

ANNEX 1
GEF BIODIVERSITY PROGRAM STUDY
Initiating Memorandum

Background

1. The GEF has allocated over \$1 billion to cover the incremental costs of 395 projects in the biodiversity focal area in 123 countries from FY1992 to FY2000. About \$332 million were approved during the pilot phase (1991-94) while close to \$560 million were approved during the first Operational Phase of the GEF (up to June 1999).

2. In 1997, GEF adopted four ecosystem-based Operational Programs (OPs) in the biodiversity focal area. These OPs have provided guidance on the objective, scope, expected outcomes and outputs for each program to achieve. The four biodiversity OPs are¹:

- OP # 1: Arid and Semi-Arid Zone Ecosystems
- OP #2: Coastal, Marine, and Freshwater Ecosystems
- OP #3: Forest Ecosystems
- OP #4: Mountain Ecosystems

3. The GEF Operational Strategy² identifies the main strategic considerations guiding GEF-financed activities to secure global biodiversity benefits through:

- (a) Integration of the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity within national and, as appropriate, sub regional and regional sustainable development plans and policies;
- (b) helping to protect and sustainably manage ecosystems through targeted and cost-effective interventions;
- (c) integration of efforts to achieve global benefits in other focal areas, where feasible, and in the cross-sectoral area of land degradation, primarily desertification and deforestation;
- (d) development of a portfolio that encompasses representative ecosystems of global biodiversity significance; and,
- (e) that GEF activities will be targeted and designed to help recipient countries achieve agreed biodiversity objectives in strategic and cost-effective ways.

These strategic considerations contain the main elements of the GEF activities in the focal area and will provide guidance to the Biodiversity Program Study in assessing the results and initial impacts of the GEF biodiversity portfolio.

Objectives of the Study

4. The Biodiversity Program Study (BDP Study) will aid the work of the team assigned to implement GEF's Overall Performance (OPS2)³ by providing data on "coverage" of projects and analysis of the achievements, impacts and lessons emerging from the implementation of GEF financed projects. Specifically, the BDP study has three main objectives:

¹ GEF. 'GEF Operational Programs.' Global Environment Facility. 1997.

² GEF. 'Operational Strategy.' Global Environment Facility. 1996.

³ The Study of GEF's Overall Performance (OPS2) will assess GEF's operational and programmatic results to date, and on that basis discuss GEF's overall role in initiating and supporting actions to halt and or mitigate the degradation of the global environment within the areas of its responsibility. The study will be carried out from September 2000 to January 2002. Terms of reference are under preparation.

- (i) Conduct a statistical analysis of the area covered by GEF assisted projects, including a comparison with lists of global important ecosystems (“coverage”);
- (ii) Highlight and assess achievements, initial impacts and lessons learned from the GEF biodiversity portfolio; and
- (iii) Assess mechanisms for incorporating lessons learned into more recently approved projects.

5. The BDP Study will analyze projects on the basis of their main objectives, within constraints arising during project implementation and taking into consideration the GEF guidelines at the time of project approval.

6. The methodology of the study will include two distinct but interrelated approaches: a quantitative analysis of coverage of the portfolio and a qualitative assessment of achievements and initial impacts of GEF interventions. It is expected that the BDP Study will be able to report how the GEF, through the implementation of its portfolio, has been able to promote biodiversity conservation and sustainable use.

Biodiversity Program Study Cohorts

7. The study will work with two cohorts of projects:

Cohort 1: all completed projects plus all projects under implementation as of June 30, 1998 (‘mature portfolio’). These are the projects that have been included in the 1998 and 1999 Project Portfolio Review plus all completed projects that are not included in any of these two reviews (82 projects).

Cohort 2: all projects approved by GEF between July 1, 1998 and June 30, 2000 (‘new portfolio’, 128 projects).

Methodology

8. The BDP Study will use two distinct but interrelated approaches: (a) quantitative analysis focusing on the coverage of the portfolio; and (b) qualitative assessment of the achievements, initial impacts and lesson learned of the GEF biodiversity projects. In addition, the study will evaluate how new projects have benefited from lessons learned from past projects. The qualitative and quantitative analyses will cover projects from the “mature portfolio” while the evaluation on the feedback mechanisms will use the “new portfolio.”

9. The final report will not contain individual project evaluations or assessments but instead will contain a review of the portfolio. Individual projects would be mentioned only as examples or illustrations and will help build up aggregate results of the study.

10. Projects are the unit of information and analysis of the study. Project achievements and initial impacts will be assessed against project objectives and within particular constraints in project implementation. As much as possible, the study will be based on existing information, including project documents, internal and external evaluation reports and Project Implementation Reviews (PIRs). In addition, the study will use project desk reviews, structured consultations and when appropriate field visits.

11. Cohort 2 (“new portfolio”) will be used to evaluate how new projects have benefited from lessons learned and best practices from past projects. These projects will not be assessed for achievements, since they have been under implementation for less than one year, but for design. In addition, the study will review the processes (if any) for feeding these lessons into the design of new projects.

Quantitative analysis

12. The quantitative analysis will use indicators to measure and assess the extent of coverage (hectares, number of projects and funding) of GEF projects according to ecosystems, special lists of global important ecosystems and a series of biodiversity activities.⁴ The portfolio analysis will be undertaken as a desk study.

13. This analysis will involve designing and creating a database of Cohort 1 projects. This work will be guided by the framework developed for the GEF biodiversity program indicators⁵ and on other existing portfolio reviews. Specific attention will be paid to how well the GEF portfolio has responded to the strategic considerations set forward in the GEF Operational Strategy.⁶

Qualitative assessment

14. The qualitative analysis will highlight and assess project achievements, initial impacts and lessons learned. To organize the qualitative analysis the projects in Cohort 1 will be grouped according to their main objectives in the following three categories:

- (1) Conservation and sustainable use within protected areas and buffer zones. Projects in this category would include: setting up and developing new protected areas; planning and management existing protected areas; setting up mechanisms for sustainable financing protected areas, addressing sustainable use related to protected areas.
- (2) Conservation and sustainable use in the productive landscapes (i.e., forest, coastal zone, game ranching, agriculture, wetlands, medicinal plants). Projects in this category would include: sustainable management approaches, implementing management plans, planning, integration of biodiversity concerns into national development plans, optimization of productivity of resources, conservation of crop diversity. Projects in this category could include the use of protected areas.
- (3) Capacity development for conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity at all levels (human, institutional and systematic) within local, national, regional and global scales. Projects in Cohort 1 in this category mainly included capacity development activities in research, inventory, evaluation, monitoring, information systems, networks and databases.⁷

15. These categories are not necessarily exclusive although the assumption, to the extent possible, is that each project will be allocated into only one category. A first count indicates the following distribution: (1) 39; (2) 23; and (3) 18.

16. Achievements, initial impacts and lessons learned will be extracted from each of these three categories. To achieve this, a group of 30 projects was randomly selected to undergo in-depth review based on special terms of reference (to be developed). From these 30 projects, 10 were randomly selected to undergo field visits. The random selection was based on a stratified process to maintain

⁴ Biodiversity activities include: indigenous and local knowledge; participation of indigenous peoples (as defined in CBD); alien and invasive species; research and taxonomy; conservation trust funds and other long-term financing mechanisms; biosafety; intellectual property rights; transboundary cooperation and exchange of expertise; policies, laws and regulations; research; training; education and awareness; land tenure; NBSAPs.

⁵ Jenkins, M. and V. Kapos. 'Biodiversity Indicators for Monitoring GEF Programme Implementation and Impacts.' Draft final report. World Conservation Monitoring Centre (WCMC). 2000.

⁶ "... a portfolio will be developed from a broadly representative base of globally important ecosystems including their habitats, while recognizing the potential importance of particular species and endemism-rich ecosystems. Within representative ecosystems, particular attention will be given to the degree of threat, level of vulnerability, and priority status at national and regional levels." (page 15; GEF Operational Strategy, February 1996).

⁷ Most of the multi-country projects in Cohort 1 are in category 3 so the terms of reference of the in-depth review for this category should make special consideration and attention to this fact.

the representative distribution of projects in Cohort 1 according to Implementing Agencies, regions, categories of project objectives, phase (pilot phase and operational GEF), status (completed vs. active) and size (full vs. mid-size).

17. Achievements, lessons and initial impacts will be also extracted from issues that are crosscutting among most GEF biodiversity projects, such as:

- (a) Stakeholders participation and social issues. Analysis of this topic will be completed by in-depth review of a sub-set of projects that have as one of their main project objectives the involvement of stakeholders in the implementation of the project. At least 2 projects (from the 10 field visits) will be chosen for field studies; and
- (b) Project sustainability (institutional, financial), country ownership, replicability, and innovation. Analysis of these topics will be based on existing reports, such as the study on Trust Funds and Sustainability in Biodiversity and on experiences from the in-depth review of the 30 selected projects.

18. The three project categories and the two cross-cutting issues are defined as the “issues studies.” The Study Team will be divided in small teams (3-4 people) that will be responsible for the development of each of them.

19. The qualitative assessment will be based, primarily, on desk reviews of available documentation on the “mature portfolio” included in the study (Cohort 1) of projects and structured consultations with GEF staff and participants, including NGOs.

Work arrangements

20. The Study Team for the BDP Study will consist of one full time staff member from the GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Team, members of the Biodiversity Task Force, STAP, and one senior external consultant. Another consultant has been contracted for the quantitative analysis of coverage. A first meeting of the Study Team took place in September 18-19, 2000 to discuss on the scope and content of the study, including study themes, STAP’s contribution and participation, projects and countries for field visits and detailed work plan.

21. As presented above, in addition to the desktop studies, the Study Team will travel to conduct field visits of selected projects. Local consultants maybe contracted for country-based reviews.

Expected Outputs

22. The BDP Study will result in a report that will identify achievements and initial impacts of the GEF biodiversity portfolio. The report will consist of an executive summary, a concise main report, and detailed annexes. It will be disseminated covering the three levels of analysis with regard to the coverage, achievement of results, and preliminary impacts. The report and background documents will be made available to the OPS2 team as soon as it is available.

Timeframe

23. The Biodiversity Program Study will be undertaken from August 2000 to March 2001, with early results to be provided as an input into the OPS2 Study Team, which is expected to begin work around January 2001. Country level work will be carried out from October 2000 to January 2001. The Program Study will be completed by April 2001.

Annex 2
GEF Biodiversity Program Study
List of project in Cohort 1

ID	GEF IA	Region	Country	Type	OP	FY	Project Name	GEF \$	Phase	Category of project objectives	Status
1	UNDP	AFR	Africa	FP	ST	1996	Inventory, Evaluation and Monitoring of Botanical Diversity in Southern Africa: A Regional Capacity and Institution Building Network (Botswana, Lesotho, Malawi, Mozambique, Swaziland, South Africa, Zambia, Zimbabwe)	4.73	GEF	3. CD	Active
2	UNDP	AFR	Africa	FP	4	1997	Reducing Biodiversity Loss at Cross-Border Sites in East Africa (Kenya, Tanzania, Uganda)	12.90	GEF	1. PA (*)	Active
3	UNDP	AFR	Africa	FP	ST	1997	African NGO-Government Partnership for Sustainable Biodiversity Action (Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Ethiopia, Ghana, Kenya, Sierra Leone, South Africa, Tanzania, Tunisia, Uganda)	4.52	GEF	3. CD	Active
4	UNDP	AFR	Africa	FP	ST	1991	Institutional Support for the Protection of East African Biodiversity (Kenya, Tanzania, Uganda)	10.00	Pilot	3. CD	Completed
5	WB	AFR	Africa	FP	1	1993	West Africa Pilot Community-Based Natural Resource and Wildlife Management (Burkina Faso, Cote d'Ivoire)	7.00	Pilot	2. PL	Active
6	WB	AFR	Africa	FP	3	1997	Central Africa Region: Regional Environment and Information Management Project (REIMP) (Cameroon, Central African Republic, Congo, Equatorial Guinea, Gabon, Congo DR)	4.35	GEF	3. CD (**)	Active
7	WB	ASME	Algeria	FP	2	1991	El Kala National Park and Wetlands Management	9.20	Pilot	1. PA	Completed
8	UNDP	AP	Asia & Pacific	FP	3	1993	Conservation Strategies for Rhinos in South East Asia (Indonesia, Malaysia)	2.00	Pilot	2. PL	Completed
9	UNDP	AP	Asia & Pacific	FP	ST	1991	South Pacific Biodiversity Conservation Program (Palau, Micronesia FS, Nauru, Vanuatu, Solomon Islands, Tuvalu, Kiribati, Marshall Islands, Fiji, Tonga, Niue, Cook Islands, Samoa, Tokelau, Papua New Guinea)	10.00	Pilot	1. PA	Active
10	UNDP	LAC	Argentina	FP	2	1992	Patagonian Coastal Zone Management Plan	2.80	Pilot	2. PL (**)	Completed
11	WB	LAC	Argentina	FP	ST	1997	Biodiversity Conservation Project	10.39	GEF	1. PA (*)	Active
12	UNDP	LAC	Belize	FP	2	1992	Sustainable Development and Management of Biologically Diverse Coastal Resources	3.00	Pilot	2. PL	Completed
13	UNDP	AP	Bhutan	FP	4	1997	Integrated Management of Jigme Dorji National Park	1.50	GEF	1. PA (*)	Active
14	WB	AP	Bhutan	FP	4	1991	Trust Fund for Environmental Conservation	10.00	Pilot	1. PA	Completed
15	WB	LAC	Bolivia	FP	3	1992	Biodiversity Conservation	4.50	Pilot	1. PA	Completed
16	WB	LAC	Brazil	FP	ST	1991	Brazilian Biodiversity Fund	20.00	Pilot	3. CD	Active
17	WB	LAC	Brazil	FP	ST	1991	National Biodiversity Project	10.00	Pilot	3. CD	Active
18	UNDP	AFR	Burkina Faso	FP	1	1993	Optimizing Biological Diversity within Wildlife Ranching systems ; a Pilot Demonstration in a Semi-arid Zone	2.50	Pilot	1. PA	Active
19	WB	AFR	Cameroon	FP	3	1993	Biodiversity Conservation and Management	5.96	Pilot	1. PA	Active
20	UNDP	AFR	Central African Republic	FP	3	1995	A Highly Decentralized Approach to Biodiversity Protection and Use: The Bangassou Dense Forest.	2.50	GEF	2. PL (*)	Active
21	WB	AP	China	FP	3	1995	Nature Reserves Management	17.80	GEF	1. PA	Active
22	UNDP	LAC	Colombia	FP	3	1991	Conservation of Biodiversity in the Choco Region	6.00	Pilot	2. PL	Completed
23	UNDP	AFR	Comoros	FP	2	1996	Island Biodiversity and Participatory Conservation in the Federal Islamic Republic of Comoros	2.44	GEF	3. CD	
24	WB	AFR	Congo	FP	3	1991	Wildlands Protection and Management	10.00	Pilot	1. PA (*)	
25	UNDP	LAC	Costa Rica	FP	3	1992	Conservation of Biodiversity and Sustainable Development in La Amistad and La Osa Conservation Areas	8.00	Pilot	1. PA	
26	UNDP	AFR	Cote d'Ivoire	FP	2	1993	Control of Exotic Aquatic Weeds in Rivers and Coastal Lagoons to Enhance and Restore Biodiversity	3.00	Pilot	2. PL	
27	UNDP	LAC	Cuba	FP	2	1992	Protecting Biodiversity and Establishing Sustainable Development of the in Sabana-Camaguey Region	2.00	Pilot	2. PL	

