserve globally significant biodiversity of Guangxi Zhuang Autonomous Region (GZAR) by ensuring effective in-situ protection of threatened and globally important forest habitats and rare and endemic species. The project promotes both the conservation of natural forests and its associated biodiversity with improved forest management of production forests. This will be achieved by: (a) supporting the development and implementation of management plans for selected globally significant, high priority nature reserves; (b) promoting enhanced biodiversity management in critical watershed forest areas near to these high priority nature reserves; (c) strengthening the relationship between nature reserves and local human communities to mobilize community support for conservation; (e) providing in-service training to nature reserve staff and provincial staff to improve their performance; and (f) strengthening the capacity of institutions to manage

natural forests and nature reserves sustainably. The project will support complementary and mutually supportive management improvements in each of the three main forest categories - production, protection (ecological), and conservation.

50. An approved GEF project in Southern Africa, “Wildlife Conflict Management and Biodiversity Conservation for Improved Rural Livelihoods in Botswana” (GEF: \$ 5.32 million, Cofinancing: \$25 million) has been designed to strengthen conservation, sustainable use and mainstreaming of wildlife and biodiversity resources in Botswana’s economic development. The project seeks to enhance biodiversity conservation in Botswana’s Northern Wetland areas given their exceptional but highly vulnerable biodiversity richness. These wetlands are an oasis of biodiversity resources increasingly under threat from over exploitation, wildlife conflict with communities and agricultural transformation. Project sites focus on communities experiencing the highest level of wildlife conflict and that are engaged at some level in community based natural resource management and are living adjacent to the protected area network in critical wetlands habitat. The proposed project will assist the Botswana Department of Wildlife and National Parks (DWNP), in collaboration with local NGOs, Ngamiland and Chobe District governments, and key agencies, in strengthening conservation, sustainable use and mainstreaming wildlife and biodiversity in Botswana’s economic development, through policy and institutional reforms (including development of a National Wildlife Conflict Management Policy and Strategy, and a national community-based Wildlife Conflict Management and Early Warning System Framework), strengthening CBNRM policy and implementation (including development of the capacity of local CBOs and NGOs), and on-the-ground interventions in high biodiversity and conflict areas, focused on livelihood-enhancing community participation in wildlife management, conflict resolution, and monitoring and evaluation. The project will reduce the incidence of wildlife conflict within the project areas by assisting communities to monitor, co-manage, and directly benefit from the sustainable use of biodiversity resources while strengthening Botswana's overall wildlife policy and institutional framework.

51. All of these projects are illustrative of GEF support to sustainable use of biodiversity through mainstreaming as they bring together the sustainable use of biodiversity with the economic imperative of supporting sustainable livelihoods for rural communities that rely on biodiversity.

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

52. Through regular project support since its inception, the GEF has funded more than fifty projects for a total of \$229 million in GEF grants to support ABS issues. The grants leveraged approximately \$580 million in co-financing from various partners. During the reporting period, however, no new ABS initiatives have been supported. During GEF-3, a number of regional proposals to pilot implementation of the Bonn Guidelines were awarded project preparation grants from the GEF but they did not eventuate into fully-fledged projects.

53. Enabling Activities related to access and benefit-sharing have also been supported through the National Capacity Self Assessment under which many countries have assessed their capacity with regard to ABS issues including Armenia, Benin, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Central

African Republic, Congo, Congo DR, Dominica, El Salvador, Estonia, Ethiopia, Gabon, Gambia, Guinea Bissau, Jamaica, Federal Republic of Micronesia, Panama, Samoa, Sudan, Uruguay and Zimbabwe, among others.

54. In recognition of the incipient phase of ABS under the CBD, and before an international regime on ABS is adopted, GEF created a strategic objective and strategic program in the GEF biodiversity strategy for GEF-4 entitled “Building Capacity on Access and Benefit Sharing (ABS)”. Under this strategic program, GEF will support capacity building of governments for meeting their obligations under Article 15 of the CBD, as well as building capacity within key stakeholder groups, including indigenous and local communities, and the scientific community. This strategic program would support the establishment of measures that promote concrete access and benefit-sharing agreements that recognize the core ABS principles of Prior Informed Consent (PIC) and Mutually Agreed Terms (MAT) including the fair and equitable sharing of benefits. Projects in this strategic program should be consistent with the Bonn Guidelines on Access to Genetic Resources and the Fair and Equitable Sharing of Benefits Arising out of their Utilization and the related action plan on capacity building for ABS adopted under the Convention.

55. Even though the GEF has established this strategic priority, the GEF Secretariat has not received proposals for funding as of March 31, 2008. This may be due to the fact that negotiations on the development of an international regime on ABS have not concluded and countries are prioritizing project investments in the other Strategic Programs in the biodiversity focal area and delaying ABS proposals until a clearer picture of the policy and regulatory needs are before them. This may in fact have been the reason for the limited demand for projects in ABS during earlier phases of the GEF, including GEF-3.

### **Biosafety**

56. At its third meeting, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety (COP-MOP) adopted decision BS-III/5 on matters related to the financial mechanism and resources. This decision included recommendations to the eighth meeting of the Conference of the Parties (COP) to the CBD regarding further guidance to the financial mechanism with respect to biosafety. The COP conveyed the recommendations to the GEF in paragraphs 9 to 13 of its Decision VIII/18 on guidance to the financial mechanism. This decision urged the GEF to support in-country, regional and sub-regional stock-taking studies to better planning futures assistance; and requested the GEF to support long-term training in risk management, risk assessment and LMO detection techniques; awareness-raising, public participation and information sharing; coordination and harmonization of National Biosafety Frameworks (NBFs) at regional and sub-regional levels; sustainable participation in the Biosafety Clearance House; transfer and joint development of technology in risk assessment, risk management, monitoring and detection of LMOs; development and implementation of NBFs; development of technical, financial, and human capacity; implementation of the revised Action Plan for Building Capacities for the Effective Implementation of the CPB; and facilitation of the consultative information-gathering process leading to the preparation of national reports under the Protocol.

57. In Decision BS-III/5 the COP-MOP encouraged 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.

58. Pursuant to the above request the GEF Secretariat, in collaboration with the GEF agencies, prepared a biosafety strategy based on guidance received from the Conference of the Parties. It also took into account GEF's mandate, lessons emerging from the experience to date with the implementation of the projects funded under the GEF's Initial strategy for Assisting Countries to Prepare for the Entry into Force of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety (CPB), the results of the independent evaluation of GEF's support to the CPB, prepared by the GEF Evaluation Office, inputs received from the GEF Council, and inputs received at a consultative session held in conjunction with the COP/MOP-3 in Curitiba (Brazil).

59. The GEF Council, at its meeting in December 2006, reviewed and approved the Strategy for Financing Biosafety (GEF/C.30/8/Rev.1<sup>13</sup>) as an interim basis for the development of projects for implementation of the CPB until the Council approved the focal area strategies and invited the GEF agencies, under the coordination of the GEF Secretariat and based on their comparative advantages, to collaborate with the GEF to provide assistance to countries for the implementation of the Protocol.

60. In March 2007, the GEF CEO invited UNEP to take the lead role, in close collaboration with the GEF Secretariat, in the development of a strategic approach for programming resources for biosafety capacity-building during GEF-4. In September 2007, the GEF Council approved the biosafety strategy as part of the Biodiversity Focal Area Strategy and Strategic Programming for GEF-4.<sup>14</sup>

61. A Program Document for GEF Support to Biosafety in GEF-4 has been developed and is before the Council for consideration at its April 2008 meeting. The Program shapes the GEF Strategy for Financing Biosafety into an operational program under GEF-4 and beyond, through which GEF Agencies with a comparative advantage in biosafety can provide support to countries that have established or are in the process of establishing biosafety priorities under their Resource Allocation Framework. Projects to be funded under the GEF-4 Biosafety Program are out of the reporting period.

62. Biosafety projects approved between January 2006 and December 2007 have been developed under the interim approach to the financing of biosafety capacity building activities, approved by GEF Council at its June 2005 meeting. The interim approach sought to support countries with urgent needs to move forward in implementing their NBFs and the CPB, pending the completion of the evaluation of GEF's support to the CPB, prepared by the GEF Office of Monitoring and Evaluation, and the preparation of the new Strategy for Funding Biosafety. It was agreed that support would be provided through two regional full sized projects and 10-15 medium sized projects aimed at implementing NBFs at regional and national levels respectively.

---

<sup>13</sup> [http://www.gefweb.org/documents/council\\_documents/GEF\\_30/documents/C.30.8.Rev.1StrategyforFinancingBiosafety.pdf](http://www.gefweb.org/documents/council_documents/GEF_30/documents/C.30.8.Rev.1StrategyforFinancingBiosafety.pdf)

<sup>14</sup> [http://www.gefweb.org/uploadedFiles/Focal\\_Areas/Biodiversity/GEF-4%20strategy%20BD%20Oct%202007.pdf](http://www.gefweb.org/uploadedFiles/Focal_Areas/Biodiversity/GEF-4%20strategy%20BD%20Oct%202007.pdf)

Table 6 indicates that 13 projects addressing biosafety were approved under the interim approach described above for a total of \$16.82 million of GEF resources and \$ 32.17 million of cofinancing.

**Table 6: Biosafety Projects approved during the reporting period January 1, 2006 and December 31, 2007**

| Country GEF   | Agency     | Project Title  | Project Type | GEF Amount (\$ million) | Cofinancing Amount (\$ million) | Total Amount (\$ million) |
|---|------------|--|--------------|-------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------|
| Cambodia  | UNEP       | Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework of Cambodia   | MSP          | 0.64128                 | 0.459125                        | 1.100405                  |
| Czech Republic                                      | UNEP       | Support for the Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework                                     | MSP          | 0.4524                  | 1.4326                          | 1.885                     |
| Egypt   | UNEP       | Support the Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework   | MSP          | 0.9081                  | 1.389                           | 2.2971                    |
| Estonia   | UNEP       | Support the Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework   | MSP          | 0.669                   | 0.284                           | 0.953                     |
| Lithuania   | UNEP       | Support for the Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework                                     | MSP          | 0.6874                  | 0.404                           | 1.0914                    |
| Mauritius   | UNEP       | Support the Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework   | MSP          | 0.4278                  | 0.2079                          | 0.6357                    |
| Moldova   | UNEP       | Support to the Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework                                      | MSP          | 0.54235                 | 0.147                           | 0.68935                   |
| Regional (Benin, Burkina Faso, Mali, Senegal, Togo) | World Bank | West African Regional Biosafety Program  | FP           | 5.4                     | 15.54                           | 20.94                     |
| Regional (Brazil, Colombia, Costa Rica, Peru)       | World Bank | Latin America: Multi-country Capacity-building for Compliance with the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety | FP           | 4                       | 10                              | 14                        |
| Slovak Republic                                     | UNEP       | Support to the Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework of Slovakia                          | MSP          | 0.466                   | 0.139                           | 0.605                     |
| Tanzania  | UNEP       | Support the Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework   | MSP          | 0.7773                  | 0.6143                          | 1.3916                    |
| Tunisia   | UNEP       | Capacity Building for the Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework                           | MSP          | 0.8489                  | 0.91926                         | 1.76816                   |
| Vietnam   | UNEP       | Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework   | MSP          | 0.9978                  | 0.637                           | 1.6348                    |
|   |            | <b>BUDGET TOTALS</b>   |              | <b>16.81833</b>         | <b>32.17319</b>                 | <b>48.99152</b>           |



## **Biological Diversity and Climate Change**

63. 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 financing projects for the conservation and sustainable use and benefit sharing of biological diversity threatened by climate change impacts. 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 (SPA) 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.

64. 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 and calls for the development of synergies amongst the Conventions. 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. Priority areas of management concern vis a vis adaptation to climate change include coral reefs, forests, and protected area systems, particularly those found in highly vulnerable regions and ecosystems.

65. During the reporting period, one SPA project was approved during the reporting period that is being implemented in the Republic of Yemen. The project, “Adaptation to Climate Change Using Agrobiodiversity Resources in the Rainfed Highlands of Yemen”, (GEF: \$4.62 million, Cofinancing: \$4.18 million) seeks to enhance coping strategies for adaptation to climate change for farmers who rely on rainfed agriculture in Yemen highlands, through the conservation and utilization of biodiversity important to agriculture (particularly local land races and their wild relatives) and associated traditional knowledge. In terms of its overall strategic approach, the project will integrate adaptation to climate change with the conservation and utilization of agrobiodiversity resources by: (i) bringing together local/traditional knowledge, particularly that of female farmers, with modern farming techniques and practices; (ii) developing vulnerability profiles at the appropriate level (community/district/governorate) for target species/varieties, and (iii) developing adequate and appropriate coping mechanisms (such as planting of drought resilient varieties, cropping patterns, terrace management, early warning systems etc.) as well as policy, institutional and technology options.

66. In the biodiversity strategy for GEF-4, the potential impact of climate change on biodiversity is noted specifically in GEF's protected area strategy. The strategy identifies capacity building opportunities to help design resilient protected area systems that can continue to achieve their conservation objectives in the face of anticipated climate change. This will provide a degree of insurance for GEF's investments and contribute to long-term protected area sustainability. However, although many protected area managers recognize the need to incorporate climate change scenarios within protected area system design, the scientific understanding and basis for doing so is largely undeveloped. The GEF will support adaptation components through the climate change focal area in all projects, when needed.

67. Within the GEF's Sustainable Forest Management Program during GEF-4, the Biodiversity, Climate Change, and Land Degradation focal areas developed a new Strategic Program entitled: Management of LULUCF as a Means to Protect Carbon Stocks and Reduce GHG Emissions. Through this strategic program, the GEF will promote the reduction of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions from land use, land use change and forestry (LULUCF). GEF activities to be supported under this program could include: improving methodologies to reliably measure carbon stored/emitted from LULUCF; building national capacity; and funding investments aimed at enhancing the adoption of systems and practices that reduce emissions, increase sequestration, and accurately measure and monitor the benefits of such efforts within the forest sector. One of the first projects approved under this strategic program, "Carbon Benefits Project (CBP): Modeling, Measurement, and Monitoring" (GEF: \$5.5, Cofinancing: \$10.5) will provide a cost-effective methodology that will allow users to firstly estimate and model carbon stocks and flows and, secondly, to measure, monitor and manage carbon in GEF projects across an inclusive range of land-use systems. The project will estimate and model the impact of GEF projects on above and below ground carbon stocks in landscapes, under different climates and with different soil types. This first component of the project will estimate at a project's outset (ex. ante) the potential for carbon sequestration and it will allow project promoters to identify how different land management regimes will contribute to building carbon stocks throughout project implementation and into the future. The second component, (initially based on a detailed watershed study in Western Kenya and later expanded to the other GEF projects) will provide a protocol for project level measurement and monitoring carbon stocks in five pools (aboveground biomass, belowground biomass, soil organic matter, litter and deadwood) at any given point in a project's implementation. An agreed-upon methodology to reliably measure carbon stored in standing forests would also allow future GEF project proponents to quantify in a reliable and standardized way carbon as a global environmental benefit in forest-related projects.

68. In addition, to this program, another new strategic program was unveiled as part of the GEF-4 Sustainable Forest Management Program that also draws on the links between Climate Change, Biodiversity, and Land Degradation titled "Promoting Sustainable Energy Production from Biomass" As part of this new strategic program, the GEF will support a targeted research project to help ensure the environmental sustainability of the "Sustainable Energy from Biomass" portfolio. This effort will develop appropriate sustainability criteria to ensure that "energy from biomass" projects do not negatively impact the objectives of the other GEF focal areas and that the biomass production itself is environmentally sustainable.

69. In sum, the GEF-4 strategies in biodiversity, climate change, and land degradation are providing concrete opportunities for countries to address the cross-cutting issues of climate change mitigation and adaptation, sustainable land management, and biodiversity conservation and sustainable use.

### **Marine/Coastal Biodiversity and Island Biodiversity**

70. During the reporting period, the GEF committed 9.5\$ million to 2 projects in the biodiversity focal area to individual countries that directly target or contain elements that address marine and coastal ecosystems. An additional \$ 38.7 million was leveraged as co-financing from other partners. In the international waters focal area, the GEF committed \$61.45 million to 10 projects (2 individual countries, 7 regional, and one global) that directly target or contain elements that address marine and coastal ecosystems. An additional \$302.93 million was leveraged as cofinancing for these international waters projects.

71. During GEF-4, GEF will seek to play a catalytic role in increasing representation of marine ecosystems within national protected area systems through a specific strategic program, “Increasing Representation of Effectively Managed Marine Protected Areas in Protected Area Systems”. Under this strategic program, the GEF will encourage country-level efforts to address the marine ecosystem coverage gap within national level systems. GEF will support the creation and management of national coastal and marine protected area networks (near shore), including no-take zones, to conserve marine biodiversity, enhance long-term fisheries management, contribute to local livelihoods, help hedge against natural disasters, and mitigate the effects of global climate change. Six countries have responded to the opportunities under this strategic program and have presented focused project interventions on their marine protected area networks that have been approved or are in the April 2008 work program of the GEF.

72. Two initiatives of particular interest that are part of the April 2008 work program under consideration by the GEF Council are particular relevant to the CBD work programs related to island biodiversity, and marine and coastal biodiversity.

73. The GEF Pacific Alliance for Sustainability (GEF-PAS), (Cook Islands, Federated States of Micronesia (FSM), Fiji, Kiribati, Marshall Islands, Nauru, Niue, Palau, Papua New Guinea (PNG), Samoa, Solomon Islands, Timor Leste, Tonga, Tuvalu and Vanuatu) led by the World Bank, with participation from the ADB, UNEP and UNDP, consists of 25 projects from various focal areas (biodiversity (BD), climate change (CC), international waters (IW), and persistent organic pollutants (POPs). The goal of the GEF-PAS is to contribute to sustainable development in the Pacific Islands Region through improvements in natural resource and environmental management. This multi-agency program is regionally coordinated but nationally executed through projects supported by GEF resources of \$98.6 million (BD: \$38.2 million; CC Adaptation: \$30.4 million; CC Mitigation: \$14.7 million; IW: \$10 million; POPs: & \$5.3 million) and initial co-financing of approximately \$ 108 million. The Program was designed to enhance the achievement of both global environmental and national sustainable development goals by assisting the small island developing states in the Pacific to improve their access to GEF resources and to increase the efficiency and effectiveness of GEF’s support to the Pacific. The

GEF-PAS will add value to existing efforts by focusing on individual country investments while at the same time ensuring that shared regional objectives will be met. It will also provide a stronger framework for leveraging additional investments in the area of sustainable development in the region.

74. The GEF Secretariat is currently exploring the possibilities of developing a similar programmatic approach to GEF investment in the Caribbean region with the Caribbean constituency.

75. The Coral Triangle Initiative Program (Indonesia, Malaysia, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Solomon Islands, Timor Leste; Federated States of Micronesia, Fiji, Palau and Vanuatu) involves the protection and sustainable use of a multi-country area of coasts and oceans in East Asia and the Pacific. This area lies at the center of the world's coral reef biological diversity, with about 75% of the planet's known coral species and more than 3000 species of reef fish. Strong economic linkages exist between this area of marine ecosystems and the Pacific Small Island Developing States because valuable tuna fisheries spawn and rear young life stages in the Coral Triangle before migrating across borders toward the Pacific Islands. A changing climate and over-fishing are said to threaten this transboundary movement and its resulting economic benefits to the islands.

76. Development of this 10-country initiative was coordinated by the ADB, with the participation of UNDP, FAO and the World Bank. The initiative involves three of GEF's focal areas: Biodiversity, International Waters, and the adaptation aspects of Climate Change. (GEF: \$72.545 million (BD: \$26.525 million; IW: \$24.02 million; Adaptation: \$22 million) and co-financing of \$ 398.86 million. Beyond the beneficiary governments and GEF agencies, implementation partners include NGOs (CI, TNC, & WWF), private sector, other governments and donor agencies. This Program supports the initial strategy-setting, on-the-ground testing, pilot demonstrations, and partnership building that is needed to set the foundation for the initiative, with strong roots in the leadership of participating countries and in the NGO community. The 11 projects under this Program address a myriad of related interventions involving: marine protected areas, transboundary governance improvements for management of Large Marine Ecosystems, national reforms in various sectors, community based actions, practical approaches to integrated coastal management, reduction of land-based sources of pollutants degrading corals, and accession to multi-country legal frameworks for sustainable fisheries that link to the Pacific Islands.

77. GEF is also a partner of the Global Island Partnership (GLISPA) which brings together island nations and nations with islands -small and large, developing and developed — to mobilize leadership, increase resources and share skills, knowledge, technologies, and innovations in a cost-effective and sustainable way to catalyze action for conservation and sustainable livelihoods on islands. GEF supports the ongoing efforts of GLISPA to advance the implementation of the CBD 2010 target to further the programmes of work on Island Biodiversity.

## **Invasive Alien Species (IAS)**

78. The Millennium Ecosystem Assessment identified the spread of invasive alien species as one of the five major direct drivers of change in biodiversity and ecosystems, particularly in island ecosystems. In addition, invasive alien species can markedly decrease outputs in productive systems (e.g., agriculture, forestry, fisheries) when alien species become invasive weeds, pests, and diseases.<sup>15</sup> In recognition of the importance of addressing the threat IAS pose, since its inception the GEF has supported fifty-two projects that address the threat of invasive alien species amounting to about \$313 million in 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.

79. Within the biodiversity strategy for GEF-4, Strategic Program 7: Prevention, Control, and Management of Invasive Alien Species” has been developed to provide a specific funding window for projects that will support a) strengthening the enabling policy and institutional environment for cross-sectoral prevention and management of invasions; b) implementing communication and prevention strategies that emphasize a pathways and ecosystem approach to managing invasions; c) developing and implementing appropriate risk analysis procedures for non-native species importations; d) developing and implementing early detection and rapid response procedures for management of nascent infestations; and e) managing priority alien species invasions in pilot sites to ensure conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity.

80. During the reporting period one project in the biodiversity focal area that addressed invasive alien species was approved by the GEF for \$2 million that leveraged an additional \$4.9 million of cofinancing. The project entitled “Mainstreaming Prevention and Control Measures for Invasive Alien Species (IAS) into Trade, Transport and Travel across the Production Landscape” is being implemented in Seychelles and may have many illustrative lessons for other island states addressing the management of invasive alien species. This innovative proposal reflects the integrated and systemic approach that the GEF will seek to support in GEF-4.

81. The IAS project is one of two initiatives designed to assist in the implementation of core elements of the Seychelles Integrated Ecosystem Management Programme (EMPS) that pertain to biodiversity management. EMPS is geared to mainstreaming biodiversity management into the production activities of the main production sectors, and addressing threats to biodiversity across the production landscape. The objective of the IAS project is to increase capacities to prevent and control the introduction and spread of Invasive Alien Species through Trade, Travel and Transport across the Production landscape. The project addresses the broader threat associated with the introduction and spread of alien invasive species into the archipelago. This threat derives from trade and commerce, transport and the movement of people, and has its roots in cross sectoral economic activities including services, tourism, fisheries and agriculture. Interventions will focus on fortifying import controls to reduce this risk, installing control

---

<sup>15</sup> 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.

measures to prevent the spread within the country, and engendering voluntary measures by enterprises and the citizenry to reduce the level of threat. The project takes an innovative approach, in so far as managing the Invasive Alien Species from a production sector and landscape approach, as well as emphasizing the control and prevention aspects, summarized in the term “biosecurity”. The approach builds on strategies traditionally undertaken in the agricultural sector (quarantine and phytosanitary measures). It is expected that this approach will also generate knowledge and best practices that can be replicated in other countries, especially Small Island Developing States (SIDS), undergoing similar threats.

82. In addition to this project, an important project in the international waters focal area was approved during the reporting period that addresses invasive alien species in the marine environment. The global project, “Building partnerships to assist Developing Countries to Reduce the Transfer of Harmful Aquatic Organisms on Ship’s Ballast Water” (GEF \$5.69 million, Co-Financing: \$17.7 million) will assist developing countries to reduce the risk of aquatic bio-invasions mediated by ships’ ballast water and sediments and will expand and build on a successfully completed GEF pilot project (GloBallast Project). The project will spur global efforts to design and test technology solutions, and will enhance global knowledge management and marine electronic communications to address the issue. The partnership effort is three-tiered, involving global, regional and country-specific partners, representing government, industry and non-governmental organizations. Private sector participation will be achieved through establishing a GloBallast Industry Alliance with partners from major maritime companies. Fourteen countries (Argentina, Chile, Colombia, Venezuela, Jamaica, Trinidad& Tobago, Bahamas, Turkey, Croatia, Egypt, Yemen, Sudan, Jordan, Ghana) countries, from 6 high priority regions (Mediterranean, South Pacific, Caribbean, West and Central coast of Africa, Canary, Benguela and Guinea Current, the Red Sea and Gulf of Aden Region) have agreed to take a lead partnering role focusing especially on legal, policy and institutional reform. All told, more than 70 countries in 14 regions across the globe will participate, including the six pilot countries (Brazil/port of Sepetiba, China/port of Dalian, India/ port of Mumbai (Bombay), Iran/Kharg Island, South Africa/port of Soldanha, and Ukraine/port of Odessa) whose expertise and capacities will be drawn on for this global scaling-up effort.

