

**CONVENTION ON  
BIOLOGICAL  
DIVERSITY**

Distr.  
GENERAL

UNEP/CBD/COP/7/9  
17 December 2003

ENGLISH, FRENCH  
AND SPANISH ONLY

---

CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES TO THE  
CONVENTION ON BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY  
Seventh meeting  
Kuala Lumpur, 9-20 and 27 February 2003  
Item 15 of the provisional agenda \*

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

1. The Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the Conference of the Parties and the Council of the Global Environment Facility (GEF) (decision III/8, annex) provides, in its paragraph 3.1, that the Council will prepare and submit a report for each ordinary meeting of the Conference of the Parties.
2. Accordingly, the Executive Secretary is circulating herewith the report of the Global Environment Facility to the seventh meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity, which, following its approval by the GEF Council, was transmitted by the GEF secretariat to the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity on 17 December 2003.
3. The report contains specific information as provided for in the Memorandum of Understanding and, in accordance with past practice, is made available to the Conference of the Parties as it was received by the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity and in the languages of submission only (English, French and Spanish).

---

\* UNEP/CBD/COP/7/1 and Corr.1.





**Global Environment Facility**

December 15, 2003

---

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

## Table of Contents

<b>I. Introduction</b> .....	1
<b>II. GEF Financing in the Area of Biological Diversity</b> .....	2
<b>III. Other activities in response to Convention Guidance</b> .....	4
GEF strategic business planning.....	5
<b>IV. GEF Approaches to Addressing Priority and Thematic Issues of the COP</b> .....	7
Mountain biological diversity.....	7
Protected areas .....	8
Forest biological diversity .....	9
Marine and coastal biological diversity .....	11
Inland water biological diversity .....	12
Biodiversity of dryland .....	13
Agricultural biological diversity.....	15
<b>V. The Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety</b> .....	16
Project on Development of National Biosafety Frameworks .....	16
Projects on Implementation of National Biosafety Frameworks.....	17
<b>VI. GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Activities</b> .....	18
Third Study of the GEF's Overall Performance .....	19
Review of Financial Arrangements in Biodiversity Projects.....	19
Project Performance Report 2002.....	20
Biodiversity Program Study.....	20
Cross-cutting evaluations.....	21
<b>Annex A: Projects Approved During the Reporting Period in the Focal Area of Biodiversity</b> .....	A1
<b>Annex B: Project Summaries (July 2001-June 2003)</b> .....	B1

## I. INTRODUCTION

1. This report has been prepared for the seventh meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity. It covers the period from July 1, 2001 to June 30, 2003 (the period of the last report was until June 30, 2001). This report describes major GEF activities during the reporting period in the area covered by the Convention and provides specific information on how the GEF has applied the guidance of the Conference of the Parties in its operational activities and other work related to the Convention. Guidance to the financial mechanism concerning policies, program priorities, and eligibility criteria is contained in relevant decisions of the Conference of the Parties<sup>1</sup>. Among the decisions adopted by the most recent Conference of the Parties (COP 6 was held in the Hague, Netherlands in April 2002) two are directly relevant to the GEF<sup>2</sup>.

2. The Parties' attention is also drawn to the following GEF publications and documents which the GEF will make available to the seventh meeting of the Conference of the Parties. All the documents are available in English; some are available in additional languages.

- (a) *Beijing Declaration of the second GEF Assembly*, October 2002 (available in all UN languages);
- (b) *Decade of support to Biodiversity*;
- (c) *Forests Matter*;
- (d) *High Priorities - GEF Contribution to Preserving and Sustaining Mountain Ecosystems*;
- (e) *Making a Visible Difference in Our World*;
- (f) *Operational Report on GEF Projects*; and
- (g) *What kind of world?* (also available in French and Spanish).

3. The following reports of the GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Unit will also be made available at COP 7:

---

<sup>1</sup> See decision I/2 (UNEP/CBD/COP/1/17, 1995) *Financial resources and mechanism*; decision II/6 (UNEP/CBD/COP/2/19, 1995) *Financial resources and mechanism*; decision III/5 (UNEP/CBD/COP/3/38, 1997) *Additional guidance to the financial mechanism*; decision IV/13 (UNEP/CBD/COP/4/27, 1998) *Additional guidance to the financial mechanism*; and decision V/13 (UNEP/CBD/COP/5/23/ANX3, 2000), *Further Guidance to the financial mechanism*.

<sup>2</sup> Decisions VI/17, *Financial mechanism under the Convention* and VI/16 *Additional financial resources*.

- (a) *GEF Annual Report 2002, Year of Renewed Commitment to Sustaining the Earth* (also available in French and Spanish);
- (b) *Project Performance Report 2002 and Lesson Notes on PPR* ;
- (c) *Review of Financial Arrangements in GEF-supported Biodiversity Projects*; and
- (d) *Measuring Results of the GEF Biodiversity Program*.

## II. GEF FINANCING IN THE AREA OF BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY

4. The GEF, as the financial mechanism of the Convention, provides financing to country driven projects consistent with guidance approved by the Conference of the Parties on policies, program priorities and eligibility. GEF-financed activities are mainly managed through its Implementing Agencies: UNDP, UNEP, and the World Bank. Information on all GEF projects is available at the GEF web ([www.TheGEF.org](http://www.TheGEF.org)) under Project Data and Documents.

5. As of June 2003, over US\$1,635 million has been provided in grants from the GEF Trust Fund out of a total of US\$3,287 million in project financing allocated to biological diversity. In addition, GEF financed projects in its other focal areas, in particular projects and programs in the areas of international waters, integrated eco-system management and sustainable land management, also contribute directly or indirectly to the objectives and implementation of the Convention on Biological Diversity.

6. As indicated in Table 1, the GEF allocation in the area of biological diversity during the reporting period was US\$263 million in grant financing out of total project costs of US\$790 million. The amount of US\$527 million was leveraged in co-financing for project activities from the Implementing Agencies, executing agencies, bilateral agencies, recipient countries, and the private sector.

**Table 1: Project Financing in the Area of Biological Diversity  
(July 2001 - June 2003)**

Type of activity	Number of activities	GEF financing (in US\$ millions)	Co-financing (in US\$ millions)	Total financing (in US\$ millions)
Full-sized projects	42	203.58	428.03	631.61
Medium-sized projects	53	44.97	96.70	141.67
Enabling activities	43	8.53	2.92	11.45
Project preparation <sup>3</sup>	17	5.83		5.83

<sup>3</sup> Often, as a first step in project development, the GEF provides financing to assist recipient countries to develop a project concept into a project proposal.

<b>Total</b>	<b>155</b>	<b>262.91</b>	<b>527.65</b>	<b>790.56</b>
--------------	------------	---------------	---------------	---------------

7. During the reporting period, the GEF approved 155 projects in the area of biological diversity, including biosafety. Among them, there are 42 full-sized projects, 53 medium-sized projects, 43 enabling activity projects, and 17 project preparation financing. Annex A lists all project and project preparation grants approved during the reporting period. Annex B provides summary information on the approved projects.

8. Forty two full-sized projects approved by the GEF in the area of biological diversity focus on five operational programs in the area of biodiversity and several projects address more than one operational program. These operational programs are consistent with the policy, strategy and program priorities decided by the Conference of the Parties. Among the projects, 16 are under the operational program on arid and semi-arid zone ecosystems (OP1), 14 address coastal, marine, and freshwater ecosystems (OP2), 12 are under forest ecosystems (OP3), 10 pertain to mountain ecosystems (OP4) and 5 are under the operational program on conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity important to agriculture (OP13).

9. Fifty three medium-sized projects were approved by the GEF during the reporting period. It would be useful to recall that the GEF Council approved medium-sized project procedures in 1996 as one of the pathways for GEF funding to respond to a request of the Conference of the Parties<sup>4</sup>. As of June 2003, there were 130 medium-sized projects (MSPs) in the biodiversity portfolio out of 214 total MSPs, representing about 61 percent of all MSPs approved by the GEF. In terms of resources, GEF financing for MSPs in the area of biodiversity is US\$104 million.

10. During the reporting period, 43 enabling activity projects were approved under expedited procedures. Five projects assisted countries in preparing their national biodiversity strategies and action plans. They also included additional resources for countries to assess their capacity needs for taxonomy, incentive measures, invasive alien species, benefit sharing and indigenous and traditional knowledge, as requested in Decision VI/17.

11. Often, as a first step in project development, the GEF provides financing to assist recipient countries to develop a project concept into a project proposal. Most of the full-sized projects and a number of medium-sized projects have been developed using GEF project preparation funds. Seventeen project preparation grants were approved in the reporting period.

12. The GEF Small Grants Programme (SGP) implemented by UNDP on behalf of the GEF was launched in 1992. The SGP supports the implementation of the Convention on Biological

---

<sup>4</sup>See Decision II/6, paragraph 10, “The Conference of the Parties,... Recommends, for more effective implementation of its policies, strategies, and program priorities, that the Global Environment Facility explore the possibility of promoting diverse forms of public involvement and more effective collaboration between all tiers of government and civil society, including the feasibility of a program of grants for medium-sized projects.”

Diversity through civil society action by providing grants of up to \$50,000 to community based and non-governmental organizations, to build their capacity to undertake environmental projects. Since the last reporting period, SGP has nearly doubled its size in terms of project numbers and total funds granted. As of June 2003, the SGP funded 2,474 biodiversity projects, totaling \$49.4 million in grant funds. Of these biodiversity projects, 1,087 were approved during the reporting period with \$21.41 million in grant funds and \$24.9 million in co-financing. The SGP is expected to add to the program 10 new countries per year for the next three years. As requested by the Conference of the Parties<sup>5</sup>, SIDS and LDCs will be given priority in SGP's expansion. Further information could be found at: [www.undp.org/sgp](http://www.undp.org/sgp).

### **III. OTHER ACTIVITIES IN RESPONSE TO CONVENTION GUIDANCE**

13. The Conference of the Parties anticipated the successful and substantial third replenishment of the GEF Trust Fund in decision VI/17. The decision also notes "the strong support expressed by developing countries, in particular the least developed and the Small Island Developing States among them, and countries with economies in transition, as well as developed countries, for assistance from the Global Environment Facility in the implementation of the Convention". The GEF Trust Fund was replenished in 2002 at the level of US\$3 billion. This replenishment will provide additional resources necessary to enable the GEF to address the funding requirements of existing focal areas as well as the new ones and to continue to be responsive to the needs and concerns of its recipient countries.

14. The Conference of Parties also called on the GEF to further streamline "its processes for increased flexibility and improving access to resources". This recommendation has been echoed in the Beijing Declaration in the Second GEF Assembly. The GEF Council will keep under review an action plan so as to monitor the actions taken to respond to the Beijing Declaration and other recommendations regarding improvement of the GEF's performance. The action plan includes actions which respond directly to Convention guidance concerning capacity building, the project cycle, incremental costs, transfer of technology and the private sector<sup>6</sup>.

15. The GEF is further streamlining its project cycle to respond to requests of the Convention and the GEF Council. This will aim to meet the objective of "driving for results" through efforts to improve operational efficiency and balance the focus between project preparation and implementation. Efforts will also aimed at further modification of the project review criteria used by the GEF and establishment of project supervision and management service norms to be met by the Implementing Agencies.

16. Both the GEF Council and the Conference of the Parties requested the GEF Secretariat "in consultation with the Executive Secretary of the Convention, to initiate a dialogue to more effectively implement the guidance to the financial mechanism". The GEF and Convention

---

<sup>5</sup> See decision VI/17.

<sup>6</sup> See Action Plan to Respond to Recommendations for Improving GEF's Performance, GEF/C.22/7.



Secretariats had consultations on key issues related to the implementation of decisions VI/17 and VI/16 and exchanged information on the status of implementation of guidance provided to the GEF. In addition, key issues and agreements discussed include: (a) growing interest of the Convention to track progress through the use of indicators and targets, including the CBD 2010 targets. This development creates opportunities to demonstrate GEF's support to the Convention implementation through the use of common indicators and alignment of some of the CBD 2010 targets with GEF-3 targets; (b) assistance of the CBD Secretariat in highlighting GEF's support at the seventh meeting of the Conference of the Parties; and (c) strong coordinating mechanisms between the Convention and GEF review processes. More details on this latter point are included in Section VI of this report on GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Activities.

### **GEF strategic business planning**

17. Decision VI/17 calls for “improving and further streamlining its processes for increased flexibility and improving access to resources from the Global Environment Facility, taking into consideration the findings included in the Second Overall Performance Study of the Global Environment Facility and the second review of the effectiveness of the financial mechanism.” The decision also requests the GEF “in its plan of action to respond to the Second Overall Performance Study, to take into consideration the recommendations of the second review of the effectiveness of the financial mechanism.” The Second Overall Performance Study (OPS2) and the Policy Recommendations of the Third Replenishment recommended that the GEF undertake strategic business planning to enhance impacts of GEF supported activities.

18. Strategic business planning aims to direct allocation of GEF resources in a manner that catalyzes actions towards maximizing global environmental impacts. There are two major imperatives that drive GEF’s strategic business planning. First, as a learning-based institution, the GEF periodically needs to take stock and factor in extensive implementation experience emerging from its portfolio. Second, in recent years, as demand for GEF support has surpassed the financial resources available to the GEF Trust Fund, there has been an increasing need to match the demand with the supply of GEF resources, employing factors beyond simple eligibility criteria.

19. Strategic priorities define the major themes and approaches under which resources will be programmed within each of the focal areas. These priorities, consistent with the operational programs, guidance from the conventions, and country priorities in each focal area, reflect a sharpening of approach as follows:

- (a) *Lessons from the portfolio.* The OPS 2, other reports and studies from the GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Unit have provided substantial insight from project implementation and impacts at both the project and program levels that need to be reflected in the future portfolio. In addition, there is a rich body of experience with non-GEF supported efforts towards global sustainability. These lessons also

provide guidance on how to target convention guidance and national priorities more closely and achieve results on the ground.

- (b) *Sequencing of response to convention priorities.* The current practice ensures that GEF projects are consistent with convention priorities by requiring projects to conform to the criteria of an operational program that reflects convention guidance. GEF needs to progress to an approach where response to convention guidance is strategically sequenced while maintaining the flexibility to program resources to meet the evolving needs of the conventions and to program for synergies across the various conventions.
- (c) *Responsiveness to national priorities.* Targeting the highest national priorities more actively through review of national reports, assessments, strategies, plans, and dialogue, in addition to relying upon country focal point endorsement.
- (d) *Incorporation of scientific and technical advice.* Identifying the priority interventions, consistent with scientific knowledge, through the work of the Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel (STAP), to reduce global environmental risks.
- (e) *Portfolio gaps.* Identifying gaps in the GEF portfolio and niches for innovation that need to be explored.

