

Convention on Biological Diversity

Distr.
GENERAL

CBD/SBI/2/8/Add.1
4 May 2018

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

SUBSIDIARY BODY ON IMPLEMENTATION

Second meeting
Montreal, Canada, 9-13 July 2018
Item 9 of the provisional agenda

FINANCIAL MECHANISM (ARTICLE 21)

Preliminary report of the Global Environment Facility

INTRODUCTION

1. In paragraph 8(e) of decision XII/30, the Conference of the Parties invited the Global Environment Facility to “make available a preliminary draft of its report to the Conference of the Parties, particularly focusing on the response of the Global Environment Facility to previous guidance from the Conference of the Parties, to the Subsidiary Body on Implementation prior to the meeting of the Conference of the Parties at which the report will be formally considered, with a view to promoting effective and timely consideration of the information provided in the report”.

2. Pursuant to the above, the Executive Secretary is circulating herewith the preliminary report of the Global Environment Facility. The report in English, French and Spanish is reproduced as it was received by the Secretariat.



Naoko Ishii
CEO and Chairperson

April 30, 2018

Ms. Cristiana Páez Palmer
Executive Secretary
Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity
Montreal, Canada

Dear Ms. Palmer:

It is with great pleasure that I submit to the CBD the Report of the Global Environment Facility to the Second Meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Implementation to be held in Montreal, Canada from July 9-13, 2018.

The GEF is submitting this report to SBI-2 in response to the invitation by the Conference of the Parties to the Global Environment Facility to provide a preliminary draft of its official report to the Conference of the Parties with a particular focus on the response of the GEF to previous guidance from the Conference of the Parties (decision XII/30, para. 8 (e)). This draft report only covers the period July 1, 2016 to March 15, 2018 given the formal submission date to the SBI-2. The final report to the COP will cover the period from July 1, 2016 to June 30, 2018.

Attached is the full English version.

As a courtesy, and consistent with our past practice, we will provide Spanish and French versions of this document shortly.

Sincerely yours,


for Naoko Ishii

April 12, 2018

DRAFT CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES 14 REPORT OF THE GLOBAL
ENVIRONMENT FACILITY PRESENTED TO THE SECOND MEETING OF THE
SUBSIDIARY BODY ON IMPLEMENTATION OF THE
CONVENTION ON BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	Page 5
Full Report	
I. Project Activities to Support Implementation of the CBD	Page 13
II. GEF Response to Guidance from CBD COP 13	Page 27
III. Progress Report on GEF-6 Corporate Results and Targets	Page 36
IV. Monitoring and Evaluation Results	Page 38
V. Seventh Replenishment of the GEF Trust Fund	Page 41
ANNEX 1: Projects and Programs Approved During the Reporting Period	Page 42

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1. This draft report to the Conference of the Parties (COP) to the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) provides information on the activities of the Global Environment Facility (GEF) in the biodiversity focal area, other CBD-relevant GEF focal areas, along with Integrated Approach Pilots and Sustainable Forest Management investments that generate global biodiversity benefits, covering the period from July 1, 2016 to March 15, 2018. In addition, since the report comes at the end of the GEF-6 phase, programming information from July 1, 2014 to March 15, 2018 is included. The final COP report will cover activities from July 1, 2014 to June 30, 2018.
2. As of March 15, 2018, \$777 million (74%) of the total resources allocated to GEF-6 STAR biodiversity country allocations (\$1.051 billion) has been programmed, as shown in Table 1. The *total* amount of GEF biodiversity resources programmed to implement projects and programs was \$1.01 billion or about 78% of the total resources allocated to the biodiversity focal area during GEF-6 (\$1.296 billion).

Table 1. Summary of Programming Usage of the GEF-6 GEF Biodiversity Focal Area Resources (July 1, 2014 to March 15, 2018) ¹

Biodiversity Focal Area	GEF-6 Programming Targets (\$ million)	GEF-6 Programming (\$ million)	GEF-6 Programming (%)
STAR Country Allocations	1,051	777.2	74
STAR Set-aside			
Biodiversity FA Set Aside	50	41.4	83
Convention obligations	13	23.9	184
Global and Regional Biodiversity Projects and Programs	37	17.5	47
Integrated Approach Program Set-asides	45	45	100
Taking Deforestation out of the Commodities Supply Chain	35	35	100
Fostering Sustainability and Resilience of Production Systems in Africa	10	10	100
Sustainable Forest Management Set-aside	150	148.5	99
Total STAR Set-aside	245	234.9	96
Total Resources	1,296	1,012	78

¹ The figures include agency fees and project preparation grants.

3. Table 2 below depicts the contribution of country allocations to achieving the Aichi Biodiversity Targets.

Table 2. Distribution of GEF-6 STAR Country Allocations by Biodiversity Focal Area Objectives and Programs and Contributions to Achieving the Aichi Biodiversity Targets (July 1, 2014 to March 15, 2018)²

Biodiversity Objective and Program	Aichi Targets ³	GEF Project Grant (\$ million)	Cofinancing (\$ million)	Total Resources (\$ million)
BD-1 Program 1: Improving Financial Sustainability & Effective Management of the National Ecological Infrastructure	Target 11	137.7	660.7	798.4
BD-1 Program 2: Nature's Last Stand: Expanding the Reach of the Global Protected Area Estate	Target 11	80.4	417.3	497.7
BD-2 Program 3: Preventing the Extinction of Known Threatened Species	Target 12	72.6	345.0	417.6
BD-2 Program 4: Prevention, Control & Management of Invasive Alien Species	Target 9	35.5	146.3	181.7
BD-2 Program 5: Implementing the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety	No directly associated target	4.2	7.6	11.8
BD-3 Program 6: Ridge to Reef+: Maintaining Integrity & Function of Coral Reef Ecosystems	Targets 6 and 10	13.5	73.3	86.8
BD-3 Program 7: Securing Agriculture's Future: Sustainable Use of Plant & Animal Genetic Resources	Targets 7 and 13	37.7	325.9	363.7
BD-3 Program 8: Implement the Nagoya Protocol on ABS	Target 16	31.8	140.5	172.3
BD-4 Program 9: Managing the Human-Biodiversity Interface	Targets 3, 5, 6, 7, 14, 15	303.3	1,577.6	1,880.9
BD-4 Program 10: Integration of Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services into Development & Finance Planning	Targets 2 and 20	26.5	152.1	178.6
BD-Enabling Activity: National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (NBSAP) revisions ⁴	Target 17	18.6	13.0	31.7
Totals (does not include biosafety)		761.8	3,859.3	4,621.1


² These figures do not include agency fees or project preparation grant amounts as these amounts cannot be associated with specific GEF biodiversity programs or Aichi Targets.

³ As a general principle, the analysis avoids double counting of resource programming even though most projects are simultaneously contributing to more than one target within project components and through the same set of activities. Therefore, project amounts are allocated to specific targets, based on the primary and secondary measurable outcomes as presented in each project design.

⁴ Most of GEF-eligible countries (94%) received funds in GEF-5 to revise their NBSAP. An additional four countries have received support in GEF-6, bringing the overall total to 97% of GEF-eligible countries.

4. Over the past 15 years, countries have consistently prioritized funding the management of their protected area systems when allocating their GEF resources. However, in GEF-6, a significant shift in prioritization is observed, as presented in Figure 1. Countries are investing most of their resources in improving biodiversity management in productive landscapes and seascapes with 57% of STAR country allocations being directed to supporting activities outside the formal protected area estate, with 29% being directed towards protected area management.
5. The investments in productive landscapes and seascapes include sustainable use of agrobiodiversity and preventing extinction of known threatened species, in addition to more traditional biodiversity mainstreaming investments under GEF Programs 9 and 10. This trend to invest more GEF resources in the management of biodiversity outside the protected area estate was first observed in GEF-5.

Figure 1. Cumulative Distribution of STAR Country Allocations and Cofinancing by Biodiversity Focal Area Objectives and Programs for GEF-6 (July 1, 2014 to March 15, 2018)



6. The GEF-6 biodiversity strategy noted the contributions from other GEF programming areas given the comprehensive nature of the CBD Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2010-2020 and the fact that many thematic areas in the Strategic Plan are addressed through other GEF focal areas and programming modalities. Therefore, the report presents the totality of these contributions and their relationship to the Aichi Biodiversity Targets as it provides a more accurate portrayal of total GEF support to implementation of the Strategic Plan. Furthermore, it captures the evolution within both the GEF and CBD towards implementing integrated responses to address the drivers of biodiversity loss which necessitates engagement with a wide array of actors not traditionally associated with the biodiversity sector.
7. Table 3 below presents a summary of all contributions to achieving the Aichi Biodiversity Targets through various funding streams during GEF-6. In sum, \$1.543 billion of GEF resources have leveraged \$ 7.986 billion of cofinancing; a ratio of 1 to 5. This level of cofinancing has resulted in a total of \$9.529 billion being invested towards the implementation of the Strategic Plan and achieving the Aichi Biodiversity from July 1, 2014 to March 15, 2018.
8. Of the \$1.5 billion of GEF resources invested, 50% comes from the biodiversity focal area STAR allocations, and the remaining 50% of resources come from the biodiversity focal area set aside and other funding streams within the GEF.

Table 3. Cumulative Direct Contribution of all GEF Resources to the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and the Aichi Biodiversity Targets (July 1, 2014 to March 15, 2018)⁵

Funding Source	GEF Grant (\$ million)	% of GEF Total Grant	Cofinancing (\$ million)	% of Co-financing	Total (GEF Grant & Cofinancing) (\$ million)	% of total (GEF Grant & Cofinancing)
Biodiversity Focal Area STAR allocations	777.2	50%	3859	48%	4636.2	47%
Sustainable Forest Management (SFM) Program	205.1	13%	1189	15%	1394.1	15%
Climate Change Mitigation	218.5	14%	829.6	10%	1048.1	11%
International Waters Focal Area	134	9%	1096	14%	1230.0	13%
Integrated Approach Pilot (Commodity Supply Chains)	40.3	3%	443.2	5%	483.5	5%
Non-grant instrument Pilot	29.3	2%	218.2	3%	247.5	3%
Least Developed Countries Fund	102.6	7%	314.1	4%	416.7	5%
Small Grants Programme	36	2%	37	1%	73	1%
Totals	1543		7986.1		9529.1	

⁵ These figures do not include agency fees or project preparation grant amounts as these amounts cannot be associated with specific GEF biodiversity programs or Aichi Targets.

9. A comprehensive accounting of GEF's response to guidance contained in decisions adopted at the twelfth COP to CBD, namely Decision XII/30, a summary of portfolio monitoring results and key findings of the GEF Independent Evaluation Office are also presented in this report.
10. In dollar terms, the biodiversity focal area projects account for 27% of total GEF Trust Fund utilization from the pilot phase to GEF-6. Based on the review of 554 terminal evaluations, 83% of biodiversity projects had satisfactory outcome ratings.
11. As part of the GEF-6 Replenishment Agreement, a series of corporate targets were agreed. Table 4 below provides the cumulative targets presented in GEF Council approved concepts (Project Information Forms-PIFs) during the reporting period from July 1, 2014 to March 15, 2018 on the most relevant targets to the CBD and the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2010-2020. The cumulative targets represent key expected outcomes from these projects.
12. With regards to the expected results for the area target "Maintain globally significant biodiversity and the ecosystem goods and services that it provides to society", two programmatic approaches funded in GEF-6, the Amazon Sustainable Landscapes Program (ASL) and the Global Wildlife Program (GWP), have covered a much larger area than originally expected due to the ambition of the countries involved in these programs. The ASL coverage target is 80 million hectares and the GWP is 29 million hectares for a total of 109 million hectares from these two programs, which is 36% of the original target of 300 million. Thus, it is these two programs that drive the achievement rate of 142% for this target.
13. With regards to the expected results for the area target on "Sustainable land management in production systems", we expect almost full achievement of the target when CEO endorsements are submitted with increases in area-based outcomes as a result of the project design phase. We will reflect these changes in the final report presented to COP-14.
14. The shortfall in achieving the target on "Globally over-exploited fisheries moved to more sustainable levels" is largely due to the reduction in the expected impact of the Coastal Fisheries Initiative (CFI) Programme.