### **Global Taxonomy Initiative (GTI)**

83. In response to CBD guidance, GEF has historically supported taxonomic capacity building in projects that clearly demonstrated the effective use of the taxonomic information in the conservation and/or sustainable uses of biological diversity. Under GEF-4, GEF will continue to support country-driven proposals that show the links between taxonomy and conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity, while being consistent with GEF’s mandate and GEF’s biodiversity strategy.

84. Based on the COP decision VIII/18 paragraph 26, an analysis was conducted of GEF projects with taxonomic components that were approved during fiscal year 1991-2006. A summary of this analysis is provided below and a complete listing of projects can be found in Annex 6 of this report.

### *Taxonomy Support through Enabling Activities*

85. GEF has supported 57 projects categorized under the enabling activities that include taxonomic components. Most of these projects have focused on assessments of national capacity building needs, including taxonomy. Some of the projects had significant focus on taxonomy, with a specific component to assess the national taxonomic capacity needs. Please refer to Table 1 in Annex 6 for the list of projects and summary information on taxonomy related activities under the enabling activity window.

### *Taxonomy Support through Full and Medium Sized Projects*

86. GEF has supported 33 full and medium sized projects with explicit components related to taxonomy. The total GEF finance to these projects reached \$175 million, with cofinancing of \$282 million. Refer to Table 2 in Annex 6 for list of projects and the details of the project objectives and activities. Moreover, monitoring component of many of the GEF biodiversity projects include activities that may involve taxonomy, however, these projects were not included in this list unless explicitly noted as using taxonomic analysis and information.<sup>16</sup>

### *Taxonomy Support through Small Grants Program*

87. A few projects under the GEF Small Grants Program were also recognized as having taxonomic related activities and they are listed in Table 3, Annex 6.

## **Strategic Plan of the Convention**

88. 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.

89. At COP VII, the GEF received guidance on this issue in Decision VII/20, paragraph 11. In responding to this guidance, the GEF supported the project “Building the Partnership to Track Progress at the Global Level in Achieving the 2010 Biodiversity Target”, which was approved

---

<sup>16</sup> The list includes GEF projects that have been identified with specific activities on; 1) taxonomic database, information system, inventory, capacity building, survey, and study; 2) establishment and/or enhancement of a gene bank; 3) collection, storage, and classification of specimens; and other activities that are recognized as taxonomy related.

during the reporting period (GEF: \$ 3.95 million, Cofinancing: \$ 1.38). The 2010 Biodiversity Indicators Partnership (2010BIP) project will ensure the coordinated delivery of the full suite of selected global biodiversity indicators that are being developed by a wide range of organizations. The project will deliver products and analyses based on these indicators to a range of users, including Parties to the biodiversity-related conventions and others, in order to support policy intervention and assess progress towards the 2010 biodiversity target. The suite of 2010 indicators, and analyses based on them highlighting the rate of loss of biodiversity and consequences for poverty and human well-being will be communicated to a wide audience. Guidelines will be developed to promote and facilitate the development of 2010 biodiversity indicators at the national and regional level, and to enable stronger links between global and national and regional indicator development processes. Guidelines will also be developed to enhance the use of global biodiversity indicators in support of national and regional policy.

90. The GEF has also linked its own portfolio output and outcome indicators for the GEF-3 and GEF-4 biodiversity strategy to the CBD 2010 targets.

### **Technology Transfer and Cooperation**

91. Technology transfer and cooperation is often a significant element in GEF biodiversity projects and has been exemplified during the reporting period through activities such as: a) the development, through participatory Global Information Systems (GIS), of community information systems including patterns of wildlife conflict, community and social mapping of key wetland and other natural resources in the “Wildlife Conflict Management and Biodiversity Conservation for Improved Rural Livelihoods” project in Botswana; b) strengthening national enabling environments through the support provided to countries to implement their National Biosafety Frameworks; c) demonstrating replicable Payment for Environmental Services (PES) models in selected micro-watersheds where biodiversity is threatened in the Ecuadorian páramo and where water supply is critical for downstream users in the “Management of Chimborazo's Natural Resources” project in Ecuador; and d) the promotion of appropriate technology including communication technology to help fisher communities improve their products and access to markets in the “Fisheries Revitalization Project” in Indonesia. During the reporting period, including the illustrative examples provided above, at least fifty-two projects included technology transfer and cooperation as an element of project 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.

92. Consistent with the GEF’s Private Sector Strategy and in recognition that private sector opportunities are not being fully captured by the GEF, the GEF Council approved the creation of the GEF Public-Private Partnership in June 2007, now renamed the “GEF Earth Fund”. The purpose of the GEF Earth Fund is to leverage private sector funds, creativity and energy to generate global environmental benefits in a sustainable and cost-effective manner. The Earth Fund could be a first step for the GEF to more systematically engage with the private sector, thereby reaching beyond its own limits and fostering innovation and opening new markets that would deliver environmental benefits including in the biodiversity focal area. The “GEF Earth



Fund” proposal has been presented for CEO endorsement at this moment and is being posted on the website for four weeks for comments from Council members starting from April 7th, 2008.

93. During the reporting period, the GEF has provided support to an innovative project that engages the private sector in a comprehensive way in order to achieve some of the same goals as proposed with the Earth Fund. The expansion of agriculture and the associated use of land, water, and inputs is one of the leading causes of habitat destruction and biodiversity loss. Global production of four tropical export commodities has dramatically increased in the last decade with oil palm, cocoa, soybean and sugarcane today covering about 125 million hectares. The global project, “Biodiversity and Agricultural Commodities Program” (GEF: \$7 million, Cofinancing: \$11.7) seeks to reduce these threats in an innovative and large-scale manner by leveraging market forces at all levels of the value chain in order to mainstream the use of Better Management Practices (BMPs) that decrease the impact of production on globally significant biodiversity by these four commodities. The primary objective of the Biodiversity and Agricultural Commodities Program (BACP) is to preserve global genetic, species and ecosystem diversity within agricultural production landscapes, by transforming markets for targeted agricultural commodities. More specifically, the BACP aims to address market failures which prevent private producers, or reduce their incentives, to transition to production methods that are at the same time commercially viable and beneficial to biodiversity. BACP’s selection of each commodity takes into account production volumes, the impact of this production on biodiversity of global significance, and the potential for lessening this impact.

### **National Reporting**

94. 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.<sup>17</sup> The process of reporting also assists the individual country to monitor the status of implementation of the commitments it has taken on as a Contracting Party.

95. As noted previously under the section on enabling activities, during the reporting period, the GEF approved the global project, “Support to GEF Eligible CBD Parties for carrying out 2010 Biodiversity Targets National Assessments –Phase I”. The project is the first of two phases of a global umbrella Medium Size Project within the Enabling Activities window that is designed to provide funding and technical support to assist eligible countries to assess progress towards the 2010 Target through a national participatory assessment process, using the provisional framework for goals and targets adopted by the CBD COP decision VIII/15. The guidelines for the fourth national report of the CBD will be used in connection with this national assessment.

96. The project provides an expedited mechanism for the development, submission and approval of countries’ proposals (individual funding requests of up to \$20,000) for their 2010 Biodiversity Targets National Assessments. The joint partnership and umbrella approach are

---

<sup>17</sup> CBD Website : <http://www.biodiv.org/world/intro.asp>.

aimed at reducing transaction costs of individual country requests, providing the GEF, UNDP and UNEP an opportunity for managing the biodiversity Enabling Activities more strategically in close partnership with the CBD and other key global actors. As of March 31, 2008, the following countries have received grants: Afghanistan, Armenia, Congo Democratic Republic, Cote D'Ivoire, Croatia, Djibouti, Indonesia Jordan, Kyrgyzstan, Liberia, Mauritania, Republic Of Moldova, Morocco, Niger, Philippines, Sao Tome And Principe, Tajikistan, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, and Viet Nam. The following countries have grant applications pending:

Benin, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Chile, Guatemala, Guinea, India, and Nepal.

### **Communication, Education and Public Awareness**

97. GEF supported projects often include components or activities on education and public awareness and communications strategies in their implementation plans. More than 50% of the projects approved during the reporting period include a component or activities that target biodiversity education and awareness-raising on the values of biodiversity, both ecological and economic.

98. During the reporting period, projects addressing new areas in biodiversity conservation often emphasized education and awareness-raising slightly more than traditional conservation initiatives.

99. For example, as part of the global project, "Conservation and Management of Pollinators for Sustainable Agriculture through an Ecosystem Approach" (GEF: \$7.8 m, Cofinancing: \$18.66 m) seven countries (Brazil, Ghana, India, Kenya, Nepal, Pakistan and South Africa) have worked together to identify activities that address the threats to pollinators and expand global understanding, capacity and awareness of the conservation and sustainable use of pollinators for agriculture. The project dedicates an entire component to disseminate lessons learned globally on the role and value of pollination services and seeks to raise public awareness of pollination services by 15% in target groups around project sites through public awareness campaigns by project end.

100. Another area in agrobiodiversity conservation which the GEF has supported and where there is also limited awareness is the conservation and sustainable use of wild relatives of crops. In the project, "Conservation and Sustainable Utilization of Wild Relatives of Crops" (GEF: \$7.85 m, Cofinancing: \$12.84 m) being implemented in China, the project will facilitate mainstreaming of conservation of wild relatives of rice, soybean, and wheat within agricultural production. A key aspect of the project's stakeholder capacity building component is an awareness and education campaign for the agricultural extension service, farmers, and government officials at central and local levels on the importance of wild relatives of these key crops, the threats that they face, and the need to incorporate their conservation into mainstream agricultural technical assistance and extension packages.

#### IV. ACTIVITIES IN OTHER GEF FOCAL AREAS OF RELEVANCE TO THIS REPORT<sup>18</sup>

101. 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 and land degradation focal areas.

##### **International Waters**

102. During the reporting period, through the international waters focal area, the GEF committed \$ 61.82 million to 11 projects (3 individual countries, 7 regional, and one global) that supported directly or indirectly the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity. An additional \$315.36 million was leveraged as cofinancing for these international waters projects. One GEF medium size project implemented in Asia provides an illustrative example of the kinds of contributions that GEF's International Waters portfolio makes to the conservation of marine and coastal biodiversity.

103. In Indonesia, the GEF is supporting the project "Demonstration of Community-based Management of Seagrass Habitats in Trikora Beach East Bintan, Riau Archipelago Province" (GEF: \$ 0.40 million, Co-Financing: \$ 0.39 million). Bintan Island is located in Kepulauan Riau Province, Indonesia. East Bintan is still rich in ecological diversity but also under development pressure. There are ten species of seagrass found in the area, while twelve species are found in Indonesia and 18 species are found in the South China Sea region respectively. Seagrass beds in the proposed demonstration site have great importance, as they provide breeding, nursery and feeding grounds for economically important fish and endangered species including dugong and marine turtles. Of particular importance is Redbelly yellowtail fusilier (*Caesio cuning*), Leopard coralgroup ( *Plectropomus leopardus* ), and spotted coralgroup ( *Plectropomus maculatus* ), which are associated with this site and which have been identified as fishes of transboundary and regional importance. Due to the geographical location, which is close to Jakarta, Tanjung Pinang, Batam City and even closer to Singapore, East Bintan and other parts of Bintan Island are under heavy development pressure and resource exploitation. The project will implement an integrated management system for a total of 1,500 ha of regionally significant sea grass habitat including the adoption and implementation of a management plan.

104. In Africa, GEF support is helping address threats to marine biodiversity through a Regional project in West Africa (Cape Verde, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Mauritania, Morocco, Senegal and Gambia), "Protection of the Canary Current Large Marine Ecosystem" (GEF: \$ 8.97 million, Co-Financing: \$ 22.42 million. The Canary Current Large Marine Ecosystem (CCLME) is the ocean space (including estuaries feeding into the LME) extending southwards from the Atlantic coast of Morocco to the Bijagos Archipelago of Guinea Bissau and westwards to the Canary Islands (Spain) and the western extent of the North West African continental shelf (corresponding approximately with the EEZs of the coastal states).

---

<sup>18</sup>The 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.

105. The CCLME is one of the world's major cold water upwelling boundary currents, ranking third in the world in terms of primary productivity after the Humboldt and Benguela currents and has the highest fisheries production of any African LME. The CCLME coastal zone also provides important goods and services to coastal states including critical fish habitat, fresh water from coastal estuaries, wood from mangroves and coastal and marine space for agriculture, aquaculture, urban development, tourism and transport. The CCLME provides vital food and economic resources not only for coastal populations bordering the LME, but also for much of Western Africa. The GEF project will help develop multi-country agreements on priority transboundary management concerns, a multi-country legal framework for the CCLME, investments to address threats to habitat and water and marine living resources and strengthen existing transboundary waters institutions and a range of policy and management instruments.

### **Land Degradation Focal Area**

106. The land degradation focal area supports initiatives that address land degradation within a framework of an integrated approach to sustainable land management that contributes to sustainable development.<sup>19</sup> During the reporting period, six projects amounting to a total GEF commitment of approximately \$30.14 million in the land degradation focal area have components that address biodiversity conservation and/or sustainable use. An additional \$194 million was leveraged as cofinancing for these land degradation projects.

107. One project worth noting that was approved during the reporting period is being implemented under the Sustainable Land and Ecosystem Management Program (SLEM) in India. The project exemplifies the opportunity for integrated approaches to natural resource management that advance the objectives of both the CBD and the UNCCD and support the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals. The project, "Sustainable Land Management in Shifting Cultivation Areas of Nagaland for ecological and livelihood security" (GEF: \$3.96 million, Cofinancing: \$20 million) proposes to develop, demonstrate and upscale sustainable land management practices for the conservation of *jhum* (shifting cultivation) lands in the North Eastern State of Nagaland through an ecosystem approach. GEF support will supplement the efforts of Government of Nagaland in mitigating the adverse environmental impacts of 'shifting cultivation' on soil fertility and productivity and biodiversity, both through increasing on-farm species and ecosystem heterogeneity and through reduced clear-cutting of natural forest for new shifting cultivation plots. To address the interrelated issues of land degradation, biodiversity loss, and rural livelihoods, the project will demonstrate and upscale agri-silvi-pastoralism models, which combine food crops, pastures for livestock and trees with the active involvement of the Village Council and Village Development Board. The project will help develop a suitable legislation and policy framework for sustainable ecosystem and land management.

---

<sup>19</sup> See UNCCD, Article 2, paragraph 1.

## **V. MONITORING & EVALUATION RESULTS**

### **A. GEF-3 Portfolio Monitoring Results**

#### *Monitoring Results at the Portfolio Level*

108. The GEF Evaluation Office develops the policy, related guidelines and administrative procedures for monitoring and evaluation in the GEF. The policy and guidelines help project managers and Agency and GEF Secretariat staff plan and conduct monitoring and evaluation. The GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy provides norms and standards for the GEF Secretariat and the GEF Evaluation Office.<sup>20</sup> The Policy explains the concept, role and use of monitoring and evaluation within the GEF; establishes minimum requirements for how projects should be monitored and evaluated in line with international standards; and assigns roles and responsibilities for these tasks. The GEF Agencies plan and implement their project monitoring and evaluation, in line with their own systems and procedures and based on these minimum requirements.

109. The biodiversity tracking tools were introduced in GEF-3 to measure progress in achieving the outputs and outcomes established at the portfolio level for GEF-3 in the biodiversity focal area.<sup>21</sup> Given slight changes in the GEF's biodiversity strategy in GEF-4, modified Tracking Tools for GEF-4 projects are being applied.

110. The tracking tools are applied three times: at CEO endorsement, at project mid-term and at project completion. Project outcomes from the GEF-3 and GEF-4 project cohort are aggregated for analysis of directional trends and patterns at a portfolio-wide level to inform the development of future GEF strategies and to report to the GEF Council on portfolio-level performance in the biodiversity focal area as the projects are completed and evaluations conducted.

#### **Coverage Results from GEF-3**

111. During GEF-3, \$974 million were allocated to the biodiversity focal area. About 50% of these funds supported protected areas (Strategic Priority One), about 40% supported sustainable use of biodiversity through mainstreaming (Strategic Priority Two) and the remaining 10% of the resources were allocated to capacity building for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety (Strategic Priority Three) and Generation and Dissemination of Best Practices for Addressing Current and Emerging Biodiversity Issues (Strategic Priority Four).

112. After the close of the GEF-3 replenishment cycle, the coverage of the approved GEF-3 projects for the three primary strategic objectives of the GEF-3 strategy was compiled (see Table

---

<sup>20</sup> [http://gefweb.org/uploadedFiles/Policies\\_and\\_Guidelines-me\\_policy-english.pdf](http://gefweb.org/uploadedFiles/Policies_and_Guidelines-me_policy-english.pdf)

<sup>21</sup> The biodiversity tracking tools for GEF-3 and GEF-4 projects, respectively, can be found on the GEF website under Biodiversity-Tracking Tools.

7). As the GEF-3 projects are implemented, portfolio outcomes from these investments will be aggregated and reported on a periodic basis.

**Table 7: FY 2003-06 Project Contributions to the Targets in the Business Plan for GEF-3**

| <b>Strategic Priority One for GEF-3</b>  | <b>Targets for Entire GEF-3 (coverage)</b>  | <b>GEF-3 Coverage Targets Achieved</b>   |
|--|---|--|
| Catalyzing Sustainability of Protected Area Systems                                    | <p>At least 15 countries receive support for strengthening PA systems to ensure their long-term sustainability.</p> <p>At least 400 PAs supported, of which at least 20 percent should be new additions.</p> <p>At least 70 million ha of PAs supported.</p> <p>Number of protected areas and total hectares under any global priority list.</p>                      | <p>Forty-one (41) countries were supported to strengthen PA systems.</p> <p>566 protected areas.</p> <p>137,234,149 hectares supported.</p> <p>63 new protected areas supported, totaling 20,004,213 hectares, or 11 percent of total protected areas supported.</p> <p>10 World Heritage Sites (5,868,817 hectares)</p> <p>47 high priority ecosystems for biodiversity globally (41,314,416 hectares)</p> <p>32 Biosphere Reserves (26,389,842 hectares)</p> <p>40 Ramsar sites (3,060,447 hectares)</p> <p>Total hectares under global lists: 76,633,522 hectares, or about 56 percent of total coverage.</p>   |
| <b>Strategic Priority Two for GEF-3</b>  | <b>Targets for Entire GEF-3 (coverage)</b>  | <b>GEF-3 Coverage Targets Achieved</b>   |
| Mainstreaming Biodiversity Conservation in Production Landscapes/Seascapes and Sectors | <p>At least five projects in each of the targeted sectors focused on mainstreaming biodiversity into the sector.</p> <p>At least 20 million hectares in production landscapes and seascapes contribute to conservation or sustainable use of biodiversity.</p> <p>At least five countries promote conservation and sustainable use of wild species and landraces.</p> | <p>Agriculture: 43 projects</p> <p>Fisheries: 21 projects</p> <p>Forestry: 26 projects</p> <p>Tourism: 23 projects</p> <p>Mining: 3 projects</p> <p>98,596,081 hectares in landscapes and seascapes contribute to conservation or sustainable use of biodiversity</p> <p>33 countries with projects on wild species and landraces conservation and sustainable use.</p>  |
| <b>Strategic Priority Three for GEF-3</b>  | <b>Targets for Entire GEF-3 (coverage)</b>  | <b>GEF-3 Coverage Targets Achieved</b>   |
| Capacity Building for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety                              | <p>All (GEF eligible) Parties to the CBD that are signatories to the Protocol or have expressed the intention of becoming Parties to it, for a basic level of capacity building to prepare for entry into force of the Protocol.</p> <p>All (GEF eligible) Parties to the Protocol for more advanced capacity building for implementation of the Protocol.</p>        | <p>The global Development of National Biosafety Frameworks Project has provided support to 122 countries for developing their NBFs and for regional activities to promote regional collaboration and exchange.</p> <p>To date 98 countries have completed NBFs</p> <p>12 countries participating in the implementation of NBFs project (11 Parties).</p> <p>11 additional Implementation projects have been approved with UNEP up until October 2006 for CPB Parties with draft NBFs completed.</p> <p>The global project Building the Capacity for the Effective Participation of Parties in the Biosafety Clearing House (BCH) has assisted 119 countries to participate in the BCH mechanism.</p> |

## **B. Results from the GEF Evaluation Office**

113. During the reporting period, the GEF Evaluation Office (EO) was involved in four studies that were of relevance to the biodiversity focal area: Joint Evaluation of the GEF Small Grants Programme, the GEF Annual Report on Impact, Country Evaluations, and The Mid-Term Evaluation of the Resource Allocation Framework.

114. The most germane aspects of each report have been summarized below by the GEF Evaluation Office. Copies of the documents are currently available at the GEF web site (<http://gefweb.org/gefevaluation.aspx>). The GEF management response to each evaluation can be found under council documents for each council meeting when the evaluation results were formally presented to the GEF Council in November 2007 and April 2008. Council documents can be found at the GEF website: <http://gefweb.org/interior.aspx?id=17146>.

### **Joint Evaluation of the GEF Small Grants Programme**

115. This evaluation focused on assessing the relevance, effectiveness (results) and efficiency of the objectives of the GEF Small Grants Programme (SGP) as well as the processes used by the SGP to further its objectives. The evaluation consisted of: a portfolio review to provide an overview of SGP activities and results; and, country studies that include desk reviews, field visits or teleconferences to provide in-depth assessment of results and processes. The evaluation also included thematic studies to highlight specific issues such as comparable non-GEF experiences and monitoring and evaluation. The SGP Evaluation was jointly carried out by the GEF Evaluation Office and the UNDP Evaluation Office.

116. The conclusions and recommendations from the Study were presented to the November 2007 GEF Council meeting. The Council requested the SGP Steering Committee to develop a level of management costs on the basis of services rendered and cost-efficiency rather than on the basis of a stated percentage; to start a process to change SGP's central management system suitable for the new phase of growth and to address the risks of growing complexity; to strengthen country program oversight; to further strengthen Monitoring and Evaluation; to propose a revision of the current criteria for access to SGP resources to maintain cost efficiency; and to further develop a graduation policy for the SGP country programs which takes into account the identified risks to GEF achievements and cost effectiveness, especially in SIDS and LDCs. The SGP Steering Committee is presenting a report to the April 2008 Council meeting on this decision.

117. Regarding biodiversity, the evaluation found that about 54% of the SGP projects have been approved with biodiversity objectives throughout the world and since the beginning of the program. In addition, the evaluation concluded that the SGP has contributed to direct global environmental benefits while also addressing the livelihood needs of local populations. All 22 country programs examined by the evaluation have activities in biodiversity. In this focal area country programs are contributing to the conservation of endangered species, the reduction of threats to endangered ecosystems, and the conservation of protected areas. In Turkey, a SGP grant resulted in significant reduction of illegal pearl mullet fishing. Pearl mullet is listed on the

IUCN Red List and is endemic to Van Lake. The ratio of spawn fishing to winter fishing outside the reproductive period has been reversed. In Ghana the program has placed 250,000 ha of land outside the gazetted protected forests under effective community management. These areas include globally significant biodiversity areas, important bird areas, biological corridors and traditional protected areas. In Romania several projects are improving the protection of key species (such as the Black Sea Dolphins, White Storks and Golden Eagles), and local reserves / Protected Areas. SGP conservation activities normally involve community groups and result in direct benefit to local populations. For example, country programs supported management of forest buffer zones of protected areas and promoted the conservation of agro-biodiversity, resulting in economic gains for the local populations. SGP country programs also supported ways to add economic value to biodiversity conservation through ecotourism or development of specialty markets. Other projects in Ecuador, Mexico, Cuba, Malaysia, Romania, Niger and Vietnam have contributed to the control of invasive species affecting local production or have supported the conservation of agricultural biodiversity or medicinal plants.