ID	GEF IA	Region	Country	Type	OP	FY	Project Name	GEF \$	Phase	Category of project objectives	Status
28	WB	ECA	Czech Republic	FP	ST	1992	Biodiversity Protection	2.00	Pilot	2. PL	
29	UNDP	LAC	Dominican Republic	FP	2	1992	Biodiversity Conservation and Management in the Coastal Zone of the Dominican Republic	3.00	Pilot	2. PL (*)	
30	WB	LAC	Ecuador	FP	3	1992	Biodiversity Protection	7.20	Pilot	1. PA	
31	WB	ASME	Egypt	FP	2	1992	Red Sea Coastal and Marine Resource Management	4.75	Pilot	2. PL (*)	
32	UNDP	AFR	Ethiopia	FP	1	1993	A Dynamic farmer-based approach to the conservation of African Plant Genetic Resources	2.46	Pilot	2. PL	
33	UNDP	AFR	Gabon	FP	3	1991	Conservation of biodiversity through effective management of wildlife trade	1.00	Pilot	3. CD	
34	WB	AFR	Ghana	FP	2	1992	Coastal Wetlands Management	7.20	Pilot	2. PL (*)	
35	UNEP	GLO	Global	MSP	ST	1998	Global Biodiversity Forum Phase II	0.75	GEF	3. CD	
36	UNEP	GLO	Global	FP	ST	1997	People, Land Management, and Environmental Change (PLEC) (Brazil, China, Ghana, Guinea, Kenya, Papua New Guinea, Tanzania, Uganda)	6.28	GEF	3. CD	
37	UNEP	GLO	Global	FP	ST	1993	Global Biodiversity Assessment	3.30	Pilot	3. CD (*)	
38	UNEP	GLO	Global	MSP	2	1998	Development of Best Practices and Dissemination of Lessons Learned for Dealing with the Global Problem of Alien Species that Threaten Biological Diversity (Cote d'Ivoire, Czech Republic, Kenya, Malawi, Mauritius, New Zealand, Poland, South Africa)	0.75	GEF	3. CD	
39	UNDP	LAC	Guatemala	FP	3	1995	Integrated Biodiversity Protection in the Sarstun-Motagua Region	4.00	GEF	1. PA (*)	
40	UNDP	LAC	Guyana	FP	3	1991	Programme for Sustainable Forestry (Iwokrama Rain Forest Programme)	3.00	Pilot	1. PA	
41	Joint	LAC	Honduras	FP	3	1997	Honduras Biodiversity Project	7.30	GEF	1. PA	
42	WB	AP	India	FP	3	1995	India Ecodevelopment	20.21	GEF	1. PA	
43	UNEP	AP	Indonesia	MSP	3	1998-07	Emergency Response Measure to Combat Fires in Indonesia	0.75	GEF	3. CD (**)	
44	WB	AP	Indonesia	FP	3	1995	Kerinci Seblat Integrated Conservation and Development	14.40	GEF	1. PA	
45	WB	AP	Indonesia	FP	2	1997	Coral Reef Rehabilitation and Management Project (COREMAP)	12.28	GEF	1. PA	
46	WB	AP	Indonesia	FP	3	1992	Biodiversity Collections	7.20	Pilot	3. CD (*)	
47	UNDP	ASME	Jordan	FP	2	1992	Conservation of the Dana and Azraq Protected Areas	6.30	Pilot	1. PA	
48	WB	AFR	Kenya	FP	1	1991	Tana River National Primate Reserve	6.20	Pilot	1. PA	
49	UNDP	LAC	LAC	FP	3	1991	Regional Support for the Conservation and Sustainable Use of Natural Resources in the Amazon (Bolivia, Brazil, Colombia, Ecuador, Guyana, Peru, Suriname, Venezuela)	4.50	Pilot	3. CD (*)	
50	WB	AP	Lao PDR	FP	3	1991	Wildlife and Protected Areas Conservation	5.00	Pilot	1. PA	
51	UNDP	ASME	Lebanon	FP	4	1995	Strengthening of National Capacity and Grassroots In-Situ Conservation for Sustainable Biodiversity Protection	2.53	GEF	1. PA	
52	Joint	AFR	Madagascar	FP	3	1997	Environment Program Support	21.30	GEF	2. PL (*)	
53	WB	AFR	Malawi	FP	2	1992	Lake Malawi/Nyasa Biodiversity Conservation	5.00	Pilot	1. PA (*)	
54	UNEP	AFR	Mauritania	MSP	ST	1998	Rescue Plan for the Cap Blanc Colony of the Mediterranean Monk Seal	0.15	GEF	3. CD	
55	UNDP	AFR	Mauritius	FP	3	1993	Restoration of highly degraded and threatened native forests in Mauritius	0.20	Pilot	1. PA (**)	
56	WB	AFR	Mauritius	FP	3	1995	Biodiversity Restoration	1.20	GEF	1. PA	
57	WB	LAC	Mexico	FP	ST	1991	Protected Areas Program	25.00	Pilot	1. PA	
58	UNDP	AP	Mongolia	FP	1	1998	Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Livelihood Options in the Grasslands of Eastern Mongolia	5.16	GEF	2. PL	
59	UNDP	AP	Mongolia	FP	1	1993	Strengthening Conservation Capacity and Development and Institution of a National Biodiversity Conservation Plan (Implementation Phase I)	1.50	Pilot	2. PL	
60	WB	AFR	Mozambique	FP	ST	1993	Transfrontier Conservation Areas Pilot and Institutional Strengthening	5.00	Pilot	1. PA (*)	
61	UNDP	AP	Nepal	FP	4	1992	Biodiversity Conservation in Nepal	3.80	Pilot	3. CD (*)	

ID	GEF IA	Region	Country	Type	OP	FY	Project Name	GEF \$	Phase	Category of project objectives	Status
62	UNDP	AP	Pakistan	FP	3	1992	Maintaining Biological Diversity with Rural Community Development	2.50	Pilot	2. PL	
63	UNDP	LAC	Panama	FP	3	1991	Biodiversity Conservation in the Darien Region	3.00	Pilot	1. PA (*)	
64	UNDP	AP	Papua New Guinea	FP	3	1992	Biodiversity Conservation and Resource Management	5.00	Pilot	1. PA	
65	WB	LAC	Peru	FP	3	1991	National Trust Fund for Protected Areas	5.00	Pilot	1. PA (**)	
66	WB	AP	Philippines	FP	ST	1991	Conservation of Priority Protected Areas	20.00	Pilot	1. PA (**)	
67	WB	ECA	Poland	FP	3	1991	Forest Biodiversity Protection	4.50	Pilot	2. PL	
68	WB	ECA	Romania	FP	2	1992	Danube Delta Biodiversity	4.50	Pilot	1. PA (*)	
69	WB	ECA	Russian Federation	FP	3	1995	Biodiversity Conservation	20.10	Pilot		
70	WB	AFR	Seychelles	FP	2	1992	Biodiversity Conservation and Marine Pollution Abatement	1.80	Pilot	1. PA	
71	WB	ECA	Slovak Republic	FP	ST	1992	Biodiversity Protection	2.30	Pilot	1. PA (*)	
72	WB	AFR	South Africa	FP	3	1998	Cape Peninsula Biodiversity Conservation Project	12.40	GEF	1. PA	
73	UNDP	AP	Sri Lanka	FP	3	1992	Wildlife Conservation and Protected Areas Management	4.10	Pilot	3. CD (*)	
74	WB	AP	Sri Lanka	FP	3	1997	Conservation and Sustainable Use of Medicinal Plants	5.42	GEF	2. PL (**)	
75	WB	ECA	Turkey	FP	1	1992	In-Situ Conservation of Genetic Biodiversity	5.10	Pilot	2. PL	
76	WB	AFR	Uganda	FP	4	1991	Bwindi Impenetrable National Park and Mgahinga Gorilla National Park Conservation	4.00	Pilot	1. PA	
77	WB	ECA	Ukraine	FP	2	1992	Danube Delta Biodiversity	1.50	Pilot	1. PA (*)	
78	WB	ECA	Ukraine	FP	4	1992	Transcarpathian Biodiversity Protection	0.50	Pilot	1. PA	
79	UNDP	LAC	Uruguay	FP	2	1997	Consolidation of the Banados del Este Biosphere Reserve	2.50	GEF	2. PL	
80	UNDP	LAC	Uruguay	FP	2	1992	Conservation of Biodiversity in the Eastern Wetlands	3.00	Pilot	2. PL	
81	UNDP	ASME	Yemen	FP	2	1997	Conservation and Sustainable Use of the Biodiversity of Socotra Archipelago	4.97	GEF	2. PL (**)	
82	WB	ECA	Belarus	FP	3	1991	Biodiversity Protection	1.00	Pilot	1. PA	

Notes:

(*) Projects included in in-depth review

(**) Projects with field visits

PA: Protected Areas

PL: Production Landscape

CD: Capacity Development

ANNEX 3
GEF BIODIVERSITY PROGRAM STUDY
List of Projects in Cohort 2

GEF IA	Country	Type	OP	FY	Project Name	GEF \$
UNDP	South Africa	FP	1	1996	National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan and Country Report to the COP	\$4.66
UNDP	Morocco	FP	1	2000	Transhumans for Biodiversity Conservation in the Southern High Atlas	\$4.37
UNDP	Philippines	FP	1	2000	Samar Island Biodiversity Project: Conservation and Sustainable Use of the Biodiversity of a Forested Protected Area	\$6.11
UNDP	Venezuela	FP	2	2000	Conservation of the Biological Diversity of the Orinoco Delta Biosphere Reserve and Lower Orinoco River Basin	\$9.79
UNDP	Latin America/ Caribbean	FP	2	1995	Conservation of Biodiversity in the Lake Titicaca Basin	\$3.11
UNDP	Latin America/ Caribbean	FP	STRM	1997	Central American Fund for Environment and Development: Account for the Global Environment	\$15.00
UNDP	Argentina	FP	2	1997	Consolidation and Implementation of the Patagonia Coastal Zone Management Programme for Biodiversity Conservation	\$5.20
UNDP	Vietnam	FP	3	1996	Vietnam PARC - Creating Protected Areas for Resources Conservation (PARC) in Vietnam Using a Landscape Ecology Approach	\$6.04
UNDP	Jordan	FP	2	1997	Final Consolidation and Conservation of Azraq Wetlands and Dana Wildlands by RSCN to Address New Pressures	\$1.95
UNDP	Lesotho	FP	4	1998	Conserving Mountain Biodiversity in Lesotho	\$2.51
UNDP	Congo, DR	FP	3	1998	Rehabilitation of Protected Areas in the Democratic Republic of the Congo	\$6.30
UNDP	Africa	FP	STRM	1998	Southern Africa Biodiversity Support Programme	\$4.48
UNDP	Latin America/ Caribbean	FP	3	1996	Action for a Sustainable Amazonia	\$3.80
UNDP	Asia/Pacific	FP	1	1998	Conservation and Sustainable Use of Dryland Agro-Biodiversity of the Fertile Crescent	\$8.18
UNDP	Regional	FP	2	1997	Conservation of Wetland and Coastal Ecosystems in the Mediterranean Region	\$13.44
UNDP	Eritrea	FP	2	1997	Conservation Management of Eritrea's Coastal, Marine and Island Biodiversity	\$5.39
UNDP	Africa	FP	1	1998	Participatory Management of Plant Genetic Resources in Oases of the Maghreb	\$3.08
UNDP	Peru	FP	1	1999	In-Situ Conservation of Native Cultivars and Their Wild Relatives	\$5.22
UNDP	Paraguay	FP	3	1999	Paraguayan Wildlands Protection Initiative	\$9.20
UNDP	Pakistan	FP	4	1999	Mountain Areas Conservancy Project	\$10.60
UNDP	Congo, DR	FP	STRM	1996	Emergency Response to the Refugee Driven Biodiversity Crisis in Congo DR	\$0.25
UNDP	Cuba	FP	2	1999	Priority Actions to Consolidate Biodiversity Protection in the Sabana-Camaguey Ecosystem	\$3.89
UNDP	Belize	FP	2	1999	Conservation And Sustainable Use of the Barrier Reef Complex	\$5.36
UNDP	China	FP	2	1999	Wetland Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Use	\$12.03
UNDP	India	FP	2	1999	Conservation and Sustainable Use of the Gulf of Mannar Biosphere Reserve's Coastal Biodiversity	\$7.84
UNDP	Malaysia	FP	2	1999	Conservation and Sustainable Use of Tropical Peat Swamp Forests and Associated Wetland Ecosystems	\$6.30
UNDP	Suriname	FP	3	1999	Conservation of Globally Significant Forest Ecosystems in Suriname's Guayana Shield	\$9.54
UNDP	Bangladesh	FP	2	2000	Coastal and Wetland Biodiversity Management at Cox's Bazar and Hakakuki Haor	\$6.20
UNDP	Ecuador	FP	1	2000	Control of Invasive Species in the Galapagos Archipelago	\$18.68

GEF IA	Country	Type	OP	FY	Project Name	GEF \$
UNDP	Egypt	FP	1	2000	Conservation and Sustainable Use of Medicinal Plants in Arid and Semi-arid Ecosystems	\$4.29
UNDP	Tanzania	FP	2	2000	Development of Mnazi Bay Marine Park	\$1.62
UNDP	Brazil	FP	3	2000	Promoting Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Use in the Frontier Forests of Northwestern Mato Grosso	\$6.98
UNDP	Costa Rica	MSP	3	2000	Conservation of Biodiversity in the Talamanca-Caribbean Biological Corridor	\$0.75
UNDP	Micronesia	MSP	2	2000	Community Conservation and Compatible Enterprise Development on Pohnpei	\$0.75
UNDP	Georgia	MSP	1	2000	Arid and Semi-Arid Ecosystem Conservation in the Caucasus	\$0.75
UNDP	Nepal	MSP	4	1999	Upper Mustang Biodiversity Project	\$0.75
UNDP	Belize	MSP	3	1999	Creating A Co-Managed Protected Areas System	\$0.75
UNDP	Sudan	MSP	1	1998	Conservation and Management of Habitats and Species, and Sustainable Community Use of Biodiversity in Dinder National Park	\$0.75
UNDP	Africa	MSP	3	1998	Conservation Priority -Setting for the Upper Guinea Forest Ecosystems, West Africa	\$0.74
UNDP	Cameroon	MSP	4	2000	Community Based Conservation in the Bamenda Highlands	\$1.00
UNDP	Algeria	MSP	1	2000	Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Natural Resource Management	\$0.75
UNDP	Korea DPR	MSP	4	2000	Conservation of Biodiversity at Mount Myohyang	\$0.75
UNDP	Philippines	MSP	3	2000	Sustainable Management of Mount Isarog	\$0.75
UNDP	Philippines	MSP	2	2000	Conservation of the Tubbahata Reefs National Marine Park and World Heritage Site	\$0.75
UNDP	Sri Lanka	MSP	2	2000	Conservation of Biodiversity through Integrated Collaborative Management in Rekawa, Ussangoda, and Kalametiya Coastal Ecosystems	\$0.75
UNDP	Tanzania, United Republic Of	MSP	3	2000	Jozani Chwaka Bay National Park Development	\$0.75
UNDP	Ghana	MSP	2	2000	Biodiversity Conservation of Lake Bosomtwe Basin	\$0.52
UNDP	Sri Lanka	MSP	3	2000	Conservation of Globally Threatened Species in the Rainforests of Southwest Sri Lanka	\$0.75
UNDP/UNEP	Latin America/ Caribbean	FP	3	1998	Establishment of a Programme for the Consolidation of the Meso-American Biological Corridor	\$10.94
UNEP	Global	FP	3	2000	Millennium Ecosystem Assessment	\$7.31
UNEP	Regional	MSP	1	1999	An Indicator Model for Dryland Ecosystems in Latin America	\$0.75
UNEP	Global	MSP	1	2000	Promoting Best Practices for Conservation and Sustainable Use of Biodiversity of Global Significance in Arid and Semi-arid Zones	\$0.75
UNEP	China	MSP	1	1999	Lop Nur Nature Sanctuary Biodiversity Conservation	\$0.73
UNEP	Latin America/Caribbean	MSP	1	2000	Catalyzing Conservation Action in Latin America: Identifying Priority Sites and Best Management	\$0.75
UNEP	Kenya	MSP	1	2000	Lake Baringo Community -based Integrated Land and Water Management Project	\$0.75
UNEP/UNDP	Africa	FP	1	1998	Biological Diversity Conservation through Participatory Rehabilitation of the Degraded Lands of the Arid and Semi-Arid Transboundary Areas of Mauritania and Senegal	\$8.00
UNEP/UNDP	Africa	FP	1	1999	Management of Indigenous Vegetation for the Rehabilitation of Degraded Rangelands in the Arid Zone of Africa	\$9.05
World Bank	Zimbabwe	FP	1	1992	Biodiversity Conservation in Southeast Zimbabwe	\$4.80
World Bank	Pakistan	FP	3	1998	Protected Areas Management Project	\$11.14
World Bank	Uganda	FP	1	1997	Protected Areas Management and Sustainable Use (PAMSU)	\$10.29
World Bank	Costa Rica	FP	3	1997	Biodiversity Resources Development	\$7.28

GEF IA	Country	Type	OP	FY	Project Name	GEF \$
World Bank	Guyana	FP	3	1997	National Protected Areas System	\$6.00
World Bank	CE Europe/ Former Soviet Union	FP	4	1998	Central Asia Transboundary Biodiversity Project	\$10.49
World Bank	Nicaragua	FP	3	1997	Atlantic Biodiversity Corridor	\$7.43
World Bank	Romania	FP	3	1997	Integrated Protected Areas and Conservation Management	\$5.30
World Bank	Panama	FP	3	1997	Atlantic Biological Corridor Project	\$8.60
World Bank	Ghana	FP	3	1998	Natural Resource Management	\$8.93
World Bank	Benin	FP	1	1998	National Parks Conservation and Management Project	\$6.24
World Bank	Morocco	FP	1	1998	Protected Areas Management	\$10.10
World Bank	Ukraine	FP	2	1998	Biodiversity Conservation in the Azov-Black Sea Ecological Corridor	\$7.15
World Bank	Turkey	FP	3	1998	Integrated Protected Areas and Conservation Management	\$8.55
World Bank	Georgia	FP	2	1999	Integrated Coastal Management Project	\$1.30
World Bank	Georgia	FP	3	1999	Conservation of Forest Ecosystems	\$9.05
World Bank	Papua New Guinea	FP	3	1999	Forestry and Conservation Project	\$17.30
World Bank	Bangladesh	FP	2	1999	Aquatic Biodiversity Conservation	\$5.00
World Bank	Bolivia	FP	1	1999	Sustainability of the National System of Protected Areas	\$15.30
World Bank	Cambodia	FP	3	1999	Biodiversity and Protected Area Management Pilot Project for the Virachey National Park	\$2.75
World Bank	Cote d'Ivoire	FP	3	1999	National Protected Area Management Program	\$16.50
World Bank	Ethiopia	FP	3	1999	Conservation and Sustainable Use of Medicinal Plants	\$1.91
World Bank	Indonesia	FP	2	1999	Maluku Conservation and Natural Resources Management	\$6.00
World Bank	Malawi	FP	4	1999	Mulanje Mountain Biodiversity Conservation Project	\$5.30
World Bank	Mozambique	FP	2	1999	Coastal and Marine Biodiversity Management Project	\$4.08
World Bank	Peru	FP	2	1999	Indigenous Management of Protected Areas in the Amazon	\$10.35
World Bank	Philippines	FP	2	1999	Coastal and Marine Biodiversity Conservation in Mindanao	\$1.25
World Bank	Colombia	FP	4	2000	Conservation of Biodiversity in the Sierra Nevada de Santa Marta	\$9.38
World Bank	Costa Rica	FP	3	2000	Ecomarkets	\$8.33
World Bank	Africa	FP	4	2000	Maloti-Drakensberg Conservation and Development Project	\$15.50
World Bank	Trinidad and Tobago	FP	2	2000	Protected Areas and Wildlife Management Project	\$4.20
World Bank	Brazil	FP	3	2000	Amazon Region Protected Areas Program (ARPA)	\$30.35
World Bank	Colombia	FP	4	2000	Conservation and Sustainable Use of Biodiversity in the Andes Region	\$15.35
World Bank	Ghana	FP	1	2000	Northern Savanna Biodiversity Conservation (NSBC) Project	\$7.90
World Bank	Mexico	FP	4	2000	Indigenous and Community Biodiversity Conservation (COINBIO)	\$7.50
World Bank	Mexico	FP	3	2000	Mesoamerican Biological Corridor	\$15.20
World Bank	Panama	MSP	3	1999	Effective Protection with Community Participation of the New Protected Area of San Lorenzo	\$0.73

GEF IA	Country	Type	OP	FY	Project Name	GEF \$
World Bank	Peru	MSP	3	1999	Participatory Conservation and Sustainable Development with Indigenous Communities in Vilcabamba	\$0.73
World Bank	Vietnam	MSP	2	2000	Hon Mun Marine Protected Area Pilot Project	\$0.97
World Bank	Guatemala	MSP	3	2000	Management and Protection of Laguna del Tigre National Park	\$0.75
World Bank	South Africa	MSP	1	2000	Conservation of Globally Significant Biodiversity in Agricultural Landscapes through Conservation Farming	\$0.75
World Bank	Kenya	MSP	1	2000	Lewa Wildlife Conservancy	\$0.75
World Bank	South Africa	MSP	1	2000	Conservation Planning for Biodiversity in the Thicket Biome	\$0.74
World Bank	Regional	MSP	1	2000	Africa Community Outreach Programme for Conservation and Sustainable Use of Biological Resources	\$0.75
World Bank	Indonesia	MSP	3	1999	Conservation of Elephant Landscapes in Aceh	\$0.74
World Bank	El Salvador	MSP	3	1999	Promotion of Biodiversity Conservation within Coffee Landscapes	\$0.75
World Bank	Seychelles	MSP	2	1998	Management of Avian Ecosystems	\$0.74
World Bank	Uganda	MSP	3	1999	Kibale Forest Wild Coffee Project	\$0.75
World Bank	Croatia	MSP	3	1999	Kopacki Rit Wetlands Management Project	\$0.75
World Bank	Belize	MSP	3	1999	Northern Belize Biological Corridors Project	\$0.77
World Bank	Syria	MSP	3	1999	Conservation of Biodiversity and Protected Areas Management	\$0.75
World Bank	Ecuador	MSP	2	1999	Monitoring System for the Galapagos Islands	\$0.94
World Bank	Colombia	MSP	2	1999	Sustainable Use of Biodiversity in the Western Slope of the Serrania del Baudo	\$0.75
World Bank	Ecuador	MSP	2	1999	Wetland Priorities for Conservation Action	\$0.74
World Bank	Mexico	MSP	3	1999	El Triunfo Biosphere Reserve: Habitat Enhancement in Productive Landscapes	\$0.75
World Bank	Peru	MSP	3	1999	Collaborative Management for the Conservation and Sustainable Development of the Northwest Biosphere Reserve	\$0.75
World Bank	Samoa	MSP	2	1999	Marine Biodiversity Protection and Management	\$0.90
World Bank	South Africa	MSP	1	1999	Sustainable Protected Area Development in Namaqualand	\$0.76
World Bank	Venezuela	MSP	2	1999	Conservation and Sustainable Use of Biodiversity in the Llanos Ecoregion	\$0.96
World Bank	Yemen	MSP	1	1999	Protected Areas Management	\$0.75
World Bank	Yemen	MSP	2	1999	Coastal Zone Management along the Gulf of Aden	\$0.75
World Bank	Colombia	MSP	2	2000	Caribbean Archipelago Biosphere Reserve: Regional Marine Protected Area System	\$1.00
World Bank	Ecuador	MSP	3	2000	Choco-Andean Corridor	\$1.00
World Bank	Seychelles	MSP	2	2000	Marine Ecosystem Management Project	\$0.75
World Bank	Slovak Republic	MSP	2	2000	Central European Grasslands - Conservation and Sustainable Use	\$0.75
World Bank	Regional	MSP	2	2000	Coral Reef Monitoring Network in Member States of the Indian Ocean Commission (COI), within the Global Reef Monitoring Network (GCRMN)	\$0.74
World Bank	Grenada	MSP	1	2000	Dry Forest Biodiversity Conservation	\$0.75
World Bank	Mauritius	MSP	2	2000	Restoration of Round Island	\$0.75
World Bank/ADB	Bangladesh	FP	2	1998	Biodiversity Conservation in the Sundarbans Reserved Forest	\$12.20
World Bank/IFC	Latin America/ Caribbean	FP	STRM	1999	Terra Capital Biodiversity Enterprise Fund for Latin America (IFC)	\$5.00