Table 4. Progress towards GEF-6 Replenishment Targets during GEF-6 (July 1, 2014 to March 15, 2018)

Indicators	Target	Expected Results	Completion Rate
Maintain globally significant biodiversity and the ecosystem goods and services that it provides to society			
Landscapes and seascapes under improved management for biodiversity conservation (million hectares)	300	426	142%
Sustainable land management in production systems (agriculture, rangelands and forest landscapes)			
Production landscapes under improved management (million hectares)	120	56	47%
Promotion of collective management of transboundary water systems and implementation of the full range of policy, legal, and institutional reforms and investments contributing to sustainable use and maintenance of ecosystem services			
Number of freshwater basins in which water-food-energy-ecosystem security and conjunctive management of surface and groundwater is taking place	10	27	270%
Globally over-exploited fisheries moved to more sustainable levels (percent of fisheries, by volume)	20	12	60%

FULL REPORT

I. Project Activities to Support Implementation of the CBD and the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and Achievement of the Aichi Biodiversity Targets

1. This draft report to the Conference of the Parties (COP) to the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) provides information on the activities of the Global Environment Facility (GEF) in the biodiversity focal area, other CBD-relevant GEF focal areas, along with Integrated Approach Pilots and Sustainable Forest Management investments that generate global biodiversity benefits, covering the period from July 1, 2016 to March 15, 2018 (the final report presented to COP-14 will cover the period up to June 30, 2018). In addition, since the report comes at the end of the GEF-6 phase, programming information from July 1, 2014 to March 15, 2018 is included. The final COP report will cover activities from July 1, 2014 to June 30, 2018.
2. The GEF-6 biodiversity strategy noted the contributions of the biodiversity focal area to achieving the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and the Aichi Biodiversity Targets. In addition, contributions from other GEF programming areas were identified given the comprehensive nature of the Strategic Plan and the fact that many thematic areas in the Strategic Plan are addressed through other GEF focal areas and programming modalities. These other programming areas include the Sustainable Forest Management program (SFM), the International Waters Focal Area (IW), the Climate Change Focal Area (CC-M), the Least Developed Countries Fund for adaptation (LDCF), the Integrated Approach Pilots (IAPs), the Non-grant Instrument (NGI) pilot, and the Small Grants Programme (SGP). The contribution of the GEF Small Grants Programme (SGP) to the Strategic Plan is focused on at least twelve Aichi Targets, and is reported in the final summary table.
3. This draft report to CBD presents the totality of these contributions and their relationship to the Aichi Biodiversity Targets to provide a more accurate portrayal of total GEF support to implementation of the Strategic Plan. Furthermore, the report captures the evolution within both the GEF and CBD towards implementing integrated responses to address the drivers of biodiversity loss which necessitates engagement with a wide array of actors not traditionally associated with the biodiversity sector.
4. Table 1 below provides a summary of resource usage from the biodiversity focal area during GEF-6 up to March 15, 2018. As of March 15, 2018, \$777.2 million (74%) of the total resources allocated to STAR biodiversity country allocations (\$1.051 billion) have been programmed. The *total* amount of GEF biodiversity resources programmed to implement projects and programs was \$1.012 billion or about 78% of the total resources allocated to the biodiversity focal area during GEF-6 (\$1.296 billion). These resources have been programmed through 211 projects using biodiversity resources, either in stand-alone biodiversity projects/programs or multi-focal area projects and 11 programmatic approaches. These figures include agency fees and Project Preparation Grants (PPGs).

5. The GEF Council, at its 51st meeting in October 2016, approved a measure to address the funding shortfall resulting from currency fluctuations⁶. The Council decided that allocations for least developed countries, small island developing states, biodiversity focal-area set-asides, and Enabling Activities should be protected on a priority basis.

Table 1. Summary of Programming Usage of the GEF-6 Biodiversity Focal Area (July 1, 2014 to March 15, 2018)⁷

Biodiversity Focal Area	GEF-6 Programming Targets (\$ million)	GEF-6 Programming (\$ million)	GEF-6 Programming (%)
STAR Country Allocations	1,051	777.2	74%
STAR Set-aside			
Biodiversity FA Set Aside	50	41.4	83
Convention obligations	13	23.9	184
Global and Regional Biodiversity Projects and Programs	37	17.5	47
Integrated Approach Program Set-asides	45	45	100
Taking Deforestation out of the Commodities Supply Chain	35	35	100
Fostering Sustainability and Resilience of Production Systems in Africa	10	10	100
Sustainable Forest Management Set-aside	150	148.5	99
Total STAR Set-aside	245	234.9	96
Total Resources	1,296	1,012	78

⁶ <http://www.thegef.org/council-meeting-documents/update-gef-6-resource-availability-0>

⁷ The figures include agency fees and project preparation grants.

Biodiversity Focal Area

6. The GEF-6 biodiversity strategy is composed of ten programs that directly contribute to implementing the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2010-2020 and achieving the Aichi Biodiversity Targets through a continuum of measures that address the most critical drivers of biodiversity loss across entire landscapes and seascapes. The programs include direct conservation/protection, threat-reduction, sustainable use, and biodiversity mainstreaming approaches. Each program provides a response to threats and opportunities that are spatially and thematically targeted, i.e., provide a focused and calibrated response in a specific ecosystem or location in a landscape or seascape. In addition, for the first time, the strategy addresses the most critical underlying driver of biodiversity loss; the failure to account for and price the full economic value of ecosystems and biodiversity. As such, GEF's biodiversity strategy reflects the GEF 2020 strategy and its emphasis on addressing drivers of global environmental degradation, and supporting innovative and scalable activities that deliver the highest impacts, cost-effectively.
7. The GEF-6 biodiversity strategy clearly identifies the relationship of the ten GEF programs to the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity and the Aichi Biodiversity Targets. Table 2 below depicts the contribution of GEF biodiversity resources to achieving the Aichi Biodiversity Targets as prioritized by countries in the projects that have been submitted and approved during GEF-6 until March 15, 2018.
8. Whereas some GEF biodiversity programs have a one-to-one relationship to Aichi biodiversity targets such as Target 11 on protected areas, other GEF programs contribute to multiple Aichi targets making the reporting of resource allocation per target very challenging if not impossible. This is particularly true in the realm of biodiversity mainstreaming under Program 9 (Managing the Human-Biodiversity Interface) where an analysis of the resources invested on a dollar basis in biodiversity mainstreaming projects revealed that GEF project activities often contribute to more than one Aichi biodiversity target given the integrated nature of these investments and the description of the targets themselves. For the sake of the presentation of programming resources in the following tables, these targets are clustered together and have not been disaggregated by the total amount of resources invested on a target by target basis.

Table 2. Distribution of GEF-6 Biodiversity Focal Area Resources by Biodiversity Focal Area Objectives and Programs and Contributions to Achieving the Aichi Biodiversity Targets (July 1, 2014 to March 15, 2018)⁸

Biodiversity Objective and Program	Aichi Targets ⁹	GEF Project Grant (\$ million)	Cofinancing (\$ million)	Total resources (\$ million)
BD-1 Program 1: Improving Financial Sustainability & Effective Management of the National Ecological Infrastructure	Target 11	137.7	660.7	798.4
BD-1 Program 2: Nature's Last Stand: Expanding the Reach of the Global Protected Area Estate	Target 11	80.4	417.3	497.7
BD-2 Program 3: Preventing the Extinction of Known Threatened Species	Target 12	72.6	345.0	417.6
BD-2 Program 4: Prevention, Control & Management of Invasive Alien Species	Target 9	35.5	146.3	181.7
BD-2 Program 5: Implementing the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety	No directly associated target	4.2	7.6	11.8
BD-3 Program 6: Ridge to Reef+: Maintaining Integrity & Function of Coral Reef Ecosystems	Targets 6 and 10	13.5	73.3	86.8
BD-3 Program 7: Securing Agriculture's Future: Sustainable Use of Plant & Animal Genetic Resources	Targets 7 and 13	37.7	325.9	363.7
BD-3 Program 8: Implement the Nagoya Protocol on ABS	Target 16	31.8	140.5	172.3
BD-4 Program 9: Managing the Human-Biodiversity Interface	Targets 3,5,6,7,14, 15	303.3	1,577.6	1,880.9
BD-4 Program 10: Integration of Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services into Development & Finance Planning	Targets 2 and 20	26.5	152.1	178.6
BD-Enabling Activity: NBSAP revisions ¹⁰	Target 17	18.6	13.0	31.7
Totals (does not include biosafety)		761.8	3,859.3	4,621.1


⁸ These figures do not include agency fees or project preparation grant amounts as these amounts cannot be associated with specific GEF biodiversity programs or Aichi Targets.

⁹ As a general principle, we avoided double counting resource programming even though most projects are simultaneously contributing to more than one target at the same time within project components and through the same set of activities. Therefore, we chose to allocate project amounts to specific targets, based on the primary and secondary measurable outcomes as presented in each project design.

¹⁰ Most countries (94%) of GEF-eligible countries received funds in GEF-5 to revise their NBSAP. An additional four countries have received support in GEF-6, bringing the overall total to 97% of GEF-eligible countries.

9. Over the past 15 years, countries have consistently prioritized funding the management of their protected area systems when allocating their resources. However, in the last two years of GEF-6, countries continued shifting priorities as presented in Figure 1, with countries investing most of their resources in improving biodiversity management in productive landscapes and seascapes with 57% of STAR country allocations of biodiversity resources being directed to supporting activities outside of the formal protected area estate with 29% being directed towards protected area management. This includes investments in sustainable use of agrobiodiversity, management of invasive alien species thorough systemic approaches, reducing the illegal wildlife trade, in addition to more traditional biodiversity mainstreaming investments under GEF Programs 9 and 10. This trend to invest more GEF resources in the management of biodiversity outside the protected area estate was first observed in GEF-5.

Figure 1. Cumulative Distribution of STAR Country Allocations and Cofinancing by Biodiversity Focal Area Objectives and Programs for GEF-6 during the Reporting Period (July 1, 2014 to March 15, 2018)



Project Preparation Grants (PPGs)

10. As a first step in project development, the GEF provides financing to assist recipient countries to develop a project concept (PIF) into a project proposal for CEO endorsement. Eighty (80) project preparation grants (PPGs) were approved in the reporting period amounting to \$10.7 million plus a PPG Fee of \$0.99 million.¹¹

Support for the Implementation the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety to the Convention on Biological Diversity

11. During the reporting period, the GEF funded two country-based projects (Cuba and Guatemala) in support of the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety. GEF invested \$3.2 million leveraging \$4.6 million in co-financing.

Support to Ratification and Implementation of the Nagoya Protocol on Access to Genetic Resources and the Fair and Equitable Sharing of Benefits Arising from their Utilization to the Convention on Biological Diversity

12. During the reporting period the GEF approved six country-based projects (Brazil, Cambodia, Congo DR, Lesotho, Timor Leste, and Uganda) to strengthen the required technical, legal, and institutional capacities to implement the Nagoya Protocol. GEF invested \$15.3 million and leveraged \$50.4 million in co-financing.
13. During the reporting period, the GEF approved a global project to support 65 countries to produce an Interim National Report. The GEF invested \$1.4 million and leveraged \$1.1 million in cofinancing.

Sustainable Forest Management

14. The GEF-6 SFM Strategy advocates an integrated approach at the landscape level, embracing ecosystem principles and including livelihood objectives in the management of forest ecosystems. The strategy's four objectives and programs make direct contributions to forest protection (Target 11), forest management (Target 7), forest restoration (Targets 14 and 15), and technology and knowledge transfer (Target 19). Table 3 below depicts the contribution of GEF SFM resources to achieving the Aichi Biodiversity Targets as prioritized by countries. Please note that SFM Program 3 contributes to Target 14 and 15 whereas the other programs are directly related to one Aichi Target each.

¹¹ These figures include the full amount of the PPGs for programmatic approaches that include biodiversity resources.

Table 3. Cumulative Distribution of GEF Resources by Sustainable Forest Management (SFM) Focal Area Objectives and Programs for GEF-6 and contributions to achieving the Aichi Biodiversity Targets during the Reporting Period (July 1, 2016 to March 15, 2018)¹²

SFM Objective and Program	Aichi Biodiversity Targets	GEF Project Grant (\$ million)	Cofinancing (\$ million)	Total resources (\$ million)
SFM 1: Maintained Forest Resources: Reduce the pressures on high conservation value forests by addressing the drivers of deforestation	Target 11	3.9	110.8	114.7
SFM 2: Enhanced Forest Management: Maintain flows of forest ecosystem services and improve resilience to climate change through SFM	Target 7	24.5	151.2	175.8
SFM 3: Restored Forest Ecosystems: Reverse the loss of ecosystem services within degraded forest landscapes	Targets 14 and 15	2.2	17.5	19.8
SFM 4: Increased Regional and Global Cooperation: Enhanced regional and global coordination on efforts to maintain forest resources, enhance forest management and restore forest ecosystems through the transfer of international experience and know-how	Target 19	0.04	2.6	2.6
Totals		30.6	282.1	312.7

Climate Change Mitigation Focal Area

15. The goal of the GEF-6 Climate Change Mitigation Strategy is to support developing countries and economies in transition to make transformational shifts towards a low emission development path. The most critical direct contribution to achieving the Aichi Biodiversity Targets by the climate change mitigation strategy is through the land-based activities supported under Program 4 to promote conservation and enhancement of carbon stocks in forest, and other land-use, and support climate smart agriculture. Table 4 below depicts the contribution of GEF climate change resources to achieving Aichi Biodiversity Target 15 as prioritized by countries.