20. During the last decade, the emphasis in the GEF biodiversity portfolio has been on financing protected areas with smaller, but growing, engagement with sustainable use, mainstreaming and private sector initiatives. As GEF moves into its second decade, and while recognizing that protected areas are the cornerstones of conservation, it is proposed that biodiversity conservation be mainstreamed increasingly by emphasizing growing support for conservation beyond protected areas. Such an approach would place greater emphasis on sustainability of results and the potential for replication, and move beyond a projects-based emphasis to approaches that systematically target country enabling environments and long-term institutional building. The proposed strategic priorities are:

- (a) *Catalyzing Sustainability of Protected Areas* – to conserve biodiversity through the expansion, consolidation, and rationalization of national protected area systems. Its operational focus will be flexible and based on a thorough understanding of key strengths and weaknesses at the system and national institutional levels, and on how any given individual intervention contributes towards long-term sustainability within a protected area systems context.
- (b) *Mainstreaming Biodiversity in Production Landscapes and Sectors* – to integrate biodiversity conservation in agriculture, forestry, fisheries, tourism and other production systems and sectors to secure national and global environmental benefits. The operational emphasis will be flexible to allow for the development

of tailored activities based on understanding of country context, biodiversity conservation problems, opportunities and demand. Consistent with the GEF's Operational Strategy, on-the ground activities will focus on areas of high global biodiversity unless clear and measurable replication can be shown to result in global biodiversity gains elsewhere through the transformation of markets and demand.

- (c) *Capacity Building for the Implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety*. There is a recognition of the potential risks posed by modified living organisms and therefore biosafety constitutes a high priority for recipient countries. This priority also responds to the guidance from the CBD and it is consistent with the recommendations of the Intergovernmental Committee for the Cartagena Protocol.
- (d) *Generation and Dissemination of Best Practices* - the key objective of GEF support under this pillar will be to improve the effectiveness of analysis, synthesis, dissemination, and especially uptake of best practices, innovative approaches and new tools from projects and programs, to maximize the sustainability and effectiveness of GEF impacts in the biodiversity focal area. The objective will be cross-cutting within the context of guidance from the Conference of the Parties of the CBD

#### **IV. GEF APPROACHES TO ADDRESSING PRIORITY AND THEMATIC ISSUES OF THE COP**

##### **Mountain biological diversity<sup>7</sup>**

21. The GEF has focused on mountain biodiversity as one of four types of critical life-supporting systems, which also include drylands, forests, and coastal/marine/freshwater areas. Mountain protected areas have been the focus of many GEF funded projects, and worldwide one third of designated protected areas are mountainous areas. During the first decade, the GEF had committed more than \$620 million and leveraged additional funding of about \$1,400 million in support of 107 mountain-related projects in 64 nations. Most of these projects have focused on protected areas and surrounding areas. In addition, at least 87 projects are in globally significant sites including World Heritage Sites, the Global 200 list, and UNESCO-Man and the Biosphere, among others. The GEF SGP has also supported over 140 projects related to mountain ecosystems.

22. The GEF supports a range of projects to protect biodiversity in Africa's mountainous regions, including protecting species important to people's livelihoods, health, or culture. For example, in Ethiopia's Bale Mountains National Park and nearby Haremma Forest, the wide diversity of medicinal plants is increasingly threatened by agricultural expansion, deforestation,

---

<sup>7</sup> See Decision I/2.

and overharvesting. A GEF project to conserve and sustainably use medicinal plants, implemented by the World Bank, is supporting farmer-based cultivation trials of selected threatened and indigenous species in home gardens.

23. GEF projects have also provided resources in support of community management in mountainous regions. A GEF project implemented by UNDP supported Bhutan in strengthening the integrated management of Jigme Dorji National Park, Bhutan's largest and one of the most diverse protected areas containing globally significant biodiversity. The project had two components, the first being to strengthen park management and the second involved the incorporation of local communities within the park in implementing a Community Natural Resource Management Plan.

24. In 2002, a UNEP implemented project, Barriers and Best Practices in Integrated Management of Mountain Ecosystems, set out to promote and enhance the protection and sustainable development of mountains and their resources. Thematic papers were produced by leading practitioners and presented at the Bishkek Global Mountain Summit. Other achievements include the adoption of the Bishkek Mountain Platform as the overall framework for sustainable mountain development in the twenty first century, the production of the Mountain Watch report, and the public-private partnership “Water and Mountain Initiative” which was launched in 2003.

25. The project in Armenia: Natural Resources Management and Poverty Reduction, World Bank, covers mountain, forest, meadow and steppe ecosystems and a transboundary wildlife corridor between Armenia and Georgia. The protected areas include Lake Sevan, unique alpine lake ecosystem and littoral habitats, and Dilijan NR, unique forest ecosystem containing endangered species in the Southern Caucasus. However, these sites are under pressure from illegal activities, including logging for timber and fuelwood and resulting soil erosion. Pressures on biodiversity resources are also expected to increase. The project will address some of the root causes, such as, weak regulatory agencies, limited financial resources to continuously manage forest and pasture lands, lack of alternative income generating options and of public awareness.

### **Protected areas**

26. The first pillar of the GEF strategic priorities in its biodiversity focal area is to catalyzing sustainability of protected areas, i.e. to conserve biodiversity through the expansion, consolidation, and rationalization of national protected area systems. During the first decade, the GEF provided nearly \$1,100 million for approximately 200 biodiversity projects with protected area components. The portfolio includes more than 1,000 protected areas, covering at least 226 million hectares. This equates to more than a quarter of the total area under protection in developing countries and countries with economies in transition. In addition, other GEF initiatives such as the Small Grants Program and the Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund, administered by Conservation International, also contribute significantly to protected areas. For example, the GEF has taken steps to address some weaknesses in the African protected area network, a full 37% of hectares under protection in Africa receive GEF support, covering 266

individual sites. In areas where capacity is particularly limited the GEF is using its resources to make contributions to the protected area system.

27. To extend conservation efforts beyond protected areas, GEF supported projects have worked to create linkages between protected areas and their surrounding context in a myriad of ways. Important components of these activities include buffer zones, corridors, cultural linkages, integrated coastal zone management, and transboundary protected areas. Buffer zones and corridors have proven that they can be effective in providing a means for improved management and increased biodiversity conservation, and GEF projects have made extensive use of these planning and management mechanisms. Forty-four GEF-financed biodiversity projects have incorporated buffer zones, and these projects include at least 209 protected areas.

28. The GEF's approach to protected areas reflects the importance of mainstreaming by linking protected areas to other development priorities through an ongoing dialogue that engages different stakeholders at the international, national, local, and grassroots levels. One of the keys to mainstreaming is building awareness and support for protected areas, and increasing awareness of protected area values. The challenge is to develop partnerships by identifying sectors not directly related to protected areas, and to attract new constituencies to expand the appreciation of protected area values. The process of mainstreaming protected areas, however, can be indistinct, and may occur in different ways depending on the context of implementation. These activities can include the incorporation of protected area considerations into policies governing non-protected area sector activities, and the simultaneous achievement of gains for protected areas and gains in economic sectors.

29. A lesson learned from GEF programs and projects is that development and enrichment of governance structures related to protected areas is one of the keys to improving the sustainability and management of protected areas. Initiatives towards this end include activities such as incorporating traditional management systems, legislative initiatives, and involving NGOs and the private sector. The GEF has supported activities in each of these areas, with a heavy emphasis on NGOs.

### **Forest biological diversity**

30. Through June 2003, the GEF has committed \$777.6 million for nearly 150 projects that help conserve forest ecosystems, with an additional \$2,000 million in co-financing also being leveraged for a total of \$2,730 million in support of forest related projects in 76 countries. Forest related projects account for more than 50 percent of the total GEF biodiversity portfolio. GEF forest projects support more than 650 protected areas covering many different types of ecosystems, such as cloud forests, tropical rainforest, dry forest, temperate forests, boreal forests, and mangrove forests.

31. Under the Convention guidance<sup>8</sup> the GEF targets forest ecosystems as a key to the conservation, sustainable use, and equitable sharing of benefits from biodiversity. Under the GEF strategic priority, the second pillar is to mainstream biodiversity into production landscapes and sectors, including forestry. The GEF has focused on protected areas as a key tool for conserving forests and biodiversity. The GEF is also looking to support efforts that mainstream biodiversity in production systems at the broader landscape level. Thematic reviews and project monitoring processes have identified the need for the GEF to move beyond addressing the immediate threats to ecosystems, through the identification and targeting of underlying causes of habitat loss at the landscape scale. Forest biomes will be a primary component of this effort.

32. The GEF supports biodiversity conservation activities in forests at both local site and broader systemic country levels. Working at the local site level involves working within the specific parameters or unique situation of individual sites to identify and conserve specific globally significant biological resources. At the systemic level, the GEF works in partnership through the Implementing Agencies and others to help countries build a conservation vision and strengthen key institutions and policy frameworks. Complementary initiatives from multiple partners are critical to sustain overall efforts for forest conservation.

33. In order to achieve long-term conservation of biological resources, biodiversity conservation must be integrated and given appropriate consideration at the wider landscape level. To achieve this aim, the GEF is working with partner governments and communities to mainstream biodiversity considerations in non-traditional sectors and in the broader development agenda. When biodiversity considerations are taken into account in everyday management decisions in natural resource use sectors, significant progress can be made in securing the integrity of the overall ecosystem. Traditional sectors relevant to biodiversity include tourism, forestry, fisheries, agriculture, and other production systems.

34. GEF financed forest conservation projects take a number of innovative approaches to forest conservation. Projects supporting forest ecosystems are undertaking the following activities:

- (a) Promoting sustainable finance for protected areas in Uganda's Bwindi Impenetrable National Park and Mgahinga Gorilla National Park
- (b) Increasing community support through education and awareness for formally and informally protected forests in Indonesia's Sangihe-Talaud Islands
- (c) Encouraging public-private partnerships for protected areas in Chile's Valdivian Forest Zone

---

<sup>8</sup> See decisions IV/13, V/13 and VI/17.

- (d) Developing an integrated management system for Lebanon's Tannourine-Hadath El-Jebbeh Cedar Forest
- (e) Supporting indigenous management of protected areas in the Peruvian Amazon to ensure equitable benefit sharing from the establishment of communal reserves
- (f) A Small Grant Programme project in the Sabah forest of Malaysia assists the community to register communal lands and fight illegal logging operations on their lands

### **Marine and coastal biological diversity**

35. Recognizing the importance of coastal and marine biological diversity to the healthy functioning of the world's ecosystems and following the guidance of the Convention<sup>9</sup>, the GEF has committed a significant portion of its resources to coastal and marine areas. Under the GEF's biodiversity program, 102 projects for \$ 441 million in GEF grants and \$ 1,666 million in total cost of projects with 82 countries have been identified as targeting or having components addressing coastal and marine ecosystems. Projects financed by the GEF under its other focal areas also contribute directly or indirectly to marine and coastal biodiversity. For example, 33 projects under the international waters focal area directly address conservation and sustainable use of marine and coastal resources.

36. GEF projects on coastal and marine resources entail several approaches, including integration of conservation and regional development, establishment of partnerships for sustainable resource management, and design and implementation of management plans that conserve habitat by financing alternative income-generating activities. A few projects illustrate innovative approaches in view of sustainable use of marine and coastal resources.

37. A GEF supported project is working in Mnazi Bay Marine Park in Tanzania to conserve a representative sample of internationally significant and threatened marine biodiversity. The project is enabling local and government stakeholders to protect and sustainably use marine biodiversity and resources of the Mnazi Bay and Ruvuma estuary. Tanzania's Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism is executing this project, which is implemented by UNDP.

38. The fate of Bangladesh – its people and its prospects for sustainable development – is, to a large extent, determined by its relationship with water and wetlands. During the monsoon season, at least seven to eight million hectares, or about half the country, may be considered wetland. In addition to providing the livelihood for millions of people, these habitats support a large number of avian and aquatic species, many of which are threatened. The GEF Coastal and Wetland Biodiversity project implemented by UNDP is working to establish and demonstrate an innovative system for management of specially designated Ecologically Critical Areas in

---

<sup>9</sup> See decisions I/2, V/13 and VI/17.

Bangladesh that will have a significant and positive impact on the long-term viability of the country's important biodiversity resources.

39. Philippines - Asian Conservation Foundation (ACF) (World Bank/IFC). The project supports a new approach to mobilizing private capital and grant funding to help conserve new and existing marine protected areas at six sites in the Philippines. It is innovative in the way that a holding company is set up. Essentially, private investors are willing to take lower returns on their investment on the Asian Conservation Company in exchange for funding biodiversity conservation. It will provide funds for the first biodiversity oriented holding company which will become a long-term (up to 50 years) shareholder in companies that are strategically located in sectors and regions within the Philippines which allow it to leverage significant benefits for biodiversity. The investment company will work in tandem with a parallel foundation, ACF in order to provide technical assistance and funding for conservation activities at key marine and coastal sites.

#### **Inland water biological diversity<sup>10</sup>**

40. The GEF addresses conservation and sustainable use of inland water ecosystems through the operational programs under both its biodiversity and international water focal areas. A number of GEF financed projects under coastal, marine, and freshwater ecosystems operational program (OP2) support directly inland water ecosystems. During the reporting period the GEF approved the following projects to address inland water issues: Lithuania - Conservation of Inland Wetland Biodiversity (UNDP), Mongolia - Conservation of the Eg-Uur Watershed (World Bank/IFC), Regional (China, Iran, Kazakhstan, Russian Federation) - Development of a Wetland Site and Flyway Network for Conservation of the Siberian Crane and Other Migratory Waterbirds in Asia (UNEP).

41. These projects use various approaches to help countries conserve and sustainably use inland water resources. For example, Lithuanian project implements an integrated approach to the protection of inland wetlands biodiversity. Project activities include: establishment of a system of tradable collection permits for cranberries, reconversion of farming lands to wetland-friendly agricultural activities, adoption of biodiversity-friendly forestry protocols, strengthening enforcement of reserve regulations and boundaries, restoration of selected wetland habitats. The project also focuses on public awareness and support activities, gathering and codification of lessons and best practice, and elaboration of a strategy for replication to other priority wetland sites nationally.

42. The project to conserve Siberian crane in Asia aims to conserve the network of critical wetlands needed for survival of the Siberian Cranes, other threatened cranes, and numerous water birds that form an important resource for local populations. The project focuses on the conservation of the international network of wetlands upon which this species depends, together

---

<sup>10</sup> Guidance of the Convention on inland waters includes decisions IV/13, V13 and VI/17.



with a wide range of other wetland biodiversity. Nearly fifty percent of these wetlands are Ramsar Convention sites. The project area covers the flyways used by populations of Siberian Cranes in western Central Asia and in East Asia targeting key wetland sites located in China, Iran, Kazakhstan, and Russia. The project also contributes to the implementation of the Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals.

43. The Eg-Uur watershed project is to conserve biodiversity-rich taiga riparian, forest and prairie ecosystems and monetize a previously unvalued natural resource through implementation of a natural resource use concession and licensing system. The project also aims to demonstrate to the local inhabitants and other communities throughout Mongolia, that flyfishing ecotourism can provide a competitive rate of return as compared to alternative, higher impact industries, such as mining, logging, and hunting, while complementing the traditional pastoral nomadic way of life.