Annex 4
GEF Biodiversity Program Study
Methodology for random selection of projects

1. Thirty projects were randomly selected for in-depth review and from them 10 were selected for field visits.⁸ The selected projects represent the distribution of projects in Cohort 1 from the point of views of regions, IAs, OPs, phases, size, and project objectives (categories). The steps in the selection process:

- a) The projects were sorted according to regions. A predetermined number of projects (see below) were then selected randomly per region. The random methodology consisted in having the projects on the computer screen in an Excel worksheet and then calling out numbers randomly. The project selected was pulled out and put into a new worksheet.
- b) The projects selected by regions were sorted according to IAs. If any of the IAs was over (under) represented then a number of projects from that group was removed (added) randomly (see below).
- c) The regional distribution was checked again to ensure that the regional balance was not disrupted.
- d) The same methodology was followed to ensure adequate representation of the various project objectives (categories), phase(pilot vs. GEF), status (active/completed) and size.

Stratification element	BD Program Study Cohort 1 = 82	Project for in-depth review = 30	Projects for field visits = 10
<u>REGIONS</u>			
AFR	25	9	3
AP	19	7	3
ASME	5	2	1
ECA	9	3	1
GLO	4	1	0
LAC	20	8	2
<u>IAs</u>			
WB	39	14	5
UNDP	35	13	4
UNEP	6	2	1
JOINT	2	1	0
<u>CATEGORIES</u>			
PA	41	14	5
PL	22	9	3
CD	18	7	2
Unclassified	1	0	0
<u>PHASE</u>			
PILOT	55	20	6
GEF	27	10	4

⁸ Two country visits had to be dropped later because of time and budgetary constraints. In addition, the visit of the Conservation of Biodiversity in the Choco Region project in Colombia was cancelled due to security problems. The project was substituted (on a blind drawing) by the Argentina Patagonia Coastal Zone Management project which was part of the initial 30 projects and fulfilled similar characteristics than the project in Colombia.

Stratification element	BD Program Study Cohort 1 = 82	Project for in-depth review = 30	Projects for field visits = 10
STATUS			
COMPLETED	35	14	4
ONGOING	47	16	6
SIZE			
MEDIUM SIZE	4	1	1
FULL	78	29	9

Annex 5
GEF Biodiversity Program Study
Review Form for In-depth Reviews and Field Visits

1. Each of the 30 projects randomly selected underwent an in-depth review by members of the study team in the three categories of project objectives: (1) Protected Areas (14 projects); (2) Production Landscape (9 projects); and (3) Capacity Development (7 projects). As part of the study, the GEFSec has created a database of common information for all of these 30 projects. Reviewers attempted to answer questions for each project according to the following headings: (I) project objectives and implementation progress; (II) impacts, achievements and lessons learned within the particular study issue in which the project was classified; and (III) crosscutting issues. In-depth reviews focused on impacts, achievements and lessons learned and did not merely attempt to duplicate descriptive project information in project and other documents. In addition to the form below, each of the study teams had a separate set of questions that were answered only for those projects classified in a particular category. Both sets of questions – common and specific for each study issue- were intended to provide guidance to the reviewers and were answered only if enough information was available and if applicable to particular project design and objectives. Team members participating in the participation crosscutting issues studies had a different review form.
2. The sources of information for the in-depth reviews included Project Document, Mid-term Evaluations, PIRs, Completion Reports, and Final Evaluations. The Secretariat and each of the Implementing Agencies collected and sent packages of available documentation on each of the projects selected to the appropriate reviewers. If necessary, reviewers were encouraged to contact project managers and other relevant people involved in project implementation to receive additional information and to verify facts. Each project review took about 2 days.
3. The same form was used for field visits. The field missions provided an opportunity to the reviewer to identify gaps in information and improve the accuracy of their judgment.

IN-DEPTH AND FIELD VISITS REVIEW FORM

Project title:
Country:
Category of Project Objective:
Reviewer:
Date:
Sources of information available:
Field visit (if applicable) date and team members:

PART I. Project Objectives and Implementation Review

Project Objectives

1. What was the primary objective of the project?
2. What were the secondary/other objectives of the project?
3. What are the main outputs of the project?
4. Have project objectives (primary and/or secondary) changed since endorsement by GEF Council?

Project Implementation

1. Given the indicators of success inherent in the project design and stage in project implementation, how far and how well did the project achieve the various objectives?

2. In case one or more objectives have not been achieved, please indicate possible causes if related to project design.

Part II. Impacts, achievements and lessons according to project objectives⁹

1. What, if any, have been the major achievements and impacts of this project in terms of conservation and sustainable use of Biodiversity?
2. What, if any, have been the major achievements and impacts of the project in terms of capacity development (individual, institutional, systemic)?
3. Are there other impacts and achievements expected?
4. What, if any, were the unintended or incidental impacts of the project (positive and negative)? What, if anything, could have been done to minimize or prevent adverse unintended impacts?
5. What are the outstanding lessons/examples of best practices that could be replicated in other projects?
6. Given the specific context of the project and the inherent constraints, what lessons, if any, does this project teach us for the future?
7. Are there any implementation issues / risks / assumptions that may jeopardize the achievement of project objectives and could also be distilled into lessons?

Part III. Crosscutting Issues

Participation

1. How are stakeholder groups contributing to the achievement of project objectives?
2. What modes or mechanisms of participation have been applied in project implementation? What mechanisms have been used to encourage participation?
3. What are the roles of various institutions (including scientific and technological community) in the project?
4. What modalities of benefit sharing are used in this project (e.g., environmental service payment, bio-prospecting, compensation to owners, etc.)?

Project Sustainability

1. Within the context of the particular project, country and circumstances, have appropriate, adequate and realistic human and financial resources been identified to continue to support conservation after the project is completed?
2. Have project goals and methods and the various project components been accepted by the various stakeholders as their own?

Regional Projects (only)

1. Does the project deal with a transboundary environmental problem?
2. Is the regional approach based on an ecosystem approach?
3. Is the regional project within existing (new) political or legal arrangements?
4. What are the particular implementation arrangements between and within participating countries?
5. What are the most positive and difficult aspects of project implementation in a regional setting?
6. Have impacts and achievements of the project been more than what would have been achieved in individual country projects?
7. Are regional arrangements sustainable ?

Science and Technology Issues

- Within the project design and implementation, are there examples of south-south and north-south science & technology transfer, applications of indigenous technology,

⁹ Please indicate temporal and spatial scale of impacts, achievements and lessons (i.e., now or future, local, national, regional, global)

technologically innovative use of monitoring systems, potential impacts on the scientific and technological domains of the project?

Land Degradation¹⁰

- How has the project (objectives or components) directly or indirectly addressed land degradation issues? You may want to highlight achievements, impacts or lessons, if applicable of improvements of cropping or herding practices to prevent or mitigate land degradation, soil conservation, fire control, watershed catchment management, habitat restoration, reduce land use intensity, land use planning, deforestation, agroforestry, and addressing land degradation underlying causes (i.e., rapid human population growth, land tenure, land policies, land degradation policies, generation of alternative livelihood income).

Underlying Causes and Policies

Are there any lessons on identifying and analyzing causes of biodiversity loss, application of analytical tools for decision-making, economic incentives for conservation and sustainable use.

TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR PROTECTED AREAS PROJECTS

Planning

- How effectively has the project identified the priority sites for conservation? For example, did the project carry out or support a gap analysis for assessing the adequacy of the PA network in the country/region? Did the project carry out or support a process by which priority sites and species were identified for conservation?
- What is the system of monitoring and evaluating project progress and achievements (for example, was baseline information collected for relevant parameters at the start of the project). Is this monitoring system likely to survive the project and would it continue to inform the various stakeholders of relevant indicators of progress and success?
- What has the project achieved in terms of developing management plans that are ecologically, socially, politically, economically and culturally workable and themselves sustainable over time, specifically after the completion of the project?
- How far has the project been successful in developing a participatory approach to PA management involving all the stakeholders, especially the local communities?
- Have the management plans become operative under the project?
- Has the project succeeded in ensuring that management plans are adequately funded and implemented on schedule?
- Has the area been demarcated into effective management zones under the project?
- Has the project succeeded in ensuring that these zones are effectively managed?
- Has the project managed to ensure that the control and command structure in and for the PA is effective?

¹⁰ Land degradation is defined by the Convention to Combat Desertification (CCD) as “reduction or loss, in arid, semi-arid and dry sub-humid areas, of biological or economic productivity and complexity of rainfed cropland, irrigated cropland, or range, pasture, forest, and woodlands resulting from land uses or from a process or combination of processes, including processes arising from human activities and habitation patterns such as: soil erosion caused by wind and/or water; deterioration of physical, chemical and biological or economic properties of soil; and long-term loss of natural vegetation.” The GEF Operational Strategy, Section 2 (page 14) provides guidelines on GEF funded activities addressing land degradation.

- What has been the quantum and quality of research, survey and technical support provided through the project and how appropriate has this been to the management needs of the area?
- What is the quality and quantity of information that has been collected and disseminated as a part of the project, how relevant is it to the management issues of the area and what sorts of information networks and systems, if any, have been set up as a part of the project?
- To what extent has the GEF been instrumental in supporting the global coverage of protected areas through the creation of new ones?

Legal Issues

- Has the project succeeded in ensuring that the legal parameters of the PA are clear and settled, including issues related to the boundary and to legal control?
- Has the project provided adequate capacity to detect and prosecute legal violations in the PA?

Personnel

- Has the project succeeded in ensuring that there are adequate personnel in the PA, at appropriate levels, to effectively manage the area?
- Has the project managed to ensure the retention of trained and experienced staff in the PA?

Capacity Development

- How successfully has the project managed to develop the human resources of the various stakeholders, and how appropriate have been these new skills and attitudes in meeting with project objectives?
- How far has the project been instrumental in formulating and/or reviewing policies and/or laws so that they are supportive of project objectives?
- What institutions have been set up, supported or strengthened as a part of the project and how appropriate are they to the objectives of the project. Are they likely to continue functioning effectively after the project?
- Has the project been successful in integrating biodiversity conservation concerns into regional/nations/local development plans?
- What other capacities has the project developed in the region, country or site, (among individuals, institutions and systems) and how appropriate and sustainable are these?
- Has the project succeeded in raising the awareness levels among stake holders on issues relevant to the project?
- To what extent have the CD activities under this project, for individuals, institutions and systems, contributed to the conservation of the PA?

Equipment

- Has the project ensured that there is enough equipment/vehicles of the appropriate type to manage the PA according to the management plan?
- Is the equipment/vehicles well maintained and replaced when required?
- Are there constraints (like the shortage of fuel or of other consumables) that inhibit the effective use of the equipment/ vehicles?

Socio economic issues

- Has the project assessed the impact that the PA has on the people living in and around it or otherwise being dependent on it?
- Has the project ensured that adverse impacts on various stakeholders are minimised or compensated for?
- How effective has the project been in getting the support of the local communities to the better management of the PA?
- Has the project been sensitive to social issues, especially to the needs of women, the poor and the indigenous people?

Sustainability

- Would the PA management practices and improvements introduced through the project endure after project completion?
- Are there effective institutional mechanisms in position to ensure that project gains and activities sustain and develop after project completion?
- Would the capacities that have been developed through the project, at various levels, endure and develop after project completion?
- Has a consensus been reached among key stakeholders on the need and importance of conserving the PA?
- Are there any pending threats that have not been addressed by the project and can later compromise sustainability?
- Has the project been able to evolve or support mechanisms by which there is a sustained flow of financial resources available (even after project completion) for continuing to manage the area sustainably?

Overall Achievements

- What, if any, were the unintended or incidental impacts of the PA component of this project?
- In what ways, if any, could the design and/or implementation of the PA component of this project be improved and what lessons, if any, does this project teach us for the future?
- How far has the strengthening or setting up of protected areas resulted in the conservation of biodiversity and/or its sustainable use?
- In what ways, if any, could the design and/or implementation of this project be improved and what lessons, if any, does this project teach us for the future?
- What aspects of this project could bear replication in other similar projects?