### **GEF Annual Report on Impact**

118. The EO has added a new annual report to its work program: GEF Annual Report on Impact. The first report was presented to GEF Council at its November 2007 meeting and contained two different assessments. The first assessment examined the long term impact of three Protected Area projects in East Africa (Bwindi Impenetrable National Park and Mgahinga Gorilla National Park Conservation Project, Uganda; Lewa Wildlife Conservancy, Kenya; and Reducing Biodiversity Loss at Cross-Border Sites in East Africa, Regional (Kenya, Tanzania, Uganda). The second impact evaluation approach was a statistical analysis of existing time series data on deforestation and protected areas in Costa Rica. Comparisons were made between protected and unprotected areas over several years to determine differences in the extent of deforestation which occurred between them. Within the protected areas, additional comparisons were also made between GEF-assisted projects and those supported through other sources.

119. The main conclusions of the impact evaluations were:

- (a) There are measurable and recorded improvements to the status of two key threatened species in Bwindi (Mountain Gorillas) and Lewa (Black Rhino);
- (b) The Bwindi and Lewa projects have contributed to a sustained reduction in the threats to key conservation targets, gorillas and rhinos, respectively;
- (c) The Cross Border project has not been able to effectively continue with its threat-reduction mechanisms after GEF support ended. Although project outcomes were achieved there were no effective mechanisms set up for sustaining projects gains;
- (d) Impact was achieved in the Bwindi and Lewa projects because an explicit plan for institutional continuity was built into the project from the start;



- (e) The Bwindi and Lewa projects have both contributed towards substantial additional benefits through catalytic effects;
- (f) The Bwindi project has not yet satisfactorily resolved some negative impacts of the Protected Areas on the indigenous Batwa;
- (g) Even though Costa Rica's protected area policy was not primarily focused on avoiding deforestation within a specified time frame, it achieved a measurable impact on avoided deforestation of about 110,000 hectares between 1960 and 1997. GEF supported protected areas in Costa Rica were between 2% and 7% more effective at achieving avoided deforestation than similar projects funded by other sources; and
- (h) The most cost-effective and realistic approach to impact evaluation for the GEF Evaluation Office is a combination of opportunistic quasi-experimental analysis, using available data, with targeted case studies utilizing a theory-based approach.

120. The only recommendation by the GEF EO stemming from this report was that: Protected Area projects should include a specific plan for institutional continuity, which should be included in the biodiversity tracking tools of the GEF, or through the development of an alternative system, under the direction of the GEF Secretariat.

### **Country Evaluations**

121. During the reporting period, the EO has concluded six evaluations of GEF support using a country as the unit of analysis: Costa Rica, Samoa, the Philippines, South Africa, Benin and Madagascar. These evaluations try to respond to three key issues: (i) what is the relevance of GEF support to the sustainable development agenda and environmental priorities of a country as well as the relevance to the GEF global mandate; (ii) what is the efficiency of the implementation of the GEF in the country; and (iii) what are the results of the GEF support. The scope of these evaluations includes all GEF supported projects across all focal areas and GEF Agencies.

122. With regards to the biodiversity focal area, these evaluations have made specific conclusions:

- (a) in all five countries, the GEF support to biodiversity has been relevant to the countries development of biodiversity policies and strategies;
- (b) the GEF support has generated globally significant impacts, particularly on biodiversity conservation (through extensive support to protected areas management programs) and sustainable use (for example, working outside protected areas and assisting countries to mainstream biodiversity considerations in other production sectors, such as agriculture and forestry);
- (c) GEF has targeted globally significant ecosystems such as the Cape Floristic and Succulent Karoo regions in South Africa, the unique environments of Madagascar and the Pendjari and W national parks in Benin; and

- (d) GEF support has also helped develop institutions that have international reputations such as Instituto Nacional de Biodiversidad (INBIO) in Costa Rica, the South Africa National Biodiversity Institute (SANBI) and the National Center for Wildlife Management (CENAGREF) in Benin.

### **Mid-Term Evaluation of the Resource Allocation Framework**

123. In September 2005, the Council adopted the Resource Allocation Framework (RAF), as a new system for allocating GEF resources to recipient countries in the biodiversity and climate change focal areas during GEF-4. Council also requested the Evaluation Office to undertake an independent 'mid-term evaluation' of the RAF after two years of implementation. In November 2007, the Council approved the Terms of Reference and budget of the mid-term review of the Resource Allocation Framework. The report is scheduled to be presented to Council at its November 2008 meeting. Updates on the progress of the review are available on the GEF Evaluation Office website under 'RAF mid-term review', including the work-in-progress Evaluation Matrix, the team composition, and frequently asked questions about the review.

124. The review will (i) evaluate the extent to which the design of the Resource Allocation Framework is able to facilitate maximization of the impact of scarce GEF resources to enhance global environmental benefits; (ii) assess the extent to which the early implementation of the Resource Allocation Framework is providing countries with predictability, transparency as well as enhancing country driven approaches to improve the potential for delivery of global environmental benefits; and (iii) compare the design and implementation of the Resource Allocation Framework with the resource allocation systems of other multilateral agencies.

125. Work has started and is progressing well. A team of independent consultants has been recruited and started work together with staff of the Evaluation Office. Extensive consultations and semi-structured interviews were launched in April 2008, with organizations providing data for the indices; agency task managers and regional coordinators, the GEF Secretariat; STAP; members of past RAF task forces and working groups. Over the next months, documentation review, statistical analysis of original indices data obtained from the GEF Secretariat, and the portfolio review will be completed. The team made a proposal of cooperation to the GEF NGO network and established a schedule for consultations and outreach to the NGO community. An electronic survey among broad range of stakeholders will be launched during May 2008. Extensive consultations are envisaged on the draft report during September 2008.

## **VI. OTHER RELEVANT ISSUES TO THE CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES**

126. 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.

## **Fourth Replenishment of the GEF Trust Fund**

127. At the conclusion of the negotiations for the fourth replenishment of the GEF Trust Fund in June 2006, 31 donor countries agreed to replenish the Trust Fund with 3.13 billion dollars for the four year period, FY07-FY10. Agreement was also reached on the policy recommendations to be implemented during GEF-4. The Council reviewed the Summary of Negotiations on the Fourth Replenishment of the GEF Trust Fund (GEF/C.29/3) at its meeting held on August 28, 2006, in Cape Town, and endorsed the Replenishment Resolution, the policy recommendations, and the allocation of resources among focal areas set forth in the programming paper. As requested by the Council, the CEO/Chairperson transmitted the Summary to the World Bank with a request that the World Bank Executive Directors be invited to adopt the Replenishment Resolution agreed during the negotiations, thereby authorizing the World Bank, as the Trustee of the GEF Trust Fund, to manage the resources made available under GEF-4. The Executive Directors of the World Bank approved the resolution authorizing the GEF-4 replenishment on October 19, 2006.

## **Financial Resources**

128. The GEF Secretariat provided technical assistance to the CBD Secretariat and input to its “Draft Strategy for Resource Mobilization in Support of the Achievement of the Convention’s objectives.” The strategy for resource mobilization will be considered at the ninth Conference of the Parties (COP 9), which will take place on 19-30 May 2008 in Bonn, Germany. The GEF Secretariat participated in three informal consultations with the Parties to the CBD, which took place on: 13 October 2007 at the headquarters of the Secretariat in Montreal, Canada; 20 January 2008 in Geneva, Switzerland; and 16 February 2008 in Rome, Italy. At the third consultation, the GEF presented a strategy document on resource mobilization for biodiversity conservation as an information document and the GEF contributed the following information document to the ninth meeting of the COP: UNEP/CBD/COP/9/INF/14.

## **GEF Sustainability Compact**

129. The GEF is almost halfway through its fourth replenishment period (GEF-4). The policy recommendations of the replenishment provide guidance for the priorities and activities for the 4-year period of GEF-4 (FY07-10). To better focus and integrate GEF’s response to the policy recommendations, the CEO presented to the Council at the December 2006 meeting a five-point sustainability compact consisting of five key elements (strategy, innovation, equity, accessibility, and focus) aimed at raising the impact of GEF investments to a new level of results, and making the GEF a leading force for sustainable development and addressing global environmental issues.

130. GEF’s progress as of April 2008 in achieving the objectives of the sustainability compact is presented in Table 8 below.

**Table 8. Progress in Implementing the GEF Sustainability Compact**

| Component  | Initial Plan of Action  | Progress through FY08   |
|------------|---|---|
| Strategic  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Focus focal area strategies on a clear set of priority issues for global environment by building synergies for cross-cutting issues.</li> <li>• Move to a programmatic approach and away from project-driven approach.</li> <li>• Apply tracking tools and measurable indicators of global outcome and impacts to all GEF projects.</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The revised focal area strategies approved by the Council in June 2007 includes a clear set of objectives by focal area and cross-cutting issues.</li> <li>• A number of programmatic approaches have been approved by the Council in FY08 and more strategic programs will be approved during FY09-10.</li> <li>• A set of indicators that are included in the focal area strategies will be used when developing projects, and will be tracked as part of the Results-based Management Framework.</li> </ul> |
| Innovative | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Finance innovative entrepreneurial efforts and technologies for which there is no market base.</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Council approved project proposal in the June 2007 work program for the creation of a public private partnership fund.</li> </ul>  |
| Equitable  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Help most vulnerable countries by ensuring concrete results for global environment and for sustainable development.</li> <li>• Ensure today's beneficiaries have the opportunity to make financial contributions.</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure that the most vulnerable countries, including LDC/SIDS and countries in Africa are not disadvantaged in the composition of the work programs.</li> </ul>  |
| Accessible | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Direct Dialogue with countries.</li> <li>• Creation of a position of Ombudsman.</li> <li>• Enhance Effectiveness of Corporate programs (NDI, CSP, CMSP, SGP).</li> <li>• Strengthen corporate image and public communications.</li> <li>• Strengthen GEF's capacity to tap into and share its knowledge base.</li> </ul>                       | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Secretariat has initiated direct dialogue with countries in the context of programming resources under the RAF.</li> <li>• Conflict Resolution Commissioner on board at the GEF Secretariat.</li> <li>• Developed Guidelines on Programming resources under the SGP. Report on implementation of Strategic Approach to Enhance Capacity Building submitted for Council review at the April 2008 meeting.</li> <li>• Council approved a communications strategy in November 2007.</li> </ul>                    |
| Focused    | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Draw on the comparative advantage of each GEF partner</li> <li>• Eliminate corporate budget for implementing agencies beginning FY08 and increased the Agency project cycle management fee to 10%</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Council approved guidelines on comparative advantage of agencies in June 2007, which is being used to guide resource programming through agencies.</li> <li>• Council approved these reforms recommended by the CEO at the December 2006 meeting.</li> </ul>   |

| Component | Initial Plan of Action  | Progress through FY08  |
|-----------|---|--|
|           | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Simplify approval process</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Council agreed on a set of rules and procedures for project selection, management of pipeline and project cancellation in December 2006.</li> <li>• Reduced existing pipeline to \$700 million</li> <li>• Ensure quality at entry through rigorous review of the PIF</li> <li>• Modified project review templates to focus on administrative cost and cost-effectiveness</li> <li>• Replaced PDFs with PPGs, based on actual project preparation grants.</li> <li>• Proposed new project cycle for Council review in June 2007 that reduces the time between project identification and start of implementation to an average of 22 months .</li> <li>• Developed an internal alert system to ensure that project cycle business standards are met within the Secretariat.</li> </ul> |

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

| Country            | GEF Agency | Project Title   | GEF Amount (\$ million) | Cofinancing Amount (\$ million) | Total Amount (\$ million) |
|--------------------|------------|---|-------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------|
| Argentina          | World Bank | Biodiversity Conservation in Productive Forestry Landscapes   | 7                       | 7.22275                         | 14.22275                  |
| Bosnia-Herzegovina | World Bank | Forest and Mountain Protected Areas Project   | 3.4                     | 3.5                             | 6.9                       |
| Botswana           | World Bank | Wildlife Conflict Management and Biodiversity Conservation for Improved Rural Livelihoods   | 5.5                     | 25                              | 30.5                      |
| Brazil             | UNDP       | Effective Conservation and Sustainable Use of Mangrove Ecosystems in Brazil   | 5                       | 15.34569                        | 20.34569                  |
| Brazil             | World Bank | Rio Grande Do Sul Biodiversity Conservation   | 5                       | 6.1                             | 11.1                      |
| Brazil             | World Bank | Espirito Santo Biodiversity and Watershed Conservation and Restoration Project  | 4                       | 8                               | 12                        |
| Brazil             | UNDP       | SFM Catalyzing the Contribution of Indigenous Lands to the Conservation of Brazil's Forest Ecosystems                                       | 6                       | 31.7                            | 37.7                      |
| Chile              | UNDP       | Regional System of Protected Areas for Sustainable Conservation and Use of Valdivian Temperate Rainforest                                   | 4.707                   | 15.61177                        | 20.31877                  |
| Chile              | UNDP       | Building a Comprehensive National Protected Areas System: A Financial and Operational Framework   | 5                       | 21.95                           | 26.95                     |
| China              | UNDP       | Conservation and Sustainable Utilization of Wild Relatives of Crops (resubmission from Feb 2006 IWP)  | 7.85                    | 12.842                          | 20.692                    |
| China              | World Bank | Guangxi Integrated Forestry Development and Biodiversity Conservation   | 5.25                    | 199.33                          | 204.58                    |
| China              | ADB        | Ningxia Integrated Ecosystem and Agricultural Development Project   | 5                       | 210.73                          | 215.73                    |
| China              | UNDP       | CBPF Priority Institutional Strengthening and Capacity Development to Implement the China Biodiversity Partnership and Framework for Action | 4.54                    | 15.1                            | 19.64                     |
| China              | ADB        | CBPF Shaanxi Qinling Mountains Integrated Ecosystem Development   | 4.27                    | 126.2                           | 130.47                    |
| China              | UNDP       | CBPF Conservation and Sustainable Use of Biodiversity in the Headwaters of the Huaihe River Basin   | 2.7272                  | 10.355                          | 13.0822                   |

| Country   | GEF Agency     | Project Title  | GEF Amount (\$ million) | Cofinancing Amount (\$ million) | Total Amount (\$ million) |
|---|----------------|--|-------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------|
| Congo DR  | World Bank     | Support to ICCN's Program for the Rehabilitation of the National Parks Network   | 7                       | 48.6                            | 55.6                      |
| Costa Rica  | World Bank     | Mainstreaming Market-based Instruments for Environmental Management Project  | 10                      | 80.3035                         | 90.3035                   |
| Costa Rica  | UNDP           | Overcoming Barriers to Sustainability of Costa Rica's Protected Areas System   | 4.8                     | 20.30978                        | 25.10978                  |
| Cuba  | UNDP           | Mainstreaming and Sustaining Biodiversity Conservation in Three Productive Sectors of the Sabana Camaguey Ecosystem          | 4.119498                | 23.35318                        | 27.47268                  |
| Ecuador   | World Bank     | Management of Chimborazo's Natural Resources   | 3.9                     | 7.5                             | 11.4                      |
| Ethiopia  | UNDP           | Sustainable Development of the Protected Area System   | 9                       | 22.4295                         | 31.4295                   |
| Global  | UNDP           | Supporting Country Early Action on Protected Areas   | 9.4                     | 4.036                           | 13.436                    |
| Global  | UNEP           | Building the Partnership to Track Progress at the Global Level in Achieving the 2010 Biodiversity Target (Phase I)           | 3.639                   | 10.3808                         | 14.0198                   |
| Global  | UNDP           | Institutionalizing Payments for Ecosystem Services   | 5.690939                | 12.027                          | 17.71794                  |
| Global  | World Bank     | Critical Ecosystems Partnership Fund (CEPF), Phase 2   | 20                      | 80                              | 100                       |
| Global (China, Ecuador, Morocco, Uganda)                            | UNEP           | Conservation and Use of Crop Genetic Diversity to Control Pests and Diseases in Support of Sustainable Agriculture (Phase 1) | 3.411148                | 4.274344                        | 7.685492                  |
| Global (Ghana, Kenya, South Africa, India, Nepal, Pakistan, Brazil) | UNEP           | Conservation & Management of Pollinators for Sustainable Agriculture through an Ecosystem Approach                           | 7.810682                | 18.64732                        | 26.458                    |
| Global (Indonesia, Malaysia, Cote d'Ivoire, Ghana, Brazil)          | World Bank/IFC | Biodiversity and Agricultural Commodities Program (BACP), Phase 1  | 7                       | 11.674                          | 18.674                    |
| Global (Peru, Chile, China, Tunisia, Philippines, Algeria)          | FAO            | Conservation and Adaptive Management of Globally Important Agricultural Heritage Systems (GIAHS)                             | 3.5                     | 14.5                            | 18                        |
| Guatemala   | IADB           | Improvement of Management Effectiveness in the Maya Biosphere Reserve (MBR)  | 4.06                    | 10.94                           | 15                        |

| Country   | GEF Agency | Project Title   | GEF Amount (\$ million) | Cofinancing Amount (\$ million) | Total Amount (\$ million) |
|---|------------|---|-------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------|
| India   | World Bank | Biodiversity Conservation and Rural Livelihoods Improvement   | 11.5                    | 35.6                            | 47.1                      |
| Indonesia   | World Bank | Fisheries Revitalization Project (FRP)  | 8                       | 87                              | 95                        |
| Indonesia   | ADB        | Citarum Watershed Management and Biodiversity Conservation Project  | 3.75                    | 69.98                           | 73.73                     |
| Jordan  | World Bank | Integrated Ecosystem and Natural Resource Management in the Jordan Rift Valley  | 6.15                    | 6.1                             | 12.25                     |
| Kazakhstan  | UNDP       | Conservation and Sustainable use of Biodiversity in the Kazakhstani Sector of the Altai-Sayan Mountain Ecoregion  | 2.3957                  | 16.3387                         | 18.7344                   |
| Mexico  | World Bank | Consolidation of the Protected Area System (SINAP II) - Third Tranche   | 7.35                    | 7.35                            | 14.7                      |
| Mongolia  | World Bank | SFM Forest Landscapes Development and Conservation  | 1.73                    | 3.2                             | 4.93                      |
| Nicaragua   | UNDP       | Strengthening and Catalyzing the Sustainability of Nicaragua's Protected Areas System   | 1.8                     | 3.82                            | 5.62                      |
| Peru  | World Bank | Strengthening Biodiversity Conservation through the National Protected Areas Program  | 8.891                   | 22.9                            | 31.791                    |
| Regional (Brazil, Colombia, Costa Rica, Peru)       | World Bank | Latin America: Multi-country Capacity-building for Compliance with the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety  | 4                       | 10                              | 14                        |
| Regional (Benin, Burkina Faso, Mali, Senegal, Togo) | World Bank | West African Regional Biosafety Program   | 5.4                     | 15.54                           | 20.94                     |
| Regional (El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras)         | IADB       | Integrated Management of the Montecristo Trinational Protected Area   | 3.5                     | 5.6                             | 9.1                       |
| Regional (India, Indonesia, Malaysia, Thailand)     | UNEP       | Conservation and Sustainable Use of Cultivated and Wild Tropical Fruit Diversity: Promoting Sustainable Livelihoods, Food Security and Ecosystem Services | 3.649994                | 6.714074                        | 10.36407                  |
| Regional (Pakistan, Sri Lanka, Vietnam, Bangladesh) | UNEP       | Development and Application of Decision-support Tools to Conserve and Sustainably use Genetic Diversity in Indigenous Livestock and Wild Relatives        | 1.98277                 | 3.781                           | 5.76377                   |



| Country              | GEF Agency | Project Title  | GEF Amount (\$ million) | Cofinancing Amount (\$ million) | Total Amount (\$ million) |
|----------------------|------------|--|-------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------|
| Russian Federation   | UNDP       | SFM Strengthening Protected Area System of the Komi Republic to Conserve Virgin Forest Biodiversity in the Pechora River Headwaters Region | 4.5                     | 15.90345                        | 20.40345                  |
| Serbia               | World Bank | Transitional Agriculture Reform  | 4.5                     | 32.31                           | 36.81                     |
| Seychelles           | UNDP       | Mainstreaming Biodiversity Management into Production Sector Activities  | 3.7                     | 7.59336                         | 11.29336                  |
| Seychelles           | UNDP       | Mainstreaming Prevention and Control Measures for Invasive Alien Species into Trade, Transport and Travel Across the Production Landscape  | 2                       | 4.605                           | 6.605                     |
| Sierra Leone         | World Bank | Wildlife Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Project  | 5                       | 11.6                            | 16.6                      |
| South Africa         | UNDP       | National Grasslands Biodiversity Program   | 8.3                     | 37.26176                        | 45.56176                  |
| Tanzania             | UNDP       | SFM Extending the Coastal Forest Protected Area Subsystem  | 3.55                    | 6.2                             | 9.75                      |
| Ukraine              | UNDP       | Strengthening Governance and Financial Sustainability of the National Protected Area System  | 1.8                     | 4.506                           | 6.306                     |
| Uruguay              | UNDP       | Catalyzing the Implementation of Uruguay's National Protected Area System  | 2.5                     | 4.903                           | 7.403                     |
| Venezuela            | World Bank | Expanding Partnerships for the National Parks System   | 6                       | 18.52                           | 24.52                     |
| <b>Budget Totals</b> |            |  | 290.5249                | 1515.2888                       | 1805.8137                 |

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

| Country         | GEF Agency | Project Title  | GEF Amount (\$ million) | Cofinancing Amount (\$ million) | Total Amount (\$ million) |
|-----------------|------------|--|-------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------|
| Albania         | World Bank | Butrint National Park: Biodiversity and Global Heritage Conservation   | 0.95                    | 1.20816                         | 2.15816                   |
| Bhutan          | UNDP       | Integrated Livestock and Crop Conservation Program   | 0.897485                | 2                               | 2.897485                  |
| Bulgaria        | UNDP       | Conservation of Globally Important Biodiversity in High Nature Value Semi-natural Grasslands through Support for the Traditional Local Economy | 0.95                    | 1.203                           | 2.153                     |
| Cambodia        | UNEP       | Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework of Cambodia   | 0.64128                 | 0.459125                        | 1.100405                  |
| Czech Republic  | UNEP       | Support for the Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework   | 0.4524                  | 1.4326                          | 1.885                     |
| Egypt           | UNEP       | Support the Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework   | 0.9081                  | 1.389                           | 2.2971                    |
| Estonia         | UNEP       | Support the Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework   | 0.669                   | 0.284                           | 0.953                     |
| Global          | World Bank | Assessment and Recommendations on Improving Access of Indigenous Peoples to Conservation Funding   | 0.25                    | 0.36                            | 0.61                      |
| Indonesia       | World Bank | Partnerships for Conservation Management of the Aketajawe-Lolobata National Park, North Maluku Province  | 0.999954                | 1.085596                        | 2.08555                   |
| Kenya           | UNDP       | Improved Conservation and Governance for Kenya Coastal Forest Protected Area System  | 0.8                     | 2.29                            | 3.09                      |
| Lithuania       | UNEP       | Support for the Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework   | 0.6874                  | 0.404                           | 1.0914                    |
| Macedonia       | UNDP       | Strengthening the Ecological, Institutional & Financial Sustainability of Macedonia's National Protected Areas System                          | 1                       | 4.1614                          | 5.1614                    |
| Mauritius       | UNEP       | Support the Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework   | 0.4278                  | 0.2079                          | 0.6357                    |
| Mexico          | World Bank | Sacred Orchids of Chiapas: Cultural and Religious Values in Conservation   | 0.837392                | 1.173746                        | 2.011138                  |
| Moldova         | UNEP       | Support to the Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework  | 0.54235                 | 0.147                           | 0.68935                   |
| Slovak Republic | UNEP       | Support to the Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework of Slovakia  | 0.466                   | 0.139                           | 0.605                     |
| Tanzania        | UNEP       | Support the Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework   | 0.7773                  | 0.6143                          | 1.3916                    |
| Tunisia         | UNEP       | Capacity Building for the Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework   | 0.8489                  | 0.91926                         | 1.76816                   |
| Vietnam         | UNEP       | Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework   | 0.9978                  | 0.637                           | 1.6348                    |
|                 |            | Budget Totals  | 14.10076                | 20.11249                        | 34.21325                  |

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

| Country | GEF Agency | Project Title  | Project Type      | GEF Amount (\$ million) | Cofinancing Amount (\$ million) | Total Amount (\$ million) |
|---------|------------|--|-------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------|
| Georgia | UNDP       | Assessment of Capacity Building Needs for Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Use, Participation in Clearing House Mechanism and Preparation of a Second and Third National Reports to CBD | EA                | 0.272186                | 0.01                            | 0.28219                   |
| Global  | UNDP/UNEP  | Support to GEF Eligible CBD Parties for Carrying Out 2010 Biodiversity Targets National Assessments – Phase I.   | MSP <sup>22</sup> | 1                       | 0.75295                         | 1.75295                   |
|         |            | Budget Totals  |                   | 1.272186                | 0.76295                         | 2.035136                  |

---

<sup>22</sup> This project was approved through the MSP modality to expedite enabling activity support to aid in preparation of the fourth national report.