44. GEF projects in its international water focal area contribute directly to “the implementation of the programme of work on biological diversity of inland water ecosystems”<sup>11</sup>. Among 120 GEF financed projects under its international water focal area, 42 projects address inland waters related issues with a GEF financing of more than \$295 million and an additional financing of \$917 million. The projects help address inland water issues through the water body-based operational program (OP 8), integrated land and water multiple focal area operational program (OP 9) and contaminant-based operational program (OP 10).

45. Over 130 Small Grant Programme projects have addressed inland water biological diversity in the past reporting period. A SGP project initiated two years ago is to address alien invasive species along the Senegal River. Invasions of aquatic plant species have created serious disruption of the river ecosystem, affecting areas of high biological significance such as the Djoudj National Bird Sanctuary, a World Heritage Site. Through a SGP project, over 27,000 square meters have been cleaned and are being continually maintained by community efforts. This experience is being replicated in other areas of Senegal and in Mauritania.

### **Biodiversity of dryland**

46. Since 1991, the GEF has helped developing countries and countries with economies in transition address challenges raised from dryland ecosystems under the Convention guidance<sup>12</sup>. Specific projects promote conservation and sustainable use of natural resources inside and outside protected areas, and assist in preventing or controlling land degradation, while addressing local needs to increase the productivity of agricultural lands and improve food security. Thirty three full and medium-sized projects approved during the reporting period are under arid and semi-arid zone ecosystems operational program (OP1).

---

<sup>11</sup> See Decision VI/17.

<sup>12</sup> See Decisions I/2 and V/13.

47. One significant initiative taken at the second GEF Assembly in October 2002 was to designate land degradation as a GEF focal area to support the implementation of the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification. This is also a direct support to GEF current dryland efforts under the biodiversity focal area. The new GEF operational program on sustainable land management<sup>13</sup> adopted at the GEF meeting in May 2003 operationalizes the designation of land degradation as a focal area. Over the next three years, the GEF expects to invest more than \$250 million to projects that (a) integrate sustainable land management into national development priorities; (b) strengthen human, technical, and institutional capacities; (c) bring about needed policy and regulatory reforms; and (d) implement innovative sustainable land management practices.

48. Preserving biodiversity for agriculture. The GEF supports on-site conservation of crop diversity, which maintains the complex interaction of genetically diverse traditional varieties with their associated pests, predators, and pathogens. One GEF project in Ethiopia, for example, worked to conserve globally important crop genetic resources in the long term by strengthening Ethiopian institutional capacity, providing local farmers more secure seed sources and improving knowledge on seed selection and management. The project is managed by UNDP.

49. Community knowledge in managing natural resources. Several GEF financed work with local communities in Botswana, Kenya, and Tanzania to help stabilize soils and reverse the degradation of dryland ecosystems with globally significant plant species that are resilient to droughts, climatic variability and other stressful events. These projects are managed by UNDP, UNEP and the World Bank.

50. Promoting sustainable livelihood for biodiversity. In Mongolia, a GEF financed project, managed by UNDP, is working for the long-term conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity in the last remnants of temperate grassland habitat in the Eastern Steppes, a venue of high biological significance. Project activities include ensuring protection of biodiversity in protected areas and buffer zones and improving incomes for people living in surrounding areas.

51. Addresses range management in the context of climate change and introducing innovative approaches. For example, in Sudan, a GEF project rehabilitated rangelands, while increasing carbon sequestration. The project helped increase soil cover, reduce soil erosion, increase plant and fauna species diversity, reduce airborne particulates through improving socioeconomic conditions for livestock producers and strengthening local capacity. A GEF project in Morocco High Atlas Mountains is introducing novel ways to integrating pastoral range management with biodiversity conservation in ecosystems used for grazing. Managed by UNDP, the project is reviving biofriendly seasonal movement of livestock up and down mountainsides and common property management; it is doing so by enhancing conservation –oriented land use and providing innovative incentives for managing rangelands sustainably.

---

<sup>13</sup> See document GEF/C.21/6.

52. A Small Grant Programme project in Mali worked with seven villages in the southern Sahel to reverse desertification that threatens local plant and animal species. The project not only undertook ecosystem restoration, but also helped improve the capacity of local people to sustainably manage their lands, and to advocate with local authorities for the right to do so.

### **Agricultural biological diversity**

53. The GEF is widening its support for the maintenance of biodiversity important to agriculture, particular since the GEF has created an operational program on Conservation and Sustainable Use of Biological Diversity Important to Agriculture in view of responding to the Convention guidance<sup>14</sup>. The second pillar of the GEF strategic priorities in the area of biodiversity is to mainstream biodiversity into production landscapes and sectors, including agriculture. In addition to the projects in Egypt, Ethiopia, Peru, Lebanon, Syria and Jordan, ten new projects were approved during the reporting period and they address and or partially help countries conserve and sustainably use agricultural biodiversity resources.

54. Regional Conservation of Gramineae and Associated Arthropods for Sustainable Agricultural Development in Africa, implemented by UNEP. Grasses comprise a large and diverse plant group that is probably the most important to mankind. Another largely neglected group in biodiversity studies is insects and other arthropods, which represent about 70% of the world's biodiversity. Both figure strongly in agrobiodiversity. Yet species and races of grasses and insects are under threat due to increasing human pressure. The project aims first to understand how diversity of Gramineae and associated insects in and around various agro-ecosystems and socio-economic surroundings contributes to ecosystem stability in Ethiopia, Kenya, and Mali, and how indigenous and novel agricultural practices using native biodiversity can contribute to stability and conservation, and finally to adapt and promote the practical application of this knowledge in self-regulatory pest control and sustainable agriculture, while building national capacity and public awareness to effect lasting changes. The overall objective thus will be the development and application of best practices for sustainable use of African grasses and their associated insect resources for agricultural development and grassland conservation.

55. In-situ Conservation of Crop Wild Relatives through Enhanced Information Management and Field applications is a global project. The development objective of the project is to help improve global food security through effective conservation and increased use of priority crop wild relatives. The immediate objectives are the enhanced conservation of crop wild relatives in Armenia, Bolivia, Madagascar, Sri Lanka and Uzbekistan and enhanced capacity to use information for the conservation and sustainable use. An information system will enable countries to access dispersed information held by different international organizations and advanced research institutes that can support improved crop wild relative conservation. National information systems will also be created to bring together relevant information held by countries.

---

<sup>14</sup> See Decisions III/5, V/13 and VI/17.

Actions that increase national knowledge and awareness of the importance and value of conserving crop wild relatives will be undertaken. Information gathered from national and international sources will be used to establish the endangerment status of crop wild relatives in the countries; determine the *in situ* and *ex situ* locations of the crop wild relatives (in protected areas, reserves, gene banks, botanic gardens.); develop capacity to engage in planning and priority-setting exercises; and formulate procedures for action and undertake selected activities identified through the decision making process.

56. In addition, more than 200 Small Grant Programme projects relate to agricultural biodiversity, accounting for an investment of over \$3.8 million. Many of these projects involve the recovery and documentation of indigenous knowledge about agricultural and medicinal plants. For example, a SGP project in Ecuador has supported an indigenous women's group to conduct *in situ* conservation of local Andean plant varieties. The women are implementing traditional techniques for cultivating these plants, developing a seed bank, and documenting and sharing indigenous knowledge about the species.

## **V. THE CARTAGENA PROTOCOL ON BIOSAFETY**

57. Decision VI/17 requests the GEF to provide financial resources “for national capacity building in biosafety, in particular for enabling effective participation in the Biosafety Clearing-House and in the implementation of the Action Plan for Building Capacities for the Effective Implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety proposed by the Intergovernmental Committee on Cartagena Protocol at its second meeting and for other needs identified in the recommendations of the Intergovernmental Committee at its second meeting for assisting developing countries to prepare for the entry into force of the Protocol.”

58. The GEF biosafety activities have been carried out in the context of the GEF Initial Strategy on Biosafety of November 2000, the aim of which is to assist countries to prepare for the coming into force of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety. The GEF's Initial Strategy for Biosafety has been operationalized through a global project on the Development of Biosafety Frameworks in more than 100 eligible countries, and through demonstration projects on capacity building for the implementation of biosafety frameworks in 12 countries. In addition, as noted above, capacity building for the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety is listed as one of the four pillars of the strategic priorities in the GEF biodiversity focal area for the third replenishment process. Over the reporting period, the following activities were carried out.

### **Project on Development of National Biosafety Frameworks**

59. This GEF project aims to assist countries to prepare draft National Biosafety Frameworks (NBFs) through strengthening their capacity for risk assessment and management, promoting information sharing and collaboration at regional and sub-regional levels. Main components of NBFs include a policy and regulatory regime, a system to handle requests for permits, systems for monitoring and enforcement, public information and participation. One hundred nineteen

countries are helped to develop drafts for their NBFs through national surveys and in consultation with stakeholders. The project is managed by UNEP and has a total cost of \$38.4 million with a contribution of \$26.1 million from the GEF and co-financing from UNEP and participating countries.

60. Four regional workshops were organized in 2002 for Africa, Asia-Pacific, Latin America and the Caribbean, and Central and Eastern Europe with 293 participants from 124 countries. The workshops allowed countries to better understand key issues in the development of National Biosafety Frameworks. Six sub-regional workshops for Anglophone and Francophone Africa, Small Island Developing States, Latin America, Asia and Central and Eastern Europe have been held to build capacity on risk assessment/management and public participation. These sub-regional meetings took place from November 2002 to May 2003 with 583 participants from 139 countries. Another 6 sub-regional workshops on “regulatory regimes and administrative systems” will be organized within the scope of the project.

### **Projects on Implementation of National Biosafety Frameworks**

61. With a view to demonstrating the types of capacity that need to be built in order to implement national biosafety frameworks (NBF), the GEF approved 12 demonstration projects as shown in Table 2 in countries that had prepared their NBFs. The aim of these projects is to provide countries with legal, scientific and technical support in implementing their NBF. The projects also provide assistance in finalizing the draft regulatory regime and implementing regulations, setting up systems for handling requests for permits and for monitoring and enforcement, as well as, for public information and participation.

**Table 2: Projects on Biosafety**

Country	Project Name	IA	GEF Financing (in US\$ millions)	Total Financing (in US\$ millions)
Bulgaria	Support for the Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework for Bulgaria	UNEP	0.41	0.50
Cameroon	Support to the Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework for Cameroon	UNEP	0.56	0.67
China	Support to the Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework of China	UNEP	0.99	1.27
Colombia	Capacity Building for the Implementation of the Cartagena Protocol	World Bank	1.00	4.48
Cuba	Support to the Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework of Cuba	UNEP	0.65	0.93
India	Capacity Building for Implementation of the Cartagena Protocol	World Bank	1.00	3.07
Malaysia	Capacity Building for Implementation of Malaysia's National Biosafety Framework	UNDP	0.91	5.21
Mexico	Capacity Building for the Implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety	UNDP	1.46	6.40
Namibia	Support to the Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework	UNEP	0.67	0.91
Kenya	Support to the Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework	UNEP	0.51	0.62
Poland	Support to the Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework	UNEP	0.46	2.62
Uganda	Support for the Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework within the context of the Cartagena protocol	UNEP	0.56	0.64
<b>Total</b>			<b>9.18</b>	<b>27.32</b>

## VI. GEF MONITORING AND EVALUATION ACTIVITIES

62. During the reporting period, the GEF presented the Second Study of GEF's Overall Performance at the GEF Second Assembly in Beijing. The study contributed to the Beijing Declaration adopted at the second Assembly.

63. In May 2003, the GEF Council also approved the terms of reference for an independent monitoring and evaluation unit in the GEF. Documents on the GEF's Monitoring and Evaluation program are available at the GEF web site: [www.TheGEF.org](http://www.TheGEF.org).

### **Third Study of the GEF's Overall Performance**

64. The GEF Council approved the preparation of the Third Study of the GEF's Overall Performance (OPS3). An evaluative framework will be presented for GEF Council approval in November 2003. The Terms of Reference for the OPS3 are to be approved by the GEF Council in early 2004. This schedule will allow for the final report to be completed by May 2004 before the start of the fourth GEF Replenishment process. It is proposed that OPS3 comprise key issues such as: assessment of global results and impacts of GEF programs, including linkages among focal areas; effectiveness of GEF as a financial mechanism for the conventions; the appropriateness of GEF's institutional arrangements; adequacy of GEF policies, strategies, programs and procedures; and program and project adherence to GEF review criteria such as country ownership, financial leverage, sustainability, replication and monitoring and evaluation.

65. Following decision VI/17 of the Conference of the Parties, the GEF Secretariat, GEF M&E Unit and Convention Secretariat consulted on how best to create synergies between the Convention's third review of the effectiveness of the financial mechanism and the Third Study of the GEF's Overall Performance. Plans to accomplish this are presented in UNEP/CBD/COP/7/14/Add.5. The two Secretariats have agreed to share common elements of both the OPS3 and the Convention's third review, such as databases, studies and background information. The GEF M&E Unit has also agreed to share with the independent evaluator contracted to do the third review for the convention all relevant studies generated by the unit in the context and process of OPS3. Furthermore, the Convention Secretariat and independent evaluator will participate in key steps in the OPS3 process. For these purposes, the terms of reference of OPS3 will be forwarded to the Convention Secretariat for circulation to all Parties as soon as they are approved by the GEF Council.

### **Review of Financial Arrangements in Biodiversity Projects**

66. The Review of Financial Arrangements in Biodiversity Projects was presented as an information document (GEF/C.21/Inf.13) to the Council meeting in May 2003. The rationale for the study emerged from the findings and conclusions of several earlier evaluations. They suggested that GEF supported biodiversity initiatives need to become financially self-sufficient after the completion of GEF financing. Although GEF projects have been successful in using trust funds to secure reliable and long-term funding, there are many other examples and experiences of financial arrangements currently under implementation that could offer other options for project proponents throughout the world. The GEF needs to assess, highlight, and learn from these experiences.

67. The scope of the study was limited to reviewing financial arrangements that deal with the projects' needs to meet their conservation objectives. An in-depth review of environmental funds was excluded from this study since they were covered by a study in 1999<sup>15</sup>. This study focused on: (i) identifying sustainable finance options for the conservation and use of biodiversity; (ii) assessing the use of financial arrangements in GEF projects; (iii) reviewing the most relevant financial arrangements for proponents of GEF projects to consider issues relative to design and implementation; and (iv) synthesizing the main lessons learned and providing guidelines for project proponents and recommendations for the GEF. The main findings of the study, including the portfolio review, a more in-depth look at 18 projects selected by the Implementing Agencies, and the integrated analysis of four case studies, are presented in the document GEF/C.21/Inf.13, available at GEF web site: [www.TheGEF.org](http://www.TheGEF.org).