¹² These figures do not include agency fees or project preparation grant amounts as these amounts cannot be associated with specific GEF biodiversity programs or Aichi Targets.

Table 4. Cumulative Distribution of GEF-6 Resources by Climate Change Focal Area Objectives and Programs for GEF 6 and Contributions to Achieving the Aichi Biodiversity (July 1, 2016-March 15, 2018)¹³

Climate Change Objective and Program	Aichi Biodiversity Targets	GEF Project Grant (\$ million)	Cofinancing (\$ million)	Total resources (\$ million)
CC 2 Program 4: Promote conservation and enhancement of carbon stocks in forest, and other land-use, and support climate smart agriculture	Target 15	142.1	343	485.1

Climate Change Adaptation Focal Area

16. The GEF manages two separate trust funds with a priority on climate change adaptation, namely the Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF) and the Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF). These funds were established to address the special needs of developing countries under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), and some of the projects approved during the reporting period contribute to the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity and the Aichi Biodiversity Targets. Table 5 below depicts the contribution of LDCF resources to achieving Aichi Biodiversity Target 7 and 14 respectively as prioritized by countries.

Table 5. Cumulative Distribution of GEF Resources by the LDCF in GEF-6 and Contributions to Achieving the Aichi Biodiversity Targets (July 1, 2016-March 15, 2018)¹⁴

Aichi Biodiversity Targets	GEF Project LDCF Grant (\$ million)	Cofinancing (\$ million)	Total resources (\$ million)
Target 7	10.5	35.2	45.7
Target 14	8.2	30.4	38.6
Totals	18.7	65.6	84.3

International Waters Focal Area

¹³ These figures do not include agency fees or project preparation grant amounts as these amounts cannot be associated with specific GEF CC programs or Aichi Targets.

¹⁴ These figures do not include agency fees or project preparation grant amounts as these amounts cannot be associated with specific LDCF objectives or Aichi Targets.

17. The International Waters focal area (IW) focal area helps countries jointly manage their transboundary surface water basins, groundwater basins, and coastal and marine systems to enable the sharing of benefits from their utilization. The GEF-6 IW strategy has three objectives to achieve its goal of promoting collective management for transboundary water systems: 1) Catalyze sustainable management of transboundary water systems by supporting multi-state cooperation through foundational capacity building, targeted research, and portfolio learning; 2) Catalyze investments to balance competing water-uses in the management of transboundary surface and groundwater and enhance multi-state cooperation; and, 3) Enhance multi-state cooperation and catalyze investments to foster sustainable fisheries, restore and protect coastal habitats, and reduce pollution of coasts and Large Marine Ecosystems. While objectives one and two of the strategy will make indirect contributions to the Aichi Targets, objective three makes a direct contribution to Aichi Target 6. Table 6 below depicts the contribution of GEF IW resources to achieving Aichi Biodiversity Target 6 as prioritized by countries.

Table 6. Cumulative Distribution of GEF Resources by International Waters Focal Area Objectives and Programs for GEF-6 and contributions to achieving the Aichi Biodiversity Targets (July 1, 2016-March 15, 2018)¹⁵

International Waters Objective and Program	Aichi Biodiversity Targets	GEF Project Grant (\$ million)	Cofinancing (\$ million)	Total Resources (\$ million)
IW 3 Program 7: Foster Sustainable Fisheries	Target 6	79.4	677.1	756.5

Integrated Approach Pilots

18. The GEF Integrated Approach Pilots (IAPs) were introduced in GEF-6 to test delivery of a more integrated approach that address discrete, time-bound global environment challenges whose resolution are closely aligned with targets and goals of the Multilateral Environmental Agreements (MEAs) which GEF serves as a financial mechanism. As noted in the GEF-6 Biodiversity Strategy, two IAPs were most closely aligned with the Aichi Biodiversity Targets: *Taking Deforestation out of Commodity Supply Chains* and *Fostering Sustainability and Resilience for Food Security in Africa*.
19. Table 7 below depicts the contribution of GEF IAPs to the Aichi Biodiversity Targets. The IAP on commodity supply chains provides the most direct contribution to the Strategic Plan for biodiversity. The IAP on Food Security makes a less robust contribution to the Aichi Biodiversity Targets. Hence, the IAP on Food Security is presented for information purposes only. It has an indirect contribution to the Aichi Targets, and is not included in the overall reporting. Table 7 below depicts the direct and indirect contribution of GEF IAP resources to achieving the Aichi Biodiversity Targets 4, 5, 7, 13, and 14.

¹⁵ These figures do not include agency fees or project preparation grant amounts as these amounts cannot be associated with specific GEF IW programs or Aichi Targets.

Table 8. Cumulative Distribution of the IAP Resources and Contributions to Achieving the Aichi Biodiversity Targets (July 1, 2014-March 15, 2018)¹⁶

Integrated Approach Pilot	Aichi Biodiversity Targets	GEF Project Grant (\$ million)	Cofinancing (\$ million)	Total resources (\$ million)
Taking Deforestation out of Commodity Supply Chains	Targets 4, 5, 7 and 14 (direct contributions)	40.3 (35 provided by biodiversity focal area set aside)	443.2	483.5
Fostering Sustainability and Resilience for Food Security in Africa	Target 7 and 13 (indirect contributions)	106.36 (10 provided by biodiversity focal area set aside)	805.4	911.7

Non-grant Instrument

20. The use of non-grant instruments was expanded in the GEF-6 period to leverage capital from private sector and contribute to long-term financial sustainability through their potential for generating reflows. Two projects have been approved during the reporting period that make direct contributions to Aichi Biodiversity Targets 1, 6, 7, 10, 14, 15, and 20 as presented in Table 8 below.

Table 8. Cumulative Distribution of GEF Resources by the NGI Pilot and Contributions to Achieving the Aichi Targets (July 1, 2016 to March 15, 2018)¹⁷

NGI Pilot Project	Aichi Biodiversity Targets	GEF Project Support (\$ million)	Cofinancing (\$ million)	Total Resources (\$ million)
Third South West Indian Ocean Fisheries Governance and Shared Growth Project (SWIOFish3)	Target 6	5.0	32.0	37.0
CPIC Conservation Finance Initiative - Scaling up and Demonstrating the Value of Blended Finance in Conservation	Targets 1, 6, 7, 10, 14, 15, 20	8.3	102.8	111.1

¹⁶ These figures do not include agency fees or project preparation grant amounts as these amounts cannot be associated with specific Aichi Targets.

¹⁷ These figures do not include agency fees or project preparation grant amounts as these amounts can't be associated with specific Aichi Targets.

Totals	13.3	134.8	148.1
--------	------	-------	-------

Small Grants Programme

21. During the reporting period, core resources of \$36 million were invested in the Small Grants Programme (SGP), which leveraged an additional \$37 million in cofinancing. Annex 1 presents SGP projects supported by STAR.
22. Building on its baseline of support achieved in earlier GEF phases, the SGP has increased its strategic focus and targeted grant-making approach during GEF-6 through the clustering of small grants in priority landscapes/seascapes selected as part of the Country Programme Strategy (CPS) formulation exercise involving inputs from governments, civil society, academia, indigenous peoples, and the private sector. Previously tried-and-tested approaches, such as the SGP Community Management of Protected Areas Conservation (COMPACT) approach, developed with the support of the UN Foundation for World Heritage Sites from 2001-2014, have been extended and replicated in protected areas worldwide with support from the UNESCO World Heritage Centre and IUCN.
23. With regards to the CBD Aichi targets, the SGP continues to occupy a strategic niche in the following:
 - a. the recognition of the traditional knowledge, innovations and practices of indigenous peoples and local communities (IPLCs) as addressed by the CBD Working Group on the Implementation of Article 8j (traditional knowledge) and 10c (customary use);
 - b. the role of indigenous peoples' and community conserved territories and areas (ICCAs) towards the achievement of Aichi target 11 with reference to government managed/governed protected areas (PAs), as well as "other effective area-based conservation measures" (OECMs) comprising of ICCAs and privately-run protected and/or conserved areas (including \$16.3 million in co-financing from the Government of Germany BMUB).
24. With regards to Aichi target 15 (ecosystem resilience), with \$12 million of co-financing support from the Government of Australia, the SGP continues to serve as a delivery mechanism for a global support programme for Community-Based Adaptation (CBA) in 37 out of the 38 SIDS at the global level; as well as for 20 countries in support of socio-ecological resilience of production landscapes (SEPLs) with \$10 million in support from the Government of Japan "Satoyama Initiative". In relation to Aichi target 16 (Nagoya Protocol), the SGP has established a partnership with the multi-partner ABS Capacity Development Initiative with regards to the dissemination of awareness on the Nagoya Protocol amongst IPLCs at the local level with projects underway in over ten countries at the global level.

Overall GEF Contributions to Achieving the Aichi Biodiversity Targets

25. Table 9 below presents a summary of all contributions to achieving the Aichi Biodiversity Targets through various funding streams during GEF-6. In sum, \$1.543 billion of GEF resources have leveraged \$7.986 billion of cofinancing; a ratio of 1 to 5. This level of cofinancing has resulted in a total of \$9.529 billion being invested towards the implementation of the Strategic Plan and achieving the Aichi Biodiversity Targets from July 1, 2014 to March 15, 2018.
26. Of the \$1.5 billion of GEF resources invested, 50% comes from the biodiversity focal area STAR allocations, and the remaining 50% of resources come from the biodiversity focal area set aside and other funding streams within the GEF.

Table 9. Cumulative Direct Contribution of all GEF Resources to the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and the Aichi Biodiversity Targets (July 1, 2014 to March 15, 2018)¹⁸

Funding Source	GEF grant (\$ million)	% of GEF total Grant	Cofinancing (\$ million)	% of Co- financing	Total (GEF Grant and Cofinancing) (\$ million)	% of Total (GEF Grant and Cofinancing)
Biodiversity Focal Area STAR allocations	777.2	50%	3859	48%	4636.2	47%
SFM Program	205.1	13%	1189	15%	1394.1	15%
Climate Change Mitigation	218.5	14%	829.6	10%	1048.1	11%
International Waters Focal Area	134	9%	1096	14%	1230	13%
Integrated Approach Pilot (Commodity Supply Chains)	40.3	3%	443.2	5%	483.5	5%
Non-grant instrument Pilot	29.3	2%	218.2	3%	247.5	3%
Least Developed Countries Fund	102.6	7%	314.1	4%	416.7	5%
Small Grants Programme	36	2%	37	1%	73	1%
Totals	1543		7986.1		9529.1	

II) GEF Response to Guidance from CBD COP 13

¹⁸ These figures do not include agency fees or project preparation grant amounts as these amounts cannot be associated with specific GEF biodiversity programs or Aichi Targets.

27. In Decision XIII/21, the Conference of the Parties provided guidance to the GEF on a variety of topics, including programme priorities for the GEF-7 period. GEF has fully incorporated the guidance provided in the four-year outcome-oriented framework of programme priorities (2018-2022) in its GEF-7 biodiversity strategy and through three Impact Programs that seek to deliver impact at scale by addressing key underlying drivers of biodiversity loss as well as direct drivers/pressures. Specific guidance on GEF operations and on specific biodiversity thematic topics have been duly addressed and a progress report on GEF's response is provided in Table 1 below.