## ANNEX 4: PROJECT SUMMARIES

### Summary of Full-Size Projects Approved Between January, 2006-December, 2007

***Argentina: Biodiversity Conservation in Productive Forest Landscapes.*** The project is partially-blended with a WB loan for the Sustainable Forestry which seeks to improve plantation productivity and management, foster rural development, and enhance the environmental values of plantation forestry in Argentina by updating the policy framework, strengthening institutional capacity at provincial level, improving public and private information delivery services, improving the efficiency of research, facilitating the involvement of small and medium-scale farmers in plantation forestry and agro forestry, and institutionalizing environmental safeguards and best practice into plantation management. The GEF project will integrate biodiversity-responsible practices and policies into the plantation-forestry sector at the national level and in seven provinces in Northern Patagonia and Mesopotamia region. The GEF project will support advanced education and training programs for government officials who work directly with plantation forests, researchers who generate the knowledge necessary for technological advancement, and extension agents who bring these advances to the producers. The project will also work to improve the legal, policy, and economic frameworks which influence the establishment and management of plantations and support environmental education activities designed to sensitize producers to the need for, and benefits of, conserving biodiversity and ecosystems. The project will also support creation of protected areas and buffer zones to conserve critical areas and species in zones with high pressure for conversion. (WB, GEF: \$ 7 m, Total project: 14.22 m).

***Bosnia-Herzegovina: Forest and Mountain Protected Areas Project.***

The project will increase the area in forest and mountain ecosystems under formal protection status, and develop mechanisms to conserve these ecosystems while ensuring that these natural assets provide a basis for improved livelihoods in rural areas and for increased tourism revenues. The project will achieve these objectives through: (a) the expansion and strengthening of the protected areas network; (b) the restoration or enhancement of the capacity of national institutions and other actors to manage protected areas and to preserve biodiversity within production landscapes (forest and agricultural land); (c) more sustainable management of resources outside protected areas (integrated land-use of productive landscapes); and (d) the integration of Bosnia-Herzegovina into transnational biodiversity conservation initiatives. This will provide benefits to local communities through improved livelihoods and increased revenues from tourism. (WB, GEF: \$3.4 m, Total project: \$6.9 m).

***Botswana: Wildlife Conflict Management and Biodiversity Conservation for Improved Rural Livelihoods in Botswana.*** This project has been designed to strengthen conservation, sustainable use and mainstreaming of wildlife and biodiversity resources in Botswana's economic development. The project seeks to enhance biodiversity conservation in Botswana's Northern Wetland areas given their exceptional but highly vulnerable biodiversity richness. As a semi arid savannah ecosystem, biodiversity is concentrated in critical wetlands habitat found only in northern part of the country in three primary wetlands: the Okavango Delta, Chobe Linyanti and the Makgadikgadi Wetlands system. These wetlands identify an oasis of biodiversity resources increasingly under threat from over exploitation, wildlife conflict with communities and agricultural transformation. Project sites focus on communities experiencing the highest level of wildlife conflict, engaged at some level in community based natural resource management and

living adjacent to the protected area network in critical wetlands habitat. The proposed project will assist the Botswana Department of Wildlife and National Parks (DWNP), in collaboration with local NGOs, Ngamiland and Chobe District governments, and key agencies, in strengthening conservation, sustainable use and mainstreaming wildlife and biodiversity in Botswana's economic development, through policy and institutional reforms (including development of a National Wildlife Conflict Management Policy and Strategy, and a national community-based Wildlife Conflict Management and Early Warning System Framework), strengthening CBNRM policy and implementation (including development of the capacity of local CBOs and NGOs), and on-the-ground interventions in high biodiversity and conflict areas, focused on livelihood-enhancing community participation in wildlife management, conflict resolution, and monitoring and evaluation. The project's objective is to reduce the incidence of wildlife conflict within the project areas, by assisting communities monitor, co-manage, and directly benefit from the sustainable use of biodiversity resources, as well as strengthen Botswana's overall wildlife policy and institutional framework. (GEF: \$ 5.5 m, Total project: \$30.5 million)

***Brazil: Effective Conservation and Sustainable Use of Mangrove Ecosystems in Brazil.***

Mangrove ecosystems are among the most productive on earth, supporting globally significant biodiversity and providing resources and environmental services that underpin economic activities and ensure the environmental integrity of coastal areas. Moreover, their role in increasing the resilience of coastal ecosystems, communities and economic activities to climate change is increasingly recognized. While Brazil has put in place a comprehensive framework for ensuring that mangrove ecosystems are conserved, there are a number of weaknesses in the systems that undermine the delivery of effective protection. The result is the loss of mangrove habitats and the provision of resources on which many communities and sectors depend. This project will directly address this problem by tailoring existing protected area management tools in the National System of Conservation Units (SNUC) to address the specific characteristics of mangrove ecosystems and increase capacities for their implementation, thus establishing minimum standards and improved approaches to mangrove conservation and sustainable use across the country. In doing so it would provide the operational consolidation of a sub-set of mangroves PA based on field-tested innovative management approaches in both sustainable use and strict conservation categories thus advancing the maturation of the SNUC. The result would be direct conservation benefits to 568,000 ha of globally significant mangroves, positive impacts on the livelihoods of some of the poorest segments of Brazilian society and a framework through which lessons learnt could be replicated to all of Brazil's mangrove ecosystems and others globally. (UNDP, GEF: \$ 5 m, Total project: \$20.35).

***Brazil: Rio Grande Do Sul Biodiversity Conservation.*** Within Brazil, the grassland biome is unique to the state of Rio Grande do Sul and is home to a rich and unique fauna and flora of global significance with high levels of biodiversity, e.g. 3,000 vascular plants (and 400 grasses), more than 60 mammal species, 210 birds, 30 reptiles, 20 amphibians and 40 inland waters fish. This grassland biome is considered one of the world centers for endemic birds and holds 17 species of birds that are globally threatened and another 11 are near threatened. The key threats to the grassland biome are: a) accelerated land conversion due to agriculture, forestry production plantations, and livestock production; b) lack of knowledge and technical capacity for farmers to adopt conservation practices; and, c) deficient regulatory framework to promote sustainable practices integrated with biodiversity conservation. The State of Rio Grande do Sul has developed a series of programs for the economic development of the grasslands; one of these

programs is aimed at promoting biodiversity conservation within policies. The proposed project would promote a biodiversity-friendly conversion process under this program.

The objective of the proposed project is to promote the conservation and restoration of biodiversity in the state's grassland ecosystem through mainstreaming biodiversity conservation within the forestry, agriculture, and livestock productive landscapes. This project would be based on two primary pillars: a) helping private landowners in rural areas to adopt biodiversity-friendly conservation practices, and b) providing the public sector with the tools needed to promote conservation and to create an enabling environment for biodiversity integration. By the end of the project, it is expected that through demonstration, dissemination, and technical assistance, a significant number of landowners in priority areas of the grasslands would have adopted biodiversity conservation practices. It is also expected that government institutions will have developed an improved policy framework conducive to biodiversity conservation co-existing with sound economic development of the grasslands. (WB, GEF: \$5 m, Total project: \$ 11.1 m)

***Brazil: Espirito Santo Biodiversity And Watershed Conservation And Restoration.***

The Atlantic Forest biome is one of the world's most biologically diverse areas, but has been reduced to less than 8% of its original forest cover. Farming by smallholders and some larger scale producers has reduced and fragmented forest cover and poses a continuing threat to the area's globally significant biodiversity. It has also resulted in severe erosion, substantially increasing silt loads and reducing the quality and timing of water supplies. The project watersheds provide about 95% of water supplies for the Vitória metropolitan area, which has 1.4 million inhabitants and generates 62% of state GDP, and also generate hydroelectricity. The project area – two watersheds in south-central Espírito Santo, one of the Brazil's poorest states, covering 400,000 ha – has some of the largest clusters of Atlantic Forest remnants, but biodiversity is under constant threat because of a combination of three main problems: (1) inadequate capacity to plan and implement appropriate NRM policies; (2) obstacles to the landholders adopting sustainable land management (SLM) practices; and (3) the fact that many of the benefits provided by Atlantic forests are externalities from the landholders' perspective, so that they have no incentive to preserve them. The project ("*Florestas para Vida*") will address each of these issues by a) strengthening the participatory institutions responsible for planning and implementing NRM strategies in the watersheds, including technical agencies capable of monitoring conditions and developing responses to problems and governance mechanisms that bring stakeholders together in participatory ways to agree on appropriate responses; b) undertaking targeted intervention to restore and enhance the protection of critical areas for biodiversity conservation, and support the PA system in the watersheds, including assistance to landowners in the creation of private nature reserves; c) adopting a two-pronged approach to helping induce an increased adoption of SLM practices: development of a system to provide technical assistance on SLM to landholders, as well as a program of short-term PES payments for activities that are particularly beneficial for biodiversity conservation; and by developing a PES mechanism for critical areas for water service delivery (which are in many cases also important for biodiversity) in cooperation with water users such as state water agency CESAN. (WB, GEF: \$4 m, Total project: \$ 12 m)

***Brazil: SFM: Catalyzing the Contribution of Indigenous Lands to the Conservation of Brazil's Forest Ecosystems.*** The predominant type of PA in Brazil is a Conservation Unit (UC). Since 2002, the 256 federal, state, and municipal UC have been bought under a National System of Conservation Units (SNUC). SNUC-PAs cover 12% of the territory but do not include Brazil's Indigenous Lands (ILs), which cover a further 12% of the country. Given their crucial role in forest conservation and to address ecosystem under-representativity in the PA estate, Brazil is seeking to complement SNUC-PAs protection with that afforded by ILs. The project objective is that Indigenous Lands (ILs) are consolidated as protected areas critical to the conservation of Brazil's forest ecosystems and as an integral part of the National Protected Area Plan. This will be achieved through three main approaches. At the systemic level mechanisms, tools and strategies will be developed to inform policy and recognize ILs as PA, thereby providing the support needed for their continued role in conservation over the long-term. To inform this systemic level, on-site demonstrations will be undertaken in selected pilot ILs to (a) model and test different approaches to increase the management effectiveness of conservation set asides in ILs for biodiversity conservation and (b) remove barriers that currently hamper sustainable use strategies in some ILs, increasing access to markets and determining sustainability thresholds appropriate for each forest type. Thus, while the project will work at a demonstration level and in pilot ILs, targeted systemic intervention will remove key barriers so as to unlock the potential of ILs as PAs in the long-term. By triggering this change the project will thus ultimately contribute to a larger goal of increasing global benefits in all ILs. The project will capture direct benefits in those ILs selected as pilots (initially estimated at between 10-20% of ILs). These will be in areas of high priority for forest biodiversity conservation and with all land regularization processes complete. (UNDP, GEF: \$6 m, Total project: \$37.7)

***Chile: Regional System of Protected Areas for Sustainable Conservation and Use of Valdivian Temperate Rainforest.*** Chile's natural isolation and topographic diversity result in very high levels of species diversity - some 28,450 native species are known - and one of the highest levels of endemism in the Latin America and Caribbean region. Government commitment to biodiversity conservation has resulted in the establishment of an impressive National System of State Wilderness Protected areas including 31 national parks, 15 national monuments, and 48 national reserves which cover more than 14 million hectares. In addition, 300 private protected areas cover another 1.1 million hectares. Despite these efforts, many critical biodiversity areas remain unprotected. One of these is the Valdivian Rainforest Eco-Region, the world's second largest temperate rainforest recognized for its outstanding globally significant biodiversity. The project will set up in the Los Lagos Region (Xth), the first Regional PA System in Chile. This System will support regional development goals and conserve its biodiversity endowment – the Valdivian Eco-region. While focusing primarily on regional-specific barriers, the Regional System will also provide a paradigm for progressive replication elsewhere in Chile, with the aim of advancing in the maturation of a National PA System. The project will adopt an intervention strategy based on two strategic approaches. One will be to create the general enabling environment for the Regional System. The other will be to support on-site demonstrations, which deliver immediate protection to sites of outstanding biodiversity value, while providing models that can be replicated through incentives and regulatory mechanisms developed within the overall framework of the System. The project's long-term goal is that Chile has an effective and representative national system of conservation and sustainable use protected areas, which support national and regional development goals. The project objective is: An effective, multi-stakeholder, multi-use Regional Protected Areas System (RPAS) is modeled in the Valdivian Region. There are five planned outcomes in support of the project's stated objective: (i) Regional

protected area structures are in place, including appropriate and sustainable policy, financing and institutions; (ii) Sustainable and replicable models of NGO stewardship of protected areas are in place; (iii) Sustainable and replicable models of collaborative buffer zone management are in place (IUCN II-IV); (iv) Sustainable and replicable models of private and indigenous managed resource protected areas are in place (IUCN V-VI); and (v) Institutions and individuals involved in the RPAS have the necessary knowledge and skills to function effectively. (UNDP, GEF: \$5 m, Total project: \$20.32 m).

***Chile: Building a comprehensive National Protected Area System for Chile: a financial and operational framework.*** The project will put in place a consolidated framework to improve the financial and operational efficiency and coherency of its current assemblage of PAs, designing an integrated new National Protected Area System with aligned management standards and efficiencies across its constituents PAs to ensure sustainable financing in the short-term and to provide the basis for the expansion of Chile's PA estate in the future. The project will pursue 3 main approaches: (i) increasing revenue generation by lifting legal and regulatory barriers that impede different revenue mechanisms or that act as disincentives for on-site revenue generation; and by testing resource generation mechanisms (amongst others, PA visitation fees schemes and service concessions based on a financing options assessment that indicated a potential increase of at least 50% over current tourism related revenues in the short-term); ii) reducing National Protected Area System cost burdens by unleashing resources from development entities and productive sectors to buffer zones and communities to reduce threats at source, potentially reducing management costs and sharing the financial burden of PA costs; (iii) improving operational effectiveness and thereby cost effectiveness of PA management through, amongst others, the definition of operational standards, resource allocation and reporting systems, management and business planning and capacity building to ensure that investment in PAs is better spent and thus maximizes conservation benefits. (UNDP, GEF: \$5 million, Total project: 26.95 million)

***China: Conservation and Sustainable Utilization of Wild Relatives of Crops.*** Wild relatives of rice, soybean, and wheat are significant for sustainable development in both China and the world. The *China Agricultural Agenda 21* (1999) identified a large number of important *in-situ* conservation sites but, because of capacity and financial constraints, threats still exist at most sites. This project will eliminate barriers to the mainstreaming of conservation of wild relatives within the agricultural sector, thus promoting integration of conservation and production, and ensuring that the global environmental benefits secured thereby are sustainable. The project will involve participation from local stakeholders in eight diverse provinces and autonomous regions to secure conservation of wild relatives of soybean, wheat, and rice, in their natural habitats. This will be achieved through a combination of actions aimed at establishing sustainable sources of financial and other incentives for conservation, modification to the legal framework, capacity building and awareness raising. (UNDP, GEF: \$7.85 m, Total project \$20.692 m)

***China: Guangxi Integrated Forestry Development and Biodiversity Conservation.*** The project will improve the effectiveness of forest management and institutional arrangements in timber production, watershed protection and nature reserves management in Guangxi Province and demonstrate this integrated approach to forest management. This will be achieved by supporting complementary and mutually supportive management improvements in each of the three main forest categories - production, protection (ecological), and conservation. Specifically, the project will (a) expand and strengthen forest resources development; (b) improve the existing provincial



ecological forest protection program; (c) strengthen the management of selected nature reserves established to protect globally important ecosystems and biodiversity and identifying opportunities for enhancing biodiversity outside of protected areas; and (d) support stakeholders in the forestry sector in GZAR through the development of a forestry strategy, guidelines and policies, and applied research needed for sustainable forest resources management. (WB, GEF: \$5.25 m, Total project: \$ 204.58 m)

***China: Ningxia Integrated Ecosystem and Agricultural Development Project.*** The Project area covers 3,655 km<sup>2</sup> of the oasis of the Yinchuan Plain extending into the piedmont zone and the Helan Mountains to the west of the Yellow River in Ningxia Hui Autonomous Region of China. Approximately one-third of the Project area will be managed to enhance biodiversity linkages between the Helanshan Nature Reserve, the Piedmont area and the Yinchuan plain using the IEM or landscape approach. Almost 11,500 ha of wetlands will be managed to protect biodiversity while enhancing eco-tourism. The Project area supports a variety of wildlife species of national, regional and global conservation significance. Fifteen species are recognized by IUCN as globally threatened, of which nine are permanent residents of Ningxia, e.g. the Chinese Softshell Turtle, six species are migratory birds e.g. the Great Bustard. Institutional capacity will be built and integrated land and water resource management approaches demonstrated through spatial planning, sustainable land management and more efficient water use. The focus for improved dryland ecosystem management is on 24,220 ha of fragile soils, where previously resettled poor communities will be assisted through a transition to sustainable land management practices linked to and made sustainable through modern agribusiness enterprises. (WB, GEF: \$5 m, Total project: \$215.73 m)

***China: CBPF Priority Institutional Strengthening and Capacity Development to Implement the China Biodiversity Partnership and Framework for Action.*** This project will support the implementation of CBPF. It will establish an effective biodiversity conservation planning framework from the national to provincial levels. It will strengthen the State Environment Protection Administration's capacity to coordinate a critical mass of international and national stakeholder action relevant to China's biodiversity conservation. The project will establish mechanisms to facilitate interactions between these stakeholders and the central government policy-makers to develop, test and scale-up innovative approaches. The project will also establish a common framework to monitor CBPF's progress and to assess its achievements (including all projects developed under it) with regard to impacts on- the-ground. Further, this project will ensure the integration of biodiversity conservation issues within the planned national climate change adaptation guidelines and demonstrate how to do this in the sectoral policies/plans in a province as a demonstration. (UNDP, GEF: \$4.54 m, Total project: \$19.64 m).

***China: CBPF Shaanxi Qinling Mountains Integrated Ecosystem Development.*** The Qinling Mountains (QM) is located south of Xian, the capital province of Shaanxi Province (SP). QM is one of the most critical biodiversity hotspots in the PRC containing many globally-endangered species of fauna and flora, including the giant panda and crested ibis. Despite its importance, about 70% of the total area of QM has been highly degraded due to inappropriate farming practices, logging, overuse of natural resources and encroachment, destructive mining and pollution from solid waste and intensive use of agrochemicals over many decades. The Project will improve the environment and the quality of life for the local inhabitants through improved and sustainable biodiversity conservation and increased tourism revenues. The Project will support the following: commercial uses in the ex-situ areas of high volume tourism to support in-

situ activities in the nature reserve; community development for local income-generating activities; realistic models for linking project improvements with other nature reserves in QM; and strengthening capacity of key institutions in project management and communities in project participation (ADB, GEF: \$4.27 m, Total project: \$130.47 m).

***China: CBPF Conservation and Sustainable Use of Biodiversity in the Headwaters of the Huaihe River Basin.*** The project will demonstrate mainstreaming in the national-level Ecological Function Conservation Areas (EFCA) to be established in the Headwaters of the Huaihe River Basin (HHRB), a biodiversity-rich, 21,109 km<sup>2</sup> area. The project will demonstrate practical and complementary mechanisms for conserving ecological functions and mainstreaming biodiversity in China by focusing on: (i) land use planning and management, (ii) incentive-based regulation of natural resource-based business sectors, and (iii) integration into poverty alleviation efforts. HHRB is one of the important water supply source areas and, therefore, the project will have a direct demonstration value for replication to the other 16 water supply source sites. HHRB is one of a few remaining areas where substantial forest and wetland ecosystems can still be found. It supports more than 8,800 species (including 2,100 species of higher plants), including 360 regionally endemic species. Of these, 46 species are listed in CITES Annexes and 97 species are listed as endangered in China's Red List. (UNDP, GEF: \$2.7272 m, Total project: \$13.0822 m).

***Congo DR: Support to ICCN's Program for the Rehabilitation of the National Parks Network.*** The global objective of this project is to support the biodiversity sub-program of the National Forest and Biodiversity Sector Program with an aim to raise the political profile of biodiversity conservation in DRC and enhance its linkage to the economic recovery agenda. The GEF project will: 1) support the implementation of an institutional capacity building program at the national level with the national parks institution, ICCN; 2) target rehabilitation and institutional strengthening efforts in two of the prioritized ten national parks and their buffer zones, namely – Garamba and Virunga – to ensure that a significant portion of their biological diversity is protected and sustainably managed; and 3) lay the foundation for creation of new protected areas covering up to 15% of the national territory. (World Bank, GEF: \$7 m, Total project: \$55.88 m).

***Costa Rica: Mainstreaming Market-Based Instruments for Environmental Management.*** GEF support has been instrumental in the development of market-based instruments for environmental management in Costa Rica, resulting in substantial on-the-ground improvements in biodiversity conservation in Costa Rica, as well as valuable lessons learned that have been applied in many other countries. GEF support for this project will help consolidate Costa Rica's PSA Program (Pago por Servicios Ambientales, or Payment for Environmental Services), and focuses particularly on the improvements needed to ensure sustainable long-term conservation of biodiversity in the buffer zones of protected areas and biological corridors that connect them, thus enhancing the sustainability of the national protected areas system and of the Costa Rican portion of the Mesoamerican Biological Corridor. The objective of the project is to enhance the provision of environmental services of national and global significance and to assist in securing their long-term sustainability. The global environmental objective is to enhance the conservation of globally significant biodiversity and ensure its long-term sustainability by mainstreaming market-based instruments in productive landscapes in the buffer zones of protected areas

and the corridors connecting them. This will be accomplished by consolidating the PSA Program, improving its efficiency, and expanding its coverage. The project will also support the development of new, market-based approaches to sustainable finance environmental management. The bulk of the project's work will be devoted to demand-side efforts to develop and implement new mechanisms to generate sustainable financing and to address the particular needs faced in generating long-term financing for biodiversity conservation. This will be complemented by supply-side efforts to improve the program's efficiency together with efforts to increase its contribution to poverty reduction and sustainable rural development.

***Costa Rica: Overcoming Barriers to Sustainability of Costa Rica's Protected Area System.*** The project will support Costa Rica's efforts to strengthen its Protected Areas System administered by the National System of Conservation Areas (SINAC). The aim is a System that effectively conserves a representative sample of Costa Rica's biodiversity, advance national goals and captures global benefits in a range of ecosystems. This will be achieved through five interrelated Outcomes: 1) Costa Rica's legal and policy framework is reformed and enhanced to ensure effective management and long-term financial and ecological sustainability of the PA System; 2) SINAC's institutional PA System framework and capacities are enhanced for eco-regional planning and optimal management effectiveness; 3) SINAC has the financial sustainability to effectively attain its strategic objectives and provide resources for long-term PA System management needs; 4) SINAC tests new and innovative conservation approaches at the Conservation Area and PA levels; and 5) Successful PA System management models are scaled-up and replicated at the systemic level through strategic partnerships with key stakeholders. On-site pilot interventions will enable ground-proofing of the reformed legal and policy frameworks, by developing and testing new tools for enhancing PA management effectiveness - including different PA governance models - while hosting training and awareness-raising activities (UNDP, GEF: \$ 4.8m, Total project: \$20.30).

***Cuba: Mainstreaming and Sustaining Biodiversity Conservation in three Productive Sectors of the Sabana Camaguey Ecosystem.*** The project will be implemented in the Sabana-Camagüey Ecosystem (SCE), which occupies a strip of approximately 465 km along the central north zone of Cuba, including the northern watersheds of the provinces of Matanzas, Villa Clara, Sancti Spíritus, Ciego de Ávila, and Camagüey, an extensive marine archipelago, the adjacent shallow marine shelf, and the oceanic Exclusive Economic Zone. The project represents the third and final phase of a long-term commitment by GEF to the project area. Phase 1 identified problems and opportunities, completed bio-geophysical, economic and social characterization of the SCE and developed a Strategic Plan. Phase 2 secured the conservation of particularly sensitive or high biodiversity value areas in a network of protected areas that covers 20% of the SCE, and made progress in promoting an ecosystem-based approach within a traditionally centralized and sector-driven development-planning framework. Phase 3 will promote operational changes within the tourism, fisheries, and agriculture sectors to ensure biodiversity conservation across the productive sea and landscape that make up 80% of the archipelago. In addition to interventions that directly change productive sector activities, the project also will strengthen the national, regional and local enabling environments for the financial, institutional, environmental and social sustainability of biodiversity conservation in these sectors. (UNDP, GEF: \$4.11, Total project: \$24.47).