### **Project Performance Report 2002**

68. This Project Performance Review (PPR) draws on the findings of the 2002 Project Implementation Review (PIR), a monitoring process based upon reporting by the GEF Implementing Agencies (IAs) on all projects under implementation for at least one year. Under the PIR, projects are specially assessed on their implementation progress and likelihood of attaining the development/global environment objectives. The 2002 PPR also incorporates findings, lessons, and recommendations from two new instruments used this year by the GEF M&E: Specially Managed Project Reviews (SMPRs)<sup>16</sup> and Terminal Evaluation Reviews (TERs)<sup>17</sup>. PPR for 2003 will be submitted to the Council in May 2004. *Project Performance Report 2001* and other monitoring and evaluation reports are also available at the GEF website.

### **Biodiversity Program Study**

69. A review of the GEF Biodiversity Program will take place in 2003-2004. The objective of the study is to assess and report on the main impacts the GEF supported biodiversity programs have had on global biodiversity through its projects and programs and to highlight the main lessons learned from the implementation of this portfolio. The review will incorporate a series of desk reviews of projects and policies and strategies, field visits, thematic reviews, and case studies conducted by a team of experts including a lead consultant, staff members from the GEF Secretariat, the M&E Unit and the Implementing Agencies. The final report will be available in 2004.

---

<sup>15</sup> See Building Strategic Focus in a Conservation Trust Fund at [www.TheGEF.org](http://www.TheGEF.org)

<sup>16</sup> The Specially Managed Project Review is a new GEF M&E tool intended to complement the PIR process, to enhance the PPR review and implement the GEF strategy "Driving for Results". The SMPR is also a follow up on the recommendation from the Second Overall Performance Study that the GEF Secretariat strengthens its participation in regular project monitoring and evaluations.

<sup>17</sup> Terminal Evaluations, which are carried out by IAs, are primarily a tool for generating lessons from individual projects that might apply across the portfolio, but they are also an accountability tool. Terminal Evaluation Reviews are conducted and implemented by the GEF M&E. The reviews assess project adherence to the GEF's eight project review criteria.



## **Cross-cutting evaluations**

70. Cross-cutting evaluations provide the opportunity to assess topics of concern to all operational programs. Many GEF evaluations and reviews, including OPS 2, have pointed to the lack of clarity on the links between global environmental objectives and the local benefits at community or national levels. No systematic empirical evidence and comprehensive analysis from the GEF portfolio exists. To fill this void and promote the sharing of knowledge and good practice in this area, a study on the nature and role of local benefits in GEF program areas has been initiated and will be completed during FY05. This study will assess the benefits that GEF-supported projects have promoted at the community level and the links between local and global environmental benefits. In many cases, the actual costs of activities targeting local benefits and stakeholders are regarded as “baseline activities” and does not constitute the “increment” that GEF finances. As such, the costs have mostly been met by the Implementing Agencies, co-financiers, the governments and/or the communities themselves. Nevertheless such benefits are an integral part of the overall intervention strategy, particularly since they are essential to secure long term sustainability of the global benefits.

## ANNEX A: PROJECTS APPROVED DURING THE REPORTING PERIOD IN THE FOCAL AREA OF BIODIVERSITY

### 1. Full-Sized Projects

Country	Project Name	IA	GEF Financing (US\$ m)	Total Financing (US\$ m)
Global (Brazil, Cote d'Ivoire, India, Indonesia, Kenya, Mexico, Uganda)	Conservation and Sustainable Management of Below Ground Biodiversity	UNEP	5.30	8.88
Regional (Armenia, Bolivia, Madagascar, Sri Lanka, Uzbekistan)	In-situ Conservation of Crop Wild Relatives through Enhanced Information Management and Field Application	UNEP	6.16	12.68
Regional (Benin, Burkina Faso, Cote d'Ivoire, Mali, Niger)	Building Scientific and Technical Capacity for Effective Management and Sustainable Use of Dryland Biodiversity in West African Biosphere Reserves	UNEP	2.75	6.58
Regional (Burkina Faso, Botswana, Kenya, Mali, Namibia, Niger, Senegal, South Africa, Zimbabwe)	Desert Margin Programme, Phase 1	UNEP/ UNDP	5.35	15.58
Regional (China, Iran, Kazakhstan, Russian Federation)	Development of a Wetland Site and Flyway Network for Conservation of the Siberian Crane and Other Migratory Waterbirds in Asia	UNEP	10.35	22.71
Regional (Lao PDR, Cambodia, Vietnam, Thailand)	Mekong River Basin Wetland Biodiversity, Phase I	UNDP	4.53	13.89
Regional (Mozambique, Zambia, Zimbabwe)	Integrated Management of Dryland Biodiversity through Land Rehabilitation in the Arid and Semi-Arid Regions of Mozambique, Zambia and Zimbabwe	UNEP/ UNDP	7.83	13.42
Algeria	Conservation and Sustainable Use of Globally Significant Biodiversity in the Tassili and Ahaggar National Parks	UNDP	3.72	6.37
Armenia	Natural Resources Management and Poverty Reduction	World Bank	5.21	16.21
Brazil	Parana Biodiversity Project	World Bank	8.00	32.86
Bulgaria	Conservation of Globally Significant Biodiversity in the Landscape of Bulgaria's Rhodope Mountains	UNDP	3.81	18.70
Cambodia	Tonle Sap Conservation Project	UNDP	3.60	19.14
Cape Verde	Integrated Participatory Ecosystem Management In and Around Protected Areas, Phase I	UNDP	3.93	9.64
Chad	Conservation and Sustainable Use of Biodiversity in the Moyen-Chari	UNDP	1.66	3.30
China	Biodiversity Management in the Coastal	UNDP	3.51	12.74

Country	Project Name	IA	GEF Financing (US\$ m)	Total Financing (US\$ m)
	Area of China's South Sea			
Colombia	Capacity Building for the Implementation of the Cartagena Protocol	World Bank	1.00	4.48
Croatia	Karst Ecosystem Conservation Project	World Bank	5.30	8.63
Cuba	Strengthening the National System of Protected Areas	UNDP	2.15	13.44
Guinea	Conservation of the Biodiversity of the Nimba Mountains through Integrated and Participatory Management	UNDP	3.99	11.88
Guinea-Bissau	Coastal and Biodiversity Management Project	World Bank	5.15	9.55
India	Capacity Building for Implementation of the Cartagena Protocol	World Bank	1.00	3.07
Indonesia	Komodo National Park Collaborative Management Initiative	World Bank/IFC	5.38	16.98
Jordan	Conservation of Medicinal and Herbal Plants	World Bank	5.35	12.85
Kazakhstan	In-Situ Conservation of Kazakhstan's Mountain Agrobiodiversity	UNDP	3.02	7.81
Lithuania	Conservation of Inland Wetland Biodiversity	UNDP	3.44	13.86
Maldives	Atoll Ecosystem-based Conservation of Globally Significant Biological Diversity in the Maldives' Baa Atoll	UNDP	2.71	8.63
Mali	Arid Rangeland Biodiversity Conservation	World Bank	5.68	8.39
Mexico	Capacity Building for the Implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety	UNDP	1.46	6.40
Nepal	Landscape Level Biodiversity Conservation in Nepal's Western Terai Complex	UNDP	3.55	13.11
Papua New Guinea	Community-based Coastal and Marine Conservation in the Milne Bay Province	UNDP	3.55	7.13
Peru	Participatory Management of Protected Areas	World Bank	15.15	31.06
Philippines	Asian Conservation Foundation (ACF)	World Bank/IFC	1.60	16.40
Russian Federation	Conservation and Sustainable Use of Wild Salmonid Biological Diversity in Russia's Kamchatka Peninsula, Phase I	UNDP	3.31	13.83
Russian Federation	An Integrated Ecosystem Management Approach to Conserve Biodiversity and Minimize Habitat Fragmentation in Three Selected Model Areas in the Russian Arctic (ECORA)	UNEP	3.38	8.01
South Africa	Agulhas Biodiversity Initiative (ABI)	UNDP	3.23	11.79
South Africa	Greater Addo Elephant National Park Project	World Bank	5.84	40.28

<b>Country</b>	<b>Project Name</b>	<b>IA</b>	<b>GEF Financing (US\$ m)</b>	<b>Total Financing (US\$ m)</b>
South Africa	C.A.P.E. Biodiversity and Sustainable Development Project	World Bank/UNDP	11.32	55.77
Swaziland	Biodiversity Conservation and Participatory Development Project	World Bank	5.85	12.25
Syria	Biodiversity Conservation and Protected Area Management	UNDP	3.49	6.92
Tanzania	Conservation and Management of the Eastern Arc Mountain Forests	World Bank/UNDP	12.37	50.82
Tunisia	Protected Areas Management Project	World Bank	5.38	10.33
Zambia	Securing the Environment for Economic Development (SEED)	World Bank	4.24	15.24
<b>Total</b>			<b>203.58</b>	<b>631.61</b>

## 2. Medium-Sized Projects

Country	Project Name	IA	GEF Financing (US\$ m)	Total Financing (US\$ m)
Global	Ecosystems, Protected Areas and People	UNEP	1.00	5.61
Global	Global Biodiversity Forum (GBF): Multistakeholder Support for the Implementation of the Convention on Biological Diversity - Phase III	UNEP	1.00	4.10
Global	Barriers and Best Practices in Integrated Management of Mountain Ecosystems	UNEP	0.93	2.12
Regional (Bahamas, Dominican Republic, Jamaica)	Sustainable Conservation of Globally Important Caribbean Bird Habitats: Strengthening a Regional Network for a Shared Resource	UNEP	1.00	1.97
Regional (Bolivia, Costa Rica, Mexico, Peru, Belize, Ecuador, El Salvador, Panama, Paraguay)	EcoEnterprises Fund	World Bank/IFC	1.00	10.00
Regional (Ecuador, Kenya, Philippines, Ukraine)	Biodiversity Indicators for National Use	UNEP	0.85	1.46
Regional (Ethiopia, Kenya, Mali)	Conservation of Gramineae and Associated Arthropods for Sustainable Agricultural Development in Africa	UNEP	0.97	2.54
Regional (Honduras, Nicaragua, Panama, Dominican Republic)	Biodiversity Conservation and Integration of Traditional Knowledge on Medicinal Plants in National Primary Health Care Policy in Central America and Caribbean	UNEP	0.75	1.55
Regional (Kazakhstan, Uzbekistan, Turkmenistan, Tajikistan, Kyrgyzstan)	Development of the Econet for Long-term Conservation of Biodiversity in the Central Asia Ecoregions	UNEP	0.77	2.16
Argentina	Management and Conservation of Wetland Biodiversity in the Esteros del Ibera	UNDP	1.00	10.40
Bhutan	Linking and Enhancing Protected Areas in the Temperate Broadleaf Forest Ecoregion of Bhutan (LINKPA)	UNDP	0.79	1.85
Bolivia	Removing Obstacles to Direct Private-Sector Participation in In-situ Biodiversity Conservation	World Bank	0.71	1.13
Brazil	Formoso River -- Integrated Watershed Management and Protection	World Bank	1.00	2.18
Bulgaria	Support for the Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework for Bulgaria	UNEP	0.41	0.50
Cambodia	Developing an Integrated Protected Area System for the Cardamom Mountains	UNDP	1.00	4.33
Cameroon	Support to the Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework for Cameroon	UNEP	0.56	0.67
Chile	Santiago Foothills: Mountain Ecosystem Conservation	World Bank	0.75	1.21

Country	Project Name	IA	GEF Financing (US\$ m)	Total Financing (US\$ m)
Chile	Ecosystem Management of the Salar del Huasco for Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Use Outside Protected Areas	UNDP	0.86	2.73
China	Support to the Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework of China	UNEP	0.99	1.27
China	Lake Dianchi Freshwater Biodiversity Restoration Project	World Bank	1.00	1.86
Colombia	Naya Biological Corridor in the Munchique-Pinche Sector	World Bank	0.75	2.22
Costa Rica	Improved Management and Conservation Practices for the Cocos Island Marine Conservation Area	UNDP	1.00	3.17
Cuba	Support to the Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework of Cuba	UNEP	0.65	0.93
Ecuador	Conservation of Biodiversity in Pastaza	World Bank	0.79	1.04
Gambia	Integrated Coastal and Marine Biodiversity Management	World Bank	0.99	1.77
Guatemala	Community Management of the Bio-Itza Reserve Project	World Bank	0.75	1.50
Indonesia	Indonesia Forests and Media Project (INFORM)	World Bank	0.94	1.23
Indonesia	Conservation of Key Forests in the Sangihe-Talaud Islands	World Bank	0.84	1.19
Jordan	Conservation and Sustainable Use of Biodiversity in Dibeen Nature Reserve	UNDP	1.00	2.02
Kenya	Support to the Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework	UNEP	0.51	0.62
Korea DPR	Coastal Biodiversity Management of DPR Korea's West Sea	UNDP	0.77	1.32
Lebanon	Integrated Management of Cedar Forests in Lebanon in Cooperation with other Mediterranean Countries	UNEP	0.56	1.21
Madagascar	Participatory Community-based Conservation in the Anjozorobe Forest Corridor	UNDP	0.97	1.55
Malaysia	Capacity Building for Implementation of Malaysia's National Biosafety Framework	UNDP	0.91	5.21
Mexico	Private Land Mechanisms for Biodiversity Conservation in Mexico	World Bank	0.75	1.85
Moldova	Biodiversity Conservation in the Lower Dniester Delta Ecosystem	World Bank	1.00	2.04
Mongolia	Conservation of the Eg-Uur Watershed	World Bank/IFC	1.00	1.93
Mongolia	Developing a Model Conservation Programme- Conservation of the Gobi Desert Using Wild Bactrian Camels as an "Umbrella Species".	UNDP	0.98	1.56
Namibia	Support to the Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework	UNEP	0.67	0.91
Pakistan	Conservation of habitats and species of global	UNDP	0.79	1.25

Country	Project Name	IA	GEF Financing (US\$ m)	Total Financing (US\$ m)
	significance in Arid and Semi-arid Ecosystems in Balochistan			
Paraguay	Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Use in the Mbaracayu Natural Reserve	World Bank	1.00	3.15
Peru	Conservation and Sustainable Use of Biodiversity in the Amarakaeri Communal Reserve and Adjoining Indigenous Lands	UNDP	0.99	1.88
Peru	Poison Dart Frog Ranching to Protect Rainforest and Alleviate Poverty	World Bank/IFC	0.81	1.85
Peru	Community-based Conservation and Sustainable Use of the Atiquipa and Taimara Lomas Ecosystems	UNDP	0.75	2.22
Poland	Support to the Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework	UNEP	0.46	2.62
Russian Federation	Strengthening Protected Areas Network for Sikhote-Alin Mountain Forest Ecosystems Conservation in Khabarovsk Krai	World Bank	0.75	1.75
Seychelles	Improving Management of NGO and Privately Owned Nature Reserves and High Biodiversity Islands in Seychelles	World Bank	0.84	1.91
Slovak Republic	Conservation, Restoration and Wise Use of Calcareous Fens	UNDP	1.00	2.46
South Africa	Richtersveld Community Biodiversity Conservation Project	World Bank	0.90	2.07
Uganda	Support for the Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework within the context of the Cartagena protocol	UNEP	0.56	0.64
Vietnam	Integrating Watershed and Biodiversity Management in Chu Yang Sin National Park	World Bank	1.00	20.98
Vietnam	The Green Corridor	World Bank	1.00	2.06
Vietnam	In-situ Conservation of Native Landraces and their Wild Relatives in Vietnam	UNDP	0.93	3.92
<b>Total</b>			<b>44.97</b>	<b>141.67</b>