Table 1: GEF's Response to Guidance Contained in Decision Adopted by CBD COP 13 (Decision XIII/21)

COP Decision	GEF's Response
<p>A. Four-year outcome-oriented framework of programme priorities (2018-2022)</p>	
<p><i>Adopts</i> the consolidated guidance to the financial mechanism, including the four-year framework of programme priorities (2018-2022) for the seventh replenishment of the Global Environment Facility Trust Fund, as contained in annexes I and II to the present decision, and <i>decides</i> to retire the previous decisions and elements of decisions, as related to the financial mechanism and limited only to those provisions related to the financial mechanism;</p> <p><i>Invites</i> the Global Environment Facility, the recipient and non-recipient Global Environment Facility participants, relevant global and regional partner organizations, and the Executive Secretary to promote a successful implementation of the four-year framework of programme priorities (2018-2022) for the seventh replenishment of the Global Environment Facility Trust Fund;</p> <p><i>Encourages</i> the Global Environment Facility to continue and further strengthen integrated programming as a means to harness opportunities for synergy in implementing related multilateral environmental agreements as well as the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and its Sustainable Development Goals, in particular Sustainable Development Goals 14 and 15;</p>	<p>The GEF-7 Programming Directions and Policy Agenda document prepared for the replenishment meetings has emphasized integrated programming to achieve synergies across the MEAs. The document presented to the fourth replenishment meeting can be found at: https://www.thegef.org/council-meetings/gef-7-replenishment-fourth-meeting</p> <p>Specifically, the proposed GEF-7 biodiversity strategy fully embodies an integrated approach to biodiversity management that comprehensively addresses the four-year framework of programme priorities (2018-2022) for the seventh replenishment of the GEF Trust Fund, as contained in annexes I and II to CBD/COP/DEC/XIII/21. As currently formulated in the proposed GEF-7 Programming Directions, implementation of the GEF-7 Framework of Program Priorities from CBD COP 13 is supported through the proposed GEF-7 biodiversity strategy along with three Impact Programs that seek to deliver impact at scale by addressing key underlying drivers of biodiversity loss as well as direct drivers/pressures. Together, they provide a comprehensive strategic response to the most prominent direct drivers/pressures of biodiversity loss.</p>
<p><i>Notes</i> the initial assessment of the accreditation pilot, and <i>requests</i> the Global Environment Facility</p>	<p>The GEF Council, at its 50th meeting in June 2016, having reviewed the Secretariat's analysis</p>

COP Decision	GEF's Response
<p>to consider improving its access modalities, including enabling the participation of a number of additional national agencies from developing countries, based on its own experiences, including the conclusions of this assessment, and taking into account the experience of other international financial instruments with relevant access modalities.</p>	<p>of the coverage and effectiveness of the GEF's network of 18 Agencies (GEF/C.50/07), and an evaluation of the expansion of the GEF Partnership carried out by the Independent Evaluation Office (GEF/ME/C.50/06), decided to reassess, at the end of the sixth replenishment period of the GEF Trust Fund (GEF-6), whether to launch a process to accredit a limited number of additional Agencies. The Council agreed that this assessment should build on the findings of the Sixth Comprehensive Evaluation of the GEF (OPS6), expected in September 2017, and take into account the criteria set out in the Secretariat's paper.</p> <p>OPS6 notes that the latest expansion of the Partnership has contributed towards enhanced access by countries to a broader range of technical capabilities; greater choice among Agencies; and country ownership. The report also finds, however, that increased competition among Agencies has sometimes been counterproductive, and the expansion has resulted in efficiency trade-offs, with an increase in transaction costs for the Secretariat and country focal points.</p> <p>In view of the findings, conclusions and recommendations of OPS6, as well as an updated analysis presented by the Secretariat at the second meeting on the seventh replenishment of the GEF Trust Fund (GEF-7) in October 2017, most Participants to the replenishment noted that the current network of 18 Agencies provide adequate geographic and thematic coverage, suggesting no imminent need to expand the GEF Partnership. That understanding is reflected in the Participants' latest draft policy recommendations, subject to final review and approval at the fourth replenishment meeting in April 2018.</p> <p>The final GEF-7 policy recommendations, including on the issue of accreditation and the GEF Partnership, will be transmitted for review and endorsement by the GEF Council at its 54th meeting in June 2018. At that meeting the GEF</p>

COP Decision	GEF's Response
	Secretariat will also present updated analysis on the geographic and thematic coverage, as well as the effectiveness, efficiency and engagement of the GEF Partnership pursuant to the Council's request in June 2016.
<i>Requests</i> the Global Environment Facility to include information regarding the individual elements of the consolidated guidance, in particular the four-year outcome oriented framework of programme priorities, in its future reports to the Conference of the Parties.	The GEF will include this information in future reports to the COP once GEF-7 is under implementation.
D. Second determination of funding requirement	
<i>Requests</i> the Global Environment Facility to take the Strategic Plan and the Aichi Biodiversity Targets as well as the expert team's needs assessment report into consideration in the process of the seventh period of replenishment of the Global Environment Facility Trust Fund but also noting the limitations identified by the expert team.	During the GEF-7 replenishment process, this has been taken into consideration by the replenishment participants. The proposed GEF-7 biodiversity strategy and the aforementioned impact programs all map their objectives and outcomes to their contributions to achieving the Aichi Biodiversity Targets.
E. Further guidance	
<i>Encourages</i> the Global Environment Facility to consider joint financing, in partnership with other international financial instruments, of projects designed to achieve the objectives of more than one Rio convention;	<p>GEF continues to act on opportunities for joint financing to achieve global environmental benefits and achieve the objectives of multiple Rio conventions.</p> <p>For example, the WB/GEF project, "Sustainable Low Carbon Development in Colombia's Orinoquia Region", (GEF biodiversity grant: \$5.9 million, cofinance: \$70.1 million), includes a \$20 million grant from the BioCarbon Fund Initiative for Sustainable Forest Landscapes and will help achieve GEF strategy objectives of relevance to the CBD and the UNFCCC. The project will address current and projected direct and indirect causes of biodiversity loss and Agriculture, Forestry and other Land-use (AFOLU) emissions in Orinoquia. The project aims to: a) strengthen territorial planning instruments with sustainable (biodiversity and low-carbon landscape management) criteria including land-use planning, land tenure, and deforestation control</p>

COP Decision	GEF's Response
	<p>measures; b) improve biodiversity protection in 494,901 hectares of protected areas; c) integrate biodiversity and ecosystem service values into land use planning that will cover an area of 4.6 million hectares; and d) design a large-scale Emission Reduction Program for the Orinoquia region including the establishment of a Monitoring and Verification System for Emission Reduction and the design of the future Results Based Payment program.</p> <p>Another example is the WB/GEF project, "Mai-Ndombe REDD+ Integrated Project" (GEF biodiversity and climate change mitigation grant: \$6.2 million, cofinance: \$32.4 million), in Congo DR which aims to improve forest management and reduce greenhouse gas emissions from deforestation and forest degradation. The project includes a \$14.2 million grant from the Forest Investment Program and \$18.2 million grant from the Central African Forestry Initiative. The project will help achieve GEF strategy objectives of relevance to the CBD and the UNFCCC and aims to improve management of biodiversity-rich areas totaling 250,000 hectares, improve sustainable land management in 100,000 hectares, and mitigate 1.45 million metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent.</p>
<p><i>Takes note</i> of the projected shortfall of resources from sixth replenishment of the Global Environment Facility due to exchange rate movements, and the decision of the Council of the Global Environment Facility on item 6 of the agenda of the 51st meeting of the Council;</p> <p><i>Notes</i> the crucial role of the Global Environment Facility in the mobilization of resources at the domestic level and in support of the achievement of Aichi Targets, and <i>requests</i> the Global Environment Facility to continue its efforts to minimize the potential consequences of the projected shortfall referred to in paragraph 18 above for its support to developing countries, aiming to fulfil the relevant programming</p>	<p>The GEF has sought to minimize the consequences of the project shortfall consistent with GEF Council Decision GEF/C.51/04.</p> <p>Over the course of the negotiations on the seventh replenishment of the GEF Trust Fund, participants have discussed options to manage the GEF's exposure to currency risks, based on information prepared by the GEF Trustee (GEF/R.7/16, <i>Financial Considerations for the GEF-7 Replenishment</i>; GEF/R.7/Inf.15, <i>Overview of the International Development Association's [IDA's] Experience of Hedging Donor Contributions</i>). As of March 2018, participants have not yet concluded those deliberations.</p>

COP Decision	GEF's Response
<p>directions of the sixth replenishment of the Global Environment Facility and with a view to</p> <p>maintaining the level of support to Global Environment Facility recipient countries;</p> <p><i>Requests</i> the Global Environment Facility to consider exploring measures to mitigate possible risks, including currency risks, in order to avoid potential negative impacts on future replenishment periods for the provision of financial resources for all Global Environment Facility recipient countries, taking fully into account the provisions of paragraphs 5 and 6 of Article 20 of the Convention;</p>	
<p><i>Urges</i> the Global Environment Facility and its partners to support recipient countries in their efforts to identify and mobilize co-financing for its projects related to implementation of the Convention, including through public-private partnerships, as well as applying co-financing arrangements in ways that improve access, do not create barriers or increase costs for recipient countries to access Global Environment Facility funds;</p>	<p>GEF and its partners will continue to help identify and mobilize co-financing to support the implementation of GEF projects. Table 9 presents a summary of all contributions to achieving the Aichi Biodiversity Targets through various funding streams during GEF-6. In sum, \$1.543 Billion of GEF resources have leveraged \$7.986 billion of cofinancing; a ratio of 1 to 5. This level of cofinancing has resulted in a total of \$9.529 billion being invested towards the implementation of the Strategic Plan and achieving the Aichi Biodiversity Targets.</p> <p>Of the \$1.543 billion of GEF resources invested, 50% comes from the biodiversity focal area STAR allocations, and the remaining 50% of resources come from the biodiversity focal area set aside and other funding streams within the GEF.</p>
<p><i>Requests</i> the Global Environment Facility, in response to the concerns of the Parties on transparency of the process of approving Global Environment Facility projects, to include in its report to the Conference of the Parties, information regarding paragraph 3.3(d) of the Memorandum of Understanding.</p>	<p>During the reporting period, all biodiversity projects and multi-focal area projects using biodiversity resources submitted to the council were approved.</p>
<p>Ecosystem restoration</p>	
<p><i>Invites</i> the Global Environment Facility and Parties in a position to do so and other donors, such as international financial institutions, including</p>	<p>In GEF-6, the GEF supported “The Restoration Initiative - Fostering Innovation and Integration in Support of the Bonn Challenge” program with</p>

COP Decision	GEF's Response
<p>regional development banks, to provide support for ecosystem restoration activities, as well as monitoring processes as appropriate, and integrated where relevant into programmes and initiatives for sustainable development, food, water and energy security, job creation, climate change mitigation, adaptation, disaster risk reduction, and poverty eradication.</p>	<p>\$53 million of GEF resources which leveraged \$201 million of cofinancing. The participating countries include: Cameroon, Central African Republic, China, DRC, Guinea Bissau, Kenya, Myanmar, Pakistan, Sao Tome & Principe, and Tanzania.</p> <p>In GEF-7, a proposed Impact Program entitled "Food Systems, Land-use, and Restoration" seeks to provide a programming window to support ecosystem restoration, in addition to support for forest restoration offered under the "Sustainable Forest Management" Impact Program.</p>
Strategic Plan	
<p><i>Requests</i> the Global Environment Facility, and <i>invites</i> other development partners and donors in a position to do so, to continue to provide support in a timely manner, based on the expressed needs of Parties, especially for developing countries and, in particular, least developed countries and small island developing States, as well as countries with economies in transition, for the development and implementation of national biodiversity strategies and action plans, in line with the strategy and targets for resource mobilization agreed to in decision XII/3.</p>	<p>During GEF-5 and GEF-6, virtually all GEF-eligible countries have received support to revise their NBSAP. During GEF-7, GEF will support the very few remaining countries that have not revised their NBSAPs. In addition, GEF will respond to any further guidance that may be directed to the GEF on NBSAP development during the GEF-7 phase. Allowances are made for this support in the proposed GEF-7 biodiversity strategy.</p>
Aichi Targets 11 and 12	
<p><i>Invites</i> the Global Environment Facility and its implementing agencies to facilitate the alignment of the development and implementation of protected area and other effective area-based conservation measures in its sixth and seventh replenishment periods with the national actions identified in national biodiversity strategies and action plans and, as appropriate, through the regional workshops for the achievement of Targets 11 and 12, with a view to facilitating the systematic monitoring and reporting of the results of those projects as they contribute to the implementation of the national action plans for the achievement of Aichi Biodiversity Targets 11 and 12 and other related targets.</p>	<p>GEF will continue to support implementation of protected area projects in support of Aichi Targets 11 and 12 in support of priorities identified in the NBSAPs and other relevant planning documents and this is included in the proposed GEF-7 biodiversity strategy.</p>