***Ecuador: Management of Chimborazo's Natural Resources.*** The Ecuadorian province with the largest and among the best-conserved expanse of páramos in the country is the Province of Chimborazo. Approximately 30% of the existing páramos in Ecuador are located in Chimborazo, mainly within and around two protected areas (PAs)—Sangay National Park and the Chimborazo National Fauna Reserve. The total area of páramos within the province has been decreasing at a rapid rate due to inappropriate use of natural resources; historical, environmental, and socio-economic pressures contributing to the expansion of the agricultural frontier; unsustainable water use practices (especially for irrigation); poor institutional capacity; and the lack of adaptation strategies to counter the acute effects of global warming at high altitudes. The project would be blended with the IBRD's Chimborazo Productive Investments Project (PIDD) whose objective is to increase production and market access of rural families through investments in irrigation and roads improvement. The strategic linkage between the two projects allows for an integrated approach to reducing the threats facing the páramos while supporting the province's poverty alleviation goals. Specifically, the GEF project would focus on mainstreaming biodiversity considerations into policy and legal frameworks as well as sector strategies (agriculture, forestry, water, and ecotourism) that impact the páramos and surrounding areas. Demonstrative productive landscape projects and replicable Payment for Environmental Services (PES) models would be piloted in selected micro-watersheds where biodiversity is threatened and water supply is critical for downstream users. The PES approach offers the potential of addressing both problems in a sustainable and efficient manner. All activities would be implemented through a participatory process with an emphasis on incorporating traditional indigenous knowledge and techniques into improved practices, involving stakeholders at all levels in the decision-making process. (WB, GEF: \$ 3.9, Total project: \$ 11.4)

***Ethiopia: Sustainable Development of the Protected Area System.*** The project aims at strengthening capacities to manage the Ethiopian Protected Area system in order to improve the sustainability of the protected area system. The GEF project will focus on: 1. Mainstreaming of Protected Areas in the development framework; 2. Implementation of appropriate governance frameworks; 3. Capacity development for Protected Area planning; 4. Implementation of pilot operations to test new protected area management options and partnerships; and 5. Financial sustainability plan will be developed. (UNDP, GEF: \$9 m, Total project: \$32.99 m).

***Global: Supporting Country Early Action on Protected Areas.*** The project goal is to assist eligible countries meet their commitments under the CBD Programme of Work on Protected Areas (PoWPA) adopted by COP-7. The project objective is to enable eligible countries in need of assistance to launch early action in response to the PoWPA that complements, but will not be addressed by, other national programmes and projects, including those supported by the GEF, by other official donors, and by international NGOs. To achieve its objective, the project will provide a fast-disbursing and flexible mechanism to assist GEF eligible countries, with an emphasis on Least Developed Countries (LDC) and Small Island Developing States (SIDS), thus generating numerous country-based projects. Based on a needs and feasibility assessment, thirteen activities under the PoWPA were considered as suitable for support under this project. (UNDP, GEF: \$9.4m, Total project: \$13.43m)

***Global: Building the Partnership to Track Progress at the Global Level in Achieving the 2010 Biodiversity Target (Phase 1).*** This project aims to ensure that the wide range of agencies and organizations tracking progress in achieving the 2010 CBD indicator targets can collaborate more effectively to deliver the suite of global indicators that will be used for tracking and communicating progress. The aim of the full project is to support regular delivery of a full suite of 2010 indicators at the global level that is meaningful to a range of audiences in supporting both policy intervention and communicating degree of success in achieving the 2010 target. The indicators will be delivered through a partnership of the organizations and agencies working on the individual indicators. The indicators will be meaningful at a global level, but clearly linked to related indicators at national and regional levels, to targets and indicators used by other international conventions and programmes, to targets and indicators relevant to other sectors (in particular the Millennium Development Goals), and to assessing the impact of climate change on biodiversity. (UNEP, GEF: \$3.63 m, Total project: \$14.01 m)

***Global: Institutionalizing Payments for Ecosystems Services.*** Around the world, widespread interest is emerging in markets and payment schemes that reward actors who conserve or restore the ecosystem services (PES) provided by terrestrial, freshwater, and marine ecosystems, while providing a viable and sustainable source of livelihood for rural communities. This project seeks to establish institutional capacity for expanding systems of payments for ecosystem services to a scale sufficient to have a meaningful impact on global conservation of biodiversity and ecosystem services and on achieving the Millennium Development Goals. The principal *outcomes* of the project are (i) timely, relevant market information for PES available to all stakeholders globally, through The Katoomba Group's Ecosystem Marketplace; (ii) national champions and stakeholders of PES in Eastern and Southern Africa and Tropical America have improved capacity and access to technical assistance for institutional and policy development for PES; and (iii) operational models and capacity to effectively design establish and implement new types of PES for biodiversity conservation. (UNDP, GEF: \$5.69 m, Total project: \$17.71 m)

***Global: Critical Ecosystems Partnership Fund (CEPF) Phase 2.*** The project would support a second phase of the global CEPF program to expand and replicate successful civil society implementation models more broadly within at least 14 of the 30 eligible hotspots, including at least 9 new ones. It would build on the lessons learned under the first phase of CEPF, as well as recommendations from the independent evaluation carried out in 2005, to further strengthen the program in existing hotspots and to expand activities to marine ecosystems and to new hotspots. By focusing on a small number of critical ecosystems, and expanding into nine new hotspots, the project would maximize its overall impact. The program may also serve as a mechanism to direct other donor investments to the hotspots. (WB, GEF: \$20.00 m, Total project: \$100.00 m)

***Global (China, Ecuador, Morocco and Uganda): Conservation and Use of Crop Genetic Diversity to Control Pests and Diseases in Support of Sustainable Agriculture: Phase I.*** The development objective of this project is to conserve crop genetic diversity in ways that increase food security and improve ecosystem health. The immediate objective of the project is to enhance conservation and use of crop genetic diversity by farmers, farmer communities, and local and national institutions to minimize pest and disease damage on-farm. The six project target crops, rice (*Oryza sativa*), maize (*Zea mays*), barley (*Hordeum vulgare*), common bean (*Phaseolus vulgaris*), faba bean (*Vicia faba*), banana and plantain (*Musa spp.*), are major nutritional staples for large segments of the developing world and their yield stabilities are important factors in food security. The crops represent different breeding systems (cross-

pollinated, partially outcrossing, self-pollinated, clonal), as differences between varieties would be expected to be less prominent in cross-pollinated crops than in self-pollinated ones. Banana and plantain, as a result of their sterility, have followed a clonal crop improvement strategy, with farmers doing most of the selection breeding. In addition, the life cycles of major pest and disease that affect these crops are well studied. The project has three anticipated outcomes: Outcome 1: Rural populations in the project sites benefit from reduced crop vulnerability to pest and disease attacks; Outcome 2: Increased genetic diversity of target crops in respect to pest and disease management; Outcome 3: Increased capacity and leadership abilities of farmers, local communities, and other stakeholders to make diversity rich decisions in respect to pest and disease management. Each of the four countries, China, Ecuador, Morocco and Uganda, which developed this initiative and jointly selected these target crops, contain areas of important crop genetic diversity for the selected crops, including different types of resistance to major pests and pathogens in the countries' local crop cultivars maintained in traditional farming systems. (UNEP, GEF: \$ 3.4 m, Total project: 7.7 m)

***Global: (Brazil, Ghana, India, Kenya, Nepal, Pakistan and South Africa) Conservation and Management of Pollinators for Sustainable Agriculture through an Ecosystem Approach.*** The development objective of the project is to achieve improved food security, nutrition and livelihoods through the enhanced conservation and sustainable use of pollinators. The project's immediate objective is to harness the benefits of pollination services provided by wild biodiversity for human livelihoods and sustainable agriculture, through an ecosystem approach in selected countries. The project seeks to achieve four outcomes: 1) An integrated and accessible knowledge base for management of wild pollination services, for farmers, land managers and policy makers; 2) Enhanced conservation and sustainable use of pollinators for sustainable agriculture. The project will identify demonstrate and document the tools, methodologies, strategies and good agricultural practices that are needed for pollinator conservation and sustainable use, in selected agroecosystems in Brazil, Ghana, Kenya, India, Nepal, Pakistan and South Africa; 3) Increased capacity for conservation and sustainable use of pollinators by farmers and land managers. In partner countries, capacity among farmers, the agricultural research and extension community, and policy-makers to design and implement pollination management plans and policies will be strengthened; and 4) Mainstreaming of pollinator conservation and sustainable use. The project will ensure that the lessons learned are disseminated globally, that public awareness of the role and value of pollination services is enhanced and that measures to conserve and sustainably use pollinators are supported by the policy environment. (UNEP/FAO, GEF: 7.8 m, Total project: \$ 26.46 m)

***Global: (Brazil, Ghana, Côte d'Ivoire, Indonesia, Malaysia) Biodiversity and Agricultural Commodities Program (BACP).*** The expansion of agriculture and the associated use of land, water, and inputs is the leading cause of habitat destruction and a major threat to global biodiversity. Global production of tropical export commodities has dramatically increased in the last decade. Oil palm, cocoa, soybean and sugarcane today cover about 125 million hectares. The proposed Biodiversity and Agricultural Commodities Program (BACP) seeks to reduce these threats in an innovative and large-scale manner by leveraging market forces at all levels of the value chain in order to mainstream the use of so-called Better Management Practices (BMPs) that decrease the impact of production on biodiversity in these four commodities. BACP will strategically target its interventions so as to have the greatest impact in each commodity and will seek replication to other commodities. In doing that, IFC will be applying to commodities its successful market transformation experience gained in other sectors such as energy. The primary

objective of BACP is to preserve global genetic, species and ecosystem diversity within agricultural production landscapes, by transforming markets for targeted agricultural commodities. More specifically, the BACP aims to address market failures which prevent private producers, or reduce their incentives, to transition to production methods that are at the same time commercially viable and beneficial to biodiversity. BACP's selection of target countries for each commodity takes into account production volumes, the impact of this production on biodiversity of global significance, and the potential for lessening this impact. The initial target countries are Malaysia (palm oil), Indonesia (palm oil, cocoa), Ghana and Côte d'Ivoire (cocoa), and Brazil (sugarcane and soy). Each of these countries contains high levels of biological diversity and/or endemism, some of which is in biodiversity hotspots that overlap with areas of commodity production. (World Bank/International Finance Corporation (IFC), GEF: \$ 7, Total project: \$ 18.67)

***Global: Multiple (Chile, China, Algeria, Tunisia, Peru, Philippines) Conservation and Adaptive Management of Globally Important Agricultural Heritage Systems (GIAHS).*** Globally Important Agricultural Heritage Systems (GIAHS) represent a unique sub-set of agricultural systems, which exemplify customary use of globally significant agricultural biodiversity and merit to be recognised as a heritage of human kind within the national sovereignty jurisdictions. GIAHS may be defined as “remarkable land use systems and landscapes which are rich in globally significant biological diversity evolving from the co-adaptation of a community with its environment and its needs and aspirations for sustainable development.” The project will aim to redress the erosion of GIAHS, through addressing the key barriers related to awareness, policy, institutional capacity, community capacity and markets at global, national and local scales. In order to provide systematic support to the conservation and adaptive management of GIAHS, the project strategy is to make interventions at three distinct levels. First, at the global level, it will facilitate international recognition of the concept of GIAHS wherein globally significant agrobiodiversity is harboured, and it will consolidate and disseminate lessons learned and best practices from project activities at the pilot country level. Second, at the national level in pilot countries, the project will ensure mainstreaming of the GIAHS concept in national sectoral and inter-sectoral plans and policies. Third, at the site-level in pilot countries (Chile: Chiloe Island, Rice-fish system ; China: Lonxiang village , Zhejiang Province; Oases of the Maghreb (Algeria: Bénélsouen, Tunisia: Gafsa); Peru: Agriculture of Andes; Philippines: Ifugao Rice Terraces) the project will address conservation and adaptive management at the community level.

***Guatemala: Improvement of Management Effectiveness in the Maya Biosphere Reserve (MBR).*** This project recognizes that the ecological integrity of the MBR as a critical part of the Selva Maya will depend on a substantial improvement of its management effectiveness. To this end, the Project strategy has several distinctive and innovative features including: (i) a regional approach that places the MBR within a broader context of the Department of Peten and addresses the root causes of biodiversity loss and encroachment such as poor coherence in sectoral policies; (ii) a focus on participatory conservation with the aim of communities settled in the MBR becoming, instead of a threatening element, allies of the MBR; (iii) enhanced involvement of municipalities within the MBR in conservation activities; (iv) self-reliance with an emphasis on the horizontal transfer of knowledge and experience among communities and user groups so that they can manage their territories and resources while also reducing conflicts and improving the quality of life of their inhabitants; (v) consolidating and expanding the network of co-

administrator organizations in specific parts of the MBR; (vi) capacity building and the promotion of institutional leadership that make it possible for the administrators of the MBR (SECONAP and others) to handle the different situations that stem from the direct and indirect influence of the communities settled in or around the MBR; (vii) land use management to ensure a balance between the activities for fostering sustainable production and those associated with protection for the zones of high biological importance; and (viii) a regional monitoring and evaluation system linked to the national monitoring system of SIGAP. These features coincide with the strategic vision of the Government of Guatemala for the MBR as presented in the Strategy for Participatory and Inclusive Conservation. (IADB, GEF: \$4.1 million, Total project: \$15 million).

**India: Biodiversity Conservation and Rural Livelihoods Improvement.** The project will (i) scale-up successful conservation models to the landscape level; (ii) raise awareness of the values of biodiversity goods and services; (iii) promote explicit linkages between conservation and poverty alleviation; (iv) mainstream biodiversity into policy and development programs at regional and national levels; (v) Undertake monitoring, linked to adaptive management, learning and replication; and (vi) Replicate participatory conservation mechanisms to other PAs nationally. The project will be implemented in eight landscape sites in different bio-geographic zones of the country. Each landscape unit contains a mosaic of land uses, but typically would include one or more protected areas. The eight landscape sites are: (i) Agasthiyamalai Landscape of Tamil Nadu, (ii) Agasthiyamalai Landscape of Kerala, (iii) Rann of Kutch/Wild Ass Landscape in Gujarat; (iv) Upper Indus Valley Landscape of the Western Himalayas in Jammu and Kashmir; (v) Dampa Landscape of North-East India in Mizoram; (vi) Askote landscape in Uttaranchal; (vii) Dibru-Dihing landscape of Northern Assam<sup>23</sup>; and (viii) Satpura Landscape of Central India in Madhya Pradesh. (WB, GEF: \$11.5 m, Total project: \$47.1 m).

**Indonesia: Fisheries Revitalization Project (FRP).** Indonesia's more than 81,000 kilometer coastline forms a dynamic web of ecosystems and interlinked habitats that support some of the highest levels of biodiversity in the world, including rare and endemic species of global value. This coastline comprises every imaginable tropical coastal habitat, including a significant portion of the world's coral reefs (roughly 8 to 15 percent), wide belts of mangrove forests (over 2 million hectares comprised of at least 47 different species), inter-tidal mudflats that provide food for a large variety of migratory birds (including the globally endangered Milky Stork, Lesser Adjutant and Spot-billed Pelican), and vast seagrass beds (approximately 30,000 square kilometers of seagrasses, housing at least 12 of the 60 known species). The project will reduce poverty in rural coastal and fisheries communities in participating districts, by: (i) increasing coastal and fisheries commodity-based economic growth and diversification (including support for (a) primary production, (b) value-added processing, and (c) export-oriented marketing; and (ii) developing a system for sustainable utilization and collaborative management of coastal fisheries resources and ecosystems. (WB, GEF: \$8 m, Total project: \$95 m)

**Indonesia: Citarum Watershed Management and Biodiversity Conservation**

**Project.** The Citarum River Basin (CRB) is the most strategic river basin in Indonesia. The basin covers over 13,000 km<sup>2</sup> and hosts some 9 million people. Within the CRB are three major dams and three large multipurpose reservoirs which supply about 80% of the Capital, Jakarta's, raw water. CRB has 12 nationally registered protected areas (PAs) that are essentially important

---

<sup>23</sup> Site under discussion



representatives of the West Java montane forest type. The project will conserve the unique and internationally recognized biological diversity found in the Citarum River Basin representing the West Java Montane Forest type. This will be done through (i) establishing protocols and models of good conservation management design and practices, including innovative mechanisms for funding biodiversity conservation, at a designated Indonesian Model National Park and a variety of other PA types, and leverage these practices to other Indonesian PAs, (ii) reducing threats to biodiversity values in PAs and their surrounding landscape in CRB and (iii) demonstrating and up-scaling approaches to community-based conservation management, including environmental and biodiversity stewardship in both PAs and their surrounding landscape in CRB (ADB, GEF: \$3.75 m, Total project: \$73.73 m).

***Jordan: Integrated Ecosystem and Natural Resource Management in the Jordan Rift Valley.*** The Jordan Rift Valley is an integral part of the Great Rift Valley and provides a globally critical land bridge between Africa, Europe, and Asia that supports a large variety of ecologically diverse habitats of international importance and funnels millions of migrating birds between these continents each year. The Valley is of strategic economic importance, linking the five countries of Egypt, Israel, Jordan, the West Bank, and Syria, which share many of its natural resources, including the Jordan River, Dead Sea, and Gulf of Aqaba. The project will apply the principles of integrated ecosystem management to the existing land use master plan of the Jordan Rift Valley and establish a network of well-managed protected areas that meets local ecological, social and economic needs. (WB, GEF: \$6.15 m, Total project: \$12.25 m).

***Kazakhstan: Conservation and Sustainable use of Biodiversity in the Kazakhstani Sector of the Altai-Sayan Mountain Ecoregion.*** This project represents one integral element of a trilateral initiative represented by three complementary projects in Mongolia, Russia and Kazakhstan that are adopting an ecoregional approach to the conservation of biodiversity in a globally significant international trans-boundary setting, the Altai-Sayan ecoregion. The project will secure globally important biodiversity benefits through replicable and sustainable biodiversity conservation and efficient protected areas management in the Kazakhstani sector of the Altai-Sayan ecoregion. The project will demonstrate comprehensive approaches to sustainable and replicable conservation of biodiversity in two existing protected areas as a model for sustainability and management effectiveness of national PA systems in the Kazakhstani sector of the Altai-Sayan ecoregion. (UNDP, GEF: \$2.40 m, Total project: \$18.73 m).

***Mexico Consolidation of the Protected Area System (SINAP II) - Third Tranche.***

The objective of the project is to promote the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity in Mexico through the consolidation of the National System of Protected Area (SINAP). The original SINAP II project was approved by the GEF Council and a commitment was made to finance the SINAP II project under an innovative multi-tranched structure with a total final grant amount of \$31.1 million. Based on the independent evaluation and the WB mid-term evaluation, the project implementation is going on satisfactory and the conservation trust fund is considered as an innovative model globally and regionally. The objective of the project is as follows: 1. Conserve globally important biodiversity in selected areas of SINAP (at least 12 PAs) 2. Promote the economic, social, and environmental sustainability of productive activities in selected PAs. 3. Promote social co-responsibility for conservation 4. Promote the inclusion of biodiversity conservation and sustainable use criteria in development projects and other practices affecting selected PAs. (WB, GEF: \$7.35 m, Total project: \$14.7 m).

***Mongolia: SFM Forest Landscapes Development and Conservation.*** Mongolia's forest ecosystems have been subject to much mismanagement. Forest resources and wildlife trade are rapidly approaching a very serious state due to poorly-controlled legal harvesting and illegal activities, and disruption of important natural disturbance regimes. The project will strengthen the PA system and improve protection of globally-significant biodiversity in Mongolia's northern forests through (a) more effective management, including increased financial sustainability and (b) improved capacity for protected area management including the development of a corridor approach to landscape-level conservation planning. Threatened species (IUCN Red List) expected to benefit from the project include: e.g. Critically Endangered: Siberian Crane, Przewalski's Horse; Endangered: Swan Goose; Vulnerable: Great Bustard, White-naped Crane, Hooded Crane, Musk Deer, and Wolverine. (WB, GEF: \$1.73 m, Total project: \$4.93 m).

***Nicaragua: Strengthening and Catalyzing the Sustainability of Nicaragua's Protected Area System.*** This project builds on on-going conservation initiatives in Nicaragua and will focus on tackling the most critical barriers to management and financing that limit the National Protected Areas System's (SINAP) effectiveness as the cornerstone of in-situ biodiversity conservation. The project will support the conservation of Nicaragua's 53 ecosystems that contribute to the Meso-american Biodiversity Hotspot. The project approach has been designed to: a) Improve the national enabling environment so that the legal, policy and strategic frameworks are in place to allow SINAP to function more effectively. This will include key legal reforms and adoption of an updated master strategy for SINAP detailing its process for decentralization, coverage and management; b) Share the responsibilities of PA management across all relevant stakeholders including Ministries, regional government bodies, municipalities, private landowners and concessionaires and NGO co-managers. The project will support establishing and strengthening multi-stakeholder institutional structures so that they are operational and have capacity to engage stakeholders in PA management. This component will also develop the capacities of stakeholders, primarily landowners within PAs, to work with the PA authorities on biodiversity friendly economic activities; c) Improve SINAP's financial situation through transforming its financing system to generate, retain and account for funds and more effectively invest them at the site level. Reforms will also improve financing possibilities and create incentives (and reduce disincentives) for private producers within PAs to develop production in harmony with biodiversity conservation; d) Institutionalize the learning within the project and Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment for broader uptake, sustainability and replication.

***Peru: Strengthening Biodiversity Conservation through the National Protected Areas Program.*** The goal of the proposed project is to enhance Peru's biodiversity conservation through increasing the area of key ecosystems under protection and strengthening the capacity for strategic analysis and management under a decentralized management framework. This would be accomplished by supporting the establishment and management of regional, local and private PAs near or adjacent to critical PAs from the National System of Protected Areas (SINANPE), allowing for the creation of conservation mosaics and/or corridors. To achieve its goal, the project will: (i) support institutional strengthening at the central, sub-national and local levels to coordinate and effectively manage the Peruvian System of Protected Areas within the decentralized framework; (ii) establish alliances, incentive systems, coordination mechanisms and an integrated strategy that would allow participatory management of PAs by national, sub-national and local authorities with the support and active participation of the private sector, civil society and local communities; (iii) promote and establish mutually beneficial relationships

between sub-national authorities and local communities in PA management; and (iv) promote the sustainability of the Peruvian System of local and sub-national PAs (the SPANP) through the establishment of an endowment fund for financing recurrent costs. This goal would significantly strengthen the fulfillment of the CBD-COP7 Plan of Work for Protected Areas and the achievements of priority actions included in the SINANPE updated National System Plan of Protected Areas. (WB, GEF: \$8.9 m, Total project: \$ 31.8)

***Regional (Brazil, Colombia, Costa Rica, Peru) Latin America: Multi-country Capacity-building for Compliance with the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety.*** The project's objective is to support implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety by improving institutional capacity of agriculture and environmental ministries as well as specific, biosafety-related agencies in the four participating countries, to implement their national biosafety regulations in compliance with the CP. This project is one of two projects, the second project being a GEF Medium Sized Project on Regional Capacity-Building on Public Awareness and Communication Activities for Compliance with the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety, which has been developed to address the biosafety knowledge and capacity gap. Both of these projects will be executed by the Colombia-based International Center for Tropical Agriculture (CIAT) in collaboration with participating countries. (WB, GEF \$4.00m, total project \$14.26m)

***Regional (Benin, Burkina Faso, Mali, Senegal, Togo): West African Regional Biosafety Program.*** The project seeks to protect regional biodiversity against the potential risks associated with the introduction of LMOs into the environment. This will be achieved through the development of common science-based risk assessment and management methods, in compliance with the CPB and other international standards. The Program will initially benefit the WAEMU region but offers the potential to scale up to the larger Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) region. ECOWAS will be involved from the beginning of the program to ensure synergies and consistency across the entire ECOWAS region. (WB, GEF \$5.40m, total project \$20.94m).

***Regional (El Salvador, Guatemala and Honduras) Integrated Management of the Montecristo Trinational Protected Area (MTPA).*** The Montecristo Massif is a mountainous area in the center of the territory known as the Trifinio Region where the borders of El Salvador, Guatemala and Honduras meet precisely at a peak of Punto Trifinio found at 2,418 meters above sea level. Recognizing the biological value of the zone, in November 1987, the governments of El Salvador, Guatemala, and Honduras, through the Trinational Commission of the Trifinio Plan (CTPT) signed a declaration for the protection of the ecosystems in the Trifinio Region. The objective of this Project is to support the initial implementation of the Integrated Management Plan (IMP) of the Montecristo Trinational Protected Area in the Trifinio Region of El Salvador, Guatemala and Honduras, through a trinational institutional framework operating in a participatory, integrated and effective manner as a means to conserve the biodiversity, natural processes and environmental services of local, regional and global importance provided by the MTPA and facilitate its integration into the Mesoamerican Biological Corridor. The Project is aimed at catalyzing the initial activities undertaken to establish the MTPA, at facilitating the development of a trinational framework for the management and administration of the area, and initializing effective on-ground implementation of the MTPA's Integrated Management Plan. (IADB, GEF: \$ 3.5 m, Total project: \$ 9.1 m).