Terms of Reference for PRODUCTION LANDSCAPE Projects

Planning, research and monitoring

- How effectively has the project identified the major interventions required to sustainably manage the production landscape?
- What is the system of monitoring and evaluating project progress and achievements (for example, was baseline information collected for relevant parameters at the start of the project). Is this monitoring system likely to survive the project and would it continue to inform the various stakeholders of relevant indicators of progress and success?
- What has the project achieved in terms of developing plans and strategies for sustainable use and management that are socially, politically, economically and culturally workable and themselves sustainable over time, specifically after the completion of the project?

- How far has the project been successful in developing a participatory approach to sustainable use and management involving all the stakeholders, especially the local communities?
- What has been the quantum and quality of research, survey and technical support provided through the project and how appropriate has this been to the management needs of the area?
- What is the quality and quantity of information that has been collected and disseminated as a part of the project, how relevant is it to the management issues of the area and what sorts of information networks and systems, if any, have been set up as a part of the project?

Capacity Development

- How successfully has the project managed to develop the human resources of the various stakeholders, and how appropriate have been these new skills and attitudes in meeting with project objectives?
- How far has the project been instrumental in formulating and/or reviewing policies and/or laws so that they are supportive of project objectives?
- How successfully has the project managed to demarcate the area it is working in into zones and developed and/or implemented a land use plan that is workable and just while ensuring sustainable use and management of the area?
- What institutions have been set up, supported or strengthened as a part of the project and how appropriate are they to the objectives of the project. Are they likely to continue functioning effectively after the project?
- Has the project been successful in integrating biodiversity conservation concerns into regional/nations/local development plans?
- What other capacities has the project developed in the region, country or site, (among individuals, institutions and systems) and how appropriate and sustainable are these?
- Has the project succeeded in raising the awareness levels among stake holders on issues relevant to the project?
- To what extent have the CD activities under this project, for individuals, institutions and systems, contributed to the conservation and sustainable use of the area?

Other Project Impacts

- How far has the project succeeded in implementing the various plans and strategies developed?
- How far has the implementation of these plans and strategies resulted in the establishment of a regime of conservation and sustainable management?
- Has the project been successful in developing and/or implementing a system for sustainable commercial use of the site and its natural resources such that stakeholders, especially the local communities (where relevant), have an economic stake in conserving the area and share the costs and benefits equitably?
- Has the project been sensitive to social issues, especially to the needs of women, the poor and the indigenous people?

PAs and Buffer Zones of PAs

- Some of the production landscape project areas include PAs or buffer zones of PAs. Project activities in PAs and their buffer zones should be assessed in accordance with the management objectives of these areas and using, where necessary, the TOR of PA projects.

Sustainability

- Would the sustainable management and use practices and improvements introduced through the project endure after project completion?
- Are there effective institutional mechanisms in position to ensure that project gains and activities sustain and develop after project completion?
- Would the capacities that have been developed through the project, at various levels, endure and develop after project completion?
- Has a consensus been reached among key stakeholders on the need and importance of conserving biodiversity in the project area?
- Are there any pending threats that have not been addressed by the project and can later compromise sustainability?
- Has the project been able to evolve or support mechanisms by which there is a sustained flow of financial resources available (even after project completion) for continuing to manage the area sustainably?

Overall Achievements

- How far has the project resulted in the conservation of biodiversity and its sustainable use?
- What, if any, were the unintended or incidental impacts of this project?
- In what ways, if any, could the design and/or implementation of this project be improved and what lessons, if any, does this project teach us for the future?
- What aspects of this project could bear replication in other similar projects?

Terms of Reference for CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT Projects

The issue study on Capacity Development will highlight and assess the approaches, results and lessons of capacity development activities undertaken through GEF projects at three levels: the individual level, the institutional (entity/organization) level and the systemic level.

Special emphasis should be given to the following issues:

a- Results of CD at three levels :

Level of individual:

- How successfully has the project managed to motivate individuals to participate effectively in activities designed to develop their skills, knowledge and attitudes?
- How successfully has the project managed to develop the human resources of the various stakeholders, and how appropriate have been these new skills, information and attitudes in meeting with conservation and sustainable use objectives?
- How appropriate are these capacities in the cultural, social, economic and political reality of the project area/country?
- How successful has the project been in ensuring that the skills, attitudes and capacities developed among individuals have found appropriate application?
- How successful has the project been in motivating individuals to continue to use and upgrade the acquired skills and add to the acquired knowledge and information.

Level of institution (entity/ organization):

- How effectively did the project reorient (where required) the specific goals and objectives of the institution, to make them more appropriate to the overall mandate?

- How effectively did the project identify the major capacity constraints to the effective achievement of the institutional goals and objectives?
- How effectively and comprehensively has the project removed these constraints?
- To what extent has the project contributed to the improvement of the performance of the entity/organization as a result of CD activities?
- How successful has the project been in setting up required new institutions and institutional structures that will endure after project completion?
- How likely is the institution to retain the improved capacities and to further develop them, once the project is over?
- How far have CD activities in this/these institutions influenced similar development in other institutions?

Systemic level

- How effectively has the project identified the major systemic constraints to biodiversity conservation and sustainable use?
- What has the project achieved or contributed to in terms of strengthening the capacity of the system to deal with conservation and sustainable use of BD ?
- How sustainable is the developed capacity in terms of its endurance and evolution?

b.- CD needs across levels

- How appropriately has the project identified the critical capacity needs, across the three levels, for biodiversity conservation and sustainable use?
- To what extent has the project been instrumental in developing capacities of concerned individuals, institutions and systems that interface well and support each other across levels and are therefore appropriate for conserving biodiversity and ensuring its sustainable use (and, where relevant, for benefit sharing and prevention and control of land degradation)?
- To what extent has the project succeeded, through CD, in ensuring that biodiversity is better conserved and more sustainably used (and benefits are better shared and land better protected)?
- How sustainable is the CD intervention as a whole, across levels, in terms of retaining and developing the capacities created and modifying them to changing needs?
- How participatory has the project been, in terms of involving and catering to all major stakeholders, at the planning, implementation and evaluations stages?
- How sensitive has it been to social issues, especially gender, class and indigenous people issues?

Terms of Reference for Special Study on Participation and Social Issues

Objectives

1. The Special Study on Participation and Social Issues forms an integral part of the GEF's Biodiversity Program Study. The Program Study will provide a database and statistical analysis of the coverage of biodiversity issues and assessment of results and initial impacts of the GEF's biodiversity portfolio within key themes. One of these themes is the cross-cutting concern for stakeholder participation and related social issues.
2. The specific objectives of this Special Study on Participation and Social Issues are to:
 - supplement the biodiversity portfolio information with an in-depth assessment of participation and social issues contained in a randomly selected set of 20-30 projects which have been under implementation for at least one year, or completed projects; and

- provide case studies, which describe activities in at least two projects on-the-ground, that can inform the overall study regarding participation and social issues, including lessons and good practice examples. One of these case studies, organized by STAP will particularly focus on science and technology issues.
3. The basis of this study will focus on the main objectives of the projects to be reviewed, including its stakeholder participation components.

Approach and Methodology

4. The special study will be organized around four themes. These are:
- *Nature of stakeholder participation*: How stakeholder groups are involved in the project, including the scientific and technological (S&T) community as a special stakeholder group, and how far it has contributed towards project effectiveness (or achieving the project's objectives); how far has this participation helped build the capacity of stakeholder groups and the S&T community to contribute in the long range towards achievement of GEF objectives;
 - *Utilization of traditional ecological knowledge and resource use practices*: How has the project attempted to understand and build upon local community based ecological knowledge and practices of conservation and sustainable resource use; Has the project helped develop methodologies of documentation and long term maintenance of such knowledge and practices? Has it helped develop methodologies of assessing contribution of such knowledge and practices to value added products of biodiversity based enterprises? In what ways has the project helped develop ways and means of equitable sharing of benefits of use of traditional ecological knowledge and practices in commercial enterprises ?
 - *Understanding of the behavior of stakeholder communities*: How do different stakeholders such as industry, bureaucracy, NGOs (international, grassroots etc), local community groups(herders, fishers, farmers, artisans etc) differ from each other in the way they are linked to the ecosystems of interest, how do they interact with each other, what factors motivate their behavior in relation to the ecosystem, what institutions mediate stakeholder behavior in relation to the ecosystem, how the variety of possible project interventions may affect stakeholder behavior as it impinges on the ecosystem of interest, how has the pertinent understanding of stakeholder behavior been built up during the course of the project.
 - *Learning through doing*: How has the project organized monitoring of the inter-linked natural and social system to augment the understanding of the responses to project interventions, how has the project organized learning of lessons through involving various stakeholders, how has the project involved the various stakeholders in adaptive management of the ecosystem.
5. **Content analysis**. Using a desk review of project documents, the Team will be looking at projects with respect to their participation objectives,¹¹ including the special S & T issues mentioned above. This will be based on a content analysis of available documents, such as the final project document, interim supervision or M&E reports submitted in relation to the GEF's PIR, special reports undertaken on behalf of the project, and other relevant materials.
6. **Case studies**. Field visits of at least two projects, which have been under implementation for one year or more will be conducted during the last week of November and first week of January to gather data on stakeholder participation activities on-the-ground. The field visit will also serve to document good practices. Since the field visit will be done over a period of 7 to 10 days, the methodology that will be used would be rapid rural appraisal (RRA), combined with process documentation.

¹¹ Projects included in the review are those with explicit participation objectives.

7. In each country, the field visit may cover the following activities: (a) *a focus group meeting* with identified key stakeholder group representatives, using a semi-structured set of questions so that information can be compared across sites; (b) *survey of key informants*, including scientists, officials, traders, industry representatives, different types of livelihood groups (e.g., farmers, fisherfolk, etc), in key areas to be visited; and (c) *contextual or ethnographic analysis* (social organization, culture, reciprocity and exchange, stratification, etc). These will be supplemented by in-country gathering of secondary data. A local consultant will be hired to assist in data gathering and field arrangements, and will join the Team in the conduct of the case study and analysis.

Outputs and Timetable

8. Three sets of outputs will be produced: (a) summary of the content analysis of 20 projects; (b) back-to-office report or summary of field visit; and (c) report of the special study, summarizing findings from the content analysis and case studies.

9. The content analysis will be completed prior to the field visits, and a brief summary should be available by second week of December. The back-to-office reports will be submitted one week after each field visit. The special study report's first draft will be ready for submission to the M&E Study Team by the end of January 2001.

10. In addition, a set of questions will be given to the other study teams regarding participation. These are requested in case some information would be available.

ANNEX 6
DATABASE FOR QUANTITATIVE ANALYSIS

FY	OP	Type	Reg.	Country	GEF IA	Project Name	GEF Financing \$ mil	PA GEF Financing \$ mil	Other Financing \$ mil	Total Costs	Phase	No Prot. areas	Ha Prot. Area (,000)	Spec. list: No	Spec. list: Ha (,000)	Type of Ecosystem	Comments
1991	ST	FP	AFR	Africa	UNDP	Institutional Support for the Protection of East African Biodiversity (Kenya, Tanzania, Uganda)	10.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	Pilot	0	No Info	No Info	No Info	wetlands and forest	
1996	ST	FP	AFR	Africa	UNDP	Inventory, Evaluation and Monitoring of Botanical Diversity in Southern Africa: A Regional Capacity and Institution Building Network (Botswana, Lesotho, Malawi, Mozambique, Swaziland, South Africa, Zambia, Zimbabwe)	4.73	0.00	4.69	9.42	GEF	0	-	0	-	arid-and semi-arid, Mediterranean type ecosystem, coastal, marine and freshwater, forest, mountain	
1997	4	FP	AFR	Africa	UNDP	Reducing Biodiversity Loss at Cross-Border Sites in East Africa (Kenya, Tanzania, Uganda)	12.90	0.00	5.53	18.43	GEF	0	-	0	-	No Info	
1993	1	FP	AFR	Africa	WB	West Africa Pilot Community-Based Natural Resource and Wildlife Management (Burkina Faso, Cote d'Ivoire)	7.00	7.00	6.19	13.19	Pilot	4	3,000	CITES; some species listed in IUCN Red list	No Info	Area between the arid sudanian savanna and the moist Guinean forest, 70% covered by savanna woodland incl. Wooded savanna, grassland, bowal, gallery forest, semi-deciduous forest islands	
1997	ST	FP	AFR	Africa	UNDP	African NGO-Government Partnership for Sustainable Biodiversity Action (Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Ethiopia, Ghana, Kenya, Sierra Leone, South Africa, Tanzania, Tunisia, Uganda)	4.52	0.00	7.12	11.64	GEF	No Info	No Info	No Info	No Info	Aid- and semi-arid, forest, mountain, coastal and freshwater ecosystems in every country	
1997	3	FP	AFR	Africa	WB	Central Africa Region: Regional Environment and Information Management Project (REIMP) (Cameroon, Central African Republic, Congo, Equatorial Guinea, Gabon, Congo DR)	4.35	0.00	11.32	15.67	GEF	No Info	No Info	No Info	No Info	No Info	
1991	2	FP	ASME	Algeria	WB	El Kala National Park and Wetlands Management	9.20	0.00	2.36	11.56	Pilot	No Info	No Info	EKNP is UNESCO's biosphere reserve and RAMSAR convention site	No Info	wetlands, water, agriculture and forest	