COP Decision	GEF's Response
Sixth national report	
<p><i>Requests</i> the Global Environment Facility, in the light of the revised guidelines for reporting under the Convention and its Protocols, to assess the required funding levels for national reporting, and provide financial support to developing countries accordingly in a timely and expeditious manner.</p>	<p>The GEF undertook an assessment of required funding levels for the national report and, as a result, provided a fourfold funding increase to produce the sixth National Report when compared to funding of previous national reports. These projects were approved to support production of the sixth National Report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support to Eligible Parties to Produce the Sixth National Report to the CBD (Africa-1 and Africa-2) • Support to Eligible Parties to Produce the Sixth National Report to the CBD – (Global: Africa-3, plus Maldives, Nicaragua, Pakistan and Solomon Islands) • Support to Eligible Parties to Produce the Sixth National Report to the CBD (LAC I and LAC II) • Support to Eligible Parties to Produce the Sixth National Report to the CBD (Europe, CIS and Mongolia) • Support to Eligible Parties to Produce the Sixth National Report to the CBD (Pacific) • Support to Eligible Parties to Produce the Sixth National Report (6NR) to the CBD (Asia) • Support to Eligible Parties to Produce the Sixth National Report to the CBD (6NR - North Africa, West/Central Asia and Mauritania) • Support to Eligible Parties to Produce the Sixth National Report to the CBD (6NR - Mixed regions)
Cross-sectoral mainstreaming	
<p><i>Invites</i> the Global Environment Facility and other donor and financial institutions to provide financial assistance for country driven projects</p>	<p>The GEF will continue to support cross-sectoral mainstreaming, an area of the GEF portfolio that continues to increase relative to other</p>

COP Decision	GEF's Response
that address cross-sectoral mainstreaming when requested by developing country Parties, in particular the least developed among them and small island developing States, and countries with economies in transition.	conservation investment strategies prioritized by Parties. Opportunities for cross-sectoral mainstreaming are provided for in the proposed GEF-7 biodiversity strategy.
Traditional knowledge	
<i>Invites</i> the Global Environment Facility, international financial institutions and development agencies and relevant non-governmental organizations, as appropriate and consistent with their mandates to consider providing financial and technical assistance to developing country Parties, indigenous peoples and local communities, particularly women within these communities, to raise awareness and to build their capacity relevant to the implementation of the Rutzolijirisaxik Voluntary Guidelines for the Repatriation of Traditional Knowledge of Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities Relevant for the Conservation and Sustainable Use of Biological Diversity, and to develop, as appropriate, community protocols or processes for “prior and informed consent” or “free, prior and informed consent”, depending on national circumstances, or “approval and involvement”, and fair and equitable benefit-sharing.	GEF will support activities within relevant projects to respond to these capacity building requests.
Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety	
<p><i>Requests</i> the Global Environment Facility to continue to provide finance in support of activities related to the Biosafety Clearing-House;</p> <p><i>Emphasizes</i> the importance of continuous and predictable support by the Global Environment Facility to eligible Parties to support their compliance with reporting obligations under the Protocol;</p> <p><i>Requests</i> the Global Environment Facility to continue to provide financial support to enable developing country Parties, in particular the least developed countries and small island developing States among them, and Parties with economies in</p>	The GEF-6 biodiversity strategy included Program 5 to support implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety and support for these activities. A dedicated programming area to support implementation of the Cartagena Protocol is part of the proposed GEF-7 biodiversity strategy and responds to all past and current guidance presented to the GEF.

COP Decision	GEF's Response
<p>transition to further implement the Framework and Action Plan for Capacity-Building;</p> <p><i>Invites</i> the Global Environment Facility to continue to assist eligible Parties that have not yet done so to put in place a national biosafety framework and to make funds available to this end;</p> <p><i>Requests</i> the Global Environment Facility to provide eligible Parties with financial resources to facilitate effective implementation of the programme of work on public awareness, education and participation concerning the safe transfer, handling and use of living modified organisms, in the context of relevant project activities and within its mandate;</p> <p><i>Invites</i> the Global Environment Facility to continue to provide funding for capacity-building related to risk assessment and risk management in the context of country-driven projects;</p> <p><i>Invites</i> the Global Environment Facility:</p> <p>To continue to make specific funding available to eligible Parties to put in place their national biosafety frameworks;</p> <p>To continue to fund projects and capacity-building activities on issues identified by the Parties to facilitate further implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety, including regional cooperation projects, such as those using regional and sub-regional networks to build capacity for the detection of living modified organisms, with a view to facilitating the sharing of experiences and lessons learned, and harnessing associated synergies;</p> <p>To ensure that the policy, strategy, programme priorities and eligibility criteria adopted in annex I to decision I/2 of the Conference of the Parties are duly followed in an efficient manner in relation to access and utilization of financial resources.</p>	

COP Decision	GEF's Response
Nagoya Protocol on Access and Benefit-sharing	
<i>Invites</i> the Global Environment Facility to provide support to eligible Parties for interim national reports under the Nagoya Protocol.	GEF approved a global project to support 65 countries to produce an Interim National Report. The GEF invested \$1.4 million and leveraged \$1.1 million in cofinancing.

III) Progress Report on GEF-6 Corporate Results and Targets Relevant to the CBD

28. As part of the GEF-6 Replenishment Agreement, a series of corporate targets were agreed. Table 11 below provides the cumulative targets presented in GEF Council approved concepts (Project Information Forms-PIFs) from July 1, 2014 to March 15, 2018 on the most relevant targets to the CBD and the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2010-2020. The cumulative targets represent key expected outcomes from these projects.
29. With regards to the expected results for the area target “Maintain globally significant biodiversity and the ecosystem goods and services that it provides to society”, two programmatic approaches funded in GEF-6, the Amazon Sustainable Landscapes Program (ASL) and the Global Wildlife Program (GWP), have covered a much larger area than originally expected due to the ambition of the countries involved in these programs. The ASL coverage target is 80 million hectares and the GWP is 29 million hectares for a total of 109 million hectares from these two programs, which is 36% of the original target of 300 million. Thus, it is these two programs that drive the achievement rate of 142% for this target.
30. With regards to the expected results for the area target on “Sustainable land management in production systems”, we expect almost full achievement of the target when CEO endorsements are submitted with increases in area-based outcomes as a result of the project design phase. We will reflect these changes in the final report presented to COP-14.
31. The shortfall in achieving the target on “Globally over-exploited fisheries moved to more sustainable levels” is largely due to the reduction in the expected impact of the Coastal Fisheries Initiative (CFI) Programme.

Table 11. Progress towards GEF-6 Replenishment Targets (July 1, 2014 to March 15, 2018)

Indicators	Target	Expected Results	Completion Rate
Maintain globally significant biodiversity and the ecosystem goods and services that it provides to society			
Landscapes and seascapes under improved management for biodiversity conservation (million hectares)	300	426	142%
Sustainable land management in production systems (agriculture, rangelands and forest landscapes)			
Production landscapes under improved management (million hectares)	120	56	47%
Promotion of collective management of transboundary water systems and implementation of the full range of policy, legal, and institutional reforms and investments contributing to sustainable use and maintenance of ecosystem services			
Number of freshwater basins in which water-food-energy-ecosystem security and conjunctive management of surface and groundwater is taking place	10	27	270%
Globally over-exploited fisheries moved to more sustainable levels (percent of fisheries, by volume)	20	12	60%

IV. Monitoring and Evaluation Results (submitted by GEF Independent Evaluation Office)

A. Results from the GEF Independent Evaluation Office

32. During the reporting period the Independent Evaluation Office of the GEF (IEO) conducted several evaluations that are of relevance to the biodiversity focal area. The key messages from these evaluations and reports are summarized below.

Sixth Comprehensive Evaluation of the GEF (OPS6)

33. The evaluation highlights the close alignment between the GEF's Biodiversity Focal Area Strategy and CBD guidance. The GEF-6 strategic objectives are well aligned with four of the five goals of the Strategic Plan of the CBD for 2011–2020 and the corresponding Aichi Targets. The GEF has continued to support the preparation of national biodiversity strategies, action plans and national reports to the CBD through enabling activities. The biodiversity focal area has also responded to specific guidance of the CBD on various protocols, including the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety (GEF-4) and the Nagoya Protocol on Access and Benefit Sharing (GEF-5). The biodiversity focal area also serves other biodiversity-related treaties including the Ramsar Convention and the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES).
34. In dollar terms, the biodiversity focal area projects account for 27 percent of total GEF Trust Fund utilization from the pilot phase to GEF-6. Based on the review of 554 terminal evaluations, 83% of biodiversity projects had satisfactory outcome ratings. The outcome performance of the biodiversity portfolio is comparable to that of the GEF overall (81%), but sustainability remained a challenge.
35. GEF investments in biodiversity projects deliver value for money. A value for money analysis using a value transfer approach was conducted for 550 GEF biodiversity projects across 3,095 project locations. The analysis estimated the impacts along multiple indicators to capture changes in natural capital in three ecosystem services: carbon sequestration, recreation, and soil retention. The results demonstrated the positive returns on investment of \$1.04 per dollar invested, which is likely to be an underestimate.
36. Projects in the biodiversity focal area account for only 13% of the private sector portfolio. However, private sector engagement with biodiversity issues is picking up pace through biodiversity mainstreaming and access and benefit sharing (ABS) programs and projects. Challenges remain in engaging the private sector with biodiversity, primarily due to poor enabling conditions such as weak policy environments, inadequate financing, limited awareness and capacity, and the absence of well-developed sustainable markets. The biodiversity focal area dominated the indigenous people's portfolio, accounting for a total of 55% of projects, though a shift is evident toward a greater concentration of indigenous peoples projects in the Multifocal and Climate Change focal areas.

Study on the GEF Support to Access and Benefit Sharing (ABS) and the Nagoya Protocol

37. The GEF has been providing financial assistance through the ABS strategy since GEF-3. The GEF has been supporting implementation of the Nagoya Protocol both through GEF

Trust Fund resources and the Nagoya Protocol Implementation Fund (NPIF) which was established during GEF-5. As of June 2017, 26 biodiversity projects have supported ABS since GEF-4. There were 13 additional ABS projects funded by the NPIF; all of them are GEF-5 projects.

38. The evaluation findings highlight GEF's role in supporting countries in ratifying the Nagoya Protocol in collaboration with the CBD Secretariat, and in supporting the development of ABS pilots with the private sector.
39. The projects in the GEF's ABS portfolio are very relevant to the GEF and NPIF strategic priorities, as well as the priorities identified in the CBD's consolidated guidance on ABS. Activities to build governmental capacity, support to discovery of "promising compounds," and development of legislation dominate the ABS portfolio. Other categories of project activities include building stakeholder capacity and technical capacity, increasing awareness of stakeholders not directly involved in government implementation of ABS frameworks, and support for indigenous and local communities (including awareness raising) and the protection of access to traditional knowledge.
40. GEF support to ABS initiatives at the global level was significant particularly with respect to promoting the NP's early entry into force, and the support to the development and coordination of international infrastructure and mechanisms for its implementation. The GEF also enabled and supported the development of the ability and willingness of provider-side countries to identify and develop promising genetic resources or elements of associated traditional knowledge (ATK). The evaluation also highlighted that GEF support to ABS initiatives have made important contributions to the linkage between ABS and conservation and to that of equitable rights, welfare, resources and the needs of indigenous peoples and local communities.
41. An effective ABS strategy includes steps for legislative development, domestic research and development (R&D) and compound identification, development of national ABS contracts, and protection of and benefit sharing for indigenous and local communities, which need to be implemented progressively. The evaluation indicated that the project designs may be "overpacked" with activities and/or outcomes to address each of these elements of the GEF's ABS strategy, and recommended that ABS project activities should be implemented progressively. While activities such as awareness raising may be done in parallel, a clear legislative framework is a precondition for other interventions for ABS to be effective. In addition, the evaluation pointed to the need for recognizing the complexity and individual uniqueness of each ABS situation, to ensure that draft instruments and procedures prepared are consistent with country level legislative and administrative requirements for adoption.

GEF Support to Address Illegal Wildlife Trade (IWT)

42. Aichi Target 12 provides that "[by 2020 the extinction of known threatened species has been prevented and their conservation status, particularly of those most in decline, has been improved and sustained." Responding to Target 12, the GEF introduced Program 3 in the GEF-6 Biodiversity strategy: Preventing the Extinction of Known Threatened

Species. The GEF set out a framework to guide the funding of activities pertaining to avoiding biodiversity loss generally and to combat illegal wildlife trade specifically.