***Regional (India, Indonesia, Malaysia & Thailand): Conservation and Sustainable Use of Cultivated and Wild Tropical Fruit Diversity: Promoting Sustainable Livelihoods, Food Security and Ecosystem Services.*** Tropical Asian countries are the center of origin and diversity of many globally important tropical fruit tree species and their wild relatives. These tropical fruit tree genetic resources include more than 400 species of edible tropical fruits. The project will strengthen sustainable livelihoods through improved management and utilization of tropical fruit genetic diversity. This will be done through improving the conservation and use of tropical fruit genetic diversity in Asia by strengthening the capacity of farmers, local communities and institutions. The project will focus on four commercially important tropical fruit species with high diversity levels in the region, both at intraspecific level as well as at species level: citrus (*Citrus* spp.), mango (*Mangifera indica*), mangosteen (*Garcinia mangostana*), and rambutan (*Nephelium lappaceum*) as well as their wild relatives. (UNEP, GEF: \$3.65 m, Total project: \$10.36 m).

***Regional (Pakistan, Sri Lanka, Vietnam & Bangladesh): Development and Application of Decision-support Tools to Conserve and Sustainably use Genetic Diversity in Indigenous Livestock and Wild Relatives.*** The loss of farm animal genetic resources (FAnGR) diversity is considerable: FAO's Global Databank for FAnGR reports that around 20% of FAnGR breeds are classified as at risk and, during the last six years, 62 breeds became extinct – amounting to the loss of almost one breed per month. And this is only a partial picture: breed inventories are inadequate in many parts of the world; population data are unavailable for 36% of all breeds; and, among many of the most widely used high-output breeds, within-breed genetic diversity is being undermined by the use of a few highly popular reproducers or reproducing lines. To address these challenges of the loss of livestock genetic diversity and the non-conducive policy and institutional environments, this project will develop, apply and make available various, mutually strengthening decision-support tools to identify and manage priority FAnGR and their wild relatives. (UNEP, GEF: \$1.98 m, Total project: \$ 5.76 m).

***Russian Federation: SFM- Strengthening Protected Area System of the Komi Republic to Conserve Virgin Forest Biodiversity in the Pechora River Headwaters Region.*** The taiga ecosystems of the eastern part of the Republic of Komi represent the last examples of extensive virgin forests in Europe, and the largest expanse of relatively unfragmented forests on the continent. This project will conserve the globally significant biodiversity of the Republic of Komi. This will be done through achieving social, financial and institutional sustainability of the protected areas system of the Republic of Komi and by demonstrating effective conservation practice and resource use in two protected areas of the Upper Pechora Basin and their buffer zones. Good practices and lessons learned will be disseminated throughout the Komi Republic and the Russian Federation. (UNDP, GEF: \$4.5 m, Total project: \$20.40 m).

***Serbia: Transitional Agriculture Reform.*** Serbia has significant comparative advantages in agriculture, thanks to an abundance of high quality agricultural land, a strategic trading location, and an educated workforce. Primary agricultural production and agro-processing was estimated to be 15 percent of GDP and 20 percent of exports in 2005. About 0.8 million ha, or 15 percent of the arable land consists of about 1050 large corporate farms and agro-kombinats. Privately owned commercial farms, averaging about 10 ha, account for another 46 percent of agricultural land. The remaining 39 percent comprises over 600,000 small private farms, most under five ha and often consisting of several fragmented parcels of land. The project will enhance the

competitiveness of Serbian agriculture, while conserving the globally important eco-system in the Stara Planina mountainous area. (WB, GEF \$4.5 m, total project \$36.81 m).

***Seychelles. Mainstreaming Biodiversity Management into Production Sector Activities.*** The project aims to develop an integrated ecosystem management approach for the Seychelles with the implementation of different tools in land use planning, coastal zone management and partnerships with the private sector. To ensure long-term effectiveness, the project will also support the improvement in current institutional capacity and will promote broad stakeholder participation in decision-making and management of ecosystems. The existing network of protected areas will be extended to maintain corridors and take into account different natural habitats (e.g. terrestrial ecosystems in the granitic islands). A special management focus will be on Silhouette Island to put in place a long-term conservation framework to be supported with revenues from nature-based tourism. The outer islands will get much needed attention in terms of assessment of biodiversity, as well as the development of viable conservation programmes on Cosmoledo Atoll. (UNDP, GEF: \$36 m, Total Project: \$11.59 m).

***Seychelles: Mainstreaming Prevention and Control Measures for Invasive Alien Species (IAS) into Trade, Transport and Travel Across the Production Landscape.*** The project aims at addressing the threats posed to the Seychelles' biodiversity by the introduction of IAS through the movement of people and merchandise into and within the country. Working on the principle that 'prevention is better than the cure', the project will address three sets of barriers to addressing this threat, namely capacity deficits inherent in the policy and regulatory framework, capacity weaknesses within institutions, and technical capabilities. Measures to halt the inter-island spread of IAS already established on some islands will be instituted together with a monitoring system to assess their efficacy and inform national management responses. Finally, the project will establish a knowledge management facility to ensure that control and eradication schemes for IAS are being undertaken with full access to information on the relative efficacy and the costs of different treatment options. (UNDP, GEF \$2.00m, total project \$6.95m)

***Sierra Leone: Wildlife Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Project.*** The GEF project will focus on the improvement of sustainable protected area management and biodiversity conservation within Sierra Leone contributing to socio-economic development of beneficiary communities. The project is based on a capacity development strategy and the involvement of all stakeholder groups at national and local levels. More specifically, the proposed project will contribute to: (i) improve the integrity of four selected critical protected areas, (ii) enhance biodiversity protection within protected areas and adjacent landscapes, (iii) ensure the conservation of genetic diversity within four and outside protected areas that rural people traditionally use for medicinal and consumptive purposes and (iv) enhance the sustainable use of biological resources. (World Bank, GEF: \$5 m, Total Project: \$16.95 m).

***South Africa: National Grasslands Biodiversity Program.*** The South Africa Grasslands biome is a repository of globally significant biodiversity. Much of the grasslands ecosystem presently lies in production landscapes allocated to livestock production, agriculture, afforestation with exotic tree species, and coal mining. The objective of this project is to involve all the major production sectors in directly contributing to the achievement of biodiversity conservation priorities within the grasslands biome. The main intervention areas are: (i) strengthening the enabling environment for biodiversity conservation in production landscapes and (ii)

mainstreaming grassland biodiversity conservation objectives into the main sectors (agriculture, forestry, urban economy, coal mining). (UNDP, GEF: \$8.3 m, Total Project: \$45.91 m).

***Tanzania. SFM Extending the Coastal Forest Protected Area Subsystem.*** The aim of the project is to strengthen biodiversity management fundamentals within the Protected Area network in Tanzania. This project addresses the Coastal Forests which are arguably the most threatened of all hotspots ecosystems in Tanzania and Zanzibar islands. The governance framework is going to be revised at national and district levels to extend the Protected Area network. Different legal, regulatory, financial and institutional tools are going to be renewed to implement an effective conservation management in protected areas and sustainable approaches with forest-adjacent communities. The project will pilot novel institutional arrangements and partnerships in three priority landscapes (Zanzibar, Kichi–Matumbi Hills, greater Rondo system on the Tanzanian mainland). (UNDP, GEF: \$3.55 m, Total Project: \$9.75 m).

***Ukraine: Strengthening Governance and Financial Sustainability of the National Protected Area System.*** The biodiversity of Ukraine is widely recognized to be globally significant, because 141 Important Bird Areas (IBAs), and 33 Ramsar Sites are recognized in the country. Although the country covers less than 6% of the area of Europe, it contains approximately 35% of Europe’s species diversity due to its location at the crossroads of many different ecosystems and bird migration routes. Ukraine has 82 of the 104 European vertebrate species that have been identified as globally threatened (as per the IUCN Red List). The project will ensure conservation of globally significant biodiversity in the Ukrainian Upper Pripyat. It will do so through the strengthening of biodiversity conservation efforts for the Shatsk National Park and the new national park in the Pripyat-Stokhod landscape complex (including restoration of critical areas). It will ensure biodiversity-friendly land-use practices in the agriculture, tourism, forestry and fishing sectors and will improve public awareness and environmental education for biodiversity conservation. (UNDP, GEF: \$1.8 m, Total project: \$6.31 m).

***Uruguay: Catalyzing the implementation of Uruguay’s National Protected Area System.*** Uruguay is the second smallest country in South America, yet its location at the convergence of different bio-geographical regions has resulted in a complex mosaic of biological diversity for its size and subtropical nature. The proposed project will support Uruguay to design and implement a National System of Protected Areas that effectively conserves a representative sample of Uruguay’s biodiversity, is consistent with the country’s socio-economic context, and facilitates the integration of PAs with other relevant territorial, social, economic, and institutional frameworks and systems. This will be achieved through four interrelated outcomes: 1) Legal, policy and institutional frameworks that encourage effective management and sustainable financing for the NPAS are in place and operational; 2) Key stakeholders directly involved in PA management have the appropriate balance of knowledge and skills required for effectively running the NPAS and its constituent PAs; 3) Increased awareness on the values of protected areas and their importance for sustainable development influences policies and practices; 4) Know-how on cost-effective management structures is expanded and reinforced through field demonstrations of different PA governance structures based on decentralized management approaches. On site interventions will enable ground proofing of the new legal and policy frameworks, testing and developing tools for enhancing PA management effectiveness and hosting training and educational activities. As the long term sustainability of the NPAS will depend on the country’s ability to secure sufficient financial resources to meet the management costs of the PAs, financial issues have been addressed as cross-cutting components. The project

takes into account land tenure characteristics of Uruguay and recognizes the role that private reserves, multi-use management categories, and collaborative and decentralized management approaches will have in the PA System. (UNDP, GEF: \$ 2.5, Total project: \$ 7.4).

***Venezuela: Expanding Partnerships for the National Park System Project.*** Venezuela boasts among the highest levels of biodiversity in the world, ranking between 4<sup>th</sup> and 10<sup>th</sup> according to various taxa. Canaima National Park (CNP), located in Bolivar State in southeastern Venezuela and spanning 3 million hectares, is particularly important, harboring nearly 120 endemic genera, 2 endemic families and 117 endangered species. CNP's massive table-top mountains, known as *tepui*<sup>24</sup>, were classified by Dinerstein *et. al* (1995) as one of two Globally Outstanding and Relatively Intact ecoregions in Latin America.<sup>25</sup> Indeed, CNP was declared a Natural World Heritage Site in 1994 due to its singular scenery, a unique mosaic of ecosystems including high levels of biological diversity, numerous endangered animal species, and a high concentration of globally vulnerable species such as endemic plants and animals restricted to montane and *tepu* formations. The Project would build develop a participatory co-management model for CNP based on four fundamental criteria: (i) threat prevention and mitigation, (ii) sustainable development of local communities by undertaking sustainable production sub-projects, (iii) implementation of sustainable and long-term financial mechanisms to support PA management, namely through an inter-institutional agreement between CVG EDELCA, Venezuela's largest government-owned hydroelectricity company, and the Park's tripartite committee whereby the hydroelectric company transfers the resources to the Park in recognition of the valuable environmental services it provides, and (iv) involvement of all stakeholders, including indigenous peoples (Pemon's indigenous organization (FIEB)) in CNP's Management Plan design and implementation. The Project would pilot such a model in CNP, support this unique partnership, and seek to replicate a PA co-management scheme to other National Parks in Venezuela and other countries. (GEF: \$ 6 m, Total project: \$ 24.53 m.)

---

<sup>24</sup> The *tepu* formations are abrupt, rocky mountains reaching heights of between 800 and 3,015 feet above sea level. Given the region's warm and moist climate, these formations harbor unique ecosystems that are distinct from those of other tropical mountains due to their high number of endemic species. Thus, a *tepu* is a physical and biological unit containing unique species and ecosystems.

<sup>25</sup> Along with the Japura Negro moist forests in Amazonia, cited in Dinerstein et.al, *A Conservation Assessment of the Terrestrial Ecoregions of Latin America and the Caribbean* (1995), The World Bank, p. 24.

## Summary of Medium Size Projects Approved Between January, 2006-December, 2007

**Albania: Butrint National Park: Biodiversity and Global Heritage Conservation.** From the global point of view, the Butrint wetland complex together with Karavasta and Nartan lagoons are identified as critical wetlands in the Mediterranean coastline of high biodiversity importance to migrating birds along the Africa-Palearctic flyway. The Butrint wetland complex is an essential flyway stepping stone between the Mediterranean/Adriatic/ Ionic Seas and the Sahara desert and since 2003 is considered a site of international importance under the Ramsar Convention. The project will connect biodiversity conservation and sustainable ecosystem management with conservation of world heritage in the World Heritage site - Butrint aquatic and wetland complex, while also mobilizing donor's support for long-term financing of the Park complex. The project will protect and rehabilitate about 13,000 hectares of coastal and aquatic habitats for endangered flora and fauna, piloting restoration work on degraded landscapes (natural, semi natural and agricultural). (WB, GEF: \$0.95 m, Total project: \$2.16 m).

**Bhutan: Integrated Livestock and Crop Conservation Program.** This project will help maintain Bhutan's crop and livestock biodiversity of both national and global significance by overcoming barriers to mainstreaming their conservation into agricultural sector policy and practice at the national and sub-national level. The project will: 1) Promote the *in situ* maintenance of globally significant crop and livestock biodiversity in Bhutan through increased on-farm conservation of genetic resources thereby increasing the resilience of its agricultural production systems; 2) Strengthen key institutions in the agricultural sector and mainstream agrobiodiversity conservation into agricultural policy and practice at the national and sub-national level; 3) Increase the sustainability of local livelihoods by linking these to improved agricultural production and marketing. (UNDP, GEF: \$0.89 m, Total project: \$2.89 m).

**Bulgaria: Conservation of Globally Important Biodiversity in High Nature Value Semi-natural Grasslands through Support for the Traditional Local Economy.** Semi-natural grasslands are some of the most valuable ecosystems in the agricultural landscape and are the result of many centuries of stable agricultural management using the grasslands for grazing animals (pastures) or making hay (meadows) or combinations of both uses. A total of 350,000 hectares of semi-natural grassland habitats in Bulgaria are important from a biodiversity point of view. The project will preserve a number of high nature value (HNV) grassland habitats, which provides habitat for globally important species such as: Corncrake (*Crex crex*), Saker Falcon (*Falco cherrug*), Imperial Eagle (*Aquila heliaca*), and a number of other species that are threatened at the European scale. Farmed grasslands and pastures are the only habitat used by European Souslik (*Spermophilus citellus*, Global IUCN Red List category: Vulnerable) whose colonies define the distribution of Saker Falcon and Imperial Eagle. The total of 11 predominantly grassland habitats in the selected project sites are priority for conservation. (UNDP, GEF \$0.95 m, total project \$2.13m).

**Cambodia: Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework of Cambodia.** The project will assist the Royal Government of Cambodia to put in place a workable and transparent national biosafety framework, in line with national development priorities, Agenda 21 and the CBD. The project will more specifically: (i) establish and consolidate a fully functional and responsive regulatory regime in line with Cartagena Protocol and national needs and priorities; (ii) establish and consolidate a functional national system for handling requests, carry out risk



assessment decision-making and administrative tasks; (iii) establish and consolidate a functional national system for "follow-up" activities such as monitoring of risk exposure and environmental effects, and strengthening of enforcement mechanisms, institutions and procedures and (iv) establish and consolidate a functional national biosafety system for public awareness, education, participation, and access to information. (UNEP, GEF: \$0.64 m, Total project: \$1.10 m).

***Czech Republic: Support for the Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework.*** This project will assist the country in implementing its NBF in accordance with Agenda 21 and the CPB. Specifically seeks to integrate biosafety issues into sectoral policies and strategies; amend the national regulatory regime in line with the CPB process, including the new COP/MOP decisions, and to better reflect national needs and priorities; improve the national system for handling requests, performing risk assessment, decision making and other administrative tasks; consolidate a functional national system for monitoring and enforcement; and improve and extend a national system of public awareness, access to information, education and participation. (UNEP, GEF: \$0.45m, Total project: \$1.88m).

***Egypt: Support the Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework.*** The goal of the project is that by 2009 Egypt has a workable and transparent national biosafety framework, in line with its national development priorities and international obligations. The project seeks to help the country develop a fully functional and responsive regulatory regime in line with CP and national needs; support a functional national system for handling requests, performing risk assessment, and handling, storing and exchanging information in line with the BCH requirements; develop a functional national system for monitoring of environmental effects and enforcement; and promote public awareness, education, participation and access to information. (UNEP, GEF: \$0.90, Total project: \$2.29)

***Estonia: Support the Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework.*** The purpose of this project is to help Estonia to strengthen the existing institutional and technical structures and infrastructures needed to meet the obligations of the Protocol and have a National Biosafety Framework fully operational by completing drafting the biosafety legislation; strengthening the appropriate institutional structures for risk assessment and decision making; inclusion of LMOs policy into agricultural, environmental and biotechnology policy; training relevant people to handle requests and make decisions, including scientific, technical and legal training; enhancing monitoring and surveillance system; strengthening existing infrastructures for LMO detection and surveillance; and enhancing public awareness and information exchange. (UNEP, GEF: \$0.66m, Total project: \$0.95).

***Global: Assessment and Recommendations on Improving Access of Indigenous Peoples to Conservation Funding.*** This MSP addresses the issue of limited access to international conservation funding experienced by Indigenous Peoples. The project plans to identify the main obstacles to Indigenous Peoples access to these funds, to document these obstacles and to provide strategic and innovative options on alternative practices that would make international conservation funding more available and accessible to Indigenous Peoples. The project will also establish an active network of Indigenous Practitioners to share knowledge on best customary conservation and stewardship programs by Indigenous Practitioners that have been successfully funded. (WB, GEF: \$ 0.25 m, Total project: \$ 0.36 m).

***Indonesia: Partnerships for Conservation Management of the Aketajawe-Lolobata National Park, North Maluku Province.*** The proposed project's central development objective is to

develop and test a collaborative framework to manage protected areas in Indonesia and protect key biodiversity areas and ecosystem services in North Maluku. The new approach would be tested in ALNP in Halmahera Island, North Maluku, and if deemed successful, its pilot interventions would be adopted elsewhere in the country. In particular, the project proposes to: (a) involve local stakeholders, including local government, the private sector and adjacent communities, in the conservation of ALNP through an awareness program, management agreements, and the creation of a multi-stakeholder forum; (b) implement targeted conservation interventions to protect the biodiversity and forests of ALNP and build conservation management skills; and, (c) disseminate lessons learned and guidance on replicating the project's lessons to national parks and concerned stakeholders throughout Indonesia. (WB, GEF: \$1.0 m, Total project: \$2.09 m).

***Kenya: Improved Conservation and Governance for Kenya Coastal Forest Protected Area System.*** This MSP addresses the sustainable conservation and management of one specific subset of the Protected Area system of Kenya: the coastal forests. The project focuses on institutional support and capacity development for the stakeholders involved in the Coastal Forest Eco-Region, one of the world's most threatened biodiversity global hotspots. The project works at the landscape level, bringing together the varied institutional stakeholders. The project uses the new opportunities offered by the Forest Policy and emerging Forest Act, emphasizing partnership and community involvement. The main outcomes will be: 1. Piloting of conservation processes in the Kwale District Forest Landscape around the Shimba Hills, with some 12 different Protected Areas of several categories; and 2. Dissemination of lessons learned and best practices more broadly in Kenya. (UNDP, GEF: \$0.8m, Total project: \$3.095m).

***Lithuania: Support for the Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework.*** This project will assist the country to implement its National Biosafety Framework and specifically will help integrate the biosafety policy into the nationally agreed long-term strategic governmental program on sustainable development; consolidate an operational regulatory regime in line with the CPB and EU regulations; setup a functional national system to handle notifications and requests, perform risk assessment and monitoring of environmental effects and enforcement; and promote public awareness, access to information and public participation in the decision-making processes. (UNEP, GEF: \$0.68m, Total project: \$1.09m)

***Macedonia: Strengthening the Ecological, Institutional and Financial Sustainability of Macedonia's National Protected Areas System.*** The biodiversity of the Republic of Macedonia (RM) has high levels of taxonomic diversity, relictness and endemism. Some 30 plant communities in Macedonia are considered seriously endangered and threatened with extinction, or considerably reduced in their populations and biological viability, while 252 individual plant species are locally endemic and at least 70 species are threatened. The threats to Macedonia's protected areas are primarily linked to: insecure legal and institutional tenure; limited skills and capacity of the responsible national environmental and local protected area agencies; illegal developments, lack of political and civil support and the inappropriate management and unsustainable use of protected areas to meet individual protected area agencies economic imperatives. This project will conserve the biological diversity of Macedonia by strengthening the planning, establishment and management of Macedonia's national system of protected areas. (UNDP, GEF: \$1.0 m, Total project: \$5.16 m).

***Mauritius: Support the Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework.*** This project will help the country to implement regulations needed to make the GMO Law fully operational. In addition the project will contribute to the development of technical guidelines on handling of requests, transport, labelling of GMOs will be developed; staff will be trained on risk assessment/risk management and on handling, transport and packaging of LMOs and operational manuals will be developed; application forms will be available on the website; Guidelines/Procedures on monitoring prepared; and public awareness and education on biosafety will be promoted on the country. (UNEP, GEF: \$0.42m, Total project: \$0.63m)

***Moldova: Support to the Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework.*** The main purpose of this project is to help Moldova to strengthen the existing institutional and technical structures and infrastructures needed to meet the obligations of the Protocol and have a National Biosafety Framework fully operational. Specifically the project will assist Moldova to (i) implement its legislative framework on the safe use of biotechnology through improvement of the Biosafety law and develop sectorial regulations, guidelines and manuals; (ii) strength institutional structures for risk assessment and decision making; (iii) training decision makers, scientists, and technical staff on legal and technical matters; (iv) reinforce existing infrastructures (laboratories) for monitoring and setting up a mechanism for monitoring and enforcement; (v) strengthening communication, information exchange, public awareness, education and participation in decision making relating to biosafety both at the national level as well as through the BCH. (UNEP, GEF: \$0.54m, Total project: \$0.68m)

***Slovak Republic: Support to the Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework.*** The goal of the project is that by 2010 the Slovak Republic has a workable and transparent national biosafety framework, in line with its national development priorities and international obligations. The project will help the Slovak Republic to integrate biosafety into the National Biosafety and Biotechnology Policy (NBBP) and National Development Strategy; to review and update regulatory regime in line with CP and its national needs and priorities; to create a National Centre for Biological Safety and enhance the system for handling requests, perform risk assessment, decision-making and perform the administrative tasks; to consolidate a functional system for follow-up, namely monitoring of environmental effects and enforcement; and to enhance the functional system for public awareness, education, participation and fully available access to information on Biosafety. (UNEP, GEF: \$0.46m, Total project: \$0.60m)

***Tanzania: Support the Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework.*** The project will help the United Republic of Tanzania to strengthen the existing institutional and technical structures and infrastructures needed to meet the obligations of the Protocol and have a National Biosafety Framework fully operational and will contribute to (i) the development and implementation of biosafety regulations; (ii) the implementation of the country's legislative framework on the safe use of biotechnology through decrees, orders, guidelines and manuals; (iii) the preparation of specific technical guidelines; (iv) the strengthening of appropriate institutional structures for risk assessment, risk management, detection of LMOs and decision making; (v) the development and implementation of policies for biotechnology and biosafety; (vi) the training of regulators, decision makers, scientists, and administrative and technical staff on legal and technical matters relates to GMO application; (vii) the reinforcement of the existing infrastructures (laboratories) to strengthen monitoring and detection of LMOs; (viii) the setting up of a mechanism for monitoring and enforcement; (ix) the strengthening of communication and information exchange relating to biosafety both at the national level as well as through the global BCH; and (x) putting in place systems for strengthening public awareness, education and participation in decision making on LMOs. (UNEP, GEF: \$0.77m, Total project: \$1.39m)

***Tunisia: Capacity Building for the Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework.*** The overall objective of the project is to implement in Tunisia, a workable, responsive and transparent NBF, in line with the national development priorities, the Cartagena Protocol and other international obligations. The project will provide the necessary financial and technical assistance to transform its NBD to a legally binding national regulatory regime through the enactment of Laws and implementing regulations; prepare specific training guides and manuals; train decision makers, scientists, administrative and technical staff on legal, scientific and technical matters; enhance existing institutional facilities and infrastructures to undertake LMO detection and monitoring activities; set up a mechanism for monitoring of enforcement; strengthen channels for communication and information dissemination nationally, as well as through the Biosafety Clearing House (BCH); and promote public awareness and participation (UNEP, GEF: \$0.84m, Total project: \$1.76m)

***Vietnam: Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework.*** The project will assist Vietnam in creating a workable and transparent national biosafety framework by 2010, to fulfill its obligations as a Party to the Cartagena Protocol on biosafety, and to comply with the country's Agenda 21, the government strategy on development of biotechnology (Resolution 18/CP), and the National Action Plan for biosafety (NAPB). Specifically the project will (i) assist Viet Nam to integrate and incorporate safe use of biotechnology into national sectoral action plans and strategies in conformity with the national Agenda 21; (ii) strengthen the legal and regulatory framework on biosafety so that it is consistent with the Cartagena Protocol, workable and responsive to national needs and priorities; (iii) set in place a workable system for handling requests, carrying out risk assessment, and decision making for GMOs; (iv) set in place a workable and effective national system for monitoring and enforcement and (v) establish a workable and effective national system for public awareness, education and participation in decision-making for GMOs. (UNEP, GEF: \$ 1.0 m, Total project: \$1.63 m).