### 3. Enabling Activities

Country	Project Name	IA	GEF Financing (US\$ m)	Total Financing (US\$ m)
Angola	National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan and Preparation of the First National Report to the COP	UNDP	0.34	0.40
Antigua And Barbuda	Assessment of Capacity Building Needs and Country Specific Priorities	UNDP	0.21	0.26
Belize	Assessment of Capacity Building Needs and Country Specific Priorities	UNDP	0.18	0.23
Bhutan	Assessment of Capacity Building Needs and Country Specific Priorities	UNDP	0.17	0.17
Bolivia	Assessment of Capacity Building Needs for Biodiversity	UNDP	0.19	0.22
Burundi	Capacity Needs Assessment for Implementation of the BSAP and CHM Support	UNDP	0.19	0.19
Cambodia	Assessment of Capacity Building Needs for Implementation of Priorities	UNDP	0.10	0.10
China	Capacity Building of (CHM) and Preparation of the Second National Report	UNEP	0.39	0.44
Colombia	Assessment of Capacity Building Needs and Country Specific Priorities and CHM	UNEP	0.15	0.17
Congo	Assessment of Capacity Needs and CHM	UNDP	0.19	0.19
Congo DR	Capacity Needs Assessment and Country Driven CHM project	UNDP	0.11	0.11
Cook Islands	Biodiversity Enabling Activity 'Add-on'	UNDP	0.20	0.22
Dominica	Assessment of Capacity Building Needs and Country-specific Priorities	UNDP	0.19	0.19
Egypt	Assessment of Capacity Building Needs and country Specific Priorities	UNEP	0.15	0.19
Eritrea	Assessment of Capacity Building Needs and CHM	World Bank	0.17	0.19
Grenada	Assessment of Capacity Building Needs and Country Specific Priorities	UNDP	0.21	0.25
Guatemala	Definition of National Priorities and Assessment of Capacity Building Needs	UNDP	0.23	0.23
Guinea	Capacity-Building Needs Assessment and Strengthening of the CHM	UNDP	0.21	0.21
Guinea-Bissau	Capacity -building Needs Assessment and Strengthening of CHM	UNDP	0.24	0.24
Iran	Assessment of Capacity Building Needs and Country Specific Priorities	UNDP	0.10	0.15
Jordan	Assessment of Capacity Building Needs and Country/Authority Specific Priorities	UNDP	0.09	0.13
Kazakhstan	Assessment of Capacity Building Needs and Enhancement of Information Management	UNDP	0.18	0.23
Kenya	Assessment of Capacity Building Needs and Participation in CHM	UNEP	0.24	0.29
Kiribati	Assessment of Capacity Building Needs and CHM	UNDP	0.19	0.23
Liberia	National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan, and Country Report	UNDP	0.26	0.26
Madagascar	Consultations for the Second National Report on	UNDP	0.03	0.03



Country	Project Name	IA	GEF Financing (US\$ m)	Total Financing (US\$ m)
	Biodiversity			
Mali	Capacity Needs Assessment and Country Driven CHM	UNDP	0.18	0.18
Marshall Islands	Assessment of Capacity-building Needs and CHM	UNDP	0.22	0.27
Micronesia	Assessment of Capacity-building Needs and CHM	UNDP	0.17	0.19
Nicaragua	Assessment of Capacity-building Needs	UNDP	0.19	0.19
Niger	Capacity Needs Assessment and CHM Support	UNDP	0.21	0.21
Niue	Assessment of Capacity-building Needs	UNDP	0.28	0.31
Oman	Assessing Capacity-building Needs and Country-specific Priorities in Biodiversity	UNDP	0.15	0.23
Palau	National Biodiversity Strategy Action Plan and First Report to the COP	UNDP	0.33	0.33
Philippines	Assessment of Capacity Building Needs	UNDP	0.16	0.16
Poland	Biodiversity Enabling Activities	UNEP	0.23	0.29
Samoa	Additional Funding of Biodiversity Enabling Activity	UNDP	0.22	0.24
South Africa	Development and Implementation of the National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan	UNDP	0.41	2.02
St. Vincent and Grenadines	Assessment of Capacity Building Needs and Country Specific Priorities	UNDP	0.21	0.39
Swaziland	Assessment of Capacity Building Needs, Completion of the CHM Process	UNDP	0.21	0.31
Tanzania	Consultations for the Second Report to CBD and CHM	UNDP	0.04	0.06
Tonga	National Biodiversity Conservation Strategy Action Plan and First Report	UNDP	0.32	0.36
Zimbabwe	Assessing Capacity Building Needs for Biodiversity Management	UNDP	0.09	0.19
<b>Total</b>			<b>8.53</b>	<b>11.45</b>

#### 4. Project Preparation Activities

Country	Project Name	IA	GEF Financing (US\$ m)
Global	Conservation & Management of Pollinators for Sustainable Agriculture through an Ecosystem Approach	UNEP	0.70
Global	Conservation & Use of Crop Genetic Diversity to Control Pests & Diseases in Support of Sustainable Agriculture	UNEP	0.35
Regional	Conservation of the Biodiversity of the Paramo in the Northern and Central Andes	UNEP	0.67
Regional	Conservation of Dryland Biodiversity in the Amboseli - Monduli Cross-border Site in Kenya and Tanzania	UNDP/UNEP	0.18
Regional	OECS Protected Areas and Associated Sustainable Livelihoods	World Bank	0.11
Regional	Development & Application of Decision-support Tools to Conserve & Sustainably Use Genetic Diversity in Indigenous Livestock & Wild Relatives	UNEP	0.45
Regional	Removing Barriers to Invasive Plant Management in Africa	UNEP	0.70
Regional (Lao PDR, Cambodia, Vietnam, Thailand)	Mekong River Basin Wetland Biodiversity, Phase I	UNDP	0.08
Regional	Corazon Transfrontier Biosphere Reserve Project	World Bank	0.40
Bulgaria	Conservation of Globally Significant Biodiversity in the Landscape of Bulgaria's Rhodope Mountains	UNDP	0.26
Chile	Conservation of Biodiversity in the Valdivian Temperate Rain Forest Ecoregion	UNDP	0.33
China	Conservation and Sustainable Utilisation of Wild Relatives of Crops	UNDP	0.21
Mozambique	Transfrontier Conservation Areas and Sustainable Tourism Development Project	World Bank	0.35
Panama	Second Rural Poverty and Natural Resources Management Project	World Bank	0.27
South Africa	Conservation and Sustainable Use of Biodiversity on the South African Wild Coast	UNDP	0.34
South Africa	Agulhas Biodiversity Initiative (ABI)	UNDP	0.08
Venezuela	Expanding Partnerships for the National Parks System	World Bank	0.35
<b>Total</b>			<b>5.83</b>

## **ANNEX B: PROJECT SUMMARIES (JULY 2001-JUNE 2003)**

### **1. Full-sized Projects**

**Global (Brazil, Cote d'Ivoire, India, Indonesia, Kenya, Mexico, Uganda) - Conservation and Sustainable Management of Below Ground Biodiversity, Phase I**, (UNEP), GEF financing: \$5.3m; Total: \$8.88m; OP 1,2,3,4  
The objective of this project is to enhance awareness, knowledge and understanding of below-ground biological diversity (BGBD) important to sustainable agricultural production in tropical landscapes by the demonstration of methods for conservation and sustainable management. The project will explore the hypothesis that, by appropriate management of above- and below-ground biota, optimal conservation of biodiversity for national and global benefits can be achieved in mosaics of land-uses at differing intensities of management and furthermore result in simultaneous gains in sustainable agricultural production

**Regional (Armenia, Bolivia, Madagascar, Sri Lanka, Uzbekistan) - In-situ Conservation of Crop Wild Relatives through Enhanced Information Management and Field Application** (UNEP), GEF financing: \$6.16m; Total: \$12.68m; OP 13, 3

The objective of the project is the safe and effective conservation of crop wild relatives and their increased availability for crop improvement in Armenia, Bolivia, Madagascar, Sri Lanka and Uzbekistan.

**Regional (Benin, Burkina Faso, Cote d'Ivoire, Mali, Niger) - Building Scientific and Technical Capacity for Effective Management and Sustainable Use of Dryland Biodiversity in West African Biosphere Reserves** (UNEP), GEF financing: \$2.75m; Total: \$6.58m; OP 1

The purpose of the project is to conserve and sustainably use biodiversity in six Biosphere Reserves in West Africa that are predominantly composed of savannah ecosystems. In order to achieve this goal, project implementation will emphasis both strengthening stakeholder capacity and integration of stakeholders in biosphere reserve management.

**Regional (Burkina Faso, Botswana, Kenya, Mali, Namibia, Niger, Senegal, South Africa, Zimbabwe) - Desert Margin Programme, Phase 1** (UNEP/UNDP), GEF financing: \$5.35m; Total: \$15.58m; OP 1, 4

The project aims to (a) review and analysis the extent and nature of land degradation and its socio-economic and biophysical causes; (b) identify and test available solutions (indigenous, new technologies, and policy and institutional changes) together with farmers, NGOs, and NARS; (c) develop improved solutions (technologies, policies, institutions) through participatory research; (d) assess the likely impact of solutions in solving degradation problems and designing monitoring systems for measuring impact; and (e) collaborate with researchers, farmers, communities, NGOs, policymakers, and donors in implementing and monitoring the findings and recommendations of the DMP.

**Regional (China, Iran, Kazakhstan, Russian Federation) - Development of a Wetland Site and Flyway Network for Conservation of the Siberian Crane and Other Migratory Waterbirds in Asia** (UNEP), GEF financing: \$10.35m; Total: \$22.71m; OP 2,1,3,4

The objective of the project is to conserve the network of critical wetlands needed for survival of the Siberian Cranes, other threatened cranes, and numerous water birds that form an important resource for local populations. The project focuses on the conservation of the international network of wetlands upon which this species depends, together with a wide range of other wetland biodiversity. Nearly fifty percent of these wetlands are Ramsar sites. The project area covers the flyways used by populations of Siberian Cranes in western Central Asia and in East Asia targeting key wetland sites located in China, Iran, Kazakhstan and Russia.

**Regional (Lao PDR, Cambodia, Vietnam, Thailand) - Mekong River Basin Wetland Biodiversity, Phase I** (UNDP), GEF financing: \$4.53m; Total: \$13.89m; OP 2

The project will assist the countries to conserve and sustainably use biological diversity in the lower Mekong wetlands. It will establish a multi-sectoral planning process at national and regional levels, to strengthen macroeconomic and policy frameworks for wetland biodiversity conservation and sustainable use, to provide

adequate information to support sound policy, planning and management, to improve human and technical capacity to better conserve and sustainably manage wetlands; and to improve community-based natural resource management of wetlands.

**Regional - Integrated Management of Dryland Biodiversity through Land Rehabilitation in the Arid and Semi-Arid Regions of Mozambique, Zambia and Zimbabwe** (UNEP/UNDP), GEF financing: \$7.83m; Total: \$13.42m; OP 1

The overall objectives of the project are to: (a) conserve the arid land adapted animal and plant biodiversity of the transboundary range and grazing lands common to Mozambique, Zambia, and Zimbabwe by improving community-based resource management; and (b) improve the quality of rural livelihoods through diversified and sustainable natural resource use and biodiversity protection.

**Algeria - Conservation and Sustainable Use of Globally Significant Biodiversity in the Tassili and Ahaggar National Parks** (UNDP), GEF financing: \$3.72m; Total: \$6.37m; OP 1

The project aims to protect a representative sample of the biodiversity of the Central Saharan region. This will be achieved through the conservation and sustainable use of globally significant biodiversity in the Tassili N'Ajjer and the Ahaggar National Parks. In sites of key biodiversity resources, more intensive management will be supported through the clustering of activities. Priority will also be given to ecological corridors in order to ensure at least stepping-stone connectivity between areas of key resources. This adaptive management strategy, emphasizing flexibility and movement, is tailored to the ecological imperatives of desert ecosystems, as reflected by the survival strategies and movement patterns adopted by both animals and humans in such extreme environments.

**Armenia - Natural Resources Management and Poverty Reduction** (World Bank), GEF financing: \$5.21m; Total: \$16.21m; OP 4

The project area covers mountain, forest, meadow and steppe ecosystems in the Gegharkunik and Tavoush Districts, including a transboundary wildlife corridor between Armenia and Georgia. The protected areas include Lake Sevan NP, unique alpine lake ecosystem and littoral habitats and Dilijan NR, a unique forest ecosystem containing endangered species in the Southern Caucasus dependent on broad-leaved forests. However, these sites are currently under pressure from illegal activities, including logging for timber and fuelwood and resulting soil erosion. Pressures on some 10% of biodiversity resources are also expected to increase. The root causes are thus sectoral in nature, including weak regulatory agencies, limited financial resources to continuously manage forest and pasture lands, lack of alternative income generating options in rural communities, and lack of public awareness.

**Brazil - Parana Biodiversity Project** (World Bank), GEF financing: \$8.00m; Total: \$32.86m; OP 3, 4

The project will assist the State of Parana to conserve two globally significant biomes, the interior Atlantic Forest and the Araucaria forest ecosystems. It will do so by (i) upgrading management of protected areas and buffer zones; (ii) resolving threats and underlying causes of biodiversity loss; (iii) establishing a framework to encourage community and private sector participation in conservation by employing sustainable development production systems; and (iv) implementing a system of disseminating information on the value of protected biomes. It will achieve these through (a) mainstreaming biodiversity conservation among government and civil society stakeholders; (b) mitigate threats through creation of ecological corridors; (c) reform relevant policy and regulatory frameworks.

**Bulgaria - Conservation of Globally Significant Biodiversity in the Landscape of Bulgaria's Rhodope Mountains** (UNDP), GEF financing: \$3.81m; Total: \$18.70m; OP4

The objective of this project is the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity in the Rhodope Mountains of southern Bulgaria. The successful completion of the project will result in stakeholders devising innovative and adaptive practices to mitigate and prevent threats to biological diversity in two new landscape-scale Nature Parks by applying new partnerships, conservation tools, information, and sustainable livelihoods to conserve biological diversity. The Rhodope is an ancient, European cultural landscape where productive uses of forestry and agriculture predominate and protected areas are small and scattered. The application of landscape-scale conservation

practices and perspective to the productive landscape as a whole and protected areas' within it, constitutes the project's strategic approach to securing the sustainable long-term conservation of biodiversity in these mountains.