43. The Global Partnership on Wildlife Conservation and Crime Prevention for Sustainable Development (known as the Global Wildlife Program) was launched in 2015. The Program features 21 child projects that include 20 country-specific projects and a global grant. An evaluation was carried out to assess the effort to combat IWT through the Global Wildlife Program (GWP), while the program is under implementation.
44. The formative evaluation of the ongoing GWP program found that GEF support to address IWT through the Global Wildlife Program is a relevant and important response to address the issue of illegal wildlife trade. The program is designed to address each stage in the illegal wildlife trade supply chain - the source of wildlife traded illegally, the trafficking of wildlife and wildlife products, and the market demand for those products.
45. With respect to the scope of the GEF's illegal wildlife trade funding, the evaluation reported limitations in scope in terms of the coverage of species, countries, and regions. The global coordination grant of the GWP which seeks to coordinate actions and build capacity, learning, and knowledge management to address the issue of IWT with implementing partners, donors, and international organizations, is an innovative design element of the program and plays an important role in facilitating cooperation and knowledge exchange, fostering interagency cooperation, and disseminating good practices and lessons to address IWT.
46. The evaluation recommended that given the scale of illegal wildlife trade, additional efforts are required including increased funding under the GEF-7 replenishment cycle, and strategic expansion to other species, countries, and regions to address illegal wildlife trade. The evaluation also recommended that in addition to country-led national projects, stronger regional and global programming is important. Adjustments to the funding mechanism such as non-STAR funds and private sector funding for IWT activities could facilitate integration of these approaches. Finally, the evaluation pointed out that political will and corruption should be explicitly and directly addressed in all IWT projects. Participating countries in future GEF funded projects should be encouraged to invest financial resources in addressing corruption issues. Alternatively, the GEF could support third parties like the International Consortium on Combating Wildlife Crime (ICWC) to engage with countries to pursue this part of the agenda as is being done in some countries.

V. Seventh Replenishment of the GEF Trust Fund

47. Resources in the GEF Trust Fund are replenished every four years by countries that wish to contribute to the Fund ("Contributing Participants").
48. The GEF Council, at its 51st meeting in October 2016, requested the Trustee, in cooperation with the Secretariat, to initiate the discussions on the seventh

replenishment of the GEF Trust Fund (GEF-7). (*Joint Summary of the Chairs: 51st GEF Council Meeting, October 25–27, 2017*).

49. Through the replenishment process, Contributing Participants review the GEF's performance, assess future funding needs, agree on a financing framework, and set out key policy reforms and programming directions.
50. As of March 2018, the Contributing Participants have met three times:
 - a. in Paris, France on March 28–30, 2017;
 - b. in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia on October 4–5, 2017; and
 - c. in Brasília, Brazil on January 23–25, 2018.
51. A fourth meeting will take place in Stockholm, Sweden on April 25, 2018, and the outcomes of the replenishment process will be presented for endorsement by the GEF Council at its 54th meeting in June 2018 in conjunction with the Sixth GEF Assembly in Da Nang, Vietnam.
52. The replenishment meetings have been co-chaired by Axel van Trotsenburg, Vice President, Development Finance, World Bank Group and Naoko Ishii, GEF CEO and Chairperson. In addition to Contributing Participants, the replenishment meetings have brought together non-contributing recipient country participants representing Africa, Asia, Eastern Europe and Central Asia, and Latin America and the Caribbean; as well as observers from the secretariats of the five multi-lateral environmental agreements that the GEF serves as a financial mechanism, the GEF Agencies, civil society, the private sector, and the Green Climate Fund (GCF) secretariat. The meetings have also been attended by representatives of the Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel (STAP) and the GEF IEO.
53. Over the course of the first three meetings, the Contributing Participants have considered the findings, conclusions and recommendations of IEO's OPS6, the proposed programming directions and policy agenda for GEF-7, and the financial structure of the replenishment. All documents presented at these meetings as well as the Co-Chairs' summaries of the discussions are publicly available on the GEF website¹⁹.

¹⁹ <http://www.thegef.org/council-meetings/replenishments>

ANNEX 1: LIST OF ALL PROJECTS and PROGRAMS APPROVED DURING THE REPORTING PERIOD²⁰

A) Full-Sized Projects and Programs Approved Under the Biodiversity Focal Area (amounts in millions \$USD)

GEF ID	Country	Agency	Title	GEF Grant	Co-finance	Total
9735	Angola	UNDP	Combating Illegal Wildlife Trade and Human Wildlife Conflict	4.1	16.5	21.0
9913	Bangladesh	UNDP	Implementing Ecosystem-based Management in Ecologically Critical Areas in Bangladesh	3.0	6.0	9.3
9449	Brazil	UNDP	Sustainable, Accessible and Innovative Use of Biodiversity Resources and Associated Traditional Knowledge in Promising Phytotherapeutic Value Chains in Brazil	5.7	24.3	30.6
9705	Cabo Verde	UNDP	Managing Multiple Sector Threats on Marine Ecosystems to Achieve Sustainable Blue Growth	3.8	13.4	17.5
9578	Colombia	World Bank	Sustainable Low Carbon Development in Colombia's Orinoquia Region	5.9	71.0	77.5
9802	Congo DR	UNEP	Promoting the Effective Management of Salonga National Park through Creation of Community Forests and Improving the Well-being of Local Communities	5.7	34.5	40.8
9435	Cuba	FAO	Introduction of New Farming Methods for the Conservation and Sustainable Use of Biodiversity, including Plant and Animal Genetic Resources, in Production Landscapes in Selected Areas of Cuba	3.0	23.8	27.0
9282	Ecuador	CI	Safeguarding Biodiversity in the Galapagos Islands by Enhancing Biosecurity and Creating the Enabling Environment for the Restoration of Galapagos Island Ecosystems.	3.3	18.6	22.2
9799	Lesotho	UNDP	Promoting Conservation, Sustainable Utilization and Fair and Equitable Benefit-sharing from Lesotho's Medicinal and Ornamental Plants for Improved livelihoods	2.9	4.5	7.7
9606	Madagascar	CI	Conservation and Sustainable Use of Biological Diversity in the Northwestern Landscape (Boeny region)	6.8	10.8	18.2
9668	Maldives	UNEP	Enhancing National Development through Environmentally Resilient Islands (ENDhERI)	3.5	12.0	15.9
9553	Mauritius	UNDP	Mainstreaming IAS Prevention, Control and Management	3.9	17.0	21.3
9613	Mexico	UNDP	Mainstreaming Biodiversity Conservation Criteria in Mexico's Tourism Sector	7.2	43.5	51.4

²⁰ Please note that all documentation for each project can be found through the GEF ID hyperlink.

			with Emphasis on Biodiversity-rich Coastal Ecosystems			
9917	Micronesia	UNDP	Safeguarding Biodiversity From Invasive Alien Species in the Federated States of Micronesia	4.1	18.8	23.3
9579	Nicaragua	World Bank	Resilient Landscapes Management Project	4.4	21.9	26.8
9536	Papua New Guinea	UNDP	Sustainable Financing of Papua New Guinea's Protected Area Network	11.3	49.5	61.9
9410	Regional (Marshall Islands, Niue, Tonga, Tuvalu)	UNEP	Strengthening National and Regional Capacities to Reduce the Impact of Invasive Alien Species on Globally Significant Biodiversity in the Pacific	6.3	12.7	19.5
9551	South Sudan	UNEP	Capacity Development in Reducing Illegal Wildlife Trade and Improving Protected Area Management Effectiveness in South Sudan	5.3	16.0	21.8
9481	Uganda	UNEP	Institutional Capacity Strengthening for Implementation of the Nagoya Protocol on Access to Genetic Resources and Benefit Sharing in Uganda	2.6	9.2	12.0
9847	Vanuatu	IUCN	Expanding Conservation Areas Reach and Effectiveness(ECARE) in Vanuatu	2.5	6.3	9.0
TOTAL				95.4	430.4	534.7

B) Full-sized Non-grant Projects Approved Which Contribute to the CBD (amounts in millions of \$US)

GEF ID	Country	Agency	Title	BD STAR	IW	NGI	GEF Grant	Co- finance	Total
9563	Seychelles	World Bank	Third South West Indian Ocean Fisheries Governance and Shared Growth Project (SWIOFish3)	2.9	2.9	5.5	10.3	32.0	43.3
9914	Global	IUCN	CPIC Conservation Finance Initiative - Scaling up and Demonstrating the Value of Blended Finance in Conservation			9.0	8.3	102.8	111.8
TOTAL							18.5	134.8	155.1

C) Medium-sized Projects Approved Under the Biodiversity Focal Area (amounts in millions of \$US)

GEF ID	Country	Agency	Title	GEF Grant	Co-finance	Total
9748	Angola	UNDP	Creation of Marine Protected Areas in Angola	1.8	11.1	13.0
9741	Cambodia	UNDP	Developing a Comprehensive Framework for Practical Implementation of the Nagoya Protocol	0.8	1.8	2.6
9926	Congo DR	UNEP	Effective National Implementation of Access and Benefit Sharing (ABS) in accordance with the Nagoya Protocol and Valorization of Botanical Plants (Medicinal, Cosmetic and Neutraceutical) in the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC)	2.0	6.8	8.8
9860	Cuba	UNEP	Creation of Additional Biosafety Capacities that Lead to A Full Implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety in Cuba	1.8	1.9	3.7
9671	Egypt	UNEP	Effective Management of Wadi El-Rayan and Qarun Protected Areas	1.3	9.0	10.3
9944	Fiji	UNDP	Strengthening Fiji's Network of Locally Managed Marine Areas (LMMAs) to Support Globally Significant Marine Biodiversity	0.8	3.2	4.0
9879	Georgia	UNDP	Enhancing Financial Sustainability of the Protected Area System	1.8	7.9	9.7
9858	Global	UNEP	Supply Change: Promoting Reduction of Deforestation Impacts of Commodity Supply Chains	1.0	2.0	3.0
9633	Guatemala	UNEP	Strengthening and Expansion of Capacities in Biosafety that Lead to a full Implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety in Guatemala	1.4	2.7	4.1
9539	Malawi	UNEP	Enhancing Sustainability of Protected Area Systems and Stabilizing Agro-production in Adjoining Areas through Improved IAS Management	1.5	5.2	6.7
9762	Montenegro	UNEP	Promoting Protected Areas Management through Integrated Marine and Coastal Ecosystems Protection in Coastal Area of Montenegro	1.6	12.5	14.1
9804	Panama	UNDP	Conservation and Sustainable Use of Biodiversity in Coastal Marine Production Landscapes	1.8	5.5	7.3
9889	Panama	IADB	Mainstreaming Biodiversity Conservation through Low-Impact Ecotourism in SINAP II (ECOTUR-AP II)	0.8	6.0	6.8
9678	Regional (Colombia, Mexico, Peru)	UNEP	Generating Enhanced Political Will for Natural Resource Management and Conservation	2.0	2.2	4.2
9882	Regional (Gabon, Kenya,	UNEP	Enhancing Legislative, Policy, and Criminal Justice Frameworks for Combating Poaching and Illegal Wildlife Trade in Africa	1.0	1.1	2.1

	Malawi, Mozambique, Zambia)					
9542	Thailand	UNEP	Integration of Natural Capital Accounting in Public and Private Sector Policy and Decision-making for Sustainable Landscapes	2.0	8.2	10.2
9703	Timor Leste	UNEP	Establishing the National Framework and Operational Capacity for Implementing the Nagoya Protocol in Timor Leste	1.3	3.8	5.1
			TOTAL	24.7	90.8	115.6

D) Multi-focal Area Full-sized Projects that include funding from the biodiversity focal area (in millions of \$US)

GEF ID	Country	Agency	Title	BD	CC	LD	IW	Hg	NGI	SFM	GEF Grant	Co-finance	Total
9806	Algeria	FAO	Rehabilitation and Integrated Sustainable Development of Algerian Cork Oak Forest Production Landscapes	2.8		0.9					3.4	23.7	27.5
9583	Argentina	UNDP	Mainstreaming Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Land Management (SLM) into Development Planning: Making Environmental Land Use Planning (ELUP) Operational in Argentina	5.8		4.1					9.0	41.8	51.6
9791	Bahamas	UNEP	Meeting the Challenge of 2020 in The Bahamas	5.0	1.8						6.2	12.0	18.8
9796	Belize	UNDP	Integrated Management of Production Landscapes to Deliver Multiple Global Environmental Benefits	3.8		1.8					5.1	15.1	20.7
9383	Benin	AfDB	Sustainable Forest Management and Conservation Project in Central and South Benin	0.9	0.5	0.5				1.0	2.6	15.9	18.8
9764	Burkina Faso	UNDP	Integrated and Sustainable Management of PONASI Protected Area Landscape	3.7	0.9	1.1					5.3	19.2	25.0
9781	Cambodia	UNDP	Integrated Natural Resource Management (INRM) in the Productive, Natural and Forested Landscape of Northern Region of	2.7		1.0					3.3	10.0	13.7