## **Summary of Enabling Activities Approved Between January, 2006-December, 2007**

***Georgia: Assessment of Capacity Building Needs for Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Use, Participation in Clearing House Mechanism and Preparation of a Second and Third National Reports to CBD*** The overall goal of this project is to develop Georgia's capacity in meeting its obligations under the CBD. This will be achieved through following objectives: 1) To enable Georgia to assess its capacity development needs in priority areas for the conservation and sustainable use of its biodiversity; 2) To establish the country-driven Clearing House Mechanism and to enhance Georgia's participation in CHM, including biodiversity information systems; and 3) To enable the National Focal Point of CBD to undertake the necessary consultations for completion of the Second National Report and the preparation of the Third National Report. (UNDP, GEF: \$ 0.272 m, Total project cost: \$ 0.282)

***Global: "Support to GEF Eligible CBD Parties for carrying out 2010 Biodiversity Targets National Assessments –Phase I"***. The project is the first of two phases of a global umbrella Medium Size Project within the Enabling Activities window that is designed to provide funding and technical support to assist eligible countries to assess progress towards the 2010 Target through a national participatory assessment process, using the provisional framework for goals and targets adopted by the CBD COP decision VIII/15. The guidelines for the fourth national report of the CBD will be used in connection with this national assessment. (UNDP/UNEP, GEF; \$ 1.0 m. Total project: 1.75)

**ANNEX 5: SUMMARY OF COUNTRY GRANTS OF THE GEF PROJECT “SUPPORTING COUNTRY ACTION ON THE CBD PROGRAMME OF WORK ON PROTECTED AREAS” UNDER IMPLEMENTATION**<sup>26</sup>

**Bahamas** (PoWPA Activities 3.1.2, 3.2.1, 4.2.1, and 4.1.2): The project is supporting an assessment of protected areas contribution to the national economy; training for government and protected area staff in the application of economic tools; launching vocational training courses for park officers; developing a database and software to measure protected areas’ management effectiveness and designing a system to monitor the country’s progress in the implementation of PoWPA. The project will be embedded within the National Implementation Support Partnership (NISP) and will be implemented in cooperation with TNC.

**Dominican Republic** (PoWPA Activities 1.1.5, 3.2.1, 3.4.1, and 4.1.2): The project is assisting with formulating a protected area system master plan for the national protected area network; undertaking a comprehensive protected area gap analysis; developing a national capacity building plan and conducting a series of thematic workshops; helping identify innovative financing mechanisms and design a monitoring system to track country’s progress in PoWPA implementation.

**Guatemala** (PoWPA Activities 2.1.2 ; 3.2.1 and 3.1.6): Under the auspices a NISP and in collaboration with international NGOs, funding will facilitate establishment of locally managed conservation areas; launch a capacity building action plan for the protected area system; test payment-for-ecosystem services mechanism in at least two protected areas and introduce a scorecard to measure the financial sustainability of the whole protected area system.

**Honduras** (PoWPA Activities 2.1.2; 3.1.2; 3.4.1): Funding will aid the establishment of legal mechanisms to promote private, indigenous and community protected areas and processes for assigning community and private reserves; undertake an economic valuation of natural resources of protected areas and study their contribution to the MDGs, and promote financial mechanisms for the sustainability of the protected areas system. The project will be implemented under the supervision of the country’s NISP Political and Technical Committees, in close collaboration with TNC.

**Liberia** (PoWPA Activity 1.2.1): The project will review the integration of protected areas into the country’s poverty reduction plans and policies; develop mechanisms for biodiversity-friendly coexistence of the poor residing close to protected areas and identify opportunities for alternative income generation. The project will be implemented by the Government in partnership with UNDP.

**Federated States of Micronesia** (PoWPA Activities 4.1.2, 4.2.1, 1.1.5, 3.2.1, and 3.4.1): Building on strong technical and financial support from the participating Governments and NGOs, funding will help the four states develop and adopt national standards and criteria for protected area planning and management to achieve the goals of the Micronesia Challenge; assist in the completion of pan-Micronesia comprehensive protected area gap analysis; launch a

---

<sup>26</sup> Full project applications can be downloaded from <http://www.protectedareas.org/approved-grants/>

protected area capacity building plan; develop a financial sustainability plan for the protected area system and launch a fund-raising strategy for the Micronesia's protected areas.

**Mongolia** (PoWPA Activities 1.1.1, 1.1.5, 3.2.1 and 3.4.1): Implemented in partnership with WWF and TNC, this project will focus on a countrywide protected area representative and ecological gap analysis; a national protected area capacity building programme; testing financing mechanisms for protected areas and aligning the National Programme on Protected Areas with PoWPA.

**Panama**: The project will focus solely on the protected area gap analysis (PoWPA Activity 1.1.5). The analysis will provide recommendations for prioritized action to protect highly threatened or highly valued areas taking into account regionally and nationally relevant criteria (i.e. ecological representation, integrity and connectivity). The project will complement the ongoing PoWPA activities under a NISP agreement.

**Samoa**: The project will concentrate on developing scientific knowledge which will help carry out a comprehensive up-to-date ecological gap analysis (Activity 1.1.5) and on capacity development (PoWPA Activity 3.2.1) following the launch of a permanent protected area training curriculum. In parallel, a second-phase proposal will be finalized, as more knowledge and capacity is gained from the Phase 1. Phase 2 will focus on the critical issue of conflicts between customary and government land ownership and conservation objectives, exacerbated by too few (as yet, untapped) rural economic development opportunities. The project will be implemented with support from local scientific community and Conservation International.

**Tajikistan** (PoWPA Activities 3.1.2, 3.1.5, 3.2.1, and 4.1.2): Funding will focus on the economic valuation of protected area resources; identification and removal of perverse sectoral incentives which are putting pressures on protected areas; launching a curriculum and training courses on protected areas and putting in place an electronic system for monitoring PoWPA implementation.

**The Gambia** (PoWPA Activities 1.1.4, 2.1.2, 3.1.6, and 4.2.1): Implemented by the Government in partnership with WWF, the project will concentrate on reviewing conservation models in the country and will support the establishment of a countrywide coalition for protected areas; facilitating the development of new country-tailored protected area governance types, including community engagement mechanisms; helping to launch an ecotourism programme and launching tools to track the management effectiveness of protected areas.

**Grenada**: The application will focus solely on Activity 3.1.2, helping the Government to assess the contribution of protected area resources to economy. The project, implemented in partnership with TNC will raise the *awareness* of the value of protected areas; generate a value for marine and terrestrial PAs to be used for *policy advocacy*; inform the design of the most effective tools for environmental *management*; identify willingness to pay and appropriate *charging* rates for environmental use; identify best methods to *extract finances* from environmental goods and services; and help to compare *costs and benefits* of different uses of the environment.

## ANNEX 6: GEF SUPPORT TO TAXONOMY

Table 1 – GEF Enabling activities with Taxonomic Component

### UNDP

- Antigua and Barbuda - Assessment of Capacity Building Needs & Country Specific Priorities (2002-2003)  
<http://www.gefonline.org/ProjectDocs/Biodiversity/Antigua%20and%20Barbuda%20-%20Assmt%20of%20Capacity%20Building%20Needs%20-%20Add%20on/Antigua%20Barbuda%20BD%20EA%20Add-on%20Nov%202022.doc>  
(Assessment of capacity building needs for initial assessment and monitoring programs, including taxonomy)
- Armenia - Assessment of Priority Capacity Building Needs for Biodiversity and Establishment of CHM Structures. (2000-2001)  
[http://www.gefonline.org/ProjectDocs/Biodiversity/Armenia-%20Assessment%20of%20Priority%20Capacity%20Building%20Needs/BSAP\\_II\\_Armenia.doc](http://www.gefonline.org/ProjectDocs/Biodiversity/Armenia-%20Assessment%20of%20Priority%20Capacity%20Building%20Needs/BSAP_II_Armenia.doc)  
(Assessment of capacity building needs for initial assessment and monitoring programs, including taxonomy)
- Azerbaijan Republic - Biodiversity Strategy, Action Plan and National Report (2000-2001) [http://www.gefonline.org/ProjectDocs/Biodiversity/Azerbaijan-Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan/EA\\_Azerbaijan1.doc](http://www.gefonline.org/ProjectDocs/Biodiversity/Azerbaijan-Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan/EA_Azerbaijan1.doc)  
(Assessment of capacity building needs for initial assessment and monitoring programs, including taxonomy)
- Barbados - Assessment of Capacity Building Needs and Country Specific Priorities in the Conservation of Biodiversity and Participation in the National Clearing House Mechanism (2005-06)  
(Assessment of capacity building needs for initial assessment and monitoring programs, including taxonomy)
- Belize - Assessment of capacity building needs and country specific priorities in biodiversity (2002-2003) [http://www.gefonline.org/ProjectDocs/Biodiversity/Belize\\_-\\_Assessment\\_of\\_Capacity\\_Building\\_Needs-add\\_on/Revised\\_Brief\\_03-06.doc](http://www.gefonline.org/ProjectDocs/Biodiversity/Belize_-_Assessment_of_Capacity_Building_Needs-add_on/Revised_Brief_03-06.doc)  
(Assessment of capacity building needs for initial assessment and monitoring programs, including taxonomy)
- Benin - Capacity Needs Assessment for the Implementation of the Benin's National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan, 2nd National Report, and Clearing House Mechanism. (2001-2002)  
[http://www.gefonline.org/ProjectDocs/Biodiversity/Benin\\_Capacity\\_Needs\\_Assessment...Biodiversity\\_Add\\_on/Bein-final-6.rtf](http://www.gefonline.org/ProjectDocs/Biodiversity/Benin_Capacity_Needs_Assessment...Biodiversity_Add_on/Bein-final-6.rtf)  
(Assessment of capacity building needs for initial assessment and monitoring programs, including taxonomy)



- Bhutan - Assessment of Capacity Building Needs and Country Specific Priorities in Biodiversity (2001-2002)  
<http://www.gefonline.org/ProjectDocs/Biodiversity/Bhutan%20-%20Additional%20Financing%20-%20Assessment%20of%20Capacity%20Building%20Needs/Bhutan%20-Add%20On%20-%20brief%20-11-06-01.doc>  
 (Assessment of capacity building needs for initial assessment and monitoring programs, including taxonomy)
- Botswana - National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (2001-2002)  
[http://www.gefonline.org/RAMON/Databases/Enabling Activities/1stQ 2001/Botswana Bio/BOT BSAP brief- 5.doc](http://www.gefonline.org/RAMON/Databases/Enabling%20Activities/1stQ%202001/Botswana%20Bio/BOT%20BSAP%20brief-5.doc)  
 (Assessment of capacity building needs for initial assessment and monitoring programs, including taxonomy)
- Bulgaria - Needs assessment and CHM establishment in Bulgaria (2001-2002)  
[http://www.gefonline.org/ProjectDocs/Climate Change/Bulgaria-Needs Assessment and CHM Establishment/Bulgaria BD Ea 2 - 27 Oct 2000.doc](http://www.gefonline.org/ProjectDocs/Climate%20Change/Bulgaria-Needs%20Assessment%20and%20CHM%20Establishment/Bulgaria%20BD%20Ea%202-27%20Oct%202000.doc)  
 (Assessment of capacity building needs for initial assessment and monitoring programs, including taxonomy)
- Burundi - Capacity Needs Assessment for the Implementation of the National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan and CHM Support (2002-2003)  
<http://www.gefonline.org/ProjectDocs/Biodiversity/Burundi%20-%20Capacity%20Needs%20Assessment%20for%20Implementation%20of%20BSAP%20and%20CHM%20Support/Burundi%20BD%20EA%20add%20on%20CHM%20brief.doc>  
 (Assessment of capacity building needs for initial assessment and monitoring programs, including taxonomy)
- Central African Republic – Capacity-Building Needs Assessment for the Implementation of the Central African Republic’s National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (2001-2001)  
<http://www.gefonline.org/ProjectDocs/Biodiversity/Central%20African%20Republic%20Needs%20Assessment%20of%20Nat%20Biodiversity/CAR%20BD%20EA%20add%20on%20proposal.doc>  
 (Capacity strengthening in taxonomy)
- Chad - Identification of Capacity-Building needs for the Implementation of the national BSAP (2003-2004, Add on project in 2004)  
[http://www.gefonline.org/ProjectDocs/Biodiversity/Chad - Identification of Capacity-building --Implementation of BSAP/Chad BSAP add-on June 30 \(OP revision\).doc](http://www.gefonline.org/ProjectDocs/Biodiversity/Chad%20-%20Identification%20of%20Capacity-Building%20--Implementation%20of%20BSAP/Chad%20BSAP%20add-on%20June%2030%20(OP%20revision).doc)  
 (Assessment of capacity building needs for initial assessment and monitoring programs, including taxonomy)
- Comoros - Capacity Needs Assessment for the implementation of the National Biodiversity Strategy and support to the Clearing House Mechanism (2004-2005)

<http://www.gefonline.org/ProjectDocs/Biodiversity/Comoros - Capacity Needs Assessment Natl BD Strategy Clearing House/Comoros EA Biodiversity Add on 29th Jan-031004.doc>

(Assessment of capacity building needs for initial assessment and monitoring programs, including taxonomy)

- Congo - Assessment of Capacity Needs for the Implementation of the Congo's National Biodiversity Strategy and Strengthening of Clearing House Mechanism (add on) – (2002-2003)

<http://www.gefonline.org/projectDetails.cfm?projID=1569>

(Assessment of capacity building needs for initial assessment and monitoring programs, including taxonomy)

- El Salvador - Assessment of capacity building needs and country specific priorities in biodiversity in El Salvador (2001-2002)

<http://www.gefonline.org/kathryn/BIO%20Team/Project%20Proposals/FP's%20%20MSP's%20&%20EA's/EL%20SALVADOR%20-%20add%20on-Assessment%20of%20Cap%20Building-revised-05-02-01.doc>

(Assessment of capacity building needs for initial assessment and monitoring programs, including taxonomy)

- Guinea – Identification of Capacity-Building Needs for Biodiversity Strategy Implementation and Strengthening of the CHM (2002-2003)

<http://www.gefonline.org/ProjectDocs/Biodiversity/Guinea - Identification of Capacity-Building Needs for BD Strategy/Guinea Add On 28June02.doc>

(Assessment of capacity building needs for initial assessment and monitoring programs, including taxonomy)

- Guinea-Bissau - Capacity-building needs assessment for the implementation of the National Biodiversity Strategy of Guinea-Bissau and Strengthening of Clearing House Mechanism (2001-2002)

<http://www.gefonline.org/ProjectDocs/Biodiversity/Guinea-Bissau%20-Capacity%20Building%20Needs%20-Additional%20Financing/GBS%20final%20add-on%20II.doc>

(Assessment of capacity building needs for initial assessment and monitoring programs, including taxonomy)

- Iran – Assessment of capacity building needs and country specific priorities in biodiversity (2001-2002)

<http://www.gefonline.org/ProjectDocs/Biodiversity/Iran%20-%20Additional%20Financing-%20Assessment%20of%20Capacity%20Building/Iran-%20add%20on%20brief%20-%202010-10-01.doc>

(Assessment of capacity building needs for initial assessment and monitoring programs, including taxonomy)

- Jordan – Assessment of Capacity Building Needs and Country/Authority Specific Priorities in Biodiversity (2001-2002)

<http://www.gefonline.org/projectDetails.cfm?projID=1434>

(Assessment of capacity building needs for initial assessment and monitoring programs, including taxonomy)

- Lebanon - Assessment of capacity building needs and country specific priorities in biodiversity (2001-2002)  
<http://www.gefonline.org/projectDetails.cfm?projID=1306>  
(Assessment of capacity building needs for initial assessment and monitoring programs, including taxonomy)
- Micronesia - Assessment of Capacity Building Needs and Country Specific Priorities in Biodiversity (2001-2002)  
<http://www.gefonline.org/ProjectDocs/Biodiversity/Micronesia%20-%20Assessment%20of%20Capacity-building%20Needs%20and%20Country%20Specific%20Priorities/Micronesia%20BD%20EA%20add%20on%20brief%2028Mar02.doc>  
(Assessment of capacity building needs for initial assessment and monitoring programs, including taxonomy)
- Nicaragua - Assessment of Capacity-building Needs (2001-2002)  
<http://www.gefonline.org/projectDetails.cfm?projID=1380>  
(Assessment of capacity building needs for initial assessment and monitoring programs, including taxonomy)
- Niger - Capacity Needs Assessment for the Implementation of the Niger's National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan and CHM Support (2002-2003)  
<http://www.gefonline.org/ProjectDocs/Biodiversity/Niger%20-%20Capacity%20Needs%20Asst%20--National%20Biodiversity%20Strategy%20--%20Add%20on/Niger%20BD%20EA%20Capacity%20Needs%20Asst%20proposal.doc>  
(Assessment of capacity building needs for initial assessment and monitoring programs, including taxonomy)
- Oman - Assessing Capacity-building Needs and Country-specific Priorities in Biodiversity (2001-2002)  
<http://www.gefonline.org/projectDetails.cfm?projID=1313>  
(Assessment of capacity building needs for initial assessment and monitoring programs, including taxonomy)
- Peru - Assessment of Capacity Building Needs for Implementation of the Convention on Biological Diversity (2000-2001)  
<http://www.gefonline.org/projectDetails.cfm?projID=995>  
(Assessment of capacity building needs for initial assessment and monitoring programs, including taxonomy)
- Philippines - Assessment of Capacity Building Needs for Biodiversity Conservation and Management in the Philippines. (2001-2002)  
<http://www.gefonline.org/projectDetails.cfm?projID=1440>

(Assessment of capacity building needs for initial assessment and monitoring programs, including taxonomy)

- Serbia and Montenegro - Biodiversity Strategy, Action Plan and National Report (2004-2005)  
<http://www.gefonline.org/projectDetails.cfm?projID=2477>  
(Assessment of capacity building needs for initial assessment and monitoring programs, including taxonomy)
- Sudan - Assessment of capacity building needs and country specific priorities in biodiversity management and conservation in Sudan- (2000-2000)  
<http://www.gefonline.org/projectDetails.cfm?projID=1070>  
(Assessment of capacity building needs for initial assessment and monitoring programs, including taxonomy)
- Swaziland - Assessment of Capacity Building Needs, Completion of the CHM Process and Preparation of the 2nd National Report to the CBD COP (2001-2002)  
<http://www.gefonline.org/projectDetails.cfm?projID=1292>  
(Assessment of capacity building needs for initial assessment and monitoring programs, including taxonomy)
- Syria - Assessment of capacity building needs and country specific priorities in biodiversity (2001-2002)  
<http://www.gefonline.org/projectDetails.cfm?projID=987>  
(Assessment of capacity building needs for initial assessment and monitoring programs, including taxonomy)
- Tajikistan - Additional financing for capacity assessment in biodiversity priority areas (2004-2006)  
<http://www.gefonline.org/projectDetails.cfm?projID=2528>  
(Assessment of capacity building needs for initial assessment and monitoring programs, including taxonomy)
- Uzbekistan – Assessment of Priority National Capacity Development Needs for Implementation of the BSAP and Establishment of CHM Structures (2005-06)  
(Assessment of capacity building needs for initial assessment and monitoring programs, including taxonomy)
- Yemen - Assessment of capacity building needs and country specific priorities in biodiversity - (2000-2001) <http://www.gefonline.org/projectDetails.cfm?projID=909>  
(Assessment of capacity building needs for initial assessment and monitoring programs, including taxonomy)
- Zimbabwe - Assessing Capacity Building Needs for Biodiversity Management and Development, and Consultations Leading to Preparation of Second National Report to CBD (add on)  
<http://www.gefonline.org/projectDetails.cfm?projID=1418>

(Assessment of capacity building needs for initial assessment and monitoring programs, including taxonomy)

- Global - Biodiversity Planning Support Programme (1998-2000)  
[http://www.gefweb.org/wprogram/July98/undp/bsp\\_req.doc](http://www.gefweb.org/wprogram/July98/undp/bsp_req.doc)  
(Capacity building in view of writing NBSAPs, guidelines on taxonom

#### World Bank

- Eritrea - Assessment of Capacity Building needs, for Biodiversity, Participation in Clearing house mechanism and Preparation of a second national report. (2002-2003)  
<http://www.gefonline.org/projectDetails.cfm?projID=1506>  
(Assessment of capacity building needs for initial assessment and monitoring programs, including taxonomy)
- Macedonia – Enabling Activity and Assessment of Capacity Building Needs Proposal in Biodiversity (2000-2002)  
<http://www.gefonline.org/projectDetails.cfm?projID=918>  
(Assessment of capacity building needs for initial assessment and monitoring programs, including taxonomy)
- Moldova - Assessment of capacity building needs and country specific priorities in biodiversity (2000-2001)  
<http://www.gefonline.org/projectDetails.cfm?projID=908>  
(Assessment of capacity building needs for initial assessment and monitoring programs, including taxonomy)
- Mongolia - Assessment of Capacity Building Needs and Country-Specific Priorities in Biodiversity (2000-2001)  
<http://www.gefonline.org/projectDetails.cfm?projID=866>  
(Assessment of capacity building needs for initial assessment and monitoring programs, including taxonomy)
- Ukraine - Assessment of capacity building needs and country specific priorities in biodiversity (2001-2002)  
<http://www.gefonline.org/projectDetails.cfm?projID=980>  
(Assessment of capacity building needs for initial assessment and monitoring programs, including taxonomy)

#### UNEP

- Bahamas – Assessment of Capacity Building needs to Conserve Biological Diversity, Participation in National Clearing House Mechanism, and Preparation of a Second National Report to CBD. (2001-2002)  
(taxonomy working group, which will organize workshop and contribute to National Report, training, assessment, networking, information network, collection, fill gaps in database)

- Barbados – National Biodiversity Strategy, Action Plan and First National Report to the CBD (1997- 1999)
- Belarus – Assessment of Capacity Building needs for biodiversity, participation in CHM, and Preparation of a Second National Report. (2001-2002). (assessment and monitoring)
- China – Capacity Building of Clearing House Mechanism and Preparation of a Second National Report to the COP (2002-2003) (databases, training, information system)
- Cote d’Ivoire – Assessment of Capacity-building needs for Biodiversity, Participation in CHM, and Preparation of a Second national Report (2001-2002) (Initial Assessment and monitoring programs including taxonomy)
- Cuba- Assessment of Capacity-Building Needs for Biodiversity, Participation in CHM and Preparation of Second National Report (2001-2002)
- 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 (Identify through a national and regional consultation process the capacity and need for the creation of a technical and scientific entity that can carry out the taxonomic investigations and other matters on biological diversity resources.)
- Estonia – Assessment of Capacity-Building Needs for Biodiversity and Participation in Clearing House Mechanism (2000-2001) (Assessment of capacity building needs for initial assessment and monitoring programs, including taxonomy)
- Gambia – Assessment of Capacity Building Needs for Biodiversity, Participation in CHM and Preparation of Second National Report (2001-2002) [http://www.gefonline.org/RAMON/Databases/Enabling\\_Activities/1stQ\\_2001/Gambia Bio/Gambia add on 20.12.00.rtf](http://www.gefonline.org/RAMON/Databases/Enabling_Activities/1stQ_2001/Gambia_Bio/Gambia_add_on_20.12.00.rtf)
- 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) (Initial assessment/monitoring including taxonomy)
- Korea DPR – Updating of National Biodiversity Strategic Action Plan, Preparation of 2<sup>nd</sup> national Reports, and Establishment of a National CHM (2005-06) (Assessing national taxonomic needs)
- Mauritania – Assessment of Capacity Building Needs for Biodiversity, Participation in CHM and Preparation of Second National Report (2001-2002) <http://www.gefonline.org/projectDetails.cfm?projID=990>(Assessment of capacity building needs for initial assessment and monitoring programs, including taxonomy)