FY	OP	Type	Reg.	Country	GEF IA	Project Name	GEF Financing \$ mil	PA GEF Financing \$ mil	Other Financing \$ mil	Total Costs	Phase	No Prot. areas	Ha Prot. Area (,000)	Spec. list: No	Spec. list: Ha (,000)	Type of Ecosystem	Comments
1991	ST	FP	AP	AP	UNDP	South Pacific Biodiversity Conservation Programme (Palau, Micronesia FS, Nauru, Vanuatu, Solomon Islands, Tuvalu, Kiribati, Marshall Islands, Fiji, Tonga, Niue, Cook Islands, Samoa, Tokelau, Papua New Guinea)	10.00	0.00	3.80	13.80*	Pilot	0	-	0	-	No Info	
1993	3	FP	AP	AP	UNDP	Conservation Strategies for Rhinos in South East Asia (Indonesia, Malaysia)	2.00	2.00	0.00	2.00	Pilot	11	3,418	11	3,418	lowland dipterocarp submontane forest, mountain and cloud forest, planted forest, bamboo and palms in Indonesia; lowland, hill, mountain oak, mountain ericaceous, palm/heat forest in Malaysia	areas where Rhinos will be prot. by CITES, IUCN/WWF World Heritage
1992	2	FP	LAC	Argentina	UNDP	Patagonian Coastal Zone Management Plan	2.80	0.00	0.00	2.80	Pilot	0	No Info	0	-	marine and coastal	
1997	ST	FP	LAC	Argentina	WB	Biodiversity Conservation Project	10.39	10.39	37.50	47.89	GEF	5	358	3	314	9 ecoregions covered: Pampas, Brazilian Interior Atlantic forest, Semi-arid Chaco, Patagonian Steppe, Argentine Espinal, Humid Chaco, Cordoba Montane Savannas, Littoral/Marine habitats, Central Andean Dry Puna	large list of endemic species; Ramsar, CITES, CBD, Migrat.Spec.
1992	2	FP	LAC	Belize	UNDP	Sustainable Development and Management of Biologically Diverse Coastal Resources	3.00	0.00	0.00	3.00	Pilot	0	NA	Signed CITES, Sea Law, IWC	No Info	atolls, patch reefs, seagrass beds, cays of sand and mangrove, mangrove forest, coastal lagoons, estuaries	

FY	OP	Type	Reg.	Country	GEF IA	Project Name	GEF Financing \$ mil	PA GEF Financing \$ mil	Other Financing \$ mil	Total Costs	Phase	No Prot. areas	Ha Prot. Area (,000)	Spec. list: No	Spec. list: Ha (,000)	Type of Ecosystem	Comments
1997	4	FP	AP	Bhutan	UNDP	Integrated Management of Jigme Dorji National Park	1.50	1.50	1.03	2.53	GEF	1	435	1	No Info	8 of 11 classified vegetation types of biodiversity from temperate broadleaf to evergreen forests, sub-alpine grasslands, alpine meadows, glaciated ice & rock	Threaten and endangered species
1991	4	FP	AP	Bhutan	WB	Trust Fund for Environmental Conservation	10.00	10.00	7.57	17.57	Pilot	3	Partial information	No Info	No Info	tropical to temperate and subalpine forest	new PA to be estimated; existing ones cover 9505 km2
1992	3	FP	LAC	Bolivia	WB	Biodiversity Conservation	4.50	4.50	3.85	8.35	Pilot	8	4,271	1	400	Tropical ecosystems from dry to moist	Park in Ramsar
1991	ST	FP	LAC	Brazil	WB	Brazilian Biodiversity Fund	20.00	0.00	5.00	25.00	Pilot	0	-	0	-	No Info	
1991	ST	FP	LAC	Brazil	WB	National Biodiversity Project	10.00	10.00	10.00	20.00	Pilot	3	10,365	No Info	No Info	No Info	
1993	1	FP	AFR	Burkina Faso	UNDP	Optimizing Biological Diversity within Wildlife Ranching systems ; a Pilot Demonstration in a Semi-arid Zone	2.50	0.00	1.00	3.50	Pilot	No Info	No Info	No Info	No Info	No Info	Project document not available.
1993	3	FP	AFR	Cameroon	WB	Biodiversity Conservation and Management	5.96	5.96	6.43	12.39	Pilot	6	2,187	NA	NA	From savannah to montane and tropical moist forest	Montane and other moist forest, savannah, faunal reserves, maps; compr.appr.
1995	3	FP	AFR	Central African Republic	UNDP	A Highly Decentralized Approach to Biodiversity Protection and Use: The Bangassou Dense Forest.	2.50	2.50	1.00	3.50	GEF	1	1,305	NA	NA	dense primary forest, semi-deciduous growth, evergreen trop forest, wetlands, savannas	

FY	OP	Type	Reg.	Country	GEF IA	Project Name	GEF Financing \$ mil	PA GEF Financing \$ mil	Other Financing \$ mil	Total Costs	Phase	No Prot. areas	Ha Prot. Area (,000)	Spec. list: No	Spec. list: Ha (,000)	Type of Ecosystem	Comments	
1995	3	FP	AP	China	WB	Nature Reserves Management	17.80	17.80	5.70	23.50	GEF	5	725	Partial information	Partial information	wetlands, mountain forest, mixed deciduous and evergreen, mountain sub-alpine meadows of grasses and bamboo, pine and fir temperate forest, tropical lowland rainforest, tropical mountain rainforest, tropical seasonal rainforest, monsoon evergreen broadleaf forest, mossy evergreen broadleaf forest, forest on limestone; freshwater and wetland	MAB, CITES, threaten and endangered species in IUCN Red list	
1991	3	FP	LAC	Colombia	UNDP	Conservation of Biodiversity in the Choco Region	6.00	0.00	4.00	10.00	Pilot	0	-	0	-	tropical forest, mangrove swamps		
1996	2	FP	AFR	Comoros	UNDP	Island Biodiversity and Participatory Conservation in the Federal Islamic Republic of Comoros	2.44	2.44	0.84	3.28	GEF	1	No Info	0	-	Terrestrial ecosystems. Marine and littoral.	1 lake with wetland in Ramsar	
1991	3	FP	AFR	Congo	WB	Wildlands Protection and Management	10.00	10.00	6.80	16.80	Pilot	5	2,566	1	1,050	wetlands, tropical moist forest, coastal and freshwater zones, savannahs	Ramsar	
1992	3	FP	LAC	Costa Rica	UNDP	Conservation of Biodiversity and Sustainable Development in La Amistad and La Osa Conservation Areas	8.00	8.00	0.00	8.00	Pilot	2	NA	1	No Info	mountain, forest, coastal marine	Biosphere reserve and World Heritage Site	
1993	2	FP	AFR	Cote d'Ivoire	UNDP	Control of Exotic Aquatic Weeds in Rivers and Coastal Lagoons to Enhance and Restore Biodiversity	3.00	0.00	1.90	4.90	Pilot	No Info	No Info	No Info	No Info	No Info	PD not available	

FY	OP	Type	Reg.	Country	GEF IA	Project Name	GEF Financing \$ mil	PA GEF Financing \$ mil	Other Financing \$ mil	Total Costs	Phase	No Prot. areas	Ha Prot. Area (,000)	Spec. list: No	Spec. list: Ha (,000)	Type of Ecosystem	Comments
1992	2	FP	LAC	Cuba	UNDP	Protecting Biodiversity and Establishing Sustainable Development of the in Sabana-Camaguey Region	2.00	0.00	0.00	2.00	Pilot	0	-	0	-	coral reefs, seagrass beds, muddy bottoms, mangroves, evergreen microfilous for., shrub and herbaceous comm.	species listed under CITES and SPAW
1992	ST	FP	ECA	Czech Republic	WB	Biodiversity Protection	2.00	2.00	0.75	2.75	Pilot	3	329	1	No Info	forest (mountain, primeval, lowland floodplain), wetland and alpine bogs and meadows, Grass- and woodlands	3 biosphere areas of which is planned to be incl in Ramsar
1992	2	FP	LAC	Dominican Republic	UNDP	Biodiversity Conservation and Management in the Coastal Zone of the Dominican Republic	3.00	0.00	0.00	3.00	Pilot	No Info	No Info	No Info	No Info	mangroves, coral reefs, seagrass beds, wetland ecosyst.,	species to be protected within CITES, RAMSAR, SPAW
1992	3	FP	LAC	Ecuador	WB	Biodiversity Protection	7.20	7.20	1.60	8.80	Pilot	7	1,779	3	1,458	from volcanic to tropical moist and dry forest, coastland, marine reserve	1 World Heritage, 1 Critical ecos., 1 W. Biosphere reserve (does not include Galapagos)
1992	2	FP	ASME	Egypt	WB	Red Sea Coastal and Marine Resource Management	4.75	0.00	0.98	5.73	Pilot	0	-	0	-	Coral reef comm., seagrass comm., wetland and mangrove comm.	
1993	1	FP	AFR	Ethiopia	UNDP	A Dynamic farmer-based approach to the conservation of African Plant Genetic Resources	2.46	2.46	0.00	2.46	Pilot	6	No Info	0	-	No Info	
1991	3	FP	AFR	Gabon	UNDP	Conservation of biodiversity through effective management of wildlife trade	1.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	Pilot	0	-	0	-	From mangrove to montane forests	CITES
1992	2	FP	AFR	Ghana	WB	Coastal Wetlands Management	7.20	7.20	1.10	8.30	Pilot	5	173	0	-	coastal wetlands, incl.urban areas	planned to fit Ramsar
1993	ST	FP	GLO	Global	UNEP	Global Biodiversity Assessment	3.30	0.00	0.18	3.48	Pilot	0	-	0	-	No Info	
1998	ST	MSP	GLO	Global	UNEP	Global Biodiversity Forum Phase II	0.75	0.00	0.90	1.64	GEF	0	-	0	-	No Info	

FY	OP	Type	Reg.	Country	GEF IA	Project Name	GEF Financing \$ mil	PA GEF Financing \$ mil	Other Financing \$ mil	Total Costs	Phase	No Prot. areas	Ha Prot. Area (,000)	Spec. list: No	Spec. list: Ha (,000)	Type of Ecosystem	Comments
1997	ST	FP	GLO	Global	UNEP	People, Land Management, and Environmental Change (PLEC) (Brazil, China, Ghana, Guinea, Kenya, Papua New Guinea, Tanzania, Uganda)	6.28	6.28	4.82	11.09*	GEF	15	No Info	No Info	No Info	semi-arid and forest margin ecosystem; mountain (Ghana); mountain and semi-arid (Guinea); corridors between mountains in Kenya, Uganda, Tanzania, corridor from mountain to forest; mountain and forest (China); wetlands (Papua New Guinea) and floodplains in Amazon (Brazil)	
1998	2	MSP	GLO	Global	UNEP	Development of Best Practices and Dissemination of Lessons Learned for Dealing with the Global Problem of Alien Species that Threaten Biological Diversity (Cote d'Ivoire, Czech Republic, Kenya, Malawi, Mauritius, New Zealand, Poland, South Africa)	0.75	0.00	3.23	3.98	GEF	No Info	No Info	No Info	No Info	Agro-ecosystem	
1995	3	FP	LAC	Guatemala	UNDP	Integrated Biodiversity Protection in the Sarstun-Motagua Region	4.00	4.00	5.70	9.70*	GEF	9	41	No Info	No Info	wetlands, freshwater and coastal marine zones, rainforest	7.800 km2 PA and buffer
1991	3	FP	LAC	Guyana	UNDP	Programme for Sustainable Forestry (Iwokrama Rain Forest Programme)	3.00	3.00	0.40	3.40*	Pilot	1	388	0	-	Tropical rain forest ecosystems	
1997	3	FP	LAC	Honduras	Joint	Honduras Biodiversity Project	7.30	7.30	41.70	49.00	GEF	11	1,500	Red list of IUCN, CITES, SPAW	No Info	5 ecoreg.: dry f. of Pac. in LA, pine-oak of CA, mountain f. of CA in high alt., humid f. of Atl. In CA, pine f. in Mosquitia; mangrove, coral reefs; proj. in 4 ecoreg.: mangroves, coastal-marine areas incl. Wetlands, lagoons, reefs and keys; pine savannas of Modquitia and humid trop.f.; over 30 terrestrial and over 15 aquatic ecosystem.	