			Cambodia							
9604	Cameroon	UNEP	Removing Barriers to Biodiversity Conservation, Land Restoration and Sustainable Forest Management through Community-based Landscape Management – COBALAM	2.1	1.3		3.1	19.0	22.4	
9766	Chile	UNEP	Mainstreaming Conservation of Coastal Wetlands of Chile's South Center Biodiversity Hotspot through Adaptive Management of Coastal Area Ecosystems	3.8	1.8		5.1	16.9	22.5	
9441	Colombia	FAO/ UNIDO	Contributing to the Integrated Management of Biodiversity of the Pacific Region of Colombia to Build Peace	5.1	0.8		2.4	7.6	35.3	43.6
9760	Congo DR	World Bank	Mai-Ndombe REDD+ Integrated Project (GEF)	2.8	4.0		6.2	32.4	39.2	
9366	Cote d'Ivoire	UNEP	Sustainability and Scaling Up Approaches for Transformational Management, Restoration and Conservation of Forests Landscapes and Biodiversity in Cote d'Ivoire (SSATMARC – FOLAB)	1.3	0.7		1.1	2.8	27.1	30.2
9266	Eritrea	UNDP	Restoring Degraded Forest Landscapes and Promoting Community-based, Sustainable and Integrated Natural Resource Management in the Rora Habab Plateau, Nakfa Sub-zoba, Northern Red Sea Region of Eritrea	1.7	2.4	3.2	1.8	8.3	23.5	32.5
9772	Gambia	UNEP	Landscape Planning and Restoration to Improve Ecosystem Services, and Livelihoods, Expand and Effectively Manage Protected Areas	3.0	3.2		5.6	19.8	26.0	
9857	Global (Afghanistan, Albania, Armenia, Bahamas, China, Cuba, Ethiopia,	UNDP	GEF SGP Sixth Operational Phase- Strategic Implementation using STAR Resources, Tranche 2 (Part IV)	9.7	7.0	3.2	19.2	19.9	39.9	

	Georgia, Jordan, St. Kitts And Nevis, Lao PDR, St. Lucia, Marshall Islands, Mali, Niger, Nigeria, Papua New Guinea, Palau, Sierra Leone, Turkey, Tuvalu, Tanzania, Ukraine, Uganda)									
9774	Global (Argentina, Burkina Faso, Bhutan, Belarus, Colombia, Cabo Verde, Dominican Republic, Eritrea, Gambia, Jamaica, Madagascar, Mali, Malaysia, Nepal, Panama, Congo DR)	UNDP	GEF SGP Sixth Operational Phase- Strategic Implementation Using STAR Resources Tranche 1, Mainly in LDCs and SIDs (Part III)	7.0	6.7	4.3		17.3	18.0	36.1
9577	Grenada	UNDP	Climate Resilient Agriculture for Integrated Landscape Management	1.0		3.0		3.7	13.7	17.7
9783	Guinea	UNDP	Integrated Management of Natural Resources in Middle and Upper Guinea	3.0	2.9	1.8		7.1	25.0	32.7
9565	Guyana	UNDP	Strengthening the Enabling Framework for Biodiversity Mainstreaming and Mercury Reduction in Small and Medium-scale Gold Mining Operations	4.0			1.0	4.5	29.7	34.6

9777	Haiti	UNDP/F AO	Sustainable Management of Wooded Production Landscapes for Biodiversity Conservation	5.8	1.0		6.2	36.0	42.8	
9239	Indonesia	IFAD	Integrated Management of Peatland Landscapes in Indonesia (IMPLI)	2.8	0.7	0.4	1.5	4.9	20.7	26.0
9600	Indonesia	World Bank	Strengthening of Social Forestry in Indonesia	9.7	0.9		5.0	14.3	95.1	110.7
9862	Jamaica	UNDP	Conserving Biodiversity and Reducing Land Degradation Using an Integrated Landscape Approach	4.5	2.3		6.2	43.9	50.7	
9573	Liberia	CI	Conservation and Sustainable use of Liberia’s Coastal Natural Capital	3.3	1.0		3.9	10.0	14.3	
9793	Madagascar	UNEP	Conservation and Improvement of Ecosystem Services for the Atsinanana Region through Agroecology and the Promotion of Sustainable Energy Production	1.5	1.5	1.3	3.8	20.1	24.2	
9294	Mauritania	FAO	Integrated Ecosystem Management Program for the Sustainable Human Development in Mauritania	1.9	2.7	2.5	1.8	8.2	23.2	32.2
9555	Mexico	World Bank	Sustainable Productive Landscapes	11.1	2.9	2.0	7.9	21.9	54.3	78.1
9389	Mongolia	UNDP	Ensuring Sustainability and Resilience (ENSURE) of Green Landscapes in Mongolia	4.1	3.2		1.4	8.0	34.0	42.7
9537	Morocco	FAO	Revitalising Oasis Agro-ecosystems through a Sustainable, Integrated and Landscape Approach in the Draâ-Tafilalet Region (OASIL)	4.8	4.7		8.6	41.3	50.7	
9261	Myanmar	FAO	My-Coast: Ecosystem-Based Conservation of Myanmar’s Southern Coastal Zone	2.4	1.0		3.0	15.7	19.0	
9426	Namibia	UNDP	Namibia Integrated Landscape Approach for Enhancing Livelihoods and Environmental Governance to Eradicate Poverty (NILALEG)	3.8	2.0	3.9	2.2	10.8	65.2	77.0
9437	Nepal	WWF- US	Integrated Landscape Management to Secure Nepal’s Protected Areas and Critical Corridors	2.4	2.4		2.4	6.7	42.6	49.9
9405	Niger	UNEP	Integrated Management of Oasis Ecosystems	1.0	1.2	1.2	1.6	4.6	34.3	39.3

			of Northern Niger (IMOIE -NN)								
9589	Panama	CAF	Ecosystem-based Biodiversity Friendly Cattle Production Framework for the Darien Region of Panama	1.9	1.9			3.5	14.3	18.2	
9554	Philippines	FAO	Enhancing Biodiversity, Maintaining Ecosystem Flows, Enhancing Carbon Stocks through Sustainable Land Management and the Restoration of Degraded Forestlands	1.5	0.4		1.0	2.6	49.4	52.3	
9584	Philippines	UNDP	Integrated Approach in the Management of Major Biodiversity Corridors (IA-Biological Corridors)	11.0	0.9		1.4	12.3	67.5	80.9	
9906	Regional (Benin, Sao Tome and Principe, Togo)	World Bank	West Africa Coastal Areas Resilience Investment Project	3.3	6.8	12.0		20.2	185.8	207.9	
9770	Regional (Bolivia, Brazil, Colombia, Ecuador, Guyana, Peru, Suriname, Venezuela)	UNEP	Implementation of the Strategic Action Programme to Ensure Integrated and Sustainable Management of the Transboundary Water Resources of the Amazon River Basin Considering Climate Variability and Change	0.3	0.1	0.1	12.4		11.7	108.5	121.3
9385	Rwanda	UNDP	Forest Landscape Restoration in the Mayaga Region	1.9	2.7	1.2		0.9	6.2	25.8	32.6
9431	Seychelles	UNDP	A Ridge-to-Reef Approach for the Integrated Management of Marine, Coastal and Terrestrial Ecosystems in the Seychelles	1.9	2.4			3.9	28.3	32.5	
9563	Seychelles	World Bank	Third South West Indian Ocean Fisheries Governance and Shared Growth Project (SWIOFish3)	2.9		2.9	5.5	10.3	54.0	65.3	
9903	Sierra Leone	UNDP	Sustainable and Integrated landscape management of the Western Area Peninsula	2.8	2.9			5.2	18.0	23.7	
9846	Solomon Islands	IUCN	EREPA - Ensuring Resilient Ecosystems and Representative Protected Areas in the Solomon Islands	4.4	1.0			4.9	8.5	13.9	

9372	Sri Lanka	UNDP	Managing Together: Integrating Community-centered, Ecosystem-based Approaches into Forestry, Agriculture and Tourism Sectors	1.7	0.9		1.1	3.3	28.5	32.1
9785	St. Kitts and Nevis	UNEP	Improving Environmental Management through Sustainable Land Management in St. Kitts and Nevis	0.6	0.4	2.4		3.0	14.5	17.8
9580	St. Vincent and the Grenadines	UNDP	Conserving Biodiversity and Reducing Land Degradation Using a Ridge-to-Reef Approach	2.3	1.8			3.8	10.5	14.6
9425	Sudan	UNDP	Strengthened Protected Areas System and Integrated Ecosystem Management in Sudan	2.3	2.2			4.1	17.2	21.7
9400	Tanzania	UNDP	Safeguarding Zanzibar’s Forest and Coastal Habitats for Multiple Benefits	3.3	1.4	1.0		5.2	23.0	28.7
9558	Thailand	UNDP	Sixth Operational Phase of the GEF Small Grants Programme in Thailand	1.0	1.0	0.7		2.4	8.7	11.3
TOTAL								339.4	1,616.6	1,985.8

E) Multi-focal Area Medium-sized Projects that include funding from the biodiversity focal area (in millions of \$US)

GEF ID	Country	Agency	Title	BD	CCM	LD	IW	GEF Grant	Co-finance	Total
9928	Egypt	FAO	Sustainable Management of Kharga Oasis Agro-Ecosystems in the Egyptian Western Desert	0.5	0.6			1.0	9.0	10.1
9803	Haiti	IADB	Managing the Human-Biodiversity Interface in the Southern Marine Protected Areas of Haiti - MHBI	0.9	1.1			1.8	10.6	12.6
9545	Regional (Albania, Montenegro)	UNEP	Implementation of Ecosystem Approach in the Adriatic Sea through Marine Spatial Planning	0.4			1.6	1.8	12.0	14.0
9738	Regional (Nigeria, Senegal, Congo DR)	UNEP	GLOBE Legislators Advancing REDD+ and Natural Capital Governance Towards the Delivery of the 2030 Agenda	0.8	0.3			1.0	3.4	4.5
9409	Sri Lanka	UNEP	Healthy Landscapes: Managing Agricultural Landscapes in Socio-ecologically Sensitive Areas to Promote Food Security, Well-being and Ecosystem	1.5		0.7		2.0	8.7	10.9

Health													
TOTAL											7.7	43.7	52.2

F) Programmatic Approaches and Child Projects (shown in millions of US dollars)²¹

GEF ID	Country	Agency	Title	BD	CC	LD	IW	CW	IAP	SFM	GEF Grant	Co-finance	Total
<u>9060</u>			<i>CFI: Coastal Fisheries Initiative</i>										
<u>9126</u>	Regional (Cote d'Ivoire, Cabo Verde, Senegal)	FAO/ UNEP	Delivering Sustainable Environmental, Social and Economic Benefits in West Africa through Good Governance, Correct Incentives and Innovation	0.3			6.7				6.4	45.6	52.6
<u>9129</u>	Indonesia	WWF-US/CI	Eco-system Approach to Fisheries Management (EAFM) in Eastern Indonesia (Fisheries Management Area (FMA)- 715, 717 & 718)	6.9			4.3				10.2	52.1	63.2
<u>9124</u>	Regional (Ecuador, Peru)	UNDP	Coastal Fisheries Initiative- Latin America	0.5			6.7				6.6	65.6	72.7
<u>9070</u>			<i>Fostering Sustainability and Resilience for Food Security in Sub-Saharan Africa - An Integrated Approach</i>										
<u>9178</u>	Burundi	FAO	Support for Sustainable Food Production and Enhancement of Food Security and Climate Resilience in Burundi's Highlands	1.0	1.9	1.2			3.9		7.4	45.1	53.1
<u>9135</u>	Ethiopia	UNDP	Integrated Landscape Management to Enhance Food Security and Ecosystem Resilience	2.0		5.2			4.0		10.2	145.0	156.1
<u>9340</u>	Ghana	World Bank	Sustainable Land and Water Management Project, Second Additional Financing	3.2	2.4	4.3			4.0		12.8	22.0	35.9
<u>9139</u>	Kenya	IFAD	Establishment of the Upper Tana Nairobi Water Fund (UTNWF)	1.0	1.0	2.0			3.9		7.2	61.1	68.9
<u>9138</u>	Malawi	IFAD	Enhancing the Resilience of Agro-Ecological Systems (ERASP)	1.0	1.5	1.5			3.9		7.2	87.4	95.2
<u>9136</u>	Niger	IFAD	Family Farming Development Programme	0.5	0.5	3.3			4.0		7.6	60.3	68.6

²¹ Programmatic approaches are *italicized* and their "child" projects are shown below them. Where the child projects have not been CEO Endorsed yet, remaining financial balances are shown as part of the program. Some programs were approved by Council during the first two years of GEF-6, but most child projects were cleared since July 1, 2016.