**Cambodia - Tonle Sap Conservation Project** (UNDP), GEF financing: \$3.60m; Total: \$19.14m; OP 2

The objective of the project is (i) to support economic development and natural resources management; (ii) to strengthen community-based natural resources management systems for rural development; and (iii) to conserve globally significant biodiversity through protection and/or sustainable use of resources in threatened components of the ecosystem and critical habitats.

**Cape Verde - Integrated Participatory Ecosystem Management In and Around Protected Areas, Phase I** (UNDP), GEF financing: \$3.93m; Total: \$9.64m; OP 1

The overall objective of the full project is to conserve globally significant biodiversity and ensure sustainable use of natural resources through an integrated approach whereby protected areas and community-based sustainable use activities are woven into a "win-win" package. Through this integrated community biodiversity conservation project and the implementation of the provisions of the National Biodiversity Strategy, long term solutions will be sought for better management of water, natural resources, land use, and invasive species.

**Chad - Conservation and Sustainable Use of Biodiversity in the Moyen-Chari** (UNDP), GEF financing: \$1.66m; Total: \$3.30m; OP 1

The Moyen Chari region in Southeastern Chad constitutes one of the few remaining undisturbed ecological zones of Sudanese savanna. This project will devise conservation measures for the Manda National Park, the Aouk Reserve, and the Nyala reserve.

**China - Biodiversity Management in the Coastal Area of China's South Sea** (UNDP), GEF financing: \$3.51m; Total: \$12.74m; OP 2

The objective of this project is to protect globally significant marine and coastal biodiversity along China's sub-tropical and tropical southeast coast between its border with Vietnam and latitude 28 N, corresponding with the border of Fujian and Zhejiang provinces.

**Croatia - Karst Ecosystem Conservation Project** (World Bank), GEF financing: \$5.30m; Total: \$8.63m; OP 4, 3, 2

The project development objective is to protect the biodiversity of karst ecosystems in Croatia in a way that is participatory, economically viable, and integrated with the country's socio-economic goals. The project will address a key environmental policy issue facing the government - how to manage the country's future growth and development, while protecting the environment, on the national and local level. The project will assist the Government to preempt the potential threats to biodiversity related to tourism and other economic development activities in the region.

**Cuba - Strengthening the National System of Protected Areas** (UNDP), GEF financing: \$2.15m; Total: \$13.44m; OP 2

The objective of the full project is to conserve highly representative assemblages of four of Cuba's terrestrial ecoregions of global importance and classified as highest priority for conservation nationally and regionally. The Cuban archipelago harbors the greatest biological diversity in the Caribbean region. Given its insularities and threats, biodiversity conservation faces serious threats. The project would improve management of the National System of Protected Areas by addressing gaps and by supporting a number of site-based demonstration/investment activities geared to mitigating a cross section of threats/ risks and refining conservation practices and approaches.

**Guinea - Conservation of the Biodiversity of the Nimba Mountains through Integrated and Participatory Management** (UNDP), GEF financing: \$3.99m; Total: \$11.88m; OP 4

This proposed programme will contribute to the protection and sustainable use of the biological diversity of the Nimba Mountains Biosphere Reserve, including the World Heritage Site (officially on the list of Sites in Danger since 1992).

**Guinea-Bissau - Coastal and Biodiversity Management Project (World Bank)**, GEF financing: \$5.15m; Total: \$9.55m; OP 2

The project would aim to strengthen the conservation of globally significant biodiversity to promote sustainable management of Guinea Bissau's coastal biodiversity for both conservation and sustainable development ends. In conjunction with an IDA credit, this project would implement biodiversity conservation components of the National Coastal Zone Management Plan. Key project components include: establishment of a sustainable institutional framework for biodiversity conservation and management; Biodiversity conservation and protected areas management; and sustainable biodiversity management-based community development.

**Indonesia - Komodo National Park Collaborative Management Initiative (World Bank/IFC)**, GEF financing: \$5.38m; Total: \$16.98m; OP 2

The project will experiment with a privatization scheme in park management through a Joint Venture (JV) between the Nature Conservancy (TNC) and a local tourism company (JPU) who will implement a collaborative management strategy based on a 25-year park management plan. The JV will obtain a tourism concession from government to authorize this private sector-NGO partnership to set and collect gate fees, establish and implement tourism carrying capacity limits, and to develop a tourism licensing system. The overall strategy seeks to make Komodo National Park a self-sustaining entity with its management costs being covered by tourism revenue. The project includes substantive positive incentives and will enforce negative incentives to encourage local communities to switch from the current destructive fishing practices to sustainable livelihoods based on the rational use of park resources.

**Jordan - Conservation of Medicinal and Herbal Plants (World Bank)**, GEF financing: \$5.35m; Total: \$12.85m; OP 1, 13

The overall objective of the project is to support the conservation, management, cultivation and sustainable utilization of medicinal and herbal plants in Jordan while ensuring effective in situ protection of threatened habitats and ecosystems.

**Kazakhstan - In-Situ Conservation of Kazakhstan's Mountain Agrobiodiversity (UNDP)**, GEF financing: \$3.02m; Total: \$7.81m; OP 13

The project focuses on the conservation of key areas of mountain agro-biodiversity in Kazakhstan. The immediate project objective is that stakeholders conserve and sustainably use agro-biodiversity in two priority sites within Kazakhstan's Tien Shan Mountains by developing and applying new methods and tools for conservation, including partnerships among conservation and land-use agencies, local governments, SPAs, local communities and the private sector.

**Lithuania - Conservation of Inland Wetland Biodiversity (UNDP)**, GEF financing: \$3.44m; Total: \$13.86m; OP 2

The project will develop and implement an integrated approach to the protection of inland wetlands biodiversity of Lithuania. The immediate objective is to ensure biodiversity protection in a reduced number of Strict Nature Reserves (wetlands). Main activities will include the establishment of a system of tradable collection permits for cranberries, the reconversion of farming lands to wetland-friendly agricultural activities, the adoption of biodiversity-friendly forestry protocols, the establishment of a biodiversity reserve, strengthening enforcement of reserve regulations and boundaries, restoration of selected wetland habitats, public awareness and support activities, the gathering and codification of lessons and best practice, and the elaboration of a strategy for replication to other priority wetland sites nationally.

**Maldives - Atoll Ecosystem-based Conservation of Globally Significant Biological Diversity in the Maldives' Baa Atoll (UNDP)**, GEF financing: \$2.71m; Total: \$8.63m; OP 2

The goal of the Project is to work with island communities to identify and sustainably remove threats to Biodiversity in selected atolls.

**Mali - Arid Rangeland Biodiversity Conservation (World Bank)**, GEF financing: \$5.68m; Total: \$8.39m; OP 1

The project targets the GEF Operational Program 1 (Arid and semi-arid ecosystem) with the Global Objective that Biodiversity and range degradation trends are reversed in selected conservation areas and stabilized elsewhere in the Gourma.

**Nepal - Landscape Level Biodiversity Conservation in Nepal's Western Terai Complex (UNDP)**, GEF financing: \$3.55m; Total: \$13.11m; OP 3, 13

The project's focus is on strengthening protected area management and integrating biodiversity conservation criteria with sustainable forest use and agricultural production in the surrounding productive landscape of Western Terai. Within the Western Terai Landscape complex, project interventions will occur in three sites, including two protected areas, Royal Bardia National Park and Royal Suklaphanta Wildlife Reserve, their respective bufferzones, and priority areas in the intervening productive landscape that are critical for biodiversity conservation. The immediate objective is to establish effective management systems and build capacity for the conservation and sustainable use of Nepal's Western Terai landscape complex.

**Papua New Guinea - Community-based Coastal and Marine Conservation in the Milne Bay Province (UNDP)**, GEF financing: \$3.55m; Total: \$7.13m; OP 2

The project will develop participatory management processes that protect a sample of Milne Bay coastal marine biodiversity in three designated zones that are representative of the ecosystems and social settings in the Milne Bay Province. The Province contains some of the most biologically diverse coral reefs, mangrove forests, and sea grass beds left in the world. These ecosystems remain some of the least impacted in the planet too. The first phase of this will pilot activities in the first of the three targeted zones by overlaying conservation goals into the sustainable development framework, removing barriers to the ecologically sustainable utilization of marine ecosystems at the local level.

**Peru - Participatory Management of Protected Areas (World Bank)**, GEF financing: \$15.15m; Total: \$31.06m; OP 3

The resulting project would provide continuity to a GEF Pilot Phase activity supporting biodiversity conservation in globally significant areas of Peru. The proposal is a follow-up from a pilot phase project. An independent evaluation has been completed and submitted to the Secretariat for review. PDF B resources would be used to finalize project design including: institutional assessment and targeted area selection, stakeholder assessment, technical analysis, economic and incremental costs analysis, procurement and financial management analysis, the consultative process, and project coordination and support.

**Philippines - Asian Conservation Foundation (ACF) (World Bank/IFC)**, GEF financing: \$1.60m; Total: \$16.40m; OP 2

The project will support the incremental costs of a new approach to mobilizing private capital and grant funding to help conserve new and existing marine protected areas (MPAs) at six key sites in the Philippines. It is innovative in the way that a holding company is set up. Essentially, private investors are willing to take lower returns on their investment on ACC in exchange for funding biodiversity conservation. It will provide funds for the first biodiversity oriented holding company which will become a long-term (up to 50 years) shareholder in companies that are strategically located in sectors and regions within the Philippines which allow it to leverage significant

benefits for biodiversity. The investment company will work in tandem with a parallel foundation, the Asian Conservation Foundation (ACF) in order to provide technical assistance and funding for conservation activities at key marine and coastal sites.

**Russian Federation - Conservation and Sustainable Use of Wild Salmonid Biological Diversity in Russia's Kamchatka Peninsula, Phase I (UNDP)**, GEF financing: \$3.31m; Total: \$13.83m; OP 13, 2

The overall objective of the proposed project is the sustained conservation of Kamchatka's salmonid genetic and life history diversity and the maintenance of river ecosystem integrity. Upon completion of the project, Government agencies and local communities and indigenous peoples will be conserving salmonid diversity in the project's four river sites by applying a new diversity-oriented approach, conservation tools, and sustainable livelihoods. The project will use an adaptive management approach that is designed to respond to emergent threats and orient conservation activities to threat mitigation.

**Russian Federation - An Integrated Ecosystem Management Approach to Conserve Biodiversity and Minimize Habitat Fragmentation in Three Selected Model Areas in the Russian Arctic (UNEP)**, GEF financing: \$3.38m; Total: \$8.01m; OP 3, 4

This project will develop and implement integrated ecosystem management strategies in the Russian Arctic in two to three model areas, and strengthen the capacity of federal and regional/local authorities, indigenous people and other stakeholders in sustainable biodiversity management.

**South Africa - Agulhas Biodiversity Initiative (ABI) (UNDP)**, GEF financing: \$3.23m; Total: \$11.79m; OP 1

The Agulhas Biodiversity Initiative (ABI) comprises one of three complementary GEF initiatives in support of C.A.P.E. aimed at strengthening systemic, institutional and individual capacities and establishing the know-how needed for conservation in different ecological and socio-economic conditions as needed to attain and sustain positive conservation outcomes. The initiative has been designed to distil lessons and best practices in Phase 1 of C.A.P.E., through demonstration activities geared to addressing gaps in the management framework, to inform implementation of subsequent phases. The Agulhas Plain constitutes one of the largest extant storehouses of lowland fynbos and Renosterveld habitats in the world. The diversity of habitat types, wetland ecosystems, Red data plant species and local endemics is unmatched in the CFR.

**South Africa - Greater Addo Elephant National Park Project (World Bank)**, GEF financing: \$5.84m; Total: \$40.28m; OP 1

The proposed project is aimed at improving the conservation of biodiversity in the Greater Addo National Park. The project would specifically support activities to: (a) identify and protect areas of unique biodiversity under threat; (b) identify the minimum area required to maintain ecological patterns and processes; (c) reduce critical threats facing the park; (d) develop and implement a conservation plan; (e) promote sustainable ecotourism; and (f) promote capacity building in local communities to develop environmentally acceptable economic activities.

**South Africa - Cape Action for People and the Environment (C.A.P.E.) Biodiversity and Sustainable Development Project (World Bank/UNDP)**, GEF financing: \$11.32m; Total: \$55.77m; OP 1, 2, 3, 4

The Government of South Africa (GoSA) has developed an innovative program to protect the rich biological heritage of the Cape Floristic Region (CFR). The overall goal of this Program is that the natural environment of the Cape Floristic Region and adjacent marine environment will be effectively conserved, restored and will deliver benefits to the people. The CAPE 2000 Strategy identified the key ecological patterns and processes which need to be conserved in the CFR. There will be 3 phases within the 20 year C.A.P.E. program. GEF will support the first 6 years of the Program. This Project is aimed at (i) establishing the systemic and institutional framework for effective implementation of the C.A.P.E. Program; and (ii) piloting and demonstrating site-based interventions in the CFR by bringing in an additional 4000km<sup>2</sup> of protected area and to establish the know-how for conservation required to give effect to the C.A.P.E. Program. GEF will support two of the project objectives: (1) Securing the co-operation of capable institutions to develop a foundation for mainstreaming biodiversity in the region into economic activities;



(2) Enhancing the conservation of the region is through piloting and adapting site-based models for sustainable, effective management.

**Swaziland - Biodiversity Conservation and Participatory Development Project (World Bank)**, GEF financing: \$5.85m; Total: \$12.25m; OP 1, 3

The Global Development Objective of Biodiversity Conservation and Participatory Development Project (BCPD) is to encourage and support environmentally, economically and socially sustainable development in the rural areas of Swaziland, based on conservation and sustainable use of its rich biodiversity resources. 2. The project will develop an integrated approach in full partnership with other key stakeholders to meet the goals and objectives of the Swaziland Biodiversity Conservation Strategy and Action Plan (BSAP).

**Syria - Biodiversity Conservation and Protected Area Management (UNDP)**, GEF financing: \$3.49m; Total: \$6.92m; OP 1

The project will demonstrate a model of protected area management promoting conservation and sustainable use of globally significant biodiversity.

**Tanzania - Conservation and Management of the Eastern Arc Mountain Forests (World Bank/UNDP)**, GEF financing: \$12.37m; Total: \$50.82m; OP 3, 4

The primary objective of GEF support is to bring about the long-term sustainable implementation and financing of forest biodiversity conservation and community-based conservation and sustainable development activities in Tanzania's Eastern Arc Mountain forests. GEF support responds to the increasing threats to the forests at a time when both local communities and more distant populations are increasingly dependent on them for their livelihoods as well as their water and energy potential. GEF support, which is integrated into the implementation of the Tanzania National Forest Program, will focus on protection of forests which are areas of exceptionally high biodiversity and species endemism. These outputs of the project form an integrated package of strategies, initiatives, and actions intended to provide global benefits.