FY	OP	Type	Reg.	Country	GEF IA	Project Name	GEF Financing \$ mil	PA GEF Financing \$ mil	Other Financing \$ mil	Total Costs	Phase	No Prot. areas	Ha Prot. Area (,000)	Spec. list: No	Spec. list: Ha (,000)	Type of Ecosystem	Comments
1995	3	FP	AP	India	WB	India Ecodevelopment	20.21	20.21	54.00	74.21	GEF	7	260	2	No Info	1.Trop.moist&sub trop.hill f.; 2.Very dry teak f.; 3. Dry decid.scrub f.; 4.Trop.semi-evergreen, southern trop.moist&dry decid., manmade wetlands; 5. Sal dominated&mixed decid., bamboo f.; 6. Southern trop.dry decid., Teak dominated and mixed; 7. Trop.wet&semi-evergreen&moist decid.f., montantane grassland; 8. Trop.dry&northern dry decid., dry decid.scrub, manmade wetlands.	core areas of total 876,900 ha reserves; Birdlife, critical ecosystems, threatened species in all 7, incl tiger, lion, birds etc.
1992	3	FP	AP	Indonesia	WB	Biodiversity Collections	7.20	0.00	4.20	11.40	Pilot	0	-	0	-	All tropical forest, agriculture, wetlands, coral reefs (Indonesia)	
1995	3	FP	AP	Indonesia	WB	Kerinci Seblat Integrated Conservation and Development	14.40	14.40	25.50	39.90 *	GEF	1	1,300	0	-	wetlands,lowland dipteroc., subalpine montane,	
1997	2	FP	AP	Indonesia	WB	Coral Reef Rehabilitation and Management Project (COREMAP)	12.28	12.28	48.00	60.28	GEF	4	No Info	1	Not classified	Coral reef	
1998-07	3	MSP	AP	Indonesia	UNEP	Emergency Response Measure to Combat Fires in Indonesia	0.75	0.00	0.00	0.75	GEF	No Info	No Info	No Info	No Info	various forest	
1992	2	FP	ASME	Jordan	UNDP	Conservation of the Dana and Azraq Protected Areas	6.30	6.30	0.00	6.30	Pilot	1	8	1	7	Saharan Trop Arid, Irano-Turinian, Mediter.semi-arid, ; wetlands	
1991	1	FP	AFR	Kenya	WB	Tana River National Primate Reserve	6.20	6.20	0.94	7.14	Pilot	1	17	1	17	Semi-arid savanna, patches of riverine f., wetlands, semi-arid bushland,	whole area of the reserve, 2 endangered species

FY	OP	Type	Reg.	Country	GEF IA	Project Name	GEF Financing \$ mil	PA GEF Financing \$ mil	Other Financing \$ mil	Total Costs	Phase	No Prot. areas	Ha Prot. Area (,000)	Spec. list: No	Spec. list: Ha (,000)	Type of Ecosystem	Comments
1991	3	FP	LAC	LAC	UNDP	Regional Support for the Conservation and Sustainable Use of Natural Resources in the Amazon (Bolivia, Brazil, Colombia, Ecuador, Guyana, Peru, Suriname, Venezuela)	4.50	0.00	0.00	4.50	Pilot	0	-	0	-	No Info	
1991	3	FP	AP	Lao PDR	WB	Wildlife and Protected Areas conservation	5.00	5.00	15.30	20.30	Pilot	4	650	0	-	Montane and tropical forests	
1995	4	FP	ASME	Lebanon	UNDP	Strengthening of National Capacity and Grassroots In-Situ Conservation for Sustainable Biodiversity Protection	2.53	2.53	0.76	3.29	GEF	3	4,509	0	-	Mediterr. Marine-island ecos., montane f. ecosyst.,	1 area (no specified) listed in BirdLife Int.
1997	3	FP	AFR	Madagascar	Joint	Environment Program Support	21.30	21.30	135.20	156.50*	GEF	39	1,400	No Info	No Info	forest, wetlands, coral reefs, mangrove and marine and coastal	
1992	2	FP	AFR	Malawi	WB	Lake Malawi/Nyasa Biodiversity Conservation	5.00	5.00	0.44	5.44	Pilot	3	750	0	-	freshwater, coastal and forest ecosystems	
1998	ST	MSP	AFR	Mauritania	UNEP	Rescue Plan for the Cap Blanc Colony of the Mediterranean Monk Seal	0.15	0.00	0.08	0.23	GEF	0	-	Mediterranean Monk seals endangered; part of AP for Marine Mammals of UNEP	No Info	coastal and marine ecosystems in Cap Blnac Colony in Mediterranean	
1995	3	FP	AFR	Mauritius	WB	Biodiversity Restoration	1.20	1.20	0.40	1.60	GEF	3	No Info	No Info	No Info	coastal ebony f., volcanic, palm savanna, forest ecosyst.	
1993	3	FP	AFR	Mauritius	UNDP	Restoration of highly degraded and threatened native forests in Mauritius	0.20	0.00	0.00	0.20	Pilot	No Info	No Info	No Info	No Info	No Info	PD not available
1991	ST	FP	LAC	Mexico	WB	Protected Areas Program	25.00	25.00	17.20	42.20*	Pilot	17	No Info	No Info	No Info	No Info	
1998	1	FP	AP	Mongolia	UNDP	Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Livelihood Options in the Grasslands of Eastern Mongolia	5.16	5.16	6.87	12.03	GEF	8	1,902	CITES, Ramsar, Migratory Species	No Info	3 vegeta. Zones: forest-steppe transition zone, complex of forest-steppe and grass.shrub veget. Zone, grass zone	
1993	1	FP	AP	Mongolia	UNDP	Strengthening Conservation Capacity and Development and Institution of a National Biodiversity Conservation Plan (Implementation Phase I)	1.50	0.00	0.35	1.85	Pilot	No Info	No Info	No Info	No Info	No Info	

FY	OP	Type	Reg.	Country	GEF IA	Project Name	GEF Financing \$ mil	PA GEF Financing \$ mil	Other Financing \$ mil	Total Costs	Phase	No Prot. areas	Ha Prot. Area (,000)	Spec. list: No	Spec. list: Ha (,000)	Type of Ecosystem	Comments
1993	ST	FP	AFR	Mozambique	WB	Transfrontier Conservation Areas Pilot and Institutional Strengthening	5.00	5.00	3.10	8.10	Pilot	6	2,086	0	-	coastal, dry forest, grasslands, riverine veget., mangroves, wetlands including swamp forest, and bushy savanna, deciduous miombo deciduous tree savanna, dry woodland. C. Moist f., dry montane f., open woodland, treeless grasses, rocky soils.,	
1992	4	FP	AP	Nepal	UNDP	Biodiversity Conservation in Nepal	3.80	0.00	4.60	8.40	Pilot	0	-	0	-	from subtropical Monsoon to cold desert	
1992	3	FP	AP	Pakistan	UNDP	Maintaining Biological Diversity with Rural Community Development	2.50	2.50	0.00	2.50	Pilot	12	570	Threatened and endearous species IUCN Red List	NA	7 veget. zones: Perman. Snowfiled and desert zone, dry alpine and cold desert zone, alpine shrub and moist alpine zone, Himalayan dry coniferous with ilex zone, Himalayan Moist temperate forest, Sub-tropical pine forest, Sub-tropical dry mixed deciduous forest	
1991	3	FP	LAC	Panama	UNDP	Biodiversity Conservation in the Darien Region	3.00	0.00	0.00	3.00	Pilot	No Info	No Info	No Info	No Info	No Info	
1992	3	FP	AP	Papua New Guinea	UNDP	Biodiversity Conservation and Resource Management	5.00	0.00	0.00	5.00	Pilot	No Info	No Info	No Info	No Info	No Info	
	3	FP	LAC	Peru	WB	National Trust Fund for Protected Areas	5.00	5.00	2.86	7.86	Pilot	5	2,039	0	-	11 ecoregions, 16 biogeographical prov., 101 life zones; in proj.area mangrove, montane, trop.moist f.	
1991	ST	FP	AP	Philippines	WB	Conservation of Priority Protected Areas	20.00	20.00	2.86	22.86	Pilot	10	1,006	0	-	15 biogeographic zones; proj.area incl.lowland evergreen f., mid-montane, upper montane, wetland, freshwater and coastal f., coral reef, seagrass form.	
1991	3	FP	ECA	Poland	WB	Forest Biodiversity Protection	4.50	4.50	1.70	6.20	Pilot	1	58	1	58	Primeval forest ecosystem	Biosphere reserve by UNESCO and World Heritage list
1992	2	FP	ECA	Romania	WB	Danube Delta Biodiversity	4.50	4.50	0.30	4.80	Pilot	1	450	1	590	3 distinct fluvial zones, coastal zones	Biosphere reserve
1995	3	FP	ECA	Russian Federation	WB	Biodiversity Conservation	20.10	20.10	5.90	26.00	Pilot	42	10,098	0	-	7 geog. Ecoregions	

FY	OP	Type	Reg.	Country	GEF IA	Project Name	GEF Financing \$ mil	PA GEF Financing \$ mil	Other Financing \$ mil	Total Costs	Phase	No Prot. areas	Ha Prot. Area (,000)	Spec. list: No	Spec. list: Ha (,000)	Type of Ecosystem	Comments
1992	2	FP	AFR	Seychelles	WB	Biodiversity Conservation and Marine Pollution Abatement	1.80	1.80	0.20	2.00	Pilot	1	35	1	Aldabra World Heritage site, CITES	coral reefs, sandy and granite ground, mangrove, slope f.:	Aldabra ecosystem
1992	ST	FP	ECA	Slovak Republic	WB	Biodiversity Protection	2.30	2.30	0.87	3.17	Pilot	3	115	1	MAB; species in Red List of IUCN; Ramsar	Tatra: cold temperate f., East Carpathians from grassy meadows to primeval beech and fir f., Morava: wetlands, agric.ecosyst., floodplain f.	
1998	3	FP	AFR	South Africa	WB	Cape Peninsula Biodiversity Conservation Project	12.40	12.40	80.80	93.20	GEF	1	29	1	29	terrestrial, marine and coastal ecosystems	Ramsar
1997	3	FP	AP	Sri Lanka	WB	Conservation and Sustainable Use of Medicinal Plants	5.42	5.42	20.40	25.82	GEF	5	No Info	0	-	-	Agro-and for.ecosyst.
1992	3	FP	AP	Sri Lanka	UNDP	Wildlife Conservation and Protected Areas Management	4.10	4.10	0.00	4.10	Pilot	6	No Info	0	-	-	wet and coastal zones and ecosystems,
1992	1	FP	ECA	Turkey	WB	In-Situ Conservation of Genetic Biodiversity	5.10	0.00	0.60	5.70	Pilot	No Info	No Info	No Info	No Info	in-situ cons. Of genetic res. In cereals, hortic. Crops, medicin. Plants, forest trees pasture grasses and legumes	
1991	4	FP	AFR	Uganda	WB	Bwindi Impenetrable National Park and Mgahinga Gorilla National Park Conservation	4.00	4.00	2.31	6.31	Pilot	2	365	1	34	Volcanic and glacial ecosystem with endemic species, montane f. ecosystem., Afro-Alpine ecosystem.,	area to be included. in World Heritage list
1992	4	FP	ECA	Ukraine	WB	Transcarpathian Biodiversity Protection	0.50	0.50	0.08	0.58	Pilot	5	21	0	-	unique beech and spruce f.ecosyst., limestone ecosystem., with threatened and endangered spec.	MAB and Red list of IUCN; Part of Carpathian Biosphere reserve
1992	2	FP	ECA	Ukraine	WB	Danube Delta Biodiversity	1.50	1.50	0.24	1.74	Pilot	17	97	0	42 species in Red book of IUCN	floodplain and estuarine veg., riverine and floodplain f., young and old coastal ridges incl. xerothermic veg.,steppe areas incl refugia of festuca and stiga steppes, lakes and limas	
1992	2	FP	LAC	Uruguay	UNDP	Conservation of Biodiversity in the Eastern Wetlands	3.00	0.00	0.00	3.00	Pilot	0	-	0	MAB biosphere reserve; Ramsar	native woodlands, palm-tree zones, plains wetlands	

FY	OP	Type	Reg.	Country	GEF IA	Project Name	GEF Financing \$ mil	PA GEF Financing \$ mil	Other Financing \$ mil	Total Costs	Phase	No Prot. areas	Ha Prot. Area (,000)	Spec. list: No	Spec. list: Ha (,000)	Type of Ecosystem	Comments
1997	2	FP	LAC	Uruguay	UNDP	Consolidation of the Banados del Este Biosphere Reserve	2.50	0.00	1.00	3.50*	GEF	No Info	No Info	No Info	No Info	coastal ecos., wetlands, agroecos.,	
1997	2	FP	ASME	Yemen	UNDP	Conservation and Sustainable Use of the Biodiversity of Socotra Archipelago	4.97	0.00	8.01	12.982*	GEF	0	-	No Info	No Info	terrestrial, coastal and marine ecosystems	