(ProDAF)										
9143	Nigeria	UNDP	Integrated Landscape Management to Enhance Food Security and Ecosystem Resilience in Nigeria	2.7	0.2	0.9	4.0	7.1	57.0	64.8
9140	Regional	IFAD	Cross Cutting Capacity Building, Knowledge Services and Coordination Project for the Food Security Integrated Approach Pilot Program				11.8	10.8	85.1	96.9
9133	Swaziland	IFAD	Climate-Smart Agriculture for Climate-Resilient Livelihoods (CSARL)	0.5	0.6	2.9	3.9	7.2	48.0	55.9
9132	Tanzania	IFAD	Reversing Land Degradation Trends and Increasing Food Security in Degraded Ecosystems of Semi-arid Areas of Central Tanzania	2.0	1.0	1.0	3.9	7.2	53.0	60.8
9137	Uganda	UNDP/ FAO	Fostering Sustainability and Resilience for Food Security in Karamoja Sub Region	0.6	1.3	2.1	3.9	7.1	58.0	65.8
9071			<i>Global Partnership on Wildlife Conservation and Crime Prevention for Sustainable Development</i>	11.4	0.8	1.9	1.5	14.4		
9531	Afghanistan	UNDP	Conservation of Snow Leopards and their Critical Ecosystem in Afghanistan	1.3	0.7		1.0	2.7	6.0	8.9
9154	Botswana	UNDP	Managing the Human-wildlife Interface to Sustain the Flow of Agro-ecosystem Services and Prevent Illegal Wildlife Trafficking in the Kgalagadi and Ghanzi Drylands	2.0		4.6		6.0	22.5	29.0
9155	Cameroon	UNDP	Integrated and Transboundary Conservation of Biodiversity in the Basins of the Republic of Cameroon	2.4		0.4	1.4	3.9	25.8	30.0
9159	Congo	UNDP	Integrated and Transboundary Conservation of Biodiversity in the Basins of the Republic of Congo	1.2	0.6	0.5	1.1	3.1	20.7	24.1
9700	Congo	World Bank	Strengthening the Management of Wildlife and Improving Livelihoods in Northern Republic of Congo	4.1		0.6	2.4	6.5	123.8	130.9
9157	Ethiopia	UNDP	Enhanced Management and Enforcement of Ethiopia's Protected Areas Estate	8.0				7.3	83.4	91.4
9212	Gabon	World	Wildlife and Human-Elephant Conflicts	5.6		1.0	3.3	9.1	50.8	60.7

		Bank	Management							
9211	Global	World Bank/ UNDP	Coordinate Action and Learning to Combat Wildlife Crime	7.6				7.0	58.0	65.6
9148	India	UNDP	Securing Livelihoods, Conservation, Sustainable Use and Restoration of High Range Himalayan Ecosystems (SECURE)Himalayas	7.3	1.1		4.2	11.5	60.8	73.4
9150	Indonesia	UNDP	Combatting Illegal and Unsustainable Trade in Endangered Species in Indonesia	7.6				7.0	44.9	52.6
9659	Kenya	UNDP	Kenya- Combating Poaching and Illegal Wildlife Trafficking in Kenya through an Integrated Approach	3.2	1.0			3.8	15.6	19.7
9842	Malawi	World Bank	Shire Valley Transformation Program - I	2.6	1.5		2.0	5.6	39.1	45.2
9158	Mozambique	UNDP	Strengthening the Conservation of Globally Threatened Species in Mozambique through Improving Biodiversity Enforcement and Expanding Community Conservancies around Protected Areas	8.2	3.3		5.7	15.8	64.8	82.0
9658	Philippines	ADB	Combating Environmental Organized Crime in the Philippines	2.0				1.8	1.3	3.3
9527	Thailand	UNDP	Combatting Illegal Wildlife Trade, Focusing on Ivory, Rhino Horn, Tiger and Pangolins in Thailand	4.4				4.0	27.8	32.2
9529	Vietnam	World Bank	Strengthening Partnerships to Protect Endangered Wildlife in Vietnam	3.3				3.0	10.2	13.5
9213	Zambia	World Bank	Zambia Integrated Forest Land Project (ZIFLP)	2.9	1.5	1.5	2.9	8.1	55.2	64.0
9660	Zimbabwe	UNDP	Strengthening Biodiversity and Ecosystems Management and Climate-Smart Landscapes in the Mid to Lower Zambezi Region of Zimbabwe	2.3	1.1	3.9	3.6	10.0	47.4	58.3
9072			<i>Taking Deforestation Out of Commodity Supply Chains</i>							
9617	Brazil	UNDP	Taking Deforestation Out of the Soy Supply Chain				7.2	6.6	28.2	35.4

9179	Global	UNDP/ WWF- US	Adaptive Management and Learning for the Commodities IAP					4.3	4.0	5.3	9.6
9180	Global	UNDP	Reducing Deforestation from Commodity Production					15.9	14.6	164.7	180.6
9182	Global	WWF- US/ UNDP	Commodities-IAP: Generating Responsible Demand for Reduced-Deforestation Commodities					9.5	8.7	42.3	51.9
9696	Global	World Bank/ UNEP	Enabling Transactions - Market Shift to Deforestation Free Beef, Palm Oil and Soy					7.0	6.4	23.0	29.9
9077			<i>Sustainable Cities Integrated Approach Pilot</i>								
9142	Brazil	UNEP	Promoting Sustainable Cities in Brazil through Integrated Urban Planning and Innovative Technologies Investment	4.0	15.7			5.0	22.6	195.7	220.3
9162	Global	World Bank	Sustainable Cities IAP - Global Platform for Sustainable Cities					9.8	9.0	5.4	15.2
9127	Paraguay	UNDP	Asuncion Green City of the Americas – Pathways to Sustainability	1.5	2.4		2.3	2.0	7.5	240.3	248.5
9698	Peru	IADB	National Platform for Sustainable Cities and Climate Change	0.5	3.0			3.5	6.4	301.0	308.0
9123	Senegal	World Bank/ UNIDO	Sustainable Cities Initiative	1.0	2.0	1.0	1.5	4.0	8.7	51.8	61.3
9484	Vietnam	ADB	Integrated Approaches for Sustainable Cities in Vietnam	1.0	4.0			4.0	8.3	148.5	157.5
9272			<i>Amazon Sustainable Landscapes Program</i>								
9664	Brazil	World Bank	Amazon Sustainable Landscapes Project	32.9	7.6	3.3		21.9	60.3	373.8	439.5
9663	Colombia	World Bank/ UNDP	Colombia: Connectivity and Biodiversity Conservation in the Colombian Amazon	10.9	2.7	1.6		7.6	21.0	107.2	130.1
9374	Peru	WWF- US	Securing the Future of Peru's Natural Protected Areas	6.2		0.4		3.3	9.0	54.5	64.3
9387	Peru	UNDP	Sustainable Productive Landscapes in the	10.9	1.5	1.0		6.7	18.3	129.0	149.0

			Peruvian Amazon									
9339	Regional (Brazil, Colombia, Peru)	World Bank	AMAZON Coordination Technical Assistance	1.0				4.5	5.0	20.0	25.5	
9403	China	UNDP /FECO/ CI	China's Protected Area System Reform (C-PAR)	20.3					18.6	129.0	149.3	
9768	China	UNDP/ FAO/ World Bank	PRC-GEF Partnership Program for Sustainable Agricultural Development	9.3	4.1				12.3	83.3	96.7	
9264	Global (Central African Republic, Cameroon, China, Guinea-Bissau, Kenya, Myanmar, Pakistan, Sao Tome and Principe, Tanzania, Congo DR)	IUCN/ FAO/ UNEP	TRI The Restoration Initiative - Fostering Innovation and Integration in Support of the Bonn Challenge	14.4	10.0	12.3		22.3	54.1	201.5	260.5	
9433	Madagascar	WWF-US/ World Bank	S3MR Sustainable Management of Madagascar's Marine Resources	6.9					6.3	40.0	46.8	
9607	Regional (Albania, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Egypt, Lebanon, Libya, Morocco, Montenegro, Tunisia)	UNEP/ EBRD	Mediterranean Sea Programme (MedProgramme): Enhancing Environmental Security	1.5		27.8	16.9		42.4	708.0	754.2	

G) Support to Enabling Activities: Convention Reporting Requirements

ID	Agency	Country	Title	GEF Grant	Co-finance	Total
9817	UNEP	Regional (Burundi, Botswana, Central African Republic,	Support to Eligible Parties to	1,963,500	1,116,060	3,079,560

		Congo, Djibouti, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Gabon, Kenya, Comoros, Rwanda, Sudan, South Sudan, Chad, Tanzania, Uganda, Congo DR)	Produce the Sixth National Report to the CBD (Africa-1)			
9821	UNDP	Regional (Antigua And Barbuda, Argentina, Bolivia, Belize, Colombia, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Guyana, Honduras, Jamaica, St. Kitts And Nevis, St. Lucia, Peru, Paraguay, El Salvador, St. Vincent and Grenadines)	Support to Eligible Parties to Produce the Sixth National Report to the CBD (LAC)	1,963,500	1,380,000	3,343,500
9822	UNEP	Regional (Albania, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Belarus, Georgia, Moldova, Montenegro, Macedonia, Mongolia, Serbia)	Support to Eligible Parties to Produce the Sixth National Report to the CBD (Europe, CIS and Mongolia)	1,270,500	250,000	1,520,500
9823	UNEP	Regional (Cook Islands, Fiji, Micronesia, Kiribati, Marshall Islands, Nauru, Niue, Palau, Tonga, Tuvalu, Vanuatu)	Support to Eligible Parties to Produce the Sixth National Report to the CBD (Pacific)	1,270,500	590,000	1,860,500
9824	UNEP	Regional (Burkina Faso, Benin, Cote d'Ivoire, Cabo Verde, Ghana, Gambia, Guinea, Equatorial Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Liberia, Mali, Niger, Nigeria, Sierra Leone, Senegal, Sao Tome and Principe, Togo)	Support to Eligible Parties to Produce the Sixth National Report to the CBD (Africa-2)	1,963,500	453,600	2,417,100
9826	UNDP	Global (Bangladesh, Bhutan, China, Indonesia, India, Cambodia, Lao PDR, Sri Lanka, Myanmar, Malaysia, Nepal, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Thailand, Timor Leste, Vietnam, Samoa)	Support to Eligible Parties to Produce the Sixth National Report (6NR) to the CBD (Asia)	1,963,500	2,148,902	4,112,402
9829	UNDP	Global (Afghanistan, Barbados, Bahamas, Algeria, Egypt, Iraq, Jordan, Kyrgyz Republic, Kazakhstan, Lebanon, Morocco, Mauritania, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Tunisia, Uzbekistan, Yemen)	Support to Eligible Parties to Produce the Sixth National Report to the CBD (6NR - Mixed regions)	1,963,500	1,822,500	3,786,000
9832	UNEP	Global (Angola, Cameroon, Lesotho, Madagascar, Mauritius, Maldives, Malawi, Mozambique, Namibia, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Solomon Islands, Seychelles, Swaziland, South Africa, Zambia, Zimbabwe)	Support to Eligible Parties to Produce the Sixth National Report to the CBD	1,963,500	1,129,495	3,092,995
9840	UNDP	Global (Brazil, Chile, Cuba, Dominica, Grenada, Guatemala, Haiti, Mexico, Panama, Suriname, Trinidad and Tobago, Uruguay, Venezuela)	Support to Eligible Parties to Produce the Sixth National Report to the CBD (6NR - LAC-II)	1,501,500	691,000	2,192,500
9866	UNEP	Global (Antigua And Barbuda, Albania, Burkina Faso, Burundi,	Support to Preparation of the	1,430,000	1,111,321	2,541,321

Benin, Bolivia, Bhutan, Botswana, Belarus, Congo, Cote d'Ivoire, Cameroon, Cuba, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Micronesia, Gabon, Gambia, Guinea, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, India, Kenya, Kyrgyz Republic, Cambodia, Comoros, Kazakhstan, Lao PDR, Liberia, Lesotho, Moldova, Madagascar, Marshall Islands, Mali, Myanmar, Mongolia, Mauritania, Mauritius, Malawi, Mexico, Mozambique, Namibia, Niger, Philippines, Pakistan, Rwanda, Seychelles, Sudan, Sierra Leone, Senegal, Sao Tome and Principe, Swaziland, Togo, Tajikistan, Uganda, Vietnam, Vanuatu, Samoa, South Africa, Zambia, Congo DR)

Interim National Report on
the Implementation of the
Nagoya Protocol