**Tunisia - Protected Areas Management Project (World Bank)**, GEF financing: \$5.38m; Total: \$10.33m; OP 1, 2

The project will assist the government of Tunisia in improving the conservation of biodiversity within the protected areas through implementation of management plans at three national parks together with local communities and capacity building at the regional levels to assure sustainable ecosystem management and monitoring.

**Zambia - Securing the Environment for Economic Development (SEED) (World Bank)**, GEF financing: \$4.24m; Total: \$15.24m; OP 1, 3

SEED-Biodiversity will contribute to and catalyze SEED-Tourism initiatives to secure the management and conservation of Critical Species and Habitats (IUCN, 1990) that are of key significance to global biodiversity and to Zambia's economic development. These initiatives will in turn help to mitigate the root cause of biodiversity loss in Zambia - poverty.

## **2. Medium-sized Projects**

**Global - Ecosystems, Protected Areas and People (UNEP)**, GEF financing: \$1.00m; Total: \$5.61m

The overall goal of the project is that protected areas in developing countries that contain biodiversity of high global value will be managed adaptively to cope with the threats and capture opportunities from global change factors. This project will consist of a cooperative program with local stakeholders for the purpose of articulating, analyzing, and sharing lessons being learned from work already funded and in progress through a Protected Areas Learning Network. The project Ecosystems, Protected Areas and People therefore will not initiate, develop or finance projects per se. The purpose of the project is to enable PA managers, policymakers, NGOs and local communities to develop their capacity to manage their areas in the face of global change factors.

**Global - Global Biodiversity Forum (GBF): Multistakeholder Support for the Implementation of the Convention on Biological Diversity - Phase III (UNEP),** GEF financing: \$0.99m; Total: \$4.10m

The project will allow stakeholder groups to a) explore and debate in-depth central issues around CBD implementation; b) expand the CBD constituency to foster broader involvement and commitment of independent, public and business sector partners in actively supporting and assessing CBD implementation; (c) to catalyze new cooperative partnership and initiatives involving governments and stakeholder groups, and among different sectors, at global, regional, and national levels, in support of the implementation of the CBD. It will do so through the following activities: 1. Convene three formal meeting of the BBF Steering Committee; 2. Organize and convene a series of at least nine meetings over the next two years (three global and six regional sessions of the GBF); 3. Provide financial assistance packages to participants from developing countries and countries with economies in transitions.

**Global - Barriers and Best Practices in Integrated Management of Mountain Ecosystems (UNEP),** GEF financing: \$0.93m; Total: \$2.12m; OP 4, 9, 12

The overall objective of the project is to assist developing countries to promote and enhance the protection and sustainable development of the mountains and their resources globally, as a contribution to the International Year of Mountains, WSSD and BGMS. Through collaboration among GEF implementing agencies and other partners this MSP will identify best practice in GEF and non-GEF projects dealing with biodiversity, climate change, and international waters in the context of integrated management of mountain ecosystems. Common obstacles to success and lessons learned from recent experiences will be highlighted.

**Regional (Bahamas, Dominican Republic, Jamaica) Sustainable Conservation of Globally Important Caribbean Bird Habitats: Strengthening a Regional Network for a Shared Resource (UNEP),** GEF financing: \$0.99m; Total: \$1.97m; OP 1, 2, 3

The development objective of this project is that the conservation status of globally important sites for biodiversity in the Caribbean is enhanced through strengthened local and national partnerships and increasingly aware national and international networks of public and private sector stakeholders and decision-makers. The project is aimed at enhancing cooperation, communication and consensus among biodiversity conservation stakeholders through the coordination of a strengthened network of NGO, government agency and regional institution partnerships.

**Regional (Kazakhstan, Uzbekistan, Turkmenistan, Tajikistan, Kyrgyzstan) Development of the Econet for Long-term Conservation of Biodiversity in the Central Asia (UNEP),** GEF financing: \$0.77m; Total: \$2.16m; OP 1, 12, 13

To elaborate the scheme of Econet development, based on a regionally unified and integrated information management system (GIS), combining existing data on biodiversity and natural resource (at the regional scale), existing system of protected areas, economic development (traditional, recent, planned and probable alternatives), together with newly obtained data through limited targeted research to fill key gaps. 2. To elaborate and achieve agreement for a regional "Econet" development plan implementation. 3. To establish the necessary legal, institutional, technical and financial capacities and mechanisms within the region to allow the effective joint implementation of the Econet plan.

**Regional (Bolivia, Costa Rica, Mexico, Peru, Belize, Ecuador, El Salvador, Panama, Paraguay) EcoEnterprises Fund (World Bank/IFC),** GEF financing: \$1.00m; Total: \$10.00m; OP 2,1,3,4

The objective of this project is to abate threats to biodiversity conservation in Latin America and the Caribbean by creating economic incentives to protect critical natural resources.

**Regional (Honduras, Nicaragua, Panama, Dominican Republic) Biodiversity Conservation and Integration of Traditional Knowledge on Medicinal Plants in National Primary Health Care Policy in Central America and Caribbean (UNEP)**, GEF financing: \$0.75m; Total: \$1.55m; OP 1,12,13

The project will contribute to the conservation and management of medicinal plants in globally significant ecoregions of Central America and the Caribbean. The primary focus of this project will be on forest ecosystems and indigenous and local knowledge.

**Regional (Ecuador, Kenya, Philippines, Ukraine) Biodiversity Indicators for National Use (UNEP)**, GEF financing: \$0.85m; Total: \$1.46m; OP 3,2,4

The project will directly address the development of indicators of biological diversity in four of the operational programme areas of the GEF biodiversity focal area: coastal, marine and freshwater ecosystems; forests; mountains; and agrobiodiversity. Case studies in each country will concentrate on one or two ecosystem types, chosen because that country has both nationally and globally important samples of that ecosystem type. Ecosystem types for each country area as follows: Ecuador - Forests and Mountains: Ecuador's forests occupy nearly half of its land area, and are among the richest in biodiversity globally. Ecuador holds around 10% of the world's plant species, nearly 4% of the world's reptiles, 7.5% of the world's mammals and over 17% of the world's bird species. Kenya's wetlands include unique habitats and sites of global importance, including RAMSAR sites, World Heritage sites and a Biosphere Reserve. The Philippines has more than 2.2 million ha of marine and coastal ecosystems, which support one of the most diverse marine faunas and floras in the world. Ukraine - Agricultural ecosystems: In the Ukraine, agricultural land covers more than 70% of the country and therefore plays a critical role in biodiversity retention. The country is home to more than 50 globally threatened species.

**Regional (Ethiopia, Kenya, Mali) Conservation of Gramineae and Associated Arthropods for Sustainable Agricultural Development in Africa (UNEP)**, GEF financing: \$0.97m; Total: \$2.54m; OP 13,1,3,4

Grasses comprise a large and diverse plant group that is probably the most important to mankind, yet has rarely been the focus of biodiversity projects. Another largely neglected group in biodiversity studies is insects and other arthropods, which represent about 70% of the world's biodiversity. Both figure strongly in agrobiodiversity, as beneficial species (crops and enemies of pests) and as noxious species (weeds and crop pests) that nevertheless may act as reservoirs of beneficial species. Yet species and races of grasses and insects are under threat due to increasing human pressure. The project proposed herein aims first to understand how diversity of Gramineae and associated insects in and around various agro-ecosystems and socio-economic surroundings contributes to ecosystem stability in Ethiopia, Kenya, and Mali, and how indigenous and novel agricultural practices using native biodiversity can contribute to stability and conservation, and finally to adapt and promote the practical application of this knowledge in self-regulatory pest control and sustainable agriculture, while building national capacity and public awareness to effect lasting changes. The overall objective thus will be the development and application of best practices for sustainable use of African grasses and their associated insect resources for agricultural development and grassland conservation.

**Argentina - Management and Conservation of Wetland Biodiversity in the Esteros del Ibera (UNDP)**, GEF financing: \$1.00m; Total: \$10.39m; OP 2

The objective of the project is to protect and manage for sustainable use, globally significant wetland biodiversity in a threatened ecoregion of Argentina, with full participation of local stakeholders. Project activities include: (a) Bioregional management plan; (b) Policy and regulatory reforms and incentive systems; (c) Management of threatened and endangered native species; (d) Land acquisition program; (e) Awareness raising, environmental education, and information dissemination program; (f) Capacity building and training for local stakeholders, and (g) Sustainable productive activities and coordinated ecotourism strategy.

**Bhutan - Linking and Enhancing Protected Areas in the Temperate Broadleaf Forest Ecoregion of Bhutan (LINKPA) (UNDP)**, GEF financing: \$0.79m; Total: \$1.86m; OP 3

To strengthen management of biological corridors and protected area network in the broadleaf forest ecoregion based on a landscape scale conservation approach.

**Bolivia - Removing Obstacles to Direct Private-Sector Participation in In-situ Biodiversity Conservation (World Bank)**, GEF financing: \$.071m; Total: \$1.133m; OP 3, 4

The objective of this project is to facilitate the development of private conservation initiatives that will contribute to globally-significant biodiversity conservation in high-priority eco-regions. This will be done through strengthening the regulatory and incentives framework, testing innovative conservation initiatives on four pilot sites, strengthening the technical capacity of private landowners, and disseminating the lessons learned throughout Bolivia and Latin America.

**Brazil - Formoso River -- Integrated Watershed Management and Protection (World Bank)**, GEF financing: \$0.99m; Total: \$2.18m; OP 3, 2

The specific objectives of the proposed project are to: (i) promote the strengthening of local environmental and agricultural institutions and communities, by providing them with land-use planning tools for the formulation and initial implementation of an integrated watershed management plan; (ii) promote the integrated management of existing public and private protected areas; and (iii) support the implementation of sustainable activities on a pilot and demonstrative basis that would serve to reduce pressure on key natural resources, and rehabilitate natural habitats, particularly riparian forests, native grasslands and savannahs.

**Cambodia - Developing an Integrated Protected Area System for the Cardamom Mountains (UNDP)**, GEF financing: \$0.99m; Total: \$4.33m; OP 3, 4

The goal of this project is the long-term conservation and sustainable management of the Cardamon Mountains ecosystems.

**Colombia - Naya Biological Corridor in the Munchique-Pinche Sector (World Bank)**, GEF financing: \$6.0.75; Total: \$2.22m; OP 3, 4

The rationale of the project is the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity and the development of strategic land use planning in the Naya Corridor Sector Munchique-Pinche based on stakeholder participation in conservation and in the establishment of activities encouraging biodiversity-friendly agricultural production. The Specific Objectives of the project are to: (i) develop a long-term strategy that allows the conservation and sustainable management of natural ecosystems that contain biodiversity of global importance; (ii) create a biological corridor between core conservation areas; (iii) integrate biodiversity conservation with the development of sustainable production systems, and (iv) develop environmental land use planning within the ethnic and social dynamics of Afro-colombian groups, the Paeces and Eperara-Siapidaara indigenous communities.

**Chile - Santiago Foothills: Mountain Ecosystem Conservation (World Bank)**, GEF financing: \$0.75m; Total: \$1.21m; OP 4

The goal of the project is to protect, conserve, and restore in-situ a 12,900 ha area located in proximity to Santiago consisting of a representative example of a Mediterranean-mountainous ecosystem (i.e., the Santiago Foothills) and support the continued functioning of the ecosystem's ecological processes on which much of the city depends. The specific objectives of the proposed project are to: (i) improve the legal, institutional, and political groundwork required to create a conservation area in the Santiago Foothills; (ii) develop conservation activities in the proposed conservation area; (iii) promote among the urban population an increased environmental awareness of the significance of this ecosystem, as a way to ensure the sustainability of conservation efforts; and (iv) disseminate information on, and promote the concept of, mainstreaming mountainous ecosystems conservation efforts into urban planning processes.

**Chile - Ecosystem Management of the Salar del Huasco for Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Use Outside Protected Areas (UNDP)**, GEF financing: \$0.86m; Total: \$2.73m

The project is intended to assist stakeholders in applying species and habitat planning and management techniques in the framework of a conservation plan for sustainable use of biodiversity in the Salar del Huasco.

**China - Lake Dianchi Freshwater Biodiversity Restoration Project (World Bank)**, GEF financing: \$0.99m; Total: \$1.86m; OP 2

The objective of the proposed four-year GEF project is to restore and manage habitats around the lake in order to secure the conservation of the remaining endemic species of Lake Dianchi and its immediate tributaries. This will be achieved by providing suitable breeding habitat, comprehensively surveying the biological environment of the Lake and its immediate tributaries, establishing a program to monitor lake quality improvements (using the presence/abundance of the endemic species as indicators of improved ecosystem health), and improving public awareness of the Lake region's unique biological environment.

**Costa Rica - Improved Management and Conservation Practices for the Cocos Island Marine Conservation Area (UNDP)**, GEF financing: \$1.00m; Total: \$3.17m; OP 2

This project will result in the reduction of threats to the Island's marine and terrestrial biodiversity through strengthening protected areas management and regulating local economic activities in a sustainable manner. As other islands, Cocos Island has evolved quite isolated from the mainland leading to a high degree of marine and terrestrial biodiversity and high endemism. This biodiversity is under threat due to among other things: extensive fishing, visitation and tourism, and the introduction of alien, invasive species. The project will improve enforcement and compliance with policy and regulatory frameworks, improve tourism management, eradicate and control alien, invasive species to allow restoration of native species, develop financial instruments to generate revenues to sustain conservation activities and provide economic incentives to promote sustainable use of biodiversity resources.

**Ecuador - Conservation of Biodiversity in Pastaza (World Bank)**, GEF financing: \$0.79m; Total: \$1.04m; OP 3

The wealth of biological resources in Ecuador is in danger due to an annual deforestation rate of 2.3%. Progressive deforestation in the Ecuadorian Amazon region is due to economic models based on deforestation practices. In addition, these productive activities have made indigenous communities dependent upon external technologies, thereby eroding their ancestral knowledge about biological diversity, its uses, techniques and resource management practices. Also, there are other causes contributing to the loss of biological diversity, such as the overexploitation of forest resources; a faulty land distribution system. To address the above problems and preserve outstanding biodiversity mainly contained at selected sites covering 250,000 hectares, the indigenous people of Pastaza and indigenous technical institutions consider that management planning of communal territories is urgent, including the implementation at a pilot level of sustainable management programs for flora and fauna species, and training of community members to be able to carry out the sustainable management of the natural resources contained in their territories.

**Gambia - Integrated Coastal and Marine Biodiversity Management (World Bank)**, GEF financing: \$0.99m; Total: \$1.77m; OP 2

The project will assist the Government of Gambia to promote active stakeholder participation in biodiversity conservation and management inside and outside key protected areas. The processes and mechanisms will be initially developed in two contrasting sites and their replicability tested in at least one further site during project implementation. Identified sites are the Tambi, Bao Bolong and Niumi wetlands. The goal of the project is to conserve and sustainably manage globally significant biodiversity in coastal, marine and wetland ecosystems in Gambia. Its objectives are to strengthen coastal and marine protected area system and in-situ conservation of globally significant species and habitats in Gambia.