ANNEX 7
ASSESSMENT OF ACHIEVEMENTS AND INITIAL IMPACTS

ACCORDING TO THE TYPE OF REVIEW

TOPICS	In-Depth Reviews (A)	Field visits Reviews (B)	Desk reviews of completed projects with detailed independent evaluations – UNDP (C)	Desk reviews of completed projects with brief independent evaluations – World Bank (D)	Desk reviews of projects that have been completed but whose independent evaluations are not available (E)	On-going projects desk reviews (F)	Total (G)
Number in brackets are completed projects N/A: not applicable							
Total number of projects reviewed	21(11)	7(2)	8	8	4	30	78(33)
Were objectives changed?							
YES	8(6)	1	3	N/A	N/A	N/A	12(9)
NO	10(5)	5(2)	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	16(8)
NO INFO	3	1	4	N/A	N/A	N/A	8
Were objectives met?							
FULLY	1(1)	0	1	1		3	6(2)
MOSTLY	8(6)	2(1)	5	2	1	11	29(15)
PARTLY	8(4)	3(1)	1	4	2	12	30(12)
MINIMALLY	1	0	1	1	0	3	6(3)
NOT AT ALL	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
NOT KNOWN	3	2	0	0	1	0	6
Were objectives realistic?							
YES	2(1)	1(1)	2	N/A	N/A	N/A	5(4)
NO	12(7)	5(1)	6	N/A	N/A	N/A	23(14)
NO INFO	7(3)	1	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	8(3)
Was timeframe adequate to meet objectives							
YES	1(1)	0	3	N/A	N/A	N/A	4(1)
NO	11(6)	4	5	N/A	N/A	N/A	20(11)
NO INFO	9(4)	3(2)	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	12(6)
Were financial resources adequate?							
YES	3(2)	1	4	N/A	N/A	N/A	8(6)

Annex 7

TOPICS		In-Depth Reviews (A)	Field visits Reviews (B)	Desk reviews of completed projects with detailed independent evaluations – UNDP (C)	Desk reviews of completed projects with brief independent evaluations – World Bank (D)	Desk reviews of projects that have been completed but whose independent evaluations are not available (E)	On-going projects desk reviews (F)	Total (G)
Number in brackets are completed projects N/A: not applicable								
	NO	3(1)	5(1)	2	N/A	N/A	N/A	11(4)
	NO INFO	15(8)	1(1)	2	N/A	N/A	N/A	17(11)
Impact on Biodiversity								
	SUBSTANTIAL	1(1)	1	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	3(2)
	SOME or LITTLE	5(2)	5(2)	4	N/A	N/A	N/A	14(8)
	NO INFO	15(8)	1	3	N/A	N/A	N/A	19(11)
	NONE							
Baseline data collection								
	YES	0	0	4	0	0	10	14(4)
	NO	10(5)	6(1)	4	7	2	10	39(19)
	PLANNED	2(2)	0	0	1	2	10	15(5)
	NO INFO	8(4)	1(1)	0	0	0	0	9(5)
	NOT APPLICABLE	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Stakeholder Participation								
	COMPREHENSIVE	11(7)	5(2)	2	1	0	4	23(12)
	PARTIAL	3(2)	1	4	2	1	6	17(9)
	POOR	6(2)	1	0	0	0	0	7(2)
	PLANNED	0	0	0	0	3	16	19(3)
	NONE	0	0	2	4	0	3	9(6)
	NO INFO	1	0	0	1	0	1	3(1)
Were benefit sharing issues addressed?								
	SUBSTANTIALLY	3(1)	1(1)	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	5(2)
	PARTIALLY	3(2)	0	3	N/A	N/A	N/A	5(5)
	POOR	2(1)	0	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	2(1)
	PLANNED	2	0	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	2
	NO	2(1)	5(1)	2	N/A	N/A	N/A	10(4)
	NO INFO	7(6)	1	3	N/A	N/A	N/A	10(9)
	NOT APPLICABLE	2	0	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	2
Were sustainability issues addressed?								
	SUBSTANTIALLY	2(1)	0	2	2	0	2	8(5)

Annex 7

TOPICS		In-Depth Reviews (A)	Field visits Reviews (B)	Desk reviews of completed projects with detailed independent evaluations – UNDP (C)	Desk reviews of completed projects with brief independent evaluations – World Bank (D)	Desk reviews of projects that have been completed but whose independent evaluations are not available (E)	On-going projects desk reviews (F)	Total (G)
Number in brackets are completed projects N/A: not applicable								
	PARTIALLY	4(2)	2(1)	6	1	0	6	19(10)
	POOR	0	2(1)	0	0	0	0	2(1)
	PLANNED	1	0	0	0	2	14	17(2)
	NONE	12(8)	2	0	5	2	3	24(15)
	NO INFO	2	1	0	0	0	5	8
Ownership								
	SUBSTANTIAL	3(2)	2(1)	5	N/A	N/A	N/A	10(8)
	PARTIAL	3(2)	3	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	6(2)
	POOR	4(3)	0	3	N/A	N/A	N/A	7(6)
	NONE	5(2)	0	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	5(2)
	NO INFO	6(2)	2(1)					8(3)
Science and technology issues addressed								
	SUBSTANTIALLY	11(8)	5(1)	6	N/A	N/A	N/A	22(15)
	PARTIALLY	4(1)	1(1)	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	5(2)
	MINIMALLY	3(2)	1	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	4(2)
	NO INFO	3	0	2	N/A	N/A	N/A	5
Land degradation issues addressed								
	SUBSTANTIALLY	5(3)	5(2)	7	N/A	N/A	N/A	17(12)
	PARTIALLY	3(3)	0	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	3(3)
	MINIMALLY	3(2)	0	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	3(2)
	NONE	3(1)	0	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	4(2)
	NO INFO	4(1)	2	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	6(1)
	NOT APPLICABLE	3(1)	0	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	3(1)
Root causes tackled?								
	SUBSTANTIALLY	0	0	2	N/A	N/A	N/A	2(2)
	PARTIALLY	0	0	2	N/A	N/A	N/A	2(2)
	MINIMALLY	5(5)	0	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	5(5)
	NONE	10(5)	6(2)	4	N/A	N/A	N/A	19(11)
	NO INFO	5(1)	1	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	7(1)
	NOT APPLICABLE	1	0	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	1

Annex 7

TOPICS	In-Depth Reviews (A)	Field visits Reviews (B)	Desk reviews of completed projects with detailed independent evaluations – UNDP (C)	Desk reviews of completed projects with brief independent evaluations – World Bank (D)	Desk reviews of projects that have been completed but whose independent evaluations are not available (E)	On-going projects desk reviews (F)	Total (G)
Number in brackets are completed projects N/A: not applicable							
Prioritization of sites							
YES	7(5)	3(2)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	10(7)
PARTIAL	0	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	0
NONE	0	2	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	2
NOT RELEVANT	1(1)	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	1(1)
NO INFO	8(4)	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	8(4)
Were social and cultural issues addressed							
SUBSTANTIALLY	4(3)	1	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	6(4)
PARTIALLY	3(1)	1	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	6(2)
POORLY	0	0	5	N/A	N/A	N/A	5(5)
PROPOSED	1	0	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	1
NONE	1(1)	3(1)	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	4(2)
NO INFO	10(6)	2(1)	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	14(8)
Were past lessons incorporated							
YES	0	0	1	1	3	12	17(5)
PARTIALLY	1	0	2	4	0	10	17(6)
NO	11(8)	3(1)	4	3	1	3	25(17)
NO INFO	9(3)	4(1)	1	0	0	5	19(5)

N/A: not applicable because the particular question was not responded in the available documents.

ACCORDING TO WORK PROGRAM APPROVAL: PILOT PHASE VS. GEF

ALL PROJECTS IN COHORT 1

		Pilot	Pilot %	GEF	GEF %	Total	Total or Overall %
Total number of projects reviewed		51	65%	27	35%	78	
Were objectives met?							
	FULLY	3	6%	3	12%	6	8%
	MOSTLY	24	51%	5	20%	29	40%
	PARTLY	18	38%	12	48%	30	42%
	MINIMALLY	3	6%	3	12%	6	8%
	NOT AT ALL	1	2%	0	0%	1	1%
	NOT KNOWN	2	N/A	4	N/A	6	N/A
	Projects with Information	49		23		72	
Baseline data collection							
	YES	6	14%	8	31%	14	21%
	NO	25	60%	14	54%	39	57%
	PLANNED	11	26%	4	15%	15	22%
	NO INFO	8	N/A	1	N/A	9	N/A
	NOT APPLICABLE	1	N/A	0	N/A	1	N/A
	Projects with Information	42		26		68	
Stakeholder Participation							
	COMPREHENSIVE	15	31%	8	31%	23	31%
	PARTIAL	13	27%	4	15%	17	23%
	POOR	3	6%	4	15%	7	9%
	PLANNED	12	24%	7	27%	19	25%
	NONE	6	12%	3	12%	9	12%
	NO INFO	2	N/A	1	N/A	3	N/A
	Projects with Information	49		26		75	
Were sustainability issues addressed?							
	SUBSTANTIALLY	6	12%	2	10%	8	11%
	PARTIALLY	13	27%	6	29%	19	27%
	POOR	1	2%	1	5%	2	3%

Annex 7

		Pilot	Pilot %	GEF	GEF %	Total	Total or Overall %
	PLANNED	8	16%	9	43%	17	24%
	NONE	21	43%	3	14%	24	34%
	NO INFO	2	N/A	6	N/A	8	N/A
	Projects with Information	49		21		70	
Were past lessons incorporated							
	YES	9	24%	8	38%	17	29%
	PARTIALLY	10	26%	7	33%	17	29%
	NO	19	50%	6	29%	25	42%
	NO INFO	13	N/A	6	N/A	19	N/A
	Projects with Information	38		21		59	

PROJECTS WITH INDEPENDENT EVALUATIONS AND IN-DEPTH REVIEWS

		Pilot	Pilot %	GEF	GEF %	Total	Total or Overall %
Total number of projects reviewed		26	72%	10	28%	36	
Were objectives changed?							
	YES	10	48%	2	29%	12	43%
	NO	11	52%	5	71%	16	57%
	NO INFO	5	N/A	3	N/A	8	N/A
	Projects with Information	21		7		28	
Were objectives realistic?							
	YES	5	25%	0	0%	5	18%
	NO	15	75%	8	100%	23	82%
	NO INFO	6	N/A	2	N/A	8	N/A
	Projects with Information	20		8		28	
Was timeframe adequate to meet objectives							
	YES	4	21%	0	0%	4	17%
	NO	15	79%	5	100%	20	83%
	NO INFO	7	N/A	5	N/A	12	N/A
	Projects with Information	19		5		24	

Annex 7

		Pilot	Pilot %	GEF	GEF %	Total	Total or Overall %
Were financial resources adequate?							
	YES	8	57%	0	0%	8	42%
	NO	6	43%	5	100%	11	58%
	NO INFO	12	N/A	5	N/A	17	N/A
	Projects with Information	14		5		19	
Impact on Biodiversity							
	SUBSTANTIAL	2	18%	1	17%	3	18%
	SOME or LITTLE	9	82%	5	83%	14	82%
	NONE	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
	NO INFO	15	N/A	4	N/A	19	N/A
	Projects with Information	11		6		17	
Were benefit sharing issues addressed?							
	SUBSTANTIALLY	3	19%	2	25%	5	21%
	PARTIALLY	4	25%	1	13%	5	21%
	POOR	1	6%	1	13%	2	8%
	PLANNED	1	6%	1	13%	2	8%
	NO	7	44%	3	38%	10	42%
	NO INFO	8	N/A	2	N/A	10	N/A
	NOT APPLICABLE	2	N/A	0	N/A	2	N/A
	Projects with Information	16		8		24	
Ownership							
	SUBSTANTIAL	10	45%	0	0%	10	36%
	PARTIAL	3	14%	3	50%	6	21%
	POOR	6	27%	1	17%	7	25%
	NONE	3	14%	2	33%	5	18%
	NO INFO	4	N/A	4	N/A	8	N/A
	Projects with Information	22		6		28	
Science and technology issues addressed							
	SUBSTANTIALLY	16	73%	6	67%	22	71%
	PARTIALLY	3	14%	2	22%	5	16%
	MINIMALLY	3	14%	1	11%	4	13%
	NO INFO	4	N/A	1	N/A	5	N/A

Annex 7

		Pilot	Pilot %	GEF	GEF %	Total	Total or Overall %
	Projects with Information	22		9		31	
Land degradation issues addressed							
	SUBSTANTIALLY	13	62%	4	67%	17	63%
	PARTIALLY	3	14%	0	0%	3	11%
	MINIMALLY	3	14%	0	0%	3	11%
	NONE	2	10%	2	33%	4	15%
	NO INFO	2	N/A	4	N/A	6	N/A
	NOT APPLICABLE	3	N/A	0	N/A	3	N/A
	Projects with Information	21		6		27	
Root causes tackled?							
	SUBSTANTIALLY	2	9%	0	0%	2	7%
	PARTIALLY	2	9%	0	0%	2	7%
	MINIMALLY	5	23%	0	0%	5	18%
	NONE	13	59%	6	100%	19	68%
	NO INFO	3	N/A	4	N/A	7	N/A
	NOT APPLICABLE	1	N/A		N/A	1	N/A
	Projects with Information	22		6		28	
Were social and cultural issues addressed							
	SUBSTANTIALLY	5	38%	1	20%	6	33%
	PARTIALLY	3	23%	3	60%	6	33%
	POORLY	5	38%	0	0%	5	28%
	PROPOSED	0	0%	1	20%	1	6%
	NONE	2	15%	2	40%	4	22%
	NO INFO	11	N/A	3	N/A	14	N/A
	Projects with Information	13		5		18	

ANNEX 8
LIST OF PEOPLE AND DOCUMENTS CONSULTED
(FORTHCOMING)