- Namibia – Assessment of Capacity Building Needs to Conserve Biological Diversity - Add on (2005-06)  
(Complete Taxonomic Capacity Assessment for Namibia and submit to GTI)
- Panama- Assessment of Capacity-Building Needs for Biodiversity, Participation in CHM and Preparation of Second National Report (2001-2002)  
<http://www.gefonline.org/projectDetails.cfm?projID=988>  
(Assessment of capacity building needs for initial assessment and monitoring programs, including taxonomy)
- Poland - Biodiversity Enabling Activities: Assessment of Capacity Building Needs for Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Use (2001-2002)  
<http://www.gefonline.org/ProjectDocs/Biodiversity/Poland - Add-on -Assessment of Capacity Building Needs/Poland -Add-on-Assessment of Capacity Building - project brief -9-12-01.doc>  
(Assessment of capacity building needs for initial assessment and monitoring programs, including taxonomy)
- St. Lucia – Assessment of Capacity-building Needs for Biodiversity, Participation in CHM and Preparation of Second National Report (2001-2002)  
<http://www.gefonline.org/projectDetails.cfm?projID=991>  
(Assessment of capacity building needs for initial assessment and monitoring programs, including taxonomy)
- Vanuatu – Assessment of Capacity-Building Needs for Biodiversity and Participation in Clearing-House Mechanism (2000-2001)  
<http://www.gefonline.org/projectDetails.cfm?projID=860>  
(build scientific capacity, implying the inclusion of taxonomic)

**ANNEX 6- TABLE 2 PROJECT DETAILS**

| # | Country            | Title of Project   | GEF Agency | GEF Finance (\$ million) | Co-finance | Total Finance | Approximate Total Budget          | Date of Work Program Approval | Status            | Taxonomic activities  | Expected results of the Taxonomic component   |
|---|--------------------|--|------------|--------------------------|------------|---------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------|---|---|
| 1 | Belarus            | Biodiversity Protection  | WB         | 1                        | 0.25       | 1.25          | 0.225                             | 1991                          | Completed         | Seeds, pollen, and plant parts collection and storage, determination of genetic diversity | In-situ and ex-situ conservation in Berezinesky and Pripriatsky Reserves: activities include seed and plant parts collection and storage; in-situ conservation of native populations including scots pines and other species; determination of genetic diversity of selected individual plants and animals. |
| 2 | Columbia           | Conservation of Biodiversity in the Choco Region   | UNDP       | 6                        | 3          | 9             | no relevant information available | 1991                          | Completed         | Taxonomic identification and quantitative analysis of sampling, fenology studies          | no information available  |
| 3 | Poland             | Forest Biodiversity Protection   | WB         | 4.5                      | 1.7        | 6.2           | 3.56                              | 1991                          | Completed         | Gene bank, assessment and seed collection   | Ex-situ conservation of genetic materials in the Sudety forests, including investment in programs to preserve endangered forest ecosystems through a forest genebank and related archival nursery equipments.   |
| 4 | Costa Rica         | Conservation of Biodiversity and Sustainable Development in La Amistad and La osa Conservation Areas | UNDP       | 8                        | 0          | 8             | no relevant information available | 1991                          | Completed         | Inventories and paratoxonomos   | Research on the biodiversity of Osa and Amistad Conservation areas, including inventories and paratoxonomos   |
| 5 | Malawi             | Lake Malawi/ Nyasa Biodiversity Conservation   | WB         | 5                        | 0.44       | 5.44          | 2.46                              | 1991                          | Project Completed | taxonomy study on cichlid   | The research component includes: biodiversity surveys to inventory fish species and their distribution; studies on the taxonomy, ecology and distribution of the cichlid species; a limnology and water quality monitoring program  |
| 6 | Dominican Republic | Biodiversity Conservation and Management in the Coastal Zone of the Dominican Republic               | UNDP       | 3                        | 0          | 3             | no relevant information available | 1992                          | Completed         | Taxonomic database  | Distribution, systematic and the conservation status of plant and animal species in the coastal zone to contribute for sustainable coastal zone management, and long term monitoring. Databases will be organized by taxonomic groups and ecosystems.   |



| #  | Country   | Title of Project   | GEF Agency  | GEF Finance (\$ million) | Co-finance | Total Finance | Approximate Total Budget          | Date of Work Program Approval | Status            | Taxonomic activities  | Expected results of the Taxonomic component   |
|----|-----------|--|-------------|--------------------------|------------|---------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------|---|---|
| 7  | Indonesia | Biodiversity Collections   | WB and UNDP | 8.76                     | 4.2        | 12.96         | 12.96                             | 1992                          | Project Completed | collections, research, information systems management               | Strengthen the institutional capacity to support systematic biological collections, a basic reference tool for biodiversity inventory and monitoring. Project objectives include: restore and develop the collections and associated functions of the Botany and Zoology Divisions; design and establish a computerized database of specimen-based data for collections management, collection plans and development, and external use; and to strengthen the capacity to coordinate and foster collaborative biological research activities and client services.                                     |
| 8  | Turkey    | In-Situ Conservation of Genetic Biodiversity   | WB          | 5.1                      | 0.6        | 5.7           | 5.7                               | 1992                          | Project Completed | survey and inventory, development and training of human resources., | This project will identify and establish in-situ conservation areas for the protection of genetic resources and wild relatives of important crops and forest tree species that originated in Turkey, providing for sustainable in-situ conservation of genetic resources in cereals, horticultural crops, medicinal plants, forest trees, and pasture grasses and legumes through an integrated ecosystem approach. Project components include site surveys and inventories, gene management zones (GMZ), data management, a national plan for in-situ conservation, and institutional strengthening. |
| 9  | Uruguay   | Conservation of Biodiversity in the Eastern Wetlands                                   | UNDP        | 3                        | 0          | 3             | no relevant information available | 1992                          | Project Completed | inventory and database  | Increased knowledge and conservation of Eastern Wetland fauna and Flora. Activities include: inventory of species and electronic database; identification and study on migratory birds; identification of endemic, dominant, and scientifically interested species; study of phenology, physiology, biomass, and production of the plant biocenosis of the area.  |
| 10 | Ethiopia  | A Dynamic Farmer-Based Approach to the Conservation of African Plant Genetic Resources | UNDP        | 2.46                     | 0          | 2.46          | no relevant information available | 1992                          | Project Completed | inventory, storage, and database on crop species                    | Under the objective to strengthen the institutional capacity for planning and implementing in-situ conservation, activities include enhancing capacity to collect, characterize, document and store crop specimens and crop germplasm materials for, in situ conservation activities, enhance research capacity, and establish databases.   |

| #      | Country  | Title of Project  | GEF Agency | GEF Finance (\$ million) | Co-finance | Total Finance | Approximate Total Budget | Date of Work Program Approval | Status            | Taxonomic activities  | Expected results of the Taxonomic component  |
|--------|--|---|------------|--------------------------|------------|---------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------|---|--|
| 1<br>1 | Cameroon   | Biodiversity Conservation and Management  | WB         | 6.09                     | 6.43       | 12.52         | 0.91                     | 1993                          | Project Completed | zoological and botanical surveys and inventories                    | Improve the biological knowledge base of the project sites for effective conservation planning and management.   |
| 1<br>2 | Regional (Angola, Botswana, Lesotho, Malawi, Mozambique, Namibia, Swaziland, South Africa, Zambia, Zimbabwe) | SABONET: Inventory, Evaluation and Monitoring of Botanical Diversity in Southern Africa: A Regional Capacity and Institution Building Network | UNDP       | 4.72                     | 4.68       | 9.41          | 9.41                     | 1996                          | Project Completed | database, information management network, assessment and survey,    | The primary goal of the project is to develop a strong core of professional botanists, taxonomists and plant diversity specialists within the ten countries of southern Africa, competent to inventory, monitor and evaluate the botanical diversity of the region in the face of specific development challenges, and to respond to the technical and scientific needs of the Convention on Biological Diversity. |
| 1<br>3 | Argentina  | Biodiversity Conservation Project   | WB         | 10.39                    | 37.5       | 47.89         | 0.7                      | 1997                          | CEO Endors ed     | inventory, monitoring, develop information system                   | Develop a Biodiversity Conservation Project Information System and fully incorporate it in the National Environmental Information System. The project will conduct basic inventory and monitoring activities   |
| 1<br>4 | Costa Rica   | Biodiversity Resources Development Project  | WB         | 7.28                     | 13         | 20.38         | 5.6                      | 1997                          | Project Completed | training, inventory, laboratory                                     | 1) Biodiversity inventory: the actual collection of specimens of Hymenoptera, Coleoptera, vertebrate parasites, and fungi; cataloguing and information management activities; and 2) a development of a laboratory at the National Biodiversity Institute.   |
| 1<br>5 | Regional (Cameroon, Central African Republic, Congo, Guinea, Gabon, and Zaire)                               | Regional Environment and Information Management Project (REIMP)   | WB         | 4.37                     | 11.31      | 15.69         | 15.69                    | 1997                          | Project Completed | information network for data sharing, capacity building to use data | The main goal of the project is to improve the planning and management of natural resources in the Congo Basin, with a specific focus on biodiversity conservation, by providing the various stakeholders with appropriate information on the environment in response to the information needs they have identified and will identify  |

| #  | Country   | Title of Project  | GEF Agency | GEF Finance (\$ million) | Co-finance | Total Finance | Approximate Total Budget | Date of Work Program Approval | Status            | Taxonomic activities  | Expected results of the Taxonomic component   |
|----|-----------|---|------------|--------------------------|------------|---------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------|---|---|
| 16 | Sri Lanka | Conservation and Sustainable Use of Medicinal Plants              | WB         | 4.91                     | 20.4       | 25.31         | 25.31                    | 1997                          | Project Completed | inventory, taxonomic data collection and analysis   | Project will design and implement a medicinal plants conservation program. For five botanical reserves where medicinal plants are collected from the wild, it will support activities including baseline research, monitoring, and conservation planning. Ex-situ cultivation and conservation of medicinal plants will be supported too, through research on and promotion of ex-situ cultivation, and through enhancing ex-situ collections. Lastly, legal and policy reforms in support of medicinal plant conservation, a national information network, and training and awareness campaigns will be financed.                                      |
| 17 | Morocco   | Protected Areas Management  | WB         | 10.35                    | 3.4        | 13.75         | 3.5                      | 1998                          | CEO Endors ed     | database and monitoring system  | The component on strengthening national implementation capacity include activities to establish the taxonomy of individual species, using molecular biology, on order to characterize the genetic diversity of these species, and as the building block for developing detailed programs for in-situ genetic resource conservation.   |
| 18 | Peru      | In-Situ Conservation of Native Cultivars and Their Wild Relatives | UNDP       | 5.22                     | 1.2        | 6.42          | 4                        | 1998                          | Completed         | collection, inventories, and database development on genetic resources, development of gene centers | Components related to taxonomy are: 1) Traditional knowledge, techniques, and organizations required for the maintenance of agrobiodiversity are strengthened; 2) Awareness of the ecological, cultural, and nutritive value of wild relatives and native crops is enhanced at the local and national levels and mainstreamed into the programmes of educational and research institutions; 3) Policies, norms and mechanisms to motivate farmers to conserve agrobiodiversity are established; and 4) An information and monitoring system is established as a management tool for coordinating and planning agrobiodiversity conservation activities. |

| #  | Country                              | Title of Project  | GEF Agency | GEF Finance (\$ million) | Co-finance | Total Finance | Approximate Total Budget | Date of Work Program Approval | Status            | Taxonomic activities  | Expected results of the Taxonomic component   |
|----|--------------------------------------|---|------------|--------------------------|------------|---------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------|---|---|
| 19 | Regional (Algeria, Morocco, Tunisia) | Participatory Management of Plant Genetic Resources in Oases of the Maghreb           | UNDP       | 3.07                     | 3.5        | 6.57          | 2.2                      | 1998                          | Project Completed | developing methodologies for locating genetic diversity in cultivated and wild species, guidelines and training for appropriate collecting and sampling | The project will remove barriers to genetic erosion of date palm in the Maghreb region; namely (1) the replacement threat from national programmes, on in-situ genetic resources, that are multiplying and distributing only a few varieties of trees and (2); market forces that are encouraging a preference by farmers to grow only a few high value varieties of date palm to the exclusion of a wide range of other varieties. Together with the number of baseline programmes described, the project will form an integrated ecosystem approach to the management of the oases sites. |
| 20 | Ethiopia                             | Conservation and Sustainable Use of Medicinal Plants                                  | WB         | 1.91                     | 4.9        | 6.81          | 2                        | 1999                          | CEO Endors ed     | Gene bank, study, and database  | The project activity includes establishment of medicinal plant field Gene Bank and development of intellectual property rights policy and guidelines. Moreover, the project supports establishment of species database based on various research and studies.   |
| 21 | Peru                                 | Indigenous Management of Protected Areas in the Amazon                                | WB         | 10.35                    | 14         | 24.35         | 3                        | 1999                          | CEO Endors ed     | Inventory and database  | Project monitoring and evaluation component includes biodiversity information to be organized taxonomically.  |
| 22 | Columbia                             | Conservation and Sustainable Use of Biodiversity in High Andes Region                 | WB         | 15.35                    | 15         | 30.35         | 8.7                      | 2000                          | CEO Endors ed     | training, inventory, develop, information system  | Strengthen regional capacities through training efforts in taxonomy, for a unified biodiversity inventory collection. Development of a decentralized Biodiversity Information System for the Andean Region of Columbia.   |
| 23 | Egypt                                | Conservation and Sustainable Use of Medicinal Plants in Arid and Semi-Arid Ecosystems | UNDP       | 4.29                     | 4.77       | 9.05          | 1.18                     | 2000                          | CEO Endors ed     | survey, inventory of wild medicinal plants,   | Identify critically endangered medicinal plant species through: 1) update and complete existing survey data; 2) build local capacity to monitor and evaluate the enclosures, including genetic diversity analysis; 3) register and deposit genetic samples of target species in National Gene Bank; and other measures.   |

| #  | Country                              | Title of Project   | GEF Agency | GEF Finance (\$ million) | Co-finance | Total Finance | Approximate Total Budget | Date of Work Program Approval | Status       | Taxonomic activities                              | Expected results of the Taxonomic component  |
|----|--------------------------------------|--|------------|--------------------------|------------|---------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------|---|--|
| 24 | Kenya                                | Lake Baringo Community-based Integrated Land and Water Management Project                              | UNEP       | 0.75                     | 0.2        | 0.95          | 0.045                    | 2000                          | CEO Approval | Gene bank development                             | The component on Improved Sustainable Use of the lakes includes gene bank development through the preservation of important biological species of the Baringo region and the assessment. This activity will build on the experiences of the Kenya Marine and Fisheries Research Institute (KMFRI), Baringo Research Centre in formulating activities in collaboration with the community aimed at exploiting the lake resources sustainably.   |
| 25 | Ecuador                              | Albarradas in Coastal Ecuador: Rescuing Ancient Knowledge on Sustainable Use of Biodiversity           | WB         | 0.75                     | 2.35       | 3.1           | 0.365                    | 2000                          | CEO Approval | taxonomic study on species collected              | Botanical and Paleo-ethnobotanical determination of wild relatives of cultivars, and their dependence upon local ecosystems and the Albarrada technology. Activities include: 1) identification of wild relatives of cultivars from the ecosystems where ancient Albarradas occur; 2) Botanical collection of modern specimens for comparative analysis; 3) Rapid ecological assessment to identify the environmental conditions of each area; 4) Taxonomic studies of the species collected, geographical areas and priority taxonomic groups and Identification of the biological diversity characteristic of the region's ecology, and seed collection of endangered endemic species. |
| 26 | Regional (Ethiopia, Kenya, and Mali) | Conservation of Gramineae and Associated Arthropods for Sustainable Agricultural Development in Africa | UNEP       | 0.972                    | 1.56       | 2.532         | 2.3                      | 2001                          | CEO Approval | Taxonomic training, research, database,           | Capacity and capability of national agricultural research and extension systems and non-governmental organizations in monitoring, protecting, and promoting biodiversity of Gramineae and associated insects strengthened. Activities include: conduct short-term training courses to enhance taxonomic expertise of national scientists in collection, identification and use of Gramineae and insects in environmental monitoring and sustainable agriculture systems. Other components on sampling and database development are also closely related to taxonomy.   |
| 27 | Vietnam                              | In-situ Conservation of Native Landraces and their Wild Relatives in Vietnam                           | UNDP       | 0.925                    | 2.99       | 3.915         | 0.762                    | 2001                          | CEO Approval | Document taxonomy of species, inventory, research | Targeted research, information, management and analysis in support of Gene Management zone establishment and operationalization. Activities include document the taxonomy and polymorphism, environment, ecosystem, and exploitation of target species and their relatives.  |

| #  | Country                                | Title of Project   | GEF Agency | GEF Finance (\$ million) | Co-finance | Total Finance | Approximate Total Budget | Date of Work Program Approval | Status       | Taxonomic activities                          | Expected results of the Taxonomic component  |
|----|--|--|------------|--------------------------|------------|---------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------|---|--|
| 28 | Peru                                   | Inka Terra: An Innovative Partnership for Self-Financing Biodiversity Conservation & Community Development                             | WB/IFC     | 0.75                     | 11.36      | 12.11         | 0.55                     | 2003                          | CEO Approval | inventory, database, classification           | Under the forest management component, the project will enhance the biodiversity Inventory: The inventory on fauna and flora will be expanded over the course of this project so that comprehensive information will exist for many of the key species found within the reserve, including their ecology and potential sustainable uses. The information gathered through this exercise will be classified and made readily available in a database. This program component will be developed in collaboration with the Missouri Botanical Garden (MOBOT).   |
| 29 | Regional (Latin America and Caribbean) | Building the InterAmerican Biodiversity Information Network (IABIN)  | WB         | 6.65                     | 30.29      | 36.94         | 36.94                    | 2004                          | CEO Endorsed | exchange of taxonomic data, capacity building | The component to enhance interoperability and access to data includes activity to develop regional consensus on standards for communication, taxonomic information, metadata, controlled vocabularies, and record structures to ensure region-wide compatibility to promote greater coordination, better management and decision-making of biological information  |
| 30 | Tanzania                               | The Development and Management of the Selous-Niassa Wildlife Corridor  | UNDP       | 1                        | 1.06       | 2.06          | 0.458                    | 2004                          | CEO Approval | database, inventory.                          | Creation of reliable ecological and socio-economic databases for the corridor to serve as decision-making tools for communities and local authorities. Biological studies will be completed during years one and two. Socio-economic studies will identify primary economic practices and natural resources needs of the communities. Biological studies will include further refinement of the species inventories in the corridor, identification of threatened species, and needs assessments for the endemic species including, species endemic to the corridor, their specific range and habitat needs. |
| 31 | Argentina                              | In-Situ Conservation of Andean Crops and their Wild Relatives in the Humahuaca Valley, the Southernmost Extension of the Central Andes | UNDP       | 0.96                     | 0.9        | 1.86          | 0.255                    | 2005                          | CEO Endorsed | Survey, database,                             | Communities, indigenous farmers and local authorities have increased information on native crop varieties and wild relatives and on traditional knowledge and practices relevant to their cultivation, processing and improvement. Surveys will also include wild relatives of the target crops, and a database will be established that includes taxonomy, past and present distribution, and knowledge related to wild relatives of target crops present in the Humahuaca Valley.  |

| #            | Country                                    | Title of Project  | GEF Agency | GEF Finance (\$ million) | Co-finance   | Total Finance  | Approximate Total Budget | Date of Work Program Approval | Status           | Taxonomic activities          | Expected results of the Taxonomic component  |
|--------------|--|---|------------|--------------------------|--------------|----------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------|-------------------------------|--|
| 3<br>2       | Regional (Ethiopia, Uganda, Zambia, Ghana) | Removing Barriers to Invasive Plant Management in Africa                    | UNEP       | 5.72                     | 6.17         | 11.89          | 1.44                     | 2005                          | CEO Endors ed    | Capacity building             | Capacity built for multisectoral prevention and management of invasive alien species. Taxonomists will be trained on risk analysis and prevention.   |
| 3<br>3       | Brazil                                     | National Biodiversity Mainstreaming and Institutional Consolidation Project | WB         | 22                       | 75           | 97             | 30                       | 2006                          | Council approval | information sharing, database | The component on institutional strengthening and generation of biodiversity information for policymaking includes the establishment of the Brazilian Virtual Institute for Biodiversity, which could include information sharing on taxonomic related information. |
| <b>TOTAL</b> |  |   |            | <b>175.597</b>           | <b>282.2</b> | <b>457.867</b> | <b>180.22</b>            |                               |                  |                               |  |

## ANNEX 6

### Table 3 – Small Grants Programme

Gaza Strip – Assessing and restoring the Wild Plant Species in the Coastal Sand Dunes in the Gaza Strip (1999-2001)  
(capacity building, trained students in taxonomy, research)

Papua New Guinea – Biological Inventory of the Kuper Range/Lake Trist Conservation Area (1994-1995)

Turkey – Inventory of Endemic Plant Species in the GAP Region (South-East Anatolia) in Turkey (1998-2000)



## ANNEX 7. MULTI FOCAL AREA PROJECTS

| Country   | Project Title   | Biodiversity Allocation |
|---|---|-------------------------|
| Regional (Costa Rica, Panama)   | Sustainable Environmental Management for Sixaola River Basin  | 0.80                    |
| Brazil  | Caatinga Conservation and Sustainable Management Project  | 6.00                    |
| Philippines   | National Program Support for Environment and Natural Resources Management Project (NPS-ENRMP)                                       | 2.00                    |
| Regional (Albania, Algeria, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, Egypt, Lebanon, Libya, Macedonia, Morocco, Serbia, Syria, Tunisia, Turkey) | World Bank-GEF Investment Fund for the Mediterranean Sea Large Marine Ecosystem Partnership, Tranche 1, 1st Allocation              | 5.00                    |
| Global  | SGP Small Grants Program, 4th Operational Phase, RAF Allocation 2   | 3.13                    |
| Global  | SGP Small Grants Program, 4th Operational Phase, RAF Allocations 1  | 9.66                    |
| India   | SLEM/PPP-Sustainable Rural Livelihood Security through Innovations in Land and Ecosystem Management                                 | 3.00                    |
| India   | SLEM/PPP-Sustainable Land Management in Shifting Cultivation Areas of Nagaland for Ecological and Livelihood Security               | 1.80                    |
| Iran  | SFM Rehabilitation of Forest Landscapes and Degraded Land with Particular Attention to Saline Soils and Areas Prone to Wind Erosion | 1.11                    |
| Global  | Carbon Benefits Project (CBP): Modeling, Measurement and Monitoring   | 1.67                    |
| Indonesia   | SFM Strengthening Community Based Forest and Watershed Management (SCBFWM)  | 3.50                    |
| Regional (Indonesia, Malaysia, Philippines, Thailand, Vietnam, Singapore, Brunei)   | SFM Rehabilitation and Sustainable Use of Peatland Forests in South-East Asia   | 2.51                    |
| Paraguay  | SFM Improving the Conservation of Biodiversity in Atlantic Forest of Eastern Paraguay   | 1.00                    |
| Slovak Republic   | Integration of Ecosystem Management Principles and Practices into Land and Water Management of Slovakia's Eastern Lowlands          | 0.97                    |
|   |   | 42.15                   |

**ANNEX 8: LIST OF GEF DOCUMENTS AVAILABLE AT THE  
NINTH SESSION OF THE CONFERENCE OF PARTIES**

Documents for general information

- Financing the Stewardship of Global Biodiversity
- GEF: Indigenous Communities and Biodiversity Conservation
- Mainstreaming Biodiversity in Production Landscapes and Sectors
- GEF Global Support for Biodiversity Conservation: Fact Sheets
- GEF Support to Wilderness Area

Reports of the GEF Evaluation Office

- Biodiversity Program Study
- The GEF M&E Policy
- Country Portfolio Evaluations of the Philippines, Samoa and Costa Rica
- Signposts (2-page summaries of evaluations)

-----