**Guatemala - Community Management of the Bio-Itza Reserve Project (World Bank)**, GEF financing: \$0.75m; Total: \$1.50m; OP 3

The project would assist Bio-Itza and Conservation International Guatemala to conserve and sustainably manage a sizable piece of land of great biological significance next to Tikal National Park, and other important areas in the central region of the Maya Biosphere Reserve, one of the largest reserves in Guatemala. It would empower

indigenous communities to strengthen control of their land and manage it over the long term. Proposed activities include: capacity building of the Bio-Itza association, (b) creation and implementation of a strategy and management plan for the protection of the Bio-Itza reserve; (c) creation and implementation of a socio-economic and biodiversity M&E plan; (d) creation and implementation of an information, training and research center, providing training on traditional production systems and adequate information on the state of biodiversity in the reserve and its surroundings and the impacts of natural resource uses such as tourism, non-timber forest products, timber, etc.; and (e) project management and monitoring

**Indonesia Forests and Media Project (INFORM) (World Bank)**, GEF financing: \$0.94m; Total: \$1.23m; OP 3  
This project will focus on the promotion of forest conservation and improved forest management as a means to stop deforestation and environmental disasters. The campaign would strive to simultaneously educate policymakers and forestry officials on the need for effective sustainable forest management policies, and consolidate concern and public pressure for resolution of forestry concerns by promoting more active roles for NGOs and civil society in encouraging local and national government (particularly Ministry of Forestry, Ministry of Environment) to take strong action to address forest issues.

**Indonesia - Conservation of Key Forests in the Sangihe-Talaud Islands (World Bank)**, GEF financing: \$0.84m; Total: \$1.19m; OP 3

This project will apply emerging principles of the ecosystem approach, adopted by the CBD. Because Sangihe is a cultural landscape with no existing protected area, and threats derive locally, we propose an integrated landscape approach. On Talaud there is already a protected area and threats derive from higher level policy we propose a more traditional protected area management approach. For Sangihe, the project will seek to strengthen protection, and increase local-level support for an area of protection forest because of its ecosystem services, as an alternative strategy to the establishment of a conventional nature reserve or sanctuary. The success of such an approach would be of immense relevance to other areas of biodiversity importance in Indonesia, which are currently classified as watershed protection forest and at present lie outside the country's protected area network. For Karakelang, Talaud, the project has already achieved a change in status of an existing reserve and will build on this to strengthen protection and support government agencies in their management work. A Public Awareness Programme will be implemented linking the two sites and addressing the social and cultural context in which their management is embedded.

**Jordan - Conservation and Sustainable Use of Biodiversity in Dibe'en Nature Reserve (UNDP)**, GEF financing: \$1.00m; Total: \$2.02m; OP 3

The overall objective of the project is to establish a nature reserve in Dibe'en Forest to conserve unique and globally significant biodiversity, develop sustainable alternative economic uses of the forest resources in context of a regional forest park, and build in-country capacity in forest management and conservation-orientated land use planning.

**Korea DPR - Coastal Biodiversity Management of DPR Korea's West Sea (UNDP)**, GEF financing: \$0.77m; Total: \$1.32m; OP 2

The goal of the project is to plan implement a sustainable development of the coast of the Gulf of West Korea, with a focus on globally significant biodiversity, human health and quality of life, thus securing a balance between protection of natural resources and environmentally-sound development. It will operate at three levels: (a) at the provincial and national level, planning processes will be enhanced through capacity building, increased public involvement and the development of broad-based planning processes for South Pyongan Province. At the county level, a fully developed integrated Coastal Zone Management Plan will be implemented in the Mundok County Coastal zone. At the local level, demonstration of effective and integrated coastal zone management plans will be implemented for biodiversity conservation, agriculture, and other related sectors, focusing on and around the Mundok reserve. Four broad project objectives have been identified: (a) planning processes for wetland management effective at national and local levels; (b) Public awareness of natural resources and biodiversity values achieved through increased participation in protected areas management; (c) implementation of the integrated

coastal zone management plan in Mundock County to demonstrate biodiversity conservation with sustainable development; (d) Management practices in industries and other sectors with potential environmental impacts improved.

**Lebanon - Integrated Management of Cedar Forests in Lebanon in Cooperation with other Mediterranean Countries (UNEP)**, GEF financing: \$0.56m; Total: \$1.21m; OP 3

The project will contribute to the management of cedar forests and their protection from serious insect pests. The primary focus of this project will be on determining the causes of appearance of *Cephalcia tannourinensis* in the Tannourine-Hadath el-Jebbeh Cedars Forest and determining means to prevent its spread to other countries in the region.

**Madagascar - Participatory Community-based Conservation in the Anjozorobe Forest Corridor (UNDP)**, GEF financing: \$0.98m; Total: \$1.55m; OP 3

The objective of the project is that biodiversity and habitat are conserved in the globally significant highland forest corridor of Anjozorobe, Madagascar. This will be achieved by promoting a model of sustainable community-based management within the context of a Regional Forest Reserve (RFR).

**Mexico - Private Land Mechanisms for Biodiversity Conservation in Mexico (World Bank)**, GEF financing: \$0.75m; Total: \$1.85m; OP 3, 1, 2

The project is structured around its five main objectives: Toolkit development, Site implementation, Policy promotion, Capacity building and Dissemination. The five components are closely inter-linked, with some outcomes serving as inputs for other components of the overall project, as is shown in the Matrix of Inter-linkage of Project Components and Activities that summarizes the input of the relevant actors participating in the design. (see Matrix/Table 2) It is expected that this project will produce field-validated methodologies, guidelines and criteria that will significantly potential the extensive use of the PLMBCs. This project will, through a systematic application of the conservation tools in selected pilot sites, refine and field validate the tools developed to date in Pronatura. It will also carry out additional legal and incentive studies to complement the toolkit and ensure that it covers all relevant aspects of sustainable private land conservation.

**Moldova - Biodiversity Conservation in the Lower Dniester Delta Ecosystem (World Bank)**, GEF financing: \$1.00m; Total: \$2.04m; OP 2

The project would assist the Government of Moldova and Biotica, an NGO, to improve wetland protection and management in the Lower Dniester Ecosystem. The area has been identified as a national priority and the project will assist in expanding the area under strict protection from 500 ha to 5000 ha under the category of National Park. It will assist in restoring affected wetlands and floodplain forests in the park, engaging individuals and communities in the buffer zone of the project and in strengthening collaboration with Ukraine on the protection and management of the Lower Dniester ecosystem and with Romania on the Black Sea coastal zone.

**Mongolia - Conservation of the Eg-Uur Watershed (World Bank/IFC)**, GEF Financing: \$1.00m; Total: \$1.93m; OP 2

The objectives of the project are: to conserve biodiversity-rich taiga riparian, forest and prairie ecosystems; to monetize a previously unvalued natural resource through implementation of a natural resource use concession and licensing system, and to demonstrate to the local inhabitants and other communities throughout Mongolia, that flyfishing ecotourism can provide a competitive rate of return as compared to alternative, higher impact industries, such as mining, logging, and hunting, while complementing the traditional pastoral nomadic way of life.

**Mongolia - Developing a Model Conservation Programme-Conservation of the Gobi Desert Using Wild Bactrian Camels as an "Umbrella Species". (UNDP)**, GEF financing: \$0.98m; Total: \$1.56m;

OP 1

Goal: To ensure the long-term conservation of the Great Gobi ecosystem and the keystone species it supports through improving participation of local communities in the management of the Special Protected Area (SPA).

Objectives: The project has 3 main objectives: 1) Strengthen the management of the Great Gobi SPA. 2) Improve the stewardship of the buffer zone areas. 3) Develop and implement targeted responses for the cross-cutting issues of, overgrazing and range deterioration; over-collection of Saxual bushes and downy poplars; declining water resources.

**Pakistan - Conservation of habitats and species of global significance in Arid and Semi-arid Ecosystems in Balochistan (UNDP)**, GEF financing: \$0.76m; Total: \$1.25m; OP 1

The Project Objective is to promote conservation and sustainable use of globally significant habitats and species in the Torghar and Chagai Conservancies. The immediate objectives are 1) To raise awareness of local communities and stakeholders about biodiversity conservation and sustainable use of natural resources. 2) To create an enabling environment for community based biodiversity conservation and natural resources management. 3) To build institutional capacity of local communities, NGOs, and government institutions to conserve and make sustainable use of biodiversity. 4) To strengthen the Conservancies and establish management regimes for conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity 5) To diversify and improve rural livelihoods and reduce pressure on habitats through better agro-pastoral practices and sustainable resource use alternatives.

**Paraguay - Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Use in the Mbaracayu Natural Reserve (World Bank)**, GEF financing: \$0.99m; Total: \$3.15m; OP 3

Goal: To conserve globally significant biodiversity in the highly threatened Interior Atlantic Forest of Paraguay by supporting the effective protection and consolidation of the Mbaracayú Natural Reserve and promoting conservation, sustainable use, and land-use planning in the Upper Jejuí River Watershed.

**Peru - Conservation and Sustainable Use of Biodiversity in the Amarakaeri Communal Reserve and Adjoining Indigenous Lands (UNDP)**, GEF financing: \$0.99m; Total: \$1.88m; OP1

The project aims to conserve Amazonian forests in Amarakaeri Reserved Area (157,875 ha) and adjoining titled lands (419,139 ha) of the indigenous through legally established Communal Reserve by promoting Reserved Area, effectively managed by local indigenous communities, and effective alternative livelihood opportunities are developed for indigenous and immigrant resource extractive communities. There are approximately 1,500 indigenous people, and their traditional knowledge and practices for biodiversity conservation will be maintained. Ecotourism and natural medicines activities will be promoted as alternative livelihoods for them. For approximately 10,000 immigrants miners, loggers and agricultural settlers occupying lands on the edge of the RAA and the titled lands, the project will provide environmental education and training as well as create alternative livelihood projects.

**Peru - Poison Dart Frog Ranching to Protect Rainforest and Alleviate Poverty (World Bank/IFC)**, GEF financing: \$0.81m; Total: \$1.85m; OP 3

The objective of the project is to promote sustainable cultivation of poison dart frogs for export, so local people can earn a better living from conserving the forest than by cutting it down. The project's main outcomes are in three complementary areas: forest preservation, poverty alleviation, and frog conservation. The project also supports a few related beneficial outcomes.

**Peru - Community -based Conservation and Sustainable Use of the Atiquipa and Taimara Lomas Ecosystems (UNDP)**, GEF financing: \$0.75m; Total: \$2.22m; OP 2, 3, 4

The objective of the project is to protect the Atiquipa and Taimara ecosystem and its attendant biodiversity through effective conservation and sustainable management in collaboration with stakeholders. The project will specifically attempt to do this through enhancement of the capacity of communities to manage natural resources, establishment of community managed protected areas, restoration of three forest sites.

**Seychelles - Improving Management of NGO and Privately Owned Nature Reserves and High Biodiversity Islands in Seychelles (World Bank)**, GEF financing: \$0.84m; Total: \$1.91m; OP 2

The goal of the project is to improve management of NGO and privately owned biodiversity-rich islands by installing a shared program framework and infrastructure for enhanced and sustainable conservation, financing and



use of biodiversity. The project would build long-term capacity for sustainable conservation and use of island biodiversity through program and capacity-building, infrastructure acquisition and installation, co-management, and education and advocacy. The project will seek to generate incremental funding from government and donors for long-term conservation management; address impacts on island biodiversity by ecotourism activities, staff, and scientists; attract and maintain a world class conservation and scientific work; manage stakeholders, community participation and reduce poaching; establish adequate mechanisms for collaboration and increase capacity; and defining appropriate models to manage high biodiversity islands and reserves that are no state owned.

**Slovak Republic - Conservation, Restoration and Wise Use of Calcareous Fens (UNDP)**, GEF financing: \$0.99m; Total: \$2.46m; OP 4, 2

The project aims at the conservation of Carpathian peatland biodiversity, with a focus on calcareous fens, a unique ecosystem with its center of distribution in Slovakia. In particular, the following will be addressed: 1) drainage of fens, 2) lack of appropriate management of protected fen areas, 3) lack of public awareness and appreciation of peatland biodiversity, 4) low institutional capacity to address threats to fen biodiversity, 5) weak policy environment to ensure adequate protection of fen biodiversity.

**Russian Federation - Strengthening Protected Areas Network for Sikhote-Alin Mountain Forest Ecosystems Conservation in Khabarovsk Krai (World Bank)**, GEF financing: \$0.75m; Total: \$1.75m; OP 13, 2

The project will support the establishment in the South of the Khabarovsk Krai of an integrated system of protected areas to ensure preservation and sustainability of highly endangered habitats in the Sikhote-Alin mountain forests.

**South Africa - Richtersveld Community Biodiversity Conservation Project (World Bank)**, GEF financing: \$0.90m; Total: \$2.07m; OP 1

This project will contribute to the protection of globally significant biodiversity (a portion of the Succulent Karoo biome) in the Richtersveld, South Africa through the establishment of a strong system of community-based biodiversity conservation in partnership with other key stakeholders.

**Vietnam - In-situ Conservation of Native Landraces and their Wild Relatives in Vietnam (UNDP)**, GEF financing: \$0.93m; Total: \$3.92m; OP 3

Vietnam is one of the Vavilov's centers of origin of domesticated plants and animals and is one of the 10 centers highest biodiversity in the world. This medium-sized GEF project will target conservation of six important crop groups (rice, taro, tea, litchi-longan, citrus and rice bean) including native landraces and wild relatives in three local eco-geographical areas: the northern mountains, the northern midlands, and the north-west mountains of Vietnam. These areas are rich in biodiversity of native landraces and their wild relatives. The six crop groups will be protected by mitigating the threats to the agrobiodiversity of the target sites and preserving their genetic diversity, thus improving global food security. This will be done through promoting community based gene management zones and providing the enabling conditions for preserving agrobiodiversity.

**Vietnam - The Green Corridor (World Bank)**, GEF financing: \$0.99m; Total: \$2.06m; OP 1, 3

This project will provide the additional resources required to demonstrate and ensure that by improving the management of productive landscapes, global conservation targets can be met whilst sustaining benefits to local communities and provincial coffers. This project will improve the capacity and increase the motivation of provincial authorities and local communities to cooperate for biodiversity conservation and sustainable management of natural resources.

**Vietnam - Integrating Watershed and Biodiversity Management in Chu Yang Sin National Park (World Bank)**, GEF financing: \$0.99m; Total: \$20.98m; OP 3

The overall goal of the project is to conserve the biodiversity attributes of Chu Yang Sin in the long term and developing integrated watershed and biodiversity management at a broader scale.